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Fig. 5.13 Inveraray Castle; undated plan and elevation for a well-head attributable to John Adam (early-1750s).
(NMRS)

Fig. 5.14 Inveraray Castle; undated “Sketch for Adding a Spire to the Mineral Well, to Serve as a Visto from the Garden” attributable to Robert(?) Adam (c.1750s).
(NMRS)

Fig. 15a Inveraray Castle; Proposed screen for Carlundon Mill attributed to John Adam (1757)
(Saltoun MSS, MS17687, f.123)

Fig. 15b Gothic garden building designed by Robert Adam, 1749.
(NMRS)

Fig. 5.16 Inveraray Castle; plate 74 of Vitruvius Scoticus depicting elevations of ornamental bridges constructed on the estate.

Fig. 5.17 Inveraray Castle; capriccio painting by Agostino Brunias of the completed estate as envisaged by Robert Adam.
(Lindsay and Cosh, p.34)

Fig. 5.18 Inveraray Castle; “Building proposed for the Belvidere on Duniquech” attributed to James Adam (c.1756/7).
(NMRS)

Fig. 5.19 A Gothic tower by Robert Adam dated 1753.
(NMRS)

Fig. 5.20 Inveraray Castle; a “Design for an Addition to the Building on the Top of Duniquech and a Wall with Turrets and Battlements to Surround it” inscribed “Adams” (c. late-1750s).
(NMRS)

Fig. 5.21 Proposal for a Chinese seat by James Adam
(sketch Book 2, drawing 10, NMRS)

Fig. 5.22 Taymouth Castle; location map.
(McGowan, Taymouth Castle, fig. 9)

Fig. 5.23 Taymouth Castle; “A Plan and Survey of the Gairdens of Taymouth and Country Adjacent” (?misdated 1720).
(RHP721)
Fig. 5.24 Taymouth Castle; Painting of the Taymouth estate attributed to James Norrie (1733) with alterations attributed to Jan Griffier II (1739).

(SNPG)

Fig. 5.25 Taymouth Castle; landscapes by John Sanger (c.1756) depicting views north and south across the estate.

(SNPG)

Fig. 5.26 Taymouth Castle; detail from Sanger of the Venus Temple on Tom More.

Fig. 5.27 Taymouth Castle; vignette of the Venus Temple from George Langland’s survey (1786).

(RHP961/2)

Fig. 5.28 Taymouth Castle; detail from Sanger of Apollo’s Temple or the Fairy Temple.

Fig. 5.29 Taymouth Castle; vignette of Apollo’s Temple from George Langland’s survey (1786).

Fig. 5.30 Taymouth Castle; Apollo’s Temple as replaced sometime before 1786.

Fig. 5.31 Taymouth Castle; painting by Charles Steuart (1767) of the view across Loch Tay from Tom na Croiche.

(SNPG)

Fig. 5.32 Taymouth Castle; vignette of Maxwell’s Temple from George Langland’s survey.

Fig. 5.33 The second building from plate 82 of Gibbs’s Book of Architecture.

Fig. 5.34 Taymouth Castle; detail from Sanger of the Star Seat.

Fig. 5.35 Taymouth Castle; vignette of the Star Seat from George Langland’s survey.

Fig. 5.36 Taymouth Castle; vignette of the summerhouse terminating the ‘Surprise Walk’ (one of a pair) from Langland’s survey.

Fig. 5.37 Taymouth Castle; the Tower c.1950.

Fig. 5.38 Taymouth Castle; the rear of the Tower.

Fig. 5.39 Taymouth Castle; vignette of the Temple of Aelous from George Langland’s survey.

Fig. 5.40 Taymouth Castle; vignette of the Octagon or Mary’s Temple from George Langland’s survey.

Fig. 5.41 Taymouth Castle; detail of a vignette from Stobie’s map of The Counties of Perth and Clackmannan (1783).

(NLS)

Fig. 5.42 Taymouth Castle; vignette of the Dardanelle Fort from George Langland’s survey.

Fig. 5.43 Taymouth Castle; the Dardanelle Fort.
Fig. 5.44 Taymouth Castle; “field garrison pieces” being fired from the Dardanelle Fort depicted in a painting c.1820 by D. O. Hill.
(SNPG)

Fig. 5.45 Taymouth Castle; the entrance to the Hermitage and the tunnel leading to the viewing chamber.

Fig. 5.46 Taymouth Castle; The view towards the viewing chamber of the hermitage from above the waterfall and the view through the main chamber to the waterfall.

Fig. 5.47 Blair Castle; detail of Charles Esplen’s copy of Thomas Winter’s 1744 “Plan of Blair Atholl” depicting the core of the designed landscape.
(Blair MSS, B5(2))

Fig. 5.48 Blair Castle; “Plan of a Building Intended for the Top of the Broom Know at Blair” dated 1742 and signed by Roger Morris.
(Blair MSS, D2/12/5)

Fig. 5.49 Blair Castle; elevation of an “Obelisk of Portland stone carved on ye four fronts,” dated verso June 23rd 1742 and signed by John Cheere.
(Blair MSS, bundle 55)

Fig. 5.50 Blair Castle; sketch of the “Insides of the Temple of Fame at Blair,” dated 1744.
(Blair MSS, D12/2/18)

Fig. 5.51 Blair Castle; aerial view of the Hercules Garden.
(Dingwall (1992), fig.15)

Fig. 5.52 Blair Castle; view west across the Hercules Garden.

Fig. 5.53 Blair Castle; elevation of the eastern end of the Hercules Garden (c.1748).
(Blair MSS, D2/12/25)

Fig. 5.54 Blair Castle; undated and unsigned drawing for “The Parispad ovali” that probably relates to the alcove constructed within the Hercules Garden by 1753.
(Blair MSS, D2/12/12)

Fig. 5.55 Blair Castle; an undated “Design of a Bridge for his Grace the Duke of Athol” by Abraham Swan.
(Blair MSS, D2/12/8)

Fig. 5.56 Blair Castle; designs for railing in the Chinese taste.
(Blair MSS, D2/12/23, /24 and Box 40/1/A/6)

Fig. 5.57 Blair Castle; the Balveny Pillar.
(NMRS)

Fig. 5.58 Blair Castle; a plan and elevation of “A Ruin” dated 1747 possibly by William Adam.
(Blair MSS, D2/12/15)

Fig. 5.59 Blair Castle; proposal dated 1762 for The Whim.
(NMRS)
Fig. 5.59a  Blair Castle; the ‘Whim’.

Fig. 5.60  Dunkeld House, Perthshire; a detail of Stobie’s Survey.  
(Blair MSS, uncatalogued)

Fig. 5.61  Dunkeld House; detail of Stobie’s survey illustrating the form of Stanley Hill.  
(Blair MSS, uncatalogued)

Fig. 5.61a  Dunkeld House; extract from Stobie’s survey illustrating the Gothick eye-catcher.  
(Blair MSS, uncatalogued)

Fig. 5.62  Dunkeld House; a “plan and Elevation of a Circular House for His Grace the Duke of Atholl” dated 1738.  
(Blair MSS, D2/12/16)

Fig. 5.63  Dunkeld House; the grotto viewed from the riverside.

Fig. 5.64  Dunkeld House; the grotto viewed from the rear towards the river.

Fig. 5.65  Dunkeld House; a design for a Chinese temple probably by Abraham Swan.  
(Blair MSS, D2/12/1)

Fig. 5.66  Dunkeld House; the Tower from the south-east.

Fig. 5.67  Dunkeld House; the Tower from the south.

Fig. 5.67a  Dunkeld House; extract from Stobie’s survey illustrating the ‘Chinese Temple’, switch-backs and ‘Fort’.  
(Blair MSS, uncatalogued)

Fig. 5.68  Dunkeld House; plan sketched by the Duke of Atholl c.1756 presumably for an angle-tower intended to be raised as part of the Tower’s foreworks.  
(Blair MSS, Box 40/4/106)

Fig. 5.69  Dunkeld House; detail of the second edition (1900) Ordnance Survey illustrating the location of the Hermitage in relation to the core of the Dunkeld designed landscape.  
(NLS)

Fig. 5.70  Dunkeld House; engraving of what may have been the first Hermitage.

Fig. 5.71  Dunkeld House; rear view of the Hermitage as it was rebuilt in 1782.

Fig. 5.72  Dunkeld House; view of the Hermitage from across the Braan.

Fig. 5.73  Dunkeld House; entrance to Ossian’s Cave.

Fig. 5.74  Perspective view of a Chinese bridge attributable to the Adam brothers (c. 1750s).  
(NMRS)

Fig. 5.75  Sketch by John Adam dated 1769 for improvements to The Glen at Blair Adam, Perthshire.  
(NMRS)
Fig. 5.76  Landscaping proposal by Robert Adam for Kedleston Hall, Derbyshire (1759). (Jackson-Stopps, p.14)

Fig. 5.77  Yester House; the west gable of the nave of the chapel, remodelled to create a mausoleum by John and Robert Adam (c.1753)  
(Cameron, Architectural Heritage, fig. 4.3)

Fig. 5.78  The South (Woodhouselee) Aisle of Glencourse Church near Penicuik. 
(Cameron, Architectural Heritage, fig. 4.2)

Fig. 5.79  Yester House; detail of the chapel's nave.

Fig. 5.80  The south front of the former Parliament House in Edinburgh. 
(Engraving by P. Foudrinier, published in W. Maitland's History of Edinburgh in 1753 and reproduced in Cameron, Architectural Heritage, fig. 4.4)

Fig. 5.81  Rough sketch for a Chinese bridge probably by Robert Adam (c.1750s)  (NMRS)

Fig. 5.82  Undated design for a rustic cottage attributable to Robert Adam.  (NMRS)

Fig. 5.83  Design by Robert Adam (c.1790) for a rustic summerhouse intended for Dalquharran, Ayrshire. 
(NMRS)

Fig. 5.84  Undated sketch proposal by Robert Adam for a bridge at Blair Adam.  (NMRS)

Fig. 5.85  Dumfries House, Ayrshire; detail from General Roy's Military Survey (c.1750).  (NLS)

Fig. 5.86  Dumfries House; undated design for a "Rusticated Temple" for Mount Stair by Robert Adam.

Fig. 5.87  Dumfries House; ornamental well-head (demolished).

Fig. 5.88  Dumfries House; late-19th-century photograph of the "Temple."

Fig. 5.89  Detail of the Adam's final scheme for the Tombreac dairy at Inveraray Castle.

Fig. 5.90  Craigiehall House, west of Edinburgh; detail of General Roy's Military Survey (c.1750).

Fig. 5.91  Craigiehall House; the grotto from across the River Almond.

Fig. 5.92  Craigiehall House; view from the grotto window.

Fig. 5.93  Craigiehall House; undated engraving of the "View of the Bridge and Grotto at Craigie Hall" (c. late-18th-century).  (NMRS)

Fig. 5.94  Craigiehall House; undated design for a summerhouse possibly by John Adam (c.1750s).  (NMRS)
Fig. 5.95 Craigiehall House; undated “Sketch for the Chinese Raill of the Bridge at Craigyhall” attributed to the Adam brothers (c.1750s).

Fig. 5.96 Craigiehall House; undated “Plan and Elevation of a Temple for the Island at Craigyhall” attributed to the Adam brothers (c. 1750s).

Fig. 5.97 Craigiehall House; the gazebo.

Fig. 5.98 Craigiehall House; undated “Plan and Elevation of a Temple for Mount Leney at Craigyhall” attributed to the Adam brothers (c.1758).

Fig. 5.99 Craigiehall House; undated proposal for a two-storey gazebo attributed to the Adam brothers (c.1758).

Fig. 5.100 Craigiehall House; executed scheme for the gazebo attributed to Adam brothers (undated, c.1758).

Fig. 5.101 Craigiehall House; interior of the first floor of the gazebo.

Fig. 5.102 Craigiehall House; interior of the first floor of the gazebo.

Fig. 5.103 Arniston House, Midlothian; undated “Design of a Gothick Bridge for Arnistone” attributed to John Adam (c.1750s)

Fig. 5.104 Arniston House; the grotto from the south.

Fig. 5.105 Arniston House; entrance to the grotto.

Fig. 5.106 Duddingston House, Edinburgh; the temple.

Fig. 5.107 Monymusk, Aberdeenshire; Robert Robinson’s improvement plan of 1761.

Fig. 5.108 Lochnell House, Argyllshire; the tower.

Fig. 5.109 Panmure Estate; part of the sham ruin.

Fig. 5.110 Panmure Estate; part of the sham ruin.

Fig. 5.111 Melville Castle, Midlothian; the temple.

Fig. 5.112 The third and forth buildings from plate 79 of Gibbs’s Book of Architecture (1728).

Fig. 5.113 The Lees, Berwickshire; the temple.
Fig. 5.114 Orangefield House, Ayrshire; ‘Macrae’s Monument.’

Fig. 5.115 Plate 70 of Gibbs’s *Book of Architecture* (1728).

Fig. 5.116 Amisfield Estate, East Lothian; the temple.

Fig. 5.117 Plate 101 from Isaac Ware’s *A Complete Body of Architecture* (1756)

Fig. 5.118 Blackadder House, Berwickshire; the gazebo overlooking the walled garden.

Fig. 5.119 Cavens House, Kirkcudbrightshire; an undated and undated “Design of a Green House” attributed to Robert Adam. (NMRS)

Fig. 5.120 Newbattle Abbey House, Midlothian; the remains of the greenhouse.

Fig. 5.121 Beanston House, East Lothian; the greenhouse.

Fig. 5.122 Huntingdon House, East Lothian; the dovecote.

Fig. 5.123 Cambo House, Fife; the dovecote.

Fig. 5.124 Nisbet House, Roxburghshire; the dovecote.

Fig. 5.125 Ednam House, Roxburghshire; the summerhouse.

Fig. 5.126 Ednam House; detail of the capitals and frieze to the summerhouse.

Fig. 5.127 Plate 51 from Batty Langley’s *Ancient Architecture Restored and Improved* (1742).

Fig. 5.128 Errol Park House, Perthshire; the summerhouse.

Fig. 5.129 Errol Park House; detail of the tripartite pointed-arch opening to the rear of the summerhouse.

Fig. 5.130 Errol Park House; detail of the first edition *Ordnance Survey* depicting the ramparts and “The Maze” around the summerhouse. (NLS)

Fig. 5.131 Plate 30 of Overton’s *Original Designs of Temples* (1766).

Fig. 5.132 Dunmore Estate, Stirlingshire; the gazebo overlooking the walled garden.

Fig. 5.133 Penicuik House; the Chinese Gates.

Fig. 5.134 Castle Semple, Ayrshire; remains of a gazebo overlooking Loch Winnoch.

Fig. 5.135 Design ‘E’ of Thomas Wright’s *Six Original Designs of Grottoes*.

Fig. 5.136 Illustration of “Primitive Buildings” from Chambers’s *A Treatise on Civil Architecture* (1759).
Fig. 5.137 Illustration of a “Primitive Hut” from William Wrighte’s *Grotesque Architecture* (plate 1, 1767).

Fig. 5.138 Newhailes House; the grotto viewed obliquely from the north-west.

Fig. 5.139 Mellerstain House; a “Design for a Ruinous Building” attributable to Robert Adam (1770). (NMRS)

Fig. 5.140 Mellerstain House; a plan and elevation by Robert Adam for a “Tower to be built on the Hill at Mellerstain,” dated 23 November 1774. (NMRS)

Fig. 5.141 Culzean Castle, Ayrshire; viaduct from the south-west (c.1920). (NMRS)

Fig. 5.141a Culzean Castle; Robert Adam’s 1780 scheme for a ruined arch and viaduct.

Fig. 6.1 Plate 9 of John Plaw’s *Ferme Ornée* (1795).

Fig. 6.1a Culloden House, Invernesshire; late-19th century(?) photograph of the kennels.

Fig. 6.2 Tulloch Castle, Ross-shire; sham ruin.

Fig. 6.2a Tulloch Castle; Robert Adam’s first sketch proposal for a sham ruin.

Fig. 6.3 Novar House, Ross-shire; sham ruin.

Fig. 6.4 Kinoull Hill, Perthshire; sham ruin.

Fig. 6.5 Kinnaird Castle, Perthshire; temple overlooking the River South Esk. (NMRS)

Fig. 6.6 Cairness House, Aberdeenshire; the larder. (NMRS)

Fig. 6.7 Dryburgh Abbey House, Berwickshire; the Temple of the Muses.

Fig. 6.8 Cullen House, Banffshire; the Temple of Pomona. (NMRS)

Fig. 6.9 Cullen House, Banffshire; James Playfair’s 1788 proposal for a ‘Temple of Pomona’.

Fig. 6.10 Invermay, Perthshire; game larder-cum-icehouse.

Fig. 6.11 Invermay; dairy.

Fig. 6.12 Taymouth Castle; dairy set on the site of the Venus Temple. (NMRS)

Fig. 6.13 Culzean Castle; Plate 31 of Robert Lugar’s *Plans and Views* (1823) and Lugar’s pheasantry as built.
Fig. 6.14 Culzean Castle; the derelict remains of the early-19th-century pagoda-cum-menagerie.

Fig. 6.15 Pitfour estate; bath-house in the form of the Temple of Theseus.

Fig. 6.16 Unexecuted “design for a bath at Dunkeld” (late-18th century) with glasshouses flanking.

Fig. 6.17 Kelburn Castle, Ayrshire; monument to the 3rd Earl of Glasgow.

Fig. 6.18 Panmure estate; the ‘Panmure Testimonial.’

Fig. 6.19 Lanrick Castle, Stirlingshire; monument to the Murray family.

Fig. 6.20 Temple and hot-house complex (undated and unexecuted) proposed by Robert Adam for Auchencruive.

Fig. 6.21 Unexecuted temple and hot-house complex proposed by Walter Nicol in 1802 for Invermay.

Fig. 6.22 Culzean Castle, Ayrshire; conservatory known as the ‘Camellia House.’

Fig. 6.23 Dalkeith Palace, Midlothian; the conservatory.

Fig. 6.24 Invermeil, Argyll; one of a pair of angle-towers within the walled garden.

Fig. 6.25 Amisfield estate, East Lothian; angle temples within the walled garden.

Fig. 6.26 Prestonhall House; gazebos within the walled garden.

Fig. 6.27 Fasque House, Kincardineshire; summerhouse within the walled garden.

Fig. 6.28 Elvingston, East Lothian; crenellated dovecote.

Fig. 6.29 Gargunnock, Stirlingshire; crenellated dovecote.

Fig. 6.30 Harburn House; crenellated dovecote.

Fig. 6.31 Saltoun House, East Lothian; crenellated dovecote.

Fig. 6.32 Cally House, Kirkcudbrightshire; crenellated gardener’s house.

Fig. 6.33 Pitfour, Perthshire; clock tower.

Fig. 6.34 Cammo (dem.); water tower.

Fig. 6.35 The Burn, Kincardineshire; the ‘Doulie Tower.’
Fig. 6.36 The Burn; the ‘Doulie Tower.’

Fig. 6.37 Elevation and Plan by Walter Nicol for a “Gothic Temple for the point near the Hummel-bummel” at Invermay Perthshire, dated 1802. (NMRS)

Fig 6.38 Extract from Barker’s Panoramic View from Calton Hill (1793) (NMRS)

Fig. 6.39 Kinfauns Castle, Perthshire; Binns Hill Tower.

Fig. 6.40 Raith House, Fife; tower on Comrie Hill. (NMRS)

Fig. 6.41 Balcarres House, Fife; Craig Tower.

Fig. 6.42 Bandrum estate, Fife; tower.

Fig. 6.43 Craigend House, Stirlingshire; the ruinous remains of the former tower.

Fig. 6.44 Johnston Lodge, Kincardineshire; tower.

Fig. 6.45 Belmont Castle, Angus; ‘Kinpurney Tower,’ reputedly a former observatory.

Fig. 6.46 Lour, Angus; tower.

Fig. 6.46a Cullen House; Robert Adam’s undated and unexecuted scheme for a banqueting house.

Fig. 6.47 Auchencruive House, Ayrshire; two stage tower known as ‘Oswald’s Temple.’

Fig. 6.48 Cargen House, Kirkcudbrightshire; two-stage tower set within the later(?) walled garden.

Fig. 6.49 Arthurstone, Angus; the tower adjoining the walled garden.

Fig. 6.50 Pitfour estate, Banffshire; the ‘Observatory.’

Fig. 6.51 Kilmarron estate, Fife; miniature tower set within walled garden.

Fig. 6.52 The Binns, West Lothian; the tower on Binns Hill.

Fig. 6.53 Blair Castle, Fife; the tower. (Historic Scotland)

Fig. 6.54 Scotscraig estate, Fife; remains of the ‘Waterloo Tower.’

Fig. 6.55 Hill House, West Lothian; the ‘Waterloo Tower.’ (Jaques and McKeen, p.107)

Fig. 6.56 Newton House, Morayshire; tower raised to commemorate the Duke of York.

Fig. 6.57 Corehouse, Lanarkshire; mausoleum
Fig. 6.58 Whitehaugh, Aberdeenshire; detail of the principal elevation of the mausoleum.

Fig. 6.59 Duff House; principal elevation of the mausoleum.

Fig. 6.60 Thurso Castle, Caithness; Sinclair mausoleum.
(NMRS)

Fig. 6.61 Brocklesby, Lincolnshire; mausoleum.
(Colvin (1991), fig.327)

Fig. 6.62 Callendar House, Stirlingshire; mausoleum.

Fig. 6.63 Gosford House, East Lothian; mausoleum.

Fig. 6.64 Penicuik Churchyard, Penicuik; the Clerk mausoleum.

Fig. 6.65 Prestonhall House, Midlothian; mausoleum-cum-memorial.

Fig. 6.66 The monument of the Julii, Saint Remy, France.
(Colvin (1991), fig.48)

Fig. 6.67 Kinnettles, Angus; mausoleum.

Fig. 6.68 Marlee House, Perthshire; mausoleum.

Fig. 6.69 Carstairs House, Lanarkshire; mausoleum.
(NMRS)

Fig. 6.70 Springwood estate, Roxburghshire; mausoleum.

Fig. 6.71 Springwood; undated perspective of mausoleum attributed to James Gillespie Graham.
(NMRS)

Fig. 6.72 Kirkdale House, Kirkcudbrightshire; mausoleum.

Fig. 6.73 Crawford Priory, Fife; mausoleum on Walton Hill.
(NMRS)

Fig. 6.74 Rossie Priory, Perthshire; unexecuted proposal for a mausoleum by John Patterson, 1797.
(Rossie Priory MSS, Box 22, fol. 1v, Sandeman Library, Perth)

Fig. 6.75 Macbiehill estate, Tweeddale; mausoleum.

Fig. 6.76 Logie House, Angus; mausoleum.

Fig. 6.77 Cambo House, Fife; mausoleum.

Fig. 6.78 Hamilton Estate; mausoleum
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This thesis offers a history of ornamental garden buildings in Scotland. It is based on a comprehensive inventory of the country's garden structures, compiled from primary sources, secondary sources and site visits. The thesis is divided into an introduction and six chapters. The introduction outlines past research into the subject of garden buildings generally and those in Scotland particularly, and sets out the need for historical revision. The first two chapters treat of the period between the 12th century and the Restoration, and focus upon the architecture and iconography of ornamental structures at Linlithgow Palace, Pinkie House and Dundas Castle. The third chapter examines developments up to the Union of Parliaments and evaluates the oeuvre and influence of Sir William Bruce. The fourth chapter covers the period up to the last Jacobite rebellion and draws attention to the role of garden buildings in focusing views upon ruined towers and 'sublime' natural features. It is suggested that such features were emblematic of Scotland's lost nationhood. The fifth chapter analyses mid-18th-century garden buildings and is structured around John Dalrymple's contemporary text, An Essay on Landscape Gardening, which, it is suggested, articulated commonly-held Scottish attitudes to landscape design. The style and distribution of garden buildings are offered as evidence in support of this assertion. Attention is also drawn to the allegorical significance of the Hermitage at Dunkeld. The final chapter chronicles the demise in popularity of garden buildings in the years between 1780 and 1840, and looks at those most commonly built during this time - the tower and the mausoleum. The thesis concludes that the study of garden buildings in their proper context can contribute appreciably to our understanding of Scotland's intellectual, architectural and garden history.
The nomenclature used to describe garden structures is problematic. For example, is a crenellated pigeon house properly a tower or a dovecote? When does a summerhouse become a gazebo? When does a greenhouse become a conservatory? Should a crenellated dovecote really be considered a tower? The list goes on. It is rarely possible to be quite precise. For the purposes of this study, therefore, a convention, however arbitrary, has had to be adopted and adhered to. The glossary below lists all the types of structure that have been considered within this study, and provides a brief description or definition of each. A summary gazetteer of ornamental structures raised between 1500 and 1840 within Scotland's gardens and designed landscapes is provided as an appendix.

Arbour
A timber (generally trellis-work) structure used to support trees or climbing plants to create a shelter that can often be architectonic in appearance.

Aviary
A structure for keeping birds.

Bath-house
A building containing a bath used for bathing and washing.

