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Abstract of Thesis

This thesis has been based on a detailed examination of the ten thousand two hundred letters which form the extant 17th century correspondence in His Grace the Duke of Hamilton's archives, and of approximately ten thousand household, building and estate accounts in the same Collection. A Calendar of the letters forms the appendix to the thesis; a Calendar of the accounts is in preparation.

The exact period under consideration is 1625-1712, from the succession of the 1st duke to the family titles until the death of his grandson the 4th duke. It has often been assumed that in the society of seventeenth century Scotland there was a great gulf between the anglicised peerage and the rest of the population, that the leading members of the Scottish aristocracy enjoyed a high standard of living in England while their fellow-countrymen remained at home in comparatively primitive conditions. The present survey suggests that this view is inaccurate.

The dukes of Hamilton were Scotland's premier peers, and the 1st and 2nd dukes did spend a large part of their adult lives in London. Nevertheless, they retained strong links with their own estates which they visited frequently. After the Civil War, the family became once more firmly based at Hamilton. They had their children educated locally, married their daughters into the Scottish peerage, and formed the focal point of the local community. Their houses were large, their furniture fine and their gardens well laid-out, but in this they were no different
from their contemporaries of a similar status. A comparison with the family papers of other Scottish peers shows that they shared a common standard of living and indeed a common outlook.

It would therefore seem probable that throughout the seventeenth century the Scottish peerage remained an integral part of Scottish society, living at home in a manner similar to that of the gentry and richer merchants, and relying to a large extent on local loyalties. Only towards the end of the period, with the coming of union with England and the emergence of a party political system, did the situation begin to change.
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INTRODUCTION

On 6 February 1648/9 James, 1st duke of Hamilton, was brought to trial in London, charged under his English title of earl of Cambridge with having 'traiterously invaded this nation in a hostile manner, and levied war to assist the king against the kingdom and people of England.' Throughout the hearing which followed, the duke's main defence was that, as a Scotsman, he was an alien and could not be tried in England: he had undertaken the invasion of England on the orders of the parliament of Scotland and had committed no act of treason. The prosecution alleged that the duke's father, James, 2nd marquis of Hamilton, had been a naturalised Englishman and that the son was therefore English too. The duke replied that he had been born before his father's naturalisation and so was not included in it.

At his eighth appearance before the court, the duke spoke in his own defence, arguing that 'he was sent by the kingdom of Scotland, which was a free kingdom, and independent on [sic] England; that he having had his birth, honour and fortune there, was bound to give obedience to their orders.' His protests were in vain. On 2 March the prosecution declared that even if he were a Scotsman born, 'yet he was no alien, having enjoyed all the privileges an Englishman was capable of, as being a peer, a privy councillor, possessing lands and inheritances, and marrying in England.' Four days later, the duke was sentenced to death. On 9

March 1648/9 he was beheaded at Whitehall.

The 1st duke of Hamilton's political career awaits a reappraisal - there has been no full-scale biography of him since Burnet's Memoires - but whatever the final verdict on his actions, his trial raises the very interesting question of whether his accusers were justified in arguing that he was a Scotsman so anglicised that he should be regarded as an Englishman. Nor does this question have relevance for the Hamilton family alone, or for that one generation only. It has frequently been assumed that with the removal of the Scottish king to London in 1603, the Scottish Court went south with him en bloc, a notion fostered by contemporary English criticism of impoverished Scotsmen flocking to the wealthier south at the heels of their sovereign, and by a preoccupation with such well-known residents at the English Court as William Murray and the duke of Lauderdale. It is therefore concluded that from 1603 onwards the Scottish peerage was detached from the rest of Scottish society; that the noblemen spent most of their time in England and were so anglicised in outlook and way of life that even when they did come to Scotland they could not be considered within the context of Scottish society.

The accuracy of any such view is dubious. Would it not be more true to suggest that the members of the peerage were scarcely more anglicised than the rest of Scottish society, that many of the Scottish peers had a standard of living little different from that of the gentry or of the richer merchants, that the real move south came after the union of the parliaments, not the union of the crowns?

This question is an important one not for narrow reasons of
nationalism. There is no intrinsic merit in being Scottish, no demerit in being anglicised. What is important is that if the peerage remained Scottish in outlook we shall have to reconsider the traditional view of Scotland in the seventeenth century, rejecting the notion of a deeply divided society in which the thoroughly anglicised aristocracy was alienated from the impoverished and non-anglicised lower classes, recognising instead that the divisions were much less clear cut; that what existed may have been a much more equitable situation where barriers of class were not nearly so evident as in some other countries, where all sectors of society were now beginning to adopt English ways to a certain extent, but where, for all classes including the aristocracy, the old local loyalties were still paramount.

Until a survey of the entire peerage has been undertaken it is, of course, difficult to generalise. However, by studying one significant family in detail, it may well be possible to find indications of what the truth of the matter really was. The Hamiltons are particularly well suited to such an investigation. Because of their exalted position they, of all the Scottish peerage, are assumed to have been a largely English family; the opinion expressed by the 1st duke's accusers is still echoed today by many who believe that the Hamiltons were, from as early as the sixteenth century, a family isolated from the rest of their fellow countrymen by their predominantly English outlook and way of life. Should this prove to be erroneous, it may well be true that other preconceived ideas about Scottish society in the seventeenth century are equally mistaken.
CHAPTER 1

The Hamiltons in England

James, 2nd marquis of Hamilton, died at Whitehall on 2 March 1624/5.\(^1\) His death was sudden — as John Donne wrote in his elegy;

>'Never made body such haste to confess
What a soule was: all former comelinesse
Fled, in a minute...\(^2\)

— and it was premature; he was only thirty-six. For several years past he had lived permanently in the south and, high in the favour of James VI, had been made a privy councillor of England, a gentleman of the bedchamber, and lord steward of the household. He was also created earl of Cambridge, and became a naturalised Englishman.\(^3\) Although his wife and younger children stayed at home in Hamilton, and this was to be of significance for the family, his heir was already living in England, so it must have seemed to contemporaries that the Hamiltons would now remain in the south for good.

This could at first sight seem to have been what did take place. The marquis's elder son succeeded him as earl of Cambridge, was a gentleman of the bedchamber, knight of the garter and master of the horse to Charles I.\(^4\) His younger son also held the title of earl of Cambridge in his turn, was

---

1 D.N.B., viii, 1062; S.P., iv, 375.
4 C.P., vi, 260-1; Edmund H. Fellowes, The Knights of the Garter, 12, 27.
at one time M.P. for Portsmouth and was nominated as a knight of the garter although never installed. The 3rd duke had the garter and was an English privy councillor and his son the 4th duke was for many years a gentleman of the bedchamber to Charles II, was briefly master of the wardrobe, and towards the end of his life was created duke of Brandon in Suffolk. In view of these and various other English honours and appointments it might indeed seem that the Hamiltons in the seventeenth century were more English than Scottish, but this would be a facile generalisation and in the search for the truth of the matter one must first of all consider just how much time these Hamiltons did spend in England.

The 2nd marquis’s son James, successively Lord Arran, 3rd marquis and 1st duke of Hamilton was born at Hamilton on 19 June 1606 and spent the first fourteen years of his life in Scotland. His mother Lady Anna Cunningham, famous in history as a vigorous supporter of the covenanters, had apparently refused to go south with her husband and remained at home looking after his estates and exerting a considerable influence over two generations of the family. In 1620, however, she agreed to send her elder son to England. His father intended that he should study at Oxford, and at the same time he set about negotiating a brilliant marriage for him. The boy therefore left Hamilton on 15 November of that year and travelled south with his governor. He was not to be sent to university straight

1 C.P., 263.
2 Ibid., 265.
3 Ibid., 267. This was of course a United Kingdom peerage.
4 Hereafter referred to by his final title.
GENEALOGICAL TABLE I

The dukes of Hamilton.

James, 2nd marquis of Hamilton.
  d. 1625.

James, 3rd marquis and 1st duke of Hamilton.
  Executed 1649.

=  

Lady Mary Feilding.
  d. 1638.

William, earl of Selkirk and 3rd duke of Hamilton.
  d. 1694.

=  

Lady Anna Cunningham.
  d. 1647

Anne, suo jure 3rd duchess of Hamilton.
  d. 1716.

=  

William, earl of Selkirk and 3rd duke of Hamilton.
  d. 1694.

=  

Lady Elizabeth Maxwell.
  d. 1659.

issue

James, earl of Arran and 4th duke of Hamilton.
  d. 1712.

=  

1. Lady Ann Spencer, d. 1690.
2. Lady Elizabeth Gerard, d. 1734.

issue
away, but was allowed a few months to see the sights of the city and the
Court, and was accordingly installed in the house of a Mr Watson in Holborn,
paying £2:5/- sterling a week for his lodgings. There he remained, except
for a few excursions to Theobalds and Whitehall,¹ until he went to Oxford
in the autumn of 1621.² His stay there was, however, destined to be brief,
for in the early summer of 1623 he was once more summoned to Court, this
time to be married to Lady Mary Feilding, daughter of the earl of Denbigh.³
For the next two decades - with important intervals - he was to make his
home in London.

It is important to note, however, that although it has been remarked
that the duke 'had property both in England and Scotland' and was therefore
divided in his loyalties,⁴ he actually owned a house and ground in England
for only eight years, and in size his English possessions were negligible
compared with his Scottish estates. His father had occupied Fisher's
Folly (also known as Devonshire House) in Bishopsgate Street,⁵ and had
feued extensive stabling accommodation in Covent Garden,⁶ but the 1st duke
does not seem to have inherited either of these, or if he did, disposed of
them in his efforts to pay off his father's large debts.

Instead, the duke probably had lodgings in the warren of rooms which
formed the old palace of Whitehall. This residence was preferred by

¹ HA 506/1/5,7.
² Ibid., Alumni Oxonienses, ed. Joseph Foster, ii, 659.
³ See Chapter 2.
⁴ D.N.B., viii, 1064.
⁵ E.B. Chancellor, The Private Palaces of London Past and Present, 3, and
 The Squares of London, 365.
⁶ See typescript list in Hamilton Box ES 19.
Charles I to St James's, and was now the principal seat of the Court. As his majesty's master of the horse and constant companion — William Middleton described him as 'a most diligent waiter upon the king' — he would be entitled to apartments there, while his wife as a lady of the bedchamber would be at St James's Palace in attendance on the queen. The duke also had a suite at Theobalds, on the ground floor of the Fountain Court, consisting of a diningroom, bedchamber and other rooms, and as steward of Hampton Court would have apartments there too.

Married at an early age, the duke and his wife did not at first live together, and from 1626-8 the duke left the Court altogether. A final quarrel with Buckingham seems to have precipitated this move, and it was only when the latter was assassinated that the duke agreed to return to London, and shortly afterwards took up residence with his wife. Even then he seems to have been restless, for in September 1631 a few months after the birth of his first daughter he left with an army to join Gustavus Adolphus in Germany. By the time he returned, a year later, his first child had died but his wife had presented him with another daughter and was soon pregnant again, so it became desirable to find a more permanent home

1 Edgar Sheppard, The Old Royal Palace of Whitehall, 11; J.T. Smith, Antiquities of Westminster... 18-72; the booklet Five Centuries of London reproduces an engraving of the old palace.
2 C.S.P. Venet, xxiv, 603; xix, 121; G. Albion, Charles I and the Court of Rome, 240; Burnet, op. cit., passim.
3 H.M.C. Report Denbigh, v, 10.
4 Sheppard, op. cit., 266-8.
5 Edgar Sheppard, Memorials of St James's Palace, i, 68.
6 D. Lysons, The Environ of London, iv, 34.
7 HL 9255.
for the family, and in 1635 Lady Mary's aunt by marriage, the widowed countess of Buckingham, lent her Wallingford House, which had fallen vacant on the death of its tenant the earl of Portland. ¹ This mansion, which stood on the site now occupied by Admiralty House, was most conveniently placed, overlooking the Spring Gardens at Whitehall. ² It had been built a generation earlier, and had been purchased by Buckingham who lived there until he acquired the more splendid York House. ³ Even so, Wallingford was extensive enough to accommodate a large household: as well as Lady Mary's lodgings and her children's rooms there were lower and upper dining rooms, a hall and gallery, a great chamber, a full complement of bedchambers and all the usual offices. ⁴ It would be at Wallingford House that Lady Mary's younger children were born, and it was there that she herself lay ill throughout the summer and autumn of 1637. ⁵ Having borne six children in just over four years she had little resistance against the violent fever she had contracted, and by the following spring she was resigned to the fact that she would not recover, in the last weeks refusing to see her children 'lest the sight of them might have kindled too much tenderness in her.' ⁶ On 10 May 1638 she died, and shortly afterwards her husband took their children away with him to Hampton Court. ⁷

Wallingford House had been lent to Lady Mary as a favour, and in the

² The Old Royal Palace of Whitehall, i, 176-9.
⁴ HA 121/8/3.
⁶ Burnet, op. cit., 407.
⁷ C.S.P.D. 1637-8, 431; HA 121/8/12.
Ratebook for 1638 she and not her husband appeared as the tenant. Now that she was dead he would have to find another home for his children for apparently the duchess of Buckingham, now remarried, intended to lease the house to someone else. Eleven days after his wife's death the duke therefore had Francis Vernon buy for him the manor house of Chelsea, and on 23 June 1638 the king gave him a grant of Chelsea Place and the Manor of Chelsea.

Chelsea at this time was still a village outside London, and as well as being extremely fashionable would no doubt be healthier for the duke's delicate children. It was not, however, possible for them to be moved there at once, for apparently there was a lack of suitable accommodation. There were two manor houses in Chelsea: the original, also known as Beaufort House, had been the home of Sir Thomas More and had passed into the possession of Henry VIII, who then erected a second house there to accommodate his children. The existing houses must have been unavailable or unsuitable, for the duke decided to have built an entirely new brick house adjoining the New Manor.

Work on this house must have begun in 1638, and an undated account of about that time records the purchase of 110,000 bricks, 16,000 tiles, 615

1 Survey of London, xvi, 48n.
2 HL 1167, 1169.
3 Thomas Faulkner, An Historical and Topographical Description of Chelsea... i, 325.
4 C.S.P.D. 1637-8, 526-7; Lysons, op. cit., i. 76-7.
6 Wilberforce Jenkinson, The Royal and Bishops' Palaces in Old London, 60.
loads of sand, 13 stones 16 hundredweights of lime and 10 loads of clay, as well as brooms, ladders, and nails for scaffolding. The Henry VIII manor house had been built round a courtyard, and the duke's adjoining building was actually a complete house, also built round a quadrangle, as a ground plan of 1706 shows. The older house had elaborate Tudor chimneys, a crenellated roof and small diamond pane windows. The duke's house was externally very plain. Like the Henry VIII house it was two stories high, but it was completely lacking in ornamentation and had larger, plain windows.

The ten first floor windows of the new house looked out over a terrace to the Thames, and at the back were gardens and an orchard. On the ground floor round the Fountain Court were the great hall, library and various other chambers together with a great gallery, for the duke's pictures, leading to the garden. The 3 kitchens, the larder and the other offices were on this floor too. From the spacious entrance hall a fine staircase led up to the first floor where three large drawing rooms extended the whole length of the front. Seventeen bedchambers and four closets were situated in the north front, overlooking the gardens, and

1 HA 121/8/10.
2 This drawing is in the Chelsea Library, London.
3 Faulkner gives an interesting drawing of the two houses in the corner of the map which forms the frontispiece of his book. It is not, however, suitable for reproduction.

Plate 1 Winchester Palace, the house built for the 1st duke of Hamilton.
directly over the main gallery was another upper gallery with a balcony. Above the bedrooms were some garrets and 'summer-rooms', and the accounts also mention a banqueting house, which may have been a separate structure, and in the grounds a stable and coach house.

Work on the new house, which was to be known as Chelsea Place, continued throughout 1639, and by the following year preparations were being made for the duke to move in: £1:11:6 sterling was paid 'for 3 weomen 7 days to wash the house and to make it clean', 56 chimneys were swept, and the ratcatcher was paid 5/- for his services. Furnishings arrived by boat, and finally a payment of 2/- was made 'for a boate to follow my lord to Chelsey.' With him he brought his one surviving son and two daughters.

In the summer of 1640 his heir died, and he and his daughters were to stay at Chelsea for only a few years more. With the financial difficulties of the Civil War the duke was having to borrow large sums of money, and at some point in the 1640's he made the house over to his cousin and brother-in-law John, Lord Belhaven. In 1646 the manor was seized by the commission for the compounding of delinquents, who put it up for sale, but Lord Belhaven explained that the property had been assigned to him in recognition of the substantial loans he had made to the duke, and the sale was stopped. The matter was now complicated by the fact that Lord Belhaven

2 HA 121/8/10.
3 HL 848.
4 HA 121/8/11.
decided to disappear altogether, allowing everyone but his closest relations to believe that he was dead. Before he did so, he assigned his claim to Chelsea to the 1st duke's gentleman Andrew Cole. Cole and the duke's leading creditors, John Jeffs, Thomas Manley, James Gould and others, were permitted by the commission to buy the manor back so that they might sell it again and pay off all the creditors with the proceeds. They accordingly purchased the property and in 1657, having first of all paid off the mortgage, re-sold the manor to Charles Cheyne. This was done with the consent of the duke's daughter Lady Susanna, who was in effect one of the creditors because her dowry had not been paid.¹ A few years later Cheyne sold the manor house to the bishops of Winchester, and as Winchester Palace it remained their town house until it was finally demolished in 1828.² Now all that remains of it is a fragment of the brick garden wall between numbers 19 and 26 Cheyne Walk.³

For some twenty years the 1st duke of Hamilton lived in England and for eight years of that time he actually owned property there. Yet he still retained strong ties with Scotland. He is described as having been 'the great patron of all Scottsmen in the Court',⁴ he patronised tradesmen of apparently Scottish origin, like his tailor David Murray,⁵ and many of his household were Scottish. The faithful Andrew Cole who tried to arrange his escape from prison and was with him to the last⁶ had come

¹ C.C.C.D., iv, 2424-6; HA 101/5; H.MSS., ES 15/3, 4.
² The Gentleman's Magazine, June 1822, 506.
³ William Gaunt, Chelsea, 29.
⁴ Burnet, op. cit., 412.
⁵ HL 5926, 5936.
⁶ HA 506/1/7, 457/19; Burnet, op. cit., 397-405.
south with him, as had Dr Bailie and Mr James Bailie. There were
Hamiltons like the John and James who were on his staff, and there were
other men whose names indicate their Scottish origin - Andrew Duncan,
James Crichton and John Neilson. 1 More important, the duke's settling in
London did not mean that he never visited Scotland: in the fifteen years
which followed his return to Court in 1628 he paid a lengthy visit to
Scotland almost every year, staying for three to five months, usually in
the summer. 2 When he was released from his long imprisonment in Pendennis
Castle his one desire was to withdraw to his own estates. 3 This ambition
to live privately at Hamilton or even abroad was not to be fulfilled, for
he was once more persuaded to enter public affairs in support of the king, 4
but he did in fact remain in Scotland until the final disastrous expedition
south. 5

---

1 BL 8191, 5927; HA 506/1/5, 7; 560/27.
2 1629 H.M.C. Report Buccleuch, iii, 346.
   1630
   1631 Munro of Foulis Inventory, no. 190.
   1632
   1633 C.S.P. Venet, xxiii, 93, 131; HA 435/1/5.
   1634 Hope's Diary, 13.
   1635
   1636 Hope's Diary, 45; HA 435/1/6; 457/10/26; 457/11/4, 8.
   1637
   1638 C.S.P. Venet, xxiv, 417; HL 552, 554, 555, passim.; GD 112/734
   ed. S.R. Gardiner, Hamilton Papers, passim.
   1639 Hamilton Papers, passim; GD 112/771.
   1640
   1641 H.M.C. Report iv, 258; HA 457/18/8, 237/204/3, HL 1573, 1568,
   1567, passim.
   1642 Hope's Diary, 171; HA 560/22.
   1643 HL 1821, 1846; HA 457/19/9; 560/19; GD 112/935; GD 237/204/1.
4 HL 2268, 2096.
5 GD 156/6/2; GD 237/204/2, 3; GD 25/9/38; GD 237/112/2; HL, passim.
It has not, as yet, been possible to compile a complete itinerary for the 1st duke of Hamilton, and in some years his visits to Scotland may have gone unrecorded. Nevertheless, on existing evidence it is possible to conclude that he spent at least 22 years out of his 43 in Scotland, 1 in Germany, and approximately 21 in England - these being totals, of course, not consecutive years. Nor must it be forgotten that he seemed to show a genuine preference for a retired life. Both after the quarrel with Buckingham and after his own imprisonment he evinced a desire to withdraw from public affairs, and there is no reason to doubt that this desire was genuine: Burnet, who had consulted those of his friends still alive in the late 1660's, emphasises this fondness for a peaceful life, and other evidence bears this out. In 1647, for instance, the duke was having his furniture sent home to Hamilton and even ordered seeds for the gardens there, apparently hoping to make a prolonged stay. It would seem then that here was no naturalised Englishman anxious to spend all his time at Court. Rather, his tragedy lay in the fact that the political demands on a man in his high position compelled him to devote his life to public affairs when he would have preferred a quiet existence at home.

When the duke was executed in 1649 his titles passed, in accordance with his wishes, not to his daughter Anne but to his younger brother William, earl of Lanark. Lanark was ten years his junior, and he too had been brought up by their mother at Hamilton. Apparently on his brother's
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advice he was sent to Glasgow University,¹ but when he returned from the Grand Tour he decided to stay on in England after paying a few months' visit to the rest of the family at Hamilton.² He was soon back in London enjoying the life of a young man at Court. At first he took lodgings in King Street,³ but most of his time was spent at Whitehall, Newmarket and Hampton Court, and by January of 1636 he had acquired lodgings at St James's. Much of his time was spent in recreation. He played tennis, went riding and took part in the masques at Court. He went to plays at the Cockpit, and would go shopping for such items as books and guitar strings.

After two years, his brother decided that he should marry. The earl moved into Wallingford House and negotiations for the match went on during the early months of 1638. By May of that year everything had been arranged, and shortly after his sister-in-law's death he was married to the rich Scottish heiress Lady Elizabeth Maxwell.⁴

According to the marriage settlement, the earl had possession of a house in London, near Charing Cross, which, with the grounds, furniture and household goods, was valued at £4000 sterling, and there the young couple were to live. This presumably refers to the property in Angel Court, just off Charing Cross, which Lanark feued from the earl of Cleveland on 3 August 1638. It consisted of a mansion house formerly occupied by Lord Cottington, a house built by Sir Robert Brett, and a smaller property

¹ See Chapter 4.
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occupied by Ralph Banes. These had previously been feued by Cleveland from Sir Humphrey Lynde, and for £225 sterling Cleveland now set them to the earl of Lanark for the years which the leases still had to run.¹

At Michaelmas 1638 Lanark and his bride moved in to the Angel Court mansion house, and set about making various improvements to it. They hired painters, plasterers, carpenters and smiths that winter, and had a stair removed and part of the courtyard paved in.² They purchased large quantities of household linen, employed an upholsterer, and bought new gilt leather hangings for the blue diningroom. A woman came in regularly to weed the garden, trees were bought from a French gardener, and in the following spring thirty loads of gravel were purchased for the garden,³ possibly so that it might be laid out in the Italian style favoured by the 1st duke's Chelsea neighbour Sir John Danvers.⁴ The earl and his wife continued their visits to masques and theatres, called frequently upon his brother and her father, the earl of Dirleton, and it was at Charing Cross that their older daughters and their only son was born.

As was the case with his brother, many of the earl's household were Scotsmen. The well-known Hamilton family of Nasmith provided the earl with his porter and his footman; his provisor was a Hamilton and his coachman a Maxwell. Robert Kennedy, James Watson and James Jack had all come south with him and were to follow him into exile in Holland, and
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⁴ Gaunt, op. cit., 40.
servants like Armstrong and Auchterlonie the grooms and John MacKenzie the footman were obviously of Scottish origin. Moreover the earl himself was often to be found in the company of his fellow countrymen. His accounts record that he played tennis at Whitehall with Mr James Cunningham, went to the Blackfriars with Lady Sophia Murray, and played cards at Newmarket with Hamilton of Orbiston.

Like his elder brother the 1st duke, Lanark spent the first years and the last months of his life in Scotland. Until he was sixteen he was in Hamilton and in Glasgow, then he spent two years finishing his education in Paris. His residence in England was, like his brother's, punctuated by long visits home, and he spent from 1645-7 in Scotland. After the Engagement he managed to escape to Holland, and during his exile there inherited his brother's titles when the 1st duke was executed. In the spring of 1651 he returned to his native land and spent the remaining few months before Worcester on the island of Arran. In all, approximately 7 of his 34 years were spent in England, 4 abroad and 23 in Scotland.

When the 2nd duke died, he was succeeded by his niece Lady Anne Hamilton, elder daughter of the 1st duke. After her early years in London the 3rd duchess, as she now became, had been sent home to Hamilton
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to be brought up by her paternal grandmother Lady Anna Cunningham, and after the tragic deaths of her father and uncle she regarded England with acute dislike and in fact never used the title of countess of Cambridge although she apparently regarded it as still belonging to the family. Apart from this personal antipathy, there were other reasons for disliking London, and these were shared by her husband William, earl of Selkirk, later 3rd duke of Hamilton, and indeed by many of the peerage at this time. There was, for instance, the feeling that London was a place full of temptations: in his last letter of advice to his wife the 2nd duke had urged her to 'forget and hate the empty pleasures of a licentious Court, or of London, and with David pray, "Turn my eyes from beholding vanity, and quicken thou me in thy way."' With seven sons to bring up the 3rd duke and duchess were very much aware of the temptations of the Court, and in 1689 the duke complained to his wife about the 'vexation and trouble' he was caused by those of his sons who were with him in town, adding 'I wold not for anything in the world that I had broght Basile with me. It would have perfectly debossed him as it has John, for I cannot allways be over their head as a governor, and I wish with all my heart I had left John with you for he minds nothing but his pleasure.' Five years later he was still worrying that 'Charles, John and Archbald...have not one groat and yet you cannot imagin the pride and folly that poses them...and they are advisable in nothing contrare to their owne mind.'
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This last comment suggests that it was probably not so much the moral as the financial implications of life in London which troubled the 3rd duke. As he explained to his wife, their sons 'do no good here [in London] and they think they should have everything as they see others of their quality have, and my purse will not hold out with that.'

Life at Court was expensive, and the duchess often reminded her children that her own grandfather despite his high position had 'brought his family to the verie brink of ruin' by residing at Whitehall. As Lord Basil told his brother the earl of Arran, a long stay in England 'has never been for the advantage of this family nor will be to any great one in the kingdom.'

Most of the other Scottish noblemen agreed that visits to London placed a severe strain on their finances, and in 1700 the earl of Cassillis was driven to draw up an overture suggesting that 'because of our king's not residing amongst us, and the great expenses many of this kingdom are at in going to Court, that a small number be chosen by his majesty to reside at Court for five or six years to represent to his majesty the state of the kingdom and advise him.' Few Scottish peers could afford to keep up a permanent home in London. There were one or two exceptions: William, earl of Stirling had a house in Covent Garden in the 1630's, when he was secretary of state, the 8th earl of Eglinton
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lived in England with his second and then with his third English wife, and of course Lauderdale had Ham House, but these were unusual and most Scottish peers were content to hire lodgings in town. In the 1660's, for instance, Lord Ogilvy took rooms in Mrs Vaughan's house in King Street, the earl of Ancrum borrowed a house in Lincoln's Inn Fields, and Lady Elizabeth Kerr found lodgings in Blackfriars. Queensberry seems to have preferred Suffolk Street, and Lord Murray in the 1680's and 90's lodged variously at Bennet Street 'over against the Scots Arms', in St James's Street, and at Mr Fox's house in Leicesterfields. The main considerations were that the rooms should be reasonably inexpensive but in a fashionable area, and Lord Polwarth's letter to Lord Yester on the subject in 1673 is typical. 'You are desyred by the earl of Tweeddale to bespeak lodgings for him in Suffolk Street or thereabouts...' he told him, '...where Mr Cole bespeakes lodgings for the Duke Hamiltoun. See they be good and convenient, for you knowe he loves a good lodging. The earl of Balcarres had a good one in the end of that street nixt Whitehall, a dyning roome, bedchamber and 2 bedchambers above for yourself and Blackbarrony, or as many on a flour as can be had...'

The best method of finding lodgings was certainly to ask a friend to
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seek them out, and although on his first visit to London in 1660 it was not until he was actually in town that the 3rd duke 'found lodgings' in King Street,¹ thereafter he had Andrew Cole his London agent and later his own sons hire them for him. Whenever possible he liked to be 'as near Whitehall or St James Parke as you can'² and he preferred to have a coach house and stables as part of the premises: it was inconvenient for him when he was at Mrs Rugley's, for instance, for then he had to stable his horses and leave his coach with Richard Clinsh at the Nag's Head in Haymarket.³

Generally he took the lodgings by the week, since he never knew for how long he would be in town.⁴ During the 1670's he tried various places. He was with the oddly named Mr Imp in 1674, at some unspecified address,⁵ but he really preferred to be in Pall Mall, or in Mrs Nepho's house in Leicesterfields. There was one unfortunate occasion in 1682 when he arrived at a house in Pall Mall but moved out the very next day, 'his grace not being pleased with them [the lodgings] because in great disorder.'⁶ Mr Russley's in the same street was much more satisfactory, and the duke told his wife that he was 'well-lodged at a reasonable rate there',⁷ and in 1689 stayed at the sign of The Two Flowerpots at the end of St Alban's Street.⁸ At one time he lodged in St Martin's Lane,
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perhaps the most fashionable street in London,¹ but his favourite house was Mrs Nepho's. Not only was it large enough to accommodate his household in comfort, but it had its own stables, and Mrs Nepho herself was on hand and willing to help the duchess with her various purchases if necessary.²

Mrs Nepho charged £6 sterling a week for her house,³ and this was the highest rate ever paid by the duke. Mrs Rugley asked £4 a week,⁴ the St Martin's Lane house was £3 with an additional £1 a week for a bed and table-linen,⁵ Mrs Elizabeth de Gloxin in Park Place took £3:10/-⁶ and Mr Imp charged only £2:10/-⁷ In every case this would include furniture and bed- and table-linen, although the duke occasionally hired the odd item from elsewhere - he borrowed a clock from a Mr Knib in 1694 for his Leicesterfields lodgings.⁸

The weekly rent did not, of course, include food. Very often the duke would have his main meals out, dining almost every evening with friends or at Court, and sometimes he would eat out at a tavern - the 'Rose' in Brydges Street,⁹ the 'Fountain',¹⁰ or the 'Horseshoe' in Charing Cross.¹¹
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Sometimes he would arrange to have food sent in from a nearby eating house, but in later years when he had to be careful what he ate he would bring his provisor from Scotland with him to supervise a temporary cook hired in town. He was not always as fortunate as in 1693 when he 'got a very good cooke, and seaims to be a very honest fellow', as he wrote home to his wife, adding 'I give him 10/- a week beside his intertainment, and a maid under him. He makes the bills for dinner as wee used there [in Scotland] and wryts a good hand and understands the buying of meat much better than Lamb [the provisor] ...I drink broth every morning and eats jealy every night, which the cooke makes very well.' As well as the cook and the cook maid, the duke would take on another female servant to help with the food, would sometimes hire a porter and on at least one occasion had a temporary English footman.

By far the greater part of his household in London, however, was made up of his own Scottish servants. He usually brought with him his coachman, his postilion, and several grooms, one of whom was invariably James Bishop. Two or three footmen were also in his entourage - very often Charles Jack and James Moffat, and William Fleming and Thomas Harkness actually died in London while in the duke's service. His grace's secretary also accompanied him, and so did his valet and one of his gentlemen. On those few occasions when the duchess went along with
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her husband, they took with them a fuller complement of servants: the cook, an undercook and porter, pages, more footmen, and of course extra women servants. 1

The cost of maintaining this large household in London was high: food was expensive, there were many purchases to be made to send home to Scotland, and there were always items like coach and horse hires, flambeaux and 'pocket money' for the duke himself to add to the cost of the visit. On average, the duke would spend £6,000 Scots a month while in London, 2 and this could rise to as much as £8,400 as when he came south in 1682 to receive the Garter. 3 Most of this money was given by the duke to his secretary before he left home and had been derived from the rents of his estates. Sometimes it was possible to defray the cost a little by selling something in London, but this formed only a fraction of the total charge; in 1686, for example, the duke gave James Hamilton over £3,000 Scots for the coming trip: Hamilton received an additional £21:14/- sterling from the earl of Arran's servant William Hamilton as the balance of one of the duke's accounts, and later made £4:10/- sterling by selling an old grey gelding. 4 Once, in 1686, the duke received a payment of £400 sterling from the Privy Council 'for his journey to and from London on the king's service', but this was exceptional 5 because he was usually in the opposition party.
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Despite all the expense, which the 3rd duke deplored, he found himself going south more and more often on affairs of state. Not only did he have to wait upon the king, but his visits to Court gave him the opportunity of making valuable contacts. At first, he associated mainly with friends and relations. In 1660 he spent a good deal of time with his brother Lord George Douglas and with his wife's uncle the earl of Lindsay and Crawford. He was friendly with the duchess's other uncle Basil, earl of Denbigh, and on at least one occasion visited the 2nd duchess of Hamilton's second husband Mr Thomas Dalmahoy. Lord Carnegie, one of the 1st duke's creditors, was another frequent companion in the 1669's and in the 1670's the duke was often to be found with Lord Ailesbury.

In later years, with his growing significance as a statesman, he associated more with fellow politicians and took a rather touching pride in this sign of his own importance. 'All the great men about the town and Court has made me vissits', he told his wife in 1693, and he was always careful to record any noteworthy invitations: 'I mett this day with the archbishop of Canterbury at Weithall, who inveited me to dine with him on Saterday', 'I was particulary inveited to my lord mairor's feast on Monday', and so on. His companions during the last years were
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men who, like himself, were supporters of the 1688 settlement. At least once a week he would go to dine with Charles Powlett, 1st duke of Bolton, an almost exact contemporary and a strong Whig. Almost as often he saw William, 1st duke of Devonshire, another leading Whig, and Hans Bentinck, 1st duke of Portland, William III's close friend.

Most of the social occasions in London at which the duke was present had a political purpose, and his letters leave the reader in no doubt that he went south on business, with the occasional trip to the baths for his health. He did not go for pleasure. This explains why, in the early days, he went south infrequently. His first stay in London - at any rate his first since his marriage - came in 1660 and he was there in the subsequent two years, but from 1663 until 1672 he went south only once. During the last 22 years of his life, however, there were only 7 years when he stayed at home, and in 1674, 1679, 1688, and 1689 he made two trips south. On those occasions the first visit was usually for business, the second to go to the baths. Normally he preferred to go in the summer time, but as the years went by winter journeys were more frequent despite the difficulties of travel. Most of his visits to London lasted for about two months, although there were those times when he stayed on longer.
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and he was often delayed by the fact that it was necessary to obtain the king's permission before departing.

Only on rare occasions did the duchess go south with her husband. Her visit to town in the summer of the Restoration to pave the way for her husband's acceptance at Court was the first time she had been there since childhood, and on few other occasions did she go back. Apart from her general dislike of England and her awareness of the need for someone to stay at home and run the family estates, she no doubt disapproved of the easygoing atmosphere of Charles II's Court on moral and religious grounds. She would therefore usually refuse to go to Court with her husband, although she sometimes accompanied him to Tunbridge Wells or Bath. After his death she never went to England again.

Very different was the attitude of her eldest son the earl of Arran, despite the efforts of his parents. He was born at Hamilton in the spring of 1658, and spent his childhood in what must have been happy surroundings at Hamilton palace - in a large house with many servants and an ever increasing number of brothers and sisters to keep him company. As soon as he was sent to school in Glasgow, however, he began to show signs of the irresponsible behaviour which was to characterise the rest of his life. He wasted his time at the university, got into bad company, and on the Grand Tour developed habits of extravagance which he never outgrew. By the time he came back from France he had come to regard Scotland as a prison, and his great determination was never to return there. He was,
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of course, beguiled by the attractions of the Court, where his resemblance
to his dead great-uncle the 2nd duke and his undoubted charm had already
made him a favourite with Charles II and with the ladies of the Court, but
he was also anxious to escape from his father's influence.

The relationship between father and son had never been a happy one.
The 3rd duke, meticulous and hard working, had saved the Hamilton estates
from ruin and wanted an heir who would continue his policies of economy and
improvement. The earl of Arran saw his inheritance not as a sacred trust
but as a source of wealth to finance his hedonistic if cultured life at
Court. With growing dismay the 3rd duke and duchess watched their eldest
son adopt a dissolute and extravagant way of life from which there was no
reclaiming him. While his brothers settled down to pursue steady careers
the earl's behaviour became erratic to the point of irrationality. It
seemed that he cared nothing for anyone but himself, and in 1687 when his
mother fell seriously ill all that concerned him was whether or not he
could be duke on her death although his father was still alive.¹ His
outspoken criticism of the duke in public shamed and angered his parents,
and his letters home made it plain that he was simply waiting for the day
when the family estates were his.

When he first returned from France the earl did everything in his
power to stay on at Court, even threatening to go to sea if he could not
remain in London. However, he persuaded the king to make him a gentleman
of the bedchamber, and after a much postponed visit to Hamilton, he took up
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residence at Court. Throughout the early 1680's, he enjoyed the favour of Charles II and then of James VII. At this period he was living in a series of lodgings in town, but accommodation was always something of a problem; in 1682, for instance, his former landlady claimed that she had not leased to him the garret where his clothes were stored, and refused to let his servants collect them. Lodgings in the Whitehall area were as usual hard to come by, and he does not seem to have had chambers in the palace itself.

In the late autumn of 1683 he went to Paris as ambassador extraordinary to Louis XIV, and stayed on there as the French king's aide-de-camp despite the disapproval of his family and friends. He paid a brief visit to Scotland on his return, but was soon back at Court again, and in 1688 his financial difficulties compelled him to marry. He had hitherto been dependent on his father for money, apart from the occasional pension from the king, and he had lived largely on credit and loans. When he married, however, he was entitled to draw the revenues from the Kinneil estates, and even tried to claim the rents for previous years.

With the Revolution, his fortunes took an abrupt turn for the worse. While his father welcomed the arrival of William of Orange, the earl remained loyal to James VII. This course may have been theoretically...
admirable, but practically it was disastrous. Throughout the century the Hamiltons had suffered from the fact that they were at the same time supporters of the monarch and upholders of presbyterianism. This double allegiance explains many of the 1st duke's difficulties: in the end he placed his loyalty to the Stewarts first, and lost his life as a result. At the Restoration the Hamiltons naturally welcomed the return of Charles II, although they were not in sympathy with his religious policy. The accession of his Roman Catholic brother made the position even more difficult, and so from religious as well as from practical reasons the 3rd duke welcomed the arrival of William of Orange. It would have been folly to jeopardise the work of years by upholding James VII and risking exile and forfeiture.

The 3rd duke therefore supported the Revolution. His son greeted William of Orange with a defiant message from James VII and was immediately imprisoned in the Tower of London. Even this had its advantages, for as the duke pointed out, if the earl had been released at once 'he wold have been seased by his creaditors.' Nevertheless, his father eventually managed to arrange his release and had him brought secretly from the Tower on a Sunday afternoon and sent home at once to Scotland.

Now that he was a married man, his parents hoped that the earl would
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at last settle down at Kinneil and learn something of estate management and the family's affairs. When the young countess of Arran died, however, her husband lost his new-found enthusiasm for Scotland and once more went back to London. He took lodgings in Charles Street, and resumed his old way of life. His parents had witnessed his behaviour thus far with a disbelief which eventually turned into despair, but in 1694 an event took place which his family hoped would bring about an alteration in his attitude: the 3rd duke died.

There was now reason to hope that the earl would go home to Scotland and settle down. He had made no attempt to conceal his dislike for his father, but he had always professed an affection for his mother, very often asking her to intercede with the duke on his behalf. She on her part saw her son's faults all too clearly, but throughout many tribulations and in the face of constant ingratitude, treated her son's requests with patience and reasonableness. In spite of this it soon became clear that nothing had changed. The earl wanted to live in London, and he wanted the family estates so that he could afford to do so. His protestations to the contrary deceived no one, least of all his relations. 'Don't think your saying...that you are wearied of London will make the world believe it till you alter your course of life', his brother Lord Basil told him, 'you having now lived, I suppose, the halfe of your time out of your own country countrery and too much a stranger to the affairs of it', while the duchess sadly confided to her eldest daughter that James's behaviour 'is liker a man

1 HL 9074.
that's out of his witts than in them, God in his mercy pitie him and me who had him thus for the punishment of my sins.¹

In 1698 the duchess resigned her titles in favour of her son. He had married for a second time, and she still hoped to see a change in him; moreover she felt that it was time that he represented his family in parliament. She did not however give him control of her estates; everyone knew that this would have been disastrous and even Defoe makes an oblique reference to this fact in his Tour.² As it was, his behaviour in parliament left his mother feeling 'so ashamed on his behalf that I know neither what to say or how to look.'³

In the ensuing years the duchess was to become one of the leaders of the anti-Union campaign. Herself half English and now in her seventies, she was nonetheless active in urging opposition to the proposed treaty. Her whole concern was for 'this poore peopell that our cruell neigbors would starve and treates them and our nation with scorne.'⁴ Although she had hitherto insisted that she was above party politics, she was now openly 'more then can be expressed against this Union.'⁵ As she remarked, 'It's sad to sit still and be ruined', so she set about organising local opposition. 'We have frequent rendezvouz here', she wrote in mid-November, 'and as long as we have law for it, let them say
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what they will of me, I will encourage them..." 1 At the same time, she was careful to prevent civil disorder, and on 4 December forbade the tenants of other parishes to come to a meeting at Hamilton because she was anxious to protect them from reprisals, knowing that 'this is the place that the Court seems most to levell at, and I see our laws cannot long protect us when they suspend them on such a sudden.' 2 She feared that 'the English does intend to hector and cudgell us into anything they have a mind to', 3 an opinion which was reinforced when in the middle of December Queensberry ordered the arrest of her servant John Porterfield and of Hamilton's town treasurer, William Weir. The arrest of these two perfectly innocent men was rightly seen by the duchess as an attempt to intimidate her, but this they could not do. 4

The difference in character between the 3rd duchess and her son is nowhere more clear than in their behaviour during these last months of 1706. The 4th duke had certainly come north and was attending parliament, but his erratic behaviour bewildered all those who looked to him for leadership. In fact, he was behaving with all his usual irresolution. He was ready enough to declare to his mother that he was exhausting himself in the service of his country, but like many of his contemporaries his real motive was self-interest. Everyone knew that his English wife had brought him extensive lands in the south; he could hardly be expected to be
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wholeheartedly against Union. Then again he was desperately anxious to insinuate himself into the queen's favour. He lacked the strength of mind to base his conduct on any one of these considerations, and so he veered constantly between opposition, and doubt about the wisdom of such a course, falling victim to anything from a fever to a toothache whenever any really decisive move was required of him.

One of his more curious actions was the drawing up of a protest in the name of his mother and himself declaring that the 1st article of the treaty should in no way prejudice their right and interest in the succession to the crown of Scotland. This immediately raised the perennial question of the Hamilton attitude towards the succession: their enemies never could believe that a family so close to the throne would not grasp any opportunity to secure the crown for themselves. In the sixteenth century the possibility of the Hamiltons succeeding had been very real, but there is no evidence that either the 1st or 2nd dukes ever did plot to seize the throne, despite the accusations of their opponents, and so in the seventeenth century all serious thoughts of a Hamilton succession died away. When the 4th duke sent a copy of his protest to his mother and asked her to sign it she was therefore amazed, and immediately refused. Her son persisted, but she was adamant. 'I am more confident the doing of it now', she told him, 'will doe more hurt than good, and only expose me to be laughed at.'
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There was really nothing very sinister in the drawing up of this protest - the 4th duke was at all times liable to fall victim to sudden violent enthusiasms with a fine disregard for their practicality. He was always ready to snatch at anything which would bring him financial advantage or enhanced reputation, no matter how far fetched the scheme, but it is difficult to believe that even he ever entertained serious hopes of one day sitting on the throne of Scotland.

Distracted by so many conflicting notions, his leadership of the opposition left much to be desired. He at first seemed to support Cunningham of Eckatt's plan for an armed rising of the western shires, then suddenly sent word of a postponement to those concerned, and the scheme fell through. He then summoned the country gentlemen to Edinburgh to address the queen for a new parliament, abruptly decided that unless their petition insisted on a Hanoverian succession he could have nothing to do with it, and in the ensuing argument the plan collapsed. When the 22nd article of Union was being debated he drew up a protest which he intended to present in parliament before withdrawing from it altogether, but on the morning when this was to have taken place he suddenly developed his toothache and refused to go. His long-suffering supporters at last persuaded him to attend parliament, but he refused to present the counter resolution. ¹

Obviously whenever he had decided upon a course of action, someone had only to suggest to him that this might incur the disfavour of the queen, of the Hanoverian successor, or of any other influential person and he

¹ D.N.B., v, 1233.
would immediately change his mind, or at least fall into his usual state of 
nervous indecision. Whether his ensuing illnesses were, as his family 
thought, psychosomatic in origin, or whether they were merely diplomatic 
must remain a matter for conjecture, but whatever the reason for them they 
had the same damaging effect upon his cause.

When the Union had been passed, the duke remained for a time in 
Edinburgh, complaining that financial troubles prevented him from 
departing. He now hoped that his mother would invite him to stay with 
her permanently at Hamilton palace, but although the 3rd duchess always 
treated him with kindness and forbearance, she had come to realise that 
she and her heir would never agree while they both lived.¹ Only to her 
daughter Katherine did she confide her thoughts on this subject, 
explaining that James 'coveats mine so much that itt trebles me for his 
sake. I am sure I wishe he may succeed to the Estate and be a blessing 
to the family, but alas, he is not in the way he should, tho he thinks 
all right that he duse, and that I am both unkind and unjust to him."²

In view of the fact that he possessed Kinneil and had just married an 
heiress, the 4th duke had little cause for complaint. His bride had 
already inherited her father's lands, and these were extensive. The 
Gerards possessed large areas of Lancashire and Staffordshire: the lord­
ship of Nether Wyresdale alone extended to over 28,000 acres,³ and the

1 The duke of Atholl's Archives, Box 45, i, 204.
2 Ibid.
3 The Victoria History of the Counties of England: Lancashire, iii, 
196-304; iv, 742-5.
duke and duchess had houses in Preston\(^1\) and Scorton,\(^2\) and at Ashton Hall.\(^3\)

They do not seem to have lived in Staffordshire at all, but with the exception of 1703 when nine months of the year were spent in Scotland and three in England, the 4th duke and duchess were usually in Lancashire for at least one month and usually for three or four each year.\(^4\)

For the most part they lived in Preston itself, because although Ashton Hall was the main Lancashire residence, it was in a ruinous condition. The 4th duke went to inspect it in 1705 and was favourably impressed. He spent most of the day there and told his wife, 'I can't express how much I like that place. It was a sweet day and the place tho extremely out of order look't soo well that I have taken a possitive resolutive of repairing soo much of itt as to make it habitable.'\(^5\) The situation of the house was certainly very pleasant: it stood on the banks of the Lune, in fine, wooded country just three miles from Lancaster, and was surrounded by extensive grounds, where there was a large lake and, later on at least, a good deer park.\(^6\) Rebuilding would, however, be expensive, and the earl of Selkirk when he examined the existing house, told his brother that it would be better to pull down what was left and build a smaller house in the grounds.\(^7\) The duke was nonetheless employing
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masons at Ashton Hall in 1708, although he never seems to have lived there again, and the hall was eventually rebuilt: when offered for sale along with the Lancashire estates in 1840 it was described as 'a large baronial and commodious residence' the date of whose erection was 'remote'.

Although the duke liked the countryside in Lancashire, he did not agree with his tenants. In his opinion they were 'litigious knaves' who had been without a landlord for so long 'they had gott into a notion that the estatt was thers upon paying what I may call a small feue dieuty', while the tenants for their part were just as dissatisfied. A Lancashire Quaker living near Ashton Hall told the earl of Selkirk that there was 'a mighty cray out' against the 4th duke in that county 'for the racking of the rent' and because his grace's Scottish steward 'understands very little of the matter and is very ruff and harsh with the people, which does not do well in the county', and even the duke's own London agent agreed that these complaints were probably justified.

The predictable difficulties experienced by a Scottish landowner taking over English estates must have been enhanced by the duke's lawsuit against his mother-in-law, and, eventually, against Lord Mohun. Not only was he more anxious than ever to exploit every available source of revenue, but the tenants felt that some doubt had been cast on his title to

1 H. MSS., E.S., 31/9/1.
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the lands, watched every move in his case with avid interest, and were ready to attorn to another landowner at the slightest hint that the outcome would not be in his favour.

Possibly because of these difficulties, the duke grew tired of visiting Lancashire, and at the end of 1708 decided to settle permanently in London. This decision was perhaps inevitable. There was now no parliament in Edinburgh, and the 3rd duchess had made it clear that she was not willing to have her son and his family live at Hamilton with her. Moreover, the 4th duchess shared her husband's preference for London, and so in the autumn of 1708 they took a house in the city, leaving their children with the 3rd duchess to be brought up by her and at her expense, and ignoring the criticisms of those friends who had believed the duke's anti-Union sentiments to be genuine: even his own son James Abercrombie warned him that Carnwath and others were of the opinion that 'You would do more for yourself sitting in Holyroodhouse then in St James's Square hearkening to amusements.'

St James's Square was one of the most fashionable areas of London. Built in the time of Charles II, it had housed such illustrious inhabitants as Arabella Churchill, Clarendon, Barillon, the duke's first father-in-law Sunderland and the duchess's father Lord Digby Gerard. The mansion now rented by the 4th duke was London House, newly vacated by the
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duke of Portland.¹ It was not the largest house in the square - in 1716 it was to be rated at £10, compared with, for example, Norfolk House at £21:10/- and Derby House at £15² - but it was nevertheless an imposing building and had been occupied by a variety of important tenants including the 3rd earl of Chesterfield, and the marchioness of Worcester, and in 1771 it was to become the town house of the bishop of London.³

Unfortunately, few details of the 4th duke's tenancy survive. Before he actually moved in, he had glaziers at work putting in sash windows on the ground floor, installing 'lead windows' on the stairs, and repairing the sashes in the hall, parlour, St James's room, dressing-room, drawing-room and in some of the offices.⁴ Two months later he was employing plasterers, but the account does not specify what work was done,⁵ and the only other information about the house comes from a list made in the summer of 1709, noting that 62 pictures hung in the duchess's closet in the St James's Square house, 19 in the duke's apartment, 15 framed prints in his closet, 23 in the eating room above and 20 in its closet.⁶ These were said to 'belong to ther graces, besydes what belong to the house', so presumably it was let furnished.⁷

Whether he was in London or in Edinburgh, the duke's household was

² Dasent, op. cit., 248.
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English, part Scottish. His butler, William Becket,¹ and his provisor, Anthony Elie,² were English, but also served him at Kinneil; his secretary John Spens³ and his master of the horse Robert Kennedy⁴ were Scottish but went with him to London. With his Anglo-Scottish household, the 4th duke was to live in the St James's Square house for the rest of his life, and it was from there that he went out on the morning of 15 November 1712 to take part in the fatal duel in Hyde Park. He was 55 when he died; he had spent at least 29 of those years in Scotland, 4½ on the continent, and the remainder in England.

It would therefore appear that the seventeenth century dukes of Hamilton may not have been as anglicised as is sometimes imagined. Each spent more than half of his life in Scotland, and although in childhood none had any say in the matter of where he lived, a Scottish upbringing must have had some effect on his outlook in later life. Then again even those dukes who found it necessary to live in London did not sever all connections with Scotland but paid frequent visits home.

It is true, of course, that mere physical presence in Scotland would not necessarily be synonymous with an entirely Scottish outlook. Other factors are much more telling, and so before any generalisations can be made, it will first of all be necessary to consider the Hamiltons' way of life when they were in Scotland; whom they chose to marry, how they
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brought up their children, and in what ways their standard of living differed from that of other Scottish peers.
During the period 1625-1712 five of the Hamiltons were married to Englishwomen. Obviously these marriages were of significance to the family itself, for however negligible a woman's legal status, however short her residence in Scotland and however small her part in the upbringing of her own children, she must have influenced her new family to an appreciable extent. The results of such a marriage are therefore important, but even more telling are the reasons underlying it. A peer's choice of bride, whether for himself or for his son, was indicative of his wealth, social standing and aspirations. From the motives which prompted his choice, one can deduce his financial position, his political ambitions and so on. The main questions which now arise are therefore why five of the Hamiltons sought their brides outside Scotland and if, in doing so, they were in any way different from their fellow peers in Scotland.

Before any such questions can be answered it is necessary first of all to place the Hamilton marriages in context by making a few observations about the Scottish peerage in general. It would seem that during this period approximately one Scottish peer in seven found his bride south of the border. During the period under consideration 454 Scottish peers and their heirs contracted marriages; 80 of them married
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Englishwomen and a further 6 married Welshwomen. These totals are henceforth taken together since the latter presumably met their husbands in London or in one of the other centres of English society. It can therefore be said that 15.5% of the Scottish peerage found their brides south of the border. This figure is, however, deceptively high, including as it does men who were in fact English but happened to hold Scottish titles; Viscounts Falkland, Irvine and Newhaven, Lords Aston, Cramond and Fairfax all belong to this category and may therefore be excluded from the total, along with the earls of Abercorn who were by this time more Irish than Scottish. This therefore reduces the total to 62, or 13.7%.

Were there, then, any characteristics shared by these 62 which might point to an explanation of why they and not their contemporaries sought their brides outside Scotland? Perhaps the most obvious common factor is that almost a quarter of the peers involved were themselves half English. The 2nd earl of Breadalbane, the 1st earl of Dunmore, Lord Huntingtower, the 2nd, 3rd and 4th earls of Elgin, the 2nd earl of Home, the 4th and 6th dukes of Lennox, the 12th earl of Morton, the 1st and 2nd earls of Newburgh, and the 4th and 5th earls of Stirling
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all had English mothers while James, earl of Dalkeith\(^1\) and Lionel, earl of Dysart\(^2\) had English fathers but are included in this study because their mothers were Scottish peeresses in their own right. Moreover, at least two of the English brides had Scottish mothers – Anne Howard, Lady Garlies\(^3\) and Catherine Cecil, 4th countess of Kinnou\(^1\) – while the 1st earl of Newburgh’s wife was the widow of a Scotsman,\(^5\) the 2nd earl of Middleton had an English stepmother,\(^6\) and the 2nd earl of Galloway had an English sister-in-law.\(^7\)

Too much should not be made of existing relationships by marriage since a bride might not see her own family again afterwards nor might her husband be on good terms with them, but the fact that someone in the family was already English did mean that there were connections and contacts to facilitate unions whose main motivation may have been financial or political. It was not simply by chance that two earls of Breadalbane,\(^8\) four earls of Elgin,\(^9\) two earls of Kinnou,\(^10\) two dukes of Lennox,\(^11\) three earls of Morton,\(^12\) three earls of Stirling\(^13\) and of course two dukes of Hamilton married Englishwomen, and this would seem to indicate that, in a family where an English match had already been made, there was a predisposition
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for a further such marriage to be arranged. This would appear to be borne out by the fact that sixteen of the 62 peers took a second English wife when their first English wife died.

That the main motive for many of these Anglo-Scottish marriages was financial may be deduced from the fact that 39 of the 62 peers took wives who were not themselves of the peerage. This would suggest that in many cases they could not afford an expensive English noblewoman but were eager to improve their financial position by marrying the daughter of a wealthy merchant, or a rich widow. Such brides would bring in a far larger portion than could the daughter of a Scottish peer, and were quite willing to ally themselves to an impoverished nobleman for the sake of his title. It is not surprising to find that 17 of the 62 married English widows, the 8th earl of Eglinton¹ and the 6th duke of Lennox² doing so twice. How these marriages with commoners were regarded among the Scottish peers themselves is not altogether clear, but the need for a wealthy bride was an accepted fact of the time. There is, however, a hint here and there that some of the matches met with disapproval. The 3rd duke of Hamilton was certainly displeased when his brother George, earl of Dunbarton, married Anne Wheatley³ and according to Baillie⁴ the 4th Viscount Kenmure 'cast himself away' on a foolish marriage with Martha Norton. It may of course have been some personal characteristic or the lady's reputation
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with which these critics found fault; for example when the earl of Orkney married Elizabeth Villiers his family's disapproval was occasioned entirely by her notorious past.

As for the status of the bridegroom, 43 of the 62 were earls or their heirs, 12 were lords, 6 were dukes and 1 was a viscount. The most relevant point here is that 6 of the Scottish dukes alive during this period married Englishwomen: one in two as compared with the one in seven for the Scottish peerage in general. Greater wealth and more frequent contacts with England may be the significant factors here and so too may be the degree to which these men had become anglicised.

Finally, it is noticeable that intermarriage with the English peerage was a trend which increased towards the end of the seventeenth century. Despite James VI's attempts to promote such marriages, which were almost unknown before 1603, only a few took place during his lifetime and from 1625 until 1640 only 11 Scottish peers married Englishwomen. During the Civil War period the numbers fell still further and again only 7 such marriages are known to have occurred between 1660 and 1679. Towards the end of the century the numbers rose again and in the 1690's and 1700's there were at least 23 such marriages. London was becoming a marriage market for Scotland as well as for England.

It is against this background that the Hamilton marriages must be considered. If the Hamiltons married Englishwomen because they wanted wealthy wives or influential relatives, they were entirely typical of a sizeable proportion of the Scottish peerage. If, however, they married Englishwomen because they themselves had become so anglicised that it
seemed the natural thing to do, they belonged to a small minority. Probably the Lennoxes were in this category, and possibly a few other peers may have been: whether or not the Hamiltons differed from the rest of Scottish society in this way can be discovered from a detailed consideration of their English marriages.
On Trinity Sunday 1622 the 1st duke of Hamilton, then earl of Arran, married Lady Mary Feilding. Although this marriage took place three years before the start of our period, it is nonetheless included by virtue of the fact that the 1st duke is one of the main subjects under consideration; moreover the marriage did not become a reality until three years after 1625. It is also relevant to note here that the bride's name was Mary and not Margaret, as she has frequently been called by later historians. Burnet, who knew her daughter well, refers to her correctly as Mary, which is the name on her funeral certificate.

To say that the 1st duke of Hamilton married the earl of Denbigh's daughter is an interesting enough statement of fact, but to add that the bride's mother was Susan Villiers, sister of the duke of Buckingham, is to make the importance of the match abundantly clear. Buckingham's ascendancy at Court was by 1622 obvious to all, and his determination to marry his female relatives into the established aristocracy was notorious. The 2nd marquis of Hamilton was the leading Scottish favourite. He could not hope to supplant Buckingham but by arranging a matrimonial alliance with the latter's family he could transform a potential enemy into an all-powerful friend. As a friend of Buckingham, his own influence would
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Plate 2 James, 3rd marquis and 1st duke of Hamilton, by Mytens.
be considerably enhanced.¹

Then again it was plain that the Court was now permanently settled in London, and advancement depended upon close attendance on the monarch. Clearly the future of any ambitious Scot lay at Whitehall. The marquis himself now spent most of his time there and it was reasonable to suppose that his son would do so too. It was therefore desirable that the heir to the house of Hamilton should marry an Englishwoman. Moreover, although the marquis had to a large extent been assimilated into English society, his counterparts there no doubt remained conscious of the fact that he was a foreigner. By marrying his son into the English aristocracy he could remedy this situation - if not for himself, at least for future generations.

In addition to all this, James VI was bound to approve, for not only would the match please Buckingham but it would further his own as yet unsuccessful policy of promoting Anglo-Scottish marriages.² Indeed the suggestion that the young couple should marry may well have originated with the king.

Throughout the early summer plans were accordingly made. The bridegroom would be just sixteen on 19 June³ and was a student at Oxford. The bride was only nine years old.⁴ Such child marriages were becoming unpopular, but if the parents were anxious for a match to go through it was
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as well, in this age of high child mortality, that it should take place as soon as possible. For this reason the negotiations were speedily completed, and on 16 June 1622 after supper and in the presence of the king, the earl of Arran married Lady Mary Feilding. ¹

Few of the high hopes for this marriage were fulfilled. Certainly the marquis of Hamilton enjoyed a position of increased influence for what remained of his life, but within three years he was dead. To his son, whom he had sacrificed for the sake of his own ambition, the marriage had been repugnant from the start. It was natural enough that so young a girl should remain with her family, but in addition to this the 1st duke had developed a distinct aversion to his wife. ² This was in part occasioned by their disproportionate ages, and may also have been caused by the feeling that the duke had married beneath him. However, although Burnet in his final version of the Memoires declared that the duke disliked his wife for 'other secret considerations', in the original draft the sentence had simply stated that 'his love of liberty might make him hate constraint.'³ Whatever the reason, his relations with his wife's family grew worse and on 6 November 1626 Alvise Contarini reported to the doge and senate of Venice that 'The marquis of Hamilton left London as I announced, the pretext being to look into his affairs, having now attained his majority. But really he is offended with the duke [of Buckingham] who, among the Court pensions which have been generally suspended,
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included his, which amounts to some £3,000 a year and was enjoyed by his father. It is said that he refuses to solemnise his marriage with the duke's niece...that he demands an inquest upon his father's death which is generally attributed to poison, and above all he resents the annexations I mentioned of church property to the Crown.¹

It was perfectly true that the 1st duke had to return to Scotland to look after his financial affairs, for his father had lived extravagantly and had died deeply in debt. It was also true that, as public gossip emphasised, the duke was on no good terms with his wife,² but the real reason for his departure would seem to have been his quarrel with Buckingham over the financial benefits which he had hoped to secure. Whether or not he really believed the poisoning charges is open to speculation. In 1626 his father's former physician George Eglisham had published at Antwerp a book entitled Prodramus Vindictae accusing Buckingham of having poisoned the king, Richmond, Southampton and Hamilton.³ These accusations have since been proved groundless so that although the 2nd marquis's death had been untimely it had certainly not been unnatural. If his son did believe that he had been murdered, then his hatred of Buckingham must have been redoubled. If not, he possibly used the suspicions as a further means of damaging his enemy's reputation. What is without doubt is that it was his quarrel with Buckingham rather than his aversion to his wife which prompted him to leave for Scotland.
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Despite the pleas of his father-in-law,\(^1\) the urgings of Buckingham\(^2\) and the wishes of Charles I himself,\(^3\) the duke spent the next two years in Scotland with his mother and brother. He passed the summer of 1627 in Edinburgh\(^4\) and the spring of the following year in Arran,\(^5\) for which Burnet says he developed a strong affection.\(^6\) He seems to have given little thought to his wife, who was now in attendance on the queen as a lady of the bedchamber\(^7\) and had been, according to her uncle, 'so long disseved with hopes' that he dared not mention to her rumours of her husband's possible return.\(^8\) Despite such reproaches the 1st duke remained adamant and in the spring of 1628 still told the king that his private affairs made his return to Court impossible.\(^9\) In the autumn, however, the situation changed abruptly. On 23 August Buckingham was assassinated and soon afterwards the earl of Denbigh was sent north with the news and with the offer that if his son-in-law would return to London the latter would be made master of the horse in the dead favourite's place.\(^10\)

This time Denbigh's persuasions were successful. In November the duke returned to Court. He consummated his marriage and settled down with his wife.\(^11\) From this time onwards he seems to have remained on good
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terms with both her and her family. His already close friendship with her brother Lord Basil Feilding continued throughout the 1630's and when the earl of Denbigh died he left to his son-in-law a gift of pictures, described in a catalogue made about 1643 as 'A Legacie left by my Lord Denbeige to my lord marquess of Reubens "Josep" and "Mary and Christ" of Titian.'

Unfortunately the marriage did not provide the duke with a surviving male heir. On 5 March 1631 his daughter Henrietta Maria was baptised, having been born on the last day of February, and Elizabeth of Bohemia wrote to chide him for telling no one of the baby, accusing him of being 'half-ashamed' of having a little daughter, and hoping that his next child would be a boy. This first baby, known to the family (as the queen was to her relations) as Mary, died when only a year old. Between 1632 and the spring of 1634 two more daughters were born, Anne, later third duchess of Hamilton, on 16 January 1631/2, and Susanna, afterwards countess of Cassilis, about December of the same year. Probably in 1634 a long hoped for son was born and christened Charles, then in 1635 a second son James followed, and before December 1636 the family was
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completed with the birth of a third son William.\(^1\) Sadly, these children were, as Percy Church remarked, 'both weake and sicklie'.\(^2\) William fell ill at Hampton Court in the winter of 1638 and died there, being buried in Westminster Abbey on 6 December of that year.\(^3\) Four months later James also died after a week's illness,\(^4\) and in 1640 the greatest blow fell when Charles, earl of Arran died and was buried in Westminster on April 30.\(^5\) Their mother had herself died in May 1638.\(^6\) 'Thar never lived a better nor a more religious creatur', her husband wrote to his own mother, adding that she 'left me behind her with a sad and greved sould.'\(^7\) As Burnet afterwards wrote, Lady Mary's excellent qualities had overcome the duke's aversion to her and had inspired in him 'as much affection as he was capable of' while she on her part had been in the habit of remarking that 'she had the greatest reason to bless God for having given her such a husband, whom as she loved perfectly, so she was not ashamed to obey.'\(^8\)

Although still a young man when his wife died, the 1st duke of Hamilton did not remarry, and political events were soon to disrupt his life. The few years between his return to England and the outbreak of the Civil War demonstrate quite clearly what would have been the pattern
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of life for the Hamiltons in future years. All this was altered by the outbreak of war, and the resulting deaths of the 1st and 2nd dukes meant that the family once more became fixed in Scotland. Hamilton palace became again their real home, and when in the 1680's the earl of Arran began to look for a wife in England, this was primarily because London was now the great marriage market for a wealthy bride.

