



University
of Glasgow

Hale, Caroline Inness (2006) *"A perfect Elysium and the residence of a divinity": a social analysis of country houses and policies in late seventeenth and eighteenth century Scotland*. PhD thesis.

<http://theses.gla.ac.uk/3201/>

Copyright and moral rights for this thesis are retained by the Author

A copy can be downloaded for personal non-commercial research or study, without prior permission or charge

This thesis cannot be reproduced or quoted extensively from without first obtaining permission in writing from the Author

The content must not be changed in any way or sold commercially in any format or medium without the formal permission of the Author

When referring to this work, full bibliographic details including the author, title, awarding institution and date of the thesis must be given

**"A Perfect Elysium and the Residence of a Divinity":
A Social Analysis of Country Houses and Policies in late Seventeenth and
Eighteenth Century Scotland.**

Volume One

© Caroline Inness Hale

**Submitted for the degree of PhD in the Department of Archaeology, Glasgow
October 2006**

Abstract

‘A perfect Elysium and the residence of a divinity’ (Mawman 1805, II)

Archaeology, the study of people in the past through their material culture, recognises the potential of space and the built environment to create and transmit social statements. Country houses were dynamic and active elements in the history of Scotland. The above quote records a traveller’s impression of the eighteenth century Inveraray Castle, epitomising the intended and the perceived image of the country houses of the period. It suggests the erudite classical order applied to many buildings and referred to throughout the landscape, and the notion of a beautiful, exclusive enclave. Wealth, splendour and education were all embodied in these structures and their surroundings.

It also indicates the success of the projected identity of the country house owner as the omnipotent, almost ‘godly’ overlord whose decisions affected the everyday lives of those under his authority. Landowners did not act in a social vacuum. As society changed houses, as the clearest physical expression of identity and status, were used to negotiate relations with others, and with the natural world. Houses were used to appeal to traditional power bases, while at the same time allowing a response to, and involvement in, the changing political and social world.

This thesis uses a multidisciplinary approach in an attempt to understand architecture not just as art, but as a reflection of, and element in, the social lives and relationships of the people who lived in, worked around, viewed and visited the country house.

Contents

List of Illustrations	i
List of Plates	x
Acknowledgements	xiii
Chapter One: Introduction	1
1.1 Architectural History Approaches	3
1.2 Definition and Functions of a Country House	9
1.3 Architecture as Material Culture: An Archaeological Approach	17
Space and place	17
Space and spatiality	20
1.4 In Search of Meaning- The Role of Archaeology	24
Form, function and space	24
‘Knowing’ meanings: enculturation and socialisation	27
‘Communicating’ meanings: Signs and symbols	29
A contextual understanding: textual evidence	31
1.5 ‘Peopling’ the Past: Social Relations and Audiences	33
The Georgian Order: An explanatory model	34
The use of symmetry: A perfect image	39
Negotiating the everyday: potential audiences and actors	40
1.6 Data Selection and logistics: Refining the case study sample	42
Refining the case study samples	42
The final case studies	56
The fieldwork element	60
Some Scottish peculiarities?	65
Chapter Two: Methodology- Some Approaches to Space	70
2.1 Informal or Experiential Approaches	71
2.2 Formal Approaches	74
Shape or transformational grammar	75
Planning diagrams	77
Access analysis	79
Other methods building on access analysis	97
2.3 Landscapes	99
Some conclusions	102
2.4 Case Study Diagrams	102
Hamilton Palace	103
Hopetoun House	108
Blair Castle	112
Inveraray Castle	115
Discussion	118
2.5 Conclusion	120


Chapter Three: The Political and Social World	125
3.1 1603 Unification of the Crowns: Scotland and England	127
3.2 1625 Charles I and the Civil Wars	130
3.3 1660 Restoration to 'Revolution'	132
3.4 1688 Dissatisfaction, distress and Darien	136
3.5 1707 Union	138
3.6 Aristocratic involvement in trade and commerce	142
3.7 Resistance and rising: smuggling, riots and Jacobitism	145
3.8 Responses: 'Georgian', rationalisation, and good manners	147
 Chapter Four: Architectural Context	 153
4.1 Medieval Scotland: Towers and courtyards	153
4.2 Renaissance castles and 'chateaux'	154
4.3 Royal building programmes: Linlithgow Palace	157
4.4 Hierarchy: Status, height and precedence	158
4.5 Balance and privacy: centralisation and segmentation	161
4.6 Glamis Castle: Restoration and adaptation	163
4.7 1660: 'Scottishness' and Classicism	166
4.8 Kinross House: a new tradition	170
 Chapter Five: Hamilton Palace	 174
5.1 The Progress of the 'Great Design'	174
5.2 The Dukes of Hamilton: 'The nation's premier landed dynasty'	176
Roles, responsibilities and contradictions	182
Religion: belief and pragmatism	185
5.3 Discussion: Hamilton Palace, fit 'for the Court of a Prince'	186
'A new standard of austere grandeur'	186
Show house and ducal home: the Hamilton notion of family	189
A well informed design: fashion, modernity and learning	191
Paths of movement: sequences and selection	192
Relations within the house: family and servants	195
5.6 Arranging the Landscape	199
Changing relations with Hamilton Town	199
The 'Great Design' of the landscape	203

Chapter Six: Hopetoun House	208
6.1 Stages in the Building of Hopetoun	209
6.2 The Rise of the Hope Family: Industry and Gentility	214
6.3 Discussion: the Earl of Hopetoun and His 'Princely Seat'	217
Expectations and requirements	217
Conforming to the 'Rules of Taste'	220
Horizontality and visibility: the 'show front'	222
Inside the house: order and ordering	225
'Progress' and precedent; regularisation and references	228
Chapter Seven: Blair Castle	232
7.1 The 'Rationalisation' of Blair Castle	232
7.2 The Murray Dukes of Atholl: National, local and family affairs	233
Civil War: tension and geographic vulnerability	234
Political manoeuvring: balancing local and national concerns	235
Jacobitism: personal and pragmatic attitudes	239
'Sovereign' power: authority and patronage	240
Changing roles and responsibilities	242
Controlling Atholl: rents and rights; crime and punishment; education and language	243
7.3 Discussion: From Blair Castle to Atholl House	248
Ideal plans and realistic practices	248
Spatial divisions: 'Backstairs'	251
Spatial divisions: family and visitors; comfort and control	252
7.4 The Manipulation of the Landscape	256
The integral landscape: exploitation and beautification	256
The 'rationalisation' of the landscape: a precise 'wilderness'	260
A political landscape? References and audiences	262
Chapter Eight: Inveraray Castle	266
8.1 The Exterior: A Perfect Castle	267
8.2 The Roles of the Dukes of Argyll: Chiefs, Lords and Politicians	269
Conflicting interests: local and national positions	270
'Managers for Scotland': Power and patronage	271
Eighteenth century clan chiefs: modernisation and maintenance	275
The three Dukes: Monarch, man of the world and 'model of manly grace'	279
'A princely edifice': A new Inveraray Castle	281
8.3 Inside Inveraray Castle	286
Service areas- the basement and attic	287
The principal floor	290
The bedroom floor	294
A visitor's glimpse of daily routine	294
8.4 Inveraray Town: Removal and Segregation	296
Encouragement of industry: an antidote to unrest	302
Ducal relations: demands and distrust	304

8.5 The Designed Landscape	308
Avenues and vistas: barriers and corridors	308
Ornamental features	310
Tourism and communications	314
8.6 Discussion: Mediating Paradox and Conflict, a House for a Duke of Argyll	315
Chapter Nine: Conclusion	321
9.1 An Archaeological Approach	321
The Georgian Order: inspiration not explanation	322
9.2 The Country House: Reality and Representation	324
The Real and Symbolic Landscape	326
9.3 Making Sense of Contradiction: Changing Roles and Responsibilities	332
A Social World <i>in</i> the Country House	340
9.4 Some Conclusions: A Starting Point	341
Appendix One: Catalogue of Houses Considered for Study	345
Appendix Two: Analysis of Houses: Fieldwork Checklist	371
List of References	374


List of illustrations


Colour key to plans

Family: Communal (e.g. family dining room) 


Private apartments (e.g. Duchess' bedchamber) 

Entertaining: Public (e.g. gallery) 

'Private' apartments (e.g. State bedchamber) 

Service: Service areas, such as kitchens. Includes backstairs. 

Relatively private servants rooms (e.g. cook's room) 

Highlights 'neutral' areas such as corridors, antechambers,
hallways where decisions as to further movement were made. 

(Key provided at beginning of each case study.).

*Note: for ease of access colour sheets mark chapter ends.

- 1.1 The Social Garden in the eighteenth century
- 1.2 The North Parade, Bath, as reflective of eighteenth century sociability
- 1.3 Bentham's Panopticon 1787
- 1.4 The transformation of the 'organic' house to the symmetrical Georgian house
- 1.5 Bernera Barracks (c.1719) showing the symmetry of design and layout
- 1.6 Map showing the 'Highland Line' and location of the case studies

- 2.1 An example of Glassie's building grammar
- 2.2 Faulkner's use of planning diagrams at Bolton Castle.
- 2.3 Example of Foster's access analysis on the Broch of Gurness, Orkney

- 2.4 Example of Markus' access analysis on eighteenth century hospital blocks
- 2.5 West's access analysis on English country houses
- 2.6 Example of different symbols used in access diagrams (Richardson 2003)
- 2.7 Non-distributed and distributed access diagrams
- 2.8 Examples of access graphs with different carrier spaces (Hanson 1998, 26)
- 2.9 Different interpretations of deep space
- 2.10 Access diagrams of Hardwick Hall and Coleshill House (Hanson 1998, 171)
- 2.11 Bounded and convex interpretations of open spaces
- 2.12 Interpretations of staircases leading to four floors
- 2.13 Hamilton Palace access diagram. Visitor to 1677 Millar plan
- 2.14 Hamilton Palace access diagram. Service areas in Millar 1677 plan
- 2.15 Hamilton Palace access diagram. Visitor route through James Smith plan
- 2.16 Hamilton Palace access diagram. Service areas in James Smith plan
- 2.17 Hopetoun House access diagram. Visitor to Bruce house
- 2.18 Hopetoun House access diagram. Visitor to planned Adam house
- 2.19 Hopetoun House access diagram. Service areas of Adam house
- 2.20 Blair Castle access diagram. Visitor to castle
- 2.21 Blair Castle access diagram. Visitor to perfect 1743 Winter castle
- 2.22 Blair Castle access diagram. Actual service area
- 2.23 Blair Castle access diagram. Ideal service area from 1743 Winter plan
- 2.24 Inveraray Castle access diagram. Visitor route pre-1771
- 2.25 Inveraray Castle access diagram. Visitor route post-1771
- 2.26 Inveraray Castle access diagram. Service areas

- 3.1 Views of Thirlestane Castle showing proposed modifications in the 1670s
- 3.2 Ruthven Barracks (1719-22)
- 3.3 Map of the military road network

- 4.1 Edzell Castle, an example of the geometric, walled garden
- 4.2 The development of the plan of Linlithgow Palace
- 4.3 The north range of James V's Falkland Palace
- 4.4 Linlithgow Palace. Plan of the first floor showing potential division of private/ public
- 4.5 Glamis skyline
- 4.6 Fyvie Castle. The great stair
- 4.7 Glamis Castle. An example of an armorial panel used to adorn a building
- 4.8 Castle Menzies suggesting a private/ public arrangement
- 4.9 The main façade of Fyvie Castle
- 4.10 Glamis Castle. Developmental diagram suggesting creation of balance
- 4.11 Glamis Castle. General plan showing separation of public and private areas
- 4.12 Glamis Castle. View of façade indicating focus on great stair
- 4.13 Glamis Castle. Plan of second, or entertaining, floor
- 4.14 View of Glamis Castle on approach
- 4.15 Roof top view of the avenue at Glamis Castle
- 4.16 View of Glamis Castle showing avenue and courtyards on approach
- 4.17 The drawing room at Glamis Castle, still a barrel vaulted great hall
- 4.18 Balcaskie House, Fife

- 4.19 Kinross House- general view
- 4.20 First floor plan of Kinross House
- 4.21 Second floor plan of Kinross House
- 4.22 Kinross House. Plans showing visitor access through the house
- 4.23 Plans of each floor of Kinross House
- 4.24 Landscape layout at Kinross House showing gardens, parterres, terraces and rides
- 4.25 Map of Kinross marking the line of the formal vista

5. Hamilton Palace

- 5.1 Detail of Pont map showing the location of Hamilton to the south of Glasgow
- 5.2 Ground floor plan of the palace in about 1677 before modification
- 5.3 The new, late seventeenth century courtyard design as seen in *Vitruvius Scoticus*
- 5.4 Isaac Millar's sketch of the façade c.1677
- 5.5 James Smith's plans for modifications at Hamilton Palace
- 5.6 Detail of the south front entrance showing the ducal crest on the pediment
- 5.7 James Smith draught of the new South facing entrance 1696
- 5.8 The façade to show the impression of enclosing wings and plan
- 5.9 Plan of the ground floor emphasising the enclosing nature of the entrance courtyard
- 5.10 Ground floor plan before changes with ceremonial route up stairs to principal floor
- 5.11 Ground floor plan after changes with same ceremonial route to principal floor
- 5.12 Plan and view of Kinneil Castle
- 5.13 First floor- gallery as 'reception' area between family and entertaining areas
- 5.14 Examples of corridors in Hamilton plan

- 5.15 The entrance façade showing the vertical pull of the first floor windows
- 5.16 First floor plan highlighting alienation of state and family areas
- 5.17 Ground and first floor plans highlighting segregation, but convenience, of servants
- 5.18 Examples of the spatial relationship of servants to the rooms served
- 5.19 Hierarchy of servants- the principal servants as a separate group
- 5.20 Hierarchy of servants- the place of the Duchess' gentlewomen
- 5.21 The levels of permeation just to get to the gallery
- 5.22 Slezer view showing Hamilton town clustered around the palace
- 5.23 Map of Hamilton in 1824 showing the degree of separation between town and
palace
- 5.24 The Hietoun mid- eighteenth century
- 5.25 Hamilton tolbooth
- 5.26 Alexander Edwards 1708 landscaping scheme
- 5.27 Sketches of Hamilton high and low parks
- 5.28 General view of Chatelherault hunting lodge
- 5.29 Chatelherault, elevation and profile
- 5.30 View and plan of Cadzow Castle

6. Hopetoun House

- 6.1 General picture and map
- 6.2 Elevation of Bruce east façade and principal floor plan
- 6.3 General view of Adam east front as seen in *Vitruvius Scoticus*
- 6.4 Adam ground floor plan

- 6.5 Adam first floor plan
- 6.6 Ground floor showing general development from Bruce to Adam house
- 6.7 The large pediment over the recessed centre to the west
- 6.8 Elevation of Adam's east front
- 6.9 Section of the house showing colonnade and single storey end pavilions
- 6.10 Detail of the Corinthian portico of the east front
- 6.11 Details showing Adam creation of passage, stair and vestibule in family area
- 6.12 Details of plan showing Adam's uncompleted aim of shifting main stair to one side
- 6.13 Detail of plan showing the extension of the private dining room
- 6.14 Path of movement through the family area of the house
- 6.15 Detail of plan showing service areas concealed behind the south colonnade
- 6.16 Detail of plan highlighting the Greek cross-plan centred on an octagonal staircase
- 6.17 Access through the house to the garden parlour
- 6.18 Restricted access to apartments form central 'corridor' of movement
- 6.19 The place of the charter room
- 6.20 Plan showing the formalised juxtaposition of entertaining and family areas
- 6.21 Detail of plan highlighting the antechamber in the family apartments
- 6.22 Section of the main block of the house showing the centrality of the great stair
- 6.23 Map showing the alignment of the house on an axis with North Berwick Law
and Abercorn
- 6.24 Map locating Midhope Castle and Abercorn Castle in the grounds of Hopetoun
- 6.25 William Adam's 'General plan of the grounds'
- 6.26 Aerial photographs with parch marks showing the knot garden

7. Blair Castle

- 7.1 General view to introduce the regularised, simplified house
- 7.2 Plans of the castle in 1736 before modification
- 7.3 Sketch plans showing the development of the building in the eighteenth century
- 7.4 Examples of references on plans and sketches to Atholl House
- 7.5 Speculative plans of John Douglas 1736, and James Winter 1743
- 7.6 Map of the Atholl estates showing their central geographical position
- 7.7 Detail of military road network showing the central position of Blair Castle on the route south from Badenoch to Perth
- 7.8 Detail of clan map showing the Robertsons and Stewarts in Atholl and the neighbouring Campbell lands
- 7.9 Detail of map showing association of Tom-na-Croiche (Gallows Hill) with the castle
- 7.10 Detail of estate map showing proximity of the military road to the castle
- 7.11 Sketches showing the plain silhouette of the pitched roofs
- 7.12 Douglas 1736 proposed plan for the ground/service floor
- 7.13 Douglas 1736 proposed plan for first/family floor
- 7.14 Douglas 1736 proposed plan of second/state floor
- 7.15 Detail of Douglas 1736 state floor showing dining, drawing and billiard rooms
- 7.16 Detail of Douglas 1736 showing separation of nursery from Duke and Duchess' apartment
- 7.17 James Winter 1743 proposed plan for the ground/service floor
- 7.18 Winter 1743 proposed plan for the first/ family floor

- 7.19 Winter 1743 proposed plan for the second/state floor
- 7.20 Detail of Winter plans highlighting stairways through the building
- 7.21 Hierarchy of servants- detail Winter ground floor plan showing exclusive areas
- 7.22 Plan and elevation of the east wing and dairy wing service extension
- 7.23 Plan and elevation of the washhouse and dairy
- 7.24 Detail of Winter second floor showing access to dining and drawing rooms, and segregation of bedchambers
- 7.25 Winter plans with service, family and entertaining/public areas defined
- 7.26 Winter first floor plan as opposed to what was executed
- 7.27 Winter second floor plan as opposed to what was executed
- 7.28 Access up the great stair before and after the addition of the single storey vestibule
- 7.29 Plans of each floor after the addition of the picture staircase
- 7.30 1744 estate map showing the landscaping around the castle
- 7.31 Plan and elevation of the kitchen garden
- 7.32 An eighteenth century plan for the ground layout of trees
- 7.33 Detail of 1744 estate map highlighting the avenue
- 7.34 1737 plan of Diana's Grove wilderness
- 7.35 Plan of the Temple of Fame
- 7.36 Plan and elevation of the sham ruin 'The Whim'

8. Inveraray Castle

- 8.1 Dugald Campbell's rejected militaristic design for the new castle c1747
- 8.2 Roger Morris elevation of new castle emphasising the principal floor, central tower

and corner turrets

8.3 Examples of the pointed arch windows

8.4 The Whim, Peebleshire- plan and view

8.5 Aerial view and plan showing almost square castle and detached corner towers

8.6 Plan showing the unequal division of the gallery after 1771

8.7 Plan of the basement

8.8 John Adam attic plan

8.9 Original progress through the principal floor

8.10 Plan of principal floor showing the original apartment layout

8.11 1771 plan with complete reversal

8.12 New processional route through the principal floor (after 1771)

8.13 Plan showing the Duke and Duchess' apartment as a separate, isolated group

8.14 Plan of the bedroom floor c.1747

8.15 Location map showing Inveraray new town and castle

8.16 1722 map showing site of old town in the shadow of the old castle

8.17 Sketch of market place of old town in 1746

8.18 View of the new castle from Aray Bridge

8.19 Plan and sketch of the Gothick, crenellated Aray bridge

8.20 Aerial view and detail 1722 map showing the segregating Beech/ Town avenue

8.21 View of the new town on approach

8.22 Plan showing the orientation of the town

8.23 The screen wall and unified impression of the town front

8.24 The great inn

- 8.25 Detail of 1756 survey showing the avenues on the Inveraray estate
- 8.26 1731 estate map showing geometric plantations and walks before the third Duke
- 8.27 General plan, elevation and view of Dun na Cuaiche
- 8.28 Plan, elevation, section and photograph of Bealach an Fhuarain (1747-8)
- 8.29 Plan, elevation, section and photograph of Carloonan dovecote (1747)
- 8.30 Adam plan and elevation of Tom Breac dairy showing Gothic courtyard
- 8.31 Plan and view of Cherry Park court of offices showing symmetry and classical detail
- 8.32 Plan and elevation of Maltland Square
- 8.33 View of the Garron Bridge
- 8.34 Plans of the principal and bedroom floors showing central place of service stairs
- 8.35 Plan of principal floor after 1771 defining entertaining, service, and private areas
- 8.36 Plan of principal floor after 1771 showing access through the floor

Conclusion

- 9.1 Rough outline of process of understanding houses

Appendix One

- 10.1 Map showing location of all potential case study houses

List of Plates

- 1.1 The saloon, House of Dun
- 1.2 General view of Hopetoun House

1.3 General view of Blair Castle and the surrounding Highland landscape

4.1 View of James V palace at Stirling

4.2 Aerial view of the courtyard of Linlithgow Palace

4.3 Chivalry and classicism- armorial panels and the balanced north range at Linlithgow Palace

4.4 Fyvie Castle

4.5 Reconstruction of the avenue and courtyards at Glamis Castle

4.6 Aerial view of Holyrood Palace

4.7 The saloon, Kinross House

4.8 Kinross House- the formal vista to Loch Leven Castle

5.1 Drumlanrig Castle

5.2 Aerial view of Chatelherault hunting lodge, the Avon Gorge and Cadzow Castle

6.1 General view of Hopetoun House

6.2 Hopetoun House- Bruce's West front

6.3 North west side of Hopetoun House showing Adam additions

6.4 A colonnade at Hopetoun House

6.5 Hopetoun House pavilion- single storey units with cupola towers

6.6 View of the remodelled east front showing the shallow U-plan

6.7 Hopetoun House- the contrast between the service stair and the main stair

6.8 Vista from the entrance façade of Hopetoun House across the Firth of Forth

7.1 Blair Castle- harled and whitewashed against the Highland landscape

7.2 Clayton's lavish plasterwork in the dining room, Blair Castle

7.3 Statue of Diana in the wilderness at Blair Castle

8.1 Inveraray Castle- the new drawing ('tapestry') room created after 1770s alterations

8.2 View from Dun na Cuaiche to Inveraray new town and castle

Acknowledgements

It goes without saying that I have a number of people to thank for their welcome advice, support and encouragement. First and foremost thanks to my family who have supported and encouraged me even when I seemed to make no sense, and for a lifetime of castles and houses. This thesis and more would have been impossible without them.

Thank you to my supervisor Professor Stephen Driscoll in the Department of Archaeology for inspiration, guidance and good humour; Geoffrey Stell of the Royal Commission on the Ancient and Historical Monuments in Scotland and Aonghus Mackechnie of Historic Scotland for initial advice and helpful conversation; and Professor James Macaulay of the Glasgow School of Art for his time and clarification of an architectural historian's perspective. The staff of each of the houses in this thesis and others that I visited showed patience, interest and an encouraging enthusiasm for their houses; and thanks must also go to the staff at the RCAHMS, National Archives of Scotland, and, in particular, the National Library in Edinburgh and the Hamilton library for their guidance and help in finding various materials.

The 'inhabitants' of the postgraduate room over the last three years have always provided an interesting, often challenging atmosphere. I am particularly thankful to Chris Dalglish, Meggen Gondek, Stuart Jeffrey and Donna Maguire for their friendship and all that comes with it; Sarah Phillips for invaluable help with graphics; and Angus Mackintosh, because a promise is a promise. Special thanks too to Martin Carruthers for years of good advice, bad jokes, friendly 'debate' and a reliable shoulder.

Unfortunately I have to take full responsibility for any mistakes or oversights found in this thesis.

Chapter One: Introduction

‘Despite the evident social role of buildings the boundaries of architectural discourse are drawn as to exclude it. Buildings are treated as art, technical or investment objects. Rarely as social objects. Why?’ (Markus 1993, 26).

Country houses and their landscapes were dynamic and active elements in society, designed as material expressions of the social roles, aspirations and attitudes of the landed elite. They provided a material means by which to negotiate social identity and relationships, reflecting *and* actively creating social attitudes and modes of social organisation.

The country house in Scotland is a class of material too important to be considered only within the narrow confines of architectural history, as a work of art. Although these houses were often beautiful, and aesthetic taste influenced their design, their social and political roles are too significant to overlook. An archaeological approach emphasises contextual and symbolic interpretation, allowing analysis to move beyond considerations of form to look at ideas, and so the people who built, lived and worked in and around, and visited these buildings.

The original direction, and indeed goal, of this thesis was not to suggest that archaeology alone held merit when considering architecture. Years of enlightening historical research into archives and through architectural history into artistic trends and motivations still provide an integral backbone to any enquiries made today. Rather than

advocating archaeology as the only discipline capable of worthwhile ideas this thesis stresses the value of a multidisciplinary approach.

While not rectifying “false” ideas created by more traditional studies, nor suggesting that they represent an ‘incorrect’ way to study architecture there are certain misapprehensions about the study of archaeology which may explain why, until recently, it was overlooked as an appropriate tool in understanding this material. Archaeology to many equates with the activity of excavation. The worth of this thesis, in terms of it providing an archaeological approach to a ‘modern’ architectural type, has been questioned. The presupposition seems to be that if an old derelict barn is still standing it is architectural history; if on the other hand the barn has collapsed, weeds have grown over it, and an effort needs to be made to retrieve it from the ground then, and only then, is it archaeology.

Such a clear demarcation and isolation of disciplines is false. The material remains of human activity may be one of many forms of written record, including maps, paintings and plans; or examples of “small things forgotten” (Deetz 1977) such as plates, clay pipes and tools; or built remains. This last category ranges from prehistoric earthworks to Roman walls, Highland shielings to massive monumental castles. Numerous studies of medieval churches and castles have revealed the benefit of archaeological studies of buildings (for example see R Morris 2000). These buildings are not questioned as valid subjects for archaeological study, but country houses with their high art associations are not traditionally seen as demanding the attention of archaeologists.

1.1 Architectural History Approaches

Archaeology and art history are closely allied disciplines, especially given that 'archaeology as a discipline is characterised by fluidity between fields and cooperative research' (Wicker 1999, 169). A falsely sharp dividing line exists between definitions of artefacts and works of art. Many art objects have uses beyond the aesthetic; many useful objects are also beautiful. Archaeology is readily accepted as being of use to the study of art in terms of dating and uncovering technical processes through, for example, metallurgical studies and isotopic analysis (Wicker 1999, 161-2). Both art history and archaeology strive to understand style and typology. The 'New Art History' of the 1970s expanded the subject from being concerned only with 'high art' to concerning itself with all material culture. The concept of art changed with the influence of social theories such as Marxism, socialism and feminism, and an interest in explanatory processes such as the semiotic and psychoanalytical. Art became seen as a means of communication (Wicker 1999, 167). However, much architectural history is still firmly ensconced in the more traditional or 'high art' appreciation approach to art history. This section of the discussion considers these approaches. Newer, interesting and more socially aware ideas and methods are not discounted and permeate further discussion of architecture and archaeological methodologies.

Although seventeenth and eighteenth century country houses and gardens in Scotland are not completely overlooked by historians the prevailing discourses about them concentrate on the functional or aesthetic. Practical concerns include the question of what was built, when and by whom, while the aesthetic focuses on style and treats houses as works of art. The attribution of designs to specific architects or movements, and the

representation and evolution of form and decoration are valuable, but they focus interpretation on changing artistic fashions. The relationship of houses and fashions to their particular historical context (social, economic, political and cultural), considering *why* houses were built, is usually disregarded.

This section of the discussion will focus mainly on Scottish studies and publications. Further sections of this and the next chapter will deal with more general approaches and contributions to the study of houses. General architectural studies of the period tend either to neglect or consider houses in Scotland only in terms of the influence of England, France, Holland and Italy. Work such as John Summerson's *Architecture in Britain 1530-1830* (1993) deals with architecture in Scotland as an appendix. 'On the death, in 1710, of Sir William Bruce, Scotland's last Court architect, the architecture of the country was in a condition of remote provincialism from which it was not to emerge for another half a century' (1993, 348-9). Even books devoted to Scotland place its architecture in comparison to developments south of the Border. John Dunbar, in his *The Architecture of Scotland* (1978) observes that 'fashions in decoration also changed...the Scottish Baronial manner gradually being superseded by new and equally distinctive style, ultimately derived from books and engravings published in the Low Countries, but reaching Scotland in a digested form evolved in Elizabethan England' (1978, 69). Only brief mention is made of an historical context that may explain the strength of English influence.

Generalisations over the evolution of architectural and garden forms, and with periods of transition, are also concerned primarily with style. Tait's *The Landscape Garden in Scotland* (1980) traces the transition from the formal to the informal garden.

The success of specific gardens, and their place in the evolution of the landscape garden, is judged in relation to contemporary treatises on gardens, nature and art. This approach is aesthetic, cultural and intellectual, but fails to consider any social or political context. Therefore the 'derivative and routine approach obvious in the gardening of the Duke of Atholl at Blair was normal', while the 'intimate mood at Mavisbank was less typical' (1980, 23). No explanation is made other than in terms of style and taste. Moreover, Mavisbank, the exception, is focussed on to the detriment of Blair which was 'normal'. The size of these gardens, the expenditure and knowledge invested in them, and the attention given to them, suggests that they were *all* exceptional. Only within a narrow social world can the distinction between Blair and Mavisbank be made, and this is not discussed.

The treatment of a house such as Hopetoun demonstrates the predominant concerns of architectural historians. James Macaulay's *The Classical Country House in Scotland 1660-1800* (1987) is a comprehensive account of the houses built during the late seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. Some historical context is provided, but the sources of inspiration and influence are paramount in his discussions. Macaulay seeks the source of the Hopetoun ground plan in Louis XIV's Château de Marly (1987, 21). Francis I's Château de Chambord inspired the central staircase design, and the Queen's House at Greenwich influenced the design of the corner apartments (Howard 1995, 57; 60). The objective of giving Hopetoun its place in a broader evolution of European architecture recognises the international characteristics of the aristocracy but tends to omit the Scottish, and the individual, contexts of the houses. Moreover, to judge these houses in

terms of their place in international artistic movements reinforces the interpretation of them as works of art.

Books aimed at potential visitors follow a different agenda. General accounts such as the recent *Great Houses of Scotland* (Montgomery-Massingberd and Sykes 2001) provide lovely pictures but little information beyond a basic description of the houses. However, these do deal with individual buildings. Guidebooks to specific houses such as the House of Dun (Hartley 1992) exemplify the non-academic presentation of buildings. The houses are portrayed as an achievement of the family, focussing on how the grandeur of the building reflects personal achievement. Individual rooms are illustrated, providing a guide to the visitor circuit of the house, but emphasis is placed on artistic acquisitions or, in the case of the House of Dun, the ornate and allegorical plasterwork (plate 1.1). The art in a house, particularly if a gift, suggests the social network to which the family belong, and their status. However, often no indication is given as to the past functions of a room and the social life appertaining to it.

A study such as *Inveraray and the Dukes of Argyll* (Lindsay and Cosh 1973) is a rarity, dealing with one house in detail and treating it as an individual structure, including its designers and owners, the possible relevant influences, and the more general historical context. Inveraray Castle is considered on its own terms and as part of a more general architectural development. While this book is invaluable when considering Inveraray, even here there is no analytical emphasis on motives behind the construction of the castle, the landscape and the New Town. The book is a companion to the renovations by the eleventh Duke of Argyll which were completed in 1953, and this may explain a focus on the physical development of the house and the characters of the Dukes. It may be that

motivations behind the original building are presumed to be self-evident: the Duke of Argyll needed a large, impressive house.

A different, but complementary approach to country houses is that of the Royal Commissions. The National Monument Records (NMRS) and the regional inventories of the Royal Commission on the Ancient and Historical Monuments of Scotland (RCAHMS) provide a large database of records and surveys of houses and gardens. Little analysis is apparent, although the agenda is dominated by art history. The coverage given to different houses is not uniform and suggests subjectivity as to what is and is not worth recording. This would be less problematic if the selection process was demystified, with reasons given for the choices made. The approach is informative rather than enlightening. Numbers and measurements proliferate. The ashlar blocks at Inveraray are ‘diagonally tooled with 15mm-wide grooves’. The castle ‘forms a rectangular block 35.7m from NW to SE by 29.8m over walls up to 1.5m thick...’ and the surrounding fosse is 9.1m wide and about 3.5m deep (RCAHMS 1992, 370).

The achievements of architectural historians in areas such as dating, the attribution of designs and additions to architects, and the acknowledgement of stylistic elements within a broader aesthetic framework are useful. For instance, the construction of Hopetoun House would be unclear without the research of Rowan (1984), and the studies of Macaulay and Howard mentioned above. In terms of elements such as dating I have relied on ‘received knowledge’ from architectural narratives. My interest in how a house may have been used or what it was intended to do renders the attribution of a fireplace or a colonnade to a specific architect of significance only in that it indicates the form of the house at a given time.

Mark Girouard's *Life in the English Country House* (1978) considers the functioning of country houses in terms of the uses of rooms, their relationships to one another and to the social structure. He charts how plans and functions changed in England from the medieval to the Victorian periods. He emphasises also that this is not a usual architectural history approach by admitting to stepping outside his own discipline (1978, v). 'This kind of approach no more provides a complete explanation of country houses than an art historical analysis. But it is sufficiently coherent to stand on its own' (Girouard 1978, 12). Most significant to my approach is the acknowledgement of the importance of the inhabitants of the house, their relations with one another, and with those outside. The broad chronological scope and the number of examples used to illustrate Girouard's argument facilitate the examination of evolving social space in England over a number of centuries, but on a general level.

In terms of buildings in Scotland in the eighteenth century the work of Thomas Markus is important in its combined application of theory to architecture and its emphasis on context. His study of largely urban, institutional buildings such as prisons, asylums, museums and schools root them firmly in the socio-political context of the Enlightenment, and the responses to the French and Industrial Revolutions. As his quote at the beginning of this chapter indicates he redresses the minor role which architecture usually plays in the social history of the period (1982, 1), recognising the duality of architecture which is both reflective of, and active upon, social and political life. As with an archaeological understanding of buildings, the changing structure of social space is seen as both a consequence of, and active upon, changing social relations.

A different approach to country houses does not, therefore, deny the importance of architectural history studies. It would be ridiculous and confusing to abandon established stylistic terms. However, attributing design decisions simply to fashion or taste is uninformative if one does not also ask why this should be so. Both fashion and taste are culturally and socially constructed concepts. Country houses tend to be considered in terms of size, style and ostentation, and often in isolation from their landscapes. Some are seen in the immediate context of their owners, and general historical narratives, but these studies tend to be descriptive, failing to ask why changes were made or the status quo maintained. Questioning why such houses were built and how they were intended to be used allows an understanding of the society which created them. As an archaeologist has argued, ‘...architecture was intended, not as a way to symbolise culture, but as a way to create, maintain and symbolise social connections and to establish social boundaries between people’ (Orser 1998, 313).

1.2 Definition and Functions of a Country House

A country house was not just the large rural residence of a wealthy landowner. Economic, political and social concerns caused these structures to be built. The house was the administrative centre of an agricultural estate, but its essential role was as the dominant countryside symbol of the elite.

This type of architecture does in itself embody the incongruity in the position of the aristocracy who maintained both a paternal role, at once both caring and controlling, and at the same time were an integral part of a community. This uneasy situation was reflected, for example, in relation to smuggling where often the elite in their role as

members of local society either aided or turned a blind eye to the illegal importation of goods. Country houses highlight this contradiction representing both the ostentatious display of power and a perfect image of a controlled, replicable façade. Therefore while displaying and legitimising the place of the landed aristocracy in the world, these houses represent attempts to resolve contradictions. The country house was also a device with which, and a household wherein, social relations were negotiated as the inhabitants acted and reacted to one another and to those outside. Through rules and routine and building upon the arrangement and use of space, the owners created and maintained these social relations.

It is often supposed that polite or academic architecture based on designed, imposed architect's plans fails to reflect the motives and attitudes of the owner. Vernacular architecture, on the other hand, is considered as directly reflective of the mind-set of the owner and his or her environment, and is a more natural, organic process (Deetz 1996, 126). However, in terms of seventeenth and eighteenth century country houses there is no simple dichotomy. Although polite architecture in terms of the involvement of architects and the influence of treatises, pattern books and aesthetic trends, these houses were the product of their owners wishes and requirements, and often their direct design input. The country houses of this period were the physical embodiment of the attitudes and motives of their owners.

The construction of country houses developed in juxtaposition to town houses. However, within a rural setting these residences maintained a link with nearby villages and towns. Villages grew around castles as centres of power, and this relationship continued where old structures were modified, or new ones appropriated the site. The

relationship was a close one socially, with tenants and employees housed there. In the eighteenth century it was also a changing one. Physical changes reflected and caused social change. At Hamilton, for instance, the town slowly became segregated from the palace (see chapter five). At Inveraray the old town was demolished and a new one built on a grid-plan site relocated at a distance from the new castle (see chapter eight).

The uses of the country house are prescriptive. It was understood that they were to be used for a specific purpose, and they were familiar through these functions. Owned by the aristocracy and gentry, and surrounded by private land, the country house was the head quarters of an agricultural estate, rooted in the local economy, with 'the potential to be economically self-sufficient' (West 1998, 103). The dependence of agricultural labourers and tenants on the owner of the house and estate ensured that the house was at the centre of the local community. Aristocratic power was based on ownership of the land which brought with it tenants and rents. 'Land provided the fuel, a country house was the engine which made it effective' (Girouard 1978, 3). Resources and followers also had national significance, leading to government jobs and other rewards in return for support.

The local and national significance of the country house required that it symbolise the position and power of the owner. The analytical device of separating the symbolic and the functional is impossible, 'such a division is unreal.... This vigorous segregation is harmful for it precludes the recognition that symbolism has important social functions and that it may be expressed in functional forms' (Samson 1990, 210).

As the rural residences of the ruling class country houses were image-makers. They were power houses projecting 'an aura of glamour, mystery or success' (Girouard 1978, 2). In this sense the house represented an immediately recognisable symbol of the owners

wealth and power, education and breeding, even his martial prowess. The changing emphasis put on these different qualities required the ability to adapt to meet contemporary requirements.

By the late seventeenth century the elite no longer demanded a military function of their country residences. It is simplistic to see a clear evolution in the adaptation from defensive structures (see Stell 1985) but walls became thinner, and features such as iron grilles or *yetts*, and arrow slits if included served only a decorative purpose. The third Earl of Strathmore (1643-95) could write of tower houses that 'such houses truly are worn quyt out of fashione, as feuds are, which is a great happiness' (Millar 1890, 33). The perception of the castle as the symbol of rank and lordship endured, though, through the image of country houses. Change and continuity were strong forces in seventeenth and eighteenth century Scotland, and could cause tension *and* be used to advantage. This will be illustrated in some detail with the example of Inveraray Castle where innovation and tradition were manipulated and used successfully to overcome tensions.

The country house had to work at a number of different levels. Intimately connected to its symbolic role, the house was a landmark and a show house. Houses were experienced and used, not just looked at. Eighteenth century country houses were not private, family residences. They played a public role, not only in terms of being focal points of hospitality and entertainment, but also in that their interiors and grounds were always open to other members of the elite (figure 1.1). Houses played a key role in the social circuit of the aristocracy, 'so that during the summer season the more famous and accessible homes could appear like country versions of the Parades at Bath or Tunbridge

Wells' (Girouard 1978, 189) (figure 1.2). Or like country versions of Edinburgh or Moffat Spa.

Numerous tour diaries such as Defoe's *Tour through the Whole Island of Great Britain and Ireland* (1727), Pennant's *Tour in Scotland* 1769 (1771, 1772) and *Tour in Scotland and Voyage to the Hebrides* 1772 (1774, 1776), and Boswell's recollection of his tour with Samuel Johnson (1773), all illustrate the role of country houses in these travels. Travelling became so fashionable that by 1773 Lord Breadalbane complained about the number of English visitors at his house, Taymouth Castle, Kenmore, with 'sixteen often at table for several days together' (in Johnson and Boswell 1984, 12). Slow and uncomfortable transport increased the appearance and appreciation of the house as an enclave of hospitality and comfort. This early tourism was also reflective of eighteenth century sociability. 'The spirit of these old days was eminently hospitable, and exuberantly hearty' (Graham 1900, 12). However, sociability at this social level, and travelling for pleasure were elite pursuits. James Boswell, for example, 'between his father's merit and his own, is sure of reception wherever he comes' (Johnson and Boswell 1984, 56). His father was a peer, Lord Auchinleck.

The pleasure and comfort afforded of these houses provided the opportunity for display. Often near to roads the buildings achieved high visibility, though this began to change through the eighteenth century as they became enclosed in secluding parkland. Gardens further emphasised the element of display, symbolising membership of the elite to any passer-by. Throughout the eighteenth century elements of seclusion and segregation developed, making clear the difference between the polite world inside the house and garden and the socially-inferior world excluded from it (Williamson 1998,

152). The notion of social inclusion and exclusion is integral to an understanding of these houses in their role as show house and pleasure palace

Sociability itself was considered to be a responsibility by the eighteenth century aristocracy and gentry. They were convinced of the morality of conversation and social interaction which encouraged opinions and led to mutual understanding. This 'touching faith in the miraculous mechanism of intelligent conversation' (Allan 2002, 130) was inspired by Joseph Addison and Richard Steele's *The Spectator* (1711-12) which purported to consist of reports from coffee house discussions, and included debate and opinion on social matters, in particular manners and behaviour in various eventualities. 'Ignorance, dogmatism, violence, boorishness, inanity, divisiveness - whatever militated against politeness was targeted. Promoting propriety, good manners and style, its lay sermons declared war on false values, foppery and folly - and low taste, like puns' (Porter 2000, 195). In the towns coffee houses and clubs like Edinburgh's Easy Club or Mirror Club provided the arenas for debate. Outside the towns the evolving drawing rooms of the country house provided the perfect forum for such conversation and interaction amongst the upper echelons of society.

Certain areas of the house were delegated either a public or a private role, most clearly seen through the provision of state rooms for entertaining guests. The evolution of the role of the apartment from a private, isolated enclave within the house where a guest's activities were concentrated, to a haven away from the social routine of the public rooms where the guest spent most of his or her day, increased the sociability of the house while also emphasising the seclusion of the individuals within their apartments. They did not entertain within their own suite of rooms, they came out of them to more communal

areas, and then retreated back to their rooms. The control over access into, or exclusion from, private areas allowed a further articulation of power and status. The owner could only be excluded through his or her own choice. Separate rooms with specialised purposes developed as modes of entertaining changed. For instance, dining rooms and withdrawing rooms evolved in relation to one another. They were complementary, but separate, areas with their own appropriate activities and behaviour.

Country houses were also homes for the owners, their families and their servants. The house was a vessel containing a range of social relations, and with its opportunity for everyday encounters represents a microcosm of the social order of the eighteenth century. As with ideas of hospitality, and manners, the notion of family changed in the late seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. The changing nature of the family and household required that functional programmes within the house adapted.

Servants inhabited their own sectors of the house, increasingly segregated from the family. As the upper and lower regions of the house became associated with service areas backstairs developed to ease their movement through the house, and also to ensure that they became almost invisible. Roger Pratt, mid-seventeenth century 'gentleman architect', advocated that the house should be, 'so contrived...that the ordinary servants may never publicly appear in passing to and from their occasions there' (Gunther 1928, 64). Servants were tidied away, but those of respectable positions such as a tutor, or those whose role depended on direct personal service such as ladies' maids, were more acceptable, and therefore more visible than others.

In a paternalistic society 'the family was central to social order; disciplined families were therefore a prerequisite of that order' (Amussen 1988, 38). In terms of the family

their movements within the house were generally unrestricted. However, they may have been bound by other factors such as expectations, practicalities, social politics and manners. Rules and restrictions of polite society dictated certain types of behaviour. For instance, children had a specific place in the house, often segregated from entertaining areas. This was both practical, and a result of attitudes towards the place of infants. The house provided the arena in which children would receive their basic social education.

‘Civility’, the code of conduct of the elite, consisted of technical knowledge such as correct forms of address, and a more general awareness of how to behave in relation to themselves and to others. ‘Manners...might be defined not just as a set of social rules, but as the rules which define the end-product of socialisation’ (Bryson 1998, 9). The good manners which marked out the upper ranks of society provided a method of structuring and interpreting the social world. Social form, patterns of hospitality and social ritual, ‘correct’ deportment and salutation, were all bound up in a set of values and ‘discriminations’ (Bryson 1998, 1). The house as a basic unit of society, and a vessel within which social relations were played out, was the perfect and natural teaching apparatus.

As correct manners were indicators of the elite, so too were country houses. They were symbols, show houses and homes within which social activity occurred, but they were also a means of constructing and demonstrating identity. This consisted of identifying with other members of the elite through shared values and symbolism, though it often led to tense relationships. The landowners could identify themselves as a group in relation to others, so their country houses demonstrated them to be a unified ruling group with wealth and power. The owner also required a sense of his own identity. As opposed

to others and, in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, in relation to the natural environment. The control of the landscape around country houses is a visual expression of the relationship of humans with nature, not just an opportunity to express power and control to others.

Country houses were not just large, elite rural residences. They were complex social and political instruments which demonstrated and accommodated the intricate values, attitudes, activities and problems of eighteenth century society.

1.3 Architecture as Material Culture: An Archaeological Approach

An understanding of architecture as material culture allows the archaeologist to consider the humans who created and interacted with the built environment. Material culture is not culture itself but is its product. Culture is understood as the embodiment of 'socially transmitted rules for behaviour, ways of thinking about and doing things' (Deetz 1996, 35). The manner in which we shape our physical world, in this instance build our buildings, is a product of this culturally determined behaviour. It is necessary then to clarify first an archaeological understanding of architecture and space; and then to consider how archaeology as a multidisciplinary approach may uncover meaning, or indeed meanings, in buildings.

Space and Place

Space itself is inactive but *also* an area in which activity takes place and thoughts are formed; it is nebulous but considered to be measurable as the distance between walls and other barriers. Space is a 'blank veneer where actions take place' (Tilley 1994, 10). Space is not, however, objective. Until space is used and experienced it does not exist. It has no

meaning until it is recognised through the appreciation and naming of it by humans.

‘Space is transformed into place as it acquires definition and meaning’ (Tuan 1977, 136).

Therefore space can become a place with a function and significance only through human experience and the assignation of meaning.

The naming of a structure also provides associations with specific groups or individuals. It supplies a means by which to know and refer to the site, and a name to which associations, perceptions and emotions may be attached. The house provides a physical reminder of historical actions and identities, of groups and of individuals (Yentsch 1998). The use of ‘palace’ or ‘castle’ signifies the social status of the owner, testifying to the historical roots of the family whether real or fictional. Country houses in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries often carried the name of their family as at Hamilton Palace. Renaming, or rebuilding, appropriated the authority perceived of as being historically linked to the site. This relationship was consciously created as seen in the linking of new structures with old established buildings of power, as seen at Inveraray Castle for example (see chapter eight).

Any meaning attached to space is dependent on human activity and understanding. Therefore by nature it is polysemous. Space has a potentially different meaning, or meanings, for each person who experiences it. ‘Space has no substantial essence in itself, but only has a relational significance created through relations between people and places...it [space] cannot have an universal essence. What space is depends on who is experiencing it and how’ (Tilley 1994, 11). Experience of each space depends upon the interaction of the individual with the physical structure, with other individuals and, therefore, with society itself. Moreover, the meaning of any one space is not constant. For

example, privacy and comfort are culturally specific concepts varying according to time and the social actors involved, thus requiring an informed contextual understanding.

Architecture as material culture is created through human actions, and then actively becomes part of, and acts upon, life. Social structures, such as social rules and traditions, have a dialectical relationship with human actions. Giddens' structuration theory suggests that 'All human action is carried on by knowledge agents who both construct the social world through their action, but yet whose action is also constrained by the very world of their creation' (Giddens 1981, 54). Social practices structure human actions which, routinely performed, reproduce the institutions that characterise society. It is through social practice that social discourse, involving people in social relations, is maintained. Social interaction is controlled and negotiated through the use of resources. These resources can be 'of knowledge (competence, skill, ability) as much as material...or the ability to rely upon the agency of others' (Graves 1989, 298). All of these resources were in the grasp of the educated, relatively wealthy landowners who employed the labour of others, and this was physically embodied in their country houses.

Spatial structure, as a result of this, 'is now not merely seen as an arena in which social life unfolds, but rather as a medium through which social relations are produced and reproduced' (Gregory and Urry 1985, 3). The built environment is both the medium and the outcome of social practices. In a reflexive relationship human action creates buildings, the buildings then act upon human activity. It is argued, most influentially by Hillier and Hanson in their *The Social Logic of Space* (1984) that the configuration of building plans formalises and frames social relationships. Enclosed spaces form stages

upon which social actions take place and those actions are to some extent restricted and dictated by the nature of space (Grenville 1997, 17). However whereas the form of a building may be intended to enforce a certain patterning of behaviour, the physical organisation of space does not control how space is used, and *cannot* control how that space is perceived (Samson 1990, 16-17). This supposed direct correlation between form and function is one criticism levelled at formal spatial analyses. The implications for interpretation are considerable. Space is complex: subjective, polysemous, dynamic and reflexive; dependent for its creation upon human activity, then active upon its creators.

Space and Spatiality

Charles Orser addresses this by observing differentiation between space as the distance between things and spatiality which is concerned with 'ordering relations between people' (Orser 1998, 319). As Orser argues, spatiality itself can be described as an ideological tool hiding or misrepresenting the realities of social relations (Orser 1998, 319). People interacting in their social world create spatial relations which are often not equally conceived or created. Invented spatiality then reflects the spatial views of the dominant elite.

Since 1993 Orser has undertaken archaeological investigation into the Anglo-Irish Mahon family estate in central Ireland. Here a huge Palladian mansion, rigidly symmetrical and stark white sat within a walled park in an estate of 15,000 acres. Hundreds of small farms were inhabited by cottiers who paid rents to head tenants who held land of Mahon until 1847 when, as a result of the Great Famine, the cottiers were evicted and given paid passage to Quebec. The Georgian mansion conformed not just to an aesthetic principle but also symbolised all the ideals of the Protestant Ascendancy in

Ireland (Orser 1998, 314). Orser questions the relevance of 'Georgian' thought to the bulk of the population whose lives were altered by their Georgian landlords, but who were not part of that mindset. To address this he approaches the physical evidence from the point of view of the cottiers, attempting to see the response to the control and manipulation of the Mahon family. However, he recognises that they cannot be considered in isolation from the landlords, and so the political and social significance of Georgian architecture in Ireland.

The importance of this approach is the acknowledgement that architecture was intended as a way to 'create, maintain and symbolise social connections and to establish social boundaries between people' (Orser 1998, 313). Power is recognised as inherent in the control of space. It is recognised as a tool of the powerful and privileged. Decisions are not made in isolation but in connection to others and to the environment. Human actors are not so much self aware as self and other aware (Carrithers 1992).

The influence of architecture can be persuasive or coercive, aiding or facilitating movement and activity. 'Material culture is viewed as a medium of communication and expression that can condition and at times control social action' (Beaudry et al 1996, 275). Jeremy Bentham's panopticon (figure 1.3), for instance, embodied architecture at its most coercive, with a supervisor able to see into every cell from one vantage point. It was a 'diagram of a mechanism of power reduced to its ideal form' (Foucault 1973, 207). The persuasive or coercive element of architecture is usually less obviously manipulative, but can be used intentionally to order and control. Doors and gates, stairways and the routes of pathways or corridors regulated movement in and around the country house;

established routes and permission also allowed or denied access. Ideologically image and perception were manipulated to persuade audiences of the social standing of the owner.

Spatiality concerns the distance between humans, the organisation of space in houses and buildings, and the layout of larger landscapes such as towns, or as in the case of this thesis, country estates (Orser 1996). Therefore possible social interactions must be considered in order to interpret spatiality in terms of large, complex houses and landscapes. Social encounters - meetings between social actors - take place in space and time, both of which can be organised, isolated and located with architecture and spatial arrangements. They may be informal and transitory gatherings; or formalised, planned social occasions involving a number of individuals (Goffman 1963, 18; cited in Giddens 1984, 71). Encounters may be focussed or unfocussed, planned or unintended (Giddens 1984, 73). As vital elements in the reproduction of society (Giddens 1984, 72) encounters represented a means by which to affirm and reaffirm self and group identities, or support a sense of social security. Architecture, by providing spatial context, can initiate, provoke, organise or be used to avoid encounters.

Architecture provides the means by which to create and maintain the spatial circumstances of these encounters. A locale is a bounded area providing a defined setting and so a context of an encounter. The locale is not a passive space but plays an active role in an encounter. In the country house the locale may reinforce the sense of security through the actors' assumed freedom to act within defined, predictable circumstances. 'The features of the setting are also used...to constitute the meaningful context of the interaction' (Giddens 1984, 119).

Locales are areas created by boundaries which restrict activity and movement to specific locales. Access through these boundaries is accomplished most often through the provision of a doorway. Boundaries create a demarcation between internal and external, the 'two opposing domains of experience' (Grahame 1995, 20). Movement through boundaries changes the context of space with the access through the boundary often providing cues as to appropriate behaviour. Magnificent staircases and doorways with carvings, family crests and adornment all make the social actor aware of his or her place.

A boundary such as a wall or screen may be accessed but the existence of the boundary indicates that movement is controlled. As boundaries can create encounters they may also prevent them from occurring. This is most often associated with a lack of privacy, or being a public place. However a dichotomy between private interiors and public interiors is too simplistic. Boundaries do represent a mechanism by which to distance encounters. Interaction can only take place between bounded locales at the point of access ensuring the significance of entranceways as taking the individual from one area to another (Grahame 1995, 18).

The physical distance created by boundaries is related to social order, even social distancing. Architecture can be a tool by which to reinforce spatial segregation, reflecting and emphasising social segregation. An authority figure such as an aristocratic landowner may isolate him or herself through spatial placing and context of locales. Those in authority can enter and exit any locale as they wish. This lack of restriction is a power resource that allows 'the authority figure the flexibility to engage or disengage in encounters at will' (Grahame 1995, 19). Of course divisions may be made through behavioural patterning and limitations. 'Very simple environments may be highly divided

conceptually and these divisions may be indicated either not at all physically- or only in very subtle ways' (Rapaport 1982, 298-9). In order to appreciate potential divisions and boundaries a contextual understanding is vital.

1.4 In Search of Meaning – The Role of Archaeology

Form, function and space

As a social product architecture, as with material culture in general, can be interpreted in various ways. Treating architecture as material culture provides an antidote to architectural determinism which has generated two causal relationships as explanatory models: that behaviour determines architectural form ('form follows function'), or that behaviour is a result of the environment ('function follows form') (Parker-Pearson and Richards 1994, 5). Although certain architectural forms are associated with specific functions the relationship is ambiguous, dependent on the activities and perceptions of people. 'Meanings are negotiated, related to inter-personal practices and aspirations' (Hodder et al 1995, 9). Changes in thought and social structure caused particularly by the upheavals of the eighteenth century confused any previous sense of predictability or regularity in the relationship between form, function and space (Markus 1993, 30).

Transformations occurring as a consequence of the French Revolution demonstrate how differently a building can be viewed and used. Markus cites an example from Frankl (1914, 158) wherein a medieval monastery was converted into a courthouse, and later a concert hall (Markus 1993, 5-6). The changing function required small modification to the form of the building but the space changed as the people using it recognised the difference through their own experience and use of it. They became familiar with a new concept, began to recognise the new function, and developed different expectations of the

space. The key factor in change, then, was the shift in function suggesting new social relations. This discussion centres on notions of form and function but the real issue is space with its focus on the social actors creating and using it. Relationships between form and function change as use and movement give the relationship meaning.

The relationship between physical form, function and understanding of, and so behaviour within, space changes, prompting different responses and perceptions in different people. Whether changes are intentional or not the relationship is significant in terms of both social identity and social relations. 'A building's form, function and space each has meanings in the field of social relations, each is capable of signifying who we are, to ourselves, in society and in the cosmic scheme of things. And each speaks of both power and bond relations. This is readily seen in function and space, but less so in form' (Markus 1993, 30). Therefore in order to fully appreciate the form of a building it is necessary to understand the general historical and specific social context of the building and those who created and interacted with it.

As the late medieval period became 'early modern' functional programmes in country houses changed dramatically too. The most noticeable change, for instance, was the development from the great hall or hall and private chamber design, to grand apartments and processional routes, and finally to suites of rooms cut off from each other. Functions became more isolated and specialised while at the same time rooms continued to be part of an integral whole. Only the hall maintained its social role, though its functions changed. It remained the only socially inclusive area of the house where all were accepted (Girouard 1978, 120).

One aid to understanding the relationship between meaning and material culture developed from linguists and suggests that we read it much as we read a text. If architecture is seen as conditioning social life then we should be able to read that social life from a surviving spatial layout, at least at the general level of understanding patterns of social interaction (Grahame 1995, 26). Matthew Johnson, for example, suggested that once we have the competence to understand a building we can read that building in the same way as the original inhabitants (1996, 127).

However the relationship between the material culture and, in terms of a building, the original occupants is as complex as that between a modern 'reader' and the physical remains. Each relationship has multiple layers with contradictory and ambiguous meanings. Contemporaries of the buildings may not have seen or understood all of these meanings fully. 'Reading' material must be culturally specific and dependent upon a wider context. A text cannot be understood by breaking it up, but instead it can be interpreted only as a complete discourse. Moreover the individual, either in the past or now, does not passively read this text, instead he or she actively creates and changes it. Meaning is not read *from* the material but is read *into* it, with interpretation dependent on the context of the reader. Those in authority such as landowners attempted to preempt this by creating a total context in which they framed themselves for others to see them.

Interpretation is made difficult by the different experiences of a building and the different opinions of, and attitudes towards, them. It is impossible for the modern day 'reader' to replicate the experience of past occupants and visitors, particularly as so much of their behaviour was taken for granted. Instead the social significance of the buildings is considered. Further complexity is encountered when looking at motives behind the

layout and design of a house, how it was used and perceived. Any interpreter needs to 'know' the 'repeated handling of words and sentences until they have learned and internalised individual meanings and syntax by which they are strung together into an intelligible statement' (Isaac 1982, 325). For contemporaries this understanding came through enculturation, a shared language learned from childhood.

'Knowing' Meanings: Enculturation and Socialisation

The recognition of country houses as expressions of the position of a specific social group, and the associations this entailed, was not a natural one. People in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries were not born with the innate knowledge that they inhabited a particular geographical and social place. Culture is inherited through information from, and the examples set by, our elders and peers. The individual becomes socialised primarily within the parental house. Through everyday, repetitive actions people learn about and recreate their social world. Social relations are played out, 'through the intermediary of the divisions and hierarchies it sets up between things, personas and practices, this tangible classifying system continuously inculcates and reinforces the taxonomic principles underlying all the arbitrary provisions of this culture' (Bourdieu 1977, 89). Repetition ensures that cultural norms are imbued defining 'normal' and extreme behaviour.

Attitudes towards, and activities involving, material culture provide a link between the material world and human understanding and use of it. In a process of enculturation humans learn what behaviour is expected of them, and learn to understand the material or physical cues which guide their responses. Therefore the use of material objects, the nature of movement through a building or landscape, rules and restrictions governing

these, the place of specific items and activities in time, all create awareness of status and how to behave in relation to others. The material world provides a mnemonic for action, informing the individual of a 'practical knowledge of "how to go on"' (Barrett 1988, 8).

These material conditions are represented in space and time so the social actor understands who does what, where, when, and with whom (Rapaport 1982, 80). For example humans learn at an early age that some areas are segregated by gender, others by status and others are accessible to all (Grenville 1997, 22). Certain environmental cues become associated with certain people and behaviours constructing a process whereby cues may be used to identify unknown people and select the correct action and behaviour (Rapaport 1982, 60). This behaviour becomes habitual and routinised, almost automatic (Rapaport 1982, 62). Architecture structures this space and time, the latter through controlled or focussed action in and movement through the building.

'Architecture...fuses space and time in the creation of places which structures the activities of life by representing fixed points in the fluidity of existence' (Richards 1993, 148). Through architecture an appropriate social context could be created for every aspect of the lives of the people within the building. Country houses were one means by which landowners could represent their knowledge, wealth and dominant position. The mechanics of this may be presented thus:

The social actor notices clues - the social actor understands clues - the social actor is prepared to obey clues (Rapaport 1982, 59).

However, houses are the result of both conscious and unconscious expression. As an individual but also a socialised actor the controlling hand behind the design of the house may not necessarily have been aware of all the attitudes behind decisions, or of the

implications of certain features. In terms of the eighteenth century it may have been understood that a certain overall effect was to be achieved to give the correct impression to others as suggested by the use of pattern books for example. At the same time as creating these social structures within which they could exist, the upper ranks of society were creating limits to the extent to which they could break free of the restrictions and expectations of their social world.

‘Communicating’ Meanings: Signs and Symbols

In order for the meanings behind architecture to be understood it is imperative that the cues given are recognised and interpreted. The complexities of this have been discussed in reference to our ability to ‘read’ architecture. Further to this is the relationship between signs, the signifier or author of the signs, and the signified or social actor receiving and interpreting the message. As Rapaport notes though, if *everything* is a sign, then the notion of the sign becomes so broad as to be trivial (1982, 37). Signs and their meanings are pluralistic in nature, subject to disjunction, distortion, and misinterpretation (Lefebvre 1991, 160-1). Rather than searching for semiotic meaning, attempting to understand signs, it is perhaps more helpful to understand stimuli as symbols.

Symbolic interpretation does not search for a single, definitive meaning. Symbols do not stand for something else, but are a means of communicating. Therefore they are multivocal with many meanings and many audiences (Rapaport 1982, 46-7). Rather than emphasising the uncovering of actual meanings the focus is on the process by which the meanings are created (Graves 1989, 308). Emphasis is placed on the social actors creating and receiving meanings. Symbols are social, related to status and representative of the social order and the individual’s place in it (Rapaport 1982, 48). In essence the

interpretation of symbols requires the classification of what is seen, then its being matched against schemata based on social and cultural context:

Symbols → form recognisable style → recognised acceptable behaviour (Rapaport 1982, 44-5).

As discussed above, while the social situation influences behaviour it is the physical environment that provides the cues as to what the situation actually is. It is the immediate environment which helps people behave in a manner acceptable to all members of a group, in a role which that particular group accepts as appropriate for the defined context and situation. The cues perform the task of letting people know what kind of domain or setting they are in (Rapaport 1982, 56-7). A number of levels of understanding are required in order to interpret symbolic interaction, such as:

1. A sender (encoder)
2. A receiver (decoder)
3. A channel
4. The message form
5. The cultural code
6. A topic (social situation of the sender, intended receiver, place)
7. The context or scene (Rapaport 1982, 52).

The archaeologist must build an understanding of each level in order to attempt to appreciate the whole.

An archaeological solution to the problems of reconciling structure and human agency, and our relationship to material culture and past social actors, is Barrett's concept of the 'fields of discourse'. The notion of reading a text is replaced with discourse-

communications that 'draw upon and reproduce particular structures of knowledge, thus also reproducing relations of dominance between individuals and collectives' (Barrett 1988, 11). The relationship between discourse and material culture is that the latter provides a context which guides particular forms of discourse (Barrett 1994, 19). 'The field' is the area in space and time in which discourse takes place. These fields contain the material conditions which structure action and which are structured by action.

Allocation of place and time provides the mechanism whereby people create, organise and view their own world (Barrett 1994, 73). Through studying material conditions the archaeologist does not uncover these precise allocations, but does have the ability to suggest what allocations may have taken place. Meaning is not being searched for, but in engaging with material remains the archaeologist understands 'what may have been possible within certain material conditions' (Barrett 1994, 73). Social actors or groups able to advance their positions to the exclusion of other interpretations were those in power and authority such as large landowners. This is an advantage in terms of 'hearing their voices' but beginning to understand their actions requires an appreciation of their social world and their positions, real and imagined, in it.

A Contextual Understanding: Textual evidence

I adopted form, function and space as the basis for analysis. It now turns out that archaeologists do just that. It is true that we may have other evidence such as texts, drawings and photographs which they lack. But it does suggest that decoding a building is unconscious archaeology (Markus 1993, 30).

Knowledge of spatial arrangements is of great value, and one of the advantages of studying houses of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries is that a great many of them are intact. The study of spatial organisation provides a different but complementary perspective to that of documents. Large and detailed archives do not provide the same information as a structure made up of numerous and differentiated spaces. Space and the walls that define it are a primary source of evidence. On the other hand, without further evidence to suggest the general and specific context of the house and its rooms and corridors, it would be difficult and inappropriate to discuss the inhabitants and how they related to each other and to the outside world. Historical archaeologists *do* have the benefit of texts, drawings and photographs. The wealth of information does not make the documents easy to draw conclusions from, but it does provide a context within which to consider the contemporary behaviour within, and attitudes towards, the building.

Textual sources have a dramatic effect on our ability to understand past social structures and practices from material culture. Documents add an extra layer to our understanding. However, if both types of evidence are used they must be seen in a different manner. As discussed above material sources are not a record, but are the remains created by social practices and are active in the reproduction of social practices. Material evidence does not preserve knowledge in the same way as a text. It is more ambiguous with more interpretations possible. Written sources also demonstrate social practices. They provide a degree of understanding of the meanings that material remains would have had to individuals. Textual evidence provides the means, in other words context, through which we can translate the language of past material culture (Barrett 1988, 6; Deetz 1977; Glassie 1975; Leone 1982).

Through an appreciation of the social and historical contexts we gain an insight into the possible physical cues used, including spatial arrangements and decorations, and can begin to create possible interpretations of material culture. In a sense the archaeologist may adapt Rapaport's model. First we must notice the possible clues, and then understand them. From this we can understand how clues may have been obeyed and why they were there in the first place.

The archaeologist notices possible clues→ the archaeologist attempts an understanding of the clues→ the archaeologist understands how clues may have been obeyed and why they were there in the first place.

Observations in this thesis are based chiefly upon a contextual and symbolic analysis of a range of material from archives and archaeology. In order to understand motivations, attitudes and actions spatial and social relations are culturally and historically contextualised. 'Actions are human events which can't be decontextualised or distanced from the socio-historic conditions of their products' (Tilley 1994, 121). Rather than reading or decoding the meaning of architecture and landscape as one would read a text, interpretation is based on the relationship of the owners, their social world and social relations, and the house as material culture.

1.5 'Peopling' the Past: Social Relations and Audiences

Discussion returns again and again to one vital understanding: an active role must be given to people in the past. Things did not just happen to passive human puppets. Giddens' notion of structuration has already been discussed, recognising the reflexive relationship of structure (society) and agency (individual action). Humans structure the

world; it then constrains, though doesn't determine, action. Humans have the ability to maintain, alter and manipulate conditions and social relations. Equally significant is the consequence given to the concept that different audiences would have understood and responded to different signs and symbols in a country house. Through consideration of the contexts of the owners of these houses I aim to demonstrate that this was a consideration in the design and construction of the houses, whether conscious or unconscious.

The Georgian Order: An Explanatory Model

Underlying my approach is a modified notion of a Georgian worldview, or the Georgian Order, which was developed as an explanatory model by historical archaeologists working in the USA, most notably James Deetz. It provided a link between new patterns in everyday life, as manifested through changing material culture, and the instability and upheaval in eighteenth century colonial Anglo-America. It is argued that the desire for order and control became motives behind the manipulation of objects, from houses and landscapes to sets of plates. This preoccupation developed along with reason, balance and scientific thought. Regulation reflected, and was active in, the creation of a worldview in which attention became focused on the mechanical over the organic, balance rather than asymmetry, and an individual rather than a corporate way of life (Deetz 1977, 40) (figure 1.4).

The Georgian Order is an unhelpful interpretative concept if it is considered as a cultural monolith. The notion of ideology tempers this inclination and allows it to be a possible device with which to consider how people lived in relation to their physical and

social environments. Spatial and temporal divisions are made to appear natural through created and recreated ideologies.

Ideology being neither worldview nor belief, is ideas about nature, cause, time, and person, or those things that are taken as granted by society as given...these ideas serve to naturalise and thus mask inequalities in the social order; ideas, such as notion of person, when accepted uncritically, serve to reproduce the social order, including the uneven distribution of resources, and it reproduces rather than transforms society (Leone 1996, 372).

Daily time is cut up into rational, controllable segments. Past time is segmented and used to give the impression of a continuum between the past and the present (Leone 1996, 374). Through ideology these taken for granted are made legitimate and natural, giving the illusion that they should be and have always been as they are. Power relations are mystified, control is made natural and usual, timeless and perpetual (Orser 1996).

Ideological constructs emerge in response to challenge and change, or 'where there are disparities in wealth, power, or access to knowledge and opportunities...or where traditional forms of social control are being eroded' (Handsman and Leone 1989, 119). However, recognising social tensions and their causes, and the use of houses to mask these problems, fails to realise that the houses could, consciously and unconsciously, be used not just to mask, but also to mediate complex social relations.

The nature of the relationship between humans as individuals and as part of a nexus of social relations creates tension. McGuire suggests that contradiction, and so conflict within all human relationships and with the natural world, generates the dynamics of change (McGuire 1992, 15). Small changes in relationships can alter the general structure of relations, which in turn affect individuals and so on in a dialectic relationship (McGuire 1992, 12). Humans act as individuals, as part of social groups and as part of society as a whole, and consciously or unconsciously these roles often act in conflict with

one another. Giddens refines this notion of contradiction, proposing that each society has a primary contradiction,

...societal totalities are *structured in contradiction*, involving the fusion and exclusion of opposites. In other words, the operation of one structural principle in the reproduction of a societal system presumes that of another which tends to undermine it. This view supposes that...there is one principle axis of contradiction, which I shall call the *primary contradiction* of that type of society (Giddens 1995, 231-2).

Giddens considers the primary contradiction of feudal, agrarian societies to be located in the dichotomy between the differing social institutions of the city and country (Giddens 1995, 237). In terms of country houses in Scotland the primary contradiction was located in the identity and role of the landowner, as much as in the appeal to both innovation *and* restoration or maintenance of the status quo, or change *and* tradition. At Inveraray and Blair, for example, the traditional kin-based clan system eventually became superseded by the legalistic relationship of the landlord and tenant. The increasing importance of documents and finances over paying rents in kind (through either goods or service) and personal relationships suggest the difference in social organisation.

The involvement of landowning aristocrats in society outside of their areas of power affected the way they perceived the world, and in turn influenced the management of their estates and design of their houses. Highland chiefs were involved in Lowland society, if not in England, and industrial or mercantile interests became fused out of necessity with landed interests.

Social change, and indeed the maintenance of social structure, is a continuous process of social negotiation. It is not a process instigated and controlled by an elite. Power and ideology are not exclusive to this elite, instead they are tools used and manipulated by all social agents to create and maintain their own place in the social world. The material

world can be imbued with a number of meanings at any given time. This is particularly true if meaning only exists through human agency. Therefore 'power lies with those institutions or individuals who manage to continually promote a particular authoritative meaning or knowledge against the intrusion of others, for the possibility exists that alternative meanings may be advanced to challenge that authority' (Graves 1989, 299).

It is assumed, though, that a consideration of the landowners, their social context and motivations, would be to consider the rest of rural society passive. In the sense of not seeing the actions and reactions of others to changes demanded by the landowner, seeing their social strategies, and acceptance, manipulation or rejection of imposed conditions, this is true. However, the actions and decisions of the landowner did not take place in an isolated social vacuum. They acted and reacted in relation to others, of their own and other social groups. The elite did not just impose rules *on to* others, they were defining and maintaining their own place in the world *in relation to* others. This allows an active role for others in their world. This is seen through the physical projection of their power which reached its apotheosis in their country houses and estates. Designs and functions were not based purely on cultural incentives. Rather as social actors they 'do things with, to, and in respect of each other, using means which could be described as cultural' (Orser 1998, 316).

The aristocracy are not often seen as people, but rather tend to be considered as a nebulous entity, or an homogenous, omnipotent group. For instance, 'On the local scene down in the countryside where most Scots lived the power of the lord who gave the lease and took the rent was as little to be questioned as the power of God who brought the seedtime in spring and the harvest at the end of the summer' (Smout 1985, 261). The elite

were not a unified group perhaps because, rather than in spite of, the fact that they shared general goals such as the maintenance of position and authority. Competition over limited resources of land, influence and royal or governmental favour created tension and antagonism.