Beacon
A structure designed to house a fire or light and located in a prominent position so that its light can be seen from a considerable distance in case of an emergency and the need to provide a warning. Typically located on a coast.

Bear cage
A structure for keeping bears.
Belvedere  A viewing structure that forms part of the roof of a house.

Boat-house  A building at the edge of a river or loch for housing boats.

Bone house  A structure for storing bones or, occasionally, a structure built partly from bones.

Camellia House  A heated structure used to house and cultivate camellias and characterised by glazed walls and a covered roof to prevent strong overhead sunlight.

Chapel  A small, free-standing building used as a place of Christian worship.

Cistern House  A building containing a tank for storing water.

Column  An upright, circular pillar of any height, usually taking the form of one of the five classical Orders.

Conservatory  A (generally) heated structure used to house and cultivate plants and characterised by glazed walls and roof with a plain interior. The term is used within this thesis to apply to other similar, predominantly glass structures, such as peach-houses, greenhouses and vineries.

Cottage Ornée  An artificially rustic, domestic building, elaborately designed and decorated, often asymmetrical in plan, and typically with a thatched roof and rough-hewn wooden columns.
Curling House  A building found by a pond or loch used for storing curling stones; also to provide shelter during games.

Dairy  A building for the storage, processing and distribution of milk and its products.

Dovecote  A shelter and breeding house for domesticated pigeons. Characterised by nesting holes. [Note: if a dovecote has been ornamented to appear, for example, like a tower, it has been classified nonetheless as a dovecote.]

Eye-catcher  A ‘screen-like’ structure designed without depth and intended to appear like a full building when viewed from a distance. An eye-catcher may be used to front a smaller, usually utilitarian, building.

Fernery  A structure (sometimes heated) used to house and cultivate ferns and characterised by glazed walls and roof with a rock-work interior designed for the display of the ferns.

Folly  For reasons set out in the introduction, the term folly is not here.

Fort  A garden building constructed to imitate a castle or fort. As with ruins these are occasionally termed sham-fort or sham-castle for emphasis.

Fountain  A structure designed to supply and display water.
Larder  A building for storing food.

Laundry  A building for washing clothes in.

Loggia  An open-sided gallery or arcade characterised by columns (generally classical) supporting a platform roof.

Mausoleum  A monumental, burial chamber usually reserved for the members of one family; often containing sarcophagi and/or bearing memorial plaques.

Monument  A structure of no specific form or style but erected with the express or implied aim of commemorating or celebrating a person or event, and typically, though not necessarily, bearing a dedication plaque. Since it may not always be clear whether a structure was indeed raised to commemorate a person or event, monuments are referred to according to their form, such as an obelisk, column, tower etc.

Obelisk  A tapering shaft of stone, of square or rectangular plan, set on a plinth and ending pyramidically, and typically, though not necessarily, bearing an inscription or dedication plaque.

Observatory  A room or building equipped for the observation of natural, especially astronomical or meteorological, phenomena. Frequently domed.

Ruin  The partially wrecked remains of a building or a structure created in imitation of such. The text of the thesis makes the particular origins of a ruin clear, however, the term sham-ruin is sometimes used for emphasis.
Rustic arch  An arch of any size, usually of rubble and generally Gothic in essence if not in detail.

Seat  A bench or chair usually set into an architectonic surround or recess. If extremely deep then the structure becomes a summerhouse. Sometimes referred to in the 18th century as a 'covered seat'.

Shell-house  A building decorated predominantly with shells and typically very small with little or no fenestration.

Store  A simple building used for storage.

Summerhouse  A building that is used for shelter from weather. It can be closed, open or semi-open, designed in any style and constructed from any material.

Temple  A building constructed in imitation of classical Greek or Roman temples. Typically prostyle or peripteral or a derivative thereof. Not to be confused with a loggia.

Tower  A garden building of any height characterised by a crenellated parapet and usually square or circular in plan.

Well-head  An ornamental building constructed around a water source. Not to be confused with a fountain.
For the purposes of this study the term ‘garden’ is used to refer to a piece of enclosed ornamental ground adjoining a house used for growing flowers, for recreation and relaxation. The term ‘designed landscape’ is used to refer to areas that have been artificially crafted to create an idealised interpretation of nature on a more extensive scale than that of the garden. Designed landscapes may include parkland, woodlands and shelterbelts, gardens and water features.

Gardens increased in size up to the early-18th century. Once their enclosing walls had become visually and practically meaningless and were removed gardens may be said to have become designed landscapes. As a general rule, therefore, ‘gardens’ are referred to in the first half of the thesis (i.e. before 1700) and ‘designed landscapes’ in the second (i.e. after 1700). The terms ‘garden building’ and ‘garden structure’ require some explanation: a garden building is a feature that constitutes an enclosure providing shelter, such as a summerhouse or gazebo, while a structure, though built - such as a bridge, obelisk, well-head etc. - does not. Both of these terms have been used as a convenient short-hand throughout this thesis for features that have been raised within a garden and a designed landscape.
SCOPE OF RESEARCH

This thesis examines the role of ornamented structures within gardens and designed landscapes. For the most part it refers to structures such as summerhouses, temples, gazebos and other ornamental objects. However, occasionally more practical buildings, such as dairies and icehouses, were ornamented (especially in the late-18th century) to create pleasing incidents within an estate. Where this is clearly the case - that is, a practical building has been raised in a garden or designed landscape and is treated as a decorative element and is clearly separate from the steading complex - then it has been included. In the list of the building types set out above, three significant omissions should be noted: sun-dials, gate lodges and bridges. These have been excluded for three reasons: firstly, each type is essentially utilitarian while garden buildings are not; secondly each is extremely numerous and would have distorted the balance of this study; and thirdly each has already been studied comprehensively elsewhere. Andrew Somerville has provided a definitive study of “The Ancient Sundials of Scotland”, Dr Timothy Mowl and Brian Earnshaw have examined in detail the evolution of the park lodge in Trumpet at a Distant Gate, and Ted Ruddock has done much the same for Scotland’s bridges in Arch Bridges and their Builders, 1735-1835. It is unlikely, therefore, that this study could contribute appreciably to the current body of knowledge. That said, on occasion, sun-dials, lodges and bridges are alluded to - the emergence of ‘ornamental bridges’ during the mid-18th century is referred to especially in Chapter Four.
The aim of this thesis is to present a broad historical survey of Scotland’s garden buildings. The period of study starts in the 12th century when the earliest known garden structure is recorded, and ends in 1840, at which point the number of ornamental buildings being added to Scotland’s designed landscapes began markedly to decline. For a work such as this, the surviving structures must together form the principal source of evidence. In order, therefore, to provide a solid foundation upon which to base the thesis, a detailed inventory of Scotland’s ornamental garden buildings has been compiled. This inventory, which contains over 1200 entries and extends to nine county-by-county volumes, records for the first time (what is hoped to be) every garden building in Scotland.1 The evidence of the inventory is revealing, as it indicates that Scotland’s garden buildings are greater in number, quality and variety than previously thought. This thesis must, therefore, seek to challenge contemporary wisdom; and as such it is essential to summarise at the outset both past and current understanding of the subject.

Garden buildings have long attracted the attention of architectural historians, and it is perhaps not surprising that the most striking of them should have been examined in the first book on the subject - Eleanor von Erdberg’s Chinese Influence on European Garden Structures. This book, which was published in 1936, draws early attention to the important role of garden buildings in the evolution of new architectural styles. Kenneth Clarke’s Gothic Revival, which was published 14 years later, does much the same but stresses as well the way that a tower and a ruin might also stand as “monuments to moods,”2 affording not only visual but ‘emotional’ articulation to a large designed landscape. These qualities are expanded upon in the first work to research and analyse systematically the gamut of Britain’s garden buildings - Barbara Jones’s

1 A copy of all six volumes of An Inventory of Ornamental Garden Buildings in Scotland is held at the library of Historic Scotland, Salisbury Place, Edinburgh.

2 Clarke, Gothic Revival, p.48
Follies and Grottoes. In its combination of a typological analysis with a simple inventory, Jones’s study, which was published in 1953 and then expanded and revised in 1974, provides a pioneering overview of the subject as a whole.

Follies and Grottoes is aimed at a general audience and, though well researched, is intended to be neither definitive nor academic. As a result, Jones is at liberty to indulge her own unfettered and infectious enthusiasm for her subject. She derives considerable delight from hunting out and discovering ivy-mantled garden buildings “just on the edge of disintegration and apparently forgotten.”3 Her firm belief is that this emotional response to 18th- and 19th-century garden buildings is precisely what their designers had originally intended, stating “with certainty that follies in general were inspired by romantic painting and poetry.”4 For Jones, a folly is “a useless building erected for ornament;” it is “at once cheerful and morbid, both an ornament for a gentleman’s grounds and a mirror for his mind.”5 In short, Jones considers a folly to be any garden building - from a Gothic gazebo to a classical temple - that strikes profound and immediate emotion within the observer, be it melancholy, surprise, curiosity or disbelief. Jones no doubt intended to convey a largely personal opinion, but due to the popularity of the book her views have gained widespread currency.

The publication of Follies and Grottoes led to the formation of a specialised amenity body - The Folly Fellowship. Inspired by the ‘romantic’ tenor of Jones’s work, the Fellowship seeks above all to promote through its Follies Magazine the ‘whimsical’ character of garden buildings. This aim is also expounded by Gwyn Headley and Wim Meulenkamp whose book, Follies: A National Trust Guide, implies that all garden buildings are follies and declares all follies to be “ostentatious over-ambitious and useless,” the work of a man who was usually
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3 Jones, Follies and Grottoes, p.2.
4 Ibid., p.7.
5 Ibid., p.6.
"mad... obsessive, bound up in private gratification," and determined to "indulge a natural urge to express eccentricity with all the resources of wealth and imagination he can muster."⁶

Now, there can be little doubt that from at least the mid-18th century garden ornaments were viewed by some to reveal 'folly' in their patrons. In an article published in *The World* magazine in 1754 an anonymous writer complained of the "injustice and ingratitude with which those worthy patriots are treated, who ruin their estates, or lay out fortunes of their younger children on their seats or villas, to the great embellishment of this kingdom."⁷ The author remarks that "if you are in danger of losing yourself on the vast and dreary wastes of some comfortless heath, and are directed on your course by a friendly beacon of prodigious height, you are told that this is such a gentleman's folly." This he feels is the result of ignorance since "the munificence of a man of taste raises at an immoderate expanse a column or turret in his garden, for no other purpose than the generous one of giving delight and wonder to travellers; and the ungrateful public calls it his folly." Indeed, he notes that "were her late Majesty Queen Anne... to reign again, and fifty new churches to be really built, I doubt if in this dissolute age, this also might not be called her majesty's folly." However, Samuel Johnson's *Dictionary of the English Language* (1755) defines 'folly' only as "weakness of intellect; depravity of mind; or an act of passion unbecoming deep wisdom," and amongst all the historical documents examined in the course of researching this thesis the term has been encountered just once, in reference to the eye-catcher at Mellerstain on General Roy’s Military Survey of c.1750. That the word 'folly' does not occur once within any estate papers is surely a crucial point, since it indicates that, as suggested by the writer to *The World*, during the 18th and 19th centuries a garden building meant one thing to a patron, his friends and cognoscenti, and quite another to an uninformed passer by. Whilst some garden buildings were no doubt the product of aristocratic malaise, a whim or a wager, very


⁷ This and the following quotations are taken from an anonymous letter “To Mr Fitz-Adam” in *The World*, 14 February, 1754.
many more were not. It may be said, therefore, that the general public during the 18th-century (and perhaps even into the 19th century) was either unwilling or unable to decipher the motivation behind the construction of a "column or turret," and that they thought all of them to be ridiculous as a result. The same may be said of the Folly Fellowship, Headley and Meulenkamp, who in evaluating garden buildings with such a "zealous superficiality" wantonly misunderstand and thereby demean the full significance of the subject they hold dear.

Fortunately there has evolved in recent years a strong (if less high-profile) academic 'counter-culture' which has sought to locate garden buildings in their social, intellectual, political and aesthetic context, and to evaluate their significance as 'cultural monuments.' The earliest of these works was Alistair Rowan's Garden Buildings (published in 1968). Making use of the drawings collection of the Royal Institute of British Architects, this slender work was the first to evaluate the genre chronologically, and as a result it highlighted the importance of garden buildings as "architectural innovators." Thus, Rowan calls attention to the fact that the earliest essays in the Gothic revival (an eye-catcher c.1720 at Shotover Park in Oxfordshire); the castle-style (Vanbrugh's turrets raised c.1719 as part of the park walls at Castle Howard in Yorkshire); the Chinese-style (built in 1747 at Shugborough Park in Staffordshire); the Greek revival ('Athenian' Stuart's Doric temple at Hagley in Worcestershire); and neo-Palladianism (the temples built by Lord Burlington between 1717 and 1721 at Chiswick in London) are all found amongst garden buildings. The reasons for this are that garden buildings "rarely exceeded a modest scale" and were therefore "comparatively inexpensive, and comparatively easy to design, and both these conditions favoured novelty." That so many garden buildings should in themselves be such fine works of architecture is also examined by Rowan who suggests that "for
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9 Rowan, Garden Buildings, p.3.
10 Ibid., p.11.
architects the economy of expression necessary to garden architecture must have exercised as
great an attraction as the economy in cash did for their patrons.”

He continues noting that

“in any art, new ideas are hard to control. Rules must first be formulated and initially
the difficulty of sustaining a constant level of design is great. This is especially true
of architecture, where human requirements normally force a design into
measurements that easily become too large to be managed with clarity. And in this
situation it is clear that many architects welcomed the chance to design a garden
building as an opportunity to develop a new manner or to explore formal problems
on a small scale.”

Certainly it is this “that is the most rewarding feature about the work of individual architects”
and it is no coincidence that some of the most satisfying and innovative designs of so many
architects, from Jones to Soane, are garden buildings.

What Rowan does not examine in any depth is the emblematic role of ornamental
structures within a landscape. Howard Clark’s article, “Eighteenth Century Elysiums: the role of
association in the landscape movement,” published in the Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld
Institutes in 1943 was arguably the first work to draw attention to the iconographic potential of
garden buildings. Since 1981 this area has become the particular province of the New Arcadian
Journal. Amongst the many allegorical programmes examined and uncovered by the Journal
have been those that have informed the construction and layout of garden buildings at Kew,
Wentworth Woodhouse, Wentworth Castle, Greenwich, Hampton Court, Stowe, Stourhead and
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11 Ibid.

12 Ibid.
Garden: Meditation and Memorial, contributed significantly to the subject by examining in detail the emblematic significance of sundials, ruins, hermitages, towers, monuments, memorials and mausolea. To these works must be added a small number of excellent typological surveys - chiefly Naomi Miller’s Heavenly Caves: Reflections on the Garden Grotto; Howard Colvin’s Architecture of the Afterlife; and Tim Mowl’s Palladian Bridges, as well as the brief analyses of the role of garden buildings in the stylistic development of Chinoiserie (set out in Patrick Conner’s Oriental Architecture in the West), 18th-century Gothic (in Michael McCarthy’s The Origins of the Gothic Revival) and neo-Palladianism (in Giles Worsley’s Classical Architecture in Britain: the Heroic Age).

What then of particular research into Scotland’s garden buildings? Really there is very little. Jones notes that “there are few large follies in Scotland, but those few are both superlative, and stranger than anything in the south,” and adds that “most of them are in Perthshire.”13 Amongst the 50 or so ‘follies’ she lists for Scotland, the most striking (such as the Pineapple at Dunmore (fig. 5.145) and the Lanrick ‘tree’ (fig. 6.76) for example) are all present, as they are in the most recent edition of Headley and Meulenkamp’s uncritical gazetteer (which lists around 100). The only work to be dedicated to the subject of Scotland’s garden buildings, Tim Buxbaum’s Scottish Garden Buildings: From Food to Folly (1989), is disappointing. Its use as a reference book is limited by the lack of either an index or a bibliography, and although it offers a basic gazetteer of 200 structures and a brief précis of the architectural, agricultural and garden history of Scotland, the buildings and their context remain segregated, whilst their emblematic potential is not explored. The reasons for this are most likely twofold. Firstly, the sample of garden buildings upon which it is based is probably too small. Secondly, the work almost certainly depends too heavily on secondary sources that relate solely to Scottish garden history. In the latter respect just two books of any consequence have been published. Despite being written
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13 Jones, op. cit., p.418.
in 1935, E. M. Cox’s scholarly *History of Gardening in Scotland* is something of a revisionist text. He is thankful that the ‘old idea that Scotland is a bleak land where little grows has vanished never to return’ and goes so far to suggest ‘a national type, the walled garden, although it is only two centuries old.’ Yet Cox falls prey to his own prejudices, paying only perfunctory attention to the occurrence of the English Landscape Garden in Scotland. Alan Tait’s history of the *Landscape Garden in Scotland, 1735-1835* was written largely to compensate for Cox’s omission and in this it succeeds admirably. However, by examining the influence of the style it paid little attention to any contemporary native traditions, and by concluding that the Landscape Garden in Scotland was derivative and rarely well-executed, Tait’s commentary possesses something of a negative tenor. Thus, taken together, both Cox and Tait offer only a basic framework for the interpretation of garden buildings. Through the works of modern scholars such as Christopher Dingwall and Patrick Eyres, the significance of Scotland’s garden buildings is slowly being unveiled, but the subjects so far examined (principally the Hermitage at Dunkeld and the ‘Happy Valley’ landscape at Culzean) are few in number, and a broad historical survey can hardly be more required.

The aim of this thesis is therefore: to analyse garden buildings in both a Scottish and a wider cultural context by making use wherever possible of primary source material; to evaluate such structures in relation to the gardens they occupy rather than as isolated satellites of the main house; and to examine any iconographic value that garden buildings may have possessed. In so doing, the thesis indicates much about Scotland’s architectural, garden and intellectual history. With the above framework set out the chronological development of the garden building in Scotland may now be examined, and there is no better place to start than with the first recorded example - a 12th-century fountain that was once set within a royal garden associated with Edinburgh Castle.
Gardens in Medieval Scotland

The study of gardens and their architecture during the medieval and early-modern periods in Scotland suffers, as do so many other areas of the country’s cultural history, from the scarceness of primary source material.¹ From the evidence of contemporary poetry, however, there can be little doubt that ornamental gardens played a significant role in the lives of Scotland’s courtiers and kings. The events of William Dunbar’s early-16th-century allegorical poem, *The Golden Targe*, take place within a “park of most plesere” that is replete with “flouris faire”;² in the *Thrisil and the Rois*, Dunbar’s narrator “enterit in a lusty gairding gent [beautiful]... most dulce and redolent / Off herb and flour and tendir plantis sueit, / And grene levis doing of dew doun fleit”;³ and in *The Tretis of the Tua Mariit Wemen and the Wedo*, the poet recounts a visit to “ane gudlie grein garth, full of gay flouris, / Hegeit, of ane huge hicht, with hawthorne treis” where he happens upon “thre gay ladies sit in ane grene arbeir, / All grathit in to garlandis of fresche gudlie flouris.”⁴ As vivid are the descriptions penned by Dunbar’s
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contemporary, Gavin Douglas, whose work, *The Palice of Honour*, begins with the poet walking at dawn through a garden in which

> "The fragrant flouris blomand in thar seis
> Ouirspred the leuis of natures Tapestreis;
> Abone the quhilk with heuinly Harmoneis
> The birdis sat on twystis and on greis,
> Melodiously makand thair kyndlie gleis,
> Quhais schill noitis fordinned all the skyis."

Whilst these gardens may have been imagined, they surely drew on actual examples: certainly that described in *Tayis Bank* - a poem generally attributed to Dunbar and Douglas’s patron, James IV - seems to relate to Stobhall in Perthshire, where the young king courted his "dyament of delyt," Margaret Drummond, in a "bour / with blossumes broun and blew, / Ofret with mony fair fresch flour, Helsum of hevinly hew." Evocative though all these lines are, beyond the single reference to the "grene arbeir" (that is an ‘arbour’ - a feature composed of vines trained around a wooden substructure to present an architectonic appearance and generally constructed to form a tunnel or simple shelter) they offer no real indication of the actual layout and content of Scotland’s medieval gardens. Sadly, there are no plans, topographical surveys, nor detailed written descriptions of such gardens prior to the 17th century, and rather it is from the dry bones of the royal accounts and monastic chartularies that evidence must be gleaned. As a result, any suggestion as to their appearance must be conjectural. However, if it is accepted that immigration, foreign trading and an allegiance to the Roman Catholic church provided the country with a cultural background typical of northern European nations, and that the climate
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was, at least for much of the 14th and 15th centuries, warmer than that today, then the altogether more abundant documentation regarding the layout and content of foreign demesnes might be taken as generally applicable to those in Scotland.¹

The appearance of European gardens may be used, then, as the backdrop against which the particulars of those in Scotland might be projected, and for this purpose the painted miniatures that illuminate contemporary French and Flemish manuscripts cannot be bettered. These indicate that the finest Scottish medieval gardens would have adorned the homes of aristocrats or clergy and would very probably have featured a lawn interspersed with flowers, shrubs, low trellis covered with vines or roses, turf benches and perhaps a pool and orchard.² Regarding ornamental structures they would have most commonly contained either a fountain³ (generally Gothic - figs. 1.1 and 1.2) or an arbour. However, other types of garden buildings are known to have existed across Europe. Summer-houses were constructed amid the gardens created at Palermo by Roger II (r.1129-54), the Norman king of Sicily; at the Iberian garden of Tafalla (begun 1405); at the Royal Mews, Charing Cross (erected 1440-1); and upon an island in the River Thames near Richmond Palace (erected in the 1380s).⁴ Aviaries were constructed at Winchester Castle during the 12th century, at Westminster Palace in the 13th century⁵ and at the Spanish estate of Olite around the turn of the 15th.⁶ At the French palace of Hesdin, on the other


² By 1520 a typical feu farm required “an adequate house of stone and lime, with hall, chamber, granary, byre, stable, dovecote, orchards, gardens and beehives with hedges and a plantation of oaks” (Stell, G., “Kings, Nobles and Buildings of the Later Middle Ages: Scotland” in Simpson, Scotland and Scandinavia, p.68).


⁴ The summerhouse at Richmond was a timber framed building with benches and trestle tables; that at Charing Cross was a “spy-house” (presumably a gazebo) with plastered walls painted green, those at Palermo were set alongside pools (Colvin, H., “Royal Gardens in Medieval England” in MacDougall, Medieval Gardens, pp.16-17).

⁵ Ibid., p.16.

⁶ Harvey, Medieval Gardens, p.45.
hand, Count Robert II of Artois enclosed a park in 1295, within which he constructed not only an aviary but also a pavilion amongst marshland, a revolving summer-house, a chapel of glass and a stone tower. Thus, it seems reasonable to assume that at least the more basic of these buildings would have ornamented Scotland’s gardens. A little evidence can indeed be found for the possible existence of three such structures: these are a fountain or well-head at Edinburgh, an aviary at Dumbarton and a summer-house at Perth.

Ornamental Structures within Medieval Gardens

Founded by David I and endowed for the Canons Regular of the rule of Saint Augustine, Holyrood Abbey was constructed in its present position from 1128. Around this time it was bestowed with the church of St Cuthbert (which was located below the walls of Edinburgh Castle) and all its dependencies, amongst which was a plot of land bounded by a “fonte” - a fountain or well-head - that rose “near the corner of the king’s garden on the road leading to Saint Cuthbert’s church.” Whatever the nature of the structure, given its association with a royal garden, it seems likely to have been in some way ornamental.
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1 Hagopian van Buren, A., “Reality and Literary Romance in the Park of Hesdin” in MacDougall, Medieval Gardens, pp.115-34.
2 Anon. (ed.), “Charters of Holyrood: Liber Cartarum Sancte Crucis,” Bannatyne Club, Edinburgh, 1840, p.4. It seems unlikely that a garden would have been created beneath Edinburgh’s castle walls during the turbulent years of David’s reign and as such it may be the work of King Malcolm or more probably his much-loved wife Margaret, a devout Christian who was canonized after her death. Certainly, in later years the structure was referred to as ‘St Margaret’s Well.’ For a history of the gardens associated with Edinburgh Castle see Malcolm, C., “The Gardens of the Castle,” The Book of The Old Edinburgh Club, vol.14, 1925, pp.101-20.
3 Well-heads were as much capable of decoration as fountains. An excellent example was constructed during the late-15th century at St. Triduana’s at Restalrig, near Edinburgh. A small, hexagonal-plan basin was enclosed beneath six rib-vaults and designed as a simplified imitation in miniature of the lower chamber of St. Triduana’s Aisle. It seems to have stood in the grounds of the church, though it was not apparently associated with any gardens. The well-head was removed in 1859 to its present position in Holyrood Park and is now known also as ‘St. Margaret’s Well’ - see Maclvor, I., “The King’s Chapel at Restalrig and Saint Triduana’s Aisle, a Hexagonal, Two-storied Chapel of the Fifteenth Century,” PSAS, vol.96, 1962-3, pp.247-63; and Grant, J., Old and New Edinburgh, vol.3, pp.129-30.
In 1326, the manor of Cardross on the River Clyde was acquired by Robert the Bruce. It is recorded as having possessed both a garden and a park. By 1329 a house for the royal falcons was repaired and re-roofed at a cost of two shillings. Whether this aviary was ornamental can not be determined, however, the fact that it was surrounded by a hedge suggests that it may not only have been set within a garden but also constructed with some regard to its aesthetic value.