If the 1st duke of Hamilton showed unwillingness to marry, his grandson the earl of Arran approached the subject with an even greater antipathy. It has been said that the eldest son of a peer had as little freedom of choice in the matter of his marriage as did any of his sisters, but the earl managed to evade his family's matrimonial plans for him for more than ten years. Moreover, it was obvious from the start that only financial considerations led him to entertain the prospect at all: if he did marry it would be to a woman rich enough to finance his extravagant way of life and underwrite his ever increasing debts. He therefore thought only of marrying an Englishwoman.

Of course, unless he was forced to marry, he had no intention of doing so. Ever since his return from the Grand Tour he had been deaf to his family's pleas that he take a wife and settle down in Scotland. He obstinately refused, preferring the unrestricted and infinitely more exciting life at the Court of Charles II. He had no intention of relinquishing his bachelor freedom in favour of domesticity.

His parents, on the other hand, were most anxious that he should
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marry, both for the immediate and for the future good of the family. The financial aspect was not without interest to them, as they had yet to provide for three daughters and five younger sons, and while the earl imagined that he would be the sole beneficiary of his future wife's wealth, they were equally positive that they would be the sole recipients of the portion. By their own unremitting efforts the 3rd duke and duchess had paid off the huge debts with which the Hamilton estates were burdened and were now in a position to think of buying lands and making improvements on their estates, but of course the younger children had to be considered too. Large portions would have to be found for the three daughters, and because the estate was entailed the need to make provision for the younger sons presented something of a problem.

Finance was not for them the only consideration as it was for their son. Whatever the wealth of a future countess of Arran, she must be of suitable lineage, so the duke and duchess always inquired carefully into the antecedents of any lady suggested for their son. The duchess especially was concerned for the future welfare of the family, and the provision of a male heir in the next generation. She also hoped that a suitable wife would stabilise her son's erratic behaviour and that he would settle down at home. The desirability of this latter course was constantly emphasised by both the 3rd duke and duchess. Their predecessors, as they never failed to point out, had ruined the family
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fortunes by living at Court and neglecting their estates. It was therefore of the utmost importance that, after their own years of struggle to recoup the family's losses, their son should not throw all this away but should interest himself in the running of the lands which would one day be his.

As early as 1672 a wealthy heiress with a large estate in Stepney had been suggested by Sir Robert Moray as a possible wife for the earl of Arran, who was at that time only fourteen, but not until his lordship was on his way back from the Grand Tour was the matter of his marriage given serious consideration. While he was in France his uncle the earl of Dunbarton had put forward the names of various candidates. The most promising of these was Mademoiselle de Roussi, a niece of Turenne and granddaughter of the leading French Protestant nobleman the comte de Roussi. Not only were her religious beliefs satisfactory, but she would bring with her a dowry of 50,000 crowns. Both Dunbarton and Mr James Forbes, the earl's governor, pressed this marriage on the grounds that it would improve the family's position for putting forward their claims to Châtelherault. However, despite the fact that their French pretensions were a constant preoccupation with the Hamiltons, the 3rd duke and duchess rejected the notion of their son marrying a foreigner. Marriages with foreign ladies were indeed uncommon in the Scottish peerage - only ten Scottish peers contracted such unions during the period
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1625-1712\(^1\) - and as the duchess pointed out, such a marriage would lead her son into journeys and expense when it seemed that in any case he did not know how to manage his money.\(^2\) The idea was therefore dropped, and although in 1684 there were rumours of the earl marrying a wealthy French lady,\(^3\) no serious negotiations for a foreign bride ever took place.

Mr Forbes, however, continued to make suggestions and advised the duke of Hamilton to look for someone suitable in England or in Scotland 'if there be any there worth looking after.'\(^4\) It is significant that from then until 1688 only two Scottish ladies were ever mentioned in the existing correspondence in this connection. In 1686 the earl of Arran mentioned that the marquis of Atholl had unmarried daughters, but his mother dismissed this on the grounds that his own sister Katherine's marriage to Lord Murray had given them enough connection with that family.\(^5\) A year later the earl apparently had some hopes of marrying the widowed duchess of Monmouth, but this too came to nothing.\(^6\)

Other than these two ladies, the brides proposed for the earl of Arran were either English, Welsh or Irish and were met by him in London or elsewhere in the south. His parents presumably concentrated on the financial benefits of such an alliance, consoled themselves with the hope that after his marriage he would have a change of heart and agree to settle
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in Scotland, and gave their blessing to his various negotiations. After he returned to England he persuaded them that he was actively looking for a wife, and indeed he was conscious of the fact that, as his uncle the duke of Perth had stressed, the duke of Hamilton was not willing to settle any considerable sum upon his eldest son until the latter marry 'some fine rich lady.'

Mr Forbes had suggested Lord John Butler's widow, who had a jointure of £2000 sterling, but she decided to marry the earl of Plymouth. He then suggested Lady Katherine Sands as 'absolutely the best and worth looking into' but nothing came of this either. In the spring of 1679 the earl was seriously negotiating for Lord Coventry's daughter but by the autumn he had in view Nellie Paulett, grand-daughter of the 5th marquis of Winchester. In 1682 he was rumoured to be married to Lord O'Brien's daughter and in the following year hoped to succeed with one of the earl of Rochester's daughters. Four years later his name was linked with that of Lady Conway but he seems to have been more interested in the duke of Newcastle's daughter Arabella, who although marked by smallpox was said to be 'fine shaped otherwise' and likely to make a good wife. It was in
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the following year that his exasperated father told the duchess that as for their son's marriage 'his head is on the duchess of Monmouth which I believe will come to as little as all the rest.'

It was during this period too that the earl formed liaisons with various other ladies. He apparently had two illegitimate daughters, Katherine and Mary Ruthven, who must have been born in the 1680's as their uncle the earl of Selkirk described them in 1701 as being nearly women.

About the same time he had a son, James Abercrombie, who when he grew up was given a commission in the earl of Selkirk's regiment and was described by the latter as 'very proud to be thought the man's son he is...is the greatest ill-lier that ever was, drinkes like a fish, confident to the last degree...' and so on. Abercrombie was made a baronet in 1709, gained his father's support in his attempts to enter parliament, and finally died in 1724.

For over ten years, then, the earl had been seeking a wife, and on several occasions had been well advanced in drawing up the marriage articles. In most of these instances he had chosen the bride for himself, and generally encountered no parental opposition to his choice. Yet as time went by, as plan after plan fell through and rumours linking his name with first one lady and then another followed each other in rapid
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succession (and those occurring in the correspondence can have been but a proportion of the total), it became increasingly clear that the earl had no serious intention of marrying unless his financial straits made such a course imperative.

There were naturally a variety of reasons which explained the breakdown of his matrimonial plans. Inevitably the two parties could not always agree on financial terms, and since the 3rd duke and his son were usually at loggerheads, the situation was all the more complicated. Had the two been in harmony an accommodation with, for example, Lord Coventry, might have been reached, but again and again the fact that the earl was preoccupied with wresting as much as possible from his father for himself in addition to the demands made by the bride's family meant that the negotiations broke down. Reconciling two interests was difficult enough; reconciling three often proved impossible.

Argument over the terms of the articles ended the treaty with Lord Coventry, who was demanding a jointure of £2000 for his daughter where the duke would give only £1,500, and would allow the earl as present maintenance less than the annual £2000 sterling which his lordship demanded.¹ There were similar difficulties with the Pauletts when the earl of Arran was dissatisfied with the dowry offered, but in that particular case the main reason for the failure of the match lay elsewhere.

Although the marriages of the seventeenth century peerage were arranged and the daughter in question had little say in the matter, the
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element of personal choice was not altogether absent. Such was the case with Nellie Paulett, who was obviously a girl of spirit. She lived with her aunt and uncle in Wells and had a portion of £10,000 sterling.\(^1\) At first she had listened willingly to suggestions that she might marry the duke of Hamilton's heir, but came back from a visit to her aunts, Mrs Paulett told the earl of Arran, 'soe fild with abusive stories to your lordship's disadvantage' that she seemed quite altered in her attitude.\(^2\) Her aunts followed up their advice with letters almost every post reminding her that the earl's affections were engaged elsewhere and that he was a notorious spendthrift. The result was that when his emissary Sir John Copleston called to see the lady he met with a very cool reception. As he wrote to the earl afterwards 'shee had said if you came she would runne out of the house; and when I alighted at the doore, shee imediatly shut herself into a clossett.'\(^3\) Her uncle finally prevailed upon her to emerge, whereupon the visitor favoured her over lunch with 'a discourse of marriage, as who could prove the best husbands and wives, what scarcity there was of both' and stressed his lordship's 'unspeakable affection for her.' Nellie listened to him in silence and then replied that as she was young and a stranger to the world, she would need time to consider, so Sir John withdrew and spent the rest of the day playing cards.

Next morning he arrived at her home early, and noted with satisfaction that she was 'much better dressd and very chearfull.' Nevertheless her
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answer remained the same and Sir John once more betook himself to the card table. He remained with her uncle until eleven o'clock that night, but on the following day she still asked for time to consider.¹

While her aunt and uncle continued to hold out hopes of success, the earl tried writing letters to Nellie. These she received with 'a great deal of sowerness and morousnes';² and later refused even to read them.³ At last in the summer of 1680 the earl failed to put in a definite proposal by an agreed date, and the treaty was at an end. As Mrs Paulett told the earl afterwards, Nellie later confessed that 'she with pleasure told the hours as they drew on to the conclusion of your limited time, that she might be at liberty.'⁴

One of the reasons given by Nellie for her reluctance to accept the earl was that she did not wish to 'marry to a forraine estate', in other words, live in Scotland.⁵ The prospect of sending his daughter to live in the remote north must have deterred more than one father. The earl of Rochester refused to send his daughter to stay with the duchess of Hamilton until the marriage and the earl of Arran then told his mother that her insistence that the couple settle in Scotland 'will absolutly put ane end to this treatie, for I know her freinds will neaver consent to it' adding that 'at this raite I ame like to be ane old batchelour for if you continue
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positive noe bodie that has parents and that is to be maried by treatie will marie me without your consent, and if living in Scotland be one of the first articles I believe they who have such a fortune as will be necessar to provide for my younger brothers and give me a present suteable allowance will be apt to think they cane doe much better nearer hand.'

This line of argument made little impression on his mother, who told him that neither his persuasions nor those of his father would convince her on this subject. She quoted her 'grandfather's liveing of of his estate ate court tho in so advantages a post that itt is not to be expected you will arrive att yet brought his family to the verie brink of ruin', adding that 'this is not that I am such a foole as to think Scotland a finer place or neare soe good as England, but being the country whare your intrest lyes can't but be most your advantage to sett up your residence in', and 'as for that you writ you ar like to be an old bachelor is your owne fault not mine.'

In the opinion of his parents, such reasons for the earl's failure to marry were merely excuses. Having initiated proceedings with the Pauletts, his deliberate procrastination had ruined his chances there and his behaviour with regard to the duke of Newcastle's daughter had been even worse. His arrival at his grace's house rather the worse for drink soon became the subject of gossip and caused his mother to tell him that 'it's
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no wonder at the rate it's talked that his daughter nor any other discreet
parson ever desired to match with you...unless you change your way people
will be feared to meddle with you.'

These reproaches from his father might be discounted as
exaggeration in view of the hostility between them, but the duchess was a
woman of eminent good sense, whose remarks cannot be dismissed lightly.
Nevertheless, however strongly the earl of Arran wished to remain a bachelor,
the arguments for his marrying had by 1687 become distinctly pressing. For
one thing he was almost thirty, and most young noblemen in his position
had married long since. More important, his debts now amounted to some
£10,000 sterling and he had been forced to pawn his jewels. If he were
to settle with his creditors he would have to obtain a large portion and
an allowance from his father. Since the latter depended on the former,
mother was the only answer, and in January 1687/8 he took as his wife
Lady Ann Spencer, eldest daughter of the earl of Sunderland.

The possibility of this marriage was first mentioned in the winter of
1687. In November of that year the 3rd duke of Hamilton was on one of
his periodic visits to London, where he was staying with his sons Arran,
Charles, John and George while the duchess remained at home in Hamilton.
The duke's anxious letters to her, the drafts of her replies and the
marriage articles themselves combine to give a fascinating picture of the
negotiations involved on such an occasion.
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The duke was not the instigator of this marriage, and not until the middle of November did his son inform him of the plan.\(^1\) Arran's name had been mentioned in connection with Lady Ann on previous occasions,\(^2\) which was not surprising since the earl was a protégé of Sunderland, and Lady Ann was attractive and popular. Apparently there had been little or no basis for these earlier rumours, but as 1687 drew to a close, Sunderland's political position made such a match the answer to his problems. By allying himself with the duke of Hamilton he hoped to counteract the influence of Melfort with the king. It is therefore probable that the suggestion for the marriage came from Sunderland himself. Certainly he wished the negotiations to be kept secret and at first the only person outside the two families to know anything about the proposal was the French ambassador.\(^3\)

In the negotiations which followed, Arran and his future father-in-law were generally working together. When he told his wife about the proposal, the duke of Hamilton remarked that the 'terms they demand are very high which I believe our son helps well to',\(^4\) and his suspicions were confirmed a few days later when he learned from the French ambassador that the earl, although he had pretended to his father that the match was designed for the family's interest, 'had been discourseing the terms with the earl of Sunderland and how to bring me up to give great conditions and
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have his debts payed.' His grace was understandably annoyed, and reported to the duchess that 'upon this subject you need not doubt my son and I has had reaknings you have heard us have before.' Nevertheless, he now gave serious consideration to the suggested terms which Sunderland had drawn up in his own hand. These stated that as Lady Ann would have a dowry of £12,000 sterling, the young couple should have settled on them £6,000 sterling per annum, £1,500 of which would be for present maintenance. Should the earl become duke of Hamilton, this would be increased by £500, and £1,500 more would be added on the death of either the 3rd duke or duchess. This £12,000 to £1,500 was a portion/jointure ratio of 8:1 and was quite in keeping with the figures generally accepted at that time in the English peerage. By the last quarter of the seventeenth century it was rare to find a ratio not somewhere between 8:1 and 10:1.

Also in keeping with English practice, the bride was to be provided with an annual sum in the form of pin money. (This provision was not usually included in Scottish marriage contracts of the period.) Her father thought that £400 per annum would be satisfactory, and wanted her and her husband to be able to burden the Hamilton estates with up to £15,000 sterling. Moreover, should the duke predecease the duchess, half of the estate should go to the young couple. If the earl of Arran were to die before his parents, £4,500 of the yearly amount settled on
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him would revert to his parents. It was to be left to the earl of Arran to make a settlement for any daughters born of the union, and when Lady Ann's portion was paid only £8,000 would go to the duke of Hamilton, the remaining third being paid direct to the bridegroom.¹

In much of this the earl of Arran's own hand can be seen, so favourable to him personally were the proposals. It was true that an affectionate father was always anxious to safeguard his daughter's future by seeing that she was provided with an adequate jointure and pin money, but the clause allowing the earl to burden his parents' estate with up to £15,000 was plainly put in at his own request.

As might have been expected, the duke of Hamilton was far from satisfied with these terms. He told Sunderland that he was willing to settle £6,000 on his son, and of course would give Kinneil as the jointure lands, but he did not see why Lady Ann's jointure should go up to £2,000 if she became duchess of Hamilton. Sunderland insisted, however, nor would he agree to a reduction of the pin money to £200. The duke would not hear of allowing a burden of up to £15,000 to be placed on the estates, and suggested £5,000 as a more acceptable figure. At this, Sunderland reminded him that his grace had already refused to pay Arran's debts, and that Sunderland himself had promised to entertain the young couple in his family for so long as they remained at Court, both in London and in Windsor. He therefore pressed hard for the duke to agree to the £15,000 and also urged that, should his mother die first, the earl
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should be given £1,500 more and that her estate be divided between her
husband and her eldest son. 'This proposition I understand to have
been occasioned by our son', the duke told his wife, 'which I confess I
tooke not very kindly, considering what I had done for the famely and what
he had done, for his debts is called £10,000...'

When he saw Sunderland again he therefore told him that if the
duchess were to die first her son could have only £500 more, and warned
his wife that if he himself were to die first a larger sum would be
expected from her since she was a woman and would have less expense than
a man. He also mentioned to her that there were plans that should the
duke die first Arran would succeed to his title, though of course the
dukedom was her own. He advised his wife that she should agree to this
scheme for 'it is not your interrest to oppose it, for I see the necessity
of allways haveing a man to represent the famely els it wold be run down.'
The decision on this would, of course, lie with the duchess and indeed
her approval was supposed to be necessary before the marriage articles
could go through at all. Until her reply was received, the matter was to
remain a secret. On November 21 the duke therefore sent his son John
north with both his and Sunderland's drafts and instructed his wife to go
in to Edinburgh to advise with the president, Sir Patrick Home and Mr
William Hamilton about a draft of the articles 'after the Scots way.'

On 22 November the king and queen were told of the proposed marriage
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and were well pleased. Much to the duke of Hamilton's annoyance the bridegroom himself was strangely reluctant. His father had already noted him to be 'little desirous to be settled and...affrayed of that condition of life' and had confided to the duchess that their son was 'in as much perplexity of thinking to be married as I have been in fears not to be married to you.' Arran was greatly annoyed at the arrangement whereby his wife's pin money was to be paid out of the sum set aside for present maintenance, and seemed oblivious to the charms of Lady Ann.

As soon as the duchess of Hamilton heard about the negotiations she wrote to her son welcoming the news and gladly giving her consent to his marrying 'so fine a lady for whom I had a particular respect for from the first time I saw her.' She now, however, complicated matters by declaring that she would resign her interest in Châteelherault to him, on the understanding that he do nothing to alienate it from the family, and told him that he might burden the estate with no more than £5,000. At about the same time she wrote to her husband refusing to part with more than £500 of yearly rent should he predecease her.

These letters dismayed the duke considerably. After all, in the tentative contract for Nellie Paulett the duchess had been willing to quit £1,000. Moreover, the duke wrote back to her, as for her notion of resigning Châteelherault, 'your parting with it is not considered worth
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a groat.\textsuperscript{1} All this caused his grace great difficulties and he even thought of sending Arran north to discuss the situation with her, but since this would cause delays he decided against it and took it upon himself to offer that should he die first the duchess would quit £1,000 per annum. He explained this to her as tactfully as he could the next time he wrote, remarking, 'I am confident when I meet with you I will convince you that you wold have done it yourself if you had not been in haste.'\textsuperscript{2} This arrangement mollified Sunderland, who went off to have the articles drawn up by his lawyers. The earl of Arran remained very ill pleased, 'swears he will be a beggar and he is undone' and declared that he would be better off single and had a mind to break the match.\textsuperscript{3}

It was now planned that the wedding should take place a week before Christmas so the duke began to worry about the expense of the new clothes needed by himself and his sons.\textsuperscript{4} As Christmas drew near he was busy with the drawing up of the contract, for the marriage had actually been announced before the news of the duchess's approval came, thanks to the indiscretion of the bride's parents, and he found himself involved in a new series of difficulties. 'The laweirs here', he complained, 'there terms of law are such and their way of bussines so different from ours that I have difficulty to understand them and they I believe more to understand me.'\textsuperscript{5} He could not fully comprehend the draft made by
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Sunderland's lawyers and so had a better one made although he added gloomily 'I believe when it comes there [to Edinburgh] our lawyers will not well understand it unless I be their interpreter.' To add to his troubles, the earl of Arran was demanding £800 so that he could redeem his jewels, wanted extra money to buy new clothes, and insisted that his bride be given an expensive wedding present. He also continued his complaints about the terms of the contract and 'goes mad that the £10,000 sterling is not allowed him to take on the estat.'

On December 29 the duke was still busy with drafts, rewriting the whole contract many times in his own hand and telling his wife that he 'never wanted you so much nor has had no friend nor could get no Scots lawyer to help me.' At last, however, the articles were completed and on 5 January 1687/8 the signing took place. The atmosphere on this occasion was not exactly festive, for as the duke recorded 'even at the subscribing our son was repining at not having power to burden the estat with the ten thousand pound and got my Lord Sunderland to speak to me that it might be done at extending the articles but he was not very earnest and I put it off.' The future bride was also far from cheerful. The duke observed that she 'seamed in some concern today at signing the articles which I thought no wonder off for she cannot but know his wildness.' His grace therefore went across and 'sayed some things to incourage her', to which she replied that if she pleased him she would
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think herself very happy. Lady Ann had no need to fear on this score, for her future father-in-law had already decided that the more he saw her the better he liked her. She was 'both handsome and personable', had been carefully educated and if anyone could reclaim the earl from his present ways she would do it.

The final articles were somewhat different from those originally envisaged by Sunderland. The sum settled on the young couple, the present maintenance and the increase of £500 in the jointure in case of the earl becoming duke all remained unchanged. There never had been any debate about these clauses. Sunderland had his way in seeing that his daughter was given £400 p.a. pin money, although the duke had been successful in arguing that this should be provided out of the present maintenance. In the terms directly relating to the Hamilton estates, the duke had been able to have his own way. If he died first, Arran would receive £1,000 more but if the duchess died first the increase would be £500. More important, Arran was to burden the estate with no more than £5,000, only a third of the sum originally mentioned. The duke had also seen to it that specific provisions were made for any daughters born of the marriage, although these were less detailed than in many other contemporary contracts. If one or two daughters were born, they were to have £5,000 sterling, and if three or more, £6,000. These sums would be payable when the girls
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reached the age of sixteen or when they married, until which time they were to be educated in a suitable manner and paid the lawful interest from the principal sum. It was later commented that Sunderland might well have asked for greater provisions to be made, but no discussion of this point seems to have occurred during the negotiations. The duke also saw to it that plans were also made for the contingency of the earl remarrying should Lady Ann predecease him. If this happened and he had no sons he was to settle any part of his present maintenance up to £1,500 as a jointure for the second wife, and if there were male issue of the first marriage, £600. Any such settlement was to be dependent on the consent by the duke of Hamilton to a second marriage.

As for the portion, the duke of Hamilton had another victory there. £10,000 was to be paid directly to him, and only £2,000 to his son, although he had to promise to redeem the earl's jewels for him. The portion was to be paid within two days of the wedding - a very short space of time since in most Scottish contracts payment did not usually have to be completed for a year or so afterwards. Presumably because payment was to be so prompt, no penalty clause was included. The other articles were more in the nature of formalities. The young couple would have power to grant leases and enter vassals on the present maintenance lands, and since the Hamilton estates were strictly entailed they were to pass down in accordance with the entail.

The contract was clearly a mutual accommodation between the duke of
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Hamilton and the earl of Sunderland; Arran's attempts through the latter to improve his own financial position had failed. Nevertheless, he had to sign and seal the articles whether he liked them or not. Along with the main parties, the earls of Middleton and Dunbarton with Godolphin and Harry Sidney signed as witnesses on the back of the parchment sheets, then they all celebrated with a ball and supper at Sunderland's lodgings. On 16 March at Holyrood the duchess of Hamilton added her signature, with Annandale, Forfar, Lord Murray and Hamilton of Bargany as witnesses.  

The first provision of the articles had ordained that the marriage take place on or before 15 January 1687/8, and on 10 January the earl of Arran was able to write to his mother that he had 'bein a maried man a quarter of ane hour.' Up to the very eve of the ceremony he had been threatening not to go through with it, but his father saw that he appeared next morning at the earl of Sunderland's lodgings as arranged. The marriage service was performed in the dining-room there by the bishop of Rochester. The duke of Hamilton and his sons all had new suits, and the earl and his new countess were both splendidly attired in garments covered in ribbons which were later cut off and given as wedding favours. Seven such knots were sent home to the duchess, and another recipient was John Evelyn who wrote in his diary two days later that the wedding had been celebrated with 'extraordinary splendour' and that he and his family
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'had most glorious favours sent us.'

Throughout the ceremony the bride looked rather grave, but everyone else enjoyed the supper which followed, and the dinner and supper on the next day. The duke of Hamilton was certainly feeling satisfied. He had heard that £1,000 had been bestowed on Lady Ann's clothes, and he considered that if his son 'could have had his choice of all England he could not have had [sic] a finer young woman.' He could also reflect with pleasure on how he had arranged to leave £2,000 of the portion in London so that when he returned in the summer he would not have rates of exchange to pay. Then he still had £8,000 left with which to help pay off his daughter Margaret's portion, provide for his younger sons, and finance his legal suits with Southesk and Richard Cunningham. The only thing he had forgotten to do was to give the bride a present, and he seems to have been oblivious to the fact that this caused some comment among the guests and a good deal of irritation to his son. Now all that remained to be done was the drawing up of the contract in Edinburgh, and this was completed by the summer of 1688.

The earl of Arran was married at last - but how successful was this long deferred match? As far as Sunderland was concerned, his alliance with the Hamiltons proved a failure. Sunderland's influence was by now too much reduced for him to risk continuing his opposition to Melfort, but
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the duke of Hamilton returned to Scotland and set about exposing the mismanagement of Perth and Melfort. However, soon after the birth of the prince of Wales, Sunderland announced his conversion to Roman Catholicism, thereby deliberately throwing away the political benefits of his daughter's marriage. ¹ It is, however, interesting to note that he remained on good terms with his son-in-law for the rest of his life, and as late as 1696 Lord John Hamilton in a letter to his brother Arran, referred to 'your friend and our patron my Lord Sunderland.' ²

For the Hamiltons, the marriage was a success. They had received the generous portion and along with it the friendship of an influential man. They also gained a daughter-in-law who was much beloved by them. At the time of her marriage Lady Ann had already won the respect of her father-in-law, and her graceful first letter to her mother-in-law evoked a welcoming and affectionate reply. ³ Much more important, of course, was the fact that despite the earl of Arran's previous misgivings about matrimony, he was very happy with his bride. It was unfortunate that they had to endure many separations in their short life together. At first the earl was away with his regiment while Lady Ann was at Court as a lady-in-waiting to Princess Anne, then she visited her parents' home and wrote to her husband 'Althrop is so fine that I have no reason at all to repent me of it, only because I am from you, but indeed that is enough to hinder me from having much pleasure. However if I could but be sure that
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you think of me now even though it were not half so often as I do of you, it would make some amends.'¹ On another occasion she assured him 'with all sincerity in the world that whatever you think nobody ever loved another so well as I do you, my dearest lord. Pray wrote two words by this bearer to comfort me.'²

With the Revolution of 1688 the earl was imprisoned in the Tower of London, where he remained throughout that year. Sometime about then his wife had a daughter, who died in infancy.³ In the autumn of 1689 the duke of Hamilton was in London and reported that Arran was remaining in the Tower for fear of his creditors. His lordship's finances were as chaotic as ever and when at last prevailed upon to sell some of his plate, instead of paying off his debts he bought a velvet bed and a set of hangings for it.⁴ Finally it was arranged that in order to avoid his creditors he would slip out of prison secretly and at once ride for Scotland while with some trepidation the duke agreed that when he himself left for home he would take with him Lady Ann, who was now expecting her second child.⁵

At first the earl and countess occupied Dundonald's lodgings at Holyroodhouse,⁶ but by the spring of 1690 Kinneil had been put in order and they moved in there. Political and financial circumstances had
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forced the earl to return home and the duke of Hamilton's warning to his wife that 'nether of them will ever thinke of leiving in Scotland tho wee wer both dead and gone' could now be forgotten. On 13 March 1690 the earl's second daughter was born at Kinneil and named Mary. Tragically, Lady Ann fell ill of a fever a few weeks later. The duchess of Hamilton hurried to Kinneil and the earl of Sunderland sent medical advice about the treatment of his daughter, but on 2 July 1690 the young countess of Arran died. She was only twenty-four, and had been married less than two and a half years. A month after her death she was buried at Hamilton, and shortly afterwards the earl of Arran returned to London. His baby daughter was taken to Hamilton by her grandmother.

The earl was genuinely heartbroken at the death of his wife; two years later he wrote sorrowfully to his sister-in-law Lady Clancarty describing his daughter as 'the only comfort I have left, yet I can never look upon her without griving that her dear mother is not allive to share with me the pleasure of that pritty baby. I meak noe dout she is much more happie and wee ought to submitt to God's will yett I can't think it any crime to wish it had pleassed him to order itt otherwies.' On his return to Court he sought consolation in the company of Lady Barbara Fitzroy, the illegitimate daughter of Charles II, who in 1691 bore him
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a son, Charles.¹ The birth of this child must have emphasised the fact that the earl as yet had no legitimate male heir. Once again he would have to set about finding himself a wife.

As on previous occasions, his financial difficulties made it necessary for him to seek a wealthy bride, so she would have to be found in the south. In 1691 both he and his brother Charles had thoughts of marrying Lucia, the only daughter of Viscount Lisburne and heiress to the Loftus estates in Ireland.² This lady eventually married Thomas, Lord Wharton as his second wife.³ A year later, the earl was making advances to the duke of Devonshire's daughter Elizabeth, but she declared that Scotland was too far away for her to consider settling there.⁴ At the end of 1691 he was spoken of in connection with Newcastle's daughter Arabella,⁵ whom he had considered marrying in 1687.⁶ His emissary Robert Murray of Tippermuir reported having seen the lady very often in St James's Park and at Court and having found her to be 'not very tall but otherways she is well enough.'⁷ The earl went so far as to authorise Murray to make a proposal to her⁸ but nothing came of this match either and disquieting rumours of the earl 'having sent to King James to have liberty to marry

---

1 Hamilton, op. cit., 450.
2 HL 4086; Burke's D.P., 330.
3 Ibid.
4 HL 3712; Burke, op. cit., 726.
5 H.M.C. Report, 78, Hastings ii, 341.
6 HL 6206.
7 HL 7688.
8 HL 7719.
my Lord Portland's daughter seem to have been groundless. At last in 1693 it seemed as though the earl might seriously think of remarrying. He appeared to be interested in Lord Crewe's daughter, who was also the niece of Lady Belasyse, a former lady-in-waiting to Mary of Modena. He described this lady as 'tal, weel shapit, a good skin, verie well fashioned and has been carefully bread.' More to the point, she had a portion of £17,000 sterling, which he hoped might be raised still higher.

Unfortunately, the duke of Hamilton did not think much of his choice. He had seen the lady walking in the Mall and declared her to be no beauty, in addition to which he considered that her quality was not great. He therefore suggested that his son would be better to try for Anne Thomas of Wenvoe and Ruperra, the only daughter of William Thomas and granddaughter of Lord Wharton. Anne was the heiress to extensive lands in the Bristol area, and her only dependent was her mother who had a jointure of £700 a year. Otherwise the estate was at Anne's disposal. The duke had also taken the precaution of seeing her first. He told the duchess in one of his regular letters home, 'I saw her yesterday at the king and queen's dinner where I beleive she was scarce ever befor. She was with the countess of Denbigh your cusen's relict, who I stood and spoke with a little a purpose to observe the young lady who I [was] pleased [with]
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extremely. She is about seventeen [she was 18½], tall and well sheaped, brown hair and a very white skin. Her face has good features but a little pale and grein. She hears many good presbyterian prayers at my Lord Wharton's so her education is what I believe you would like. She was definitely the best match in town, but if she could not be had, he knew that one of Lord Ossulston's daughters would bring in £20,000.

When his father put these alternatives to him, the earl of Arran was displeased. Anne Thomas would be 'much difficulter to be had' because of her large fortune, and in any case he preferred Crewe's daughter. His father then pointed out that according to the Spencer marriage contract, his consent to his son's remarriage was necessary if any provision was to be made for the daughters and younger sons of a second marriage. The earl thereupon retorted that if that were so he would not marry at all; however, with many complaints he turned his attention to Anne Thomas.

At first his chances of success seemed small, for Anne's relatives did not approve of him and as the duke found out, 'the pretence is that her mother nor herself has no minde she should go to Scotland.' Lord Wharton himself told the duke that this was the reason for their attitude, but his grace feared that 'anybody that is anything well at this Court has no minde to medle with him [Arran] for there is no alteration in him as to his politicks.'
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The duke and his son also continued to quarrel over the provisions of any forthcoming contract. Unless his grace obtained at least part of the portion, he would make no provisions for the daughters and younger sons.\footnote{HL 7450.} After all, if the earl received all the portion he should be able to provide for his own children, and by the time they were grown up the earl would presumably have inherited the Hamilton estates. Before anything could be agreed, the duke of Hamilton died. Although this made little difference to his son's position, since the titles and lands remained in the duchess's possession, it did give him a freer hand in the choice of his second wife, and increased the chances of his returning to Scotland.

Despite his lack of enthusiasm for the match, he continued to pay court to Anne Thomas. The main difficulty now was that he had many rivals, and throughout the early summer of 1694 there were constant rumours of the lady being about to marry Lord Ossulston's son.\footnote{HL 3952, 3900, 3942, 3899, 3911, 3906, 3907, 3904.} The earl's own position was not improved by the fact that his father's death had necessitated his own return to Scotland, so he had to rely on various emissaries who included Sir John Dalrymple.\footnote{HL 3905, 3907, 3908, 3911, 3954, 3958.} At the beginning of July, Lord Wharton announced that he was taking his grand-daughter into the country with him,\footnote{HL 3910.} and in August she was receiving the addresses of Lord
Warrington, described by the earl of Selkirk as 'one of the ugliest young men eaver I saw.' Towards the end of the month Anne fell ill. She had contracted smallpox, and within a week she was dead.

When the earl of Arran returned to London in the autumn of 1694 he therefore had to begin looking for a wife all over again, urged on by frequent letters from his mother, brothers and sisters. In October of that year he wrote home explaining to the duchess that although 'ther are severall matches to bee had...it is not eassy to gett one with all the quallities that my inclinations and circumstances require, so it is much eassiere said "Mar[r]y" then to doe itt. I am sieur I wish itt and longes myself more to bee settled then I can express. Great portiones requires great settlements and a small one is not able to extricatt me out of my difficulties.' He then set about listing the matches available in London. Lord Rochester's daughter (the younger sister of the countess of Dalkeith) was 'one of the prittiest young women that I have seen of a greatt while. She won't have above ten thousand pounds and is very young tho sufficiently a woman and verie pritty but they expect great tyrmes.' There was also the drawback that Rochester was not a great favourite at Court just then, though that might be outweighed by the fact that the lady was really very agreeable and had a good deal of wit. Then again there was his previous friend Lord Crewe's daughter, who was still
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unmarried and whose mother favoured the earl. Finally 'ther is ane
other talked of...a maid of honour, Mrs Henrietta Villiars, the old knight
marshall's daughter. I have had som insinuations made to me that I meight
gett twenty thousand pound ther, but that would lead to ingagments that I
am not verie fond off at present.'

His mother was appalled when she read of this last suggestion. 'I...
beseech you', she wrote back at once, 'not to think of the knight
marshall's daughter. You have by my mother the honoralest part of that
aliah [sic] and I admire you ever touk that into consideration knowing how
mad the father was.' (The 2nd earl of Breadalbane was not so
particular. In the following May he married Henrietta Villiers.) The
duchess favoured Rochester's daughter and thought that her son had under-
estimated the father's interest at Court. However, she left the final
choice to her son, adding the warning that he should come home as soon as
he did marry, for otherwise 'I should never consent to the match or any
other. Those that will not come to Scotland's not for you.' As for
his using another title in England, she did not think that he should
take that of earl of Cambridge but felt that 'marquis of Clydesdale'
might be 'more pleasing to any lady you maryed, being higher than an earle
tho doublle.' She followed this up a month later by telling him that
even if he had all her own lands and titles they 'would not afourd you and
an English wife to live high in England, so I must return to my old
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opinion that a Scots wife is by far the preferablest where you may live comfortably on what you have and pay your debt by degrees as your father and I did before you." ¹

The earl of Arran would, of course, have preferred his mother to resign her estates to him then and there. He tried to convince her when the match with Rochester's daughter came to nothing that he had been rejected because of his small allowance, but it seems that in fact he had made little attempt to further the marriage.²

Throughout the next four years the earl's entire family, including even his little daughter, urged him to remarry³ but to so little effect that his mother at last told him in exasperation that she had given over any expectation of seeing him marry again. She was 'sory you ar so much more unhappy then other men that you can find no parson fitt for you that will be content to live with you where your intrest lyes' but, she added, 'itt is to evident where the fault liys that itt is needles for me to perswe itt further.'⁴ The earl's brother Lord Basil summed up the feelings of them all when he told his lordship '...staying at London, loosing your time, consuming your health, unprofitably spending your money, neglecting your affairs and a stranger to your friends and country, still treating mariages and never marying, give me leave dear brother to say it; that's unaccountable.'⁵
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Before this letter was written, however, the earl had already begun to negotiate for the lady whom he was eventually to marry in 1698. About three years earlier, he had begun to turn his thoughts to Elizabeth Gerard, the only child of the deceased 5th Baron Gerard and the heiress to considerable estates in Lancashire and Staffordshire. She was only half his age - she was still a minor when she married, and he was forty - but she was of a very good family and was very wealthy.\footnote{C.P., vi, 268.} It was not long before the earl began to negotiate for her hand. With his mother's approval he began discussions with the widowed Lady Gerard, whom he described as 'a most extraordinary woman for understanding but very stifle,'\footnote{HL 8469.} and for the next three years his matrimonial plans dragged on.

In the months which followed, his mother and brothers urged him to complete the arrangements in every letter they wrote him, but he always replied with a whole series of excuses. At first he declared himself dissatisfied with the provisions for his present maintenance. His mother retorted that it could not be increased, pointing out that after all he had over £6,000 sterling \textit{p.a.} settled on him, all she did in the way of building, improvements and litigation was for his good, and in any case her age was such that there was no reason to think that she would 'live long to stand in the way of your full possesing of the whole estate of your most affectionat mother.'\footnote{HL 6224.}

The earl therefore abandoned this line of argument and hinted instead
that the jointure lands could be altered. He still hoped that his mother would resign all her lands to him, but the duchess knew full well that if she did so before he married, no marriage would ever take place. She explained to him patiently that although his father had often remarked that it was a pity that Kinneil was in jointure since life-renters do not keep a place in good repair, there were no other suitable lands available. There was no question of the earl occupying Hamilton palace, 'Aran would be thought very redeculous and Evandaill has no habetable house and if there were on[e] there yet the place would be very unfitt for an English lady.'

Having digested this, the earl now explained that legal difficulties occasioned the delay, 'for here in England thingis of this kind are verie intricate.' This was true enough, as the 3rd duke had found in the winter of 1687, but he had managed to overcome similar obstacles in the space of a few weeks. Arran also claimed that Lady Gerard considered it excessive that the duchess of Hamilton could burden her estates with £20,000 without the earl's consent, but her grace refused to reduce the sum. Her son then declared that the wedding was held up because Lady Gerard did not have enough ready money to pay the portion at once. The duchess reasonably pointed out that he could accept the sum in goldsmith's notes or banknotes or security: by this time she was convinced that he
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intended to use such excuses to break the match altogether.¹

This conviction was strengthened when the earl wrote her a letter asking her to be a signatory to his marriage articles, and spoke of coming to Scotland in person.² The former suggestion indicated to her that he would end the negotiations and lay the blame on her; and as for the latter notion 'I am sure' she replied, 'you would never attempt it without the desigene of breaking the match whatever pretence you can make and that you would so fane have broke your first marage even the very day before, and if your father had not hindered you, you had made yourselfe so redelicous at that time.'³

In spite of her urgings, no marriage took place that winter and the following January the earl was saying that everything was delayed by the general scarcity of money. Much to her dismay the duchess then received from him a letter in which he declared that there had been so many delays to his marriage plans that he was almost ready to give them up, and complaining that 'it's a creuell thing when one's circumstances are such that one must prefer monie to other things wher the wholl happines of one's life is concerned.'⁴

The duchess could only continue her persuasions, telling him that if the match did not go through 'I blush to think of your disgrace in it, for I think you are too far engagged in honour ever to retreat.'⁵ In an
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attempt to hurry matters up she herself wrote to Lady Gerard\(^1\) and by September of 1697 his brother John at least was under the impression that the marriage was soon to be concluded.\(^2\)

The earl still had one more objection to make. It now appeared that he wished to return home and settle down there, but where Elizabeth Gerard was concerned 'it's death to talk of living in Scotland.'\(^3\) It is difficult to estimate just how sincere he was in this new notion. He had always before regarded such a prospect with repugnance, and he was in the habit of writing to his mother what he knew she wanted to hear, although she usually recognised his hypocrisy for what it was. On the other hand, his fortunes in the winter of 1697 were at a very low ebb. He had been in trouble again because of his political opinions,\(^4\) his debts were greater than ever, and in December he was truly distressed at the death of his only little daughter, Lady Mary. In replying to his mother's letter of condolence he remarked that his marriage 'yett subsists and will goe on, tho I am convict a Scots wife with a thousand marks might give me more confort: for I can't expect another Lady Aran though I may gett ane other wife,' and added with typical exaggeration that, as far as his living in Scotland was concerned, 'my heart is more sett one that then ever, nay much more. I hope you'l lett me be your chamberland in Aran that I may live ther or lett me bee your keeper that I may live in
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the little hous in the wood.'

If this objection to his future wife was designed to influence the duchess, it failed in its intention. In her usual commonsense manner she told her son Basil that she had once been as unwilling to come to Scotland as any, but that 'a good husband with not despicable fortune will make a reasonable woman content to go where their interest lyes.' At this the earl seemed finally to realise that there was no use arguing any longer, and on 16 July he wrote home announcing that he had signed his marriage articles and that the wedding would take place on the following day. Also on July 16, the duchess resigned her titles in his favour.

This English marriage had indeed momentous consequences for the 4th duke of Hamilton, as the earl of Arran now became. Basically, of course, it brought him a second wife with whom he was reasonably happy. Elizabeth Gerard suited him rather well. When Swift got to know her some years later he decided that 'She has abundance of wit and spirit...handsome and airy, and seldom spared anybody that gave her the least provocation, by which she had many enemies and few friends.' She was very young when she married, but she always seems to have been petulant and wilful, with an excitable nature which matched her husband's volatile disposition. She felt ill at ease in Scotland among his formidable relations, and when in
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1704 he had to leave her at Kinneil and go to Edinburgh, she sent a constant stream of letters to 'my Jewell', sometimes more than one a day, accompanied by gifts of jelly, butter, soup, porridge, and on one occasion a pie which 'looks so ill but when I tasted it and found it so good I cou'd not forbear sending it. It 'twas made a purpose for you, and Beauty came and eat a partridge and spoiled the crust but I have scrap'd it so there's none that she touched.' With considerable kindness her husband replied that 'your partridge pye was the best I ever eatt and was a most seasonable morsell. I have good enough meat but I want my dear and she is constantly in my thoughts. Belive me upon my salvation I adore you and admire your understanding byont what I can express.'

Elizabeth's relations with the rest of the family were not so good, mainly because she was jealous of them, resenting his mother's supposed influence over her husband and hating in particular the duchess of Atholl, 'your politick self designing sister.' 'I wish I were dead', she told the duke on one occasion, 'then you and your famely wou'd be rid of what they don't care for.' She and her English sister-in-law the countess of Orkney disliked each other cordially from the start and never were reconciled despite Lady Orkney's efforts in this direction in the winter of 1712.

Apart from the domestic success of the marriage, Elizabeth provided
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her husband with a male heir. They had three sons, James, marquis of Clydesdale, William, and a third boy whom the duke scandalised his family and amused London society by naming Anne. The duchess of Marlborough was later to recount that at the christening of another child named after the queen, she 'turned to the duchess of Somerset and said to her in a smiling way that the Duke Hamilton had made a boy a girl and christened it Ann, and why should not we make this girl a boy and call it George. This was then understood to be meant no otherwise then as a jest upon Duke Hamilton as it plainly was.' The duke was at this time willing to go to any lengths to ingratiate himself with the queen and to one who had spent some years in France the name was not so very extraordinary. There were also four daughters of the marriage, Elizabeth and Catherine who died in childhood, and Charlotte and Susan.

Apart from the purely domestic aspect, the Hamilton-Gerard marriage was of the utmost importance to the family. For the first time a duke of Hamilton now possessed extensive territories in England and it was only to be expected that much of his time would now be spent there. His revenues were considerably enhanced, although his finances remained precarious. As late as June 1712 the earl of Mar begged the earl of Oxford to make some provision for his grace, explaining 'he is really I think run out to the last and can hold out no longer...'
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Naturally enough his new possessions also coloured his political opinions and it was only to be expected that his attitude to the Union would be somewhat equivocal. With his great estates in Lancashire and Staffordshire he could hardly be expected to give the anti-unionists his wholehearted support. What is surprising is that after his marriage he actually spent more time in Scotland than before it. This could be accounted for by the fact that he now had a Scottish dukedom and could sit in parliament. With his father dead and his own status improved, he could become a leading figure at home while in London his influence remained small.

To his English marriage could also be attributed the improvement in his position at Court which at last seemed to be taking place in 1711. On September 11 of that year he became a knight of the Garter and an English peer - Baron of Dalton and duke of Brandon.\(^1\) Without his English possessions such an honour would have been unlikely. Unfortunately, because of the act of union he was disqualified from sitting in the house of lords.

The 4th duke of Hamilton's second marriage thus gave him an heir and helped him increase his influence, but it did not remedy his financial difficulties and in fact it was to be the direct cause of his death. The reason for these two disasters was to be found in the actual marriage contract with Lady Gerard. Most of the provisions were unexceptionable enough. As in the Spencer contract £6,000 sterling was to be settled on
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the duke, with £1,500 present maintenance, and the jointure would be Kinneil with an annual value of £1,500. The portion in this case was immense - £60,000, or six times that given with Lady Ann Spencer. Of this sum, £2,000 was to go towards the portions of any daughters born of the marriage, and after some dispute it was agreed that Lady Gerard should have a dower of £260 per annum during her daughter's minority, to be increased to £400 after that, but ceasing altogether should Lady Gerard remarry.¹

The cause of all the trouble lay in a further provision. The 4th duke promised to give Lady Gerard a general release of her guardianship two days after the marriage, and as surety of this, gave her his bond for £10,000. This arrangement seemed a fair one to Lady Gerard and her brother the earl of Macclesfield, for they had sustained the expense of looking after Elizabeth's estates, engaging in lawsuits on her behalf, educating her and safeguarding her health.² However, when the 4th duke married Elizabeth he then told his mother-in-law that he had no intention of giving her the release, and likewise refused to honour his bond. Lady Gerard was incensed, and when her lawyers warned her that if her son-in-law went to Scotland it would be difficult to reach him, she initiated a lawsuit against him and wrote angrily to the 3rd duchess of Hamilton.³

The duchess did her best to reconcile the two, on the one hand
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apologising to Lady Gerard if her son had not acted as he should, and on the other rebuking him for his conduct and urging him to honour his obligations. She even sent her son George south to act as an intermediary, but this only resulted in 'a great quarell' between him and the duke. The dispute with the Gerards was to drag on for the rest of his grace's life, becoming more and more complicated and costing him more and more money. In 1700 Lady Gerard died, and the duke went so far as to order mournings to be draped in the rooms at Holyrood, but her death was far from ending the quarrel because in her Will she left to her only daughter five shillings and a diamond necklace. The earl of Macclesfield now carried on his late sister's lawsuits, and eventually constituted Lord Mohun as his heir. The duke thereupon sought a bill of chancery obliging Mohun, as executor to Lady Gerard, to give account of her guardianship.

In January 1712 it was decided that Mohun owed the petitioners £15,000, but his lordship delayed matters by seeking a commission to examine witnesses. Finally, in November of that year the duke and Mohun, the latter apparently drunk, quarrelled in the Chancery Temple over one of Mohun's witnesses, an old steward whose memory was gone. On the next day, November 14, General George MacCartney called on the duke with a challenge from Mohun. He and the duke then met in the Rose Tavern,
Covent Garden, to discuss the details, and it was decided that the antagonists should meet between seven and eight o'clock the following morning in Hyde Park, with MacCartney acting as Mohun's second and Colonel John Hamilton as the duke's. The events which took place on November 15 are described in numerous pamphlets of the time. In brief, both Mohun and the duke were mortally wounded: Mohun died instantly, the duke a few moments after receiving a deep chest wound. Whether it was Mohun or his second who had struck the fatal blow was argued hotly at the time, and MacCartney fled from the country with a charge of murder hanging over him. It seems that he was innocent, but whoever was responsible, the 4th duke of Hamilton was dead. When the news was brought to his wife, she shed not a tear but inveighed against Mohun and his friends, rejected the sympathy of her husband's relatives, and argued bitterly over where he should be buried. The duke of Hamilton's second English marriage, like his first, had ended in tragedy.

The other two Hamilton peers who married Englishwomen were brothers of the 4th duke - John, earl of Ruglen and Lord George who became earl of Orkney shortly after his marriage. As younger brothers, they had
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comparatively little financial provision made for them, and so it was not surprising that Lord George should seek a wealthy English bride. With the earl of Ruglen, however, the position was rather different.

In 1694 John had married his first cousin Lady Anne Kennedy. She and her brother Lord John were the only children of the earl of Cassilis and Lady Susanna Hamilton, sister of the 3rd duchess of Hamilton. Lady Anne and her brother both died of a fever in the winter of 1699/70, within a few weeks of each other. Lady Anne left her husband with three small children who had to be sent to their grandmother at Hamilton. Lord John Kennedy left a widow, Elizabeth Hutchison, and a baby son. It therefore seemed to the earl of Ruglen that the most sensible thing to do would be for him to marry his cousin's widow.

Elizabeth was the eldest daughter of the late Charles Hutchison of Owthorpe in Nottinghamshire, and under her previous marriage contract with Lord John she had a jointure of £1,500 p.a. The old earl of Cassilis was still alive and had taken a second wife, but when he died his successor would be Elizabeth Hutchison's baby son. As the child's stepfather, the earl of Ruglen would be in an influential position, and he could bring back his own family to live with him again. From every point of view the match would be an advantageous one for him. He therefore told his brother in August 1700 that 'I lost no time in making
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the proposall which I did at Blaickburn. She [Elizabeth] is mighty nice [i.e. particular] and cannot hear of such things till her year [of mourning] be out, and then she cannot tell what will be her answer. I am frequently with her and [have] taken lodgings hard by hers and made myself master of all the advantagious posts in order to advance the siege... His efforts were rewarded, and on 24 March 1701/2 the earl of Ruglen's footman brought to the 3rd duchess of Hamilton the news of her son's remarriage. He was reunited with his children and the new family seem to have settled down happily together. They all paid frequent visits to Elizabeth's people in England and eventually Elizabeth's son, the 8th earl of Cassilis, was to marry Ruglen's daughter Susan. No children were born of Ruglen's second marriage.

Very different from this unsensational mariage de convenance was the wedding of Lord George Hamilton, who in November of 1695 scandalised everyone by marrying Elizabeth Villiers. She, a close friend of the earl of Sunderland, was the daughter of Sir Edward Villiers and sister of the Henrietta Villiers whom the earl of Arran had once thought of marrying. She was actually related to Lord George, for her grandfather was the half brother of Susan Villiers, George's maternal great-grandmother. Apart from the question of the father's sanity, which had preoccupied the duchess of Hamilton on the previous occasion when a union with one of the knight marshal's daughters had been suggested, what really horrified

1 HL 6413.
2 S.P., vii, 362.
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everyone was the fact that Elizabeth Villiers was notorious as the only English mistress of William III. Although she was far from beautiful, she was witty and charming, and, more to the point, was very rich and very influential. Just six months before her marriage to Lord George she had been granted almost all the Irish estates of James VII, comprising 95,649 acres and worth something like £25,995 sterling a year.¹ As William Hamilton of Pencaitland remarked at the time, it was 'a very promising rich marriage.'²

Very different was the reaction of Lord George's family. His mother was at first extremely vexed and angry, and threatened never to write to him again if he went through with the match,³ while the earl of Ruglen told the earl of Arran 'My brother George's marriage is in everybody's mouth. I am sorry for him. Hitherto he has been in great repute.'⁴

Despite this unpromising beginning, the marriage seems to have been a success. The duchess of Hamilton was by the beginning of December 'much mitigatt',⁵ probably because of her son's new wealth and title but also because she found in her latest daughter-in-law a woman whose intelligence and humour matched her own. Unfortunately the union did not prove as beneficial financially as had at first been anticipated, for in 1699 parliament resumed all the Irish lands formerly granted to the

¹ C.P., x, 108; S.P., vi, 579.
² HL 6827.
³ HL 4012, 6689, 7469.
⁴ HL 6919.
⁵ HL 4071.
countess of Orkney.\footnote{HL 7794, 7408, 7825.} However, she and her husband were able to live comfortably enough at Cliveden near Taplow, their only regret being that although three daughters were born to them, they had no sons.

Finally, it is relevant to note here the first marriages of Lord Archibald Hamilton. He made the navy his career, and when he tired of his 'little wooden world'\footnote{HL 6319.} decided to look for a wife whose fortune would enable him to leave the sea. According to most authorities, his first wife was Anne, the daughter and co-heiress of Charles, Lord Lucas and widow of Edward Cary. She died in 1719,\footnote{S.P., iv, 382.} but in a letter written on 4 November 1709 the earl of Selkirk refers to the death of Lord Archibald's wife, so presumably Anne Lucas was his second wife.\footnote{HL 7266.} The identity of his first wife remains obscure.

During the years 1625-1712, five of the Hamiltons were married to Englishwomen. As has already been remarked, seventeenth century marriages can provide a good deal of information about the attitudes of the parties involved and so it might be supposed that the six English marriages of the Hamiltons (the fourth duke having twice married an Englishwoman) are evidence of a considerable degree of anglicisation. However, this is not necessarily so.

In all these six marriages, not once did any of the Hamiltons choose his bride because of her nationality. They did not marry Englishwomen...
because they believed that their futures lay in England, or because they felt more English than Scottish or because they found Englishwomen more congenial. Four of the six marriages were motivated by finance, one by politics and one by convenience. Of course this is a simplification, and there was usually more than one reason for any match, but the primary considerations are in each case obvious. It is true that the second marquis of Hamilton may specifically have wished his son to have an English wife, but this was of secondary importance to the desire that he should marry into the Buckingham faction. It is also true that the fourth duke concentrated almost entirely upon Englishwomen throughout his protracted matrimonial negotiations, but this was because he needed a rich wife and only in England could he find a woman rich enough. Similarly, the earl of Orkney and Lord Archibald had to marry for money because as younger sons it was their only hope of making financial provision for themselves. Yet although they married Englishwomen there was no doubt that the Hamiltons continued to regard themselves as Scottish, and the desire of the fourth duke's family that he marry a Scottish girl was made clear in innumerable letters from his mother and brothers and sisters. As for the earl of Ruglen, his second wife was by marriage a member of a leading Scottish family and Ruglen would presumably have married his cousin's widow whatever her nationality.

Moreover, in marrying Englishwomen those five Hamiltons were acting in a manner entirely consistent with their position as Scottish peers. One Scottish peer in seven was marrying an Englishwoman, and usually from reasons of finance or a desire for greater influence. The Hamiltons were
therefore no more anglicised than their fellow peers as far as their marriages were concerned. In the absence of a detailed study of the seventeenth century peerage marriages it is impossible to assess the significance of this statistic of one in seven, but it seems likely that the degree of English influence on this section of society was not so great as has sometimes been imagined. Certainly the Hamiltons were no different from their fellow peers in the marriages of their sons, and in the end these English marriages did little to bring about a change in their way of life. The money which came into the family's hands in the form of dowries was used along with other normal revenues, and was not sufficient to alter their pattern of spending. The 1st duke's influence did not increase because of the matrimonial alliance with Buckingham, and the 4th duke merely added to his unpopularity with William of Orange and Queen Anne by marrying Sunderland's daughter. Only the Gerard marriage brought a significant accession of lands and influence, and even so, it was not until the very end of the duke's life that he managed to improve his position at Court.

Finally, it must be remembered that three of the younger sons married Scottish, not English, ladies. At a time when it did not seem as if he would inherit the family titles, the earl of Lanark was contracted to Lady Elizabeth Maxwell. His initial dislike of her was dismissed as unimportant because she and her sister were the co-heiresses of the very wealthy James Maxwell, earl of Dirleton, and on 26 May 1638
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they were married in London at St Anne's, Greyfriars, the bride's dowry being £16,000 sterling.¹ Finance was also the main consideration in the marriage of the 3rd duke's sixth son Lord Basil, who was betrothed at a comparatively early age to Mary Dunbar, his father's ward and heiress to the Baldoon estates.² Then of course there was the marriage of his brother John to their first cousin Lady Anne Kennedy.³ This match was no doubt arranged by the 3rd duchess and her sister, and after all there was nothing unusual in marrying a near relation. Such alliances were very common, particularly when a peer's daughter was involved, and in the marriages of their daughters the Hamiltons showed themselves to be entirely typical of their country and class.

1 GD 109/2742.
2 HL 9146, 6392, 6774, 7773, 6161, 6162, 6396, 6859; N.L.S. 1031, 136; HA 120/3.
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'Think not of ever cumming into this kingdome wher your father hes ended his dayes in shuch a maner,' the 1st duke of Hamilton wrote in his last letter to his daughters on the eve of his execution. He had already instructed his brother that he wished Anne and Susanna to 'be maried in Scotland' and when the 2nd duke was near the end of his life he confided the care of his own little girls to Anne, stating in his Will that they should give themselves in marriage 'to some of the Scottis name.'

In view of their experiences during the Civil War it was not surprising that the 1st and 2nd dukes of Hamilton should display an antipathy towards England and should hope that their children would marry their fellowcountrymen, but in fact there was nothing unusual in this latter course and it seems to have been customary for the daughters of Scottish peers to marry Scotsmen.

Any cursory survey of the daughters of Scottish peers is hampered by a lack of information. The figures which follow are based on a study of the relevant families in the Scots Peerage, but it must be borne in mind that in some cases the fate of various daughters remains unknown, and indeed not all daughters born to peers may have been included. However, there are enough details to make such a survey representative even if not
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complete.

During the years 1625-1712, 284 peers seem to have had daughters who survived to marriageable age, making a total of 826 ladies. As in the previous chapter, this number excludes the families of those peers who were English, Welsh or Irish but happened to hold Scottish titles. Of these 826, only 28 married English, Irish or Welsh men. This gives a percentage of 3.39, which is very much lower than the 13.7% English marriages achieved by their brothers during the same period.

As with the brothers, it would seem that the presence of an English member in the family increased the likelihood of a further English marriage taking place. Thus the 1st marquis of Atholl's daughter Charlotte, 1 the earl of Dysart's daughter Elizabeth, 2 the 1st earl of Ancrum's daughter Vere, 3 Lady Mary Alexander the daughter of the 3rd earl of Stirling 4 and Lady Juliana Murray, daughter of the 1st earl of Tullibardine 5 all had English mothers and married Englishmen. The same is true of the 3rd duke of Lennox's daughters Frances and Catherine, 6 the 4th earl of Stirling's daughters Mary and Judith, 7 and of course Diana, Anne, Christian, Mary, Charlotte and Henrietta, all daughters of the 2nd earl of Elgin and his English wife Lady Diana Grey. 8 Also, Lady
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Elizabeth Ramsay's mother was Irish and her husband English, and the 1st earl of Middleton's youngest daughter Elizabeth had an Irish mother and married an Englishman.

On the whole then, it would seem that Scottish peers preferred to choose a Scotsman when selecting a husband for one of their daughters. The reasons for this preference are not far to seek. The most obvious factor was the disparity between the portion offered with an English noblewoman and that available with the poorer Scottish lady. Any English peer was usually looking for a wealthy wife and therefore sought his bride at home, where there was a variety of rich merchants' daughters in addition to well endowed noblewomen. Very often the Scottish father simply could not afford to give the large portion expected in the south and so had to look elsewhere for a husband for his daughter.

Lack of opportunity must also have played a part. Most of the young Scottish ladies stayed quietly at home with their mothers, unless on an infrequent trip to London or Bath, and what with the trouble of marrying off his eldest son and finding his way through the maze of English legal terminology a father would not usually burden himself with the task of arranging an English marriage for his daughter. Then again the girl's mother would probably wish to voice an opinion on her daughter's future, and it was only natural in these days of bad communications that she would prefer to see her child married to some comfortable local gentleman who

1 S.P., iii, 101-2.
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would not take her away to a distant part of the country where she might never see her again. Both of these considerations no doubt help to explain why only 3 out of the 826 daughters married foreigners - the 1st earl of Melfort's daughter Mary marrying a Spanish count,¹ the 2nd marquis of Huntly's daughter Catherine becoming the wife of the grand treasurer of Poland,² and the 3rd earl of Elgin's daughter Marie, herself half-Flemish, marrying a Flemish prince.³

Not only did Scottish peers choose to marry their daughters into Scottish families; the husband selected was often enough a relation and frequently a near neighbour. Lady Anne Murray,⁴ Lady Anne Kennedy,⁵ Lady Katherine Maule,⁶ Lady Anne Erskine,⁷ and Lady Jean Stewart⁸ were just a few of those ladies who married their first cousins. The 3rd, 4th and 5th earls of Perth all married daughters of succeeding marquises of Huntly.⁹ The 1st and 3rd Lords Duffus married daughters of the 1st and 2nd earls of Seafield¹⁰ while the 1st and 2nd Lords Balvaird married daughters of the 1st and 2nd earls of Southesk.¹¹ Three of the 5th Viscount Kenmure's daughters married Gordons, he himself and his 1st wife
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both being Gordons, and three of them married Maxwells.\footnote{S.P., v, 124-6.}

The 1st Lord Carmichael's daughter married Sir William Weir of Stonebyres and his granddaughter married James Weir of Stonebyres\footnote{S.P., iv, 588.} ... and so the pattern continues, fascinating in its intricacy.

A similar web of intermarriage can be found among the families of any one area. In Ayrshire, for instance, the Eglintons, Glencairns and Dundonalds married through each other and with the Kennedys, Baillies and Blairs. Such matches were contracted with a view to cementing alliances, reconciling enemies, furthering political advancement or consolidating landholding. Some matches, of course, were founded solely on mutual affection - widows, for example, were usually able to exercise personal choice - and some were not planned at all: the 3rd earl of Wigtown's daughter Lilias ran away with one of her father's servants\footnote{S.P., viii, 552.} and Julian, daughter of the 3rd earl of Marchmont, eloped with Charles Bellingham 'a man of neither fortune nor position.'\footnote{S.P., vi, 17.}

The earls of Wigtown and Marchmont were no doubt horrified at the behaviour of their daughters, but it was not that they would have expected their daughters to marry peers or indeed titled men at all. With the fact that most fathers had at least two daughters on their hands and some were unlucky enough to have as many as twelve, many of them were quite satisfied if they married their girls to well-off young men of
reasonably good family. Obviously in any generation there would be far more daughters of peers than there were heirs of peers for them to marry. Indeed 149 of the peers who had adult daughters during this period failed to marry any of them to fellow peers. Of those noblemen with an only daughter, 33 found them a titled husband but 41 did not. Seventy peers had two daughters but only nineteen managed to marry off both daughters to a peer and a further 19 found a peer for one of their children. Similar figures apply to those with larger families and no peer with over four daughters managed to find peers for all his girls. The 11th earl of Angus was doing exceptionally well when his first daughter became Lady Alexander, his second Lady Bargany, his fifth countess of Annandale, his 7th duchess of Queensberry, his 8th duchess of Perth and his 9th countess of Nithsdale. Incidentally his son William made the most brilliant match of all when he married Anne, duchess of Hamilton.¹

Of course a reasonable proportion of the daughters who did not marry peers married the younger sons or cousins of noble families; many married baronets, some married soldiers, some merchants; Lady Anne Arbuthnott married an advocate,² Lady Mary Colville a minister³ and the 2nd Lord Duffus's daughter Elizabeth married the town clerk of Inverness.⁴ Quite a number did not marry at all, and whether or not some of them did marry remains in doubt.