These pressures also exerted themselves in a local context, where the rural population were not always passive, but subverted authority in subtle ways such as trespassing. The elite were not always in contradiction with others, the chief contradiction was in their own role as both paternal overlords, and as part of a local and a national community. Buildings express individual and social identities. 'A building's form, function and space each has meanings in the field of social relations, each is capable of signifying who we are, to ourselves, in society and in the cosmic scheme of things. And each speaks of both power and bond relations' (Markus 1993, 30).

The country houses of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries were essential in sustaining the owner's part in the social world. In a dialectical relationship the house received its meaning from the social existence of the owner, and contributed to the shaping of his or her patterns of behaviour. Country houses demonstrate an awareness of different audiences, and again contradictions are highlighted. At Inveraray Castle, for instance, Gothic and classical styles are used together in the same building to project images specific to the intended audiences. This is subtler than a relationship of domination and resistance. Moreover, the meanings given and those received can be contradictory, and these contradictions may be subtle and incipient rather than open and obvious.

The Use of Symmetry: A Perfect Image

Late seventeenth and eighteenth century houses symbolised the power of an elite at the top of a carefully structured hierarchical pyramid. One means by which society expresses rank is through an ostentatious display of wealth and social position.

Paradoxically, through the emerging use of symmetry hierarchy is also denied.

As a member of society the individual favoured a symmetrical image that could be easily conceived and was, therefore, egalitarian. As an individual, however, he must have felt a need to repress his own potential behind a mask, for his humanistically perfectible house was a perfect image of enclosed, artificial control (Glassie 1975, 170).

Conformity to the rule of symmetrical presentation suggests that its use went beyond an aesthetic display. Ordered, symmetrical houses are, 'the denial of personality and a public presentation of an ethos' (Glassie 1975, 170). The willingness to conform implies a wish to appear to belong to a specific group, those who are using the same patterns. Those within the same privileged group as the owner of the house would understand the message of education and wealth in a classically inspired symmetrical façade. Everyone who encountered a Georgian house may not have understood the cultural associations of the symmetrical image, but it would still have created an impression of harmony and balance. Familiarity with military architecture such as the barracks at Bernera near Glenelg or Inversnaid on Loch Lomond (figure 1.5) would also unambiguously have associated symmetry with authority.

Symmetry was a powerful tool in creating the required impression of harmony and balance. The visual presentation of symmetry and order could mask an irregular collection of rooms, or an optical illusion hide the absence of true symmetry as at the remodelled Glamis Castle where a new wing was built to add balance (see figure 4.14). It is the intended impression which is important.

Negotiating the Everyday: Potential Audiences and Actors

Country houses are particularly apt structures to demonstrate the negotiation of everyday encounters. Within and around even a moderately sized house a number of different types and ranks of people lived out their daily lives. Owners and 'owned' lived together, and these two general groups were fractured also. Within the family there were divides between male and female, adults and children, and to some extent the old and young. Servants, too, were subject to segregation along lines of gender, and also differentiated due to rank. For instance, the steward and housekeeper were treated differently to kitchen maids and stable boys.

The housekeeper must report to Lady B[readalbane] if any of the women should show symptoms of levity or lightness of conduct; the men servants must be made aware of the impropriety of paying improper attentions to any of the women, and that as no such conduct will be permitted in this house, their names will be reported to Lord and Lady B[readalbane] (Lady Breadalbane in Lochhead 1948, 186-7).

Unfortunately servants' accounts such as John MacDonald's *Memoirs of an Eighteenth Century Footman* (1927) are rare. Even this valuable account is unconcerned with mundane, everyday organisation. This can be seen in the spatial organisation of houses. Stewards and housekeepers had their own rooms, for example. Different experiences of the same layout meant that contrasting views of the same house developed. Meaning was realised through social practices, and this could include the social practice of exclusion on both a symbolic and functional level.

Markus has noted that most studies of architectural space allow for only two categories of people: inhabitants and strangers (1993, 13). These two broad categories

indicate the essential opposition in types of people who may interact with each other and the building- those within and those without. As with those living in the building, visitors and those who were excluded did not represent homogenous entities. Those outside may be familiar with and to those within the house, and the actual structure. A nearby farmworker will probably have a differing view to an itinerant worker, or a touring member of similar social rank to the owners of the house. Visitors to the house, those allowed access, may be strangers who maintain a formal distance from the inhabitants, or intimate visitors such as friends and patrons, or members of extended families. Those within the house could be part of the family, or the servants, and both of these groups contained individuals who may not have similar views and opinions. They may not be permitted to move around the house in the same way and to be allowed access to certain areas and rooms. For instance, 'None of the country people, tradesmen, or out-door servants must be permitted to come into the hall.... None of the servants are to go into the kitchen or scullery. No eating or drinking allowed except in the servants' hall at the regular hours' (Lady Breadalbane in Lochhead 1948, 185).

The motivations of the owner are the key to understanding country houses, particularly as they were likely to have helped 'design' the building, or at least have approved of the layout, and the implicit social order it represented. The house embodied an idealised social order, and so embodies the perceived place of the owner, his or her sense of social identity within society as a whole, and demonstrates society as they experienced and conceptualised it. Country houses were the most conspicuous medium through which landowners could attempt to control their social world. This was

complicated by the different roles and relationships their position required them to maintain.

1.6 Data selection and logistics: Refining the case study sample.

The selection of houses for detailed case studies in this thesis is the outcome of extensive background research, familiarity with the potential sample for study, trial and error and, on occasion, personal preference. This section discusses the processes of selection and decision-making, clarifying the range of buildings and other materials available for study, and defining questions asked, problems encountered and potential found. Associated with this discussion are two appendices. The first provides a reference point for each of the houses discussed here, including location and map references, owners and architects, a brief description and some bibliographical references. It also includes the short lists of the twenty-eight, then sixteen houses considered for study. Appendix two is a copy of the fieldwork checklist discussed later in this section.

Refining the case study sample

To be equipped with a firm understanding of the subject, the resources available and range of houses suitable for study, research initially constituted the scanning of general sources on Scottish country houses of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. In particular, overviews such as John Dunbar's *The Historic Architecture of Scotland* (Dunbar 1966), and Miles Glendinning et al.'s *A History of Scottish Architecture* (Glendinning et al. 1996) represent a solid starting point in terms of potentially interesting houses and possible availability of resources. Other works of architectural history such as James Macaulay's *The Classical Country House in Scotland* (Macaulay

1987) or Deborah Howard's *Architectural History of Scotland: Scottish Architecture from Reformation to Restoration 1530-1660* (Howard 1995) augment this general overview and, through highlighting themes such as architectural influences, also direct attention to a selection of houses specific to the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries which feature regularly throughout these works. Most of these houses feature in this section and will be discussed. Periodicals concerned with country houses, most notably *Country Life* and the *RIAS Quarterly*, provided short but interesting articles on buildings. The Scottish Development Department of 1960 published a *List of Buildings of Architectural or Historic Interest* which is available in the architectural department of the RCAHMS, and is complemented by Historic Scotland's (HS)/ Scottish Natural Heritage's *Inventory of Gardens and Designed Landscapes* (HS 1998).

Regional guidebooks with a focus on buildings emphasise any regional differences and, obviously, refocus interest on geographical location. The regional illustrated architectural guides of the RIAS and the Exploring Scotland's Heritage series (general editor A. Ritchie for the RCAHMS) are particularly useful as guides to potential houses. These are complemented by two very different resources, the RCAHMS inventories which provide facts, statistics and some guidance as to source materials, and eighteenth century travel diaries such as Defoe's *A Tour Through the Whole Island of Great Britain* (1724-7), Pennant's *A Tour in Scotland and Voyage to the Hebrides 1772* (1772) and Johnson and Boswell's *A Journey Through the Western Islands of Scotland and the Journal of a Tour to the Hebrides 1773* (1984). *Vitruvius Britannicus* Campbell (172?-1725), *Vitruvius Scoticus* (Adam 1980) and, for instance, Slezer's views in his *Theatrum*

Scotiae (1693) encouraged further research into their images providing, along with diaries and accounts, an essential primary resource.

Personal visits to national institutions such as the National Archives of Scotland (NAS) and the Royal Commission of Ancient and Historic Monuments in Scotland (RCAHMS) and their associated internet resources (for example the RCAHMS' Canmore) and consultation with architectural historians such as Geoffrey Stell (RCAHMS) and Aonghus McKechnie (HS) proved pertinent to the refining of potential case study examples and resource base.

Once fully conversant with the material and with a firm understanding of Scottish country houses of the period and the available resources, the list of potential case studies was whittled down to a sample group of twenty-eight houses. Each of these houses can be found in appendix one (see also figure 10.1). The main conditions at this stage included factors such as when the houses were built, the location, landscape and size. The decision to focus quite strictly on 1660-1760 immediately reduced the number of potential houses, with more building programmes carried out in the last third of the eighteenth century. However, a few examples such as the late sixteenth century Fyvie Castle in Aberdeenshire, and Glamis Castle, Angus which, though modified in the 1670s, symbolises an earlier building type, were too important to reject. They were the houses of politically important men and show the transition from castellated structures to balanced, ordered houses. Size of the buildings is linked to status, of the house and of the owner. Smaller houses such as Mavisbank House, Midlothian, Dunkeld House in Perthshire and the House of Dun, Angus were included. These structures were significant in terms of

architectural development and their owners. Mavisbank, for instance, was built for Sir John Clerk, author of *The Country Seat* (1727), Dunkeld House was conceived as a winter retreat for the Marquess of Atholl. Early in the selection process they presented a range of architectural material to be considered (i.e. villas).

Even at this initial stage the original owners of the houses were considered, their place in society, status and wealth. Their contemporary significance was assessed basing judgement on historical (i.e. socio-political) context gleaned from letters, diaries, reports and secondary sources (see chapter three). Those at the very apex of Scottish society demanded equally high status residences. These include Blair Castle, Perthshire for the Duke of Atholl; Dalkeith Palace, Midlothian for the Duchess of Monmouth and Buccleuch; Drumlanrig Castle, Dumfries and Galloway for the 1st Earl of Queensberry; Floors Palace, in the Borders, for the 1st Duke of Roxburghe; Hamilton Palace, South Lanarkshire for the Duke and Duchess of Hamilton; Inveraray Castle, Argyll and Bute for the 2nd and 3rd Dukes of Argyll; and Thirlestane Castle in the Borders for the 2nd Earl (later 1st Duke) of Lauderdale. Each of these houses and aristocrats dominated Scottish politics in the late seventeenth and eighteenth centuries.

Other houses acquired high status through, for example, their place in Scottish architectural history. The houses of the architect-mason Sir William Bruce, a courtier himself and cousin by marriage to the Duke of Lauderdale, include Balcaskie House, Fife and Kinross House, Perthshire, and were influential in the introduction and development of the classical country house in Scotland. The architect also designed other buildings such as Thirlestane Castle and Hopetoun House. His name, along with James Smith and the Adam family, for this period William Adam in particular, dominate Scottish country

house architecture. Of the twenty-eight houses considered at this stage only four - Blair Castle, Dysart House, Fyvie Castle and Glamis Castle - have no input from these three men.

Each house was evaluated in terms of how well-known they potentially were, as suggested, for example, by their featuring in travel diaries, and how well-known they are now. All of the houses chosen as case studies feature in almost every eighteenth century tourist account of Scotland (see case study chapters). This allows a nice parallel between the current and past role of the house. For instance, a number of houses such as Drumlanrig Castle, Hopetoun House and Floors Castle now run successfully as businesses, publishing guidebooks, hiring out space for special occasions and producing their own line of merchandise. A number of houses are owned and opened to the public by the NTS: The House of Dun, Fyvie Castle, Haddo House in Aberdeenshire, and Newhailes House, East Lothian; or HS such as Aberdour Castle, Fife. All are locations in the tourist and heritage routes round Scotland.

This also links back to the question of location. The majority of houses, as befits one of the roles as centres of agricultural estates, were in those areas of Scotland which were fertile, the Borders, Dumfries and Galloway, Angus, and especially the Lothians and Fife. The north east, Scotland's 'castle country' provided examples of modified tower houses. More specifically, as show houses intended to be seen, they were generally in areas with increased visibility such as the area around Edinburgh. These houses tend also to be those most visible in the architectural/ archaeological record, and so are of immense value to further study. Modern day familiarity suggests availability of resources, including access to the actual houses.

This sample group was culled further to a list consisting of sixteen houses which were singled out for more detailed research and the first phase of fieldwork. The majority of the houses discarded at this stage provided limited opportunities due to problems of access or extensive later alterations and additions. Dysart House in Fife, for instance, is now a Carmelite monastery. Leslie House in Fife, though built by Sir William Bruce for the 7th Earl (later 1st Duke) of Rothes, a Restoration peer who financed the project with the proceeds from office rather than an agricultural estate, was almost completely destroyed in a fire in 1763. Melville House, Fife, is now a preparatory school. This not only causes issues of access but the severe but rich interior, preserved in its eighteenth century form, was removed to accommodate the present function of the structure. These issues would not, however, have been prohibitive if other, more complete examples were not available. Fortunately, for instance, other Bruce houses such as that at Kinross have fared better.

Castle Grant in the Highlands and Taymouth Castle, Perthshire represent, along with the chosen examples of Blair Castle and Inveraray Castle, the only Highland examples of country houses in this period. Both Castle Grant and Taymouth were earlier tower houses which were modified, made more uniform and 'Georgian' in the mid-eighteenth century. Both had designed landscapes, and both had the involvement of the Adam family - John Adam modified Castle Grant and his father, William, worked on the landscaping at Taymouth. However, both of these had issues of access. Castle Grant was for sale and in poor enough condition to be listed on the *Buildings at Risk schedule* (Architectural History Society of Scotland). Taymouth Castle had similar issues of ownership. Blair and

Inveraray Castle simply presented themselves as better examples. Taymouth Castle, in this period owned by and modified for a Campbell, the 3rd Earl of Breadalbane, is overshadowed by the other Campbell structure, Inveraray Castle. Blair Castle, today still owned by a Duke of Atholl, accessible and redesigned for a Highland chief and a British politician, provides a more complex example than Castle Grant.

Other houses were rejected because better, similar examples were available. Aberdour Castle in Fife is a seventeenth century building modified in 1715 by James Smith for the Earl of Morton. However, Kinneil Castle, West Lothian is not only a similar structure, an earlier building remodelled to give an appearance of symmetry, but it was redesigned for the Duke and Duchess of Hamilton, providing almost a trial for their modifications to Hamilton Palace. Balcaskie House in Fife was rejected for a similar reason. This is another example of a tower house remodelled to give an impression of symmetry and with imposed axial planning, another feature of the Classical programme. Sir William Bruce designed the house and formal garden for his own family. Later alterations and additions promote Kinross House, also built by Sir William Bruce, as a better example. This house is seen as seminal in the development of the classical house in Scotland.

Dunkeld House, Perthshire is another example of a Bruce design but in a different manner to those already mentioned. Dunkeld provided Sir William Bruce with his first opportunity to build a new house on a clear site. Built around 1679 for the 1st Marquess of Atholl, Dunkeld House was a compact, tripartite structure, intended as a winter retreat from the harsher conditions of Blair Castle. Extra interest is generated by the fact that Dunkeld House is no longer standing. However, further extensive alterations and structures on the site, which are also no longer visible above the ground, complicate

further study. The decision to not include the house, though, was made from the realisation that while there was not enough material for a full case study on its own merits, as an accompaniment to Blair Castle it may have value.

Arniston House, Midlothian embodied a complete Palladian programme but was one of many examples in the Lothians. Similarly Dalkeith Palace, Midlothian was omitted, not because it too was in the Lothians, but because other high status houses and families, such as the Hamiltons at Hamilton, Lauderdale at Thirlestane and Queensberry at Drumlanrig were chosen. Dalkeith Palace is now part of the University of Wisconsin. Dumfries House, Dumfries and Galloway was rejected as another example of a classical programme where others such as Haddo House, Hopetoun House and Newhailes were more interesting.

In summary, of the original data set of twenty-eight, sixteen (marked*) were chosen for further study. To clarify briefly the remaining twelve were rejected for the noted reasons:

* Blair Castle, Perthshire	* Hamilton Palace, S Lanarkshire
* Drumlanrig Castle, D&G	* Hopetoun House, West Lothian
* Duff House, Moray	* Inveraray Castle, Argyll and Bute
* House of Dun, Angus	* Kinross House, Perthshire
* Floors Castle, Borders	* Mavisbank House, Midlothian
* Fyvie Castle, Aberdeenshire	* Mellerstain House, Borders
* Glamis Castle, Aberdeenshire	* Newhailes House, East Lothian
* Haddo House, Aberdeenshire	* Thirlestane Castle, Borders

Aberdour Castle – Kinneil Castle more interesting as ties in with Hamilton Palace

Arniston House – just one example of classical houses in the Lothians

Balcaskie House – Kinross House similar but a more complete Bruce project

Dalkeith House – high status but chose Hamilton, Thirlestane and Drumlanrig instead

Dumfries House – Haddo and Hopetoun Houses more interesting

Dunkeld House – Not standing, numerous additions to site. Accompany Blair not stand alone.

Dysart House – Poor access, now a Carmelite monastery

Castle Grant – Access – poor condition and for sale. Blair Castle a better, fuller example.

Kinneil Castle – Use with Hamilton Palace, not alone.

Leslie House – Almost completely destroyed 1763

Melville House – Poor access, changed function. Now a preparatory school.

Taymouth Castle – Poor condition and ownership issues. Inveraray better Campbell example

Each of the sixteen remaining structures was visited in order to assess accessibility and to further familiarity. A simple process of initial observation and recording was carried out noting, for example, general structure and material, landscapes and vistas, and taking preliminary photographs. Obviously Hamilton Palace was not visited, though the site and the associated hunting lodge at Chatelherault were.

The final four case studies were chosen on a range of requirements taking into consideration both the aims of this thesis and the process of research. In broad terms these included:

- A. Good archival resources and access to facilitate a consideration of the building and its inhabitants.
- B. At least one famous example. This gives access to distinctive eighteenth century resources such as travel diaries.
- C. Each must have a designed landscape/ garden.

D. At least one example of an older building altered to conform to developing styles.

Perhaps an example where a Classical façade was used to hide an earlier building or other concessions were made to Georgian style without completely conforming. This may be due to practical and/ or ideological reasons.

E. Royal palaces and/ or houses of the Court aristocracy to be used in recognition of their influence (the owners and houses).

F. An example of a house which is no longer there. Other examples may have earlier buildings in their grounds so also indicating issues of precedence and the significance of history. The house no longer there is only a consideration if a suitable house is found – it could be a disadvantage too. Otherwise prefer houses in a good state of preservation and not too altered.

G. The presence of associated villages or townships. This allows consideration of the relationship between the ‘big house’ and the locals, and the extent to which surrounding landscapes may have been manipulated.

(N.B. These letters A-G are used for quick reference in the following three pages.).

(A) Each of the houses, other than Haddo House and Mellerstain House have good records for the period. (C) Moreover, every building has an associated landscape. The most impressive in terms of gardens in close proximity to the building are Glamis Castle with its system of courts, and Kinross House, where the formal gardens and forecourts were part of an integrated building and landscape design. Extensive, far-reaching landscapes of note include Inveraray Castle, Blair Castle and Hamilton Palace. The landscape design at Duff House, Morayshire included the provision of a canal.

(G) Houses such as Floors Castle, situated just to the west of Kelso, or Kinross House which was built outside the town of Kinross but situated on an axis with the tolbooth steeple, are associated with towns. However, at the period in question only Inveraray, where the town was deliberately moved to a site away from the new castle, and Hamilton where a more gradual removal of the town occurred, are specifically associated with towns. In fact these buildings can not be discussed without mention of the neighbouring communities.

(B; E) Those buildings which garner most mention in travel diaries tend also to be those which were designed for the court aristocracy. In other words 'palatial' projects such as Hamilton Palace, Blair, Inveraray and Floors Castles, and Hopetoun House. These houses were both visually and fiscally impressive, and equipped to provide hospitality, whether the family were at home or not. The building programmes, lavish and large-scale, invited curiosity and, therefore, appealed to travellers such as Dr. Johnson and James Boswell. Drumlanrig and Thirlestane Castles were also structures designed for court aristocrats, the Dukes of Queensberry and Lauderdale respectively.

(D) Older buildings modified to provide uniformity and balance, if not to conform to strict Classicism, include the early examples of Fyvie Castle which was remodelled in 1596 with a monumental, symmetrical entrance wing, and Glamis Castle which in the late seventeenth century was modified to present, with clever angles and use of perspective a symmetrical image upon approach down the main avenue. Floors Castle, in order to provide a suitable residence to reflect the new Dukedom conferred on the 5th Earl of Roxburghe, was transformed in the 1720s from a tower house to a Georgian mansion.

In this case, unfortunately, significant remodelling of the interior and exterior by William Playfair between 1837-45 completely altered the fabric and character of the building.

Thirlestane Castle was also a project of remodelling and enlargement provoked by aristocratic competition. The late medieval tower house was considered out of date, particularly for the Duke of Lauderdale, prominent as Charles II's first minister in Scotland. A symmetrical forecourt layout and graduated pavilions added to the old house created an image of balance and proportion. Internally the new design was based around sequences of spaces, reinforcing the processional character of the long axis. Classicism inspired the provision of state rooms on the first floor, a second great apartment on the ground floor for the Duke and Duchess, and so the displacement of service areas to the wings.

Hamilton Palace is similar to Thirlestane. It was an earlier building, modernised in the late seventeenth century to reflect the status of its ducal family. Modification became almost complete reconstruction with an eventual half H-plan courtyard design emerging, incorporating an elaborate porticoed centrepiece. The rooms were based largely on a sequential design with division of family and state, and separation of main service areas. In addition it provides a rare and fascinating example of a building which is no longer standing (F). This requirement was not essential for a case study, but provides an extra layer of interest in an archaeological study (see chapter five).

Blair Castle represents an almost 'split personality' structure. In the 1740s the medieval tower house was 'tidied up' to give an image of balance, for instance, with the ordered placement of sash windows. It is painted white in stark contrast to the surrounding countryside, and includes a vast designed landscape complete with sham

castle and wilderness. It also still looks like a tower house and, during the period under discussion, exercised its defensive role. Plans drawn up but not executed due to the restrictions of the older structure ensure that Blair Castle presents an opportunity to consider an ideal structure as opposed to the reality of that structure (see chapter seven).

In terms of the broad considerations (A-G) listed above (pp50-51) the sixteen houses may be annotated as providing examples with these factors:

Blair Castle - A B C D E G	Hamilton Palace – A B C D E F G
Drumlanrig Castle – A C D E	Hopetoun House – A B C E
Duff House – A C	Inveraray Castle – A B C D E G
House of Dun – A C	Kinross House – A B C
Floors Castle – A B C D E	Mavisbank House – A B C
Fyvie Castle – A B C D E	Mellerstain House - C
Glamis Castle – A B C D E	Newhailes House – A C
Haddo House - C	Thirlestane Castle – A C D E

In addition to these issues both large, complex houses and smaller houses such as villas which may have been either secondary houses or owned by those further down the social scale were initially considered. Dunkeld House, built as accompaniment to Blair Castle, has already been discussed and rejected as a case study. Mavisbank House is another example, built by Sir John Clerk of Penicuik as a villa located halfway between Edinburgh and the principal family residence at Penicuik. This elegant, compact villa, complete with garden and fake Roman archaeological excavation was located to supervise the nearby coal mine. The House of Dun was built for an important man, David

Erskine, a Judge of the Court of Session, but not for a high status, court aristocrat.

Townhouses such as Queensberry House on the Canongate in Edinburgh were also briefly considered.

All of these would have provided a means by which to compare and contrast the requirements of buildings which largely had the same functions but were different in nature. Emulation and influence were essential facets of the relationship between the court and lesser aristocracy and the socially aspiring gentry. Due to time and space constraints, however, these issues were dealt with only superficially, although discussion of, for example, the Palace of Holyrood does deal with this.

Comparison of neighbouring aristocratic houses would have been interesting, but in what was already a relatively small available sample for study may have proved too limiting. To accomplish this the geographical area within which the greater number of classical houses were built would have necessitated the case studies all being located within the Lothians, around Edinburgh. The aims of this thesis required houses to be located in differentiated localities. For instance, consideration of the significance of social and political factors meant it was essential to include rarer Highland examples which had a differing social context to the Lowland region. Therefore social, religious and political factors were integral to the decision-making process. Moreover, given the possibility of only four Highland examples, two of which, Blair and Inveraray, conformed to every broad area of interest except that both are still standing, whereas Taymouth and Castle Grant are already noted as weaker examples and had prohibitive access problems, two of the case studies were confirmed.

The final case studies

Blair Castle and Inveraray Castle both presented themselves as interesting, viable studies. As high- status, ducal seats, the houses of important aristocratic politicians, each has extensive written records, both in their own archives and in national archives such as the NAS and NLS. The Inveraray archive is not openly accessible, however, Inveraray and the Dukes of Argyll are strongly represented in nationally accessible arenas. *The Saltoun Papers*, for example, can be found in the National Library of Scotland (NLS) and contain numerous examples of correspondence, with information as to estate affairs, between the 3rd Duke and Lord Milton. Both buildings and their vast landscapes are open to the public, both feature in travel diaries and are still well-known in Scotland. Blair Castle represents a modified tower house but one which, interestingly, is restrained by its own earlier fabric. Inveraray Castle, on the other hand, is a fascinating instance of a town being subject to aristocratic whim, but not necessarily with a completely compliant town populace.

Of the fourteen houses remaining it was decided that two more would provide a neat balance to these two Highland buildings. All fourteen are in the south and east of the country. Evidently some suggested themselves more strongly than others. Essentially the case studies, in order to present complimentary studies to the two already chosen, needed to be of comparative status. Duff House has good records and a designed landscape but represents an example more perfectly suited to a discussion of lesser status houses built from trade and industry. The House of Dun has the same advantages, records and landscaping. Haddo House, though austere classical, otherwise only had a landscape to recommend it, but both suggested, much like Duff House, greater relevance to a different type of enquiry - in this case houses built by Lords of Justice, important but not at the

apex of society. Mellerstain House would also fit into this parallel study, as would Newhailes House. This last, however, is a wonderful example of the classical country house in Scotland with excellent records in the form of the *Newhailes Papers* (NTS).

Drumlanrig Castle, Floors Castle, Hamilton Castle and Thirlestane Castle are all high status, almost palatial, building projects of the court aristocracy. Although not a ducal project, Hopetoun House is a building of equally high status, built for a member of the court aristocracy, though financed with 'new' money. Each of these presented a viable topic for detailed study. Hamilton Palace, however, is an outstanding example. It has good archival resources, is high profile, featuring in letters and diaries and so a feature of the eighteenth century travel circuit, is an integral part of an extensive and impressive landscape which included the Chatelherault hunting lodge, and was a palace in terms of size and grandeur, and the status of the Duke and Duchess. Moreover, it is a modification of an older structure which is an exemplar of both architectural ambitions and of restrictions presented by the actual, physical structure. The environs over which the building and owners exerted an influence extends to the neighbouring town which was gradually removed and segregated from the house. As a case study it would also allow for Kinneil House, modified for the same Duke and Duchess almost as a precursor to the larger project at Hamilton, to be included. Last, but not least, it is the only short-listed house to no longer be standing (see chapter five).

The choice of Hamilton as a third example did, in a sense, condition the fourth case study. Drumlanrig, Floors and Thirlestane, though all interesting, are a little too similar to Hamilton. All are the seats of high profile, politically important Dukes. All are large, impressive houses and landscapes with good archival resources. Hopetoun House,

however, high profile and high status, complements Hamilton, Blair and Inveraray, but also offers enough difference to provide variety. Unlike Hamilton in the south west of the country, Hopetoun is in the south east, embodying the classical ideal and an exemplary instance of such a house in the Lothians. Given the concentration of classical houses in this area it would seem incongruent not to use one. Built with the proceeds from industry it was still the house of a politically and socially prominent family, designed to exude this status and grandeur. It is also a house which, while a new construction on a green site, developed from a large Bruce house into a sprawling, complex Adam palace (see chapter six).

Further to these four houses which were to be looked at in detail others were chosen which, while not intended to form entire studies on their own, were considered essential for an understanding of Scottish country houses. Fyvie Castle and Glamis Castle, as discussed above, are fundamental buildings in the context of Scottish architecture, particularly in the transition from the medieval castle or tower house form to the classical country house. Kinross House is another seminal building in the development of the classical style in Scotland. Mavisbank House is an interesting example of a smaller villa, more so as a house of the author of *The Country Seat* (1727), a poem which guides readers as to the ideal image and layout of the classical country house. The first three of these, in particular, contribute strongly to the discussion of architectural context (see chapter four).

One of the most significant questions permeating the choice of case studies was whether the houses in question were examples or exceptions. In a sense the four buildings chosen are both. They exemplify aristocratic buildings of the period, particularly in the

manner in which they embody responses to the Classical ideal. They are exceptional in the same terms. As houses of the few families at the apex of the social pyramid in Scotland the sheer size and magnificence of these buildings renders them exceptions. They were exceptional buildings which became influential examples permeating the ideals of Classicism down.

The research required in order to select examples for further study had collected a good level of information about the houses, including potential routes for further study such as archival resources and bibliographical references. Resources ranged from maps, in particular Roy's military survey in the eighteenth century, first edition Ordnance Survey maps generally from the mid-1800s, and estate maps. Plans for each house are found in *Vitruvius Scoticus*, estate archives and national repositories, in particular the RCAHMS. Travel diaries, letters, contracts and different visual images are available similarly in private and national archives including the NLS, NAS and RCAHMS. These constituted primary material but it must be stressed that the fundamental primary resource of an archaeological study of houses is the actual buildings.

Research provided clarity and focus for fieldwork which consisted of personal visits, observations and recording. Detailed record sheets were created in order to note features and were supplemented with sketches and photographs. Specific routes were walked in order to consider various approaches and to experience as much of the sites as possible. This more detailed approach allowed for a more focussed assessment which then aided analysis and interpretation.

The Fieldwork Element

Fieldwork provided an opportunity to understand, first hand, the physical nature of the country houses considered in this thesis. The fieldwork sheet formulated for this exercise represents a regulated, ordered system for viewing the houses and landscapes (see appendix two). The *fully* articulated checklist was guided by the case study selection process and so was only applied at the final case study stage. The form aims to cover all areas of the buildings, but is not comprehensive. The term 'checklist' is slightly misleading with its implication that concrete points are searched for, found and then simply noted. An element of flexibility is built into the form, with some points left 'loose' to allow for the individuality of each house.

The fieldwork plan is firmly rooted in the extensive research which went before it. The checklist is informed by a solid understanding of historical and artistic context, theoretical and ideological concepts (such as the concept of 'reading' architecture as a text). In terms of the buildings alone the research undertaken was general and specific to the type of building, the individual building, the individual owner and/or family and the geographical area. This knowledge was then refined down to the most salient, and potentially observable, points. In essence detailed background information formed a basis from which to assess what *might* be found in the buildings and the potential significance of these features. For example, in order to appreciate seventeenth and eighteenth century aristocratic houses, to understand their full contemporary significance and to detect underlying elements requires one to be fully conversant with Classicism.

Even with extensive preparation and a firm understanding care must be exercised. An unbreachable divide exists between the modern researcher and the past. When considering the actions of past actors and the nature of space it is essential to bear this in

mind. Modern perceptions inevitably inform understanding to some extent and it is impossible to fully eradicate this. The question-based archaeological approach does acknowledge and allow for this. A research-led, self-aware and critical approach addresses empirical attitudes. At this fieldwork stage assessment was made within reason. Decisions as to types of space, for instance whether a space should be seen as a transition area, came later in the interpretative process.

The fieldwork form was required as evidence of a systematic approach to the material. However, it should be noted that there are different kinds of 'systematic'. On one level it holds unappealing connotations of scientific analysis. As an aid to observation this form was an appropriate recording tool, but as an element in a question-based study there is still a certain level of superficiality. The 'systematic' of the Royal Commission of Ancient and Historical Monuments in Scotland (RCAHMS) is useful but unnecessary here. Each of the four case study buildings has already been surveyed, measured, categorised and recorded. In the case of Inveraray Castle in particular this has been done in intricate detail as the greater part of volume seven of the RCAHMS Argyll inventory (1992). As the bare skeleton of observation this information is essential. To augment and compliment these measurements and technical drawings, photographs were taken, and sketches and notes made, in order to record observations and experiences. Questions and problems thrown up by the background were investigated, though not necessarily answered definitively. The development in the plan of Blair Castle, for instance, was ultimately untangled from plans and descriptions rather than just from the physical remains which have since been further altered and are harled and whitewashed over in order to present a uniform image.

The observations made at this stage were used to inform further study of the buildings and to illustrate analysis.

More important for this thesis is the *significance* of the material. The buildings are large and complex, composed of distinct elements and constructed for specific functional and individual or socio-political reasons. The designed functionality of these buildings went beyond utilitarian functions, and the cultural and social significance of this must be inferred from background research and the material evidence of the buildings themselves. Even so function is often blurred. Whereas measuring and recording can define spaces in terms of size, shape and light for example, context has the advantage of potentially providing the insight required to label the space, to identify its possible uses, the possible people who may have interacted in that space, and the significance of the space to those social actors. Context provides reference points from which to assess not only the spaces which are present, but the importance of those which are absent. This may include, for example, the presence of features such as fireplaces in certain rooms, or the absence of socially significant areas such as galleries or state apartments.

Context represents an opportunity to identify ideological elements and trends. The aim of this thesis is not to follow many historical archaeological studies and search for these processes. However, any study of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries must acknowledge the potential expression of ideals such as privacy. Classicism and the Georgian Order model suggest a template from which to observe elements such as the increasing specialisation and classification of areas within buildings. This highlights once again the absolutely fundamental process of research from which a firm foundation for study can be built. Vital to interpretation is the ability to observe and judge value-laden

elements and terms which come from the differential uses of space, such as alienation and segregation. While observable in the material remains these processes are rooted in the social and cultural. Significant potential (and observable) trends used here include: symmetry and balance which are often based in the tripartite plan; simplicity and uniformity; perspective as seen throughout and around country houses from the creation of vistas, the use of proportion and the angles of approach; and various elements of symbolism such as stonework and height and hierarchy. Binary opposites provide integral points of comparison and include internal/external, front/back, ornamentation/plainness, and colour/whiteness.

My access to each of the buildings studied was limited in the sense that I could not investigate every single space within the house and grounds. To some extent this was unavoidable, for example the Duke of Argyll is in residence at Inveraray, but it was also partly intentional allowing a greater understanding of, or empathy with, the eighteenth century visitor. As with tourists such as Samuel Johnson and Daniel Defoe public rooms represent the experience of a country house. Travel diaries dealt with our regions of access. In other words the visitor is experiencing only those rooms which were intended to be seen. In terms of fieldwork this should not be considered to invalidate the possibility of looking at 'backstairs' areas and private spaces, indeed service areas were looked at. Archaeological methods are tested as analysis relies to a greater extent on the house itself and the received knowledge of how it works. At least the notion of different regions such as private and public, or entertaining and family is confirmed

Houses have changed enough, in function if not also in form, to remove the need for every inch of the house to be covered. In a large number of country houses such as

Hopetoun House, kitchens and stables in particular have been turned into cafes or gift shops. This indicates how dependent the use of each space is on the immediate function of the house and the residence patterns and social role of the owners. Most houses of this period are now dependent on visitor income rather than being required as permanent residences, so priorities are now in favour of the tourist. When families are in residence patterns of access change to accommodate their privacy.

This fieldwork form formalises the principles of observation. The fieldwork process as indicated by this discussion was more complicated. Questions such as what elements remained distinctively Scottish in a type of house increasingly conforming to an international architectural 'language' are essential in considering why these houses were built. Messages are sent and received, consciously and unconsciously, by combinations of symbols. As discussed by Rapaport for instance the pluralistic nature of messages requires that the message, the sender and the receiver are all understood (Rapaport 1982, 52).

Specific questions asked of each of the case studies are discussed throughout the opening chapters of this thesis. The issue of whether changes are a specifically Scottish phenomenon, in other words specific to the context of Scotland's political, economic and social situation, or whether they are products of a global 'phenomenon' underlies this thesis. Issues of individuality, sociability and politics are more significant. The question of what knowledge may be gained from an archaeological approach is implicit, though it cannot be stated too strongly that this is not a polemic advocating archaeology as the only discipline equipped to 'correctly' study this material. Practical concerns, in terms of the

original house owners and designers, were not lost sight of. At every stage a balance between the general (context) and the specific (case study) was aimed for.

Interpretation and analysis relied on a process which generally consisted of asking how houses were intended to be used or viewed, how they were actually used and/or viewed and so how successful the intended image was. Social context was then referred back to in order to assess why the image was believed to have been needed in the first place.

Some Scottish peculiarities?

Regardless of shared pattern books and experiences in France and Italy the country houses of the Scottish aristocracy developed from a different tradition. Some of these differences were slow to disappear into the uniformity of the Classical programme. McKean has noted that the predominant architecture of each country is a consequence of its geography, geology, culture, climate, politics, materials, religion and wealth. Scotland suffered from rain and weak light; relied heavily on stone as a building material until the seventeenth century; and as a consequence of a short growing season was often low in ready cash though rich in men and materials, but relied on craftsmen from the south rather than managing to afford those from abroad. The result was 'an indigenous architecture of unique plan form, geometry and mass' (McKean 1993, 232-233).

The historical context presented here emphasises that Scotland and England became increasingly aligned after the Restoration of a Stuart king in 1660 and increasingly so after the Union of 1707. The geographically mobile and socially connected aristocracy formed a progressively more cohesive group as interests and influences in the two countries became more firmly united. This is apparent throughout the case studies

presented in this thesis, particularly through the time spent at Court in England and the shared architectural ambitions of aristocrats both north and south of the border.

Classicism, which became the shared architectural ideal of both countries, was by nature a 'levelling' programme. The socio-cultural history of the style made it international in character, intentionally applied to signify wealth, education, authority and precedent, and through its uniform characteristics, symbolised membership and confirmed identity as part of an elite group.

To a great extent the point of this thesis is the complexity of the situation of the two countries, both internally and in relation to one another. The two countries were different but there was a move towards cultural conformity. Scotland by the mid-eighteenth century was not radically different to England or to other European countries. The significance is not how different or alike the countries were, but the impact the changes had *for* and *within* the country.

The greatest asset, economically, politically and socially in England was land. Through the seventeenth to the nineteenth centuries land represented the dominant employer and mainstay of the English economy. The foundations of society continued to be rooted in land ownership (Clemenson 1982, 7; 12). The geography and climate of Scotland meant that the nature of the socio-political network of relations was based on two predominant factors. Lowland, arable areas shared the emphasis on land with England. The more extensive Highland areas lacked arable land. The economic and social system in these regions was more ostensibly based on people, or the presence of vassals. The case studies in this thesis provide examples of both systems, and so an opportunity to register the possible solutions employed to manage changes, particularly those from a

vassal based 'feudal' system to a land/trade/industry based economy. These solutions had to take account of the changing nature of the power base. The authority of the landowner relied on his role and position in relation to others. While consciously changing these relationships his or her own positions had to be preserved. The country house, at the heart of their power bases, symbolised the status quo. Their main architectural preoccupation of building country houses suggests their efforts to maintain their own dominance. 'Never in Scottish architectural history, before or since, has a single building type overshadowed all others to the same extent' (Glendinning et al 1996, 71). Intensifying the protection of the landowners' positions and interests was the common sense of identity based on family, name and estate. As Edmund Burke noted at the end of the eighteenth century landed interest is 'a partnership not only between those who are living, but between those who are living, those who are dead, and those who are to be born' (1968, 194-5). Both position in society and self-identity were at stake. National prejudices and differences were still apparent. Defoe, for example, on his tour through the Highlands noted that the landscape was not sublime, but 'a frightful country' - bleak, mountainous and terrifying. He also noted the absence of industry (Defoe 1724-7, 3). Once again the significance of context and symbol cannot be over-emphasised. This is provided in more detail in the historical discussion and throughout the cases studies.

The next three chapters are concerned with context: chapter two with the methodological context, chapters three and four with an historical and architectural framework within which to situate the following case studies. The houses in the case

studies demonstrate a material response to the social world of their owners, the difficulties of the period and the complexities and contradictions of their positions.

The case studies are not completely uniform as each was chosen to highlight slightly different aspects of the aristocratic country house. The scale and grandeur of rebuilding at Hamilton Palace symbolised the maintenance of the status of its owners, locally and nationally. It was intended to modify an earlier structure but an almost wholly new building finally emerged. Internally it is an early example of the sequential layout of rooms. The picture is completed with an extensive landscape, including changing relationships with the town of Hamilton which demonstrate shifting attitudes towards responsibility, duty and an increasing tendency towards isolation and segregation.

Hopetoun House, on the other hand, was a new house, though interestingly built in two defined phases. Built by a new peer with the proceeds from industry, this grand example of adherence to classical austerity (plate 1.2) highlights the material projection of belonging to a group. Spatially significance is given to an apartment layout and the inclusion of state rooms. The house is also representative, although on a grand scale, of the numerous houses built around Edinburgh.

Contradictions in the roles of the owners of both Blair and Inveraray Castles are strongly reflected in the houses as each strove to appeal and respond to different roles and audiences. Blair Castle was, essentially, a modified tower house. Although balanced with Classicism it even maintained its defensive purpose. The complication of the suggested plans for modification and the compromises made between these plans and the actual changes to the house are interesting. Blair is also an example of an outstanding landscape.

Inveraray Castle is the finest example of the relationship between the roles and responsibilities of a house and its owners. The castle fuses tradition and innovation; it was a new building formed to resemble a castle, a classical house with a Gothick style. Interestingly the orientation of the house changed between its original layout and its actual use. The landscape and the complete removal of a town are equally significant. Blair Castle (plate 1.3) and Inveraray Castle both provide rare Highland examples, and it is interesting to consider them in relation to the two Lowland houses (figure 1.6).

Each case study chapter does follow a similar pattern, briefly noting the changes to the house, then providing some context as to the house and its owner(s), and concluding with discussion including landscapes and towns where applicable. All of the houses have status in common, belonging to members at the apex of the social pyramid. Each is an outstanding example of the country house as mediator between the individual owner, his or her own and other social groups, and with nature. The concluding chapter will then consider the case studies in relation to one another, the ideas informing analysis, and how successful the houses were in mediating the place of their owners in society.

Chapter Two: Methodology - Some Approaches to Space

The common goal of archaeological approaches to buildings is the attempt to understand the people who created and used architectural space, their actions and attitudes, and their relationships with one another and with their environment. Informal and formal spatial analyses stress sight and movement, or the placing of people and things in relation to one another in varying degrees by considering notions of architectural space such as boundaries and access. Each method has an interesting contribution to make to the study of spatial arrangements, but the significant theme is the consistent emphasis placed upon people and society.

The origins of the various methods point to the multidisciplinary nature of an archaeological approach. The aim in this thesis is neither to advocate one specific spatial approach nor to create a new methodology. Indeed a variety of methods inform this thesis. This does not constitute a “pick and mix” approach involving a trawl through all the approaches and discarding disliked elements. Instead it represents a carefully considered selection of appropriate tools which may enhance the required understanding of the buildings. This refers back to archaeology as providing a question-based approach. In order to further an understanding of houses the archaeologist must choose the best tools for the job. In the case of each method the important advantages and disadvantages, what the method has been used for in the past and why it may or may not be appropriate for this thesis, are discussed.

2.1 Informal or Experiential Approaches

At the most basic level is the anthropologically observed concept of houses as people. A house is considered as an extension of the person and so an extension of the self. Space is inhabited in daily life and in the imagination and, as such, is the container of human thoughts and of human bodies (Parker-Pearson and Richards 1994). All houses satisfy basic needs of living including cooking and eating, possibly entertaining, and sleeping, but there is a huge variety in the ways these functions and needs are accommodated in houses of different historical periods and cultures (Hanson 1998, 2).

Informal, or experiential, approaches focus upon qualitative interpretation. Buildings, or the spaces within them, are considered in terms of their potential meanings, or the possible emotions they elicit. Symbols and context are vital to understanding.

Cosmological approaches recognise the importance of a society's conception of the world, and the place of humans in it. Cosmology is examined as an overall principle of classification and order, directing spatial and temporal elements of daily routines. It also stresses the danger of deterministic interpretations. Richards' studies of Neolithic houses in Orkney (for example Parker-Pearson and Richards 1994), for instance, use symbolic analysis to consider how preference for specific orientations and attitudes towards factors such as light and dark, and male and female relate to activity and the way space is structured through the medium of architecture. Spatial structure is further linked to conceptions of the world by examining other forms of late Neolithic construction such as henges, passage graves and standing stones. Richards considers how the development of monuments occurs and how they draw on the visual imagery of the natural world in their

architectural representation (for example 1996). The sequence of construction transforms an area as new ‘landscapes’ are created and manipulated. This, Richards concludes, comes to embody the totality of the Neolithic Orcadian world and acts as an *axis mundi* for cosmological belief.

Cosmological approaches tend to focus on prehistoric structures. The absence of documentary resources prompts the need to look for explanations elsewhere. Cosmology is understood by archaeologists to underlie to varying degrees structures from all periods but it is taken for granted in more modern buildings. This approach is of interest in this thesis with its emphasis on the link between belief and material culture. For instance the preoccupation with, and manipulation of nature in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries indicates a link between spatial organisation, ways of seeing the world and the place of humans in it. In particular formality was juxtaposed with informality with contrasts highlighted between the ordered house and the ‘natural’ world, the geometrical parterres and plantations and the untamed landscape, and the formality of manners with the comfort of hospitality.

Experiential approaches strengthen the archaeological perception of the built environment as a result of human manipulation, *and* as active upon human experience. Sight and movement, views and impressions are stressed, making it explicit that people moving in and around the house are central to an understanding of the structure. The significance of signs and symbols becomes integral to this viewpoint as do personal views, ideas and experiences. In a country house the deliberate impression of grandeur and wealth symbolised for instance by a lavish, high-ceilinged public room, and the

impact of this upon a visitor, as seen in the sentiments of awe, delight and respect expressed in travel journals demonstrate that the demands made of a building were not just practical. A functional interpretation would see a high ceiling as simply providing the larger and lighter space needed to entertain large gatherings (see Etlin 1994, 131). The possible experiences of a building are recognised as important. The reaction of an infrequent visitor to a house upon noticing a beautifully decorated ceiling, or a grand staircase, would not have been the reaction of someone who lived in the house and saw them everyday. Their opinions would in turn be different to those of the servants who had to keep them clean and well maintained.

Interesting concepts such as the presence of transitional areas can be appropriated for the analysis of space within a country house. A transitional area, such as an entrance way or an initial reception room is often seen as a neutral space, purposely devoid of social meaning. However, these areas have a fluid meaning, changing with the actions and perceptions of the people within them. In the country house a drawing room or salon becomes public when receiving visitors, but once they are accepted the room reverts to privacy. The relationships of the various actors involved, and the active role of architecture, are emphasised.

As a generator of general concepts ethnoarchaeological methods are useful and have been used, for example, to study architectural space in reference to social differences. Roberta Gilchrist, for example, applied this method to her consideration of the 'evolving perception of the concept of community in medieval English monasticism' (Gilchrist 1989, 55). This approach was facilitated by the existence of a modern monastic

community living in a restored medieval monastery and following the original Rule of their order.

A study of eighteenth century country houses cannot import the particular social conditions of Gilchrist's monastery. Useful though is Gilchrist's suggestion that, from her ethnographic evidence, space is structured according to real and ideal boundaries such as seniority within the house, male and female liturgical roles, the secular/religious divide, and the recognition of individual and communal time and space (Gilchrist 1989, 58). In more general terms these are the notions of seniority or authority, gender roles, ideological divides and private and public times and spaces. The creation and use of architecture is demonstrated through its active role in the social world.

2.2 Formal approaches

Informal, or experiential, analyses add a layer of abstraction to the study of space in that they do not reduce buildings or settlements to diagrams in order to emphasise features such as access and form. Instead they seek to find explanation within anthropologically observed behaviour, perceived similarities elsewhere within the material record, or similar patterns in the landscape. Formal analyses based on the relationships of spaces have been used by archaeologists to focus on the possible movement of people through spaces, how they communicated with each other, and how their actions may have been constrained. Emphasis is placed on everyday use of a building as reflective of more nebulous, ideological aspects. Therefore, in terms of understanding space, methods such as shape grammar, access analysis and planning

diagrams provide interesting insights. However as practical applications the reduction of complex buildings to abstract graphical representations can be over-complicated, confusing and ultimately unproductive.

Formal analysis brings us no closer to past social actors. Spatial diagrams also fail to provide objective presentations of physical reality, instead adding their own level of abstraction. Any conclusions reached or diagrams drawn are products of interpretation, and inevitably represent a way of looking at buildings which would be unrecognisable to the original occupant. Even the most spatially aware inhabitant would understand a building by being brought up in it, living in it, experiencing and inhabiting its spaces.

Shape or Transformational Grammar

Shape grammar as developed by Henry Glassie in his *Folkhousing in Middle Virginia* (1975) utilised his understanding of structural linguistics to develop rules which formed a building competence for the colonial farmer/builder in Virginia. These rules were unconsciously held by the farmer/builder who learnt them by experiencing the surrounding architecture (Glassie 1975, 67). 'Buildings...incorporate a "grammar" whose rules- although used as unconsciously by their designers as linguistic grammar is employed by the speakers of a given language - can be recovered by archaeologists' (Samson 1990, 8). Transformational grammar permits changes in architectural form and plan over time to be traced, and in turn to be related to the historical context of the period.

Shape grammar equates to a detailed language with associated grammar. As different words can produce sentences of various meanings depending on the rules of grammar employed, units of space can be placed together in different ways to produce various

structures. Working on the basis of squares and half-squares Glassie developed eight rule-sets which by observing the varying degrees to which builders conformed allowed him to measure innovation and change in the house, and subsequently in society (Glassie 1975, 67; 89). He concluded that the open, non-symmetrical house with multifunctional communal areas became a closed, symmetrical house whose rooms had specialised functions and whose inhabitants were isolated. This embodied a response to a changing, unstable society.

However in aiming to equate building structure with social structure Glassie's analysis is constrained by his structuralist standpoint. New house forms provided a means by which social tensions were eased or disguised but there is no explanation as to how the structure (social conditions) was originally created. The potential for individual agency, or freedom of thought and action, is neglected in the conviction that 'all the old houses down in middle Virginia were products of one mind at work' (Glassie 1975, 40). Matthew Johnson (1993) adapted some of Glassie's ideas in an archaeological context, explaining the change from open-hall to subdivided (closed) plans in Suffolk houses at the end of the medieval period. He chose a wider application of the method using the binary principle of open/closed to explain house form not as reflective, but as a *reflexive* instrument of social control and social change (Grenville 1997, 21).

Shape grammar also concentrates on the structure of a building, to the extent that it overlooks the actual experience of living in such a structure, and the active participation of the builder/ owner. Glassie's study also centres on vernacular buildings as they developed from organic to planned, making this method less applicable to a study of

formal architecture. Moreover, without the use of graphic aids the mathematical notations used to demonstrate buildings are complicated and difficult to read (figure 2.1). Constant reference needs to be made to keys which added to already difficult formulas make the charts almost impossible to understand. As a methodology Glassie's work is difficult both to use and to comprehend. Theoretically it is equally flawed in its striving to find underlying structure to the detriment of the individual, but it still has great value in the link Glassie established between spatial and social structure.

Planning Diagrams

Planning diagrams represent an early syntactic approach to space, basing analysis on the assumption that 'the ordering of space in buildings is really about the ordering of relations between people' (Hillier and Hanson 1984, 2). As developed by Faulkner in his study of fourteenth century castles (1963) (figure 2.2) planning diagrams are primarily concerned with architectural space, and how the experience of one space may be different to another. Attention is paid to which spaces are connected to which others, but the focus is on the differences between the actual spaces. Therefore some notion of form and scale is given as well as movement through space.

Planning diagrams represent space in an abstract, graphical manner and consist of the breaking down of an architectural plan to show rooms drawn to scale with one another. Rooms are reduced to simple rectangles so small rooms and recesses, for example, may be ignored or reduced to symbols. Access routes are drawn between rooms but their scale is not important. Floor levels are made clear, but no focus is placed upon relative depths within the building. This allows a clarified view of what type of spaces led into one

another, their size, shape and relationship with other spaces. It could be argued that planning diagrams show little more information than conventional floor plans, but the accent is placed upon various routes and the shape and scale of different spaces. For example the differences between an anteroom that then led into a large salon used for entertaining would provide an impact, heightened by the juxtaposition of these two different spaces.

The absence of explicit theory makes planning diagrams accessible to a number of different uses. Faulkner's aim was not to describe underlying 'truths' about buildings or to locate all-encompassing worldviews but to understand buildings in a more precise way and to note underlying similarities and differences. He used it as a comparative technique to discern groupings of particular rooms representing the growing number of households and sets of lodgings within the fourteenth century castle. The various functioning and attitudes towards these different groups may lead to enlightenment as to social relations within the houses. Faulkner compared his groupings in relation to various positions of authority, and in relation to one another at the beginning and the end of the fourteenth century demonstrating 'the elaboration of domestic demands over the period and manner in which these were integrated into a single concept' (Faulkner 1963, 221).

Planning diagrams have also been used as a means of studying and recreating planning arrangements of individual buildings. As part of a restoration programme Gilyard-Beer used this method to clarify the original arrangements of de Ireby's Tower at Carlisle Castle (1977) which had been lost through five hundred years of continual occupation.

Rutherford (1998) pushed the method further by using it to help to elucidate social relations within the medieval castle in Scotland.

Significantly this method emphasises the possible impressions given and received of the spaces which make up a building, recognising the central role of the individual and the experience of passing through varying spaces. As Fairclough notes, by pointing to functional relationships between spaces in a building rather than just spatial arrangements, planning diagrams are appropriate representations of the experience of the insider (1992, 351). Space is not considered as objective, not just reducible to sets of measurements. It must still be remembered though that a number of different views of the same space may exist simultaneously.

Access Analysis

Access analysis developed as a method by which the relational, or syntactic, nature of spaces may be represented (figure 2.3). Spaces are not considered individually, but are seen as units within an interconnected nexus. In concentrating on relational aspects of space this method highlights the element of access pointing to its chief benefit - the emphasis on action and movement within space, rather than the static presence of walls and doors. This allows for focus to be placed on the people within the structure, their possible routes around it, elements of choice and restriction, and the everyday meetings with other actors which may have occurred. The possible reality of living in or visiting the house is considered. 'The theory of "space syntax" is that it is primarily - though not only - through spatial configuration that social relations and processes express themselves in space' (Hillier et al 1987, 363).

Because the key to access analysis is that spatial relationships are seen as inherent in the social world, not as isolated and individual phenomena, this method has become a popular one. Archaeologists have used it in attempting to understand a range of structures, such as Foster's study of Early to Late Iron Age Orcadian structures (1989) (figure 2.4), Gilchrist's nunneries (1994) or, more appropriately for this thesis, Markus' consideration of Enlightenment Scotland (1993) or West's discussion of eighteenth century country houses in England (1998) (figure 2.5). Allan Rutherford gave the method its most thorough and interesting archaeological treatment in his study of castles (1998), emphasising social life within a class of building usually interpreted in terms of defence. While the possibility of interpreting social relations from archaeological remains proves attractive, most archaeologists use access analysis only partially, rejecting much of Hillier and Hanson's theoretical basis.

As with Glassie, linguistics provided the starting point for a theory of space syntax. A morphic language was created emphasising pattern, or syntax, as the conveyor of meaning. A decade of research into space syntax or the 'lawfulness of space created for human social purposes' (Hanson 1998, 1) culminated in *The Social Logic of Space* (Hillier and Hanson 1984). The notion of space syntax developed as a system of rules which restrict the configuration and use of space but do not determine every aspect of layout. Similar to Glassie's identification of the space grammar underlying superficially different eighteenth century houses in Virginia, Hillier and Hanson ascertained the space syntax underpinning a variety of layouts in various hamlets across the Vaucluse region of France (Hillier and Hanson 1984, 61).

Building on the linguistic model originally associated with the theory of space syntax *The Social Logic of Space* borrowed the genetic concept of the self-replicating and mutating gene to allow for a dynamic and reflexive concept of space. Hillier and Hanson searched for a genotype (organising rule or principle) which produces the overall form of a spatial configuration, or phenotype (the actual physical realisation of the rule). The genotype consists of flexible elements which can be applied in varying measures, added or removed, but always conforming to the underlying pattern and so reproducing the genotype. Therefore not every phenotype need include all the principles which make up the genotype allowing for variation and so individuality within the confines of the pattern. Any phenotype, or layout, represents only one of a number of possible outcomes that could be generated by the genotype (Hillier et al. 1987, 381-382).

The theoretical basis is still simplistic but does reinforce the argument that spatial order correlates in some way to social order. The search for a genotype though, much like Glassie's search for underlying structure, is of doubtful benefit. The discovery of a pattern may assist if looking at layouts in a comparative way but the detection of this genotype does not enlighten the aspect of social relations from spatial layouts.

Hillier et al. have demonstrated that the mapping element of access analysis can be used legitimately without the theoretical background. By recognising that an understanding of social significance is part of the interpretative process informed by an understanding of the context of a layout they remove the focus from the search for a genotype. Instead access analysis is used in an experiential way to investigate concepts of space based on movement around a building. Statistical analysis of spatial integration and

segregation suggested two genotypical tendencies for seventeen complex farmhouses in Normandy with apparently quite different floor plans. The defining of two 'types' of building, in this case the farmhouse based around the *salle commune* and the other around the entrance hall, is not the most interesting element. The significance of this study is the correlation made between lifestyle variables such as the fresh light placed on the distinction in the historical record which draws a contrast between female- and male-centred views of the interior (Hanson 1998, 80) and the patterns of space. Three defining elements were identified: *orientation* which regulated the general orientation of the built elements of the farm in relation to one another and the outside world; *frontalité* which distinguished between front and back areas, and associated functions; and *lateralité* which regulated the functions inside and in the farm as a whole by disposing spaces and functions to the left and right of the master as he stood at the entrance to welcome guests (Hanson 1998, 80). These elements formed the designing principles of the farms rendering the search for a genotype unnecessary (Hanson 1998, 80-107). The mechanics of access analysis can be separated from the theory of space syntax. However without context, in this case gender differences, such a study would be impossible.

Access analysis as a relational mapping technique aims to map and quantify interrelationships of rooms as a means by which the structure and functioning of a given society may be drawn. Access maps provide a visual guide to the complexity of individual plans and a way of comparing them for similar patterns. The graphs themselves are made up of vertices or dots representing space, and edges or connecting lines representing access between spaces. More recent studies use keys to allow better

definition of spaces. For instance symbols are used to represent service areas or state rooms in palaces (for example Richardson 2003) (figure 2.6).

Hanson's later work on the nature of space added further complexity to the issue of how to distil spaces into classes. She defines four space types: **terminal**, end points in a justified graph linked to other areas by one entrance. Terminal spaces accommodate movement to and from themselves and are intended mainly for static occupation by people or things. **Thoroughfares** cannot be dead ends but are on the way to or from dead ends. By implication any movement through a thoroughfare is highly directed. **Traversed** spaces have more than one link so can be passed through. They lie on a single ring so it is possible to enter at one point in the ring and leave at another. **Intersections** have two or more links and form the intersection of more than one ring. Movement generates choice as to where to go (Hanson 1998, 173-4).

The starting point of an access graph is referred to as the carrier space, represented by a circle within a circle \circ . The carrier space is usually a point outside the structure, more often than not the main entrance but it can be placed anywhere. Different carrier spaces may generate very different graphs of the same spatial layouts. Weighting access graphs to consider the patterns from various carrier spaces allows an understanding of possible physical progression through a structure, the depth of each space relative to the exterior and the choices that a person moving through the layout can make (Hillier 1987, 364). Choice depends on the availability of different routes to get to a particular space in the building, or the possibility of access.

Access graphs representing possible circulation routes in the building are either ring-like or dendritic (tree-like) in form (figure 2.7). Rings represent ease of access or distributed space; a tree-like graph signifies inaccessibility or the non-distributed, relative discreteness of spaces. The more ringy the graph the greater the number of possible routes to a specific space; the more tree-like the more limited the number of routes (Hillier and Hanson 1984). Non-distributed, tree-like routes are generally interpreted as indicative of hierarchical societies, or products of strongly programmed forms of domestic spatial arrangements, as there is less freedom of choice in the movement from room to room (Richardson 2003, 132; Hanson 1998, 278). Ringy routes are more difficult to characterise as they allow for the element of choice. The significance of these spatial patterns depends on the question of permission - who is controlling movement? Hanson, aiming to see integration patterns, also gives importance to the question of how extensive the ring is in linking together parts of the spatial network. For instance, rings linking together only two or three immediately adjacent rooms only have a localised effect (Hanson 1998, 279). Spaces providing intersecting points often have consequence, usually representing powerful places occupied by key inhabitants or functions (Hanson 1998, 279).

The depth, or permeability of spaces within a building is reliant on the availability of access and depends on the number of other spaces travelled through to reach that particular point. The relative permeability of each room in a structure is considered to have a social meaning with more open, socially inclusive, or integrated rooms shallower in the building than more private, isolated areas. Access graphs are justified so that all

spaces of the same depth (in terms of the minimum number of steps taken to reach them from the carrier space) are positioned at the same horizontal level. Justifying graphs this way represented castles, for instance, as defended structures seen by the vast majority of the populace only from outside, intended to be entered through the main gates (Ferne 1998, 128). The same is true of country houses.

Different justifications can show comparisons from different points within the interior, therefore changing depth patterns (Hanson 1998, 27). In a more recent study Hanson advocates considering houses with and without links to the exterior so as to understand the relative importance of inhabitant-inhabitant and inhabitant-stranger relations for the planning of a home. Different routes from different entrances may also be considered, especially if they have different functions such as being for the sole use of men or women or for formal or informal occasions (Hanson 1998, 29-30) (figure 2.8).

Once again an understanding of context is essential. For instance the experience of and interpretation placed on occupying the deepest terminal space in the home can be quite different depending on who the occupant is and what material surroundings surround the act of 'being there'. For example, being locked as a prisoner in deepest space A with a guard occupying one of the B spaces on the only route to the exterior is different from the householder withdrawing voluntarily to an identically configured A space to which intimate guests are admitted by way of a B space anteroom. Both express inequalities in power and control but the former does so to the detriment of the occupant of the deepest space whilst the latter does it to his or her advantage (Hanson 1998, 272) (figure 2.9).

Although useful as visual aids these graphs can be deceptive, failing to take into account the specific social context of the spaces in question. Access from one space to another relies on more than availability and adjacency, but is contingent on factors such as permission and routine. Hanson (1998) used configuration analysis to look at a sample of English country houses from the beginning of the seventeenth century to the end of the nineteenth century. This method develops the analysis of access patterns. Comparisons of the size and elaboration, the number of transitions (corridors, passageways and stairs) and entrances highlight the different natures of movement or potential movement patterns. For example the internal circulation of Hardwick Hall in Derbyshire (1590-96) makes it impossible to move through the house without passing through important occasion spaces where the household gathered together, and for the reception and entertainment of guests. Patterns had changed by the time of Coleshill House, Wiltshire (1650) where no function space participates in any of the global, ringy routes which pass through the exterior. Four substantial chains of directly linked spaces forming major global rings within the domestic interior were composed of transitions so it was possible to move throughout the house without ever entering a room (Hanson 1998, 171-2) (figure 2.10).

Methodologically speaking access analysis generates its own problems. Primarily it requires the definition of discrete spaces. The difficulty arises from the physical and socially constructed properties of spaces. A series of corridors, for example, would be considered a single space as all are within the same boundary and possess no doors or screens to restrict movement. On the other hand small lobby spaces are considered as part of the more substantial spaces which they lead into. As an access graph this interpretation

of space is misleading, missing detail and blurring potentially significant boundaries (Grahame 1995, 55). In terms of country houses a seemingly innocuous lobby area may have served as a vital distancing space which only an understanding of the types of adjacent spaces could make clear. Open layouts with no clear architectural boundaries may still embody spatial configurations. Problems arise in identifying such indistinct often conceptual boundaries in archaeological contexts (Grahame 1995, 55). Even in relatively well-documented country houses such spaces are difficult to interpret.

Rather than dividing space on the principle of boundedness an alternative suggestion has been to divide open space into the fewest number of convex spaces possible. Convex space is where 'straight lines can be drawn from any point in the space to any other point in the space without going outside the boundary of the space itself' (Hillier and Hanson 1984, 97) (figure 2.11). Basically the spatial layout is divided into the fewest number of rectangles possible (Markus 1993, 14). Dividing up the open spaces and translating each convex space into access graphs gives a greater sense of progressing around a building than when the same area is treated as a single space (Markus 1993, 14). This allows for angles and dimensions which alter views, potentially alter the direction of movement and create a sense of moving from one space to another (Markus 1993, 14). However dividing the space up too rigorously can also indicate a different kind of space, or segregation of a space where there is none (Grahame 1995, 68). Bounded and convex principles may be applied to the same building which while not representing methodological vigour (Hillier and Hanson 1984, 98ff) does more realistically represent the nature of most layouts.

Hanson deals with the ambiguities of open and continuous spaces with convex spaces and isovists, or visual fields. Visual fields allow for aspects of apparently open areas hidden by the placing and shaping of walls and rooms to be seen. For example, chicaned entrances designed to prevent direct viewing into interiors (Hanson 1998, 40). Visual fields essentially embody the 'panoramic rendering of much of the interior transparent, or are penetrating so that narrow glimpses of the interior are revealed' (Hanson 1998, 43-44). The barriers which end-stop visual fields can be significant architectural or cultural features or blank walls. The area covered by a visual field can highlight important object arrays, gatherings of people, or movement patterns (Hanson 1998, 43-44). The actual methodology is a complicated one requiring advanced computer knowledge. The principle of the visual field is significant to any consideration of a class of building, such as the seventeenth and eighteenth century country house, in which visual alignments, vistas and the element of vision are so important. In terms of the analysis of house interiors though this methodology can be simplified, considering the general views available from certain points.

Even more problematic when dealing with complex, multi-floored country houses is that access analysis tends to provide a graphical representation of space as applicable to the horizontal plane, ignoring the three-dimensional aspect of buildings. Hillier et al. state that multi-storey buildings can be looked at by reducing three-dimensional space to two dimensions by the use of stairs, ladders or lifts (Leach 1978, 197; Hillier et al 1987, 403). However Hillier and Hanson's examples all focus upon the ground floor of a building and no specific methodology is indicated (1984). Each floor may be considered individually

but the treatment of the connecting staircases can change the overall shape of the access graph, and consequently how the interpreter sees the building.

The key problem is in trying to represent vertical movement in a two dimensional diagram. How should the staircase be seen in spatial terms? Is a staircase which serves several floors to be considered as one single space, or does it represent a number of defined spaces? For example a staircase serving four floors could be considered as four spaces or as a vertical corridor represented as a single transition space from which other spaces are accessed (Rutherford 1998, 70) (figure 2.12). Each view generates very different diagrams of the same layout, so permits very different interpretations. The staircase as a single space, vertical corridor is represented with each room linked to the staircase at the same level, disregarding floor levels. The vertical corridor staircase has less depth in graphical form than the staircase made up of separate spaces.

The treatment of staircases depends on the reasons for using access analysis. Rutherford, for example, is interested in the sense of movement through a building so views staircases as embodying various spatial elements (1998, 71). The staircase is seen as a vertical corridor, but recognition is made that height has a different quality than distance. As the vertical plane is an important element in how space is considered, height can be given recognition in an access graph, defining it from horizontal space. Therefore every area of a staircase which represents a transferable space is treated individually: stairfoot, landing and stairhead (Rutherford 1998).

Different stairs in seventeenth and eighteenth century buildings need to be treated according to their functions. The main staircase must be represented in diagrammatic

form as in Rutherford's study as a series of discrete spaces. The main, or great staircase was a central and highly symbolic feature of country houses of the period. The stair itself represented rank and power, culture and education as seen through its scale and location within the structure. The intricate carving of expensive wood or stone and other artistic features such as painted ceilings and murals, or the significant placing of coats of arms and portraits augmented the focus on wealth and lineage.

Permission to access and use the stair was equally important indicating acceptance of the visitor and implying shared values and standards. The Great Stair could suggest equality of position and status to one visitor while another guest was made to feel awe and gratitude at such patronage. These stairs often led from the entrance hall to the principal, or entertaining, floor (i.e. the *piano nobile* or State floor) with no direct access to any other area of the building. At Hamilton Palace for example the visitor proceeded from the entrance hall to another hall which led only to the Great Stairs. The sole purpose of these stairs was to take the visitor to the state rooms above (see figure 2.13).

The landing areas of these stairs were as important as the stairs themselves. As the flights of steps provided a ceremonial route upon which encounters could take place and conversations be held, so the landings were discrete spaces providing a pause in processional movement. They also represented another distancing space both in terms of actual spacing and permeability (i.e. the distance from the carrier space to a specific room in the house) and in their role as transitional spaces. Access to a landing indicates acceptance and is a fixed point on a route. If doors leading to other areas are present on stairways they are accessed from the landing areas. A consideration of the nature of

landings leads to problems of representation with access graphs. For example should a landing be denoted with its own symbol \diamond , or as a transitional space? Hence the need for a contextual understanding of the spaces which cannot be extracted from a diagram.

Service stairs on the other hand functioned more as vertical corridors. The essential role of these stairs was to allow quick, fluid movement throughout the building. Unlike the great staircase these stairs were usually hidden and discrete. They were neither intended to be seen or to be lingered over, nor to be symbolic. Service stairs were functional and areas such as landings generally contained doors which provided direct or indirect access into an area requiring service. Of course while stairs were designed and formed for these purposes no graph can account for the likelihood that servants took some advantage of their isolation to pause for a rest or gossip along their way.

Theoretically the treatment of stairs is of vital importance when considering methodologies. However it is not an overriding *practical* concern in this thesis. Access analysis is not a central feature of this study. The case study diagrams attempted in this chapter are used to assess the uses of this method in reference to the aims and approaches of this thesis. The frequent absence or fragmentation of plans for each floor of the seventeenth/ eighteenth century structures create difficulties in drawing a detailed diagram. For the sake of translation the entrance floor (as the primary level at which access to the house was gained) was considered as the departure point of any graph. Upper and lower levels were considered as separate diagrams though indication was given as to how each level linked into another.

The issue of multi-storey buildings provides a particularly strong example of how access analysis can obscure meaning, or suggest a meaning which is not contextually aware. It has been suggested that access analysis could, for example, help to explain why state apartments in country houses and palaces are rarely found on the ground floor, but are usually one level higher. In the same way the position of family rooms may be elucidated. This may be useful in terms of family rooms, showing their depth within the building. However, an understanding of the place of state rooms is dependent on other criteria, in this case the architecturally established notion of the *piano nobile*. The spatial and social significance of this derive from the tenets of Classicism and are absolutely integral to the identity of the eighteenth century landowner and the projection of this identity. To have employed and to appreciate Classicism stated membership of the educated, social and political elite.

In structures as symbolically rich as country houses access analysis represents severe limitations. It is criticised for ignoring form as an element of architectural space (Markus 1982; Boast 1987; Fairclough 1992). It could be argued that planning diagrams redress this balance by providing an impression of relative room sizes. However large amounts of potentially critical information such as decorative schemes are lost (Grenville 1997, 17). Formal analysis has no capacity to understand or illustrate elements such as different staircases and entrances. The significance of ornamentation and even ostentation cannot be underestimated in the country house where a great deal of social meaning was invested in these elements. 'By ignoring symbolic meanings we overlook the possibility that design structures have different meanings in different cultural contexts' (Parker-Pearson

and Richards 1994, 30). Such analysis is highly codified and mechanistic involving the systematic extraction of symbols from their historical and social context (Lawrence 1987, 48).

Symbolism is socially and culturally contingent. Access analysis allows the assumption that social organisation can be 'read' off from an access diagram, that the 'social is reflected in the spatial' (Grahame 1995, 52). Different social systems may be represented in similar access patterns, highlighting the significance of contextual understanding. A building with multiple routes for instance may suggest an egalitarian society with freedom of movement. Alternatively a number of routes may be explained by a strictly hierarchical society with divisions between masters and servants firmly in place (Grenville 1997, 20). On the other hand 'very simple environments may be highly divided conceptually and these divisions may be indicated either not at all physically - or only in very subtle ways' (Rapaport 1980, 298-9).