Finally, Perth tradition relates a reference to a ‘Gilten Arbour’ at the town’s former Dominican Priory, an occasional residence for the nation’s monarchs. Reputedly attached to the Priory and overlooking the North Inch, the structure is said to have been enriched with gilded (hence ‘gilten’) detailing, and to have contained an elaborate ceiling decorated with allegorical and astronomical figures, whilst its roof is claimed to have provided the platform from which Robert III viewed the notorious ‘Battle of the Clans’ in 1396. This anecdotal account of an arbour with a stout roof and painted ceiling sets it quite apart from typical, vine-clad, trellis-work examples, rather it describes a highly elaborate building more closely related to the open loggia - a form that may well have been known to Scotland’s nobility.

---

1 ER, vol. 1, p.127.
2 Fittis, R., The Ecclesiastical Annals of Perth, Perth, 1885, pp.157-8. Local tradition also recounts that this ceiling was later replicated within a gazebo constructed during the early-17th century within the gardens of Gowrie House, also in Perth (ibid., p.158).
3 The account should be treated guardedly. The term ‘arbour’ may here be a corruption of ‘herbar’ - that is, a garden. In 1535, the Perth Town Council took possession of the Priory’s land for the general recreation of the town’s people. In response to the remonstrations of the friars, James V adjudicated against the Council’s appropriation of “a part of their crofts called the Gilded Herbar.” The dispute continued however, and as late as the end of the century the friars were still asserting their claim to the “lea-land at the foot or east part of their croft, beside the North Inch, which piece of land is now called the Gytt herbar, and was called before the King’s Garden” (ibid.). However, the term herbar can also refer to an arbour. For example, in 1577, Thomas Hill noted that “the herber in a Garden may bee framed with juniper poles, or the willowe, eynth to stretch, or be bound together with oysers, after a square forme, or an arche manner” (Hill, T., The Arte of Gardening, London, 1577, chapter 12, p.22).
4 An illustrated frontispiece of a 15th-century manuscript depicts the reception of Aeneas by Dido at the city gate of Carthage (fig. 1.4). A small hunting park dominates the foreground whilst at the top right of the picture, behind the city gate, stands a rectangular-plan loggia with fluted columns, round-arched openings to the side and front, and apparently a highly decorated interior. The manuscript is of French origin, however, it bears the arms of Scotland just below the vignette and seems to have been prepared for a Scottish patron. Whilst the manuscript could hardly have informed a widespread taste for such buildings, it serves at least to illustrate one way in which Scottish nobles could have been kept abreast of developments in garden architecture abroad (compare the structure for example to that depicted in fig. 1.3). For details of the manuscript see Borland, C., A Descriptive Catalogue of Western Medieval Manuscripts in Edinburgh University Library, Edinburgh, 1916, pp.281-3.
The predominance of arbours and fountains within Europe’s gardens continued into the early-modern period, though by the mid-16th century a new type of structure - the banqueting house - was also finding favour.

**Ornamental Structures within the Courtyards, Gardens and Parks of the Early-Modern Period**

Between 1414 and 1417, Henry V of England had an enclosed quadrangular pleasance of four acres created within a marsh adjoining the ‘Great Pool’ at Kenilworth. Enclosed by two moats it contained towers at each of its corners with a banqueting house at its heart, and outside a dock for boats to bring parties of courtiers on summer outings from the castle. A year after its completion James I, then aged 24, was incarcerated at the castle as part of his 18-year internment amongst the royal and Lancastrian residences of England. This remarkable creation must have intrigued the captured king; certainly he was engaged by the vista from his cell in the ‘Marshal’s Tower’ at Windsor, describing the castle’s gardens in his autobiographical love poem *The Kingis Quhair*. Between 1420-2, James accompanied his captor on a trip to France, and there too he must have seen a good many of the Continent’s most splendid estates. Therefore, given James’s
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2 Brown, M., *James I*, Edinburgh, 1994, p.20. James is known to have been held at Kenilworth in 1418 and may have returned in the spring of 1421 (Balfour Melville, E., *James I, King of Scots, 1406-37*, London, 1936, pp.77, 84).

3 Henry’s relationship with James seems to have turned from one of jailer to patron, allowing him ever-increasing freedom towards the end of his captivity. It is not known for sure whether James saw the king’s impressive new garden at Kenilworth, but it would seem likely, particularly if James returned to live there towards the end of his captivity.


5 James accompanied Henry V on his French embassies of 1420-2. Certainly James visited Poix, Amiens, St. Pôl, Thérouanne and Calais. It is probable that he also accompanied the entourage to Paris (Balfour Melville, *James I,*
experience of, and evident sensitivity for, fine gardens, it seems likely that when he came to lay out his own at Edinburgh Castle in 1435, its appearance would have recalled those he had seen in his youth, and, as such, might well have included aviaries, loggias, banqueting houses, fountains and arbours - at least the latter of these are likely to have been created subsequently at the royal hunting lodge of Falkland.¹

During the regency which followed James I’s death in 1437, the long-established policy of raising the influence of Scottish royalty abroad through propitious marriage was continued. The hand of a Burgundian princess was negotiated for the heir and in 1449, at the age of 19, James II was married to Marie of Gueldres.² As the daughter of the Duke of Gueldres and niece of the Duke of Burgundy, the credentials of the King’s new wife were impeccable. However, the improved status of his court in Europe appears not to have been celebrated in architecture with any significant patronage. The comparative sparsity of major commissions during James II’s reign is perhaps symptomatic of the low priority he gave the arts. As such it is remarkable to find the regular recording of royal garden-work beginning during his reign, with a gardener at Falkland first noted as being employed from 1451 onwards and improvement work being undertaken at a garden within Stirling Castle two years later.³ Now, if the garden at this time

---

¹ ER, vol.4, p.623 records a payment in 1435 to “Waltero Massoun” and “Nicolao Plummar” for “complecione herbarii regis infra castrum de Edinburgh.” Massoun (the master of works) was presumably a stone-mason and Plummar a lead-worker. If so, then it seems possible that they may have been employed to construct water-works within the garden.


³ At Falkland the recording of an annuity to an “ortulano” began in 1451 (ER, vol.5, p.472 et seq.). At Stirling, the Exchequer Rolls record a payment of 18 shillings made in 1453 “pro emendatione gardine de Strivelyn et mundacione clausure”, i.e. for the garden to be ‘put in order.’ This is the earliest record of a garden at the castle (ER, vol.5, p.597). The poverty of the crown accounts in part for the lack of significant architectural patronage. This was partly mitigated by the seizure of the ‘Black’ Douglas’s lands in 1455. For details of Marie’s considerable personal wealth see Macdougall, N., James III, A Political Study, Edinburgh, 1982, p.61, and ER, vol.7, pp.xlvi-xlvi.
was the especial province of women"; it might be suggested that this modest surge in royal gardening was achieved through the efforts of the new Queen. Certainly it seems reasonable to assume that Marie would have been familiar with the aesthetic and allegorical value of a garden. Contemporary miniatures contained within illuminated manuscripts depict the palaces of Marie’s blood-relatives enveloped by enclosed gardens of arbours and covered walks (fig. 1.5). The garden and its architecture were essential to the mechanics of the Burgundian ducal court and quickly assumed not only a practical, but a symbolic significance. Amongst these, the *hortus conclusus* (that is the ‘enclosed garden’) represented the qualities of the Virgin and was assumed by Duchess Isabella - Marie’s aunt - as her own device. It is therefore not surprising to find the Queen undertaking gardening works at her personal residence of Falkland within a year of her husband’s death. In 1461 the Exchequer Rolls reveal the creation of two rooms within an existing gallery at the Palace. By implication, the gallery was both within the main building and acting as more than a simple corridor. Such a gallery was without precedent in Scotland or England and is perhaps of continental inspiration and an early example of Marie’s influence. The alteration of the gallery coincided with payments for the creation of a new chamber for the Queen with a door leading to a new pleasure garden below. It is intriguing to consider a relationship

1 Colvin, “Royal Gardens,” p.9.
2 Numerous illustrations of these are reproduced in Harvey, *Medieval Gardens*, pp.114-15.
4 An avenue of trees at Falkland is still called ‘Gilderland’ (inf. ex Dr. Ian Campbell).
5 *ER*, vol.7, p.106 records expenses “censura duarum camerarum in le galry.” The date of construction of the gallery is unknown. It may have formed part of the extensions to Falkland executed during the mid-century. Certainly Marie brought the influences of her homeland to bear in other spheres of her artistic patronage: for example, the particular appearance of the Dowager’s first commission, the Trinity College Church in Edinburgh (demolished, except for the apse), has led some scholars to suggest the probable influence of Burgundian masons in its design (Fawcett, R., *Scottish Architecture from the Accession of the Stewarts to the Reformation*, 1371-1560, Edinburgh, 1994, pp.175-7). Moreover, the use of the French term “le galry” may be telling.
6 Coope, R., “The ‘Long Gallery’: Its Origins, Development, Use and Decoration,” *JAHGB*, vol.29, 1986, pp.43-84 (though Coope makes no mention of the Falkland gallery). A gallery formed part of the French royal residence of the Hôtel St Pôl - see Bournon, “L’hôtel royal de St. Pôl,” p.100. Notably, a gallery was proposed to be constructed as part of improvements to the Palace at Stirling over a century later when “ane fair gallery” and “ane terras” were recommended in order to capitalise on views of the “perk and gairdin” (*MW*, vol.1, 7th May 1583, pp.310-11).
7 *ER*, vol.7, p.75, records payments of 24 shillings “pro factura viridaria prope camera regine descendentiis ad viridarium in Faucland.”
between these various features, since if, as is likely, stairs led from the Queen’s chamber (presumably at or above the first floor), to gardens below, the arrangement may have been similar to the demesnes of Marie’s uncle, the Duke of Berry (fig. 1.6).¹

James III inherited something of his mother’s evident finesse becoming the greatest patron of Scottish arts up to that date.² Expanding his grandfather’s palace at Linlithgow along Italianate lines³ he had established a garden there by his death in 1488.⁴ If this is reflective of a fancy for the art of gardening amongst the King’s myriad interests, then the employment of two keepers of the grounds at Stirling Castle between 1479 and 1480, rather than the customary one, might serve to confirm this.⁵ The location of this garden is unknown, though it seems very likely that it was set within the walls of the castle, and that it may have been used to receive two Spanish ambassadors in the winter of 1495.⁶ Indeed, if this was the case, it may have contained some form of garden-room to shelter the proceedings from the seasonal weather.

---

¹ An example of a privy stair leading to a garden is illustrated clearly in a late-15th-century painting presented to Isabella of Spain (fig. 1.7). Certainly it seems that this feature predates English examples, the earliest of which would appear to have been constructed at Eltham by 1520 (Thurley, S., Henry VIII and the Buildings of Hampton Court, London, 1998, p.21). A payment made in 1513 for the removal of “roots and trunks” might relate to the destruction of arbours (ER, vol.13, p.508).


⁴ TA, vol 1, p.92, records a payment in 1488 of 28 shillings to “the gardynar of Lythgow.” Identical payments were made in 1496 and 1497 and a payment of 10 shillings to the “gardinare of Lythgow to by seydis to the gairdin” was made in 1490.

⁵ In 1461 an annuity of 10 shillings was begun to “Jacobo Wilsoune” the “ortulano de Strivelyn.” This was doubled two years later (ER, vol.7, p.59). In 1479 payments were made to “Gilheso Makgilhoise” and “Malcolmo Maklery” for “custodio gardini et prati de Strivelyng” - that is the maintenance of the gardens and lawns of Stirling (ER, vol.8, p.563).

⁶ Following the complaints of the ambassadors to the Spanish king and queen regarding their treatment by James during their embassy, Ferdinand and Isabella wrote that “they were sorry for what the king of Scotland had done in the garden of the Castle” (quoted in Macdougall, N., James IV, Edinburgh, 1989, p.122).
The patronage of James IV was at least as progressive as that of his father, his tastes as cosmopolitan as they were educated.1 Amongst his artistic achievements - and they were many - the gardens he created at Stirling are of particular interest. Their development at this time can be divided into two phases. The first involved the creation of new gardens within the castle ward in 1493;2 the second the laying-out of `new gardens below the walls of the castle' between 1501-3.3 That this "nove gardine" was in some measure ornamental is suggested by its contents: hedges, fruit trees and vines, any one of which could have been trained to form arbours.4 The creation of the garden spans precisely the period between the year of the restart of James's negotiations for the hand of Margaret Tudor of England and that of the ensuing marriage.5 James would have learnt of Henry VII's impressive new garden at Richmond Palace from his ambassadors dispatched to London to negotiate the terms of the contract of marriage.6 The creation of a Stewart equivalent could at once answer the work of his rival and prospective father-in-law and gild the prospect of his queen's new home. Its appearance is unknown though the presence of French gardeners hints at the continuing influence of a country increasingly dominant in the art

1 See generally Macdougall, James IV.

2 ER, vol.11, p.144 (payments made in 1499) and ER, vol.10, p.404 (payment made in 1500 to "Friar Archibald Hamilton" for repair work to the "gardino castri strivelin"). See also ER, vol.11, p.18 (a payment of 20 shillings made in 1497 to "Friar Robert Cauldwell for work in the "gardino castri Strivelin"") and ER, vol.11, p.142 (virtual presented in 1499 to the "ortulano infra castrum de Strivelin... pro reparacione gardini infra dictum castrum"). With the rebellions of 1488 and the following year, along with the unsettled climate that followed, the king was unable to assert himself as an effective ruler until around 1494. Perhaps the creation of the garden can be interpreted as a sign of the king's growing confidence and as a facade to the numerous artistic works commissioned by him during the long period of ensuing peace. The Treasury Accounts indicate that considerable planting was undertaken towards the close of the century within the Castle or possibly in orchards just outwith or in the park below. Payments were also made in 1497 to "Dean Matho of Culros for the yard bigging" (TA, vol.1, pp.367, 370, 377-8, 388).

3 The first reference to a garden 'beneath the castle walls' was made in 1501 when it was described as 'new' and a payment was made to the "ortulano nove gardine sub muro castri de Strivelin" (ER vol.11, p.314).

4 Colvin, "Royal Gardens," p.15.

5 The 'marriage of the thistle and the rose' was held at Holyrood Abbey on 8 August 1503 and was celebrated with an Anglo-Scots peace agreement.

6 The Palace of Richmond was improved for the arrival of Catherine of Aragon in 1501. At this time it possessed "most fair pleasant gardens with royal knots alleyed and herbed: many marvellous beasts, as lions, dragons, and such other of divers kind, properly fashioned and carved in the ground, right well sanded, and compassed with lead, with many vines, sceds and strange fruit" (Harvey, Medieval Gardens, p.135).
of gardening.¹ If it did defer in content and appearance to the pleasure grounds of the French royal family then it may be speculated that the King’s magno gardino at Stirling would have done much to consolidate and promote a tradition not only for arbours but perhaps garden architecture of all forms across Scotland.²

In September 1536, James V left Kirkcaldy for Dieppe at the age of 24 in pursuit of a fitting wife. Whilst securing the hand of Madeleine de Valois, James fell under the spell of the royal court of her father, François I, and became imbued with the French king’s taste for architectural patronage. On his return to Scotland James immediately initiated large-scale remodelling and extension work to each of the royal residences of Stirling, Falkland and Linlithgow. Moreover, for each of the latter two he commissioned a fountain.³ That at Falkland has long since disappeared and nothing is known of its appearance,⁴ the fountain at Linlithgow, however, survives in a restored state at the centre of the Palace courtyard.⁵ Though it is not strictly a garden building, the fountain is so closely related to - and would surely have been so profoundly influential upon - the genre that it merits some analysis.⁶

¹ Two payments are recorded to the “Franch gardiner” in 1501 (TA, vol.2, pp.352, 445).
² A late-19th-century sketch depicts an overgrown arbour (now lost) within the grounds of Moray House in Edinburgh (Grant, Old and New Edinburgh, vol.2, p.32).
³ For Falkland see MIV, vol.1, p.261 which records payments in 1538-9 to “Robert Murray, plumbar” for “werkmanship of certane of the leid... for casting of the ground of the fontane,” and for “certane cruikis and bottis... to the fontane.” The construction of the Linlithgow fountain is not recorded amongst the royal accounts, however, its date must be very close to that of 1538 etched on the fountain’s lead feeding-pipes which were excavated in the Kirkkait in 1894 (McWilliam, C., Lothian Except Edinburgh, London, 1978, p.298).
⁴ It is possible, however, that the footings of a structure set within the Palace courtyard and identified by the Royal Commission as a “monument” may in fact relate to the fountain (RCAHMS, Fife, Kinross and Clackmannan, Edinburgh, 1933, p.136).
⁵ The extent of the restoration is not easy to determine. Probably the most reliable source is a mid-19th-century engraving of the fountain by Robert Billings which depicts only the base and central structure intact - see Billings, R., Baronial and Ecclesiastical Antiquities of Scotland, 5 vols., Edinburgh, 1848 vol.3 (fig. 1.8).
⁶ At least one nobleman constructed a fountain within his castle some short time after the completion of that at Linlithgow. In a “Petition to the Lord of the Council by John Roytell, mason against John, Lord Borthwick, as factor to Patrick, Earl of Borthwick,” Roytell, a French mason, claimed for an unpaid sum that was “contained in the said earl’s precept to the late Thomas Franche and the said John for making ane fountain in the place of Halis - At Edinburgh, 1551” (quoted in Mylne, R., The Master Masons to the Crown of Scotland and Their Works, Edinburgh, 1893, p.44). This may refer to Hailes Castle at Prestonkirk, near Haddington, which was described by Lord Grey of Wilton in 1548 as being “for bignes, of such excellent bewtie within, as I have seldom sene any in Englande except the Kings Majesties and of verie good strengthe” (RCAHMS, East Lothian, Edinburgh, 1924, p.94).
Rising like a vast Gothic wedding cake all iced in ashlar, the fountain is an exquisite confection of pinnacles, statuary, crockets and quatrefoils (fig. 1.9). As resolute as it is ostentatious, it is easy to understand how so remarkable a structure could once have been earnestly considered “the beautifulest Fountain in the World.”¹ A large, octagonal basin with pinnacled angle colonnettes forms its base, from which cusped buttresses fly to a second similar though smaller cistern. Upon this, individual statues rest at each corner and effect to hide the column that supports a third bowl lined with retching gargoyles. From here, four slender clustered-columns rise to support a robust, enclosed crown - finely wrought, superbly crafted and unquestionably intended to form the focal point of the entire agglomeration.

Although the quality of the fountain can hardly be questioned, it might be suggested that the choice of a Gothic idiom was, at this time and for this type of building, a little surprising. James was contemporaneously making use of Continental craftsmen to create a classical courtyard at Falkland inspired directly by the French châteaux in which he had stayed.² He was, then, at ease with the architectural avant garde. Indeed, given that James would have seen any number of new, classical fountains whilst in France,³ it seems reasonable to assume that the

¹ Macky, J., A Journey Through Scotland, London, 1723, p.200. Macky, who travelled through Scotland in the early-1720s, describes the fountain as being “after the shape of an Imperial Crown, adorned with Statues, and other fine Carved Work; each Statue pouring forth Water into a Cistern below them.” Around half a century earlier, Sir John Lauder of Fountainhall described the fountain as “a most artificial font of most excellent water” (Crawford, D. (ed.), “Lauder of Fountainhall Journals, 1665-76,” Scottish History Society, vol.136, Edinburgh, 1900, p.182). The fountain was apparently “destroyed by the royal army in 1746” (Black, A. and C., Picturesque Tour of Scotland, 9th edn., Edinburgh, 1851, p.164). Sir Robert Sibbald described the fountain in 1710 as being “well adorned with several statues and waterworks, curiously wrought, which when they go, raise the water to a considerable height [sic]” (Sibbald, Sir R., The History Ancient and Modern of the Sherifdoms of Linlithgow and Stirling, Edinburgh, 1710, p.15).


³ During the first third of the 16th century, classical fountains were constructed at Amboise (1496-1500), Blois (which had two, both built in 1503) and Guillon (which possessed three, all built between 1506-8). A non-classical fountain was constructed at Villers-Cotterêts (1528) - see Miller, N., French Renaissance Fountains, London,
temptation to create a similar one would have been a strong one, especially for a structure that was comparatively cheap to erect and in itself well suited to architectural experimentation. Moreover, the builders of the Linlithgow fountain were well aware of classical detailing having ornamented its base with small circular portrait busts similar to those used at Falkland. Yet a very traditional Gothic form was adopted for the overall design of the fountain. The reason for this may lie in the intended role of the building, for it is likely to have been as much a piece of political allegory as it was an ornament or even a source of water. This idea requires a little explanation.

It has been observed that “to scrutinise the Renaissance in a national context it is necessary to examine the different ways in which [the Scots] also related themselves [not just to Rome but] to ancestors and authorities even further back in time.”¹ Certainly by the mid-16th century, Scotland could boast a rich tradition of historiography. John of Fordun in the 1380s, Andrew of Wyntoun around 1420 and Walter Bower in the 1440s, all compiled Scottish histories based on long-established origin myths. Each of these asserted that the Scottish kingdom had never been conquered and that Scots genealogy stemmed from the Egyptians and Greeks. Such an august, if apocryphal, lineage was contrived to refute the claim of English suzerainty over the country, a claim whose spurious validity was based on a reputed common ancestry and English overlordship that was alleged to date from the founding of the single country of ‘Britain’ created under Roman rule. The popularity and usefulness of the various Scottish origin myths remained current throughout the Renaissance during which time they were lent humanist credentials by

Hector Boece in his *Scotorum Historiae* - a Latin work published twelve years before the fountain was built and reissued in translation just one year after. This establishment of a so-called \textquoteleft national epos\textquoteright was \textquoteleft in its own way the most profound of all acts of emancipation\textquoteright,\footnote{Mason, \textquoteleft Chivalry and Citizenship,\textquoteright p.51.} and much of it crystallised around the Stewart dynasty\textquotesingle s claim to the justification and dignity embodied in the enclosed, that is the imperial, crown.\footnote{In line with other European independent kingdoms, James III had the royal diadem adapted to an enclosed \textquoteleft imperial\textquoteright type by adding two crossing arches on to its top with a surmounting orb and cross. It was depicted on a coin struck in 1484. The crown was remodelled once again in 1539 (Burnett, C. and Tabraham, C., *The Honours of Scotland*, Edinburgh, 1993, p.23).} It can hardly be an accident that such a diadem is celebrated above the fountain - as if sanctified in water and, literally, set in stone.

Indeed, the fountain bears other symbols of Scotland\textquotesingle s links with, and independence within, Europe: principally the pedestals at the angles of the lower tank are elaborated by carvings of a thistle, lily and rose, in turn representative of the King, his French wife and his English, Tudor mother; and a heraldic lion squatting upon one of the pedestals bears the Royal Arms of Scotland impaled with those of France. Moreover, certain of the architectural details of the fountain are peculiarly and identifiably Scottish: the buttresses for example must surely relate to the tradition of the crown-spire, whilst the blind-quatrefoiled parapets are close to those on the tower of St Giles Cathedral in Edinburgh. It may be suggested, therefore, that although a few classical details were incorporated within the fountain, presumably for their potent imperial connotations, for the most part such Renaissance imagery was eschewed in favour of traditional, \textit{native}, Gothic - a style resonant with historical associations and singularly appropriate to what was surely a monument to nationalism.\footnote{For the use of classical architecture to invoke imperial connections see Yates, F., \textit{Astraea: The Imperial Theme in the Sixteenth Century}, London, 1975, esp. pp.2-22, and Burke, P., \textquoteleft The Uses of Italy\textquoteright in Porter, R., \textit{Renaissance in National Context}, pp.6-20. Significantly, recent research at Falkland by the Royal Commission has revealed that the broadly Gothic facade of the main entrance block at Falkland and the classical courtyard elevation were, in fact, constructed contemporaneously and not, as previously thought, a generation apart. It has been argued that \textquoteleft a courtly, \textquoteleft foreign\textquoteright \textquoteleft classical\textquoteright style was considered appropriate for the enjoyment of the socially and culturally privileged and an \textquoteleft ecclesiastical\textquoteright style connoting divine authority for external, general consumption\textquoteright (see Cameron, N., \textquoteleft Public Facades and Private Fronts,\textquoteright *Newsletter of the Society of Architectural Historians of Great Britain*, no.66, Spring 1999, pp.1-3.)}
However, despite this apparently advised use of Scottish detailing, the broad lines of the Linlithgow fountain may nonetheless derive from French precedent; specifically the *Fontaine Jaques d'Amboise* which was constructed in 1515 within the town square of Clermont Ferrand, in the Puy-de-Dôme region of central France¹ (figs. 1.10 and 1.11). Both comprise a principal octagonal basin with pinnacled angle-colonnettes and two further basins all clad in statuary and bearing gargoyles from which water issues to create similar hydraulic effects. Furthermore, whilst each is broadly Gothic in appearance and details, they both bear a small number of Renaissance motifs: grotesques, water nymphs and sprites at Clermont Ferrand; carved masks, mermaids, nudes and busts at Linlithgow.