¹ S.P., i, 205.
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When they did marry, however, they took with them a portion which might be as little as 4,000 merks or as much as 100,000 merks. Lawrence Stone has calculated that in England in the years 1625-49 the average size of portions was about £5,400 sterling with many peers offering over £10,000 and 'in the next seventy-five years the average figure continued to move up steadily to about £9,700.' These were indeed huge sums compared with those normally offered with Scottish brides. In a random sample of 100 Scottish brides during the period 1625-1712 (and including the Hamilton ladies who married during those years) the highest tocher given was the 100,000 merks provided by the 1st duke of Queensberry when his daughter married the earl of Wemyss. The average portion was approximately 24,000 merks and the sums most frequently named were 40,000 merks, 30,000 merks, 20,000 merks and 18,000 merks. No particular conclusions can be drawn about what an earl or a marquis might be expected to give as compared with a viscount or lord: the 2nd earl of Airlie's daughter Anne had a tocher of only 6,000 merks in 1660 while Lord Banff's daughter Helen had 80,000 merks in 1629. Obviously financial circumstances dictated the amount of tocher given, and the fact that a lady's tocher was usually fixed when her mother's marriage contract was drawn up, meant that the sum given might seem very low because of a fall in the value of money.

1 Stone, op. cit., 639-40.
2 S.P., vii, 140.
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The tocher was, of course, one of the most important provisions in the marriage contract. Most Scottish marriage contracts of the period were fairly straightforward. They were usually antenuptial, and so began with the young couple's promise to marry before a certain date - although the space for the date is often left blank. The father of the groom then arranged to infeft the bride in her jointure lands, and sometimes resigned his own lands for a new infeftment in favour of his son and the heirs of the marriage. Occasionally the father also promised to keep the couple and their children in his own household.\(^1\) As most estates were by now entailed, provision had to be made for the daughters of the marriage should no sons be born. Sometimes these provisions were simple - William Graham of Garthmoir when he married Lady Elizabeth Graham in 1664 stated that if one daughter were born of the marriage she should receive a tocher of 12,000 merks and if more than one were born he and his wife would decide what sum the younger daughters should be given.\(^2\) Generally the arrangements were more specific and the contract between John Graham of Claverhouse and Lady Jean Cochrane is typical in this respect.\(^3\) If Lady Jean had only one daughter, the child would receive £20,000 Scots. If there were two daughters each would be given 20,000 merks, and if three or more the eldest should have 20,000 merks and 30,000 merks would be divided among the rest. The sum of money was payable at a stated age, which varied from 14 in the earlier years of the period\(^4\) to
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18 later on,¹ or on their marriage. Until that time they would receive the annualrent and their father would entertain and educate them in a manner befitting their station.

Apart from providing the bride with a jointure and securing the future of her daughters, the marriage contract sometimes contained other clauses concerned with her welfare. Robert Hamilton of Silvertonhill, for instance, had to promise to repair his bride's dower house because it was 'somewhat ruinous',² James Nicolson of Cockburnspath had to make sure that he could provide a dwellinghouse for Lady Magdalene Bruce,³ and if Lady Anna Wemyss outlived her husband the earl of Leven she was to receive 500 merks p.a. for a house. Sometimes, too, it was specifically stated that were the bride left a widow she would receive half of the household plenishing instead of the more customary one third, and sometimes it was agreed that her jewels and plate would remain at her own disposal.⁴

Finally, the tocher was stated, often with a penalty clause in case of delay in payment. The marriage contract of Lord Forbes's daughter Anna and Arthur Forbes of Echt contains the interesting and unusual provision that should the lady die within a year and a day of the marriage, the money was to be refunded to her father,⁵ but such a condition was rarely made and was a sign that the father was in a position to dictate the terms.

¹ GD 47/786; GD 44/33/5.
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The Scottish marriage contract was, then, fairly simple, and when a Scottish peer's daughter was the bride concerned her husband was usually a Scotsman, often a neighbour and sometimes a relation. He might be a peer or the heir to a title, but he might equally well be a professional man or a well to do country gentleman. Such is the picture for the peerage in general, but so far the Hamiltons have been excluded from this brief survey. Were they, perhaps, so anglicised that they married their daughters to Englishmen where other peers preferred fellowcountrymen? Did they ignore local connections, offer huge dowries and draw up complicated marriage contracts on the English model? Or were they, in fact, typical of the Scottish peerage?
GENEALOGICAL TABLE II

The family of the 2nd marquis of Hamilton.

James, 2nd marquis of Hamilton. = Lady Anna Cunningham.

James, 1st duke of Hamilton.  
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>William, 2nd duke of Hamilton.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anna.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lord JOHN, JAMES, SIR JOHN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montgomerie, Lindsay, Lindsay and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>later 17th earl of Eglintoun.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>issue</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Anne, 3rd duchess of Hamilton.  
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>John, 7th earl of Cassilis.</th>
<th>1. Robert Seton.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anne.</td>
<td>issue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>\ 1st earl of Findlater.</td>
<td>\ 3rd earl of Findlater.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

issue issue issue
During the ninety or so years here considered, fifteen Hamilton daughters married, one of them three times and two of them twice. On no occasion did any of them marry an Englishman; all 19 husbands were Scottish.

The 2nd marquis of Hamilton would probably have envisaged a very different future for his family, and there is evidence that he planned to marry at least one of his three daughters to an Englishman. In the spring of 1622 the earl of Kellie reported that the marquis had "made a match of his daughter with Lord Digby's son, whitche makes monye think that he is more Spanishe then he was." 1 This comment was a reference to the fact that Baron Digby of Sherbourne (later that year created earl of Bristol) had been ambassador to Spain in 1617-18 and was again appointed to that position in 1622. Whether he and the marquis disagreed over a Spanish alliance or whether it was because Digby was no friend of Buckingham, 2 with whom the marquis was negotiating a marriage settlement a few months later, the match fell through, and Digby's heir eventually married the 4th earl of Bedford's daughter. 3

The 2nd marquis did not seem particularly interested in a Scottish dynastic marriage for one of his daughters even when the opportunity arose in 1623. Apparently at the king's instigation, Argyll approached the marquis about a marriage for Lord Lorne. Despite the momentous implications of such an alliance, the marquis was unenthusiastic and
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2 D.N.B., v, 962-4.
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declared that 'if the Lorde of Lorne weare the emperour's soun hee should not marri his daughter', with the excuse that 'my Lord of Lorrone did neclect his daughter beecause she is not faire but blacke.'¹ (Dark hair was a Hamilton family characteristic and was still known as such at the end of the century.)² No doubt many people were relieved when nothing came of the negotiations, for as Argyll's emissary had remarked, 'Some folkes as I heare are unwilling my Lorde of Argile's house and the Marquesse Hambleton's house should joyne together.'³ Not for another twenty years was the notion of such a union revived.

When the 2nd marquis died in 1625, none of his daughters was yet married. They had been brought up at Hamilton by their mother, Lady Anna Cunningham, and when their father died it was she who played a major part in arranging their marriages. As a result, there was no more talk of marrying them into the English aristocracy, and in fact all three girls became the wives of men with local connections.⁴ The benefits to be gained by the bride's family from a match were always difficult to assess and were in some respects more negative than positive - no peer wanted the expense of having unmarried daughters living at home indefinitely. On the more positive side, there was always the chance that the estates of the two families could one day be united under a common heir, remote though this possibility might be. The immediate
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### TABLE I
Marriages of the Daughters of the 2nd Marquis of Hamilton.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Date of Marriage</th>
<th>Husband</th>
<th>Connection</th>
<th>Tocher</th>
<th>Other Terms</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lady Margaret Hamilton</td>
<td>1630</td>
<td>John, Lord Lindsay.</td>
<td>He was brought up in West by mother (a Haddington Hamilton) and step-father, Lord Boyd. Educated at Glasgow University.</td>
<td>30,000 merks?</td>
<td>Not known.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lady Mary Hamilton</td>
<td>contract 3-6-1631</td>
<td>James, master of Drumlanrig.</td>
<td>His father heir to what were later the Queensberry to south of Hamilton estates.</td>
<td>20,000 merks.</td>
<td>Groom's father infefts young couple in lands in Hawick area. Begin married life in his household, drawing 5000 merks p.a. from jointure lands.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lady Anna Hamilton</td>
<td>contract April 1631</td>
<td>Hugh, Lord Montgomerie.</td>
<td>His father a friend and neighbour of bride's mother. The 3rd earl of Eglinton had married a Hamilton.</td>
<td>40,000 merks.</td>
<td>Unknown.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes for Table I - See next page.
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result of marrying a daughter into the peerage was expected to be an increase of influence: if a man was bound to a family by ties of marriage he was more likely to act in its interests.

This time, however, the hopes for two of the three marriages were disappointed, for by the autumn of 1633 both Lady Mary¹ and Lady Anna² were dead. Lady Margaret's marriage certainly brought an increase of influence to her husband who, at a time when the Hamiltons were high in the favour of Charles I, became successively lord high treasurer and president of parliament, and was created earl of Crawford.³ On their part, the Hamiltons gained his support in the Engagement, and the earl and countess of Crawford remained on terms of close friendship with the 1st duke and his family: Lady Margaret lived on into her seventies, exchanging regular letters and visits with her niece the 3rd duchess of Hamilton.⁴

Mention should also be made here of the fact that, apart from his legitimate children, the 2nd marquis of Hamilton also had a natural daughter Margaret, by Lord Abernethy's widow Lady Anna Stewart.⁵ Very often illegitimate daughters were married off to a relative - the 7th Argyll's natural daughter married a Campbell⁶ and one of the 1st earl of

¹ S.P., iii, 451.
² S.P., iv, 375; Index to Genealogies, Birthbriefs etc. in the Lyon Office, 34-67.
³ S.P., iii, 35-6; D.N.B., xi, 1183.
⁴ GD 526/9/1, 13; GD 248/567/89; HA 535/8/1, 3, 5.
⁵ S.P., ii, 40, 85.
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Buccleuch's daughters a Scott¹ - and Margaret was no exception. She was married to the 1st duke's close friend and kinsman Sir John Hamilton of Biel, later Lord Belhaven.² Throughout his life both he and Margaret remained close friends of the Hamiltons. Lord Belhaven took part in the Engagement and afterwards 'with his ladie a very cuttie woman's advyce did faine death.'³ His family put it about that he had been drowned in the Solway but in fact he seems to have escaped to England where he worked as a gardener until it was safe for him to return home.⁴ Lady Belhaven was a resourceful woman, much respected by the 3rd duchess of Hamilton. The duchess often stayed with her aunt at Biel and, in common with the rest of the family, sought Lady Belhaven's advice on medical matters since she was skilled in herbal remedies.⁵ She outlived her husband, who died in 1679,⁶ and was still alive in 1686.⁷

That the 2nd marquis of Hamilton's illegitimate daughter should marry a relation was only to be expected, but it was the accident of his early death which ensured that his three legitimate daughters also married Scots. Had he arranged their marriages it is likely that he would have found them husbands among the English aristocracy, but because none of them was married by the time he died, their mother saw to it that they became the wives of presbyterian Scots.
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It would be interesting to know what part the 1st duke of Hamilton played in the choice of these men as husbands for his sisters, and to what extent such considerations were taken into account by him. He was in Scotland from 1626-8 and again in 1629 and 1631, and he did sign his sister Mary's contract, but from the tone of a letter from his mother to the earl of Eglinton about her youngest daughter's wedding, it seems as though his mother was the person who arranged the marriages. She was very much in charge of his Scottish affairs during his frequent absences, and it is probable that even had this not been so, the marriage of her daughters would have been regarded as coming within her province.

One cannot therefore draw conclusions from his sisters' marriages about the attitudes and aspirations of the 1st duke of Hamilton, but there was at least one occasion on which he did negotiate a Scottish marriage for a member of his family. In the autumn of 1641 the duke and the earl of Argyll were involved in the mysterious episode known as the Incident — apparently a plot to murder Hamilton, Argyll and the earl of Lanark. Whatever the truth of that strange affair, it brought Hamilton and Argyll closer together and in November Charles I seems to have been urging the duke to cement a friendship which could bring Argyll into the king's service. It was against this background that the notion

1 See Chapter 1.
2 H.MSS., RH 180/29.
3 Ed. Sir William Fraser, Memorials of the Montgomeries, i, 232.
4 HL 1440, 1535, 1537, 1536, 1541, 1551, 1552, 1553, 1554, 1567, 1568, 1569, 1571, 1572, 1573, 1574, 1575, 1576.
5 Burnet, op. cit., 239.
of an Argyll/Hamilton marriage was revived, and although the 1st duke's elder daughter Anne was at this time only 9 years old, it was in December planned that she should marry Lord Lorne. It must be remembered that at this point the duke did not expect his daughter to succeed to his estates, for with his own sons now dead he intended to make his brother his heir. However, the political implications of such a match were immense, and could Argyll with all his influence with the church and the covenanters be brought over to support the king, the whole situation in Scotland would be altered.

As a result, on 3 December 1641 and 12 January 1641/2 Argyll and Hamilton, in Edinburgh and London respectively, signed a minute of contract for the marriage of their children.¹

According to this document, the couple were to marry within 6 months of Lord Lorne attaining the age of 17 and Lady Anne that of 14. Argyll promised to infeft the bride in the lands of Campbell Muckart, Dollar and others, which would yield an annual rent of 10,000 merks. In return the duke would provide his daughter with a tocher of 100,000 merks. The penalty for failure on either part was to be 36,000 merks. This simple minute of contract, written out on a single sheet of paper by the sheriff clerk of Argyll, was witnessed by the earl of Lindsay and Sir Archibald Johnston in London and by the earl of Loudon and Lord Balmerino in Edinburgh.

Despite all the advantages of this match, it was really rendered

¹ H.MSS., RH 188/191; H.M.C. Report, Hamilton, 55.
impracticable by the differences between the king and Argyll. It soon became obvious that Argyll was not prepared to use his influence in the king's favour or to compromise his own religious principles. The beginning of 1643 saw a breach between Argyll and Hamilton, and the marriage negotiations were broken off presumably before the contract had been extended.¹

If the 1st duke made any further plans for the future of his daughters, they were not successful, and when he died they were still unmarried. In his Will he expressed a desire that either Lady Anne or her sister Susanna should become the wife of James, Lord Paisley, son of the 2nd earl of Abercorn.² This suggestion was probably motivated by a desire to safeguard the future of the family. Should the main line die out, the next heir would be Abercorn, as the descendant of Châtelherault's son Claud, and indeed if the earl of Lanark were to die without surviving male heirs, Abercorn might well put forward a claim to the dukedom on the grounds that it should not pass down through the female line. (The earl of Abercorn did in fact use this line of argument when he later claimed Châtelherault.)³ There is, however, no sign that any serious attempt was made to follow the 1st duke's wishes in this respect.

When the 2nd duke of Hamilton died after the battle of Worcester leaving all his honours and estates to Lady Anne, the question of her

¹ Cf. Sir John Scott of Scotstarvet, The Staggering State of Scottish Statesmen, 41, where the sequence of events is erroneous.
² H.M.C. Report, Hamilton, 57, no. 119.
³ HL 8114, 8116, 8135; see too GD 1/499/1.
marriage became all the more pressing. In 1651 she was almost twenty, had lost the protection of father, uncle and grandmother, and with the Cromwellian invasion of Scotland, saw her estates confiscated. Her position was precarious and she was ruined financially, so it became obvious that she needed a husband who was either himself very rich or who could somehow restore the Hamilton finances. It was indeed a happy chance that she found such a man in the earl of Selkirk.

Lord William Douglas, later earl of Selkirk, was born on 24 December 1634. His father, the 11th earl of Angus, married twice and as well as 8 daughters, had by his first wife 3 sons and by his second wife 3 more, the eldest of whom was the earl of Selkirk. As has already been noted, six of Selkirk's sisters married into the Scottish peerage, and his eldest half-brother married the 3rd duke of Lennox's daughter. Usually a younger son could not expect to marry an heiress but in this case Lady Anne's estates were so burdened with debts that her possessions were more of a liability than anything else. However, they had great possibilities, and could the creditors be paid off she would once more be the most important heiress in Scotland.

A further obstacle lay in the way of the marriage for the earl was 'by education a papist, his ancestors professing the same religion.' Fortunately he was willing to alter his opinions and 'to obtain her [the

1 S.P., i, 204-6.
2 C.P., iv, 438.
duchess and her wide domains...he consented to embrace the protestant creed.' It must have been true that he had 'gained the affection of the youthful duchess', for she had been brought up by her covenanting grandmother and would not normally have contemplated marriage with a Roman Catholic. Burnet's description of him is scarcely flattering: the earl 'wanted all sort of polishing. His temper was neither fit to submit nor to govern. He was mutinous when out of power and imperious in it. He wrote well but spoke ill. For his judgement when calm was better than his imagination...a narrow and selfish temper brought such an habitual meaness on him, that he was not capable of designing or undertaking great things.' Of course Burnet had been a protege of Lauderdale, and had quarrelled with the Hamiltons many years before he wrote these words. If his portraits are to be believed, the earl of Selkirk was a very handsome man, and the duchess no doubt saw in him those virtues which made him the very person she needed to rescue her from her financial difficulties.

Unfortunately no correspondence exists to give any indication of the negotiations preceding the marriage, and an even greater want is occasioned by the disappearance of the marriage contract. According to

2 G. Burnet, A History of his own Time, 105.
3 See Plate 3.

Plate 3 William, earl of Selkirk and 3rd duke of Hamilton, by Kneller.
a catalogue of Hamilton Papers printed by the Maitland Club, there is a
minute of this contract among the Hamilton Archives, but this has not yet
been found.\(^1\) There is, however, a letter from one of the earl of Arran's
correspondents, stating that in the missing document the 3rd duchess
'contracts to give the earle of Selkirk as her portion twentie thousand
pounds Scots, and he dischargeth all other claime, either by the right of
marriage or anie other manner of way. But I am informed Kinneil is since
granted in lieuw thereof, at least tenne thousand merks of yeerlie rent
about it ar to be made up so much.'

The only other provision of the contract definitely known is that the
marquis of Douglas was to provide the earl and his bride with the barony
of Douglas and with several lands within the barony of Crawford. By a
contract of excambion made at the castle of Crawford on 17 April 1656 it
was agreed that the lands beside the castle, which was the home of the
marquis, should be exchanged for lands in the barony of Avendale, and for
the lands and feu duties of the lordship of Bothwell.\(^2\) No doubt the
dowries of any daughters to be born of the marriage were fixed in the
marriage contract, and it would be arranged that the earl and his heirs
would take the name and arms of Hamilton. Throughout his life the 4th
duke of Hamilton used Hamilton as his surname; he was never known as
Lord James Douglas or even Douglas-Hamilton. Similarly, his brothers and
sisters all signed themselves with 'Hamilton' as their surname. There was

\(^1\) Maitland Club Miscellany, iv, part 1, 202.
\(^2\) Register of Deeds, Dal., 618.
nothing unusual in this, the customary procedure where the marriage of any heiress was concerned.

According to a later remark made by Lady Margaret Kennedy, the duchess's husband 'uses her most base in giving her nothing without great grudging, because she did not reserve in her owne power anything from him by contract for herselве.' It must be remembered, however, that Lady Margaret and the earl of Selkirk disliked each other cordially. Lady Margaret was a close friend of the 3rd duchess and lived in her household for many years before marrying Gilbert Burnet, but as the duchess admitted later 'my lord and she did not always agree so well together', adding in her draft letter and then deleting the words 'and said he would rather pay for her boarding in any other place then she should stay here.'

Lady Margaret's opinion of the earl of Selkirk is therefore to be treated with caution, and it is difficult to know whether or not to accept the statement that the duchess did not reserve any particular powers to herself. Her sister's contract certainly did contain a good many safeguards, but it was drawn up twelve years later in rather different circumstances. It is quite possible that it did not occur to the duchess to ask for specific reservations, or that she did not consider it necessary to do so.

Less than a fortnight after the contract of excambion was signed, John Nicoll recorded in his diary, 'Penult of April, 1656, the dutches of

1 Letters from Lady Margaret Burnet to John, duke of Lauderdale, 53-4.
2 HL 8109.
Hammiltoun wes mareyit to the erle of Selkirk, second lauchfull sone to
the marques of Douglas, at the kirk of Corstorphyn.¹ The marriage is
also recorded in the Hamilton parish register.²

The duchess and her husband, who was created 3rd duke of Hamilton at
the Restoration, now re-established Hamilton palace as the family home,
and it was there that their large family was born.³ By any standards the
3rd duchess's marriage was a success, for whatever the duke's motives in
marrying her, they enjoyed an affectionate working partnership throughout
nearly thirty years of married life. Even Burnet⁴ had to admit that the
duke at first 'minded nothing but the recovery of that family from the
great debts under which it was sinking, till it was raised up again by his
great management...he made himself a great master in the knowledge of the
laws, of the history, and of the families of Scotland, and seemed always
to have regard to justice and the good of his country.'

The duke certainly identified himself with his wife's family, to an
extent where his signature as duke resembled more nearly that of his
predecessors in that title than it did his own handwriting.⁵ By
meticulous hard work he managed to restore the Hamilton finances. The
2nd marquis, 1st duke and 2nd duke had all died deeply in debt, a fact to
which the 3rd duke and duchess often referred, blaming their forbears'

¹ Nicoll's Diary, 117.
² Hamilton O.P.R., i.
³ See Genealogical Table III.
⁴ G. Burnet, A History of his own Time, 103.
⁵ e.g. HA 462/3/2.
GENEALOGICAL TABLE III

The children of the 3rd duke and duchess of Hamilton.

Anne, 3rd duchess of Hamilton = William, earl of Selkirk and
3rd duke of Hamilton

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Birth</th>
<th>Notes</th>
<th>Death</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Marie</td>
<td>30 April 1657</td>
<td>Died in childhood.</td>
<td>July 1666</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 James</td>
<td>11 April 1658</td>
<td>4th duke of Hamilton.</td>
<td>November 1712</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 William</td>
<td>14 July 1659</td>
<td>Died aged 22 on the Grand Tour.</td>
<td>23 September 1681</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Anna</td>
<td>1661</td>
<td>Born in London, died in infancy.</td>
<td>September 1663</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Katherine</td>
<td>24 October 1662</td>
<td>Married John, 1st duke of Atholl.</td>
<td>January 1706/7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Charles</td>
<td>5 February 1663/4</td>
<td>Earl of Selkirk. Never married.</td>
<td>13 March 1738/9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Birth</td>
<td>Notes</td>
<td>Death</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 John</td>
<td>25 January 1664/5</td>
<td>Earl of Ruglen. Married: 1. Lady Anne Kennedy 2. Elizabeth Hutchison</td>
<td>3 December 1744</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 George</td>
<td>9 February 1665/6</td>
<td>Earl of Orkney, first British field marshal. Governor of Virginia. Married Elizabeth Villiers.</td>
<td>29 January 1736/7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Susan</td>
<td>September 1667</td>
<td>Married: 1. earl of Dundonald 2. Lord Yester</td>
<td>7 February 1736/7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Margaret</td>
<td>11 December 1668</td>
<td>Married earl of Panmure</td>
<td>1731</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Anna</td>
<td>3 December 1669</td>
<td>Died in childhood</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
'not leaving where there bussines was' for having done 'more to reuin their family then their expence.'\textsuperscript{1} For this reason the duke spent much of his time at home, devoting his energies to business. Countless notes and memoranda in his writing on accounts and papers in the Hamilton Archives and elsewhere\textsuperscript{2} bear witness to his ceaseless activity. Every penny was now accounted for, down to the money he paid to have his beard cut or the few shillings his wife spent on candy for the children.\textsuperscript{3} At first the duchess was occupied with her ever increasing family, but as her children grew older she played an active part in the administration of the estates. The result was that by the 1680's the huge debts had been paid off and the duke and duchess could think of expansion - of buying lands, building at Kinneil and Hamilton, planting trees and laying out new gardens.\textsuperscript{4}

In private, too, the marriage was a success. Early on the duke told his wife that 'when I see the ways of others and thinks on you I cannot but acknowledg myself most happie in so vertueus a parson.'\textsuperscript{5} He genuinely enjoyed a retired life on the family estates and in 1678 told the duchess that 'iff it pleas God to presairve you and give me the satisfaction to live the rest of my life with you I could be satisfied with a very small share of this world, to be in quiet in so good company.'\textsuperscript{6} When in later years affairs of state took him more frequently to London it was his habit

\textsuperscript{1} HL 6259.  
\textsuperscript{2} e.g. HA 462/3; GD 237/201-3.  
\textsuperscript{3} HA 526/9/7.  
\textsuperscript{4} See Chapter 8.  
\textsuperscript{5} HL 8154.  
\textsuperscript{6} HL 8095.
to write to her with every post. Their letters to each other were brisk and unemotional, but this was occasioned as much by the fear of the post being intercepted as by a natural lack of sentimentality. On his way to London in the autumn of 1687 the duke wrote back to his wife of how he missed her company 'hourly and dayly, and I am sure to do so more and more.' He valued her judgement, relied on her advice and worried that she would overexert herself in his absence for he knew her to be indifferent to personal comfort. In November of 1687, for instance, he had to reproach her because 'you did not tell me you was necessitat to lay in a coalhouse all night betwixt Cassillis and Aire as you went, as is reported here. I am sure I did forewarned you to have a care of being in the night...I confes I feared some such accident and never desires you should make journeys when I am not with you...'

As he grew older the duke longed for a peaceful life, and hoped that he and the duchess would 'be happy togither in our old age after all the deficulties and turmoillings wee have had in this world.' Unfortunately the last few weeks of his life were spent in London on state affairs. He was far from well that winter and declared that he would 'not easily be persuaded to make this jurney again.' When about to leave for home on April 3 he ended his letter with the words, 'God send us a good meeting

---

1 HL 7455.
2 HL 6233.
3 HL 7673.
4 HL 7675.
5 HL 7452.
and I hope we shall never be so long asunder again.'

He left London that same day, in company with his daughter and son-in-law Lord and Lady Murray, his son Lord John and his secretary David Crawford. At first he hoped that the journey would improve his health, but on April 12 he suffered what must have been a stroke. Although 'much desheartned' he insisted on continuing the journey and on April 13 wrote to the duchess from Darnton describing his symptoms but telling her not to be too alarmed about him although he himself did not know what would come of such an illness.

When the duchess heard the news she immediately rode south to Cockburnspath to meet him. They spent the following night at Biel but by the time they arrived in Edinburgh the duke had lost consciousness and it was obvious that he was sinking fast. He died in his room at Holyroodhouse on the morning of April 18, at about half past five.

The duchess was heartbroken. Usually self-contained, she admitted to the earl of Arran the following November that 'my tears...ar but to frequent both in the night as well as day.' In 1695 she was still 'extremely melancholy' and her family found Hamilton Palace a sadly altered place. A year later she remarked that 'the great grief that still

1 HL 7491.
2 HL 7491.
3 HL 7606, 7607.
4 HL 3916.
5 HL 7738; HA 516/11/1.
6 HL 7605, 7738, 7739.
7 HL 7740.
8 HL 6659.
9 HL 9092.
possesses me for the lose of my deare lord makes other trubells not have so deep an impression¹ and she often said that now that he was gone she expected that her own life would soon be at an end. In fact she had to endure many more tribulations without his support, for she survived him for more than twenty years.

Just as they shared the running of their estates, the 3rd duke and duchess must have consulted each other carefully about suitable marriages for the various members of their family. To them fell the task of finding husbands for the duchess's four young cousins, for her own three daughters, and of course for her sister.

The duchess had married in 1656 but ten years later Lady Susanna, now in her thirties, was still unmarried and living at Hamilton with her sister's family and Lady Margaret Kennedy. Then in December 1668, she signed a contract agreeing to marry Lady Margaret's brother the 7th earl of Cassilis.²

At first sight there was nothing particularly unexpected in this. The Kennedies as an Ayrshire family were neighbours of the Hamiltons³ and were noted for their strong covenanting sympathies.⁴ The 5th earl had been a close friend of the 2nd duke of Hamilton and had acted as a commissioner in the contract whereby the 2nd duke gave possession of Kinneil to his duchess.⁵ What is surprising is that while Lady Susanna

---

¹ HL 6741.
³ GD 25/9/38.
⁴ S.P., ii, 482.
⁵ GD 237/203/1.
was 34 her future husband was only 19, and their marriage contract is particularly interesting because it afforded her advantages not usually accorded to a wife.

The contract was signed at Hamilton on 26 December 1668, Lady Susanna acting with the special advice and consent of the duke and duchess. She and the earl agreed to marry, then it was stated that Lady Susanna's jointure lands would consist of the barony of Cassilis, Dalrymple, Turnberry and Dunure, yielding 18,000 merks per annum. Should the earl be in any way unable to provide properly for his spouse during his lifetime, she was to have full benefit of all the jointure lands 'as if he were dead.' The earl would resign his lands for a new infeftment in favour of himself and his heirs male, whom failing, his sisters and their heirs, and if he acquired more lands they too would be held thus.

Generous and detailed provision was made for any daughters, should Lady Susanna die before the earl leaving no sons. (Normally no mention is made of the mother predeceasing the father.)

There then followed the clauses involving Lady Susanna directly. Her tocher was to be £60,000 Scots which was by Scottish standards a very handsome sum and the second highest portion recorded in the random sample of 100 already mentioned. In accepting this, the earl agreed that 'all profit and commoditie thereof shall onlie belong to the said noble lady herself and that shee shall not onlie have the sole management and administration thereof during the marriage...to intromitt and apply the same to what ends and uses shee shall please...' but also make assignation, grant tacks and so on without the consent of the earl of Cassilis. He thus
gave up all right to any money that she had, while still promising to maintain her and her family and servants. Lady Susanna was also empowered to keep all plate, jewels, household furniture and so on belonging to her before the marriage, over and above the liferent provisions, regardless of the usual claims _jure mariti_. She could use and dispone such articles as she pleased, and bequeath them without her husband's consent. Only if she did not dispose of them before her death would he have a right to them 'as anie other husband would have.'

Because of these renunciations, the duke and duchess of Hamilton had advanced the tocher to the bridegroom, with the unusual provision that should Lady Susanna predecease her husband and leave no children, or should she die within a year and a day of his death, £20,000 Scots of the tocher was to be paid back to the duke and duchess. This clause is reminiscent of that contained in the contract between Anna Forbes and Arthur Forbes of Echt, but the latter specified that the dowry was to be refunded should Anna die within a year and a day of the marriage, whereas the provision affecting Lady Susanna's dowry might not come into operation for ten, twenty years or even longer.

Lady Susanna's position was also safeguarded by a document issued the day before she signed her marriage contract. On 25 December 1668 Charles II issued a declaration of precedence in her favour stating that, in consideration of the services of her father and uncle, the king ordered that 'both now and albeit she should marry a peer' Lady Susanna 'shall from henceforth enjoy the place, praeheminencie and praecedencie before all countesses in all assemblies and meetings whatsoever, any custom
or constitution to the contrarie notwithstanding. 1

On 26 December, she and the earl signed their contract with the duke and duchess of Hamilton as consenters and the master of Cochrane and Sir John Dalrymple of Stair among the eleven witnesses. On 12 February 1670/1 the earl of Cassilis endorsed the document with his ratification.

This was obviously a marriage contract which had been more or less dictated by the bride's family so favourable to her and to them were the conditions laid down. In return for a large tocher the earl had to renounce all the benefits usually conferred upon a husband jure mariti, and also put himself in a position where he might well lose a sizeable part of the tocher. This situation may be attributed to the fact that the earl was a minor with no father to negotiate on his behalf whereas Lady Susanna, although not an elder daughter, was an heiress of a powerful family. As a woman in her thirties, she was long past the stage of being used as a pawn in political or financial manoeuvrings, so why she chose to marry the earl at all remains something of a mystery. She certainly does not seem to have made a love-match: in a letter she wrote to him in 1689 in case she should die without seeing him, the one personal remark she made was to tell him in what can only be described as lukewarm terms, 'You have had a large shaire in my best wishes and I trust shall have so till the end of my time.' 2 Of course the disparity in ages may not have seemed so incongruous to contemporaries as it does to us. After all, the earl's

1 GD 103/2/4/31.
2 GD 25/9/79.
sister married a man very much younger than herself and the odium this incurred was occasioned rather by the poverty and inferior social position of the bridegroom than by his youth.

The earl of Cassilis's motives for marrying Lady Susanna are fairly obvious. His father had died heavily in debt as a result of his expenditure in the public service, and because of his own covenanting sympathies the 7th earl had difficulty in regaining this money. Even when his finances were improved with the tocher brought to him by his wife, he had to sell some of his Wigtownshire estates in the 1670's. His wife also provided him with an heir. Their son John was born about 1671, and a daughter Anne, named after the 3rd duchess of Hamilton, followed in 1673. Although Lady Susanna and her sister kept in close touch with each other this friendship was not shared by the earl and his brother-in-law, and in 1684 the 3rd duke told Queensberry that Cassilis 'never favored me this severall years with much of his correspondance so I medle litle in his affairs.' It was no doubt through Lady Susanna that it was arranged that her daughter Anne should marry the duchess of Hamilton's son Lord John in 1694. A few months after this contract had been signed, Lady Susanna died. In her Will she left a ring to her sister and another to the earl of Arran, and to her son Lord Kennedy 'a dimond clasp, 2 pendant

1 S.P., i, 481-3.
2 GD 248/566/85.
3 GD 224/171.
4 See Chapter 2.
5 GD 25/8/759.
6 GD 25/9/79.
perl, a hundred jacobins, the vilot damask bed and what other of the furniture I brought to the hous of Cassilis my lord plases to give him.¹

Four years later her husband married Susan Fox, an Englishwoman much younger than himself.²

Apart from his two legitimate daughters, the 1st duke of Hamilton had by Euphemia Hamilton another daughter Mary. Who arranged her marriage is unknown, but in 1661 she became the wife of one of her father's creditors Sir Thomas Hay of Park, again of course, a local man.³ In 1658 and 1659 the 3rd duchess had disposed to him certain lands in Lesmahagow in satisfaction of a bond by the 1st duke for £12,013 Scots. Incidentally, these lands of Southfield and Calderwater were eventually returned to the duchess when Sir Thomas's grandson disposed them to Lord John Hamilton, who then passed them on to his parents.⁴ In view of these transactions it seems likely that Mary's marriage was arranged by her half-sister the duchess. She seems to have had only one child, a son Charles, and her husband died in 1666.⁵

As well as finding husbands for her sisters, it fell to the 3rd duchess of Hamilton to arrange the marriages of the 2nd duke's daughters, Anna, Elizabeth, Mary and Margaret. These four ladies had lost both their parents at a comparatively early age. Their father died in 1651 and their mother Lady Elizabeth Maxwell, 2nd duchess of Hamilton, soon remarried and

¹ GD 25/9/79.
² S.P., i, 484.
³ C.B., iii, 341.
⁴ GD 26/217.
⁵ Reg. Tests, Wigtown, 1666.
GENEALOGICAL TABLE IV

The family of the 2nd duke of Hamilton.

James, 1st duke of Hamilton.

   = Lady Elizabeth Maxwell.

      = Anna Elizabeth Maxwell.

      Anne, 3rd duchess of Hamilton Polmont d. 1647/8.
      = = = =
      Mary Margaret Diana, died in child-
      hood.

      Robert, 1. James, 1. Alexander, William Blair
      Lord Lord Lord
      Carnegie, Kilmaurs Almond
      later 3rd earl of
      Southesk.

      2. Sir David Livingstone
      2. Sir James
      Cunning- of West-
      ham of quarter
      Robert- 3. James, 3rd
      land.

      issue

      Charles, William Diana William Blair.
      4th earl Carnegie. Cunning-
      ham. Blair.
      of Southesk.
took her family to live in London with her second husband Thomas Dalmahoy. Although the four girls must have enjoyed life in the south they were on very bad terms with their stepfather, probably because he had been merely one of their own father's gentlemen of the horse. When he made his testament in 1681 and 1682 he bequeathed to Lady Anna 'twenty shillings of lawful English money and no more, because she was unjust to me, by endeavouring by all unlawful means, to have ruined both my reputation and fortune by calumnies and aspersions, traducing me to all people of her acquaintance and confessed herself to me that she begged of the king...that his majesty would never grant me any place about him, though she knew very well how much I had suffered for my constant loyalty...'. Similarly, he left twenty shillings to Lady Mary 'because her husband did endeavour to ruin my fortune in Scotland.' He seems to have got on rather better with Lady Elizabeth and Lady Margaret, both of whom inherited £500 sterling from him, but with the other sisters feeling as they did it was obviously out of the question for them to stay on in London after their mother's death, so they came back to Scotland to live in the household of the 3rd duke and duchess.

In choosing husbands for them, the duke and duchess adhered to the usual principles governing such matters. If possible the husbands should be noblemen with a background of royalist support, presbyterian beliefs and local connections.

---

1 The Family of Dalmahoy of Dalmahoy, Ratho, county of Edinburgh, 38-97.
2 Ibid.
3 HA 526/9/1, 526/4/1.
4 See Table II.


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Date of Marriage</th>
<th>Husband</th>
<th>Connections</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lady Elizabeth Hamilton</td>
<td>contract 24 &amp; 28-8-1663 (Postnuptial.)</td>
<td>James, Lord Kilmaurs</td>
<td>He was a second cousin of the bride, whose grandmother had been a Glencairn. Had relatives married into the families of Crawford and Cassilis, as did the bride, and his sisters had married Bargany and Orbiston. Covenanting sympathies of Glencairns but also his father had taken part in the Engagement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lady Mary Hamilton</td>
<td>contract 1663.2</td>
<td>Alexander, Lord Almond</td>
<td>He was the first cousin of the 3rd duke of Hamilton. Callendar's lands adjoined the Hamilton jointure lands of Kinneil and the bridegroom eventually made an entail in favour of one of the 3rd duke's sons. Bridegroom's father a Royalist who had taken part in the Engagement.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 GD 39/1/305; Register of Deeds, Dal., 12, 516.
3 H.MSS., RH 182/10.
4 S.P., ii, 360-1; R. Douglas, Baronage of Scotland, 96; J. Paterson, History of the counties of Ayr and Wigtown, iii, 165-6; HL 7520.
### TABLE II (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lady Anna Hamilton.</td>
<td>contract 1 5-7-1664. (Postnuptial.)</td>
<td>Robert, Lord Carnegie.</td>
<td>His father and hers had been close friends. The earl of Southesk was one of the leading Hamilton creditors. Bridegroom was one of the bride's curators.</td>
<td>£30,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lady Margaret Hamilton.</td>
<td>contract 27-2-1666, 28-3-1666.</td>
<td>William Blair of that Ilk.</td>
<td>He was a first cousin of Lord Kilmaurs, and distantly related to the bride through the Glencairns.</td>
<td>£30,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 H.MSS., RH 182/6.
2 S.P., viii, 56; GD 16/2291, 2292, 2293.
3 H.MSS., RH 182.
Between the years 1663 and 1666, all four sisters were married. Each had been provided with a dowry of £30,000 Scots by bonds of provision drawn up by their father, ¹ and the 3rd duke of Hamilton saw to it that in return for these sums they gave up all claim on the Hamilton estates, although they were allowed to reserve the right to inherit lands through their mother from either Guildford or from the Dirleton estates.

In this and in other respects their marriage contracts were very similar, underlining the fact that they were all negotiated by the 3rd duke. Each bride was to be infeft in suitable jointure lands. Lady Elizabeth would have an annuity of 3,000 merks if widowed, ² Lady Mary would have the manor house of Hayning and the mill of Bamburgh, ³ Lady Anna would be infeft in the barony of Leuchars, ⁴ while Lady Margaret would have the lands of Dalry worth 4,300 merks a year plus an annuity of 200 merks. ⁵ In each case suitable provision was made for daughters should no sons be born of the marriage.

The four contracts differed very slightly in their more minor clauses. Since Lady Margaret and her future husband were both minors they would have to ratify their contract when they reached the age of twenty-one. The contracts of Lady Margaret and Lady Mary were ante-nuptial and those of Lady Elizabeth and Lady Anna post-nuptial. This made little difference to the terms, which were usually agreed before the marriages took place.

---

¹ Register of Deeds, Dal., 12, 367; Dal., 15, 634.
² GD 39/1/305; Register of Deeds, Dal., 12, 516.
³ H.MSS., RH 182/10.
⁴ H.MSS., RH 182/6.
⁵ Ibid., RH 182.
There is, however, an interesting difference in the signatories. The duke of Hamilton signed all four contracts but the duchess signed only three. One would have expected her to sign Lady Anna's contract as a consenter even if she could not be present when it was drawn up. She signed Lady Mary's contract at Hamilton although the others had signed at Holyrood. The explanation must lie in the fact that she and Lady Anna had long since fallen out.

In 1665 the 3rd duchess remarked of her cousin 'allas as to her she is rueined on so menie accounts that I cannot tell you on which most...she is at present at Keperington with her sister Killmars but what her carage now is since she went to that place, which is about a month agoe, I kno not. Itt is long since she past my power...'¹ A quiet domestic life obviously did not appeal to Lady Anna, and about the same time Lady Margaret Kennedy told Lauderdale that 'it is said my Lady Carnegy is much bent on going to Court. She is said to ground her resolve on somewhat the king wrote to her in my Lady Castlemayn's letter tho I am confident intended no hurt, yet that hath made her so insolent there is nothing but partin[g] from her lord, tho really his carriage to her is not censurable in my opinion even by ther owne relation that complains of it.'² If anything, he was too complaisant about her other friendships.

In February 1674/5 Lady Anna and her husband finally separated, and she sued him for aliment, claiming that he had asked her to come to London

---

¹ *Seafield Corresp.*, xi-xii.
² *Letters from Lady Margaret Burnet to John, duke of Lauderdale*, 30-31.
to live with him but deserted her and their two sons. She was granted 3,000 merks without prejudice to the £600 sterling already allowed her. She never did go back to her husband, but went to live in Paris and eventually died in Brussels in October 1695.

Lady Anna's was the least successful of the four sisters' marriages, although Lady Mary too had some differences with her husband, occasioned mainly by her friendship with her husband's kinsman James Livingstone of Westquarter. Lord Almond went so far as to forbid Livingstone to enter his house 'on jealousy', but this failed to put an end to Lady Almond's liking for the man. However, perhaps she and her first husband usually agreed well enough for when she died she expressed a desire to be buried beside him 'at the burial place of Callendar within the church of Falkirk'. He himself died in August 1685, without legitimate issue.

The marriage of Lady Elizabeth and Lord Kilmaurs lasted just nine months. Presumably they spent that time in the household of the earl of Glencairn, for it had been arranged in their marriage contract that they should at first live with him, receiving only 5,000 merks out of the lands in which they were to be infeft. The contract also stated that should Elizabeth be widowed she would have an annuity of 3,000 merks, and this must have been paid to her after her husband died childless on 30 May 1664.

---

1 R.P.C., 3rd series, iv, 384.
2 Ed. Fraser, History of the Carnegies, ii, 154-9.
3 HL 7517.
4 HL 7089.
5 GD 39/1/305; Reg. Deeds, Dal. 12, f516.
6 S.P., ii, 363.
Lady Margaret, the youngest sister, seems to have made the most satisfactory marriage. William Blair was entirely respectable. He was a commissioner of the peace in Ayrshire, and a supporter of the Revolution Settlement.¹ His politics accorded with those of the 3rd duke of Hamilton, and his wife seems to have been the only one of the sisters to remain on friendly terms with the 3rd duke and duchess. Lady Margaret and William Blair lived comfortably at Blair, with a staff of servants including a gentleman, cook, footman, groom, gardener, Lady Margaret's gentlewoman, chambermaid and a page.² A son, William, was born of the marriage, and a daughter Betty, who died in childhood.³

William Blair died in 1689 on the island of Mull. The strange circumstances of his death are revealed in the accounts for his burial. These record a payment 'to John McClean that went the tyme of his [the laird's] sickness to deal with the clans anent his release' and 'to two servants to go to Mulle to try what had become of his corps after his death was made known to his sonne.' The servants found out that Blair had been attended by a French doctor and by a Mr Kennedy during his fortnight's illness. His own footman had also remained with him throughout that time. His body was then embalmed, placed in a double deal coffin, and brought back to the mainland for burial. Presumably the rebellion of that year explains why the laird had been taken prisoner.⁴

---

¹ R. Douglas, Baronage of Scotland, 196; J. Paterson, History of the Counties of Ayr and Wigtown, iii, 165.
² GD 167/10/2.
³ Douglas, op. cit., 196; Paterson, op. cit., iii, 167; HL 8119.
⁴ GD 167/10/2.
The marriages of the 2nd duke of Hamilton's daughters had been carefully planned, on a basis of political, religious and territorial considerations, but however suitable a husband might be from this point of view, an acceptable political outlook, desirable religious convictions and financial security did not ensure a happy marriage, and personal antipathy could cancel out all the benefits hoped for by those who had arranged the marriage. The later marriages of the Hamilton ladies serve to emphasise the fact that their own choice was dictated by personal motives. Because a lady had no influence over the selection of her first husband, she often took the opportunity to remarry if he predeceased her, and in many cases the second marriage was based solely on her feelings for the man, however unsuitable he might be. A wealthy widow was therefore easily susceptible to the flattery of an unscrupulous adventurer.

When Lady Elizabeth's first husband died, she chose to marry Sir David Cunningham of Robertland, who was both her own second cousin and a second cousin of Lord Kilmaurs. His aristocratic connections were, however, no guarantee of integrity and throughout a long career he was accused of all manner of frauds and was even said to have tried to murder his own father. In 1696 he was declared insolvent and imprisoned in the tolbooth of Ayr until parliament released him and gave him permission to dispose of his estates for the benefit of his creditors.¹

Sir David and his wife had one daughter, Diana, but it almost goes without saying that they were ostracised by many of Lady Elizabeth's

¹ C.B., ii, 385.
relations. The 3rd duchess of Hamilton inevitably disapproved of her cousin's remarriage, and in 1675 the countess of Rothes referred to this when commenting on Lady Margaret Kennedy's marriage to Gilbert Burnet. Lady Margaret, she told the duchess, should no longer be allowed to stay at Hamilton, for 'as ye wold not countinanc nather my Lady Findlatare nor Lady Killmars affter what they had done, it will be expected she should be no otherways delt with, whos mariag hath given much more ofenc then thers did from whom les was expected.' Again, at some unspecified date, Lady Margaret declined to call upon the 3rd duchess on the grounds that she had promised to accompany Elizabeth on a visit to their other sister Lady Mary. Had Lady Elizabeth and the duchess been on corresponding terms they would both have come to Hamilton 'but she never geting an envetasion from your grace to com...it was not fet for me to desiar her...'

Incidentally, the purpose of the visit to Lady Mary was as much to reconcile her with Lady Elizabeth as for any other reason. The two had not seen each other since Lady Mary's 'last marriage' and now it was hoped that they would be friends again since Lady Elizabeth 'hes desiared her to bring her daughter with her and sent her a pre[sa]nt.'

This 'last marriage' of Lady Mary's was probably her second. When the earl of Callendar died in August 1685 his countess and the 3rd duke of Hamilton were immediately embroiled in the arguments over the dead man's

---

1 HL 8672.
2 HL 8819.
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4 S.P., ii, 363.
entail. Since Lady Mary argued that her late husband had not been entitled to alter the entail in favour of Lord John Hamilton, she and the duke were on opposing sides and in his irritation he described her as 'the strangest unworthy parson in the world', explaining to his son in December of the same year that her ladyship 'is wholly guided by one Livingston of Westquarter, a creatur of Linlithgow's and on who her husband wold not looke on, and they talke as iff she intended to mary him. I am sure at best he will cheat her.'

A few weeks later he elaborated on this. Lady Callendar was doing everything in her power to oppose the Hamiltons, and 'all this has been wroght on her by one Liveingston who was by the late Calander discharged his house on jealosy, I fear now on to good ground, for she trusts him absolutly and they say she is married to him.'

In this case rumours exaggerated, and it was not until 1690 that a marriage contract was drawn up between them. It was signed in London on 28 June and registered in Edinburgh on 13 January 1701/2. Sir James assigned to his future wife his house and lands of Westquarter, giving her full power over them and allowing her to keep her jewels and dressing plate as her own. Lady Mary on her part disponed to the heirs of the marriage in fee and to her husband in liferent all goods, gear and money she then had or might acquire during the course of the marriage. When Sir

1 HL 7520.
2 Ibid.
3 HL 7517.
4 Reg. Deeds, Dur. 98, f 401.
James died in Edinburgh on 27 November 1701 he bequeathed all his belongings to her.¹

By that time Lady Mary must have been in her sixties, but she married yet again. Her cousin Lady Anne Montgomerie had been the wife of the 3rd earl of Findlater but had died, leaving him a widower with three sons.² In the summer of 1703 he sought the hand of Lady Mary. As the latter wryly remarked, she was 'feeter for my grafe then to be a bride'³ but the earl was persistent, and early in September Lady Mary was making plans for her third wedding. On September 10 she wrote from Westquarter to the earl explaining that 'I cannot the next week come in to make an end of our afare but any time the week after that you can get a spare day...I think the most privet way wode be for you to take a hackne coach as if you ware goinge to take the eair and let nobody know, and meet me at Mortan and bring Mr Meldrum with you...if the Lord will I shall meet you ther about twell or wone aclok and bring the menester that is hear with me, but I had far rather you brought one and it wold make les noyse and suspecsion...and I wode presently take with you that same night in the hackne so that you wode not be much mised out of toune...'⁴

The pair were duly married, and were apparently happy together: during one of their separations Lady Mary wrote a short letter to her husband addressing him as 'My dearest lord an life' and mentioning with

¹ C.B., iv, 384; Reg. Test., Edin., 13 Sept 1705.
² S.P., iv, 36.
³ GD 248/559/36.
⁴ GD 248/559/36.
how much impatience she longed for them to be reunited. ¹ That was in the summer of 1704, and on 4 May 1705 she died in Edinburgh. ² The belongings she left in her houses of Callendar, Westquarter and in Edinburgh were valued at £14,000 Scots, including her jewels and silver dressing plate at £6,666:13:4, and of this she bequeathed 5,000 merks to her husband, with money for her funeral charges. ³

Lady Mary and her sisters had first been married in the 1660's, and after the wedding of Lady Margaret to William Blair almost twenty years elapsed before the 3rd duke and duchess were again involved in marriage negotiations for their immediate family. They themselves had five daughters. Mary, the eldest and Anna, the youngest, died in childhood ⁴ but by the 1680's Katherine, Susan and Margaret were of marriageable age and naturally enough there were various noblemen eager for a matrimonial alliance with the house of Hamilton.

It is interesting to note a definite broadening of geographical range when it came to the selection of husbands for these ladies. This was to a large extent a reflection of the general tendency to move away from purely local alliances. The second half of the seventeenth century saw a loosening of the ties of family and kinship, a moving away from the old parochial outlook, and this can be observed as much in the marriage alliances of the period as in any other sphere. There was also, however,

1 GD 248/559/36.
2 HL 6414.
3 Reg. Test., Edin, 13 Sept 1705.
4 HA 526/9/16; Hamilton O.P.R., i.
the fact that after the troubles of the Cromwellian period the duke of
Hamilton was once more among the most influential men in Scotland, his
friendship and patronage well worth seeking. The 3rd duke had restored
the finances and status of the family, and his opposition to Lauderdale
had brought him to the forefront of political activity. It was therefore
only natural that other Scottish statesmen should desire a closer
connection with him.

The marquis of Atholl was particularly anxious for such a match. On
23 March 1682 he wrote to the duke declaring that 'the honnour I have for
your grace and famillie makes me ambitious of a nearer relation to it.'

The marquis was at this time at the height of his career. A privy
councillor since the Restoration, he had become an extraordinary lord of
session in 1673, vice-admiral of Scotland in 1680, and president of
parliament in 1681. He had already sought a marriage with the Hamiltons
(probably between one of his daughters and the earl of Arran) but had been
rebuffed, and he now wished to marry his heir Lord John Murray to the duke's
eldest daughter Lady Katherine, claiming that 'noe match in Britaine would
have made me goe the lengths I have don in this.'

Throughout the summer and autumn of 1682 the marquis employed the
services of Sir George Lockhart, an old friend of the Hamiltons, to press
for the match. Sir George recommended Lord Murray as 'a verie sober and

1 HL 6075.
2 S.E., i, 473-5.
3 HL 6083.
4 HL 6073.
accomplished youth, but the duke was doubtful. The main obstacle lay in the marquis's financial situation. Normally he would have given to his son the lands of Balquhidder and Huntingtower, but these were burdened with debts and both Lord Murray and the duke suspected that the marquis would attempt to pass these on to his son. The wadsets on the maintenance lands of Huntingtower alone amounted to over £40,000 Scots, Huntingtower Castle was unfit to live in, and Falkland would require extensive repairs before it could be made habitable. Then again Lady Katherine in marrying Lord Murray would have to live far from Hamilton, which worried her mother greatly. There was, too, an opportunity for Lady Katherine to marry into the traditional family group - her uncle the duke of Queensberry had spoken of marrying his son to her. However, the 3rd duke did not care for his brother-in-law and on this occasion did not incline to the customary local marriage. The discussions with Atholl continued despite the earl of Arran's urgent letters of disapproval, and the marquis was prevailed upon to promise that he would infeft the young couple in the lands of Huntingtower and Balquhidder, free of all burdens, and would deliver up a list of his debts. Moreover, he would use Katherine's portion of 40,000 merks to pay off the wadsetters. The lands he conferred

1 HL 6083, 6074, 6131, 5883, 6083.  
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upon Lord Murray would be guaranteed to yield 31,700 merks a year and Lord and Lady Murray would be given 15,000 merks a year as present maintenance. Lady Katherine would have an annual rent of 10,000 merks for life and the dwelling house of Falkland after the death of her husband. She would also be entitled to half of the household goods were she widowed and had only daughters.

These appeared to be adequate safeguards for his daughter's future, so on 4 April 1683 the duke signed the marriage contract at Hamilton palace, arranged the wedding for April 24,¹ and began to worry about obtaining new clothes and wildfowl and experienced servants for the celebration.²

Unfortunately the signing of the contract and the subsequent marriage did not end Lord Murray's financial troubles for his father did everything he could to avoid using the portion to pay off his creditors.³ He had not even seen to it that all the encumbrances on the warrandice lands were contained in the list of debts he had drawn up, and Lord Murray himself found difficulty in accounting for all the debts because the chamberlains in Atholl claimed that they did not know exactly what the encumbrances were.⁴ The marquis was finally compelled to honour his obligations, but not before a good deal of bad feeling had arisen between Lord Murray and his wife's family on the one part and his parents on the

¹ GD 224/171.
² HL 6999.
³ HL 6082, 6083, 6085.
⁴ HL 6076.
Lady Katherine found herself in a very difficult position. In March 1684 she sent her own mother a copy of the indignant letter which she had written to her mother-in-law, denying that her father had attempted to alter the marriage contract and thanking her ladyship derisively for 'the good advice you give me to be an obedient wife, which I intend to make my studey, and as yet my lord has not told me that I please him onely in his fiddal fadells: and so long as he is content with me I doe not intend to truble myselfe tho others think me an ill wife.'

A year later she was on even worse terms with the marchioness. The latter called to see her 'in a most extraordinar huff that her son had not come to wait on her before he came to Edinburgh to me', she reported and told her mother that 'all that he or I do are still reconed crimes how inosent soever it is. I cannot express to your grace howsoever she looked on us. I confes it is a litle trublesom to be tayed to pay respect and wait upon those who when we do it looks on us as if we were malifactors, so that I am so ashamed when people are by that I know not where to looke.'

Matters were made much worse when in 1688 the marquis of Atholl resigned his highland estates to his son Charles instead of to Lord Murray as he had previously promised, so that by 1700 Lady Katherine was convinced that her parents-in-law were 'the most unraisonable unjust people

1 Reg. Deeds, Dal., 64.
2 HL 6121.
3 HL 6120.
4 HL 7600, 6627.
that I believe is on the earth.'¹ Not only did they tell all manner of lies about their son, but when he was ill in their house 'he was no more notised then he had been a footman, neather father nor mother sent so much as to his roome to ask how he did.'²

Fortunately Lady Katherine and her husband remained united in the face of these insults. In the early days of their marriage she assured her brother the earl of Arran that he would never regret any kindness he did Lord Murray 'for he deserves it all, better then I do; but perhaps you may think it is partiality in me which I do asuer you is not, but reall truth, for if you knew him you wou'd say it all and more.'³ A letter of about 1690 gives a pleasing glimps of their domesticity: in the course of writing to the earl of Arran Lord Murray mentions that his wife 'has been feeding me with my breakfast while I have been writing this.'⁴

From Lord Murray's point of view the marriage was definitely a success. He was always on good terms with the duke of Hamilton and his relationship with his grace stood him in good stead. For example in February 1692/3 James Johnston, the secretary of state, told the duke of Hamilton that preferrment was promised for Lord Murray along with Lord Archibald Hamilton, and a few months later the duke was assured that his desire to have his son-in-law on the privy council would be gratified.⁵ The marquis of Atholl benefited from the marriage too. According to Major

¹ HL 7960.
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General Mackay the subduing of the lands of Atholl had been done with moderation because of the duke's relationship with Lord Murray. ¹

By his marriage to Lady Katherine, Lord Murray had seven sons and five daughters. Six of these children did not survive childhood and Lady Katherine's own health was undermined by the production of this large family. ² In January 1707 while on a visit to her mother at Hamilton she fell seriously ill. Her husband was in Edinburgh and when he heard of her condition he set out immediately 'but mett the cruel doctor within two mile of Hamilton, about 2 o'clock, who gave me the surprising and astonishing sad accompt and immeadeatilie left me. There being none had rode up with me but my two sons, William and James, and one servant Robert Stewart, I did cast myself on the ground where I do not remember what I said or did.' ³ He later heard how his wife had commended him to her mother with her dying words. ⁴

Lady Katherine was buried at Hamilton on 17 January 1707. Her husband long remembered her piety and upright nature, and remained a close friend and regular correspondent of the duchess of Hamilton, even seeking her advice when he decided to remarry. ⁵

A year after the marriage of their eldest daughter, the 3rd duke and duchess of Hamilton contracted their second daughter Susan to John, Lord Cochrane. ⁶ Perhaps because of the financial complications arising from

---
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the marquis of Atholl's behaviour the duke accepted the offer made by a member of the familiar Dundonald family when considering the suitors for Susan's hand. Even this match was not without its problems, although the Hamiltons and the Cochranes already had many close connections. Lord Cochrane's mother was Lady Katherine Kennedy, a sister-in-law of Lady Susanna Hamilton, and his brother Thomas became the husband of Diana Cunningham, Lady Elizabeth Hamilton's daughter. However, the bridegroom's uncle was Sir John Cochrane of Ochiltree who in 1684 was once more in trouble with the government for his support of the covenanters. The duke of Hamilton therefore hesitated when approached about the marriage. Certainly he thought Lord Cochrane 'a very fine young man' but he feared that he would lose favour at Court should he ally himself with a family of such well-known religious fanaticism. After some thought, he made a 'parade to the duke of York' of needing his consent to the match and then went ahead with the negotiations. At the beginning of September the terms were settled and on 13 and 17 November at Hamilton and Paisley the full contract was signed.

In its terms this resembled very closely the contract of Susan's elder sister. She too would receive an annuity of 10,000 merks Scots with half
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the household plenishings should her husband predecease her. Generous provision was made for daughters of the marriage and it was promised that the bride's own tocher would be £20,000 Scots, a sum very much smaller than that given with Lady Katherine.

The marriage took place in the late autumn of 1684 and as had been stipulated in the contract, the young couple began their married life in the earl of Dundonald's household. At first Lady Susan was depressed and unhappy. She told her mother that she 'never knew what itt was to be bid to doe everything my selfe before.'\(^1\) The earl of Dundonald, her husband's grandfather, was an old man and Lord Cochrane himself was frequently away from home. However, he was very kind to his young bride and her position probably improved when he inherited the title in 1685. Unfortunately he did not live long to enjoy it. On 17 May 1690 he died, leaving Lady Susan with three young children under the age of five.\(^2\)

Lady Susan's youngest sister Margaret was by this time married too. In 1687 the duke of Hamilton had been approached by the earl of Panmure about a marriage with Lady Margaret. The earl came from a strongly royalist family. The 1st earl had attended Charles I during his captivity at Holmby and the 4th earl's uncle had been taken prisoner at Worcester.\(^3\) The 4th earl himself was a fervent supporter of the Stewarts as became obvious in later years, and of course at this time the duke of Hamilton supported the Stewart monarchy. It is interesting to note, too, that

\(^1\) HL 6011.  
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although most of Panmure's estates were in Angus, he owned lands in the Linlithgow area, as did the 3rd duke, and he also possessed those lands formerly held by the abbey of Arbroath and granted to the then Lord Hamilton in 1573. The 1st duke of Hamilton had resigned the lordship and abbacy to Charles I in 1636, receiving the superiority of Lesmahagow 'in partem compensationis' and in 1715 the 3rd duchess was to give to her son-in-law Panmure 'several of the old chartors of the abbacy of Aborbrothock.'

The earl of Panmure was apparently anxious for an alliance with the Hamiltons and in November 1686 propositions for the marriage articles were drawn up. Lady Margaret was to have the same portion as Lady Susan, namely £20,000 Scots, and in return would be given the same annualrent as the countess of Dundonald - 10,000 merks. She would be infeft in the castle of Brechin and would be entitled to half of the household plenishings should the earl predecease her and, were no heirs born of the marriage, an only daughter would have a dowry of £40,000 Scots (double her mother's tocher and an unusually high figure). Handsome provision was also made for any younger daughters.

These terms remained unchanged when the marriage contract proper was signed at Holyroodhouse on 5 February 1686/7. That, and the fact that
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the contract so closely resembled those of Lady Katherine and Lady Susan, indicates that the terms were laid down by the 3rd duke, who was in a strong enough position to enforce them. The 3rd duke was indeed well satisfied with the Panmure marriage. 'It's a rich one', he told the earl of Arran, 'and that's all and she is pleased and he is in haste to be married before Lent.'\(^1\) The result of the earl's anxiety was that on the very day that the contract was signed the duke announced that 'Margaret is to be married this night for since my last [letter] Panmure has been so earnest that it be absolutely privat and that it may not be delayed till Monday night that you mother agreed to it last night, so we have nobody at it but Cassilis and Dundonald and his wife and those within our own famely and he has with him onely Earl Mar and his own brother Hary.'\(^2\)

To her regret Lady Margaret had no children\(^3\) but she was a devoted wife. Resembling her father closely in features,\(^4\) she also had her mother's strength of character and this was to be particularly obvious after her husband's attainder and exile. Those events, however, occurred after 1712 and so do not come within the range of this study.

Lady Margaret's was the last family marriage arranged by the duke and duchess of Hamilton. The 3rd duke died in 1694, and after that although the duchess was always consulted about the marriages of any of her relations, and had the power to stop them if she felt them to be unsuitable,

---
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she did not play an active part in the negotiations. In fact when her
daughter Susan married again her choice of husband was against the duchess's
wishes.

When her husband died, Lady Susan devoted herself to her children.
Her little daughter died too, and she spent the next few years worrying
about the health of her sons and quarrelling with their tutors.¹ In 1697,
however, she began to think seriously of remarrying. At least three
different suitors came forward at this time. One was her cousin, Lord
Drummond. The son of the 1st duke of Perth and the 3rd duke of Hamilton's
sister Jane, he had been educated in Paris then returned to Scotland in
1693.² Early in 1697 he had expressed a desire to marry the countess of
Dundonald, but then, in Lord Basil Hamilton's words, 'turned taile'³ and
for some months did not make any mention of the subject. Although the
Hamiltons felt that 'he is so neare a relation to us that we aught to
cover his failings as well as wee can'⁴ they came to regard his behaviour
as very shabby and when in June of the same year he reiterated his
proposal Lord Basil 'lookt upon it as a sudden airy flash and answered him
pretty teartly.'⁵ Lady Susan herself never seems to have considered him
seriously, and told the earl of Arran that his lordship had proposed to
her but 'he is our cusen so I will say no more but wishes him a senceable

¹ HL 6420, 6423, 6425, 6426, 6427.
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wife.¹

By this time there were two other rivals for her hand, one supported by her family, the other favoured by herself. To the Hamiltons, Lord Montgomerie represented the traditional and therefore desirable candidate. He was the son of the earl of Eglinton and was actually Lady Susan's brother-in-law, being the widower of her late husband's sister.² He was also one of her sons' tutors,³ and was therefore favoured by the Cochranes. Lord Basil Hamilton's arguments in support of Lord Montgomerie epitomise the considerations which had been taken into account by successive generations of Hamiltons when arranging marriages for their ladies. The Eglintons had 'great portion and benefit' and the match would be a desirable one since 'it unites us in the west very much, being related through all the great families.'⁴ Again, he emphasised the benefits of a marriage 'which makes a contiguous friendship from Kenneill to the Mull of Galloway.'⁵

In the opinion of Lady Susan's relations, Lord Montgomerie was infinitely preferable to his rival, the master of Yester. Possibly the Hamiltons objected to the master on the grounds that he was the grandson of the 3rd duke's old enemy Lauderdale. They also saw him as inferior in status, and dismissed the 'mean and shamefull terms'⁶ he offered as
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'rediculous.' As Lord Basil commented, 'My lady [the 3rd duchess] nor none here doth approve of it.'

Lady Susan, however, had other ideas, and as her brothers complained, 'follows nobodies advice but her own humour' and 'will take her own mind.' From the very first she had recommended the master as 'very deserving' and when the terms he offered were unacceptable, allowed her family to think that she had given up all thought of him, though they soon discovered that she 'has had a correspondence with the master unknown to any of us.'