Without contextual awareness a formal approach may ignore differing cultural strategies of privacy regulation. Unwarranted assumptions about the relative depths of space as equivalent to ease of access are implicitly made, while rarely yielding any information on the meaning and uses of specific spaces (Parker-Pearson and Richards 1994, 30). Furthermore it should not be assumed that because a building retains fixed access patterns its use has not changed. The social use of space is constantly adapting and changing (Grenville 1997, 20). This is demonstrated through the case study diagrams later in this chapter. '...buildings are more than passive containers for relations. Like all

practices they are formative, as much through the things that happen in them, their functional programme, as by their spatial relations and their form' (Markus 1993, 11).

Richardson's 'Gender and Space in English Royal Palaces c.1160-c.1547: A Study in Access and Imagery' (2003) is a good example of the importance of context in any interpretation based on access analysis. The context of interpretation is, as the title suggests, provided by reference to imagery. Without this element the spatial analysis would be reduced to random and meaningless observations of space. The paper focuses on the apartments of queens consort, examining routes through the building in tandem with analysis of their decorative treatment. It is revealed that the queens' apartments are isolated from public buildings and ceremonial routes through the palace complexes. 'Alongside the paucity of female imagery, particularly in halls, such patterns appear to be the architectural manifestation of restricted access to power' (Richardson 2003, 131).

The siting of the kings' and queens' apartments considered through spatial analysis revealed contrasting expectations and perceptions respecting their occupants. Gender theory and imagery further illuminate some aspects of the gender role assigned to women. Queens' apartments in general, and their chambers in particular, constituted 'private' space, where the kings' were 'public'. 'The early palaces describe a spatial manifestation of the king's central role in government' (Richardson 2003, 163). Though Richardson has created extensive, interesting access diagrams the success of the study is from the consideration of imagery. Results are based on this, or its absence (over the period studied there was 'little female imagery within public areas and hardly any in halls' (Richardson 2003, 164)) rather than access analysis. The sparse amount of

documentary evidence for the role of women in medieval palaces prompted the use of access analysis to reveal potential elements which would otherwise be invisible. Spatial analysis, if used, must be employed alongside other information integrating strengths and eliminating weaknesses of each form of evidence.

Even with the possibility of varying the justification of graphs access analysis, as it is most often used, allows for only two types of people - inhabitants and strangers. 'Space around buildings and within them is a continually structured entity, which allows strangers to move around but only to admit into buildings two categories of people - 'inhabitants' and 'visitors'' (Markus 1993, 13). The inhabitants control the space as they have an investment of power; visitors are controlled, as they become subject to the system that they are entering (Hillier and Hanson 1982). 'The *raison d'être* of the building is to interface the two groups and exclude strangers' (Hillier et al 1987, 383).

King's study of twenty manor houses in East Anglia c.1300-c.1530 employed techniques of formal analysis to elucidate changes in size and spatial organisation. The aim of this study was to explore trends such as increasing complexity in domestic architecture while moving away from emphasis on the seemingly universal desire for privacy and the emulation of aristocratic fashions (King 2003, 106). Traditional access analysis is modified to consider only one point of access, the main entrance. This permitted a focus on the experience of the visitor. Spatial diagrams are used not to represent the true morphological access diagrams, but are interpretative only, designed to explore some of the actual experience of moving through a medieval manor house. Other paths of movement are recognised as having been possible (other than those seen through

access analysis). These alternative experiences are not necessarily easy to reconstruct. King, for example, would face the problem of the fragmentary survival of service buildings (King 2003, 118). Access is also recognised as being dependent on function and status. There is some success in the observed centrality of the hall and courtyard (King 2003, 110).

Architecture by its very nature creates interiors and exteriors and consequently those who belong inside and outside. However, I would argue for a number of different levels of perception and engagement within these two groups. Those within the house could include servants, women, children, even the elderly, who would be perceived differently, and would use the house in a manner specific to their role. It could be argued that not all audiences are equally important, or are not equally valid. However, this is slightly missing the point. The major recognition is that there *are* different audiences. It must be accepted that not all audiences can even be considered in great detail. To some degree an understanding of their place in the house is reliant on supposition and informed guess work. This is not necessarily a weakness though as to argue that access analysis allows us to look at buildings in a way that an original occupant would find natural (Rutherford 1998) disregards the fact that we ask very different questions of spatial layouts to the original inhabitants (Grahame 1995). All actors cannot be equally appreciated but this standpoint acknowledges the significance of their views. The range of people involved with the house highlights the position and authority of the owner. This in turn emphasises the complexity of his or her role so explaining the required complexity of the social and political role of the house.

The fluidity of space, either physically as with rebuilding, or conceptually as with transitional spaces is not considered. Transitional spaces have already been discussed (see p73). The fluid and dynamic element of time also adds to the difficulties of spaces containing so many different groups of people. Servants' daily routines and permitted movements around a house were restricted and regulated. These controls were imposed in relation to the other members of the household, the family. A servant may have been allowed access to a private room such as a bedchamber, or an entertaining room, but only at specific times. These movements would be controlled by time as well as space - timed to either avoid contact with the family and guests, perhaps while cleaning, or to coincide with a need for direct service, such as at meal times. None of this can be considered through access analysis. For the seventeenth and eighteenth century country house daily routine and, in particular, seasonality, were integral in defining their use. The country house was used differently, and contained varying groups of people, at different times of the day, week, month and year. To apply access analysis to all these different moments would be complicated and not guaranteed to bear useful results.

Other Methods Building on Access Analysis

Fairclough used composite analysis, combining planning diagrams and access analysis, to look at castles. Instead of symbolising spaces as dots rooms are represented as in planning diagrams (1992, 462). He considered depths of spaces as well as relational and comparative aspects but, rather than negate the limitations of each method, they are combined. Diagrams are complex and confusing and, as Rutherford points out, staircases pose a particular problem. 'In access analysis a staircase is a number of specialised

spaces from which other spaces are accessed. In planning diagrams they are represented pictorially as routes linking rooms. Form and scale are ignored, so feature very differently' (1998, 77).

Hanson has built upon a number of concepts presented as elements of access analysis, or the consideration of spatial configuration. The importance of integration is highlighted with integration analysis. Based upon the creation of an access graph views of the most integrated and most segregated spaces are compared with the mean integration value for the complex, taking account of links to the exterior. 'Where a degree of difference between the integration values of any three (or more) spaces or functions is consistent for a sample of house plans, so that the most integrated space is shallow and pivotal and the most segregated is very secluded and private, we can infer that this has not occurred by accident' (Hanson 1998, 30). The difference factor quantifies the spread or degree of configuration differentiation among integration values. Each space can then be labelled as to its function and regularities are detected in terms of the relations between syntactic positions within the complex and the way in which labels are assigned to spaces (Hanson 1998, 31).

While Hanson argues that this allows the detection of a configuration rather than an interpretation by minds (Hanson 1998, 32) this is a complex addition to an already complicated method. The flaws of access analysis are built upon as the graphs provide the basis of interpretation. This is also less useful when considering only a small sample of houses. Integration analysis essentially represents an adjunct to the search for a genotype and a consideration of the degree to which each house conforms.

2.3 Landscapes

Each of the case studies presented here, Hamilton Palace, Hopetoun House and Blair and Inveraray Castles demonstrates the relationship of houses and created landscapes. Country houses provided focal points in, but also constituted integral parts of, their landscapes. As such the approach used to gain an understanding of the country house can be extended to the landscape around it. The manipulated, and manufactured, landscapes of these houses provide enough material, raise enough question and debate, and have social significance enough to merit an entire thesis. The papers presented at the garden archaeology conference organised by the RCHME and the Garden History Society in 1996 (Pattison 1998) suggests the scale and diversity of landscape studies. Recording and recognition techniques ranging from aerial survey to methods of assessing earthworks (Taylor 1998, 1-6) offer a vast area of study and causes the subject to suffer from a lack of focus even before attempting interpretation.

Landscape as considered in each of the case studies here represents a larger notion than that of a garden or park. It shares, but extends, 'area' or 'region'. It is more than the 'visual and functional arrangement of natural and human phenomena'. As understood in this work the meaning of landscape relies on the active engagement of a human subject with a material object (Cosgrove 1998, 13). Landscape architecture represents a fundamental mode of human expression and experience. Therefore, as Hunt notes, the production of landscape is not simply a question of environment but one of mediation of

environment. In other words the physical environment and how the individual or society conceives of that environment (Hunt 2000, 8).

Manufactured landscapes from walled gardens to vast open parks demonstrated, reflected, reinforced, and created social attitudes and modes of social organisation. As a visual medium, and one which was experienced on a wide scale, landscape design articulated membership of a particular social group. Successful, if arduous and time-consuming, human control over nature enhanced these feelings of identity and power. For instance, the geometric garden represented an ideal to the educated landed classes. Such artificial forms could be regarded as 'natural in the Neoplatonic sense that they created the "ideal form of things"' (Williamson 1998, 20). An appreciation of this and the appropriate study of it are identical to the approach used to consider the houses. Indeed the house, garden and wider landscape are treated as a whole.

Landscapes are used and moved through, not just looked at, making their symbolism particularly powerful. A consideration of external and internal impressions of the houses allows for certain features to be recognised and assessed such as the use of location, the creation of vistas and alignment with both natural and manufactured landmarks. The alignment of vision and the use of geometrical and optical principles are all significant when looking at the social lives within these houses and their immediate landscapes. Contemporary maps in particular illustrate the significance of an appreciation of geometric form and optical illusion.

Houses and gardens were inextricably linked to the surrounding countryside, the fields and forests owned by the landlord, and the villages and houses of tenants and labourers.

Power and responsibility were inherent in these spatial and social relationships, and that of landowners to the natural environment. Avenues, for example, illustrate through the single axis of symmetry the integration of the house, garden and wider landscape. The grand avenue provided a frame within which to view the symmetrical facade of the house. The great length of the grand avenue and the planning of subsidiary avenues created views to and from the house. More importantly the avenue provided a startling demonstration of the extent of landownership: in order to plant across the land one must own it (Williamson 1998, 31-33). Radiating avenues from the house symbolised local avenues of influence and power converging on the landowner (Girouard 1978, 145).

The scale and range of choices in a landscape make formal spatial diagrams too complicated and unhelpful. Although choices of movement and vision were limited through the design of landscapes, these were effective once the visitor was already accepted *into* the particular landscape of the park or in closer proximity to the house. Limitations and manipulation then took place on a more subtle level. Many are focal such as lines of vision, features placed at strategic locations, angles and distances and cannot be wholly appreciated in plan, or at least in plan as considered when translating into a graph.

Geographical location on a more general level, such as proximity to the socially and politically developing Edinburgh may have influenced design, just as a house in the Highlands such as Inveraray Castle had to respond to a completely different social context which was to some extent dependent on the landscape.

Some conclusions

Space is not a concept which is easily quantified or classified. This is not quite the same as labelling a space such as a dining room or a library with a specific function that would be common to all. The applications of formal methods are intended to provide a graphical representation to clarify and elucidate interpretation. However, their complexity and that of the graphs they generate do not necessarily improve understanding. Access analysis can be almost indecipherable, requiring a great amount of effort and background knowledge of the structures to understand the nature of the spaces and the buildings represented. Rutherford, for example, used access analysis as the abstract graphical representations allowed him to communicate the spatial and therefore the social complexities of his medieval castles. He used access graphs for three reasons: - to provide structure for his initial analysis and interpretations; to help to structure discussion; and to aid the reader (Rutherford 1998, 50). In the case of country houses, buildings made up of even more complex spaces than Rutherford's medieval castles and governed by numerous complicated rules, and experienced by such a broad range of people, it seems inappropriate to look at spaces in a 'scientific' way. Instead a consideration of context and symbolism allows an engagement with the physical evidence and with the social life of the house.

2.4 Case Study diagrams

The case study diagrams presented here represent a consideration of the uses of access analysis in relation to the aims of this thesis in particular. In each case study more than one phase had to be considered, and both a visitors' approach and a servants' approach

have been highlighted. For the purposes of this discussion landscapes are not considered. The plans of the houses were deemed sufficient to judge the appropriateness of access analysis. A uniform approach was attempted though each building highlights some different issues. It should become clear though that difficulties and trends are present throughout the diagrams.

It is vital to note that in this instance the case study graphs were completed *after* the case studies themselves. Therefore a thorough knowledge of each building permitted, and possibly wrongly influenced, the creation of the graphs. A purer consideration of space should perhaps come from a 'cold' viewing of a plan where no previous judgement and understanding influences how spaces are seen.

Hamilton Palace

Two phases of Hamilton Palace are considered in this thesis. The 1677 Isaac Millar plan suggests the form of the building before the changes commissioned of James Smith in the last decade of the seventeenth century. Initial problems arise from the Millar plans. Only one floor is represented but, more especially, the function of each room is unclear. This is not just a problem of translation once the graph is complete but is essential when judging how to represent a space in graph form.

Hamilton Isaac Millar's 1677 plan (presumably the entrance floor).

Graphical representation from visitor 'ceremonial' entrance to the North (figure 2.13)

Hallways

The Horn Hall is clearly the starting point of the house as the initial transition space adjacent to the entrance. Exit is made either via the ceremonial route into the Laigh Hall,

into the courtyard or into a range of rooms probably used for family and familiars including the Low Dining and Drawing Rooms. It is the vital space in which decisions are made. The essential point is the separation of areas. The exit to the Laigh Hall *only* follows one route, up the Great Stair to the State rooms. Problems of quantifying space are highlighted with two different types of hall with two different functions present in the same building. The Laigh Hall is not a transitional space. By this stage the decision as to the route through the house has already been made, along with judgements as to status and expectations of the experience of the building.

Ceremonial Route

The sequence of movement beyond access up the Great Stair is unknown, but it is significant that the visitor has gone through three levels of permeability just to get to the stairs. Again it should be stressed that access via this route does not allow deviation into any other area. (Dotted line of access on the graph the only one open to a visitor of state). Another either more 'lowly' or more intimate visitor may proceed to the sequence of rooms to the east of the Horn Hall.

Courtyard

The courtyard has been represented in this graph though it seems unlikely that the visitor proceeding via the Laigh Hall would have great experience of this area. The backclose as the location of offices and working areas such as the bakehouse has been disregarded in this graph as an area which no such guest would habitually have been allowed to experience.

The size and nature of the courtyard means that it is 'over-represented' in the graph in order to be considered properly. As such a large area it potentially features at different

levels, or permeabilities, of access depending on the route taken. For example from the Horn Hall it features as only the second depth of permeability and provides access to all other areas; from the Eastern range of rooms, also open to some levels of visitor, it can either be the fourth or the sixth depth from the entrance. Representation of such an area is dependent upon where access is gained from. The area cannot feature twice on a graph. Beyond the graphical aid of localised access diagrams these graphs then become problematic and confusing. Moreover the two main conclusions about the actual building are that the courtyard arrangement provides access to many areas; and that some segregation of space is present on the basis of functions. The ceremonial route is completely isolated as is the Backclose containing the chief service areas. These observations are obvious from the plans.

Access from the backclose, the most likely route of servants or tradesmen (figure 2.14)

The first transitional area in this graph is the gateway where rights of access were established. The backclose itself was made up of a number of discrete service spaces, each isolated on the basis of function. The main building was removed from this service area in spatial terms by the provision of only two routes of access between the two areas. The ceremonial route was the furthest removed spatially from the Backclose. Again all of this is evident in plan form.

Hamilton James Smith plan

Guest route from the south into the Horn Hall (figure 2.15)

(N.B. Service areas not included in this graph as visitors would not have entered this area).

Entrance

The entrance to the Horn Hall and the nature of the courtyard arrangement have changed. Entrance to the main body of the building is now from the South into the Horn Hall where decisions as to continued movement were made. The Horn Hall was still the primary transition area. Given that the room to the immediate East of the Horn Hall is the billiard room decisions made were not so much based on the type of visitor and their experience of the house but more on their purpose and function in the house. The function of the house is equally important. The billiard room was unlikely to be a primary experience of the building but one which featured during a visit.

Once past the Horn Hall the Gallery becomes the main pivotal point in the house. The Great stairs lead only to this area and it is from the gallery that decisions as to ensuing movements were made. Access was permitted to the dining and drawing room sequence, the guest suites or to the Duke's apartment. The latter is further removed by the backstairs area.

Laigh Hall

What was the Laigh Hall now features more as a transitional space. Once access has been gained to this hall there are now options as to movement rather than the enforced procession to the Great Stair. Back stairs and servants quarters may now be reached from this area. Once again the route taken is dependent less on the form of the house than on

status and the motives for being in the house (and the relationship to the ducal family). It is still unlikely that a visitor would follow any route other than that leading up the Great Stair. The ground floor now contained the offices and service areas.

Clusters?

Clusters are identifiable from the diagram, but again these are equally apparent in plan form. Each cluster represents an apartment or suite of rooms (in the case of the gallery and state dining and drawing rooms) and is served by its own stair. This both suggests convenience and the isolation of areas on principles not just of function but of attitudes towards spaces. The Duke's apartment and the main state suite are both in an enfilade arrangement whereas the apartments are ringy clusters in themselves. The depth of the State apartment must also be noted with effectively eight levels of depth having to be passed through before reaching the antechamber. The position of the charter room is significant in the same spirit of isolating areas. Near the Duke's apartment the charter room has a service stair nearby but has no direct access as it is located off a corridor arrangement. The charter room space represents the eleventh depth within the house from the Horn Hall entrance.

Entrance of a servant from service 'courtyard' to West (figure 2.16)

Each route of access is preceded by a lobby/courtyard space separating interior and exterior.

Courtyard

There is some difficulty in the circularity of rooms in a courtyard arrangement. Groups of rooms are identifiable but the nature of a courtyard is that all the rooms are

ultimately physically related. Any separation of the spaces comes from the way the rooms are used, experienced and thought about. It is clear that specific clusters of service rooms link to specific clusters of family/ entertaining areas via the proliferation of stairs throughout the house. Again this is evident in plan form.

Can the Millar and Smith plans be compared through the diagrams to see new concerns addressed by the building form? This is difficult as practicalities of the house have to be taken into account. Hamilton Palace did not have a basement so the first floor largely became service areas. The function of the Backcourt was moved into the main body of the building. This was in an effort to 'tidy up' the building, but makes comparison of the spatialities of the different phases difficult. This difficulty is increased as only Millar's ground floor plan is seen.

In each phase the separation of areas is seen as is the presence of the 'ceremonial' route. The latter is more marked in the earlier plan as movement from the Laigh Hall can only be made to the Great stair, but this is more a comment on service patterns than on visitor routes. The most significant conclusion of these graphs is that no new information about the spaces which form the building has presented itself. All observations and conclusions mentioned here are easily identifiable in plan form.

Hopetoun House

Visitor to William Bruce house (1699-1702) (figure 2.17)

The graphs of the Bruce house are based on the assumption of a finished and used house. In other words the perfect planned layout of the building. However the Bruce

house was changed almost as it was finished so creating some difficulty in judging its use. The plan used is of the principal floor.

Central axis

The key movement in the house follows the central axis straight through the entrance floor from the hall to the tribune and into the garden parlour. This provides the central focus of the house. No interconnection in the house is available other than through these central areas. The two isolated flanking areas are considered to be for the family on one side and for entertaining on the other. Once again the integration of service stairs can be seen to provide access to each area. This allowed for a clearer separation of areas but ensured that each was equally well served.

Charter room

The charter room occupies the deepest space in the house and could be accessed only through the Earl's bedroom and closet. Again this indicates the consequence given to this room. In practical terms the isolation of the charter room meant it was highly protected and difficult to reach. In the same sense the location of a room containing important documents relating to the house, estate and family was symbolic. Isolation and security proclaim the significance of the room's contents.

Whereas the closet in the family wing is accessed only through the bedroom that in the entertaining wing also had access to the garden parlour. Use of this room was either regulated by rules and convention, or access into the garden parlour suggests the public nature of this space. Access from an inclusive area into a more exclusive apartment could be explained elsewhere in the plan. The lobby to the right of the tribune (in graph form)

shows a line of access to the drawing room. However in reality this relationship did not exist. Sideways movement was discouraged, so the lobby and connecting areas existed only as service routes. This can only be known from a contextual appreciation of the building. Therefore to enter the garden parlour from the guest apartment meant either a journey through the state drawing and dining room to the entrance hall, then through the tribune to the parlour, or the additional access provided from the previously discussed closet.

Visitor to the Adam house (1699-1746) (figure 2.18)

The second phase of building at Hopetoun House increased the size and ostentation of the building. As with the Bruce plan the house was never fully used during this period. Regular use was made of the southern Adam addition and the south side of the main Bruce block in the 1750s. On public occasions additional use was made of Bruce's Garden Parlour. Apart from this the house (the main block and the whole of the north wing) remained unfinished or unused. As with the Bruce plan the graph presented here is based on a view of the intended perfect plan.

Divisions of space

The corridor arrangement of the north side of the house is emphasised with the separation of the state rooms also clear in graph form. The same applies to the northern part of the main block. The central division apparent in Bruce's plan is still essential to the plan of the Adam house as the central corridor marks the ideal dividing line between public and private areas. The central stair hall and garden parlour provide focal points. The apartment in the entertaining area of the house is in a corridor formation but the link

between the closet and garden parlour discussed in the Bruce house is still apparent. The Lord and Lady of the house are now provided with separate but adjacent apartments. Each of the groups discussed here is well provided with service stairs.

The corridor/ lobby/ antechamber arrangement preceding the family apartments provide distancing spaces from the entrance whereas other routes enter immediately into a sequence of rooms. The Bruce hall exited onto five spaces whereas Adam's hall provides access to only three. This suggests both a refining and a defining of areas of the house. To the south a corridor provides the starting point for entry to the family area; a straight path through the house leads to the stair hall and garden parlour; and direct access is given to the state rooms to the north. Therefore Hopetoun contains a clear division of areas, people and functions.

Adam's planned service floor (figure 2.19)

The diagram of the service areas of Hopetoun House mainly shows the extent of the area. Thirteen levels of permeability suggest this range rather than any protection for the deeper areas. However the areas at the end of routes tend to be those with functions which may need controlled access such as cellars and stores, or with functions needing to be separate such as the laundry, coal storage rooms, and the slaughter house. The service area is based largely on corridors. With access needed throughout this level corridors permit the greatest fluidity or ease of movement. Some isolated areas are based on the required privacy, and so status, of certain servants. The chaplain had his own apartment cluster as did the 'women'. The deepest rooms in the house are naturally enough the cellars. These rooms contained valuable goods which often needed to be kept cool. These

deep (literally and figuratively) spaces were the most natural areas to store goods.

Whereas the stables seem to be deep in the graphs they could also be accessed directly from the outside. These were not strictly speaking purely service areas but in each case they accessed corridors which separated their functions and smells from the functions of the rest of the floor.

Blair Castle

When considering Blair Castle in terms of spatial diagrams the difficulties of figuring out which plans were executed must be born in mind. For instance the 1736 Douglas plans tell us a lot but were not executed. The Winter plan of 1743 led to some changes but were not wholly carried out. Further changes were made which are not necessarily shown in plan. The 1750s conversion of the dining room to a drawing room and vice versa are significant in spatial terms although no physical changes were made to the actual form of the structure.

Visitor to actual house after 1746 (figure 2.20)

The 1746 porch adds one more level of permeability than previously. These graphs consider the house before the addition of the picture stair in 1756.

The representational graph of Blair Castle is narrow and deep. To reach the dining room, later the drawing room, which is the first space in which a decision as to movement may be made the visitor must pass through eight levels of permeability. Progression from the dining room follows one of two routes into clearly separated sectors of the building. Service stairs accessed each of these areas.

Visitor to the perfect 1743 Winter planned castle (figure 2.21)

The ideal Winter plan for Blair Castle still translates into a deep, narrow diagram. Five levels of permeability still had to be accessed before an area was reached in which choices were available as to the direction of movement. This transitional area was the stairhead. The visitor had progressed through five levels of space within the house without ever having entered a single room. Therefore to even find oneself at the top of the stair was to be an accepted, privileged visitor.

Direct access is permitted from the stairhead to both the billiard room and drawing room. These are both inclusive areas, with both opening onto the main entertaining area of the dining room. In reality direct access was to the dining room. Winter's plan suggests that the ideal arrangement was to welcome people into the drawing room first, rather than following a medieval pattern of direct access into a hall. In this case the dining room which remained at Blair Castle was previously the banqueting hall of the medieval tower house. Service stairs provide access to both sides of the building but in Winter's plan the old great stair does not reach this level.

Once the stair head is reached the diagram is not as narrow as that of the actual plan. Use is still made of the separating device of using lobbies to antecede bedchambers and apartments. The 'ringy' nature of this graph is principally due to the place of drawing rooms and lobbies indicating that both are used not just as separating but as transitional areas.

Servants actual plan (figure 2.22)

The difficulty with considering how a servant may move around a house begins with deciding where he or she may enter a building. For the sake of clarity this diagram uses the hall as the carrier space. This space is in the same position as the vestibule used by visitors. In order to represent spaces in graph form a simplification of the nature of those spaces can require too narrow an interpretation. Courts, for example, as used in the service areas at Blair Castle, are both areas in themselves and transitional areas as they provide access to other spaces. On another practical level the clarification of the East wing of Blair's service areas is problematic as ground and upper storeys are unclear.

As at Hopetoun House the size and range of the graph indicates the service area needed for such a house. Spaces are grouped and isolated mainly according to function. Coal storage, for instance, always occupies segregated spaces at the ends of pathways. The offices of the East wing were accessed through a corridor arrangement. As offices the function of each room, and so the inhabitant of each room, was isolated by the corridor/ lobby arrangement. The large loop from the stair foot to the passage way suggests the flow of service through the house. Actual movement, as with the other houses, was dependent on action and function.

Ideal service area from 1743 Winter plan (figure 2.23)

It is immediately obvious that the graph of Winter's plan is far more compact and narrow than the graph of the actual service area (figure 2.22). The range of functions in the wings of the actual plan are compressed here into the main block of the house. For instance the laundry is within the main structure of the house rather than removed into

one of the wings. There is some allowance given for a corridor which may enter the wings.

Servants' entry into the house is assumed to be from the east wing as the area underneath the perron stair was intended to be a cellar. The service area is based here on a passage arrangement. Apartments create clusters on the graph and suggest servants' hierarchy. The porter's lodge has an attached bedroom and closet and the cook has a room and closet. Again the role of functionality is demonstrated in the service region with areas such as coal rooms and cellars placed at the end of routes.

Inveraray Castle

Inveraray Castle represents different problems of phasing to the other case studies in this thesis. The building was not completely changed as at Hamilton Palace, or even structurally changed as at Hopetoun House and Blair Castle. Instead the layout of the principal floor was completely reversed in 1771 with the principal entrance moving from the south west to the north east front. The advantage of Inveraray is that various accounts give an understanding of access throughout the house. However the changes made to the principal floor occurred before the original house was actually used. In its original form Inveraray Castle basically was unfinished and unoccupied. This reorientation causes real difficulties when extending the area of analysis to include the external entrance ways to the building. These completely changed the way the castle was approached and the relationship of the structure and its inhabitants to the adjoining town.

Pre-1771 visitor to Inveraray Castle (figure 2.24)

From this consideration of just the principal floor the basic template of a tripartite building is immediately apparent. A strong focus was placed upon central movement with other 'clusters' feeding into, or feeding off, this central area. This central corridor is made up of transitional spaces until the gallery is reached at the fifth level of depth within the building. The gallery is an important area as it is both an integral space with a function, or functions, of its own and is a transition space providing an inclusive area preceding the more exclusive apartments. The two apartments are elsewhere both removed from the central area by lobby spaces or stair halls. Access to the stair halls and apartments via the dressing rooms made it easier for servants to move through the house and serve the apartment areas. Their turret stairs, running through the entire building, were convenient for these entrances, especially as access from the stair halls to the dressing rooms was *under* the stairs. This is not evident in graph form but from a study of the plans and context.

Post-1771 visitor to the house (figure 2.25)

Are there any changes to the priorities of the building after 1771?

As before the focus of the building is the inclusive, transitional areas in the centre. Clusters of apartments are evident but they feed back into this central corridor. The centrality of all the stair ways is still vital to movement around the building. The corner turrets are cut off by the nature of the structure as they are linked by only one route to the rest of the building. The functions of these spaces are formed according to this. The east turret was a study for instance.

There is no great change from the pre-1771 structure. Both buildings are symmetrical though the post-1771 form is slightly unbalanced because of the Duke's dressing room partitioned off the saloon in the north east angle. The key areas of this house are the central entrance, armoury hall (central vestibule) and the saloon. Stair halls and lobbies continue to provide distancing points.

Servants route through the house (figure 2.26)

Unlike the visitor or family entrances the service entrances were not over bridges but were through doorways in the fosse. Potential entry through two opposing entrances makes the plan of the basement circular. Choice as to which entrance to use was dependent presumably upon purpose. It is imperative to remember that the servants have access to every part of the house but this graph, as with the others service area graphs, considers the general areas of use through the house. Focus is on the areas exclusive to servants so while still indicating how they reach the principal and bedroom floors these levels have not been put into graph form.

Documents mention mezzanines, entresols and partitions created to accommodate servants but these are not shown in plan form. Context is again essential as areas were used and moved through in a manner which is not evident from plans. The attic area, for instance, was solely a service area. Although it is possible that this space was used to contain guest overspill in 1788. This would have changed the integral nature of space on this floor and throughout the building.

Other contextual information such as gender roles, status and function are more important in reference to servants who have comprehensive access throughout a structure.

For example the eastern turret stair serves the female quarters in the attic floor. The western turret accessed the male areas and the servants out of livery. At some point as movement was made through the building segregation based on gender was made which is not apparent in plan.

Areas such as the kitchen, wine cellar and store rooms occupy end points on graphs. These location choices are self-explanatory. The pastry room is separated in a turret probably due to the functional need for a cool room. Again based on status the steward, butler and housekeeper had spaces which isolated them from the rest of the building.

Discussion

The problems of incomplete and obscure plans are increased by the modifications made to each of the case study buildings in this thesis. One clear factor in each of these structures is that practicalities often made ideals impossible. Hamilton Palace, for instance, retained its general courtyard layout. As seen from the differences between Blair Castle and the ideal plans produced by Winter the tower house structure prevented the neater, more formalised building from being wholly created. These graphs were simplified so as not to show all the floors on one graph. With so many access routes between floors, especially service stairs, this representation would be over-complicated.

The definition of spaces adds further complexities when attempting to represent plans in diagrammatic form. It has been demonstrated that the nature of spaces such as courts and halls, for instance, is open to interpretation. Some spaces such as courtyards have to be 'over-represented' in graphs in order to understand their role within larger structures. The significance of function cannot be over-estimated particularly where it is unclear.

How and why rooms were used is as important for interpretation as actual structural form. Many ways of using these spaces cannot be seen in graph form stressing the need for contextual information. This can include factors based on elements such as gender and status.

The diagrams do demonstrate the separation of areas, the use of lobbies and corridors as dividing spaces and the presence of 'ceremonial' or state routes. Each of the houses here is also demonstrated to strive for a general tripartite division. Even the courtyard design of Hamilton Palace suggests a three-part plan. In each case a central corridor of movement encompasses inclusive areas flanked by various apartment arrangements which follow a pattern of family areas on one side and entertaining or guest areas on the other.

The advantages of creating access diagrams of these houses can be just as effectively accomplished through analysis of conventional plans and contextual study. The 'true' picture of a building, for example a non-symmetrical building appearing to be symmetrical, can be interpreted without recourse to spatial diagrams. Defining features such as the strong trend towards a tripartite plan can be appreciated from plans and actual structures. Each of the conclusions presented in this access-based discussion had already been reached. It is important to repeat that the case studies in this thesis were completed before the spatial diagrams so perhaps creating an unfair impression of spatial diagrams.

Access diagrams *can* be useful in terms of identifying important spaces and, if well annotated and analysed, can serve as useful illustrations. However the greatest accomplishment of spatial analysis such as access diagrams is to give a central place to

people. While this is meritorious it was already an established aim of this thesis, and of an archaeological approach in general. It cannot make you think differently about buildings and your approach to studying them if your concern is already how the rooms relate to one another and how people can or may have moved through the building. Another interest of this thesis is attitudes, views and opinions and this is not evident through a purely spatial investigation.

2. 5. Conclusion

A primary aim of many interpretations employing formal analysis is to distance them from 'traditional' studies. As with this present thesis established archaeological methods or approaches are used deliberately to break the subject matter out of the confines of more traditional, and often more accepted, approaches. King's primary aim, for example, was to 'move beyond the narrow perspective of earlier typological approaches to manorial architecture, to explore the relationship between changing architectural forms and the social life of the late medieval gentry' (King 2003, 104). An archaeological approach encompasses many different aspects, but the use of a formal method seems to provide legitimation which less 'scientific' methods cannot.

Formal spatial analysis does specifically place people - movement, action, permission and acceptance - at the centre of any consideration of buildings. Each space is seen as part of a network not as an individual, isolated cell, so the mechanics of the house are focused upon. In terms of access and permeability the assessment of levels of integration can highlight the place of specific rooms in the house, and consequently the associated

people or functions. The nursery, for example, is usually deeply placed within the country house. As are charter rooms as seen at Hamilton Palace and Hopetoun House. The same process used conversely looks at the acceptance of various people by following their possible route through the house. The problem, as has already been noted, is embodied in the place of servants who spatially are assessed as being very integrated, but who are segregated by time and routine. As suggested by the case study diagrams clusters of rooms within the house may also be emphasised, pointing to potential foci of the building and so suggesting significant social roles of the house and its occupants. A rigidly symmetrical house in plan can be completely asymmetrical in functional terms. For example, Henry III and Eleanor of Provence's lodgings at the Tower of London in form seem to have deliberately planned symmetry, whereas access analysis reveals a complete lack of balance (Richardson 2003, 131).

This serves to highlight once again the central significance of context. In this case the broader architectural form of the structures under study. This enables a focus on the attributes which define the functions and status of rooms and contribute to an articulation of social encounters within the building. This in turn allows a more sophisticated understanding of the relationship between space and social practice. King's study considers the specialised use of space, especially in relation to an increase in the ratio of private to public space in the manor house. Even if there is a decrease in size his conclusion must take into account the fact that halls are ostentatious spaces 'provided with richly decorated timber roofs, elaborate bay windows, wall fireplaces and formal screens' (King 2003, 113). The case study examples presented in this chapter consistently

demonstrate the inability to accurately create a diagram without contextual knowledge of function of people and spaces, attitudes and conventions. Once again a study advocating the use of access analysis relies heavily on other approaches for interpretation.

Possibly the best use of formal analysis is as a comparative tool, allowing a number of houses to be compared. This usually involves searching for a type and then assessing differences or the level of deviation from the ideal type. In terms of late seventeenth and eighteenth century country houses this may be of some interest in assessing the adherence to the rules of Classicism. This is problematic in the same way that Glassie's search for underlying shape grammar and Hillier and Hanson's quest for genotypes were flawed. Comparison may be more fruitful if considering specific buildings over time. Due to the case studies chosen in this thesis this is less useful than, for example, for Julianne Hanson who considered use patterns of four English country houses over a lengthy period of time (Hanson 1998). In terms of the case studies presented in this thesis comparison could be made between four buildings which, while having different pedigrees and roots and not appearing visually similar, all to some extent conformed to an ideal. The uniformity aimed at in building design emphasises the degree of conformity to the tight confines of Classical structure. All good points of formal analysis must be tempered by the limitations of the material under study, or the condition and nature of the evidence. Plans do not exist for all floors. One case study of this thesis, Hamilton Palace, was demolished so limiting study opportunities. Architectural conventions seem to prize first floor plans above all others, presumably due to the significance of the rooms on this level, usually the state rooms.

The key reason for using these formal methods is if they can be argued to add an understanding of buildings that could not be found elsewhere. In terms of this thesis the required understanding of space is not served by the methods discussed in the section above. Archaeology is not put forward as the only discipline with the required tools to study buildings, nor am I attempting to suggest a new methodology for looking at country houses. An interest in the various roles and responsibilities of an owner, the different audiences they played to and impressions they had to give are dependent, not primarily on a rigid understanding of space, but an understanding of context and symbol. Spatiality as defined by Orser is studied, not space. It is in this area that the weaknesses of formal spatial analysis lie.

On the other hand it is difficult to discuss such complicated buildings without reference to graphic representation. Plans, though the fundamental basis of all discussion, do not necessarily allow for an appreciation of the interrelated nature of spaces and may not have been how original occupants saw the building. Their experience may have been far more limited. Anne Yentsch sums up the difficulty involved in using only formal analysis. 'In the physical layouts of old houses, we can see the world-as-lived only in fragmentary form; we can begin to see the world-as-thought when we conceptualise house plans as incorporating both real space and imaginary space expressing social order' (Yentsch 1988, 17).

To keep visual representation clear I have upheld the use of house plans as basic guides to analysis in the text. Colour is used to identify groupings of rooms according to possible general perceptions of them, dividing the house into family (private),

entertaining (public) and service areas. Different shades of colours have been used to differentiate subtly between, for example, communal family areas such as dining rooms (red), and the relatively private bedchambers and apartments (pink). Given the complexity and dynamism of space, as discussed above, this is intended only as a general guide. Servants, for instance, inhabited their own sectors of the house, segregated from the family, although service areas such as storerooms were more accessible than servants' bedrooms.

The four houses and their owners presented in the case studies feature throughout these earlier chapters and sections. In particular the methodological discussion and access diagrams in this chapter are closely linked to the case studies, but this earlier discussion will not be wholly reproduced. While consideration of the houses includes a spatial aspect the methodology should be referred back to, to avoid verbatim repetition. As was noted when discussing the diagrams, they were created *after* the case studies, so analysis already included spatial relationships within the houses. The access diagrams produced in this chapter are augmented with a focus on specific points of the plans in a kind of localised access analysis to bring out possible relationships and routes, such as the processional route of guests into the house from the entrance, or service routes. On a practical note the illustrations are presented as a separate volume to allow for ease of simultaneous access to the text and images.

Chapter Three: The Political and Social World

The Countrey lyes very quiet; it is exceeding poor; trade is nought; the English hes all the moneyes. Our Noble families are almost gone: Lennox hes little in Scotland unsold; Hamilton's estate, except Arran and the Baronrie of Hamilton is sold; Argyle can pay little annuel rent for seven or eight hundred thousand merks; and he is no more drowned in debt than publick hatred, almost of all both Scottish and English; the Gordons are gone; the Douglasses little better; ... many of our chief families (e)states are cracking...

(Robert Baillie 1658 in Fyfe 1928, 173-4).

Ther is a profound peace at present, and nothing stirring of any publick nature almost.... Under this peace we are growing much worse. The gentry and nobility are generally either discontent, or Jacobite, or profane; and the people are turning loose worldly; and very disaffected. The poverty and debts of many are increasing, and I cannot see how it can be otherwise...the prodigious run of our nobility and gentry to England, their wintering there, and educating their children there...takes away a vast deal of money every year

(Robert Wodrow 1724 in Fyfe 1928, 384-5).

The reconciliation of contradictions is the key to many actions and reactions of the nobility from the Restoration to the aftermath of the last Jacobite rising. Their attempts to manipulate and control, both those belonging to other social groups, their peers, and their own role and importance are underlying themes of late seventeenth to eighteenth century society and politics. These concerns were then poured into the concrete symbols of their identity and power, their country houses.

Scotland was a country much changed in the century from the Restoration of Charles II in 1660 to the death of George II in 1760. Intense economic and religious upheaval both directly affected the whole population and through the impact on politics had a more indirect relevance. In considering the affairs and activities of the aristocracy, both as a group and as individuals, it is political events and trends that are of greatest importance. This is not a history of 'great men and kings' but considers the political in terms of

government and as generally expressing relationships between, and the exercise of authority over, others. The role of this social and political elite became modified as its members adapted to and at the same time instigated changes within all spheres of public life. Most significantly it is during this period that realignment from a country with dynastic and religious problems to a position as part of the British Empire occurred. Turbulence was experienced as traditional and innovative influences failed to be resolved with one another resulting in political intrigues, financial crises, struggles for power and even armed rebellion. The aristocracy, the country house clientele, including significantly the families discussed in the following case studies, played a critical role in all of these events. As comparison of the above quotes indicates, some consolidation of the position of this social group did occur, but their position as leaders in political affairs dictated that their roles had to be continuously negotiated and renegotiated.

The dating framework of this thesis begins with the Restoration of Charles II in 1660. This date also marks a restoration for the aristocracy, their political roles and building programmes. The end date is indefinite, but focuses around the middle of the eighteenth century with the aftermath of the '45. An earlier seventeenth century context historically locates an understanding of the post-Restoration aristocracy. Different facets such as political, social, religious, economic, and cultural are all integral to one another so for the sake of clarity and to avoid repetition a loosely chronological framework has been used to structure this context.

3.1 1603 Unification of the Crowns: Scotland and England.

The circumstances within which the aristocracy of Scotland exercised influence changed dramatically with the accession of James VI to the English throne in March 1603. The union was specific only to the monarchy with Scotland maintaining a separate administration and parliament. As Roots notes, 'James VI failed to unite England and Scotland other than in his own person' (1992, 18). Scotland managed to keep its governmental machinery, but in a strictly hierarchical society it forfeited perhaps its most significant element, the monarch himself. As the ruler of Great Britain James VI became an absentee king in Scotland, choosing instead to rule from London. While this did not diminish his own personal authority, partly due to his self-conscious manipulation of both personal and dynastic imagery, his nobles felt acutely his distance from them. More so due to the fact that where the king went so his Court followed and only a select few could afford either the journey to, or the standard of living in London.

The Scottish nobility was amongst the strongest in Europe at the beginning of the seventeenth century. Born to rule in what seemed to be a naturally hierarchical society they enjoyed immense power due to the localisation of Scottish political institutions. 'Parliament was only an occasional event, royal administration was rudimentary, the central courts were very limited in competence, taxation was low, the coercive powers of the state minimal, and the country divided into a mosaic of private and ecclesiastical courts' (Brown 1992, 3). The majority of the population experienced government only through the authority of their aristocratic landowner. In relation to their tenants then, the landed elite sustained their strong position. Therefore the absence of the king and court, at this stage, removed one of the few major establishments to impinge upon this power.

However, long term difficulties were created for the nobility. Their need to maintain favour within court circles, with the monarch and with their peers, was made more intricate and arduous as competition intensified between different individuals and groups or factions. Whereas the king was aware of political opinion before 1603, his absence resulted in communication becoming no more than correspondence between himself and the Scottish Privy Council (Brown 1993, 546). Any astuteness he may have possessed in relations with his nobles became subject to more indirect influences as distance was put between him and the men exercising power in Scotland. This becomes much more evident in the eighteenth century, as does the impact of the removal of many of the political elite to England, many on an almost permanent basis. Alienation between court and what may be termed country nobles inevitably intensified as the Court became absent from Scotland.

An important theme to emphasise is the question as to the degree of Anglicisation of the Scottish aristocracy, or the extent to which they resolved the tension between their roles in Scotland and England. Keith Brown, while arguing that the aristocracy consolidated their position throughout the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, maintains that, 'there was very little Anglicisation of the Scottish aristocracy outside a handful of court families, and even these retained a strong sense of national consciousness' (1993, 543). While it seems to be the case that Scottish aristocrats for the most part remained *Scottish* aristocrats, adaptation had to be made to the changing situation in relation to where the hub of royal and political power was. A number of factors point to minimal alignment along 'English' lines, including the continuing trend

of sending sons initially to Scottish universities. At the same time the isolation from King James and the influential Court would indicate increasing vulnerability rather than consolidation of power other than in personal and highly localised terms.

Proximity to, and competition with, the English aristocracy for those who did venture to London encouraged the accumulation of large debts as appearances were kept up. 'What the royal tours of 1617 and 1633 encountered was not a dispirited provincial aristocracy, but a national elite determined to paper over any cracks and show the English that anything they could do the Scots could do just as well' (Brown 1993, 560). Pride and honour were at stake. Unfortunately the king still remained the sole fount of honour, and only on two occasions in the early seventeenth century, in 1617 and 1633, did a King of Great Britain visit Scotland. Moreover keeping up appearances was a very expensive business, as indicated in both of the excerpts at the beginning of this chapter. In both 1658 when the country was crippled by civil war *and* in 1724 the complaint was not that there was no money, but that the money was all in England. In the latter quote the blame for this seems to be firmly placed with the Scottish nobility, creating debt through both their absence and their spending south of the Border (see in particular chapter five).

Regal union provided opportunities not only in local terms, but also in national and wider spheres, simply by opening up prospects in a swiftly developing financial power. It is difficult to see the extent to which this inspired the urge 'to emulate the wealthier and more desirable society of their English neighbours' (Whately 1990, 7). Some notable examples can be seen in the eighteenth century, though, of nobles not only ensconced in English social life, but also seemingly more at home in London than north of the Border. The second Duke of Argyll and his brother Lord Ilay (Islay, later the third Duke) are

instances of this. Both were born at Ham House, Petersham, the home of their maternal grandmother the Countess of Dysart and her second husband the Duke of Lauderdale. Their grandfather, her first husband, was a Suffolk landowner. Extenuating circumstances explain their early absence from Scotland, including their parents' long separation, and the fact that the forfeited Argyll estates were not restored to their father until 1689 (Stuart Shaw 1999, 65). However, houses owned in Oxfordshire and in London, and the building of Sudbrooke House next to Richmond Park would indicate that England was home. As with the first Duke of Atholl, another highly influential landowner, English maternal parentage did not prevent deep involvement in Scottish affairs. The Duke of Argyll in particular was a paradox, more so even than his grandfather the Duke of Lauderdale. Whereas the latter had been an English gentleman and a Scottish peer and politician, his grandson was also a Highland chief, MacCailein Mór, with all the responsibilities that entailed. Perhaps this may explain to some extent the contradictions apparent in the building of the new castle at Inveraray from the 1740s by the third Duke, previously Lord Ilay (see chapter eight). These courtly nobles represented what may be considered the top tier of the Scottish aristocracy though, with most unable or unwilling to venture south on anything more than a temporary, and then if only necessary, basis.

3.2 1625 Charles I and the Civil Wars

Relations between the monarchy and nobility became less stable with the rule of Charles I from 1625. This instability was exacerbated by the increasing competition within the peerage due to the creation of new nobles. In 1603 there were fifty-seven peers in Scotland: one duke, two marquesses, twenty-one earls and thirty-three lords of

parliament. Between 1603 and 1625 the ranks of the nobility were increased by fifty-one percent. During Charles I's reign from 1625 to 1649 a further thirty-eight percent increase occurred, the largest group of new peers being the 'Lords of Erection', men who had acquired former church lands. Upon the death of Charles I there were 119 Scottish peers (Brown 1992, 35). These statistics alone point to destabilisation within the aristocracy. Competition for favour, for office and so for power and wealth intensified as ranks swelled and the monarch became more difficult to reach.

Magnates felt their power and wealth attacked in other ways. The Act of Revocation (1625) was a particular blow to their interests in terms of property and in their relations with, and attitudes towards, the king. Prior to 1560 the Church owned one-third of land. The Reformation initiated redistribution with much of this transferred into lay ownership (Howard 1995, 49). The reannexation of all Crown and Church lands in 1625, then, effectively robbed nobles of territorial power and wealth. The simultaneous restructuring of the Scottish Privy Council, the king's chief body of advisors, removed a degree of political influence at the centre. This was felt more acutely as bishops were brought into the council, and 'to most in the Reformed Church the aggrandisement of bishops above the modest role assigned to them by James VI smelt of popery' (Smout 1985, 106). The lay aristocracy suffered from the removal of power in terms of both property and influence and, most importantly, this power was transferred to Episcopalian authority. The role of bishops was to be a continuing focus of tension and violence throughout the seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries.

Although tactless and harmful these decisions did not in the long term relegate the Scottish aristocracy 'to a position of a remote provincial aristocracy without hope or

influence at the fountain of power' (Smout 1985, 106). The activities of men such as the Duke of Lauderdale in the latter half of the seventeenth century would argue against this. However the Act of Revocation, the restructuring of the Privy Council and numerous other slights created a tense atmosphere, and an aristocracy with a sense of its own vulnerability and insecurity. This intensified with the political, religious and social turmoil resulting from Scotland's involvement in the Civil War from 1644, and the following Interregnum. Repercussions from this period were felt for some time after, particularly in terms of the financial positions of many nobles such as the Duke and Duchess of Hamilton, fined either by Cromwell or by Charles II upon his accession (see chapter five).

3.3 1660 Restoration to 'Revolution'

The Restoration was not simply the return of monarchical government. It was the reestablishment of the traditional ruling elite giving a 'fresh lease of life to reactionary elements in Scottish politics' (MacInnes 1996, 124). The Act Recissory of 1660 annulling all legislation since 1633 is particular evidence of a backward-looking mentality. This conservative perspective is highlighted in Scotland where Charles had been crowned at Scone nine years before his restoration to the throne of Great Britain in 1660. With Charles II came the return of the Episcopalian church, aristocratic rule and the loose regal union of James VI (Brown 1992, 5). Scotland was permitted its own parliament and administration once more. However, Charles II had no intention of devolving rule north of the Border. London remained firmly in control, the seat of Scottish government (Patrick 1991, 120).

Scottish aristocrats were in much the same position as they had been in 1603. The Scottish Indemnity Act, which was to put a final end to the war, was very generous. Most men of note in Scotland had at some time fought against the king so with a few notable exceptions, such as the eighth Earl of Argyll, any charges of treason were absolved. The dominance of the landed aristocracy was not doubted but their power was not unqualified. Only six Scots reached the King's bedchamber after 1660, indicating a lack of influence beyond a few prominent men such as the Duke of Lauderdale (Brown 1992, 11). A polarisation of authority and influence within the aristocracy seems to have developed, with control devolving onto a smaller group of extremely powerful men. Constitutional affairs within Scotland were not left to parliament to decide but were dictated by the Court; officials and councillors were no longer accountable to the Scottish Estates for their conduct of Scottish government. Essentially government was controlled by political opportunists intent on restoring their own positions after the upheaval and losses of the last twenty years which had 'almost eclipsed' their political dominance (MacInnes 1996, 124).

The aristocracy may have begun to retighten their grip on government and the localities (Brown 1992, 146), but for the majority of them this implies the need to rebuild confidence rather than the opposite. After two decades of civil war the prospect of social revolution was no longer inconceivable, and with such an experience fresh in mind the nobility were afraid of further disruption especially as the social links which had made them so strong seemed to be weakening. Diaries and memoirs of the period demonstrate caution, though it is difficult to judge the opinions of the majority of the population regarding the aristocracy (Mitchison 1983, 69). Even those prominent in Edinburgh were

part of a nascent administration, and were isolated and exposed to criticism away from London. This only served to increase the influence of the representative at Court, the Duke of Lauderdale.

Fighting and faction began to be prominent from the Restoration onwards. Lauderdale and his contemporaries, including the three Dukes - Hamilton, Atholl and Argyll - with whom I am concerned in the case studies (see chapters five, seven and eight) are particularly good examples of this. Lauderdale was an outstanding political survivor, retaining the post of secretary until he became incapacitated by a stroke in 1680 (Patrick 1991, 128). Coinciding with his high status political appointment he began to modify his country residence of Thirlestane Castle in Berwickshire in 1670 intending it as a 'fitting palace from which to direct the affairs of Scotland' (Jauncey 2000, 30) (figure 3.1).

Unrest between 1660 and the accession of William and Mary in 1689 is much clearer. Political intrigues continued but were augmented by popular disturbances such as the Pentland Rising in 1666. This movement is significant in that it indicates unrest outside the aristocracy. Restricted to the south-west of Scotland this was the first occasion upon which no magnate was involved, not even a substantial landowner (Mitchison 1983, 73; Brown 1992, 153). The usual resort of political bargaining at Court was of no influence in this situation.

When a similar situation seemed to be in danger of arising in 1678 Lauderdale employed the tactic of quartering Highland troops in the south-west in an effort to pressurise landlords into accepting bonds making them responsible for their tenants, labourers and servants (MacInnes 1996, 134; Mitchison 1983, 76). This so-called 'Highland Host' was intended as a threat to local power rather than merely a method by

which to extract money (Mitchison 1983, 77). The expedient worked, but was also partly responsible for the outbreak of armed rebellion culminating at Bothwell Bridge in 1679. Once more few magnates were involved in this action. The impounding of the arms and horses of the aristocracy to prevent a rising indicates the unstable position of the nobility at this stage, with even the Duke of Hamilton having to appeal to the King for the use of his own horses (Mitchison 1983, 76). However, Lauderdale's policy appeared to have failed, and the necessity of summoning troops from England indicated weakness on his part.

The eager acceptance of James, Duke of Albany (later James VII), and his establishment of a court in Edinburgh from 1679-82 demonstrates the disposition of the aristocracy at this juncture. During this period much of Holyrood Palace was rebuilt, the Stuart portraits were commissioned, and the Order of the Thistle was revived indicating a 'desire to impose an image of authority rooted firmly in the past' (Brown 1992, 163). This atmosphere of tradition lent an aura of stability to an elite usually isolated from its monarch. It also emphasises an evolving contradiction between change and restoration or maintenance of the status quo.

Even so further disruption was caused by the introduction of the Test Act in August 1681 which demanded recognition of the king as head of the Church (Brown 1992, 162). A number of nobles attempted to evade acceptance of this, arguing that supremacy in matters temporal and spiritual was mutually contradictory. The Earl of Argyll who took the oath 'as far as it was consistent with itself' was held up as an example, tried and convicted, but allowed to escape abroad (Mitchison 1983, 78). Interestingly Argyll was the chief beneficiary of Lauderdale's rule, so perhaps the example was intended as a

broader one to demonstrate that only so much power was permitted. Matters swiftly escalated though, with troops being sent once more to the south-west to force landowners to take the bond. Savage arrests developed into shooting out of hand all who refused to renounce the 'Apologetical Declaration' printed in desperation as a result of the arrests, and declaring open war on all government supporters. During this 'Killing Time' estimates of a hundred executions, mostly in the field, have been made (Mitchison 1983, 78). Significantly, apart from the Earl of Argyll most of the dissenters were not noble, but were lairds and tenantry, as in the Pentland Rising and at Bothwell Bridge. In addition to instability and armed disruption the aristocracy would have to meet the challenge of the increasingly significant class of gentry.

3.4 1688: Dissatisfaction, distress and Darien

The reign of James VII was short-lived, with the English 'Glorious Revolution' occurring in 1688, only three years after James' accession. The English gave the crown of Britain to William and Mary, seemingly without reference to the Scots. Further problems resulted from this including an armed rising under Viscount Dundee which ended with the inconclusive encounter at Killiecrankie in July 1689. Whether this was 'never more than an irritant to the government in Edinburgh' (Brown 1992, 173) or not it highlights mounting disaffection with decisions made by the central authorities. This feeling increased with the reestablishment of Presbyterianism in 1690, and the infamous 'Massacre' of Glencoe in 1692 (for more on post-Glencoe politics see in particular chapter seven).

Economic problems intensified unrest and dissatisfaction within Scottish society in general, and particularly amongst the aristocracy. The hardship of the short harvest of 1695 was exacerbated by the strain of war in Europe, and Scotland began to slip into a state of famine. In 1696 the harvest was a disaster in the south, and once more in 1698 the agricultural crops failed everywhere. The relatively healthy crop of 1699 was still not sufficient to prevent severe local shortages (Mitchison 1983, 108). Due to famine more than 100,000 Scots probably died, with the national population falling by about thirteen percent between 1695 and 1699 (Allan 2002, 87).

Amongst these problems came the notion that the establishment of colonies could provide a solution to economic decline. Colonies established on trade routes were major strings in the bows of both English and Dutch prosperity. Unfortunately the Scottish attempt in the late 1690s failed with dramatic consequences. The 1695 Act for the Encouragement of Foreign Trade - renamed 'An Act in Favour of the Scots Company Trading in Africa and the Indies' - established the Company of Scotland. This founded the Darien expedition to set up a Scottish colony in Panama, independent of England due to political problems. Darien was to be a colony overseeing the transportation of goods across the isthmus so creating a new trade route from the Pacific and Caribbean; a plan which was 'visionary but impracticable' (Brown 1992, 182). Inability to grasp the reality of the situation including the economic, political, climatic or strategic factors in choosing a location, caused the failure of the main settlement in 1700, only two years after its establishment. Disease and the active hostility of the Spanish government that claimed the territory resulted in the loss of some 2000 lives, and £1.8 million Scots, or £150,000 Sterling was squandered. The money represented a large proportion of Scotland's liquid

capital, but more significantly, most of it was money invested by the aristocracy (Brown 1992, 182; Mitchison 1983, 108).

The Darien expedition demonstrates aristocratic interest in trade, showing their attempts to keep up with, and to change, economic and social attitudes. The failure added to the tension caused by new ideas. Individuals lost large amounts of money without ever seeing any financial return. Lady Margaret Hope invested £1000 Sterling for herself and £2000 for her son Sir Charles Hope. The Duchess of Hamilton likewise subscribed £3000 (Lenman 1986, 179). Personal financial misfortune and the disfavour of London added to the problems created by the financial and fiscal burdens of poor harvests and war with France.

3.5 1707 Union

The Treaty of Union was the product of...sophisticated but divisive management, the subordination of principle to pragmatism, and a demonstrable contempt for public opinion within the Scottish Estates. National independence was sacrificed for the preservation of aristocratic privilege, the institutional autonomy of the kirk and the prospect of economic gain (MacInnes 1996, 193).

The political divergence of Scotland and England coincided with a period of war in Europe. William III had failed to protect his Scottish subjects in Darien as peaceable relations with Spain were integral to the war against Louis XIV (Allan 2002, 6). The threat to English strategic concerns and the economy and interests of Scotland, demonstrated by the outcome of the Darien expedition, led to full union between the two countries (Brown 1992, 5). The decision was an aristocratic one, with the prospect of financial aid and political influence at Westminster leading to a brief alliance of the

opposing groups of the Dukes of Queensberry and Argyll, and the group known as the Squadrone Volante. Scotland would receive benefit such as, crucially, a shared currency and economic regime, including the assurance of trade with England and the colonies, but the prizes offered were also personal ones. Reimbursement was given for Darien investors, known as the 'Equivalent'. The Duke of Argyll and his brother Lord Ilay, both Unionists, were rewarded respectively with a military commission and an earldom; the Duke of Queensberry was sent £20,000 Sterling to purchase votes, £12,325 of which went to him personally (Brown 1992, 191); and the Earl of Roxburghe received a Dukedom in 1707 (Allan 2002, 13).

This short cease-fire amongst the nobility was remarkable as just before the Union Scotland was referred to as a country 'riven by 'court divisions, pairties and animosities among nobles' (George Lockhart in Stuart Shaw 1999, 18). This infighting was generated from insecurity rather than 'complacency which gave [the ruling landed order] the security to indulge its squabbles' (Stuart Shaw 1999, 19). Strength may still have been felt in relation to other social groups but amongst their own aristocrats were constantly competing. Consequences of this had a detrimental long-term effect on the importance given to Scottish affairs, and so the Scottish nobility.

Trivialisation of Scottish politics became more noticeable and more damaging as the political union of 1707 placed them in stark relation to English affairs. For much of the eighteenth century Scots did not have formal control of their country's business, particularly after the abolition of the Scottish Privy Council in 1708 and the office of Scottish Secretary of State in 1709. From the dismissal of the Earl of Mar as Secretary in that year there was, strictly speaking, no post of Scottish Secretary until 1925 (Stuart

Shaw 1999, 26-7). Instead a third Secretary of State of Great Britain was introduced with the appointment to the post of the Duke of Queensberry in 1709. This position was only sporadically filled though. After Queensberry's death in 1711 the Secretaryship lapsed until Mar held it from 1711 to the accession of George I in 1714. It was used three more times with the Dukes of Montrose and Roxburghe and the Marquess of Tweeddale holding it in 1714-15, 1716-25 and 1742-46 respectively (Stuart Shaw 1999, 27).

Scotland was given representation in the new parliament of only sixteen seats of 206 in the House of Lords, and forty-five of the 568 in the House of Commons. Whereas the last Scottish Parliament had included eighty-eight country and sixty-seven royal burgh representatives, this had been reduced to thirty and fifteen respectively in the new parliament (Allan 2002, 20). This increased jostling for political favour and influence.

Union in 1707 opened access to a wider network of patronage and opportunity in a colonial power. '1707 to 1766 for ambitious Scots was a period of initial adjustment to the Westminster spoils system and was, at the same time, for many politicians throughout Britain the era of the naked and unashamed pursuit of patronage' (Simpson 1996, 47). Patronage in Scotland was dominated by those with extensive family and client connections. The second and third Dukes of Argyll, the unofficial "managers of Scotland" in the early eighteenth century, were often accused of exercising dictatorial authority. Argyll was the wealthiest peer in Scotland, with a family interest so large and influential that even Robert Walpole saw the wisdom of creating an alliance in 1725 (Murdoch 1980, 7) (see chapter eight). Few, if any, aristocrats could claim such political advantages. Even a magnate with such enormous power was not invulnerable though, and on a number of occasions the second Duke was out of favour in both London and

Edinburgh. After the rising of 1715, for instance, his failure to undertake a harsh campaign of attrition as was later carried out in 1746 resulted in his dismissal from all posts by George I (Stuart Shaw 1999, 57). The Duke of Argyll held a great deal of authority and influence but he could not be complacent. The aftermath of 1715 provides a perfect example of his precarious position. Dismissal from office for failing to carry out severe punishments was preferable to the discredit he would have experienced in Scotland, particularly in Highland society, by supporting such measures. A great magnate and politician he understood that his power was based in the land and ultimately his territory and had to defer to it.

Transitions in aristocratic power were based in, and highlighted by, the increasing emphasis given to patronage. Feudal magnates who often used coercion as a means of control became influential politicians with clients and followers commanded by the prospect of advancement through patronage. Coercion became persuasion or 'influence had to take over from domination' (Mitchison 1983, 162). Relations between voters and candidates were still usually highly personalised. Localised rivalries were also exacerbated by national tensions. Perthshire's 277 voters, for example, were strongly polarised between the administration's Duke of Atholl and the opposition's Earl of Breadalbane (Allan 2002, 20) (see chapter seven). It was not unheard of that political competition would lead to the manufacturing of county votes.

Instability within the nobility was added to by the rise of the local gentry, which had adopted a large degree of local authority as the great landlords' attention was diverted in Edinburgh or London. Mitchison points out the changing concerns of the elite demonstrated in a complaint of Sir John Clerk the Younger of Penicuik as to how little

credit Midlothian landowners received for £2000 donated to local relief (Mitchison 1983, 174). Seventeenth century aristocratic status anxieties were directed at their social equals. This was inherent in the rush to register family coats of arms and certificates of descent when legislation established a Public Register of All Arms and Bearings in Scotland in 1672 (Lenman 1980, 23) (see in particular chapters five and seven for aristocratic interest in heraldry). It also manifested itself in architectural adornments. Sir John Clerk's concern highlights eighteenth century landowning society's fear that those below them may 'not appreciate the benefits it could confer and would try to conduct their lives without using their patronage' (Mitchison 1983, 173-4). It also suggests the changing character of the upper ranks of society, with the gentry beginning to enjoy a lifestyle previously restricted to their social superiors. The period 1660 to 1760 incorporates this transition and the uncertainty it produced.

3.6 Aristocratic involvement in trade and commerce

Aristocratic involvement in commerce signifies the transitional nature of the late seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, and of their role within society. The strong social links and constant communication between the different levels of society maintained by the system of payment in kind (Mitchison 1983, 99) became looser as commerce and consumerism gained strength. An increasing dependence on activity such as trading changed the dynamics of power relations of the feudalistic social system. This process was theorised by Adam Smith, particularly in his *Wealth of Nations* (1776) where although he justified agricultural interest as the stage of progress society had reached, transition to commerce was seen as inevitable. Leaders within an agricultural society

were those with the most land, and consequently the most retainers. Therefore agriculture consolidated the basis of subordination, with the crucial relationship being one of dependency with roots in customary obedience (in Berry 1997, 101-2). In a commercial society that dependency was absent, instead property gave coherence to social organisation. 'Property played that role because its 'organisation' has to entail how ownership is identified and maintained and that in turn is inseparable from how law and power both formally (government) and informally (manners) function' (Berry 1997, 114).

Landowners still held considerable power, but a modification in how they exercised control had to be made. The transformation in the aristocratic power base added to the instability created by failed investment. Social competition from the increasingly important gentry forced the aristocracy to realise and reevaluate their position. Therefore while investing in trade they continued to exert the traditional image of their power as being solely based in the land. Industrial roots were hidden rather than celebrated, as seen through merchants and industrialists building within the established architectural idiom of Classicism. Intellectual notions of progress added an educated element to trade and industry, naturalising the participation of the educated elite in commercial activity. At the same time precedent was intoned as a justification for the social order as it was, with houses and gardens full of historical references. Statues of Greek and Roman deities were placed in gardens surrounding classical houses, which were linked with local precedent by aligning them with castles, churches and natural features. The rising gentry was made aware that social and political control was exercised by landowners who traditionally maintained this role. As Adam Smith pointed out, 'everything by custom appears to be right' (in Berry 1997, 35).

In keeping with this aristocratic participation in industrial and commercial activities not only enhanced revenues *from* the land, they were based *on* the land. Therefore while responding to and instigating changes an element of consistency was maintained, and so too was control over the process. All of Scotland's main industries in the late seventeenth and eighteenth centuries – linen, coal, salt and fishing- were localised and so prevented any reduction of the local, rent-paying population. It is important, too, that the main exports from Scotland were primary materials, manufactured goods were imported, such as 'pots and pans, needles and books from England and the Netherlands, Scandinavian timber, Swedish iron and bay salt' (Mitchison 1983, 105). The significance of this for elite interests is suggested by the series of laws enacted to aid and promote manufacture. The idea was to forbid the import and the use of certain foreign luxuries, and to offer incentives encouraging local industry such as the right to bring in foreign workers to train local labour and the removal of duty on raw materials (Mitchison 1983, 105). These laws carried on throughout the eighteenth century, including the establishment in 1723 of the Honorary Society for the Improvement of Agriculture in Scotland and in 1727 of the Board of Trustees for Improving Fisheries and Manufacture in Scotland. The Forfeited Estates Commission appointed in 1752 was set up to assist Scottish manufacture, particularly in the Highlands. All of these were government ventures, demonstrating that the elite who ran the country recognised the increasing socio-political significance of trade and industry, and were intent on maintaining their place within a changing social world.

3.7 Resistance and rising: smuggling, riots and Jacobitism

Increasing resistance to central government and those associated with it, the nobility, was another key feature of Scottish society in post-Union years. From the 1690s Jacobitism, the political expression of the wish for the return of the old Stewart monarchy, became a destabilising force, particularly as a number of outbreaks of armed rebellion accompanied political intrigue. The campaigns culminating at Killiecrankie in 1689 and Sheriffmuir in 1715 have already been mentioned. Further rebellions were attempted in 1719 in Kintail and in 1745, which ended with the disastrous defeat at Culloden and a brutal programme of repression.

The nobility was involved in these risings though many chose to remain neutral or in support of the government. However, the establishment of a royal court in Edinburgh in 1745-6 provided them with an often-lacking recognition of their status. In particular they were given the opportunity to reassure themselves. The romantic image often given to Jacobitism has detracted from its more pragmatic aspects, all of which indicate a belief in a lack of recognition for both the landed elite and, by implication, Scotland. Union and the Hanoverian succession had marginalised and isolated Jacobite politicians, incurring economic consequences and the curtailment of freedoms. The treatment accorded to the Earl of Mar, dismissed from his post as Secretary of State in 1709 after he had actually worked for the Union, was a factor behind the rising of 1715 which he led (Mitchison 1983, 138). Religion, too, was a predominant motivation. Episcopalians were given permission to meet and assemble without hindrance by the Toleration Act of 1712. This was a consolation prize as worship was prohibited in parish churches; but all births and baptisms were to be registered there and tithes were to be paid to the parish minister.

Therefore Episcopalians were subservient to the Presbyterian Church of Scotland and their ministers to the Crown. If an oath of allegiance was not taken they could not legally perform their duties (Stuart Shaw 1999, 90). Significantly many Episcopalians who had not taken the oath were involved in rebellion.

Resistance to economic decisions was demonstrated through violent rioting. This also highlighted increasing tensions between a narrow governing elite and an unenfranchised population. Hamilton, Glasgow, Ayr, Dundee, Elgin, Paisley and Stirling all experienced riots in 1725 as a result of the imposition of a malt tax (Whatley 1990, 8-9). These were only instances of the general hostility to tax collection after 1707. Attacks made on customs and excise officers enforcing the new five-fold increase on duties, and the warehouses where they kept seized goods, occurred with more frequency and aggression than before the Union (Whatley 1990, 7). More subtle defiance of central authority was shown through smuggling activities, with necessary resort to military intervention demonstrating the government's ineffective control. Landowners played a role in this illegal activity. 'The illegal importation of French wines and brandy, for example, brought both financial rewards and personal palatal satisfaction' (Whatley 1990, 10).

Landowners were also integral elements in the local community and had a role to perform. As with the Duke of Argyll's recognition of the local nature of his powerbase in 1715, the local elite upheld their traditional paternal role and, at the same time, conceded that their responsibility must first be to their tenantry. Attempts to exercise control over smuggling increased in the late 1720s as concern grew over the danger inherent in permitting such disorder (Whatley 1990, 10). The eighteenth century was precarious for the aristocracy of Western Europe treading a fine line between allowing innovation and

change, and wanting to control the process and maintain its own elite status. It was not until the end of the century that France provided the dramatic example of what could occur if such transition was not tightly controlled. Localised issues of resistance and control directly affecting the landowners are harder to see, but include everything from tenants refusing to pay rent or make changes demanded of them, to poaching and trespassing, or subverting accepted manners (see chapters seven and eight). For instance, while the Duke of Atholl and his agents were drawing up legal documents to regulate the forest of Atholl, one of the ducal estates main forms of income, the tenantry felt they had the right to use the forest as they wished (Leneman 1986, 178). Poaching was a continuous problem but became increasingly difficult to prosecute as the legal standing of landowners became less certain. In 1711 a case against someone who had killed deer on private property had failed because 'the forest laws did not make wild animals the property of a landowner' (Leneman 1986, 183; Hart-Davis 1978). Negotiations were constantly taking place in the relations of the landowning elite both with their peers and, increasingly, with their social inferiors as they endeavoured to consolidate and stabilise their position in relation to others.

3.8 Responses: 'Georgian', rationalisation, and good manners

Scotland's relationship with England changed dramatically during the eighteenth century and recognition of this relationship was negotiated through the aristocratic adoption of a behavioural and material expression of their position, termed Georgian after the coronation of George I in 1714. In its specific sense Georgian is understood to refer only to an architectural style, but this was the material expression of a systematised

preoccupation with control and order, reason, balance and scientific thought which permeated everyday life. This is exemplified by the rationalisation of the state, epitomised by Stair's *Institutes*. Published in 1681 this constituted the codification of the law, presenting 'Scottish law for the first time as a complete and coherent system' (Smout 1985, 108). The new mental framework highlighted the mechanical over the organic, balance rather than asymmetry, and an individual rather than a corporate way of life (see also pp34-5).

'Georgianisation' is also associated with the development of manners, or etiquette as it was to become known later in the eighteenth century. Adam Petrie's *Rules of Good Deportment* (1720) censured the absurd fixation of his social group with learning all the heavy finesse of English good manners (Smout 1985, 269). This was part of a process of Anglicisation, but it also indicates a growing awareness of self, as individuals and a group, as opposed to others. Adherence to a specific mode of behaviour created a perception of social cohesion. In particular Petrie condemns the rage for 'elocution' and 'correct pronunciation and elegant reading' as being 'indispensable acquirements for people of fashion' (Smout 1985, 269). The correct language and pronunciation was English. David Hume, for instance, considered the acquisition of English to be so important that when he was asked for advice as to his nephew's schooling he recommended Eton:

There are several Advantages of a Scots Education; but the Question is whether that of the language does not counterbalance them, and determine the Preference to the English. He is now of an Age to learn it perfectly; but if a few years elapse, he may acquire such an Accent, as he will never be able to cure of.... The only inconvenience is, that few Scotsmen, that have had an English Education, have ever

settled cordially in their own Country, and they have been commonly lost ever after to their Friends (Hume 1932, 154).

This intellectual response has been seen as superiority being demonstrated 'by out-Englishing the English' (Adam Smith 1996, 112).