James V seems never to have visited Clermont Ferrand, restricting his trip to the lower reaches of the Loire valley, and as such the influence of the *Fontaine Jaques d'Amboise* might be questioned. However, given that the fountain seems to have been much the finest and most innovative to have been constructed within early-16th-century France, it may well have inspired imitations within town squares noblemen's gardens. Yet a direct connection may exist between the fountains at Linlithgow and Clermont Ferrand in the person of Sir James Hamilton of Finnart (c.1500-40). Appointed captain and keeper of Linlithgow in November 1526, he assumed responsibility nine years later for its remodelling and repair, and in 1539 was appointed to accompany John Scrymgeour in the post of “maister of werk principale to our soverane lord” with the sole responsibility for the palaces of Linlithgow and Stirling.² Having spent much of his youth in the court of François I,³ a knowledge of the then newly built (and surely renowned)

³ *DNB*, vol.8, p.1051.
fountain at Clermont Ferrand is not implausible - the 'style Louis XII' (1495-1515) had an impact on the young Finnart, reflected as some have suggested in the elevations of the Palace Block at Stirling.¹

Further connections may be provided by the coterie of Continental artisans working for the court around this time. Notable amongst it was the Frenchman, Mogin Martin. Master mason to the crown from at least 1536, Martin accompanied James to France, apparently to collect ideas for new work at royal palaces and probably assisted in the remodelling of the East Range at Falkland (started 1537). Following his death in 1538 he was replaced by Nicholas Roy (appointed April 1539), another Frenchman, who is credited with Falkland’s completion.² The influence of either of these men might explain the use of portrait busts at both Linlithgow and Falkland. Similarly, Thomas Frenche (a Scot but of probable French descent), was the king’s master mason at Linlithgow in 1535 and Falkland 1537-8, and was involved in the creation of the ‘crown-spires’ at St Giles, Edinburgh, St Michaels, Linlithgow and King’s College, Aberdeen.³ His influence might explain the robust form of the flying buttresses. Thus, though clearly a vexatious issue, it seems reasonable to suggest that the experience of one or more of Finnart, Martin, Roy and Frenche would have been brought to bear on the Linlithgow fountain and that perhaps one of them would have been able to draw generally on the rich tradition for such structures in France, and perhaps recall that at Clermont Ferrand as a particular source of ideas.

¹ McKean, “Hamilton of Finnart,” p.10. In this respect it is worth noting that the cusping beneath the buttresses of the Linlithgow fountain and that within the niches of the Palace Block at Stirling is very similar.

² MW, vol.1, p.254

³ Kelly, W., “Scottish Crown Steeples” in Simpson, W (ed.), A Tribute Offered by the University of Aberdeen to the Memory of William S. Kelly, Aberdeen, 1949, pp.34-48. McWilliam remarks on the similarity between the crown of the fountain and that at King’s College, Aberdeen, apparently implying the influence of the former upon the latter (McWilliam, Lothian, p.298). This may be misleading since this part of the spire was substantially remodelled after its collapse in the early-1600s, a century after it was first built. It is perhaps beyond coincidence, though, that crown steeples were considered to be representations of imperial diadems. For example, Boece remarked that “the church [of King’s College, Aberdeen] has a bell-tower of immense height, with a stone arch in the shape of an imperial crown, built with wonderful art and raised above the leaden roof” (Moir, J. (ed. and trans.), “Hectoris Boetii Murthlacensium et Aberdonensium Episcoporum Vitae,” New Spalding Club, Aberdeen, 1894, p.95).
Another remarkable structure of James's reign was not built by him but for him by John Stewart, 3rd Earl of Atholl. In 1531 the 19-year-old king visited the Highlands about Atholl on a hunting expedition, accompanied by his mother, Queen Margaret, and an ambassador of the Pope. To greet him Atholl "maid ane great provisioun for him in all thingis necessar pertening to his estait as he had been in his awin palice in edinburgh,"¹ and had a sumptuous temporary hunting lodge-cum-banqueting house constructed for their convenience. Like the Linlithgow fountain, the lodge was not set within a garden, however, as a notable and early example of ornamental estate architecture, it demands consideration.

Sir Robert Lindesay's 1575 account of Atholl's "curieous palice" merits quotation at length for its detailed description of so rare and impressive a work. Lindesay (a close confidant of James V) recounts a substantial building where the king, his mother and guest,

"ludgit as they had been in Ingland, France, Italie and Spaine for thair hunting pastyme quhilk was buildit in the midis of ane fair medow ane faire palice of greine tymmer wond with birkis that war grein batht wnder and abone quhilk was fesnitt in foure quarteis and everie quarter an nuike thairof ane greit round as it had been ane blokhouse quhilk was loiftit and lestit the space of thrie house hight; the fluir laid witht greine cherittis witht sprattis medwartis and flouris. Then no man knew quhairon he zeid bot as he had bene in ane gardin. Farder thair was tua great roundis in ilk syde of the zeit and ane greit portcullis of trie falland doune the maner of ane barrace witht ane greit draw brege, and ane greit fowsie and strak of watter of sextene foot deipe and XXX futte braid of watter and also this palice within was

weill syllit and hung with fyne glassin windowis in all airtis that this pallice was
allis pleasantlie decorit with all necessaris pertenand to ane prince as it had bene his
awin palice royall at hame."

An extravagant structure with wooden walls, a drawbridge and portcullis, encircled by a broad
moat, it was sufficient to impress the papal ambassador who until then had considered Scotland
"the erse of the world".2

As a hunting lodge, the “palice” was related directly to those wrought in stone amongst
the deer parks of Tudor England.3 Being temporary, it may also have been built in imitation of
similar fleeting structures inspired by popular chivalric writing which at that time formed the
centre-pieces of ostentatious royal festivities across Europe.4 Its destruction could be interpreted
as a romantic gesture couched in the rigorous codes of chivalric behaviour then being revived,5
for the wildly ostentatious building was wilfully burnt to the ground as its guests finally left, it

---


2 *Ibid.*  Scotland’s perceived remoteness, at least from Italy, was commented on by the Milanese ambassador who considered the country to be “in finis orbis” (quoted in Macdougall, *James III*, p.115).

3 Some sources for the particular form of the lodge may be suggested here. Lindsay’s choice of the term “blookhouse” hints that the building may have been circular in plan (the Gaelic for round being ‘bloc’ - see Dwelly, E. (ed.), *Illustrated Gaelic-English Dictionary*, 10th edn. Glasgow, 1988, p.84) and as such might have been inspired by the circular-plan royal castle residence at Rothayse (the gate-house of which was later reproduced at Castles Stalker and Craigmillar (MacKechnie, A., “Scots Court Architecture as the erse of the world”).


5 As for example that depicted by Holbein in his painting of Henry VIII’s extravagant fete at the ‘Field of the Cloth of Gold’.

6 For the 16th-century revival of interest in chivalry in Scotland see Nicholson, *Scotland*, esp. pp.574-9; see also Cline, R., “The Influence of Romance on the Tournaments of the Middle Ages,” *Speculum*, vol.20, 1945, pp.205-11. It is perhaps also significant that popular contemporary novels such as Jacopo Sannazzaro’s *Arcadia* and Ariosto’s *Orlando Furioso* (published in Italian in 1514 and 1532 respectively) vividly described chivalric incidents set within pastoral settings.
being "the wse of hielandmen thocht they be newer so weill ludgit to burne thair ludging quhene they depairt."

During the regency of Marie of Guise (1542-60) and the reign of her daughter, Mary (1561-7), gardening continued to enjoy royal patronage where major architecture failed to do so. It is during this period that is found what may be Scotland's earliest surviving garden building - 'Queen Mary's Bath-house' (figs. 1.12, 1.13 and 1.14). The building once adjoined the Privy Garden of the royal residence at Holyroodhouse but now stands unhappily isolated on the wrong side of a carriage drive that was driven through the gardens as part of crude re-landscaping undertaken in the mid-19th century. The two-storey structure has been considerably altered and extended since its construction, adaptations which give the diminutive building an engaging if somewhat clumpy appearance. It is built of random rubble (presumably once harled) with raised dressings and margins and is topped by a pyramidal slate roof apsed over a bartisan at the north angle. Of the building's few discernibly original features, the waist-high corbel course to the north-west elevation remains the most obvious and intact.

The date of the building is unknown. Its traditional name may refer either to the queens Marie de Guise or Mary Stuart. Its design and the condition of its fabric suggest a later-16th-century construction date with subsequent 19th-century additions and alterations (of which some, if not all may date from 1852 when it is known to have been reconditioned). Royal accounts shed little light on its origins. Mention is made of payments in 1535-6 for work to a "littil garding chalmer," though being "abone the peind" suggests it was either part of the palace (perhaps overlooking a garden), another garden structure altogether, or even a "guarding chamber" - that is a guard's room. The accounts also record work to an "averyhous," a "dansing hous," and a


“cophous” although it is unclear whether these were discrete ornamental structures.\(^1\) The evidence of contemporary maps is unrewarding. The earliest detailed depiction of the grounds about Holyrood is Robert van den Hoyen’s earlier-17th-century map (fig. 1.15).\(^2\) This shows knot gardens enclosed by walls around Holyroodhouse, with the walled parterre to the north containing a square or circular-plan building at its north-east corner. The north-west corner, which approximates more closely to the position of the present structure is, unfortunately, eclipsed by a tree, though the presence of a twin structure is easy to imagine.\(^3\) A survey of Edinburgh produced by John Gordon of Rothiemay in 1647\(^4\) (fig. 1.16) depicts a simple, square-plan, two-storey, gabled building to the north-west corner of the north garden at the termination of a wall. This arrangement is confirmed firstly by a “small mapp of his maj[est]ies palace of Hallyrudhouse” prepared by the Master of Works, Robert Mylne, some 16 years later\(^5\) (figs. 1.17), and secondly by evidence on the ground, where an excavated stump of a wall still connects with the bath-house. A *terminus post quem* date for the structure may be 1558, as this was the year that the land to the north-west of the Holyroodhouse estate was purchased from Dean Abercromby, canon of Holyrood and “maid in ane garding to her grace,”\(^6\) Marie of Guise; though it is equally possible that the building was in place beforehand.

\(^{1}\) *MW*, vol.1, pp.73, 96, 97, 187-8, 190, 302. It seems likely that the term “cophouse” relates to the modern term ‘caphouse’ and as such refers to the palace rather than its outbuildings; *inf. ex.* Mr John Dunbar.

\(^{2}\) Entitled “*Edinburgum Civitas Scotiae Celeberrima.*”

\(^{3}\) A small garden building in the east corner of the garden is also illustrated by W. Hollar’s “South Prospect of the City of Edinburgh” (1670) and Samuel Buck’s engraving of the city made before 1764 (fig. 1.18). Photographic copies of each of these are held by NMRS: Hollar is uncatalogued, Buck EDD/1/116/1.

\(^{4}\) Based on a survey of 1647 by the Revd. James Gordon of Rothiemay, the map was published by de Witt in *Theatrum Praeciparium Totius Europae Urbium* around 40 years later, and a copy is held at the Map Department of the National Library of Scotland.

\(^{5}\) Robert Mylne undertook a survey of the buildings of the estate of Holyroodhouse in 1663. The survey is reproduced in Mylne, *Master Masons*, p.169.

\(^{6}\) Quoted in Jamieson, “Holyroodhouse,” p.27.
Alterations to the fabric of the building and the ambiguity of its date, make its original purpose difficult to determine. There would seem to be four possible uses. The first and, at least to judge by its epithet, the most obvious, would have been as a bath-house. The tradition of Mary, Queen of Scots’s affection for bathing dates back at least to 1776 and the publication of John Pinkerton’s Craigmillar, which recalls that at the castle of that name there was a

“...chamber, where the Queen, whose charms divine
Made wond’ring actions own the pow’r of love,
Oft bath’d her snowy limbs in sparkling wine,
Now proves a lonely refuge for the dove.”

However, aspects of the ‘bath-house’ seem to mitigate against such a role: the placing of a substantial bath on a wooden upper floor seems impractical, whilst the location of the structure next to open land (and later a highway) could hardly have been considered satisfactory for so private a function.

1 In 1789, Lord Adam Gordon, commander of the forces in Scotland, took up residence at Holyrood and immediately granted permission to certain of his officers to erect small cottages along the wall of the palace garden. In order for one of these houses to be constructed, a stair turret that led to the roof of the bath-house, was demolished. Whilst so doing a “richly inlaid dagger of antique form, greatly corroded with rust” and with “the King's arms on it, done in gold” was found hidden within the turret’s roof. This was promptly acclaimed to be that used to murder Rizzio. The adjoining house was removed in 1852 and the bath-house partially restored (Grant, Old and New Edinburgh, vol.2, pp.40-1; Stewart-Smith, J., Historic Stones and Stones of Bygone Edinburgh, Edinburgh, 1924, p.268; and RCAHMS, Edinburgh, p.152). For contrasting illustrations of the bath-house before and after restoration see “Queen Mary’s Bath, Holyrood” by James Drummond (drawn 1848) and Sir George Reid (drawn c.1890) respectively, both of which are in the collection of the National Gallery of Scotland. For other illustrations of the bath-house see those by G. Aikman (n.d); James Skene (1819); J. Stewart-Smith (1868); A. McArthur (1905) and J. Harris (1934) in the collection of the Central Public Library in Edinburgh (see Campbell, M., Drawings and Watercolours of Edinburgh in the National Gallery of Scotland, Edinburgh, 1990).


3 From at least the 17th century, the structure was adjacent to the Watergate which led eastwards from the Canongate, it seems likely, therefore, that there would have been easy access to water from the structure. However, the use of the building as a bath-house is also questioned in CDAS, vol.4, pp.475-6. For details of bathing during the 16th century see Thornton, P., The Italian Renaissance Interior, 1400-1600, London, 1991, pp.315-19.
A second use might have been as a small banqueting house. Such building types were increasingly popular at this time, particularly in England where a very early example was recorded in 1535.1 The use of the banqueting house is rooted in two late-medieval traditions. The first was the ending of a grand meal with sweet-meats (thought to be beneficial to digestion), hippocras (a type of wine) and wafers. The second was the imported French fashion called voidée - that is the tradition of leaving the dining area (initially to another room and later to the garden where the outdoor environment was considered beneficial to health) in order to consume wines and spices as a pragmatic response to the limitations of the master, his family, guests and servants, all eating in a single hall.2 For this purpose banqueting houses needed to be of sufficient size to contain a dining party, and it is perhaps for this reason that the structure might be discounted for such a use.

A third possible role for the building may have been as a gazebo or a maison de plaisance. Unlike England, there seems never to have been a Scottish tradition of constructing galleries around the perimeter of enclosed gardens.3 As such, raised structures - or ‘gazebos’ - would have been required to view knots and parterres to good effect (especially when they were removed from the main house, as at Holyrood). Yet Mylne’s survey indicates that the building was connected with the adjoining garden only at its east corner, and that no passage was provided between the two4 - hardly an ideal arrangement for a gazebo, a banqueting or bath-house (fig. 22

---

1 The earliest example in England seems to be the banqueting house built into the garden walls at Lyddington Bede House during the late-15th-century (Henderson, “Visual Setting,” p.203). For the use of banqueting houses in 16th-century England (where they seem to have been rather more profuse, or at least more durable) see also Girouard, English Country House, pp.104-8, Henderson, “Visual Setting,” pp.203-4, and Hughes, G., “The Old English Banquet,” Country Life, 17 February 1955, p.474.


4 At first sight, one of the corbels to the north-west elevation which displays the worn remains of nail-head carving would seem to lend support to a mid-16th-century date for the structure. The carved stone would have been an unusual and expensive inclusion to a corbel course which, facing out of the garden and being very low-set, would rarely have been seen. As such, it could have been a reused stone from the nearby Abbey which was severely damaged during the 1544 and 1547 attacks by English troops. This clue should however be treated guardedly. For a
1.18). It may be postulated therefore, that either the structure predates the adjoining garden, it was remodelled prior to Mylne’s survey, or its function related to something else entirely. In the latter respect, the building may have been an angle tower of the precinct wall that once enclosed the Abbey grounds, though it’s size hardly appears sufficient for a defensive use.¹

More likely, however, is that it was associated with the “Tennis Court” (now demolished) which once faced it to the west. Réal (or royal) tennis was a popular leisure activity of the aristocracy during the 16th-century.² One example of a court in Scotland exists at Falkland whilst others are known to have been in place at St Andrews and Linlithgow. The date of the tennis court at Holyroodhouse is unknown but it could be contemporary with that at Falkland which was built in 1539. Given that Mylne’s survey indicates that the main door of the ‘bath-house’ was at that time angled towards the former tennis court, the two buildings may have been related. This suggests an altogether more prosaic origin for Queen Mary’s Bath-house - that of a mere changing room or store.

---

1 Malcolm notes that “immediately north of the Guard House stood that fragment of Abbot Bellenden’s Abbey or ‘Foir Yett,’ known as the Abbey Sanctuary,” and that the “older survivor of the original Abbey Wall” is the “turret on the north-west angle... the so-called Queen Mary’s Bath.” He questions why “the old turret” should be “known as ‘Queen Mary’s Bath’ instead of the ‘Postern Gate,’ or side entrance, for that is what is it was,” and presents a conjectural elevation of the “Foir Yett, Queen Mary’s Bath and its companion turret linking up the Abbey Wall” (Malcolm, C., Holyrood, London, 1937, pp.84, 94, 133). However, Malcolm offers no evidence for these assertions and his ideas are not supported by modern research (Jamieson, “Holyroodhouse,” p.36, n.49). As such, his conclusions must be viewed with caution. Indeed, the somewhat unfunctional nature of the architecture must itself suggest that the original purpose of the ‘bath-house’ was more ornamental than defensive.

2 Howard, D., Scottish Architecture from the Reformation to the Restoration, Edinburgh, 1995, p.99. The tennis court was also used as a venue for stage productions (Grant, Old and New Edinburgh, vol.2, pp.39-40).
Conclusion

In summary, therefore, not only can there be little doubt that ornamental buildings were a feature of Scotland's medieval gardens, but it seems reasonable to suggest also that their considerable emblematic and decorative potential was well understood, and at Linlithgow, fully realized - certainly, this was the case during the century that followed.
CHAPTER TWO

FROM THE REFORMATION TO THE RESTORATION

The Gardens of Renaissance Scotland

The religious and political upheavals that characterised the minority of Queen Mary reduced Scotland's government to a "deplorable level." Moreover, following the Reformation, the church could no longer be impuniously extorted to fund royal extravagance. As a result, for much of the later-16th century, the Stuarts had neither the opportunity nor the finances to indulge themselves greatly in the art of gardening.

Under the long reign of James VI, stability was steadily re-established across the country, and with the Union of the Crowns permanent peace with England was assured. Moreover, throughout the early part of the 17th century some measure of rapprochement was enjoyed across much of Europe, at least until the advent of the Thirty Years War on the Continent in 1619 and the Bishops' Wars in Scotland two decades later. Yet on acceding to the southern throne James removed his Court to England; and at a time, therefore, when the art of gardening in Scotland might have been expected to flourish it was deprived of its principal patron.

Fortunately, this period of stability had proved sufficient to nurture business and the wealth of burgesses had grown steadily with rising foreign trade. The numbers of landowners had increased through the gifting of monastic properties, as had the amount of Scottish peers - peers who grew in wealth as they began to develop and improve their own estates, and in importance as

they became essential to a remote king that enacted government through grace and favour.\(^1\) With the loss of the Court, it was these noblemen that now dictated taste.\(^2\)

Their gardens shared much in common with those of the medieval period, with knots, mounts, arbours and such like all finding continued favour.\(^3\) However, the arrangement of these features was influenced considerably by ideas from the Continent, particularly those emanating from Renaissance Italy by way of Northern Europe. As a result there was a general increase in the size of gardens; a greater emphasis on symmetry within gardens and the axial relationship between gardens and adjoining houses; and a willingness to mould terrain to an architectural form (usually terracing) that related both to the house and the surrounding landscape. There was also a desire occasionally to establish one or more allegorical programmes within the garden through the use of buildings, inscriptions or carved ornament, in order that they might challenge the mind as much as the senses.\(^4\)

Similarly, the types of structures used to ornament gardens were also unchanged from the medieval period. The banqueting house, gazebo, bath-house, well-head, summerhouse and fountain all found repeated expression. The Italian Renaissance added only grottoes to this familiar repertory,\(^5\) and it may have been a grotto that was seen by the surveyor, Timothy Pont,

---


\(^2\) For the economy of Scotland during this period see Lythe, S., *The Economy of Scotland in its European Setting 1550-1625*, Edinburgh, 1960. For an overview of the developing importance of the nobility and their influence on Scotland’s architecture see MacKechnie, “Scot’s Court Architecture”, and Howard, *Scottish Architecture*.

\(^3\) See for example advice contained within Gervase Markham’s *The English Husbandman*, London, 1613, pp.112-28, and William Lawson’s *A New Orchard and Garden*, London, 1618, p.73.


who, on visiting Kelburn Castle in Ayrshire in the late-16th century, noted that ‘in one of the Gardens [there was] a Spacious Room adorned with a Christalline fountain cut all out of the living Rock.’ However, if the types of buildings changed little, their appearance was altered more dramatically, for after 1600 almost every one was classical. Indeed, the best structures display the influence of mature Mannerism - their surfaces bristling with the wanton application of endless scrolls, strap-work and classical ornament.

Sources of Advice for the Selection and Design of Ornamental Garden Structures

As was the case prior to the Reformation, a nobleman might learn of developments abroad first-hand from foreign travel, or second-hand through an immigrant mason or perhaps an informed acquaintance. However, by the 17th century another important source had emerged, a source that would influence the general taste for, and particular appearance of, garden buildings for the next two centuries - that is, the book of designs.

The expansion of the publishing trade meant that ever-greater numbers of people had access to books on architecture and it seems likely that many of these works would have found their way to Scotland. Of this array of pattern books and treatises, four provided designs for garden buildings. Jacques Androuet du Cerceau’s *Livre d’architecture* (published in France in 1559) depicts six well-resolved schemes for ornamental well-heads whose finely-detailed plans and elevations beg to be realised in stone. Wendel Dieterlin’s *Architectura* (published in Germany

---


2 It has not been possible in the course of this research to examine systematically 16th and 17th century Scottish library catalogues. However, Durkan and Ross’s review of libraries in Scotland between 1470 and 1560 reveals that both Vitruvius’s *De architectura* (Rome, c.1486) and Alberti’s *De re aedificatoria* (Florence, 1485) found their way into at least one collection (that of a lawyer, John Marjoribanks) shortly after their publication - see Durkan, J. and Ross, A., *Early Scottish Libraries*, Glasgow, 1961, p.128.
in 1593) on the other hand contains a single, effusive proposal, again for a well-head, that is surely intended only to exemplify in an exaggerated way the decorative potential of north-European Mannerism. A greater range of garden buildings is contained in du Cerceau’s Les plus excellents bastiments de France (two volumes published in 1576 and 1579 respectively) and Hans Vredeman de Vries’s Hortorum viridariumque elegantem et multiplices formae (1583).

The topographical illustrations contained in these two books depict a welter of French and Flemish gardens typically comprising of a series of knots with a fountain in the centre, enclosed by an ornamented wall or gallery with banqueting houses set at each angle. However, given the small scale of their illustrations these works could only have informed the broad lines rather than the detail of a new demesne.