She said quite openly that 'the master of Yester won't, as he says, so easily be put of what he pretends to like' and throughout the summer she permitted both Lord Montgomerie and the master to visit her. At last, in September, they arrived in Glasgow to see her and she told Lord Montgomerie 'what I always had said: I was sory he gave himselfe and me to so much treble to no purpose for I never gave no allowance but told freely that I was in terms for another', after which his lordship departed for Edinburgh and Yester returned to Hamilton with Lady Susan.

The marriage of Lady Susan and Lord Yester, as he had now become by the death of his grandfather, took place in Edinburgh at the end of the

1 HL 7564.
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10 HL 6428.
year, then Lady Susan went to live with her husband's people.¹ Her own family continued to worry about the lowering of her status. The earl of Ruglen told the earl of Arran 'It was my opinion alwayes that my sister could be called nothing else but Countess Dundonald, but they[her new family] will not allow it and she says she will yeild to what they please and calls herself my Lady Yester, by which she looses her place as Countess Dundonald and takes rank as Lord Yester's wife and all the countesses goe before her, for they said they would not dispute her rank as Countess of Dundonald but will bot yeild it to my Lady Yester except she had the king's warrant to take place as a duke's daughter.'²

The other noblewomen of the country were equally puzzled, and when the marchioness of Montrose wrote to Lady Yester she enclosed the letter in one to the countess of Panmure, for 'I don't know if I heive derekted it right upon the bake, so was unwilling to send it by a servant not bieng serten if shi'll kipe her ould neame or if sh'ill be called Lady Susana Hay and take her pllace as a douches doghter.'³

To Lady Susan herself, the position was clear enough. 'As for my being called Yester', she told the earl of Arran, 'I belive if it wer your own circumstances you woud do the same. I own itt was allways my opinion on[e] should be called after the man they marry nor do I think it worth the while to dispute it sence itt is what is thought reasonable.'⁴

¹ HL 6336.
² HL 6358.
³ GD 45/14/243.
⁴ HL 9051.
Her husband had suggested that she might obtain a patent as a duke's daughter, but 'truly I don't think it worth the while of asking...if there were a court there [in Edinburgh] or we had the privilege of peeress has woud be quite another thing.'

By her second marriage Lady Susan had four sons and four daughters. Her husband was for a time associated with her brother the 4th duke of Hamilton as a leader of the Jacobite party and her brothers' misgivings about her status were no doubt removed when the death of her father-in-law made her marchioness of Tweeddale.

None of Lady Susan's daughters was of marriageable age by 1712, and indeed only one of the 3rd duchess's granddaughters married before 1713. Rather against the duchess's will, Lord Basil Hamilton's daughter Eleanor was contracted to John Murray of Philiphaugh. Eleanor's grandmother thought that he was rather lacking in both wealth and rank, but when she saw that both the bride and her mother were anxious for the match she did not oppose it, and on the last day of 1711, in the Canongate Church, Eleanor Hamilton married Mr Murray. Perhaps she, more than any of her predecessors, had been able to express her own views when it came to the question of selecting her husband.

1 HL 9051.
2 S.P., viii, 462-3.
3 Ibid.
4 HL 6962; GD 45/4/211.
5 HL 6961, 7462, 7991; GD 45/14/211.
6 HL 8121, 5802.
To what extent, then, were the Hamiltons typical of the Scottish peerage where the marriage of their daughters was concerned? Their marriage contracts were unexceptionable. Of the 19 Hamilton marriages here considered, 10 of the contracts involved have been found and examined. All are fairly normal. In general form they follow the plan of any ordinary Scottish contract, and in detail too, their provisions are quite usual. It would seem from the similarity of the contracts of the 2nd duke's daughters and again of the 3rd duke's daughters that the terms were proposed by the person negotiating on behalf of the Hamiltons - in this case the 3rd duke himself - and that he was influential enough to have them accepted with only a few modifications. However, the proposals he made were entirely within the framework of the normal Scottish marriage contract, and any clauses safeguarding the future of the bride by assuring her a generous annuity or half of the household goods should she be widowed, merely indicate a genuine concern for her welfare and are in no way unexpected. Similarly, the dowries given with the Hamilton ladies fall within the upper 57% of the random sample of 100 tochers mentioned before, and with the highest Hamilton tocher at £5,000 sterling and the lowest at £1,111 sterling, they were well within the range of Scottish portions in general.

As for choice of husband, the position of a lady where her first marriage was concerned remained unchanged throughout the period. It is true that in his final letter the 1st duke of Hamilton had expressed the wish that neither of his daughters should be forced to marry against their will, and probably none of the Hamiltons would have insisted on a daughter
entering into a union that was totally distasteful to her: nevertheless, from the time of the 2nd marchioness of Hamilton to the death of her great-grandson the 4th duke, Hamilton ladies, in common with other Scottish noblewomen, realised that they would have to accept the husband chosen for them by their family.

That this choice was governed by well known principles is evident when the various husbands are compared. Naturally enough, a man was expected to be financially sound, and because of their elevated status the Hamiltons, more than their fellow peers, could expect their daughters to marry within the peerage: thirteen of the fifteen did so. There are, however, other noticeable similarities.

Six of the Hamilton ladies married into Ayrshire families and a seventh married Lord Lindsay, who through his mother had strong Ayrshire connections. Two more married into families whose lands adjoined or lay close to the Hamilton possessions in the west, while another two married men who would inherit estates next to the Hamilton barony of Kinneil. Again, where kinship was concerned, the brides were almost invariably related to their future husbands if not by close family ties then by a multitude of less direct connections arising from the continual inter-marriage of the great Scottish families.

As for politics and religion, it is at once apparent that the husbands chosen were royalist and presbyterian. Six of them either took part in the Engagement or were near relations of men who did so. The earl of Cassilis's father had been a close friend of the 2nd duke of Hamilton and Southesk's father had shared his exile. All fifteen were royalists. In
religion too, their views are similar. The 2nd marchioness of Hamilton had been an ardent supporter of the covenant; she had brought up two generations of Hamiltons so it comes as no surprise that her daughters, grand-daughters and great-grand-daughters married into such well-known covenanting families as Lindsay, Cassilis, Glencairn and Dundonald. William Blair upheld the Revolution Settlement and although Panmure was a passionate Jacobite he remained a presbyterian. The only husband who may not have been a presbyterian was the 3rd duke of Hamilton himself, and if he was not one at the time of his marriage he was soon converted.

It therefore seems that it was accounted desirable for a Hamilton lady to marry a presbyterian, a royalist, preferably a local man and possibly a relation. That this was so might in part be attributed to mere propinquity - what more natural than that a peer should marry his daughter to a man whose opinions he shared and whom he met frequently? There was, however, much more to it than that, and the Hamilton custom of marrying into a local family group accords completely with the prevailing practice of the Scottish peerage at this time.

Marriages were but one way of cementing an alliance sought or already made. Politics and religion in the 17th century were inextricably interwined, and it was still an accepted fact that political/religious alliances were founded on a territorial basis. A nobleman was concerned with extending his influence, whether to raise men for war or to win favour at Court or to gain support for himself in parliament, and it was natural that in doing this he would begin at home with those men whose estates lay adjacent to his own. Even towards the end of the century Lord Basil Hamilton
was clearly wanting to build up a wide area of Hamilton interest by bringing a whole chain of contiguous estates under the family's influence.

The result of all this was that in any one area there existed a recognisable group of men linked by marriage and by territorial possessions. In the west this grouping centred on the great families of Ayrshire and Lanarkshire - the Hamiltons, Glencairns, Eglinton, Kennedies and Dundonalds, and it was the desire of each to build up connections with the others as a means of furthering their own interest. Of course there were long-standing enmities too, traditional feuds between, say, Eglinton and Dundonalds, as well as more passing quarrels. In November 1669, for instance, the earl of Eglinton and Blair of that Ilk fought a duel and were summoned before the privy council with their seconds, the earl of Glencairn and Skelmorlie's brother Hugh Montgomerie. 1 Then again intermarriage did not always bring the expected benefits and might lead to a complete rift between the two families concerned instead of an increase of friendship. Nevertheless, this emphasis on local and kinship connections remained a deeply entrenched attitude, and one in which the Hamiltons shared. Had the 2nd marquis of Hamilton lived on to negotiate marriages for his daughters, the future of the family might have been very different, but his death and the deaths of his two sons meant that the Hamilton links with England were severed and, like any other Scottish family, they sought alliances and made marriages at home.

Difficulty of communication goes far to explain what might be described as a parochial attitude, and only towards the end of the period

---

1 R.P.C., 3rd series, iii, 95.
did the Scottish nobility become more outward-looking. The country was at peace, travel was easier and it was possible to meet a greater variety of people. More important, the whole political structure was changing and with the emergence of political parties the old allegiances were less effective. Something of this can be seen in the marriage of Lady Katherine Hamilton to Lord Murray: the Atholl and the 3rd duke of Hamilton knew each other as statesmen in Edinburgh and it was on this more national basis that the marriage was made. Finally, more and more people were contemplating the prospect of a union with England. Since the 1680's serious negotiations between the two countries were afoot, and the spread of English influence, begun in 1603 with the removal of the Scottish Court to London, was rapidly accelerated. The result was that Scottish noblemen began to marry their eldest sons into the English aristocracy, and some of them found English husbands for their daughters. These changes were slow to come, however, and in common with the rest of the Scottish peerage the Hamiltons went on marrying their daughters to Scotsmen, usually to local men and sometimes to relations.
A consideration of where and how the members of any specific group in society were educated is useful not only because of the undeniable if variable effect of education upon the individual, but because the method of schooling chosen indicates something of the parents' attitudes and aims. It is therefore of value to consider the upbringing of the dukes of Hamilton and their immediate relatives - whether they were educated at home or at school, in Scotland or in England, in accordance with the custom of their contemporaries or in a manner which marked them out from the rest of Scottish society.

Unfortunately, few details of the early years of the first two dukes of Hamilton survive, and nothing is known of the 1st duke's childhood until he went south to join his father in 1620. He spent that winter in London becoming acquainted with the town. He saw the usual sights, paying 5/6 'at Wastieminster...quhan [he] saw the monumentises', visited 'the lyons in the toure' and St Paul's Cathedral,¹ watched parliament ride on 3 January 1620/1, and on more than one occasion was taken to Theobalds.² He passed the rest of the time tilting, playing tennis, chess and cards, and the only indication of any study being done was when, soon

¹ For the popularity of these sights, see Stone, op. cit., 390.
² HA 506/1/5.
after his arrival, he bought a copy of 'Coming's historie'. 1 In the autumn of 1621 he went to Oxford, where he matriculated at Exeter College on 14 December. 2 Burnet states that his studies there were interrupted by his marriage, which took place in June 1622, 3 and that his 'education in letters' never recovered, so that he was 'no great scholar'. 4

The 1st duke of Hamilton was ten years his brother's senior, and so it was he who supervised the earl of Lanark's education, although the influence of their mother Lady Anna Cunningham should not be underestimated. Perhaps it was her wish that her younger son should remain with her in Scotland, and in his early childhood he seems to have been taught at home: in 1625 he and his sisters had a special master to teach them French, 5 then by 1630 he was attending classes at Glasgow University in company with his cousin William Cunningham, heir to the earl of Glencairn, 6 and under the immediate supervision of his pedagogue Mr Henry Maule. 7 What exactly he studied there remains unknown, but in later life he certainly showed a familiarity with the classics. 8

Both the 1st and 2nd dukes were to die without surviving male issue. The small sons of the 1st duke passed their brief lives in London, 9 and the
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2nd duke's only son died in London as a child. Of the 1st duke's sisters, only Lady Margaret Hamilton, wife of the 17th earl of Lindsay and Crawford, had any surviving sons, but details of their education are not available.

With the following generations, the pattern becomes clearer and it is possible to draw some conclusions from the upbringing of the seven sons of the 3rd duchess of Hamilton, their cousins, and their own sons. The 3rd duke and duchess considered very carefully the matter of educating their heir the earl of Arran. At first he was sent to school in Hamilton, and by the time he was eight years old was studying Latin. He also had his own pedagogue, and when he was 12 his parents began to consider the advisability of sending him to the grammar school in Glasgow. The duchess discussed the problem with her old friend Sir Robert Moray, but contrary to his advice, decided to go ahead with the plan to transfer James to Glasgow. It was arranged that he should stay during term time with Gilbert Burnet, who was by then professor of divinity in the university there, and, since being introduced to the duchess by Sir Robert in 1667, had become a regular visitor to Hamilton palace. Sir Robert had all along advocated that the earl should be taught at home, and was of the opinion that a bachelor establishment would not be the
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6 T.E.S. Clarke and H.C. Foxcroft, A Life of Gilbert Burnet, bishop of Salisbury, 72.
most suitable place for the young man to stay, but from 1669 until Burnet resigned in 1674, the earl and his brother Lord William lodged with him, paying £100 Scots for each quarter's 'dyett'. During this time they were in the care of their governor, Mr John Bannantyne of Corehouse, himself a graduate of Glasgow University and a descendant of Isabella Hamilton, the illegitimate daughter of James, 2nd Lord Hamilton.

Mr Bannantyne's accounts for this period begin on 17 November 1671, the day that the earl of Arran entered Glasgow University. Few details of his earlier studies at Glasgow grammar school survive, although other accounts reveal that his father bought for him Buchanan's History, various books in Greek and The Imitation of Christ, while his governor supplied works by Ovid, Cicero and Erasmus. When Lord William in his turn studied at the grammar school, his fees were £11:12/- Scots a quarter, with a further £2:18/- to the doctor of the schools. He and the earl shared singing lessons, and in 1674 he was at work on Caesar's Commentaries. Although only a year younger than his brother, he did not go on to the university until 1675, his progress having been held back by ill-health.

By 1678 Lord Charles, Lord John and Lord George were at school in Glasgow, although the services of a special master had to be employed 'for
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perfecting Lord George [then aged twelve] to write.¹ Like their elder brothers, the boys had of course been taught at home before being sent to Glasgow, and had probably attended Hamilton school. In March 1673, for instance, '3 pairs of Rudiments' (probably Wedderburn's well-known Rudimenta Grammatica)² had been bought in Glasgow 'for the young children'³ and in December three grammars and three copies of a work by Corderius, no doubt the Colloquiorum Scholasticorum⁴ were sent 'to the three young lords at Hamilton' with a pair of Rudiments and the little authors to Lord George.⁵ In the following year they received three more copies of Corderius and of the newly printed Kirkwood's Grammatica.⁶

The two youngest brothers, Lord Basil and Lord Archibald, attended the school in Hamilton, for on 20 October 1681 their father paid £100 Scots to Mr George Skirving the schoolmaster 'for intertaining our two youngest sones and ther servant in ther dyet' from 14 July until 6 October.⁷ If they spent the winter there too, they would have had as companions the sons of John Hamilton, Lord Bargany, the latter paying £25 sterling to Mr Skirving 'in full satisfaction of his children their buirding at the schoole of Hamilton' from 1 October 1681 until 1 April 1682.⁸

As for the 3rd duchess's near relations, her only nephew was John,
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Lord Kennedy, the son of Lady Susanna Hamilton and the earl of Cassilis. In 1688 Lady Susanna remarked in a letter that her son was about to leave school, but did not specify which one he had been attending. Mention should also be made here of two of the 3rd duke's nephews. When William, later the 1st marquis of Annandale, was orphaned at an early age he and his brother were brought up by the 3rd duke and duchess. In company with the young Hamiltons they were sent to Glasgow grammar school and stayed with Mr John Bannantyne who had by that time married Margaret Hamilton, one of the duchess's gentlewomen, and had settled in Glasgow.

The Annandales and all seven of the duke's sons went on from school to Glasgow University. This was an obvious choice, for apart from being the nearest university, Glasgow had a long association with the Hamiltons. Their ancestor James, Lord Hamilton had in 1459 bequeathed a tenement in the town to the college of arts, and their grandfather the 1st duke had promised 1000 merks for the new library and had later become the university's first lay chancellor. It was therefore not surprising that in 1672 the earl of Arran matriculated there along with James, marquis of Montrose, Lord Charles Bruce and Archibald Kennedy of Culzean.

The earl had actually begun his studies at the university on 17
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5 Cleland, op. cit., 25.
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November of the previous year, paying his regent £87 Scots and spending £38:8:10 on having a gown made. He began by reading Caesar's Commentaries, and on 16 December was rewarded with £5:16/- by Mr Bannatyne 'for expounding Caesar's Commentaries to me in twelve dayes space.' In April 1672 he bought an Isocrates and a Homer in Latin and Greek, both of which languages he was studying, and he seems to have received instruction in logic, theology, geography, and French as well as in dancing and singing, and for some time had lessons in the handling of pike and musket. He attended church regularly, was sometimes allowed to see a comedy or a puppet play, and on one occasion paid £2:16/- to watch the dissection of a dog.

To his parents' dismay, the earl was in fact inclined to spend more time on pleasure than on study. In 1674 he was hotly denying Mr Burnet's accusations that he had been wasting his time, and wrote to the duchess declaring that his day was a full one. Each morning, he claimed, he rose between 5 and 6, and spent the next three or four hours with the professor
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of scripture. From 9 until 10 he was preparing disputes, and from 11 to 12 had a class. Certainly he had an interval for dinner after that, and 'diverted himself' until 3 o'clock, but he spent the rest of the afternoon reading and from 5 until 7 did his history.\(^1\) The effect of this recital of lessons was rather spoiled by his admission that he had indeed gone out without permission in the past, so his family's fears were not allayed. 'Pray consider', the duchess begged him a year later, 'what creadett it will be to you that after four years being att the colledge you come from itt a dunce.'\(^2\)

The earl of Arran remained at the university until 1675, when he set out on the Grand Tour. By this time Lord William had begun his university studies, to be followed three years later by the earl of Annandale, who was in the same class as the earl of Kilmarnock's son William and the earl of Argyll's son James.\(^3\) In November 1678 Lord Charles and Lord John matriculated at Glasgow,\(^4\) to be followed by Lord George then Lord Basil.\(^5\) Lord Charles and Lord John studied arithmetic and the classics, and presumably took the usual courses in theology, philosophy and law. In the summer of 1681, however, the 3rd duke decided to take John and George away from Glasgow and send them instead to St Andrews. Why he did so does not emerge from the correspondence, but the boys arrived in the city in July 1681 and spent the next three years there
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with their governor Mr David Mitchell. Their main subjects of study were mathematics, fortification, gunnery and geography. This would seem to indicate that Lord George was already destined for a military career, and John was probably sent along with him for company - Lord George was to become Britain's first field marshal, but Lord John never did enter the army. They lodged together with a Mr Simon Greig, their board costing £672 a year, and their main recreations were golf and archery. Meanwhile Lord Basil and Lord Archibald remained in Glasgow, studying Latin, Greek and Logic until at last, by 1688, the duke's seven sons had completed their university education.

It is interesting to note that some of their servants were educated along with the Hamiltons, and at their employer's expense. The 3rd duchess in particular always made sure that her servants were supplied with Bibles, but the matter did not end there. The pages were taught to write, and then sent to school. In 1659 the duchess was buying Latin grammars for her page William Scheills, and in 1673 she paid £1:16/- 'for ane Greeke gram'er' for another page. These young servants were sent to the university along with the duchess's own sons. The earl of Arran's servant William Hamilton (clearly not the same person as Lord William, who is always designated in the accounts by his title) was in
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February 1673 given £14:10/- by Mr Bannantyne to give to his regent, and in December of that year payments were made to the 'bibliother' [sic] and to the bedellus on behalf of the earl of Arran and William Hamilton. A few days later, two paper books were purchased 'on[e] to Lord William, another to his man' while in the following May a paper book like those bought for the three young lords at Hamilton was given to the duchess's page. At the same time Lord William and his man both received copies of Caesar's Commentaries, and both were given a theme book a week later.¹

When Lord Charles and Lord John were at university in 1678, £5:16/- was paid to the janitor of the college for them 'and there man'² David Crawford, later the 3rd duke's secretary, and in 1673 there had been mention of a payment to a schoolmaster for a boy called Gilbert who had been sent to Glasgow three weeks before.³

Nor were the social graces neglected. William Hamilton and one of his predecessors had been taught to dance by a special master,⁴ and in 1669 Robert Hamilton the page was taught to play, sing and dance.⁵ That this practice of educating the pages along with the sons of the house was a well-known Scottish custom can be seen from a remark of Christian, marchioness of Montrose. Recommending a Mr John Robertson to the duke of Queensberry, she explained that Robertson 'was brad upe in the famely and at skoules with my dear lord, and had as much of his favor as enay
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The 3rd duchess's sons thus received their early education entirely in Scotland, and her influence remained a dominant factor in the upbringing of her grandchildren. Because she was head of the family she would in any case have been consulted about their education, but circumstances made the family ties closer than they would normally have been. When the young countess of Arran died in 1690 her infant daughter Lady Mary was taken to live at Hamilton. The earl of Ruglen's son and daughters spent some time there when their mother died, and the duke of Atholl's daughters Susan and Katherine were taken to live with their grandmother when their mother died. Finally, the 4th duke insisted that his second wife's children be brought up by his mother while he and his duchess divided their time between Kinneil and Preston, ignoring the 3rd duchess's protests that she was 'too old and inferme to be a nurs to children, and the death of two of yours [Lady Mary and Lady Elizabeth] makes my hart aike when anything ailes any of them.'

Throughout the 1690's and 1700's the duchess was therefore responsible for a little group of children who lived in a separate house in the woods near the palace, and whose frequent illnesses were an added burden to her. Her letters about them are mainly concerned with their physical welfare, although there is no doubt that she had decided views about their lessons.
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GENEALOGICAL TABLE V

Grandchildren of the 3rd duchess of Hamilton: the 4th duke's family.

Anne, 3rd duchess of Hamilton

1. Lady Ann Spencer = James, 4th duke of Hamilton = 2. Lady Elizabeth Gerard

a daughter, b. 1688, d. in infancy

Mary 1690-97

Elizabeth 1700-02 d. 1712 Katherine marquis of Clydesdale
James, 1704
Henrietta 1705-34
William 1706-1755
Susan c 1707-1777
Charlotte Anne (a son) 1709-1748

Anne 1709-1748 (a son)
as well, and on one occasion rebuked the marquis of Clydesdale's father for sending a drummer to him, 'for that is a pice of lairning I think not worth his whyl, tho for his deversion I allow'd him sumtime to beat with the man hear.' Two years before the child had been presented with a new drum by 'the drummaker of Gorbells.'

The marquis of Clydesdale was eventually sent to school at Eton, but that was not until after 1712 and so does not come within the scope of this study. He was not, however, the first of his family to attend an English school. As early as 1694 two of the 3rd duchess's grandsons, Lord John Murray and his cousin William, earl of Dundonald, were sent to Mr Cappel's school in Hackney. Lord John spent over two years there learning French and otherwise improving himself until his father declared that he was 'so fond of him he can want him no longer' and brought him home. In 1700 the boy was sent north to the highlands 'to learn Irish', and in the following year he was staying at Huntingtower with his governor, who complained to the earl of Tullibardine that Lord John 'continues to be as disrespectful and disobedient as ever...read some Latine, Irish and French on Monday last, but Tuesday, Wednesday and Thursday he did not read one word of anie thing or other, except a chapter in the Bible morning and evening. Friday he read some Latin and Irish but little or nothing else.

1 HL 7461.
2 HL 7262.
3 Chron. Atholl, i, 344; H.M.C. Report, Atholl, no. 123; HL 6492, 6501, 6502, 6503.
4 HL 7960.
5 Chron. Atholl, i, 485; c.f. GD 112/534, 470.
GENEALOGICAL TABLE VI

Grandchildren of the 3rd duchess of Hamilton: Lady Katherine's family.

Anne, 3rd duchess of Hamilton

Lady Katherine Hamilton = John, 1st duke of Atholl

John, Anne Mary William, James Charles Kath- George George Susan Kath- Basil
marquis 1685- 1686- marquis 1690- 1691- erine b. & 1694- 1699- erine 1704-
of of 86 89 of 1764 1720 1692- d.1693 1760 1725 1702- 12
Tulli- Tulli-
bardine bardine
1684- 1689- 1709 1746
On Saturday he again did read some Latine and Irish, and read some hours on the history of Europe till the treaty of Ryswick. He had wrott but one copie I think since he came to the countrie. He had begun to speak Irish to his man but often forgettis...he is absolute in all his proceedings and his answers when desired to do anything are ordinarily "I will not", "When I think fit", "When it pleaseth me", or "I'll consider on't", and when reproved he is boisterous and hectoring, and says it's not so much his fault but pick, humour and passion in me, from which your lordship may conjecture how uneasie my life is.'¹ Lord John Murray later studied at the university of Leyden,² but was to fall at the battle of Malplaquet at the age of twenty-five.³

The earl of Dundonald's life was also short, and it was ill-health which interrupted his schooling in London. His mother Lady Susan Hamilton had originally intended him to go to school in Glasgow, 'which is', she remarked, 'the place in the world I hate most to live in, but is healthier and has better schools than Edinburgh.'⁴ She had been overruled in this by her son's tutors, but when an injury to the boy's arm proved very troublesome she brought him back to Scotland and, 'his deare father ordering that his children should go to Glasgow',⁵ resolved once more 'to try him there for a littell.'⁶ Later he attended Glasgow

¹ Chron. Atholl, i, 485.
² S.P., i, 480.
³ Ibid.
⁴ HL 7470.
⁵ HL 6430.
⁶ HL 6430.
University.1 His mother had by this time remarried, and it would seem that some of her children by Lord Yester were educated in England, for in 1711 she referred to her 'sons att London', in the charge of Mr Alston, presumably their governor.2

The only other Hamilton of this period for whom an English education was contemplated was Lord Basil's son Basil. In 1708 his widowed mother sought the 3rd duchess's advice about sending him to Westminster school, which some of his tutors had suggested, although others had considered that he was as yet too young to go to London.3 By 1711, Lady Mary still had her son with her,4 and six months later was searching for a governor for him since the earl of Panmure had advised her against sending Basil to St Andrews.5

The other grandsons of the 3rd duchess were educated in Scotland. Lord John Murray's brothers went to Perth Academy as their father before them had done,6 William and James following his example by going on to St Andrews University.7 Charles was sent to Edinburgh to study law, but soon evinced a desire to go to sea,8 and George's studies at Glasgow were ended when it became obvious that he had 'no great inclination to be

1 Munimenta Alme Universitatis Glasguensis, iii, 173.
2 HL 7897.
3 HL 5490.
4 HL 6963.
5 HL 5809.
6 H.M.C. Report, Atholl, nos. 157-9; Chron. Atholl, ii, 72; HL 7040, 4039, 7913.
7 Chron. Atholl, i, 164.
8 HL 7093, 7967.
Genealogical Table VII

Grandchildren of the 3rd duchess of Hamilton:
the families of Lady Susan and Lord Basil.

Anne, 3rd duchess of Hamilton

1. John, 2nd earl of Dundonald = Lady Susan = 2. Charles, Lord Yester = Lord Basil = Mary Dunbar of Baldoon

Anne

John 1685
1686 died in childhood

William 1687

John Susan Mary James Catherine Charles Anne George
1698- 1699- 1700 died 1702- d. 1760 1704- 1772
1762 1739 young 1773

William Anne Eleanor Basil Mary Elizabeth Katherine
1692- 1696- 1698- 1699- 1701 (posthumous)
d. 1701 1742 1701 1701
1703

John Murray of Philiphaugh
a scorer but raither inclyns to the armie.'

He was, of course, the famous Lord George Murray of the '45.

The countess of Dundonald's sons by her first marriage went to Glasgow University, and her eldest son by her second marriage studied law at Edinburgh. The earl of Ruglen's son William was taught at home with his step-brother the earl of Cassilis by a governor whom Ruglen described as having been 'a long time in France...is a graduate physician, a good scholar and much recommended', adding with some satisfaction, 'He sits at table with us and I give him a very good salary.' As for the grandsons of the 2nd duke of Hamilton, Lord Charles and Lord William Carnegie went to St Andrews University, and their cousin William Blair probably attended Glasgow, as his father and son did. None of the other Hamiltons had sons old enough to be taught before 1712.

Finally, something should be said about the upbringing of the Hamilton daughters, although information on this subject is scarce. Just as the education of the seventeenth century nobleman may be said to have been vocational in that it was designed to fit him to take his place in society, and, to some extent at least, to manage his estates, so too his sisters would be trained for their future place in life. The wife of a peer would be expected to run her household, perhaps keep accounts, and display various social accomplishments such as singing and dancing.

---
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GENEALOGICAL TABLE VIII

Grandchildren of the 3rd duchess of Hamilton:
the families of Lord John and Lord George.

Anne, 3rd duchess of Hamilton

1. Lady Anne Kennedy = John, earl of Ruglen
   1695 - 1699
   John
   1695
   William
   1696 - 1699
   Anne
   1698 - 1699
   Susan
   1742
   1748
   1763

2. Elizabeth Hutchison, Lady Kennedy = George, earl of Orkney
   Elizabeth Villiers

   Anne
   Frances
   Harriet
Presumably the earlier generations of Hamilton women were restricted to the usual feminine subjects. Women's spelling, for example, was notoriously erratic, and the 2nd marchioness of Hamilton's was entirely phonetic. When in fact she learned to write is difficult to ascertain: in 1637 she paid £13:6/- Scots 'to Mr Jhone Qioneer that teiched me to writ', but she had already for some years been keeping her own account books in a vigorous italic hand.

Her own daughters were taught to write in their youth, but did not study any academic subjects, and Lady Margaret Hamilton, countess of Crawford, probably assumed that she was merely stating the obvious when, on the return of her sons from France, she wrote that 'ther governor says they...have profitet by ther travels, bot I can say leies of that, being an ill judge.'

Later generations of Hamilton ladies would probably have been better equipped to judge their sons' standard of achievement. The 3rd duchess was well-read in theology, and certainly spoke one foreign language; in 1696 she mentioned to her daughter Katherine, 'You may tell him [her own son Charles] I was not angrie that he tould the king I had no French, which is true I have verie litell, but that I had once.'

The existing correspondence reveals little about the education of the duchess's daughters, but the accounts record that they had a regular dancing master, and when Lady Katherine went to London with her parents in

1 HA 560/1.
2 GD 248/566/85.
3 The duke of Atholl's Archives, 29 (i) 8, 95.
1676 she had special dancing lessons there. Care was always taken to see that even if the ladies' spelling was eccentric their writing was satisfactory, and the Hamilton daughters all wrote a more or less similar, rather elegant italic hand. When Mary Dunbar became the ward of the 3rd duke, 'Adam Amslie, wryting master' was paid £13:10/- Scots 'for teaching her to wryt', and two years later she was having lessons from John Grant, another writing master. Similarly, the earl of Arran's daughter by his first wife was taught to write by Mrs Porterfield, wife of one of the duchess of Hamilton's servants. Lady Mary was about seven years old at the time, which was apparently early for such lessons; as the duchess had said not long before that, her own daughters 'weer much elder before they began.'

Apart from learning to write, most ladies would be expected to keep accounts, and so when the 3rd duke's eldest daughter Katherine reached the age of eighteen she was given £66:13:4 by her father and told to keep a proper account of how it was spent. The payments she noted down were mostly small personal disbursements - for gloves, stockings, and little presents for the family - but included £2:18/- to her brothers' writing master for teaching her arithmetic. For the next two and a half years she continued to keep her accounts, and her father gradually increased the

1 HA 535/10/27; 535/16/30; 519/10; 538/17/18.
2 HA 516/5/1.
3 HA 516/1/12.
4 HA 446/11/1.
5 HL 6741.
money he gave her until she was entrusted with £250 for four or five months. Her early training in household management was to stand her in good stead: in 1693 she checked over for her husband one of his chamberlain's accounts and found his addition to be wrong. 'I made you but about a groat in his debet', she told her husband jokingly, 'which he was convinced off himselfe.'

It would also seem that Lady Katherine and her sisters may have had some training in the classics, for John Stuart in his preface to the Registrum de Panmure comments that Lady Margaret Hamilton's '...acquaintance with the classics...is evinced by the remarks and notes in her own handwriting which appear upon Latin books in the Panmure library.'

From an early age, too, Lady Margaret was fond of writing poetry, and some of her verses are in the Dalhousie Collection of manuscripts, including four lines marked by her as being 'made when I was 10 years of age, which my father always wore in his pocket.'

By the time the earl of Arran's children were growing up, it had become the custom to teach girls a wider range of subjects. When she was seven his first daughter Lady Mary had already attained 'great proficiency in her writing', to an extent where 'pen and paper must be kept well out of her hands, for if she gett to the letters she will soon learn to answer them, being abundantly forward always.' In August 1697

---

1 HA 60/3/3, 4, 5.
2 The duke of Atholl's Archives, 29, i (7) 15.
3 H. Maule, Registrum de Panmure, i, lxviii.
4 GD 45/26/99.
5 HL 7728.
she needed both a new copy book from London, and 'a book of the rudiments of Latin grammar,'¹ while Mrs Anne Twyford was engaged to teach her French, and the duchess sent for 'the newest and best edition of a French grammar' for the child.² As Lord Basil remarked, she was 'a dear, engadging, witty creature as ever was seen, far beyond her years',³ and the countess of Dundonald thought that 'for witt [she] is her mother's apprehension in younger years.'⁴ The 3rd duchess was even thinking about training Lady Mary to act as her secretary when her granddaughter contracted smallpox and died on 13 December 1697.⁵ The 4th duke's second family were also brought up at Hamilton, and so his daughters were probably educated along similar lines. Lady Elizabeth and Lady Katherine were certainly taught Latin 'becaus it helps them to spell and understand the English.'⁶

Generally the Hamilton daughters were educated at home in this way, but sometimes circumstances made it necessary for them to be sent away to school. When the duchess of Atholl died in 1707, her daughters Katherine and Susan were at first sent to their grandmother. Their own mother had been affectionate but strict: in 1702 she had told her husband that she had 'a litle pain in my back with whiping Susan today, who strugled so that I have got a wrench. It was for throing a great stick at her sister's head so that it was a mercy she did not brain her; she is the likest thing

¹ HL 4182.
² HA 446/11/1.
³ HL 7776.
⁴ HL 9100.
⁵ HL 4223, 7776; HA 446/11/9.
⁶ HL 5795.
to you that ever was seen, which you may imagen does not make me the less fond.'¹ The girls' stay at Hamilton was interrupted by frequent visits to their father, despite the disapproval of the 3rd duchess, who had 'found by experience that they were not the better of going their before and in a twelvemonth after Lady Shousan could not be gott reclamed of the rudnes she gott by the liberty she had when their.'²

Soon afterwards her father sent Susan to Edinburgh where she stayed with Mrs Douglas, who had a school in the town.³ There she learned dancing and by 1711 could 'play on the harpsicords pritty well' although she could not ride. The 3rd duchess had originally suggested that she be sent to Mrs Williamson's, and it was in the latter's house that the earl of Ruglen's daughters lived while their father was in England on business.⁴ They had lessons in arithmetic and dancing as well as being taught how to read and write.⁵ When it had been suggested that they might accompany their father south and go to school there, he had replied at once that as 'for the London boording schools, the ladies here [in England] have the worst opinion of them in the world and would never put any of their own children or relations to such a place', nor would the earl of Orkney's daughters be likely to go there.⁶

From this consideration of the early years of the Hamiltons it can be

¹ Chron. Atholl, i, 501.
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⁴ HL 7006.
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⁶ HL 7006.
concluded that in general the men were educated at school and university, usually in Scotland. It is not enough, of course, to say that because the Hamiltons were being educated in Scotland they were therefore typical Scottish peers. This follows only if the manner in which they were educated was characteristic of the nobility, which does indeed seem to have been the case. In the absence of any survey of the education of the Scottish nobility, it is difficult to generalise on this subject, but reference in such works as the Scots Peerage and in family histories seem to suggest that the sequence of school and then university was widely accepted. The 1st duke of Atholl and some of his sons went to school in Perth, for instance, while the 3rd earl of Annandale was at Glasgow grammar school and the 3rd earl of Airlie and Sir Colin Campbell's nephew Alexander went to school in Dundee. The records of Glasgow University make it plain that it was popular with the nobility; from 1625-1712 more than sixty sons of peers matriculated there, including seven sons of the 1st earl of Stirling, five sons of the 6th earl of Eglinton, six members of the Argyll family and six of the earl of Galloway's relatives, as well as representatives of such well-known families as the Cunninghams of Robertland, the Hays of Craignethan, the Cornwalls of Bonhard and the Hamiltons of Aikenhead, Broomhall, Orbiston, Silvertonhill and Wishaw.

Similarly, Alexander, master of Saltoun, went to King's College, which was where the Seaforths usually sent their sons. The 2nd earl of

1 S.P., i, 263; the duke of Atholl's Archives, 29, i (3) 42.
2 S.P., i, 126; GD 112/533, 4.
3 Munimenta Alme Universitatis Glasguensis, ii, 78-204.
Stair studied at Edinburgh, 1 the 4th earl of Strathmore and the 2nd Lord Ruthven of Freeland at St Andrews, 2 and so on. It is interesting to observe that from 1625-1712 only six Scottish peers other than the 1st duke of Hamilton seem to have been students at Oxford. The 1st earl of Elgin, who came from a family with strong English connections, matriculated there in 1638. 3 Robert, Viscount Teviot, 4 James, Viscount Fincastle 5 and James, Viscount Strathallan 6 were at Oxford, and so was James, earl of Newburgh 7 and John, 3rd earl of Breadalbane. 8 Three other Scottish peers, including the 3rd duke of Hamilton's brother Dunbarton, received honorary degrees from that university, 9 but the other nine Scottish titles which feature in the list of graduates were borne by Englishmen. 10 Again, although Cambridge conferred an LL.D. on the earl of Elgin in 1675 11 and on the 2nd marquis of Atholl two years later, 12 Scots peers do not seem to have considered sending their sons to study at Cambridge any more than they thought of sending them to English schools: no Scottish boys were ever at Westminster school before 1712. 13

1 S.P., viii, 151.
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13 G.F. Russel Barker and Alan H. Stenning, *The Records of Old Westminsters...from the earliest times to 1927*, i and ii passim.
It is evident from this that as far as their early education was concerned, the Hamiltons may confidently be placed within the context of the Scottish peerage in general, but it must be remembered that when they left the university at the age of fifteen or sixteen, it was to enter a new phase of their education. They set off on the Grand Tour.
As early as the mid-sixteenth century the idea had grown up in England that a period of study in France and Italy was an excellent preparation for future life, and as time passed and increasing emphasis was placed on the acquisition not only of learning but of culture, so the Grand Tour became an indispensable part of the courtier's training, be he English or Scottish. Certainly the Scots with their more limited resources did not travel abroad in such a style as did their English counterparts, but already in the second decade of the seventeenth century the earl of Mar's sons, the master of Roxburgh, and the earl of Morton were improving themselves in France; in the 1630's the master of Ross and Lord Lindores were there, while the future earls of Southesk, Leven, and Airlie were but a few of those others who undertook the Tour. Nor was it restricted to the upper levels of the nobility. Lesser men like Sir John Kennedy of Culzean and Sir Alexander Carnegie of Pitarrow

---
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were likewise to be found in the academies of France. All who could afford to send at least their eldest sons abroad did so. Expensive though the Tour undoubtedly was, those peers whose sons went to study in Paris or Amsterdam or Rome were reconciled to the financial loss by the expectation that their heirs would return home accomplished gentlemen who could ride well, fence well and dance well, who could reminisce about the splendours of Versailles and point to paintings and antiquities collected during their travels; who could converse fluently in French and Italian. Such accomplishments were immediate indications of social status, and what might seem to the twentieth century to be mere sports or diversions were regarded by the seventeenth as serious and worthwhile occupations. The most frugal or puritanical of fathers would be perfectly satisfied to hear that his son was spending his time singing, riding and playing the lute.

It is true that the young men studied mathematics, philosophy and history as well, but by the middle of the seventeenth century these were of secondary importance, unless in the case of some younger sons who studied law or military matters with a view to their future careers. The primary object of the Grand Tour was to fit the young nobleman to take his place in society, and there to display all the necessary social attributes. Something of this attitude may be seen from the tone of a remark by William Crofts after a ball in Paris in 1634. Writing to Lord Basil Feilding who had recently passed through that city on his way to take up an ambassadorial post in Italy, he observed gravely that 'some of the other Cavaliers did not take so well [as his lordship had done] especially my Lord Hambleton, whose
dancing was not liked at all', although there had since been another ball at which 'my Lord Hambleton was taken to daunce and everybody sayes he did acquit himselfe much better then before.' The Lord Hambleton of these remarks was the 1st duke, who never did undertake the Grand Tour but was on this occasion on his way to join Buckingham and the prince of Wales in Spain.

The 2nd duke of Hamilton did, however, receive part of his education abroad. Accompanied by his governor Mr Henry Maule, and by a valet-de-chambre, he arrived in Paris on 20 March 1633 and eleven days later entered the academy of Monsieur Benjamin Janniques, paying £542:17:6 a quarter in fees. For the next two years he remained in the academy studying riding, dancing and fencing, learned how to handle a pike and musket, and had a private master who coached him in French. He also had a writing master, and was taught by Signor Couur, a Spaniard, how to play the guitar. By October of 1633 he had added mathematics to his list of studies and was paying £34 for a case of mathematical instruments.

By way of recreation he played tennis and cards, and went on various sightseeing trips. He never lacked for company, since many of his fellow countrymen were also on the Tour at this time. His most constant companion was Hugh, Lord Montgomerie, afterwards 7th earl of Eglintoun, who was to marry Lanark's sister Lady Anne, and twenty years later was present with him at the battle of Worcester. Lord Montgomerie's younger

1 H.M.C. Report, Denbigh, v, 10.
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brothers Harry and Alexander were often with him,\(^1\) as was Lord Ogilvie. He also visited Lord Gordon's sons, played cards with Sir William Hamilton and James Douglas, dined with the earl of Glencairn at Charenton in January of 1634/5, and when he visited Saumur supped with the earl of Wigtown's son.\(^2\)

For most of his stay abroad he remained in Paris itself, but in the spring of 1634 he fell ill and by way of convalescence was sent to St Clou for a fortnight where he soon recovered his health. In July 1634 a more exciting expedition was undertaken, when with Lord Montgomery and Harry he went to see the siege of La Motte, and on 4 August spent the entire night there with Colonel Hepburn and the rest of the officers. The party returned to Paris by way of Strasbourg, where they saw the arsenal and 'a rare cabinet.'\(^3\) The following spring Lord William saw a little more of France when he paid a visit to Orleans and Tours, returning to Paris by way of Saumur, Blois and Amboise. He had by this time left the academy, having won the approval of Monsieur Janniques, who wrote to the 1st duke praising 'monsieur votre frere duquel je me sais parfaeytement honore de lavoir en ma mayson, non seulement pour sa qualite mais pour ses bonnes meurs et acsions et pour le soin quil prent de prendre toute les choses necessaire et bien seante aux personnes de la condision et nesance.'\(^4\)

He added in a postcript that the duke had provided so well for his brother's

---
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conduct in the choice of a governor that he himself had little to do.

Lord William was probably presented at the French Court during this time, for it was later claimed a valuable sword was given to him by the king of France: George Murray, coachman to Charles II declared that 'Duk Willam Hamelton when hie was in France...their was a sword presented to him by the then king in France,

"Take too thy sword thou noble knight,

It will de[fe]nt the[e] in thy right"

this words was wryten in gold lettres and lost at Wister feight.'¹ On 8 May 1635 Lord William left Paris and four days later sailed from Boulogne for Dover.²

Practically nothing is known of the travels abroad of the 3rd duke of Hamilton. His father the marquis of Douglas was continually in difficulties because he was a Roman Catholic and had married 'ane notour papist' Lady Mary Gordon. The marquis's children by his first wife were brought up as Catholics and seem to have remained so for the rest of their lives: in 1646 he promised to send his children by Lady Mary to school in Glasgow, and in July offered to board them with the minister of Douglas, but the presbytery claimed that he was already preparing to send William (later the 3rd duke of Hamilton) 'to be bred in France'. He did not at that point do so, and in January 1647/8 undertook to send William to Glasgow grammar school. Nevertheless, in October of that same year he was

¹ HL 7628.
² HA 560/3.
accused of keeping his son in France and not providing him with a tutor.\(^1\)

That this was so is confirmed by a remark made by the 3rd duchess of Hamilton many years later. When her eldest son in 1676 complained of being left alone in France\(^2\) she retorted that his father was abrod without any formerly acquainted with him when he was younger than you are.\(^3\)

As it was, the earl of Arran need not have worried about being left to his own devices in a foreign land, for nothing was further from his father's mind, and careful plans had been made from the very start to ensure that the young man was adequately supervised. As soon as he had left Glasgow University in the spring of 1675 the earl had been anxious to set out on the Tour,\(^4\) and by the middle of July preparations were well under way, with the duke of Hamilton giving serious consideration to the choice of a governor for his son. He eventually decided upon Mr John Bannantyne, the earl's tutor at Glasgow. Although Mr Bannantyne at first declared himself reluctant to accept the responsibility and emphasised that he could not think of going unless not only the duke but the earl himself desired his company,\(^5\) his objections were overruled and in the middle of October the earl, his governor and William Hamilton his servant sailed for France.\(^6\) On 1 November they arrived at La Rochelle and, having inspected the king of France's great magazines and ships there and

---
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bought a book called *The Voyage of France*, they made their way to Angers where they were to pass the winter.

Angers was a favourite town with the English and Scottish visitors, for it allowed the young nobleman to avoid the temptations of Paris while learning the pure French spoken in the Loire towns. The earl of Lothian's two eldest sons and Lord Balvaird's brother Mr Murray had stayed there in 1655, and eleven years later Lord Drumlanrig spent some time there. John Bruce the younger of Balcaskie stayed in the town in the 1680's, and the marquis of Atholl's heir Lord Murray, who later married the earl of Arran's sister, lived in the house of a Protestant in Angers when he was only sixteen.

Unfortunately the earl of Arran's stay in the town was far from being a success. Mr Bannantyne complained constantly of home sickness, but the real trouble seems to have been that he had little control over his charge. Masters of French, geography, history, dancing, fencing, designing and the guitar were all engaged for the earl, but he seems to have profited little from their teaching. Worse still, Mr Bannantyne was unable to curb his lordship's extravagance. No sooner had he arrived in Angers than the young man was spending over £39 on a silver sword and £27
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on a fine hat. He spent much of his time playing tennis, for which he had developed a passion, and was in the habit of entertaining his dancing master to dinner. None of this was calculated to please the duke of Hamilton, and when in Mr Bannantyne's accounts for 4 February 1675/6 he read the words 'For the expenses of a ball given to Mademoiselle Chimery £100, for mascarads £12', his reaction was as swift as it was predictable. He wrote back at once to the earl rebuking him for having spent far more than was justifiable, 'and in things very unfit for you, as balls, mascarads, unnecessary clothes and tinnis.' At the same time he recalled both Mr Bannantyne and William Hamilton.

Although the governor was no doubt privately relieved at this decision, it came as an unpleasant surprise to the earl, who felt that it was very hard of the duke to insist on the return of young Hamilton as well. It was upon this occasion that he wrote home that he would thereby be left 'in a strange place distitute of any whom I can presume hes tendernes for me.' His pleas failed to move his father, who remained adamant. The earl had behaved badly and must now mend his ways. After all, he was not being left in a foreign country without companions, for his grace had found a replacement for the unhappy Mr Bannantyne in the person of Mr John Forbes, to whom the duke now remitted full and absolute
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charge of his son. The latter was to obey his new governor as if he were his father, and was warned by the duke that 'if you do not regulate your expence better and leave these vanities, your aboad abroad will not be long, for it was to improve you in usefull breeding you was sent ther and not to follow vanity and folly.' The duchess added her warning that 'if thare should fall the least diffrence betwne you [and Mr Forbes] it will prove an irepairable lose to you and upon the first notices of itt you wil imeadeatly be called home, and what the consequences of that will be I shall not heere innumerat.'

This letter was sent by the duchess with Mr Forbes, who arrived in Paris in the middle of April 1676, bringing with him the papers relating to the Hamilton claim to Chatelherault. He was no doubt in some trepidation about what he should find at Angers, for it was with obvious relief that he was able to report to the duchess on 6 May that 'his lordship's humor and disposition...is much better then ether I did expect or was told of.' The earl seemed sensible, spirited and vivacious, and on the previous day had demonstrated his good nature when seeing off his former companions. 'He did cry mightely', Mr Forbes noted, 'expressing a great deal of sorrow to part with them having attended him so long and so well, and notwithstanding all the litle quarrels betwen him and Mr
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Bannantyne. 1 That same day the new governor and his charge left Angers for Blois, where his lordship's improvement could now begin in earnest. 2

After a pleasant journey by way of Richelieu where they saw the great house and paid £1:10/- for a description and drawing of it, 3 the travellers arrived at Blois and settled down in a house near the King's Walk, 'a garden of simples just before our door,' 4 where Mr Forbes hoped that the earl would 'endeavor to learn the art of gardening and the virtue of plants, and love them as well as your grace [the duke] does.' 5 More important, the town afforded a variety of good masters under whom the earl could pursue his studies. Although he had picked up a good many French words at Angers, he could not write the language or speak it correctly, so a French master was engaged. 6 The earl also claimed, somewhat surprisingly, that he was altogether ignorant of even the first principles of mathematics, therefore Monsieur Bonhart, an excellent teacher, was hired, together with masters of fencing, dancing and singing. 7

During his few weeks in Blois the earl made gratifying progress. He mastered the four rules of arithmetic, studied geometry, navigation and fortification, and continued to play tennis. With the arrival of the hot weather Mr Forbes thought it wise to replace the tennis and fencing lessons with something less strenuous, and found for the earl a singing master;

---

1 HL 5976.
2 HA 405/5/1.
3 Ibid.
4 HL 5977.
5 Ibid.
6 HL 5976.
7 HA 405/5/1.
his lordship was then discovered to have 'a good tunable voice', and a knowledge of little French songs would 'give him a good ear for dancing and make him more acceptable among the ladys at his return to England.'

Despite this success, however, Mr Forbes began to think of moving on. The main reason for this was the customary desire of the governor to avoid the company of his fellowcountrymen, whose presence meant that the young noblemen did not need to exert themselves to speak French. At first Blois had been agreeably free from Englishmen, but these now began to arrive in force and it was reported that the earl of Plymouth would soon be coming from Saumur. There was also the fact that only in one of the Parisian academies could his lordship's improvements be perfected. On 16 July they therefore left Blois, and, pausing at Orleans for two nights, made their way to the capital. On 19 July they had their first meal in the city.

Mr Forbes now set about choosing a suitable academy in which the earl could pass the winter. The duke of Hamilton's brother George, earl of Dunbarton, was at the French Court and suggested Monsieur de Valle's, but Mr Forbes rejected this on the grounds that it had neither good horses nor good masters (the order of precedence is significant) and had as its pupils some young English noblemen who would be undesirable companions for his charge. Instead he preferred Monsieur Faubert's in the Rue Ste.
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Marguerite, off the Faubourg St. Germain, a favourite area for Scottish visitors to Paris. Its proprietor was a Protestant and its reputation good; moreover although the sons of Lord Halifax and the earl of Bath were already there, they were sober and discreet youths and were accompanied by their governors.¹

Before entering the earl in the academy, Mr Forbes sensibly permitted him a short period of sightseeing, during which they visited the Tuileries, the Opera, the Louvre and Versailles. After that, his lordship went into residence at Monsieur Faubert's where he was to spend the next few months riding, fencing, dancing, drawing and improving his French.² At weekends he left the academy, attended the famous Protestant church at Charenton, paid visits and continued his sightseeing. This pleasant routine was somewhat disturbed towards the middle of August by the arrival of an apparently irate letter from the duke of Hamilton criticising the move to Paris.³ In common with many of his contemporaries he was obviously of the opinion that Paris was too expensive and too full of temptations for his heir, so Mr Forbes hastened to appease him with descriptions of the earl's good progress and assurances that his clothes would be neither 'rich nor gaudy, but plain and fashionable.'⁴ A further danger was avoided in October when Lord Bruce's son Charles arrived from Holland but was dissuaded from entering the same academy as the earl
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because Mr Forbes 'on account of ther being so long togider at Glassgow... was affrayed ther scool acquaintance, and too much former familiarite, might oblige them to play the little tricks they learned ther over again here.'

The rest of the earl's time at the academy was uneventful, although enlivened by seeing 'the desicting of an attemy' and by visits to fireworks displays and fairs. The most important occasion of that winter was when in December the earl was presented to the king of France, who took particular notice of him 'and made him more then an ordinary returne of his civilite with a smile, which is not very common to that king to do.'

Finally, on 4 May 1677, term ended and the earl left the academy.

Mr Forbes had at one time had thoughts of taking him to Caen that summer to study civil law, but in April a letter from the duke of Hamilton had arrived bringing the totally unexpected but altogether welcome news that he wished his son to travel to Italy that autumn. Italy was not always included in the Grand Tour, for political as well as for financial reasons, although as early as 1618 the earl of Mar's sons had visited Venice, Padua, Rome and Naples, while in 1632 Lord Lindores told his brother that he longed to visit that country 'avec telle passion que si quelque malheur
It was customary to wait until the autumn before going south, and because of the advent of the great heat it was necessary for the travellers to leave Paris and spend the summer elsewhere. There had been some plans for Lord William to join his brother in France that summer, but these were postponed, probably because of the younger brother's state of health. After much discussion, Mr Forbes finally chose Bourges as the next stopping place so, taking with them Cassell's *Book of the Voyage of Italy* (a copy of which was in the earl's library at Kinneil in 1712) they made their way south through Orleans and Fountainbleau. For the next few weeks the earl studied civil law, and although no mathematics or Italian masters could be found in the town, continued to apply himself to French, under the tuition of Monsieur Grudeh, who taught him how to write letters in that language and to read French history. He also prepared himself for the autumn by purchasing a *Journal d'un Voyage de France et d'Italie*. Armed with this, two Italian grammars bought at Lyons, The Prince of Conde's *Voyage into Italy* and a book called *Le Guide des Chemins*, all of which were to end up in the library at Kinneil, the earl at last set out for Italy at the end of September. Unhappily it was to be several months before he was able to cross the Alps into that country, for when they reached

---

1 GD 22/3/595.
2 HL 5999.
4 HA 405/5/2.
5 HL 6017.
Turin Mr Forbes fell seriously ill of a tertian fever.\(^1\) The earl was greatly upset, and, fearing the worst, declared that 'never gouvernour hes taiken of anie gentilman [such care] as he has done hithertoo upon me.'\(^2\) For several weeks Mr Forbes was critically ill, able to take only oranges by way of nourishment.\(^3\) Fortunately the duke of Savoy's excellent physician was put at his disposal, and the earl was befriended by the French ambassador at the Court of Savoy, the marquis de Vilar, who was a close friend of the earl's uncle the earl of Dunbarton.\(^4\) Although he now had to keep his own accounts and write home himself, his lordship had two servants to attend him and was soon being treated like a son by the duke and duchess of Savoy. As he spent his days at Court in hunting, playing tennis, visiting the comedy and dancing,\(^5\) the young earl soon became convinced that this was 'the pretiest and most civilized court of Italy.'\(^6\) Meanwhile Mr Forbes was making good progress although it was not until January that he was well enough to travel.\(^7\)

After his happy time in Turin it must have been with mixed feelings that the earl moved on, but a very pleasant two weeks were now spent in Venice,\(^8\) during which time the visitors toured by gondola round the arsenal and the other sights, with an Irish priest as guide. From there they went
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to Florence, where they saw 'the great duke's galleries...and...the lyons', St Laurence's Chapel and the Bibliothèque before moving south to Rome.¹

On 20 February they arrived in the city, and were to spend the next three months there, involved in a happy round of visiting and sightseeing.² Almost every afternoon Mr Watson the language master carried the earl off to see some of the antiquities; on 26 February it was the Capitol, on 21 March the tomb of Bacchus, on 7 April 'the reliques of Aaron's Rod' and on 4 May Prince Borghese's palace. The earl also visited Naples during this time, attended a carnival, went frequently to the baths, bought some more Italian books, and paid £55 to have his portrait painted by 'Ferdinando'.³

The stay in Rome was much prolonged by the political situation, as Mr Forbes could not contemplate travelling north because of 'the uncertainty of warr or peace',⁴ and when they finally left Rome on 26 May they made their way towards the French border as quickly as possible. The only real stop was made at Bologna, where Mr Forbes suffered a recurrence of his fever, but he soon recovered and by 20 July they were in Paris once more.⁵

The earl of Dunbarton now suggested that his nephew stay on in the
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Plate 4 James, earl of Arran and 4th duke of Hamilton, at the age of twenty: by Ferdinando?
city for the purpose of promoting his family's claims to Châtealherault, but his parents were anxious to see him again after his absence of two and a half years. More important, he was now of marriageable age and a suitable bride must be found for him. Consequently he was ordered to return to England at a time which was all the more convenient since the duke of Hamilton was then in London.¹ He therefore stayed in Paris for six weeks only, and on 23 September 1678 embarked on the yacht Merlin, which that day sailed for Gravesend.²

'Six tymes more welcome then returning light To Greenland men, after six tymes more night... Illustrious Arran thou art welcome home, Fraught with improvements from all Christendom.'³

Thus did an anonymous poet greet the earl's return from the continent; whether or not his own family would find him much improved and think their expense worthwhile remained to be seen.

At first the duke of Hamilton was favourably impressed with his son, although he found no outward difference in him despite his long absence, and was able to tell the duchess that 'You will see litle change in his face and he is scarce so tall as my brother James [Lord James Douglas], adding
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'I hope he will have sence enugh, and he carys himself discreetly and I use him as a camarad.' A fortnight later he was less optimistic. Not only had the boy returned home with very few clothes, but 'I find also that he has neglected even his exercises and not followed them so as he should have done, and even spent his time abroad as he did at home at Glasgow by conversing to much with idle company which is his great satisfaction still... and for his sincerity I fear he retains to much of the way he had when he was a child.'

It is difficult to assess the real effects of his Grand Tour upon the earl, and to judge how far his father's complaints were justified: they certainly did not prevent him from sending his younger sons abroad. What is obvious is that the earl returned home with a love of France which was to endure for the rest of his life and which resulted in his being sent as envoy to the French king on more than one occasion. It is ironical to recall that it was also in France that he acquired his passion for fencing and duelling, for his death in a duel occurred only a few days before he was about to take up his appointment in Paris as British ambassador. On a happier note, it may well have been in the galleries of France and Italy that he developed his enthusiasm for paintings. Certainly he returned with a taste for a far more sophisticated way of life than Scotland could offer, so that thoughts of settling down there

1 HL 8130.
2 Infra.
were, in his father's words, '...much the same to him as to go to the
gallies.'1

Despite this unsatisfactory state of affairs, four of the duke's
younger sons went on the Tour. Lord William, his second son, was sent
first to the Low Countries to study law, for his delicate constitution
made it plain that he would have to 'wine his livelyhoode by his pen and
by the endowments of the spirit.'2 Patient and hardworking, he kept his
own accounts in a beautiful hand, and went abroad alone without a governor.
He spent a year in Poitiers3 before entering one of the Paris academies,4
and was on the point of returning home when in the late spring of 1681
his health broke down completely and on 23 September he died as calmly
and uncomplainingly as he had lived,5 cheered by his mother's last letter
to him which was found beneath his head after his death.6 His cousins
the earl of Drumlanrig and his brother, in Paris on their own Tour,
attended his burial in the Protestant cemetery near the Hospital of the
Charity in the Faubourg St Germain;7 the Châtelherault papers, in his
care at the time of his death, were deposited in the Scots College; and
his few pathetic belongings were shipped home to Scotland in the care of
a young Scots merchant called Hamilton.8
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A year later, the duke's third son Lord Charles was sent to France with his governor Mr Fenton, and after a few months in Blois, went on to Paris where he unwillingly entered one of the academies. Unfortunately the earl of Arran now arrived at the French Court, thereby providing a source of distraction, and finally carried his brother off to watch the siege of Luxembourg despite their father's irate commands that Lord Charles be made to resume his exercises at once or return home, 'for it's not a sojor I intend him and so long as he stop there he shall not have sixpence from me.'

After repeated threats of this nature, Lord Charles was eventually prevailed upon to return home, whereupon Lord John and Lord George were dispatched with their governor Mr David Mitchell and 'some pils to take to sea.' Lord John was to study law at Poitiers while Lord George underwent a military training. They too spent a winter in one of the academies before returning in the summer of 1686. As for the youngest sons, Lord Basil remained in Scotland when he left university, and Lord Archibald entered the navy almost immediately.

Although the two youngest sons never enjoyed a Grand Tour, it would seem that this had become an established part of the education of most of
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the Hamiltons, and this was equally true of their family circle. Their relations the Eglintons, the Queensberrys, Douglasses, Southesks and Atholls all undertook the Tour as a normal part of their education, and in this were no different from their fellow Scots. That the Grand Tours of the Hamiltons may be seen in the context of the Scottish rather than of the English nobility seems to be borne out by the style in which they travelled abroad.

The English nobleman set off for France with an entourage of at least ten attendants; only a mere gentleman would move around with just one or two servants. Expenditure was accordingly high. In the 1630's the earl of Salisbury gave his eldest son £1,500 sterling a year and his two younger boys £1,200 each. Lord Cranbourne and his brother in 1636 had a five months' conducted tour of France which cost them £500 sterling, while in 1629 the duke of Lennox was claiming that he could not live on £2,000 a year and asking for more. In contrast to these large sums, the earl of Arran was expected to spend no more than £600 sterling a year, so that economy was one of Mr Forbes's main preoccupations.
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his employer to send bills of exchange from London rather than from
Edinburgh as Scots bankers exacted more and were much less obliging than
the English and French. ¹ He allowed the earl only two servants, and in
Paris managed to save money by borrowing the earl of Dunbarton's coach.²
The fees of an academy were themselves high - a contemporary 'Memoire de
de qu'il coute a un Gentilhomme qui entre pensionnaire a l'Academie'
estimated a quarter's fees at 790 livres with another 150 or so for
masters' fees and domestic expenses,³ and the earl of Arran paid more than
£150 a quarter, what with the 700 livres to Monsieur Faubert, the cost of
clothing, servants' wages and his lordship's own pocket money of two
crowns a week.⁴ As Mr Forbes pointed out, a gentleman of the earl's
status was expected to live in a certain style, and during the previous
session of the academy the sons of Lords Bath and Halifax had each spent
over £800 sterling but were not more in company than the earl.⁵ Mr
Forbes did in fact manage to keep almost within the limits imposed and by
May of 1678 could boast that since he had entered the duke's service he
had spent only 15,565 livres or £1,203 sterling.⁶

The Grand Tours of the earl's younger brothers were on an even more
economical scale, being both shorter in duration and less extensive in
itinerary; not for them the lengthy wanderings of the English marquises
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and earls. All five of the duke of Hamilton's sons who were sent abroad on the Grand Tour must have been well aware that they should avoid the extravagances of their English counterparts. They were Scotsmen, and fairly typical Scotsmen at that.
The first two dukes of Hamilton spent most of their adult lives at Court, visiting Scotland almost every summer. The 3rd duke and duchess made their permanent home at Hamilton itself. Their son the 4th duke in later life divided his time between his Scottish and English estates.¹ In considering the extent to which the Hamiltons were anglicised, it is necessary to assess their way of life while in Scotland. When they were at home, did they live in a manner which suggested that they had been influenced by the outlook and customs of the south, or was the household at Hamilton little different from those of other Scottish peers? Perhaps all the great Scottish peers of the seventeenth century were to some degree anglicised, but were the Hamiltons more noticeably English than their contemporaries?

One method of finding an answer to these questions is to examine the purchases made by the various dukes. The goods which they bought for themselves and for their homes give a real indication of their tastes and of their environment. If the Hamiltons were generally satisfied with articles available at home, it would seem that they regarded Scotland as their natural setting. If, however, they made all their major purchases in England, it could be inferred that they did not feel themselves to be an integral part of Scottish society: that they saw themselves rather in

¹ See Chapter 1.
the context of the English aristocracy.

London had by this time become the great centre of conspicuous consumption. Because the Court was there, the English nobility, or all who could afford to do so, flocked to the capital each autumn and stayed in town until after Christmas. They saw to their legal business, arranged marriages, went to plays and other entertainments and above all else, attended Court. As a result, they spent large sums on fashionable clothing and jewellery, and could purchase all manner of luxuries not available elsewhere.\(^1\) Now that the Scottish king was living at Westminster it was only to be expected that the Scottish nobility would participate in the London season. They were handicapped by the distance they had to travel and by their more limited resources, but theoretically an anglicised Scottish peer would winter in London, returning to Scotland in the spring with all kinds of English goods and fashions so that he could reproduce in his northern home the sort of surroundings he had enjoyed in the south.