A revolution in manners affected the aristocracy who after the Restoration were well educated, often abroad, and well travelled. Even the lifestyles of the Highland nobility were altered. Poets attacked the MacLeod chief at Dunvegan for the degenerate quality and quantity of his hospitality, doubting his honesty because he chose to eat in private (in Smout 1985, 134). William Mackintosh of Borlum concluded his *Essay on the Ways and Means of Inclosing* (1729) with a diatribe on changing manners and customs, including dress, food and how it was served, and the fashion for tea-drinking (Smout 1985, 266). However, it was not just the practices he criticised, but the equipment required to be seen to possess. As paying rents in kind became superseded by money payments, so material wealth became equated with politeness. This increased social tensions as a 'polite' lifestyle became open to lairds lower down the social scale.

Smaller, more varied, segregated individual portions of food accompanied the matching tea sets required for tea drinking, and dinner plates for meal times (Smout 1985, 266). This modified eating etiquette was a material and behavioural expression of the adherence to order, isolation and individualisation. Increasing significance was also given to the segmentation of time, as seen through the incredible success of clockmakers throughout the eighteenth century. By the time of the *Statistical Account* in the 1790s almost every town and many villages had a clockmaker, whereas a century before it had been an unusual occupation (Smout 1985, 340). 'Scientific', rational thought contributed

to this interest in time, but so too did the developing industrial world in which time controlled the working day.

Government control was intensifying too as symbolised by the militarisation of the state. The building of barracks such as Ruthven (figure 3.2) in 1719 and roads particularly represents the creation of an image of authority. Interestingly barracks were to prove ineffectual in 1745 (Stell 1973, 30) prompting the conclusion that they relied on their architecture for dominance rather than the inadequate soldiery posted to them. Roads, on the other hand, provided the opportunity for quick mobilisation, better communications and, significantly, the resulting economic advantages of easier trade. Almost 1000 miles of road were built in the early eighteenth century (Taylor 1976) (figure 3.3). The mapping of these roads and of Scotland, as seen in Roy's military survey for instance, epitomised the preoccupation with order, of the mind as well as the landscape.

Accompanying a process of militarisation and ordering was a general 'civilising' particularly of the Highlands. After 1715 repercussions included executions and forfeitures of the peerages and land of high profile participants. After 1745 the aim became to completely eradicate the traditional judicial and tenorial system of the Highlands and align it instead with Lowland society. In terms of landowners the crucial change was the Heritable Jurisdictions Act of 1747. This removed the great magnates legal dominance over their tenants, their right to sentence all criminals in their domain through their Court of Regality. 'This tremendous power he held, bound by no legal process, restrained by no fear, guided by no precedents. However wrongly he might abuse his right, it could not be withdrawn, for it came by charter, was inherited by birth,

and yet could be sold at his will' (Ramsay 1900, 228). The Act affected landowners throughout the country, the Duke of Hamilton for example claimed £38, 000 compensation and received £3000 (Agnew 1893, 429), but it had most impact in the Highlands where, due to the nature of the social system, justice was dispensed from the local nobility rather than from central government. The ordering and controlling of society through centralisation aimed to create a uniform administration, if not society.

The potential instability and vulnerability of reconciling contradictions provoked the tightening of control and the creation of an image of security. The aristocracy was still powerful but competition within its ranks, and general unrest in the society over which it exercised power caused fear and tension. Between 1603 and 1714 the peerage increased by 140 percent. Sixty four percent of the families with peerages in 1714 had been untitled in 1603 (Brown 1992, 35). The naturalising elements of continuity and change are constantly discernable. The Restoration, for example, was both innovative and traditional; Jacobitism incorporated both forward and backward-looking elements. Even the archives of families without strong Jacobite convictions collected the dying speeches of martyrs recorded as they went to the gallows. The Duke of Atholl was head of a family that balanced between the Jacobites and Hanoverians. His family seat at Blair Castle does, however, contain a collection of such speeches made by men such as Lord Balmerino executed in 1746 (Lenman 1980, 26) (see chapter seven). Concession to tradition and the past is an important element in polite architecture, with castles continuing to exert an emotional pull. In analysing the reactions of the elite to change and unrest it is imperative that consideration is given to whom they wished to give an impression of strength, authority and continuity.

Country houses are central to aristocratic image building. Keith Brown interprets them as 'monuments to conspicuous consumption which acted as evidence of the aristocracy's confidence and ongoing economic dominance' (1992, 39). The key words in this definition ought to be 'acted as'. Country houses were not built just because the finances were available (they often were not), nor were they reflective of a basic need for shelter. Many of the houses were not employed as permanent family residences. The necessity of presenting a façade of control and dominance, and the wish to justify such power was translated into the concrete medium of architecture. The building boom of the 1680s to 1720s was not just motivated by a desire to spend on ostentatious displays, but was the result of an aristocracy restored to power after twenty years of severe upheaval and challenge to their authority. One reaction to this vulnerability was to build symbols of unassailability

Chapter Four: Architectural Context

To fully understand and appreciate the possible architectural responses to the social and political climate after 1660 it is necessary to recognise and situate these architectural traditions and innovations, both historically and culturally. Academic discussion has focussed on particular issues such as the changing need for defence and the impact of Renaissance thought, at first through the selective adoption of useful elements, and in the late seventeenth century as a symbolic and functional programme. This chapter is not intended as a comprehensive account of the building projects of the nobility before the late seventeenth century, or as an opportunity to discuss in detail the contentious issues concerning architectural historians. Instead themes and elements of both continuity and change can be identified which provide a context in which not only to situate the transition of building types, but of society and the real and perceived place of the owners of these houses.

4.1 Medieval Scotland: Towers and courtyards

Two general approaches to architecture in Scotland before the late seventeenth century facilitate the aim of looking at the architectural lineage of post-Restoration buildings, each suggesting important themes and aspects. The 'traditional' view presents late medieval buildings in Scotland as divided into two dominant but exclusive types, the tower house and the courtyard palace. Academic discussion focuses on the former structural type over the higher status courtyard palaces, particularly as tower houses feature more prominently in the discussion of defence. A transition is seen between the

tower house and courtyard palace and the classical house (for example Dunbar 1966), advocating a clearer break in architectural expression than is actually born out by the buildings constructed in the late seventeenth century which appear to have their origins in different traditions. As will be seen in this chapter the notion of a clean architectural break in 1660 stems from misconceptions about Scotland from the fifteenth to seventeenth centuries, and the subsequent view of the Restoration as an enlightening and civilising period.

The view of two classes of building remaining unchanged until the end of the seventeenth century suggests a somewhat static image. Even within the basic tower house model evolution of forms can be seen. There was a remarkable lack of standardisation, or indeed the *expectation* of it, before the eighteenth century. The architects MacGibbon and Ross (1887-92) constructed an evolutionary classification which has provided the basis for subsequent study of Scottish tower houses and castles. During their fourth period (1542-1700), for example, rectangular keeps such as Drum Castle in Aberdeenshire and L-plan houses were augmented with Z-, E- and T-plans.

4.2 Renaissance castles and 'châteaux'

Recent revision of the view of Renaissance Scotland recognising its full and early participation (for example Howard 1995) has led to the proposal of another step within the transition from castellated to classical houses. Advocated by Charles McKean in particular, as in his *The Scottish Château: The Country House of Renaissance Scotland* (2001), the traditional view of tower houses and courtyard palaces is augmented with the more complex notion of the 'château'. 'The dwelling of the owner of a great property, a

large and beautiful pleasure house in the countryside' (*Le Petit Robert*), the château is chosen to indicate a structure nobler than a house, more martial than the classical country house, and more exotically European than British (McKean 2001, 3). The use of the term emphasises symbolism, even romanticism, as it consciously evokes older forms over practicality in these buildings. These structures were to exude dignity and authority and, through the symbolism of the castellated image, chivalric nobility.

The continuation of the image of the castle is not evidence that late medieval Scotland was a warlike nation, isolated and inward-looking until union with England (McKean 2001, 236). I have discussed the role of defensive features and the expectation of European education and travel in chapters one and three, but McKean argues in particular that Scotland was peaceful in comparison to a country such as Italy (2001, 236). The much-quoted letter of Sir Robert Kerr from 1636 proposing improvements to Ancrum House in Roxburghshire directed that, 'By any meanes do not take away the battlement as some gave me counsaile to do...for that is the grace of the house, and makes it looke lyk a castle' (Laing 1875, 64). The image of defence was difficult to leave behind due to the status and symbolism of power traditionally attached to the concept of the castle. No longer castles in the medieval sense, castellated forms allowed domestic houses to continue to carry an imagery of 'feudal power, chivalric honour and knightly virtue' (Howard 1995, 50).

Other architectural historians seem not to favour the use of château in a Scottish context; palace, house and castle are used for example in *A History of Scottish Architecture* (Glendinning et al 1996, 23). The term château is useful in that it rejects militaristic interpretations and instead evokes the importance of symbolism and of the

image of the building. The self-conscious manipulation of the castellated image continued throughout the seventeenth, eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. Therefore while the importance of imagery and perception is a main theme of this thesis I intend to use conventional terminology, especially as the term *château* has been applied particularly to Renaissance buildings.

Patrons and designers were cultured, aware of European aesthetic trends, but still chose not to use the classical architectural language of Italy and Serlio (McKean 2001). As most of Europe moved away from castellated architecture Scotland chose to retain and accentuate traditional castellated forms. Rather than being a country suffering from ignorance and barbarism as part of the political and cultural world of Renaissance Europe, it made a conscious culturally informed decision to reject the classical forms of antiquity.

Gardens may be more indicative of the knowledge of European fashions. The taming and improving of the natural world is implied by the formality and restraint of the Renaissance garden as seen, for example, in the geometrical garden created at Edzell, Angus (figure 4.1) in 1604 by Sir David Lindsay, Lord Edzell. The control of nature seen both through the inherent nature of gardening, and through the inclusion of manmade testaments to knowledge in the form of carved panels and other ornaments emphasises the growing obsession with the manipulation of the natural world. At Edzell the gardens were enclosed by walls including a summer house and bath house and included 'pilasters, pediments, Stuart unionist royal symbols and carved panels depicting planetary deities, the Virtues and the Arts' (Glendinning et al 1996, 59).

4.3 Royal building programmes: Linlithgow Palace

The impetus of building before the seventeenth century came largely from royal building projects which introduce issues of continuity and change, the different roles and expectations of both owners and their houses, and the significance of buildings in the projection of an image to others. In the early sixteenth century James IV and James V undertook the refitting of Linlithgow Palace (figure 4.2), the refortification of Blackness Castle, built a Royal Pavilion at Stirling Castle complete with classical proportions (plate 4.1), extended the hunting palace at Falkland (figure 4.3), and added a lodging to Holyrood (McKean 1993, 236). This extensive expenditure on buildings provided a grander stage for court society and politics and symbolised the growing power of the monarchy in relation to the nobles and the church.

The image of Roman imperial power and authority appealed to the Stewart royal family. At the same time there was growing fascination with medieval and Arthurian chivalry, with images of the Crusades and Jerusalem becoming particularly popular. These different cultural expressions paralleled the complex role and character of a monarch such as James IV. He was a 'humane prince', a patron of musicians and poets, but also a courtly prince who loved hunting and martial display, conforming to the chivalric image to the extent that he died at the head of an army in 1513. Finally he was a hard-headed statesman, intent on raising the international profile of Scotland through diplomacy and the calculated pomp of a cosmopolitan court (Glendinning et al 1996, 6-7). All of this had to be reflected through the most impressive and visual media, the royal palaces.

Linlithgow, West Lothian is a particularly good example of the fusing of traditional and new ideas, and the often contradictory priorities and expectations of kings. It evolved as a simple quadrangular structure, the building ranges following a square courtyard pattern (plate 4.2) which James IV completed with the building of the west range. This courtyard plan conformed to the most fashionable pattern of Italian seigniorial palaces of the fifteenth and early sixteenth centuries. However corner towers added a castellated impression. Symmetry and “‘classical’ stateliness” (Glendinning et al 1996, 9) were matched with the imagery of chivalry (plate 4.3). Later changes at Linlithgow under James VI emphasise the earlier incorporation of styles and the new pattern emerging between 1618 and the 1620s. A completely new north range consisting of a four-storey block of fourteen two apartment self-contained lodgings served by a central stair turret was constructed after the old quarter collapsed. The first floor also contained a long dining room or gallery which provided a socially levelling link between the royal apartments in the west range and the kitchens in the east (Pringle 2000, 19) (figure 4.4). Ranks of pedimented windows gave an external balance, and internally a double-pile plan with rooms opening off a cross-corridor on each level gave the further appearance of symmetry. Prominent changes were being made which, due to its status as a royal palace were influential, filtering down and flowering at a later period.

4.4 Hierarchy: Status, height and precedence

The nobility gradually took the architectural impetus from the monarchy. Certain themes can be identified as integral to noble building programmes but most prominent was a great sensitivity to status, hierarchy and precedence. Visually height had always

been important. The tall, compact nature of tower houses must have constituted a marked contrast to the low, comparatively insubstantial housing of the rest of the population. This distinction itself is of some importance with the expression of social status implied in the domineering verticality of the tower. Attention given to skylines allowed for emblematic expression. Ornamentation also increased the perceived height of the building exhorting the viewer to look upwards in the same manner as a spire or tower of a church forces attention heavenwards. Tower house 'walls are generally very plain, and the ornamentation is confined to the parapet and upper portions, where it often bursts out with extraordinary profusion and richness' (MacGibbon and Ross 1887-92, ii 3).

Developments at the wall head include the tendency to abandon the previously popular parapet-walk and to adjust the roof so that it met the wall head. However, it was still intended that attention be drawn to the top of the building. Defoe's description of Glamis Castle in about 1725 attested to this. 'When you see it at a Distance it is so full of Turrets and lofty Buildings, Spires and Towers, some plain, others shining with gilded Tops, that it looks not like a Town, but a City' (1769, 196) (figure 4.5). More simply, but perhaps more intrinsic was the continuing tendency to create the notion of height. Height itself implied a higher, nobler status. Its visibility in a relatively low architectural landscape, and the necessity for the viewer to look up to it, both imply that height had a symbolism of its own.

Internally this was expressed through a clear hierarchy of height with the ground floor used for storage purposes and those above accommodating the principal rooms. Stairways enhanced the importance of the first floor with its great hall, the one area in the house to which all who were admitted to the building could gain entry. Stairs became wider and

more ornamental as at Fyvie (figure 4.6), but spacious ascent was still usually only permitted to the first floor. The decoration or, more appropriately, the display of the actual staircase would make clear to visitors the privilege they were experiencing in being allowed admission to the principal apartments. The more private chambers could usually be accessed only via small spiral staircases with their compact, discrete nature indicating a more exclusive, private role.

Stairways, ornamentation and the massing of detail had a symbolic role to play in the control of both access and of perception. A façade of wealth and aesthetic taste and knowledge carefully masked and, at the same time, enforced the control of the lord's space. Decoration also had a more obvious function in terms of display in that embellishment is evocative of glamour and the trappings of wealth. Reuse and adaptation of architectural motifs could express veneration for ancestors and for family. The Earl of Strathmore when remodelling Glamis in the 1670s was 'inflam'd stronglie with a great desire to continue the memorie of my familie' (Millar 1890, 19). Ancient lineage can also be exploited in the creation of imagery or ideology that establishes noble status through the display of precedent and, so, justification or consolidation of position. As the Stewart monarchy reinforced their claims to power through imperial and origin-myth imagery (see for example Parry 1981), so their nobles exploited images of a chivalric and heraldic nature. Armorial panels and commemorative inscriptions such as those at Glamis (figure 4.7) increased in popularity, establishing the concrete place of the present inhabitants in history and, at the same time, referring to their connection with, and knowledge of, the past. Classical columns and pediments implied knowledge of even more distant history. The Renaissance had provided the ultimate tool with the universal, timeless canon of

classical correctness as exemplified architecturally through the system of the Orders (Glendinning et al 1996, 1).

4.5 Balance and privacy: centralisation and segmentation

The social and political position of nobles during the late sixteenth century can be suggested through the melding of classical and castellated imagery. Attempts to instil balance became gradually more popular, though there was no general trend or expectation of a symmetrical, ordered appearance. At Castle Menzies some regularity was introduced into the positioning of windows and doors. Rough symmetry was adopted at the Z-planned Castle Fraser. Diagonal wings, one square, one round were added by about 1592 to a plain rectangular tower, with further changes in 1617-18. The addition of flanking wings with turrets and the huge armorial panel at the top of the main block all created an harmonic balance which was lacking before (Glendinning et al 1996, 46).

Functionally increasingly horizontal and symmetrical plans necessitated (or facilitated) a move towards centralisation. A focal hub of the structure, usually the initial area into which admittance was gained such as the great hall or later the entrance hall, allowed movement further into the building to become more firmly controlled and suggests a developing desire for privacy while still maintaining the hospitable role of the house. Although suites of private rooms began to be provided for in the sixteenth century after the Renaissance prominence was still given to the communal, inclusive great hall. This is made clear through the number, arrangement and functional programmes of the rooms. A suite of rooms usually consisted of a withdrawing chamber or antechamber, a bedchamber and a closet. Husband and wife had separate apartments, either above or next

to each other, and these were the only chambers with any degree of privacy. There is no marked sequence of rooms through which access becomes more difficult, or through which segmentation of people into accepted and not accepted becomes clear. The beginnings of distinctions made between owners and guests did not achieve full expression until a later period.

However, some provisions did begin to be made towards adding further chambers which were often horizontally laid out and were slightly more difficult to access. L- or Z-plan towers introduced more space, but by the late sixteenth century more fundamental changes were being made. At Castle Menzies building work between 1572 and 1577 permitted the two principal apartments to be placed en suite. These extensions provided further space and so allowed for increased comfort or efficiency, but it is too simple to suggest as does John Dunbar (1966, 50) that these changes were motivated purely by expediency. Increased space allows for the greater expression of privacy, of segregation and specialisation in function, rather than just 'making life easier'. At Castle Menzies the refitting of an old tower as the entrance tower, and adding a square tower to the rear created a pattern with guests in the entrance tower, public rooms in the main body of the house and a separate family wing (McKean 2002, 8-10) (figure 4.8). Horizontal spread and segregation of functions provided an architectural indicator of status. The courtyard palace of Linlithgow with its north range of self-contained lodgings exemplified the most prestigious plan allowing for a degree of separation between public and private.

In elevational terms the picture of balance was active in articulating an inherent authority, the management of a previously less rational image. The notable examples of modification before the late seventeenth century such as the Catholic Alexander Seton's

house of Fyvie (figure 4.9; plate 4.4) seem to imply a requirement for image to be controlled in order to establish and maintain position. Interestingly balance was adopted within the castellated tradition.

4.6 Glamis Castle: Restoration and adaptation

Work at Glamis Castle, Angus in the 1670s exemplifies post-Restoration attempts at adapting, or restoring the old forms of tower houses. The work carried out and the concerns which it reflects embody the different aspects discussed in this overview of architectural development, and in particular emphasises the dichotomy in the urge for both continuity and change. Patrick, the third Earl of Kinghorne (after 1677 the Earl of Strathmore and Kinghorne) modified an L-plan tower house with the extension of the west wing to give it some semblance of balance (figure 4.10) and to accommodate modern social requirements with the incorporation of a great apartment or suite of rooms to house guests (Slade 2000, 37). The great hall on the second floor merely changed its function and became known as the drawing room. Private apartments were contained within the east wing highlighting the tendency to separate the public and private roles of the house and its owners (figure 4.11).

A central staircase added earlier during work from 1606 to 1624 opened onto every level and so had already reorganised circulation and modified access throughout the building (figure 4.12). From the stairway a central room was entered with corridors leading from it through the towers. The second floor was different as the great hall, or drawing room, constituted the whole of the main tower block (Slade 2000, 31-35) (figure 4.13). The hospitable and inclusive role of this room had not changed with those visitors

permitted access to the stairway initially being admitted to the drawing room. Whereas the terminology used to refer to the room had changed the function of the room remained fundamentally the same. The drawing room was more specialised than the great hall though. The latter was a communal room used for a range of purposes including eating, entertaining and sleeping. The addition of a great apartment, particularly a bedchamber and dining room allowed for the drawing room to be used more specifically for receiving and entertaining guests. The drawing room as the first room to which visitors were admitted represented a liminal area wherein the decision to allow or refuse admission to other areas of the house could be made.

The visitor's perception of the house would have been manipulated from the instance they set foot in the grounds (figure 4.14). A long tree lined avenue was placed at a forty-five degree angle to the house, aligned on the stair turret through which the building was accessed (figure 4.15). Therefore the stair became the centre of the composition as vision was forced straight ahead. In the late seventeenth and eighteenth centuries the avenue would have passed through entrance gates in front of the castle and then opened onto structured courts and vistas, decorated with carefully placed sculptures (Innes-Smith 2000, 41) (figure 4.16; plate 4.5). Statues placed on the terrace portrayed minor classical deities; another four on the grass below represented the Stuart monarchs James VI, Charles I, Charles II and James VII (Slade 1995, 123). The popular depiction of classical gods and other mythical figures provided the aristocracy with a method by which to demonstrate their education, and therefore their suitability for governance on a local and national scale. This theme was continued in the house with examples of Jacob de Wet's work on the interior including Ovid's *Metamorphosis* for the dining room ceiling and a

painting of Icarus for the principal bedchamber (Slade 2000, 40). The portrayal of royal figures is much more specific to the political climate within the which the castle was modified, in particular the Restoration of Charles II, and the accession of James VII in 1685. Statues of the reigning monarch and his family expressed loyalty and flattery during unstable times. The relationship between the Earl's family and the Scottish monarchy had been a long one, dating as far back as Sir John Lyon's grant of the thaneage of Glamis from Robert II in 1372, and his subsequent marriage to the King's daughter in 1376 (Slade 2000, 1-2).

Glamis Castle was modified but at the same time efforts were made to express continuity. While the Earl noted that, 'Tho' it be an old house and consequentlie was the more difficult to reduce the place to any uniformitie yet I did covet extremely to order my building so that my frontispiece might have a resemblance on both syds' (Millar 1890, 41), and recorded a strong dislike of 'these old fashions of tours and castles' as noted before he was also strongly desirous of continuing the memory of his family (Millar 1890, 33; 19). The Earl of Strathmore later wrote of castles that, 'everie man who hes such houses would reform them, for who can delight to live in his house as in a prisone' (Millar 1890, 33). Visually Glamis remained a tower house though, and this provides a framework within which changes such as the introduction of false symmetry could be made. Again the role of the drawing room should be highlighted as a selection area. This room had been the great hall, and even with modern plasterwork it still consisted of a large barrel vaulted chamber (figure 4.17), which maintained the image of Glamis as a long-established country seat. Intellectual and emotional reactions were manipulated. Externally the continuing character of Glamis as a tower house presented a recognisable

and consistent visual image to those denied access to the interior. The armorial panels over the focal staircase emphasised the privilege given to those permitted entry and highlighted the position of those inside. The developing segregation of private and public, or family and entertaining areas created increased limitation of movement around the building.

Patrick, Earl of Kinghorne had succeeded to that title in 1646 at the age of three, inheriting an estate which was mortgaged and debts amounting to between £400,000 and £600,000 Scots or £33,000 and £50,000 Sterling. Further debt was incurred during his minority by his step-father's plundering of the estate (Slade 2000, 6). Over the next forty years debts began to be paid off and finally houses repaired; first Castle Lyon, then Glamis from the 1670s. As a member of the Privy Council from 1682 and an Extraordinary Lord of Session after 1686 the Earl was involved in national affairs, though, like others, compromises had to be made. Although opposed to the Presbyterian party for instance, in 1690 he took the oath of allegiance to the new monarchs, William and Mary and their administration (Slade 2000, 6). The blending of old and new styles allowed the Earl not just to persist with the 'architectural language of his forefathers' (McKean 2001, 251) but also to order and segregate his house behind the legitimising façade of the castellated image.

4.7 1660: 'Scottishness' and Classicism

The academic debate over the impact of the Renaissance, though significant after the Restoration, deals mainly with the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries. My interest in this thesis is with the later transition at the end of this period between the castles, tower

houses and possibly châteaux and the ‘classical’ country house. The aim is not to perpetuate the traditional view of 1660 as the revival of ‘architecture’, or to treat it as a complete break isolated from what went before. As the conventional date at which many narratives see a break in building traditions 1660 is a perfect point for a revision of the approach. Many changes did occur with the restoration of Charles II, but at the same time I have argued that both change *and* continuity were important aspects in late seventeenth century society. Although Classicism may not have been established as a building programme until the late seventeenth century some overlap occurs with aspects of the style being used selectively.

Although the examples mentioned in this chapter demonstrate elements of continuity such as the increasing emphasis given to horizontal spread and the development of apartments, it is still common to discern through architectural history discourse that 1660 provides a clear break between classical architecture and what came before. I intend to show through the case studies presented in this thesis that both a specifically Scottish context *and* the influence of external agents contributed to the form of the country house in late seventeenth and early eighteenth century Scotland. McKean argues that misinterpretations of Scotland post-1660 and after the Union of 1707 have subsequently affected the interpretation of an earlier period (2001, 8). Any misinterpretation of houses after 1660 is what concerns me in this thesis.

Perhaps no consistent relationship between patrons’ political affiliations and the architecture of their houses can be found (Glendinning et al 1996, 40), but it is not specific symbolism, either of political or religious affiliation which is of importance here.

General trends are apparent including the earlier dominance of height over horizontal expression, the use of ornamentation, the primary role of the great hall and the lack of smaller more exclusive apartments, and an earlier lack of symmetry. All of these, and the fruition of changes which were to become fully expressed later, imply the motives and expectations of the owners/ occupiers and the impression they wanted to give. This in turn suggests their position, their need to establish and maintain their often acquired status. This process continued and became more significant, perhaps more urgent, after the Restoration as Classicism became established as a building programme.

If Charles McKean is right about the reasons behind the decision to retain the tradition of Scottish building while at the same time understanding but consciously not adopting whole-heartedly the Renaissance influences of classical order, why did this same rejection not recur again in 1660? By the late seventeenth century the role of the nobility was changing within an unstable society. Rather than, as before, celebrate their Scottishness with a strong effort to replicate old forms, Classicism became adhered to. Classicism represented more than an aesthetic programme. In particular its appropriation by architects and their patrons indicated its potency as an expression of political and moral principles (Ackerman 1990, 156). This educated, literate elite dictated the use and perception of Classicism. They could afford to import and read the twenty-five or more treatises and books on architecture which appeared in Britain between 1710 and 1760 (Wittkower 1974, 201-2). These included Palladio's *The Four Books of Architecture* first translated in 1669, made more accessible by Leoni's translation in 1716, and first correctly translated by Ware in 1738. If it did represent the fading of the preoccupation with inventing history (McKean 2001, 265), then it provided an image of stability and

constancy, universal and timeless. However, attention to precedent and to posterity is still a feature of each of the case studies in this thesis, most obviously at Inveraray Castle a century after the Restoration.

Attitudes to the past have been argued as being considered more important than Classicism before the last quarter of the seventeenth century with the tone being exemplified by the Duke of Lauderdale and Sir William Bruce at Holyrood (McKean 2001, 247). However the work at Holyrood between 1671 and 1679 could be argued to have helped to introduce and establish Classicism as a design principle in Scotland. Bruce's creation of a new façade involved building a replica of the James V tower house to counter balance the original, and linking the two with a low balustraded screen and portico (plate 4.6). The main quadrangle was remodelled to house a new series of state apartments. Bruce also formalised earlier trends, incorporating them into his designs. The practice of including pavilions, for example, developed from the earlier H-plan building, which itself had evolved out of the less balanced Z-plan. Sir William Bruce is seen as representing two building pedigrees, one Scottish and the other more international, or English. Holyrood (1671-9) and probably his own house of Balcaskie (1665) (figure 4.18) are part of the old tradition, whereas Kinross House (1679-93) belongs to another tradition altogether. This is particularly important in the crucial break in the relationship or tradition between earlier buildings and the 'classical' country house.

4.8 Kinross House: a 'new tradition'

'The most beautiful and regular piece of architecture' (Defoe 1769, 178), Kinross House (1679-93) benefited from being a completely new structure. It was not subject to restrictions based on an earlier building form. The four-storey elevations of the building were treated uniformly creating a simple, elegant impression through the use of ashlar blocks and the full articulation of the Orders. 'The house is a picture, 'tis all beauty, the stone is white and fine, the order regular, the contrivance elegant, the workmanship exquisite' (Defoe 1769, 178) (figure 4.19).

Kinross House was a solid block rather than a courtyard layout. Changes to quadrangular courtyards, such as the development of a U-plan structure at Hamilton, failed to remove the internalised, inward-looking nature of the layout. Courtyards were enclosed. At Kinross the solid mass of the building forced the attention of those within the safety of the house outwards.

Moreover the move away from processional layouts of rooms allowed for the controls discussed in relation to palaces to be enforced in an understated manner. Progression from one area to another was no longer laid out in a sequential order. Instead areas of the house were assigned particular purposes. The first floor of Kinross House was the family area where guests were also initially received (figure 4.20). The main entrance opened into a vestibule behind which lay the drawing room with access to the garden. The state apartment was situated on the second floor and was accessed via the main staircase that began at the first floor and terminated at the second (RCAHMS 1933, 301) (figure 4.21). The two areas were separate, but the position of the main stair and the fact that it only served these two floors indicates their significance. Access to the stair was from the

vestibule on the first floor to the salon on the second. From the initial entrance area then, guests were taken to the primary entertaining area of the house. From the salon direct entrance was possible to a drawing room and dining room, and through either these rooms or a corridor the bedchambers could be accessed (figure 4.22).

Kinross House was of double-pile plan with a corridor running through the centre of the structure (figure 4.23). However, on the upper three floors the passage is confined to the sides. A 'more grandiose and formal effect was achieved by channelling communication' (Glendinning et al 1996, 95). On the first floor this was through the central vestibule, and on the second and third through the double height salon (plate 4.7). These two rooms were passage spaces and were intended as initial entrance or reception areas from which further movement was made.

Service areas were more noticeably segregated from the rest of the house. The ground floor comprised a vaulted service area, but Bruce also provided for service areas on mezzanine floors at each end of the house. Small newel stairs in the passage way ascended to these rooms (RCAHMS 1933, 301). Servant's access to both family and state apartments was made easier by this innovation. It is also possible that with this extra accommodation servants were segregated from each other, as guests brought their own servants. This division of service space from the rest of the house was indicated externally once more by the treatment of the stone at ground level to give it a rusticated appearance (RCAHMS 1933, 299). Servants were placed to be readily available when assistance was required, but were still hidden from view. A service passage on the ground floor is even hidden from the entrance by screen walls (RCAHMS 1933, 301).

Formal gardens, parterres and terraces, surrounded the house as did rides (figure 4.24), but the lasting achievement was the creation of formal vistas centred on historic as well as natural features (figure 4.25; plate 4.8). As Kinross house was built on a new site the entire building could be aligned on an axis to maximise the location. Rather than vistas being created around the house, the house was an integral part of the process. For example, the main east vista from the house was of the ruins of Loch Leven Castle, providing historical precedent. The house was also built at a small distance from the small market town, 'so as not to annoy the house, and yet do as to make it the more sociable' (Defoe 1991, 344).

More pertinent than the Italian influence seen in the 'Serlian block' married to 'an extended layout derived from Palladio' (Macaulay 1987, 15) is the fact that Sir William Bruce designed Kinross House as his home. Bruce was not of the same status as his patrons but he was an important man who suffered political and social insecurity. As a protégé of the Duke of Lauderdale and a close supporter of the exiled Charles II much of Bruce's success was derived from his courtier status. After the decline of Lauderdale and the removal of the Stuarts from the throne 'Bruce was reduced to a relatively hand-to-mouth architectural existence, subject to constant official harassment' (Glendinning et al 1996, 74). Kinross House represented a new type of architecture, and this may be significant in that Bruce wished to emphasise a break with the architecture he had designed for others. The control of space throughout the house separated its use into clearly defined areas, with the family and state rooms occupying different floors, each apartment though was spatially almost exactly the same. Therefore selection of people

and specialisation of space took place under an egalitarian, uniform impression. This will be seen in other houses such as Hamilton Palace in the late seventeenth century.

Archaeology embraces a holistic approach, allowing interpretation to use the consideration of architectural forms to look at ideas. Motives are suggested through the design and intended uses of a building, and in turn permit an appreciation of the society in which the owners lived, and their perceived role within it. As discussed in chapter one, practicalities and symbolism are not separate issues. They are intertwined, one does not exist without the other. The continuation of the castellated image exemplifies this, providing an architectural genealogy to legitimate the place of the owner in the world, signifying their ancient power and status. Houses, like castles, played a role in the replication of power not just as a traditional architectural symbol, but also as active elements in social relations. Classicism became recognised as the architectural expression of stability, order and balance. Elements of new and traditional building forms reflected the conscious association with, and legitimation through, ancient nobility and authority, while at the same time keeping up with and encouraging change. Houses, like their owners had a number of roles to play and a range of audiences to appeal to.

Chapter Five: Hamilton Palace

The renovation, or restoration, of Hamilton Palace, Lanarkshire (figure 5.1) demonstrates changing attitudes towards and requirements of aristocratic residences. Hamilton Palace underwent two major periods of change. Duchess Anne and her husband the third Duke restored the family to good fortune after the Civil War and began their 'Great Design'. This included the rebuilding of a house (1684-1701) that no longer adequately reflected the status of its inhabitants. The redesign of the gardens and changes made to the actual town of Hamilton were important aspects of the rebuilding. Their grandson the fifth Duke made further landscaping changes in the 1730s.

It is possible to see these two periods of alteration and modification as part of an overall design with the fifth Duke merely continuing to implement his grandparents' plans. However both were exerting their position in response to the society and times in which they lived. The fifth Duke grew up in a world with different concerns and attitudes to his grandparents and to some extent this shows in the changes he made to the Palace grounds and the town, and the relationships he maintained with the people inhabiting the area. Both periods of change highlight the context, both personal and historical, in which they were made.

5.1 The progress of the 'Great Design'

Hamilton Palace was not a suitable residence for a family of the standing of the Hamiltons at the end of the seventeenth century. A great family must have a residence appropriate to their status. Various other motives behind the modifications include the desire for a more comfortable and convenient house and the wish to modernise. Defence was no longer a priority, instead a

house had to be a 'visible symbol of its owner's wealth and power and so it must be dignified and spacious' (Marshall 1973, 35). Once fortunes were restored the plan to rebuild the house could be put into action. Plans were drawn up in 1684 to modify the single depth courtyard construction into an open U-shaped design. This would still be based upon the idea of the courtyard but would allow for a more regularised design. Whereas previously the offices and other service areas were located in a courtyard annexe to the Palace, the new plan intended to make them an integral part of the building (figures 5.2; 5.3). In essence the renovation was a 'tidying up' process, making the house into a standardised whole and ensuring it represented adequately the status of its owners. The building project was of a scale which can only be termed palatial. Hamilton Palace was the largest house building project of the age (Glendinning et al 1996, 88).

Before the changes made by the third Duke and Duchess Anne the sixteenth century palace was a three-storey quadrangular structure with a tower at each end of the north front of one storey higher (figure 5.4). Beside it stood the irregular courtyard of two-storey, thatched buildings known as the Back Close (see figure 5.2). The plan for the modified palace consisted of the demolition of three sides of the quadrangle leaving only the north quarter with its principal public rooms standing. New east and west wings would be added onto the remaining block, and the entire alignment of the building would change to the focus on the south entrance. Work began with a new stable in 1684. The old stables became kitchens in 1687, and a new building was decided upon for other offices. To achieve this the existing north-south building was taken down and replaced with a new structure with a bakehouse alongside it. The renovation of the old Back Close area was completed in 1691 with the construction of three more new stables (Marshall 1973, 191-192).

Upon completion of the stables, kitchens and offices work began on the west quarter of the palace. The Duke died during this stage of the building programme (April 1694), leaving the Duchess to continue for the sake of her family. Within two years an identical east quarter had been built on the opposite side of the courtyard. The north side was to be left intact though the interior was to be remodelled (figure 5.5). This original plan was changed when the roof was deemed too dangerous to retain (Marshall 1973, 204). It is perhaps a fortunate accident then that the building eventually presented an image of unified order. Although the intention had always been to produce this image on the outside, the interior floor levels would not have been quite level between the wings and the older north block. The change of plan also allowed for all the blocks to be the same width, adding a further element of uniformity.

Building was virtually completed in 1701. Changes made to the building achieved the enlightened aim of unity and standardisation. This allowed an irregular, uncontrolled mass to become both regularised and ordered. This had always been an intention, 'Her Grace is content that we should make it as fine as possible so as the same be not gaudy or exceed the rules of proportion and true symmetry with the rest of the work' (*Hamilton MSS CI.8453*).

5.2 The Dukes of Hamilton: 'The nation's premier landed dynasty'

The status of the Hamilton family alone makes them and their house an important example, and also serves as an explanation as to the importance placed on the political and social standing of the family. A brief history serves to demonstrate the standing of the Hamiltons in Scotland. Robert I granted the barony of Cadzow to Walter Fitz-Gilbert de Hameldon between 1315 and 1329 (Torrie and Coleman 1996, 14). In 1445 James Hamilton was created a Lord of Parliament, joining his lands together into the lordship of Hamilton. The family was not only an ancient one

it also had close royal connections. In 1479 James, the son of the first Lord Hamilton succeeded to the title Lord Hamilton. His mother was Mary Stewart, the daughter of James II. In 1503 he became the first Earl of Arran. With the death of James V in December 1542 the second Earl of Arran became Governor for Queen Mary, or Regent of Scotland. In 1549 the family's titles were added to further when he received the French dukedom of Châtellherault (Torrie and Coleman 1996, 15). The role of the family in the politics of Scotland continued to be a chief consideration in their actions throughout the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. Knowledge of just how high the 'traditional' standing of the Hamiltons was in Scotland helps to understand the fundamental import of status and influence in the actions of the Dukes and Duchesses of Hamilton. They were 'the nation's premier landed dynasty' (Glendinning et al 1996, 88), and through their building work they intended to maintain and extend their position.

The principal ducal residence, Hamilton Palace, had to reflect its owners and their power and authority. Not just the position of the current inhabitants but also of their ancestors who gave precedence to their status. This is seen elsewhere in the activities and attitudes of the Duke of Hamilton. One of his chief interests was family history and his and his wife's lineage. 'Genealogy fascinated him, and he copied out for himself many family trees of quite remote connections of the Hamiltons and the Douglasses. He listed all the errors in a manuscript history of his father's family, and he was an expert on heraldry' (Marshall 1973, 116). The Duke also studied early charters and land grants. Although stemming from an apparently genuine interest in history this attentiveness to details of genealogy was a preoccupation of many aristocrats of the period. Lineage lay 'at the heart of noble self-consciousness' (Brown 2000, 4), it was a key to defining one's status (see p142). The fact that power and privilege had been in a family for a few generations provided justification for its continuation. This became increasingly important as

relationships with England developed and old loyalties began to be less important. Heraldry was used to the same purpose as armed men had been used in the past - it was intended to impress an audience. Visitors to Hamilton Palace were made immediately aware of the lineage of the family by the pediment over the new entrance which included a carving of the ducal crest (figure 5.6).

The interest in genealogy and the status of the Hamilton family becomes clearer when the political context of the period and their role in, and opinions of it, are considered. The elucidation of the position of the family in relation to the monarchy and other aristocrats provides an aid to understanding the reasons behind the changes made at the palace and further afield. The instability of the late seventeenth and early eighteenth century was personal as well as political, religious and economical.

At the time of Duchess Anne's birth in January 1632 the family lands extended from Hamilton right through the Clyde valley, and from Arran in the west, to Kinneil in the east (Marshall 1973, 13). However, by the time Anne inherited the title and lands the Civil War had brought about changes. Her family's close links with Charles I had brought difficulties and recriminations before, during, and after the Civil War. Her father had been a close companion and adviser to Charles I, while her mother had been a Lady of the Queen's Bedchamber. The King was also Duchess Anne's godfather. The Marquis of Hamilton acted as a mediator for Charles I; both the Marquis and the King were executed.

Duchess Anne inherited an unenviable position. Debts accumulated by her father and uncle in the name of the Royalist cause left her close to financial ruin. The occupation of Scotland by the Parliamentary Army and the annexation of the country as part of the Commonwealth led to the severe punishment of all active Royalist supporters. The Hamilton estates were confiscated and shared out amongst various officers in Cromwell's army. For example General Monck was given

Kinneil, and a Colonel Ingoldsby received Hamilton Palace and the barony of Hamilton (Marshall 1973, 26). Many of the Hamilton holdings lay deserted and destroyed and the Duchess herself lived in a small house in the woods near the Palace. The determination to retrieve and restore their property constituted a primary motivation behind the actions of the third Duke and Duchess Anne. The family were 'by station and extent of possessions without equal in Scotland' (Macaulay 1987, 35), but by the time of the Restoration these attributes were no longer taken for granted. The Duchess had raised the £7000 needed to pay off the fines to the government and reclaim Hamilton Palace, and had seen off a challenge to her inheritance. The position and property of the Dukes of Hamilton had been worked and paid for.

Fortunes were further restored and strengthened with the Restoration in 1660. Charles II repaid more than £25,000 sterling which his father had owed to her father. At the special request of the Duchess her husband Lord William Douglas, Earl of Selkirk was created the Duke of Hamilton. The financial benefit of the Restoration should not be considered a solution to all the family's problems. The Restoration did provide to some extent 'a return to normality and the possibility of planning for the future' (Marshall 1973, 31) but the position of the Hamiltons, just as with other noble families, continued to be vulnerable. This is seen in the emphasis on heraldry and continuing political manoeuvring and manipulation. Some of the lands that had been left in their hands had been sold along with personal belongings to pay off the original fine to the government. The Duke and Duchess still had enormous debts to pay. The request for the title of Duke to be bestowed upon her husband indicates the reality of the continuing political atmosphere; a male was needed to represent the Hamilton name. Their position and Hamilton Palace were restored to them with the new King, but they still had much to do to regain the previous standing of the family.

The third Duke of Hamilton was an ambitious man, aware of his role as representative of an ancient family and desirous of political power. His subsequent political activities serve to exemplify the position of Scottish nobles as regards the King, the Court in England and their fellow peers. Competition for the King's favour and the accompanying power and offices led to the importance of attending the Court in London and of 'keeping up appearances'. The Duke of Hamilton was excluded from office for many years as a result of his being the leader of the opposition to the political monopoly of the Secretary of State, the Duke of Lauderdale (see chapter three). When Lauderdale fell the Duke finally received royal recognition. He became a Knight of the Garter, sat on the English and the Scottish Privy Councils, and was made a Commissioner of the Scottish Treasury and an Extraordinary Lord of Session (Marshall 1973, 84). The change in the Duke's fortunes serves to highlight the highly competitive, insecure political context of the late seventeenth century. As Marshall points out, 'a Duke of Hamilton was appointed to high office because he was Duke of Hamilton' (1973, 84), but his position was not automatic anymore and competition had intensified. Whereas within the traditional sphere of his power, Scotland, his name alone secured him a certain level of respect and provoked instant recognition of his standing and the extent of his territory, the King's English advisers in Whitehall would be harder to impress. Rather than just competing with fellow peers Scottish aristocrats had to compete with preconceptions and attitudes of those outside their usual sphere of influence. The Duke of Hamilton achieved the required impression of grandeur and finery through lifestyle and material acquisitions. The house he and his wife planned provided the most ostentatious symbol of this power.

The Duke spent a great deal of time in London and in Edinburgh where he saw to the family's legal affairs while attending the Scottish Parliament and Privy Council. The Hamiltons,

as Hereditary Keepers of Holyroodhouse, kept apartments in the palace. The Duchess accompanied her husband to Edinburgh where she hosted the necessary political entertainment. However she rarely visited London due to personal childhood memories and the loss of her parents. Through her family though she had close connections with England which are interesting to note. Her mother, the niece of the Duke of Buckingham, had been brought up at the English Court and had never been to Scotland. The Duchess' childhood was spent on 'the periphery of the elegant and civilised Court of Charles I' (Marshall 1973, 14). She had always been aware of the troubles and difficulties surrounding the Royal Court. It is hard to imagine that this did not affect her attitudes, and certainly educated her as to the necessity of keeping up a certain image.

The Duchess' position became even more complicated with the debates over union with England in the early eighteenth century. Although aware of her own personal and her family's standing and the problems of maintaining favour the Duchess was against full union. The whole issue of union brought instability to the aristocracy and to the country in general. Noblemen owned lands in England and their political influence depended upon the whims of London. At the same time their 'traditional' seats, or bases of power, were in Scotland. The interests of the two countries did not necessarily coincide. Concern over the economic conditions of her tenants prompted the Duchess to openly declare herself against the Union and she began to organise local opposition. She was concerned for 'this poor people that our neighbours would starve, and treats them and our nation with scorn' (*Atholl MSS 45175*). This attitude had been hardened by the failure of the Darien scheme (see pp137-8). The Duchess' son Lord Basil was a director of the Company, while the Duchess herself had been the first to sign the subscription books when they opened in Edinburgh. She had personally given £3000 sterling to the venture, Lord Basil

contributed £1000, the palace secretary David Crawford gave £200, and even the page, John Porterfield subscribed £100 (Hill Burton 1849, 371-417). These four contributions alone indicate the hope placed in the scheme to set up a Scottish trading colony. Although the Duchess had genuine concern for her people she must have been aware also of the personal consequences. She had lost a great deal of money and her name was attached to a scheme that had failed disastrously. She had been brought up with the awareness of the significance of England in Scottish affairs, and with the knowledge that her position depended to some extent on the opinions of those in London. Local and national interests had become difficult to reconcile. Her opposition to union could be precarious, serving only to undermine her position.

On a less personal but equally dangerous level the Duchess was aware of the possibility of local instability. While levying opposition to Union she was careful to prevent any civil unrest within her estates, forbidding tenants of other parishes to attend meetings in Hamilton. Intimidation was brought to bear upon her when, for example, in the winter of 1706 her page and the Hamilton burgh treasurer were arrested (Marshall 1973, 221).

Roles, responsibilities and contradictions

The role of the Duchess in the Union negotiations demonstrates some of the prevalent attitudes and difficulties of the period. However the position of her eldest son, James, Earl of Arran (Duke of Hamilton after 1698) serves to suggest some of the other problems experienced by aristocrats at the time. By the time of the Union in 1707 James was the chief male representative of the Hamilton family, his father having died in 1694. Although anti-Unionists and his mother hoped he would lead the opposition in Parliament the fourth Duke behaved erratically and without resolution, providing no clear leadership at all. This conduct appears not to have been out of character, but also highlights the difficulty of his personal position. James

had always shown a marked preference for England and the excitement of London society. After attending Glasgow University and having completed a Grand Tour through France and Italy he 'returned with a taste for a far more sophisticated way of life than Scotland could offer, so that thoughts of settling down were, in his father's words "much the same to him as to go to the galleys"' (Marshall 1973, 143). With his second marriage he had also gained vast lands in England. He did not want to jeopardise his English property, nor did he wish to upset Queen Anne whose favour he desperately courted. Rather than taking a stance either way he pleaded illness whenever a decision was required of him.

James, the fourth Duke, provides an instance of personal wishes clashing with national and even family interest. In general he had always provided a point of vulnerability for his family. As the eldest son, and the first male heir of the House of Hamilton to live in the Palace for forty years, great things were expected of him. Unfortunately he caused his family great worry and expense. The question of his marriage emphasises conflicting interests, particularly in an Anglo-Scottish context. The Hamilton estates were entirely in Scotland, and one day he would become master of them all. It was expected, if not demanded of him as a future Duke of Hamilton, that he marry a Scottish lady and settle down in Scotland. He did marry in 1688 when it became financially imperative, and settled in Scotland for a short while but upon his wife's death in 1690, although distraught with grief, he returned to England.

The Duke had failed to provide an heir. Therefore it was crucial that he remarry. Aware of expectations he again entered into his pursuit of wealthy women, while once more having no intention of marrying or of discontinuing his way of life in London. Finally after reaching a new low point in his fortunes with the death of his daughter, his Jacobite sympathies and debt he signed a marriage contract in 1698. The next day his mother resigned her titles in his favour. She

continued as Duchess in her own right and maintained control over the estates, but James could call himself the Duke of Hamilton and was entitled to sit in the Scottish Parliament (Marshall 1973, 216). As has been shown, although a male voice was required to represent the family in Parliament he tended to create problems rather than uphold the family name and position. It is significant that the Duchess kept control of the estates preventing her son from placing the family in financial ruin again. His three sons and two surviving daughters guaranteed the succession. However, the Duke was bored with Scotland and frustrated at his mother's refusal to give him control of the estates, so he went south again and never returned to Scotland. In 1712 he fought and was killed in a duel, leaving his stunned mother with more debts and his children to raise.

The life of the fourth Duke also demonstrates the vulnerability of his position. Although he was over-indulged and maintained an ostentatious way of life even he had to perform to certain standards. He had to marry and provide an heir and he was expected to represent his family in Parliament. His family despaired of him, and there is a pervasive feeling that if he had not been able to keep up such a magnificent lifestyle he would not have been as accepted as he obviously was. His title and family status particularly after receiving the title of Duke of Hamilton must have contributed to his social standing. The splendour of his family was represented by their home at Hamilton Palace and his ostentatious way of life.

The life of the fourth Duke also demonstrates changing attitudes. He may have been motivated by self-interest but even his father understood the need for sustaining a good relationship with London. In a letter to her son Duchess Anne had told him to return home. 'This is not that I am such a fool as to think Scotland a finer place or near so good as England, but being the country where your interest lies cannot but be most your advantage to set up your residence in' (in

Marshall 1973, 174). However, by the time she had to think about sending her grandson, the fifth Duke away to school it was not to Glasgow Grammar but to Eton that she sent him. This was on the advice of her sons Charles, Lord Selkirk and George, Lord Orkney, who persuaded her that to keep up with other peers, socially and politically, he must be sent to London. It is evident that times were changing and aristocratic attitudes and actions were required to adapt in order to maintain status and position in reference to their peers.

The fifth Duke continued on to achieve a leading role in London society and in politics, becoming Lord of the Bedchamber in 1727 (Balfour Paul 1904). He retired from politics in about 1733, returning to live principally at Hamilton. His relationship with the town in particular was not a good one, and it will be shown that he made physical changes which both reflected and contributed to this relationship. It is possible that the time spent in England, particularly at school, as well as the different times in which he was living contributed to his attitudes towards his home and responsibilities there.

Religion: belief and pragmatism

Intertwined with all the matters discussed here is the issue of religion. This was a particularly destabilising force in the late seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. The Duchess was brought up as a Presbyterian which made her naturally sympathetic to the Covenanters cause of which her mother and many of her tenants were supporters (Marshall 1973, 18). Religion was also a more personally sensitive issue. The third Duke of Hamilton, unlike his wife, had been brought up within the Catholic faith. His father, the Marquess of Douglas was in constant trouble with the local Presbytery, and his mother was 'notoriously papist' (Rogers 1884, ii 176). The Duchess' uncle's entail had been most specific about religion, forbidding her to marry a Catholic. The Earl of Selkirk (after third Duke of Hamilton) converted to Protestantism in order to marry her.

However, occasionally this prompted difficulties. The Duke's brothers and sisters remained Catholics, one sister was married to the Duke of Perth who was exiled because of his faith in 1689, and although they remained on good terms it was not always possible to receive them at sensitive times.

Religious attitudes caused further difficulties when considered in relation to their other commitments and duties. An integral part of maintaining the impression required to keep up appearances at Court was a certain degree of ostentation. This directly clashed with the diametrically opposing attitude prevalent in their religious views. The Duke chose to put status before all other considerations and lived a life distinguished by finery. He followed fashion to the extent that he hired a French valet because it was 'the done thing' (Marshall 1973, 67). The Duchess, on the other hand, found a compromise. She preferred simple, sober clothes but of fine quality. Her stance was made easier by the fact that she did not often go to London. The Duke had an image to keep up within the highly competitive environment of the Royal Court. The significance of this is highlighted by the fact that he put religious views, or matters of conscience, aside in order to keep up appearances. Again these contradicting views were able to be resolved, but failed to contribute to a necessarily secure way of life.

5.3 Discussion: Hamilton Palace, fit 'for the Court of a Prince'

'A new standard of austere grandeur'

The duty to live in the manner expected of the representative of this ancient and noble family was most notably and ostentatiously achieved through their chief residence, Hamilton Palace. Particular importance was placed on the impression that the building gave. The changes made in the late seventeenth century provoked Defoe into writing that the state apartments were 'fit rather for the Court of a Prince than the Palace or House of a Subject' (Defoe 1769, iv 148). Amongst

the other intended changes a new south facing ceremonial entrance was designed (figure 5.7). The three-storey tetrastyle Corinthian portico highlighted the monumentality of the building, introducing 'for landowners of the top rank, a new standard of austere grandeur' (Glendinning et al 1996, 88). At the same time as providing an image of ostentation, a lavish display of wealth, the house represented a controlled, balanced façade. 'The palace at Hamilton is large...the front is very magnificent indeed, all of white freestone with regular ornaments according to the rules of art' (Defoe 1769, iv 148). The classical education of the family was presented to the world, providing further evidence of their ability to govern.

The scale and extravagance of the entrance to the house highlighted, to those permitted entry, the honour they were receiving. Those who were left outside had their place clearly demarcated from those inside. In troubled times a feeling of solidarity was nurtured amongst those on the inside, while simultaneously an outward image of unassailability was presented. The ashlar blocks of the façade served to emphasise the monumental nature of the structure, as did its proportions. Criticism from John Macky in the 1720s labelled the house as 'preposterous'. The U-plan 'is not nearly Eighty Foot broad while the Wings are one hundred and fifty feet long' (1729, 279). To a visitor entering the open courtyard area of the house the impression was overwhelming. The long wings of the new arrangement almost reached out and enfolded them (figures 5.8; 5.9).

The new ceremonial entrance led to an equally formal route through the house. The path which visitors took had not changed, even though the building had. From the entrance they proceeded through the Laigh Hall, up the Great Stair and into the gallery which consisted of the entire length of the north front (figures 5.10; 5.11). The visitor was immediately assailed with visual statements of learning and authority. The entrance, or Horn Hall, was decorated with no

less than five maps of the world. A clock regulated their time (making them aware of how long they may be kept waiting?), though at the same time the provision of a large fire added a welcoming, homely aspect. The inventory of 9 December 1690 also mentions four tables and four forms whose uses need no explanation. The same cannot be said for the (temporary?) presence of a bathing tub (Marshall 2000, 254).

Modifications began in 1684 with the construction of new offices, stables and a kitchen. The west wing, which embodied the state apartment, was built next (1691-3), and the family east wing was completed in 1696. The order in which these modifications took place is important. As soon as the accommodation could be completed the house was ready for immediate use. The practical provision of offices, stables and a kitchen before anything else indicates a focus on the house as the centre of a business enterprise, a haven of entertainment, and also as a family house. These similar but separate functions of the house are seen in the alienation of state and family areas from each other by placing them on opposing sides of a courtyard layout. The building of the west wing first may have been 'a telling sign of the craze for state apartments among the aristocracy' (Glendinning et al 1996, 87), but until the east wing was completed the Duke and his family inhabited these rooms.

An impression of splendour continued to be given throughout the house, but it was not necessarily a true reflection of the position of its owners. The inventory of 1690 lists arras hangings [tapestries] in almost every room. While these hangings suggest opulence and wealth they were necessary fittings in a large house without the benefits of modern central heating; the functional and symbolic were often combined to great effect. The grand marble fireplaces seen in the finest public rooms of the palace were not reflected in the imitation marble used in the rooms frequented less by visitors (Marshall 1973, 205-6). The perceived necessity of opulence in the

rooms that people would see suggests again the importance of presenting the outside world with an impression of stately grandeur. Even in the eighteenth century there are indications that an element of pretence was necessary, and that complete opulence was not always achievable. Loveday noted in 1732 that 'many of ye rooms are not fitted up, wainscoted etc.' (1889, 114). Later in the century rooms were criticised as being 'not well furnished' (Pococke 1887, 47). The ceremonial entrance ensured that at least the first impression of the Palace was one of the grandeur befitting a ducal family.

Show house and ducal home: the Hamilton notion of family

Appearances were important, but the intended role of the house was as a family home. While work was continuing on the west wing the Duke declared that, 'I do not intend to pull down a stone more until we are living in that now in hand and until we see a little more appearance of peaceable times' (in Marshall 1973, 195). This indicates both that the house was a family seat and that the Duke, although undertaking an expensive and conspicuous building programme, was aware of his own limitations and instability during difficult and dangerous times. Changes to the house had begun during 'The Killing Time' (1684-88), and the battle at Bothwell Bridge (1679) had been uncomfortably close to Hamilton. The problems of reconciling a family home with a business centre and an aristocratic show house are reflected in the conflicting images of opulence and austerity.

This is complicated further with the notion of family as understood by the Hamiltons. Their self-image as aristocrats was based largely on their duties towards their country, the people who relied on them for their livelihoods, to themselves, and most importantly to their families and name. The notion of family had two slightly different meanings. The actual family for which the nobles were responsible, and the family which they represented with all its history and precedent.

Duchess Anne's notion of family was of an extended group of people. She herself had thirteen children of whom seven sons and three daughters survived into adult life. Her own sisters and cousins stayed at the Palace until they found suitable husbands, and the Duke's younger siblings lived with them until his brother joined the army and his sister died. His two orphaned nephews were welcomed into the house. Rules of hospitality and the notion of family overcame even personal feelings. A close friend of Duchess Anne's sister was granted permanent residence even though the Duke disliked her and offered to pay for her to live elsewhere (Marshall 1973, 32). Even towards the end of her life the Duchess found herself at the heart of a group of women and children for whom she was responsible. A number of her grandchildren were brought up in her house. Lord Basil's wife and posthumous daughter moved into the Palace, so too did the two youngest daughters of her own daughter, Lady Katherine when she died in 1707. Lord John sent his daughters to stay for a number of months when his wife suddenly died, and James, the fourth Duke insisted she bring up his children as they clearly did not fit in with his lifestyle (Marshall 1973, 225).

The sense of family began to change and develop in the eighteenth century, as seen partially in the behaviour of the fourth Duke. For the third Duke and Duchess Anne the notion of family was integral to their actions. The awareness of the importance of family extended further than looking after relatives. The concept is a complicated one, including affection and the knowledge that being part of such a family demanded an acceptance of duty and respect, 'a consciousness that over the centuries the original ties of blood and the basic alliances for defence had combined into a much more complicated concept of the kinship group' (Marshall 1973, 32). Remote connections were remembered, and patronage given to all branches of the family. The Duke or Duchess of Hamilton were linked to anyone sharing their name, and felt themselves in some way

responsible. Therefore numerous examples exist of acts of charity ‘to a poor man called Hamilton’ or ‘to a boy [who] called himself Hamilton’ (Marshall 1973, 33).

Even in patterns of entertaining at Hamilton Palace there seems to be a continued emphasis on this notion of family. Rather than entertaining only guests of their own station, the Hamiltons preferred to welcome members of the local gentry, younger sons and professional men who could discuss local affairs. For instance they frequently received Sir Daniel Carmichael, the commissioner of the peace for Lanarkshire. Rather than mixing only with fellow peers or political cronies the Duke and Duchess preferred to defer to other considerations such as old local and kinship connections (Marshall 1973, 108).

A well informed design: fashion, modernity and learning

The choice of James Smith as architect is a telling one. Other projects of his included work at Holyroodhouse (1679) and the Duke of Queensberry’s Drumlanrig Castle (1679-90) (plate 5.1). Smith has been credited along with Sir William Bruce with ‘firmly establishing in Scotland the new view of Classicism and the orders as a comprehensive system of values rather than as a vocabulary of applied detail’ (Glendinning et al 1996, 75). This can be seen in the treatment of the façade of Hamilton Palace and the general appeal to simplicity and order seen throughout the building. James Smith was the favoured establishment architect after Bruce.

The modernising of Hamilton Palace required the services of an estimable and respected architect. Opinions were sought from other renowned architects such as Sir William Bruce, and attention was paid to influences from London and the Continent. Architectural treatises were consulted, and reports sent back from the Earl of Arran on his Grand Tour suggest his parents’ interest in architecture. For instance after visiting the great house at Richelieu he paid £1 10/- for a description and drawing to send home to his father (Marshall 1973, 137). The Duke and

Duchess were well informed and closely involved with their plans. Their building projects were not based on an adherence to taste as suggested by their designers; instead they were personally aware of the functions and impressions required of their houses and of the means by which to achieve them. They had even managed to have a kind of trial run with their house at Kinneil which they had modified for the Earl of Arran in the 1670s. Here they added on a new wing to the existing tower house, creating an L-plan block (figure 5.12). Attention was paid to enlarging the structure while aiming for an image of classical elegance (Marshall 1995, 34-42; RCAHMS 1929, 190-2).

Further modernising and fashionable details were added at Hamilton including, for example, the innovative inclusion of sash windows in 1690. The adherence to the accepted practice of having state apartments within great houses has already been addressed. The enfilade arrangement in each of the wings of the house is an equally significant feature. This allowed for a line of vision from the northern end of each wing through to a window overlooking the gardens. This too was a fashionable arrangement, as seen in palaces such as Versailles. There is an element of keeping up with modern taste, of maintaining an image of adhering to, if not dictating, fashion. As has already been discussed the importance of keeping up a good impression was tantamount to the status of a family such as the Hamiltons. The amount of money spent during hard times suggests the importance. 'Expense was well nigh prohibitive and the trouble involved was tremendous' (Marshall 1973, 202).

Paths of movement: sequences and selection

Hamilton Palace was more than a project in fashionable modernity. The modification of a quadrangular design to an open courtyard maintained the sequential nature of internal spaces. This suggests more than an adherence to fashion. The processional nature of a single-depth

courtyard accentuated selection as movement from one room to another was controlled. At royal palaces such as Versailles or Linlithgow courtiers were selected to move from one room to the next according to a strict hierarchy and the level of royal favour. Rules for progression were established chiefly in terms of status. However, once admission was gained to a house such as Hamilton selection proceeded on the basis of personal relationships. A shift in priorities is perceptible, then. Instead of determining the level of access allowed through the house according to notions of status it was based on familiarity or trust. Selection on the basis of hierarchy was made at the front door. Originally this selection had taken place chiefly in the entrance or Horn Hall. A visitor other than a family member would have proceeded through the Laigh Hall, up the stairs to the first floor. There was no possibility of deviation from this pathway. The modified building manoeuvred the visitor through the same corridor of movement. From the Horn Hall they reached the gallery via the Laigh Hall and Grand Stair. Again any deviation from this route was unlikely (see figure 2.15 and p106). Thereafter admission was permitted to either the family or the state apartments. Access to both areas was via the gallery, which constituted the whole north block of the principal floor (figure 5.13). In a troubled political and social climate this hints at the aristocracy's awareness of its own vulnerability. The third Duke of Hamilton's reference to 'more peaceable times' demonstrates his own anxieties.

The absence of corridors in the house does suggest a distinct lack of privacy. Marshall notes this as a motive for changes made to the house (1973, 35). However, the use of the enfilade arrangement, which continued the previous style of one chamber opening onto the next indicates otherwise. The Duke and Duchess, with their interest in architecture, would have been aware of the precedence for arranging their rooms in such a way. They would also have realised the potential for the control of access mentioned before. Moreover, as will be shown, rooms tended

to be arranged in clusters (see p107). Apartments, for example, consisted of bedchambers, dressing rooms and closets. Therefore immediate access into one room from another was often necessary. A few areas of the redesigned building did have corridors rendering some rooms separate (figure 5.14). Reasons for this are not obvious, particularly as the rooms are those of servants and the nurseries. The rooms are all on the principal floor though, so perhaps there was an effort to cut them off from the other rooms on that floor. The nurseries appear to be isolated physically from the focal areas of the house. The children spent many of their earliest years in the nurseries, 'but these formed no enclosed world of their own' (Marshall 1973, 131). The children spent time with their parents. As with the town and servants their sphere of activity was both integral and separate to the rest of the Palace.

The charter room is also isolated on a corridor, on the principal floor near the Duke's apartment away from the main routes of circulation through the house. In terms of permeability it is deep within the building, removed by ten other spaces from the Horn Hall entrance (see figure 2.15). The position of the room indicates its importance. It is hard to exaggerate the importance of paper, especially when considering the emphasis placed on genealogy, precedence and property. The third Duke's will demonstrates the value of paper, or written records. Amongst other gifts the Duke left the Earl of Arran the deed of entail settling the estates on him but limiting his powers of contracting debts against the Hamilton possessions; Lord Charles was given the title deeds to the lands of Crawford; Lord John received the title deeds of Riccarton; and Lord Basil was given papers clearing the debts on his wife's lands at Baldoon. All of the title deeds were sealed up in trunks and placed in storage (Marshall 1973, 199-200). The size of the Hamilton archives today with its lists, accounts, letters and other records gives an example of the penchant for recording and ordering even everyday events. This in itself was a method of

controlling, the household, and life in general. Moreover, the act of recording implies the recognition of the importance of posterity and precedence.

The exterior vertical pull of the principal floor windows points to the significance given to this floor (figure 5.15). The upper level has shortened windows just under the roofline. This became a usual feature as rooms used for entertaining were selected as focal points externally, and were provided with large windows from which to appreciate the manufactured vistas. The pattern of entertaining at Hamilton under the third Duke and Duchess Anne leads to some reservation over the practical need for state rooms. The lavish scale at which the Hamiltons entertained when in Edinburgh was not continued at home in the Palace. As has been mentioned the guests were mainly chosen from the local gentry or family, or had had business in the Palace. Guest rooms were rarely unoccupied, with two or three guests visiting at a time for a few days each. Significantly not even near relations would call uninvited (Marshall 1973, 104). The state apartments, which were fit 'for the Court of a Prince' (Defoe 1769, iv 148), perhaps provided a symbolic rather than a practical function. It was expected that a family such as the Hamiltons would have such apartments. To uphold their status and name money had to be spent on the image which a state apartment provided. The entire house maintained both a symbolic and a functional role.

Relations within the house: family and servants

Different groupings of rooms are discernable throughout the house, for example the alienation of state and family areas from each other (figure 5.16). Unusually at Hamilton there was no half-basement, due to the restricting nature of the original building. Therefore the entire ground floor of the wings was adapted as office space and bedrooms for the principal servants. Although rare this arrangement still ensured the segregation of servants from their masters. At the same time

servants were conveniently placed to access the rooms they served (figure 5.17). The change from stairs in courtyard turrets to back stairs integrated within the main body of the building created convenient routes for them around the house (figure 5.18). For example, the principal servants rooms were directly underneath the withdrawing room and an apartment, with easy access provided by a set of back stairs. The chambermaid's room had direct access via a stairway to the principal floor and servants rooms were separate but within easy reach of the Duke's apartment.

The image of a close but separate relationship can be applied to that between the family and servants. It would be easy to see the servants as part of the family. For instance the first full-time secretary to be appointed by the third Duke, David Crawford, had been employed as 'the children's man'. He was, though, a contemporary of their eldest son and attended Glasgow University with their children. The children's governor John Bannatyne married Margaret Hamilton, one of the Duchess' servants (Marshall 1973, 63; 66). Pages were also still brought up within the household in the medieval tradition. The servants were treated well, receiving good rates of pay, medical treatment and often education. The Duke and Duchess often contributed if any servants married, supported them as Hamilton pensioners upon retirement, and paid for funerals.

A number of servants showed remarkable loyalty to the Hamilton family. In 1649 the Duchess had had to disband her staff due to uncertainty of the future. Men such as her English groom Valentine Beldam remained loyal throughout this period (Marshall 1973, 62). Many were members of old established Hamilton families, such as the Palace lawyer Arthur Nasmith. Some even shared the name Hamilton with their employers though this custom was waning. Out of a random thirty servants of the Duchess's grandmother seven had the surname Hamilton, in the

Duchess's own time only eighteen out of three hundred and ten did so. However two were master households, two were head porters and three had been taken on as pages (Marshall 1973, 81). Therefore some were qualified to serve the Hamiltons by birth.

However the layout of the house indicates that the servants were still seen as a separate group, or groups. Rather than being a large undefined group the servants were clearly defined, both in reference to the family and to each other. A hierarchy of servants existed and is reflected in the floor plan of the palace (figure 4.19), though it must be remembered that not all servants resided in the Palace. David Crawford, the secretary, for instance, owned a house in the town. 'The personal servants and the professional servants in the Palace formed a separate and identifiable group of their own, a group which was socially superior to the other principal servants' (Marshall 1973, 68). Rooms intended for principal servants are found together in a demarcated group on the ground floor of the east wing. The rooms used by the Duchess' gentlewomen, however, are on the principal floor (figure 5.20). This arrangement was convenient, but it also indicated the relatively high standing of the women in the house.

This separation of households was necessary, for the sake of privacy if nothing else. Problems did occur and the servants had their own demands to make. This may have caused not necessarily strain, but definitely an awareness of the relationship between family and servants. The Duke's relationship with his secretary, David Crawford, for instance, suggests the occasional difficulties of the relationship between employer and employee. Although the secretary was hard to replace he did, for a number of years, maintain a thriving legal practice in Edinburgh while serving the Duke. His employer complained at times of his inability to give all his time and concentration to his affairs (Marshall 1973, 63). The fact that a secretary was

necessary at all indicates the difficulties inherent in running large estates and business interests, while also maintaining a political role.

Spatial analysis of Hamilton Palace is difficult, even with the multitude of records concerning the house there is not a great deal upon which to base movements around the house. Themes can be distinguished such as the fact that even after the changes to the building access from the front door still proceeded along a ceremonial route through the Horn Hall, up the grand stairs to the gallery. This involved the permeation of a number of levels of access just to get to this stage (figure 5.21). Permission had to be granted to enter the building, to proceed through two hallways, up the staircase, and into the gallery. No other rooms could be accessed along the route. This points to a concentration on privacy, but even more so on the required consent of the owners of the house to enter.

The house had become ordered and simplified. However, the real controls acting upon actions within the house were temporal not merely spatial. The demarcation of space provided zones for activities, time determined what those activities would be, and who would perform them. Servants would have been permitted entry to all rooms in the house at one time or another, whether it was once a day, week, month or year. The times at which they were permitted entry would have been formalised. When these times might have been is difficult to see. For instance, it is not even clear at what times meals were taken in the Palace (Marshall 1973, 38). Smooth running of the house required thirty or more servants. Servants were well treated, and possibly looked on with affection, but they were not part of the actual ducal family. The wish for privacy demanded that controls were implemented to ensure efficiency but at the same time that distance was maintained.

5.4 Arranging the landscape

Changing relations with Hamilton town

The Palace had a superficially close relationship to the town and its people. However, in reality there appears to have been two types of relationship, the physical and the emotional or ideological. As with other facets of the Hamilton's way of life this does not exactly represent a contradiction but there is some disparity in their attitudes. On the one hand the relationship was a close, paternal one, demonstrating what was traditionally expected of a great landowner. At the same time the family were distancing themselves physically. There is a sense that the Duke and Duchess could increasingly choose when townspeople could come into their own personal enclave.

Originally the house was nestled amidst the town. 'This palace...was at first built in the middle of the town, which formerly stood clustering around it' (OSA 1791-99, vii 180) (figure 5.22). Gradually though

...the lower part having been gradually purchased, and pulled down, by the noble family above mentioned, for the extension and improvements of their pleasure grounds, (as soon as the more secure state of the country gave them less occasion for the assistance of the inhabitants,) the town has since stretched to the south and west, and the palace is almost left standing detached below it (OSA 1791-99, vii 180) (figure 5.23).

Hamilton had been created a free royal burgh in 1549 (*RMS* ii, no270).

But the rights and privileges thus acquired from the Crown, were, after the Restoration, resigned into the hands of William and Ann, Duke and Duchess of Hamilton; who, in 1670, restored to the community its former possessions, and erected it into a "burgh of regality", dependent on them and their successors: and thus it has continued, after some ineffectual struggles, to this time (OSA 1791-99, vii 182).

The earlier charter had granted the status of royal burgh in perpetuity, suggesting that the new arrangement was an unlawful removal of rights. Duchess Anne may have made an effort to listen to the views of the townspeople 'through the proceedings of the head courts, which all burgesses

were officially and traditionally supposed to attend' (Torrie and Coleman 1996, 27). However, from 1670 the Duke and Duchess demanded feu duty from the town.