Outwith these architectural treatises there were two other significant sources of published illustrations that could be used to inform the appearance of garden buildings. The first were emblem books. As collections of symbolic pictures accompanied by mottoes and verse, these provided not only ready patterns for the carving of stones or relief-work but also ideas for an allegorical programme. The second was Francesco Colonna’s illustrated novel, Hypnerotomachia Poliphili. Published in Venice in 1499 and translated into English a century later, the book describes in meticulous detail the travels of a love-struck young man through a dreamscape of pyramids, ruins and inscriptions, with set-pieces enacted in gardens that are medieval in conception but infused with Antique allusion. The work is richly illustrated and amongst its various plates are found a fountain, a classical well-head and arbours formed from

---

1 Though emblem books made a notable contribution to the arts of Renaissance Scotland, due to their considerable number it has not been possible to evaluate in detail any particular influence they may have had on Scotland’s garden architecture. However, for the influence of emblem books on earlier-18th-century English gardens see Gordon, “The Iconography and Mythology of the Eighteenth-Century English Landscape Garden,” PhD, University of Bristol, 1999. Drawing on a thorough understanding of classical literature and emblem books Gordon evaluates the selection and placement of classical statuary within the gardens at Rousham in Oxfordshire, Shurdington in Gloucestershire, and Castle Howard in Yorkshire, and in so doing reveals the iconography of each site. I am grateful to Dr Michael Bath for information relating to emblem books in 15th-, 16th- and 17th-century Scotland.
columns (figs. 2.1, 2.2, 2.3).\(^1\) The book’s easy alliance of romance and Antiquity jibed with the *modus vivendi* of the aristocracy across Europe and for this reason the book and the plates within it remained current throughout the 16th and early-17th centuries.\(^2\)

Native advice on the choice and deployment of garden buildings was little more than cursory. Gervase Markham’s *The English Husbandman* (1613) recommends the erection of “quaint fountaines or any other antique standard” and a “Dyall or other Piramid” in order “to grace and beautifie the garden,” along with “some curious and arteficiall banqueting house” constructed “upon the ascent from one levell [of the garden] to another.”\(^3\) This advice was repeated five years later by William Lawson who recommends the use of “a true Dyall or Clock and some antique works.” However, Lawson also presents a simple plan of his ideal garden which depicts a classical fountain at its centre and simple, square banqueting houses at the four corners.\(^4\) Henry Wotton’s *The Elements of Architecture* (1624) commends the use of fountains and hydraulics, condemns the creation of “artificall devices under ground” (presumably grottoes), and encourages the use of aviaries if they incorporate a “great scope of ground” in order that the birds might not “know that they are prisoners.”\(^5\) A year later Francis Bacon’s essay “Of Gardens” advised much the same in as little detail, adding that on top of a garden mount should be raised a “fine Banquetting House, with some Chimney neatly cast, and without too much Glasse.”\(^6\)

---

1. At least the latter of these may have gained expression in Scotland at Huntly Castle in Perthshire where there once were “a range of pillars, supporting an arched roof, which seemed to have been intended as a cover for such as inclined to take the air, or a view of the garden” (OSA, vol.15, pp.204-5).


Published comments on the use of such buildings beyond their purely aesthetic contribution to a garden are also sparse. Conspicuous consumption seems to have been at least one reason for their construction. In his 1598 *Survay of London*, John Stow writes of the city’s “fayre summer houses,” noting that

>“some of them like midsommer Pageantes with Towers, Turrets, and Chimney tops, not so much for use, or profite, as for shew and pleasure, betraying the vanitie of mens mindes, much unlike to ye dispositio[n] of the ancient Citizens, who delighted in the building of Hospitals, and Almes houses for the poore, and therein both imploied their wits, and spent their wealthes in preferment of the common commodotie of this our citie.”

To judge by Phillip Stubbes’s complaint in *The Anatomie of Abuses*, by the close of the 16th century the comparative seclusion of the banquetting house had become valued for reasons other than dining:

>“In the fields and suburbes of the cities, they have gardens either palled or walled round about very high, with their herbars and bowers fit for the purpose. And least they might be espied in these open places, they have their banquetting houses with galleries, turrets, and what not, therein sumptuously erected; wherein they may (and doubtless do) many of them play the filthy persons.”

---


The private garden building was also well suited to other, rather more wholesome, pursuits. Removed from the hurley-burley and tense formality of the tower, to sit in a summerhouse was as quiet as it was relaxing, and highly amenable to lonely contemplation - contemplation that was naturally inspired by the encompassing garden. Gardens had long been valued as aids to devotion, their occult mechanisms begging consideration of the Creator. This changed little after the Reformation (for Catholics and Protestants alike) and as such, the summerhouse, and later the hermitage, evolved as the modern ascetic’s secular alternative to the cloister. But the garden also suggested the mutability of life. As the eye ranged across the shrubs and flowers, thoughts of seasonal shifts and the relentlessness of time might emerge and crystallise around a richly-wrought sundial. The corollary of such considerations was melancholy, and, in line with the revival of interest in the philosophy of Aristotle, this was a feeling to be cultivated, not as inimical to the vibrant celebration of life but, if harnessed properly, as an enhancement to man’s imaginative powers. Yet, the setting most conducive to the melancholic mood was not the garden in all its comprehensible sensuality, but the foreboding wilderness beyond its walls. In his *Anatomy of Melancholy* (1621), for example, Robert Burton wondered “what is more pleasant than to walke alone in some solitary grove betwixt Wood and Water, by a Brook side, to meditate upon some delightsome and pleasant subject” and illustrated the frontispiece with a soul-searching man overlooking at once an enclosed garden (complete with a circular gazebo at its angle) and the rugged, surrounding landscape in which he sits. Similarly, the melancholic poet, William Drummond, could praise the solace he found amongst the wooded walks that surrounded his cliff-top estate of Hawthornden near Roslin in Midlothian:

---


"Deare Wood, and you sweet solitarie Place,
Where from the vulgare I estranged live,
Contented more with what your Shades mee give
Than if I had what Thetis doth embrace."¹

Therefore, for a person harbouring religious and intellectual pretensions in Renaissance Scotland, quiet contemplation both within and outwith the garden was essential, and for this summerhouses and such-like were much the most appropriate venues.²

In summary, the Renaissance garden in Scotland would have appeared much the same as its medieval forbear save for the following important differences: the garden would have been larger, of a regular plan, and whenever possible axially related to the main house; garden buildings would have been disposed symmetrically within the garden (generally at two opposing corners) and of a classically-based architecture that made use of Antique detailing (drawn from pattern books) and native ornament deployed together in an essentially Mannerist way; and rather than remaining plain, the boundary wall might have been treated architecturally. Each of these elements could have been read separately as religious or intellectual emblems or together to communicate a single allegorical programme. In featuring all of these elements, the ‘pleasance’ at Edzell is the apotheosis of the type.

¹ Untitled sonnet contained in Drummond, W., Poems by William Drummond of Hawthorne-dene, 2nd edn., Edinburgh, 1616, facing page ‘F.’
² For a summary of the role of the garden in the fashion for melancholy see Strong, Renaissance Gardens, pp.203-19.
Chapter Two: Reformation to Restoration

The Communication of Iconographic Programmes through Garden Architecture at Edzell, Pinkie and Dundas

Edzell Castle perches upon the undulating farmland that unites the Grampian Hills and the Howe of the Mearns. Built in the 16th century by the Stirlings of Glenesk, the Castle passed by marriage to the Earls of Crawford and Sir David Lindsay, who succeeded as Laird of Edzell at just eight years of age.1 Educated in Paris and Cambridge, Lindsay was knighted in 1581, raised to the peerage as Lord Edzell in 1597 and made a privy councillor the following year. During the peaceful trading years of the later-1500s, Lindsay sought to capitalise on his estate by planting crops and trees and extracting minerals and precious metals.2 However, the most enduring improvement made to Edzell remains its finest ornament: a “delicat garden with walls sumptuously built of hewn stone, polished” with “a fine summerhouse” and “a house for a bath” all “far exceeding any new work of thir times.”3

The enclosed garden, which is dated 1604, is entered by a gate on the south side of the castle courtyard, whilst the bath-house, and slightly-smaller banqueting house occupy the southern corners (figs. 2.4). The inside of the garden walls (which are built from random rubble that was surely once harled to set off the fine dress-work) are all richly ornamented, and projecting columns divide the faces into regular bays (though only the capitals, bases and dog-toothed centre-bands survive) made up of a row of carved stars (around holes that may have been used for nesting) above chequered recesses (perhaps intended for flowers), alternating with

---

2 King James granted “his weel beloved councillor” the life office of master of all metals and minerals within the kingdom in recognition of “his travels in seeking out and discovering of divers metals of great valor within this realm, and in sending to England, Germany and Denmark, to get the perfect assay and knowledge thereof” (Lindsay, Lives, vol.1, pp.332, 345).
3 Ochterlony of Guynde reporting the statistics of his county to Sir Robert Sibbald at the start of the 18th century and quoted in ibid., p.349.
oblong alcoves (probably used as bee-foles') beneath carved bas-reliefs depicting the cardinal virtues to the west, planetary deities to the east and liberal arts in between. Above the centre of each bay is set an arched-recess (which probably once house a bust or statue) capped with a segmental pediment bearing blank scrolls, and framed with a moulded architrave that continues as a cornice beneath the battered and roll-topped copes (fig. 2.7). A carved armorial panel and broken pediment span a door at the north-east corner that gives out to the open landscape.

At the south-east corner is the banqueting-house, an extravagant two-storey affair with a barrel-vaulted preparation room set behind a groin-vaulted eating area and an ample sitting-room on the first floor (fig. 2.5). On the garden front are a neatly roll-moulded door and a square opening. Above are small elliptical oeil-de-boeuf flanking the central bas-relief, and in the centre of the crow-stepped gable of freestone is set an aedicule window with a swept pediment topped by creeping acanthus leaves and containing Lindsay’s foliate monogram. Outside of the walled garden the structure reverts to coursed rubble work, though with an elegant moulded eaves course that continues as the cornice of the adjoining garden walls. Two small openings dimly light the preparation room, whilst at first-floor level a corbelled turret breaks out at the southern corner and prim, redented gun-loops (that is gun-loops repeatedly recessed to create a ‘stepped’ section) underpin the numerous roll-moulded windows (with the pediment and surround of the gable window being similar to that which overlooks the garden). In this connection it is worth noting that of all of these windows only one directly overlooks the garden, the rest survey the surrounding open landscape and what was once Lindsay’s extensive planting.² It seems likely therefore that in constructing the banqueting house-cum-gazebo Lindsay sought not only to provide an appropriate platform from which to see the garden, but also a place from which his plantations might be viewed and melancholic thoughts invoked. At the opposite corner of the

¹ These were often included within the pleasure garden as well as the kitchen garden - see Mount, D., The Profitable Art of Gardening, London, 1582, p.22.
² Lindsay, Lives, vol.1, p.345.
pleasance are the remains of a bath-house whose excavated walls describe a lobby, changing-room and bathing chamber with a small back stair leading to a cramped service area with a well and fireplace (fig. 2.6).

A number of sources for the garden may be suggested. The articulation of a wall through the application of columns was employed during the 1530s at Stirling and Falkland; whilst in 1574 the plain parapet on the retaining wall of the garden terrace at Windsor was ornamented with “ballysters” and “buttresses” and two years later more of the wall was replaced with balustrading and pedestals, terms and beasts.¹ As the king’s “weel beloved councillor” Lindsay could have been familiar with any of these royal residences. The ornamentation of walls was also popular in France and Germany, and if Lindsay did not see them first hand then he could easily have cribbed ideas from du Cerceau’s Les plus excellents bastiments de France which depicts gardens enclosed by galleries (Gaillon and Bury - fig. 2.8, see also fig. 2.9) and walls treated architecturally (Vallerie), or Hans Vredeman de Vries’s Hortorum viridariorumque elegantes et multiplices formae which depicts architectonic pergolas with angle arbours enclosing square gardens categorised according to the orders. A further source might have been the house of Ippolito d’Este (commonly called ‘Le Grand Ferrare’) at Fontainebleau, France (1544-66), designed by Sebastiano Serlio (now demolished apart from the entrance portal). An Italianate version of the French hôtel, the building’s cour basse was enclosed by a door-height wall, the upper half of which comprised a series of framed, square recesses sandwiched between two string courses and topped with segmental arches, which in elevation read identically to the upper portion of the walls at Edzell (fig. 2.10). Only the design of the gateway was published by Serlio but the building could have been seen by Lindsay perhaps when he visited France in 1572.²

¹ Colvin, King’s Works, vol.3, p.323.
² For Lindsay’s trip to France see Lindsay, Lives, vol.1, p.333.
The Continent seems to have provided some inspiration for other of the architectural detailing. The stone reliefs were carved in imitation of illustrations contained in a 16th-century, German *album amicorum* (a type of autograph book) purchased perhaps by Lindsay whilst abroad or imported by one of the many mining engineers he brought across from Germany to advise him on his mineral excavations. Similarly, the gun-loops that pierce the summerhouse, though close in shape to those found at the nearby castle of Tolquhon, are redented in a fashion similar to examples found in Germany.¹

But these classical and foreign influences should not be over-emphasised, for there is much at Edzell that is of native origin. The banqueting-house, for example, is identifiably Scottish in its bulky form and outshut stair, window surrounds, crow-stepped gable and corbelled, corner tower. Indeed, it may be suggested that the blending of native architecture with that of the Antique was a conscious decision, since at least one of Edzell’s allegorical programmes seems to be a celebration of Scotland’s noble past and imperial future. Carved on the rear of the segmental pediments that top the walls’ arched recesses are alternately thistles, roses, shamrocks and *fleur-de-lys*. Echoing the symbolism of the Linlithgow fountain, these represent respectively the countries of Scotland, England, Ireland and France. Since they were created in the year that James rode into the English capital through temporary triumphal arches as if a modern Roman emperor, they are surely representative of the confidence of Lindsay and his fellow courtiers in the ability of their king to bring “all Britayne to obey”² and achieve a Union of Crowns on Scottish terms whilst maintaining the long-held claim to French sovereignty. Moreover, as the only features of interest on the outside of the walls, they seem intended to strike an important if subtle symbolic key-note for the garden they encompass. In this context, perhaps the traditional architectural features of the garden might be understood as celebrations of

¹ The identification of Germany, and more specifically Nuremberg, as the source of inspiration for the bas-reliefs and probably the redented gun-loops is made in Simpson’s seminal article on Edzell.

Scotland’s own cultural heritage, and the Antique elements as symbolic of the emergent ‘British empire’.

Two further allegorical programmes treating of more personal, less vexatious issues can be discerned inside the garden. The first is suggested by the carved panels. As with many of his contemporaries, astrology and the occult were important strands to Lindsay's religion; he sought his destiny in the stars, consulted lists of ‘good’ and ‘evil’ days prior to making decisions and was a keen student of Greek and Latin texts on the subject. But such interests only complemented his faith, and were at any rate derived from his impressive education. Christianity, learning and the occult, the principal influences upon Lindsay’s credo, at Edzell are all set in stone: the cardinal virtues line the west wall, the liberal arts the south wall, and the planetary deities the east.\(^1\) Read together they seem to instruct on the requirements of a successful life - that is virtue, strengthened by education and guided by heaven. The second allegorical programme is suggested by the square recesses and stars which represent in turn the chequered fesse of the Lindsay coat of arms and the three mullets of the Stirlings of Glenesk. This heraldic celebration can be read as more than mere familial pride. At a time when the landed gentry and noblemen were increasing in number, Lindsay sought to emphasise to all that he was no *arriviste*. Lindsay’s carved-stone heraldry emphatically boasts not only his impeccable aristocratic credentials but also his ancient dominion over the surrounding lands.

The use of buildings to establish an allegorical programme within a garden is repeated at Pinkie House to the east of Edinburgh and Dundas Castle to the west. Sir Alexander Seton, the 1st Earl of Dunfermline, Chancellor of Scotland and a member of the English Privy Council, was praised by his contemporaries as a “great humanist in prose and poecie, Greek and Latine, well

---

\(^1\) See Simpson, “Edzell Castle,” pp.135-40. References to the liberal arts were also used to ornament the late-16th-century garden at Gorhambury (Henderson, “Visual Setting,” p.244).
versed in the mathematicks and [with] great skill in architecture and herauldrie."¹ Between 1612 and 1613 he began to remodel and extend an unremarkable tower-house at Pinkie on the fringes of the royal burgh of Musselburgh, east of Edinburgh, into a second family home.² The building evolved as an easy-going conflation of Scottish, English and classical architecture, domestic in scale and sober in appearance. Adjoining the house to the east is a large walled enclosure, slightly wider than the long range that overlooks it, that once contained "a most sweit garden" with a knot "200 foot square" and a "mighty long grein walk."³ Two gates, symmetrically positioned and distinguished with entablatures and shaped pediments lead into the garden through the north and south walls. A third gate, set off with an architrave and a pedimented cartouche, punctuates the east wall on axis with the centre of the house. However, though it once gave out to a large wooded park, it now leads only to a small, canted bothy - the last surviving fragment of what would appear to have been a modest glasshouse complex raised very probably in the mid-19th century (fig. 2.11).⁴ Ornamenting the moulded copings at regular intervals are small, ball-

¹ Maitland, R., "The History of the House of Seytoun to the Year 1559, with the Continuation by Alexander Viscount Kingston to 1687," Maitland Club, Glasgow, 1829, p.63 (of Kingston's continuation).
⁴ The entrance is articulated with a broad bolection-moulded architrave. On top are two engaged Doric columns framing a blank, oblong panel set off with foliage and scrolls. The carved stonework is all early-17th century in style and unquestionably the result of Seton's patronage. The aedicule is shaped to form a pediment, however, the sides of the pediment are stepped at a point where an entablature might logically be expected to sit upon the columns. It seems reasonable to assume, therefore, that the pediment has been reset at some point and the entablature removed thus forming the unsightly step. The garden walls that flank the gate contain brickwork and appear to have been raised, as does the pediment itself. Again, this suggests that the area around the gate has been substantially reworked at some point. The bothy itself is semi-octagonal in plan and constructed from coursed, rough-dressed masonry. It abuts the garden walls (which are of random rubble) and extends to the level of the copes (fig.2.11a). There is a door to the rear of the bothy and a tall window either side (all are now bricked up). Broached margins can still be seen on each of the openings' sandstone surrounds. Inside the bothy are two latted tables supported on cast-iron legs that are mid-19th-century in appearance. The roof is formed from slender, sawed joists with routed edges, again mid-19th century in style. The inside face of the garden wall, to the rear of the pediment, is formed substantially from brick. The first edition Ordnance Survey for "Musselburgh and its Environs" (sheet nine, five inches to one mile) indicates that in 1854 the bothy was adjoined on the other side of the garden wall by another structure, square in plan and slightly wider - most probably a glasshouse. It also indicates that a path led through both the bothy and the glasshouse, whilst another led through a gate (of which there is now no trace) within the garden wall slightly to the north of the bothy. In contrast to two other nearby structures (now both lost), one of which adjoined a wall to the south of the walled garden, the O.S. does not term the bothy a 'summerhouse.' It may be surmised with some confidence, therefore, that the bothy post-dates the walled garden, and that it was probably built in the mid-19th century along with the glasshouse, and was used perhaps as a potting room.
mounted obelisks, and set within the rubble-work are two panels bearing Latin inscriptions. A translation of the longest of these merits quotation in full since it reveals crucial information firstly about the sources that inspired the garden and secondly the intellectual programme that the garden was intended to incorporate. The inscription reads:

“To God most holy and most high, for His own benefit, for the benefit of His descendants, and for the benefit of all good, humane and cultured men, Alexander Seton, a devout lover of all culture and humanity, founded, erected and adorned his country-seat, the gardens and these suburban buildings. Here there is nothing that savours of enmity, not even for defence against enemies; no ditch, no rampart, but for the gracious welcome and hospitable entertainment of guests, a fountain of pure water, lawns and aviaries. In ways of pleasantness he has laid out all these for the honourable delight of body and soul. Whoso therefore shall have comported himself towards them with enmity, whether by robbery, sword, fire or in anyway whatsoever, let that man declaim himself devoid of charity and culture, nay rather an enemy of all humanity and of the human race. The stones of dedication will find full voice and publish it abroad.”

The panels, which are set within the rear wall, were relocated in 1882. Their original position is unknown, however, given the introductory theme of their text, and that they are explicitly “stones of dedication,” it seems reasonable to assume that they were once placed near the garden’s

---

1 A translation of the second inscription is “To God most holy and most high, the author, the giver, the prescriber of all things, Jehovah who is my strength, by whose will and loving kindness all blessings are assumed, all honour and glory, praise and thankfulness.” For both translations see RCAHMS, Midlothian, p.85.

2 Ibid.
entrance. If so, then there can be little question that the plaques were raised in imitation of the garden inscriptions, or *Lex Hortorum*, of Renaissance Rome.¹

Drawing on examples from Antiquity, during the first half of the 16th century the idea developed in Rome that gardens might be created not only for the enjoyment of their owners and their owners’ friends but also for the pleasure of the public.² Strangers were welcome to enter grounds as long as they abided by a few, very general, conditions. Along with complimentary comments, such as praise of the artists who had contributed to the garden, quotation of Antique literature, or, more often, exhortations on the learning and benevolence of the garden’s owner, these rules were committed to stone and generally placed at the main entrance. Examples of these inscriptions were numerous and varied, however, the content and tone of the *Lex Hortorum* mounted sometime during the 16th century at the Villa Borghese may be considered typical. In translation it records that:

“I, custodian of the Villa Borghese on the Pincio, proclaim the following: Whoever you are, if you are free, do not fear here the fetters of the law. Go where you wish, pluck what you wish, leave when you wish. These things are provided more for strangers than for the owner. As in the Golden Age when freedom from the cares of time made everything golden, the owner refuses to impose iron laws on the well-behaved guest. Let proper pleasure be here as the law to a friend, but if anyone with deceit and intent should transgress the golden laws


² Both Julius Caesar and Agrippa bequeathed respectively their gardens on the right bank of the Tiber and in the Campus Martius to the people of Rome. Moreover, Renaissance Romans must have been encouraged to open their gardens to the public in order to display their collections of antiquities (Coffin, *Papal Rome*, p.249).
of hospitality, beware lest the angry steward break his token of friendship.”

The similarities between this inscription and that at Pinkie are surely clear, and there can be little doubt that in creating his own *Lex Hortorum*, the Earl was consciously emulating the Humanists of contemporary Rome, and perhaps recalling examples he had seen during his time at the College of the Jesuits in Rome.

Just as Rome’s *Lex Horti* may have inspired the fabric of Seton’s garden, so the ideas of the city’s ancient philosophers may have informed its purpose and meaning. The principal inscription at Pinkie boasts that as a “suburban” estate it was intended not “for defence against enemies” but rather “for the gracious welcome and hospitable entertainment of guests” and the “honourable delight of body and soul.” From this it is clear that Seton intended the garden to be a place to which he and his guests could escape briefly from the nearby capital, for physical, spiritual and intellectual renourishment. This echoes a theme that had much occupied the *intelligentsia* of Antiquity. Almost without exception, the philosophers and writers of Ancient Rome considered their city to be not only the centre of political and financial life but, by extension, the focus of corruption and vice: in contrast the surrounding countryside was removed from such vicissitudes, and time spent within it was considered morally replenishing. The Stoic thinker, Seneca, believed that “one must indulge the mind and from time to time give it relaxation” by walking with friends along “paths in the open” before returning to the city and to

---

1 Quoted in *ibid.*, p.245.

2 Seton studied at the College of the Jesuits in Rome in the early-1570s. Around 1571 he is known to have delivered an oration to Pope Gregory XIII (DNB, vol.17, p.1199). In a lament to Seton, John Lyon noted that “Paines, travell, hazard [the Earl] esteemed nought, / To gaine the wish’d for knowledge, which hee sought. / Loire, Seine, and Rhine, With Tiber, Arne and Poe, / Their Banks, hee past to make his learning growe, / So in his travels with gracious eye, / Hee did the best of forsaine partes espie, / And what in Vertues Gardens hee found rare, / Hee brought them home, and made them flourish faire” (Lyon, J., *Teares for the Never Sufficienctlie Bewailed Death of... Alexander, Earle of Dunfermeiling*, Edinburgh, 1622, p.4).
professional responsibilities, and for this he felt the garden to be the perfect forum.¹ Now, the use of the term “suburban” to a scholar such as Seton, though relating in the context of the inscription to Edinburgh, must have carried connotations that referred above all else to Ancient Rome. It may be suggested, then, that the Stoical attitude towards private and professional life as propounded by Seneca was being recapitulated by Seton.² Therefore, the garden at Pinkie circumscribed both physically and intellectually Seton’s modus vivendi – it was at once a place in which to work, rest and entertain in the manner of the finest Ancients, and a subtle display of Seton’s own classical learning.³ For an estate founded on such scholarship, it is not surprising that its main decoration, an exquisite well-head, is amongst the earliest and best of Scotland’s wholly classical buildings.

The structure is set in the re-entrant angle of Pinkie’s two wings - more architectural show-piece than water-source (fig. 2.12). Perched on a stepped platform the tall, square well-head appears like a richly-wrought tabernacle; its polished ashlar all decorated with fine carving and its bristling silhouette enlivened by detached Doric columns, an open-arched body, crown spire and pediments of pierced, scrolling strap-work. Every surface is encrusted with Mannerist


² Seton may also have drawn his ideas from Alberti’s *De re aedificatoria* which advises that “of all buildings for practical use… the hortus [that is the suburban villa, is] the foremost and healthiest, as it does not detain you from business in the city, nor is it troubled by impurity of air.” As an accompaniment to the villa Alberti recommends “meadows full of flowers, sunny lawns, cool and shady groves, limpid streams and pools” as being essential for “their delight as much for their utility” (Alberti, L., *De re aedificatoria*, 1452, trans. and ed. Rykwert, A., Leach, N. and Tavernor, R., Cambridge Mass., 1988, p.295). The Earl may also have been inspired by the Flemish neo-Stoic, Justus Lipsius, whose Leiden garden (which also contained Lex Horti) he may have visited whilst travelling in the Low Countries, and whose influential treatise, *De constantia* (1584), which treats in part on the use of gardens as places for temporary escape from corrupt modernity (and may have been translated into Scots by the Aberdeen Schoolmaster, Thomas Cargill), he could have read. For Lipsius see Morford, “Stoic Garden”, and Allan, D., “‘A Commendation of the Private Country Life’: Philosophy and the Garden in Seventeenth Century Scotland,” *Garden History*, vol. 25, no. 1, 1997, pp. 60-80.