Whether this description could with strict accuracy be applied to any Scottish peer remains to be seen; and the exact circumstances of the first two dukes of Hamilton while in Scotland are difficult to determine. The accounts for the period are scarce, although some account books kept by the 2nd marchioness of Hamilton herself do exist,\(^2\) and in those and elsewhere there is the occasional mention of an item being sent to her from the south.
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Such articles were usually in the nature of gifts from her family. For example in November 1635 the earl of Lanark bought two books to send home to her, one entitled *Paradisus Terrestris* and the other *The Discovery of Murther*.\(^1\) He commissioned Mr John Simpson in the Black Friary to make a small copy - probably a miniature - of his mother's portrait and sent this to her in an ivory box together with some gloves.\(^2\) In 1639 he paid £38 sterling for two black coach horses for the marchioness\(^3\) and in the following year she herself sent a footman to Newcastle with 54 shillings which he was to use 'to bay mousick boks':\(^4\) she had recently brought virginals to Hamilton.

These few entries in the accounts are too isolated to form the basis for any generalisations, but it would seem possible that the 2nd marchioness obtained from England an occasional luxury which she could not buy at home. Her sons, of course, were in a different position, and as they both made their homes in London they must have gone to the city merchants for most of their needs. The few accounts for their visits to Hamilton reveal only travelling expenses, drink money and so on.\(^5\)

After the Civil War the situation was very different. The 3rd duke and duchess lived a great deal at Hamilton palace and so many of their requirements were bought locally. Food came from the Hamilton estates or
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from nearby merchants. Clothes were bought from the Muirheads in Hamilton\(^1\) and from Bailie Brand in Edinburgh,\(^2\) cloth from Robert Blackwood\(^3\) and jewellery from George Mein.\(^4\) Pots and pans could be had from James Millar in the Canongate,\(^5\) bottles from the glassworks in Leith\(^6\) and furniture from James McClelland in Edinburgh.\(^7\) These local men and a large number of other Scottish tradesmen supplied the 3rd duke and duchess with almost all the necessities of life.\(^8\) This is not to say that all the goods they bought were made in Scotland: far from it. Many must have been imported from England and from the continent, but since they were available in Scotland to the population at large their use cannot be taken to signify any particular degree of anglicisation.

Of course, the 3rd duke and duchess did not spend all their time at Hamilton, and as he began to take an active part in politics, the duke had to make frequent journeys to London. It was only natural that when he did find himself in town he should notice that fashions had changed since his previous visit and that there was in the shops a wide range of exotic consumer goods not seen at home. Inevitably, he made various purchases. Sometimes the duchess was with him and could choose for herself personal and household goods: more often she remained at home, but in that case she
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always saw to it that when he set off for England the duke was equipped with a memorandum which was in fact a shopping list.

This method of purchase was not without its difficulties. The goods required by the duchess might be too expensive or might not be available in precisely the form she desired. Then again her own list might be at fault, as in September 1689 when the duke wrote home to her in some exasperation complaining that her memorandum was 'so generall you put me to it, for you nether tell the fines you wold have the damask napkins nor the length or breadth of the tablecloths and I have no skill what to say. Your 'sallantine' I nether know what it is you mean by it nor can I find anybody that knowes what it is, so explane yourself by the next.'

The duchess evidently did explain that the 'sallantine' was really a 'palantine' or short cloak but supplied none of the other details, for her husband was soon telling her 'I wish you had lett me know the price of the yeard of the stufe you desire I should get to be a peticoat and manto to Miss and what I should bestow on a palantine for her and the price of the yeard of the silke galoun and culler and what of the beeds and ribons to wear on the head is for her and what for you and what rate the damask napkins and tablecloths should be at and the length and breadth of them... Lett me know also wher you gote the chery dishes for I can find none but what is ether much courser and as dear or much finer and none under a croun a piece.'
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Sometimes the duke was able to enlist the help of a female relative, as in 1689 when he asked his daughter-in-law the countess of Arran about buying the mantle and petticoat, but usually he saw to everything himself, so it was not surprising that on one occasion he was driven to remark, 'I confess I like this trade of buying things worst of any, for I see I do not understand it.'

Apart from all the petty irritations involved, his main reason for disliking the 'trade of buying things' was that it entailed a great deal of expense. Because of his perilous financial situation during the early years of his marriage, the 3rd duke was always aware of the need to economise. By his determined efforts he had managed to pay off the family debts, but even when this had been done he was anxious never to fall into such a condition again, and in any case he had to make provision for his large family. There was no room for extravagance, and every purchase had to be justified - all the more so because goods in London were so much more expensive than at home. The duke could buy a periwig in Edinburgh for £11 Scots but in London it would cost him £6 or £7 sterling; a suit made in London could cost as much as £29 or £30 sterling whereas in Scotland it could be as little as £200 Scots. £29 Scots spent in Edinburgh could pay a carpenter for two bedsteads and a table while in
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England a small table alone could cost £2:14:6 sterling. Of course these differences in price can in part be attributed to the fact that the articles on sale in London were often more elaborate and made of more expensive materials, but it remained true that any item purchased in London was liable to have an inflated price simply because there was always a flourishing market for luxury goods.

Because of this situation, the 3rd duke worried about whether he was being overcharged, and thought carefully before ever he bought anything. If silks had gone up in price since his last visit he would have his new bed hung with a dark coloured cloth instead. He would remind the duchess that she herself had been of the opinion that a copper warming pan would be better than a silver one, and although he admired some real Indian cabinets in the city, because the cheapest of them was 40 guineas he would tell his wife, 'For my part I thinke a counterfitt one lookes as well and will so ther [at Hamilton] so lett me know if you will take such a one or give the forty guineas.'

That the duchess was herself aware of these considerations is apparent from the somewhat defensive tone of one of her letters. In 1678 she told her husband, 'I must have sume more silks which I belive you will wonder att when you see how much they will cost, but I cannot help itt: less will not finnesh the worke.' She then went on to make the age-old
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feminine complaint of having nothing to wear, declaring that 'truly for myself I have nothing but mo[u]rning, which I confese is most suitable for me, but if you do not aprove of that habit [cause] Mr Renne make me a manto, but of verie grave cullers, and a black goune and a cullered peticote also of dark cullers and give him the buying and chusing of all, and if he doe not do it both well and chipe I shall not imploy him againe; and tho this may be sum charge yet thinking I may not be att so much againe for myself makes me the better alowe of it now.' She allocated £100 for these items, with the promise that if Mr Renne did well 'itt's posseable I may recomend him to sume better customer then myself.'

One method of economising was to give in part exchange an article no longer of any use. When the duke wanted a new silver sword he could hand in his old one and so only have to pay the £1:10/- balance. Similarly, his old gold watch could help to pay for the new one, and some useless plate could be exchanged for a new silver tea kettle and chafing dish.

Then again part of an old article could be used in the making of a new one, as in 1688 when he had the glass from a coach he had bought from the duchess of Mommouth put into a new one he was having built. On another occasion he instructed the coachmaker to convert his chariot into a travelling coach.

Because of this financial stringency, the 3rd duke did not purchase
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in London articles which could be had at home. Disregarding those items bought for consumption while in town - food, fuel and so on - the goods which he bought to send home to Scotland fell into definite categories, despite any impression to the contrary given by the bills of lading. Certainly these last recorded a heterogeneous collection of articles. In 1691, for example, the duke sent to Bo'ness in James Boutchart's ship the Rose 6 firkins of soap, 6 weather glasses, a tin box with tea in it, the Scots Acts of Parliament, 2 pamphlets, several pairs of shoes, a pound of chocolate, some harness, 6 maps of the Holy Land, a pair of old breeches, a quantity of sweetmeats, a looking glass, an old periwig, an iron grate and Montaigne's Essais in three volumes.\(^1\) This miscellaneous list could be misleading, for the duke's purchases were all carefully planned. He would spend his money on luxuries which were justifiable because his social position demanded that he live in a certain style, and he would avail himself of the specialist goods and services offered in town, but he would not indulge in needless expenditure.

In any nobleman's accounts, clothing formed one of the main items of conspicuous consumption. A man's position in society was immediately evident from the way in which he dressed, for even if lesser people imitated the Court fashions they could not afford the same sort of fabrics worn by the peerage. Normally the 3rd duke was content to dress in garments made for him at home, but when he arrived in London one of the first calls he made was upon his tailor. He had come south in order to
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attend Court, and his status required him to appear there clad in a suitably splendid fashion. Were his suits not in the latest style and of the best material his prestige would suffer and any inattention to appearance might be construed as an insult to the king. In 1689 he was particularly anxious to avoid any such contingency, having enough to do in assuring William of Orange of his loyalty and in trying to counterbalance the bad effect created by his son the earl of Arran, so when he attended the great ball to celebrate the king's birthday he was careful to wear 'a new sute with gold buttons and brocade wastcoat to complement his majestie with.'

Clothing of the kind worn at Court was highly expensive, so elaborate were the materials used. If the duke's garments were not quite of the sumptuous style worn by the first two dukes of Hamilton at Court, they were nevertheless luxurious. A fine cinnamon coloured coat and breeches bought by the duke in 1685 were decorated with no less than seven dozen gold and black buttons and six dozen breast buttons, as well as being sewn all over with gold and black loops and having a matching waistcoat of cinnamon satin. A fine black coat bought at about the same time was lined with silk crepe, had pockets lined with taffeta and was ornamented with eleven dozen black silk buttons and had gold loops too. Another suit was trimmed with ninety-nine yards of lace and a velvet cap
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was lined with sable fur.¹

When the duchess accompanied her husband to Court she also took the opportunity of purchasing gowns in the latest fashion, but she does not seem to have been particularly interested in clothes and the descriptions of her garments are much less detailed and colourful than those of her husband. She seems to have favoured clothes of dark or 'sad coloured' material like the slate grey gown she wore when she sat to Kneller.²

This preference for sombre colours was probably indicative of her religious convictions as well as being the outcome of her feeling that mourning was the most appropriate costume for someone who had suffered so many personal tragedies.³ Whatever the reason for it, this was a preference shared by many of the Scottish noblewomen of the period, particularly by those of covenanting sympathies.⁴

As well as buying gowns for his wife when she remained at home, the 3rd duke occasionally purchased coats and bonnets for his children when they were small,⁵ and frequently had his servants fitted out with new livery and other new clothes or bought cloth to be made up at home into livery for them.⁶

Apart from the main items of clothing, a variety of accessories had to be bought as well. In addition to visiting his tailor the duke always
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paid an early call on a wig-maker, buying one or two periwigs during his first week in town. ¹ When he came to London in 1682 on his way to Windsor and his installation as a knight of the garter, he bought four periwigs in the space of a few days. ² He usually bought his beaver hats in London too, ³ and during his first visit in 1660, permitted himself the luxury of spending £5 sterling on one of the fashionable new Indian gowns, which he had made by a gownmaker on Ludgate Hill. ⁴ The duchess's accounts also reveal the purchase of some fashionable accessories. When in London with her husband and eldest daughter in 1679 she paid 6d. for some patches, bought a pair of 'ear wyres' for Lady Katherine, two orange necklaces and 'an alamode hood.' ⁵

Much of the money paid out by the 3rd duke in London went towards the purchase of clothing, but the most expensive single entry in the accounts was undoubtedly a new coach. Whenever he required a new coach, he preferred to have it made in the south. In 1660, for instance, he ordered a new coach with taffeta curtains and red and white ribbons. ⁶ In 1682 he bought a new chariot ⁷ and in 1689 Evan the coachbuilder was at work on another new coach for him. ⁸ Two years later he got a new travelling coach lined with scarlet striped cloth. ⁹ These coaches were
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for use in Scotland and were shipped home as soon as they had been completed. The mourning sedan bought by the duchess in the summer of 1685 was probably used by her in London, for the Court was then in mourning for Charles II, but a sedan ordered for her in 1693 was chosen with a view to impressing friends at home. The duke reported having seen a very pretty one 'lined with blue floured velvit with blue and gold fring and white damast curtains.' Lined with red flowered velvet it would cost forty shillings less, but in any case it had gilded nails, fine glass, and in the duke's opinion was 'finer...then you son Aran's.'

As well as the actual coaches, the duke sometimes purchased horses in London. Presumably Smithfield could offer a better selection than anywhere at home, and there was always a brisk trade among the nobility themselves. Over the years the duke bought a pair of black geldings at £47 sterling, a gelding for the coach, a grey nag which cost him only £4, a white gelding and a bay gelding. His most expensive purchase of this sort was made in the month before his death, when he paid £56:2/- 'to my Lord Pallat for two grey Flanders coach horses.' Sometimes he bought other livestock in town: in 1660 he visited the dog house at Knightsbridge and chose some hunting dogs, and some twenty five years later

1 HL 2549, 6395, 6568; HA 538/6/16; 120/3.
2 HL 7305.
3 HA 519/7/2.
4 HA 519/10.
5 Ibid.
6 HA 535/2/1.
7 Ibid.
8 HA 526/3/1.
was hoping that his son would find him some speckled male fawns in the
south.\footnote{HA 519/7/2.}

Fashionable clothing and fashionable coaches were necessary for a man
of the duke of Hamilton's status, and from time to time he bought other
articles which were either better than the ones made in Scotland, or were
simply different from anything seen there. Some of these items were
designed to enhance Hamilton palace. In 1685 the duke paid £7 sterling
for 'a pair of silver candlesticks of the new fashion',\footnote{HA 538/9.} some years later
ordered 'four large double new fashioned beer and wine glasses'\footnote{HL 7676.}
and in
1687 bought 'a new fashioned screen'.\footnote{HA 354/4/67.} Generally the purchase of
furniture was limited by the difficulty of transporting it. Large items
were too heavy and cumbersome and smaller goods might be broken in transit.
A consignment of chairs was badly damaged at sea in 1678.\footnote{HL 8136.}
Nonetheless, chairs were perhaps the type of furniture most frequently bought - every
kind from easy chairs\footnote{HL 7308, 7310; HA 519/10, 60/18/4.} to the ever-popular cane chairs.\footnote{HA 538/9; T.C. Smout, Scottish Trade on the Eve of Union,
1660-1707, 200.}
Screens,\footnote{HL 7676; HA 354/4/40.} small
cabinets,\footnote{HL 3740, 6448.} and tables\footnote{HA 120/18; 519/10; 538/3/14; 60/5/2, 3, 7.}
were relatively easy to send, as were beds, which
could be dismantled for the journey. Perhaps the most splendid bed which
the duke bought was the one which cost him £218:10/- sterling in 1682.
It was made of 'crimson and gould velvett...loyned with satin' and had with it eight matching chairs and velvet cases, japanned glass stands, footstools, blankets and quilts.¹

If London could offer a wide range of well-made furniture, it could also provide all manner of entrepot goods. The capital was a great port, with the presence of the Court creating a continuing demand for luxuries, so the city became a flourishing market for foreign wares. A wide variety of textiles from the Far East and the Levant, household goods from the Netherlands, fruits and spices, dyes and medicines - all could be purchased in London.

The duke of Hamilton took advantage of this fact to buy a number of foreign articles. Whether he bought the real Indian cabinet or the counterfeit one remains unknown, but he did purchase 53 yards of crimson Indian cloth and 42 yards striped with gold, to be made into curtains for Hamilton palace.² The box of tea³ and the figs⁴ that he sent home had probably come by way of Holland, and the chocolate which the duchess enjoyed was certainly brought to Europe by the Dutch. There was a great vogue for drinking chocolate in the mid-seventeenth century. Pepys tasted it as early as 1664, and Evelyn mentioned it nearly twenty years later.⁵ Purchases of chocolate occur in the Hamilton accounts in 1679,⁶
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but the duke nevertheless thought it best to offer some advice when he sent some to the duchess in 1694.  

'Two cups of jaculat, they say, clogs your stomak', he warned her, 'and puts you from your dinner, so if the cups be big you should take but one.'  

He usually purchased it in fairly large quantities - 25 or 50 pounds at a time - and would pay about 4/- for a pound.  

(In 1682 it was advertised in the London Gazette at from 2/6d. to 5/- a pound.)  

On one occasion the duchess received 50 pounds direct from Holland when her son Charles was there with the army.  

Some of the other goods used in Hamilton palace also originated in Holland. In 1689 the duke bought from John Greene at the King's Arms in the Poultry a variety of bottles and crockery, including 'four very fine blew Dutch cups' and 'eighteen very fine Dutch painted saucers, several fashions.'  

No doubt much of the table and bedlinen of the more expensive kind came from there too, as well as many of the garden seeds and plants bought from Edward Fuller at the Strand Bridge.  

The 3rd duke seems to have taken a keen interest in gardening, possibly from a natural liking for plants, but probably too because of his general desire to improve and modernise Hamilton palace and its surroundings. On his first trip to London in 1660 he paid £7 'to the Frenchman for seids to the garden' and made a further payment of £1:10/- to him 'for two gardin

---

1 HL 7423.  
2 HL 7454.  
3 HL 7359; HA 538/3/14.  
4 Ibid.  
5 O.E.D., iii, 689.  
6 HL 7359.  
knots drawne on peaper.' He obviously shared the contemporary enthusiasm for the formal garden. Later on both he and his brother-in-law the earl of Cassilis patronised Fuller. In 1689, for instance, the duke bought there seeds of African and French marigolds, melon, cucumber, gillyflower, cauliflower, turnips and nasturtium, twelve tuber rose roots, some onions, several kinds of peas and 2/6d. worth of 'sensible and humble plants.' He also bought an ounce of cypress seeds, and often purchased fruit trees. In 1660 he commissioned Andrew Cole to get him some dwarf cherries in town, in 1678 sent home two bundles of fruit trees for Kinneil and in 1684 shipped down seeds, trees and 25 cherry standards. Of course not all of these plants came from abroad. In 1689 he bought out of Brompton Park 3 peach, 3 apricot, 3 pear and 3 cherry trees, and it may have been from there that he later bought more peach and apricot trees, six good wall cherries, two fig trees and two vines. Although Kinneil seems to have had a particularly good fruit garden, judging by the regularity with which fruit was sent from there to Hamilton, at least some of the peach trees were destined for the palace itself. All this throws an interesting light on the sort of plants that were at least being
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tried out in the duke's gardens.

While he was in London, the duke did not forget his cellar at home. His master household at Hamilton was in the habit of obtaining wine through merchants in Glasgow\(^1\) or Edinburgh,\(^2\) but this could always be supplemented with casks shipped home from London, and the duke would occasionally purchase canary and Rhenish wine, and claret, when he was in town.

Not only were foreign goods available in London; there were foreign craftsmen there too, and from time to time the 3rd duke availed himself of their services. He bought shoes from Louis Leclerc,\(^3\) hats from a Monsieur Chaigneau,\(^4\) periwigs from Monsieur Laborde\(^5\) and a bed from 'Potevin', who can probably be identified as John Paudevin in Pall Mall, the French cabinet-maker to Charles II.\(^6\) It is interesting to speculate whether or not he and other Scottish peers preferred to patronise another group of 'foreign' merchants and craftsmen in London - their own fellowcountrymen. Certainly the names of several people with whom the duke dealt suggest that they may well have been Scottish in origin. The 3rd duke patronised James Heriot the goldsmith\(^7\) and bought muffins and chocolate from James Donaldson.\(^8\) One of his tailors was named Munro\(^9\) and the duchess had gowns
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made by John Ramsay. The duke recommended to his son Alexander Mure, a Scottish merchant in London, and his brother-in-law the earl of Cassilis bought books from Robert Scott. 

If London could offer the Scottish peer the services of skilled foreign craftsmen, it could also provide those of native specialists. Plate and jewellery could be purchased at home from George Mein in Edinburgh, but something out of the ordinary was more readily secured in the south. In 1674 the duke spent £155:5/- sterling on plate in London. Much later, he paid £100 sterling for a great silver cooler. Sconces, étuis, and copper cisterns were less expensive items which he acquired on his trips south, and when he wanted his silver plate cleaned he would send it to Mr Heriot in London. 

Jewellery too, was usually entrusted to a London goldsmith when any alterations had to be made. In 1660 the duke had a new diamond set in his 'bracelett' when he was in town, and the duchess and her daughters would sometimes have their jewels reset. Lady Katherine sent a diamond clasp to her brother for that purpose in 1682 and when she was in London herself the
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duchess had Christopher Rosse alter two of her diamond rings and add some gold to one of them.¹ On another occasion she gave her husband a sapphire to be reset in the centre of a piece of jewellery,² and Lord Basil sent up a diamond to be combined with those which formerly surrounded the sapphire so that a locket could be made for his fiancée Mary Dunbar.³

Clocks and watches were sometimes bought too. A new repeating watch cost the duke £60 sterling in 1693,⁴ and some years earlier he had bought an eight-day spring clock in an ebony case, a little 30-hour clock in a walnut case, a 30-hour clock marked with minutes and the days of the month, and 'a little pendulum Larrum.'⁵

Many of the goods bought by the 3rd duke in London were intended for the interior of Hamilton palace, but his interest in modernising the house did not end there. From the 1670's onwards he was absorbed not only in seeing that the rooms were well furnished and comfortable, but in reconstructing the entire building. While he was in London in 1678 he had promised the duchess, 'I shall make you a fine house in paper which will be some charges, yet I thinke well bestowed to have such a thing by us against wee be able to build itt.'⁶ Whether or not this means that he actually had drafts drawn up while he was in town is uncertain: his architect was the famous Scotsman James Smith, but he did consult experts
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whenever he went south.

Apparently he sought the advice of at least one celebrated Englishman, for after the duke's death the earl of Arran told the duchess that he had 'been with Sir Christopher Wren who is the king's master of work and one whom my father ussed to consult with,' and the duke himself in 1693 mentioned that he was 'now consulting with one Banks who carys on the buildings at Hampton Court, who is the best at contriveing of any in England.' On 16 February 1693/4 he paid £11 sterling 'to Mr Banks the king's carpenter for drawing some draughts of the palace of Hamilton at severall times.' He was also busy at that time arranging to have sash windows made. These had first been seen in England in the early 1680's, and towards the end of the decade had been installed in one of the offices at Windsor Castle. Presumably they were rare in Scotland at this time, although Henry Grey Graham's assertion that they were unknown there throughout the first half of the eighteenth century is patently false. In November 1693 the duke sent home for precise measurements of the windows of the duchess's bedchamber, and a few weeks later he paid over £44 'to Charles Hopson the king's joiner for 2 sash windows and 2 doors.' He also made provision for having this type of window made in Scotland, for he took with him to London that winter James McLelland the wright, so that he
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could watch the joiner making the sash windows.¹

Early the following spring the 3rd duke of Hamilton died, but the duchess saw to it that the building work went ahead. She and her husband had planned the alterations together, and she was determined that they should be completed even if the earl of Arran was a poor substitute for his father in such matters. The earl did continue to consult with experts in London. It was in January 1695/6 that he had his talk with Sir Christopher Wren, afterwards noting down the famous architect's advice. When the duchess read this she dismissed his comments as 'not very materell' - however this was probably because the earl was so rarely at Hamilton that he had no real grasp of what was being done there. Nevertheless, he also consulted Banks again,² and was given the task of buying glass for the casements and sash windows. In the autumn of 1698 Lord Basil asked him to obtain a pattern for the window frames themselves, 'that sort of finishing not being frequent here.'³ He also saw to the purchase for marble fireplaces for some of the main rooms in the new building, but was regrettably careless in seeing that they were made exactly in accordance with the duchess's specifications.⁴

One of the new rooms in Hamilton palace was to be a long gallery, in which portraits of the family might be hung. The 3rd duke and duchess themselves were painted on various occasions. Neither of them seems to
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have shared their eldest son's genuine enthusiasm for paintings, but the
seventeenth century nobleman sat for his portrait as a matter of course.
Then again, to be painted by a fashionable artist was a well-known ambition
among the aristocracy, and at this period the most fashionable artist of
all was Sir Godfrey Kneller.

At one time or another, Sir Godfrey painted every member of the
Hamilton family - mainly at the instigation of the earl of Arran. Apart
from the earl's passion for paintings of all kinds, he was a protégé of
Charles II and knew the duke of Monmouth well. These two were the first
important patrons of Kneller,¹ so it was only to be expected that the earl
would soon be introduced to his work. When exactly the earl of Arran sat
to Kneller is unknown, but it must have been at the very beginning of the
latter's career. Sir Godfrey arrived in England in 1676, but not until
1679 did he receive any real recognition. In that year he painted
Monmouth, then Charles II, and with the death of Lely in 1680 became the
pre-eminent Court painter.² It is interesting to note that it was in
1679 that the 3rd duke and duchess of Hamilton sat to him - a fact which
suggests that one of the family, probably the earl of Arran, was quick to
recognise his talents. The 3rd duke was painted in the summer of that
year,³ and in the autumn several payments were made for the duchess's
portrait.⁴ Hers was particularly successful: Kneller's portraits of the
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young Court beauties have often been criticised as lifeless and lacking in individuality, but he obviously found in the duchess's strong, humorous features a subject worthy of his gifts.

Throughout the 1680's Kneller painted a galaxy of important clients, including Louis XIV, Mary of Modena and James VII, but lists of his major works for this period do not mention any of the Hamilton family. In the following decade, however, the younger generation of Hamiltons all sat to him. When the earl of Arran married Lady Ann Spencer he persuaded her to sit, and she wrote him a letter telling him that she had 'according to your commaunds been at Kneller's this morning.' This remark was echoed by her brother-in-law Lord Archibald in 1691 when he told the earl of Arran, 'According to your desire I have been at Mr Kneller and am to sit for my picture on Wenesday nixt.' He wore armour for the occasion, and was painted with a ship in the background as befitted a sailor. Lord George, who was painted that same year, and had a long career in the army, was portrayed against a military scene, as was Lord Charles. Lord John sat in 1691 after some delay while waiting for a new wig, and when Lord Basil came to London in the winter of 1699/1700 to present the African Company's petition to the king, he too sat to Kneller. Finally, in 1700, the three sisters, Lady Katherine, Lady Susan and Lady Margaret were painted.
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According to Lord Basil, Lady Susan's picture was 'very well done' but he told his eldest brother 'I don't like the other two sisters' pictures.'¹

All of the portraits were shipped home and hung in Hamilton palace.

Fashionable painters were to be found at Court; so too were fashionable doctors, and although the 3rd duke always said that he had 'ill will to medle with the doctors'² he was in middle age distinctly valetudinarian and quite often sought their advice. Normally the Edinburgh and Glasgow practitioners served him adequately,³ and he could buy his medicine in Hamilton itself,⁴ but he also placed a good deal of reliance on the medicinal value of a visit to Bath or Wells. No doubt he enjoyed the society there too, but his health was his main concern on such visits and he bathed and took the waters assiduously. In 1678, for instance, he paid £1:6/- sterling in Bath for 'a bathing suite' and gave ten shillings to the man at the pump in the King's Bath.⁵ He went to the baths in Maiden Lane while he was in London,⁶ and regularly shipped home consignments of 'spaw water' and 'Bath water' - he sent down 24 bottles in 1689,⁷ and 3 dozen in 1691,⁸ 1692⁹ and 1694.¹⁰

If the duke felt unwell while in London, he usually called in Sir
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Edmund King, the eminent surgeon who had been Charles II's personal physician,¹ and during the last few months of his life he consulted William of Orange's doctor Sir Thomas Millington, who had been recommended to him as 'a very discreet man and good phisitian and will not try experiments on his patients, for which', the duke told his wife, 'I like him much the better.'² Not only did he consult these doctors personally: he shared with his contemporaries the alarming habit of seeking long-distance treatment. When taken ill in Edinburgh he would write to one of his sons in London describing his symptoms, which were then to be relayed to Sir Edmund King for his advice.³ A method of treatment in which the patient was separated from his doctor by some 500 miles was bound to be unsatisfactory, to say the least, and it was not surprising that in 1694 while the London doctors consulted on the duke's behalf by the earl of Arran were confidently predicting his speedy recovery, their patient lay dying in Holyrood.⁴

Medical advice was also available in the form of books like the Compend of Willis Physick which the duke bought in 1685.⁵ Books could supply advice on other subjects too, and he bought in London The Mystery of Husbandry,⁶ The Expert Farrier,⁷ The True Conduct of Persons of Quality⁸
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and 'a book of gardening' which he told the duchess 'will teach us all to be good gardeners.' These books were typical of the kind bought by the seventeenth century peer interested in improving his estates, and very often such works were obtained in England. Equally typical of the Scottish nobleman's interests were the other books bought by the duke in London - the Bibles, the pamphlets, gazettes and Acts of Parliament, collections of French essays and the works of history - in this case Calderwood's History of Scotland, 'a book concerning the death of Duke James' (the 3rd duchess's father) and The History of the Plott.

Sometimes he bought maps as well, in 1689 purchasing twenty of them ranging from Scotland to Turkey and South America.

When living in London, the duke of Hamilton was served mainly by his own servants whom he had brought with him from Scotland, but he also took the opportunity to hire new servants to take back to Hamilton. It was not that he and the duchess preferred English servants, indeed most of those whom they employed were Scots and the duchess seems to have preferred them. Their English butler, Nathaniel Jennings, caused some trouble to the duchess, who attributed to him the disappearance of fifty
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dozen bottles from the palace, and when the duke heard of this he told his wife that if she thought the fellow such a knave he wondered that she did not replace him with a Scot. ¹ Again, when William Murray the duchess's servant fell ill in 1693 the duke promised to try to find a substitute in London, but added 'I wish you could find a sober, discreet young gentleman there [in Scotland] that writes a good hand, to breed yourself.' ² The duke eventually found 'an Englishman, a very pretty young man who they say will be fitt to serve you in the employment you desire,' and warned his wife that it would 'be hard to find a Scotsman so well qualified.' ³ The duchess seems to have been reluctant to accept this replacement, since three weeks later the duke was writing to her again praising the man as 'well recommended and sayed to be a very sober, discreet man, but £30 is the fie so consider what you will do, for a Scotsman to please you I fear is not to be had here.' ⁴

Why the duchess preferred Scotsmen does not emerge from her letters. It was a natural enough prejudice, and may have been based on previous experience of finding Englishmen unsatisfactory, or she may simply have preferred to have presbyterians in her household. Whatever her motives, her husband's were more obvious. Servants hired in London were, like everything else found there, much more expensive. As he himself remarked, 'here such as wee have need of will be hard to be got and not under great
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Nonetheless, England could supply experienced men of a kind not to be found at home. In the autumn of 1678 the duke sent home 'a boy I have fled to be a warrander. He understands that imployment well and seems an honest fellow. I gote him on the road to Bath.' This was Abraham Holywell, who was still the warrander at Hamilton thirty years later. Nathaniel Jennings had also been hired in London, and the names of Harry Wickliffe, William Dinsdale, Joseph Topping, Henry Marwood and Benjamin Swain suggest that they too had come from the south.

As well as Englishmen, there was a variety of foreign servants to be had in London, mostly French. In 1689 a French wine merchant in town recommended to the 3rd duke of Hamilton a confectioner, Daniel Gazeau, who had been in England for the past five years and was skilled in setting up sweetmeats. The duke duly hired him, and although he had to pay out £10 or £12 'on the man's behalf for things to make dry sweetmeats and counterfeit cherry things to make piramids and other ways of serving sweetmeats to the table', he told the duchess with some satisfaction, 'He will learn you all to make dry sweetmeats, so the keeping of him it wer but one year is worth something.'
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spent considerable sums of money in importing 250 pounds of dry confections at a time from Rouen, a French confectioner in the household was indeed an economy.

A fortnight after he had hired the confectioner, the duke was able to report that he had 'taken a French page, the sone of a gentleman that's a refuge. He is a very pretty boy and speaks good English, so you have two French servants comes home with your goods, who I hope shall prove better then the English.' Unfortunately for the duke's plans, when the page's mother heard that her son was to travel to Scotland by sea, she flatly refused to let him go. The duke was considerably put out. French servants were fashionable, and this one had the added advantage that he was even prettier than Lord Murray's page. However, a few days later the duke found another French boy whose family was not deterred by the thought of the journey north.

French pages were in vogue, and so too were valets-de-chambre. Very often when a young nobleman returned from the Grand Tour he would bring back with him his French valet, and French servants must have come across to England of their own accord in the hope of finding employment. In the 1670's the duke had Gaspard Chambon as his valet, although he employed a Scotsman, Charles Balfour, in that capacity when Chambon left.
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Unhappily, Balfour was drowned one summer while bathing in the Clyde.\textsuperscript{1}

The duke missed the poor boy very much, he told the earl of Arran, and was forced to have a barber come down every day from Edinburgh to Holyrood to shave him and comb his periwigs, so he instructed the earl to find him a suitable valet in town.\textsuperscript{2} As a result, he employed another Frenchman, Mark Rossiere, who was with him until the duke's death.\textsuperscript{3}

Having hired his servants and purchased his goods, the 3rd duke was then confronted with the problem of sending them home. Almost everything went by sea, including the servants, as the French page boy's mother had discovered. Arranging for their passage home was simple enough. In 1675, for instance, Robin Gilmour the groom was sent north and was given his wages in advance, ten shillings 'for a coat to him on the sea', another ten shillings to buy provisions during the voyage, and five shillings for his own pocket.\textsuperscript{4}

The servants could look after themselves, but with the goods it was a different matter. First of all, a ship had to be found, usually a Scottish one. Most convenient would be a vessel bound for the duke's own unfree port of Bo'ness: James Boutchart's ship the Rose, for example, used to sail from the Thames to Bo'ness.\textsuperscript{5} Alternatively, James Law,\textsuperscript{6}
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James Forrester\(^1\) or Andrew Burnside\(^2\) might be sailing from London to Leith, and on one occasion the duke sent his belongings by sea to Newcastle and then had them carried by road to Edinburgh.\(^3\) This would, however, seem to have been an exception and normally the duke entrusted his goods to a Scottish ship sailing to a Scottish port. It would seem from the entries in the Leith Bye Book\(^4\) that the other Scottish peers preferred to do so too. The earl of Tweeddale, the marquis of Atholl, Lord Murray and Lord Livingstone sent goods home with James Law as did the earl of Cassilis,\(^5\) the earl of Callendar, Lady Forfar and the marquis of Atholl relied on John Brown, the earl of Lothian, Lord Yester and the countess of Roxburgh entrusted articles to James Fisher, and the earl of Balcarres, the earl of Drumlanrig and the bishop of Glasgow patronised John Hunter.

When he had found a suitable ship, the duke would have his goods packed up carefully in hampers and boxes, the latter marked in nails with his initials and a number.\(^6\) His secretary then took them down to the docks, paid the necessary customs duties, and saw that the commission and other sailing documents were in order.\(^7\) Sometimes the duke took special precautions with his purchases. When he sent down a box of glasses in 1660 he paid 5/- to a man who was to look after them,\(^8\) and in 1694 when he
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was shipping ten baskets of growing trees he gave 5/- to the seamen for
carrying them carefully into the ship and for watering them and taking
care of them during the voyage. On those occasions when he was sending
home the family plate, he made sure that the vessel carrying his goods
sailed with a convoy, to avoid the danger of privateers: in 1693 his
belongings were sent north 'in the man of warr called the Centurion,
Captain Bridges commander.'

Even if the ship were not carrying such a precious cargo, there was
no guarantee that it would arrive safely: in 1691 a payment of £7:8/-
Scots was made 'To James Forrester, skipper, of salvage money for his
grace's hatt, which he brought from London, the ship being lost in
England.' When the ship did come into port without any accidents, a
rough passage might well have damaged the cargo. There was little that
could be done about that, apart from ensuring that the goods were packed
up carefully in the first place, and the duke was equally particular
about what was done with them on their arrival in Scotland. If they were
to arrive home before he was there to supervise the unloading, he gave
detailed instructions on how to deal with them. The duchess was told to
'cause ding out the head of the barrell with the 2 dusen of bottles of
Loupain wine and cause sett it in the best seller and tast it how you
like it and if it be beginning to spoile, dispose of it to friends.'
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She was also to make sure that his new coach 'be carefully broght up and sett in the best coach house, for I assure you it is a dear one.'\(^1\) When he sent home some peach trees she was to 'cause inquire for them and hast them out to Hamilton',\(^2\) and as for the seeds he sent in 1678, 'the names are with them and are excellent kinds, so cause Hugh set them in the best places in the garden at Hamilton as soon as they come to him.' He added that he had 'ordered the skipper to cause the chamberland at Kinneill send them over as soon as they are landed, and the seeds to be keeped till I come home. The flowers in the pots must be keeped from the snow water.'\(^3\)

Once the duke had sent his goods home - which was usually a few weeks before his own departure\(^4\) - he refrained from buying anything else, other than a few small items which could be taken back personally. He was in the habit of taking home with him presents for the family, although he experienced some difficulty in choosing these, and told his wife on one occasion, 'I intend to bring Mime[his little grand-daughter Lady Mary, the earl of Arran's child] some present so lett me know what is fittest to bring for her, for I have ill skill of these things.'\(^5\) When his own children were small he brought them playthings, and usually took to his
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female relatives silk stockings,\textsuperscript{1} gloves\textsuperscript{2} or ivory combs.\textsuperscript{3} He carried most of these gifts home personally, and when he sent the locket for Mary Dunbar with his son John he 'told him it was for you\textsuperscript{[the duchess] and sealed it and directed it for you that she might not know of it, fearing he might have told her.\textsuperscript{4}

After the death of the 3rd duke, the duchess did not again visit London herself, so she had to rely on her sons and daughters when she wished to purchase anything from the south. When the earl of Arran consulted with Sir Christopher Wren and others he also saw to the buying of marble and glass for the new building at Hamilton, and he apparently offered to make purchases for the gardens too, for in the late summer of 1695 his mother told him, 'I don't desire you to send any things for the gardens at this time, there being such a trouble of finding ready occasions that what is sent seldom comes in season...there were many of the ackorns rotten by their being so long by the way.'\textsuperscript{5} She did, however, continue to buy trees and plants from London, for in 1697 one of the gardener's men was sent in to Edinburgh 'to take care of the trees which Cornelius the gardner brought from London',\textsuperscript{6} and in 1705 the earl of Selkirk, apparently on his mother's orders, bought ten guineas' worth of seeds for the gardens at Hamilton, as well as Spanish jessamine, a vine and a tuber rose.\textsuperscript{7}
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From time to time the duchess commissioned her sons to make a variety of purchases for her. In 1695 the earl of Arran had to arrange to have a plaid bed made for her, and bought for her some glass, a little seal and a clock. When she decided to have engravings made from her late husband's portrait, she entrusted the arrangements to the earl. Her secretary David Crawford was critical of the way in which the matter was handled, and the earl wrote indignantly to his mother telling her that 'as for what David Crawford tells you that he could have gott my father's picture drawen as weel as ingraven for the 50 pounds I don't know what he means by itt. The last duke of Queensbray was a man that did not throw away his monie and his coast so the doeing. I don't belive Sir Godfry Kneller would have painted a picture for my father and gott the graver to have ingraven itt for less then we have bargained, so David must bee mistaken or does not explain well what he sayes on that subject.' As for the way in which the duke was clad, he claimed that 'ther was noe helping of its beeng done in armour. It is a most tedious work but itt will be extremly well done.'

When the earl of Orkney wanted a copy of the duke's portrait, he too made arrangements to have the work done in London, and asked his brother the 4th duke to persuade their mother 'to let one of the best halfe lengths of my father's picture come to London that I may get a good copy, for I can't think of any other way how to have one done tollerably.' Apparently it was not possible to have the copy made in Scotland, for he
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was even willing to 'be att the expence of bringing it up and sending it down again,' emphasising that 'if it be well packed up ther can come noe hurt to the picture.'

When the earl of Arran became 4th duke of Hamilton in 1698 he divided his time between Scotland and England, so it is difficult to determine which of the articles he used at Kinneil or Holyrood had been sent there specially from the south. As yet no accounts for his English purchases have been discovered, nor have any relevant bills of lading come to light, but it seems likely that if and when these are found and examined, they will reveal that the 4th duke was more anglicised in this respect than his parents.

To what extent, then, did the Hamiltons make a habit of purchasing their goods in England? Excluding the first two dukes, who were permanently resident at Court, the answer would seem to be that from 1651 onwards the Hamiltons had no more English belongings around them than did the rest of the Scottish peerage. The 3rd duke bought in London clothes, coaches, furniture and liveries for his servants, and in this he was no different from his fellow countrymen. Any Scottish peer attending Court would buy his clothes for that purpose when he was in London, and since an English coach was 'the characteristic status symbol of a Scottish noble,' it was only to be expected that the duke of Hamilton would have his coaches made in the south. Similarly, most of the other Scottish peers imported
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items of furniture and servants' liveries from England, as well as the same sort of smaller articles - chocolate and dishes and wine - shipped home by the 3rd duke. ¹

Information on this aspect of the life of the Scottish peerage is very scattered, and as yet no survey of their conspicuous consumption exists, but the indications are that for reasons of prestige the Scottish nobleman would import from England certain luxury articles. It may well be that some of the other Scottish noblemen did this on a larger scale than did the 3rd duke of Hamilton, limited as he was by considerations of economy, but whether or not this is so, it remains true to say that in buying a variety of goods in the south the duke was in no way different from his contemporaries. That his purchases were in the nature of luxuries is made obvious by the whole tone of his letters and by the care which he took in sending home these special items. Moreover, these goods fell into various definite categories which remained unaltered throughout the years: from 1660 until 1694 the accounts record a recurring selection of clothing, furniture, paintings and books, which becomes predictable in its regularity.

Once again, towards the end of the period, the situation altered. Apart from Lord Basil and the earl of Ruglen, the 3rd duke's sons spent very little time in Scotland. Lord Charles was generally at Court or with the army, and when he did come home he stayed with his mother at Hamilton. Lord George was usually with the army too, and when he married his English

¹ E 72/15/39, E 72/9/33, E 72/9/30.
wife he settled at Cliveden. Lord Archibald was in the Navy for many years, and towards the end of the period was living in Jamaica as governor-general. As for the 4th duke of Hamilton, there is little doubt that his prolonged stay at Court and his English marriages must have affected his outlook considerably, but because of the absence of material dealing with his English purchases, evidence of his style of living must be sought elsewhere.
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CHAPTER 6

The Hamiltons in Scotland.

1. Hamilton Palace.

Although the dukes of Hamilton owned various other houses in Scotland - the castles of Kinneil, Avendale and Brodick - as well as having apartments in Holyroodhouse, it was at Hamilton palace that they made their real home. Moreover, it would seem that life there was essentially Scottish in character.

Hamilton palace, known to the 3rd duke and duchess simply as 'the house', had been erected in 1591, and the original structure seems to have been little altered when the duchess and her husband began their married life there in the late 1650's. The building was three stories high, and still retained the original portcullis as a reminder of its former defensive function. The ground floor was given over mainly to offices. In 1691 there were three kitchens there, two of which were fairly recent additions, as well as a larder, bakehouse, lattermeat hall and washing house. Aside from these, this floor had its own dining-room, drawing-room and great hall, as well as the woman house and the porter's lodge.

Upstairs, on the first floor, were what might be described as the state rooms, although this term does not seem to have been applied at Hamilton until a later period. There were to be found the great high

1 Third Statistical Account of Scotland, Lanarkshire, 364.
2 HA 464/1/50.
3 See Plate 5.
dining-room and the drawing-room, with the great bedchamber, the duchess's closet, the duke's bedchamber and antechamber, and the red bedchamber. The 3rd duke's sons Lord Basil and Lord John also slept on this floor, while Lord Basil's wife had her own chamber and drawing-room close by. Not far from her suite were the extensive nurseries, and some of the principal servants were also lodged on this floor. The duchess's lady, Mrs Darlo, the duke's secretary David Crawford, and the steward John Lamb all had rooms there, while the duke's valet occupied a small chamber off his grace's own.

Above these, on the second floor, were two more dining-rooms, and the duke's library. The yellow and green bedchambers were on this floor, as were various other bedchambers and closets. In all, the palace in 1691 had sixty-two hearths.¹

Although this original Hamilton palace had a large number of rooms, it became obvious in the late seventeenth century that it was not nearly extensive enough for the 3rd duke's growing family and many servants. For this and other reasons,² he planned sweeping alterations which were carried out by the 3rd duchess after his death. Not only was the palace greatly enlarged, with a new long gallery, library and bedchambers,³ but the new buildings provided the opportunity to modernise the arrangements and
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Plate 5 Ground plan of Hamilton palace, c. 1677, by Isaac Miller.
fittings of the house. The new rooms were built with sash windows and marble fireplaces were specially shipped up from London: a white one for the duchess's bedchamber, black for the dining-room and red and white for the drawing-room.¹

The duchess also arranged to have the oak panelling of the new rooms and staircase most elaborately carved. William Morgan was at work in the palace in 1700, carving the dining-room chimney piece with fish, fowl and flowers, making 180 Hamilton cinquefoils and stars between 176 medallions on the walls, ornamenting the drawing-room with more flowers, medallions and cinquefoils, and providing a richly carved chimney-piece for the bed-chamber. The closet was decorated with the duchess's coat of arms supported by two carved boys, and the ten large folding panels of the staircase depicted boys and beasts and pendant flowers. The details are recorded in Morgan's account for the work done in 1700:² in the catalogue for the sale of the fittings of Hamilton palace in 1919 one can read once more the descriptions of the same exquisitely carved foliage and fruit, the draperies and the festoons, the amorini and the unicorns.³

In the original palace, however, the actual fittings had been much plainer, and the walls were themselves undecorated. The fashion for

¹ HL 4050, 6439, 6487; HA 516/20/18; 463/14/4.
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Plate 6 Ground plan of the new Hamilton palace, built 1693-8. [From William Adam's Vitruvius Scoticus].
hanging up tapestry continued throughout the seventeenth century. In 1676 Lilias, countess of Perth had in her possession six pieces of arras hangings, 'whereof four of them forest work and two of them scripture storie.' At Balloch the countess of Breadalbane's chamber and the yellow drawing-room were hung with tapestry, as were the dining-room at Taymouth, the earl's chamber at Cortachy and most of the rooms at Newark. One can safely assume that this fashion extended to all the other great Scottish houses of this period, and Hamilton was no exception. A list of goods sent to Holland in 1648 when the earl of Lanark was in exile there gives a good idea of the sumptuous nature of these hangings. From Kinneil and Hamilton came 'five piece of blak velvet hangings embrouthered with gold...three piece of ordinary hangings unlined...four piece of the historie Orland, lynd, being rich wrought with silk and worsett, four pieces of the historie of Orland...five piece of the historie of Artanas...five piece of the historie of Troy, verie rich, all lynd...two piece of the historie [of] Artinas and one of the historie of Troy and three of the historie of Acteon, all lynd...six pieces of the historie of Acteon...' and so on.

It would seem that some of these furnishings eventually returned to Scotland, when comparison is made with a list drawn up in 1656. On 8 June
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of that year William Lockhart granted a discharge to the 3rd duchess for £1,524 sterling, which he had raised by selling various belongings she had given him. These included 'one suite of hangings of the history of Artinisia containing seven pieces, one suite of hangings of the historie of Orlando containing eight pieces, one suite of hangings of the history of Troy containing eight pieces, five pieces of black velvett hangings all wrought...'  

As these lists suggest, not all hangings were made of tapestry. The countess of Perth owned a large collection made of lead coloured and snuff coloured cloth, linen and wool. The 3rd duke of Hamilton's drawing-room in the 1670's was hung with 'green plain stuff' which had cost his wife over £80, and when their daughter Margaret married and went to live at Panmure she found herself the mistress of a very well furnished house. Her own closet was hung with green mohair, her husband's dressing room with orange serge, and one of the bedchambers with white cloth embroidered in green. Gilt leather hangings were also much in favour throughout the century; there were some at Newark in 1632, at Yair and at Douglas, and in an interesting letter of 1638 Lord Basil Feilding told his brother-in-law the 1st duke of Hamilton that he had in his house in Turin a Fleming trained at Rome who had a new method 'of makeing great designs and 
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representing histories upon leather hangings in *chiaro scuro*, which would be, though done upon bare walls, of great ornament to a house.' ¹ He sent the duke a sample of the man's work, having 'often heard of his majesties designe of building a royall pallace for the adorning whereof this man being verie proper.' The king's reception of this piece of information does not emerge from the correspondence, but it is possible that the duke patronised the man and some of his work may even have found its way to Hamilton palace.

Apart from the wall coverings, the Hamiltons seem to have shared the contemporary enthusiasm for wainscot. In 1694 the main dining-room and the gallery were described as being lined with wood,² and two years earlier £2:2/- had been paid to the man who sawed up twenty-one deals 'for lining the little closet in the chamber where Lord Archibald lies.'³ In 1697 David Crawford, the duchess's secretary, told the earl of Arran that good progress was being made in lining with wainscot some of the other rooms in the palace,⁴ while two years later ten and a half cartloads of wainscot planks were brought out from Edinburgh to Hamilton.⁵ Moreover, those rooms which were not actually panelled could be painted to look as if they
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Plate 7 Plan of the principal floor of the new Hamilton palace, built 1693-8. [From William Adam's *Vitruvius Scoticus*].
were. In 1700 Thomas Warrander was paid £35:4/- for doing the staircase and the great waiting-room in wainscot colour, and he was further instructed to paint the earl of Arran's room in 'walnut tree colour as before.'

Even at Kinneil the colourful wall paintings were overlaid by imitation panelling.

A good deal is known about the covering of the walls at Hamilton palace: fewer details are available about the floors. Generally speaking, floorcoverings do not appear in any household accounts, most of the 'carpets' mentioned there being in fact table coverings. The Panmure inventory of 1695, recording everything down to the brass knobs on the hearth, mentions no floor coverings at all.

The countess of Perth had three carpets, and there was an old one in the earl of Forth's house in Leith, but otherwise they never feature in inventories. That some of the rooms at Hamilton had matting on the floor is revealed by a series of payments in the 2nd marchioness's accounts, to tailors to sew it together.

Among the furnishings which the 3rd duchess was obliged to give to William Lockhart in 1656 were 'one great turkey worke carpett, ane needleworke carpett, and a dozen and a halfe of French worke chayres and stooles with a carpet suitable to them.' On another occasion, mention is made of a payment to a workman 'for scouring and dressing the great carpet that was
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sent to Kinneil,¹ but these may all have been table carpets.

Probably because of the elaborate nature of the rest of the chamber, curtains seem to have been of less importance in the scheme of decoration than they are today. Throughout Panmure House the windows were hung with white serge, except in Lady Margaret's dressing-room where the curtains were of striped silk edged with fringe.² The countess of Perth had various window curtains of serge, linen and wool,³ and the crimson and gold Indian cloth curtain material bought for the 3rd duchess of Hamilton in London seems to have been particularly elaborate.⁴

Apart from the hangings and the carpets, what were these seventeenth century chambers really like? Unfortunately no inventories have as yet been discovered to reveal exactly how the rooms at Hamilton were furnished, but from the lists of plenishing of other great houses it is possible to form a generalised picture of how rooms in the palace must have looked. Usually, the bedchambers were dominated by a large four poster, the bedstead made of oak or fir and often elaborately carved. The hangings of velvet, mohair or serge were lined with a contrasting colour and matched the quilt. Sometimes the bedlinen was richly embroidered, and Sir Colin Campbell of Glenorchy even had his coat of arms and name sewn on his quilts.⁵ There were some particularly fine bedrooms at Panmure in 1695: the willow room, for example, had a fir bedstead hung with curtains of
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fringed grey-green cloth lined with a pink material which matched the quilt. Seven pieces of willow coloured cloth hung on the walls, and the stools in the room were covered with the same material as the bed. Sometimes special chairs and stools were bought with the bed. At Newark a black velvet bed had a chair and stools with it, a scarlet bed had its own stools, and a yellow bed had as part of the set two chairs and four stools of grey velvet. Occasionally a bedchamber would also contain a box bed, and there would certainly be a table, chest of drawers, a looking glass and perhaps a cabinet.

In the larger of the great houses, there were antechambers and dressing-rooms off the main bedchamber. Such was the case at Hamilton, where these smaller rooms were probably furnished in a similar style to their counterparts elsewhere. At Panmure, Lady Margaret Hamilton's closet was like a small drawing-room. There was a table of olive wood with matching stands, five cane chairs with crimson cushions, footstools covered with the same material, and a long cane resting chair with a bolster of red silk. Lady Margaret kept her dressing box and strong boxes in that room, and in her little dressing-room next door were the inevitable chests which served as cupboards, as well as a large fir sweetmeat box. Her husband's antechamber contained a square table and six chairs, while his dressing-room was furnished in very striking colours. The extra bed there had orange printed curtains, the walls were hung with orange serge,
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the tablecloth and cushions were of the orange printed material and the black chairs had orange cushions.¹

As for the public rooms, the dining-room would have at least one large oak or walnut table, perhaps oval but more commonly square, with additional leaves. In the duchess of Buccleuch's Edinburgh house in 1661 there was even a square table 'folding up in the corners, making a perfyt round table.'² About the table would be arranged something like two dozen chairs, of Russia leather or cane. The drawing-room was furnished in a similar style, with several tables and a large number of chairs.³ The main staircase would probably be hung with family portraits,⁴ and there would be more tables and chairs in the hall.⁵ As for the other principal rooms, some of the houses had a library, as Hamilton did, and there was an occasional billiard room.⁶

The great Scottish houses of the seventeenth century were certainly furnished in no mean style. With their continental tapestry, French and Dutch furniture, their inlaid cabinets, ivory clocks and Indian screens they were far from being the comfortless homes of an impoverished aristocracy,⁷ and it would seem from the accounts that Hamilton palace was very much in keeping with the general style of Scottish mansions.
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⁷ For a brief discussion on this point, see Ian Finlay's introduction to the catalogue Treasures from Scottish Houses.
As has already been noted, some of the furniture for the palace came from London,¹ and this raises once more the vexed question of where the Scottish peers purchased the articles for their homes. At one time it was assumed that all the furniture in the houses of the aristocracy had been imported, much of it from England, but it has since been shown that native furniture makers were perfectly capable of supplying all kinds of goods.² Of course the Scottish noblemen did continue to buy furniture from the south. Lord Livingstone and the earl of Errol shipped home chairs from London,³ a looking glass, chest of drawers, table and stands in the Panmure inventory had come from there,⁴ and it was not only the peerage who bought their furniture in the south. Archbishop Sharp visited cabinet makers and upholsterers while in London,⁵ the archbishop of Glasgow had chests made for him there,⁶ and lesser men like Sir William Lockhart and the lairds of Ormiston and Blackbarony⁷ imported furniture from the south.

Nevertheless, a significant quantity of the furniture required was bought at home. Of course it must be remembered that the Scottish nobility and gentry were not alone in sending to the south for goods: the Edinburgh and Glasgow merchants regularly imported large quantities of chairs,
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looking-glasses, tables and stands. However, as the Hamilton Accounts show, many of the desired articles were made in Scotland. James McLelland, the Edinburgh wright who worked on the new buildings at Hamilton palace, could also be relied upon to provide tables, bedsteads, and stands, the occasional chest of drawers, any number of footstools and even 'a block to her grace for putting up head-dresses on.' The 3rd duke and duchess bought tables and stands from William Scott the Edinburgh cabinet maker, and new chairs for the palace were frequently purchased in Edinburgh - calf leather chairs, Russia leather chairs and carpet chairs. The majority of these were probably made by the men who sold them, for James Finlayson and James McLelland were described as wrights and William Scott as a cabinet maker, none of them being designated merchants. Some of the chairs, however, may have been imported, and on more than one occasion the 3rd duchess bought direct from Holland. Four long-backed chairs and two straight chairs were shipped back to Bo'ness for her in Thomas Cassilis's vessel in 1687, and some years later Daniel Hamilton the chamberlain at Kinneil sent to Holland for four more chairs for the duchess: the man who
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brought them to Kinneil was paid £1 for his trouble.¹

Looking-glasses² and beds could be made in Edinburgh easily enough, and when the duchess needed furniture for her children or grandchildren, she called upon the services of local men. Arthur Nasmith, a Hamilton wright, made a new cradle in 1673, presumably for Lord Archibald who had been born that year, and a little chair for two-year old Lord Basil.³

Nearly thirty years later, John Hindshaw, also a wright in Hamilton, was asked to make a chair for Lord Riccartoun, the earl of Ruglen's child, as well as 'a little oak bed for the playbed' and 'two feet for a cradle' to be used by some of the duchess's other grandchildren.⁴ Small furniture specially made for children was common enough at this period: Sir John Foulis of Ravelston bought a 'bairn's wand chair' in 1680⁵ and even at Panmure in the 1690's when there were no children in the household, a wainscot chair and a footstool for a child were stored away in a cupboard - probably relics of the 4th earl's own youth.⁶

All these ordinary items of household furniture could be obtained as easily in Scotland as in England, but when rather specialised objects were required, recourse was usually had to the south. Clocks, for example, were normally purchased by the Hamiltons in London,⁷ although when repairs
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to them were needed the duchess would send them to the famous Paul Roumieu in Edinburgh. Again, musical instruments probably came from England or the continent. Although it has been suggested that the virginals purchased by Sir John Foulis in 1680 may well have been made in Edinburgh, there seems to be no positive evidence to prove that this was so. Virginals were certainly popular in late sixteenth and in seventeenth century Scotland - Bishop Guthrie had a set in the hall of Spynie castle in 1640 - but when the 2nd marchioness of Hamilton wanted music books she had to send to London and Carlisle so it seems likely that her virginals came from there too. It would therefore appear reasonable to support the view that most musical instruments of the larger kind were imported into Scotland.

This, then, was how the main rooms of a great house were furnished, but it must be remembered that a considerable proportion of any such establishment had to be given over to 'offices'; to the kitchens, bakehouse, brewhouse, washinghouse and so on. Often the inventories of goods to be found in the kitchen are so brief as to appear ludicrously inadequate to meet the needs of a large household. At Dalkeith palace in 1661, for instance, only one brass pot is mentioned, together with a few other utensils, while even at well-equipped Panmure nine years later there were
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only sixteen pots and pans.\textsuperscript{1} This can often be explained by the fact that in many cases an inventory was only made at some time of crisis. A note at the end of the 1651 Dalkeith inventory explains that the goods mentioned were all that were left unplundered by the English when they took the house,\textsuperscript{2} and the list of moveables in Spynie castle in 1640 was drawn up on the orders of General Robert Munro when he captured it from Bishop Guthrie. (Munro's signature is scrawled in flamboyant letters at the foot of the page, while the bishop added his name in very small writing underneath.)\textsuperscript{3}

Of course not all inventories were drawn up in such dramatic circumstances: often enough they followed upon the natural death of the owner of the house, and it is not surprising that in the subsequent valuation of the plenishing the servant employed to list the entire contents of the building did not bother to detail every pot and pan in the kitchens. Such articles had little monetary value. Too much significance should not be placed on the omissions in such a list, and it would be quite wrong to assume, as some historians have done, that because a certain article is not mentioned in one or two inventories it was therefore unknown in Scotland.

Despite the brevity of the lists it is possible to form a picture of what the seventeenth century nobleman's kitchen contained. Because the cooking was done over the fire, each hearth was equipped with cruiks on

\textsuperscript{1} GD 45/18/846.
\textsuperscript{2} Ed. Sir William Fraser, The Scotts of Buccleuch, ii, 292.
\textsuperscript{3} GD 188/19.
which pans could be hung, raxes and spits - Dalkeith palace in 1651 had as many as ten of the latter - and there was usually a brander or gridiron. Pots and pans were made of copper, brass and iron, frying pans and dripping pans were very common, but cauldrons were by this time fairly rare, unless they were now being described as 'great pans'. For baking there was always an oven, and it is interesting to observe that although Marjorie Plant remarked that Sir Archibald Grant of Nymusk must have been well ahead of his time in having a copper oven in his house in the 1730's, since most ovens were made of brick, both brass and copper ovens seem to have been relatively common in the seventeenth century.

Among the rest of the kitchen equipment, skillets, graters and mortars and pestles were quite usual, and at Panmure in 1670 they had such varied items as a white iron for roasting apples and an iron for warming drinks.
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Even kettles were far more common than has sometimes been supposed, although it must be remembered that unless the word 'kettle' is preceded by 'tea', it would simply mean a saucepan.

The kitchens at Hamilton certainly seem to have been well equipped. In 1670 the master household drew up a list of goods not previously noted in some former inventory and included the usual brass pans, iron pots, spits, kettles, skimmers and chafing dishes. These were normally purchased from Edinburgh in the first place, and were carefully repaired when they became worn. The 2nd marchioness invariably sent her kettles and pans to a nearby tinker to be mended, while on many occasions the 3rd duchess called in John Black to repair the great pots and dripping pans in the palace kitchens.

As well as the usual items, some more specialised utensils were purchased for the household. The 3rd duchess bought earthen pots for stewing pears and for venison as well as for holding gravy. Henry Harper the Edinburgh merchant supplied colanders, a butter print and 'a dry cow for making sillibubs', £1.4/- was paid for a 'great greater', and in 1683 a special six foot long 'new glass square for drying of sweet-
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meats on' was acquired.  

One of the cherished illusions of Scottish social history has been the belief that drinking glasses were practically non-existant in seventeenth century Scotland and that plates were almost as scarce.  

The most cursory glance at the Customs Records will suffice to show that this was not the case: for instance, when the Anna Margaret of Grangepans sailed into Blackness harbour in November 1682, she was carrying 850 Flanders drinking glasses, 710 coarse glasses, 200 glasses of other kinds and several hundred iron pots as well as over 1,000 platters and two copper kettles - and this was but one ship among many carrying a similar cargo.  

Hamilton palace had a lavish supply of plates and crockery of all kinds. There was, of course, the family plate, presumably mostly of silver. Much of this may have been inherited from previous generations - the 2nd marquis dealt with George Heriot  

but the 3rd duke and duchess extended the collection. In 1671 the duke's purchases included one great and a dozen little salts, two sugar boxes, eighteen silver hafted knives, spoons, forks and intermazers, and the duke's purchases of plate in England have already been noticed.  

The family plate was engraved with the Hamilton coat of arms and was cleaned regularly with chalk.  
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For less formal occasions there was any number of pewter plates,\(^1\) glass plates, and special items like cracknel plates and pasty plates.\(^2\) Pewter flagons were purchased in small numbers\(^3\) and glasses in enormous quantities - crystal wine glasses,\(^4\) ale glasses,\(^5\) sack glasses,\(^6\) mum glasses,\(^7\) water glasses\(^8\) ... The quaich maker supplied wooden cups,\(^9\) and as late as 1701 the 4th duke of Hamilton bought for his wife in Edinburgh 'ane fine drinking queff of ivory and ibone hoopt with silver.'\(^10\) On a lesser level, the servants in the lattermeat hall ate from wooden trenchers\(^11\) and used horn spoons.\(^12\)

Apart from the kitchens, the other offices at Hamilton were equally well-equipped. The ale cellar was kept stocked with bottles, many of which came from the Leith glassworks,\(^13\) the brewhouse had all the usual vats, and the washing-house was kept well supplied with starch, blue and soap.\(^14\) The accounts record the purchase of 'a brisle washinge rubber' which cost 1/4d.,\(^15\) and of various smoothing irons,\(^16\) but by far the most
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interesting article of this nature is revealed in a letter written by Robert Lindsay to the 3rd duchess of Hamilton's secretary. This tells David Crawford that 'The countes off Rothes hes caused this berer com to Edinburgh expres with the Hangill which hir ladyship promised to send to hir grace when at Edinburgh. My lady thought it best to send the wright with it because he wold have the graytest cear off it and he will teach the weimen how to make it goe. If anything be wrong that blounge to it when it shall com to your hands, he will right it. The price which my lady did agrie with him for it was 53 pund Scots..."\(^1\) This letter was written on 31 March 1696, and must be one of the earliest references to a mangle: certainly the text makes it plain that the women at Hamilton had never seen such an object before.

Some of the offices seem to have been housed in separate buildings near the main structure. In 1710, for instance, a new brewhouse was built at a cost of £1,030, to replace the old broom-thatched one which had been there since before 1608.\(^2\) Close by there was the stable court, which had been rebuilt in the 1690's,\(^3\) and then there was the porter's lodge,\(^4\) a sentry box\(^5\) and the inevitable doocot.\(^6\)

This complex of buildings which formed Hamilton palace stood in extensive grounds, and from an early period the area immediately adjacent
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to the house was laid out in gardens. Ever since at least 1596 there was a regular gardener employed at Hamilton, and although there seems to be no record of what was grown there at that time, the accounts do record that Robert Hutchison, who occupied the position in the early seventeenth century, was given £10 Scots each year to spend on seeds. The current fashion was for walled gardens with plentiful flowerbeds, so it is probable that this was the pattern in the palace gardens. No doubt the Hamiltons had often seen the famous gardens at nearby Barncluith, and Hutchison was sent even further afield to see how other peers had laid out their grounds. He once went as far as Fife 'to sie ane gairden' and on another occasion went to Belton to buy some seeds.

During the 1630's a major alteration was made in the layout of the grounds with the introduction of a deer park. This was the idea of the 1st duke of Hamilton, who had apparently admired the great parks of the English aristocracy. In the 1630's he wrote to Sir Colin Campbell of Glenorochy to ask for red deer and roe deer to stock his new park, and warned Sir Colin that the roe deer must be captured young, for 'we heave the experiens in Ingland that no old ones will live.' He had previously given orders to his own men to capture some deer for him but without success, so he was delighted when Sir Colin duly supplied him with red deer.
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and young harts. He also sought deer abroad, for in a letter of 1633/4 the elector of Brandenburg promised to send him harts and hinds as desired.