Further evidence suggests a close, if superior, relationship with the town. The male Hamilton children attended the burgh school before being sent away. This was normal amongst the Scottish nobility and allowed children to be kept under the supervision of their family, while having contact with the outside world. This closeness featured in the everyday contact between the household and the townspeople. In particular the Palace provided employment, both permanent and temporary. Most of the household staff were from local families (Marshall 1973, 80), and considering that the house required at least thirty servants in order to function, and at times as many as fifty (Marshall 1973, 62), the Palace appears to have been a major source of employment. Some servants lived within the Palace, but others either owned property in the town, rented it from the Duke and Duchess or, if new, may have been boarded out (Marshall 1973, 76-77). The Palace also employed local tradesmen, such as the local carpenter Arthur Nasmith. The local blacksmith, for example, found frequent employment making kitchen equipment and shoeing the Duke's horses. This affirms the close nature of the relationship between town and Palace.

The Hamiltons bestowed their charity upon their tenants in general, highlighting their perceived role as patrons, or 'substitute parents'. The poor of the parish received financial help and during bad harvests rural tenants were allowed to amass back rents totalling thousands of pounds each year. Other of the Hamilton estates benefited from their patronage. On Arran, for example, a settlement and harbour were established at Lamlash. Coal-mining was introduced to the island and a salt industry set up. A parliamentary grant bestowed the right to hold three fairs a year to encourage economic activity and a ferry boat was gifted. Religion was assisted with the

rebuilding of a chapel and the presence of a missionary, and a doctor and 'ambulatory schoolmaster' were settled on the island (Marshall 1973, 226). Although relatively speaking the ducal family lived in splendour they did not have enormous amounts of money. They continued their traditional role as great landowners, maintaining their own position while continuing their paternal relationship with their tenants.

The relationship could at times become strained and problems did occur. The owners of the Palace were clearly in an exalted social and political position, and as such were largely deferred to as the natural and legal superiors of those in the town. Occasionally punishment had to be meted out to locals who took advantage of the benevolent association. A letter home from the Duke in London in 1689 tells the Duchess to bring to trial those 'who have been the hunters of our deer and punish them severely, for as you say, if such things be past, especially when you are present, what may be expected when we are both absent?' (Marshall 1973, 56). The fifth Duke enjoyed far less happy relations with the town, becoming embroiled in issues of local government and clashing with townspeople over the appointment of officials and his rights in the town (Torrie and Coleman 1996, 28).

This occasional strain may begin to explain the gradually changing physical relationship to the town. 'There was no rigid division between the life of the Palace and the life of the burgh. On the contrary, the two were integrated to a surprising extent, and it is significant that maps of the time show the houses of the town of Hamilton coming right up to the Back Close of the Palace' (Marshall 1973, 226). This may be so, but a conscious policy of isolating the Palace from the town appears to have developed.

Although the Duke and Duchess' relationship remained good they still distanced themselves from the town. Contemporary changes made at the Palace itself indicate that this was part of an

overall strategy to give an impression of order and expensive simplicity. The gradual removal of the town reflects the specialisation and compartmentalisation of space. A relationship was maintained but it became more controlled and allowed the palace a greater degree of privacy. This detachment was to occur elsewhere, such as at Inveraray in the mid-eighteenth century where a new town was constructed at a deliberate distance from the new castle. At Hamilton the process of distancing from the town took the form, primarily, of requiring the removal of buildings in close proximity to the palace and gardens. For example the Duchess funded a new school in 1714 in order to allow her to demolish the old one, 'for her convenience' as it was 'near to her grace's gardens' (*TS.HBR* iii 17-18).

The town gradually moved uphill away from the Palace and in particular the fifth Duke's replacement of the old parish church in 1732, further up the hill than even the new school had been, succeeded in attracting the population away from the Hietoun (figure 5.24). Improvements to the Palace and its policies demanded the demolition of the church. One transept was left intact until the nineteenth century as it was the burial place of the Dukes of Hamilton (Torrie and Coleman 1996, 29). An original plan to move the church next to the school had been proposed by the Duke's grandmother but had not been achieved. More minor alterations were made which elucidate further the type of relationship between the Palace and the town. The tolbooth, for instance, provided an obstruction on the route to the Palace (figure 5.25). Duchess Anne requested the removal of the exterior stair. In place of this an interior spiral stair and a new entrance were built, at the expense of the town (Torrie and Coleman 1996, 25). The changes to the Palace were helped by the use of stone from demolished town houses (Marshall 1973, 192). It is clear that his grandmother had instigated the policy and attitude for which the fifth Duke was unpopular.

This 'assiduous policy of purchasing property' (Torrie and Coleman 1996, 34) can be seen clearly in the percentage of the town owned by the Hamiltons. The 1705 valuation roll for the burgh stated the total valuation to be £2333. The Duchess' individual property 'houses and burgh acres' amounted to £389 11s 2d, or 16.7 percent of the burgh (*MS.HTC 28 April 1705*). By the time of the Statistical Accounts at the end of the eighteenth century the Duke of Hamilton was 'proprietor of more than half, and the remainder is held of him in feu' (OSA 1791-99, vii 207). Other town records demonstrate the removal of houses away from the area near the Palace known as Nethertoun. Whereas about 13.6 percent of the town population lived in the Nethertoun in the late sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, only one percent remained by the early eighteenth century. Rather than being referred to as the Nethertoun it had become the Netherhouses (Torrie and Coleman 1996, 21).

'The Great Design' of the landscape: unity and segregation; formality and informality

Elaborate parterres were designed as a complimentary frame to complete the picture of the new house. To the north of the house, so clearly visible from the first floor gallery, were a parterre divided into two embroidered plots containing statues; and slightly further north and on a lower level, another parterre quartered around a central fountain with a row of limes along the east and west sides. The Cadzow Burn ran along the west side of these gardens then joined a small canal running east to west along the north side (Lowrey 1988, 25). This formal, controlled planting firmly indicated to the viewer the ability to form and manipulate nature as one wished - the ultimate expression of authority. The segregation of each area also highlights the urge to segment and isolate areas of space.

A vast landscaping scheme in the 1690s created a number of controlled vistas as well as the design for formal gardens. The impact of these was highlighted by the enfilade arrangement of

rooms on the courtyard side of each wing. These terminated in windows at the southern end which looked out over the parks (Macaulay 1988, 21). Vistas were also aligned with natural features or buildings outside the estate, including Bothwell Kirk and even the 'High Church Steeple of Glasgow' [the cathedral] (Lowrey 1988, 27). The location of Glasgow, ten miles away, points to an awareness of Hamilton as part of a wider picture. While the Palace was visibly the centre of a large, intricate landscape expansive views from the house emphasised the extent of the Hamilton lands and interest. Alignment with religious landmarks such as churches suggests a wish to be associated with concrete symbols of the established church during a period of religious turmoil. Particularly given the family's religious stance discussed above, and the exile of the Duke's brother-in-law the Duke of Perth in 1689.

Vital to the designed Hamilton landscape was the impression of unity. The house and park were considered to be equal parts of a uniform whole, not separate entities. The house as the centre of an estate was the natural focal point. At Hamilton a suitably grand setting was required for the new house. The entire park was aligned on a north-south axis with the house at the centre (figure 5.26). The huge avenue stretched from the Clyde to Patrickholme House almost three miles away, unifying the two parks of the Hamilton estate. The Low Parks situated in the loop in the River Clyde contained the location of the house while the High Parks to the south were cut in two by the River Avon and dense woodland to the west. Between these two parks, to the west of the house, the town of Hamilton and surrounding lands emphasised the separation of the two parks (Lowrey 1988, 25) (figure 5.27).

In unifying the parks an image of a strong power base was created, although the scale of the parks was already impressive. The entire park and house were becoming unified, defined areas as opposed to 'outside'. The process was a kind of enclosure, as seen in the removal of the town

from the immediate vicinity of the Palace and its gardens. Activities in the parks such as hunting and the rides that were laid out around the formal gardens emphasise once more the public nature of country houses and estates. Hamilton Palace's dual role as a family home and a seat of hospitality indicates why control was firmly, but subtly, exercised. This includes the gradual isolation from the town. Gardens and designed areas almost constituted a 'buffer zone' between the house and the world outside. This protective attitude intensified as vulnerability increased with political and social changes.

Many of the planned landscape changes by Duchess Anne were not carried out due to the death of Alexander Edwards, the designer commissioned to draw up a scheme in 1708 (Marshall 1973, 207) (see figure 5.26). Changes at Hamilton Palace continued under the fifth Duke in the 1730s and 1740s. Avenues and vistas remained and were extended but the chief accomplishment was the building of Chatelherault hunting lodge (figures 5.28; 5.29). This structure was situated on the brow of a slope to the south of the palace, linked by the main avenue. William Adam worked out the, '...full exploitation of the site through the design of the gardens around, and especially behind, the building which have a crucial role in the relationship between the formal and informal landscapes' (Lowrey 1988, 29). In 1732 and 1736 formal gardens on the west side of the Low Parks had been swept away and given over to a deer park. At Chatelherault formal areas were included such as the kennel yard behind the servants' quarters and stables, bowling green behind the screen wall, and small parterres behind the ducal apartments (Lowrey 1988, 29). These features were included but masked.

Due to its siting at the end of the avenue proportions of the hunting lodge were manipulated to create an image of unity with the palace. 'At 290 feet long, Chatelherault was some thirty feet longer than the palace, thus counteracting the effects of distance and heightening its visual

impact' (Lowrey 1988, 29). Further uniting the High and Low Parks was the small canal just to the east of the avenue, built in 1740 as a fishpond, which echoed the shape of the larger water feature in the Low Parks (Lowrey 1988, 29). Views were created along the formal vista to the house, and across the gardens to the Avon Gorge and the ancient castle. 'Near the centre of this gloomy chasm, the ruins of Cadzow Castle appear "like a centinel of fairy land"', on the summit of a lofty rock' (NSA 1845, 255) (figure 5.30; plate 5.2). Provision was made for both a formal and informal impression. The romantic promise of the Avon Gorge had not been exploited in the 1708 plan (Lowrey 1988, 27). Requirements of the landscape had changed between 1708 and the 1730s.

Aesthetic and functional considerations were incorporated into the garden and parkland. A herb garden, kitchen garden and fruit trees provided produce to be used in the Palace kitchens. The inclusion and upkeep of a deer park was a sign of status, when the Duchess' father introduced it there were few like it in Scotland (Marshall 1973, 55). Chatelherault is the best example of this contradictory attitude, created to be both functional and beautiful. Reference should be made here once more to the fifth Duke's difficult relations with the town of Hamilton. Enhancing the ambiguity of his position even further is the fact that Chatelherault was built on the profits from coal-mining on the family's Kinneil estate. The Duke wrote, in 1726, that 'I hear better accts of my coal, and wish it may turn out as you flatter me it will, if so Cubes, Temples, Obelisques, Cascades ec ec will go ye better on' (*Hamilton MSS* 127).

The fifth Duke was continuing to present an image of aristocratic grandeur to an audience, whether aristocratic, rich, untitled or poor. He was carrying on with the plans begun by his grandparents with their restoration of both the family, their fortune and Hamilton Palace and

estates. Both he and the third Duke and Duchess Anne shared the problems of resolving difficulties and contradictions in their family and situation in order to present a changing world with the acceptable face of the ancient house of Hamilton.

Chapter Six: Hopetoun House

Considering the wealth which has been employed, in the course of a century, and under the direction of excellent taste, in beautifying a place possessed of so many natural advantages, it is not wonderful the result should be general admiration. I forbear giving a detailed description of this princely seat, which is visited by all those who travel through Scotland, and fully celebrated by every itinerant bookmaker (OSA 1791-9, ii 397).

Hopetoun House, near South Queensferry, West Lothian (figure 6.1; plate 6.1) embodies two distinctive stages of building activity. Lady Margaret Hope signed the contract for Hopetoun House with the mason Tobias Bachop on 28 December 1698. She required a substantial family home, fitting to her status and that of her son Sir Charles Hope (1681-1742). Construction of the house, as designed by Sir William Bruce, began in 1699, and the original stage was completed by 1703 (Macaulay 1987, 21). After some further work William Adam was employed to create what constituted a new façade and a series of state rooms (1721-48). With a family of his own and as a new member of the peerage Lord Charles demanded more than just a large, comfortable house. Adam's contribution was continued by his sons, in particular John, who completed the interior and portico in the 1750s (Glendinning et al 1996, 551). Hopetoun House was 'designed by a celebrated architect, finished at great expense, half demolished within twenty years and rebuilt on a grander scale, all by one owner' (Rowan 1984, 183). The separate phases suggest different contexts in which construction occurred, and the dynamic nature of what was expected of a country seat. One owner's changing attitudes and demands are reflected, emphasising the motivations behind transformation.

6.1 Stages in the building of Hopetoun

The sequence of construction at Hopetoun has been pieced together from building papers, the Bruce plans published in *Vitruvius Britannicus* (Campbell 1717, II 4 and 75-77) (figure 6.2), and the William Adam scheme in *Vitruvius Scoticus* (Adam 1980, pls. 14-19) (Rowan 1984, 183) (figures 6.3; 6.4; 6.5). When some areas were built rather than faltering at the planning stage, such as the evolution of the colonnades, are still contentious issues.

The main house was originally described simply as an almost square block ‘four score feet in length upon the east and west sydes and four score seven feet upon the south and north sydes’ (*Contract GD45/17/769*; Howard 1995, 53). This main block was centrally-planned. Arranged in a Greek cross pattern the layout was divided into four corner sections focussed around a central stair hall with its octagonal staircase (see figure 6.2). The building contract of 1698 mentions the inclusion of two small pavilions and a pair of offices, though without precisely locating them for posterity.

The Bruce design shown in *Vitruvius Britannicus* in 1717 includes text indicating that the house was ‘begun about the year 1698 and finished four years after’, indicating that it was completed according to the published plan. However, the building papers suggest that only a modest first design was finished by 1702 (Rowan 1984, 185) (figure 6.6). After completion of the original stage, Bruce returned in 1702 to recast Hopetoun in a more imposing form with the addition of full-height angle pavilions ‘forming a U-shaped front...on the by now familiar pattern’ (Glendinning et al. 1996, 97). Even before William Adam’s involvement it is possible to consider that two Hopetoun’s had already

been designed by Bruce, that of the original building contract, and the grander design required by Lord Charles.

Externally the Bruce house at Hopetoun culminated in a central block with pedimented centrepieces to the north and south, and a large pediment over the recessed centre to the west (figure 6.7; plate 6.2). Two flanking blocks were attached to the east corners. The main effect of the house was focussed on the east (entrance) front where the pavilions and another pedimented centre ‘formed a majestic trio united by horizontal rustication’ (MacWilliam 1980, 251). Plans included a pair of convex colonnades to join service blocks to the main building. According to Campbell’s description in *Vitruvius Britannicus* the east front of Hopetoun was made up of the main block and ‘a pair of greatly enlarged two-storey pavilions, the same height as the main building but now three windows wide and visually detached from it by separate roofs, connected to the house by curving Tuscan colonnades to symmetrical stable blocks and coach houses’ (1717).

The effect was one of dignified grandeur. However, before completion of the Bruce scheme Lord Hopetoun began to change his house further with the assistance of William Adam.

Adam’s work at Hopetoun focussed on the state rooms and consequently the eastern front of the house. The façade was ‘transformed...from a square hipped-roofed block to a broad, sweeping façade topped by a balustrade’ (Howard 1995, 53-55) (figure 6.8; plate 6.3). The addition of a storey added to the impression of magnificence. The changes made by Adam for Lord Hopetoun began in 1721 when a bill was presented for the demolition of the south end of the ‘old house’ (MacWilliam 1980, 253). The traveller, John Macky, noted in the 1720s that ‘my lord is now adding two semi-circular wings of

four storeys high to the front, adorned with pillars and pilasters' (1729, 201). A new flanking block was built to the south, of greater projection than the old structure, and further from the centre. This was finished in 1725, and in 1726 the prices were agreed for 'Pillars of the Collonade' to complete the south end (Rowan 1984, 190) (plate 6.4). This suggests that Bruce's colonnades were never built. Pavilion blocks with arched entries terminated the colonnades. These were recast as single storey units adorned with cupola towers (figure 6.9; plate 6.5). The agreement on a new east front to complement the changes made on the south was made in 1728, the same time as the decision was made on the design for the north front.

Rowan argues that the completed east facade conforms to that shown in *Vitruvius Scoticus* but without the Corinthian portico or pediment which are not referred to in building documents (1984, 190). Although the front was redesigned with this giant order of Corinthian pilasters, an attic and balustrade, the huge portico provided over three bays was probably not executed, or at least not finished (MacWilliam 1980, 253) (figure 6.10). In 1736 the pavilions terminating the colonnades were started. Prices were agreed on the 'North Collonade stables and other buildings or offices in that side as also the addition to the South collonade, Library and Billiard Room...commenced the beginning of the year 1735 when the North collonade was begun' (*Memorandum of Agreement 7 May 1736*). The remodelled main part of the new front formed a shallow U-plan, enveloping the visitor within the courtyard (plate 6.6).

The external Adam additions and alterations have been criticised as not coming to terms with the original Bruce house (MacWilliam 1980, 251), with incongruities apparent to the close observer on the west front. However, internally Adam's creation of a great

state apartment on the north side of the house complemented and extended upon the existing structure. Work on the rooms created a slight asymmetry outside, with the north addition, although identical to that on the south, two feet longer (Rowan 1984, 190). Internally Adam was employed to extend the northern dining room, and ‘to alter the stair betwixt the new and old building in the passage of the ground storey’ as this space was to become a private vestibule on the ground floor (Rowan 1984, 190). The two small rooms in the south-east corner of the Bruce house were altered to form a passageway and a stair to the ground floor, with the door to the private vestibule seen to the left of the principal stairs (figure 6.11). It has been suggested that the creation of a lobby and the possibility of private access enabled the family to move about with comparative ease during the process of construction (Rowan 1984, 190). Issues of convenience and privacy will be considered along with the rest of the layout of the house. Part of the Adam plan that was not achieved was his aim of shifting the main staircase to one side, to the position of the service stair (Howard 1995, 60) as shown on the *Vitruvius Scoticus* plans (figure 6.12).

Although the majority of William Adam’s planned changes were executed, by the time of his death in 1748 his plans had not all come to fruition. The state apartments remained a shell from the time of Charles, first Earl of Hopetoun’s death in 1742. The second Earl inherited an unfinished scheme (Rowan 1984, 193; Glendinning et al. 1996, 128). The involvement of John Adam and his brothers began with minor works including the coping of the ha-ha to the east of the house and the provision of pedestals for the sphinxes placed on the approach. Masonry niches were created for hay racks in the stables, and an additional passage behind the south colonnade was built (Rowan 1984, 194). Attention was then turned to the façade, where the portico was either built (Rowan

1984, 194), or rebuilt and recut (MacWilliam 1980, 255). In either case, changes were made to William Adam's original plan, and 'the effect is one of sober magnificence; a neoclassical centrepiece to the rough and tumble of William Adam's baroque façade' (Rowan 1984, 194).

After completion of the east front, the concern of Lord Hopetoun and his architects became focussed on the interior, beginning with the extension of the private dining room in the centre of the suite of rooms in regular use by the family (Rowan 1984, 196) (figure 6.13). The interior inherited by the second Earl was only semi-inhabitable. The south addition contained the principal bedchamber, the Earl and Countess' dressing rooms and private closets, and a balcony or loggia opening off the Countess' octagonal closet which provided south facing views across the park. Only the existing south side of Bruce's main block was regularly inhabited by the family (Rowan 1984, 195). Access to the south side of the house was through the small side door and the straight stair inserted by William Adam at ground level to the left of the main door. From the vestibule on the principal floor the sequence of rooms led through the private dining room to the drawing room, and then to a new drawing room and closet (figure 6.14). Until 1741 the new drawing room had been a bedroom in one of Bruce's apartments. Other than this suite of rooms and the Earl and Countess' apartment the only other room in use on this floor was the large square room in the centre of Bruce's west front. This Garden Parlour was sometimes used on public occasions. The rest of the main block, and the north addition, remained either unfinished or unused (Rowan 1984, 195). John Adam and his brothers extended the private dining room, provided paving in the entrance hall and completed the state bedchamber (Rowan 1984, 194).

The whole entrance hall was recast in the 1750s and redesigned to harmonise with the other additions. Its austerity, in keeping with the façade, provided a preparatory stage before embarking upon the lavish interior of the public rooms to the north. Once again there is the sense of the house as theatre, aiming to impress an audience. The state apartment was fitted out after 1752 with elaborate plasterwork and rich furnishings to complete the process. The long, inconvenient period of construction and alteration created a country house which received the epithet, 'much the finest seat in Britain' (Macky 1729, 201).

6.2 The Rise of the Hope Family: Industry and Gentility

The Hope family owed its status to good relations with the Stuart monarchy. Their prominence and rank was relatively recent. Sir Thomas Hope, Sir Charles' great-grandfather, had been made Lord Advocate by Charles I. Royal favour continued with his son, Sir James Hope (1614-1661) who was appointed Master of the Mint in 1641 and made a Lord of Session in 1649. Through his marriage to Anne Foulis, the Hope family came into possession of the mining interest at Leadhills. Sir James and Lady Anne first brought the family to West Lothian in 1657 with the extension of their silver and lead mining concern into the Bathgate Hills.

John Hope (1650-82), Sir Charles' father, cemented the family involvement in the area when he bought Abercorn and the hereditary sheriffdom of Linlithgowshire from Sir Walter Seton in 1678 (Balfour Paul 1907, 493). The name Hopetoun, which had formerly been attached to the village of Leadhills, was transferred to the area and became the seat of the Hopes. Unfortunately John Hope was drowned in 1682 in the shipwrecked frigate

Gloucester from which the Duke of York (later James VII) barely escaped. Tradition has it that it was action by John Hope which may have saved the Duke of York's life, and it was owing to this that his son, Sir Charles, was ennobled at the early age of twenty-two (Hopetoun 1984, 17; Fleming 1956, 16). Some credence may be given to this tradition. The ennoblement came at the beginning of Queen Anne's reign (1702-1714) and it had been her father's life that had been saved. On the other hand his support for the government during the difficult years in which Union with England was debated and planned may have accounted for his elevation to the peerage in 1703.

The comparatively recent purchase of the Abercorn lands, and the untimely death of John Hope account for the absence of a suitably large house on the Hopetoun estate. Other factors of this family history may explain the house as finally envisaged and designed by Charles Hope. Hopetoun House was built with money from industry. Without lead and silver mining ventures the family would not have achieved and maintained the lifestyle required of their position. The Hopes would never have bought lands in Abercorn, nor would Hopetoun House have been built. As at Inveraray Castle, no old structure was required to be incorporated into designs for a new house, allowing plans to reflect the most modern and prestigious requirements. At Hopetoun there was also no sense of having to take into account an ancestral home, or indeed any inherited tradition.

The convenience of a 'green site' for the building of a structure was tempered by the lack of deference that accompanied traditional spheres of influence. The Hopes were an unknown quality in the Abercorn area. Hopetoun was not an established focal point of their power, their family could not inspire or command the loyalty of a Duke of Argyll

for example. The lands had been bought in 1678, not gifted. Therefore their status came not from a traditional sphere of influence, nor the distinction of lands gifted by the monarch, but from money. The social stigma attached to trade in England was less influential north of the Border, where participation in commerce was often an economic necessity. However, competition increased in relation to others, especially the rising gentry, who were highly successful economically. This competition was exacerbated when both were getting money from the same sources: trade and industry.

Charles, Earl of Hopetoun, became a new peer in a complex social world. The gentry, like the aristocracy, was a far from homogenous group, ranging from rich merchants and professionals, to landed gentlemen. The Hopes, before 1703, were not without social rank and status but they were not part of the titled nobility. They did, though, enjoy activities that equated them with the elite. For example, John Hope had travelled to France and studied law at Orléans (Balfour Paul 1907, 491). However, until the purchase of the Abercorn estates with the accompanying sheriffdom, and the contemporary acquisition of the barony of Niddry and Winchburgh from the Earl of Wintoun (Balfour Paul 1907, 493), their status was based on royal favour, legal and governmental office and industry. This was not unusual for Scottish aristocrats, the majority of whom found it expedient to augment rents and other profits from the land. The Hopes did not base financial or social rank on land or the number of the following they could command, either in terms of warriors, or of the size of a rent-roll. However,

the family, at subsequent periods, acquired Meidhope [Midhope], formerly the property of the Earls of Linlithgow... Philipston, Stonehill and Morton, formerly belonging to branches of the House of Dundas; Duntarvie, for nearly two centuries a seat of the Durhams; Craigton, and other lands in the parish; so that his Lordship's valued rent now is about two-thirds of the whole, being L4586.6s Scots (OSA 1791-9, ii 394).

It is interesting to note the families from which the Hopes acquired land. The Abercorn estates had previously belonged to the Douglas, Muir, Lindsay and Seton families (OSA 1791-9, ii 397). Acquiring lands held by such prominent families provided an element of precedence, and conferred some status if only by association. It also signifies that the Hopes had something that the most blue-blooded of aristocrats did not often have, available capital to spend.

Another common route to acquiring rank was marriage. John Hope, for instance, married Margaret Hamilton, a daughter of the fourth Earl of Haddington who also furnished him with a dowry of 18000 merks (Balfour Paul 1907, 493). The social status of the Hopes was complex, and perhaps the only requirement to claim affiliation with one group or another was acceptance and approval. The diverse gentry were united conceptually by the pursuit of social recognition. Whether the Hopes are to be classified as the upper echelons of the landed gentry, or as aristocrats before 1703, Hopetoun House intentionally signified wealth, education and rank. The 'supremely elegant and mature work' of Sir William Bruce, and the 'showy baroque façade' of William Adam (Rowan 1984, 183) stemmed from decisions based on an awareness of the need for acceptability. The house provided a visual symbol of respectability and prosperity.

6.3 Discussion: The Earl of Hopetoun and his 'princely seat'

Expectations and requirements

The changing status and situation of the Hope family partially explains the additions and alterations made at their chief country house. The original Hopetoun House was designed as a family home, albeit substantial and fashionable enough for a gentleman. In 1703, just after the completion of this structure Sir Charles was raised to the peerage. At

the age of twenty-two the new Earl of Hopetoun, Viscount of Aithrie and Lord Hope (Balfour Paul 1907, 493) was also married to Henrietta Johnstone, the daughter of the Marquess of Annandale, and a father of a young family. Requirements of the house, both practical and conceptual, changed with these developments. Hopetoun House was too modest for the new young peer in terms of both functional and symbolic demands. Sir John Clerk who composed the instructive poem *The Country Seat* (1727) suggests these considerations:

A family House especially for a Man of Quality ought to be large and have in it one good Apartment at least consisting of a dining Room, drawing Room, Bedchamber, dressing Room and closet...above all a good family House should be divided into three parts viz. the Body or main House with a large pavilion on each side...

The main or chief Body of the House ought to be at Least double the Bigness of each pavilion, and may serve chiefly for lodging the Master of the family and the better kind of Guests who come to visit him. One of the pavilions ought entirely to be appropriated for women and children and the other ought to contain the kitchen, with apartments for Men servants and such like conveniences. The principle floor in the main block is for the accommodation of the Family with a privat dining room (in Mitchison 1983, 149).

A large family required space and comfort, necessitating enlargement. Other practical issues dealt with include the provision made for a suitable dining room. A memorandum dated February 1752 describes the uses of the dining room, providing a nice insight into the family's utilisation of the house. In terms of its significance to changes made to the house it also expresses the discomfort afforded of such an unsubstantial space, particularly when entertaining. The private dining room

is certainly too small at present when there happens to be a great crowd in it; though even this might in a great measure be avoided, by the more frequent use of the garden room, if the Hall etc were finished; and the placing a bye table in the little drawing room is always a present relief when a crowd of company happens to come unforeseen (21 February 1752 in Rowan 1984, 196).

While discussions were made over this room the completion of the hall was begun, decreasing the inconvenience and irritation of unfinished rooms as well as inappropriately small ones.

However, even such apparently practical changes were not just convenient in functional terms. The role of entertaining is indicated in the memorandum concerning the dining room, and more blatantly in the provision of an opulent state apartment. The type of space being enlarged and altered is as significant as the actual changes. The private dining room, though intended to be used eventually for family and close acquaintances, provided an arena in which to entertain on a smaller, less formal scale. Until completion of the state dining room the scale and formality of dining must have been used to differentiate the tone of entertaining in the absence of a specialised, recognised space.

The augmentation in rank of the family was accompanied by the need to keep up with fashionable society. The motivations for, or the function of, structural change were inextricably connected to the consideration of what was suitable for what status. Again, this is demonstrated clearly in Sir John Clerk's poem *'The Country Seat'* (1727) wherein he describes the types of houses suitable to certain ranks and situations. The development of the state rooms in the opposite wing to the family apartment by William Adam and his sons suggests different priorities in layout between the original and developed house. The impression of distance between the family and state apartments juxtaposes the increasingly separate public and private functions of the house of a peer. Both practical need and fashionable taste were significant factors in change. In hindsight one cannot be prioritised over another, though both were integral to the maintenance of the Earl of Hopetoun's status.

The Earl of Hopetoun was an Anglophile, a zealous advocate of the Union, and friends with men such as the Duke of Argyll (Balfour Paul 1907, 493). The political and social climate was still unstable. The first decade of the eighteenth century in particular saw the heated debate over Union with England. Active involvement in this, especially support for the unpopular scheme, was a social and political gamble. The Earl of Hopetoun was a supporter. Plans for enlarging and aggrandising his country seat were made during this volatile political period. This may explain why the Earl was so concerned with changing the exterior of the building.

Conforming to the 'Rules of Taste'

As Sir John Clerk's statement and his poem of 1727 indicate design became more strictly regularised. Perceptions of what constituted 'good taste' grew more rigid and inflexible as rules were applied to exactly how a house should be laid out and used. As discussed in the introduction (chapter one) this allowed the owner to express individual status, while at the same time aligning him or her self with a group. Conformity to rules of taste enabled the elite to ally themselves with one another and to the carefully manipulated view projected to others of a confident ruling group. At the same time other aristocrats had to be shown an image of stability, and of educated confidence, particularly as the political atmosphere became more competitive and fraught with infighting.

Keeping up with architectural fashion and style was essential for any man of property. Hopetoun House, even in its original form, adhered to the confines of fashionable taste. The layout designed by Bruce conformed to the most prestigious conceptualised plan, Palladio's centralised arrangement of rooms. This allowed for apartments to be placed on

either side of a central area. William Adam developed this to provide a clear distinction between the state rooms on the north side, and the family accommodation on the south.

Complete symmetry also held fascination for eighteenth century Palladians, and this is reflected at Hopetoun. On plans and elevations an external impression of symmetry is reflected, even where it is not quite the case. The northern section of the entrance façade was two feet longer than the southern, for instance. William Bruce's own house at Kinross, the embodiment of fashionable architectural ideals in Scotland at the time, was used as something of a model. The traveller John Macky described Hopetoun as having been designed 'exactly after the model of the house of Kinross' (1729, 201). The various influences and skill of the architect ensured that Hopetoun House symbolised wealth, education and power. The geometrical planning and scale was evocative of 'Italian Renaissance and antique grandeur' (Glendinning et al 1996, 97).

Bruce's finalised design provided a stately and a convenient house, answering both functional and symbolic requirements. The choice of architect alone suggests the impression the Hope family intended to create. Sir William Bruce had held the appointments of Surveyor-General and Overseer of the King's Buildings in Scotland, designing the alterations made at Holyrood Palace in 1671. Considered the 'most highly esteemed architectural consultant and arbiter of taste' in Scotland (Glendinning et al 1996, 74) he was an obvious choice for a prominent family wishing to further enhance their social and political standing. His use of influences from houses such as Inigo Jones' Queen's House in Greenwich were more than just architectural models. Dependent on his courtier status Bruce was aware of the cachet of royal and aristocratic associations.

Between the commissioning of the original house, and the later additions and changes, Lord Hopetoun had toured the Continent and seen the houses of Italy, France and Holland for himself. An amateur architect, the Earl was an early subscriber to the first volume of Colin Campbell's *Vitruvius Britannicus* in 1717 (Rowan 1984, 189). The external image of the house created by Lord Hopetoun and William Adam 'responded to the more heroic resonances of elaborate classical architecture' (Rowan 1984, 184). Hopetoun House echoed with clear references to the classical knowledge of its owner. The regularised, geometrically planned house exuded an appearance of control and rationality. After 1715 'Improvement' may have been seen as 'part of an integral Enlightenment ideal, in which antiquity served as a model of rationality rather than deference to authority' (Glendinning et al 1996, 109), but work at Hopetoun took place before and after this date. Authority is implied in the control inherent in rational actions and design.

Horizontality and visibility: the 'show front'

The visual emphasis of the house was on the entrance front. At Hopetoun this was the east façade, which significantly faced Edinburgh. The proximity to, and relationship with, the politically and culturally developing capital was integral to changes made by the simultaneously evolving Hope family. The impressive entrance front was designed with an approach from, and an outlook to, the capital, whose political, legal and social role, though becoming eclipsed by London, provided the emergent Hopes with acceptance by association.

The entrance front designed by Bruce was 'rusticated in the French manner' (Campbell 1717, II, 7; Howard 1995, 57). The material of the façade was treated with

overall horizontal channelling, removing emphasis on the vertical joints. The element of rusticated stone was adapted to meet architectural fashion. Lord Hopetoun, after his travels, became dissatisfied with the façade of his house, requiring instead an impression of ‘low unbroken horizontality’ (Glendinning et al 1996, 122). William Adam’s front was modified so that only the ground storey on the main block was rusticated, in the popular manner. The status of the basement as a service floor was highlighted through the treatment of the stone. The walls above this base were of polished ashlar; channelled all over, ‘the epitome of refined severity’ (Glendinning et al 1996, 99). Simplicity and order were reflected in this modification.

Two storey pilasters stretched from the principal to the first floor. Emphasis was given also to the windows on the two main floors which were one-third as long as those in the basement and attic in Bruce’s design, and two-thirds in Adam’s. Externally focus was placed upon the state and family apartments, the floors used for living in and entertaining guests, rather than service areas. This augmented the impression given through the treatment of the stone of the façade, giving visual prominence and grandeur to the upper floors.

Horizontal emphasis provides visual references beyond aesthetic taste. Externally a horizontally spread house also symbolised a claim to the land. Most country houses were surrounded by and maintained through the profits of agricultural land. The land taken up by a house and garden was unavailable for cultivation. Therefore the greater the amount of land that was, in a sense, being wasted, the greater the implied wealth of the inhabitants of the house. Emphasis was on the land, and the size and formal nature of the

houses highlighted this. Even though Hopetoun was built with profits from industry the associations of building such a house would have remained resonant with audiences.

The horizontal line also provides a visual reference point from the corners of the pavilions (coach houses) to the entablature of the main entrance (Rowan 1984, 187). The unified, harmonised façade projected an image of balance and regulation. However, behind the southern half of the building was concealed a series of miscellaneous offices (figure 6.15). The ordered front carefully shielded the service areas from view, much the same as a half-basement. The area and range of service activities was large, comprising about the same extent of the house as was allocated for the family and their guests. This highlights the symbiotic nature of the aristocratic lifestyle and the extensive labour force required to maintain it. A factor and steward dominated the service hierarchy who managed a butler, housekeeper, chef and master of the horse who in turn oversaw footmen, house-boys, house-maids, laundry-maids, sewing-women, dairy-maids, henwives, cooks, scullions and grooms (Hopetoun 1984, 4). This army of servants were accommodated and worked in areas hidden from view.

The pavilions housed spaces within which elite leisure activities could take place. A vital part of the house these blocks were simultaneously isolated from the rest of the activities within the house. The south pavilion was intended to include a library, billiard room, laboratory and study, all indicative of wealth and education. It is particularly significant that although service areas were concealed from view, the stables were visually highlighted, housed in the north pavilion and the area behind. The Earl was a noted horseman, reputed according to Defoe to keep the best stables in Scotland (Defoe 1724-6, 722). The hierarchical nature of eighteenth century society is demonstrated

convincingly in the strict organisation and ranking of horses, suggesting the level of thought given over to the status of humans. The pavilion housed hunters, while work horses were assigned to less visible areas behind the colonnade. Putting such symbols of wealth and position in such a prominent, lavish building is a clear signifier of the family's elite taste. The stable pavilion was just far enough away as to be practical due to the smell and noise of the horses. However, they were also part of the house, so increasing their visibility. The use of space in a family house to accommodate sporting animals emphasises the role of hospitality. The money and space afforded to such animals confirms the wealth of the owner in no uncertain terms.

Inside the house: order and ordering

An apparently symmetrical and ordered exterior gave way to a balanced but segregated interior. The second phase created a showy baroque façade. Within this ostentatious display the space inside the house was becoming increasingly specialised, and activities and people isolated or restricted to specific areas. This increase is noticeable between the original Bruce house and the second phase with its completely separate state rooms.

The Greek cross pattern of the house was centred on an octagonal staircase (figure 6.16). From the avenue and entrance hall the staircase and then the garden parlour were reached (figure 6.17). Bruce's design provided for what appears to be three apartments, comprising a bedroom, a dressing room and a closet. The fourth, northeast corner, was given over to one large room, a dining room. Movement through space was sequential, due to the centralisation of the layout. The principal floor constituted nine spaces, or eight rooms arranged around the central stair. However, pathways through the house were

restricted further by layout, as well as by a regulated routine and etiquette. The biaxial symmetry of the original plan was subverted by the fact that the use of the cross-axis was discouraged. This effectively reduced the layout to two apartments. It is significant that the central stair hall does not provide access to the left, into the Earl's apartment. The simple flagged floor and plastered walls of the passage exiting the stair hall to the right indicate that it was only a service route (Howard 1995b, 61). Sideways movement from this central space was discouraged, or made impossible. Access for visitors either proceeded into the garden parlour, or continued up the stairs (figure 6.18) (see figures 2.17; 2.18 and pp108-110).

The suite of rooms used for hospitality and entertaining were distanced from the family apartment by the central corridor of movement. Even with the Adam changes after 1721, the Earl and Countess' rooms constituted a separate enclave within the structure. As in other houses of the period there is a juxtaposition of the private and public functions of the house and its family. The highly secure and restricted charter room was included in this less accessible area. In fact it constituted the deepest, so least accessible, space in the house. Converted in 1708 this small chamber was equipped with heavy iron doors and window shutters, and was made fire-proof with a stone-vaulted ceiling (Hopetoun 2000, 5). Until 1752 there was no access from this room into the garden parlour, access was only through the family rooms (figure 6.19) (see figure 2.17 and p109).

William Adam's modifications maintained this element of privacy, with circulation patterns remaining fairly static. Movement within the house changed in that more space was provided. The development of a grand state apartment - state dining room, saloon or

drawing room and grand state bedchamber and closet - created a new public focus of the house. The absence of a gallery in such a house suggests the dynamic requirements of country houses. Rather than providing a large, multifunctional area, specialised spaces were needed to cater to the formalities of hospitality. This formalised the juxtaposition of entertaining and family areas (figure 6.20). For instance, there were two dining rooms, one formal and one informal or private.

Soon after Adam's involvement at Hopetoun began the two small rooms on the entrance front of the family apartment were converted into a passage and connected to the ground floor by a straight stair. The creation of this may have been motivated by the temporary need of convenience 'to enable the family to come and go with comparative ease while the north addition was being built and the old front refaced' (Rowan 1984, 188). Between the passage and the stairs, the private dining room and family chambers, there can also be seen a 'corridor' antechamber providing a distancing space between the rooms and outside access (figure 6.21) (see pp110-111).

The creation of a corridor and stair from the outside to the family apartment during the lengthy construction period is demonstrative of the main problem with analysing the manner in which Hopetoun was used. Until the Adam brothers completed William Adam's additions and entrance front most of the north side of the house was unfinished and unused. Intended patterns of circulation or formal movement around the house could not be fully exploited while the structure was incomplete. Some processes and priorities are still evident, in particular the specialisation and segregation of people and functions. The provision of pavilions, and of opposing family and public areas demonstrate this. The nursery was situated on the ground floor, directly underneath the Countess' room,

allowing for it to be both conveniently close and far enough away, integral to the family area but also isolated from it.

Service areas were equally concealed but essential. The stairs used by servants, as at Inveraray, were central to the structure, and so allowed for fluid movement, but they were 'hidden' away from the main circulation routes through the house (see figure 2.19 and pp111-112). In comparison the great stair was central both figuratively and physically to the building (figure 6.22). The austere décor of the service stairs contrasts with the rich embellishment of the great stair, indicating the intended users of each (plate 6.7). Service areas, as in many houses, were restricted to the extremes of the house, the basement or ground floor and the attic. At Hopetoun the latter consisted of servants rooms and stores. As with the service stairs, these areas were integral to the daily routine of the house, but were concealed behind an acceptably polite veneer. Later in the eighteenth century further, separate accommodation was planned away from the house. A plan for 'a Servants House to Lodge four Families' (1776) shows a proposed building in the grounds at a place known as Society (*NMRS WLD/78/IP*). This continued the process of segregation and specialisation of space. It also suggests the increased role of the house as a centre of entertainment with the attendant need for service space.

'Progress' and precedent; regularisation and references

A compass placed above the library, and a clock over the stables, both emphasise the function of the pavilions as symbols of an exclusive, aristocratic life. A slight incline from the East entrance and avenue up to the house hides the building from the immediate vicinity of the gatehouse and ensures that the clock and compass are the first features to come into view. The compass characterised the scientific and rational obsessions of

eighteenth century high society. Its symbolism is emphasised with the realisation that it is useless - the reading remains static. The prominently placed clock may also embody the notion of regulating the working day, and, more significantly, recreation. Both the clock and compass are instruments with which to measure, to regulate and to impose order.

Even within this expectation of conformity, and of modern rational expression, references to the past, and so to precedent, were not removed. This created a further sense of stability through the implied longevity of power. The belief that actions had historical precedence legitimised the place of the elite both to others and to themselves. Symbolic of this were the vistas terminating in castles, or castles located within the grounds.

Hopetoun House was oriented so that the approaching avenue and axis of the house were aligned with North Berwick Law to the east, and Abercorn with its medieval church to the west (figure 6.23). Associations with these landmarks gave both natural and historical precedent, naturalising its place on the land. As at Hamilton the house was associated with the established church. The remains of Stonefield Tower in the deer park, and Abercorn Castle in the 'Wilderness' reinforced the allusions to the past (figure 6.24).

Excavation of the traditional site of Abercorn Castle in 1963 by Moray House Archaeology Society unearthed an eighteenth century mound covering one wall of a medieval tower and the remains of a fifteenth/ sixteenth century manor house (Rae and Rae 1963, 51).

William Adam noted in a plan, 'The avenue eastwards from the House carries your Eye over two Myles of the River Forth to the island of Inchgarvie and from thence along twenty two myles more to North Berwick Law, Being a high Mount in the form of a Suggar loaf which terminates the Avenue' (Adam *'A General Plan of Hopetoun Park'*)

(figure 6.25). The ambitious vista, terminating some twenty-four miles away, created an impression of the vast expanse of the family's influence. It also further suggests the integration of the house and its surrounding landscape. As at Kinross, the original house and garden had been conceived of as a uniform whole at the beginning of the project. As first conceived the house had been surrounded by a formal knot-garden (figure 6.26). Gradually this rigid arrangement gave way to more open parkland with rides and avenues. Views to and from the house were still strictly controlled. The jet d'eau to the west of the house was aligned with the view from the garden salon, and was still the visual focus from the Adam state apartment. Views to and from the Firth of Forth were important.

All the country, between Edinburgh and this place, is throng'd with gentlemen's houses, also as it was observ'd to be on the other side; but the beauty of all this part is Hopton House, built upon a delightful plain, and yet upon the edge...of a high precipice; from whence you, as it were, look down upon the ships as they sail by, for you stand above the top-most heads of them (Defoe 1769, 119) (Plate 6.8).

The fact that Hopetoun House figures regularly in travel accounts from the eighteenth century, famed as a 'must-see attraction', emphasises the significance placed on the intended impression to be given of the house and its family.

William Adam also built a ha-ha, or sunken wall, on the approach to the house. The purpose of this was to separate the grounds of the house from the more extended parkland, particularly as it became popular to graze stock close to the house. The ha-ha was symbolic as well as practical though. Although visible upon approach, clearly demarcating the area closest to the building, it was virtually invisible from the house. Those inside were given the impression of unrestricted grassland. This allowed the Earl and his family to feel secure in their home, with a view of their extensive land

surrounding them. Guests received the same impression of the Earl's expansive domain. The ha-ha was also isolating in that it was segregating space along the same principles that were applied within the house. The high visibility of the ha-ha from the approach made clear the distinction between the space inside and outside of the ditch's dividing line. Admission into the area of the house, beyond the ha-ha signifies the position of the building as both an integral part of the landscape and an isolated element.

Hopetoun House reflects the challenge of adhering to modern taste, while providing a home in which a family could live. The multiple roles of the house as a private sanctuary, a public show house offering hospitality, and a recognisable focus of authority, were formalised by the clear separation of family and state rooms, and the intended impression of magnificence of the entrance façade. The Earl of Hopetoun was a new member of the peerage. The scale and grandeur of his house and its surroundings demanded recognition of status.

Chapter Seven: Blair Castle

During the 1740s and 1750s Blair Castle, Perthshire underwent modifications changing it from a turreted castle to a regularised, simplified house (figure 7.1). Contemporary landscape changes highlight the importance, both then and now, of the integration of buildings with their surroundings. The status and power of the Murray Earls of Atholl (Marquess after 1674; Dukes after 1703) were complicated by the problems, national and local, inherent in their rank and specific to their family situation. Their modified house and gardens presented to the world a picture of unassailable authority and strength.

7.1 The 'Rationalisation' of Blair Castle

Before the changes instigated in the eighteenth century Blair Castle was the image of an impregnable fortress, tall and foreboding. The original date of the building is assumed to be 1269 when David, Earl of Atholl complained to Alexander III that during his absence in England John Comyn (or Cumming) had entered Atholl and begun building a castle at Blair. This structure is still the main tower of the castle, now known as Cummings Tower. In the 1500s extensions to the south included the building of a great hall by the third earl (Atholl 1988, 2-3)(figure 7.2). Further changes, including recastellation in the nineteenth century, demonstrate the dynamic nature of these buildings but also, unfortunately, deliberately detract from the eighteenth century image.

It was the second Duke of Atholl who made changes to the house and grounds at Blair Castle, employing James Winter to regularise and simplify the building (see figure 7.1).

The ‘great military garrison of the country was converted to a modern building’ (NSA 1845, 568-9) between 1747 and 1758 (figure 7.3). Plans and sketches prepared in the eighteenth century refer to the castle as Atholl House, a name more in keeping with a modern Georgian house (figure 7.4). However, restrictions of the old building and therefore finances, prevented a modern Georgian house from being built. Various speculative plans were proposed for classicising the house, for example by John Douglas in 1736 and James Winter in 1743, both of whom designed perfectly balanced, restrained classical mansions (figure 7.5). These were not carried out and any requirement for a symmetrical façade was not possible on such an irregular building, but Blair Castle was still subjected to severe ‘tidying up’.

7.2 The Murray Dukes of Atholl: National, local and family affairs

The problems of the Murrays of Atholl were related to their position and status. As is to be expected these constituted local, national and family affairs. They were, however, exacerbated by factors particular to their own politics, allegiances and geographical situation. In common with the rest of the aristocracy the Murrays were interested in heraldry. For example a ‘coat of arms and star crest in metal’ to be displayed in the house were ordered from the stone-mason John Cheere in 1740 (Cruft 1984, 288). Perhaps though this was not such a resonant symbol as, for example, the Hamilton crest would have been in Hamilton. A coat of arms signified rank and lineage to others, and evoked an additional sense of pride or belonging in those with a shared name. The Murrays, however, were a Lowland family with their traditional sphere of power to the south in Tullibardine, Strathearn. In 1629 the title of Atholl had passed to them from a long

succession of Stewart earls as a result of marriage (MacGregor and Oram 2000, 75).

Difficulties based on the slightly alien nature of the principal family in the area recur frequently, particularly when the unquestioned loyalty of tenants was required. Unlike the Dukes of Hamilton security did not come from employing, and being the landlord and patron, of men and women loyal to a shared name.

Civil War: Social tension and geographical vulnerability

The Murrays of Atholl and Tullibardine were involved in all of the major national events of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. As with any family in a prominent position at this time their situation was a complicated one. It is possible to see expedient changes made in allegiances and attitudes in order to attempt to bring some balance to their position during difficult situations. However, these adaptations proved problematic, causing friction at all levels.

During the Civil War the family maintained a position as Royalists. In 1653-4, for example, the Earl was a prominent supporter of Glencairn's Rising, adding two thousand men to the Royalist cause (Leneman 1986, 2). Most of the Perthshire gentry failed to support the Earl's enthusiastic position. Caught between the English army encamped in Perthshire and the Highland army to the north they eventually chose to opt for English protection (*Chronicles* I, 1908). Cromwell's army in Scotland marched across the region attempting to put the rising down, forcing the submission of Blair Castle with 'a devastating artillery barrage' (MacGregor and Oram 2000, 77-8). Difficulties presented by tension between the local gentry and the Atholl nobility, and by the geographic position of the Atholl lands, are themes threaded throughout the events of the seventeenth

and eighteenth centuries, and added to the vulnerability of the owners of Blair Castle (figure 7.6).

Political manoeuvring: balancing local and national concerns

Upon his restoration Charles II rewarded the Earl of Atholl with his favour. Amongst other offices his status was further confirmed by his creation as Marquess of Atholl in 1676. Political prestige and position did not guarantee a quiet life. In common with many Scottish aristocrats of the late seventeenth century the Marquess of Atholl had a difficult relationship with the Duke of Lauderdale resulting in the loss of offices. After the fall of Lauderdale he was restored completely to favour and was further appointed Lord Lieutenant of Argyll and Tarbat in 1684 (Leneman 1986, 2).

This last position highlights problems which all members of the aristocracy shared as their power was manipulated and shifted in reference to other influential families. In terms of the Murrays of Atholl their relationship with the Campbells of Argyll and of Breadalbane was one of enmity, and this prejudiced attitudes towards other issues. The government took advantage of this hostility using it to strengthen their own position through achieving a balance of power. Between 1670 and 1678 the first Marquess of Atholl held the role of Justice-General, setting him up as an alternative in the Highlands to the power and influence of the Campbells. It was the Marquess who was ordered to Argyll in 1685 to suppress the Earl of Argyll's rebellion in support of the Duke of Monmouth's bid for the throne, which resulted in the execution of the Earl.

Political manoeuvring and infighting continued throughout the instability of the late seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries. Relations with the Campbells continued to be fraught, and to be considerations in relation to other attitudes and actions. The first

Marquess of Atholl had been a strong supporter of James VII in the 1680s. Although he could accept the accession of William III and Mary he opposed the policies of the man chosen by the King to lead his efforts to gain support in the Highlands, the Earl of Breadalbane. The earl presented a serious threat to the dominance of the Murrays in the central Highlands. He was a Campbell and a local rival with lands neighbouring those of Atholl. The Massacre of Glencoe in 1692 and the Earl of Breadalbane's implication in the issuing of orders provided the Marquess of Atholl with a highly effective and emotive weapon against his enemy. After voicing loud criticisms directed at the Earl he was appointed head of the commission of enquiry into Glencoe (MacGregor and Oram 2000, 80-81).

This hostility emphasises the danger in attempting to balance local and national rivalries. A nobleman with as much power as the Marquess of Atholl had to consider his position in terms of his local power base *and* his national political influence. Problems with neighbouring families, particularly those with the power of the Campbells, caused difficulty enough. As was the case in 1688-9 this danger increased when there was the potential for these local difficulties to interfere with the wishes of the monarchy and politics on a national scale. Although the Marquess managed to strike a blow against a Campbell earl, his failure to accept completely the authority of the King ensured that he was not viewed with indisputable trust. 'At the Revolution the part played by Atholl was very equivocal, and the weakness and irresolution that characterised his conduct lost him the confidence of both parties' (*Dict. Nat. Biog.*).

More personal issues increased the ambiguity of the first Marquess of Atholl's opinions and actions. While 'there seems little doubt that he was indeed a Jacobite at

heart' (Leneman 1986, 3), personally held beliefs appear to have been repressed in order to maintain a favourable position. Political difficulties at the most localised level again constituted a problem. While the Marquess gave strict orders that none of his men were to follow Viscount Dundee, Atholl locals still sided with the Viscount in his support of the Stuart monarchy. Eventually Athollmen did not fight with the Viscount, but they also refused to fight against him. This trouble, resulting from not having a traditional power base in the area, was to occur again in 1715 and 1745.

Atholl's central position, and the location of Blair on the route south from Badenoch to Perth made it vulnerable (figure 7.7). Blair Castle was garrisoned once again, this time for King James. Highlighting the problems of loyalty the Marquess had to contend with was the fact that the castle was secured by his own baillie, Stewart of Ballechin (Leneman 1986, 3). The battle of Killiecrankie in which Viscount Dundee was mortally wounded took place in the heart of Atholl only three miles from Blair Castle. The Viscount was taken to Blair where he died and was buried in the old church (MacGregor and Oram 2000, 79). Without regard for his complete lack of participation the Marquess was taken from Bath to London and imprisoned. Blair Castle was garrisoned by government troops and the people of the country ordered to swear an oath of allegiance to William and Mary (Leneman 1986, 3-4). As well as contending with political problems and power struggles the Marquess was married to a daughter of the Earl of Derby, a relative of the house of Orange.

The first Marquess died in 1703 and was succeeded by his son, who was created Duke of Atholl in the same year. In common with his father the first Duke held high political position and influence, and had office and favour removed because of doubts over his

loyalty. He voiced strong opposition to Union with England and had failed to vigorously support the Hanoverian succession in 1714. In 1708 he was suspected of complicity in a planned invasion by the 'Chevalier de St George' (James VIII) and was ordered to Edinburgh to answer a charge of high treason. He was too ill to travel so instead he was made prisoner in his own home, Blair Castle (Leneman 1986, 4). As with the first Marquess personal opinions and feelings often had to be repressed and a more pragmatic stance taken.

The difficulties of reconciling private and public opinions, national, local and family concerns continued to trouble the second Duke who succeeded in 1724. He led a highly active political life in London, investing less time on local affairs in Scotland, but still his position lacked stability. As a grandson of the seventh Earl of Derby he succeeded to the Sovereignty of the Isle of Man and to the English barony of Strange on the death of the tenth Earl. He sat in Parliament both as a Scottish representative peer and an English baron from 1737 until 1741 (Leneman 1986, 5). His position of being twice qualified for the House of Lords could be seen as confirmation of his power and influence. However, holding lands and office in England added to the different roles his position already required of him and made it almost impossible to reconcile them all with one another. These varying roles were held in common with other magnates such as the Duke of Argyll. Unlike Argyll, however, the seat of the Duke of Atholl was outwith his family's traditional sphere of influence. It is interesting that it was the second Duke who ordered the changes to the castle and grounds, creating an image of the perfect elite enclave.

Jacobitism: personal and pragmatic attitudes

Jacobitism and the various attempts to regain the throne for the Stuart dynasty continued to cause concern as to the position of the family in relation to the central government and to the survival of the family in general. In both 1715 and 1745 the Murray family was split apart by the division over loyalties. 'The rift in the family was bitter, deep and long-lasting, and both sides suffered at one time or another for resolutely sticking to their principles' (Leneman 1986, 4).

In 1715 the Duke and his second son James (later the second Duke) supported the Hanoverians. His eldest son William, Marquess of Tullibardine and two other sons Lord George and Lord Charles joined the Jacobite cause. It is worth briefly mentioning that once more problems were encountered with the Atholl tenants. The Duke ordered his men out against the Earl of Mar but so many of them supported the other side that he was unable to proceed. On 22 September the Marquess of Tullibardine proclaimed King James at Dunkeld, and about 1400 Athollmen joined the Jacobite force. It was fortuitous for the Duke of Atholl that power was no longer measured by the number of men he could call to arms. After the failure of the 1715 attempt the Marquess of Tullibardine, attainted for treason, also forfeited the succession when his father obtained an Act of Parliament in 1716 securing his honours and estate onto his second son, Lord James Murray (Leneman 1986, 5).

This last led to the interesting, but destabilising, situation of there being two Dukes of Atholl in 1745/6. William, the titular Marquess of Tullibardine, returned with Prince Charles in July 1745 and was addressed by the Jacobites as Duke (Leneman 1986, 220). Blair Castle was a pawn in a game. The Jacobite force marched into Atholl and garrisoned it in 1745, but evacuated in February 1746 at which time the government

forces took control of it. Lord George, determined to retake Atholl, laid siege to his own family home. 'It is...probable that he had some expectation of hastening a surrender, by threatening to set fire to the castle. He fired red hot bullets from two field-pieces which he had brought with him. The point from which he fired at the north side was so distant, that the heated balls only charred the very thick rafters of the roof' (NSA 1845, 566). The strategic importance of Blair Castle is clear; so too is the emotional significance of possessing the ancestral house.

Although the second Duke (James) passed on information to Sir John Cope as to the movements of the Jacobite army and then fled south, first to Edinburgh, then to London, he still seems to have been treated with some suspicion. With two brothers prominent in the Jacobite army, in particular Lord George who was the Lieutenant-General of the force, and his ancestral home in their hands it seems inevitable that the government would be wary of his loyalty. Even afterwards in writing to his factor that he was glad his people were giving in their arms he commented that this 'perhaps may save them and the country from ruin, tho it seems that nothing I can do or you in my name can save me from being misrepresented and calumniated' (*EUL DC.1.37. 1&2*; Leneman 1986, 229). It is unsurprising that he would have been regarded with suspicion if not hostility by the government and his own countrymen.

'Sovereign' power: authority and patronage

The power of the Duke of Atholl though fraught with difficulties was immense. Before 1747 when aristocrats lost the right of heritable jurisdictions, in terms of law alone the Duke of Atholl was the Lord of Regality of Atholl with its head court at

Logierait, Lord of Regality of the Court of Dunkeld and Sheriff of Perthshire (Leneman 1986, 153). Holding the courts of regality surrounded by his followers and their men, 'this great chief appeared like a sovereign, with his parliament and army. Indeed, the whole was no bad emblem of a king and parliament, only substituting a chief and his clan for a king with his peers and commoners' (Stewart of Garth 1885, 61n).

The Duke of Atholl did possess almost sovereign power. This is reflected in petitions sent to him asking for his favour or intervention in a problem, where he is addressed by the phrase 'To a high and mighty prince James Duke of Atholl'. Allowing for the fact that this is obviously a formulaic formality does not lessen the implication that the Duke wielded the absolute power of a prince over his people. By 1747 the Duke was called upon to deal mainly with commercial, moral and practical issues not criminal cases. His power at this stage was not based on his position as Lord of the Regality (Leneman 1986, 166). Instead power came from being seen as a final authority providing adjudication. He controlled everyday life, not just the extraordinary, isolated incidents. Through the courts the Duke could hold power over life and death. Through his patronage he could control everyday life.

Control over appointments held political power at a local level. Patronage held inherent rewards as the person put in office became beholden to their benefactor. In a letter to the second Duke his brother Lord George emphasised this point:

'If ...you thought it worth your while, by doing some favours to the Cheefs themselves, or to some of their near relations, you could not miss to attach them very strongly to your Interest, which would be doing, in my opinion, Great Service to Government... which would add that weight your Familie already has in that country' (7 March 1741 *Chronicles* II 1908, 447-8).

However, a series of letters from August 1756 indicates that perhaps the Duke was not as secure in his position as all of this would imply. The letters detail the appointment of a new schoolmaster, John Mearns, at Dunkeld. Mearns had gone to the school *before* paying his respects to the Duke. When he was then taken to the Duke he was received with ill favour. A letter sent by Mearns to Humphry Harrison, one of the Duke's factors, highlights the perceived power of the Duke as it begs his forgiveness (Leneman 1986, 120-1; *AM* 47(8)129, 130, 131). More important though is the fact that the Duke had such a strong reaction to such a small and unintended slight.

Changing roles and responsibilities

As with the Dukes of Hamilton a clear difference can be seen in attitudes towards responsibility and status between the first and second Dukes. The first Duke (1703-1724) epitomises the 'old-style Scottish magnate' (Leneman 1986, 9). His actions and attitudes are characterised by a personal involvement in local affairs and a concern for the spiritual well-being of his tenants. A key to the first Duke seems to be a sense of responsibility. The second Duke (1724-64) with his concentration on London politics differed from his father. He succeeded to a title that came with certain implications. One of these was the importance of relations with the monarchy and government in London. After his accession the second Duke spent the greater part of his year in the English capital, living the standard of life expected of a man in his position. His sense of obligation to his tenants in Atholl did not completely recede with physical distance. In July 1753, for instance, the second Duke made arrangements for weekly charity to be given to the poor. The key to the second Duke was an overriding concern with maintaining his power base. He spent money on creating the correct image; also sharing with his contemporaries the

belief in the 'moral obligation to live in a style commensurate with their dignity' (Leneman 1986, 9).

The paternalism of the first Duke and the nature of his entourage, and of the second Duke's modified castle and grounds constituted the means by which to impress and persuade others of their status and authority rather than having to resort to coercion. This effort had consequences though. The second Duke of Atholl had a constant problem with money. After the death of his father a commission was appointed to look into the family's first financial crisis. Although the Duke managed to spend enormous amounts on his estates on one occasion he did not even have the money required to return to Scotland (Leneman 1986, 10). Status and authority did not necessarily guarantee financial security.

Controlling Atholl: rents and rights; crime and punishment; education and language

Landowning in Atholl came with problems for the Murray family. The relationship with the chief landowner and his tenants was particular to their situation. The usual dynamic of chief and tacksmen was impossible due to the fact that the Murrays were not traditionally a local family. Tacksmen were usually related to their chief. They held large areas of land for which they paid only a nominal rent and then sub-let to sub-tenants on an annual basis. The tacksmen mediated between the chief and the lower tenants, and would be responsible for bringing out his men in support of his chief. The difficulty that this created for the Dukes of Atholl has been seen clearly upon each occasion that the unquestioned loyalty and support of their tenants was required. The majority of the Duke's land was held by feu. The tacksmen became his vassals, none of whom were Murrays. Instead the Atholl vassals included chieftains of the Robertson and Stewart clans whose roots in the area were long established, and who continued to inhabit their

time-honoured place in the power structure (figure 7.8). Incidences of difficulties with rent collection also occurred.

The Duke did have the right to exact services from his vassals which emphasised his authority over them. In 1717, in accordance with an Act of Parliament, the Duke commuted services into cash payments provoking a bitter argument with his vassals that lasted from May into June. In a letter to his son in May the Duke wrote,

‘I have been so harrassed & fatigued by some of my undutiful vassals... I have been neare 3 weeks past in Dunkeld & Logirate treating with them as the Act directs for an annual dutie in lieu of their services of hosting hunting watching & warding, & their personal Attendance, But to no purpose, for besides the scandalous Memorial they have presented to me...they have entered into a bond of association to stand by & support one another in this affaire & al other causes whatever’ (*Chronicles II* 1908, 264; Leneman 1986,47).

The affair was serious enough for the Duke to consider summoning them before the House of Lords. An agreement was reached when the vassals discovered they had received poor information from their lawyers; their actions had been illegal (Leneman 1986, 47).

It is interesting that the Duke’s vassals resorted to legal counsel and action in reference to their lord. His authority was enormous, but it was no longer seen as final. He was not an omnipotent power acting outside the increasingly insidious rule of the law. Customary rules and modes of living and thinking were consciously being replaced by a uniform, centralised and regularised system. The Duke’s power had never been completely arbitrary. Legal precedent and procedure held an important place in his actions, and all communication with his tenants was carefully documented, creating precedents for future decisions.

Even with the provision of legal guides to actions disagreements over rights still occurred. The forest of Atholl, a significant source of income for the Duke, was one area in which his power diminished as the prosecution of poachers became more difficult (see p140). Illegal actions threatened the social stability of an area. Therefore landowners had both a personal interest and a moral obligation to concern themselves with such matters. As well as the Duke of Atholl's position at the head of courts of regality (until 1747), as a chief or landowner he was considered responsible for the peace and good behaviour of his tenantry. In September 1688 a Justiciary Court was held in Crieff. The Duke was expected to attend and give in bonds for securing the peace, along with the names of all those for whom he was to be responsible (Leneman 1986, 146). This long established tradition was largely ineffectual as a peace-keeping measure due to the problems with enforcing it. After 1715 during the 'pacification' of the Highlands this became a more politically complex issue and by implication directly concerned the landowners responsible for their tenants.

Atholl included the MacGregor area of Balquhidder, the worst area of crime in the Duke's territory, and one of the most notorious areas in Scotland. Problems with thieving in this vicinity caused problems of peace-keeping. The Duke had the power to mete out punishments including banishments, whipping and the imposition of fines. In 1736 there are also examples of the hanging of thieves (Leneman 1986, 166). Two sites within the Atholl estates provided reminders of the power of the Duke: Tom-na-Croiche, or the Gallows Hill, and Pol-nam-ban, or 'the pool into which bad women [adulteresses] were thrown' (OSA 1791-9, xii 478) (figure 7.9). The Duke had far greater authority over his lands than the far away government but such a vast area was impossible to completely

control. Laws and rules could be made, but there was no guarantee that they could be enforced. After the death of the first Duke in 1724 there is no correspondence in the Atholl archive referring to crime prevention until 1742. The second Duke maintained a distance from local affairs unless his own power and prestige were impinged upon. He played his part in persecuting crime, but entrusted others with prevention (Leneman 1986, 149).

Religion was both socially and politically sensitive but the Kirk Session itself constituted another agent of social control. In essence it acted as a local court of morality. Again personal problems could increase the difficulties of landowners in maintaining authority and a particular image. It is possible that one of the illegitimate children born in the area was that of the Honourable John Murray, son of Lord George (and future Duke). Of course this case was hushed up (Leneman 1986, 101-2).

Unlike his father the second Duke did not play a close personal role in the concerns of the local presbytery. His absence in London for most of the year meant the presbytery was left to deal with his agents, not with the Duke personally. As with the case of crime it was with the possibility of a threat to his own interests that the Duke was motivated to intervene. The Duke was concerned with protecting his position in reference to his own tenants.

Education could also be seen as an altruistic concern, with the Duke playing a paternal role in the education of his people. However, the urge to educate Highlanders in particular stemmed from the incentive of giving new values to Jacobites. Philanthropy was particularly strong when it also had political implications. The Scottish Society for the Propagation of Christian Knowledge (SSPCK) was founded in 1709 with the aim of

providing charity schools throughout the Highlands. The first Duke of Atholl was a founder member of the society, and a school was set up in Blair Atholl to which he urged his tenants to send their children. The most significant goal of the SSPCK was to eradicate the use of Gaelic. Ironically at the same time more Gaelic-speaking ministers were needed in order to achieve the other goal of a population with a full knowledge of the Scriptures. Writing and arithmetic were secondary to the ability to read English, and Latin was expressly forbidden, remaining the intellectual property of the elite.

At the end of the eighteenth century Gaelic was still the language spoken in Atholl amongst the natives, and there were few others in the parish (OSA 1791-9, xii 471). Even where tenants were bilingual their first language was still Gaelic. Estate records are in English however, and the adherence to English bureaucracy ended the use of the patronymic in referring to tenants (Leneman 1986, 49). More than any other factor the use of language highlighted the varying, often conflicting concerns and attitudes of the Duke and his vassals. It remained an everyday reminder of their differences.

The location of Atholl in the central Highlands, and the place of Blair Atholl on the route north made it strategically important and militarily vulnerable. The sieges of the castle during each of the Jacobite risings signify its tactical importance. When General Wade began the huge project of building a network of strategically important roads across Scotland he realised the importance of Atholl. The suspicion of the Duke of Atholl's loyalty and that of his men may also have been considered. A road was built between 1728 and 1730 from Dunkeld to Inverness, passing next to Blair Castle and through Dalnacardoch on its way north (Taylor 1976, 49) (figure 7.10). Although this would inevitably have aided the Duke on his journeys south the road represents more

than comfortable travel, especially as the road aided the movement of troops regardless of their affiliations. When Blair Castle was garrisoned by government troops in 1746 the chief object 'was certainly to prevent any treasonable correspondence, and to cut off by proper parties...the communications by the great roads between the south and northern part of the country' (NSA 1845, X 565) As well as politically, socially and economically the Duke of Atholl was often in a physically difficult position.

7.3 Discussion: From Blair Castle to Atholl House

Unlike Blair Castle, 'Atholl House' was not required to appear to be an impregnable fortress. 'Till the year 1747, or later, it was about three stories higher than it is at present, and was fortified with many Gothic turrets and battlements, mounted with guns' (OSA 1791-9, xii 477). The removal of the top storeys of the building reduced the emphasis on vertical expression and also necessitated the taking down of the parapets and bartizans. The castellated nature of the roofline became the plain silhouette of pitched roofs (figure 7.11). The thick medieval walls were punctured by large new rectangular sash windows which, arranged in a more regularised pattern, added further to the picture of a grand eighteenth century house rather than a castellated tower (see figures 7.1 and 7.11). The house was harled and whitewashed providing a stark contrast to the lushness of the surrounding landscape (plate 7.1). It would have been impossible not to notice the house from the viewpoint of the route north.

Ideal plans and realistic practices

As with the exterior of Blair Castle the layout of the interior and the sequence of changes are made complex by subsequent alterations. In terms of looking at plans I

intend to consider those proposed by John Douglas in 1736 before looking at those of James Winter, the architect chosen to modernise and simplify the house. The number of extant plans which were proposed within a relatively condensed period of time is potentially confusing, particularly considering that even the Winter plans were not wholly implemented; some proposals were rejected, some were deferred. However, Blair Castle is an enlightening example of the compromises made between the ideal of planned changes, and the reality of problems and restrictions. In each case intentions can be considered, as well as the plans which were accomplished.

John Douglas provided a first design for the modernising extension to Blair Castle for the Duke of Atholl in 1736. He proposed a symmetrical E-plan structure, created by a central entrance projection and flanking wings set forward from the regular façade. The expected pattern of lateral hierarchical planning provided for the servants on the ground floor (figure 7.12), the family apartments including the nursery on the first (figure 7.13), and the principal state rooms on the second floor (figure 7.14). The arrangement of rooms on each floor focussed on a central area, the vestibule on the first floor, and the billiard room on the second. These areas were flanked by two grand stairs with back stairs beyond which accessed bedchambers and dressing rooms in the end projections, allowing the movement of servants throughout the house.

Douglas' plans provided for various divisions within the house. The lateral planning allowed for the segregation of service, family and entertaining areas, but further groupings were made on the basis of gender and age. Male and female servants were allocated sleeping areas isolated from each other in the end pavilions of the ground floor,

with interaction minimised further by the provision of a back stair at each end. On the state floor the potential for after dinner gender division was accommodated with access from the dining room to a drawing room where ladies would take tea, and to the accepted male area of the billiards room (figure 7.15). Within the family accommodation children and adults were also distanced with the nursery and other bedrooms placed on the opposite side of the central drawing and dining room to the Duke and Duchess' apartment and the library (figure 7.16).

Douglas suggested designs which encompassed modern requirements, visually and in terms of social relations within the house. The rational, symmetrical exterior gave way to an ordered, balanced interior in which people were given a place according to their accepted roles. However, these plans were not carried out, probably because of financial reasons. The removal of the turret stair, for example, would probably have made an aristocrat with no money worries hesitate. However, the employment of James Winter only a few years later signifies the perceived necessity of modernising the house while maintaining its grandeur. The plans prepared by James Winter in 1743 were for a symmetrical E-plan house, similar to that proposed by John Douglas. Restrictions still prevented the completion of the plans in full.

The 1743 plans for Blair Castle followed the hierarchical patterning of service areas on the lowest floor (figure 7.17), family rooms on the first (figure 7.18), with entertaining or state rooms above (figure 7.19). As with the John Douglas plans rooms were laid out symmetrically, focussing on the central areas of the vestibule and billiard room. Two grand staircases flanked these areas with backstairs beyond. These plans, once again, represented an ideal which proved impractical, if not impossible. The existing great stair

continued to be the means of movement throughout the house for notable visitors and on grand occasions. Service stairs consisted of the turret which would have been removed if plans had been completely executed, but exists to this day, and a back stair placed behind the great stair. There was no vestibule area until 1746 when John Douglas returned to design a single story addition. As a consequence there was also no billiard room. Instead of directing movement around central areas in each floor, access through the house had to continue largely on the basis of moving through sequences of rooms.