³ For a detailed account of the role of the garden in late-16th-century neo-Stoical thinking in north-west Europe see Morford, “Stoic Garden”. For a less-convincing and somewhat abstruse assessment of the influence of neo-Stoicism on the gardens of post-Reformation Scotland see Allan, “Commendation.” It should be noted also that inside Pinkie, the ceiling of the ‘Long Gallery’ commissioned by Seton is painted with allegorical images, many deriving from emblem books, that also refer to the classical, ‘suburban’ function of the house (Bath, M., “Alexander Seton’s Painted Gallery” in Gent, L., *Albion’s Classicism: The Visual Arts in Britain, 1550-1660*, London, 1994, pp.102-4).
ornament: the base and angle pilasters are each panelled, the dosserets support pinnacles encrusted with circles in low-relief, and anthemia scuttle up the roof’s four ribs.

The well is often dated between 1607 (Seton’s marriage to Margaret Hay whose monogram appears intertwined with his own on two of the four pediments) and 1622 (the date of Seton’s death). However, a more precise age may be suggested, since the earl’s coronets that surmount the paired coats of arms that form two of the strap-work pediments were not admitted to Seton’s heraldry until 1618.

The broad lines of the well-head would appear to derive from pattern books. A monument similar in form to the Pinkie structure, along with an ornamental well-head, are illustrated in the Italian version of the *Hypnerotomachia Poliphili* (figs. 2.13 and 2.2) and a considerably more extravagant example is contained in Dieterlin’s *Architectura* (fig. 2.14). The elevational treatment of a round arch with a scrolled and salient tripartite key-stone, supported on piers with moulded imposts and flanked by columns is the standard composition for the rustic doors contained in Serlio’s *Tutte l’opere d’architettura et prospettiva* (1584, trans. 1619) (figs. 2.15 and 2.16), and it would have taken little imagination to adapt one of these to the requirements of a large, square well (see for example plate ten of book four). Indeed, it is perhaps to Serlio that certain of the details are also indebted: the garlanded bucrania carved on the salient blocks at the mid-point of the frieze of each face, and the egg-and-dart mouldings to the echinus of each capital, for example, were not a component of the early-17th-century Scottish stonemason’s repertoire, and given that they are all carved with a fluency and precision that could only

1 For example in Howard, *Scottish Architecture*, p.102.

2 In 1628, Charles I sent a letter to the Scots’ Privy Council authorising Scottish nobility to wear coronets of degree similar to those permitted in England. Hence, the shields on the seals of the Earls of Haddington and Kinnoul were ensigned with the earl’s coronet in 1633 and 1634 respectively. However, the blazon of Seton had been permitted to bear such an emblem from 1618 (Stevenson, J., *Heraldry in Scotland*, Glasgow, 1914, p.198).

3 *Architectura* also illustrates strap-work in abundance. Indeed, it may be no coincidence that the three pear-shaped guttae that form part of Dieterlin’s proposal for a Doric fireplace (plate 65 - fig. 2.21) are repeated on the aedicule around the entrance to the bothy.
have stemmed from imitation, it is reasonable to assume that each detail was filched from Serlio (see for example pages 11 and 12 of book one - fig. 2.17). However, much the most likely source for the well-head was surely the first plate of the six well-heads illustrated in du Cerceau’s Second livre d’architecture (1561), which in plan, elevation and ornament is very close to that at Pinkie (figs. 2.18, 2.19, 2.20).

However, the influence of published sources should not be overstated; the well-head is too fine a structure to be the work of a mere ‘hack’ mason, and Seton too significant and well-informed a patron to employ anything other than Scotland’s most creative and capable craftsmen. Indeed, in the latter respect it would seem that Seton made use of the King’s Master Mason, William Wallace. Evidence for this is suggested by the well-head’s idiosyncratic ‘triglyph’ details. Here v-sections project from the surface of the frieze to create ridges rather than incising the face to create channels (fig. 2.22). These triglyphs may either be the result of a misreading of a pattern book¹ or the product of playful Scottish Mannerism.² Whatever the reason, the motif was also used on the bartisans of the Palace Block at Edinburgh Castle (1615-17) and the refectory door of Heriot’s Hospital in Edinburgh (circa 1630) and both of these are associated with Wallace. The elaborate strap-work and Anglo-Dutch panelling used on the well-head are also a feature of Wallace’s oeuvre and are found both in his main door at Heriot’s Hospital and his monument for John Byres of Coates (d.1629) in the adjoining Greyfriars’ churchyard, a work which shares similar elevational treatment and details (delicate monogrammed keystone and

¹ Many of the most popular pattern books contain highly ambiguous engravings of the triglyph detail. See for example page 142 of book four of Serlio’s Tutte l’opere (Venice, 1584), plate one of Vignola’s Regole di cinque ordine (Venice, 1563), and especially plate 147 of de l’Orme’s Architecture (Paris, 1568 - fig. 2.23). That the detail is the result of a misinterpretation is also supported by the fact that it is found on the refectory door of Heriot’s Hospital, which is itself copied from a plate published by Vignola (Rowan, A., “George Heriot’s Hospital,” Country Life, 6 March 1975, p.556).

² For example, Hendrick de Keyser’s Westerkirk (1620-31) in Amsterdam incorporates a Mannerist triglyph (Kuyper, W., Dutch Classicist Architecture, A Survey of Dutch Architecture, Gardens and Anglo-Dutch Architectural Relations from 1625-1700, Leyden, 1980, plate 24, and Mackechnie, “Scot’s Court Architecture,” p.18), as do some of the proposals for doors contained within Allesandro Francini’s Livre d’architecture (Paris, 1631) (see for example plates 9-13, 16-8, 20-1, 25-6 and 38, all of which are either ambiguously-rendered standard triglyphs or clear Mannerist variations on the detail - fig. 2.24).
winged cherubs) with the well-head. With evidence for Wallace either living or working in Musselburgh around the time of the well-head’s construction, the attribution to him of the overall design, though probably in conjunction with Seton, seems reasonable.

The well-head is replete with symbolism. The numerous cinquefoils and crescents of the relief carving are taken from Seton’s coat of arms and reflect not only his reputed love of heraldry, but also his anxiety, like that of Lindsay before him, to advertise his own heritage. The “Imperial Crown of Stone,” clad with sprigs of foliage in close imitation of the Scottish diadem, is a revival of the popular Stewart emblem of the previous century and was surely intended to demonstrate Seton’s close relationship with, and loyalty to, the absent monarch, and proclaim his own authority as Chief of the King’s Council. However, it is the Latin inscription carved upon the frieze that reveals most about the well-head’s hidden meaning. Translated, the inscription records that “from this well unsurpassed for coolness and purity there flows water benign alike for head and limbs.” This surely paraphrases part of Horace’s 16th Epistle which describes the Roman writer’s home as possessing “a spring worthy to give a name to the stream, for Hebrus is not more clear or cool, good for the head and good to the stomach.” Seton’s choice of quotation may be telling since he seems to have been dignifying his own suburban residence by likening it explicitly to that of Horace. Moreover, the Epistle ends on a moralising note, opining “the liability of men to be deceived in respect of their own goodness and that of others by the

---

1 The Accounts for the Master of Works record that on the 20th July 1618 a payment of 23 shillings was made to “William Wallace” for “his horse hyre to Lithgow and back to Musselburgh agane” (MW vol.2, p.127). The bartisans at Pinkie are also very similar to those at the Palace Block of Edinburgh Castle.

2 Wallace’s mason mark of a cross and heart (which is evident on the Heriot’s door) does not appear on the surface of the well-head. However if payment for the structure was not being made on a piece-work basis this would be expected. It is worth noting, also, that the well-head may, in turn, have been of some influence. For example, it shares a remarkable amount in common with the monument to Sir Thomas Gorges and his wife, which was erected in 1635 at Salisbury Cathedral (for an illustration see Colvin, H., Architecture and the Afterlife, London, 1991, p.307).

3 Macky, Journey, p.45.

judgement of the multitude,” and this must have struck a chord with Seton whose Catholicism had frequently made him the subject of widespread suspicion.

A similar garden to that of Seton’s seems to have been created at Dundas Castle, west of Edinburgh. Here a large, walled enclosure of hewn stone was created in 1623 by Sir Walter Dundas, with banqueting houses in two of its corners and a fountain in the middle. Two centuries later the garden was destroyed except for its centre-piece which was removed to a small lawn alongside the newly-refashioned house. And it is as well, for this exquisite structure represents the very highest attainment of Scottish Mannerist architecture.

The dressed-ashlar fountain is elegantly proportioned and precisely as wide as it is high (fig. 2.25). On each face, three bulging pilasters support a salient entablature. Above, a cornice advances and recedes, with the middle portion extending further over a carved console; and below the profile is mirrored by a corbelled water basin. Each salient block and pilaster bears a mask or piece of heraldry, every plain surface is enriched with egg-and-darts, strap-work and arabesques (fig. 2.26). To the west, a flying-arched stair leads to the top, where four winged termini rise to support a sundial set within a faceted receptacle from which masks stare down to a shallow basin below. The water once played in numerous narrow jets from the platform to the basin to the sundial, and then drained in thicker streams through the masks on the pilasters to the zigzag trough below. Yet amidst this welter of ornament are two Latin inscriptions, the first within the frieze, the second linking the capitals. Both are of considerable importance to understanding

---

1 NSA, vol.2, p.100, and CDAS, vol.1, p.332. A pen and wash sketch by David Allan (1793) in the Scottish National Gallery collection illustrates the fountain and a part of the original walled garden. Macgibbon and Ross state that a painting in the possession of the Royal Society of Arts in Edinburgh depicts the garden in its entirety, however, this work can no longer be traced. Little is known of the life of Dundas other than that he was knighted by James VI at the baptism of Prince Henry “for a pair of silk stockings lent by him to the modern Solomon” (Omond, G., The Arniston Memoirs, Edinburgh, 1887, p.xxviii).

2 As at Edzell and Pinkie, the dignity of the Dundas family is being extolled through the profuse display of heraldic emblems - in this case Dundas’s monogram, a lion’s head wreathed with oak leaves and a salamander.
properly the sources of the garden and as such merit repetition in full. The first advises the visitor to:

"See, read, think, and attend. Through rocks and crags by pipes we lead these streams, that the parched garden may be moistened by the spring water. Forbear to do harm therefore to the fountain and garden which thou see'st. Nor yet should'st thou incline to injure the signs of the dial. View and with grateful eyes enjoy these hours and the garden, And to the flowers may eager thirst be allayed by the fountain. In the year of human salvation 1623."

The second records that:

"Sir Walter Dundas, in the year of our Lord 1623 and 61st of his own age, erected and adorned, as an ornament of his country and family, sacred to the memory of himself, and as a future memorial of his posterity, as also an amusing recreation for friends, guests, and visitors, this fountain in the form of a castle, this dial with its retinue of goddesses, and this garden with its buildings, walls, and quadrangular walks, surrounded with stones piled on high, rocks having been on all sides deeply cut out which inconveniently covered the ground. Whosoever thou art who comest hither, we, so many half-fiendish spectres, are placed here lately by order, expressly for bugbears to the bad, so that the hideous show their visages, lest any meddling, evil-disposed person, should put forth his hand on the dial or garden. We warn robbers to depart, burglars to desist, nothing here is prey for plunderers! For the pleasure and enjoyment of spectators
are all these placed here; but we, who rather laugh with joyous front, to a free sight we bid frankly the kind and welcome friends of the host. Boldly use every freedom with the Master, the dial, the garden, and with the garden-beds and couches - him for friendship and conversation, them for the recreation of the mind and thought. With ordinary things to content us here, is to be even with others - we envy not their better things."

In its general advice to “spectators” and warnings to the “evil-disposed,” this is clearly intended to be read as a Lex Hortorum.² It would appear, therefore, that Dundas was inspired either by the gardens in distant Rome, or, more probably, that recently laid out at nearby Musselburgh. Certainly the sentiments of the inscriptions jibe with those expressed at Pinkie, for here the appeal of “ordinary things” enjoyed amidst a garden in the company of “kind and welcome friends” is lauded once again. It seems very likely therefore that Dundas, like Seton, saw himself as a modern Stoic; discharging his public duties as a laird and a baronet at the capital then retiring temporarily with friends to the garden of his own ‘suburban’ estate.

One other iconographical structure, though lost, merits a brief mention. A robust gazebo known as the ‘Monks’ Tower’, was set in the corner of the garden adjoining Gowrie House in Perth (figs. 2.27 and 2.28). Adjoining the tall, oval structure to the west was the city wall (which also formed the south wall of the garden), and to the east the River Tay flowed past its broad and battered base. The lower stage contained only arrow-slits and was entered through an

---

¹ The translations are taken from Fyfe, W., Summer Life on Land and Water at South Queensferry, Edinburgh, 1851, pp.187-90. The fountain can hardly be considered “in the form of a castle” and as such it may once have born a crenellated cope, or perhaps a different cornice top altogether (CDAS, vol.1, p.332); however, “castellum” can also mean ‘reservoir’ and this may be a better translation (I am grateful to Dr Ian Campbell for suggesting the more likely meaning). The “stones piled on high” probably refer to the creation of a raised terrace: Allan’s illustration depicts two persons viewing the garden apparently from a wall-walk that would seem to have been approached by a recessed stair.

² It matters little that it was carved on the fountain within the middle of the garden: at the Villa della Valle in Rome, the Lex Hortorum is mounted away from the entrance and in the garden proper (Coffin, Papal Rome, p.246).
inauspicious gate, whilst the upper floor was lit with a series of dormers and entered by a flying staircase leading off a long terrace walk.\textsuperscript{1} Inside, it contained a fireplace and a coved ceiling decorated with “allegorical and astronomical [figures] representing the virtues and vices, the seasons [and] the zodiac”\textsuperscript{2} along with “heathen gods and goddesses and the arms, crest and cyphers of the Hay family,” which “from [their] style [were not] older than the time of King Charles I.”\textsuperscript{3} Together, the house and tower “were reckoned amongst the greatest ornaments of Perth.”\textsuperscript{4} The origin of the tower is not clear, but it seems reasonable to assume that it was constructed originally in the earlier-14th century as part of the city defences, and, 300 years later, its upper part remodelled to create a gazebo. If this was indeed the case, then the structure was of note for two reasons: it expressed a remarkably similar iconographical programme to the garden architecture at Edzell; and, to judge by the positions of its windows, it was remodelled not to provide views of the knots and flowers of the Gowrie garden but rather a sweeping prospect of the river and the Perthshire hills beyond. Indeed, it is reputed that during his visit to Perth in 1633, Charles I was entertained within the tower by “a pleasant show acted upon a float on the river.”\textsuperscript{5}

\textsuperscript{1} One side of the tower is illustrated in Francis Grose’s \textit{The Antiquities of Scotland} (London, 1789-91, 2 vols., vol.2, facing p.244) the second in an anonymous and undated engraving of Smeaton’s Bridge in Perth (uncataloged copy at NMRS).

\textsuperscript{2} Fittis, \textit{Ecclesiastical Annals}, p.158.

\textsuperscript{3} Grose, \textit{Antiquities}, vol.2, p.244. It is reputed that under the order of the 1st Earl of Gowrie the scenes were copied from the ceiling of the nearby ‘Gillen Arbour’ (Fittis, \textit{Ecclesiastical Annals}, p.158). Given that the latter may be apocryphal, this story must be treated guardedly.


Non-Iconographical Structures in Scottish Renaissance Gardens

Although the garden buildings of Edzell, Pinkie, Dundas and Gowrie House were most probably created at least partly to convey a particular ideological programme, as many others were not. And at the estates of the Mansion House in Greenock, Ravelston House close to Edinburgh and Moray House on Edinburgh’s Canongate, there exists a well-head, fountain and summerhouse that seem to have been designed only for use and ornament.

Within a municipal park overlooking the Clyde at Greenock, stands a substantial well-head of worn, grey ashlar (figs. 2.29 and 2.30). It was built in 1629 by John Schaw to adorn his Mansion House estate (demolished 1886). The well-head is a remarkable piece of architecture. At each corner of a tall, square plinth cut with seats are squat, Doric columns without bases, supporting a plain entablature without an architrave. It is crowned with a pyramid (that once bore a ball-finial) bereft of ornament except for a date-stone, a family shield and an entwined monogram of Schaw and his wife, Helen Houston. When first constructed, this Antique-looking building, would have appeared strikingly unusual, and it is not easy to point to a source. The most obvious is the Roman ‘obelisk’ at Thiene, which is formed from an ashlar pyramid set on four baseless Doric columns, but it seems unlikely that Schaw could have learnt of the structure first hand. Moreover, the appearance of the building was not published until 1662 when it was illustrated within Roland Fréart de Chambray’s Parallèle de l’architecture antique et de la moderne (Paris, 1650, translated by John Evelyn, London, 1668). Thus, the well-head must be


2 There is no record of Schaw having left Scotland (Williamson, G., Old Greenock, Paisley, 1886, pp.15-16).

3 The only works to illustrate the pyramidal structures of the ancient Romans were Pirro Ligorio’s plan, Antiquae urbis imago, published in 1553 (a larger version was published in 1561, plates of which were available from 1573 – see Lazzaro, C., The Italian Renaissance Garden, London, 1990, pp.215-42), Stefano du Pérac’s Roma antica which was published 20 years later, and Mario Cartaro’s plan, also called Roma antica, which was published in 1579 (see Frutaz, A. P., Le piante di Roma, 3 vols., Rome, 1962, vol.2, u.p.). A stepped pyramid surmounting a plain square structure with a templar entrance was illustrated, however, in the recently-translated Hypnerotomachia Poliphili and a similar pyramid was depicted in Book 3 (fig.93) of Serlio’s Tutte l’opere.
the work of a most original imagination, for it precedes by over a century the use of baseless Doric in England, and anticipates by a century-and-a-half the neo-classical structures it so resembles.¹

Like his relative, George Heriot, George Foulis was a wealthy and influential Edinburgh goldsmith possessed of very sophisticated taste; and if the city’s architectural inheritance is the richer for Heriot’s Hospital, it has certainly been impoverished by the destruction of Foulis’s estate at Ravelston,² for the few fragments that remain are ample testimony to his aesthetic discrimination. Of the mansion, an exquisitely-crafted dormer-surround (fig. 2.31) and fireplace (fig. 2.32) still exist within the estate’s walled garden; the former bears strap-work of the highest quality and the latter boasts what is probably the earliest use of Greek fretwork in Scotland.³ Only a fine, sculpted fountain survives from Foulis’s garden, and this too is a work of virtuoso craftsmanship (fig. 2.33).⁴ It is, in essence, an octagonal obelisk, ten feet in height and set on a stepped, circular platform. It is crowned with a panel bearing a thistle and supported by a precariously-rearing horse. Around the top, festooned drapes strike a curiously dark note that is continued beneath with four grotesque dragons through whose mouths water issues past acanthus leaves and lion masks into a deeply gadrooned basin.⁵ One side of the fountain is dated 1630 and the other is carved with the initials of Foulis and his wife, Janet Bannatyne, bound with a love-

¹ The earliest baseless Doric columns in England appear to be those used by Sir Thomas Robinson in his rebuilding of Rokeby, Yorkshire, between 1725-30. I am grateful to Dr Ian Campbell for alerting me to the significance of the baseless Doric columns and to Sir Howard Colvin for further comments on the structure.

² Most of the biographical information relating to Foulis derives from the lengthy inscription on his tomb in Greyfriars churchyard. The tomb, a large aedicular frame set on a pedestal built by the King’s Master Mason, William Ayton, is itself a remarkable piece of architecture. Its Ionic capitals, with distinctive volutes and anthemia around the necking, were without parallel in Scotland and as such may derive from similar examples in Serlio (book four, page 110 - MacKean, “Scot’s Court Architecture,” p.354). For further information on Foulis and his family see Cowper, A., Historic Corstorphine and Roundabout, 5 vols., Edinburgh, 1992, vol.2, p.14.

³ CDAS, vol.4, p.9. The source for this may be du Cerceau’s *Les plus excellents bastiments de France*, (vol.1, unpaginated) since one plate illustrates a fireplace at the Palace of Madrid ornamented with fretwork in the same manner. Figures 197 and 199 in Book 4 of Serlio’s *Tutte l’opere* also depict Greek fretwork.

⁴ The fountain has been removed recently to Wemyss Castle in Fife.

⁵ The first volume of *Les plus excellent bastiments de France* may have been of influence here also, as another plate depicts a fountain at Gaillon with a similar gadrooned basin (fig. 2.34).
knot. It was perhaps in commemoration of the couple’s first ten years at Ravelston that the structure was raised. Whatever the reason, it must have been a remarkable if grotesque centrepiece to the garden.¹

Within the grounds of Moray House on the Canongate in Edinburgh, is a plain, rectangular summerhouse built in the first half of the 17th century (fig. 2.35).² The structure once sat at the end of a long terraced garden that swept from the foot of the house to the Cowgate some distance below, but development has encroached upon it in recent decades and the summerhouse is now marooned in the tarmac of a dingy car-park. The walls are pierced with tall, round-arched windows - one on each side and two on the front flanking a central door - margined with alternately flat and fan-tailed square-channelled rybats stepped short to create an angle arris. On top are moulded copes that once bore a central ball-finial and heraldic supporters at either end, but now encircle a piended, clay-tile roof that was surely once a lead flat. The inside of the structure is plain except for an ornate plaster ceiling, inserted probably when the roof was replaced in the late-19th century. A clue as to the date and designer of the summerhouse is provided by a gate that stands nearby as it is topped by a fine open strap-work pediment that is almost identical to a window aedicule at Winton House in East Lothian.³ The designer of Winton was William Wallace, and as such it seems reasonable to assume that the Master Mason also designed the Moray House gate.⁴ If so, he may well have created the summerhouse at the same time. Indeed, this is made more likely by the similarity between the treatment of the

¹ The structure echoes vaguely the form and details of one of the fountains depicted in the Hypnerotomachia Poliphili: In his notes to Waverley, Sir Walter Scott makes reference to other garden features at Ravelston that were probably created by Foulis, including statuary and terraces (Grant, Old and New Edinburgh, vol. 3, p. 106).

² The summerhouse appears to be marked on Gordon of Rothiemay’s 1647 survey of Edinburgh that was published by de Witt in Praeciparium Totius Europae Urbium around 40 years later (fig. 2.36).


⁴ Certainly, Wallace worked on Moray House itself (MW vol. 1, p. 1xx).
summerhouse's rybats (fig. 2.37) and those around the entrance to the Palace Block at Edinburgh Castle (fig. 2.38), which is also Wallace's work.¹

Mention should also be made of a three other ornamental structures that are now lost. The first was a small, apsidal-ended bath-house decorated with extravagant plasterwork constructed within the gardens of Leven Lodge, probably some short time before the Interregnum (fig. 2.39).² The second and third structures are illustrated in the late-16th-century manuscript maps of the cartographer, Timothy Pont. Pont's “Mapp of Murray” depicts an enclosed garden at Dallas Castle apparently with a gate and angle pavilions, whilst his “Mapp of Garry and its Branches” reveals what appears to be a hunting stand within the park beyond the walled garden at Wemyss Castle (fig. 2.40).

Finally, though there is no explicit evidence, it seems likely that the impressive ramparts of the ‘Kings Knot’ that survive still beneath the walls of Stirling Castle, once bore one or more ornamental structures. The King’s Knot is a remodelling of an earlier royal garden and is almost certainly the result of work undertaken by James Murray, the Master of Works in Scotland, and William Watts, the King’s Master Gardener in England between 1626 and 1628, presumably in preparation for the visit of the king to his northern kingdom (fig. 2.41).³ The garden is really two parterres - the easterly created from a succession of raised octagons set within a large square rampart, the westerly from interlocking square plots separated by sunken

¹ It is worth noting also that the simple appearance of the summerhouse belies the finesse of its design, since it would appear to have been proportioned according to the Golden Section. I am grateful to Mr Bob Heath for this information.
³ For a brief overview of the history of the King’s Knot see Grove, D., The King’s Garden, unpublished, 1989. It should be noted, however, that Grove's conclusion that the knot is the early-18th century work of the Earl of Mar seems very unlikely, not least of all on stylistic grounds. I am grateful to Mrs Doreen Grove for allowing me access to the report and to Mrs Margaret Stewart for her opinion on certain of its conclusions. For payments made to Murray and Watts for “platting and contruyeing his majesties new orchard and gardein” see MW, vol. 2, pp. lxiii, 230, 242-3, 257.
paths, and the two joined by sharply-sloping channels.¹ The form of the garden, with all its dry troughs and canals, surely suggests that it was created to make extensive use of water. Certainly this was the opinion of two perspicacious Scottish historians. Writing in 1843 Thomas Dick-Lauder considered that “in ancient times, rival galas were held [at the Knot] by the sovereign and court, and the remains of a canal exist on which they sailed in barges”;² and over a century previously, the antiquarian, Sir John Clerk, had commented upon “the park canal” beneath the castle.³ If this was the case then it had at least three notable precedents: the water gardens created at Richmond Palace for Prince Henry; at Hatfield for Robert Cecil; and at Gorhambury for Sir Francis Bacon (fig. 2.42), each laid out in the early-17th century. In the “middle of the midlemost pond” of Bacon’s Gorhambury stood “a curious banquetting house of Roman architecture” and it is tempting to consider the central mount of the King’s Knot may have been ornamented with something similar. If this was the case (and if it was then any such building had apparently dissappeared by the time of Clerk) then such a distinct structure would surely have impressed itself upon the minds of those who saw it.⁴

¹ The precise forms of the King’s Knot are the result of a late-19th century restoration, however, it would seem that no substantial alterations were made with the broad lines of the earthworks being maintained (Grove, op. cit., pp. 28-31).