In this project the duke seems to have had an enthusiastic ally in his mother, who confessed to Sir Colin Campbell that she loved the deer 'exstremely', and on another occasion mentioned to him that she kept a tame hind.

Despite the initial difficulties, the 1st duke was successful in establishing his deer park, for in the 1680's the 3rd duke was looking for some speckled male fawns for the park, and when he was in London in 1688 he wrote home to tell the duchess to 'cause try who have been the hunters of our deer and punish them severly, for as you say, if such things be past especially when you are present, what may be expected when wee ar both absent.'

Both the 3rd duke and the duchess took an active interest in the planning of their gardens, and the duchess liked nothing better than to walk about in the yards of Hamilton palace. Her own dressing-room overlooked a small garden, and she had James McLellan make a special summer seat for her 'at the corner of the old firs.' When in old age she was prevented by gout from strolling in the gardens, she had herself wheeled
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out in a 'rolling chair.'

With the coming of the Restoration, the 3rd duke apparently contemplated laying out the gardens in the new formal style. Whether he did introduce the geometrical hedges and the topiary work associated with this fashion does not emerge from the accounts, but it is recorded that various avenues of trees were now planted. Many of the old walled gardens seem to have been retained, however, and the statue and pond gardens and probably the bowling-green, all mentioned at a later date, seem to have been walled. There were various summerhouses throughout the grounds, and even the kitchen garden had two summerhouses, two garden seats and a painted and gilded concave sundial.

That flower gardens remained popular at Hamilton is revealed by the accounts for seeds bought by the duke and duchess. In 1660 the duke bought several hundred tulip bulbs as well as crocuses, iris and fritillary. Throughout the period there were beds of the popular gillyflowers, lupins and African marigolds, and in the 1700's the duchess's gardener was putting
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in hollyhocks, snapdragon, candytuft and scabious as well as trying out ranunculus, jonquil, anemones and sweet william.

Purchases of flower seeds were, however, very much secondary to the purchase of vegetable seeds. Over twenty annual accounts for seeds exist in the Hamilton Archives, and provide a very interesting picture of the sort of vegetables and herbs grown there. At one time it was imagined that a very small variety of vegetables was grown in seventeenth century Scotland,
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and that these rarely found their way to the table. The household and
garden accounts for the period show this to have been a misconception.
From at least 1660 onwards cauliflower, cabbage, onion, leeks, turnip,
lettuce, beetroot, cucumbers, carrots, parsnips, peas and radishes were
always to be found in the kitchen garden at Hamilton. The seeds for
these were usually purchased in Edinburgh from Henry Ferguson, whose
premises were 'a little above the head of the Blackfriar Wynd' and from
his successor Robert Innes. Many of the seeds for sale had been imported
from the continent, and a wide variety was available. Strasburg onions
were the most popular, but at one time or another the gardener at Hamilton
also purchased French, Flemish and Spanish onions. There was a choice
between English or Scots cabbage, orange carrot or yellow, and a wide
selection of peas - hastings, short and long hotspurs, Barnes hotspurs,
sickle peas and sugar peas.

Nor were the more unusual vegetables neglected. Asparagus seed was
purchased as early as 1661, cucumbers were put in regularly and so were
Indian cresses, spinach, and Italian celery. Obviously these vegetables
were destined for the table. It has been suggested that the small
quantities of seed purchased at any one time indicate that such vegetables
were grown as a kind of experiment and were never intended for cooking and
eating. This argument, however, arises from a failure to appreciate that
a mere four ounces of turnip seed can sow a fairly large area, the seeds
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themselves being small and light. If the household accounts do not always mention vegetables when detailing food used in the kitchens, this is often because they concentrate on the expenditure of food which had been bought in. Then again many dishes would be cooked with vegetables in them, and so these would not appear separately in the laconic descriptions of 'boiled mutton' or 'collops'.

As well as its vegetable garden, every large house at this time had a herb garden for both culinary and medicinal purposes, and Hamilton was no exception. Sweet marjoram, thyme, dill, fennel, bay, rosemary and chervil were all grown there, as well as bushes of basil and large quantities of purslane and clary, pot-herbs famous since medieval times.¹

The gardens at Hamilton were completed by a large orchard. The 3rd duke seems to have been particularly fond of cherry trees, perhaps as much for their decorative appearance as for their fruit. He purchased new trees for the cherry-yard on several occasions. There were of course old-established plum and apple trees there already,² and against the garden walls grew peach and apricot trees.³ Grafts were common too, at this time: on one occasion the duke paid £10 to Alexander Stark the Bo'ness shipmaster for '5 peaches upon appricoase, 4 peaches upon plums and 2 appricoase.'⁴ At the same time he bought half a dozen filbert nut trees

¹ Nicholas Culpeper, Complete Herbal, 93-371.
² HA 535/22/2; 446/7/16; 537/13/8.
³ HA 467/4/1.
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from him, and from London shipped home mulberry trees, fig trees and even a vine. Towards the end of the period the gardener was also trying out nectarines.

These fruits might seem very exotic for a country which, according to some observers, had very few orchards at all, but in fact fruit trees were fairly commonplace. In 1692 the earl of Crawford decided to draw up a list of the best fruit which he had tasted. The results are very interesting. At the earl's own house of Struthers there were archduke cherries, amber cherries, Kentish, May and 'Maister Millon' cherries, pears of three or four kinds including the popular bonum magnum, and strawberries and raspberries as well. The gardens at Stevenson, Durie and Leslie could all offer a wide selection of cherry trees, pears of many kinds could be sampled at the Biel, East and West Wemyss, Paisley, Tyningham and Culross, while plums of the best sort were to be found at Leslie, Bothwellhaugh, Pinkie, Achans and Yester. Apples were common everywhere - the Hopes' estate at Craighall had some particularly good ones - but more unusual fruits could be cultivated too. Apricots grew at Stevenson, Craighall, Tyningham and Durie, peaches at Leslie, Hatton and Kilwinning, and Durie could also boast some excellent nectarines.

The earl's list is particularly interesting because it was drawn up from personal experience. He had obviously tasted all the fruits in
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question, could describe their appearance, and give a very precise date for when each would be ripe. Not only did he include fruit from great houses; his list also embraced the old castle orchard at Ballinbreich, the ancient monastic plum and apple trees at Lindores and the pears growing beside the chapel of Wemyss. He even recommended the produce of such unexpected sources as Bailie Colquhoun's yard in Glasgow and James Clephan's yard in Cupar. Not surprisingly, Hamilton and Kinneil figure in his list, for he was a first cousin of the 3rd duchess, but although Hamilton is mentioned for its nonesuch pears, duchess damsons, orange apricots, malcotton pears, white globe gooseberries and great bright redcurrants, it receives no particular attention: the orchard there was not exceptional, but was just one among many in Scotland at that time.

Such then was the palace of Hamilton in the seventeenth century - an impressive mansion standing in extensive grounds and forming the background for an important and interesting group of people. For almost the entire period the house was occupied by the ducal family, although the size of that family fluctuated considerably throughout the years. In 1625 the palace was the home of the widowed 2nd marchioness and her young children, and as her sons left home and her daughters married the household gradually decreased until for a time the marchioness was the only representative of the Hamiltons living there. With the political troubles of the 1640's, the first duke sent home his two small daughters, Lady Anne and Lady Susanna, to be brought up by their grandmother. The marchioness died in 1647,¹ and from then onwards Hamilton was occupied by Lady Anne, her sister

¹ Hamilton O.P.R., i.
Susanna and their four young cousins.

During the troubled period of the Cromwellian invasion, the 3rd duchess, as Lady Anne had now become, was forced to leave the palace, and took up residence in the greater safety of Brodick and then Avendale. Incidentally, it is interesting to note that not only the honours of Scotland were sent to Dunottar castle for safety. In December 1651 the duchess wrote to the governor thanking him 'for the sheltere which some papers that are now mine heave had under your protectione.'

With the coming of more peaceful times and her marriage to the earl of Selkirk, the duchess was able to return to the palace, where a happy new era began. In the years which followed, she and her husband lived at Hamilton with their large family, and their household was further augmented by the presence of Lady Margaret Kennedy and her gentlewoman, the 2nd duke's three younger daughters, the 3rd duke's young brother Lord James Douglas, his nephews the earl of Annandale and Lord William Douglas, and later on the duke's ward Mary Dunbar.

Towards the end of the century the family diminished. The daughters married, the sons spent most of their time elsewhere, and then the duke himself died. Although the duchess for a time had Lord Basil to help her, with his untimely death she was left to preside over a household of women and children. It fell to her to bring many of her grandchildren up and Mary Dunbar, Lord Basil's widow, stayed on in the palace with her

1 HL 5949.
2 N.L.S., 2051, 73.
children. This remained the situation until the duchess's own death in 1716.

No matter how small the family occupying the palace, a large staff was always needed to run such an extensive establishment, and so at Hamilton there was always a veritable fleet of servants. These may be divided into the two categories of indoor and outdoor servants. Nominally the most important man of the staff was the steward or master household,¹ and indeed he was responsible for all the lesser servants and for the running of the household generally. Nonetheless, there were other principal servants of equal if not greater importance. Some of these were what might be termed personal assistants to the duke and duchess - the duke's gentlemen² and the duchess's gentlewomen and wardrobe women,³ who looked after their graces' private expenditure, supervised their wardrobe and helped them generally. These were usually well born people from good local families: the Porterfields of that Ilk served the Hamiltons for several generations⁴ and the duchess's housekeeper was Mrs Anna Montgomerie, the daughter of her old friend and neighbour Andrew Hay of Craignethan.⁵

Apart from these personal servants, qualified for their position by their birth, there were other professional men who had needed some sort of training. One of the people whom the 3rd duke and duchess relied upon most
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was the secretary. This was a position which seems to have increased in importance as the years went by. Although the 1st duke of Hamilton had a secretary when he was in England in the 1640's, it was not until much later that the Scottish peers began to employ someone to act in this capacity. The earl of Seafield had a secretary by 1703, the duchess of Buccleuch's is mentioned in 1706, and a year later the secretaries of the duke of Atholl, the earl of Loudon and Lord Sinclair all became burgesses of Glasgow. Initially the 3rd duke seems to have used one of his gentlemen as a secretary, for it would appear that during the 1670's James Smith gradually took over this function but in about 1678 a full-time secretary was appointed.

David Crawford, the son of Duncan Crawford of Knockshinnoch, remained at the palace from then until after the 3rd duchess's death in 1716, and was in fact a lawyer with his own practice in Edinburgh. This created difficulties, however, for he found it hard to divide his time between his own concerns and the affairs of the 3rd duke. When his grace took him to London in 1687, he had cause to complain that 'David Crawford is very pressing to be home at his business about the session, and truly if I could get any other he is not worth pressing to stay.' Stay he did,
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however, and in 1693 the duke was still complaining that 'David Crawfurd takes a great liberty to wait when he pleases, but servants are not to be had, or he should get what time he pleased.'

This problem was resolved after the duke's death when the duchess persuaded Crawford to come and live permanently at Hamilton. By this time he was obviously a man of substance. He had been made a burgess of Hamilton and of the Canongate, and when he built a new house at Hamilton to accommodate himself, his wife and their eight children, he employed the celebrated James Smith as architect. The result was so splendid that Lord Basil wrote to tell the earl of Arran that 'Mr Crawford has built a fine house where Mrs Nasmith's house was but nearer to the park', adding critically, 'it is after the fashion of the laird of Livingston's house and as many windows in front as his, by which you may see some folks are not loosers by her grace's service.'

David Crawford looked after the duke and duchess's correspondence, wrote out many of the account books and business and legal documents needed in the running of the household and estates, and was obviously a confidential adviser of his employers. For many years he had as his colleague another lawyer, Arthur Nasmith, who is usually described simply as 'writer in Hamilton' but who was actually employed by the duchess in a
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legal capacity whenever a notary's services were required.

The other two professional men in the household were the chaplain and the governor. The Register of the Privy Council mentions James Johnstoun, minister at Stenhouse, as being chaplain to the 1st duke of Hamilton, but not until the 1680's does there seem to have been a permanent chaplain attached to the household. Mr Simon Gilly occupied this position from 1689-90, to be succeeded by Mr David Brodie, a graduate of Aberdeen whose mother was a Forbes and who may therefore have been related to the earl of Arran's governor Mr James Forbes. Mr Brodie in 1698 became minister at Dalserf, whereupon Mr George Peden took over his position in the palace until about 1709 he left to become chaplain in the provost of Hamilton's family. As for a governor, the 1st and 2nd dukes had their own pedagogues, and in common with other noblemen of the period, the 3rd duke employed a resident governor for his young family.

Such then, were the principal servants in the household. There was also a host of lesser men and women with varying degrees of responsibility. Both the duke and duchess had their own page, and the duke usually employed a valet-de-chambre. Most peers at this time employed a fairly large kitchen staff, and this was the case at Hamilton. The food was bought in
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by the caterer or provisor, \(^1\) and in charge of the actual cooking was James Greenlees, \(^2\) master cook in the palace for over forty years, presiding over two undercooks (one of whom was for a time his own son James \(^3\)), several kitchen boys, \(^4\) pantry boys \(^5\) and scullerymen \(^6\) as well as a baker and his helper \(^7\) and sometimes a confectioner. The ale and wine were looked after by a butler, whose sole function at that period was to supervise the cellars: not every household had one, although there were butlers at Hamilton, \(^8\) Mellerstain \(^9\) and Huntingtower, \(^10\) and almost every establishment had its own brewer. \(^11\)

The remainder of the indoor staff consisted of a few women servants. A number of women were employed in the nurseries to look after the youngest members of the family, \(^12\) there was a chambermaid, \(^13\) a washerwoman \(^14\) and a dairymaid, \(^15\) but otherwise the staff was predominantly male. This preponderance of menservants is explained by the large number employed out of doors. In charge of the stables was a master of the horse, \(^16\) who
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supervised one and later two coachmen,¹ two postilions,² several grooms³ and two or three footmen.⁴ Then of course there were the gardens. For many years Hugh Wood, a Quaker, was the head gardener at Hamilton, employing six men to work under him.⁵ When he retired he was succeeded by his son Alexander, who remained there until his early death.⁶ Robert Darlo was supervisor of the other outside workers in the grounds, and in addition there were various porters⁷ and carters,⁸ and a henwife.⁹ Finally, there was a group of miscellaneous servants. From as early as 1546 the Hamiltons employed a trumpeter,¹⁰ presumably for ceremonial occasions; many seventeenth century peers did so too.¹¹ The 2nd marchioness had in her household a musician named John Gray, who played the lute and who may have taught her daughters to play the virginals.¹² On special occasions such as marriages and parliaments the 3rd duke would hire violers¹³ and for several years he also employed a resident harper, Jago McFlahertie, who seems to have taken responsibility for other forms of music too, in 1682 being sent to buy strings for the virginals.¹⁴
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It is interesting to note in passing that although several Scottish peers\(^1\) - notably the earls of Annandale\(^2\) - continued the ancient practice of keeping a fool, the Hamiltons did not do so. Probably such an addition to the household was frowned upon by the more puritanical peers, and indeed one can hardly imagine either the 3rd duke or his wife having any time for an extravagance of this sort. The successive dukes were not, however, averse to other forms of entertainment, and regularly had on their staff falconers,\(^3\) fowlers\(^4\) and huntsmen.\(^5\)

At any one time, then, the duke of Hamilton's household was likely to include anything from twenty to sixty permanent servants,\(^6\) many of whom actually lived on the premises. It has often been supposed that servants formed a depressed and exploited sector of society, living a spartan existence, barefoot, poorly clad and subsisting on a diet of oatmeal, their high rate of mobility being attributed to poor conditions which forced them to make constant changes of employment in an attempt to find better conditions.\(^7\) If this description fitted any household in Scotland, it did not apply at Hamilton, and although lists of servants' wages from the early part of the seventeenth century do not appear to have survived, later accounts show that the Hamilton servants were rather well paid in comparison with their contemporaries.
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The accompanying table is an attempt to demonstrate this point by quoting some of the few comparative figures available, and at the same time to show the wage structure at Hamilton. It is interesting to note that the most highly paid of all the staff was the secretary. With £480 p.a. and an allowance of £50 for paper and ink, he was receiving more than twice as much as any other servant there - the figure of £300 or £240 for the gardener is deceptively high because it included the wages of the six men under him. The chaplain received £200 a year, and the other principal servants, the gentlemen and gentlewomen and the provisor, had £120. Of the lesser servants, it is curious to note that the falconer, warrander and coachmen were better paid than, for example, the butler and the master cook.

It is also noticeable that these wages remained very much fixed throughout the period. From 1659 until 1710 the gentlewomen received £120 a year, and during all the years of his long service, James Greenlees the cook had £66:13:4 annually. Where the wages did change, it was usually because someone had left and his successor was either better or less well qualified, so that his salary varied accordingly: when the reliable gardener Alexander Wood died, his relatively inexperienced successor George Jamieson received £60 less for himself and his men, and Anthony Murray, John Peacock's successor as butler, received only £60 instead of £75. Only occasionally was a real increase paid, as when Patrick Young the postilion had his fee increased from £33 to £48 in 1708. Otherwise, wages

1 Table III.
remained static, which was reasonable enough in a century when the value of money remained relatively constant.

The above payments were all made in money, but in addition certain of the outside servants were given quantities of meal. In 1706-7 the gardener was getting 39 bolls of victual for himself and his men,\(^1\) the keeper of the great park had 8 bolls per annum,\(^2\) and the carters, outdoor workers and porters also received payments in meal.\(^3\) The indoor servants usually received their livery\(^4\) or an allowance for clothing agreed upon when they entered the Hamiltons' service. When James Bishop first came as a groom in October 1669 it was arranged that 'he is to have yearly £24 of wages, £6 to buy linning, with his clothes and buitts'\(^5\) and similarly when Christopher Whyte was taken on a year later it was stated that 'he is to doe al that is requyred of him as coachman and other things for which he is to have yearly £5 sterling (English born servants were normally paid in sterling) and his livery as the rest of the servants getts, a pair of showes and stokins to his liveries.'\(^6\)

Many of the servants were also provided with accommodation: the gentlemen and women, provisor, pages and footmen all had rooms in the palace, and sometimes the dukes arranged for accommodation elsewhere. In 1664, for instance, the 3rd duke paid for his French cook's lodgings in
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Michael Nasmith's house,¹ and a few years later he leased from John Lang a house lived in by his trumpeter Robert Wallace,² while the duchess paid for repairs to her keeper of the high park's house in 1695.³ Some of the servants were substantial enough men to own property themselves. David Crawford's fine new house has already been noted, Arthur Nasmith inherited a number of houses in Hamilton,⁴ and Quentin Golder the duchess's baker possessed a 16/8d. land in Quarter.⁵

There is no indication of how the servants' rooms in the palace were furnished, except for one mention of a payment to a local tailor who had made 'two feather beds [i.e. mattresses] and a bolster to the servants.'⁶ Normally their chambers were furnished with a bedstead, some tables and chairs and perhaps a chest or two. Those servants who lived in, and indeed some of those who did not, ate together downstairs in the lattermeat hall. Their tables were decently laid out with a linen cloth and wooden trenchers,⁷ and if the food was monotonous at least it was sustaining, consisting as it did of mutton, veal, eggs, oatmeal and herrings.⁸ In 1700, each person is recorded as being given one pint of ale a day, the principal servants being allowed extra ale sent up to their rooms or served at table.⁹

¹ HA 465/6/10.
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³ HA 446/7/5.
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Not only the physical requirements of the servants were given attention; the duchess also saw to their education and spiritual welfare.  

It was she who paid the expenses when any of the servants fell ill, and purchases of medicine, food and clothing for them were entered on the same accounts as similar goods bought for herself and her own family. The duchess often paid part of the expenses when her servants married, indeed the Scottish nobility in the 17th century frequently attended the weddings of their servants and the baptisms of the children, and when they retired she supported them as pensioners. Finally, when any servant died, his funeral was financed by her grace, and any arrears of wages were punctiliously paid to the surviving relatives.

Of course there were the usual complaints about the difficulty of getting staff, and the 3rd duke was inclined to grumble about individual servants. In addition to his remarks about David Crawford in London in 1693, he declared of his caterer, 'Lamb is but an useless servant to me here as he was on the road up', later going so far as to tell his wife 'John Lamb's a beast and Harkness [the footman] I have turned away.'
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duchess too had her problems with the staff: her butler Jennings who made off with the empty bottles was also over-fond of their contents, an Irish boy whom she employed was inclined to help himself to anything he fancied, and there were always servants who were lazy and inefficient.

All this, however, was outweighed by the genuine good feeling which existed between the Hamiltons and most of their staff. The 3rd duke was really grieved when his young valet was accidentally killed, and in the summer of 1698 the duchess was reported as being very upset because news had come to Edinburgh that Loudon, one of her grooms, had been drowned when swimming in the Clyde with some of the other servants: although a good swimmer he had become entangled in the weeds and rushes. Again, when the duchess's page John Porterfield was arrested in 1706 in an attempt to bring pressure to make her grace cease her opposition to the Union, she wrote at once to her eldest son asking him to do what he could in the matter, for the page 'was born and bred up in my family and had been my servant ever since, and carried himself well and soberly. I never knew him guilty of any crime or ill thing...and because he is but a tender lad I hope his grace [Queensberry] will not allow him to be put in prison.' Finally, it must be remembered that the duchess's own son, Lord Basil, sacrificed his life for one of his servants. In August 1701, his brother the earl of Selkirk had been visiting him in Galloway, then towards the end of the month
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decided to move on to Cassilis to see their aunt. Lord Basil insisted on accompanying him for part of the way, together with some servants. As the party crossed the waters of the Minnoch, de Tang, a French boy who waited upon Lord Basil's young son, got into difficulties. As the others stood helplessly on the shore Lord Basil waded in to try to save the boy, but the current was too strong and both were swept away. 1 Lord Basil was only twenty-nine when he was drowned, and had been in many ways perhaps the finest of the duchess's seven sons.

There may, in fact, have been a particular bond between the 3rd duchess and some of her servants as a result of the privations they had suffered together in the 1650's, but whether because of that or because of the good conditions in the palace, although many of the staff came and went within a relatively short period, there was a permanent nucleus of long-standing servants. It is not possible to state categorically how long any one servant remained in employment at the palace, for apart from a few complete lists of the household, such information must be gleaned from the accounts and is not necessarily complete. Nevertheless, it is possible to say that out of 312 servants who were at Hamilton from 1658 until 1712, at least 50 remained for a minimum of ten years. 2

Those who left did so for a number of reasons. At least 33 died in service, 3 and in that age of high mortality this number should probably be

1 Chron. Atholl, i, 489; HL 7575, 6570, 4986, 7907, 7378, 8142, 5513.
2 Table IV.
3 HL 7424, 9066; HA 606/5; 537/18; 491/17/1; 120/8; 526/27/12; 405/6/1; 469/1; 526/27/12; 516/5/3; 491/17/1; 554/1/17; 491/17/1; 463/15/57; 532/3/1; 526/17; N.L.S. 1031, 105; Hamilton O.P.R., ii.
greater. Women servants usually left to marry, men departed to other positions - Alexander Sutherland 'went home to be cook to my Lord Strathallan'² and Nicol Neilson the cookboy entered the service of Lord Murray³ - and some left domestic service altogether - Patrick Fleming the under-butler 'took on to be a souldier.'⁴ In general, it would seem that there was the highest turnover among coachmen and butlers, and it can have been no coincidence that those positions were frequently occupied by Englishmen who presumably decided that they preferred the south. It is not easy to calculate just how many of the servants were indeed English, unless their name makes it obvious or unless there is a record of their being hired in London. From time to time there were French pages and valets at Hamilton,⁵ and the 3rd duchess employed one of the fashionable negro footmen, known to the rest of the household as John Timothy the Black.⁶

On the whole, however, these English and foreign servants were in the minority, and a good many of the servants in the palace were drawn from local families. Not unexpectedly, a proportion of them bore the surname of Hamilton, but this long-established custom of a peer being surrounded by retainers who bore his name or had adopted it seems to have been declining throughout the 17th century. In 1629, for example, the earl of Wigtown's
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son was made a burgess of Glasgow, and along with him four of the earl's servants who bore the family name, in 1642 two of the earl of Findlater's servants named Ogilvie received a similar honour, and in 1645 the marquis of Argyll had at least three Campbells in his household, but after that those servants on the burgess rolls rarely shared their master's name.

As evidence, this is very incomplete, but there are other indications of this movement away from employing servants linked by the bond of kinship. A list of those at Panmure in 1679-80 does not include one Maule, the earl of Crawford did not have a single Lindsay in his Edinburgh house when the poll tax returns were made, and there were no Hays in the marquis of Tweeddale's household in 1682. Similarly at Hamilton, although it can be noted that out of a random 30 servants of the 2nd marchioness whose names are known, 7 bore the surname of Hamilton, in her granddaughter's time only 18 out of 312 did so. The majority of these eighteen did however hold responsible positions. Two were chamberlains, two were masters household, two were head porters and three were taken on as pages. This tendency to keep fewer servants of the family name but to employ them in important positions is reflected in other households too. In 1654 Lord Elphinstone's master household was an Elphinstone, the duke of
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of Queensberry's gentleman of the horse in 1691 was a Douglas,¹ and in 1709 the duchess of Argyll's secretary was a Campbell.²

Apart from those servants in Hamilton palace who were named Hamilton, many of them were drawn from local families with a long tradition of service in the household. Because of deficiencies in the Old Parish Registers it would be a long-term task to work out the exact relationships between the servants; suffice it to say that the Hamiltons were served by successive generations of Baillies, Flemings, Jacks, Lambs, Loudons, Nasmiths and Porterfields. Families like the Jacks,³ Lambies,⁴ Golders⁵ and Barrs⁶ had been in the burgh for years, and their names recur as frequently in the parish records as they do in the lists of servants at Hamilton palace. In this as in other ways is stressed the continuing importance of local and kinship connections in the lives of the dukes of Hamilton.

¹ Roll of Canongate Burgesses, 22.
² Ibid., 147.
³ GD 85/78, 133, 147, 270.
⁴ GD 85/64, 68.
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2. Other Hamilton Homes.

In addition to their extensive lands in the west of Scotland, the dukes of Hamilton owned the baronies of Kinneil, Carridden and Polmont on the River Forth, their seat being at Kinneil, just outside their own port of Bo'ness. The original Kinneil Castle had been built as a three storey block in 1553, but throughout its history it suffered a series of misfortunes, the first of which was that less than twenty years after its erection it was demolished with powder and only the lower part of the west wall survived. Shortly afterwards a new L-shaped house was built near the original site: and this is the portion best preserved today and famous for its wall paintings.

This L-shaped house was occupied quite frequently by the 1st marquis of Hamilton, but after that it stood empty for long periods. The reason for this was that these baronies formed the jointure lands for the various marchionesses and duchesses of Hamilton, but owing to the accidents of history there was rarely the occasion for a dowager to make it her permanent home. The second marchioness when widowed in 1625 stayed on at Hamilton to run the estates for her son who was usually in London. The 3rd marchioness predeceased her husband and in any case never did visit Scotland. The 2nd duchess remarried when her husband died and resigned her rights to Kinneil, and of course the 3rd duchess inherited the family honours herself. In addition, although Kinneil was conveniently situated for Edinburgh, as hereditary keepers of the palace of Holyroodhouse the Hamiltons had much more convenient apartments there.
With the coming of the Civil War, a further disaster overtook the castle. It was captured by the Cromwellian army, the entire furniture was 'caryed away be the Englishes'\(^1\) and the house itself together with the valuable coal and salt revenues was made over to General Monk, in whose hands it remained until after the Restoration.

Once regained by the Hamiltons, its fortunes took a turn for the better when the 3rd duke decided on an extensive programme of rebuilding. During the 1660's he had a new block built on the site of the original structure, adding two pavilions and linking it up with the existing L-shaped house to form a recessed courtyard. Apparently he intended building another wing on the south side to balance the L-shaped part, but he never did so, possibly because of the danger of subsidence from the underlying ditch of the Antonine Wall.\(^2\)

By the end of the 17th century Kinneil was generally accepted as being a very pleasant place. An anonymous writer of 1697 described it as 'a very fine house indeed'\(^3\) while the earl of Selkirk declared it to be 'an extreame sweet place',\(^4\) and the 3rd duke himself had told his eldest son, 'I wish you wer here just now to see how sweet a place this is. I am sure a litle more charge bestowed on it wold mak it that there is scarce a finer seat in Scotland and may compare with Hamilton itself', adding 'but I need not insist on this subject for I fear you will hardly be prevailled on to
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thinke of a countrey life which I am sure is the happist on in this world.\(^1\)

The purpose of the 3rd duke and duchess in improving the castle was to make it an attractive home for their heir, the earl of Arran, until he should inherit Hamilton. Unfortunately, the earl had his own ideas about settling down in Scotland and it was only when his financial situation made it impossible for him to stay on in London that he at last took up house at Kinneil in the spring of 1690.\(^2\) Had things been different, he might well have made this his permanent home: he and his young wife spent a few happy months there and on 13 March 1689/90 the countess gave birth to a daughter in the castle. However, only a few weeks later she contracted a fever, and died in early June. The earl remained in Scotland for a short time, then returned to London.

For several years the house once more stood empty, except for periodical visits by the duke and duchess when on their way to and from Edinburgh. Hitherto the revenues from the Kinneil estates had been used for improvements and for the running of the castle generally, but now a high proportion of the rents was sent to the earl in London: in 1693, for instance, the total income from the estates was £17,332, of which £8,264 was sent south,\(^3\) and the earl's chamberlain was the recipient of a constant stream of letters from his lordship in a similar tone to the one he wrote on 11 February 1693/4 telling the chamberlain, 'with all dilligence gett in the rentes for I shall nead them and yow can noe way give so good
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demonstration of your serving me faithfully then by gettin them in quickly, which will recommend you better to me then any other thing. ¹

With his remarriage, however, and his accession to his mother's titles, he returned to Scotland and in the last decade of his life spent more time there than he had done since childhood. His family redoubled their efforts to persuade him to take an interest in Kinneil. In 1700 Lord Basil described to the duke how he had visited the castle and 'walked through all the parks and gardens...it's a most charming place and capable of a good deal of improvement', ² while his brother-in-law the earl of Tullibardine told him a month later, 'I took my wife to see your improvements at Kinneil where shee had not been these ten yeares. The place is very agreable and nothing was wanting but the master and mistrees's company.'³ At last, the duke himself in 1701 admitted that Kinneil was 'a verie sweet place', and even declared himself vexed that he had been away so long.⁴ From then onwards he began to take an active interest in his estates, telling his wife in 1705, 'I am making Kenill verie pretty for you: I neaver saw it look soe sweet as now'⁵ and when in London he even took the trouble to send home to his chamberlain various letters and memoranda about the running of the castle.⁶

Although small, Kinneil was a comfortable place in which to stay when

¹ HL 9776.
² HL 4680.
³ HL 4575.
⁴ N.L.S., 1031, 226.
⁵ HL 5279.
⁶ HL 5441.
any of the dukes did choose to visit it, indeed even in the 1st duke's time it seems to have been furnished quite luxuriously. To the modern eye, the most notable feature of the house as he knew it would have been the famous wall paintings, large portions of which still survive. The exceptionally fine Good Samaritan series had been painted when the L-shaped block was new, then in the 1630's the 2nd marchioness commissioned a whole series of paintings, executed by no less than Valentine Jenkin, the English mural artist who had worked at Falkland, Holyrood and Stirling;¹ the Hamilton Accounts record, 'To Vallantyn the paynter upon his task £20:6/-' in August 1634, and, 'Given to Vallentyne Jenkin for painting the galleis £100', also in 1634.²

As for the furniture in the castle, the inventory of goods taken to Holland in 1648 gives a glimpse of what was then in the chambers. The items sent to the 2nd duke included the bedding for various four-posters:

'the rich red velvat bed with brod gold and silver lace...a red scarlet bed lyned with blew and yellow taiftie wrought in chaker wayes all freinged about with blew and yellow freinge...ane rid cloth bed embroutherit with blak velvat and yellow silk...ane rid bed of cloth all laced with rid and yellow laice and lyned with red taiftie...ane grein taifitie bed flowrit with gold...' and a good deal of bedlinen and tablelinen. Also sent overseas were silver candlesticks and a little silver gilt basin.

At the end of the inventory is a list entitled 'Left behind in the

² HA 210/2/28.
House of Kinneil' which supplies some more information about the interior, and at the same time reveals the state of disorder in the house at the time. Most of the bedding not sent away had been taken up to the High Chamber, and in a cabinet in that room the servants had put 'all the pictors and all my lord's marthameticall instruments and all the sords with the crosebowes and 4 slide candilstickes, some carpettes, 4 peices of hangings some gunes and carabines.' This room also contained two rich cabinets, 'ane with pearell and gold and silk wrought and a gold freinge and a lather caice' as well as several chairs. Lady Lovat's chamber had been used to store 'a great daill of match' and several barrels of gunpowder, while the Red Chamber contained trunks of clothing, more bedlinen, red window curtains and 'the great carpette'. Still more clothing was piled up in the Tiled Chamber, where there also lay a heterogeneous collection of articles including a drum, a great number of stools and chairs, some red, some embroidered and some of cloth of silver, one or two glasses, a fir cabinet indented with pearl, and a few more guns.

These lists indicate that Kinneil had been very well furnished, but apparently that furniture not sent to Holland was pillaged by the English in the 1650's - although whether what they took was what we today would term furniture remains uncertain: the more usual word in the seventeenth century was 'plenishing', and the 'furniture' taken by the English might well mean guns or some such item.

With the rebuilding, however, the house was once more made habitable, and an inventory forming part of the 4th duke's testament details the

1 Register of Testaments, Edinburgh, 88, 16 June 1722.
contents in 1712. The main rooms throughout were hung with tapestry, and many of them had turkey carpets on the floor. The walls in the new part were panelled, and the staircase, doorcases and fireplaces have been described as simple, but 'admirably finished.' The main chambers were now in the 5-storey high new block. There, the great staircase, hung with prints and a painting of the battle of Bothwell Bridge, led up to the Great Diningroom. This had an oval oak table, two square tables and a number of Russia leather chairs. Next door was the Little Diningroom with its own table and chairs. The nearby drawingroom contained a slate table surrounded by a dozen cane chairs, and among the ten oval paintings on the wall (presumably copies of the famous set by Kneller at Hamilton) was a portrait of the earl of Arran's first wife.

The 4th duchess's bedchamber was furnished in blue, and contained a large looking glass and table, a teatable and several armchairs, Dutch wicker chairs and footstools. Fifteen paintings hung round the walls, including 'a bad copie of the old countess of Sunderland in a straw hat' and a portrait of the duchess's own father. The duchess's dressingroom opened off her bedchamber, and in her closet she kept a japanned writing table covered with green velvet, a round japanned table and some Dutch chairs.

The 4th duke's room was handsomely furnished in Indian calico, the bed having curtains of this material lined with 'changeable silk.' The Russia bottomed and cane chairs had green cushions, and the table, stands and looking glass were made of walnut. One interesting feature of the room

---

1 H.M.C. Inventory of Ancient Monuments in the Counties of Midlothian... 191.
was a large sphere. The duke's antechamber was plainly furnished, but he also had two closets. The East Closet must have been a fairly large room, and it was there that the duke had his folding writing-table. The walls were hung with flowered silk, there was a striped silver and silk armchair to recline in, and he even had a telescope at hand. The North Closet was a rather smaller room, the main item of furniture being a walnut escritoire.

The other principal chambers in the castle were mostly bedchambers. The room known as the 3rd duke's was well-furnished with a crimson damask bedstead and an inlaid table, stands and looking-glass. The earls of Selkirk and Ruglen and Lord Basil also had rooms in the house, but these were not much used and were not elaborately furnished.

Various servants were also accommodated in the castle. The duke's valet occupied a chamber near his grace's own. The valet slept in a bed hung with old blue curtains, and had several chairs and tables in his room, together with a wainscot press in which stood his master's wig block. The pages had a chamber hung with old gilded leather, and the bed there seems to have been the only item of furniture. Anthony Elie the provisor had more comfortable quarters in a room with chairs and tables as well as a bed, while the footmen all slept together in a chamber with four beds. The duchess's gentlewoman had the best of the servants' rooms. Hers was furnished in green serge and had various items of furniture as well as an extra box-bed.

Finally, there were the offices. The castle had at least two kitchens, with the usual copper pots and pans, stewing pans, fish pans and
kettles. A pantry contained three beds as well as the household utensils, and there were three larders, an ale cellar and a wine cellar as well as a brewhouse. The offices were completed by a porter's lodge and by the stables, which included a coachhouse.

The windows on the north side of Kinneil look out over the River Forth, while those on the east front face a grassy area which was once laid out in gardens. As early as 1553 there had been a garden at Kinneil; in that year the duke of Châtelherault had seeds from the yards of Holyroodhouse sent there, 'lettous seid and ane unce of mariolene seids', and on one occasion his Edinburgh gardener went to Dunfermline 'to seik floures to my lorde governoures yaird in Kynneill.'

Later accounts, as it happens, make no mention of flowers, and it seems that the 3rd duke and his gardener were more concerned with the vegetables and the fruit. Of course, Kinneil's gardens were on a much smaller scale than those at Hamilton, but in the 1680's the duke had Henry Ferguson send out to the castle seeds for French leeks and onions, carrot and turnip, beetroot, lettuce, radish and spinach. Artichokes were tried out as early as 1667, and asparagus plants were brought from Holland to be put in the kitchen garden where even melons and cucumbers were now being grown successfully.

According to the family themselves, however, the best part of the

1 Accounts of the Lord High Treasurer, x, 174.
2 HA 538/10/5; 538/6/25; 538/7/24; 60/18/6; 448/14/9.
3 HA 467/1/60.
4 HL 9066; HA 463/11/1; 516/24/3, 4.
garden was the orchard. In his 'Judgment of fruits in order sett down as I esteem them', the earl of Crawford referred to the Murray pear and the brethern pear, and interestingly enough two pear trees had been taken from Struthers to Kinneill in 1664. Cherry trees were planted round the walls of the kitchen garden and peaches and apricots were also grown. Some of this fruit was always sent to Hamilton for consumption by the 3rd duchess and her family, but the remainder was sold and the proceeds included in the estate revenues. An interesting memorandum of 17 July 1696 records that Henry Anderson, gardener in Grange, and William Pinkartoun, gardener in Linlithgow, 'being conveind at the desier of Daniel Hamilton, chamberlan of Kinneill to comprise and vallou the haill pears, aples, ploumbs, cherries, goossberries and currenberries of the yeards of Kinneill, doe find the samen (except and thos in the north yeard which are reserved for her grace the Dutches her use) to be worth only the sum of twintie pound Scots money.' A letter from the earl of Ruglen later that year refers to the poorness of the season, and generally the fruit from Kinneil was much appreciated by the family. Finally, mention must be made of an intriguing occupant of the castle grounds. In the 1700-2 lists of fodder for the animals, mention is made of a small quantity of peas fed 'to the Antelope', which apparently roamed about on the hillside.
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behind the house.  

Although from the very start there was always a gardener at Kinneil, the castle itself was normally run by a very small staff because the family so rarely stayed for any length of time. Both the house and the estates were supervised by a chamberlain directly responsible to the duke, and under his directions a cook, chambermaid and a few outside workers were responsible for the upkeep of Kinneil. On those occasions when the first three dukes did spend a few nights in the castle, they brought with them any other servants needed - grooms, footmen, a coachman and so on.

This situation remained unaltered until the arrival home of the earl of Arran. During both the periods of his residence at Kinneil - in 1690-1 and from 1699 onwards - the staff was considerably enlarged to form a small but complete household. The permanent servants stayed on, of course, but the earl now appointed a master household, a provisor, a butler and cook, footmen and grooms, and had with him his own gentlemen and his wife's ladies. For a brief period in 1690, the castle must have been fully-staffed, but with the death of his first wife the earl dismissed most of his servants and took the rest back with him to London, leaving only the original permanent servants and his English provisor Anthony Elie.

With the earl's return as duke in 1699, the castle was once more opened up for several months of the year. By now, of course, his grace had
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his own establishments in Lancashire and in London, so that many of the
gentlemen and lesser servants who accompanied him to Kinneil were English:
people like William Makepeace, ¹ Roger Dewhurst and Richard Lloyd. ² This
somewhat hybrid household was completed by a number of servants whom the
4th duke borrowed from his mother: John Peacock the butler had started
off as a butler's man in Hamilton palace, ³ John Boniman had been a footman
there ⁴ and Patrick Douglas had served the duchess as postilion before
becoming one of her son's grooms. ⁵

The miscellaneous nature of the household at Kinneil in the 1700's
was the direct result of the fact that the castle was not a permanent home
of the dukes of Hamilton. In the seventeenth century it never did fulfil
its intended function as a dower house, and, charmingly situated and
comfortably furnished though it was, it nevertheless formed no more than an
agreeable adjunct to their real home in Hamilton palace.

This was equally true of the dukes' other possessions. The Abbot's
House at Arbroath had its own permanent staff of Hamilton servants, ⁶ and
the 2nd marchioness stayed there for a few weeks every year, sometimes in
company with the 1st duke, ⁷ but for most of the time the chamberlain and
agent were in charge there, and of course in 1636 the abbacy passed out of
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the Hamiltons' possession. Then again, Brodick castle was a secure
retreat in time of political upheaval, and Avendale was also essentially a
defensive structure until destroyed by the Cromwellian forces: the 3rd
duke had it rebuilt in the 1680's but the family never stayed there.
Similarly, although the 3rd duke undertook an extensive scheme of
modernisation at Crawford castle, it too remained unoccupied. Indeed,
the only other place in Scotland where the first four dukes of Hamilton
spent any length of time was the palace of Holyroodhouse.

There are no details available about the periods of residence in
Edinburgh of the 1st and 2nd dukes, but the letters and accounts do afford
information about the later years. It seems that at first the 3rd duke
often took lodgings in town and did not occupy the hereditary keeper's
apartments in Holyrood at all. In the 1670's, however, his chambers
there were among those repaired, and after that he and the duchess
frequently stayed there, although the palace remained a vastly uncomfort-
able place in which to live. Because of its lowlying position it was
notoriously damp, and even after the repairs of the 1670's it soon
deteriorated again. A sudden thaw in the winter of 1694/5 caused water
to pour in at the roof, flooding the earl of Arran's rooms, seeping
through into the earl of Cassilis's, and ruining a fine bed and other
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furniture in Lord Linlithgow's. 1 The hiring of workmen to improve matters
could have even more disastrous consequences as the duke had discovered
some ten years before when joiners working in the garrets had allowed a
fire to start, endangering the entire building. 2

Then again, the palace was always overcrowded and the Hamiltons were
beset by the problems arising from their fellow-peers squabbling over their
various claims to have rooms there. 3 When the marquis of Tweeddale was
supposed to vacate some chambers in 1694 he departed leaving all of them
locked and taking the keys with him, so that the 3rd duke had to give
orders to have the doors forced open, 4 and a few months later the marquis's
servants tried to evict the duchess of Hamilton's underkeeper from the
latter's rightful lodgings in the palace. Moreover, not only were the
aristocracy continually claiming rooms in the palace; in 1687 the 3rd
duke complained that the garrets of both the clerk register and the marquis
of Atholl's lodgings 'are filled with the famelys of litle tradsmen and
other litle people, which keeps all these staires and that part off the
house nasty and in disorder.' 5

Despite all its disadvantages, Holyrood was a convenient place in
which to stay during parliament, and the Hamiltons were able to furnish
their apartments with their own belongings. 6 In the late 1640's the earl
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of Lanark had various beds, tables and pictures stored in the cellars, and forty years later the 3rd duke and duchess occupied an extensive suite of rooms comfortably furnished with the usual four posters, walnut tables, armchairs and so forth. The accounts record a constant coming and going between Hamilton and Holyrood, with servants transporting all manner of household and personal goods from one to the other. The 3rd duke always had his own permanent housekeeper in the palace, and on special occasions he would hire extra servants, but otherwise, as at Kinneil, the household was made up of servants from Hamilton.

There is no doubt that their own palace formed the focal point of the lives of the dukes of Hamilton when they were in Scotland. Holyrood they occupied for what might be termed business purposes, Kinneil they visited for a few days at a time in passing, but their family and their household were based at Hamilton. It is true that the 1st and 2nd dukes spent most of their adult lives in England, through force of circumstances rather than from natural inclination, but in their absence their mother was living at Hamilton with a complete household, running the family estates, so that when her sons did come home it was to an entirely Scottish environment. With the succession of the 3rd duchess to the estates, Hamilton palace was re-established as the permanent residence of the head of the family, and this remained the situation right up until the duchess's own death in 1716:
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her resignation of her titles to her eldest son in 1698 did not alter her own position in the slightest, and although he set up his own semi-English household at Kinneil, the duchess remained the head of the family and Hamilton palace the centre of all its affairs.

That the palace and the Hamiltons' other castles were little different from the houses of the rest of the Scottish aristocracy emerges from contemporary inventories and accounts. Certainly the palace was by the end of the seventeenth century a very large building, but in its furniture and hangings, its cutlery and kitchen utensils, in the very flowers and vegetables in the gardens it remained typical of the great Scottish houses of the time. There were pieces of furniture from England, hangings from the continent and crockery and plants brought from abroad, but the same could be said of the other peers' houses, and a visitor from Panmure or Kinross or Yester would have found nothing extraordinarily sumptuous or peculiarly English about the chambers in Hamilton palace.

This essentially Scottish nature of the household at Hamilton is underlined by the choice of servants employed there. There were some English coachmen and French valets, but the majority of the servants were Scottish, many of them having a longstanding connection with the family. The old bonds of kinship were slow to dissolve, and although the former ties with cadet branches of the family were gradually disappearing, local connections continued to play an important part in all spheres of life throughout the period under consideration. A lady from a local family was the desirable wife for a nobleman's son: a peer's friends were drawn from among his neighbours, and when he sought political or military support he automatically
looked to men from his own area for their help. This was as true of the Hamiltons as of any other Scottish family, and so it was too that at Hamilton the burgh and the palace remained interdependent. The dukes employed local tradesmen, bought their goods from the burgh's merchants whenever possible, and took into their domestic service the sons and daughters of their tenants. This situation was to alter when the coming of the Union and the growth of political parties brought about a widening of outlook and a shift of loyalties away from the old parochial attitudes, but this lay in the future and throughout the seventeenth century the dukes of Hamilton, like the majority of the Scottish peerage, lived their lives in essentially Scottish surroundings.
TABLE III

Wages of Hamilton servants compared with those of the servants of other peers and gentlemen.

Amounts of money are given in pounds Scots
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Years</th>
<th>References</th>
<th>Amount p.a.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Secretary</td>
<td>1703-7</td>
<td>HA 537/19</td>
<td>£480 + £50 for paper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gardener (+ men)</td>
<td>1697</td>
<td>HA 446/10/1</td>
<td>£240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1698-1703</td>
<td>HA 516/15/1, 490/6/1, 537/18</td>
<td>£300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1703-10</td>
<td>HA 537/19-532/4/42 passim.</td>
<td>£240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chaplain</td>
<td>1697-1710</td>
<td>HA 446/10/1-532/4/42 passim.</td>
<td>£200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gentlemen &amp; Gentlewomen</td>
<td>1659-1710</td>
<td>HA 469/1-532/4/42 passim.</td>
<td>£120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steward or provisor</td>
<td>1702-10</td>
<td>HA 537/18-532/4/42 passim.</td>
<td>£120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coachman</td>
<td>1692-7</td>
<td>HA 519/13-446/10/1 passim.</td>
<td>£96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1700-3</td>
<td>HA 490/6/1-537/18</td>
<td>£84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1703-8</td>
<td>HA 537/19-491/17/1 passim.</td>
<td>£132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1708-10</td>
<td>HA 532/4/1, 42</td>
<td>£120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amount</td>
<td>Peer (or gentleman)</td>
<td>Years</td>
<td>References</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£120</td>
<td>Viscount Tarbat</td>
<td>1694</td>
<td>Edin. Poll Tax, 64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£60</td>
<td>earl of Panmure</td>
<td>1709</td>
<td>GD 45/18/770</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£60</td>
<td>Lady Grisel Baillie</td>
<td>pre 1714</td>
<td>Household Book, 418</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£26:13:4</td>
<td>earl of Crawford</td>
<td>1694</td>
<td>Edin. Poll Tax, 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£120</td>
<td>earl of Crawford</td>
<td>1694</td>
<td>Edin. Poll Tax, 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£48 (men)</td>
<td>earl of Crawford</td>
<td>1694</td>
<td>Edin. Poll Tax, 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£48 (women)</td>
<td>Sir William Bruce</td>
<td>1690</td>
<td>GD 29/428</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£36 (men)</td>
<td>Lord Yester</td>
<td>1691</td>
<td>GD 28/2205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£30 (women)</td>
<td>marquis of Tweeddale</td>
<td>1682</td>
<td>GD 28/2154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£72</td>
<td>earl of Panmure</td>
<td>1710</td>
<td>GD 45/18/770</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£72</td>
<td>Sir William Bruce</td>
<td>1690</td>
<td>GD 29/428</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£60</td>
<td>Lady Grisel Baillie</td>
<td>pre 1714</td>
<td>Household Book, 418</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£30</td>
<td>earl of Crawford</td>
<td>1694</td>
<td>Edin. Poll Tax, 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£96</td>
<td>duchess of Buccleuch</td>
<td>1701</td>
<td>GD 224/418/1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£72</td>
<td>earl of Panmure</td>
<td>1710</td>
<td>GD 45/18/770</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£60</td>
<td>Lord Yester</td>
<td>1691</td>
<td>GD 28/2205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£48</td>
<td>Sir William Bruce</td>
<td>1690</td>
<td>GD 29/428</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£36</td>
<td>Lady Grisel Baillie</td>
<td>pre 1714</td>
<td>Household Book, 418</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Position</td>
<td>Years</td>
<td>References</td>
<td>Amount p.a.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Falconer</td>
<td>1697-1701</td>
<td>HA 446/10/1-516/16/1</td>
<td>£96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>passim.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warrander</td>
<td>1698-1708</td>
<td>HA 516/15/1-491/17/1</td>
<td>£84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>passim.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Butler</td>
<td>1698-9</td>
<td>HA 516/15/1</td>
<td>£75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1699-1710</td>
<td>HA 516/16/1-532/4/42</td>
<td>£60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>passim.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cook</td>
<td>1657-1710</td>
<td>HA 469/1-532/4/42</td>
<td>£66:13: 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>passim.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baker</td>
<td>1697</td>
<td>HA 446/10/1</td>
<td>£66:13: 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1699-1710</td>
<td>HA 516/16/1-532/4/42</td>
<td>£48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amount</td>
<td>Peer (or gentleman)</td>
<td>Years</td>
<td>References</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£ 63</td>
<td>earl of Panmure</td>
<td>1712</td>
<td>GD 45/18/770</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£ 24</td>
<td>Sir William Bruce</td>
<td>1690</td>
<td>GD 29/428</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£ 40</td>
<td>Sir William Bruce</td>
<td>1690</td>
<td>GD 29/428</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£ 36</td>
<td>Lady Grisel Baillie</td>
<td>pre 1714</td>
<td>Household Book, 418</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£ 180</td>
<td>marquis of Tweeddale</td>
<td>1682</td>
<td>GD 25/2154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£ 96</td>
<td>earl of Panmure [Brechin]</td>
<td>1709</td>
<td>GD 45/18/770</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£ 96</td>
<td>earl of Panmure [Panmure]</td>
<td>1712</td>
<td>GD 45/18/770</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£ 60</td>
<td>earl of Panmure [Panmure]</td>
<td>1680</td>
<td>GD 45/18/730</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£ 48</td>
<td>Sir William Bruce</td>
<td>1690</td>
<td>GD 29/428</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£ 36</td>
<td>Lady Grisel Baillie</td>
<td>pre 1714</td>
<td>Household Book, 418</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£ 20</td>
<td>earl of Crawford</td>
<td>1694</td>
<td>Edin. Poll Tax, 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Position</td>
<td>Years</td>
<td>References</td>
<td>Amount p.a.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chambermaid</td>
<td>1698-1710</td>
<td>HA 516/15/1-532/4/42</td>
<td>£24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dairymaid</td>
<td>1698-1710</td>
<td>HA 516/15/1-532/4/42</td>
<td>£24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postilion</td>
<td>1697-1705</td>
<td>HA 446/10/1-537/19</td>
<td>£24, £48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1706-7</td>
<td>HA 491/11/1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1707-8</td>
<td>HA 491/17/1</td>
<td>£33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1708-10</td>
<td>HA 532/4/1-42</td>
<td>£48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Footman</td>
<td>1692-1701</td>
<td>HA 519/13-490/6/1</td>
<td>£24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1702-8</td>
<td>HA 537/18/19-491/17/1</td>
<td>£60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carter</td>
<td>1697-1710</td>
<td>HA 446/10/1-532/4/42</td>
<td>£24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undercook</td>
<td>1659</td>
<td>HA 469/7</td>
<td>£20, £24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1698-1710</td>
<td>HA 516/15/1-532/4/42</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washer</td>
<td>1699-1700</td>
<td>HA 516/16/1</td>
<td>£18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1702-7</td>
<td>HA 537/18-491/11/1</td>
<td>£24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### OTHERS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Peer (or gentleman)</th>
<th>Years</th>
<th>References</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>£30</td>
<td>Lady Grisel Baillie</td>
<td>pre 1714</td>
<td>Household Book, 418</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£24</td>
<td>duchess of Gordon</td>
<td>1694</td>
<td>Edin. Poll Tax, 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£24</td>
<td>Lord Yester</td>
<td>1691</td>
<td>GD 28/2205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£72</td>
<td>duchess of Buccleuch</td>
<td>1701</td>
<td>GD 224/418/1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£24</td>
<td>Lord Yester</td>
<td>1691</td>
<td>GD 28/2205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£23</td>
<td>earl of Panmure</td>
<td>1712</td>
<td>GD 45/18/770</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£72</td>
<td>duchess of Buccleuch</td>
<td>1701</td>
<td>GD 224/418/1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£35:12/-</td>
<td>earl of Panmure [Brechin]</td>
<td>1709</td>
<td>GD 45/18/770</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£30</td>
<td>Lady Grisel Baillie</td>
<td>pre 1714</td>
<td>Household Book, 418</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£28</td>
<td>Harry Maule</td>
<td>1694</td>
<td>Edin. Poll Tax, 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£26:13:4</td>
<td>Lord Yester</td>
<td>1691</td>
<td>GD 28/2205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£24</td>
<td>Sir William Bruce</td>
<td>1690</td>
<td>GD 29/428</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£13: 6:8</td>
<td>Lord Elphinstone</td>
<td>1630</td>
<td>GD 156/30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£12</td>
<td>earl of Crawford</td>
<td>1694</td>
<td>Edin. Poll Tax, 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£28</td>
<td>earl of Panmure</td>
<td>1711</td>
<td>GD 45/18/770</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£24</td>
<td>Lady Grisel Baillie</td>
<td>pre 1714</td>
<td>Household Book, 418</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£16</td>
<td>Lord Kinnaird</td>
<td>17th cent.</td>
<td>GD 48/1064</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£15</td>
<td>marquis of Tweeddale</td>
<td>1682</td>
<td>GD 28/2154</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## TABLE IV

Longstanding servants in Hamilton palace.

<p>| underlined | = died in service |
| +          | = remained after 1712 |
| *          | = had relatives or wife who was servant in palace |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Minimum Period of Service, in Years</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>References</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>40 +</td>
<td>* James Greenlees +</td>
<td>cook</td>
<td>HA 469/3/40-RH 62/39/1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>John Mitchell</td>
<td>groom</td>
<td>HA 469/1-537/1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-39</td>
<td>David Crawford +</td>
<td>secretary</td>
<td>HL 2949-RH 62/39/1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>James Tod</td>
<td>groom</td>
<td>HA 526/14/5-491/12/1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* Hugh Wood</td>
<td>gardener</td>
<td>HA 469/1-446/10/1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-34</td>
<td>* John Gilkerson</td>
<td>carter</td>
<td>HA 464/1/2-537/19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Abraham Holywell +</td>
<td>warrander</td>
<td>HA 535/40/18-RH 62/39/1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* William Jack</td>
<td>footman</td>
<td>HA 469/9/40-120/18/12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-29</td>
<td>* Mrs Mary Darlo +</td>
<td>gentlewoman</td>
<td>HA 538/16-RH 62/39/1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Robert Kennedy</td>
<td>gentleman</td>
<td>HA 469/1-538/5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum Period of Service, in Years</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Position</td>
<td>References</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-29</td>
<td>* Arthur Nasmith</td>
<td>writer</td>
<td>HA 516/13/1-HL 4192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* Valentine Beldam</td>
<td>groom</td>
<td>HA 476/22-526/9/11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* John Porterfield</td>
<td>gentleman</td>
<td>HA 465/4/2-532/4/1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>George Simpson</td>
<td>falconer</td>
<td>HA 535/13/5-532/4/1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-24</td>
<td>Humphrey Currie</td>
<td>groom</td>
<td>HA 469/1-405/7/23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* Robert Darlo</td>
<td>supervisor of outside workers</td>
<td>HA 516/5/1-380/1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* Helen Greenlees</td>
<td>wardrobe woman</td>
<td>HA 469/3/40-526/17/1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* Gabriel Lamb</td>
<td>huntsman</td>
<td>HA 466/7/2-538/15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>James Moffat</td>
<td>footman</td>
<td>HA 519/2/4-120/18/2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* John Peacock</td>
<td>butler</td>
<td>HA 506/20/23-516/15/1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>James Smith</td>
<td>secretary</td>
<td>HA 526/5-405/7/23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum Period of Service, in Years</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Position</td>
<td>References</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-24</td>
<td>John Timothy the Black</td>
<td>footman</td>
<td>HA 538/7/37-491/17/1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-19</td>
<td>James Bishop</td>
<td>groom</td>
<td>HA 465/12-538/17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>William Campbell</td>
<td>carter</td>
<td>HA 506/21/39-491/17/1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Andrew Chisholm</td>
<td>baker</td>
<td>HA 516/24/3-491/17/1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* Alexander Cockburn</td>
<td>gentleman</td>
<td>HA 465/1-520/15/1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* Robert Duncan</td>
<td>footman</td>
<td>HA 535/20-526/17/3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>William Mack</td>
<td>footman?</td>
<td>HA 554/4-519/3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* James Marshall</td>
<td>stableboy</td>
<td>HA 469/1-526/14/1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Anna Montgomerie +</td>
<td>house-keeper</td>
<td>HA 406/10/1-RH 62/39/1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* William Nilson</td>
<td>cookboy</td>
<td>HA 354/10/7-491/17/1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* Hugh Peacock</td>
<td>postilion</td>
<td>HA 526/11/16-354/7/2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>William Sheils</td>
<td>gardener's boy</td>
<td>HA 469/1-554/4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum Period of Service, in Years</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Position</td>
<td>References</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-14</td>
<td>* Patrick Barr</td>
<td>footman</td>
<td>HA 469/1-519/3/2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>William Bell</td>
<td>cook</td>
<td>HA 506/20/24-120/18/12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mr Robert Black</td>
<td>gentleman?</td>
<td>HA 469/1-467/1/40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>James Buntine</td>
<td>brewer</td>
<td>HA 506/11/2-RFC viii,55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Patrick Douglas</td>
<td>postilion</td>
<td>HA 535/17/4-354/14/4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* Gilbert Duncan</td>
<td>Lord</td>
<td>HA 520/11/16-538/17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Arran's man</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>John Hamilton</td>
<td>page</td>
<td>HA 554/1/2-538/13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Thomas Harkness</td>
<td>footman</td>
<td>HA 535/13/5-120/8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Janet Inglis</td>
<td>dairymaid</td>
<td>HA 516/16/1-491/17/1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* James Jack</td>
<td>footman?</td>
<td>HA 526/9/13-526/9/12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>John Loudon</td>
<td>groom</td>
<td>HA 506/21/39-516/19/1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gavin McKie</td>
<td>workman</td>
<td>HA 516/15/1-491/19/1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum Period of Service, in Years</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Position</td>
<td>References</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-14</td>
<td>* Elizabeth Millar (Mrs John Peacock)</td>
<td>wardrobe woman</td>
<td>HA 506/30/24-354/4/5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>William Murray</td>
<td>gentleman</td>
<td>HA 354/6/2-516/13/1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Roger Semple</td>
<td>postilion</td>
<td>HA 538/13-354/14/4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>John Spens</td>
<td>secretary</td>
<td>HA 538/14-Atholl 29 i (18) 82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>James Tweedy</td>
<td>caterer</td>
<td>HA 606/4-354/3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Henry Wickliffe</td>
<td>groom</td>
<td>HA 526/17/1-448/20/22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In his study of the English aristocracy in the early seventeenth century, Lawrence Stone has suggested that 'so long as their position is secure and unchallenged, old established families are usually unostentatious in their spending.' It remains nevertheless true that the basic motive underlying a good deal of the expenditure of an established family like the Hamiltons was the desire to remind the rest of society of their own elevated position. Clothing is not only a means of keeping warm, food is not merely a source of energy, and transport is not simply a way of travelling from one place to another. If these are self-evident truths to the status conscious twentieth century, they were equally relevant in the seventeenth; all the more so to a member of the aristocracy. A peer lived for much of his time in the public gaze, and a definite way of life was expected of him. He should dress in luxurious garments, eat lavish meals and travel with an impressive entourage, so that both his rivals and his subordinates would interpret correctly these symbols of his wealth and power.

In their aspirations in this sphere the English and Scottish peers were not so very different, but Scottish expenditure was strictly limited by financial considerations, and although the Scottish aristocrat tried to

1 Stone, op. cit., 185.
emulate the English nobleman's way of life, the Scots were marked off from their southern counterparts by this very lack of means. It has been calculated that, of the Scottish representative peers in 1710, 'only one of the sixteen could have been considered in any way affluent by contemporary English standards, and this was the duke of Hamilton, whose estates after his mother's death had an estimated value of £9,000 [sterling] p.a.',¹ a statement which would indicate that, alone of the Scottish peerage, the Hamiltons might be considered in the context of English society. Just how accurate an estimate is this £9,000? Presumably the figure refers to the duke's Scottish revenues, since the valuation was made on the death of his mother, who never possessed any estates in England, but if this is so the calculation is inexact as far as the 4th duke is concerned, simply because he predeceased his mother and never did enjoy the total revenues of the family inheritance. From the time of his first marriage until his death he drew only the income from his own baronies of Kinneil and Polmont which, by the beginning of the eighteenth century, amounted to approximately £20,000 Scots a year. He was therefore far from being a wealthy man by English standards, and indeed was in continual financial difficulties even after his second marriage brought him extensive lands in Lancashire and Staffordshire.²

The 4th duke was, of course, in a special position in that he possessed the family title but not the family estates: what of his pre-

---

¹ Geoffrey Holmes, British Politics in the Age of Anne, 393-4.
² HL 3115-6695.
decessors who experienced no such difficulty? Any observations on this subject are hindered by deficiencies in the information available, but it is known that for the first two decades of the seventeenth century the annual income from the baronies of Hamilton, Cambuslang, Lesmahagow, Bothwellmuir and Avendale¹ was approximately equivalent to the amount yielded by Kinneil and Polmont: both groups could be relied upon to give from £7,000 to £10,000 Scots a year. In 1628 the Hamilton revenues rose sharply. The crop for that year amounted to over £17,000 in value at a time when Kinneil produced only £6,500 and for the next ten years income from the western estates was in the region of £15,000 a year, reaching a peak of nearly £20,000 in 1637, while the Kinneil revenues slowly declined to an annual average of £4,500. It is, moreover, interesting to note that while the Hamiltons possessed the lands of Arbroath they were drawing larger revenues from them than from either the Hamilton baronies or the Kinneil baronies.

After this, the information comes to an abrupt halt, for the Civil War and the confiscation of the Hamilton estates brought financial chaos and near-ruin, and when the Restoration allowed a return to normal the old single account book for a whole year's charge and discharge was no longer sufficient. Separate books for different types of expenditure were now kept, making it more difficult to build up a complete picture of the financial situation, and those accounts recording the annual income from

¹ But excluding Arran, which presumably did not add much to the annual revenues in any event; see Table V.
### TABLE V

Annual revenues from the baronies of Hamilton, Cambuslang, Lesmahagow, Bothwellmuir, Avendale, Kinneil and Polmont, and from the lordship of Arbroath, including rents in malt, bere, meal, oats, wedders, salmon, capons and poultry.