Spatial divisions: 'Backstairs'

Winter's original plan provided for a pair of identical backstairs, meeting the demand for convenience and for spatial balance within the house. The turret stair and the new back stair which was built still allowed for servants to move throughout the building, with ease of access to both sides of each floor, away from the grand stair (figure 7.20). However, unlike the Douglas plans, no accommodation seems to have been made for segregation along gender lines. The 'woman house' planned near the laundry, for example, was practical not ideological. Instead, 'isolated' areas were based on servants' hierarchy. The central area of the ground floor was taken over by the common hall and servants hall, both inclusive areas. Some servants such as the cook who was provided with a separate room, and the porter who had a cluster of bedroom, closet and lodge, received deferential treatment, being permitted a degree of privacy (figure 7.21). Movement throughout the service area itself was facilitated by a central passage running through the length of the house. This was convenient, probably aided productivity and allowed for the separation of groups of people and activities (see figure 2.22 and pp114).

Extensions created further space for service areas which could not be found within the limitations of the main block of the house (figure 7.22). This also maintained the place of the servants in the extremes of the building rather than have their presence intrude too much into the part of the house inhabited by family and guests. The variety of rooms provided reveals the extensive facilities required to run the Duke of Atholl's household. To the north was the washhouse and dairy wing (figure 7.23), and to the south west were various 'offices'. A list of room dimensions for the south west extension, dated 1743/4, includes a bakehouse, brewhouse, kitchen and parlour on the ground floor, and a variety of bedchambers, including some 'without fireplaces' above (*NMRS PTD/127/85. D2.13 (39)*).

Unlike many new-built country houses Blair did not have an attic storey containing servants' rooms. Winter's plans provided for the potential inclusion of an entresol, or attic floor, above the newly built areas of the house. This type of accommodation was usually reserved for servants, as with the possible entresol at Inveraray Castle (see p293); or it could have been intended as provision for extra guests to the house. As the plans for the floor below were not carried out it is unlikely that the entresol/ attic was ever executed.

Spatial divisions: family and visitors; comfort and control

The first floor of the house as the family area was to include a private dining and drawing room, with three bedroom and closet combinations other than the 'family bedchamber'. Once again a nursery was planned across the central suite of dining and drawing room from the 'family bedchamber' (see figure 7.18). The planned new great stair led up to the central entertaining area of the principal drawing room, though the

billiard room could have been entered. Bedrooms, including the principal bedchamber, could not be accessed directly, instead a vestibule or corridor space preceded these rooms which formed a separate cluster away from the more public areas (figure 7.24). The provision of two drawing rooms flanking the dining room probably signifies the intention of one as a relatively private area, included as part of the principal apartment. It also acted as an extra space, or a buffer zone, between the dining room and bedroom apartment. The new grand stair would only have serviced the first and second floors highlighting their primacy, and also that of the stair itself. The failure of the stair to extend into the service floor implies that servants did not have permission to use it, so highlighting its exclusivity (figure 7.25).

Within the limitations of the old structure some changes were possible which managed to maintain some of the spatial divisions of the ideal plans. Privacy was allowed for on the first floor with the separation of the suite of drawing and dining room from the bedroom suite by an antechamber (figure 7.26). The inclusive area of the drawing room dominated the second floor, with the rest of the space taken up by bedrooms (figure 7.27). The demands made on limited space evidently curtailed the full expression of desired ideological concepts. Perhaps the use of the house, not as a family home that occasionally provided hospitality to visitors, but specifically as a place to entertain visiting parties lessened the need for the divisions apparent in plans.

Changing priorities can be seen in the arrangement and relationship of the state rooms. Internally the house received lavish remodelling in the 1750s with plasterwork created by the Clayton family. The grandest rooms at 'Atholl House', emphasised by the sumptuous plasterwork were the dining and drawing rooms, not the bedchamber. The implied

servility in the tradition, instigated at the levées of monarchs and great men, of receiving courtiers or guests in the bedchamber had continued to be symbolised in the primacy given to the room as the hub of the house for any important guest ensconced in the state apartment. The focus on the less personal areas of the dining and drawing room reflected a change in the manner of receiving and entertaining guests. The rise of the status of the drawing room can be seen at Blair. The original dining room was converted before its completion into the drawing room (Glendinning et al 1996, 115). That such an easy conversion could take place implies that each room was seen as being of the same status.

The medieval origins of the house guaranteed that modern, classical rooms would be contrasted with older, vaulted chambers. Although presumably a necessity, there is a nice historical parallel in the rise of the status of the drawing room and the fact that it was once the sixteenth century banqueting hall. This parallel was recognised and alluded to in the focal point of the room; the overmantel, designed by Clayton, represents a montage of arms and trophies of various periods (plate 7.2). This provided a focussed visual reminder of the historical importance of the house and its family. A balance was required between modernity and the established means of promoting the status of a family through past achievements and precedence.

Access arrangements into and around the building are also explained through its history. Before John Douglas added the single storey vestibule in 1746 entry was made directly onto the great stair which then provided access throughout the rest of the building. Progress up the stair led primarily to the dining room, made understandable by the fact that the room was previously the sixteenth century epicentre of the building, the banqueting hall. After the creation of the vestibule access would still have proceeded up

the great stair, leading visitors upstairs, by-passing 'hidden' service and less formal family areas (figure 7.28). In terms of access to the house it also added an extra level of depth to be permeated by a visitor. To reach the dining room, the first space in which a decision as to movement could be made, the visitor had passed through eight sequential spaces, or levels of permeability (see figure 2.21 and p113). This suggests the privacy and security, even the isolation of interior spaces. It is possible that everyday movement into and through the building took advantage of a different entrance, perhaps even using the turret stair (though this seems more likely after the creation of the new back stair).

Douglas' original 1736 plans had provided access for the family via arcades on the ground floor, with the main entrance on the first floor, reached by a formal perron stair, opened only for special occasions. Entry through this door was intended to allow access to the state rooms. This, and the continued dominance of the grand stair, implied the formality of the main entrance. Therefore the direction of some visitors to that entrance implies either the formality of the occasion or of their relationship with the ducal family. The addition of another stair, known as the Picture Stair, in 1756 further suggests the creation of a formality and grandeur which placed guests at a remove from the family. This stair reached only from the ground to the first floor, accessed from the 'office' wing and the central corridor at ground level (figure 7.29). The attention given to decoration of the stair suggests that it was not intended as a service stair, but rather that this allowed for convenient everyday access for the family and familiar guests.

The modifications at Blair may have increased convenience and comfort. However, the second Duke of Atholl spent the greater part of the year in London. Blair Castle, or

Atholl House, provided a centre in which guests could be entertained, as seen in the emphasis given to the state rooms. 'Its apartments are numerous and elegant, and its accommodations are suited to the residence of a ducal family' (OSA 1791-9, xii 568). The amount of time the Duke spent away from his power base suggests another possible motive behind the aggrandisement of the ducal house. Although through his factors and other officers the Duke maintained a tight hold on his estates from England, the most emphatic symbol of his power was still his house. The rational Atholl House would have impressed a society that valued wealth, education and rational thought. At the same time Blair Castle was still very much a castle. Throughout the period discussed, the period within which modifications were made, the castle was repeatedly sieged, garrisoned, captured and used as a prison. The fortress of Blair Castle fortified the impression of the powerful chief ruling over his territory. The Duke's vassals and others of a lower social rank would continue to equate the large, expensive structure with the authority that controlled their everyday lives. While the Duke may not have been in Atholl for much of the year he ensured that he left behind a strong symbol of his position.

7.4 The Manipulation of the Landscape

The Integral Landscape: Exploitation and beautification

Improvements made by the second Duke were not motivated by the desire to increase the profitability of the Atholl estates. Some experimental changes were made on the home farm, but it was not until the third Duke that attempts were made to improve agricultural yield and the lives of tenants (Leneman 1986, 12). The requirements of tacks (leases) did allow for rules to be imposed upon tenants so providing a form of social control, expedient for a landowner with no kin-based link with his tenants. In particular

the presence of sub-tenants was often forbidden, so regulating their number and quality (Leneman 1986, 60). The Atholl coal mine at Blairingone, Clackmannanshire seems to have been a hobby rather than a project of improvement. The miners lived almost like serfs, bound to the mines in which they worked. Exploitation of natural resources, along with the beautification of houses and landscapes were activities expected of an eighteenth century gentleman. A man of the Duke of Atholl's status could not afford socially to not participate in such activities and take up the challenge to experiment with new ideas.

The most significant changes made at Blair were those made to the gardens and landscaping around the building (figure 7.30). This work was undertaken between the 1730s and 1761, with a break from 1742-46. The relationship between the house and garden was an intimate one, in terms of proximity and visual association. A leading publication on garden design in the early eighteenth century was Stephen Switzer's verse the *Ichnographia Rustica* which first appeared in 1718. In his verse he laid down the maxim, 'When you first begin to build, and make Gardens, the Gardener and Builder ought to go Hand in Hand, and to consult together' (Switzer 1742, II 154). As seen at buildings such as Kinross House houses and their landscapes were not seen as separate entities, they were considered as a uniform whole.

Houses and gardens can be studied in the same way as both were used and experienced rather than simply being works of art. 'Landscapes are particularly powerful symbolic artifacts because they are three-dimensional spaces.... A landscape, through the structure of its space, directs what one sees and how one moves' (Kryder-Reid 1994, 133). Whereas the term landscape, particularly in reference to gardens, usually denotes a

specific aesthetic form, I intend to use it in its broader sense to include the wider context in which Blair Castle sat.

The Duke of Atholl would probably have been aware of garden treatises and pattern books such as Batty Langley's *New Principles of Gardening* (1728) and Robert Morris' *The Lectures on Architecture* (1734), and the time spent in London also influenced him. He referred to the Mall at St James and a walk at Hammersmith as possible patterns for the avenue at Blair (Tait 1980, 23). Notes taken from A J Dezallier D'Argenville's *Theory and Practice of Gardening*, translated into English in 1712, are found amongst estate papers from 1737 (Cruft 1984, 287). This immensely popular work illustrated the development of French formal gardening after the death of Le Notre in 1700.

D'Argenville encouraged the relaxation of rigid forms, the use of the ha-ha and an open prospect as well as the suitability of a garden to its situation. The Duke noted the proportions of walks and the suitability of various schemes for Blair (Cruft 1984, 287).

It is uncertain whether an original overall landscaping plan existed which was executed over a number of years or whether it developed organically, though still within a specific referential framework and with clear requirements. Pococke gives a picture of the landscape created by the second Duke in his description of a tour of 1760:

'To the North of the house runs a small stream over which there are three or four bridges that appear in view at once and between them a Chinese rail, and close to this a square tower is built for a clock. Higher up to the North West this stream passes through a Vale, which is most beautifully planted with many sorts of American trees; This is called Diana's Grove, from a Statue of her with a Stag on a rising ground, from which there are eight walks; below in the wood is the Temple of Fame... There is a riding to drive around this part [larch plantations], the three hills and the Kitchen garden which is

to the North East between the Middle hill and Eastern hill, situated in a valley; in the whole length of which Kitchen garden, the Duke has made a fine piece of water, with six or seven island peninsulas in it, two of which are for the swans to breed on, having thatched houses built on them for that purpose, and the wild ducks breed on the Islands; The Garden is formed on a gentle declivity on each side all walled round. There is a pidgeon house at one Angle and a Gardener's house at another, and at the south end is a semicircular Summerhouse which is all glass in front; In the walk leading to this and on each side of the Cross walk are about twenty grotesque figures in lead, and painted, which have a very pretty effect in that situation, at each end is a parterre of many sorts of perennial flowers; the garden is about 1200 feet long, the breadth is not the same but may be from 4 to 500 feet. This is the most beautiful Kitchen garden I believe in the world' (Pococke 1887).

The attention paid to the layout of the kitchen garden at Blair, begun in 1751, emphasises the continuing importance of the garden in practical terms (figure 7.31). However, the new design for this enclosed area demonstrates the desire to place the everyday use of the garden into a pleasurable setting. The site of the kitchen garden, in a valley with a riding leading to it, highlights the desire to combine use and beauty and to demonstrate this to visitors touring around the estate. Theorists such as Switzer saw the amalgamation of practicality with aesthetic appeal as the ideal, 'He that the beautiful and useful blends, / simplicity with greatness, gains all ends' (translated from Switzer 1718 Hussey 1967, 11). The inclusion of elements such as the dovecot, gardener's house and birds with the summer house, statue-laden leisure walks and flower beds, all within a walled enclosure exemplifies this attitude towards gardens. Water was particularly suited to this representation of beauty whilst also being necessary for practical reasons. It was

used also to embody the perceived dominance of humans over nature, as seen in the creation of ponds and lochs, cascades and canals, and fountains.

The 'rationalisation' of the landscape: a precise 'wilderness' in the wilderness

Geometry, precision and the manipulation of perspective are seen throughout the landscape, from the kitchen garden to the carefully laid out plantations and avenues of trees. Estate plans demonstrate the 'patchwork' character of the precisely surveyed fields or 'parks' laid out around the castle, demarcating the area of human governance from the unmeasured and untamed Highland landscape (see figure 7.30). However there is little of the medieval or Renaissance type of parterre planting as seen at Edzell Castle for example. While no less precise and geometrical, the scale of landscaping was broader and more sweeping.

The Dukes of Atholl's greatest contribution to their surroundings was a lavish programme of afforestation. Between 1740 and 1830 the three dukes planted '14,096,719 larches, enough to cover 10,000 acres' (Hadfield 1960, 249). The trees provided shelter for the relatively exposed house, but again the geometrical nature of their planting suggests that more than practical considerations were important. One plan for the ground layout of trees, which marks out precise segments of different varieties (figure 7.32), demonstrates this obsession with rationalisation. The significance of measuring and perspective is emphasised further by the precision with which the physical or 'natural' world was recorded.

The most formal aspect of this planting and designing of the landscape was the avenue leading to the house (figure 7.33). As the approach to the castle the aim of the avenue was evidently to impress those travelling along it. It signified the uniformity of the house

and the land around it, and provided a controlled point from which the house was to be viewed. This effect was intended to be achieved both moving towards *and* away from the castle. The avenue did not stop when it reached its intersection with the public highway, instead it continued on, highlighting the Duke's ownership of the land over which it extended (see Williamson 1998, 31). Gardens could even be seen as providing a cordon sanitaire, or an ideological buffer zone, between the area of the house and the outside. The flat expanse of land along the line of the avenue to the entrance façade of Blair Castle allowed a clear view of the house at its most impressive point only.

One plantation set up by the second Duke of Atholl was a 'wilderness' also known as 'Diana's Grove' (figure 7.34). The modern notion of a wilderness conjures up an incorrect image of the eighteenth century landscape wilderness. The grove of trees at Blair was a carefully planned area, providing walks that radiated out from a statue of the goddess Diana in the centre (plate 7.3). The trees provided shelter by which to enjoy moving around the plantation with its array of statuary. Movement would have appeared to be free and unhindered, although in reality the paths dictated where a visitor could and could not move.

The inclusion of statues is equally significant. A guest would be able to appreciate the education responsible for the geometric planning from the house, but probably less so from the garden itself. This allowed for the privileged vision of those inside the house. From the viewpoint of the garden statues such as Apollo and Ceres were spread out around the gardens, providing references to an elite education. The statue of Diana, the goddess of hunting, may be relevant as a local reference to deer and hunting, both associated with the wealthy and with Atholl. In 1743 a statue of Hercules was added to

the Hercules Wilderness at the end of The Long Walk, and a figure of Time with a sundial placed in the kitchen garden (Cruft 1984, 292). This last refers back to the eighteenth century preoccupation with time, proportion and harmony which constituted the attempt 'to understand and codify the natural state of the world' (Kryder-Reid 1994, 136). Statues were precisely placed. For example, a list of commissioned figures states where each piece is to be displayed '3 feet 6 inch Mercury in the Middle Bacchus with grapes upon one pillar A Pomona with Fruit upon one pillar 3 to be placed upon the top of the Alcove' (1755 in Cruft 1984, 296).

A political landscape? References and audiences

The Temple of Fame, shown in a plan of 1744 provided the focus upon statuary in the garden (figure 7.35). Within this construction statues of gods and goddesses mixed with busts of poets. Homer, Seneca, Plato, Aristotle, Horace, Cicero, Pomona, Milton, Dean Swift, Pope, Sir Isaac Newton, Dryden, and Shakespeare mixed with the Vestal Virgins, the Four Seasons, Saturnus, Venus, Amphitrite, Vesta Virgin, Leda, Shifting Venus, Hercules and the Hydra and a piping Faunus (Cruft 1984, 290). Once more the symbolism of the statues, even at its most basic interpretation, implied education and wealth. The carefully considered placing of the figures adhered to the penchant for mathematical precision and reason.

It has been argued that, unlike gardens such as Stowe in Buckinghamshire, there was no political motivation behind the designed landscape at Blair. For example the Temple of Fame is intended to have a visual rather than a political emphasis, it is a 'shrine to literary and philosophical ideas but without any apparent political overtones' (Tait 1980, 5; 19). The comparison of a landscape in the Scottish Highlands with Stowe is

inappropriate, and does not take account of the different contexts of the gardens or their owners. Moreover, although the design of Blair's setting may not have implied messages in terms of knowing references to parliamentary politics or the monarchy, it is impossible for the garden to have no political overtones at all, even if only at an unconscious level. However, along with the dominant geometrical nature of the garden, the inclusion of so many classical references in a garden designed by a man who was not supposed to have had a strictly classical education, indicates that he understood at least that these images projected the appearance required of an eighteenth century aristocrat.

Moreover, this does not allow for the different audiences who may have come into contact with the house and grounds. The Duke would have been aware that the village of Blair was at no great distance from the castle (only about a quarter of a mile), and a military road ran through his policies. The road was to the north of the castle, so travelling from the east a traveller would have seen the front of the castle, crossed the line of the avenue and then passed through the village (See figure 7.10). Latin was not allowed to be taught in the parish school (Leneman 1986, 123), so if the Duke's tenants had ever managed to see any of these statues they would not have understood their significance, or may have recognised them as something forbidden; but they would have understood the scale and the expense of the enterprise undertaken by the second Duke. They would have seen the difference between their own homes and the ducal residence. The impact of this may have been heightened by the fact that for most of the year the Duke did not even live in his magnificent house. Politics concerns the relationships of people to one another, it does not necessarily have to have a nationally important reference point.

Landowners such as the second Duke of Atholl were expressing a relationship to their natural environment as well as to people. At the same time as exploiting both natural and human resources, they were creating idyllic surroundings by employing classical references in their landscapes and architecture. It was not just the case that, 'The Arcadian idyll...seems just another pretty lie told by propertied aristocrats...to disguise the ecological consequences of their greed' (Schama 1996, 12). The idyllic landscapes and the rules and laws were employed for the emotional benefit of the aristocrats as much as to give an impression of strength and authority to others.

The awareness of the importance of historical precedence is signified by the creation of a sham castle known as the Whim in 1761 (figure 7.36). This deliberate construction of a ruin clearly refers back to a castellated past. Tait criticises Blair further with his belief that the feeling for the character and history of the place came slowly (1980, 49). This situation seems not to be unusual for Scotland, possibly due to financial and geographical reasons amongst others. The eighteenth century notion of the 'genius of the place' must have been difficult for landowners in the situation of the Duke of Atholl to define. Exactly which character and history of the place were they supposed to be representing? Their houses and gardens, as extensions of their own position and authority, played a number of different roles and were required to represent a number of different aspects of their owner's power. The Duke of Atholl carried out modifications largely because it was expected of someone in his position. He also took the opportunity to rearrange his castle and grounds spatially, subtly demarcating and separating off different zones according to use and the intended users. It must also be remembered that his finances were not exactly healthy. By creating a "toned down" version of the most

ostentatious examples in England, which could almost be seen as conscious patterns that were to inspire others to a lesser degree, the second Duke of Atholl attempted to reconcile his various roles and therefore his own concept of self-identity, into one awe-inspiring image which any audience would have understood at some level, even the vassals who did not always unquestioningly recognise his ultimate authority.

Chapter Eight: Inveraray Castle

‘ It will readily be believed that this noble seat and its scenery, when beheld by the rude sons of Caledonia, in unequal comparison with their lowly huts and naked wilds, are regarded as a perfect Elysium and the residence of a divinity’ (Mawman 1805, II).

Inveraray Castle is an outstanding example of the link made between the perceived role of an owner and his house. As the above quote from an early nineteenth century tourist suggests the two are inextricably linked, and each confirms and emphasises the impression received of the other. This is particularly illuminating in the case of Inveraray due to the complicated and often paradoxical political and social role of the Dukes of Argyll- at once Scottish and English in their outlook, Highland and Lowland, feudal chiefs and modern landowners. Different aspects of these positions were adopted to appeal to different people. Inveraray Castle’s Gothick exterior hides a classically planned and designed interior. Therefore the Dukes’ chief residence in the Highlands was designed to both reflect and, at the same time, to cover up this contradiction.

Another key to Inveraray in the eighteenth century are the simultaneous processes of continuity and change, or tradition and modernisation. This can be seen in the designing and building, the manner in which plans developed, and how the house was eventually used. John, succeeded as second Duke of Argyll and first Duke of Greenwich (1680-1743) in 1703 and originated the plans for improvements. The digging of foundations began in the 1740s under the orders of his brother Archibald, Earl of Islay and third Duke of Argyll (1682-1761). The castle was not completed until the 1770s under John, the fifth Duke (1723-1806). Requirements of the house changed with the owners and their

historical contexts and it is interesting to see how fluid buildings can be, in terms of both form and function. A new town was designed in tandem with the castle providing a complete social and geographical landscape with which the Dukes of Argyll could convey a stable impression of wealth and power. With the advent of tourism as a fashionable pursuit of 'polite' society in the late eighteenth century Inveraray became an established 'must-see' location, and the town and castle 'havens of hospitality'. The numerous accounts of travellers describe life in Inveraray and allow us to judge the impressions they received of the Dukes of Argyll's projects.

8.1 The Exterior: A Perfect Castle

Inveraray Castle, as will be discussed later, is a paradoxical combination of an almost wholly classical interior and a Gothick exterior.

One is at first surprised that a castle, in appearance so ancient, should show not the slightest mark of decay: every part is so well dressed, the angles are so clean and perfect, and the colour of the stone is so equal that the building seems to have just come from the hand of the workman. My astonishment on this subject, however, soon ceased, when after crossing some drawbridges, and passing through a gateway, as Gothic as that of the time of Charlemagne, I arrived at a fine vestibule, which led to a staircase in the Italian style, with double balusters, of the best taste and the most perfect architecture (Saint-Fond 1907, 244).

Saint-Fond, visiting Inveraray in 1787, points out the contrast between exterior and interior. However, he also notes that the impression is of a *perfect* castle, ancient in appearance but with clean angles. While the style may be a conscious reflection of architecture of the past, the exterior was as classical as the inside in its symmetry and order. 'The design is so neat and perfect that its general form irresistibly suggests comparison with a vast toy fort rather than a medieval castle' (Lindsay and Cosh 1973, 37).

Various plans for Inveraray included a Palladian scheme, and the military design of Dugald Campbell (figure 8.1). These were rejected, but elements of both are discernable in the accepted design of Roger Morris. The original arrangement provided service quarters in the sunken basement which was hidden by a fosse, above that the principal floor with the state and family apartments, and a bedroom floor above that. The side and end walls consisted of, respectively, seven and five bays, and the angle towers had three windows and two arrow slits. The main feature of the house was the central tower rising above the battlemented outer walls and a lean-to roof. Crenellated and flat-roofed corner turrets, almost detached from the main structure, complemented the central tower. Lower than the tower they were still a storey higher than the rest of the house, and so continued the almost medieval vertical pull of the building (figure 8.2).

The relative heights of the storeys, divided by plain string-courses, reflect their importance. The main windows of the principal floor were later lengthened to finish at floor level, and as part of the fifth Duke's internal remodelling the style was also changed in the 1770s. Although on the outside the windows maintained their Gothick pointed arches (figure 8.3), from the inside these were to be masked and the view became framed by circular-headed top sashes (Lindsay and Cosh 1973, 200). This emphasises the importance placed on the views *from* the castle, and again highlights the internal-external paradox of the building.

In Saint-Fond's opinion

The Gothic style was selected, coupled with the best design for the interior, because buildings of the tenth century look well amidst woods, and at the foot of hills. They recall ideas of chivalry connected with the bravery and gallant adventures of those romantic times. These recollections diffuse a kind of charm over the scene: they embellish it, and make it impressive. We are all a little fond of romance (1907, 245-6).

It is the mental and emotional link made with the traditional architecture of power, the medieval castle, which conjures up images of impressiveness and charm. I shall return to this when discussing the interior of the castle.

8.2 The Roles of the Dukes of Argyll: Chiefs, Lords and Politicians

The paradoxical nature of the castle design was reflective of the different roles inherent in the position of the Dukes of Argyll. They were Scottish peers who often held English titles. The second Duke was also Duke of Greenwich, and the fifth Duke was made Baron Sundridge of Combe Park in 1766 (Lindsay and Cosh 1973, 191). The Argyll's outlook had always been more than a localised one. Both the second and third Dukes, for instance, were born in Ham House, Petersham, and spent most of their lives in England (Lindsay and Cosh 1973, 4). In common with many other Scottish aristocrats they were political magnates who were also local landlords. The Dukes of Argyll held both Highland and Lowland estates, and to increase the challenge of their social and political position, they were also Highland chiefs. Therefore their power base, although wide, inhabited completely different worlds where distinct priorities and expectations were held. The Duke of Argyll was many things to many different people, and often these various roles did not react well to one another. In particular many difficulties were caused by, or created friction between, the local and national. The process of modernising the government of the Highlands, the area of the Campbell chief's traditional power base added to tension.

Conflicting interests: local and national positions

As political magnates the fortunes of the Campbells of Argyll had always been closely tied to the monarchy. Both the Marquess (previously the eighth Earl) in 1661, and the ninth Earl in 1685 had been found guilty of treason and executed under Stuart monarchs. It was the tenth Earl of Argyll who administered the coronation oath to William and Mary in 1688, and the 'inherited enmity' (Lindsay and Cosh 1973, 4) to the Stewart dynasty finally brought rewards. In 1703 the Earl received the Dukedom of Argyll and his political importance increased. After 1688 the interests of the Duke of Argyll and the government were interdependent. There was no longer the close alliance with the Scottish crown, but 'by forging a new alliance with the Presbyterian cause and eventually with the Whig party, the house of Argyll had maintained itself, through many vicissitudes, as the controlling force in the west Highlands and as the indispensable agents of the central government' (Creegan 1996, 6). While strengthening his national position though, the Duke was ensuring more localised problems. Identified as leaders of the anti-Stuart movement and indelibly linked with the settlement of 1688, enmity in the Highlands was assured, particularly as various clans had once again lost lands and power to the Campbells.

The development of the Campbell territories in Scotland had never been conducive to contentment and stability. The whole process also weakened the relationship between a chief and his clan. In the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries the Lords of Argyll had been entrusted with reducing the Highlands to obedience. In effect this meant the destruction of the chief rival of the Campbells, Clan Donald whose territories covered an area more than one-third the size of Scotland. By 1607 this was complete, and the Campbells were

rewarded with the greater part of their old rivals' possessions. Adding to clan rivalry the Marquess took advantage of the financial problems of the MacLeans to expand his lands further. By 1700 the Earl of Argyll was the overlord of most of the landowners and chiefs in Argyll and parts of west Inverness-shire; and his own estates had quadrupled in size to cover at least 500 square miles (Creegan 1996, 5). The estate was 'the greatest and most prosperous in the Highlands, and the one to which the most comprehensive heritable jurisdictions adhered' (Mitchison 1996, 26).

However, much of the Argyll estate consisted of lands traditionally belonging to other clans, therefore many of the tenants while reliant on the Duke for their use of the land, still owed allegiance to other chiefs. This was partially settled by bringing people into the area who were either of the clan Campbell, allied to it, or Lowlanders from outside the clan system. However, throughout the eighteenth century disaffection towards the Campbells continued, causing political and economic tensions.

'Managers for Scotland': Power and patronage

Problems at a regional or local level added to the political manoeuvring required of the Dukes of Argyll at national level. With the abolition of the Privy Council (in 1708) problems in the Highlands were exacerbated. It was the Privy Council that had understood and played one chief off against another to maintain a balance of power in the area (Mitchison 1996, 27) (see chapter seven). Government was now mainly carried out through the law courts. However, 'over and above this more or less formal structure stood the Dukes of Argyll', the second Duke and his brother the Earl of Islay (later the third Duke) 'were managers for Scotland, controlling the patronage with a minuteness that led to constant complaints about dictatorship' (Mitchison 1996, 25-6).

The key to the Argyll domination of Scottish politics was patronage. By 1730 almost all judges owed their position to the Duke or his brother. The Duke was the hereditary sheriff of Argyll, and he also controlled the Commissioners of Supply and Justices of the Peace in the area who were for the most part Campbells. Both the second and third Dukes forged close personal bonds with influential members of the judicial system. The second Duke used the Lord President, Forbes of Culloden as his estate adviser and agent, and the third Duke used the Lord Justice Clerk, Lord Milton for the same purpose (Mitchison 1996, 26). Government at estate or local level was inextricably linked with decisions made at national level. The Duke's traditional position as chief of the Campbells was used to effect in his role in government in Edinburgh and London. It is ironic that he deliberately used his power and influence, giving patronage to those of his own name over whom he held nominal control for example, to augment his influence in the 'modern' world of the British governmental and judicial systems. His power in the Highlands helped his position in central government, which then allowed him the ability to change the structure of power that he had used with such purpose to gain him his position.

Although the Argyll's were recognised as viceroys, with Islay being referred to as 'King of Scotland' (Simpson 1996, 48-9) they were not given a free hand, and the third Duke, in particular, was used for a purpose by Walpole. 'Walpole was master in London, and Islay his invaluable lieutenant' (Mitchison 1996, 35). The absence of a Secretary of State for Scotland after Roxburghe's dismissal allowed for patronage to continue to be used as a weapon to gain power. With such a strong inherited power base Argyll and Islay were hard to control without the power vacuum left by the removal of a Secretary of

State being filled. 'The strongest-handed administration of its epoch, simply because its Scottish strategy ignored the need for a balance of forces, suffered a slow draining away of its patronage into the greedy maw of Clan Diarmid' (Simpson 1996, 55).

The Excise Crisis in 1733 led to the second Duke of Argyll's break with Walpole and alignment with his old opponents the Squadrone; they took just over half of the seats from the government in the elections of 1741 (Simpson 1996, 55-6). Walpole resigned in 1742, but although the Duke was prevailed upon to accept office for himself he 'hurled in his resignation and rushed off again to the political wilderness' (Simpson 1996, 57), and died in October 1743. This all indicates the unstable and manipulative political atmosphere, particularly as the brothers were not always in agreement. It also suggests that even a man of the power and influence of the Duke of Argyll was not always confident of his position. Reconciling a number of often conflicting roles, and maintaining each of them simultaneously was not always easy, 'it is hard not to sympathise with a man so evidently designed for a brilliant part, yet eternally at odds with the script, with his fellow players, and with himself' (Simpson 1996, 58). It was the second Duke who began to make changes at Inveraray.

On a number of occasions the position of Argyll and Islay was literally unstable as they moved in and out of office and influence. The second Duke was dismissed from all offices three times, moving from high favour to disgrace. This may reflect an attempt at balancing power in Scotland, or fear of the power of the Campbells. In 1745 Islay, then the third Duke, even had to persuade the King to accept him as the hereditary Lieutenant of Argyll (Mitchison 1996, 40-2).

Political manoeuvring continued in tandem with challenging events. After the Jacobite rising of 1745 Duke Archibald strove to suppress the rebellion without being seen to help his opponent Tweeddale, the new Secretary of State for Scotland (Simpson 1996, 58-9). His other actions at this politically sensitive time show the difficulty of his position. He sent reports on movements in the Highlands to the government in London but he also left Scotland, returning via Edinburgh to London. The need to appeal to various people of different political opinions and social positions meant he had to judge his actions carefully, 'he posted to London: the King was to see that he was not in Rebellion; the Rebels that he was not in arms' (Walpole 1847, I 275-8). Once safe in London he was confined due to illness but he still corresponded with Scotland, often using secret ink. However, once the rising was over positions could be stated more clearly. The foundation stone of the new castle at Inveraray carried an invocation to the Duke of Cumberland, reviled in the Highlands as the man responsible for the harsh retributions after Culloden. Laid on the 1st October 1746 the inscription reads 'CAL. OCT. ANNO DOM. MDCCXLVI POSUIT A. A. DUX GULIELMUS CUMBRIAE DUX NOBIS HAEC OTIA FECIT'¹(Lindsay and Cosh 1973, 56). Affiliation with such a figure as the Duke of Cumberland, especially in 1746, unequivocally associated the Duke of Argyll and his family with the government.

The different types of power held by the Dukes of Argyll were, to make matters more problematic, interdependent. Islay had been 'building on his natural power-base in Scotland a superstructure that made him alarmingly strong' (Simpson 1996, 61). Lord Newcastle worried about trusting Islay, wanting him excluded from influence while

¹ Laid on the first of October in the Year of Our Lord 1746 William Duke of Cumberland Made These Delights for Us.

wanting to use his power. When the second Duke of Argyll had linked up with the Squadrone in 1741 seats had swung away from Robert Walpole in Scotland. However, this breach in the relationship between the Duke and Walpole and the latter's transferral of friendship to Islay, is significant for what it demonstrates about the dependence of influence in different spheres upon each other. Islay was not as beneficial to the government as his brother at this stage, because he did not have the standing in the Highlands of an actual chieftainship (Mitchison 1996, 36-7). This irony must be emphasised. The traditional power and position of a chief was needed in order to fully effect the desired change to the modern system, while at the same time maintaining control.

Eighteenth century clan chiefs: modernisation and maintenance

Archibald, the third Duke of Argyll epitomises the precarious line taken between maintaining a traditional role and leading and controlling the process of drawing the Highlands into contemporary Lowland life (Creegan 1996, 5). The Highlands were not suited to the system of government in place in more Lowland areas. Even in the early eighteenth century clan chiefs still had greater authority than the government in Edinburgh, and certainly than the far distant Westminster. Illegal activities such as feuding and cattle theft still thrived. 'Such an area needed to be controlled by law backed by force, and also to be cajoled or coerced by political pressures' (Mitchison 1996, 26). The role of a Highland chief greatly differed to that of a Lowland landlord.

The third Duke had long advocated change in the system of government in the Highlands. When heritable jurisdictions were abolished in 1747 the third Duke backed the bill. He was against heritable jurisdictions, and clanship in general, as both put private

before public justice. He did, however, benefit, if not depend on both. He spoke for the bill, but 'Had I not been informed before that he was to speak for the bill I should have thought from his facts and reasonings that he intended to vote ag't it' wrote Andrew Mitchell (Warrand 1923-30, v 180). He had another incentive. When the bill passed he received the huge compensation of £21000, more than an eighth of the entire sum allowed for the purpose (Simpson 1996, 61).

As land became a source of revenues rather than of an armed following sentimental ties between the chief and clan weakened. The second Duke of Argyll hastened this process and the Argyll estate suffered the problems this created. In 1737 (1710 in Kintyre) the Duke changed the system of tacks so that they went to the highest bidder, so putting the renting of land on a contractual basis rather than adhering to personal loyalties. This modernisation was intended to 'skilfully drive a wedge between the tacksmen and their dependents' (Creegan 1996, 11). Rents were substantially raised but the labour services sub-tacksmen owed to tacksmen were abolished at the same time. Benefits were intended for both the ducal coffers and the sub-tenants of the estate. Moreover, creating direct tenants out of sub-tacksmen increased the potential for control over them.

However, the decisions of the second Duke effectively reduced his position as a chief to a mere landlord. Economically the plan proved to be not as successful as intended. More importantly the changing basis of land tenure to a contract weakened loyalty to the chief. This was dangerous in territory already encompassing a far from homogenous population, particularly as it included other clans whose lands had been annexed by the Duke of Argyll's ancestors, and consequently felt no loyalty to him. Serious problems

were created. For example, cattle raiders attacked Inveraray, the heart of Campbell power in the west Highlands, ‘and it is difficult to see how they got there without Campbell connivance’ (Mitchison 1996, 37; *S.P. Box 402*). The third Duke understood the weakness of his brother’s plan and immediately upon his succession made changes to the requirements of a tack. As a precondition of tenancy on his estate he demanded political loyalty. All tenants had to take the Oath of Allegiance ‘and a promissory oath never to raise or encourage any rising in rebellion against the present government’ (*Inv MSS v65*). The effect of this was intended to be increased by the careful choosing of tenants in the first place, ‘You are to use your Endeavours to Introduce tenants well dispos’d to the Government and my family’ (*S.P. Box 402*). At the same time he tried to pacify local Jacobite chiefs by returning lands that had come under his superiority with the forfeitures after 1715 (Mitchison 1996, 38). While showing the Duke’s difficult position, this also suggests the political and social aptitude of the Duke for understanding what people required of him, or what was needed to keep them content and peaceful under his control. Clan allegiance became more important than ever as the Duke was trying to remove it. He understood there was a fine line between modernising and maintaining his role. Creating a power vacuum would have been dangerous.

From 1743 for about a generation the Campbells continued to monopolise, with patronage used to encourage political support. Local tacksmen saw economic advantages in ducal improvements and began to emulate them. The third Duke successfully achieved the balancing of the dual roles of traditional chief and modern landlord. Estate management was not based purely on economics as implied by the competitive bidding for tacks. Limits of political security and family alliance were adhered to (Creegan 1996,

16). By the end of the eighteenth century, and the supremacy of the fifth Duke, the role of the Campbells of Argyll was changing. Jacobitism was no longer a threat, and modernisation of the system of governing the Highlands had reached a point where the fifth Duke did not need to play such a political role as his predecessors. His family was 'head of a more purely economic organisation and a spokesman of a general highland interest distinct from that of the clan Campbell' (Creegan 1996, 19). This can be seen in changes in the system most often used by the third Duke to gain and maintain influence, patronage. For instance, agents used around the estate were no longer just members of the Duke's clan or family, instead they were professional men trained specifically for their appointed posts.

The country in which the fifth Duke exercised power and influence had greatly progressed since the succession of the third Duke in 1743. The Highlands, in particular, had moved away from their 'semi-feudal inaccessibility' (Lindsay and Cosh 1973, 189). The 1770s were a time of political stability, improved communications, and increased opportunities. It was an 'era of elegance and aristocratic privileges' (Lindsay and Cosh 1973, 189). Whereas the third Duke had had to concern himself with infighting and political manoeuvring at both local and national levels, the fifth Duke was saved from this. His chief concerns were the modern pursuits of industrialisation, development and beautifying. Many of his schemes failed in the long-term due to financial problems. He was not as rich as the third Duke who had benefited from holding office, and labour and material costs had increased since the 1740s. However, 'He is rever'd as a prince in this country' (Jacob Pattison 1780, 11 August). This is the same kind of epithet given to the

second and third Dukes, but it did not denote the same thing. Priorities had changed along with political stability and economic developments.

The fifth Duke was praised because of improvement, and because of the house and town he created. These were seen as aesthetic *and* social achievements. The second and third Dukes were admired because of their political and social roles, their power and influence over government, and their strong power base in the Highlands. The fifth Duke was landlord over a different population and he needed to maintain his position in the Highlands. However, his preoccupations suggest that while improving the conditions of his tenants the perceptions of outsiders were still important to a man in his position. This was emphasised by the fashion of tourism. The third Duke had concerns at a national level, but his autocratic power in the Highlands was not doubted by those in Edinburgh and London, in fact it was probably feared. It was local opinion which he and his brother had to consider, making changes, including the physical ones seen at Inveraray, to ensure a stable, peaceful power base.

The three Dukes: Monarch, Man of the World and 'Model of Manly Grace'

Political and social roles were influenced by, and reflective of, the characters of the various Dukes. Moreover, they influenced the intended and the ultimate use of the house built at Inveraray. The second Duke was 'too much the monarch in the West Highlands to make a good courtier in London' (Ferguson 1968, 145). He was an old-style clan chief, but he was also intent on improving his estates, beginning the protracted developments made at Inveraray. Whereas the Duke instigated developments he did so without the long-term intention of changing the system, or his rights and duties. Lord Islay, before even becoming Duke, intended to change power structures, as with the abolition of

heritable jurisdictions. As has been discussed, the necessity of maintaining a position while attempting to make changes was difficult.

The second Duke was a family man; the third Duke was the opposite. By the time of his succession at the age of sixty-one he had long been a widower and had no legitimate children. Usually resident in London he required a home in Inveraray for his visits every year, he did not require a family residence. He was a 'man of the world', concerned with science and politics rather than art and high society.

However, although he was modern in his opinions and attitudes he 'knew when to back pedal to the security of the old clan loyalties' as when dealing with the disaffection caused by his brother's changes in estate management (Simpson 1996, 65). As a good judge of people and their expectations he understood the importance of image. His traditional status was impressive but he also needed to compete with London high society. 'The possession of five thousand fighting men as a personal following no doubt lent a certain romantic grandeur to the Duke of Argyll in the eyes of his peers, but the spending of five thousand pounds a year was more necessary if the Duke was not to appear down at heel among the Russells, the Stanhopes and the Pelhams' (Creegan 1996, 10). Again, this suggests the awareness of the appropriate impressions to be given to different audiences.

In contrast the fifth Duke was a family man. He was married to Elizabeth Gunning, Duchess of Hamilton from an earlier marriage. The Duchess understood 'society' as well as her husband as wife to two Dukes and mother to two more (her eldest son, the seventh Duke of Hamilton died at fourteen, and was succeeded by his brother). She was charming and a good politician, managing the Hamilton elections for instance (Lindsay and Cosh

1973, 191). As a large and close family the Duke needed somewhere for them and their friends to stay. He was comparatively young at his succession, only forty-seven, was rich and privileged, and intent on making his mark. Like the third Duke his interests were those of science and improvement, and in London he entertained little.

Anne McVicar, later Mrs Grant of Laggan, praised the Duke after a visit to Inveraray in 1807

A model of manly grace in his day...One hears so little about him, he is so quietly passed over to make room for dashers and feasters, and fighters, and talkers. He does not wish to be talked of 'tis certain...I have a whole volume to write of this good Duke's worth, and wisdom, which improves and blesses the whole country...this modest and amiable benefactor of mankind (1845, I 18).

Whereas the fifth Duke was not necessarily outstanding in the context of fashionable London, in the romantic setting of his Highland home his status and activities became impressive. These opinions also reflect the times in which the Dukes lived. The third Duke was ahead of his time and met resistance, the fifth Duke was in tune with his.

'A Princely Edifice': A New Inveraray Castle

Inveraray Castle was built with certain functions in mind. The changing needs and attitudes of the Dukes are reflected in the actual structure and uses of the house. The third Duke had Inveraray Castle built, but at the time of his death the house was unfinished, and he had not spent a single night in his house (Lindsay and Cosh 1973, 181). The relative family positions of the third and fifth Dukes have been mentioned, with the latter requiring a home for his family when they were in the Highlands, although this was still only seasonal. Inveraray had not provided a home for the family for some time. The second and third Dukes' mother, for instance, had lived in Argyll but inhabited Limecraigs in Kintyre (Lindsay and Cosh 1973, 15).

Convenience demanded that a new building be constructed at Inveraray, somewhere for the Dukes to entertain within their traditional sphere of authority. The old castle had been uninhabitable for years. First built in about 1432, by the eighteenth century the L-shaped structure was ruinous, used to house a few old servants and the town arms. In 1720-1 the second Duke had the 'Pavilion' 'a House of two Stories and Garret having a Jamb and a small Court' (MacPhail 1916, xii) built for his use when he visited. It was only ever intended as a temporary solution, though it remained as accommodation until the 1770s (Lindsay and Cosh 1973, 25-6). The building stood on one side of the old castle courtyard, with an opposite structure built for Sheriff Stonefield. A garden made in 1721 completed the complex with several houses demolished for his pleasure. Evidently the arrangements at Inveraray were not suitable for ducal purposes.

A survey of the old castle and pavilion commissioned by the third Duke prior to deciding to build a new castle concluded that the cost of repairing and restoring the old structure would be prohibitive (Lindsay and Cosh 1973, 27). The second Duke had considered a new building, with plans being put forward by Vanbrugh, but presumably the cost had prevented him from proceeding. When the third Duke planned his first visit to Inveraray after his succession he was advised by his Sheriff Depute and Chamberlain of Argyll, Archibald Campbell of Stonefield, to limit the size of his intended party 'till he sees what accommodation there is for him, which I can venture to tell you is none of the best' (S41 Stonefield to Lady Milton 7 June 1744). The Duke wished to visit Inveraray every autumn to deal with problems, audit his finances, and carry out his intended changes to his estates and the town. To do this he required somewhere to live appropriate

to his social and political standing, where he could bring friends and accommodate them in comfort and style.

However, this is not just a matter of convenience. A Duke required a ducal residence, a fitting physical expression of his status. The wealth and power needed to build houses of the magnitude of Inveraray Castle was enormous, and would be evident to all who came into contact with it. As Samuel Johnson remarked in 1773 ‘What I admire here is the total defiance of all expense’ (Boswell 1963, 353). The efforts taken certainly imply that the house was designed with more than practical motives in mind, particularly as the financial problems it created were far from convenient. The construction of a new house rather than a renovation allowed for the expression of various priorities with none of the obstructions engendered in the modification of an old building. Both the third and the fifth Dukes overcame serious financial difficulties created by expenditure at Inveraray. A report drawn up in 1771 for the fifth Duke revealed that expenditure on Inveraray had averaged £4500 a year, which equalled about half the net income from his Scottish estates (*Inv/Report by James Ferrier 1777/8*).

Regardless of the almost crippling expense the building of country houses was an expected aristocratic activity. The ducal library contained works, for example, by Robert Morris, his 1728 *Essay in Defence of Ancient Architecture* and 1734 *Lectures in Architecture* (Lindsay and Cosh 1973, 68). To be seen designing and constructing houses and creating landscapes was more important than the actual practicalities of construction involved. It was the pursuit of a fashionable modern man, a title which applied to both the third and the fifth Dukes, although neither was a connoisseur of, or even particularly interested in, art.

It is equally possible that the third Duke saw Inveraray as a kind of challenge or experiment, as with his estate in Peebleshire known as the Whim (figure 8.4). This moorland tract, known as 'Blair Bogg' when the Duke had purchased it in 1729 underwent extensive improvement including draining and planting. It was 'appropriately named as a personal enthusiasm of the Duke's, regarded by his contemporaries as eccentric folly' (Lindsay and Cosh 1973, 17). The Duke had carried out a similar experiment earlier at Whitton, a barren area of Hounslow Heath where he successfully planted and cultivated exotic trees and shrubs (Lindsay and Cosh 1973, 10). As a shrewd lawyer, and an excellent judge of people and their expectations it is possible that in the case of Inveraray, where his schemes could be carried out on a greater scale, and which constituted the ideal place to demonstrate and symbolise all the facets of his position and his accomplishments as a 'man of the world', he viewed his challenge as intellectual and socio-political.

The motives of the fifth Duke may have been similar, but unlike the third Duke he was able to use the new house for its intended purpose. Inveraray Castle was an enclave of hospitality and entertainment for family, friends, dignitaries and random well-positioned tourists. Before his succession the fifth Duke and his family divided their time in Scotland between Hamilton and the Clachan near Rosneath Castle on Loch Long. In 1771 they took up residence at Inveraray where the house was unfinished but ready for occupation. The necessary work to make the building habitable took another two or three years. Quotes from visitors to the fully functioning castle are enlightening, implying that everything had been considered carefully and presented a good impression. Colonel Thomas Thornton in 1786 noted that, 'So much has good sense been exercised in making

the useful the first object, the beautiful the second, which has not been always attended to in houses of such consequence'. Mrs Thrale's compliment was more lyrical, 'Inveraray promises a gentle Reception, and its Interior cherishes every Hope' (Thornton 1804; Thrale 1789).

Although Inveraray did 'promise a gentle Reception', a subtle formality governed the process of admittance to the castle, masked by the convivial welcome extended by the family. This constituted the gaining of permission for access, either by invitation, or by sending word to the castle usually with letters of introduction (as Faujas de Saint-Fond in 1787) from the inn requesting an audience. Mr Bailey in 1787 had no introduction to the Duke but was advised at the inn that in order to visit the castle

It would be right in me to send my name, and additions, to the Duchess of Argyle, and also to signify to her Grace, on the same card, the objects of my journey. I was moreover, instructed to point out the route I had taken, and to mention the names of the principal towns, islands, ruins, and other remarkable objects I had visited. This, I was informed, would secure me a marked attention... The result was a person was immediately dispatched to me, who had orders to attend me during my stay, and who was not to quit me so long as I might think him useful (Bailey 1787).

This seems to have ensured that the Duchess received an interesting man of respectable position. At the same time as showing regard for a visitor, and presenting a favourable impression of the family, the provision of a guide ensured a prohibitive element to the ducal generosity. Mr Bailey spent the morning viewing the grounds with his escort and returned to the castle at one, 'the hour which had been recommended to me as the most proper for surveying the interior of that princely edifice' (1787). While visitors were allowed access their movements and perceptions were manipulated, by the layout of the grounds, by human direction, and by time.

It is possible that Inveraray was to some extent thought of as a retreat. The third Duke upon his succession wrote to his confidante Lord Milton,

As for the necessity of my being some time in Scotland, it's very obvious, and curiosity alone if it were not my love of laying out Grounds and Gardening would draw me thither, especially considering, that I have now done with Political Ambition, and shall be very unwilling to meddle in such sort of Storms, but content myself merely to satisfie my tastes in things that can occasion no disquiet (*S401 Argyll3 to Milton 12 November 1743*).

Of course the Duke did not begin to live a quiet, reclusive life in the Highlands, though his comment does indicate his genuine interest in gardens. However, the castle was never considered, nor was it ever intended as a private place. When the fifth Duke left on an extended visit to Flanders in 1789 preparations were made to close the house down. The Duchess was in failing health (she died in 1790) and only a skeleton staff was left to air the rooms and to see to maintenance. However, one of the caretaker's specified roles was to show the house to visitors. The castle was acknowledged as both a private and a public place, and this provision for tourists indicates the owner's awareness of this dual role.

8.3 Inside Inveraray Castle

The process of building the new castle at Inveraray began with Roger Morris as architect and William Adam as the supervisor. Adam died in June 1748, Morris in February 1749, and thereafter work was continued by John Adam who had been involved with castle projects since designing the Garron Bridge in 1748 (Lindsay and Cosh 1973, 32). When the fifth Duke revived the transformation in 1770 he employed Robert Mylne. He supervised the reversal in orientation of the principal entrance from the south west to the north east front, and the elaborate decoration of the state rooms in the 1780s. Therefore the structure proceeded in two phases, up to the third Duke's death in 1761,

and from the fifth Duke's succession in 1770. It is essential to remember that the fifth Duke's circumstances were different chiefly due to the fact that he was able to use the house.

The process began in 1745 with the digging of the fosse. Excavation of this was completed between 1756-8, and in the meantime the walls had reached battlement level by 1754 (Lindsay and Cosh 1973, 70). By 1758 the castle was structurally complete, but still uninhabitable. The house was completed in about 1775, with the decorative changes added in the 1780s.

The plan of Inveraray is deceptively simple, roughly square, with almost detached towers at each corner. The old and new castles were oriented on the line of an avenue with access proceeding across level bridges to the principal floor (figure 8.5). Vaulted cellars or casemates were built at the centre of each outer side-wall and on the outer arc of each curve wall in the fosse. In contrast to the Gothick exterior the strict lateral symmetry of the plan was classical. This remained unaltered in the 1770s except for the unequal subdivision of the north east gallery (figure 8.6). In the contemporary opinion of Faujas de Saint-Fond the house was laid out 'in a manner equally elegant and commodious'. As it should be in the country, more attention was paid to 'the luxury of simplicity, and the extreme of neatness' (1907, 245).

Service Areas: The Basement and Attic

Access to the fosse and the hidden basement was down curving stone stairs and through doorways in the north west and south east end walls. Originally these opened into two servants halls, but there were soon passages partitioned off from these (RCAHMS 1992, 379). As access to the service area this was essentially for servants, not

visitors, as evident in the idea of the sunken basement. Access to the main body of the house was provided by straight flights of steps against the inner walls of the central stair-halls, where they were effectively hidden from view. There were also two spiral service-stairs behind the apsidal north east end of the central vestibule. Further access to the principal floor was added later, and will be discussed with appropriate areas of the house.

The sunken basement with its hidden service area was an ideal advocated by Palladio. Contemporaries also valued the usefulness of the fosse. William Burrell in 1758 was particularly impressed that ‘no servants appear except those who must necessarily attend, nor are any of the Transactions or Business of the Family apparent from above Stairs...’ (1758, 22). Later accounts criticise this arrangement, but this reflects changing aesthetic taste rather than social or practical comment.

The whole basement was stone-flagged and vaulted. In plan the central vault was originally a wine cellar. The old kitchen was in the south west front, and was provided with a water supply from the adjacent ‘great cistern’ (RCAHMS 1992, 379) (figure 8.7). A long north east compartment was divided into seven rooms by partition walls added after the main structure was completed. Three interconnecting central rooms had fireplaces which suggests they were intended as work rooms, or rooms for particular servants, rather than store rooms. The original function of many rooms is uncertain, but *Vitruvius Scoticus* provides a guide (RCAHMS 1992, 381). However, these three middle rooms are marked as a pantry and two larders, with one a possible ‘milk house’ which seems unlikely as plans indicate that they were provided with heat. These three compartments were separated by corridors from the wider rooms at the north and east angles, which in turn had access to the angle-towers by mural passages. The room on the

north east side was a steward's hall with the butler's room in the adjacent turret; and in the south east angle the housekeeper's room led to a store room or dry pantry in the tower (RCAHMS 1992, 381). The identities of the inhabitants of the larger rooms cut off by corridors are important. The accommodation of principal servants in their own apartments, provided with comparative privacy, suggests the adherence to a hierarchy below stairs.

The servants' halls already mentioned had adjacent smaller rooms, one a Porter's Lodge, the other a 'Lattermeat Hall'. The west room was a scullery with a pastry room in the turret, and the south room and turret had been adapted during construction to contain water-closets. It is interesting that Morris noted the passages leading north east and south west from the stairs halls afforded space 'where many Presses, Cupboards and Closets may be made, which will give great Conveniences to Servants to put things out of the way'.

Other provision for the servants was situated in the other extreme of the house, the attic (figure 8.8). Original access to the low-roof space was via the two spiral stairs which afforded access for the servants throughout the whole space of the house, from the basement to the dormitories in the attic. In 1751 John Adam prepared a plan with corridors leading from the separate stairs to dormitories for the female servants in the south east front and for the footmen in the north west, each with seven beds and lit by skylights. Two rooms labelled as being for 'Servants out of Livery' each with a single bed were proposed at the centre of the north east front and the adjacent angle rooms. The south west front designated as 'lumber garrets' were fitted up for 'principal servants' in 1771 (RCAHMS 1992, 399). The majority of servants were segregated in terms of space

from the main body of the house, but they were also separated from each other in terms of gender and status within the household hierarchy. Other provision for servants did not follow this general pattern though, with large cupboard style rooms being created by partitioning off main bedrooms or under stairs areas. Although they were probably used to accommodate more personal and therefore trusted servants, they seem to suggest that privacy could be considered secondary to practicality. On the other hand they could have been the best solution to the problem of space. For example, the areas below the half-landings at the north east end of the stair halls on the principal floor were provided with angle fireplaces, and some plans show them as being partitioned off as servants' rooms. This would make sense as they had easy access to the adjacent dressing rooms which they may have served, and the stair hall and spiral stairs that provided service access throughout the house.

The Principal Floor

The original procession of visitors to the house followed an axial route from the Great Avenue, through the entrance hall to the central vestibule flanked by stair halls, to the gallery (figure 8.9). In the west and south angles flanking the entrance hall were drawing rooms with adjacent bedchambers and dressing rooms creating an apartment layout, centred on groups of rooms (figure 8.10). Doorways in the side-walls of the central hall led to the stair-halls and to dressing rooms on the north west and south east fronts. Small round-headed doorways flanking the apse with the door through to the gallery gave access from the spiral service-stairs. The main flights of stairs were entered at the south west ends, close to the doorways leading to the parlours and bedchambers of the apartments (RCAHMS 1992, 391). These doors were preceded by small lobbies that

presumably created an impression of being isolated from the main flow through the house.

In 1771 Mylne supervised the complete reversal of the principal floor for the fifth Duke (figure 8.11). The visitors route through the house now changed as they entered the house through a small entrance hall in what used to be the gallery, passed through the central vestibule, and emerged into the saloon or ‘summer parlour’ which had been the original entrance hall (figure 8.12). So, on her visit to the castle in April 1773 Anne McVicar found herself ‘suddenly ushered into a beautiful summer parlour, which had a sashed door that opened into a beautiful lawn’ (Grant 1845, 17). This linked into the new entrance to be provided from the Garron Bridge (1775), so ensured that the route through the house was still centred on an approach. Partition walls in the old gallery formed the new entrance hall that was flanked by the great drawing room (plate 8.1), and the great dining room. The east angle was partitioned to provide a dressing room for the Duke. The state dining room had connecting doors from the entrance hall to the Duke’s dressing room.

The central hall surrounded by other apartments adheres to the Palladian principle of centralising, allowing for symmetry in the plan of a structure. At Inveraray the central vestibule, although classical in principle was the only room to include any elements of Gothick design. In 1783 muskets and swords were arranged in fans around the walls (RCAHMS 1992, 391). Faujas de Saint-Fond also pointed out,

There appears, however, to have been a desire to recall even here some reminiscences of the Gothic, for in the perspective of the staircase, a large niche, ornamented with groups of Gothic columns, has had placed in it a large organ-case which gives an imposing and religious air to the place (1907, 145).

The vestibule rises through the first floor space with balconies at the end-walls and large round-headed openings into the stair-halls at the sides, past arch-pointed tower windows and corresponding upper openings in the side walls, to a ceiling which was originally vaulted at a height of twenty-two metres (RCAHMS 1992, 391). This emphasis on verticality echoes the impression created outside by the central tower and reflects the medieval preoccupation with height as an expression of power. The impression created inside is one of grandeur and scale, with a conscious desire to make an impact on an audience. Anybody could understand the statement of wealth inherent in such a design. An educated audience would also appreciate the implied symbolic association between the medieval imagery and the status, particularly the traditional role of Highland chief, of the owner.

The vestibule led into the saloon, which had been the original entrance hall. Doorways at either end of this room connected to the parlours of the private apartments. These doors were built without pilastered architraves (RCAHMS 1992, 391) emphasising the entrance leading to the other public rooms and isolating them from the public nature of the rest of the room. Access beyond these doors required particular permission. The saloon was the biggest room, provided with two fireplaces, and was used for a number of different reasons. When Faujas de Saint-Fond stayed at the castle this was the

large room, ornamented with historical pictures of the family...Here we find several tables, covered with tea-kettles, fresh cream, excellent butter, rolls of several kinds, and in the midst of all, bouquets of flowers, newspapers, and books. There are besides, in this room, a billiard-table, pianos, and other musical instruments (1907, 248-9).

These accoutrements suggest that the saloon was the focal point for entertaining in the house.

The private apartments consisted of a parlour with adjacent turret, a bedchamber and a dressing room. The private parlour or drawing room in the south angle was used as such by the fifth Duke and Duchess, and the connecting turret room was referred to as the 'Dutchess round Tour' (RCAHMS 1992, 393). In the 1780s this small room was used as a breakfast room and fitted with a stair from the basement. This provided access to the room without the servants having to pass through the main body of the house. The size of the room and the fact that for a guest to reach it they would have to pass through the private drawing room, implies that only family members or close acquaintances would breakfast there. The bedchamber of this apartment was the State Bedchamber, with the adjacent dressing room used by the Duchess. The room to the north east was that partitioned off in 1771 to form the fifth Duke's dressing room and the turret became his study, with classical bookcases fitted in 1796 (RCAHMS 1992, 396). Both the Duke and Duchess' dressing rooms may have had unusual arrangements for their personal servants, in the form of an entresol storey, effectively partitioning off space near the ceiling. In December 1771 a doorway on the staircase was ordered to be cut to serve the 'Intersole' above the small (Duke's) dressing room (Lindsay and Cosh 1973, 197).

According to the original arrangement the Duke's bedchamber was to be in the opposite north west apartment. However, as pointed out before the third Duke did not have to consider family accommodation for anyone but himself. The fifth Duke and Duchess evidently preferred the south east side and took advantage of the ability to partition off a space for another dressing room, effectively extending their private apartment across the whole south east side of the building, with room to accommodate

them both comfortably in an area next to, but separate from, the rest of the house (figure 8.13).

The Bedroom Floor

The bedroom floor is less complicated than the rest of the house, having one specific uniform purpose. Bedchambers were to accommodate guests of varying importance though, so consequently they were of different standards. Early plans show the intention to have several of the principal bedchambers designed with the heads of the beds in alcoves, flanked by doors to a lobby on one side, and a small closet on the other (figure 8.14). Only four of these ‘Alcove Bed Chambers’ were completed in about 1758, in the south and west angles, and the large bedrooms in the south east and north west fronts. Other spaces intended as alcoves were combined to create more closet or bedroom spaces (RCAHMS 1992, 398). Thomas Pennant noted in 1769 that there were ‘eighteen good bed-chambers’ (Pennant 1769). The number of bedrooms signifies more than any other feature the hospitable role of the house.

A Visitor’s Glimpse of Daily Routine

The visit of Faujas de Saint-Fond allows a rare glimpse into the routine of daily life when the fifth Duke was in residence. The company at the castle was large, and the hospitable atmosphere of the house shown in the willingness to include Saint-Fond in the company. In fact the Duke ‘wished to have the pleasure of detaining us for a few weeks’, though Saint-Fond only stayed for three days. He paints a neat picture of family life, with the children of the Duke and Duchess at home, and a ‘physician and chaplain formed the rest of the family circle’ (1907, 247).

Visitors rose at any time they wished and went riding or hunting or walking, spending the time as they pleased until at ten o' clock a bell rang to warn the family and guests that it was breakfast time. This took place in the saloon. Again everyone was free to walk, read, play music or retire to his or her rooms until the dinner bell rang at 4.30. The table was usually laid for twenty-five to thirty covers. The chaplain made the blessing, and then the diners enjoyed the meal prepared by the Duke's French chef. This was appreciated by Saint-Fond,

The entrees, the roti, the entremets are all served as in France with the same variety and abundance. If the poultry be not so juicy as in Paris, one eats here in compensation hazel-hens, and above all moorfowl, delicious fish, and vegetables, the quality of which maintains the reputation of the Scottish gardeners who grow them (Saint-Fond 1907, 252).

After the meal the ladies withdrew to take tea. He admits that 'they were left alone a little too long; but the Duke of Argyll informed me, that he had preserved this custom in the country, in order that the people of the district might not be offended by the breach of an ancient practice to which they had always been accustomed' (1907, 253). This is a reminder of the deference given to tradition even in such a modern atmosphere as the improved landscape and tourist attraction of Inveraray in the 1780s. Later, after many toasts, the men joined the ladies in the drawing room and were served with tea and coffee. When tea was over some retired to their rooms while conversation and music continued in the drawing room, and others took advantage of walks around the grounds. The routine of the day ended with an informal supper at ten o'clock for those who wished to partake. Daily life at the castle appeared to be remarkably informal and relaxed, though at the same time it was governed by rules, of behaviour, of time, and of place.

8.4 Inveraray Town: Removal and Segregation

Inveraray is located about ten miles down the west side of Loch Fyne where the River Aray flows out into the loch. Passes through Glen Shira and the trade route of Glen Aray provided access to Tyndrum and Loch Awe respectively (figure 8.15). The town of Inveraray was small but was the only burgh for miles around, constituting ‘the marketing centre of an alluvial plain’ (Fraser 1977, 7). Town and castle grew and worked together, and this symbiotic relationship ensured that each influenced developments in the other. Whereas the castle and its inhabitants invited trade and actively encouraged industry and economic growth, the town both attracted tourists and helped to entertain them. The town was redesigned in the eighteenth century to promote an ordered, balanced impression and to create a unified prospect with the other changes originated by the Dukes. Their control over the town extended to every area of life.

The old town of Inveraray stood in the shadow of the old castle on the west bank of the River Aray (figure 8.16). Although lacking the uniformity or order of the new town, old Inveraray was not a collection of hovels. Close to the castle a bridge crossed the river from an avenue of trees and led into the market place with its Mercat cross, the tolbooth containing court house and gaol, the double church (providing for the Highland or Gaelic, and the Lowland congregations), and a school (figure 8.17). Most of the houses were thatched, but the High Street also contained the town houses of tacksmen, the provost and the sheriff clerk. These were stone built and slated, usually two storeys in height with garrets, and were provided with gardens (Lindsay and Cosh 1973, 20-21; Fraser 1977, 110).

Due to the castle the town benefited from “attractive growth”. In other words the castle provided protection, and at the same time the lifestyle of the Earl and his lady created the demand for and the supply of commodities (Fraser 1977, 7). The granting of burgh of barony status in 1474 by James III ensured the dependence between town and castle. The burgesses were vassals of the Earl, holding their land of him, and being granted office within the town by him (*RMS* No.1168 AD1474). Liberty of trade was granted in 1648 when Inveraray was made a royal burgh, and in July 1649 it was listed as a free royal burgh of Scotland. The Marquess of Argyll (previously the eighth Earl) encouraged merchants and tradesmen to settle in the town. In comparison with the natives these men had money and were given meat and wages as encouragement (Fraser 1977, 10). The people over whom the Earls and Dukes of Argyll exerted their power became more heterogeneous with each effort they made to improve the economic standing of the area. Therefore their authority and appeal had increasingly to accommodate different audiences.

Inveraray was often overrun by soldiers due to its position as a central place on the route to the Western Highlands from the south, and the position of its overlord, and generally the military had to be humoured. In 1644 the town had been laid waste by Montrose. Even when the soldiers were not hostile they caused problems, as in 1745 when they required food and wood already in short supply; or were an imposition as when an English garrison was established in 1656.

The relationship between town and castle changed with the succession of Archibald, Earl of Islay to the Dukedom of Argyll in 1743. His plans for a new castle included the removal of the town clustered around the old castle, to a location outwith the immediate

vicinity of his newly planned house. The site was to be removed to Gallows Foreland Point (its present location). Plans for a new military road would leave the old town bridge as an ornamental feature, and the road would instead follow the lochside and bridge the Aray at its mouth. The new bridge provided a clear view of the castle upon approach (figure 8.18), and also constituted a prominent feature from the castle. Therefore it was required to fit in with the Duke's scheme for the landscape of Inveraray. Like the castle the three-arch 'Sea Bridge' was Gothick in influence, with a battlemented parapet and crenellated bastions with cross-shaped arrow slits terminating the piers²(figure 8.19).

It was inconvenient for the Duke to have the population of the town, the noisy market and the harbour all on the front door step. Wholesale removal of the town had been planned in 1743. 'I intend if possible to remove the Town of Inveraray about half a mile lower down the Loch, but it must be a great secret or else the feus [feus] there will stand in my way or be held up at very extravagant prices' (*S401 Argyll3 to Milton 9 Nov 1743*). The fact that the Duke himself understood the problems that this would cause indicates that the benefits he envisioned would primarily be in his favour. At the same time as his authority is demonstrated through the power to completely relocate a town, his secrecy suggests a more complicated position. As he exercised his power he also had to protect it.

In 1746 inhabitants were served with a summons of removing. The provost was urged to instruct tacksmen to give in proposals regarding the building of a new town (MacTavish 1939, 52). Rights of common pasturage were revoked on the Town Muir in 1750 as it became enclosed within the castle policies, and instead the town cattle could pasture on the farm of Auchnabreac almost two miles from the castle (Fraser 1977, 34-5).

² Unfortunately this bridge was swept away in 1772, when a more classically inspired bridge was constructed in its place.

Some inhabitants of the old town took up plots on the new site, but generally the response was unenthusiastic and unease felt as to the future. The finer feelings of the townspeople were not considered at all. It has been estimated that the summons to remove affected more than a hundred and twenty-two people (Fraser 1977, 114). The Duke found it necessary to issue a Precept of Warning in 1753, and to apply further pressure to remove others in 1758 (MacTavish 1939, 52). At the time of the third Duke's death in 1761 the focus of population was still concentrated in the old town. The fifth Duke completed the process in the 1770s when he ordered the full scale demolition of the remainder of the old town.

The new site was well out of the way of the castle. Physically the Duke was segregating the town population and activities from his policies. The military road from the new Aray Bridge to the town skirted the Wintertown Park, the boundary of which was secured in 1758 with the construction of a six foot high sunken wall (Lindsay and Cosh 1973, 137). While providing a suitable barrier the views to and from the castle were not impeded. Therefore the townspeople and visitors could observe the centre of local authority (which was emphasised by its exclusivity), but were not permitted to enter uninvited. This notion of segregating the town from the castle also applied to the great beech avenue which extended south across the Fisherland Meadow, and effectively cut off the site of the new town on the headland from the parks (figure 8.20). The avenue was strictly private and would therefore provide an established barrier. As the avenue was planted in the late seventeenth century it is realistic to assume that the siting of the town beyond its line was a deliberate effort to create privacy for the castle. Specialised areas

were created also with the town and industry on one side, and the castle and agriculture on the other.

The proposed site of the new town on the headland provided a picturesque view on approach (figure 8.21). Although the town was not completed until the 1770s and 1780s, intentions can be seen from an early stage. The third Duke did not decide on a full plan, but the orientation of the town remained static between plan and construction (figure 8.22). The front of the town faces the direction of the castle and the approach road as it comes down Loch Fyne. Visitors would first see the neat, uniform little town from some distance as they rounded the Loch, receiving a full view of it as they passed over the Garron and then the Aray Bridges. The impression received of the town was significant in plans, it was supposed to be aesthetically pleasing. The control inherent in the Georgian ideals of order and balance also provided a reminder of social order and the presence of a dominating authority.

Houses in the town were left to individuals to build, but with strict rules laid down by the Duke. All houses were to be harled white or near white (Lindsay and Cosh 1973, 267). This provided protection from the rain and a clean aspect to the town, but it also created a strong contrast to the surrounding landscape. The town drew the eye and created an impression of an authority controlling both the population and the surrounding wilderness. A contrast was provided to the castle which, while attracting the eye, appeared to belong to its landscape.

The uniformity of the white harling was augmented with the building of a screen wall in 1786-7. This created a sophisticated, unified front street (figure 8.23). One visitor in 1787 wrote that the place was ennobled by 'the expanse of front which covers the whole

of Inveraray, and from the windows of the Castle, forms a complete screen against the port and quays...As an entrance to a town it is quite magnificent, and may justly be accused of promising too much' (Bailey 1787). Impressions prove once again to be of primary importance. Even views from the castle were not to be marred by the sight of the industry that the owners of the house were actively encouraging!

The ordered plan of the town was different to anything seen in the Highlands before the eighteenth century, and the building of new towns was an aesthetic and a social movement.

The seventeenth century village existed within the context of the traditional peasant farming all around it: it was not expected to change it. The eighteenth century village was developed in response to and also to assist a revolution in the economy of the estate and of the nation: it was expected to provide a completely new framework for human life in the countryside (Smout 1996, 75).

The traditional paternalism of Scottish landowners was benevolent but not entirely altruistic. In Sir John Sinclair's *Analysis of the Statistical Account of Scotland* (1826) he points out that the type of labourer required to live in towns was 'contented and unambitious' (I, 172, 177). The landowner required a population that would not question his authority. The new towns provided an arena that would incidentally encourage a happy and virtuous population, while increasing profits. Therefore the landowner confirmed his position of authority, and ensured the inhabitants dependence on his good will.

The Campbells of Argyll realised this potential at an early stage. Campbeltown was developed in the seventeenth century as an economic centre in the Kintyre peninsula, but it was also conceived of as part of the plan for encouraging a hard-working, civilised population (McKerral 1948, III). It was 'intended as a help to hold down and civilise wild

country', a method which was often employed after 1745 (Smout 1996, 74). A well-fed, contented population was believed to be less dangerous than a hungry one.

Encouragement of Industry: an antidote to unrest

In Inveraray attempts to establish trade began before a new town was conceived, and continued throughout the eighteenth century. The Marquess of Argyll followed a policy of settling Lowland traders in the town, introducing crafts such as weaving to the area (Fraser 1977, 150). These incomers were completely beholden to the Marquess and had no tradition of loyalty to anyone other than the landowner who set them up. Throughout the eighteenth century skilled labourers had to be brought in to teach the native population their trades.