³ GD18/2102.

⁴ For Jacobean water gardens see Strong, Renaissance Gardens, pp.125-30; for Gorhambury see ibid. p.125 (fig. 2.42).
The Emergence of Ornamental Dovecotes

However striking the King's Knot may have been, it would probably have been little imitated. An economic recession after 1627 and the establishment of the Commonwealth after 1649 meant that few nobles could have been sufficiently funded or indeed motivated to create fine gardens. It is perhaps for these reasons that around this time the dovecote began to emerge as architecture worthy of ornament.

Pigeons had been kept for food at least since the Roman times, and it seems likely that timber pigeon-houses were constructed in medieval Scotland. However, the country's earliest surviving dovecotes date from the late-16th century, their endurance indebted to their stout, rubble walls, circular and battered in the form of traditional bee-skeps. Though robust, the design of these dovecotes proved inflexible, and they were soon superseded by rectangular structures whose interiors could be sub-divided to produce compartments of different sizes. Topped with mono-pitched roofs, these lectern-like buildings became the standard dovecote form during the 17th and first quarter of the 18th centuries. These 'bee-hive' and 'lectern' dovecotes were generally very visible from the house, being set either alongside a garden or upon an eminence within an open enclosure some short distance away. That they were set so close to the principal residence is explained by the need for convenient access not only to the pigeons but also to the rich fertiliser they produced; that dovecotes should be so prominent, however, depends on quite a different reason.

---


Since the early-15th century dovecotes in Scotland had been the prerogative of abbeys, monasteries, castles and baronies - largely because the pigeons they housed could not only decimate a prized grain crop but were indiscriminate in doing so, and as such only the ruling class of wealthy landowners could be permitted to possess them. Unsurprisingly, dovecotes were soon vilified by the put-upon tenantry and during the course of the 16th century the buildings were protected by numerous and increasingly-punitive laws. In 1617, the right to own a dovecote was restricted still further to lairds whose lands produced annually “ten chalders of victual.”

Therefore, by the second quarter of the 17th century, the dovecote had become a potent architectural status symbol and as such it made good sense to locate it prominently. Hence, at Aberdour Castle in Fife, a particularly fine beehive dovecote was erected along with, and as a termination for, garden terracing laid out in the third quarter of the 16th century by James Douglas, the 4th Earl of Morton; and at Lothian House (demolished) in Ancram, East Lothian Sir Robert Kerr intended in 1632 to “make [a] garden, with walks from it to the doucat alleye.”

The bold mass of a plain dovecote was in itself impressive, but in the lean years of the earlier- and mid-17th century the temptation to enhance it with a little ornament would have been strong. Thus, at Pinkie in 1607, Seton combined a dovecote with carved panels and marriage stones (fig. 2.43); at Auchmacoy in Banffshire in 1638, a beehive pigeon-house was constructed with a crow-stepped top squared off over corbels (fig. 2.44), as was another at Letham Lands in Fife; and probably around the same time at Shapinsay on Orkney a similar structure was designed with a crenellated and corbelled parapet and a crow-stepped cap-house. Indeed, dovecotes seem to have been the only architectural ornaments to have been incorporated within gardens or their wider visual envelope during the course of the Interregnum.

1 Buxbaum, Doocots, p.8.

Conclusion

In summary, those ornamental garden buildings constructed between the Reformation and the Restoration indicate firstly that designers and masons were comfortable with the language of mature classicism (as at Pinkie) as well as Mannerism (as at Dundas Castle) and could even dabble in the avant garde (as at the Mansion House at Greenock). They equally indicate that patrons realised their value in communicating an intellectual programme. At Edzell, for example, the walls and buildings seem to hint at, amongst other things, Lindsay’s aspirations regarding Scotland’s contribution to an expected British ‘empire’ forged and fuelled by the Union of the Crowns; whilst at Pinkie and Dundas, it appears that garden buildings were used to display the neo-Stoic philosophical credos of Alexander Seton and Walter Dundas. Similarly, as a traditional emblem of power, the dovecote naturally became architecturally more celebrated and valued as much for its appearance and symbolism as its function. However, as many structures (such as the fountain at Ravelston and the summerhouse at Moray House) were intended merely to be at once pretty and practical, and it is these buildings that form the majority of those which survive from the Restoration period.
The Gardens of Restoration Scotland

The language of garden design evolved little during the Interregnum - almost nothing was added to its vocabulary and its grammar continued to derive from the classical theories of architecture. What did change, however, was the scale at which gardens were conceived. They grew ever larger in area and as such both required and could admit a greater number and variety of landscape features and architectural ornament.

Whilst the built fabric of a handful of Restoration gardens still survives, the layout and content of all of them has been long-since lost and it is from the sparse evidence of a handful of contemporary surveys, plans, paintings, engravings and written descriptions that their original appearance must be recreated. Only a few garden surveys are known to have survived. Of these, the terraced garden of Hamilton Palace in Lanarkshire (fig. 3.19), crudely sketched around 1690 by Isaac Miller (presumably the gardener), is much the largest; whilst that prepared around the same time for Dalkeith Palace in Midlothian (fig. 3.20) is, at least in terms of the content of the garden it depicts, certainly the most detailed. The outstanding plan of the period is that designed by Sir William Bruce for his own estate at Kinross House, Kinross-shire (fig. 3.24), though a
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---

few, less detailed schemes survive by the landscape designer and one-time assistant to Bruce, Alexander Edward (see for example fig. 3.49). Just one garden, at Yester House in Midlothian (fig. 3.36), appears to have been recorded in a painting - a large work of oil on canvas by an unknown artist, though much in the style of the Dutch painter, Jacob de Witt. The fine topographical folio, _Theatrum Scotiae_, prepared by the Dutch surveyor, John Slezer, and published in 1693 and in enlarged form 26 years later, contains the only known engravings of Scotland’s Restoration gardens.  

Amongst the many illustrations of the country’s principal towns and monuments are highly detailed views of the gardens of Culross Abbey House in Fife (fig. 3.25); Thirlestane Castle, Selkirkshire (fig. 3.5); Hatton House, West Lothian (fig. 3.1); Dalkeith Palace, Midlothian; Heriot’s Hospital in Edinburgh; and the College of Glasgow. Descriptions of late-17th-century Scottish gardens are few. Scotland has no equivalent to the inveterate travel writer, Celia Fiennes, whose journals are so invaluable a source of information on the appearance of English Restoration gardens. Nor does it share England’s rich tradition of ‘country-house’ poetry for just one such work relates to a Scottish estate - _Caelia’s Country House and Closet_.

The poem was written around 1667-8 by the lawyer and statesman, Sir George Mackenzie of Rosehaugh and is thought to relate loosely to Leuchars Castle in Fife. Though it offers more eulogy than description the poem does remark upon:

“Long rows of stately elms on either side
The wondering eye to that great palace guide;
Betwixt which rows, most pleasant ponds they see,
Which with the Avenue in length agree.”

---


And within the “embroidered Gardens” it refers to

“...labyrinths so please that we may doubt

If art, or pleasure, hinder getting out.

A fountain nymph here, to the life expressed,

Darts trembling waters from her marble breast.

‘Tis only here still the same things can please,

And without change, the curious are at ease.

This does with Eden in all things agree,

Save that its Mistress will not tempted be.

She here an artificial rock has raised,

By which, even whilst we’re cheated, we are pleased.

Here Nature’s equalled, future arts defied;

No lady’s glass could have more justly lied.”

Taken together, these surveys, plans, paintings, engravings and brief poetic account, suggest that gardens in Scotland were created within large, rectangular walled enclosures to the rear of the house; that they were articulated with symmetrically-set gazebos and seats; and that they were formed from grass plats, flower parterres, areas of planting (known as ‘wildernesses’) and pools that might extend to the size of a small canal. It may be said, therefore, that although Restoration gardens in Scotland seem never to have been as large as those of England, France and Holland, they were at least made up of the same elements and laid out on similar lines. As such, the country may properly be said to have possessed a ‘formal’ garden tradition that was typical to north-western Europe.

1 Ibid., p.346.
Sources of Advice for the Selection and Design of Ornamental Garden Structures

Whilst many nobleman would no doubt have borrowed ideas for the laying out of their own gardens directly from those of others both within and outwith their own country, increasingly, they could also draw advice from a growing crop of both architectural treatises and gardening books - books which, to judge by at least one catalogue, certainly found their way into the libraries of Scotland's learned noblemen. Hence, Isaac de Caus's Wilton Garden (c.1645) and New and Rare Inventions of Water-works (1659) both contain engravings of grottoes; John Rea's Flora, Ceres et Pomona (1676) advises that "noble Fountains, Grottos, Statues &c. are excellent ornaments and marks of magnificence"; and Timothy Nourse's Campania Foelix (1700) exhorts "large aviaries in convenient places" along with "Seats within the Walls on every side, in the nature of Vaults or Summerhouses, finely paved, with Arch-work, and some little rise by Steps; by which means such as walk may ease themselves, and enjoy either the Sun or Shade, and be secur'd from the annoyance of Winds and Rains, at all seasons of the Day and of the Year," and a "grotto made of shellwork with some little imagery delivering the water through little pipes, with some wetting places, as also a Bathing-place or Bason in the midst."

John Reid's Scots Gard'ner (1683) - the earliest gardening book to be devoted to Scotland and the only such work of this period - makes little mention of garden buildings. To a certain extent this is to be expected as Reid - a gardener rather than an architect by trade - is

---

1 A catalogue of books in the possession of the 2nd Marquis of Tweeddale, prepared in 1704, records architectural works by Vignola, Scamozzi, Palladio, Vitruvius, Alberti and Fréart and gardening books by Gerard, Bacon, Evelyn, Worlidge, Parkinson, Rea, Quintinie, Langford, Nourse, Channock, Hartlib, Blyth, Coke, Donaldson and Rapin. See Yester MSS, MS7112.


3 Nourse, T., Campania Foelix, London, 1700, pp.322, 326, 316.
more concerned more with issues of horticulture than design. It is probably for this reason that Reid’s only reference to garden buildings is made by way of his recommendation that a “Storehouse” and “Dove-house” be set as “pavilions” at the angles of the front court. However, there exists too the possibility that Reid was articulating a Scottish preference for the alliance of utility and beauty - a preference that had manifested itself over the last 150 years in the decorative role of dovecotes, and giba, no doubt, with the Calvinism of a good many of Scotland’s land-owners.

John Worlidge’s Systema Horticulturae (1677), the only work of the period substantially to treat of garden buildings, recommends two main types: the “Pleasure-house or Banqueting-house” and the “alcove.” Worlidge advises that the pleasure house should be located “at some remote Angle of your Garden” since “the more remote it is from your house the more private will you be from the frequent disturbances of your Family of acquaintance, and being made at an Angle, part within your Garden and part without, you will have the privileges and advantages of Air and View.” To this end he suggests that the banqueting house’s “Windows and Doors, the one or other respecting every Coast, may be glazed with the best and most transparent Glass, to represent every Object through it the more splendid,” and that “in the other corner” a “greenhouse” might be created of “the same Form to answer it.” The second type of structure is the alcove or covered seat, with Worlidge suggesting that in “the Nieches of your Wall may you place Seats covered over, that you may rest your self in at your pleasure” and advising that “the ends of your Walks are the most proper places for such seats, [so] that whilst you sit in either of them, you have the view of your garden.”

---

1 Reid, J., Scots Gard’ner, Edinburgh, 1683, p.2 and fig.1.
3 Worlidge, ibid., p.39. Worlidge then recommends that “the Best Form for these Seats is round, the one semicircle within the Wall, the other without with a Cupulo, the outward part to be supported by three or four, or more columns of Timber or Stone, the other part resting on the Wall, the Top covered with Lead, Slate or Shingle, with its duc Cornish about that part that is off from the Wall. Or you can make them of a long square Form, about two foot in the Niech of the Wall and as much without, covered as the round, but casting the drip side-ways or backward.”
That the gazebo and the alcove were considered the principal forms of Restoration garden building is born out by the evidence of surviving structures. Examples of the former remain at Hatton, West Lothian, Pitmedden in Aberdeenshire and Traquair near Peebles, and were once found amidst the gardens of Drumlanrig in Dumfriesshire.1

The Use of Gazebos at Hatton, Pitmedden, Traquair and Drumlanrig.

The tower of Hatton came into the possession of Charles Maitland through his marriage to Elizabeth Lauder in 1653. "Weak, violent, insolent and corrupt," Maitland's achievements, such as they were, were indebted to the influence of his elder brother, the all-powerful 1st Duke of Lauderdale. Appointed Master and General of the Scottish Mint in 1661, Maitland contributed little to the post but took much, and his splendid estate survived as testimony to his malversation until just 30 years ago when the house and its garden were razed almost without trace.2 All that now remains of Hatton is an impressive rubble retaining wall with tall gazebos at either end.

Between the early-1660s and the mid-1670s Maitland extended his L-plan tower to create a large, regular house, and laid out splendid new grounds to suit. It was probably to celebrate the completion of the work that he commissioned John Slezer to depict the estate in an engraving (fig. 3.1).3 Slezer's detailed and accurate illustration depicts a large, terraced walled garden set in

---

1 It is worth noting that a contract for the construction of a two-storey gazebo at Prestonhall south of Edinburgh is preserved amongst the Register of Deeds at the SRO. It was lodged in 1686 and specifies in detail the construction of a "summerhouse on the northeast corner of the yaird dyke." The structure - which would appear to fit into this typological group - has long been demolished. For a transcription of the contract see Dunbar, J. and Davies, K., "Some Late-17th-Century Building Contracts" in Scottish History Society Miscellany XI, Edinburgh, 1990, pp.310-11. This article also contains contracts for a dovecote at Nether Liberton in Edinburgh and for remodelling work to a summerhouse at Fingask Castle in Perthshire.

2 DNB, vol.12, p.807.


4 For his role at the Lauderdale properties see Dunbar, J., "The Building Activities of the Duke and Duchess of Lauderdale, 1670-82," Archaeological Journal, vol. 132, 1975, pp.202-30. Slezer may also have been involved
wooded parkland. Within the upper garden, a small fountain centres grass plats and raised flower beds, and below, a small, circular pool is set amidst a large potager. The terrace wall that divides the two is terminated at either end by matching, two-storey gazebos, each of which is crowned with lanterned, ogee roofs, clasped by a dog-legged stair and articulated by tall windows that offer views across the upper and lower gardens. It is almost certainly to these “summerhouses” that accounts for slate and lead-work were submitted to Maitland in 1678.¹

Both gazebos (figs. 3.2 and 3.3) have been subject to alterations and a good deal of decay - the pleasant contrast that would once have been achieved between the flat, harled walls and the rusticated margins has dissolved with the render, and the plain, yellow rubble is now enlivened only by the cast of low light. Yet their forms remain appealing; when viewed from the lower terrace, the gazebos are at once elegant in scale and substantial enough to provide adequate termination for the long, high terrace wall. Indeed, this may have been their designer’s intention, for when viewed from the house the upper stories appear somewhat squat (though this may have been mitigated by the verticality of the original roofs - fig. 3.4).² Little of the interior decoration has survived save for some evidence to indicate that the lower chambers of each were once plastered and lined with a dado.

¹ In 1678, the slater, Gilbert Anderson, was paid £370 4s 2p Scots for slating the “summerhouses,” and during the course of the next two years, the plumber, Alexander Thom, was paid on a number of occasions for lead-work to the “summerhouse” (NRA(S) 832 - Maitland MSS, MSS61/67 and 63/1. I am grateful to Mr John Dunbar for permitting me access to his transcriptions of extracts from the Maitland papers).

² The gazebos have been re-roofed and their lower floors partly re-faced: polished, rusticated ashlar to the east- and west-facing facades (with poorly detailed infills to the arches, though that to the east has now been removed) and stugged masonry to the south. When this remodelling was executed is not clear, but it may be the result of “work on the summerhouses” undertaken by Alexander Baxter in 1706 as part of a phase of improvement work made after Maitland’s death by his son, John (Maitland MSS, MS61/102). Why this work was left incomplete is not clear. To judge by the untidy batter of the retaining wall, this too is likely to have been substantially reworked, probably at the same time or slightly before the gazebos were re-faced since the middle of the large arches, though central within the available wall-space, does not align with the window above. The vertical channelling to the window sills and lintels also appears to be the result of afterthought.
It seems likely that the buildings were the work of Sir William Bruce, Surveyor General and Overseer of the King’s Buildings in Scotland.¹ Maitland’s vanity alone would have driven him to solicit the help of the country’s pre-eminent architect in the improvement of his home, and there is every evidence to suggest that he succeeded. Between 1670 and around 1676, Bruce was engaged as architectural adviser to Maitland’s brother, the 1st Duke of Lauderdale. During this time Bruce oversaw alterations to the Duke’s properties at Lethington (now Lennoxlove) near Haddington, Brunstane near Edinburgh and, most significantly, his principal residence of Thirlestane Castle in Selkirkshire. It was at the latter of these that Lord Hatton monitored the progress of building works during Lauderdale’s frequent absences and would often have come into contact with Bruce.² Since Maitland seized the opportunity to channel the stream of talented craftsmen then flowing through Thirlestane into his own work at Hatton, it would be surprising if he did not divert Bruce in the same way.³

A tentative attribution to Bruce may also be made on stylistic grounds, for if faint traces of his influence can be discerned in the balustraded eastern elevation of the house it is more explicit in the gazebos. Their broad lines echo those of the two dependencies that once flanked the Thirlestane forecourt (fig. 3.5),⁴ and are similar to the small pavilions located either side of Bruce’s own house at Kinross (fig. 3.6).⁵

¹ For the best analysis of Bruce’s life and works see Dunbar, J., Sir William Bruce, Exhibition Catalogue Published by the Scottish Arts Council, Edinburgh, 1970.
² Dunbar, “Building Activities,” pp.203-13. Bruce was also on friendly terms with Hatton’s wife, Elizabeth, who penned an informal note to him in 1670 recommending her nephew for employment (GD29/1900/1954).
³ Those artisans employed at both Hatton and Thirlestane were: Alexander Baxter, mason; Gilbert Anderson, slater; Thomas Wauch, glazier; Alexander Eizat, wright; and George Dunsterfield, plasterer (Maitland MSS, MSS61/102, 61/67, 63/28, 13/4, 2/7). For details of the craftsmen at Thirlestane see Dunbar, “Building Activities,” pp.202-13.
⁴ These were constructed in 1671 (GD29/1897/3).
⁵ See Slezer, Theatrum Scotiae, 1719, plate 59.
Some two hundred miles north of Maitland’s demesne, set within rich and rolling farmland is the terraced garden of Pitmedden.\(^1\) Precisely contemporary with Hatton, the estate was improved in 1675\(^2\) for the judge Sir Alexander Seton.\(^3\) The family papers were incinerated with the house in 1818\(^4\) and today only the garden architecture hints at Pitmedden’s distinguished past.

As at Hatton, the garden is entirely inward looking, hemmed on all sides by high, granite walls, though at least here a slender gate at its far end offers access to the encompassing country (fig. 3.7). The garden is divided into two levels, the lower area being set between two raised walks, whilst the central retaining wall is terminated, like that at Hatton, by twin gazebos with ink-pot roofs and ample windows that stare out across the garden (figs. 3.8 and 3.9). However, the steps are this time set in the centre of the terrace, with two scale-and-plat stairs returning around a small water-feature to create a pleasing piece of provincial Baroque (fig. 3.10).

The designer of the garden and its structures is not known, however, the similarities between Pitmedden and Hatton are remarkable. Both gazebos are 19-feet square in plan, of harled rubble with polished ashlar dressings, wave-moulded eaves courses and ink-pot roofs. Both consist of regularly-fenestrated, single chambers on two levels, and each make use of v-jointed rusticated margins. There seems not to have been any other models in Scotland for this type of building at this time and as such the correspondence between the two sites is surely beyond coincidence.\(^5\) Whilst Seton and Maitland would have been known to each other as fellow Lords of


\(^2\) A carved foundation stone reset over the entrance door to the south-west reads “FUNDAT- MAY-1675.” A memorandum dated 1675 records arrangements for the shipment of stone from Port Seton to Aberdeen that was to be used in the creation of “a basine for a fountain” at Pitmedden (GD3/E45/3129).

\(^3\) DNB, vol.17, p.1202.


\(^5\) Notably, a pair of two-storey, harled-rubble summerhouses adjoining terracing are located at nearby Meldrum House (fig. 3.11). Judging by their general appearance and the condition of their fabric, these buildings may also
the Court of Session and could have exchanged ideas on their plans for estate improvements, this alone can hardly explain the parallels. If the distance between the two sites makes it unlikely that the gardens were created by the same masons, the influence of a common architect is more plausible.

There are, though, some differences. The gazebos at Pitmedden are less refined: they are not as elegantly proportioned, and some of their details - chiefly the broad lintels carved in imitation of flat ogee arches and the awkward sill and rybat junctions - betray a lack of confidence on the part of their creator. However, this need not preclude the influence of Bruce. At a time when the architectural profession was still young, the contribution of the mason towards the final appearance of a design was considerable. In this context, then, the Aberdeenshire craftsmen might be forgiven the occasional concession to tradition or the clumsy resolution of an unfamiliar detail.

The formula used at Hatton and Pitmedden was reused at Traquair House. Towards the end of the 17th century a scheme of alterations and extensions aimed at making the tower-house appear more regular was being contemplated by Charles, 4th Earl of Traquair. To this end plans were prepared in 1695 by Bruce’s protégé, James Smith. The remodelling of the main block was not carried out and only the forecourt, terracing and summerhouses were executed, presumably as comparatively simple and cheap ways of providing a sense of symmetry.¹

---

¹ See RCAHMS, Peeblesshire, 2 vols., vol 2, pp.311-28, and Anon., “Traquair House, Peeblesshire,” Country Life, 11th August 1906, pp 198-206. It was presumably Smith that also prepared a schematic plan for a piped water supply to the “fountaine of [the] parter garden” and the “kitchin Garden” along with proposals for fountain basins (NMRS - PBD/285/71P).
Again the gazebos are two-storey and square in plan (though a foot-and-a-half smaller than those at Hatton and Pitmedden). Each is of harled rubble with wave-moulded eaves courses and ogee roofs; and whilst the shouldered door architraves lend them a little style, the absence of quoins deprive the buildings of some much-needed vigour (figs. 3.12 and 3.13). Uniquely for garden buildings of this period, that at the north end of the terrace still possesses its original interior - the fire-place, panelling, Doric frieze and coved and painted ceiling depicting Venus (the ancient Italian goddess associated with gardens and cultivated fields as well as with love), together displaying perfectly the elegance that could be contrived within so small a structure (figs. 3.14 and 3.15).

Similar gazebos once staked each of the four corners of Drumlanrig's gardens (figs. 3.16 and 3.17).1 Sadly, two of these were demolished in 1740 and the two others were absorbed into 19th-century service wings. It seems reasonable to assume, however, that they were all constructed in 1698 when accounts were submitted for lime-washing the "pavilions... unto my Ladys Garden [and] nixt the bowling green," and fitting them with marble fireplaces and wood panelling.2

The designer of the summerhouses is unknown, but the most likely candidate is Smith. The architect had already designed the main house for William Douglas, 1st Duke of Queensberry, between 1680 and 1690. Following his father's death the grounds were refashioned by the 2nd Duke, and between 1697 and 1698 Smith furnished a number of draughts for various

---

1 Their plan and location are depicted in three drawings. The first is a 1738 survey by David Low (RHP9456), the second is a 19th-century copy of an unsigned 1739 survey (NMRS - uncatalogued); and the third is a mid-18th survey by John Rocque (NMRS - DFD/58/19). A vignette bordering the latter illustrates the elevations of the summerhouses to the south of the castle, whilst a later-18th-century pen-and-wash sketch attributed to John Clerk of Eldin (undated and uncatalogued copy at NMRS) illustrates those to the north.

2 These accounts also note a pavilion "unto my Ladys Garden to be finished with the lyming unto it alreadie" and the other pavilion "nixt the bowling green." The latter was "to be finished for my Ladies use with plain cedar wood pannalls [with] washing boards not to be too high and the pannalls to be made smaller and planted upon the old pannalls" (Jamieson, F., Drumlanrig Castle Gardens, Historical Development, unpublished, 1997, appendix and p.1 - I am grateful to Mrs Fiona Jamieson for providing me with information extracted from the Buccleuch archives relating to the gazebos).
architectural components including designs for “the seats or summerhouse under the stair of the flower garden,” four pedestals and a “Well of Love.” The attribution is made the more likely by the similarity between the gazebos and the coach-buildings built in 1697 to Smith’s designs either side of the walled entrance court at Melville House in Fife (fig. 3.18).^2

The Use of Alcoves at Panmure, Kinross, Culross Abbey House, Hatton and Newbattle.