(Since the earlier figures are available, the table starts at 1574 rather than 1625, for the purposes of comparison.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Hamilton Ref.</th>
<th>Kinneil Ref.</th>
<th>Arbroath Ref.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1574 (money only)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>£ 3,640 573/1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1593</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>£ 8,921 573/2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1594</td>
<td></td>
<td>£ 2,989 210/2/2</td>
<td>£ 12,360 573/2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1595</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>£ 13,189 573/3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1596</td>
<td></td>
<td>£ 4,184 210/2/3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1597</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>£ 12,857 573/5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1598</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>£ 12,214 573/6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1599</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>£ 7,613 573/7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1600</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>£ 5,953 573/8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Hamilton Ref.</td>
<td>Kinneil Ref.</td>
<td>Arbroath Ref.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1601</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1602</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1603</td>
<td></td>
<td>£ 6,805 210/2/4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1604</td>
<td>£ 5,802 210/1/1</td>
<td>£ 5,651 210/2/5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1605</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1606</td>
<td>£ 7,608 210/1/2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1607</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1608</td>
<td>£ 7,594 210/1/3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1609</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1610</td>
<td></td>
<td>£ 9,763 573/12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1611</td>
<td>£ 9,291 210/2/7</td>
<td>£ 8,973 573/13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1612</td>
<td>£ 6,602 210/2/8</td>
<td>£ 7,391 573/14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1613</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1614</td>
<td></td>
<td>£ 10,297 210/2/10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Hamilton Ref.</td>
<td>Kinneil Ref.</td>
<td>Arbroath Ref.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1615</td>
<td>£ 5,453 210/2/11</td>
<td>£ 9,519 573/15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1616</td>
<td>£ 5,045 573/16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1617</td>
<td>£ 7,023 573/17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1618</td>
<td>£ 7,694 210/13/1</td>
<td>£ 6,149 573/18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1619</td>
<td>£ 5,715 210/13/2</td>
<td>£ 9,250 573/19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1620</td>
<td>£ 6,161 210/2/14</td>
<td>£ 9,605 573/20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1621</td>
<td>£ 10,308 210/1/6</td>
<td>£ 8,141 210/2/15</td>
<td>£ 12,647 573/21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1622</td>
<td>£ 9,318 210/1/4</td>
<td>£ 9,724 210/2/16</td>
<td>£ 13,778 573/22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1623</td>
<td>£ 10,984 210/1/5</td>
<td>£ 8,764 210/2/18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1624</td>
<td>£ 10,275 210/1/7</td>
<td>£ 6,326 210/2/17</td>
<td>£ 10,320 573/23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1625</td>
<td>£ 9,477 210/1/8</td>
<td>£ 6,969 210/2/19</td>
<td>£ 9,079 573/24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1626</td>
<td>£ 5,443 210/2/23</td>
<td>£ 9,211 573/25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1627</td>
<td>£ 9,969 435/1/1</td>
<td>£ 5,667 210/2/24</td>
<td>£ 8,854 573/26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1628</td>
<td>£ 17,268 435/1/2</td>
<td>£ 6,452 210/2/25</td>
<td>£ 10,516 573/27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Hamilton Ref.</td>
<td>Kinneil Ref.</td>
<td>Arbroath Ref.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1629</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>£ 13,266 573/28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1630</td>
<td>£ 14,366 435/1/3</td>
<td>£ 6,029 210/2/26</td>
<td>£ 10,339 573/29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1631</td>
<td>£ 12,233 435/1/4</td>
<td>£ 5,343 210/2/27</td>
<td>£ 7,900 573/30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1632</td>
<td>£ 13,242 435/1/5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1633</td>
<td></td>
<td>£ 5,928 210/2/28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1634</td>
<td></td>
<td>£ 6,713 210/2/29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1635</td>
<td>£ 15,343 435/1/6</td>
<td>£ 5,738 210/2/30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1636</td>
<td>£ 17,935 435/1/7</td>
<td>£ 3,409 210/2/31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1637</td>
<td>£ 19,814 435/1/8</td>
<td>£ 4,958 210/2/32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1638</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1639</td>
<td>£ 12,756 435/1/9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1640</td>
<td></td>
<td>£ 4,267 210/2/33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1641</td>
<td></td>
<td>£ 4,769 210/2/34</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1642</td>
<td></td>
<td>£ 6,950 210/2/35</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Hamilton Ref.</td>
<td>Kinneil Ref.</td>
<td>Arbroath Ref.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1643</td>
<td></td>
<td>£ 2,958 210/2/36</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1644</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1645</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1646</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1647</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1648</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1649</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1650</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1651</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1652</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1653</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1654</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1655</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1656</td>
<td>£ 10,667 431/1/1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Hamilton Ref.</td>
<td>Kinneil Ref.</td>
<td>Arbroath Ref.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1657</td>
<td>£ 10,154 431/1/2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1658</td>
<td>£ 14,693 497/1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1680</td>
<td>£ 15,558 464/2/1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1681</td>
<td>£ 9,937 464/3/1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1687</td>
<td>£ 11,273 464/7/1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1695</td>
<td>£ 19,151 464/8/2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1706-1709</td>
<td>£ 85,757 415/2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
the estates have not all been found. It would seem though, that by the 1690's the western estates were producing as much as £26,000 p.a. while, as already noted, the Kinneil crop totalled £20,000 p.a. by 1700. There had obviously been a spectacular rise in revenues in the time of the 3rd duke and duchess, but although the reasons for this rise are in themselves fascinating they belong to the realms of land tenure and estate management and as such are not relevant here.

Even at its highest this £46,000 for annual income does not compare favourably with the revenues of the English peerage at the same period: Newcastle's rental in 1710 was estimated to be £40,000 sterling, Bedford's about £35,000 and Beaufort's £30,000, while in the early 1640's when the Hamilton rental totalled approximately £25,000 Scots, at least 78 of the English peers had a rental of over £2,200 sterling and 42 of them had more than twice that amount. In the absence of any general survey of the incomes of the Scottish peerage it is not possible to make similar comparisons with the Hamiltons' fellowcountrymen, although according to the 1710-13 calculation for the representative peers, Eglinton was the only other Scottish nobleman with an income of over £4,000 sterling.

Of course the rents from their estates did not supply English or Scottish peers with their only source of revenue, and the Hamiltons like the rest also had a fluctuating income derived from pensions, gifts,

1 HA 354/11.
2 Holmes, op. cit., 393-4.
3 Stone, op. cit., appendix viii, 761.
4 Holmes, op. cit., 393-4.
revenues from the customs and the taxation and all the other rewards of office-holding. The first and second dukes certainly made a sizeable proportion of their income in this way, but such revenues did vary greatly and were largely dependent on the favour of the monarch. The 1st duke was more or less resident at Court and for a large part of the time high in the favour of Charles I. As a result he came to enjoy the customs payable on English wine imports,¹ and was made collector general of the Scottish taxation in 1633, and in 1639 was given a joint commission with Endymion Porter to examine all accounts rendered to the king and compound with any who kept fraudulent accounts.² His son-in-law the 3rd duke was far less fortunate: most of his political career was spent in opposition and although he and his duchess received a re-grant of the 1633 taxation he relied mainly on the income from the family estates. Similarly the 4th duke's political opinions kept him out of office for most of his life, and the pensions he had enjoyed as a young man from Charles II and James VII came to an abrupt halt with the accession of William of Orange.³

Despite their relatively low income vis-à-vis the English peerage, the dukes of Hamilton spent a sizeable amount on what may be termed conspicuous consumption. Perhaps the most obvious form of expenditure of this sort is the purchase of food and clothing, although it has often been observed that the seventeenth century Scot would live quite simply at home.

¹ Gervas Huxley, Endymion Porter, the Life of a Courtier 1587–1649, 198; C.S.P.D., 1639, 2.
² HL 810.
³ John Y. Akerman, Moneys Received and Paid for 'Secret Services' of Charles II and James II, 23–139.
even though he would go to great lengths to entertain visitors. Unlike the English aristocracy of the period, many of whom spent a good part of the year in London, most of the great Scottish families were still based at their ancestral estates, and from 1652 onwards this was true of the Hamiltons.

For the most part the provisions used in the palace were fairly plain, although the diet was not so unvaried as is sometimes thought, nor was it lacking in nourishment. There was always a good supply of meat from the Hamilton estates themselves. In any one year the Great Park would provide over 150 sheep, about 20 lambs, several cows and a dozen or so stots, while additional cattle were brought over alive from Arran to be killed and salted at Hamilton. The result was that meat formed the main part of each meal throughout the year: veal appeared on the menu almost every week, mutton and lamb were eaten in the spring, and beef, although it featured less frequently, was eaten for about three months in winter, with an occasional piece of pork for the sake of variety. This fare was supplemented with game and poultry. Several hundred rabbits and hares for the pot were caught in the palace grounds each year, the falconer and the fowler could be relied upon to bring in partridges, plovers, grouse and wild duck while the doocot supplied anything from 700 to 800 pigeons a

1 Plant, op. cit., 96.
2 HA 516/24/4.
3 HA 554/5; H.A. Vols. 127, 128, 129, 130.
4 HA 444/3.
5 HA 516/24/4.
6 HA 554/4, 5, 6, 7, 8.
Poultry was equally plentiful. The Hamiltons' own henwife would send in to the kitchen several hundred hens a year and a few turkeys, in addition to which there were kain fowl from the tenants. In the 1690's, for instance, the 3rd duchess was receiving from the baronies of Hamilton, Cambuslang and the surrounding area an annual total of over 900 hens, over 100 capons and a small number of chickens.

Meat of some sort was served up twice a day, at dinner and supper. At dinnertime it would be preceded by a barley broth made with a fowl or a piece of beef, and of course vegetables from the kitchen garden would form part of both main courses. Bread was baked in the palace bakehouse from the wheat sent in by the tenants who still paid part of their rent in kind: over 40 bolls were used one year for making rolls, loaves and pastries. A proportion of the butter used came from the duchess's own dairy, which produced twenty or thirty stones a year as well as cream cheese and skimmed milk cheese, but a further 80 to 130 stones came in the form of kain butter. In 1702-3, 40 stones came in from John Yuill in Cornhills, 9 stones from William Fleming and Thomas Steven for their lands in Airybog, 31 stones from James Strang and his subtenants in Boghead and 23 stones from John Craig in Drumloch as part of his rent. Even this amount was not sufficient for the large household, and throughout the second half of the

1 HA 516/24/4; 532/2/1.
2 HA 446/2.
3 HA 516/24/1, 2, 3, 4; 444/3.
4 HA 446/2.
5 HA 516/24/1, 2, 3, 4; 444/3.
6 HA 444/3.
seventeenth century the duchess made regular purchases of Clydesdale butter, even when the family was in Edinburgh.\(^1\)

Supper was usually a simpler meal than dinner, and consisted of meat, a dish of bread and milk, and of course eggs.\(^2\) Eggs were perhaps the most constant item in the household accounts, and nearly 400 a week were used in the palace when the family was in residence. This number is not really excessive, however, for it includes the eggs eaten by the servants and those used in baking.\(^3\) Rather surprisingly, fish does not feature greatly in the accounts. During the first ten weeks of 1702 fish was served on only a dozen occasions, and appeared even more infrequently during the rest of the year: haddock is mentioned once, pike once, an eel once, and various unspecified fish dishes on about a dozen other days.\(^4\)

Much of the food consumed in the palace was local produce, but those goods which did not come from the duchess's own lands or from her tenants could easily be purchased elsewhere. She bought groceries regularly from the Hamilton merchants themselves, and she could send further afield. Sugar was generally bought in Glasgow in 3lb. loaves, so that although there were still bee-skips in the palace gardens there was no need for the medieval reliance on honey as a sweetener.\(^5\) Spanish salt\(^6\) came from the

\(^1\) HA 554/11.  
\(^2\) HA 354/10/63.  
\(^3\) HA 516/24/1.  
\(^4\) HA 444/3.  
\(^5\) HA 210/2/14; 554/4; 606/1, 14.  
\(^6\) HA 554/4; 606/3, 8.
Glasgow merchants too, as did vinegar\(^1\) raisins\(^2\) and the occasional barrel of herring.\(^3\) Spices, on the other hand, were usually obtained in Edinburgh – nutmeg, cinnamon and mace\(^4\) – as well as dried fruits, almonds, oranges and lemons.\(^5\)

As early as 1621 the 2nd marchioness had sent to Edinburgh for hams,\(^6\) and her granddaughter the 3rd duchess regularly purchased Westphalian hams there.\(^7\) Besides patronising well-known merchants in Glasgow and Edinburgh, the duchess often had luxuries imported specially to Bo'ness. Coffee beans were brought over from Holland,\(^8\) as was drinking chocolate,\(^9\) and in 1700 a consignment of tea was shipped in for her: 1 pound of Bloom tea, 1 pound of green tea and 1 pound of Kaiser's tea.\(^10\) Tea drinking was in 1702 enough of a novelty for the duchess to remark that her daughter-in-law who was staying with her, though bored, found in the taking of tea 'sume divertessment from my old company',\(^11\) and in the autumn of the following year the duchess herself was taking 'sume tea...with sugar candie, without milk...' as a cure for a cold.\(^12\) Finally, a few non-perishable goods could be sent home from London – for example honey and chocolate.\(^13\)

1 HA 554/10.
2 HA 554/5.
3 HA 554/5, 10; 606/5.
4 HA 405/8/2; 606/5, 1.
5 HA 606/5.
6 HA 210/2/64.
7 HA 606/11; 554/4.
8 HA 463/11/1.
9 HA 463/19/9; 463/20/11.
10 HA 463/13/25.
11 The duke of Atholl's Archives, 45, ii, 229.
12 The duke of Atholl's Archives, 45, iii, 94.
13 HL 7187; HA 538/3/14; see Chapter 5.
One of the most important items bought in was wine. There was always milk to drink, and ale was brewed on the premises from the malt brought in by the tenants, but the family themselves, including the children, always drank wine at mealtimes and the palace cellar was kept well-stocked. In the 1690's over 500 bottles of claret, about 215 bottles of canary and several dozen bottles of Rhenish and Madeira wine were consumed by the household every year. The 2nd marchioness actually seems to have sent abroad for wine: her accounts for 1638 included an entry of £133:7/- 'to Spain for wine', but her successors were content to deal with Scottish merchants. Usually the 3rd duke supervised the buying of wine himself, making a special expedition to Glasgow to see William Anderson or the famous John Spruell and select the hogsheads he wanted: these were then removed to the palace cellars where the contents were bottled. After the 3rd duke's death this personal supervision was not always possible, but there were other methods of ensuring that the wine ordered was to the liking of the buyer. On at least one occasion the Hamilton postmaster brought up to the palace three pints of canary 'for a taste' before the duchess committed herself to buying the entire consignment. Normally two or three hogsheads were bought at one time, costing in the region of £60 each for French wine, although the third duke paid only £12 for a

1 HA 444/3.
2 HA 532/2/5, 6, 7.
3 HA 560/12.
4 HA 532/3/77, 78, 79.
5 HA 532/3/82.
6 HA 464/1/53; 210/3/26; c.f. E 73/24; E 73/41/1.
hogshead in 1673\(^1\) and another cost his wife as much as £120 in 1711.\(^2\)

From time to time a small quantity was purchased for a special purpose, as in 1702 when eight pints of Rhenish wine were brought from Glasgow for Lord Basil's wife 'when lying in childbed.'\(^3\)

Wine was one of the most expensive items on the list of provisions, but when the family was at home the cost of catering was relatively low. Even when there were guests to be entertained expenditure rose only slightly, unless there happened to be a large gathering for a marriage or funeral. When the 3rd duke died in the spring of 1694 over £1,300 was spent on provisions for his funeral. Seven lambs, one calf, two pigs, thirty seven pairs of pigeons, fifty eight grouse, fourteen ducks and four cocks were bought and slaughtered for the funeral feast: there were hams, newts' tongues, and three whole barrels of pickled oysters. Thirty five dozen eggs and nearly fifty pounds of fresh butter were needed, not to mention cucumbers, dried fruits and all the spices used in the preparation of the food.\(^4\)

This was probably the most sumptuous meal served at Hamilton during the second half of the seventeenth century, for usually things were done on a much more modest scale. During the last ten weeks of 1691, when the duke and his family were in residence at the palace, the total weekly cost of food was only £20 or so,\(^5\) whereas when the first ten weeks of that year

\(^1\) HA 554/2/65.
\(^2\) HA 532/3/87.
\(^3\) HA 532/2/14.
\(^4\) HA 120/17/50.
\(^5\) HA 446/2/1, 2.
had been spent in Edinburgh the weekly bill had come to over £100.1 Even higher was the cost when the family visited England. When the duke and duchess stayed in Tunbridge Wells in 1685 they were paying roughly £96 [Scots] a week for the meals of their household, a figure which rose to nearer £275 when they moved to London.2 Similarly, although during the period 1683-1704 (when the accounts are most complete) an annual average of £3,200 was spent on provisions,3 this figure excludes the year 1688-9 when much of the time was spent in the south and a total of £7,650 was paid out for food.4

There were various reasons for this increased expenditure when the family was away from home. Hamilton was cheaper because so much of the food used either came in from the duchess's tenants or was the produce of her own estates and so cost the master household nothing. When the family moved elsewhere they had all the additional worry of buying in meat, bread, milk and eggs. This was even one of the problems of living at Kinneil. The 4th duke bought his meat from butchers in Bo'ness - it took at least five of them to keep the castle supplied5 - and although there are large ovens in the Kinneil kitchen, bread was bought from Robert Fairbairn, a Bo'ness baker.6 Again, when the 3rd duke was living in Holyrood, he relied on the Canongate bakers to provide his household with the requisite forty-

1 HA 446/2/1, 2.
2 HA 538/4.
3 HA 606/11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16; 516/24/1, 2, 3, 4; 516/25; 182/1; 444/3.
4 HA 606/18.
5 HA 448/15/8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15; 354/6/18.
6 HA 448/15/22.
two dozen white rolls and forty-two dozen brown rolls each week.¹

Not only did expenditure rise when the family was away from home because unbought provisions ceased to be available: the provisor also found that prices in town were much higher than those in Hamilton. A chicken which would come from the stock of kain fowl at home would cost 2/9d. in Edinburgh and as much as 16/- Scots in London. In Edinburgh the butchers would charge 1/6d. for a pigeon whereas their London colleagues would ask as much as 10/-, and where an Edinburgh merchant took 2/- for a pound of barley a London grocer would expect four times as much.²

Then again, whenever the duke of Hamilton was in Edinburgh or London he had a certain style to keep up. There were always plenty of observers anxious to note just how luxurious were the circumstances of the ducal family, eager to compare their way of living with that of other peers. Also, there was a good deal of entertaining to be done, and for both these reasons the food served at mealtimes was usually more varied and more elaborate than was the case at home. This was particularly true on special occasions, as in 1693 when the 3rd duke was in residence at Holyrood as commissioner to parliament. Throughout May and early June he was spending up to £100 a week on such luxuries as cinnamon, amber, musk and angelica, and as the season advanced his guests enjoyed oranges, gooseberries and strawberries and cream,³ washed down with a choice of canary,

---

¹ HA 446/2/1 and c.f. Plant, op. cit., 99.
² HA 606/17; c.f: Household Book of Lady Grisel Baillie, 411.
³ HA 354/9/1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10.
claret, sherry, brandy, white wine, Rhenish wine or mumbeer.  

Menus in London were on a similar scale, and the duke and duchess availed themselves of the wider range of vegetables, fruit and shellfish to be had in the city, although it is interesting to note that in private their tastes remained simple: in the winter of 1693 the 3rd duke wrote home to his wife asking her to send up more oatmeal, 'for it's all the supper your daughter and your son and I eats.'

Their son's tastes were more exotic. His cellars at Holyrood contained such varied items as bottles of 'Andalusia...malvezio...graeco...lucina...lupiana...and vin d'goot' and during his stay in Edinburgh in 1704 his expenditure for seven months totalled over £4,398 Scots. When he moved back to Preston (Lancashire) he was paying around £60 Scots a week for provisions, and meals there regularly included items unknown at his parents' table - potatoes, roasted blackbirds, 'sausage', and Italian salad - along with the homely veal, chicken and 'mutton in Scots collops.'

For over sixty-five years, however, the 3rd duchess controlled the Hamilton estates, and her expenditure on provisions was always modest: an annual sum of £3,000 Scots was low compared with the amount spent by the English aristocracy. The Sunderland household had been spending £100 sterling a month on food at the beginning of the century, the Bedford

1 HA 354/8/9.
2 HA 606/8 and for Bath 405/10/3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10.
3 HL 7356.
4 HA 165/8/3.
5 HA 444/4.
6 HA 444/4.
kitchen accounts totalled £1,465 for the year 1671, while at Woburn in 1664 £120 sterling had been paid for wine alone. The amount spent by the English nobleman may have declined during the seventeenth century, but it still far exceeded that of his Scottish counterpart. Once again it is difficult to make comparisons with other Scottish peers because no general survey exists, but the accounts of, for instance, the earl of Panmure, reveal that his expenditure during his visits to London resembled very closely that of his father-in-law the 3rd duke of Hamilton both in the money spent and in the items bought, while the earl of Cassilis's expenditure in Edinburgh echoes that of the duke his brother-in-law.

This form of conspicuous expenditure was not an excessive drain on the Hamilton finances, but perhaps the most immediate indication of a man's social status was not so much the food that he provided at his table but the way in which he dressed. At home on his estates the Scottish nobleman could wear plain, locally produced clothing, but in public he would appear in the most splendid garments he could afford, particularly if he were attending Court. It has been remarked that some Scottish noblemen in London seem to have been more plainly clad than their southern contemporaries, but this does not seem to have applied to the 1st duke of

---

1 G.E. Mingay, *English Landed Society in the 18th Century*, 159-60.
3 Stone, *op. cit.*, 555-62.
4 GD 45/18/860.
5 GD 25/9/18.
6 Maxwell and Hutchison, *Scottish Costume 1550-1850*, 43.
7 *Ibid.*, 42.
Hamilton. Clothing at the Court of Charles I was luxurious,¹ and as one of the king's favourites the duke had to dress in the height of fashion. Ostentatious clothing may indeed have been particularly important to him, for in the first place Scottish peers at Court were not popular with the English noblemen, and in the second place the duke was not the physically impressive man that his father had been. Probably the best known portrait of the 1st duke is the Van Dyck showing him in armour, but even more interesting is the likeness done by Mytens in 1629, just after the duke returned from Scotland.² Mytens had painted the duke's father a few years earlier,³ and the contrast between father and son emerges very clearly from a comparison of the two portraits. The figure of the marquis, who was well over six feet tall, occupies most of the canvas, and even clad as he is in sombre black he immediately impresses the onlooker - as indeed he did his contemporaries - with his sheer physical presence. His son, painted to the same life-size scale, is a much shorter figure.⁴ He was only twenty-three when this portrait was done, and is still quite slender and beardless, the sort of man who might easily be passed over in a crowd were it not for the fact that he wears a dazzling suit of cloth of silver.

This splendid outfit must have been one of the outstanding items in an

¹ See for example Margot Lister, Costume, An Illustrated Survey from Ancient Times to the 20th Century, 226-7; Margot Hamilton Hill and Peter A. Bucknell, The Evolution of Fashion, 116-8.
² This portrait is at present in the S.N.P.G., on loan from the owner, his grace the duke of Hamilton. See Plate 2. It is reproduced in colour in François Boucher, A History of Costume in the West, 252.
³ Also in the S.N.P.G. on loan from his grace the duke of Hamilton. A copy of this portrait is in Hopetown House.
⁴ H.MSS., RH 154/4.
extensive wardrobe. While in residence at Court in the 1630's the duke purchased from one tailor alone two or three new outfits a month.\(^1\) Usually a suit and cloak were bought at the same time, although the silver suit does not seem to have had its own cloak. Cloth of silver was a particularly sumptuous material: more often the duke's suits were of satin, taffeta, 'Spanish cloth' or mohair, or in the winter were made of velvet. In the list of the clothes he bought from David Murray in London in the 1630's black is the predominant colour - not surprisingly for not only was it the colour of the mournings which etiquette demanded should be worn for even remote relations, but it was still a fashionable shade in its own right. Otherwise, colours were now lighter than in the reign of James VI\(^2\) and the duke was especially fond of grey and green, though he also had a carnation coloured doublet, crimson velvet hose and a scarlet cloak lined with fur.

Many of these clothes had most elaborate trimmings. Edward Basse, who provided him with his shirts and handkerchiefs, also supplied him with lace.\(^3\) A seagreen satin suit was sewn with silver lace, a pink cloth suit was 'laced thick all over with silver lace and lyned with willow cullor satin' and even a hunting coat was 'laced with a gold bone lace and a small lace on every syd of it, with greatt long French buttons on the hois and coat.'\(^4\)

---

1 HL 5926.  
2 Maxwell and Hutchison, *op. cit.*, 34.  
3 HA 120/10/1, 2, 3, 4, 5.  
4 HL 5926.
The striking impression made at Court by the 1st duke must have been enhanced by his jewellery. His collection included two Georges set with diamonds, two great pendant diamonds valued at £200 sterling, and a jewel of five diamonds. His clothes were sewn with diamond buttons, round his neck he could hang his chain of diamonds, worth £200, on his fingers would glisten the great pointed diamond ring worth £500 and some of the smaller diamond rings, and he had diamond bracelets and hatbands as well.¹

All this grandeur naturally cost a great deal of money. A plain suit of clothes and cloak would cost from £5 to £15 sterling, but an outfit trimmed with lace would cost nearer £30. Most expensive of all were the hand embroidered garments. During the winter of 1633 Alexander Maxton charged his grace £35 for the embroidery alone on a tawny satin suit, and in April 1635 over £60 was paid for a French green satin suit, part of the cost going to 'the earle of Dorsett's embroiderer for the greene suite and cloake with gold twist and carnation dublett.'² There were occasional economies: the tailor was ordered to let out the duke's suits from time to time, and in the winter of 1634 the man was paid 'for an ould mourning suite and cloake pressed and made up for my lord treasurer's funeral.'³ On the whole, however, the dictates of Court life meant that new outfits were constantly required - special suits for hunting, riding, attending funerals, waiting upon the king and participating in Court masques.⁴

¹ HA 506/1/5; 60/1/5.
² HL 5936.
³ Ibid.
⁴ Allardyce Nicoll, Stuart Masques and the Renaissance Stage, 157-213.
Moreover, not only did the duke have to finance his own wardrobe: in
the 1630's he also had to provide for his wife and children, and as a lady
of the bedchamber Lady Mary Feilding required a wardrobe as extensive as
his own. She had, indeed, spent her entire life at Court and was accustomed
to dressing in style. A portrait painted when she was about sixteen\(^1\)
shows her in the stiff and jewel-encrusted clothes of the 1620's. During the
reign of Charles I women's clothes became more natural in their line and
less ostentatious in their trimmings,\(^2\) but they remained nevertheless
elaborate. In the Van Dyck portrait painted towards the end of her life,
the marchioness wears a rich satin gown with fine lace edging the décolletage.\(^3\)
She also had gowns of gold and silver tissue, flowered satin and carnation
satin, mantles of scarlet baize and crimson damask and petticoats of green
mohair and changeable sarsnet. Her waistcoats were of white satin and
yellow taffeta, and her hungerlines (short cloaks) of sky coloured satin
and green mohair.

Often too, her dresses were sewn with jewels. In the Van Dyck
portrait the neckline of her dress is edged with a row of pearls and there
is another row round her waist. She has a double string of pearls round
each wrist, a short single string round her neck, and large pearl drops in

---

1 This portrait by Mytens has often been assigned to the early 1620's and
described as depicting the marchioness as a child, but it was more
probably done about the time her husband sat to the same artist. It
is the property of his grace the duke of Hamilton and is reproduced in
black and white in Boucher, op. cit., 287.
2 Maxwell and Hutchison, op. cit., 31-35; James Laver, Costume, 56-57.
3 S Ph II 358, 2.
each ear. Pearls seem to have been popular throughout the seventeenth century. Henrietta Maria wore a single string when she sat to Van Dyck and to Mytens: her daughter Mary and her sister-in-law Elizabeth of Bohemia also wear pearl necklaces and earrings in their portraits and a similar single string of pearls is to be seen in Kneller's portrait of the marchioness's elder daughter and Wright's painting of her younger one.

When the marchioness was very young the fashion had still been to dress up children as miniature versions of their parents, but as the century advanced there was a growing tendency for children's clothes to be simpler and more comfortable in style - Charles I's sons and daughters wore little caps and quite plain satin dresses. As babies, the marchioness's children wore white flannel or linen coats and dresses: half a dozen or so of these were made up at a time for Lady Anne and Lady Susanna. In 1635 when they were aged 3 and 2 respectively, they got coats of grogram (a mixture of wool, silk and mohair) as did their baby brother Lord Arran, who had been born the previous year. The little girls by this time had petticoats and dresses with scarlet baize sleeves, and towards the end of the year all three children were dressed in scarlet baize coats. By 1636 there were five children in the family. The three little boys, all under

1 Mila Contini, ed. James Laver, Fashion from Ancient Egypt to the Present Day, 164.
2 See Norah Waugh, The Cut of Women's Clothes, 29; N.P.G. publication, British Historical Portraits, passim; also many portraits in the S.N.P.G.
3 At Culzean Castle, the property of the National Trust for Scotland.
4 S Ph II 321, 2.
5 Contini, op. cit., 168-9; Boucher, op. cit., 282.
the age of four, wore white flannel coats and were all in petticoats. Lady Anne and her sister still had coats of linen, but that autumn each got a new carnation satin coat and when winter came all the children were attired in warm serge coats. By May 1638 Lady Anne, aged six, was old enough to be given a blue hungerline, although her sister had to be content with a blue coat like the one bought for their brother Charles.¹ Those were the last purchases made for the children on their mother's directions. The marchioness died later that month, and accounts for the children cease abruptly, resuming only in the 1640's, by which time Lady Anne and Lady Susanna, the only surviving members of the marchioness's family, were living in Scotland and dressing as young ladies.²

By that time, the girls' uncle had succeeded to the dukedom, and as far as costume is concerned he is an interesting transitional figure. As a young man at Court the 2nd duke had been known for his extravagant way of life, outdoing even his brother in his splendid clothes and jewels. He had a full complement of silk, satin and cloth of silver suits, coats lined with sables, and velvet cloaks. He seems to have been particularly fond of attending the masques so popular with the king and queen. On 10 January 1638 he had been at the king's masque Britannia Triumphane³ in a rich carnation suit embroidered all over, on 23 March of the same year he spent no less than £100 sterling on gold and silver lace for masquing suits, and in April he purchased a blue satin suit for the queen's masque,

¹ HL 6005.
² GD 237/204/2; HA 560/22.
³ Nicoll, op. cit., 217.
and had it embroidered all over.¹

The coming of the Civil War with the subsequent deaths of the king and of his brother brought about a complete change both in his way of life and in his outlook. In the sombre portrait of him painted during his exile in Holland there is no trace of the gay young man of former times.² His severely cut suit and plain white collar are typical of the clothes adopted by those who preferred their dress to reflect their puritanical opinions.

This effect of the Civil War upon costume has often been noted,³ and even after the Restoration there remained a division between those who adopted wholeheartedly the dress of the Court and those who retained simpler styles. However, despite the 3rd duchess of Hamilton's preference for plain, dark clothes,⁴ she bought her gowns for important occasions in London, and these were in the latest fashion. In 1679, for instance, she was wearing to Court one of the new loose, flowing dresses showing the full, gathered sleeves and the frilled neck of her shift⁵ - a gown very similar to that worn by Queen Anne in an engraving by Edward Cooper.⁶

The duchess also had a fine collection of jewels. Presumably she

¹ HA 560/7.
² See Plate 8.
³ e.g. Maxwell and Hutchison, op. cit., 56; James Laver, Costume, 56-9.
⁴ See Chapter 6.
⁵ As in the Kneller portrait. See also Maxwell and Hutchison, op. cit., 60.

Plate 8 William, earl of Lanark and 2nd duke of Hamilton, by Jonson.
inherited some of these from her mother - her pearl necklace and earrings are probably the ones worn by the marchioness in the Van Dyck portrait. She would also fall heir to many of her paternal grandmother's jewels, and like other early Covenanters this redoubtable lady seems to have taken an interest in such things. In her accounts for 1643 she recorded that she had paid £200 'for ane ring with nayn diamonts' and £106:13:4 'for a ring with on diamont', while a few months later she spent over £500 on a pair of diamond clasps. Having these and the Hamilton family jewels the 3rd duchess had no need to make such expensive purchases in this line herself, but she frequently sent her jewellery to Edinburgh and London to be reset: the notion of arranging smaller stones around a large one came into fashion in the seventeenth century, but apart from having the settings of her jewels modernised the duchess would have to have altered for herself those rings worn by her father and uncle. So it was that in 1659 she sent in to Conrad Etinger in Edinburgh a magnificent collection of jewels and gold which he made up into three emerald rings, five rings set with diamonds, mainly table-cut, a diamond 'in the hart fascione' in another ring, a ring with five sapphires and twelve diamonds, and a ring encircled with diamonds and rubies. In later years she sent to London to have made a ruby ring with two diamonds, an amethyst ring with two diamonds, and three rings with smaller diamonds

1 G. Donaldson, Scotland: James V-James VII, 323.
2 HA 560/19.
3 Maxwell and Hutchison, op. cit., 147.
4 HA 431/9/84.
set with larger ones,¹ and at the same time paid Etinger £12 'for makinge
ane ringe with sex dymonds and five emoralsds.'² Apart from her rings,
the duchess had a sapphire locket and various gold lockets, a pair of
diamond pendants,³ and Etinger made up for her a 'hinger' with twenty-five
diamonds.⁴ The duchess also possessed various bracelets,⁵ clasps⁶ and
diamond buckles.⁷

These fine clothes and jewels were worn for public appearances, but
at home the duchess followed the contemporary habit of having many of her
garments made up locally.⁸ John Hamilton and the other local merchants
supplied the cloth, which John Muirhead the Hamilton tailor made up into
gowns and other garments for the duchess. Her dresses were made of
grogram, serge or taffeta sewn with lace, which was also bought locally.
Her petticoats were of flowered satin and even cloth of silver, although
she also had underpetticoats of 'stuff' and her sister on one occasion had
a cotton petticoat.⁹ John Muirhead also supplied the duchess with the
usual underwear,¹⁰ even making her stays for her,¹¹ James Loudon the burgh

¹ HA 519/12/30.
² HA 465/2/2.
³ HA 405/11/3; 431/9/84; 354/15/9; 516/20/4.
⁴ HA 465/2/2.
⁵ HA 519/12/30.
⁶ HA 405/11/3.
⁷ HA 405/8/4.
⁸ Maxwell and Hutchison, op. cit., 27, 38, 63.
⁹ HA 431/4/10; 431/8/7; 464/6/; 464/6/1; 431/9/86.
¹¹ HA 537/16/7.
litser made her black silk stockings,\(^1\) and James Brown made shoes for the entire family - Spanish leather shoes, 'wet leather' shoes, 'dry leather' shoes, plain yellow shoes, shoes trimmed with lace, goloshes, riding boots and slippers.\(^2\)

Clothes for the duchess's children were also either made locally or bought in Edinburgh or Glasgow. Her babies were first of all wrapped in swaddlingbands which cost £1:2/- each,\(^3\) then as they grew older, progressed to 'carrying coats' and then to 'going' (i.e. walking) coats.\(^4\) On their heads the children wore lace caps, but by 1665 one of the duchess's small sons was presented with a large carnation taffeta bonnet with a white feather.\(^5\) As the girls grew older, their clothes were made along with their mother's by John Muirhead, who also supplied their brothers with coats and waistcoats.\(^6\) Stockings for them were sometimes bought in Glasgow, and Matthew Cumming there sent out their linen drawers and 'gallouses'.\(^7\)

The 3rd duke himself seems to have gone mainly to Edinburgh for his outer clothing, as he had done even before his marriage.\(^8\) Thomas Somerville and John Calderwood supplied him with coats, cloaks and suits. Few details of these are given, but one of his outfits is described as being

---

1 HA 436/5/37.
2 HA 431/8/18; 230/85; see Eunice Wilson, A History of Shoe Fashions, 126-35.
3 HA 465/8/1.
4 HA 465/7/1; 431/9/80.
5 HA 465/7/1.
6 HA 464/6/1.
7 HA 464/1/47.
8 HA 431/4/33.
'a black Spanish suit' and cost him over £90 Scots, while another coat and suit cost £300 Scots.¹ He bought some of his periwigs in Edinburgh,² and James Brown there could supply him with French hats and castor hats.³ Most of his linen was made at Hamilton. The cloth was produced locally and his shirts and nightcaps were sewn up at home by his daughters.⁴ Muirhead and the other Hamilton merchants supplied him with his nightshirts and cravats, but for some reason he bought his nightgowns [i.e. dressing-gowns] in Linlithgow.⁵

The 3rd duke, of course, bought a proportion of his clothes in London.⁶ Some of these he left there with his tailor,⁷ but others he probably brought home to wear in Edinburgh. Certainly the list of clothes in his dark closet in Holyrood in 1693 included some splendid outfits - black velvet and scarlet embroidered cloaks, blue and cinnamon suits, a gold stuff waistcoat and a gold stuff nightgown.⁸ The duke was always fastidious about his appearance, and his expenditure regularly included soap and sponges, an 'instrument for cleaning the teeth', boxes of powder, almond hand-powder, jasmine water, orange flower water, and the famous Queen of Hungary water⁹ - a concoction of rosemary, rosewater and spirits.

¹ HA 462/2/2; 465/5/9; 465/8/11; 465/7/11.
² HA 465/8/1.
³ HA 465/7/1.
⁴ HA 60/3/1; 60/3/5.
⁵ HA 469/1; 431/6/39.
⁶ See Chapter 5.
⁷ HA 61/1/6.
⁸ HL 6632.
⁹ HA 535/7/2; 532/2/21, 22, 23, 24; 120/21/11; c.f. GD 135/96.
of wine, for use after bathing.¹

The 3rd duke and duchess knew that they must appear in public dressed in a manner befitting their high rank, but they economised by wearing plain, inexpensive clothes at home. Their son the earl of Arran was, on the other hand, usually to be found in London. A great favourite with Charles II and a gentleman of the Bedchamber he was in close attendance upon the monarch, and required a large wardrobe. During these early years he developed extravagant tastes, and continued to spend a great deal on his appearance after the Revolution and his fall from favour. His wardrobe contained the inevitable black suits for mourning, but otherwise blue and scarlet seem to have been his favourite colours. He had a large number of coats and breeches made up in those colours, with waistcoats of gold brocade and white silk. His shirts were linen, and he had a wide selection of lace cravats, ruffles and silk stockings. His nightclothes were equally fine. He always possessed a number of nightgowns which were usually of gold brocade or silk, but at one time he even had a tartan one. For outdoor wear he would appear in a cloth or velvet cloak, wearing a French hat or black beaver, and perhaps carrying his amber topped cane.²

The earl probably brought many of his London clothes with him when he visited Scotland, but when he did settle at Kinneil for any length of time he patronised the Scottish tailors and merchants. His mournings for his first wife came from Robert Blackwood and from the Edinburgh tailor

¹ Deborah Rutledge, Natural Beauty Secrets, 128.
² HA 60/13/16; 61/1/4; 61/1/3.
William Douglas. Then again when he and his second wife were living at Kinneil he had his shirts locally made, and the duchess bought linen for their children's frocks from local weavers.

In his rich silks and satins the seventeenth century nobleman would attempt to outshine his fellow peers when in town, but he also appeared before an even wider public when travelling about the countryside, and for this reason came to regard his coach not merely as a means of transport but as an important status symbol. The countrypeople could not but be impressed when a nobleman drove by in his English coach with his entourage of livery-clad grooms and postilions. As early as 1604 the 1st duke's grandfather had owned a chariot, and in 1611 his father had shipped home a 'carrache' from London. In that year a coach-house was built at Kinneil, and from then onwards the Hamiltons always had at least one coach, and the 3rd duke had several: in the 1690's he had with him in Edinburgh his travelling coach, a new coach, another coach and a chariot, and on another occasion complained to his son that 'I find all my travelling coaches quite gone' (in need of repair).

Travel by coach was not, however, without its difficulties,
occasioned mainly by bad roads and inclement weather. Travellers of the period were in the habit of congratulating themselves if they had an uneventful journey, and were liable to be quite content if their coach had overturned only once on the way. Indeed they seemed to be almost inured to such hazards, and after a coach carrying the 3rd duchess and her eldest daughter had overturned, Lady Katherine, then seven months pregnant, reported cheerfully to her husband 'tho both my mother and the coachbox fell a top of me I was not at all hurt', adding that although the duchess had sustained a badly bruised face, 'we can lafe heartly when we thinke of some passages of our fall now.'

Local journeys were bad enough, but could always be postponed if conditions looked too bad. Even worse was travel between London and Edinburgh. At the beginning of 1674 the 3rd duke, returning home from a trip to London, had to pay 10/- 'to those that helped the coatch out of the snow', and one September he had a particularly difficult journey to London because the great rains had so raised the level of all the rivers that he could hardly cross them. Added to this, he complained to his wife, 'I had 1 very ill coachman, weak horses, and the postillion's horse fell and injured his leg so had to have the footman ride postillion.' He beseeched the duchess never to cross deep water in a coach as he had
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1 Stella Margetson, Journey by Stages, 1-34; ed. Sir William Fraser, The Annandale Family Book, ii, 84-5.
2 The duke of Atholl's Archives Box 29, i (4) 4, quoted in part in Chronicles of Atholl and Tullibardine, i, 182-3.
3 HL 3722.
4 HA 519/9.
5 HL 5889.
seen how dangerous it was, feared that the journey might take a fortnight (which was in fact the usual length of time\(^1\)) and declared that had he realised the conditions he would have ridden all the way to London.\(^2\)

This was no idle threat but a perfectly practicable alternative, at least for a younger man. When the earl of Arran returned to Hamilton from the Grand Tour he and his companions went on horseback and took just over a week: this pace was however rather much for the 3rd duke's secretary who accompanied the earl. He recorded in his accounts for November 11 and 12, 'For myself and hors that night having been jaded 4 miles short of Durham 2/6: At Durham where my Lord Arran lay...10/4...To the guides who were sent to look for me 1/-.'\(^3\) Shorter journeys at home were frequently made on horseback - visits to relations and so on - and not only by the men. The Hamilton ladies were quite accustomed to riding side-saddle and once when snowed up at Belford the 3rd duchess, then aged sixty-four, declared that she 'would red on horseback' to Edinburgh and was prevented from doing so only because she was accompanied by her daughter who was convalescing from a serious fever.\(^5\) Of course it was not always possible for ladies to use this method of transport, and when they were pregnant, in poor health or older they would make short journeys by sedan chair.

Coaches and sedans were privately owned, but it was also possible to

\(^1\) HA 354/4/62; 405/7/24.
\(^2\) HL 6234.
\(^3\) This money is in sterling. HA 405/7/6.
\(^4\) HL 6385; HA 554/1/13; 465/3/4.
\(^5\) HL 6385.
use public transport for long journeys. Although the 3rd duke occasionally used his own travelling coach for the journey to London, he and his family preferred to hire a coach and so save their own from wear and tear. This was all the more sensible when a group of friends intended to go to London. They could travel together so sharing the cost of the coach-hire. They were also thus assured of congenial travelling companions, an important consideration on such a long journey: in 1695 Lord Basil, when arranging to accompany his sister and her child to Bath, decided that it was best to book the whole coach 'to avoid being wearied with other company.' On one trip south in 1685 the 3rd duke and duchess decided not to go by coach but to travel by sea; yachting had become fashionable in the reign of Charles II. They sailed from Leith on board the yacht 'Mary', arrived at Greenwich, and went by barge to London. Why they decided to travel this way remains unexplained, but it was an experiment which was not repeated.

Food, clothing and travel were all a considerable drain on a nobleman's resources, but it was recognised that fairly lavish expenditure was necessary where these matters were concerned. Fortunately other activities were less expensive, and when it came to recreation the Hamiltons at least did not spend the vast sums which their English counterparts set aside for sport and gambling. Hunting and hawking remained the favourite pastimes of the
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Scottish aristocracy throughout the century, and the first two dukes of Hamilton took the opportunity to go hunting both when at Court and when at home in Scotland. ¹ The 3rd duke did make an occasional expedition to Leslie to enjoy the hunting available in Fife,² but he seems to have preferred hare coursing³ and always kept greyhounds for rabbit hunting.⁴

Even more popular than hunting, perhaps, was the medieval sport of falconry. Many peers kept a full-time falconer, and one of the most frequently exchanged gifts among the aristocracy was a hawk. The 3rd duke throughout the years was sent hawks by a variety of friends and relations including Lord Strathnaver, the earl of Cassilis and the Earl Marshal.⁵ If he needed still more hawks he would write to a northern acquaintance like Lord Reay to see if any could be had,⁶ and he and his son both spent money frequently on velvet hoods, bells, hawking gloves and hawking bags⁷ to take with them on their expeditions to Bellshill, Musselburgh and Arran.⁸

Hunting and hawking had a useful side since the day's bag would supplement the household's provisions. There were, however, other outdoor sports which were purely recreational. Golf and tennis were both very popular with the peerage at this time. The 1st duke does not seem to have
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played golf, but his brother the 2nd duke certainly did. Where he learned to play is uncertain, but he may well have enjoyed a game during his visit to Scotland in 1635, for on his return south he bought clubs and balls to send home to his brother-in-law the earl of Lindsay. The first mention of him actually playing does not come until 1649, when he was in exile in Holland. The 3rd duke was certainly an enthusiastic golfer in his younger days, and in the 1650's and 60's played quite often on the sands of Leith, while his sons learned the game while at university.

Probably as a result of their travels on the continent, all four dukes were keen tennis players. Both the 1st duke and his brother played at Whitehall, the 3rd duke often enjoyed a game in Edinburgh with Lord Rothes or the master of Cochrane, and the 4th duke had played a great deal of tennis while on the Grand Tour. Bowling was another popular pastime. From as early as 1604 there had been a bowling alley in the gardens of Kinneil, and there seems to have been one at Hamilton too for in 1667 the steward gave six shillings 'to my lady duches at bowles.' The 3rd duke when visiting Tyninghame and later Tullibardine bowled in company with his hosts, and in the winter time he would go curling.
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Tennis and golf seem to have supplanted at least some of the pastimes familiar to an earlier generation. Archery and football, both mentioned in the accounts as recreations of the 1st duke's father and grandfather, only occur at all in connection with the seventeenth century Hamiltons as children's recreations, and although the 1st duke took part in tilting at Whitehall that particular sport was dying out altogether. Cockfighting retained its popularity, however, with both the English and the Scottish aristocracy, and was an acceptable entertainment for children. When the 3rd duke's sons were at school in Glasgow their governor made a payment when the children 'sett their cocks doun to fyght.' Finally, an entry in the Kinneil accounts records a much more peaceful activity there: the earl of Arran paid £16:13/- 'for a new anchor, 5 oars and a new tow for the pleasure boat.'

Most of the sports favoured by the seventeenth century nobleman were those in which he could participate personally, but one spectator sport was enjoying immense popularity - horse racing. As early as 1629 the 2nd duke of Hamilton spent a day at Lanark races, but it was not until the reign of Charles II that the sport really became popular. Both the 3rd duke and his eldest son were devotees, not without some family disapproval apparently, for on one occasion when he was about to set off
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for the races the duke wrote apologetically to his wife to assure her that although 'you will think this world should putt these things out of minde but whatever world it be, without my former promise to you, I believee I shall quikly weary off this sport.' In fact neither he nor the 4th duke ever did weary of horse racing: the 3rd duke owned horses which he raced at Leith from the 1670's until the end of his life, while the 4th duke raced his own horses at Newmarket.

The 3rd duchess presumably disapproved of horse racing because of the gambling involved, disliking it for both financial and religious reasons. Undoubtedly their puritan sympathies explained why she and her husband never seem to have gone to the theatre although their predecessors were regular playgoers. No one seems to have taken exception, however, to the small sums lost at cards. When the weather was bad and there was nothing else to do a game of cards was a pleasant enough way of passing the time and was particularly popular with the ladies. The 2nd marchioness with all her covenentig principles often played cards for money when she was staying at Kinneil, and when he was in exile in Holland the 2nd duke spent many evenings at the card table with such illustrious companions as Elizabeth of Bohemia and Princess Mary. Chess, too, was popular and in the 1660's there was a billiard table in the duke's
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If the ladies of the family were glad to have a game of cards to while away the time it was not surprising, for their range of activities was limited. Sewing, of course, was an obvious occupation, both the sewing up of linen garments for their relations, and embroidery. Then again, they were usually taught to play some musical instrument, and they could keep a pet for company - both the 3rd and 4th duchesses had a parrot. Nevertheless, life must have seemed dull at times and they must have welcomed the occasional diversion provided by a travelling entertainer. Minstrels and jugglers would sometimes call at Kinneil or Hamilton palace, but in 1706 even more exciting visitors arrived. In April of that year the 3rd duchess's secretary paid two guineas 'to the man who brought the Elephant to show her grace' and in the following month no less than £73:18/- was paid 'to Mr Higgins, posturemaster, who came and acted before her grace and several persons of quality.'

These 'persons of quality' were no doubt house-guests in the palace, for of course entertaining played a far more important part than entertainment. Naturally enough visitors would prove a pleasant diversion, but there was more to it than that. Hospitality had always played an important part in the life of the peerage, partly because the exigencies of travel dictated that a guest must spend a night or two with friends before
returning home. From this had grown up the tradition that a great house must be able to offer lavish hospitality, and the peers of sixteenth century England at least had spent huge sums on entertainment. ¹ This outlook had altered in England as the nobleman had begun to spend more and more time in London and less and less on his estates. In Scotland in the seventeenth century life at home was regarded as the natural state of affairs, and the Hamiltons at least did not spend extravagant sums on entertaining.

Details of the entertaining done in the palace during the first half of the century are not available, but under the 3rd duke and duchess a regular pattern was established. Guests would arrive in time for supper, and would spend the next two or three days in the palace. They would not call uninvited - even if they were the duchess's cousins and had been brought up in the palace ² - and they would come in small groups of two or three at a time. In this way about half a dozen people were entertained each week, and the guest rooms were rarely without an occupant, but the addition of one or two people to such a large household placed no great burden on expenditure and the accounts reflect only a slight increase even when four or five visitors were in the palace at one time.

Who exactly were these guests at Hamilton palace? Were they fellow peers, political associates or business acquaintances? Very often family papers do not yield this kind of information, but in the 1670's the provisor
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GENEALOGICAL TABLE IX

Cousins of the 3rd duchess of Hamilton.

James, 2nd marquis of Hamilton.

James, 1st duke of Hamilton

William, 2nd duke of Hamilton

Margaret, countess of Crawford

Anne, Lady Montgomerie

Margaret, Lady Belhaven

Anne, 3rd duchess of Hamilton

4 surviving daughters (See Genealogical Table IV)

William = Anna = Christian

Lady Mary Douglas, niece of the 3rd duke of Rothes Hamilton

Lady Anne Montgomerie, countess of Findlater

Sir Samuel Baillie of Lamington

Sir Robert Alexander, Hamilton of 1st Viscount Silvertonhill

Anne = Elizabeth =

Christian =

Margaret =

William =

Lady Anne Montgomerie, countess of Findlater
at Hamilton noted in the margin of his account book the comings and goings of all the visitors, and his notes are highly instructive. During the period from May 1677 until September 1678, a suitable time to study since the 3rd duke and duchess and their large family were in residence, a total of 61 visitors came to stay.\(^1\) Not unexpectedly, a third of this number were near relations. The duchess's only sister came to spend a few weeks with her each summer, as did their half-sister Mary Hay of Park. Three of their cousins, having quarrelled with the duchess, did not come at all, but Margaret, the youngest, was on visiting terms. The most frequent family visitors were related to both the duke and the duchess - the Hamiltons of Bargany. Lord Bargany, the duke's nephew, was a close friend, as were his sisters Anna and her husband Sir Patrick Houston, Marjory and her husband William Baillie of Lamington, Katherine who was married to William Cunningham of Enterkin, and Grisel who died unmarried in 1678.\(^2\) The duchess's cousin Lady Rothes and her daughter called on one occasion, as did the duke's sister Lady Nithsdale, his brother Lord James Douglas, and his brothers-in-law Perth and Queensberry.

It was only natural that a sizeable proportion of the visitors to Hamilton should be relations: what is surprising is that, apart from the relatives, only 9 of the visitors were peers or their heirs. It might have been expected that the Hamiltons would entertain only those of an elevated social standing - fellow peers and statesmen. During these

\(^1\) A husband and wife being counted as one unit.
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seventeenth months, however, the only peers to pay more than one visit were the earl of Forfar, Lord Cochrane, who was a close family friend, and Lord Carmichael. Otherwise the earl and countess of Wigtown, the countess's brother Dalhousie, and Dalhousie's brother Carnwath stayed for one night, as did Lord Cochrane's eldest son, who was destined to marry the 3rd duke of Hamilton's daughter. By far the greatest number of guests in the palace were members of the local gentry, younger sons and professional men.

It would therefore seem that the 3rd duke and duchess preferred the company of those with similar tastes and interests to their own. The most frequent visitor of all was Sir Daniel Carmichael, who was invited to dinner or supper no fewer than sixteen times in the space of twelve months, sometimes with his lady, sometimes with his nephew Lord Carmichael, but often alone. Sir Daniel had been chamberlain of Scotland and master of works in 1641; during the Civil War he had fought on the parliamentary side, and later became a commissioner of the peace for Lanarkshire. With his covenanting and local background he epitomised the men and women who were friends of the 3rd duke and duchess, men like Major-General Drummond, Sir William Hamilton of Preston and Sir John Harper, all of whom shared the duchess's covenanting sympathies and could talk knowledgeably about local affairs. Not only soldiers, local commissioners of supply and sheriffs depute could be found around the dinner table in the palace: professional men were often invited too. Gilbert Burnet was still an

1 S.P., iv, 585-6.
occasional guest, and Mr William Hamilton and Mr George Bannerman the advocates came to dinner, as did Provost Anderson of Glasgow. Finally, there were the ministers. William Vilant, the Fife man who became minister of Cambusnethan, was invited to the palace, and so were John Hutchison of Dundonald and John Osborne, both known for their support of the conventiclers.¹

The caterer's guest lists² therefore provide a most interesting comment on the outlook of the 3rd duke and duchess of Hamilton. Their selection of guests was varied and remarkably democratic, for although any leading nobleman would have his own political cronies and satellites, and might be expected to mix only with fellow peers, other considerations weighed more strongly with the duke and duchess: they still relied on the old local and kinship connections, and entertained these traditional friends in a modest style.

It might, of course, be argued that the difficulties of travel dictated this reliance on local society, but in fact even when from home the Hamiltons tended to associate with relations and neighbours. This seems to have been as true of the 2nd duke as of his successors. When he returned from the Grand Tour in 1635 and came home to Scotland, the only visits he made were to his niece at Eglinton, to his sister at Struthers and to his cousin Abercorn at Paisley. While at home he entertained his maternal cousin Lord Glencairn, and travelled to Glasgow with him and with

¹ Fasti, iii, 35, 240.
² HA 444/3; 554/4, 5, 6, 8, 10.
Glencairn's kinsman Sir David Cunningham of Robertland, whose brothers he had known at university. His other companions during his stay in Scotland seem to have been Sir John Hamilton of Bargany, his old friend Lord Montgomerie, and his neighbour Andrew Clelland.¹

Similarly, when the 3rd duke and duchess went to stay with anyone it was usually to the duchess's aunt at the Biel, to her cousins at Struthers and Tyninghame, or to the duke's family at Douglas. Of course when they were in Edinburgh the opportunity to meet friends was greatly increased, but even so, social contacts were subordinated to business considerations. There were those occasions which demanded entertaining on the grand scale, but in day to day affairs there was little time for frivolity. The 3rd duke might take an afternoon off to play tennis or have a round of golf, but otherwise his time was devoted to his own business matters and to affairs of state, and even when he went for a meal at Masterton's or the Green Dragon he was usually to be found in the company of men with whom he could discuss those matters.² Many of these were also men to whom he was related. He frequently dined with Lord Rothes, who was married to his wife's cousin, and with his own brothers-in-law Annandale and Drumlanrig, and of course with Bargany. Other Hamiltons - Belhaven, Raploch and Orbiston - would join him for supper, and he was often seen about with connections of his wife - Glencairn, Callendar and the Dundonalds.

¹ HA 506/5.
² HA 526/6/6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13; 465/1; 465/5/6; 465/6/1; 465/7/1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9; 465/8/1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10; 465/9/23; 465/10/41; 519/3/3, 4, 5, 6.
He did entertain other friends too: Southesk was a frequent visitor to the taxation chamber he rented even before Lord Carnegie married Lady Anna Hamilton, for as one of the duke's leading creditors he would come to talk over financial matters. The duke also knew well Sir William Bruce, with whom he no doubt discussed his building plans, and then there were political associates like the marquis of Atholl and the earl of Home. On one occasion he even shared tobacco, pipes and a bottle of canary with his old enemy Lauderdale. His relationship with Lauderdale was an example of how personal antipathy could cancel out old loyalties. Lauderdale had been a close friend of the 2nd duke of Hamilton and indeed of the 3rd duchess and her sister, but this did not ameliorate the dislike the two men had for each other. Then again the 3rd duke could never agree with his nephews Queensberry and Annandale. These were, however, exceptions, and on the whole the 2nd and 3rd dukes found their friends and allies among their kinsmen and neighbours.

It is more difficult to gauge just whom the 4th duke regarded as his close friends. These must to a large extent have been the Englishmen he knew at Court - Sunderland, for example. When he returned to Scotland he was usually in the company of his relations - his brothers John and Basil, his brother-in-law the duke of Atholl and his cousin Belhaven, but this may have been not so much because they were his kinsmen as because they shared the same anti-Union views.

On the whole, however, it is possible to conclude that the seventeenth century dukes of Hamilton chose as their closest companions kinsmen and neighbours. They could accordingly entertain these friends in a modest
way, treating them as additions to their household rather than as strangers to be impressed, and by the same token when the Hamiltons themselves went to stay with friends it was usually with relations. For this reason expenditure on entertaining was not lavish, unless on special occasions. Family gatherings remained the most important occasions of the year, for there were indeed few other festivals to be celebrated. By the mid-seventeenth century Christmas was not marked at all in most places, although the traditional festivities lingered on in the north: in 1691, for instance, the Episcopalian marchioness of Atholl urged her eldest son to come and spend Christmas at Dunkeld, since it was no longer celebrated in Fife but was still observed in her Perthshire home. Even so, the celebrations were of a restricted nature, for a year later she wrote to him describing how the family at Dunkeld had spent Christmas day of 1692 with a sermon and devotions in the morning, adding almost apologetically that these had been followed by some 'innocent mirth.' In a similar vein Lord Montgomerie invited a friend to Christmas dinner in 1694 with the words 'I hope [that] to eate ane gouse that day will give little offence to presbitray.'

New Year, however, was usually marked with some rejoicings and the exchange of gifts. If the 3rd duke and duchess happened to be in Edinburgh at that time the town hautboys would come to Holyroodhouse 'to wish their graces a good new year', and when the earl of Arran was in England wooing

1 The duke of Atholl's Archives, 29, i, (6) 59.
2 Ibid., 96.
3 RH 9/18/28/53.
his second wife he gave as presents at Gerard House a pair of expensive earrings, a writing box and some toothpicks. His other New Year's gifts included one to his former father-in-law the earl of Sunderland and some small gratuities to the yeomen of the guard, the porter at Kensington and the keepers of Hyde Park.¹

There was now also the feeling that baptisms should be private, family affairs. The 1st duke's children had been born in London and had been christened with great splendour - the queen herself had been one of the godparents of his first daughter and Charles I had been godfather of his second child.² Usually, however, Hamilton children were baptised in Hamilton parish church, and since the baptism generally took place on the day of the baby's birth or very shortly afterwards, the ceremony was of necessity simple,³ and was held before a few friends. The only details available of any christening relate to the baptism of Lord Basil's son William, who was born on 16 September 1692.⁴ The duchess's secretary recorded on 21 September 'Lord Basil's son was christened William. My Lady Panmure [the baby's aunt] cary'd the child to church and my Lord Panmure, Sir William Maxwell, Ernock, Barncluth and Barntoun were gossips.' A month after the child's birth he noted 'The Lady Baldoon was kirked.'⁵ Although a month was the conventional period to wait before the churching of women service took place, it could if necessary be reduced: after the
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birth of one of her children the 3rd duke's daughter Susan recovered quickly and planned 'to goe to church yesterday tho her month was not out, that she might goe to Edinburgh before the parliament sat down', her mother explained to Lady Katherine Murray.¹

Birthdays, of course, were usually observed too. When the 3rd duke was in England in the winter of 1693 he wrote home to his wife telling her, 'I shall be glad to hear...you have eat a good barren doe and remembered my birthday as I intend to do yours.'² Soon afterwards he told her that he had bought 'a sute of new clothes for your birthday and shall drinke your health with your friends here', and on the actual day he, four of his sons and his brother-in-law the earl of Cassilis drank her health.³ Not everyone was as punctilious as the 3rd duke, and indeed his eldest son could be regrettably remiss about such matters: he apparently forgot all about the birthday of his own little son the marquis of Clydesdale until his mother wrote to remind him that 'this is your son's birthday, which he is much taken up with.'⁴

The real occasion for family celebrations was, however, a marriage, and in particular the marriage of the heir. As it happened, three of the seventeenth century dukes of Hamilton were married in England, and no accounts of the 3rd duchess's marriage seem to have survived. The daughters of the family were all married in Scotland, usually in Hamilton

¹ The duke of Atholl's Archives Box 45, iii.
² HL 7389.
³ HL 7391.
⁴ HL 9741.
church. Preparations for a wedding had to begin weeks beforehand for the occasion had to be a memorable one - not only must the honour of the family be upheld, but the bride's new relations must be impressed. When Lady Katherine, the 3rd duke's eldest daughter, was to marry Lord Murray on 24 April 1683, the catering arrangements were begun early in March. Servants were sent out to see about provisions, a special list of extraordinary expenditure was drawn up, and a great box of sweetmeats was brought out from Edinburgh. Invitations had to be written and new clothes made. The duke advised the duchess to ask their old master household John Hamilton to come back for the occasion 'to set the meat on the table as he is fittest.'

All sorts of extra household goods were then bought in, ranging from wine glasses to chamber pots, and as the day approached wild fowl were brought, more sugar plums were sent for, and no fewer than 30 cattle were killed. The wedding celebrations were liable to go on for as long as a week, with dancing and feasting, and the whole affair cost hundreds of pounds.

Perhaps the most expensive ceremony of all was the very last, the funeral, for the early Hamiltons went in for all the funeral pomp so dear to the hearts of the peerage, both English and Scottish. The honour of the family demanded it, and so it was that the heralds and pursuivants, trumpeters and soldiers followed the 2nd marquis of Hamilton to his grave in 1625, accompanied by a great crowd of mourners led by the dead man's
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heir. So many guests had been invited that they could not all be accommodated in Hamilton palace but were boarded out in the town; so many poor from the surrounding area tried to force their way to the church in hope of alms that six halberd men were needed to keep them back; and so grandiose was the funeral feast that the earls of Morton and Wigtown had to lend their cooks to help with the catering, and extra cooks and bakers had to be hired from Edinburgh. The whole occasion cost over £2,000 Scots.¹

Even when a child died, the ceremony was not a private one. When the 1st duke's young son William died at Hampton Court in the winter of 1638 a solemn procession accompanied by over eighty Londoners bearing torches carried his body to Westminster Abbey where the dean and subdean, four prebendaries, two vergers and a 'chanthor' were waiting to take part in the service, with the organist and his singingmen and ten young choristers to provide music.²

William's sister Mary, his brother Charles and his cousin James, the 2nd duke's only son, were buried at Westminster in the countess of Buckingham's vault in St Michael's chapel, beside their mother, and his brother James was buried in St Nicholas's chapel.³ When a peer himself died, however, it was felt that he should be buried at home in the family vault if at all possible, and this was why the 2nd marquis's body had been

¹ HA 210/1/7.
² HL 5901.
³ W.B.M., 130, 133, 134, 141.
shipped home after his death in London. Similarly, after the death of the 1st duke, his friends must have begged his body from the executioner. A torn scrap of paper originally in the Hamilton accounts records payment made on 24 March 1648/9 to John Dickson of the Strand for the embalming of a corpse, undoubtedly that of the 1st duke. An English skipper was then paid £346 Scots 'for the fraught of my lord's corps' to the Forth, and late one night the body was brought ashore and carried up to Kinneil, where it lay for some days before being taken west. Finally, on 1 May 1649, the Hamilton Burial Register records, 'James duke of Hamilton come from Kinneill in ane cotch to the barnes of Hamilton, and there outtane and borne...to his burial place...with ane great assemblie.'

Eighteen months later the 2nd duke died from wounds received at the battle of Worcester. Once more the services of Mr Dickson of the Strand were called upon. He travelled out to Worcester to embalm the corpse, but this time political circumstances made it impossible for it to be taken to Hamilton as the dead man had wished, and instead he was buried in a lead coffin below the east end of the choir in Worcester Cathedral.

The Civil War brought about a change in the attitude of the peerage

---
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towards funerals. Not only was there a feeling that lavish expenditure on such an occasion was hardly justified, but many began to feel that it was also inappropriate. Their sentiments were summed up by a request made by Anne, countess of Lothian, at the end of her Will. 'I desir no serimony at my booriall,' she wrote firmly. It became common practice to insert a clause of this sort in one's testament, and women were particularly emphatic on this point, sharing the English ladies' repugnance at the notion of embalming: 'My bodie I desire may be caried to the grave without anie seremonie and not bowelled, only wrapt in sercloth and buried in a few days after marcifull God grant my chaing', wrote Lady Susanna Hamilton, countess of Cassilis, in her Will, expressing the sentiment of many of her sex.