The third Duke encouraged industry in Scotland, for example financially backing the British Linen Company in Edinburgh of which he was Governor. Inveraray was provided with a spinning school in 1751 which, though successful, was closed in 1758. Everybody capable of learning in the district had been taught and so the school was no longer required. The encouragement of the Scottish linen industry was particularly important in social and political terms. As with the development of new towns at the end of the eighteenth century, projects for linen factories were integral to schemes for the civilisation of the Highlands. The virtues of 'hard work, thrift and sobriety' attendant on employment in industry 'were regarded by the Duke and his friends as an excellent antidote to Jacobitism and disaffection, which thrived on idleness and intemperance' (Creegan 1996, 11).

Wool was established in the town in the 1770s but with only short term success. Fishing was another staple industry of Inveraray but was seasonal, depending largely on

the herring season from January to July. Tourism also became an established, and a remarkably successful, venture benefiting the town. The third Duke provided the town with a new Great Inn (figure 8.24) and also built an inn to break the journey on Loch Long (now Arrochar).

However, the largest, and probably the most successful, industry in Inveraray was the law. The town was the centre of justice for the Western Highlands. Until the abolition of heritable jurisdictions in 1747 the baronial court was held in the town; afterwards it was still the scene of the bi-annual sessions of the circuit courts of the High Court of Justiciary. Every spring and autumn the town overflowed with members of the legal profession and their entourages. The sheriff court met twice a week, an Admiralty Court, and a board of the Commissioners of Supply all met in the town (Lindsay and Cosh 1973, 22).

The Appin Trial of 1752 indicates the importance of the town as a centre of justice and it indicates why some changes were necessary in the town. It also demonstrates the enmity felt towards the Campbells. The trial was politically significant and of personal importance to the Duke of Argyll as the Chief of the Campbells. James Stewart was on trial for his suspected part in the murder of Colin Campbell of Glenure. The court house built at the expense of the Argyll estate was in too great a state of disrepair to house such a trial, and since the abolition of heritable jurisdictions it was no longer the Duke's responsibility to finance a new building. After this important and well-attended trial had to be held in the church, however, it was finally agreed that a new Town House had to be constructed. This was begun in 1755 and opened in 1757. Problems with money had slowed down the decision to build, and the Duke was not required to contribute. Final

design approval, however, was sought from the Duke before building began. Even with the changing role of both landowners and the system of justice and government in the Highlands, it was the traditional source of authority that was granted the final decision in such matters.

As mentioned before the site of the old town was not completely evacuated and demolished until the 1770s under the fifth Duke. By 1761 the town had a façade, including public buildings such as the inn and Town House. Houses adjoining the court house were occupied, and another three privately built houses stood in different parts of the town. The harbour and quay were developing, and a main street and central site for the church were marked out (Lindsay and Cosh 1973, 171). The biggest changes the fifth Duke introduced at Inveraray concerned the town. A final plan was decided upon, with the main street running parallel to the Town Avenue and a short cross street from the central church to the loch, running parallel to the Front Street (see figure 8.22). To the south of the church site tenements were constructed to house the population, including the five great houses constituting Arkland (1774-5), and Reliefland (1775-6) built opposite. The latter housed workmen and others of a lower social station. The main street from the central square to the public buildings of Front Street was lined with the private houses of tacksmen. The old town disappeared, not because of a natural disaster or armed force, but by the contractual arrangement of the landlord and his tacksmen.

Ducal Relations: demands and distrust

The Dukes of Argyll made excessive demands. The third Duke, for example, required the removal of the harbour to its present position on the Gallow Fore Land, but it was the town that was expected to pay for it. In 1748 eight pounds sterling was collected from the

inhabitants for the quay. The town was relatively poor, and only with the prospect of slow progress and problems did the Duke allow thirty pounds sterling towards the pier (Fraser 1977, 36). The town was essentially still responsible for the costs of constructing and maintaining a project of the Duke's. Together with problems such as the recurrent possibility of famine it would be hard to believe that relations between the Duke and his townspeople were always good.

The efforts of the Duke to separate his home from the town provide an example of social relations between landowner and tenants. The creation of physical barriers increased the potential for privacy within the castle grounds, and emphasised the elite nature and authority of the family both to those who lived in and visited Inveraray, and those in the castle. The reactions of the people living under the Duke's authority, their everyday resistance or adherence to his rules, suggest the deference paid to his position.

Trespassing was a particularly common problem. In October 1748, for example, eight townspeople were brought before the Provost in the tolbooth for entering the enclosures of the Wintertown Park to gather timber (Fraser 1977, 29). As well as trespassing the inhabitants of the town continued to graze cattle on forbidden land, poached and, as with the example above, took timber. Since the revoking of rights to the Town Muir there was not enough ground for the needs of the townspeople, and what land they could use was at some distance as the town was surrounded by land belonging to the Duke. Their only recourse was to use lands from which they were officially excluded. Problems of this nature were inevitable, and it is interesting to see how tenants reacted to the dominating authority from the castle. Although their disobedience stemmed from practical needs, it is

hard to imagine that some satisfaction was not gained from disobeying the rules- unless of course they were caught.

The third Duke, in particular, seems to have been more than aware of the capacity for these problems to develop, and he tried to guard himself against them. Before he even reached Inveraray after his succession in 1743 he planned to hire his niece's gardener, Walter Paterson from Edinburgh, stating that he specifically wanted an honest man from outside who would owe loyalty to him alone, and would depend upon him for his position (Lindsay and Cosh 1973, 11). He 'will by being a stranger be of great service to me in furnishing me with true facts relating to everything about Inveraray, which however necessary for me is very difficult for me to obtain' (*S43 Argyll3 to Milton 20 March 1744*).

For most of the year the Duke would be in London or Edinburgh, visiting Argyll every autumn for about two months. He required that his estates ran efficiently and that the changes he planned be executed precisely and economically. He was aware though that his own employees could take advantage if not properly supervised. 'I have great reason to believe that there are many frauds practiced there of various kinds that will take me some time to discover and obviate' (*S43 Argyll3 to Milton 3 April 1744*). This was the view of a great landowner; a similar view is expressed in terms more specific to the Highlands and his role as a clan chief. 'Take care only that I am not cheated, which in the Highlands they think it fair to do to their chief' (*S402 Argyll3 to Lord Milton 31 May 1744*). This implies that some decisions were made with reference to the reactions of his tenants, or at least those decisions that could directly encroach on the perceptions of his position and authority.

The Duke did not take his authority completely for granted. One solution to problems of fraud, trespassing and the unauthorised sale of liquor was to employ a kind of informer. Sometimes breaking out into open hostility, this 'brisk guerilla campaign' (Lindsay and Cosh 1973, 67) gives another insight into everyday relations between the landowning family and their agents and some of their tenants. Problems between the Duke's servants and officials in the area reached a point in 1756 where the Duke found it necessary to hold an official inquiry. Although this probably concerned petty jealousies and power plays separate to actual ducal affairs, problems of this nature contributed to the slowing down of work on the castle. Other complaints include the difficulty William Adam had with townspeople wandering around the site after working hours, chipping at stones. His solution was to provide a road through the castle grounds that would avoid any contact with the town.

Local people could have more of an impact on ducal plans than they appreciated. The entire rents of the Argyll estates were being poured into the improvements being made in Inveraray, but fraud and negligence began to ensure that expenditure exceeded income. Attempts were made in 1756 to economise, with fewer men employed throughout the winter. Even if all the rents were paid there would not be enough money to settle all the debts, so money had to be borrowed from friends, Lord Milton and the Baillie of Kintyre (Lindsay and Cosh 1973, 80-1).

The problems that the fifth Duke encountered were probably more prosaic. For the most part work on the castle was finished, and his focal point was the town itself, not introducing a change of the magnitude of the third Duke's plan to remove it, but improving what was there already. By the end of the eighteenth century the town was

beginning to clearly benefit from tourism, prompted by curiosity and interest in the Duke and the projects undertaken at Inveraray. The castle was used to entertain guests who would frequent the inn at some stage during their stay. One traveller, Faujas de Saint-Fond, wrote that upon mention of the Duke in the inn the 'name was held of such esteem that instantly everything we asked for was granted' (1907, 239). Although similar problems such as trespassing must have existed for the third and fifth Dukes, the concerns of the third Duke regarding the town appear to have been more localised than the fifth Duke for whom visitors to the town, outsiders, were a primary concern. Whereas the former was convincing (or reminding) locals of his position, the latter was dealing more often with his social peers. Two different problems were reflected in the same solution, the creation and development of a lavish but ordered landscape.

8.5 The Designed Landscape

Avenues and vistas: barriers and corridors

A large part of the third Duke's correspondence regarding Inveraray before he arrived concerned trees. The eighth (later Marquess) and ninth Earls of Argyll had been keen planters, enclosing gardens, planting trees and laying out walks in the late seventeenth century (Fraser 1977, 107). Both corresponded about trees with John Evelyn, the celebrated authority on silviculture (RCAHMS 1992, 404). Trees beautified the area and gardens and the study of nature were fashionable pursuits. However, trees provided more than a pastime and a pretty view. They acted as an efficient way of demonstrating the conceptual control of nature, and by implication society, through the physical ordering of planting. They also constituted a method by which barriers could be created.

Avenues acted in much the same way as roads and walls. At the same time as manipulating lines of approach and sight to the castle, they both unified *and* segregated the landscape. While demonstrating the extent and the uniformity of the elite landscape, they segregated it from the land occupied by tenants. At Inveraray the Town Avenue has already been mentioned as a strictly private barrier between the promontory site of the new town and the Fisherland meadow. This Town, or Beech Avenue, is believed to have been planted by the Marquess in about 1650 (see figure 8.20). When the site of the new town was decided upon the line of the avenue was taken into consideration, with the proposed main street running parallel to it. Potential as a barrier was increased when a high wall was begun by James Potter in 1737 (RCAHMS 1992, 404).

The old and the new castles were oriented on the line of avenues. The Lime Avenue, also believed to have been created by the Marquess, followed a line from the south west to the gate of the forecourt of the old castle (figure 8.25). Changing requirements and priorities led to the removal of part of this avenue in the 1750s to make way for a Great Lawn. The transverse axis of the new castle, and the central walk of the new garden still preserved the line of the old avenue, allowing for a clear view to and from the castle to the surrounding landscape. The Lime Avenue continued as a means of access along the foot of Creag Dubh to the falls at Eas a' Chòsain, as referred to as early as 1680 by the ninth Earl. This was a popular excursion for visitors in the eighteenth century and, again, helped to create a uniform whole of the castle and policies, or of nature and man made ornament.

A further Beech Avenue was planted in the 1670s from the shore of Loch Shira running north east to the ford immediately downstream from the Dubh Loch Bridge

(RCAHMS 1992, 404) (see figure 8.25). Networks of estate roads, small bridges and drystone walling, while carrying out practical functions, also provided the means to enclose the parks and to manipulate how people moved around the space. Views were also carefully controlled as the lines of avenues provided 'corridors' for movement and vision (and therefore perception). Bridges were also built to fit both practical and aesthetic requirements. In 1751, for example, Roger Morris provided an estimate for a 'rustic' bridge over the River Aray, close to Carloonan. The bridge was sited so as to provide a view of the romantic, tree-clad ravine running underneath (Lindsay and Cosh 1973, 134).

Other planting around the estate follows the almost ubiquitous late seventeenth and early eighteenth century patterning of geometrical clusters and created vistas. An estate map of 1731 shows the 'Earl's Planting' and 'new planting' on the eastern slopes of Creag Dubh. From the 1720s the second Duke concerned himself with the planting of hardwood plantations along the east and south faces of Dùn na Cuaiche, leading into Glen Shira. Plans show an elaborate triangular layout of avenues on the north east bank of the Aray, with the central avenue aligned on the old castle and continuing as the 'Oak Walk' to Carloonan (figure 8.26).

Ornamental Features: Ancient and modern, practical and picturesque

The contrast between old and new, traditional and modern seen in the castle was echoed in the equally resonant landscape in which it was set. Features and buildings also combined the practical and the aesthetic. The first ornamental building constructed by Duke Archibald in 1747-8 was a tower on the top of Dùn na Cuaiche looking down over the castle and town. It was built with crenellations to suggest precedent, appearing

ancient and historical (figure 8.27). Its silhouetted position on the skyline drew the eye, and the winding road built up the west slope of the hill for the transport of building materials soon became a much traversed tourist route. Once the top was reached visitors were rewarded with stunning views of the castle and policies below, and the surrounding Highland landscape around Loch Fyne (plate 8.2).

A well-house constructed over the spring at Bealach an Fhuarain (1747-8) had much the same purpose. The small classical structure provided a picturesque stopping point along the walk to the falls at Eas a' Chòsain (figure 8.28). It was another reminder amongst so much natural splendour of the presence of human endeavour, with the classical style contrasting with the immediate context. The well had a practical purpose later, when the spring was used to pipe water to the new town from 1774 onwards (RCAHMS 1992, 409). Another classically designed feature, with practical and aesthetic purposes was the dovecot built at Carloonan in 1747. The circular, harled structure terminated the vista along the Oak Walk from the castle (figure 8.29). Dovecotes were rare in the Highlands due to the scarcity of corn and other suitable grains for feeding the birds. Visitors may not have been aware of this fact, but dovecots would still have been symbolically associated with wealth and status. The prominent position given to this feature suggests that the Duke required it to be seen, and consequently his status acknowledged.

Tom Breac Dairy situated in a prominent position fifty metres above the River Aray was also designed as an eyecatching construction. Begun in 1752 to plans by John Adam, further additions were made in 1758 and 1794, and the façade reconstructed in 1787. The new Gothick courtyard building (figure 8.30) is a perfect example of the importance of

both form and function, and the impact of tourism on the estate. Approach tracks designed to take full advantage of the view were built winding up from Carloonan and the other from the western slope of Dùn na Cuaiche, and became amongst the most favoured routes of visitors (RCAHMS 1992, 428). The dairy, therefore, demonstrates the interconnected nature of the designed landscape, but also the simultaneous specialisation of space.

In much the same spirit as Tom Breac dairy, a new court of offices and stables was designed at Cherry Park (figure 8.31). This was connected to the castle by an avenue, providing ease of access and a clear view to and from the main building. By the time of the third Duke's death in 1761 only the east range was roofed, and the court had to wait until 1772 for completion. A brewhouse, cellar and alehouse were added the following winter (Lindsay and Cosh 1973, 239). Unlike the dairy though the building at Cherry Park was classical in design: symmetrical, with pyramidal-roofed pavilions at each corner, and a triangular pediment above the central pend (RCAHMS 1992, 415).

Maltland Square was another courtyard feature of the landscape, in this case providing stables, a coach house and barns (figure 8.32). Courtyards were convenient, but they were also reflective of enclosure and ordering the physical landscape. The regulated nature of classical features emphasised this.

From 1750 the Dukes of Argyll had been taking over farms on their estates, particularly in Glen Shira, and changing farming to cattle grazing. This resulted in the depopulation of the landscape. A road was gradually built to link the farmhouses together, extending as far as the farm of Elrickmore. This all links in with the improvement of the estate by the fifth Duke, though it is significant that agricultural

buildings such as the semicircular Gothick range of the Maam Farm in Glen Shira were focal points on tourist routes around the estates. Indicative of the preoccupations of aristocratic society in late eighteenth century, the Duke did seem genuinely to want an improved life for his people. As with the development of new towns, landowners linked improvement with peace and social stability. Practical innovations on estate farms helped to create a contented population. At the same time tourists of the same social group could see the efforts put into this modern preoccupation. In fact their attention was drawn to it by the creation of rides and aesthetic facades.

The suspicion that outsiders appreciated the Duke's efforts more than his own tenants can be seen in the fact that although tourists such as Mawman (see opening quote), wrote about the contrast they saw at Inveraray as opposed to the poverty of the rest of the Highlands, locals were difficult to convince of the worth of proposed improvements. They did not adapt well to the system of enclosure, and problems arose from the primitive equipment possessed by the average farmer as opposed to the Duke. The lime needed for most of the ground outside the immediate area of the castle and Glen Shira was too expensive for most, and oats, and a little barley and potatoes still made up the majority of crops (Lindsay and Cosh 1973, 251). Perhaps other changes in the ducal domain were required to complement the comparative failure of agricultural efforts beyond the estate itself.

At the same time as modernisation was taking place it is significant that tradition was conceded to in terms of language. While architecturally modern features were constructed around the estate, they all retained their Gaelic place names. While maintaining normality

for a native audience, this suggested romance to travellers. It also allowed a symbolic link to be made between the Duke, his traditional role, and the locals.

Tourism and Communications

Tourism made developments at Inveraray all the more important, and ease of access to the area was made possible by the road network constructed in the eighteenth century. There are two types of road of importance at Inveraray, those *within* the area, such as town and estate roads, and those *to* the area. The latter consisted of military roads. When the third Duke succeeded his brother his two chief concerns were the building of a new castle, and the planned military road from Dumbarton (1744-50). The Duke wanted to be sure of the line of approach to his parks, and that the new road did not cut into them in any way. 'I have a project of varying the road near to Inveraray which I must consider of when I am upon the place, as for example, there are at present three Roads to Inveraray which cut my Parks or projected Gardens most miserably to pieces...I wish there is not at present even a fourth Road' (*S43 Argyll to Milton 16 June 1744*). The roads held legal and commercial benefits as well as military, but the Duke was determined that they should not encroach upon his planned landscape. The road was rerouted and the Duke consulted over the design of the Garron Bridge which provided a 'spectacular introductory flourish to the Duke's policies' (Lindsay and Cosh 1973, 127) (figure 8.33). The road culminated in the Gothick Bridge over the Aray discussed above (see p298), though a later military road was built to Dalmally (1757-61) (Taylor 1976, 7).

Continuing the theme of the approach to the castle, a new lodge and gate were constructed at the Garron Bridge in 1775. This was to be the private entrance, as an alternative to the Wintertown entrance. Once again the castle was distancing itself from

the town. Visitors to the castle would use this route, which also branched off to Tom Breac. In 1787,

The grand approach...is through a gateway at the foot of a bridge before you reach the town, from whence it immediately crosses a magnificent avenue of old beeches, near a freshwater lake in the park and ascends the side of a considerable hill, through a range of pleasing plantations; here all the beauties of the place break at once upon the sight; the little town, in several neat and regular fronts, lies spread over the extremity of the bay...surrounded everywhere with mountains, and filled with vessels (Skrine 1813, 46).

Tourism increased as accessibility improved, and improvements and the identity of the landowner made people curious. The cutting of rides and creation of stopping points in the landscape suggest the importance of outsiders to the schemes at Inveraray. A good impression had to be given, and movement had to be controlled as much as perception. About twenty accounts survive from the 1780s and 1790s of visits to the town and castle, and even more were written afterwards (Lindsay and Cosh 1973, 212). The castle and town were great havens of hospitality. When Saint-Fond was unable to stay at the inn due to its being full he was welcomed instead at the castle. This was obviously due to his rank and he also had letters of recommendation to the Duke. Provision was also made for viewing the castle when the ducal family were not in residence. During the time of the third Duke the provost saw to entertaining guests in the town, and he and the housekeeper Mrs. Robertson showed them around the house.

8.6 Discussion: Mediating paradox and conflict, a house for a Duke of Argyll

Inveraray castle was obviously used to accommodate guests, as seen in the accounts of travellers and, for example, the number of bedrooms provided. Convenience, or ease of

movement was considered, though this particularly applies to servants access around the house (figure 8.34). While servants could move from the bottom to the top of the house via the spiral service-stairs though, they were also hidden from view. This stair was central to the structure of the castle but it was enclosed and hidden behind small round-headed, unimposing doors. This allowed their movement around the house to be fluid but also imperceptible. This notion of hiding away the working mechanics of the castle, the service and business areas, is most evident in the provision of the sunken basement in the fosse. The hospitable and public role of the house was carefully isolated from the functional aspects which allowed it to run smoothly and successfully (see figure 2.26 and p117-8).

Segregation of groups of people and functions was achieved through the separation of service, entertaining and family areas (figure 8.35). The arrangement of the family space on the principal floor as an apartment allowed it to be a separate entity from the public rooms. Sequential access through these rooms provided the privacy which a corridor layout could not. Although doors were provided from the family apartments into the main body of the house, access would have been selective. The doors within the apartment allowed for ease of movement through its rooms without having to come into contact with public areas in the rest of the house (see figures 2.24; 2.25 and pp116-117).

Quirky elements such as the provision of entresols and cupboard spaces for servants allowed them to be convenient, but also hidden away. Unfortunately there is no mention of the provision for children, but this is due to the fact that the Dukes using the castle in the eighteenth century had grown children rather than those of nursery room age. The hierarchical nature of society is also evident, even amongst the servants. The most

obvious suggestion of this is the functions of the different floors, with the public rooms and entrance situated on the principal floor. Servants of higher standing, such as the housekeeper or the 'servants out of livery', were also provided with their own rooms, rather than sharing the dormitory-style space in the attics.

The degree of privacy afforded by the arrangement of rooms is difficult to estimate. Through the study of space specialised areas can be defined, but the flow of movement throughout the house seems to be remarkably fluid. For example, the 1770s state dining room has a door leading to the Duke's dressing room. At first the doors leading off the stair-halls into the bedchambers and parlours of the private apartments and the doors leading to the dressing rooms, give an impression of fluidity of movement and ease of access. However, the doors to the south-west leading to the bedrooms and parlours or drawing rooms, are preceded by small lobbies, allowing an impression of isolation away from the main flow of traffic to be created. The doors to the dressing rooms are effectively underneath the stairs as the stair-halls were entered from the south-west (see also p109). Again rules governing access depended on the people involved. The doors to the dressing-rooms can be seen to provide a convenient route for servants, either from the straight staircase in the stair hall or the spiral service-stair, both of which were closely situated near the entrance to the dressing rooms. Presumably these doors also allowed a simple route for the Duke and Duchess into the main part of the house, or away from it.

The actors involved are important, but so too are the rules which along with spatial arrangements governed their behaviour. As the travel journal of Faujas de Saint-Fond indicates, even when a house appears to have been informal there were certain routines which had to be observed. Control was required for efficiency as well as for social

reasons, as in the case of strictly observed meal times. Mr Bailey though had his actions governed by a guide, both spatially and temporally. He was allowed to visit the house at a certain time controlled by the wishes of the family. The nature and extent of what a visitor was permitted to see presumably depended on who you were, why you were in the house, and how long you would be spending there. When Boswell toured the castle in 1773 he restricted his comments to the ‘ladies’ maids tripping about in neat morning dresses’ (1963, 353). He was touring the castle, not staying there, and evidently his tour coincided with a period of service activity. He does not comment on the guests he encountered, so either there was noone staying at the house or the actions of the maids purposely coincided with the absence of guests. It is possible that Boswell, given his self-confessed ‘amorous constitution’ (1963, 353) was just particularly interested in ladies-maids!

Servants and anyone doing business entered through the fosse entrance (in most houses this would be the ‘backdoor’). An average visitor would enter across the drawbridge into the principal floor, and would proceed through the entrance hall and the vestibule to the gallery, or in the 1770s to the saloon (figure 8.36). Movement was directed away from other areas of the building through a central corridor of transitional spaces to the initial reception area of the gallery or saloon (see figures 2.24; 2.25). Presumably more personal visitors such as close family members may be permitted to enter the parlour or private drawing room of the apartments. Although doorways to the principal floor apartments opened off the gallery (later drawing room and dining room), under the main stairs and in the stair halls themselves, these were not public areas.

Inveraray Castle does conform to ideals of symmetry and proportion (until the unequal division of the gallery) and of centralisation. The structure is ordered and controlled in design, as is the immediate landscape and the town. Internally the Gothick elements of the vestibule are the only deviation from the classically designed interior. The paradox of the Gothick exterior as opposed to the classical interior is also concerned with the position of the Dukes of Argyll and the audience being addressed, in this case, internally as opposed to externally. The interior was designed with the perceptions of those privileged enough to gain entry in mind. Servants understood the rules governing their behaviour, and their consequent use of space. They were considered as having a role in the house, rather than as potential appreciators of the allusions and layout of the building. Their station as service providers entailed an inherent understanding and appreciation of the Duke's power and wealth. Guests privileged with access to the house were educated, and would probably have understood the scientific order and classical references seen in the house and the designed vistas of the landscape. They would appreciate the knowledge, wealth and authority of the Duke and would know his status outside of a narrow local context. The Gothick exterior and vestibule would have been understood and admired in aesthetic terms as fitting to the landscape, or conceptually as symbolic of the medieval style which it echoed.

Externally, however, a more socially and politically heterogeneous audience was to be addressed, and given an effective impression of the ducal status. Obviously such a large and magnificent structure constituted a contrast to the surrounding buildings of the town. Again externally an elite and educated audience could admire the expense and the power needed to create such an edifice, particularly when considering the town as well. The

image of a castle suited the setting, but the controlled symmetry and balance of the building provided a reminder of the education and the authority of the owner. To other audiences the intended image was of an exclusive enclave, situated apart from the town from which it had been deliberately isolated. Those of a lower social rank may be permitted access in order to serve the Duke or his family in some way. Their image of the castle and of ducal authority was increased by the way in which their world was becoming ordered at the will of those in the castle, both by the segregation from the policies and by the design of the new town.

Problems with poaching and trespassing do suggest further considered aspects of design, construction and use. Inevitably these problems continued due to the lack of public ground, but they also suggest that the local inhabitants needed reminding of the power of the castle. Tenants would be aware of the ducal restrictions imposed upon them, but the eighteenth century was a changing world. The Duke of Argyll, as a supporter of change and modernisation, relied on the position that would be jeopardised by the transformations he wished to make. Therefore he was maintaining the status quo in terms of his own authority, while initiating change in the world around him. Although his new house at Inveraray demonstrated modern educated taste to his peers, it epitomised authority in its reference to the traditional symbol of aristocratic power, the castle. The paradoxical nature of Inveraray Castle and landscape represented the conflicting roles, attitudes and requirements of the Dukes of Argyll and the changing world in which they maintained power.

Chapter Nine: Conclusion

9.1 An Archaeological Approach

In this thesis I have attempted to present a different perspective of the ‘classical’ country house in Scotland. An archaeological approach treats country houses and their landscapes as active material culture rather than seeing them in terms of their aesthetic appeal, as works of art. Archaeology moves beyond a consideration of form and demands a focus on people, their relationships with each other and with the natural world. The way in which people consciously and unconsciously manipulated their physical environments, their motivations, and the different experiences and perceptions which the changes provoked demonstrate how material changes reflect, and are active in creating, social structure and change.

An archaeological emphasis on contextual and symbolic analysis accentuates the significance of imagery and perception. The different roles of landowners as public *and* private men, and as individuals *and* members of society were mirrored through the various functions of the country house. Social identity, contradictions and ambiguities could be negotiated through the physical and ideological medium of the house, just as social relations were mediated through measured personal appeal to a range of audiences. Landowners found their roles changing within an evolving world. As with the Dukes of Argyll, one role could even be used to effect change within another sphere of life, while a house such as Inveraray Castle symbolised an element of stability.

The Georgian Order: inspiration not explanation

The original inspiration behind this thesis stemmed from an appreciation of the Georgian Order as an explanatory model for changing attitudes and material culture in eighteenth century America. The worldview and social organisation of colonial America changed from a scattered, organic, communal way of life and thought to a planned, regulated and individualistic way of interacting with the world. This is seen in buildings as an increasing trend toward isolation and privacy through the specialisation and segregation of space, and the control of access. At the same time behaviour such as manners and ‘customs’ developed from and with these physical changes. This model had some relevance to Scotland with broadly comparable relations with England, and economic and subsequent social changes such as the rise of the gentry. More importantly the emphasis of the Georgian Order was not on questions of what, where and when, but why. Why were ‘Georgian’ patterns of material culture, by name inexorably associated with England, transmitted to, or adopted by colonial America or Scotland?

As a process the Georgian Order could be condensed as the observation of, in this case, buildings and the detection of similarities or patterns, and the subsequent correlation of any spatial or stylistic patterns with socio-political developments. However, the Georgian Order model is not subtle enough, tending to explain all things Georgian as the result of a hive mind. The model does not address social relations, emphasising instead a static, socially isolated elite. Due to its governing role, the actions and decisions of the ruling group in society had a fundamental impact on others; decisions made at local and national levels affected the rest of society. However, the aristocracy was not an homogenous group but was made up of individuals with problems, relating to others within a social context. As members of society they encountered trouble with their own

position, and relative to their households and estates. At the same time houses such as those in the case studies presented in this thesis increasingly conformed to the 'Georgian' model, but still maintained individual characteristics and features.

Other responsibilities could cause tension or contradictions, such as their dual roles at local and national levels. Relationships with their peers and the monarchy, and to groups and individuals outside the aristocracy, also impacted upon their actions, as did their connection with the natural world. My aim then was to present the ruling group as important due to their role in society, and at the same time to recognise them as people; to investigate their motives and attempts to resolve problems, as individuals and as part of a group. Social negotiation between groups within and around the house is difficult to see, and even within the best regulated house it is probable that life was not as clear and segmented as it appeared, or was made to appear. John MacDonald's account of his time as a footman, for example, alludes to the servants' gossip, and also the fact that the families he experienced gossiped about their servants (1927).

By looking at houses internally and within their landscape it is possible to surmise the impression which was intended to be given. Intentions are significant as well-read and well-travelled house owners, aware of architectural styles and symbolism, initiated and had active input into the designing of building projects. General trends such as the segregated, specialised use of space, and an increasing tendency towards privacy can be seen, with different ways of moving around the building and policies emerging.

The potential experiences and viewpoints contained within and around the houses highlight the treatment given to various social actors, their movements through space, or their physical exclusion. The visual impact of the house was intended for a wider audience, appealing to different people for different reasons, but always symbolising the

status, role and wealth of the owner. The material culture of the house and the manufactured landscape negotiated social identities and relationships, and so created, articulated and reinforced social attitudes and modes of social organisation.

9.2 The Country House: Reality and Representation

The country house was both a concrete reality and an ideological construct, intended to reflect, establish and maintain the social position of its owner. All of the houses presented in this thesis were grand, both in size and in ostentation. At Hamilton the status of the family was embodied in the courtyard design and the monumentality of the Corinthian portico entrance. Hopetoun House was a colonnaded, classical, horizontal sprawl. At Blair Castle the modified, regularised tower house was surrounded by an expensive example of gardens and landscaping. Inveraray Castle was a new structure, a perfectly proportioned mock castle, situated in a designed landscape which included a new town.

The case studies also demonstrate the fluid and dynamic nature of these houses. Each house had more than one period of change even within the relatively short period from the late seventeenth to the mid eighteenth centuries. Lady Margaret Hope's requirement of a substantial family house became her son's desire to reflect his new status with a palatial structure of classical elegance and grandeur, for example. Perhaps this explains to some extent the overwhelming application of the spatial and stylistic programme of Classicism. With roots in antiquity, Classicism symbolised stability and longevity. Houses could be modified while still adhering to an established pattern; long building projects would still produce meaningful and relevant houses. The needs of different owners changed as their personal, social and political roles differed. The uses and

functions of the house matched the varying responsibilities, attitudes, characters and requirements of the owners as individuals, as part of a social group, and in relation to others. All of the houses discussed in this thesis demonstrate the range of functions, practical and symbolic, of the country house.

It is worth reiterating the complex role of these houses. Economically they were headquarters of agricultural estates, also providing both long term and seasonal employment on the land and in the house. Employment and the owner's role as landlord placed the house at the centre of the local community, as did the fact that they were also regional centres of government and authority, almost private princedoms until the abolition of heritable jurisdictions in 1747.

The houses were no longer required to be physically defensive (though Blair Castle, repeatedly sieged during the period discussed in this thesis, notably contradicts this). Instead, amongst other controls, an adherence to fashion and taste became a social weapon, providing an image of authority, education and wealth. As with other monumental structures they could commemorate, remind or warn onlookers. Almost a form of mass communication (Lubbock 1995, 60), defence was conceptual, implied in conforming to a pattern that demonstrated the individual's membership of a group. The high visibility of the buildings, usually seen clearly from passing roads demonstrates the value placed on the provision of a strong impression to outsiders. For example, the careful reorientation of the military road at Inveraray to meet the wishes of the third Duke provided a clear and picturesque view of the castle and town.

Although country houses provided nobles with a rural residence they were not private family homes. As well as landmarks they were show houses, intended as arenas in which the responsibility of sociability and hospitality could be fulfilled. The eighteenth century

footman John MacDonald cites examples of the dutiful tours of the 'social circuit'. For example, in 1746 the Hamiltons of Bargeny wintered in Ayr 'where almost all the families came from their country-houses to spend the winter in routs and assemblies', then resumed their tour and

visited in the three Lothians, and Fifeshire, the Earl of Murray; the Earl of Balcarris, my master's brother-in-law; the Earl of Wemys, my lady's father; at the Earl of Haddington's; Lord Colston's; Hamilton's of Puncatland; Sir Hugh Dalrymple's, my master's brother; Mr Charteris, my lady's second brother.... From East Lothian we set off for Duncie Wells in the shire of Berwick, a place of great resort for nobility in those years (MacDonald 1927, 27-28).

The symbolic and social role of the houses allowed for individual expression, while at the same time the nobility defined itself as a group. This was achieved visually by adhering to a shared architectural language, and socially by entertaining each other. The meetings of the elite allowed them to confirm and emphasise their identities as part of a social group in relation to those who were excluded from their enclaves of hospitality. Those who were left outside the precinct of the house and its policies were presented with an image of authority and importance, clarified further by its exclusive nature.

The Real and Symbolic Landscape

An archaeological approach does not consider houses in isolation. This is particularly relevant to a study of the late seventeenth and eighteenth centuries as landscapes and houses were integral to one another, designed as unified elements. The area surrounding the house externalised the nature of the house itself. Landscaping was used both to unify and segregate, providing an impression of extensive landholding but highlighting the exclusive nature of the house and its environs. Avenues stretched across the landscape manipulating movement as well as perception, providing access to and from the house.

As at Blair the avenue could extend into the distance to symbolise ownership of all the land in sight. At Inveraray the private beech avenue stretched out from the castle providing this unity while physically cutting off the castle grounds from the common land and the site of the new town.

Manipulated vistas and perspectives were created both *from* and *to* the house. The natural world provided a frame to the picture of the house, and from the house to the outside world. From outside a manufactured view is created, but seen as natural; the social peers of the owner, permitted into the house, could observe the patterns of geometrical gardens and avenues and appreciate the design and references in terms of knowledge and wealth. Landscapes, like houses, were not just looked at, they were moved through, experienced and used. Static views from the house were accompanied by active views from inside and outside the garden. Focal points in the landscape provided stopping places along rides and routes allowing visitors to rest and perhaps take refreshment. Manufactured landscapes were not apolitical even if they failed to make specific and topical allusions to contemporary political events. Landscapes were designed with people in mind, they were created in order to be viewed and used by a range of groups and individuals, and most importantly to symbolise the position of the owner whose power even extended over nature.

Landscapes also reflect and embody other contradictions which permeated the society of the period. Formal parterres were juxtaposed with informal romantic scenes as at Chatelherault hunting lodge. In particular the aesthetic and functional were mixed to good effect. For example at Blair the kitchen gardens were planted and situated to give the most pleasing impression, as were plantations of trees at Blair and at Inveraray. The landscape buildings at the latter exemplify the importance given to both ornamentation

and practicality, as with the Gothic courtyard of the Tom Breac dairy, the clean lines and stark whitewashing of the Carloonan dovecote, or the classical Cherry Park offices. All of these structures were situated on one of the numerous walks or rides around the estate, providing a reminder to the observer of the owner's status and authority, even over nature.

This impression was highlighted further by the geometrical precision and manipulation of perspective permeating landscape designs. The 'wilderness' at Blair, for example, was far from what its name suggests, consisting of a carefully planned grove of trees with walks radiating out from a statue of Diana. Classical references littered landscapes from buildings to statues, reaching an apex in structures such as the Blair Castle Temple of Fame.

Changes to the landscape included the more blatant moving of perspectives and of people. Although these buildings were country houses they had close, reciprocal relationships with nearby settlements. At Inveraray and Hamilton, where towns had grown up around and under the protection of earlier castles, the Dukes of Argyll and Hamilton changed the physical and ideological relationship of the settlements to their seats of local authority. At Hamilton the relationship was close and paternal, with the male children traditionally attending the local school, and townspeople, many of whom shared the name of Hamilton, finding employment at the palace. At Inveraray local trade and industry depended on the goodwill of the ducal family. In both cases there was a process of removing the town from the vicinity of the house, and therefore changing the relationship with the townspeople. At Hamilton the move was a gradual distancing of the town which had previously met the garden walls, creating greater privacy within the grounds of the palace. Inveraray provides a more extreme example as the old town,

previously clustering underneath the old castle, was completely removed to some distance from the new structure. The overall effect in both locations was one of specialising and compartmentalising space as the country house became gradually isolated, ensuring privacy within a clearly demarcated area. The towns became more orderly, as exemplified by the new balanced grid plan of Inveraray with its unified, whitewashed façade along the waterfront.

The new planned town at Inveraray was accompanied by the Dukes encouragement of industry and tenants from outside the local area. By the time of the fifth Duke greater attention had to be paid to an even wider and more heterogeneous audience as tourism increased in popularity. The focus of his efforts was the town, not making dramatic changes, but developing what the third Duke had already started. Therefore his greatest task was to appeal to his social peers rather than to locals. As ducal relationships with the town changed so too did local contexts in an almost dialectical relationship.

The significance of contextual analysis cannot be underestimated. In local terms this concerns the geographical location and the localised circumstances and relations specific to each example which further illustrate the everyday audiences of the country house. Location is not just a physical issue, but also provides a social and political context for human activity. Blair Castle, for example, commanded a strategic location on the route north from Edinburgh to Inverness, and from the west Highlands to the east. This made it vulnerable as seen through the struggles to control it during unstable periods. In 1644 the Earl of Antrim took it in support of Charles I, in 1688/9 it was garrisoned again for the Stewart monarchy, and in 1745/6 it changed hands a number of times. As at Inveraray a military road passed by the house. Government doubts over the loyalty of the Duke of Atholl suggest that an added motive for the line of the road was to provide a means of

controlling, or at least monitoring, his behaviour. Local power bases had to be considered in terms of national political events and the roles of the landowner. The government took advantage of problems between aristocratic families, such as those between the Murrays of Atholl and the Campbells of Argyll and Breadalbane, to attempt a balance of power, particularly in the Highlands where so much rested on the personal authority of the landowner.

The archaeological recognition of location as encompassing physical, landscape qualities, and different social and political systems is highlighted by the case studies, two of which were in the Highlands, and two from Lowland areas. Landowners shared some problems in common such as poaching, trespassing or the use of forbidden land. At Blair Castle though, with its lands in the central Highlands, serious problems of large-scale thieving occurred. Although the Dukes of Atholl held greater authority over their lands than a far off government they ruled over a huge area, and still depended to a large extent on personal loyalty and authority. The Lowland Murray family had only succeeded to Atholl in 1629 rendering them slightly alien to the area. They did not have the security of family or kin relationships with their tenants or servants, which led to problems of loyalty such as those occurring with the Perthshire gentry at moments of armed rising. Further tensions were created by the efforts to 'civilise' the Highlands and align them with government and society further south. This issue was a complex one and somewhat ironic, with landowners using their traditional positions to effect change, further complicating their social roles. At Blair Castle problems with raising rent culminated in 1717 with the attempt by the Duke of Atholl to commute service to money payments. This resulted in his vassals taking legal action, emphasising the fact that he was no longer the final recourse of power and had to act within the law himself. Equally significant in

highlighting this tenuous position were the Dukes of Argyll, with the problems caused by the second Duke's modernising of landholding resulting in the third Duke later having to insist on political loyalty as a precondition of tenancy.

Architecture offered a means of negotiating these difficulties. At Inveraray the external impression of a Gothic mock-castle was designed for a wide audience, a recognisable reproduction of a building type traditionally associated with authority; for those excluded from the grounds as much as for those permitted entry. The contrasting classical interior would have been seen only by those allowed into the more exclusive area, the elite. It is worth briefly noting what should be clear throughout this discussion: external and internal elements of these buildings were equally significant, designed to suggest different impressions to different audiences. Once again location is important, as Inveraray Castle provided the only example of a house of its size and status in the south west Highlands. Tourist accounts demonstrate the success of the building in terms of its roles and its symbolism of status, wealth and authority. Inveraray Castle was designed to highlight the Duke of Argyll's place and territory.

Hopetoun House by contrast was situated in the Lowlands and, more significantly, was close to Edinburgh. The intended impression and appeal of Hopetoun is quite different to that at Inveraray. With identical classical internal and external images of colonnades, porticos and centrally-planned symmetry Hopetoun provides an example of the rising 'exotic' programme of architecture based on European influences. The full impact of this imagery would be 'read correctly' only by an erudite, inward-looking audience, of which the owner could count himself. Hopetoun was also less visible than any of the other examples, *allowing* only a select audience. As a new peer the Earl of Hopetoun had no traditional power base to appeal to, although the land had been acquired

from old, established families such as the Setons and Douglasses. However, by following a specific style which was becoming associated with the notion of correct taste the Earl used his house to appeal to the audience of most concern to him, that of his peers.

Numerous large houses were situated around the capital, therefore a new house would have to compete with these for merit. In comparison with Inveraray or Blair Castles some security was afforded through the location of the house, however, it also dictated the size and splendour required to express social standing and personal status.

9.3 Making sense of contradiction: Changing roles and responsibilities

The social structure constituted an hierarchical pyramid with the aristocracy forming only a small group of which fewer than a hundred families were at the apex. The removal of the royal Court to London in 1603, and slights like the Act of Revocation in 1625 led to the polarisation of authority, with influence devolving to an increasingly small group of men. Political infighting and faction are demonstrated in each of the case studies, and caused unrest within the aristocracy. Relations with the monarchy and favoured courtiers such as the Duke of Lauderdale, loyalties during times of unrest such as the Civil War, and general attitudes and decisions meant that even a Duke of Argyll, Atholl or Hamilton was not infallible. Each of these were kept out of, or lost favour and office at various intervals. This did not necessarily increase or decrease their power, but did generate the need to constantly be negotiating social and political position.

In terms of national politics it is possible to consider the great magnates, including the Dukes of Argyll, Atholl and Hamilton, as sacrificing bigger issues to their personal power agendas. However, this is a one-dimensional view, seeing their actions in a political vacuum with no reference to their own situations and, again, to their complicated

roles. Eighteenth century society was still essentially paternalistic in nature with the landowner in a position of authority, but also in a reciprocal relationship wherein obedience and loyalty were given in return for care and protection. The aristocrat was responsible on a local and national level, as well as on a personal and familial basis. Problems with local disturbance and resistance demonstrated the often challenging nature of their position. In the case of smuggling, the landowner as part of the community turned a blind eye until it became a potential threat to peace and he or she condemned the activity from an authoritarian paternal point of view. Jacobitism too had to be considered in terms of local and national affairs and, as with the Duke of Atholl, personal inclinations were sacrificed for a more pragmatic stance.

Changes in social convention and expectation also affected actions. The evolving concepts of family and of responsibility are demonstrated particularly well at Hamilton, where under the third Duke and Duchess Anne the notion of extended family included responsibility to all those with the name of Hamilton. The Earl of Arran (fourth Duke after 1698), on the other hand, concentrated his efforts away from home, living an English lifestyle, marrying an English wife, owning English land, and craving the personal favour of Queen Anne in London. His personal wishes clashed with national, even family interest, but even he had certain responsibilities to marry and produce an heir, and upon the death of his father to represent the family in parliament. Perhaps his interest in 'home' may have differed if his mother, who outlived him, had not carried on her responsibilities and continued to represent the family in Hamilton. The fifth Duke had a different view to his grandmother, spending time away from home and maintaining strained relations with the townspeople. The same is true at Blair. For example, the first Duke of Atholl had political office and favour removed over doubts as to his loyalty but

was personally involved in, and concerned for, the material and spiritual welfare of his tenants. The second Duke enjoyed an active political life in London investing less time in Scotland, and seemed to feel real concern only if his own rights and privileges were infringed upon in any way. It was the second Duke who modified Blair Castle and landscape, spending money on an image which would help to maintain his power base, reminding people of his position without requiring his personal presence.

The concept of hospitality evolved too, both as a cause and an outcome of other changes. This is seen most clearly through the modifications and design choices made in buildings. The inclusion of a state apartment in large houses was ostensibly a requirement of practicality and fashionability. However, the presence of a state apartment in a house such as Hamilton where little large-scale entertaining occurred suggests that state apartments had a symbolic and a political role to play, representing status and show rather than just providing more space. Changing patterns are seen at Blair also where emphasis was placed on the dining and drawing rooms, rather than the increasingly private space of the bedchamber.

The growing desire for privacy already seen in the landscape, as at Inveraray with its six foot high sunken boundary wall and private avenue cutting off the town from the palace grounds, and the removal of the towns of Hamilton and Inveraray, was also a process affecting the interior space of houses. As the medieval great hall became apartments or groups of rooms, the apartments themselves became more private. Originally visitors would have been received within the chambers of the apartments but this slowly evolved until the guests left their private rooms to interact with others, and then retreated back into the segregated area. Spaces became more specialised as they became more segregated, and the large multifunctional and inclusive area of the gallery

was not even a feature of modern houses such as Hopetoun and Inveraray as it was slightly modified by the fifth Duke. The inclusion of a gallery in the original design for the third Duke demonstrates the speed with which requirements were changing.

State or entertaining and family areas became separated, often mirroring each other on opposite sides of the building. This arrangement is formalised at Hopetoun, with different wings designed to house different activities and people. Most notably each wing was designed with a dining room, one private and one public. Whether inside a classical or castellated shell, the interiors of these houses began to cater for the individual, rejecting the medieval communal lifestyle. In the earliest case study, Hamilton, there were no isolated groups of rooms, but even here the separation of state and family rooms did ensure some privacy. The sequential nature of spaces relied on other controls such as permission for access. For example, the ceremonial entrance led to a formal route through the house for visitors. Tourist accounts of Inveraray also highlight the subtle formality governing reception into the grounds and the castle.

Society was changing and so was the role of the aristocracy within it. The complicated, often contradictory, roles of the landowners was symbolised through the equally complex roles of their houses. National problems had to be considered along with local issues, and this was exacerbated further by the need, especially after 1707, of considering relationships with England as well as on a Scottish level, with lands and interest often held on each side of the Border. In the case of the Dukes of Atholl and Argyll roles in Highland and Lowland areas made a complete paradox of their positions, particularly given the complex evolving of a feudal society based on personal loyalty and rivalry to a capital based dependence on material goods. Linked to this was the progression from communal life to a desire for individual expression, as seen in the

development of private, isolated living arrangements. At the same time the eighteenth century landowner had a public role to fulfil, socially and politically, and one requirement was that his house offered hospitality to others of his social group. While a private individual the landowner was a public man, in terms of the family he represented, the social group he was a part of, and as opposed to the other groups constituting society in general. These different roles created tensions and required constant manipulation and negotiation, on a private and a public level. Again it should be noted that traditional roles of authority were used effectively to institute change while at the same time maintaining the position of power.

This contradiction and the elements of continuity and change, or tradition and innovation, are demonstrated through attitudes to and involvement in trade and industry. At Blair Castle, for instance, changes in the landscape were not intended to increase the profitability of the estate until later in the eighteenth century. The involvement of the Dukes of Atholl in coal-mining was an activity expected of eighteenth century gentlemen. As with designing, experiments in improvement were the pursuits of the fashionable modern man. At Inveraray improvements such as innovative drying barns, seemed to impress the socially aware tourist more than locals who failed to adapt well to changes such as the system of enclosure. It is a paradox that although involvement in such ventures was a socially accepted pursuit, engagement in industry through need led to the assertion of a traditional image of power being based solely in the land. At Hopetoun House, a building constructed with the proceeds of lead and silver mining, any evidence of industry or even maintenance was hidden. The ordered colonnades concealed miscellaneous offices, animal pens and other service areas.

Various strategies were adopted as responses to difficult socio-political circumstances. In terms of political relations loyalties and influence came from patronage rather than kinship and other personal relationships. An indication of the changing world is given through the association between landowners and lawyers. This is most notably seen at Inveraray where the second and third Dukes of Argyll employed high status law officers as personal agents. The importance of documents indicated by the presence and security of charter rooms, as at Hamilton and Hopetoun, symbolise the 'modern' values of order, recording, legality and administration. Society was evolving, and landowners were both creating change and maintaining their own positions.

Social status became fully expressed through an increasingly defined and inflexible articulation of hierarchy. One critic condemned this as the principal cause of the breakdown of the old social structure at the beginning of the seventeenth century, and the consequent civil war. 'For once that English divell, keeping of state, got a haunt amongst our nobilitie, then began they to keepe a distance, as if there were some divinitie in them' (Patrick Gordon of Ruthven 1844, 76). The social requirement of 'keeping state' may explain the presence of magnificent state apartments in a house such as Hamilton. The stables at Hopetoun exemplify this observation of hierarchical ranking, with horses housed according to strict grading of quality.

Scale and extravagance of houses and of lifestyles impressed onlookers either through the association of such grandeur with wealth, with education, or with authority. The external splendour of country houses has been mentioned, and internal impressions were equally as opulent even if it was only a façade. The marble mantelpieces in the state rooms at Hamilton, for example, contrasted with the fake marble used elsewhere in the house, suggesting the impression of quality and riches was more important than reality.

The created image only existed in the perceptions of others, and the possible reactions of various audiences figured in the decisions of the nobility. The relationship with England, particularly after Union, required an impression to be made with London in order to gain favour and office. The traditional recognition due to representatives of old Scottish houses in Scotland could not be taken for granted in London, especially when considered in competition with English courtiers. Therefore grandeur and finery had to be expressed lavishly through material acquisition and lifestyle, even if it went against religious conviction as with the Presbyterian third Duke of Hamilton. ‘Genteel families took a coach and six horses’ with liveried, ‘genteelly dressed’ servants to attend them (MacDonald 1927, 17; 82). The luxury of leisure was amplified in structures such as the pavilions at Hopetoun.

Fashion, as a concept, is a significant one if understood in social and political terms. Aristocrats were expected to be engaged in certain activities, including the building of impressive houses, *if* they wished to be viewed and accepted in a certain way. Expectation in itself is a social concept. Styles, like behaviour, are applied and affirmed as the established projection of a particular social or political system. In the case of this thesis this relationship is not advocated as a direct correlation between fashion and society, but as the trappings of fashion becoming established in order to negotiate identities and positions. As noted below, adhering to codes of expression and behaviour, whether speech, dress, tea sets or houses allows the assertion of identity, as an individual and as a member of a social group. Behaviours and material possessions act like symbols, and are used to present required images to the world. Difficulty comes with the acceptance of the possibility of multiples meanings understood by multiple audiences. Recognition of this is seen throughout the case studies.

Refined taste, understanding and judgement, decorum and propriety *were* expected of the higher echelons of society. The word 'Georgian' evokes images of order and regularity, rationalisation and conformity or standardisation. Architecturally this was expressed through centralised, balanced and later symmetrical design. Classicism provided an egalitarian, stable veneer allowing the controlled negotiation of changes and contradictions. Relationships with England, between Highland and Lowland systems, and with its own past make the adoption of Classicism as a social and political, not just an architectural, programme particularly powerful in Scotland. Significant changes occurred as government became increasingly centralised, with a general pacifying and 'civilising' aligning the social and political systems of the Highlands with the rest of the country.

Adherence to the social code of good manners and rational behaviour allowed an individual to align his or herself with a group of people who acted and perceived of things in the same way. In the eighteenth century the concept of behaviour emerged which ended the practice of defining behavioural propriety according to a set of coherent moral principles. Instead of this connection between manners and ethics, reconnection was made between manners and the social group itself; how individuals related to one another and constructed their understandings of the social, of others, and of the self (Arditi 1998, 3). Houses, material acquisitions, behaviour and attitudes all established, maintained, and projected the identity of the aristocrat, constantly negotiating their roles and positions.

As manners provided a means of self-identification as part of a group, important references to precedent achieved the same aim, but expressed identity in terms of family, history and tradition. This particularly marked out the old, established families from the rising gentry, helping to justify their continued role at the highest level of society. Interest

in heritage and genealogy, such as that shown by the third Duke of Hamilton, produced physical results. This was particularly manifested in the landscape, with vistas focussing on places of historic or religious importance, and association with older structures in the grounds such as the two castles featuring in the grounds of the new house at Hopetoun. New structures built at Inveraray, and the form of the castle itself, consciously appropriated or revived Gothic forms, though manipulating perception by adapting them within classical rules. While Inveraray was effectively a fake castle, at Blair the sham ruin of a castle, the Whim, was built, paradoxically at the same time as the still defensive tower house was being ordered and rationalised. Restoration and renovation, old and new ideas were used simultaneously, almost embodying the contradictions of the aristocratic role and position. Continuity was highlighted further by the association with natural features such as the vista from Hopetoun to North Berwick Law.

A Social World *in* the Country House

Country houses also constituted a microcosm of the social world. Various types or groups of people, and so various types of relationships were contained *within* the house. Within the family itself old and young, male and female, perhaps sick and healthy, or rich and 'poor' lived together. At Hamilton, in particular, unmarried sisters, orphaned children and infants who encumbered their parents were features of the family life of the house. Increasing separation and segregation of functions and of people within the house was in some part practical and convenient. However, the spatial treatment of servants emphasises ideological priorities such as the evolving desire for privacy. Servants were inhabitants of the house but also constituted another audience for the messages of the house; they were symbiotic but separate. At Hamilton, for example, where servants often

shared the ducal name or were rewarded for loyalty by being treated as members of the family, they were still divided both from the family and from each other along lines of gender and hierarchy. Service areas are to be found at extremes of the houses, in attics and basements. Their routes through the buildings confirm the idea of their roles as integral to the house, but at the same time segregated and concealed. At Hopetoun and Inveraray service stairs were central to the house, but were hidden behind discrete doors. Servants could move fluidly throughout the building, convenient when called upon, but otherwise tucked neatly out of the way. The embodiment of this was the fosse at Inveraray, creating the image of a castle, and concealing service areas behind this façade. Access for servants and tradesmen was permitted only at the obscured basement level.

9.4 Some conclusions: a starting point

An archaeological approach to a class of building usually reserved for art historical study demonstrates the potential narrowness of any interpretation based strictly within any single discipline. A diagram emphasises the multidisciplinary nature of archaeology as applied in this thesis (figure 9.1). Models such as the Georgian Order provide an understanding which underlies an approach rather than advocates a specific, rigid framework. Informal methods highlight the significance of symbol, context and belief. Experiential approaches concentrate on human interaction with the built environment focussing on sight, movement, views and impressions. Complications of formal methods, in particular access analysis, suggest it is more useful in specific, localised applications. However these spatial analyses do build on issues of movement and sustain the central place of people. A sophisticated understanding of the relationship between space and social practice is essential in interpreting plans and diagrams. Therefore a range of

disciplines provide the necessary information with which to understand elements of form, function and space which in turn may be interpreted as an understanding of spatiality, or the relationships between people and spaces (see figure 9.1).

The element of comparison is where the success of the formal methods used to consider the case studies in this thesis lies. In spatial terms comparison may be made between each of the houses and between the various humans interacting with the spatial layout. By way of example paths of service and visitor access were compared. The difference in use patterns is shown to be constrained by architectural limitations such as doors and walls, but more so by a knowledge of the potential relationships and functions of the people using the spaces. Temporal comparisons may also be made with notable differences seen between different stages of building, as at Hamilton Palace, or more remarkably at Hopetoun House. Access graphs also highlight, with the addition of a contextual understanding, the possible comparison between the ideal (intention) and reality, as at Blair Castle.

This recognition hopefully provides only a starting point. The case studies selected in this thesis conformed to patterns while each also emphasised different aspects of Scottish society and country houses. Although presented chronologically the case studies unintentionally represent the progression from a new house (Hopetoun), to an old house which became new (Hamilton), to a mock castle (Inveraray) and, finally, to a real castle (Blair). Each house enabled the presentation of a successful study; each providing evidence of the reflexive relationship between humans and the built environment.

A minutely detailed discussion of a single house was inappropriate for this thesis, though there is also the danger that this would only have provided one specific, isolated case. Further comparative study, on the other hand, may benefit from consideration of a

broader scope, either geographically, where the detailed analysis of a single estate such as that conducted by Charles Orser in Ireland (Orser 1998) may allow a stronger appreciation of the actions and responses of both landowners and tenants; chronologically, where patterns of evolution and change may be clarified; or socially, where houses of the rising gentry, in particular merchants and plantation owners, may further elucidate the use of architecture to mediate social position as they adopted or rejected trends, creating their own 'perfect Elysiums' in the quest for acceptance in evolving 'polite' society.

The emphasis on people in the past is the essence of this archaeological approach. Whereas I have avoided a complete application of the Georgian Order model, and of formal spatial analysis, I reject any approach entrenching interpretation in the 'traditional' discussion of stylistic trends and aesthetic influences to the exclusion of other discourses. Even the most beautiful house was not a work of art just to be looked at. Archaeology, as the multidisciplinary approach applied in this thesis, places an accent on movement, communication and access, on ideas, motivations and attitudes. The focus is on the people who built, lived in, worked around, viewed and visited the country house.

Financial problems troubled the four families discussed in this thesis, from losses in ventures such as the Darien scheme, fines and debts from the Civil War and its aftermath, or personal misfortune. However, each instigated and completed large scale building and landscape programmes, expensive in time and money. This alone indicates the significance of these houses as the most conspicuous media through which landowners could attempt to control their social worlds. Architecture embodies a code of communication of social identity. Landowners did not operate within a social vacuum, their actions and reactions were regulated by their own personal role and place in society.

While instigating social change, maintenance of the social order was desired, creating a continual process of social negotiation with their own, often paradoxical, roles within their social group, as opposed to others and to the natural world. Different aspects had to be adopted or promoted in relation to different audiences. Country houses did not just mask, they were an active part in the mediation of complex social relations.

APPENDIX ONE: CATALOGUE OF HOUSES CONSIDERED FOR STUDY

Original group of houses considered for study (see also figure 10.1). Those marked * represent the sixteen houses chosen for the second stage of study. The four case studies chosen from this group are marked in bold type:

Aberdour Castle, Fife	Castle Grant, Inverness
Arniston House, Midlothian	* Haddo House, Aberdeenshire
Balcaskie House, Fife	* Hamilton Palace, S Lanarkshire
* Blair Castle, Perthshire	* Hopetoun House, West Lothian
Dalkeith House, Midlothian	* Inveraray Castle, Argyll and Bute
* Drumlanrig Castle, D&G	Kinneil Castle, West Lothian
* Duff House, Moray	* Kinross House, Perthshire
Dumfries House, Ayrshire	Leslie House, Fife
* House of Dun, Angus	* Mavisbank House, Midlothian
Dunkeld House, Perthshire	* Mellerstain House, Borders
Dysart House, Fife	Melville House, Fife
* Floors Castle, Borders	* Newhailes House, East Lothian
* Fyvie Castle, Aberdeenshire	Taymouth Castle, Perthshire
* Glamis Castle, Angus	* Thirlestane Castle, Borders

ABERDOUR CASTLE

Dunfermline, Fife. Map ref.: NT 1923 8546

NMRS: NT 18 NE 8.00

Originally a seventeenth century building, reconditioned and enlarged in 1715 by James Smith for the Earl of Morton. Oblong, short wing added at each end with kitchens grouped around small court to the north. The central entrance was set forward and surrounded by a pediment.

Site includes castle, gardens, dovecote and church.

An HS property, in excellent state of preservation.

Archive: NAS Morton Papers (GD 150) (Dalmahoy collection) Box 117- Aberdour Accounts 1657-1797

Apted, MR 1985 *Aberdour Castle* (SDD, Edinburgh)

MacGibbon G and T Ross 1887-1892 *Castellated and Domestic Architecture of Scotland from the Twelfth to the Eighteenth Centuries* (D Douglas, Edinburgh) vol. 2, 468-78

RCAHMS 1933 *The RCAHM and Constructions of Scotland. 11th Report with Inventory of Monuments and Constructions in the Counties of Fife, Kinross and Clackmannan* (HMSO, Edinburgh) 17-21 no. 17

Walker B and G Ritchie 1995 *Fife, Perthshire and Angus* (HMSO, Edinburgh) 103-4

ARNISTON HOUSE

Gorebridge, Midlothian Map ref.: NT 3258 5946

NMRS: NT35 NW 18.00

1726-32 William Adam for Robert Dundas, Lord Arniston; 1754-8 John Adam for the same. Arniston constitutes a complete Palladian programme, rare in Britain.

In 1690 the house was of U-plan, north facing with wings, stable and kitchen pavilion extended forward to enclose a court. A high wall was later destroyed so the house could be seen from the sea. Prestige and the demands of an increased family were responsible for rebuilding.

William Adam extended the depth of the old house frontwards. In terms of elevations the entrance front is a contrast to the extremely plain garden front. Moreover the east side elevation was plain and orthodox, as opposed to the more sophisticated west side where the state rooms were to be built. The house was finished and adapted thirty years later by John Adam. Arcaded ancillary buildings including an orangery extend symmetry on the south side.

The failure of William Adam to build the west jamb meant the loss of the upstairs state rooms, and also the modification in the use of the rooms on the entrance level. The grand staircase was planned centrally in a stair lobby and led from the entrance floor to a half landing which then turned right onto a gallery. The other most important room was the great library situated on the north front above the hall. This placing of the library in the lodging storey became a popular planning feature early eighteenth century allowing for more privacy than was previously afforded by placing it in the parade of public rooms. However when John Adam completed the west jamb in the 1750s fashion required a downstairs suite of rooms so those upstairs were abandoned. South porch and pediment c.1800; north porch 1877; restored 1971 on. Owner: Dundas-Bekker family.

Archive: Arniston Manuscripts, Arniston House

Adam, W 1980 *VS* (Paul Harris Pub., Edinburgh) Pls. 39-44 Plans and elevations
 Cosh, M 1984 "The Adam Family and Arniston" in *Architectural History* 27 214-230
 Forman, S 1953 "The Dundases of Arniston" *Scottish Field* June 1953
 MacGibbon, D 1891 "Arniston House" *Trans. Edinburgh Architects Ass.* 1
 Omond, GWT 1887 *The Arniston Memoirs: Three Centuries of a Scottish House 1571-1838* (D Douglas, Edinburgh)
 Tait, AA 1969 "William Adam and Sir John Clerk: Arniston and 'The Country Seat'" in *The Burlington Magazine* CXI 132-40

BALCASKIE HOUSE

Carnbee near Anstruther, Fife. Map ref.: NO 5246 0357

NMRS: NO50SW 2.00

Sir William Bruce's 1670 conversion of a tower house to an approximately symmetrical classic style house. He bought Balcaskie in 1665 - referred to in 1647 as manor place of Balcaskie – and it is more likely that he altered an old house rather than built new. He also designed formal gardens making the old house the centrepiece of an axially-planned courtyard layout with concave screen walls, classical service wings and terminal vistas (Lothian coast, Bass Rock). Terracing towards sea with house in background.

Later alterations and additions in 1827 and 1853.

Occupied in private ownership, in good state of preservation.

Good NMRS information

Cope, D 1983 *Balcaskie House* (photocopy typescript in NMRS)

Coventry, M 2001 *The Castles of Scotland* (Goblinshead, Musselburgh) 68

Forman, S 1967 *Scottish Country Houses and Castles* (Collins, Glasgow) 34-7, 47

Pride, GL 1999 *The Kingdom of Fife: an Illustrated Architectural Guide* (Rutland Press, Edinburgh) 160-1

RCAHMS 1933 *RCAHM and Constructions of Scotland. 11th Report with Inventory of Monuments and Constructions in the Counties of Kinross, Fife and Clackmannan* (HMSO, Edinburgh) 47 no.85

BLAIR CASTLE

Blair Atholl, Perthshire Map ref.: NN 8647 6618

NMRS: NN 86 NE 5.00

1740s James Winter for Duke of Atholl. Remodelled tower house to become more uniform, balanced Georgian house. Intended to become Atholl House. Old building restricted changes made, it still retained its defensive role, but made more harmonious with, for example, carefully placed sash windows. Building harled and whitewashed to contrast with surrounding landscape. Landscaping modified on a grand scale including a wilderness, a sham castle known as the Whim and Hercules Garden. Complications of various planned changes and reality make the case study interesting. Present building material also makes interpretation difficult. Highland example.

Owner: Duke of Atholl

Archive: Atholl Muniments, Blair Castle

NLS Murray of Atholl correspondence 1691-1746 MSS 5136-5138

NRA 11000 Stewart-Murray family, Dukes of Atholl: family- estate papers.

Survey NRA S 0234 (catalogue filed)

Atholl 1908 *Chronicles of the Atholl and Tullibardine Families, Collected and Arranged by John, 7th Duke of Atholl* (Ballantyne Press, Edinburgh) 5 vols.

Blair Castle 1982 *Blair Castle: an illustrated survey of the historic home of the Dukes of Atholl* (Pilgrim Press, Derby)

Haynes, N 2000 *Perth and Kinross: an illustrated architectural guide* (Rutland Press, Edinburgh) 162-4

Walker, B and G Ritchie 1987 *Exploring Scotland's Heritage: Fife and Tayside* (HMSO, Edinburgh) 71-2, no.34

DALKEITH HOUSE

Dalkeith, Midlothian Map ref.: NT 3332 6790

NMRS: NT 36NW 7.00

1701-09 James Smith remodelled and enlarged castle for widowed Duchess of Monmouth and Buccleuch on her return to Scotland after long residence in the South. Incorporates part of Dalkeith Castle a fifteenth century L-shaped keep with curtain walls. Stronghold of the Douglasses of Dalkeith, enlarged c.1585 for James Douglas, 4th Earl of Morton, Regent, purchased by 2nd Earl of Buccleuch 1642. As with

Hamilton Palace (was named Dalkeith Palace in C18) the new four storey building was of half H-plan though was more assured. State apartments were not of horizontal layout as at Hamilton but were massed vertically. Centrepiece of elevation was ashlar while the rest was harled, drawing attention to the central focus of the building.

Instead of a three bay centre with pediment the Duchess, who was so in her own right, required the expensive effect of a Corinthian portico with all its implications of semi-royal status.

Both Dalkeith and Hamilton represent the ducal state and there were few, if any, in the land who could match either the titles or estates of their owners (Anne Duchess of Buccleuch married Charles II son, the Duke of Monmouth).

Interior- sober classical with marble hall and stair. A few rich rooms brought from London house. Later additions J Playfair 1786; W Burn c.1831

Stables, coach houses, gardeners cottage and bridge over Esk for 2nd D of Buccleuch 1741-2. Town rebuilt eighteenth century.

Owner: Duke of Buccleuch; Buccleuch Group, Bowhill. (Ceased to be principal seat of Dukes of Buccleuch and Queensberry c.1885). Now study centre for University of Wisconsin.

Archive: NAS family papers- Dukes of Buccleuch (GD224) 1165-1947

Adam, W 1980 *VS* (Paul Harris Pub., Edinburgh) pls. 22/24

Cornforth, J and JG Dunbar 19 April 1984 "Dalkeith House, Lothian I" *Country Life* 175, 4522

Cornforth, J and JG Dunbar 26 April 1984 "Dalkeith House, Lothian II" *Country Life* 175, 4523

Cornforth, J and JG Dunbar 3 May 1984 "Dalkeith House, Lothian III" *Country Life* 175, 4524

RCAHMS 1929 *10th Report with Inventory of Monuments and Constructions on the Counties of Midlothian and West Lothian* (HMSO, Edinburgh) 61-5 no.76

SDD (1960-) *List of Buildings of Architectural or Historical Interest* (held in Architecture Dept. RCAHMS) 1, (Scottish Development Dept.)

Stark, J 1838 *Picture of Edinburgh: Containing a Description of the City and its Environs...with a New Plan of the City and 48 Views of the Principal Buildings* (J Stark, Edinburgh) opp. 343

DRUMLANRIG CASTLE

Thornhill, Dumfries and Galloway Map ref.: NX 8519 9921

NMRS: NX 89NE 1.00

Probably designed by James Smith for Sir William Douglas, later 1st Earl

Queensberry a key government figure in the 1680s.

In plan the scheme is a grand courtyard design. A classical showfront was created including a double circular staircase, giant Corinthian order and a central entrance porch. Façade probably influenced by Sir William Bruce's west front at Holyrood Palace and indirectly from France.

Stylistically Drumlanrig contains both Caroline and Gothic elements and is considered a unique alliance of castellated and Renaissance style in which Scottish Baronial is translated into Baroque. A project of vice-regal status (Dunbar 1966, 55).

Tradition says two buildings on site but earliest mention of castle is in 1492.

Douglasses held barony since 1356.

Owner: Duke of Buccleuch (Buccleuch Estates Ltd.)

Archive: NAS family papers- Dukes of Buccleuch (GD 224) 1165-1947

Drumlanrig Archive, Drumlanrig

Anon. 1997 *Drumlanrig Castle: ancient Douglas stronghold and Dumfriesshire home of the Duke and Duchess of Buccleuch and Queensberry* (Buccleuch Estates, Bowhill)

Campbell, C 172?-1725 *VB* (London)

Drumlanrig Castle 1997 *Drumlanrig Castle, gardens and country park* (Buccleuch Enterprises, Selkirk)

Dunbar, JG 1966 *The Historic Architecture of Scotland* (Batsford, London) 55-6

McLachlan, J 1892 "Drumlanrig Castle" *Trans. Edin. Architects Ass.* 2 1892

RCAHMS 1920 *7th Report with Inventory of Monuments and Constructions in the County of Dumfries* (HMSO, Edinburgh) 61-3 no.156

Ramage, CT 1876 *Drumlanrig Castle and the Douglasses with the Early History and Ancient Remains of Durisdeer, Closeburn and Morton* (J Anderson, Dumfries) 1-22

DUFF HOUSE

Banff, Moray Map ref.: NJ 6906 6331

NMRS: NJ 66SE 8.00

William Adam for MP William Duff- wealthy Whig, later Lord Braco and Earl of Fife. Money and estates from entrepreneurial flair.

Central unit comprises tall oblong block with square angle towers linked by quadrant walls to pavilions. Pavilions and screen were never built.

State and family apartments separated vertically. Lowest floor and wings service areas; first floor family rooms; second floor state rooms, approached by grand stair. Additional floor levels in side elevations allowed each apartment direct access from servants rooms in mezzanines.

Dunbar terms it a 'medieval castle in baroque dress its rich texture and towering bulk convey a memorable impression of seigniorial pomp' (1966).

Landscaping includes canal and, later in eighteenth century, town of MacDuff.

Now principal outstation of National Galleries of Scotland

Archive: Aberdeen University MS997 1568-1804 family and estate correspondence
MS2226; MS3175

Clifford, T and I Gow 1995 *Duff House* (Nat. Galleries of Scotland, Edinburgh)

McKean, C 1990 *Banff and Buchan: an illustrated architectural guide* (Rutland Press, Edinburgh) 34-7, 82.

NSA 1845 (Edinburgh) vol 13 Banff 32

OSA 1791-9 (Edinburgh) vol 1, 237

Shepherd, IAG 1986 *Exploring Scotland's Heritage: Grampian* (HMSO, Edinburgh) 53-4 no.2

Simpson, J 1973 "The Building of Duff House" *Arch J* 130, 1973

Tait, AA 1985 *Duff House* (HMSO, Edinburgh) 146-148

DUMFRIES HOUSE

Nr Cumnock, Ayrshire Map ref.: NS 5414 2039

NMRS: NS 52 SW 12.00

John and Robert Adam 1754-9 for William Dalrymple, 4th Earl Dumfries.

Very formal, restrained design. Nine bay, two - storey and basement house with swept roof and clustered chimney stacks. Central three bays advanced and pedimented with carved cartouche.

Viewed from south it presents a well-defined articulation and massing of component blocks which, in their simplicity and emphatic horizontality point to a study of contemporary Palladianism.

Owner: Private ownership

Archive: Bute Papers (Dumfries House) Mount Stuart, Bute.

Adam, W 1980 *VS* (Paul Harris Pub., Edinburgh) pls. 17-19

Millar, AH 1885 *The Castles and Mansions of Ayrshire Illustrated in Seventy Views with History and Descriptive Notes* (Cupar, Edinburgh)

HOUSE OF DUN

Nr Montrose, Angus Map ref.: NO 6704 5988

NMRS: NO 65 NE 61.00

William Adam 1730-c.1740 for David Erskine, Lord Dun a Judge of the Court of Session, and as a friend of the Earl of Mar a Royalist and Episcopalian.