Such pious wishes were to be admired, but they did present the relatives with something of a problem. While carrying out the wishes of the deceased they must at the same time uphold the honour of the family. There therefore grew up a somewhat ambivalent attitude to the whole subject, and while a nobleman might desire for himself a plain burial, he thought that friends and relations should go to their grave with all the ceremony befitting their social status. Thus the 3rd duchess of Hamilton, who desired to be buried 'without pomp or ceremony in Hamilton church next to

---
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the body of her dearest husband, nonetheless wrote to her uncle's widow, the countess of Denbigh, offering her condolences on the earl's death but regretting what she called 'the meannes' of the funeral, and on another occasion her secretary wrote critically to the earl of Arran about the unimpressive burial of the duke of Queensberry.

Usually the matter was resolved in a compromise whereby the women and children of the family received simple burials while the head of the house had a grandiose funeral. Wives and children were generally buried at night, by torchlight, in a simple wooden coffin made by a local carpenter and with only a few friends in attendance - when the 1st duke invited the earl of Cassilis to his mother's funeral he explained that 'becaus it was hir owen express pleasure that thare should be nather solemneties nor showes used at hir funerall I shall desyre you would be pleased to come only acompaniede with your owne domestik servants for I intend not to have any there but your lordship and hir own children.'

Children were sometimes still embalmed, but usually because they had been 'opened' for medical reasons, it being felt that if the cause of death could be ascertained, precautions could be taken to prevent other offspring
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from succumbing to the same disease.¹

The funeral for a lady or a child would cost from £200 to £500 Scots,² but far more had to be expended when the head of the family died. A contemporary representation of the funeral procession of John, duke of Rothes in 1681,³ gives a graphic impression of exactly how grand such an occasion could be. Rothes was chancellor of Scotland when he died, and archbishops, bishops, the lords treasurer, register and advocate, the lords of session, Edinburgh bailies and town councillors all walked in his procession. There were trumpeters and standardbearers, 8 noblemen, servants, and 51 poor men in hoods and gowns. The coffin, magnificently decorated with coats of arms and symbols of mortality, was carried along under a canopy borne by ten men, and the dead duke's mourning coach, horse of war, saddle horse and parliament horse all were there.

One of the noble relations bearing the mortcloth was that assiduous attender of funerals, the 3rd duke of Hamilton, and when he himself died some thirteen years later his burial must have been no less splendid. The duke passed away in Holyrood on 18 April 1694, and on the same day doctors embalmed the body: this alone cost over £600.⁴ The dead linens came to half as much, and James McLellan the wright was paid £341 for 'ane extraordinar fyn wanscot coffin.'⁵ Throughout the first half of May a
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constant stream of messengers went between Edinburgh and Hamilton in connection with preparations for the funeral, and on 24 May to the sounding of guns from Edinburgh Castle the funeral procession left for Hamilton church. The service there was followed by an elaborate banquet.

The ritual of mourning did not, of course, end with the burial. Part of the church had been painted black - the area next to the tomb, the minister's and the elders' seats, the church door, railing and stairs - and in the palace itself a similar transformation took place. All the window curtains were dyed black, special black hangings were put on the walls, and the cushions, beds and chairs were all covered in black. Moreover the entire family and servants had to be fitted out with black clothes; even the duchess's fans were now made of black material. For the rest of her life she wore mournings, and kept her best bedroom and little dressing-room permanently hung with black. Letters sent out were edged with black and sealed with black wax, and the duchess gave orders to George Mein the Edinburgh jeweller to make up mourning rings containing locks of her dead husband's hair.

Strict etiquette governed these outward trappings of grief, and
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mournings were to be worn not only by immediate relations but by quite distant family connections. 1 In the winter of 1694 the 3rd duke had excused himself to his wife for not daring to put on mournings in such cold weather even though 'you have a cousen dead in Irland, the Lord Grandeson's eldest son.' 2 Even when a child died, mournings had to be worn and although Lord Basil, finding himself in town without any black clothes when his brother John's son died, hoped that 'his not wearing them can't be noticed for a child' 3 he had nevertheless been careful to wear black when the earl of Arran's daughter had died, and had consulted the bereaved father anxiously about how long he should go on wearing them. 4

The final duty which the surviving members of the family could perform was to provide a suitable monument to the defunct. Whether or not monuments to all the early Hamiltons had been erected is not clear. The only relevant mention in the accounts is of a payment in 1608 for 'aucht laid of lyme to big my lord's tombe.' 5 No monument seems to have been erected to commemorate the 1st marquis's successors until in February 1696 the 3rd duchess 'being resolved to cause build a handsome, stately and decent monument upon the buriall place of the family, adjoyning to the church of Hamilton, and more especially upon that place wher the body of the late William, duke of Hamilton her dearest husband is interred,'
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entered into a contract with the famous two James Smiths for the erection of a large marble tomb. Specific instructions as to how this tomb was to be made were laid down in the contract, which was accompanied by a pen and ink draft of what it should look like.¹

The entire monument was to be of black and white Dutch marble, forming a tall rectangle enclosed by pillars decorated with coats of arms, Hamilton cinquefoils and with capitols carved 'according to the rules of architecture.' At the base were to be panels cut with trophies of war and honour, and the emblems of mortality, 'exactly like the draught or better.' The centre of the tomb was to consist of an inscription on a large block of black marble, with a mourning boy at either side and a flaming urn on top. Above the urn was a small angel blowing a trumpet, and at the very top, outside the main rectangle, was to be a large coat of arms surmounted by another urn.

So huge was this monument that the whole aisle had to be altered to accommodate it. Marquis John's monument was to be temporarily removed, the vault enlarged, and new flooring of black and white marble put in above it. The entire roof had to be taken off so that the aisle could be heightened, the north wall was rebuilt, windows blocked up and a new stair put in. The duchess had already spent over £10,000 on her husband's

¹ HA 463/10/2; see Plate 9.

Plate 9 James Smith's draft of his monument to the 3rd duke of Hamilton.
funeral:¹ the erection of his monument cost a further £7,200.² Today nothing of the church remains; the monument now stands in Bothwell church and the dukes of Hamilton rest in Hamilton's Bent Cemetery.

In many ways the 3rd duke's monument symbolises the conspicuous consumption of the Hamilton family. Those who came to gaze at the white marble would not simply remember the man who had died but would be impressed by the wealth and position of the family he had represented. In their choice of clothing, food and transport, in the style of their entertaining and in the grandeur of their marriages and funerals, noblemen could demonstrate their social standing to contemporaries, but what of the future? When she planned her husband's monument the 3rd duchess hoped that it would provide a permanent memorial not only to the man she had loved but to the honour of the house of Hamilton. To the duchess the family did not just consist of its living members, but of generations to come, and for this reason she and her husband had devoted a good deal of their energies to improving their estates in an effort to secure the future position of the family. Conspicuous expenditure was not always for the present: it might well be for the benefit of posterity.

¹ HL 3924.
² HL 4050; HA 354/1; 354/13; 446/5; 446/14/15; 463/14/9.
The palace at Hamilton...is large as it is, tho' part of the design is yet unfinish'd; it is now a fair front, with two wings, two wings more there are laid out in the ichnography of the building, but are not attempted; the successor if he thinks fit may build them. The front is very magnificent indeed, all of white freestone with regular ornaments according to the rules of art: the wings are very deep, and when other wings come to be added, if ever that shall be, the two sides of the house will then be like two large fronts rather than wings; not unlike Beddington House, near Croydon in Surrey, only much larger.'¹ This was how Hamilton palace appeared to Daniel Defoe when he visited Lanarkshire in 1706; had he been there thirty years before he would have found a very different building, a sixteenth century structure built round a quadrangle, with office houses surrounding a smaller courtyard at the side.² In the second half of the seventeenth century the palace had been completely transformed.

¹ Daniel Defoe, A Tour through the Whole Island of Great Britain, ii, 339; see also Richard Pococke, Tours in Scotland, 47-8; Thomas Pennant, A Tour in Scotland, i, 139; James Muir, Brown's Hamilton Directory for 1855-6, with a handbook of Hamilton, 55; see Plate 10.
² See Plate 11.

Plate 10 The exterior of the new Hamilton palace, from the south.
This transformation took place during a period of building activity in Scotland as well as in England. While Montagu, Conway, Devonshire, Buckingham and their friends spent fortunes on building stately homes for themselves in the south, the Scottish peers were also finding it desirable to extend and remodel their houses. As early as the 1650's the earl of Lothian had made extensive alterations at Newbattle, and his daughter continued the work when she inherited the title. In the 1660's the earl of Strathmore was busy redesigning his castle at Glamis, while the earl of Panmure employed John Mylne to rebuild at Panmure. Lauderdale remodelled Thirlestane in the following decade, employing Sir William Bruce as architect. As well as working for the king at Holyrood, Sir William designed Moncrieffe House, Hopetoun, Craighall and Kinross House. After his death, Robert Mylne's son-in-law James Smith rose to fame. He too had worked on the remodelling of Holyrood, and in 1683 was appointed as overseer of the royal works in Scotland. Queensberry employed him at Drumlanrig House, Leven at Melville House, and he was also responsible for alterations at Traquair, Dalkeith and Yester. It was he whom the 3rd duke of Hamilton employed when he decided to transform Hamilton palace.

The duke was motivated not only by the desire to have a more comfort-
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able home, but by the feeling that the great family of Hamilton must have an appropriately splendid residence. That the 3rd duke and duchess were able to embark upon a programme of rebuilding at all is a tribute to the economic miracle they worked at Hamilton. The 3rd duchess had inherited an estate burdened with astronomical debts, yet by the 1670's she and her husband were not only solvent but were in a position to initiate an expensive scheme of rebuilding.

They did not, however, begin with Hamilton palace, but started in a smaller way at Kinneil, which they intended to be the residence of their eldest son until he succeeded to the Hamilton estates. The castle which the 3rd duchess inherited was very small, and hardly suitable for the heir to a great family, consisting as it did of only the L-shaped 'double house' built by Châteleurault. Comfortable and pleasant though the rooms undoubtedly were, with their panoramic views out over the Forth, they probably seemed old-fashioned and inconvenient to the duke, who had seen the great houses of England and France. In the early 1670's therefore, he employed masons and wrights to build a fine new house at Kinneil, dwarfing the L-shaped block beside it. This new house was five stories high, classically plain, and surmounted by a cornice and balustrade. At either side was a pavilion, one storey lower than the main house. The south pavilion accommodated the main staircase, while the north pavilion linked the new house with the old. The main entrance was through a simple Renaissance doorway which led into a large hall. Immediately above
this hall was the principal chamber in the house, a great salon which occupied the entire length of the first floor.¹

How much this cost the 3rd duke and duchess does not emerge from the accounts so far examined; indeed no details of the building work done at Kinneil have yet come to light. The 3rd duke did, however, mention to the duke of Queensberry that the pavilion containing the staircase 'was dearer than the other, being 1000 merks Scots for the workmanship of the ston worke onely.'²

When the rebuilding at Kinneil had been successfully completed the duke turned his attention to Crawford Castle. This particular house was never occupied by the family in the seventeenth century, unless for the occasional visit by the 2nd marchioness, but the duke modernised the interior over a period of years, employing as his mason James Hamilton in Abbeygreen. Many of the old windows in the castle were blocked up, while turnpike stairs were taken down and modern staircases put in instead. In 1677 a new door into the oratory was made, and the wall between it and a small new closet removed. At the same time an entirely new kitchen was constructed, and in the early 1680's three small chambers of timber and stone at the end of the great hall were taken down so that the walk behind the new kitchen could be continued round the house. Finally, new doors

¹ H.M.C. Inventory of Ancient Monuments in the Counties of Midlothian and West Lothian, 190-2; James Richardson, 'Sixteenth and Seventeenth Century Mural Decoration at the House of Kinneil' in Proc. Soc. Antiq., lxxv, 184-204; Thomas J. Salmon, Borrowstounness and District, 46.
² GD 224/171 (Queensberry Transcripts).
and fireplaces were being put in during the 1690's, and timber partitions were erected in the chambers above the dining room.\(^1\)

By this time, the duke and duchess had embarked upon their great design for rebuilding Hamilton palace. Apart from having the experience gained from the building at Kinneil, the duke had visited other great houses where alterations were being made,\(^2\) he had bought books on architecture,\(^3\) and he and the duchess had pored over the plans of the great French houses seen by their eldest son on his Grand Tour.\(^4\) As early as 1678 the duke had promised his wife that he would have the draft of a new house drawn up while he was in London, thinking it wise 'to have such a thing by us against we be able to build it',\(^5\) and in the 1680's he had further plans drawn up.\(^6\) In October 1691 James Smith went out to Hamilton and was paid £29 for drawing some drafts,\(^7\) and eighteen months later he entered into a contract with the duke and duchess for building the west quarter of the palace.\(^8\)

After much discussion the duke and duchess had finally agreed upon Smith's draft. The existing palace was built round a quadrangle: the intention seems to have been to demolish three sides of this, leaving the north side standing. Two wings would then be built on at right angles to

---

1 HA 462/3/2; 120/3.
2 HA 519/2/1.
3 HA 519/2/4.
4 HL 5881, 5995, 5998.
5 HL 8147.
6 HA 354/3.
7 HA 120/3.
8 HA 354/7/2.

Plate 11 The exterior of the old Hamilton palace, drawn by Isaac Miller.
the main block, and a further two at the other side were envisaged, so that the completed structure would form a large H if seen from above. Because of the expense involved, the 3rd duke planned to make the alterations gradually, erecting first of all the west wing and telling his wife that once it was completed they could then 'see how the world goes or wee begin another.'

He and the duchess played an active part in planning the new palace. After a discussion with one of the king's architects in London the duke told his wife, 'you will thinke you ar a better contriver then I am when I tell you he is against that stair you was, and is contryveing to put it where the turnpike is.' No detail was too small to merit their attention, and a few weeks later they were discussing a carving which was to be placed at the south end of the palace. 'I am of your minde', the duke wrote home to the duchess, 'that our cipher without the Garter will be better then a sundial...but it must be larg with the year of God under it and a floorish or a laurell about, so the place to put it in must be left till wee agrie on the cipher.' Presumably the finished article resembled the carved coat of arms which once decorated the façade of the new building at Kinneil and can still be seen in the castle although no longer in its former position.

By the spring of 1694 work on the west quarter of the palace was well under way. Timber for the joists and also for the scaffolding was brought
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out in carts from Leith and Bo'ness to Hamilton, and later on plumbers came out from Edinburgh to lay lead pipes. However, just when everything seemed to be going well, the 3rd duke died. Considering that only a small part of the final plan had been carried out, and that even the 3rd duke himself had contemplated doing no more than rebuilding the west wing, it would not have been surprising had his widow abandoned the ambitious plans for the palace. But the duchess was a woman of courage and vision, and she did not hesitate. For the sake of the future dukes of Hamilton, she was resolved to continue with the building programme even although she was convinced that she would not live long after her husband's death. Nor was her task an easy one. Without her husband to confer with, she tried to draw her eldest son into the plans for the new palace, but he was depressingly casual about the whole business. Not only did he fail to appreciate the expense involved, but when his mother sent him drafts of the proposed buildings he did not return them promptly, and his vague comments made it all too clear that his interests lay elsewhere.

Realising that it was useless to wait for his advice, the duchess went ahead on her own. The west quarter was successfully completed, and by the beginning of 1696 the east wing was almost ready. In June of that year, however, another major obstacle was encountered. The old north block which was to have formed the central part of the new palace was found to be
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in such poor condition with the roof positively dangerous that James Smith could only advise the duchess that it too should be taken down, leaving only the wall on the garden side standing.\(^1\) This was indeed a blow, for it meant that the rebuilding would have to be much more extensive than had been envisaged, and of course correspondingly costly. The duchess was perturbed but undeterred. The plans to build a third and fourth wing would have to be abandoned, but if the main house had to come down it would at least mean that when rebuilt its floors would be on a level with those of the new wings, and as Lord Basil explained to the earl of Arran, 'the house which was but eighteen feet wide formerlie will be twenty-two feet the same with the wing.'\(^2\)

Once the decision to rebuild the central block had been taken, work went ahead quickly. By July 1697 the walls were up as far as the tympanum\(^3\) and on October 6 the duchess was able to go 'up to the rooff of the north quarter of the palace.'\(^4\) In December the roof was slated,\(^5\) and by the spring of 1698 the new buildings were finished, although wrights, painters and woodcarvers were hard at work in the interior for many months to come.

All in all, the new Hamilton palace had cost a great deal more than the 3rd duke had calculated. The Hamilton accounts record payments of well over £2,000 for the timber alone,\(^6\) and more than £123,000 was paid to James
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Smith, in addition to which there must also have been payments to glaziers, painters and Wrights. This was conspicuous expenditure on the grand scale, and demonstrates very clearly that the 3rd duke and duchess were ready to sacrifice their own comfort for the benefit of future generations of the family. Nor did their improvements end there. A magnificent house must have a suitable setting, and this meant not only fine gardens but well laid out grounds.

During his tour of Scotland Defoe had noted that many of the Scottish landowners were interested in planting. In the Lothians 'you hardly see a gentleman's house...but they are distinguished by groves and walks of firr-trees about them', and Ayrshire, Fife, and the Tweed valley were equally well planted. At such houses as Floors, Yester, Aberdour and Pinkie there were particularly good examples of the landowners' interest, and many smaller gentlemen had put in trees around their homes too. If Defoe was unsuccessful in dispelling the myth of a barren, treeless Scotland, the fault was hardly his.

It might be argued that Defoe had deliberately set out to present Scotland to the English in a favourable light, but other evidence shows that planting was well under way by 1700. Fifty years before that the
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grounds of Coltness already had flourishing walnuts and chestnuts, birches and firs,\(^1\) and a decade later there were sycamores, alders, Scots pines and birches in the famous gardens at Barncluith.\(^2\) By the end of the century a good variety of young trees was being tried out at Paisley,\(^3\) while a total of 44,050 had been put in at Panmure.\(^4\) Nor indeed had Hamilton itself been neglected. When Defoe saw it he was impressed not only by the fine situation of the palace but by the grounds; both the High and Low parks were 'extremely well planted with trees.'\(^5\)

The Hamiltons had in fact long been interested in planting. As early as 1622 the 2nd marquis was giving some thought to the subject, both he and the king being apparently eager to see what they could achieve in the way of planting 'ather with the seeds or the young fir trees.'\(^6\) It was not so much the marquis himself, however, but rather his wife who was a great planter. In the 1620's her gardener at Kinneil had been instructed to buy young trees from the laird of Pollock,\(^7\) and by the 1630's she was writing to Sir Colin Campbell of Glenorchy for fir seed.\(^8\) 'I have already,' she told him, 'ane four or fayf houndir of my awin planting, that is pratti treis, and deid derekly weith them as ye set doune in your letter.' Not only did she herself 'think morr of them nor ye can imagen,'

\(^2\) Ibid., 46.
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but she had aroused the enthusiasm of both her son and her son-in-law. The 1st duke 'lovis them no les nor I doe, and hes wilit me to plant a greit manay meie' while her daughter Margaret's husband Lord Lindsay 'is ane warie grit plantter of his eig as evir I knewe any, and I am glad to cherish him to do it.' Sir Colin need only send Lord Lindsay the 'noutis', the marchioness added, since he 'can win the seid himselve as he hes sein me dou.'

Presumably the marchioness retained an interest in planting for the rest of her life, although no evidence remains to confirm this. Neither is there any record of planting in the 1650's, but this was only to be expected as the Cromwellian invasion interrupted any plans for the improvement of estates. When the Restoration brought a return to normal, the 3rd duke and duchess became enthusiastic planters. During the 1670's the 3rd duke regularly sent home from London young trees for his estates. While on these trips south, he also kept closely in touch with the work being done in the grounds at Hamilton. On hearing that the deer were spoiling the trees in the Little Park he wrote home at once to tell the duchess that he thought it strange that the paling had not yet been put up to keep them out, and gave orders that the gardener's men should put stakes about those trees which the deer were likely to damage. At his instigation mulberries and cypress trees were tried out at Hamilton.
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as well as the more usual varieties. Horse chestnuts had been sown in the grounds during the 1680's and ash trees were planted in the Ladywell enclosure at that time.¹ In February 1693 Hew Wood had planted alder trees, had begun some thorn and holly hedges, and was putting in horse chestnuts between the cherry trees in the kitchen garden to correspond with the two rows of linden trees in the north court.²

During that spring the gardener began planting the north avenue with elm trees from Paisley. These had become available rather unexpectedly. The duke's son-in-law the earl of Dundonald died suddenly and Hew Wood was sent to help make an inventory of the trees in the abbey yards of Paisley. There he found over 500 horse chestnuts, ten beds of young fir trees, several hundred oak trees, walnut trees, pine trees, two rows of elm trees and another 200 elms in the coach yards.³ Since the earl's death his gardener had already sold 100 of the elm trees to Lord Ross and another 30 to Cochrane of Kilmarnock, together with some 20 plane trees, but Hew Wood was quick to lay claim to the remaining elms and bought them for the 3rd duke.

After the duke's own death the duchess continued the work of planting. By now the young trees grown from seed were flourishing and could be transplanted from the nurseries and kitchen gardens to the avenues for which they were intended.⁴ A new walk lined with plane trees was laid out on
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the south side of the Ladywell enclosure, an avenue of trees leading down to the Clyde was planted, and only Orbiston's refusal to sell the duchess some land she wanted prevented her from carrying out her plans to lengthen another avenue as far as the fir trees at the park meadow.

Meanwhile the purchase of young trees and seeds continued. Now that the 3rd duke was no longer alive it was not so easy to obtain those from London, but it was possible to buy them locally. Young trees were purchased from Wishaw and Colinton and were brought from the north yard at Holyrood, while seeds came along with the vegetable and flower seeds bought in Edinburgh. This happened for the first time in 1702 when the duchess bought from Robert Innes 2 ounces of Norway fir seed, 3 ounces of hornbeam and 3 pounds of beech mast. Two years later she ordered half a dozen pine cones from her Edinburgh seedsman, 16 pounds of acorns in the following year, and an ounce of cypress seeds a year after that.

As time went on her purchases increased in quantity. In 1707 she purchased from William Millar the Holyrood gardener 16 pounds of beech mast, 200 beeches, 200 Dutch elms, 100 lime trees and 2000 thorns, and
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in the years which followed she sent for more acorns, beech mast, yew seeds and silver fir.

At Kinneil, too, a programme of planting had been going on ever since the 2nd marchioness had ordered young trees for the grounds, and in the 1630's a large quantity of thorns had been put in. The 3rd duke and duchess had sixty lime trees brought over from Holland for the castle gardens, and when their son was given control of the estate the work of planting continued. The earl of Arran was away in England for long periods, but his chamberlain Daniel Hamilton supervised the work done around the castle, and would write for the earl's approval before any planting was begun. The main concern there was the long straight avenue which runs eastwards from the castle entrance. In 1693 Daniel Hamilton bought 150 plane trees from the gardener at Niddrie so that he could replace those planes in the avenue which had decayed. At about the same time he purchased young ash trees from Wishaw and planted them in the avenue too. He also obtained some thorns and enclosed the young trees with hedges of these in order to protect them from the weather. Even then his troubles were not over, for it was discovered that there was a squint in the avenue, and it was some months before this was straightened.
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out. By the following spring, however, he had put matters right, had planted a hedge running from the stables to the kitchen gate, was planning to fence in the enclosure of young trees in the grounds and had 'sold the bull who was a great enemy to them.'

By 1705 the fir enclosure was thriving and an avenue running westwards from the castle towards the church had been laid out. Some vacant ground at the east end of Ladywell had been set aside as another fir and oak plantation, and a 'close vistoe' had been planted. All the young trees were protected by innumerable thorns specially brought over from Holland.

Whether the earl of Arran really took any active part in supervising the planting at Kinneil is difficult to determine: it may simply have been that the chamberlain put forward his own suggestions more as a matter of form than anything else, though it is just as possible that the earl took a real interest, if only from a desire to have as well planted an estate as did his fellow-peers. In another sphere, however, there is no doubt at all about the earl's motives. When it came to the collection of pictures, his interest was genuine and wholehearted.

The earl of Arran was not the first of his family to be a collector of paintings. In the 1630's his grandfather the 1st duke had assembled a magnificent collection. The first paintings owned by the duke were inherited from his own father, who had also been interested in art and when he died bequeathed to his son thirty seven paintings. Which of these were
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originals and which were copies was not specified on the list handed over to his son, but it included such works as Veronese's Christ in a Garden, A Chase of Lions by Rubens, several pieces by Palma and three portraits by Tintoretto. ¹ This small group of Italian paintings was to form the nucleus of the 1st duke's own priceless collection.

Still a youth when he inherited his father's titles, the duke began to collect pictures himself in the late 1630's, enlisting the help of his brother-in-law Lord Basil Feilding, who was in Venice as Charles I's ambassador. Feilding would first of all view any collections which were for sale, and would write home a description of the various items. ² If the duke sent word that he was interested, and forwarded bills of exchange to cover the cost, Feilding would then purchase them at as low a price as possible. ³ The paintings were thereupon packed in cases wrapped in cerecloth to keep out the 'steam', and sent home on board currant ships. ⁴ (It had previously been found that if the cases were not thus protected the fumes from the currants would discolour the canvases.) Various paintings were bought in this way throughout 1635 and 1636, ⁵ then in 1637 Feilding entered into negotiations for the very large group of pictures which formed the study of Bartolomeo della Nave. He went to view the study in June 1637, and wrote back to the duke in encouraging terms. Although 'I finde but three stories of Titian's best way...there
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are divers excellent ritratto originalls of his hand, of Corregio and Raphaell two ritrattos and of Old Palma the best of his hand both for the story and ritratto that are to be seen. Those of old Bassan are verie excellent, two of Bordenone of great esteeme, most of those of Paris Bordone verie perfect...''

At first he hoped that he could have the price lowered to 12,000 ducats (£2,000 sterling) but the Spanish ambassador raised this by offering 14,000 ducats.²

Despite the cost the duke was enthusiastic, and instructed his brother-in-law to buy the entire collection for him without fail. He took care to warn him that Lord Arundel would be sure to try to buy the pictures for himself. Arundel's agent William Petty also sent back weekly reports of all pictures for sale, whereupon Arundel 'if he like any of them, gives directiones to Pettie to mak great and large offers of purpose to raise the price.' Englishmen were not usually in Venice for a long time, so they would go away without having bought the more expensive paintings, and once they had gone the price would fall again, thereby allowing Arundel to step in and buy them.³ To make matters worse, Arundel had been amusing himself at the duke's expense over the question of the paintings, to such an extent that the duke declared 'the trueth is my Lord Arundell's jesting will truble me more then the loosinge dobble their value.'⁴ The purchase of La Nave's study had become a point of honour, and the duke went so far
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as to state that he wanted the pictures regardless of cost, 'for I would
be far sorrier to have them noues myne then being myne if they should
myskarie by the way and I never sea them.'

Feilding assured the duke that Petty would not be allowed to fore­
stall him, but the negotiations dragged on throughout the autumn as the
price remained at 14,000 ducats and in October rose still higher to
16,000 because of the intervention of the Spanish ambassador. In
November Lord Arundel was still exercising his 'humor of jesting' at the
duke's expense but at long last, in January 1638, La Nave agreed to sell
the collection for 15,000 ducats. By this time Feilding has also managed
to buy Procurator Priuli's collection, including the Santa Margarita of
Raphael for 4,500 ducats 100 crowns. Once the paintings were safely in
his own house it was not surprising that Lord Basil Feilding indulged in
'an extraordinary mirth' at Petty's 'choller express'd at the news of the
conclusion of the bargaine, and the plotts he used to breake it.'
Shortly afterwards, forty-four cases containing no fewer than 600 paintings,
and another twelve cases with 28 statues were shipped home for the 1st duke
of Hamilton.

As a result of his brother-in-law's exertions the duke had become the
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owner of an outstanding collection. He had Tintorettos, including Christ taken from the Cross and Cain and Abel,¹ he had more than 20 Titians of which The Woman taken in Adultery and Ecce Homo were but two,² he had several Raphaels as well as the St Margarita,³ there was Rubens' Daniel in the Lions' Den, and there were religious pieces by Veronese, Correggio and Palma.

What, however, had been his real motives in assembling such a collection? Was he a genuine art-lover, or was there some other reason? As E. Waterhouse has pointed out,⁴ it is not clear whether he 'was urged on by an infatuation with works of art for their own sake or with the prospect of commercial profit.' Various factors obviously influenced his decision to buy up the studies of Old Masters. There was the king's consuming interest in art; there was the rivalry with Arundel; there was the happy coincidence that the duke's brother-in-law was in Italy. The actual correspondence between the duke and Lord Basil Feilding⁵ would seem to suggest that his grace was very often buying with the king in mind. In 1637, for instance, he reported that Charles I having seen 'the note of Pelonone's collection is so extremlie taken therewith as he has persuaded me to by them all, and for that end has furnished me with sum monyes, so, Brother, I have undertaken that they shall all cum into England, both pictures and statues, out of which he is to mak choyse of what he lykes and
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to repay me what they coast.'\(^1\) A similar agreement was obviously in
operation in 1638 when the earl of Morton told the duke that 'the king
commandit me to let you kno that your pictures from Italie ar aryved saif
into the rever of Teams and that they ar to pay no custom be reson he
hopis [they] sall be his awin.'\(^2\)

It would however seem unlikely that the duke's motive was financial:
he was not buying paintings cheaply for the sole purpose of selling to
the king at a higher price, for all he joked about having 'a mynd to
turne merchand.'\(^3\) It was only natural that he should act as an inter-
mediary between his majesty and Lord Basil Feilding - and not only as an
intermediary but as a friend who shared the same interest. Already high
in Charles I's favour it was not surprising that he professed an interest
in art. From this grew the rivalry with Arundel, and the feeling that
the duke's honour would be impugned if Arundel were allowed to purchase a
study which his grace had boasted of owning.

This does not necessarily mean that the duke's interest in paintings
was assumed. Not all the paintings which came from Venice were re-sold
to the king, and the duke also collected pictures from elsewhere for
himself. Two landscapes, a perspective with pillars, The Story of the
Prodigal Son, A Man's Head in a Furred Gown and another head had been
bought for him at Hamburg.\(^4\) He had in 1643 Veronese's The Three Kings
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Worshipping Christ, which was probably the same painting which had been sold with the duke of Buckingham's collection in Antwerp some years before. ¹ There were also pictures given to him by friends who knew of his interest. He acquired 'A Hercules by Julio, given by his majestie be exchange for his mother's picture' and Charles I made him a gift of a painting of St Jerome which had been hanging at Hampton Court.² On another occasion Charles presented the 3rd marchioness of Hamilton with two scriptural pieces by Raphael.³ The duke's father-in-law gave him a present of a winter landscape and left him some paintings in his Will,⁴ a 'Mr Ralie' sent him A Man's Head with a Beard, and Gustavus Adolphus presented him with what may have been a copy of the Van Dyck of the Swedish king.⁵

Some indication of the duke's real enthusiasm for his paintings can also be found in his household accounts. His expenditure for 1638 when he was living at Wallingford House includes payments 'for long brushes and hand brushes for the pictures', for 'charcoall to aire the pictures', 'for porters to carry over pictures to Whitehall' and 'for carrying a greate picture to the painter's in St Martin's Lane.'⁶ These could of course be no more than the precautions taken by a businessman to safeguard a valuable investment, but it seems more likely that the 1st duke was fond of his paintings for their own sake as well as finding them a useful means

of strengthening the bond between himself and the king.

Whatever the truth of the matter the duke did not enjoy his priceless collection for long. When his English possessions were confiscated in 1643 most of his pictures were taken too. Ironically enough, they were handed over to the custody of Lord Basil Feilding, now a supporter of the parliamentary cause, and they never were returned to the duke's family.¹ A few, however, were saved, perhaps having been sent to Scotland before the confiscation. The Van Dyck of the earl of Denbigh with a blackamoor,² given by the sitter to his son-in-law, was hanging in the gallery of Hamilton palace in the 3rd duchess's time, along with The Duchess of Richmond, also once in the collection of the 1st duke.³ Several other Van Dyck portraits were inherited by the 3rd duchess, and the family portraits came down to her too - the Mytens of her grandfather and father and the Van Dycks of her parents. Apart from portraits, the 1st duke's Rubens of Daniel in the Lions' Den was safely in Hamilton palace by the end of the seventeenth century, and so too was Correggio's Head of John the Baptist, while over the two fireplaces in the great gallery hung the scriptural paintings given by Charles I to the duchess's mother.⁴

The 3rd duke and duchess themselves did not seem to share their predecessor's preoccupation with pictures. The few paintings which they
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acquired were nearly all portraits of friends and relations - of the
duchess's cousins the countess of Rothes¹ and the earl of Haddington,² and
of the duke's father,³ brother⁴ and nephews.⁵ They also added to the
collection of family portraits by sitting not only to Kneller but to
Michael Wright⁶ and David Paton,⁷ but apart from that they bought only an
occasional painting.⁸ This concentration upon family portraits was in
fact fairly typical of the Scottish peerage at this time. Most noblemen
possessed a number of religious and secular paintings, but the bulk of
their collection was often taken up by their own family portraits.⁹
Those of cousins or friends were generally gifts from the sitter, for in
an age when travel was difficult and friends might not see each other for
years at a time, a portrait was a pleasant keepsake.

Ladies seem to have been particularly anxious to have likenesses of
their relatives, as the correspondence of the young countess of Findlater
shows. A cousin of the 3rd duchess of Hamilton, she had lost her mother
in infancy but always kept in touch with her Hamilton relatives, and when
she grew up evinced a desire to collect their portraits. She began by
asking for her mother's portrait from the duchess of Hamilton,¹⁰ and went
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The countess of Crawford agreed to borrow back from her own daughter a portrait of herself so that David Scougall might make a copy of it. The countess of Crawford's daughter Lady Christian Lindsay was approached next, and obligingly sat to her portrait although she felt it necessary to warn Lady Findlater that 'if it be as ugly as myself it wod not be worth the hous room upon anay account.' Finally, she asked the duchess of Hamilton for her portrait and, after a delay occasioned by the fact that the duchess was seven months pregnant when she received the request, eventually obtained this too.

Many of the portraits thus exchanged were copies, and as such the quality was very variable: Lady Katherine Hamilton acquired two very inferior versions of the Kneller portraits of her parents. However, if the quality left much to be desired this did not really matter to the recipients, for they were not primarily concerned with the artistic merit of portraits, collecting them rather as mementoes, in the same way that people today accumulate photographs of friends and relations. This attitude seems to have been shared by the 3rd duke and duchess of Hamilton, so it is not surprising that the purchase of paintings formed a very minor part of their conspicuous expenditure.

With their son, however, it was a very different matter. His enthusiasm for paintings was well known to his family: indeed when his
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mother had cause to reproach him for neglecting his affairs she told him in exasperation, 'You are so taken up with your pictures that makes you not mind other things that you aught more to doe, and vexes me so much that I am made to wishe there weer not a picture in the world that you might be cured of that follie.'

The earl of Arran apparently wrote back demanding to know who had accused him of wasting his time thus, to which the duchess answered, 'As for your being to much taken up with the vanity of pictures, I need not information of itt, knowing itt to well.'

Unfortunately the earl's accounts do not throw any light on how he collected his paintings, for no purchases of works of art seem to be recorded. Presumably he did buy paintings in London, for he shipped home cases of them from time to time, but from whom he bought them or how much he paid for them remains a mystery. He did, of course, have other means of adding to his collection. There were the usual gifts. His brother Lord Archibald, returning from a voyage to Bilbao, sent him a portrait of the king of Spain 'since I know you are a lover of picturs.' From his 2nd wife's uncle Lord Macclesfield he obtained a painting of An Old Man's Head, from the earl of Peterborough 'a head of Permigano' and from Mr Penn - almost certainly William Penn, who was a friend of the family - another head.
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Various pictures came into his possession through marriage. He obtained a portrait of his first wife's grandmother the countess of Sunderland,¹ and later owned pictures of his second wife's father and grandfather, the Lords Gerard of Bromley.² Nor was the earl merely a passive recipient of gifts. He went out of his way to encourage members of his family to sit for their portraits and he was not above hinting that he would like any painting which might become available through the death of a relation.³ After his mother had resigned her titles in his favour he sent out a man to Hamilton palace to make copies of the family portraits in the gallery there,⁴ and he also took a lively interest in the condition of those pictures in his possession: he employed the well-known artist Crosse to restore a miniature reputed to be of Mary, queen of Scots, giving him orders to make it as beautiful as possible.⁵

Despite all his efforts, the earl's collection could not compare with that of his grandfather the 1st duke. It is difficult to assess the earl's paintings for those hanging in Kinneil and Holyrood in 1712 would include some collected by his predecessors.⁶ Then again although a brief list states that in 1709 the duke had in his lodgings in St James's Square in London 81 pictures and 58 prints, no attempt was made to detail the various items.⁷ The general impression, however, is that many of his pictures were
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not originals but copies. The 1712 inventory designates many copies as such, and the majority of the pictures valued at that time were put at under £50 Scots each.1

The amount spent by the dukes of Hamilton on paintings thus varied greatly. The 1st duke was willing to pay any price for his paintings and in 1637, at a time when his combined annual revenues from the Hamilton and Kinneil estates totalled £24,000 Scots,2 he was ready to pay £30,000 for La Nave's study alone. Even if he was reclaiming a proportion of this sum from the king, his expenditure on his collection formed a significant part of his conspicuous consumption. Very different in scale were the sums spent by his daughter and son-in-law on pictures. The earl of Douglas's portrait cost them £48 Scots,3 and the earl of Haddington's only £12,4 while most of their other acquisitions were gifts from friends. As for the 4th duke, it is impossible to estimate how much he spent on his paintings. His mother certainly thought that he spent too much on them, and when he had copies of the Hamilton portraits made, declared that the money paid for them 'and the unnecessary expences you are at with engineers at Kinneill had been better imploy'd in paying your servants' fees, and the taylors' accompts for your liveries here, which I am ashamed should be so long owing.'5 One of his greatest problems was that he was always short of money, which could indicate that he spent a lot on items like paintings,

2 HA 435/1/2-9.
3 HA 516/4/1.
4 HA 526/4/1.
5 HL 8394.
but might also suggest that he would not be able to buy as many as he would wish. If the 1712 inventory is anything to go by he never bought any really expensive pictures, and he may even have used those he did own as a means of raising money: in 1695 he handed over 25 paintings to John Norris in London, possibly as security on a loan, and reclaimed them a month later for £29:10/- sterling.¹

In their collection of paintings the 1st and 4th dukes of Hamilton were perhaps more typical of the English peerage than of the Scottish: few Scottish noblemen could afford the sums of money spent by the 1st duke on paintings, no matter how sophisticated their tastes, and many had to be content with a collection of family portraits. If, however, their galleries were disappointing, their libraries certainly were not. It has been estimated that between 1580 and 1640 there must have been a large number of English noblemen with several hundred books,² and in 1643 the 26 royalist libraries confiscated by the parliamentarians averaged 283 titles each.³ The Scottish noblemen and gentlemen seem to have collected books on a similar scale, as contemporary inventories and accounts can show. Clerk of Penicuik had in 1677 485 titles in his library, ⁴ an unknown owner of 1681 had 472,⁵ while two undated lists of the seventeenth century record
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that Lord Ogilvie had 138 books\textsuperscript{1} and Shairp of Houston 107.\textsuperscript{2}

More important than the mere size of these libraries was the content. The fact that a man has a certain book on his shelves does not necessarily mean that he has read it, but then again people do not buy the sort of books in which they have no interest at all so even if he has not read them all a man's books are indicative of his tastes. Some books, of course, are of more significance than others: most libraries included gifts, and works acquired during the owner's schooldays - Latin primers, introductions to mathematics, Greek grammars\textsuperscript{3} - and books picked up on the Grand Tour - French and Italian dictionaries, and textbooks on artillery and fortification.\textsuperscript{4} Apart from such items, the rest of a man's library can be taken to be a reflection of his interests.

The English nobleman displayed an interest in history, philosophy, politics and current affairs, possessed books in Latin, French and Italian, and purchased treatises on horsemanship, etiquette and medicine.\textsuperscript{5} What of his Scottish contemporary? The various surviving inventories would seem to show that the Scottish noblemen and gentlemen shared the same interests. Every library included a large section devoted to the classics, especially Virgil, Ovid\textsuperscript{6} and the ever-popular Caesar's Commentaries\textsuperscript{7} and Assop's
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Religion and history were equally popular. There was a great variety of theological books, and although some, like *The Imitation of Christ* and the writings of Calvin and Beza were common to several libraries, a great number were not thus duplicated since each owner had his own favourite books of sermons and theological tracts. History also covered a wide range. There were histories of Scotland — Boetius, Knox, Buchanan and Spottiswoode, but histories of France were almost more common, and other works ranged from a *History of Lapland* bought by the earl of Cassilis in 1684 to *The Generall History of the Turkis* in the library at Monymail.

Perhaps three-quarters of any library was given over to the classics, theology and history. The remaining quarter would contain a selection of books in keeping with their owner's personal interests. Clerk of Penicuik, for instance, owned several treatises on husbandry, including one he had written himself. He also had various books on architecture, medicine and plants. Lord Ogilvie, on the other hand, was more concerned with the arts. He had the poems of Sidney, Drayton, Waller, Carew and Cowley, he
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had A Book for Countrie Dances¹ and he had music books for the viol.²

The earl of Buccleuch was of a more scientific bent,³ the earl of Lothian was especially fond of history,⁴ and the earl of Airlie studied matters of precedence and affairs affecting the nobility - he owned The Instruction of the Prince, The Mutuall deuty of kingis and Courtiers and The Beginning of titilis of the Nobilatie.⁵

Finally, a word about ladies' libraries: women seem to have been preoccupied with religious books. When Mary Dunbar's mother, Lady Eleanor Montgomerie, died in 1687 she left a library which, apart from The Abridgement of the Scots Chronicle, consisted entirely of religious works.⁶ Similarly 'The inventar of the Lady Calder her Books' drawn up in 1705 consisted almost exclusively of theological works.⁷ Some ladies were interested in practical matters too. Clerk of Penicuik's wife had four books on midwifery and one on cookery, while Lady Ogilvie possessed The Art of Cookery Refined 'by John⁸ Cooper, servant to the late king '⁹ and The French Cook by M. de la Varenne.'¹⁰ These of course were only the books purchased by the ladies themselves, and many an intelligent seventeenth century woman must have enjoyed reading the books in her husband's library.
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It would seem, therefore, that many of the Scottish noblemen spent money on a library, and the dukes of Hamilton were no exception, except perhaps for the 1st duke. His accounts reveal very few purchases of this nature. Certainly when he first came to London in 1620 he bought for himself *Ane Buik of the Passions of the Mynd*, *The Histore of America* and an edition of *Don Quixote* but otherwise no record of any of his book purchases has come to light, although it is known that in 1637 he took Con the papal agent to see round the Bodleian library, which might be an indication of an interest in reading. The absence of books from the accounts may be due to a deficiency in the accounts themselves, but it is also true that the duke's education had been very much interrupted, and his adult life at Court left little time for reading. Whatever the explanation, his tastes in this sphere remain as yet unknown.

His brother the 2nd duke does seem to have been an enthusiastic reader, making regular purchases throughout the 1630's and 40's. In 1637, for instance, he bought copies of Machiavelli's *Prince* and the *Antimachiavell* as well as a variety of unnamed books. While imprisoned in Oxford he passed much of his time in reading, for he was able to borrow for a small sum such items as Seneca's *Works* and the *Essais* of Montaigne: he purchased the latter for himself a few years later. In the late 1640's
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he seems to have been learning Italian, since in January of that year he purchased Florio's Italian dictionary, and Diodati's *Biblio Italiana*, and by that time was also showing an interest in theological subjects: as well as the books on Italian he bought Digby's *Of Body and Soule*.¹

It was, however, during his months of exile in Holland in 1649-50 that he bought his greatest number of books, and by now most of these were on sacred subjects - *Funérailles Méditées* by Baptista and *Le Moyen de bien Mourir* are two of the typical titles on his lists.² He was also interested in history, buying the *Chroniques de Pologne* and an *Histoire de Flandres* and purchasing from his companion in exile the earl of Lauderdale *King Henry the Eighth his Historie*.³ Among the most interesting of his purchases were Durer's *De la proportion des Corps Humaines*⁴ and the '300 books of Gardners' which he chose in Antwerp.⁵

That these books were precious to him can be seen from the fact that he brought many of them home with him when he returned to Scotland in the spring of 1650. A list of the books in Brodick Castle drawn up at about the time of the duke's residence there in that year includes the *Funérailles Méditées, Digby's Of Body and Soule, Florio's dictionary* and other works which are familiar from the accounts.⁶

No complete list of the books of the first two dukes of Hamilton
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exists, but a good deal more is known about the tastes of their two successors, both from the accounts and from the inventory of the libraries at Kinneil and Hamilton compiled on the death of the 4th duke:¹ this list shows only those books owned by him personally, but it includes many which had been collected by his father, at least in the case of Kinneil.

Ironically enough these two men who never could agree showed very similar tastes where reading was concerned. They shared a passion for history, and their libraries contained histories of England, ranging from Blackmore's Prince Arthur to biographies of Cromwell and Charles II: they had universal histories, and histories of Sweden, Italy, Poland, Moscow and the East Indies, written in French, Italian and Latin. Their greatest interest, however, lay in Scottish history. Even Burnet had to admit that the 3rd duke was an expert on the subject,² and when the duke makes one of his rare appearances in Evelyn's Diary it is to keep the company entertained with 'many particulars of Mary queen of Scots and her amours with the Italian favourite, etc...'³ although admittedly on this occasion the interest may not have been entirely historical.

The 3rd duke's enthusiasm for history is further borne out by his own papers. He was fascinated by genealogy, and copied out for himself many family trees of quite remote connections of the Hamiltons and Douglases. He listed all the errors in a manuscript history of the house of Angus, and he was an expert in heraldry. He compiled memoranda 'for the right

² Burnet, op. cit., 103.
ordering of the arms and successions' of the houses of Hamilton and Douglas
and when he read Sir George MacKenzie's work on heraldry he made out pages
of criticisms of it, pointing out inaccuracies in coats of arms and basing
his corrections on his study of seals.

Nor was he a mere dabbler in genealogy and heraldry. His organisation
of the Hamilton estates led him into a study of early charters, and he
collected innumerable notes on fifteenth and sixteenth century documents.
The Hamilton rentals too he annotated with comments as to the origins of
various grants and tacks. Throughout, his many notes and memoranda
display an admirable precision and a strict regard for historical accuracy,
always offering the evidence on which he based his conclusions. That his
enthusiasm did not arise solely out of a desire to settle his family affairs
properly can be seen from the fact that he took the trouble to copy out 23
pages of Hawthornden's history of the Stewarts, and made 'notes out of
Samuell Daniell and other histories of England' recounting events from the
time of Caesar to the twelfth century.¹

It is not surprising to find that the 3rd duke collected a library
which included far more history than did the libraries of his contemporaries.
It is, however, more unexpected to find that the 4th duke too was a keen
collector of such works, professing a desire to make 'a compleat collection...
of all the books and pamphlets that relate to that kingdom²[Scotland]. It
was he who had bought copies of May's Breviary of the History of
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Parliament, the lives of Rochester and of Cromwell, and the edition of Tyrrell's General History of England which were in the library at Kinneil when he died. Nor did his interest end with the purchase of books. In 1701 James Anderson the writer to the signet sent a letter telling the duke that William Clelland had two men hard at work in the Advocates' Library transcribing manuscripts for his grace, and that they had already completed Balfour's Annals, a good part of Pitscottie's History and a considerable portion of the manuscripts of parliament and privy council. Two years later the duke again employed Clelland to copy out more historical documents for him and on another occasion he tried to locate John Paul Jamieson, who had transcribed documents relating to Scotland in the Vatican Archives. He also shared his father's interest in family history and in 1687 was having a family tree with the coats of arms of all his ancestors and relations drawn up for him in Paris - just one of several which he commissioned over the years.

Along with this preoccupation with history went an interest in law, so that on the shelves at Hamilton and Kinneil were to be found basic works like Justinian's Institutions and the Regiam Majestatem along with a good selection of the writings of Craig, MacKenzie and Stair, as well as treatises on such subjects as the excise duties and the collection of the
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king's revenues. There was also a large number of printed speeches, debates, acts and votes of parliament, and many bound collections of pamphlets.

History and law predominated in the library, but there was too a good collection of theological works, all reflecting the religious temper of the family: besides various Testaments there were the writings of Knox, Luther and Penn, and books like Barclay's *Apology for the Quakers*, Sage's *Fundamental Charter of Presbytery*, and *The Church of Rome Proved Heretic*. Perhaps some of the religious works had been bought by the 3rd duchess. Her son was certainly not in the habit of buying devotional writings, whereas the duchess purchased for herself Wedderburn's *Heaven upon Earth*, Hamilton's *Commentary on Romans VIII*, and in 1714 was to buy no fewer than '100 small books against Poperie.'

The duchess also displayed an interest in medicine, presumably for the benefit of her family's health. She sent for Lord Whitehall's *The Country Physician* and when it was feared that one of her small granddaughters had scurvy, purchased Dr Willis's book on the subject. The *Treatise on the Gout at Hamilton* was possibly hers, and *Le Secret des Bains et eaux minérales de Victry en Bourbon* would have been of interest to her husband. As for other practical and scientific subjects, the 4th duke in 1698 bought
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two books about fruit trees and the folio edition of the popular *Systema Agriculturae* by John Worlidge:¹ this book was later in the library at Hamilton along with a book on husbandry and *The Art of Surveying Lands*. It was the 4th duke too who bought the copy of Webster's *Witchcraft* for the library at Kinneil,² and very likely *The Scots Fencing Master*,³ *L'Ambassadeur et ses Fonctions*, and the *Dictionnaire d'un Gentilhomme*.

Of course not all the books were of a practical nature. There was a large number of novels, memoirs and letters, many in French, a small section devoted to the classics, with the inevitable Caesar and Ovid, some poetry, a very good selection of travel books, and two pieces of music by Lully.

This collection had obviously been assembled by men who were deeply interested in the history and law of their own country, and who were also concerned with current affairs and with such matters as the improvement of their estates. In these preoccupations they were typical of their time, and many another Scottish gentleman would have recognised at Hamilton and Kinneil books which he himself had at home. In the same way the Hamilton enthusiasm for building and planting was shared by other Scottish peers who had a similar desire for an improved home and well laid out estates. If the 1st duke's expenditure on pictures was unusual by Scottish standards, the conspicuous consumption of his successors was not, and their accounts reveal few items which cannot also be found in the archives of their Scottish contemporaries.
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The evidence in the foregoing chapters suggests that the seventeenth century Hamiltons differed little in their way of life from the rest of the Scottish peerage, but did they regard themselves as being primarily a Scottish family? It is difficult to assess the attitudes of men and women so long dead, but in the letters they left behind them, an answer may be sought to this, the ultimate question in any survey of the extent to which they had become anglicised.

Throughout the correspondence there recurs a preoccupation with 'the family' which amounts to far more than simply a fondness for close relations. It is, rather, a sentiment compounded of many elements: mutual affection, certainly, but also an awareness that membership of the family at the same time bestowed high social standing and demanded duty and respect: a consciousness that over the centuries the original ties of blood and the basic alliances for mutual defence had combined and grown into a much more complicated concept of the kinship group.

Loyalty to the family was a well known phenomenon in, for example, the sixteenth century. What is perhaps surprising is that it survived intact throughout the seventeenth, if in a slightly altered form. Although those later years had their share of strife, a peer would not now expect to impress his contemporaries by means of armed force, and so he resorted to more subtle methods. This was why splendid clothes, fine coaches and liveried servants were so important, why heralds and pursuivants attended the funerals of the great, why men like Campbell of Glenorchy
commissioned elaborate family trees, why the family coat of arms came into use as a decoration for domestic articles. With the new interest in the history of the family, there was a desire to maintain the honour and prestige won by earlier generations. This explains the seventeenth century's concern with precedence, the anxiety of the old established peerage families to preserve their status. When Lady Susan Hamilton's relations disapproved of her second marriage on the grounds that she might lose her precedence as a duke's daughter, and when her father the 3rd duke objected to two lords of session being designated 'Lord Haddo' and 'Lord Pitmedden' in parliament, these titles 'being only due to temporal lords', the main thought was to prevent any lessening of the prestige of an aristocratic family. A truly anglicised and separated peerage would not have experienced these feelings of insecurity: it was because the Scottish nobility were not so very different from the lairds and the gentry that they were so anxious to uphold their own position.

The sense of being the guardian of a noble heritage can be traced in many of the writings of the seventeenth century Hamiltons. Unfortunately the letters of the 1st duke are singularly uninformative about his outlook on this matter, but the 2nd duke certainly had a well developed sense of family. In his last letter to his wife he exhorted her to 'prefer your duty to the preservation of the House of Hamilton to all things else in this world, and make no difference in the testimony of your kindness to it, whether the Lord shall think fit to continue the memory of that House in

1 Fountainhall's Historical Notices, i, 323.
your own or my dear brother's issue.'

It was, however, in the next generation that the more exalted notion of the family found its fullest expression. From an early age the 1st duke's eldest daughter must have been aware that she might well inherit his titles, and although when her father was executed the family honours passed to her uncle, he himself had no surviving male heir and in his letters to her he made it plain that he envisaged no future for himself. When Lady Anne was nineteen she became duchess of Hamilton in her own right, and from then until her death at the age of eighty-four she looked upon her inheritance as a sacred trust.

The 3rd duchess and her husband accordingly restored the family finances, built a new Hamilton palace, extended the castle at Kinneil; they laid out gardens, planted trees and generally improved their estates. They purchased new lands adjoining their existing possessions and they drew up an elaborate entail to ensure that their estate should pass down undiminished to future dukes of Hamilton. Urging her to look after herself, the 3rd duke told his wife, 'you have been the mean of preserving your family by it's falling in your parson, so you may still be the happy instrument of securing it to your posterity, which nixt a livelyhood is all I shall desire...'

Nowhere is the duchess's devotion to the family more obvious than in the mortification she made in memory of her husband.
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This set up a fund of £1,000 sterling for the use of three students of theology at Glasgow university. The conditions governing the mortification were stipulated in detail in a memorandum which expressly stated that the gift was made not only 'to encourage schools everywhere' and 'for the interest or honour of the church or nation', but 'so that the house of Hamilton shall have the first offer of well bred and learned men, for serving in those churches wherein they have interest, and in tyme there may come to be a sett of the best men in the church who shall have an obligation of gratitude and consequently a dependence on the family.' The memorandum goes on to say that 'it will be honourable to the family to have given the first example in Scotland of a noble and regular foundation of this kind which may be followed by others to the great advantage of both church and state.'

The duchess's heir did not inherit her devotion to an ideal or her realistic outlook, although he was willing enough to use the argument of 'the good of the family' whenever it suited himself, imagining that this would immediately convert his mother to his own point of view. When he married his second wife he claimed that in doing so he 'had much more regard to the Family then my present easse' and when his mother would not let him live permanently at Hamilton, he reproached her with the words, 'How fare this may bee for the intrest of the Family, tymes will best tell.' The duchess was too honest herself to be deceived by his protestations, telling
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him on one occasion that they should not undertake anything 'upon pretence of doing that for our posterity which will not signifie anything to them.'

It must be remembered too, that concern for the family did not stop at its most immediate members, but embraced a far wider kinship group: as Lord Basil Hamilton once remarked, 'There is some strange thing in blood, and I believe most in Scotch of any nation, non[e] knowing that of clanship so much.'

Even quite remote connections were remembered and acknowledged, and it is well-known that the word 'cousin' could refer to a much more distant relation than we today would designate by such a term.

The fact that many of the 'cousins' would be living in the same area reinforced the natural bonds, and the ducal Hamiltons frequently married their daughters into other branches of the family and found their friends among their relations. Then again, patronage was exercised in favour of the cadet branches of the family, and many of the appeals for assistance addressed to successive dukes of Hamilton came from those who shared their name. 'All the Hamiltons' were said by Lord Basil to be concerned when the earl of Abercorn found himself in some difficulties, even though the latter was regarded as being an enemy or at least a rival of the ducal line: 'I know I need say litle to you to do all you can for a Hamilton' the 3rd duke told his son, and throughout the accounts for the period the
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dukes of Hamilton on visits to Edinburgh or London can be found giving money in charity 'to ane boy callit himselff Hamilton',¹ 'to a poor man called Hamilton'² and the like.

By virtue of their position at the centre of this group the dukes of Hamilton were inescapably involved with the affairs of local landowners, tenants and all the ordinary people who could claim a connection with them. Moreover, this paternalistic attitude extended to include townspeople, servants and a host of others who had no relation to the family but who lived on their lands or worked in their service. Although from time to time a duke of Hamilton was resident in London, Hamilton palace was never left empty. The 2nd marchioness took charge of the estates when her husband left for England, and when she died, her son the 1st duke was at home in Scotland. On his death his daughter took over the management of the Hamilton possessions. The vigorous personal control exercised by the 2nd marchioness and her grand-daughter provides an interesting commentary on the role of women in the seventeenth century: theoretically their powers might be negligible, but in practice they could be considerable.

The life of Hamilton palace and the life of the burgh of Hamilton were inextricably bound together. The 2nd marchioness and the 3rd duchess bought their clothing, food, books, household utensils and all manner of day to day items from the shopkeepers in the burgh. The local
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tradesmen were called in when repairs were needed in and around the palace, and their sons and daughters found employment there as servants. Generations of Nasmiths, Golders, Peacocks and Jacks provided the labour force needed to maintain the vast complex of buildings. In the 1690's many of the Hamilton townspeople were living in houses owned by the 3rd duchess. The grammar school and the schoolhouse had been rebuilt by her, as had been the hospital founded by her great-grandfather. She paid for the upkeep of the church and manse, and was responsible for repairs to the tolbooth. She established a spinning school in the town and encouraged the setting up of a sailcloth and woollen manufactory. Between 1692 and 1705 she presented new silver communion cups to the churches of Dalserf, Avendale, Crawford and Arran, and she invariably paid for the communion elements. Poor relief also came from the palace. On Sundays £1:8/- was distributed among the poor at the church door, and each year meal and additional money were divided amongst the needy in the town. An annuity of over £110 went to the factor of the hospital, and the gowns of the bedesmen were supplied by the duchess. Finally, she

1 Ed. F.H. Groome, A Survey of Scottish Topography, iii, 243-4; HL 6956; HA 61/3/4; H.MSS., RH 62/27.
2 HL 6956; H.MSS., RH 62/32/1.
3 H.MSS., RH 67/27; RH 62/32/1.
4 HA 230/50.
5 HA 516/17/7; 352/7/26-43.
6 HA 463/16.
7 HL 5320, 5327, 5770, 5769, 6955, 7082, 7104; HA 230/3; 516/21/3.
8 HA 490/9; 519/13; 537/10/2; 537/1; 537/10/1.
9 HL 5292.
10 HA 120/3.
11 HA 230/40; 490/10/4; 230/44; 446/5.
12 HA 230/44.
13 HA 516/21/12; 490/9.
readily allowed her tenants relief of their rents in years of bad harvest: in 1702 she allowed back £3,539 to the tenants of Machanshire alone 'in consideration of the bygon callamitous years.' It was not surprising that she was famous in her own time and is remembered to this day in parts of the west as 'Good Duchess Anne'.

In the seventeenth century the influence of the feudal superior upon the local community could still be considerable. The Hamiltons were never what could be termed 'absentee landlords' and so were known personally to the local people. They were, moreover, expected by these people to represent their interests in parliament and at Court. An inhabitant of Bo'ness, for instance, would look to the duke of Hamilton to support the burgh's interests against the rival claims of Linlithgow, and he would not be disappointed. Furthermore, when men and women all over the country were confronted with the prospect of union with England, they came to regard the Hamiltons as the leaders of the patriotic party. One anonymous poet prayed for the welfare of the 4th duke,

'For he's a man of great renown
And has been born for Scotland's good',

while another addressed him as 'The Unbyassed Patriot', declaring

'Court favours to him are but bubbles,
He does not regard them a pin.'

If these lines read more like satire than the fulsome praise intended by the

1 HA 497/22/119.
2 Anon., N.P., N.D., N.L.S.
3 Anon., 'The Unbyassed Patriot', N.P., N.D., N.L.S.
author, they do reflect the role which the Hamiltons had now assumed as leaders of the nationalist party.

The reasons why the family had come to the forefront of the anti-union movement lie not so much with the 4th duke but in the actions of his near relations. The latter had, for example, been prominent supporters of the Darien scheme. In February 1696/7 William Paterson had visited the 3rd duchess of Hamilton at Holyroodhouse and had earnestly desired her to contribute towards the fund. As the duchess explained to one of her sons, 'tho I may be short while alive to see any success thereof, yet considering it to be a good thing for the nation, I am resolved to give what assistance I can to it, and therefore designes to signe for thrie thousand pounds sterling.' The duchess was in fact the first to sign when the subscription books were opened in Edinburgh on the following day, and it is interesting to see how many of those who followed her example were her relations, friends and servants. She took along with her to the signing her cousin the countess of Rothes who put down £1,000 for herself and another £1,000 for her son the earl of Haddington. The duchess's own son Lord Basil gave £1,000 that day, the first of several contributions he made, her secretary put down £200 and her servant John Porterfield added £100. On later occasions subscribers included her son-in-law the earl of Panmure, her daughter the countess of Dundonald, her nephews by marriage Queensberry and Annandale, her cousin the dowager countess of Haddington, and her minister at Hamilton Mr Robert Wylie.  

1 N.L.S., 1031, f206; HL 6944.  
The signing of the books of subscription by this group of people epitomises the outlook of the dukes of Hamilton throughout the seventeenth century. They were an inalienable part of the society in which they lived, they identified themselves with the interests of their own locality, and they were clearly aware of being Scottish. This being so, what are the implications for Scottish society in general in the seventeenth century? It would seem that the traditional view of an impoverished country with a peerage spending most of their time in England must be discarded. The complicated web of intermarriage linked Scotland's dukes and earls with each other and with a whole host of lesser men. Lists of graduates of Scottish universities show that the sons of noble houses were educated in their native land at least until they went off to the continent on the Grand Tour. The family papers of the aristocracy suggest that the Hamiltons and their counterparts shared a common way of life, staying for the most part at home, making perhaps an annual visit to London with many complaints about the cost and inconvenience involved, buying most of their clothes and furniture in Edinburgh or Glasgow, and building up libraries of books on Scottish history and Calvinist theology. Moreover, the very fact that they sat in a parliament and had a privy council which met in Edinburgh must have strengthened their sense of identity with Scotland.

There was, of course, a degree of English influence, but it would be a mistake to imagine that only the peerage purchased English goods. True, they did send home from the south coaches, furniture and their best suits of clothes, but as the Customs Books show, Scottish merchants were also busy
importing cane chairs, drinking glasses, pots and pans, foodstuffs, spectacles, musical instruments and dozens of other items for sale in their shops in Edinburgh or Glasgow. Similarly it would be wrong to equate anglicisation with civilisation. Historians like Henry Grey Graham have painted a picture of a Scotland in which the mass of underprivileged people lived in the most primitive conditions. The Social Life of Scotland in the 18th Century is a popular and readable book which is nevertheless full of mistaken ideas and which has done a great deal of damage. To take only a few instances, Scotland was not a treeless country barren of planting, where the wretched inhabitants were poorly clad, had scarcely any bread, never ate vegetables and dined off the most rudimentary crockery. The family papers of the peerage reveal that in the seventeenth century, let alone the eighteenth, men and women were building fine houses, laying out spacious gardens and planting trees. They had comfortable and elegant rooms with good furniture, they read the latest books, and they enjoyed listening to music. Nor must it be argued that these conditions pertained only in the houses of the great. The archives of, say, a duke of Hamilton, record not only the minutiae of the lives of the aristocracy, but supply information about all levels of society - servants, tenants, merchants, small landowners...

When these sources are supplemented by the inventories and testaments of lesser men and women, it can be seen that the peerage lived on a more elaborate scale than their contemporaries, but that basically they had the same kind of way of life. The successful merchant would have his four-poster beds with their velvet hangings and his inlaid cabinets: a duchess
of Hamilton's secretary could commission his employer's architect to build him a house: a burgess or a country farmer would draw up for his daughter a marriage contract which was a reduced version of that made out for a countess. Perhaps the reason why Scottish society remained so largely homogeneous was that finance limited the aspirations of the most ambitious nobleman, and there must have been a good many peers who would envy the prosperity of a John Muirhead or a Bailie Brand. At any rate, from whatever cause, the Scottish aristocracy, led by the dukes of Hamilton, truly did have their 'birth, honour and fortune'¹ in Scotland throughout the seventeenth century.

¹ Supra, 1.
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