Plans were originally prepared in 1723, modified and then building began in 1730.

The building was to be severe. A simple, compact rectangular block with giant order running through two storeys to form a triumphal arch entrance portico.

Interior is tripartite - hall, connecting principal and secondary stairs to either side, and saloon with family apartments and customary state rooms flanking either side. Library on first floor directly above saloon, out of main circuit of house.

Baroque plasterwork by J Enzer. Allegorical programme complex- overt and cryptic Jacobite interpretations and Classical references.

Old castle of Dun on nearby promontory.

Landscapes include designs by Earl of Mar and William Adam. N-S avenue focused on house

In care of NTS

Archive: NAS (GD 123) Erskine of Dun MSS??

Hartley, C 1992 *House of Dun* (NTS, Edinburgh)

Kay, WRM 1989 "The Development of the Formal Landscape at the House of Dun" in Frew J and D Jones *Aspects of Scottish Classicism: the house and its formal setting 1690-1750* (Uni. St Andrews, St Andrews) 41-8

Kay, WRM 1989 *House of Dun: tour of the house and history* (Edinburgh)

Walker, DM 1989 "House of Dun Unique in Scottish Architecture" *Heritage Scotland* 6,1, 1989, 10

Walker, B and G Ritchie 1987 *Exploring Scotland's Heritage: Fife and Tayside* (HMSO, Edinburgh) 73-4 no,36

DUNKELD HOUSE

Dunkeld, Perthshire Map ref.: NO 0108 4259

NMRS: NO 04 SW 16.00

Built as a winter retreat by Sir William Bruce c.1679 for the 1st Marquess of Atholl. The house constitutes Bruce's first opportunity to build a new house on a clear site. Replaced a house destroyed by English troops 1653.

The plan is based upon the compact 'oblong square' developed in England. It is nearly square in plan divided on its short axis into three main portions (tripartite) by thick partition walls containing chimney flues. Consists of a hip-roofed block basement, two principal storeys and an attic. Externally it is very plain with small widely-spaced windows, a low attic storey, prominent chimney stacks and a cupola. Uniquely it was of brick with white render.

House overlooks a vista aligned with the cathedral tower.

1744 James Winter worked on house and offices; 1753 R Morris Chinese temple; R Adam 1765 gateway. Later 1820 Thomas Hopper new palace/house; 1898 J Macintyre Henry built new house

Pulled down 1830- cropmarks confirm extent of buildings seen in 1821 plan.

Archive: Atholl Muniments, Blair Castle D3.34

Blair Castle Drawings 1971 (Photocopy typescript RCAHMS)

NSA 1845 (Edinburgh) Perth Vol. X 963

Pococke, R 1887 *Tours in Scotland 1747, 1750, 1760* (DW Kemp, Edinburgh)

RCAHMS 1994 *South East Perthshire* (HMSO, Edinburgh) 145, 163

Slezer, J *Theatrum Scotiae* (London)

DYSART HOUSE

Kirkaldy, Fife Map ref.: NT 302 930

NMRS: NT 39 SW 17

Policies gifted to Kirkaldy by Sir Michael Nairn in 1726. The house became the hunting lodge of the Earl of Rosslyn.

Original part (two storey, attic and basement) at the south east was built in 1726 with a three storey arm at the south west with a return to the north east added late eighteenth century.

Now a Carmelite monastery.

Excellent NAS archive (GD 164) detailing construction and repairs, materials, additions etc. 1757 day book.

Millar, A H 1895 *Fife: Pictorial and Historical, its people, burghs, castles and mansions* (Cupar, Edinburgh) vol. 2, 97-9

NSA 1845 (Edinburgh) vol. 12, Fife 135

EDZELL CASTLE

Edzell, Angus Map ref.: NO 584 691

NMRS: NO56 NE 8.02

L-plan tower house built in first half of sixteenth century. Example of geometric formal walled garden 1604 with armorial panels, inscriptions etc. Bath house and summer house added.

In care of NTS.

Low, JG 1908 *Edzell Castle Past and Present: a guidebook for visitors to the castle* (W Jolly, Montrose)

Simpson, W D 1987 *Edzell Castle* (HMSO, Edinburgh)

FLOORS CASTLE

Kelso, Borders Map ref.: NT 7111 3467

NMRS: NT 73 SW 5.00

William Adam for 1st Duke of Roxburghe

On River Tweed just west of Kelso. James VI granted estate to one of his favourites, Robert Kerr of Cessford, later became Earl of Roxburghe. Kerrs remain powerful force in politics, 5th Earl instrumental in Union 1707 and was rewarded with Dukedom. New residence to reflect this new status, transforming old tower house into

Georgian mansion. William Adam commissioned in 1718 but Duke had large influence on design.

Fairly plain oblong building with towers projecting at each corner. Pavilion on either side which housed stables and kitchens.

WH Playfair 1837-45 significantly remodelled the castle, exterior and interior.

Owner: Duke of Roxburghe (in residence)

Archive: Roxburghe Archive, Floors Castle

Adam 1980 *VS* (Paul Harris Pub., Edinburgh) pls. 48-49 plans and elevation

Baldwin, J 1997 *Edinburgh, Lothians and the Borders* (HMSO, Edinburgh) 98-9

Blanc, HJ 1914 "Floors Castle" *Trans. Edinburgh Architect Ass.* 8, 1914, 46-7

Forman, S August 1960 "Floors Castle" *Scottish Field*, 107, 692, 30-33

RCAHMS 1956 *Inventory of Ancient and Historic Monuments of Roxburghshire: with fourteenth report of the commission* (HMSO, Edinburgh) 250, no.513

Roxburghe Estate Office (n.d.) *Floors Castle, Kelso* (Edinburgh)

CASTLE FRASER

Nr. Dunecht, Grampian Map ref.: NJ 7227 1255

NMRS: NJ71 SW6.00

The most elaborate Z-plan in Scotland. Begun 1575 by Michael Fraser, 6th Laird, and incorporates older building. Completed 1636, masterpiece of two great families of master masons, Bell and Leiper

In care of NTS.

Ash, M 1994 *Castle Fraser* (NTS, Edinburgh)

FYVIE CASTLE

Fyvie, Aberdeenshire Map ref.: NJ 7639 3930

NMRS: NJ 73 NE 9.00

First mentioned in charter 1211/1214 on occasion of visit by William the Lion. First mention of stone building on site 1395. Remodelled 1596-9 for Sir Alexander Seton, 1st Earl of Dunfermline, Chancellor of Scotland and one of Lord Kinloss' fellow members of English privy council. Pillar of Stuart political and architectural

establishment, but a closet Roman Catholic- received clerical Jesuit education in Rome and studied law in France.

Two ranges forming L-plan. An early attempt at elevational symmetry, south side monumental symmetrical entrance. Gordon Tower erected 1777.

NTS property.

Archive: NLS Ms Coll. 1624-1683 family papers; MSS9637-8, CH 8605-10, CH 8701- 8815

Anderson, R 1903 "Fyvie Castle: synopsis of its history" *Trans. Buchan Field Club* 7, 1902-3

Cruden, S 1960 *The Scottish Castle* (Nelson, Edinburgh) 151, 153, 159, 170, 172, 188, 191, 192

Hartley, C 1986 *Fyvie Castle* (NTS, Edinburgh)

MacGibbon, D and T Ross 1887-92 *The Castellated and Domestic Architecture of Scotland from the Twelfth to the Eighteenth Centuries* (D Douglas, Edinburgh) vol.2 348-55

Shepherd, IAG 1986 *Exploring Scotland's Heritage: Grampian* (HMSO, Edinburgh) 81-2 no.23

Simpson, WD 1938-9 "Fyvie Castle" *PSAS* 73, 1938-9, 32-47

Slade, HG 1985 "Fyvie Castle, Aberdeenshire, Scotland" *Chateau Gaillard* 12, 1985, 151-66

GLAMIS CASTLE

Glamis, Angus Map ref.: NO 3858 4805

NMRS: NO 34 NE 1.00

Patrick Lyon, 3rd E of Kinghorne.

1600-1606 Remodel tower and stair turret, adding large turnpike stair, two floors and fantastical roofline. 2nd Earl succeeded to great estate, but died a ruined man in 1646. Had been friends with James Graham, Marquess of Montrose but finally joined forces against him.

3rd Earl of Strathmore and Kinghorne succeeded to bankrupt, mortgaged estates.

1670s began alterations, completed 1695 and before alterations began with demolition 1775 of west wing. Drawings by John Elphinstone after '45 give most complete impression to survive of castle after building works. Dedicatory plates, plan of 2nd, 3rd

floors, and 4 external views (really shows 1st and 2nd floors). Dedicated to victory of Duke of Cumberland.

Main avenue at 45 degree angle to castle, following a baroque setting of courts with sculpture on approach.

Owner: Earl of Strathmore (Strathmore estates)

Archive: Glamis Castle

Apted, MR 1986 "The Building and Other Works of Patrick, 1st Earl of Strathmore at Glamis 1651-1695" *Antiq. J* 66, 1986

Billings, RW 1848-52 *The Baronial and Ecclesiastical Antiquities of Scotland* (Edinburgh) vol II pl.56

Defoe, D 1724-7 *A Tour Through the Whole Island of Great Britain* (London)

Dunbar, J 1966 *The Historic Architecture of Scotland* (Batsford, London)

Forman, S 1967 *Scottish Country Houses and Castles* (Collins, Glasgow) 101-4

MacGibbon, D and T Ross 1887-92 *The Castellated and Domestic Architecture of Scotland from the Twelfth to the Eighteenth Centuries* (D Douglas, Edinburgh) vol2 113-25

Millar, AH (ed) *The Book of Record. A Diary Written by Patrick, 1st Earl of Strathmore 1684-9* (SHS 1st series, 9, Edinburgh)

Slade, HG 1995 "Glamis Castle" in Gow and Rowan (eds) *Scottish Country House 1600-1914* (EUP, Edinburgh) 118-127

Slade, HG 2000 *Glamis Castle* (Soc of Antiquaries of London, London)

Walker, B and G Ritchie 1995 *Fife, Perthshire and Angus* (HMSO, Edinburgh) 94-5

CASTLE GRANT

Grantown on Spey, Inverness Map ref.: NJ 0412 3017

NMRS: NJ03 SW 2

1753-6/ 1765-83 John Adam for Sir Ludovic and James Grant.

L-shaped building. 1743-73 completely enveloped old castle in new construction, only original sixteenth century wing visible with original corbelled parapet.

Thomas Winter designed gardens 1748

Recently bought, in private ownership.

Archive: NAS RHP 9045-7; 9046-53; 9058-9 plans

NAS Seafield MSS (GD 248)

MacGibbon, D and T Ross 1887-92 *The Castellated and Domestic Architecture of Scotland from the Twelfth to the Eighteenth Century* (D Douglas, Edinburgh) vol. 3, 611-3

HADDO HOUSE

Methlick, Aberdeenshire Map ref.: NJ 6192 4622

NMRS: NJ 64 NW 64.00

William Adam for 2nd Earl of Aberdeen (Gordons)

Very restrained- plain seven bay pedimented block with wings.

Refurbished 1880s.

Surprisingly not a great deal of information.

In care of NTS.

Adam, W 1980 *VS* (Paul Harris Pub., Edinburgh) pls. 154-56

Shepherd, I 1994 *Gordon: an illustrated architectural guide* (RIAS, Edinburgh) 27, 31

HAMILTON PALACE

Hamilton, Lanarkshire Map ref.: NS 7264 5592

NMRS: NS 75 NW 16.00

Originally a tower with the earliest reference in a charter of 1445. It was reconstructed in the sixteenth century and called a palace. Burnt down c.1591 and a new house built. It was further remodelled from old palace into a fashionable mansion of the first rank in seventeenth century and eighteenth century and called Hamilton House.

Building began 1692 using plans developed by James Smith as early as 1682 and in consultation with Sir William Bruce. Great deal of input from Duke and Duchess.

A successive reconstruction of three of the original four courtyard ranges began to form half an H-plan building incorporating an elaborate porticoed centrepiece.

Courtyard elevations were French-looking, old-fashioned designs with pedimented dormer windows and ornamental lead flashing on the roof. This was later modified but the modified structure did give an impression of serene horizontality. Demolished early twentieth century.

Chatelherault

Built 1732 by William Adam. Functionally it was intended as a hunting lodge though it also provided a terminal feature to the main south vista from the palace and a frontispiece to a walled flower garden

Archive: NAS family papers- Dukes of Hamilton (GD406) 1543-1858

Lennoxlove Muniments, Lennoxlove House Ltd.

S Lanarkshire Council Archives and Information Management Service-
Hamilton Estates.

Hamilton Palace 1930 "Hamilton Palace" *RIAS Quarterly*, 1930, 1930 no.32, 113

Kerr, HF 1933 "Hamilton Palace" in *Trans. Edinburgh Architect Ass.* 10, 1933

Macaulay, J 1987 "The Seventeenth Century Genesis of Hamilton Palace" in Frew, J and D Jones *Aspects of Scottish Classicism: the house and its formal setting 1690-1750* (Uni. St. Andrews, St. Andrews)

Marshall, R M 2000 *The Days of Duchess Anne* (Tuckwell Press, East Linton)

NSA 1845 (Edinburgh) vol 6, 271-2

HOPETOUN HOUSE

Hopetoun, near South Queensferry, West Lothian Map ref.: NT 0885 7901

NMRS: NT 07 NE 13.00

Lands bought in 1678 by Lord Hopetoun's father, John Hope of Hopetoun. There was no suitable large house on the estate at the time. Work took place 1699-1702 under Sir William Bruce; then from 1721-46 W Adam undertook enlargements for 1st and 2nd Earls creating a showy baroque façade. John Adam made further changes for 2nd Earl from 1750-54. Macaulay considers it, 'the key work in the understanding and appreciation of eighteenth century country house architecture in Scotland' (1987, 21). Bruce's design shows centralisation and the arrangement of suites of rooms and apartments. The front indicates concern with horizontal channelling without emphasis on vertical joints. Angle pavilions were linked by convex walls to terminal office wings. Lord Hopetoun had a great deal of input intending the house to be conceived on a size and scale unknown in Scotland, and it was probably modified further as it appeared to be out of date, particularly as featured in *VB*, and looked incongruent amidst more modern examples.

Owner: Marquess of Linlithgow

Archive: Hopetoun archive, Hopetoun House (Hopetoun MSS catalogued in NRA survey no.888)

Adam, W 1980 *VS* (Paul Harris Pub., Edinburgh)

Baldwin, J 1997 *Edinburgh, Lothians and the Borders* (HMSO, Edinburgh) 104

Fleming, J 5 Jan. 1956 "Hopetoun House, West Lothian" *Country Life* 119, 3077

Macky, J 1723 *A Journey Through Scotland* (J Pemberton, London)

McWilliam, CE 1978 *Lothian Except Edinburgh* (Penguin, Harmondsworth) 251-8

RCAHMS 1929 *RCAHM and Constructions of Scotland. 10th Report with Inventory of Monuments and Constructions in the Counties of Midlothian and West Lothian* (HMSO, Edinburgh) 185-6, no.280

Rowan, A 1984 "The Building of Hopetoun" in *Architectural History* 27, 1984

Thrale, Mrs 1789 *Tour of Scotland 1789*

INVERARAY CASTLE

Inveraray, Argyll and Bute Map ref.: NN 0961 0924

NMRS: NN 00 NE 15.00

1740s vast estate improvement including demolition of old castle and building of new seat. William and John Adam masons for 3rd Duke.

Foundation stone laid Oct 1746, completed 1785. New castle was built about 80 metres south west of old castle. Vanbrugh had suggested a design in 1720 but the Gothic design by Roger Morris was chosen in 1744 in preference to more military design by Dugald Campbell and Palladian alternate schemes.

Interior classical, and exterior gothic including dry fosse, battlements and pointed windows. First of major Gothick revival.

Landscaping includes agricultural improvement and relocation of town .

Owner: Duke of Argyll

Archive: Inveraray Archive, Inveraray

NAS GD14 (NRA 28972) Correspondence 1722-72

NLS Saltoun Papers (shelf: Saltoun)

Cornforth, J and G Hughes-Hartman 1990 *Inveraray Castle* (Pilgrim Press, Derby)

Forman, S 1967 *Scottish Country Houses and Castles* (Collins, Glasgow)

Fraser, A 1972 *The Royal Burgh of Inveraray* (Saint Andrew Press, Edinburgh)

Lindsay, I and M Cosh 1973 *Inveraray and the Dukes of Argyll* (EUP, Edinburgh)
Musgrave, EI 1966 *Inveraray Castle: an illustrated survey of the Scottish home of the Dukes of Argyll* (Pilgrim Press, Derby)

KINNEIL CASTLE

Nr Bo'ness, West Lothian Map ref.: NS 9819 8055

NMRS: NS 98 SE7.00

For William 3rd Duke of Hamilton and wife Duchess Anne.

Principal seat at Hamilton so Kinneil stopping place for family on way to Edinburgh. Intended to set it up as permanent residence for son James, Earl of Arran when return from Grand Tour.

Extend to suit heir to Scotland's premier peer- useful experience of problems of improvement. If successful intend to rebuild Hamilton. Five storey, plain parapet around top and four storey pavilion each side. Contract and accounts not found in Hamilton archives but probably James Smith. By 1677 writing to brother in law, Duke of Queensberry, about improvements. 1698 modern lattermeat hall for servants constructed, panelled dressing room and closet for Duchess, whiten pavilions.

Archive: S. Lanarkshire Council Archives and Information Management Services

Kinneil rental and estate papers NRA 36701 Ham

NAS Dukes of Hamilton (GD406)

RCAHMS 1929 *The RCAHM and Constructions of Scotland. 10th Report with Inventory of Monuments and Constructions in the Counties of Midlothian and West Lothian* (HMSO, Edinburgh) 190-2 no. 300

Tranter, N 1962-70 *The Fortified House in Scotland* (Oliver and Boyd, Edinburgh) vol. 1, 174-5

KINROSS HOUSE

Kinross, Perth and Kinross Map ref.: NO 1263 0204

NMRS: NO 10 SW12.00

Built by Sir William Bruce as his own seat.

Sir William Bruce bought the estate in 1675 and began building a house on the west shore of Loch Leven. Until then he occupied Loch Leven Castle. Although there is no sign of castellation on the house, the structure is placed on an axis drawn between the

tower of Loch Leven Castle and the tollbooth steeple at Kinross- it is about halfway between the two.

The house is built along Palladian principles so is symmetrical. In elevational terms it is two storeys over a semi-basement with an attic storey suppressed externally by locating the windows above a cornice and below the steeply pitched roof.

Mezzanine floors at each end of the building provided servants' rooms which were lit from the gables. Therefore prominence was given to the first and second storeys. The double-pile plan of the building allowed for good communication with a central passage running the entire length of the oblong structure. Two stairways were provided to serve all floors with an additional central stair starting on the first floor and rising to the second.

Forecourts, gardens and policies are fully integrated with each other and with the house. In particular the use of trees as an external framework, the formation of rides and avenues and the creation of axial vistas on a grand scale should be noted.

Private ownership.

Archive: NAS GD29 Kinross House Papers

Dunbar, J 1970 "Kinross House" in H Colvin and J Harris (eds) *The Country Seat: Studies in the History of the British Country House* (Allen Lane, The Penguin Press) 64-69

Glendinning, M, R MacInnes and A Mackenzie 1996 *A History of Scottish Architecture* (EUP, Edinburgh)

Girouard, M 25 March 1965 "Kinross House, Kinross-shire I" *Country Life* 137, 3551

Girouard, M 1 April 1965 "Kinross House, Kinross-shire II" *Country Life* 137, 3551

Ross, T 1891 "Kinross House" *Trans. Edinburgh Architect Ass.* 1, 1891

Walker, B and G Ritchie 1987 *Exploring Scotland's Heritage: Fife and Tayside* (HMSO, Edinburgh) 75 no.37

LESLIE HOUSE

Kirkcaldy, Fife Map ref.: NO 2596 0183

NMRS: NO 20 SE 15.00

Also Rothes House. Original 'palace' of Leslie mentioned 1606.

Rebuilt by Sir William Bruce's friend John Leslie, 7th Earl later 1st Duke of Rothes 1667-72. In government so he would have been able to meet building costs from office rather than relying on estate income. A 'Restoration' peer the Earl was willing to spend lavishly on display. Bruce's advice was sought in regard to interiors and the layout of the garden. However the re-planning of the house was left to the King's Master Mason, John Mylne.

Although the rooms were connected en suite in the modern manner and there was some distinction between state and private apartments with each bedroom also having its own closet, the house was still old-fashioned by English standards. The plan consisted of a courtyard with protruding angle towers containing spiral service stairs. Leslie House does signify the growing concern for horizontal rather than vertical expression.

Three-quarters of the house destroyed by fire in 1763. West wing was then reconstructed in 1767 to form present mansion with additions 1906-7 Sir Robert Lorimer.

Owner: Church of Scotland Eventide Home

Archive: NAS GD204 Leslie Earls of Rothes; GD242 fifteenth- sixteenth century deeds and papers.

Private collection- Earl of Rothes

Estate Papers, Kirkaldy Art Gallery and Museum. Fife Council Archive.

Hannan, T 1928 *Famous Scottish Houses: the Lowlands* (Black, London) 121

Leslie House 1924 "Leslie House" *RIAS Quarterly* 1924 Winter 1924, 106

OSA 1791-9 (Edinburgh) vol6, 53

RCAHMS 1933 *Historic Monuments and Constructions of Scotland Monuments and Construction in the Counties of Fife, Kinross and Clackmannan* (HMSO, Edinburgh) 188, no. 387

MAVISBANK HOUSE

Loanhead, Midlothian Map ref.: NT 2880 6514

NMRS: NT 26 NE 54.00

William Adam with Sir John Clerk. Designs from 1696-98 show the development in design demonstrating how in one generation Scottish architects became attracted to Italianate ideas. Work began 1723.

Small country house, or villa, built halfway between Edinburgh and the family's principal residence at Penicuik. Clerk was going to reform the main house but instead built the new 'summer pavilion' at Loanhead to superintend his nearby coalmine. Style of the house considered a novelty and was very influential. It was both elegant and compact and seems to be a free translation of a Palladian villa. Fire 1973 destroyed roof, house currently a shell.

Archive: NAS family papers- Clerk of Penicuik (GD18) 1373-1966

Adam, W 1980 *VS* (Paul Harris Pub., Edinburgh) pls.46-47

Fleming, J 1962 *Robert Adam and his Circle in Edinburgh and Rome* (Murray, London) 33-44, 330

Glendinning, M, R MacInnes and A Mackechnie 1996 *A History of Scottish Architecture* (EUP, Edinburgh)

Gow, I 1987 "Mavisbank, Midlothian" *Country Life* 181, 34, 1987

Hunt, JD and P Willis 1975 *The Genius of the Place: the English landscape garden 1620-1820* (Harper and Row, London) 197-203

Gray, JM (ed) 1892 *Memoirs of the Life of Sir John Clerk of Penicuik, Baronet, Baron of the Exchequer extracted by himself from his own journals 1676-1755, ed. From the MS in Penicuik House with introduction and notes* (SHS Publications, XIII, Edinburgh)

Macaulay, J 1987 *The Classical Country House in Scotland* (Faber and Faber, London) 60-5

MacWilliam, CE 1978 *Lothian Except Edinburgh* (Penguin, Harmondsworth) 314-6

Spink, W 1974 "Sir John Clerk of Penicuik: Landowner as Designer" in P Willis (ed) *Furor Hortensis: Essays of the History of the English Landscape Garden in Memory of HF Clark* (Elysium Press, Edinburgh) 31-40

Tait, AA 1980 *The Landscape Garden in Scotland 1735-1835* (Yale UP, London) 21-2

MELLERSTAIN HOUSE

Earlston, Borders Map ref.: NT 6476 3909

NMRS: NT 63 NW 18.00

1725 William Adam for George Baillie. Central keep with flanking curtains and angle towers, includes large semi-circular pediment, platform roof and quad-linked pavilions. By time of George Baillie's death 1738, only wings were completed. Completed about 40 years later by Robert Adam.

Ceilings preserved in original Adam colours. Lady Grisell Baillie kept 'Household Book'

Owner: Earl and Countess Haddington

Archive: Mellerstain Muniments, Mellerstain

Baldwin, JR 1985 *Exploring Scotland's Heritage: Lothian and the Borders* (HMSO, Edinburgh) 63, no.29

Cruft, C 1965 "Mellerstain House" *Archaeological J.* 121, 1964, 203-4

Forman, S 1965 "Mellerstain House: the Border home of the Earl and Countess of Haddington" *Scottish Field* 112, 746, 1965, Feb.

Pococke, R 1887 *Tours in Scotland 1747, 1750, 1760* (DW Kemp, Edinburgh)

MELVILLE HOUSE

Monimail, Fife Map ref.: NO 2989 1380

NMRS: NO21 SE 16.00

James Smith 1692, garden 1697 for the 1st Earl Melville.

Includes a half mile long tree lined avenue approach. The house is H-plan and includes 'laich' floor, three upper storeys and a garret. The masonry is plastered on the garden front but exposed elsewhere. Although the exterior is severe in its plainness the house had one of the richest interiors of the age. Elevations are symmetrical with the plan set on the basis of a system of squares. Possible to say the house was planned mainly to secure the effective disposition of the second floor where state apartments located. Alterations made but second floor completely intact giving perfect example of formal apartments and furnishings (from 1925 visit noted in RCAHMS 1933)

Now a preparatory school, so furnishings removed.

Archive: NAS family papers Earls of Leven and Melville (GD 26) 1200-1853 notes on building works, including Bruce updates to Earl of Melville.

NLS holds good collection.

Campbell, C 172?-1725 *VB* (London)

Dunbar, JG *Melville House* (typescript in NMRS)

Fenwick, H 1968 "Melville House" *The Edinburgh Tatler* 1968 Oct.

RCAHMS 1933 *RCAHM and Constructions of Scotland 11th Report with Inventory of Monuments and Constructions in Counties of Fife, Kinross and Clackmannan* (HMSO, Edinburgh) 211, no.427

CASTLE MENZIES

Weem, Perthshire Map ref.: NN 8370 4961

NMRS: NN 84 NW7.00

Seat of Chief of Clan Menzies. Built on Z-plan in second half of sixteenth century with large extensions to north and west in 1840 and later.

Now Clan Menzies clan centre.

MacGibbon, T and D Ross 1887-92 *The Castellated and Domestic Architecture of Scotland from the Twelfth to the Eighteenth Centuries* (D Douglas, Edinburgh) vol. 4, 37

Tranter, N 1962-70 *The Fortified House in Scotland* (Olwer and Boyd, Edinburgh) vol. 2, 36

NEWHAILES HOUSE

Musselburgh, East Lothian Map ref.: NT 3268 7250

NMRS: NT 37 SW 168.00

Suggested by NTS.

1686 James Smith designed as his own family house Whitehill. Plain exterior.

Bought 1709 by Sir David Dalrymple renamed after his East Lothian estate of Hailes.

During eighteenth century William Adam designed new staircase and hall, access

system of house completely reversed with original front entrance and façade

becoming the back. C.1750 construction new wings, with large double-height library.

Very rich information base to work with. In care of NTS who preserve it as an example of the evolution of the country house.

Major monitoring, evaluating and recording during conservation June 2000-August 2001.

Owned by NTS

Archive: NLS Dalrymple of Newhailes Papers MS 25673-8

Duncan, P 29 Jan. 1987 "Newhailes, East Lothian I" *Country Life*

Duncan, P 5 Feb. 1987 "Newhailes, East Lothian II" *Country Life*

Fenwick, H Feb Feb. 1964 "Newhailes" *The Edinburgh Tatler*

Hannan, T 1928 *Famous Scottish Houses: the Lowlands* (Black, London) 133-6

Horrocks, H 2004 *Newhailes* (NTS, Edinburgh)

MacWilliam, CE 1978 *Lothian except Edinburgh* (Penguin, Harmondsworth) 351-3

NTS 1997 *Newhailes Collection* (NTS, Edinburgh)

PENICUIK HOUSE

Penicuik, Midlothian Map ref.: NT 2172 5920

NMRS: NT 25 NW 25.00

Sir James Clerk designed his home 1761-78, built by John Baxter Snr and John Baxter Jnr.

Pure example of horizontally proportioned Palladian villa floating in landscape.

Imposing sandstone ashlar façade entered by flight of steps to Ionic portico. One of Scotland's greatest landscape parks laid out from 1700 by Sir James Clerk.

Ruined in fire 1899, family moved to stable court converted for purpose by James Tait.

Archive: NAS family papers- Clerk of Penicuik (GD18) 1373- 1966

Forman, S 1953 "The Clerks of Penicuik: a house in the Lothians" *Scottish Field* 101, 607, Sept.

Gray, JM (ed) 1892 *Memoirs of the Life of Sir John Clerk of Penicuik, Baronet, Baron of the Exchequer extracted by himself from his own journals 1676-1755, ed. From the MS in Penicuik House with introduction and notes* (SHS Publications, XIII, Edinburgh)

Rowan, A 15 Aug 1968 "Penicuik House, Midlothian-I" *Country Life* 144, 3728

Rowan, A 22 Aug 1968 "Penicuik House, Midlothian-II" *Country Life* 144, 3729

QUEENSBERRY HOUSE

64 Canongate, Edinburgh Map ref.: NT 2666 7384

NMRS: NT 27 SE 32.00

1679-81 modifications for Lord Hatton by James Smith. 1695-1700 further remodelling by James Smith for James, second Duke of Queensberry. Addition of a major wing to the west, closet towers at either end of the south front and substantial remodelling to the north, Canongate façade.

Now part of Scottish Parliament complex- analysis and recording 1998 as part of development of the site

RCAHMS 1951 *An Inventory of the Ancient and Historic Monuments of the City of Edinburgh with the Thirteenth Report of the Commission* (HMSO, Edinburgh) 160-1 no94

Wallace, JM 1987 *The Historic Houses of Edinburgh* (J Donald, Edinburgh) 31-4

TAYMOUTH CASTLE

Kenmore, Perthshire Map ref.: NN 7844 4652

NMRS: NN 74 NE 14.00

Tower house, Balloch Castle, built c.1550 for Sir Colin Campbell. C.1733 William Adam- landscape garden including Chinese bridge and Temple of Apollo.

John Douglas c.1742 for 3rd Earl of Breadalbane. House remodelled- added two flanking pavilions linked to main block. Only west wing remains.

Present building- central block from 1806-10.

Owner: Breadalbane Estates

Archive: NAS family papers- Earls of Breadalbane (GD112) 1306-1914. Extracts

MSS GD 112/21/77-79 accounts for work Taymouth 1744-54.

Breadalbane Muniments; NAS GD112 Papers of the Campbell family, Earls of Breadalbane 1306-twentieth century

Haynes, N 2000 *Perth and Kinross: an illustrated architectural guide* (RIAS, Edinburgh) 123-5

Innes, C (ed) 1855 *The 1598 Black Book of Taymouth: with other papers from the Breadalbane charter room* (Bannatyne Club, Edinburgh)

Millar, AH 1890 *The Historic Castles and Mansions of Scotland: Perthshire and Forfarshire* (Cupar, Paisley) 145

Rowan, A 8 Oct. 1964 "Taymouth Castle, Perthshire-I" *Country Life* 135, 3527

Rowan, A 15 Oct. 1964 "Taymouth Castle-II" *Country Life* 135, 3728

SDD (1960-) *List of Builings of Architectural or Historic Interest* (Scottish Development Dept.) 6, no34
Smith, G 1991 “ [Taymouth Castle] Multi-Million Pound Plan to Turn Castle into Hotel” *Glasgow Herald* 30 Aug 1991

THIRLESTANE CASTLE

Lauder, Borders Map ref.: NT 5338 4790

NMRS: NT 54 NW 7.00

Remodelled and enlarged by Sir Wiiliam Bruce for John Maitland, 2nd Earl of Lauderdale (Viceroy of Scotland 1667-80, favourite courtier Charles II, 1st Duke from 1672). As the family residence of the King's first minister in Scotland the house was probably considered out of date, failing to keep up with aristocratic competition. Sir William Bruce's first important commission (cousin by marriage).

A symmetrical forecourt layout similar to Balcaskie was introduced to the late medieval tower house. A show parade of graduated pavilions were added to support the old house with the entrance elevated in a terrace approached by a central staircase leading to a pedimented doorway. 1670s main effort in creating dignified entrance approach The influence of Classical architecture is even more evident in plan where the sequence of family rooms was modified to reinforce the processional character of the long axis of Thirlestane.

First floor 1670s converted into lavish state apartment of five rooms, ground floor service area turned into second great apartment for Earl and Countess. Displaced service rooms to wings.

Terrace at front has entrance to two front towers- they do not connect to the rest of the house though, in terms of access. No corridors in house, rooms are processional.

Owner: Earl of Lauderdale (Lauderdale Estates Ltd.)

Archive: Private Lauderdale Archive

NLS Ms. Coll. 1652-1800 Misc. family and business correspondence

Maitland, Dukes of Lauderdale Acc. 8557

NRA: GD 224/ 173 Lauderdale Papers

Airy, O 1884-5 *The Lauderdale Papers* (Camden Society, London)

Baldwin, J 1997 *Edinburgh, Lothians and the Borders* (HMSO, Edinburgh) 105

- Binney 11 Aug 1983 "Thirlestane Castle, Berwickshire-I" *Country Life* 174, 4486
- Binney 18 Aug 1983 "Thirlestane Castle, Berwickshire-II" *Country Life* 174, 4487
- Hannan, T 1928 *Famous Scottish Houses; the Lowlands* (Black, London)
- MacGibbon, D and T Ross 1887-92 *The Castellated and Domestic Architecture of Scotland from the Twelfth to the Eighteenth Centuries* (D Douglas, Edinburgh)vol4 334-9
- RCAHMS 1915 *The RCAHM and Constructions of Scotland's Monuments and Constructions in the County of Berwick* (HMSO, Edinburgh) 106-8 no.209
- Slezer, J 1693 *Theatrum Scotiae* (London)
- Thirlestane Castle 1999 *Thirlestane Castle and the Border Country Life Museum, Lauder, Berwickshire: an illustrated guide* (Wardington, Banbury)

Appendix Two: Analysis of Houses: Fieldwork Checklist

- NAME OF BUILDING (note language used to describe house e.g. palace, castle)
 - PATRON (incl. politics, affiliations, religion, family connections)
 - ARCHITECT (other patrons, notable projects, influences)
 - DATES OF CONSTRUCTION (built on earlier structure? Adapted?)
 - STYLE(S) (to determine additions)
 - ADDITIONS (when and why)
 - PLANS
 - ELEVATIONS (front, back, sides. Phases? Façades added on?)
 - LOCATION (topography- natural or man-made)
 - VIEWS FROM SPECIFIC VANTAGE POINTS IN HOUSE (entrance, reception rooms)
 - VIEWS OF SPECIFIC VANTAGE POINTS (from driveway on approach etc. Controlled, axis with other features?)
 - ROLE OF HOUSE/ FUNCTION? (Purely social? House parties? Local occasions? When used? i.e. Seasonal?)
 - Other houses owned by patron and family?
-

EXTERNAL

- SIZE
- FAÇADE (Number of storeys? Symmetrical? Proportions? Porch? Stairs? Order? Pavilions? Temple front? Look at window and door positions etc. (number, materials))
- ROOF LINE (Detail? Shape, flat or raised? Ornamental chimneys or other features)
- MATERIAL (Plainness, treatment- ashlar, rubble, rusticated, different treatment of different floors)

- GARDENS (Gateway/ gatehouse? Formality/informality. Terraces, use of water, drives. How encompass older features? Colour. **Gardens as frames to pictures of houses**) Relation with policies and other structures

PLAN

- SIZE AND COMPLEXITY (number of rooms)
- SYMMETRY (Adherence to tripartite plan? Axial planning?)
- When comes to individual rooms generally note details of rooms then compare to/ contrast with others and place rooms in relation to others. Where does the room come in the plan?
- HORIZONTALITY (Clearly defined private/ public spaces? Servants quarters (i.e. Strong expression of owner/ owned?) Sequences more classified in function and access? Where sequences of rooms come in plan. Presence/ absence particular types of rooms)
- PRIVACY (Community or individual? Internalised/ inward-looking e.g. Courtyard or externalised/ outward-looking e.g. Groups of rooms? Marked alienation of rooms from one another? Often even servants segregated from one another)
- With extra need to give hospitality additional numbers and differentiation of servants quarters? More alienation of owner/ owned? Stronger expression of the relationship?
- What arrangement of rooms most adequately reflects privacy in plan? Sequence or cluster?
- State rooms not in everyday use by family- instead used private apartments?
- ACCESS (position of corridors. Room size)
- ROOMS (Fireplaces in rooms? Do flues service public and private spaces? Size? Position?)
- Proportion and geometry

-
- **Emotional response.** Transitional spaces like porches and gateways. Height of rooms. Heat. Smells.
 - Sound- Quality, noise vs quiet, human/ natural sounds

GUIDING PRINCIPLES

- Vision (Rapaport 1982, 50) All aspects- shape, size, scale, height, colour, material, texture, detail, décor, furniture, furnishings
- Spaces (Rapaport 1982, 51) quality, size, shape, enclosed elements, barriers,

- links, light and shade, light levels and quality
- Age- old vs new (Rapaport 1982, 53)
 - Order vs disorder (Rapaport 1982, 54)
 - Furniture/ furnishings- type, arrangements, colour, style, curtains, rugs, screens, art, plants etc.
 - (Rapaport 1982, 22-3) Much of meaning to do with personalisation and hence perceived control, with decoration, moveable elements.
-

List of References

Abbreviations used:

Atholl MS/ AM = Atholl Muniments (His Grace, The Duke of Atholl, Blair Castle,
Perthshire; NAS GD234)

Chronicles = Atholl, John 7th Duke 1908 *Chronicles of the Atholl and Tullibardine
Families* (Edinburgh)

Dict. Nat. Biog. = *Dictionary of National Biography*

EUL = Edinburgh University Library

HS = Historic Scotland

MCP = *More Culloden Papers* (ed) D Warrand 1923-30 (Inverness)

MS. HTC = *Hamilton Town Council Minute Book 1701-1735* (Hamilton Burgh Library)

NAS = National Archives of Scotland (previously referred to as SRO) (GD=Gifts and Deposits followed by
ref. number)

NLS = National Library of Scotland, Edinburgh

NMRS = National Monuments Record for Scotland (NMRS followed by ref. number)

NSA = *New Statistical Accounts of Scotland* 1845

OSA = *Statistical Accounts of Scotland* 1791-99

RCAHMS = Royal Commission on the Ancient and Historical Monuments of Scotland

RMS = *Register of the Great Seal of Scotland (Registrum Magni Sigilli Regum Scotorum)*
1882-1914 11 vols (eds) JM Thomson et al (Edinburgh)

S = *Fletcher of Saltoun Papers*. (NLS) For example S401Argyll 3 to Milton 9 Nov 1743

SAR = *Scottish Archaeology Review*

SHS = Scottish History Society

SRO = Scottish Record Office (GD= Gifts and Deposits followed by ref. number)

TS.HBR = *Typescript. Hamilton Burgh Records* A G Miller (Hamilton Burgh Library)

V.B. = Campbell, C 172?-1725 *Vitruvius Britannicus or the British Architect* vols I and II
(London)

V.S. = Adam, W 1980 *Vitruvius Scoticus* Facsimile reprint of original 1750 edition (ed) J Simpson (Paul Harris Publishers, Edinburgh)

Ackerman, J S 1990 *The Villa, Form and Ideology of Country Houses* (Thames and Hudson, London)

Adam, W 1980 *Vitruvius Scoticus* Facsimile reprint of original 1750 edition (ed) J Simpson (Paul Harris Publishers, Edinburgh)

Adam Smith, J 1996 "Some Eighteenth Century Ideas of Scotland" in Phillipson N T and R Mitchison (eds) 1996 *Scotland in the Age of Improvement* (2nd edn. EUP, Edinburgh) 107-124

Agnew, Sir A 1893 *The Hereditary Sheriffs of Galloway* (Edinburgh)

Allan, D 2002 *Scotland in the Eighteenth Century: Union and Enlightenment* (Pearson Education Ltd, London)

Amussen, S D 1988 *An Ordered Society: Gender and Class in Early Modern England* (Blackwell, Oxford)

Arditi, J 1998 *A Genealogy of Manners: Transformations of Social Relations in France and England from the Fourteenth to the Eighteenth Century* (Uni. Chicago Press, Chicago)

Atholl, John 7th Duke 1908 *Chronicles of the Atholl and Tullibardine Families* (Edinburgh)

Atholl Muniments (His Grace The Duke of Atholl, Blair Castle, Perthshire; NAS GD234)

(*Atholl MSS 45175* – Duchess of Hamilton's views on Union; *AM 47(8)* 129, 130 and 131 – letters from factor Humphrey Harrison highlighting power of Duke)

- Atholl 1988 *Blair Castle: An Illustrated Survey of the Historic Scottish Home of the Duke of Atholl* (Pilgrim Press Ltd, Derby)
- Bailey 1787 *A Journey in Scotland* (Manuscript in NLS 3294-5 II)
- Balfour Paul, Sir J 1904 *The Scots Peerage: Founded on Word's edition of Sir Robert Douglas's Peerage of Scotland* vol. iv (David Douglas, Edinburgh)
- Barrett, JC 1988 "Fields of Discourse: Reconstituting a Social Archaeology" *Critique of Anthropology* 7 5-16
- Barrett, J 1994 *Fragments from Antiquity: an archaeology of social life in Britain 2900-1200 BC* (Blackwell, Oxford)
- Beaudry, M.C, L.J. Cook and S.A. Mrozowski 1996 "Artifacts and active Voices: Material Culture as Social Discourse" in Orser, CE (ed) *Images of the Recent Past* (Alta Vista Press, Walnut Creek) 272-310
- Berry, C J 1997 *Social Theory of the Scottish Enlightenment* (EUP, Edinburgh)
- Billings, R W 1848-52 *The Baronial and Ecclesiastical Antiquities of Scotland* (Edinburgh)
- Boswell, J 1963 *Journal of a Tour to the Hebrides with Samuel Johnson LL.D 1773* (ed) FA Pottle and C H Bennett (Heinemann, London)
- Bourdieu, P 1977 *Outline of a Theory of Practice* (CUP, Cambridge)
- Brown, K M 1992 *Kingdom or Province? Scotland and the Regal Union 1603-1715* (MacMillan, London)
- Brown, K M 1993 "The Scottish Aristocracy, Anglicization and the Court" *Historical Jnl* 36, 3 543-576

- Brown, K M 2000 *Noble Society in Scotland: Wealth, Family and Culture from Reformation to Revolution* (EUP, Edinburgh)
- Bryson, A 1998 *From Courtesy to Civility: Changing Codes of Conduct in Early Modern England* (Clarendon, Oxford)
- Burke, Edmund 1968 *A Philosophical Enquiry into the Origin of Our Ideas of the Sublime and Beautiful* (Uni. Of Notre Dame Press, London)
- Burrell, Sir W 1758 *Travels in Scotland* (MS NLS 2911)
- Campbell, C 172?- 1725 2nd edn *Vitruvius Britannicus or the British Architect* vols. I and II (London)
- Carrithers, M 1992 *Why Humans Have Cultures: Explaining Anthropology and Social Diversity* (OUP, Oxford)
- Cavers, K 1993 *A Vision of Scotland: The Nation Observed by John Slezer 1671 to 1717* (HMSO, Edinburgh)
- Clemenson, H A 1982 *English Country Houses and Landed Estates* (Croom Helm, London)
- Clerk, Sir J 1727 *The Country Seat* (unpub. MS, Clerk of Penicuik Papers (NAS GD18))
- Cosgrove, D E 1998 *Social Formation and Symbolic Landscape* (Uni of Wisconsin Press, Madison)
- Creegan, E 1996 "The Changing Role of the House of Argyll in the Scottish Highlands" in NT Phillipson and R Mitchison (eds) *Scotland in the Age of Improvement* (2nd edn. EUP, Edinburgh) 5-23
- Cruft, C 1984 "James, second Duke of Atholl and John Cheere" in D J Breeze (ed)

- Studies in Scottish Antiquity* (John Donald Pub Ltd, Edinburgh) 285-301
- Deetz, J 1977 *In Small Things Forgotten: The Archaeology of Early American Life* (Anchor, New York)
- Deetz, J 1996 *In Small Things Forgotten: The Archaeology of Early American Life* (2nd edition, Anchor, New York)
- Defoe, D 1724-7 *A Tour Through the Whole Island of Great Britain. Divided into Circuits or Journies* (London)
- Defoe, D 1769 (7th edn) *A Tour through the Whole Island of Great Britain. Divided into Circuits or Journies. Vol. iv* (London)
- Defoe, D 1991 *A Tour Through the Whole Island of Great Britain* (ed) Furbank, PN, WR Owens and AJ Coulson (Yale UP, New Haven)
- Dezallier d'Argenville A J (trans. John James) 1712 *Theory and Practice of Gardening. Done from the French Original, printed at Paris AD 1709* (George James, London)
- Dictionary of National Biography*
- Dunbar, J G 1966 *The Historic Architecture of Scotland* (Batsford, London)
- Dunbar, J G 1978 *The Architecture of Scotland* (revised 2nd edn. Batsford, London)
- Dunbar, J G 1999 *Scottish Royal Palaces: The Architecture of the Royal Residences during the Late Medieval and Early Renaissance Periods* (Tuckwell Press, East Lothian)
- Etlin, R E 1994 *Symbolic Space: French Enlightenment Architecture and its Legacy* (Uni. of Chicago Press, Chicago)

- EUL DC.1.37(1&2) 2nd Duke of Atholl to factor concerning his suspected disloyalty
1745
- Fairclough, G 1992 "Meaningful Constructions: spatial and functional analysis of medieval buildings" *Antiquity* 66 348-366
- Faulkner, G 1963 "Castle Planning in the Fourteenth Century" in *Arch. J* 128 215-235
- Ferguson, W 1968 *Scotland 1689 to the Present* (Oliver and Boyd, Edinburgh)
- Fleming, J 1956 *Scottish Country Houses and Gardens Open to the Public* (Country Life)
- Foster, S 1989 "Transformations in Social Space: the Iron Age of Orkney and Caithness" in *SAR* 6 34-54
- Foucault, M 1973 *Power/ Knowledge. Selected Interviews and Other Writings* (Pantheon Books)
- Frankl, P 1914 *Die Entwicklungsphasen der Neueren Baukunst* (Teubner, Leipzig)
- Fraser, A 1977 *The Royal Burgh of Inveraray* (St Andrews Press, Edinburgh)
- Frew, J and D Jones (eds) 1988 *Aspects of Scottish Classicism: Proceedings of a Symposium Held at Chatelherault, Hamilton May 18th 1988*
- Fyfe, JG (ed) 1928 *Scottish Diaries and Memories vol. I* (E Mackay, Stirling)
- Giddens, A 1981 *A Contemporary Critique of Historical Materialism* (MacMillan, London)
- Giddens, A 1984 *The Constitution of Society* (Polity Press, Cambridge)
- Giddens, A 1995 *A Contemporary Critique of Historical Materialism* (2nd edn. MacMillan, London)

- Gilchrist, R 1989 "Community and Self: Perceptions of Use and Space in Medieval Monasteries" in *SAR* 6 55-64
- Gilchrist, R 1994 *Gender and Material Culture: The Archaeology of Religious Women* (Routledge, London)
- Gilyard-Beer, R 1977 "De Ireby's Tower" in Apted, M R, R Gilyard-Beer and AD Saunders (eds) *Ancient Monuments and their Interpretation: essays presented to AJ Taylor* (Phillimore, London)
- Girouard, M 1978 *Life in the English Country House* (Yale UP, New Haven)
- Glassie, H 1975 *Folkhousing in Middle Virginia: A Structural Analysis of Historical Artifacts* (Uni Tennessee Press, Knoxville)
- Glendinning, M, R MacInnes and A MacKechnie 1996 *A History of Scottish Architecture* (EUP, Edinburgh)
- Goffman, E 1963 *Behaviour in Public Places: Notes on the Social Organisation of Gatherings* (Free Press of Glencoe)
- Gordon of Ruthven, P 1844 *A Short Abridgement of Britain's Distemper* (Aberdeen)
- Gow I and A Rowan (eds) 1995 *Scottish Country Houses 1600-1914* (EUP, Edinburgh)
- Graham, H G 1900 *The Social Life of Scotland in the Eighteenth Century* vol I (2nd edn., Adam and Charles Black, London)
- Grahame, MA 1995 *The Houses of Pompeii: Space and Social Interaction* (unpub. PhD, University of Southampton)
- Grant of Laggan, Mrs 1845 *Letters from the Mountains; Being the Correspondence*

with her Friends, Between the Years 1773 and 1803 2 vols (ed) JP Grant (Longman, Brown, Green, and Longmans, London)

Graves, C P 1989 "Social Space in the English Medieval Parish Church" *Economy and Society* 18 297-322

Gregory, D and J Urry (eds) 1985 *Social Relations and Spatial Structures* (MacMillan, London)

Grenville, J 1997 *Medieval Housing* (Leicester UP, Leicester)

Gunther, R T 1928 *Architecture of Sir Roger Pratt* (1972 reissue, New York)

Hadfield, M 1960 *A History of British Gardening* (Penguin, Harmondsworth)

Hamilton Archives, Lennoxlove House

Hamilton MSS 127 – 1726 Duke's reference to coal paying for landscaping;

Hamilton MSS C1.8453 – Duchess' views on house

Handsman, RG and Leone, M P 1989 "Living History and Critical Archaeology and the Reconstruction of the Past" in *Critical Approaches in Contemporary Archaeology*

Pinsky, V and A Wylie (CUP, Cambridge) 117-135

Hanson, J 1998 *Decoding Homes and Houses* (CUP, Cambridge)

Hart-Davis, D 1978 *Monarchs of the Glen: a History of Deerstalking in the Scottish Highlands* (Jonathan Cape, London)

Hartley, C 1992 *House of Dun* (M & M Press Ltd, Glasgow for NTS)

Hill Burton, J (ed) 1849 *The Darien Papers. Being a Selection of Original Letters and Official Documents Relating to the Establishment of a Colony at Darien by the Company of Scotland Trading to Africa and the Indie 1695-1700* (Bannatyne Club, Edinburgh)

- Hillier, B and J Hanson 1984 *The Social Logic of Space* (CUP, Cambridge)
- Hillier, B, J Hanson and H Graham 1987 “Ideas are in Things: an Application of the Space Syntax Method to Discover House Genotypes” *Environment and Planning B: Planning and Design* 14 363-385
- Hodder, I, M Shanks, A Alexandri et al (eds) 1995 *Interpreting Archaeology: Finding Meaning in the Past* (Routledge, London)
- Hopetoun Archive (Hopetoun House, West Lothian)
- Hopetoun House Memorandum of Agreement 7 May 1736*
- Hopetoun House contract NAS GD45/ 17/ 769* – contract for Bruce house
- Hopetoun House Preservation Trust 1984 *Hopetoun House* (Pilgrim Press Ltd., Derby)
- Hopetoun House Preservation Trust 2000 *Hopetoun House* (Pilgrim Press Ltd., Derby)
- Howard, D 1995 *The Architectural History of Scotland: Scottish Architecture from Reformation to Restoration 1560-1660* (EUP, Edinburgh)
- Howard, D 1995b “Sir William Bruce’s Design for Hopetoun House and Its Forerunners” in Gow and Rowan (eds) *Scottish Country Houses 1600-1914* (EUP, Edinburgh) 53-67
- Hume, David 1932 *The Letters of David Hume* JYT Greig (ed) (Clarendon Press, Oxford)
- Hunt, J D 2000 *Greater Perfections: The Practice of Garden Theory* (Thames and Hudson, London)
- Hussey, C 1967 *English Gardens and Landscapes 1700-1750* (CL, London)

- Innes-Smith, R 2000 *Glamis Castle. Official Guidebook* (Pilgrim Press, Derby)
- Isaac, R 1982 *The Transformation of Virginia 1760-1820* (University NC Press, Chapel Hill)
- Jauncey, J 2000 *Thirlestane Castle* (Thirlestane Castle Trust)
- Johnson, M 1993 *Housing Culture. Traditional Architecture in an English Landscape* (UCL Press, London)
- Johnson, M 1996 *An Archaeology of Capitalism* ((Blackwell, Oxford)
- Johnson, S and J Boswell 1984 *A Journey Through the Western Islands of Scotland and The Journal of a Tour to the Hebrides 1773* (Penguin Classics, Harmondsworth)
- King, C 2003 "The Organisation of Social Space in Late Medieval Manor Houses: an East Anglian study" *Archaeol. Journal* 160 104-124
- Kryder-Reid, E 1994 "As is the Gardener so is the Garden: The Archaeology of Landscape as Myth" in Shackel and Little (eds) *Historical Archaeology of the Chesapeake* (Smithsonian Inst Press, Washington DC) 131- 148
- Laing, D (ed) 1875 *Correspondence of Sir Robert Kerr, 1st Earl of Ancrum and his Son, William, 3rd Earl of Lothian* 2 vols (Bannatyne Club, Edinburgh)
- Langley, Batty 1728 *New Principles of Gardening* (Bettsworth and Batley, London)
- Leach, E 1978 "Does Space Syntax Really 'Constitute the Social'?" in Green, D, C Haslegrove and M Spriggs (eds) 385-401
- Lefebvre, H 1991 *The Production of Space* (Blackwell, Oxford)
- Leneman, L 1986 *Living in Atholl 1685- 1785* (EUP, Edinburgh)
- Lenman, B P 1980 *Jacobite Risings in Britain 1689-1746* (Eyre Methuen, London)
- Lenman, B P 1986 *The Jacobite Cause* (Drew, Glasgow)

- Leone, M P 1982 "Some Opinions about Recovering Mind" in *American Antiquity* 47 742-60
- Leone, M P 1996 "Interpreting Ideology in Historical Archaeology: Using Rules of Perspective in the William Paca Garden in Annapolis, Maryland" in Orser (ed) *Images of the Recent Past* (Alta Mira Press, Walnut Creek) 371-391
- Leone, MP and Potter 1988 *The Recovery of Meaning* (Smithsonian Inst. Press, Washington DC)
- Lindsay, I G and M Cosh 1973 *Inveraray and the Dukes of Argyll* (EUP, Edinburgh)
- Lochhead, M 1948 *The Scots Household in the Eighteenth Century* (The Moray Press, Edinburgh)
- Lockhart, G 1714 *Memoirs Concerning the Affairs of Scotland from Queen Anne's Accession to the Throne to the Commencement of the Union of the Two Kingdoms of Scotland and England in May 1707* (London)
- Loveday, J 1889 *Diary of a Tour in 1732 through parts of England, Wales, Ireland and Scotland, made by John Loveday of Caversham, and now for the first time published from a MS, in the Possession of his Great Grandson J E Taylor Loveday. With and introduction and itinerary* (Roxburgh Club, Edinburgh)
- Lowrey, J 1988 "Development of the Formal Landscape at Hamilton Palace" Frew J and D Jones (eds) *Aspects of Scottish Classicism* 25-32
- Lubbock, Jules 1995 *The Tyranny of Taste: The Politics of Architecture and Design in Britain 1550-1960* (Yale UP, New Haven)

- Macaulay, J 1987 *The Classical Country House in Scotland* (Faber and Faber, London)
- Macaulay, J 1988 "The Seventeenth Century Genesis of Hamilton Palace" in Frew and Jones (eds) *Aspects of Scottish Classicism: Proceedings of a Symposium Held at Chatelherault, Hamilton May 18th 1988* 17-24
- MacDonald, J 1927 *Memoirs of an Eighteenth Century Footman* (ed) J Beresford (Routledge, London)
- MacGibbon, D and T Ross 1887-92 *The Castellated and Domestic Architecture of Scotland from the Twelfth to the Eighteenth century* vol. II (D Douglas, Edinburgh)
- MacGregor, L J and R Oram 2000 *Atholl and Gowrie, North Perthshire. A Historic Guide* (Birlinn Ltd, Edinburgh)
- McGuire, R H 1992 *A Marxist Archaeology* (Academic Press, London)
- MacInnes, A I 1996 *Clanship, Commerce and the House of Stuart 1603-1788* (Tuckwell, East Lothian)
- McKean, C 1993 "The Scottishness of Scottish Architecture" in P H Scott (ed) *Scotland: A Concise Cultural History* (Mainstream, Edinburgh) 229-252
- McKean, C 2001 *The Scottish Chateau: The Country House of Renaissance Scotland* (Sutton Publishing, Gloucester)
- McKean, C 2002 "The Laird and his Guests: The Implications of Offering Hospitality in the Scottish Renaissance Country Seat" *Architectural Heritage XIII* (EUP, Edinburgh) 1-19
- McKerral, A 1948 *Kintyre in the Seventeenth Century* (Oliver and Boyd, Edinburgh)

- MacKintosh of Borlum, W 1729 *An Essay on Ways and Means for Inclosing*
(Freebairn, Edinburgh)
- Macky, J 1729 *A Journey Through Scotland. In Familiar Letters from a Gentleman
Here to his Friends Abroad* (2nd edn, Printed for J Pemberton and J Hooke, London)
- MacPhail, JRN (ed) 1916 *Highland Papers* (SHS 1914-34, Edinburgh)
- MacTavish, D C 1939 *Inveraray Papers* (Oban Times, Oban)
- MacWilliam, C E 1980 *Lothian Except Edinburgh* (Penguin, Harmondsworth)
- Markus, T 1982 (ed) *Order in Space and Society: Architectural Form and its
Context in the Scottish Enlightenment* (Mainstream, Edinburgh)
- Markus, T 1993 *Buildings and Power: Freedom and Control in the Origin of the
Modern Building Types* (Routledge, London)
- Marshall, R 1973 *The Days of Duchess Anne* (Collins Sons and Co Ltd, Glasgow)
- Marshall, R 2000 *The Days of Duchess Anne* (Tuckwell, East Lothian)
- Marshall, R 1995 “ ‘Scarce a Finer Seat in Scotland’ Kinneil Castle and the Fourth
Duke of Hamilton” in Gow and Rowan (eds) *Scottish Country Houses 1600-1914*
(EUP, Edinburgh) 35- 41
- Mawman, J 1805 *An Excursion to the Highlands of Scotland and the English Lakes,
with Recollections, Documents and References to Historical Facts* (J Mawman,
London)
- Millar AH (ed) 1890 *The Book of Record: A Diary Written by Patrick first Earl of
Strathmore and other Documents relating to Glamis, 1684-1689: edited from the
original MSS, at Glamis with introduction and notes by A H Millar T and A
Constable for SHS 1890* (SHS 1st Series, 9, Edinburgh)

- Mitchison, R 1983 *Lordship to Patronage Scotland 1603-1745* (John Donald, Edinburgh)
- Mitchison, R 1996 "The Government and the Highlands 1707-1745" in Phillipson and Mitchison (eds) *Scotland in the Age of Improvement* (2nd edn. EUP, Edinburgh) 24-56
- Moncrieffe, I and D Pottinger 1983 *Clan Map: Scotland of Old* (J Bartholomew and Son Ltd, Edinburgh)
- Montgomery-Massingberd, H and C S Sykes 2001 *Great Houses of Scotland* (Lawrence King Publishers, London)
- Morris, RK 2000 *The Archaeology of Buildings* (Tempus, Stroud)
- Morris Robert 1728 *An Essay in Defence of Ancient Architecture* (printed for D Broome, W Bickerton, J Pole and J Walthoe, London)
- Morris, Robert 1734 *Lectures on Architecture* (J Brindley, London)
- MS.HTC 28 April 1705 Valuation roll of Hamilton
- Murdoch, A 1980 *The People Above: Politics and Administration in Mid-Eighteenth Century Scotland* (John Donald Pub. Ltd., Edinburgh)
- NSA (*New Statistical Account of Scotland*) 1845 vol. vi (Hamilton)
- NSA (*New Statistical Account of Scotland*) 1845 vol. x (Blair)
- Orser, C E (ed) 1996 *Images of the Recent Past* (Alta Mira, Walnut Creek)
- Orser, C E 1998 "Epilogue: From Georgian Order to Social Relations in Annapolis and Beyond" in Shackel, Mullins and Warner (eds) *Annapolis Pasts* (Uni Tennessee Press, Knoxville) 307-324
- OS (Ordnance Survey) *Map 2nd edition 1856 Linlithgowshire sheet 2*

- OS (Ordnance Survey) *Map 2nd edition 1867 Perthshire sheet 21*
- OSA (*Statistical Account of Scotland*) 1791-99 vol. ii The Lothians
- OSA (*Statistical Account of Scotland*) 1791-99 vol. vii Lanarkshire and Renfrewshire
- OSA (*Statistical Account of Scotland*) 1791-99 vol. viii Argyll Mainland
- OSA (*Statistical Account of Scotland*) 1791-99 vol.xii North and West Perthshire
- Parker-Pearson, M and C Richards (eds) 1994 *Architecture and Order: Approaches to Social Space* (Routledge, London)
- Parry, G 1981 *The Golden Age Restor'd: The Culture of the Stuart Court 1603-1643* (Manchester UP, Manchester)
- Patrick, J 1991 "A Union Broken? Restoration Politics in Scotland" in J Wormald (ed) *Scotland Revisited* (Collins and Brown, London) 119-128
- Pattison, P (ed) 1998 *There by Design: Field Archaeology in Parks and Gardens* (BAR British Series 267, Archaeopress, Oxford)
- Pennant, T 1772 *A Tour in Scotland and Voyage to the Hebrides 1772* vol 1 (I B Whyte, London)
- Petrie, A 1720 *Rules of Good Deportment* (Edinburgh)
- Phillipson N T and R Mitchison (eds) 1996 *Scotland in the Age of Improvement* (2nd edn. EUP, Edinburgh)
- Pococke, R 1887 "Tours in Scotland 1747, 1750, 1760" *SHS vol 1* (Edinburgh)
- Porter, R 2000 *Enlightenment: Britain and the Creation of the Modern World* (Penguin, London)
- Pringle, D 2000 *Linlithgow Palace. A Historical Guide to the Royal Palace and Peel* (Howie and Seath, Edinburgh for HS)

- Rae and Rae 1963 "Abercorn Castle" *Discovery and Excavation Scotland* 51
- Ramsay, J 1900 *Scotland and Scotsmen in the Eighteenth Century; From the MS of John Ramsay of Ochtertyre* (ed) Alexander Allardyce (William Blackwood and Sons, Edinburgh) vol.II
- Rapaport, A 1982 *The Meaning of the Built Environment: a nonverbal communication approach* (Sage Publications, London)
- RCAHMS 1929 *Tenth Report and Inventory of Monuments and Constructions in the Counties of Midlothian and West Lothian* (HMSO, Edinburgh)
- RCAHMS 1933 *The RCAHM and Constructions of Scotland. 11th Report with Inventory of Monuments and Constructions in the Counties of Fife, Kinross and Clackmannan* (HMSO, Edinburgh)
- RCAHMS 1967 *Peeblesshire: an Inventory of the Ancient Monuments* (HMSO, Edinburgh)
- RCAHMS 1992 *Argyll: An Inventory of the Ancient Monuments, vol.7, Mid Argyll and Cowal, Medieval and Later Monuments* (HMSO, Edinburgh)
- Richards, C 1993 "Monumental Choreography: Architecture and Spatial Representation in Late Neolithic Orkney" in C Tilley (ed) *Interpreting Archaeology* (Oxford) 143-178
- Richardson, A 2003 "Gender and Space in English Royal Palaces c.1160-c.1547: A Study in Access Analysis and Imagery" in *Medieval Archaeology* 47 131-165
- (RMS = Register of the Great Seal of Scotland (Registrum Magni Sigilli Regum Scotorum) 1882-1914 11 vols (eds) JM Thomson et al (Edinburgh))

- RMS ii no270* – Hamilton created free Royal Burgh 1549; *RMS no1168 AD1474* – Inveraray Burgh of Barony status granted by James III
- Rogers, C 1884 *Social Life in Scotland: From Early to Recent Times* (Grampian Club, Edinburgh)
- Rowan, A 1984 “The Building of Hopetoun” *Architectural History* 27 183-209
- Rutherford, A G 1998 *A Social Interpretation of the Castle in Scotland* (Unpub. PhD thesis, University of Glasgow)
- Saint Fond, B F de 1907 *A Journey Through England and Scotland to the Hebrides in 1784* (English trans. revised and edited by Sir Archibald Geikie) (Hugh Hopkins, Glasgow)
- Saltoun Papers* (NLS MSS.16501-17900)
- (*S41 Stonefield to Lady Milton 7 June 1744* – 3rd Duke advised that accommodation not prepared for first visit ; *S43 Argyll 3 to Milton 20 March 1744* - gardener as potential informer; *S43 Argyll 3 to Milton 3 April 1744* – frauds practised in town; *S402 Argyll3 to Lord Milton 31 May 1744* – Highlanders think is fair to cheat chief; *S43 Argyll to Milton 16 June 1744* – roads to Inveraray; *S401 Argyll 3 to Milton 9 Nov 1743* – 3rd Duke’s intention to move town; *S401 Argyll 3 to Milton 12 Nov 1743* – 3rd Duke saw Inveraray as a retreat; *Box 402* – cattle raiders attacking Inveraray; careful choosing of loyal tenants)
- Samson, R 1990 “The Rise and Fall of Tower Houses in Post-Reformation Scotland” Samson (ed) *The Social Archaeology of Houses* (EUP, Edinburgh) 197-244
- Schama, S 1996 *Landscape and Memory* (Fontana Press, London)

- Simpson, J M 1996 "Who Steered the Gravy Train 1707-1766" in Phillipson and Mitchison (eds) *Scotland in the Age of Improvement* (2nd edn. EUP, Edinburgh) 47-72
- Sinclair, Sir J 1826 *Analysis of the Statistical Account of Scotland: a General View of the History of that Country, and Discussions of some Important branches of Political Economy* (printed for Archibald Constable, Edinburgh)
- Skrine, H 1813 *Three Successive Tours in the North of England, to the Lakes and Great Part of Scotland* (2nd edn, Turner, London)
- Slade, H G 1995 "John Elphinstone and the Castle of Glamis" in Gow I and A Rowan (eds) *Scottish Country Houses 1600-1914* (EUP, Edinburgh) 110-127
- Slade, H G 2000 *Glamis Castle* (Society of Antiquaries of London, London)
- Slezer, J 1693 *Theatrum Scotiae* (John Leake, London)
- Smith, A 1776 *An Inquiry into the Nature and Causes of the Wealth of Nations, in three volumes* (Dublin)
- Smith, A 1996 *Lectures on Jurisprudence* (ed) RE Meek, Raphael DD, and Stein PG (Clarendon Press, Oxford)
- Smout, T C 1985 *A History of the Scottish People 1560-1830* (Fontana Press, London)
- Smout, T C 1996 "The Landowner and the Planned Village in Scotland 1730-1839" in N T Phillipson and R Mitchison (eds) *Scotland in the Age of Improvement* (EUP, Edinburgh) 73-106
- Stell, G 1973 "Highland Garrisons 1717-23: Bernera Barracks" *Jnl for Post-Medieval Archaeology* 7 20-30
- Stell, G 1985 "The Scottish Medieval Castle: Form, Function and Evolution" in K J

- Stringer (ed) *Essays on the Nobility of Scotland* (John Donald Pub, Edinburgh 195-209)
- Stuart Shaw, J 1999 *The Political History of Eighteenth Century Scotland* (MacMillan, London)
- Summerson, J 1993 *Architecture in Britain 1530 to 1830* (9th edn. Yale UP, London)
- Switzer, S 1742 *Ichnographia Rustica vol II* (2nd edn, London)
- Tait, AA 1980 *The Landscape Garden in Scotland 1735-1835* (Yale UP, London)
- Taylor, W 1976 *The Military Roads in Scotland* (David and Charles Pub Ltd, Devon)
- Taylor, C 1998 "From Recording to Recognition" in Pattison (ed) *There by Design: Field Archaeology in Parks and Gardens* (BAR British Series 267, Archaeopress, Oxford) 1-6
- Thornton, Col. T 1804 *A Sporting Tour through the Northern Parts of England, and great part of the Highlands of Scotland* (Verner and Hood, London)
- Thrale, Mrs 1789 *Journey to Scotland* (John Rylands Lib. Ryl. Eng. 623 Mrs Thrale's Journey to Scotland MS 623)
- Tilley, C 1994 *A Phenomenology of Landscape: Places, Paths and Monuments* (Berg, Oxford)
- Torrie, EPD and R Coleman 1996 *Historic Hamilton: The Archaeological Implications of Development* (HS, Edinburgh)
- TS.HBR (ed) AG Miller *Hamilton Burgh Records* iii, 17-18 – demolish part of Hamilton town as inconveniently close to ducal garden
- Tuan, Y-F 1977 *Space and Place: The Perspective of Experience* (Arnold, London)

- Walker, B and W Sinclair Gauldie 1984 *Architects and Architecture on Tayside* (Institute of Architects, Dundee)
- Wallace, W 1975 *Hamilton 1475-1975* (Glasgow)
- Walpole, H 1847 *Memoirs of the Reign of George II vol I* (ed) Lord Holland (Henry Colburn, London)
- Warrand, D (ed) 1923-30 *More Culloden Papers* (R Carruthers and Sons, Inverness) (A Mitchell to D Forbes 22 May 1747 v 180-3)
- West, S 1998 "Social Space and the English Country House" in S Tarlow and S West, S (ed) *The Familiar Past? Archaeologies of Later Historic Britain* (Routledge, London) 103-122
- Whately, C A 1990 "How Tame Were the Scottish Lowlanders During the Eighteenth century" in T M Devine (ed) *Conflict and Stability in Scottish Society* (John Donald Pub Ltd., Edinburgh) 1-30
- Wicker, NL 1999 "Archaeology and Art History: Common Ground for the New Millenium" in *Medieval Archaeology* 43 161-171
- Williamson, T 1998 *The Archaeology of the Landscape Park* (BAR, Archaeopress, Oxford)
- Wittkower, R 1974 *Palladio and English Palladianism* (Thames and Hudson, London)
- Yentsch, A E 1998 "Archaeology is not Enough" in M Beaudry (ed) *Documentary Archaeology in the New World* (CUP, Cambridge) 5-19

Yentsch, A E 1998b “Legends, Houses, Families and Myths: Relationships Between Material Culture and American Ideology” in Beaudry M (ed) *Documentary Archaeology in the New World* (CUP, Cambridge)

NMRS illustration references:

Blair Castle

PTD/127/1- etching of Blair setting
PTD/127/31- The Whim plan and elevation, Blair
PTD/127/34- Temple of Fame Plan, Blair
PTD/127/35- plan Diana’s Grove, Blair
PTD/127/37- C18 plan tree planting, Blair
PTD/127/41- Plan and elevation Kitchen Garden, Blair
PTD/127/66- General View, Blair
PTD/127/85.D2.13 (39)
PTD/127/90- sketches NE front, S front and W stables, Blair
PTD/127/95- section castle and E wing, elevation E wing and dairy wing, Blair
PTD/127/97- Plan and elevation washhouse, Blair
PTD/127/107- Elevation drawing of SW, Blair
PTD/127/112- 1736 Douglas façade, Blair
PTD/127/113; 114; 115- Douglas 1736 proposed plans, Blair
PTD/127/120; 121; 122- Winter 1743 proposed plans, Blair
PTD/127/123- 1743 Winter façade, Blair
PTD/127/137- Blair estate map 1744
PTD/127/142- Plans 1736 pre-modifications, Blair

Hamilton Palace

B41768/CN- Chatelherault
C76865 CN – AP Chatelherault
G85081/ G85082- South front entrance Hamilton
LA 39 561- Nineteenth century view of Hamilton
LA 410- Isaac plan c.1677 Hamilton
LA 412- Isaac façade c.1677 Hamilton
LAD/16/13- 1804 etching Chatelherault
LAD/18/22- J Smith façade 1696 Hamilton
LAD/18/26; 29- J Smith plans Hamilton

LAD/18/221- 1708 A Edwards landscape plan Hamilton

LAD59/1 PO- Wood map of Hamilton

SC600496- Plan Cadzow

Hopetoun House

A33042P- W Adam 'A General Plan of Hopetoun Park'

WLD/78/IP- Plan for a servants house to lodge four families, Society Hopetoun

WLD/18/33; 34- *V.B.* plan and elevation, Hopetoun

WLD/18/65P- Section S colonnade and pavilion, Hopetoun

NT 07NE 13 Aerial photograph of Hopetoun Garden