If the deep retaining walls of some gardens demanded the presence of large buildings to provide adequate articulation, enclosing walls could be afforded definition and ornament more simply by the introduction of an alcove. Two late-17th-century drawings - a survey of the gardens at Hamilton Palace (fig. 3.19) and a plan for a garden at Dalkeith House (fig. 3.20)^3 - both depict alcoves terminating principal walks. In this they were surely typical, for such features provided not only an enticing focal point for a long, straight path, but also “necessary... expedients for them that are weary.”^4

The earliest surviving examples of this type of architectural ornament are a pair of identical covered seats set within woodland at Panmure near Carnoustie in Angus (fig. 3.21). Each of these is formed from a rectangular recess framed by half-columns and a Doric entablature, and flanked by roughly-finished edges which clearly indicate that the seats were once set within walls.

^1 Ibid. A large masonry greenhouse was also intended.


^3 For Miller's c.1677 survey of the gardens at Hamilton Palace see NMRS - LA4/1 and /414. For an illustration of the proposal for Dalkeith see Cox, History, p.54. An elevation for a garden seat probably dating from the early-18th century depicts an arched and pedimented opening cast in ashlar within a brick wall at Callendar House near Falkirk (RHP14411).

^4 Worlidge, Systema Horticulturae, p.40.
Panmure (now demolished) was the first house to be built de novo in Restoration Scotland. It was constructed between 1666 and 1671 for George Maule, 2nd Earl of Panmure, to the designs of John Mylne, Master Mason to the Scottish Crown.1 The earliest accounts for the gardens are dated 1668 when masons were contracted “to build the said Earle his walls of good sufficient masone work... nine or twelve foot [high] as the Earle shall think fitt... and castin with lyme and sand on ye one syde for a waled Gardyne.” 2 The garden was to contain “two platformes and tarras walkes” both of which were to be balustraded, with the latter having “ane door at every end.” 3 Two years later, masons were paid for “stable walls and court dykes,” 126 balusters with their rails and bases, a “chapterhead and globe,” “two Galions heads” and “two antick heads.” Therefore, whilst the creation of the seats is not itemised within the accounts, to judge by their overall appearance and condition it seems reasonable to assume that they date from this period, that they once formed part of a highly architectural, formal, walled garden attached to the house, 4 and that they were moved to their present position when the enclosures were destroyed in

2 GD45/18/566, “Articles of agreement betwixt the Earle of Panmure and James Walker, Archibald Ruell and John Crowe, Massons,” 1668(?)
3 GD45/18/574, “Agreement betwixt the Earle of Panmure and Alexr Nisbet for building the porch, lightings the bastions and for building stables, dykes and other tasks,” 1669. The agreement records that Nisbet was to “to build the cort walls and other walls and dykes which the said earle shall give him order for. And to flag them sufficiently upon the tops wt flags of eighteen inches broad. And to have all the balusters for the two platformes and Tarras walkes with their pillars and railes and baisis and everything else belonging to them, and to set them up and fix them. And to build ane door at every end of the Tarras walke... And to have as many searchies[?] for the rest as will compleit it and to batt it and make the topfer stones conforme to the former wall... all other doors upon the garden walls and other dykes of the lyke eight at breadth, the webbers[?] being sufficientlie well dinted with backfillers four pund ten shilling. Item for the two doors at the end of the Tarras walke having the webbers[?] well dinted with backfillers and handsome cornish six pund per paire.”
4 It should be noted, however, that payments were made for “ane seat to the North Balcony” and “ane seat to the South Balcony,” though it is not clear where these balconies were located (GD45/18/585/1-2, “The Acompt that the Earle of Panmure is to pay Alexr Nisbet so soon as all things in it is perfyted,” 25 June 1670). It is worth noting also that in the same year an agreement was drawn up between the Earl and the masons for an “item they are to have for the windowes of the summer house being alyke high and breadth as the doores” (GD45/18/586, “Articles of agreement betwixt the earle of Panmure and James Walker, Archibald Ruell and John Trale, massones... Item they are to have for the windowes of the summerhouse being alyke heigh and breadth as the doores in the same pryce... for the foot of brotched - lib 2s per foot,” 1670-71). The gardens were described by Macky in 1723 as going “quite round the House” and as having contained “a great Variety of Evergreens and Grass-Plats, cover'd Walks and Labyrinths” (Macky, Journey, p.99). A basic sketch plan dated 1674 indicates the disposition of at least some of the garden walls, though it is unclear how they related to the house (GD45/18/606/1/1A3).
the later-18th century. It seems likely also that the seats were designed by craftsmen on site - very probably Alexander Nisbet, an Edinburgh mason who was contracted to oversee the completion of Panmure after the death of Mylne in 1677. However, outside advice may have been garnered for their design. The Doric entablatures feature the advancing triglyph - a detail that is only found elsewhere after the Restoration in the contemporary work of Bruce (fig. 3.22). Now, Bruce submitted a draught for a “Gate at the chieff entrie of the court that enters from ye west at the front of the house of Panmure” in 1672 and it is possible therefore that he may also have advised on the form of the seats.

Certainly Bruce designed a pair of elegant tetrastyle Doric loggias in antis for either end of a broad cross-walk within his own walled garden at Kinross (figs. 3.23 and 3.24). From these, visitors could enjoy from sheltered seats the views of the extensive parterres which Bruce had set out symmetrically on either side of the garden’s long axial walk. The deep cornices of each alcove convey a sense of poise that is complemented by the rusticated end-columns and responds, whilst the triglyphs are cast in their authentic form. More architecturally refined than the seats at Panmure, these shelters are likely also to be a little more recent. Levelling work began at Kinross in 1679, and four years later “Thomas Balk mason in Alloway” was contracted to build the

---

1 The walled gardens seem to have been intact when Panmure was visited by Bishop Pococke in 1760 (Kemp, D. (ed.), “Tours in Scotland, 1747, 1750, 1760, by Richard Pococke, Bishop of Meath,” Scottish History Society, Edinburgh, 1887, pp. 219-20), but removed by the time the estate was surveyed in 1804 (see John Walker’s “Plan of the Lands of the Parish of Panbride” surveyed in 1804-5, now in the possession of Bruce Laughton, factor of the Panmure Estate - fig. 3.48). I am grateful to Mrs Caroline Kernan for bringing the survey to my attention and to Mr Laughton for allowing me access to it.

2 Bruce designed and superintended work during the 1670s at Holyroodhouse and Thirlestane Castle. The Doric friezes in the courtyard of the former and above the main door of the latter both display the ‘projecting’ triglyph detail. It is possible that the detail may have been a conscious revival of that used at Pinkie House, Heriot’s Hospital and Edinburgh Castle in the early part of the century.

3 GD45/18/599, “Articles of agreement betwixt George Earle of Panmure and Alexr Nisbet, Meason burges of Edr... to build a gate at the Chief entrie to the court that enters from ye west at the front of the house of Panmure... according to the draught given by Sir William Bruce,” dated 1672.


garden walls according to Bruce’s plan, and presumably the “Seats with Dorick Pillars” along with them. However, just as he used Dutch artisans to create the impressive *clairvoiée* that punctuates the garden’s end-wall, so Bruce seems to have employed others for the construction of the seats since it was the mason, James Anderson, who was eventually paid for the construction of the “two summerhouses on the south and north dykes of the garden.”

If the structures at Panmure and Kinross are little more than covered seats, deeper shelters are encountered at Culross Abbey House in Fife, Hatton House, and Newbattle Abbey in Midlothian. During the later-17th century, the estate of Culross was the possession of Alexander Bruce, 2nd Earl of Kincardine. Though an accomplished politician it is as the epitome of a Restoration virtuoso that he is better remembered. Kincardine’s attainments were numerous and varied: a royalist and deeply religious, he was a leading member of the Royal Society and well versed in medicine, chemistry, classics, mathematics and engineering. During exile in Europe the Earl married a Dutch woman, Lady Veronica van Arsen, who brought him a considerable fortune. On his return home Kincardine seems to have focused much of his personal attention and his wife’s money on the improvement of his estate.

An engraving of the house and its grounds by Slezer seems, as at Hatton, to have been commissioned on the completion of improvement work (fig. 3.25). The demesne it depicts is
astonishing in its content and, for the most part, still exists today. It is made up of three sunken gardens that overlook a large walled park that sweeps sharply away beneath them. The park contains rectangular plots of trees apparently naturally disposed. These are separated by broad paths that terminate to the west on a recess within the wall and a large lectern dovecote (of which little now remains), and sweep around to the east along the very edge of a deep precipice, almost as if to provide the visitor with a thrill of danger. In its apparent juxtaposition of raw and manicured nature, the garden echoes those of Renaissance Italy, whose influence must surely be suspected.¹

Overlooking both the gardens and the park is a terrace “as long and as broad as that at Windsor”² which terminates in a small classical alcove at its eastern end (fig. 3.26). Set under a piended masonry roof, the depressed-arch opening is flanked by fluted pilasters and set off with a slender architrave which appears ready to bow beneath a weighty cornice and tall blocking course. A carved armorial panel forms the keystone and foliage fills out the spandrels, whilst on either entablature block there is a delicate monogram, and framing the blocking course, on which the date 1674 is carved, are two over-sized buckle quoins which, like the triglyphs at Panmure, may represent a conscious attempt by the designer to ‘restore’ identifiable components of Scotland’s early-17th century architecture (fig. 3.27). Indeed, there is a connection, once again, to Bruce, for the architect had spent his youth at Culross and he and Kincardine were related.³

A similar building sits shrouded in bamboo within a south-sloping walled garden west of Hatton. The shelter’s facade of rusticated ashlar is centred by a round-arched opening flanked by

¹ For the use of untended nature in the gardens of 16th-century Italy see Masson, G., Italian Gardens, London, 1961, pp.122-157, and Battisti, E., “Natura Artificiosa to Natura Artificialis” in Coffin, D. (ed.), The Italian Garden, Washington D.C., 1972, pp.1-36. It is unclear whether the Earl visited Italy during his exile, however he could have learnt of Italian gardens from others, perhaps even John Evelyn, a fellow member of the Royal Society.

² Macky, Journey, p.180. Macky also notes that by 1723 there was “a Pavilion at each end” of the terrace, though only one survives today.

³ Dunbar, Sir William Bruce, p.4.
paired and fluted ionic pilasters (fig. 3.28). On the keystone are carved the Arms of the Maitlands and on the entablature (which contains no architrave) is engraved the date of 1704. Inside, a deep barrel-vault of v-jointed freestone is framed with a moulded cornice and base-course. On either side are small alcoves and to the rear is a battered recess with a stone architrave and wooden door (fig. 3.29). The former seem to have been used for storage whilst the latter appears once to have housed a board and as such it seems reasonable to assume that the building was constructed as a bowling pavilion and that it was for this that the mason Alexander Baxter submitted in 1703 an estimate of £436 (Scots) to build a “grotto for the bowling green at Hattoune” in “rusticated masonry enriched with the Ionic order.” To judge by an estate survey of 1797 the bowling green was a walled enclosure with a small adjoining shelter, set within woodland south-east of the garden, and it seems likely that this is the bowling green referred to in the accounts. It is clear, therefore, that the alcove was relocated to its present position sometime after 1797 – which is presumably when the architrave was removed. Now, although the green was, like the garden, enclosed by walls, it was couched in a sylvan setting and this must have struck a most natural note when visitors trekked from the house for a round of bowls (indeed it may have been its rural environment that earned for the polished, classical alcove the epithet of ‘grotto’). But what is crucial here is that an ornamental structure (albeit quite a useful one) is being set outside the garden, and this point is returned to later in the chapter.

1 Maitland MSS, MS61/102. The account was discharged on the 29 August 1704 for the sum of £422-4-0 Scots. On the 11th of October 1704, Baxter agreed the sum of £15 Scots for “hewing and laying whole wall of inner court about the bowling green.” The work formed part of a wider scheme of improvements undertaken by John Maitland, the 4th Earl of Lauderdale. Thus, other accounts record payments made in 1702 for “removing gate of 5 walks, placing it in another place £3-10-0... for hewing, building 3 doors in the aviary £18... for taking down the new gate and building it in another place £10,” and in 1706 for “hewing stones that was ordered for to build the volary which was agreed but never built £30-0-0... for hewing globes and pedestals in the front of the court walls, setting them up £6 each, £60... Preparing stones for finishing the lyon gate sides, £3... for carving the pineapples and setting them on the grotto, £20... [and for] work on the summerhouse.” This is the first explicit reference to a grotto in Scotland yet to come to light.

2 John Ainslie’s 1797 survey of the “Lands of Hatton” (RHP724), depicts what is probably this structure adjoining a bowling green at this time though the accompanying walled enclosure had apparently already been demolished. It may have been relocated sometime between 1820 and 1830 (see Findlay, J., Hatton House, Edinburgh, 1875, p.39).
Given its similarity to those at both Hatton and Culross, it may be assumed that the shelter fronting the entrance to an icehouse at Newbattle Abbey in Lothian is of a similar date and as such it constitutes a part of the phase of improvement works undertaken in the late-17th century by Robert Kerr, 4th Earl of Ancram and 1st Marquis of Lothian. Kerr, like so many of his noble contemporaries, was a cultured man. Educated in France and the Low Countries he lived abroad until 1657, returning to the Continent in 1673 as a volunteer in the Dutch War. Following his succession to the earldom in 1675, Kerr seems only to have kept gardening work ticking over, however, by 1693 he had grown dissatisfied with the appearance of Newbattle and its grounds. For at least the next three years alterations were made to both. Accounts record work to the “new garden... and deer House,” the purchase of numerous lead statues, and the “colouring with whyt Leid in oyll twice over the large Pirramades in the Avenue of the house of Newbottle” - which may be a reference to a remarkably early use of ornamental obelisks.

Despite Kerr’s anxiety that his gardens would “never come up to the heights of others in the Kingdom,” by the turn of the century they were evidently of note and probably little different from those remarked on favourably by Macky who wrote that

“the Entry to the Palace is as magnificent as can be imagined. In the Area between the Avenue and the Outer Gate, is the Statue of a Gladiator; and on each

---

1 DNB, vol.11, p.63-4.
3 A letter dated 16 August 1693 from the Earl in England to his wife at Newbattle expresses his dissatisfaction at the appearance of his home noting that “when I see housis heir it seems a skandalous thing to keep that rotten thing upp” (GD40/2/8, fol.53).
4 GD40/8/478, account of monies received by James Chirnsyd (a wright), 19 July 1697.
5 GD40/2/16 ad.25, letter from Lothian to his wife recording that he had shipped six statues of lead and garden seeds, March 1696.
6 GD40/8/485 (10), account from Joseph Beech (a painter), 5 December 1703.
7 GD40/109, letter from Lothian to his wife, 16 February 1696.
side of the gate is a stone Pavilion; and through four square green courts you come to the Palace, each of the first Courts having Rows of Statues on each Side as big as the Life, and in the fourth Court the biggest Holley Trees I ever saw."\(^1\)

Similarly, Defoe considered Newbattle to be "finely situated among the most agreeable walks and rows of trees, all full grown."\(^2\) Kerr it seems was his own worst critic.

At the end of a bridge that spans the Esk, which flows along the garden’s eastern margin, is a robust little alcove (fig. 3.30). It is set in front of what would appear to be an 18th-century ice-house and, like the seats at Panmure, its design suggests strongly that it once was set within a wall. As such it must be suspected that, as occurred at Hatton, the alcove has been removed from its original position, probably within one of "the four square green courts." The components of the alcove are assimilated in a classically correct way: a segmental-arched opening in the middle of a rusticated, ashlar facade with fluted Doric pilasters supporting a full entablature. The metopes are carved with a monogram and heraldic emblems one of which - a boar’s head (fig. 3.31) - does not relate to the family of Kerr but to that of James Hamsel, the Abbot of the monastery of Newbattle at the time of the Reformation,\(^3\) suggesting that claims to ancestry, no matter how spurious, were still coveted.

Searching for a possible architect, given that the advice of James Smith was sought on the main house in 1693,\(^4\) such a practised composition may owe something to his influence. However, whilst the banding suggests a familiarity with French architecture and the overall

---

\(^1\) Macky, *Journey*, p.52.


\(^3\) RCAHMS, *Midlothian*, p.144, 145.

\(^4\) GD40/2/8, fol.58. 3rd September 1693. Letter from Lothian to his wife asking her to seek Smith’s advice on remodelling the house.
vigour of the building exudes something of the strength of a Smith design, his input here must remain a matter of speculation.

**Banqueting Houses and Grottoes at Barncluith and Hatton**

Whilst gazebos and alcoves constitute the majority of ornamental structures within Scotland’s Restoration gardens, a number of other types were slowly being introduced. Gazebo need not necessarily be placed at the angles of a garden. Worlidge had recommended “a banqueting house or house of pleasure” for the centre of a garden when water could not be found for a fountain, and within the spectacular garden at Barncluith near Hamilton, a delightful “banqueting house,” dated 1698, sits at the end of one of the “seven hanging Terras-Walks.” This prim ashlar box with its neatly panelled chimney is entered through a central door set-off with a shouldered architrave, and from inside, windows overlook the formal gardens one way and the ancient woodland the other, woodland which can be reached via a back door and an elegant curving stair that sweeps down past a retaining basement (figs. 3.32 and 3.33).

Worlidge also recommended two other types of structures: aviaries and grottoes. Recapitulating earlier advice from Wotton and Bacon, he noted that “One of the pleasures that may be esteemed belonging to a Garden is an Aviary.” This, he avers, “must be near your house, that you may take some delight in it there as well as in your Garden” in order that the birds’ “charming Notes” might “rouze up our dull Spirits that are too intent upon the cares of this world, and mind us of the Providence, the great God of the Universe hath over us, as well as these creatures.” At both Hatton and Kinross, building accounts refer to the construction of

1 Worlidge, *Systema Horticulturae*, p.17.
2 This and the following quotations are taken from Macky, *Journey*, p.285.
‘volaries.’ At the former, the volary may well have been the small structure adjoining the garden wall immediately west of the house; at the latter, the pavilions that flank the house, now used as porches for the side gardens, seem most likely to have once been used as aviaries.

Worlidge discusses grottoes in much greater detail. In order to “sequester themselves from their ordinary occupations, and betake themselves to their shades and cool places of Recess for some few hours,” Worlidge recommends that those who “have convenient places in their Villas, make themselves Grottoes or Caves in the Earth.” He recognises that the idea of a grotto was hardly new, paying homage to “the most famous of its kind that this Kingdom affords… that Wiltonian Grotto near unto Salisbury” created by Isaac de Caus, and was no doubt aware of the engravings of various grottoes contained in de Caus’s *New and Rare Inventions of Water Works* (1659).

For a grotto, John Worlidge recommends that:

“either in the side of some decline of a Hill, or under some Mount or Terrace artificially raised, may you make a place of repose, cool and fresh in the greatest heats. It may be Arched over with stone or brick, and you may give it what light or entrance you please. You may make secret rooms and passages with in it, and in the outer Room may you have all those before mentioned water-works [Baths and Fountains], for your own or your friends divertisements. It is a place that is capable of giving you much pleasure and delight, that you may bestow not undeservedly what cost you please on it, by paving it with

---

1 At Hatton, payments were made between 1668 and 1670 for work to the “volary” (Maitland MSS, MSS61/67 and 63/1). For Kinross see Dunbar, “Lowlanders,” p.374.

2 Worlidge, *Systema Horticulturae*, p.63. Worlidge may have learnt of the grotto from the engravings contained in de Caus’s *Wilton Garden* published around 1645.
Marble or immuring it with Stone or Rock-work, either Natural or Artificially resembling the excellencies of nature. The roof may be made the same supported with pillars of Marble, and the partitions made of Tables of the same.”

Worlidge’s advice may have been heeded at Hatton, for constructed midway between the summerhouses is a remarkable structure - a neat evocation in form and finish of a diminutive Roman nymphaeum. Against the terrace wall, a battered, apsidal, rubble porch with a margined door, windows and niches, rises plain and buttress-like, with hardly a suggestion of the fine room it fronts (fig. 3.34). The stuccoed walls of the ample, barrel-vaulted apartment inside are lined with stone benches and punctuated with niches which, like those on the porch, must once have housed sculptures or urns. At the back is set a circular, freestone bath measuring ten feet in diameter and four feet in depth, into which water once flowed through a lion’s-head font (now lost), and dividing the side walls from the apsidal rear is a ‘proscenium arch’ of rusticated ashlar (fig. 3.35). When first built it is reputed to have had a tessellated floor of octagonal sandstone and black marble flags, and walls “entirely crusted over with shells.”

It seems most likely that the building was created around the turn of the 18th century, and as such may be the work of Richard Maitland, the 4th Earl of Lauderdale. The 4th Earl was a highly cultured man. He lived

1 Worlidge, Systema Horticulturae, pp.62-3.
2 Findlay, Hatton, p.20.
3 No building accounts clearly relate to this structure and as such its date can only be estimated. It is not marked on Slezer’s engraving but it is indicated on the 1797 survey. Between the late-1600s and circa 1750 Hatton underwent three phases of improvement. The first and most modest was undertaken by Richard, the 4th Earl of Lauderdale. As part of this work a grand classical gateway was constructed in 1692 to terminate the east avenue (though this was relocated to its present position south of the house in 1829). The second phase was executed by Richard’s brother John, who, between his accession in 1696 and his death 14 years later, extended the garden southwards and created the bowling green. The third was undertaken gradually over three decades by John’s son, the 6th Earl, who “made many improvements in his gardens and policy, for his own amusement, whereby he not only discovered the elegance of his taste, but rendered his seat pleasant and agreeable to his posterity” (Findlay, Hatton, p.28). After 1750 the estate ebbed into decay (in 1789 Lord Cockburn remarked that “enough remained of the grounds of Hatton to show the greatness and beauty of the original design, but the gold has become dim” - quoted in Haldane, Scots Gardens, p.131). The bath-house is therefore likely to date from the earlier-18th century and as such the account presented in 1706 for “carving the pineapples and setting them on the grotto,” may relate to sculptures for its niches or wall-head.
Chapter Three: Restoration to the Union

"in great friendship" with James VII at St Germain-en-Laye, and there he prepared a translation of Virgil, perhaps from within the fine grottoes that ornamented the extensive garden terracing. It is possible therefore that the grottoes for which France was famed (there were still few in England)\(^1\) and the advice adumbrated by Worlidge formed the inspiration for that at his own home.\(^2\) The general idea may, however, be indebted to a more local source, for a grotto was constructed as part of a splendid cascade-house sometime before 1699 at Yester in East Lothian.

Ornamental Structures Outside the Garden:

**the Yester Cascade and the Panmure Column**

Like his grandfather, Alexander Seton, John Hay, the 2nd Earl and 1st Marquis of Tweeddale was not only an accomplished politician (rising to the Chancellorship of Scotland) but also, in the opinion of John Evelyn, a “learned and knowing nobleman.”\(^3\) To judge by the contents of his library,\(^4\) Tweeddale possessed a strong interest in both architecture and gardening, and it is of little surprise that in 1670 he was seeking the advice of Sir William Bruce in replacing his

---

\(^1\) Only eight grottoes of significance were constructed in England during the second half of the 17th century. These were at Wotton House (c.1653), Deepdene (c.1655), Albury (c.1667) and Durdans (c.1678) in Surrey; Cliveden (c.1674) in Buckinghamshire; Lavington (c.1675) in Wiltshire; and Patshull Hall (c.1680) in Staffordshire. I am grateful to Dr. David Jacques for this information.

\(^2\) Alberti also described his delight in a grotto “where a spring gushed out [and] the surface had been made up of various seashells and oysters, some inverted, others open, charmingly arranged according to different colours” (Alberti, *De re aedificatoria*, p.299).

\(^3\) de Beer (ed.), *Diary*, vol.4, p.180. Evelyn mentions Tweeddale again as one of an entourage of fellow Royal Society members (that also included the Duke of Lauderdale) to visit his home at Sayes Court in 1664 (*ibid.*, vol.3, p.21).

\(^4\) For a catalogue of books in the possession of the 2nd Marquis of Tweeddale, prepared in 1704, see Yester MSS, MS7112. Architectural works include those by Vignola, Scamozzi, Palladio, Vitruvius, Alberti and Fréart as well as books covering the ruins, statues and palaces of Rome, the Pyramids of Egypt and the works of Michelangelo and Raphael. Books relating to estate improvement include those by Gerard, Bacon, Evelyn, Worlidge, Parkinson, Rea, Quintinie, Langford, Nourse, Channock, Hartlib, Blyth, Coke, Donaldson and Rapin. Fictional works relating to Arcadian themes include *Orlando Furioso*, *Gerusalemme Liberata* by Tasso, *Di Sanzaro’s Arcadia, Diana* by Montemayor, Spenser’s *Fairy Queen* and Milton’s *Paradise Lost*. Classical works include those by Pliny, Plato, Virgil and Horace whilst the works of the Latin agronomists Cato, Palladius, Varro and Columella are all represented. Other books of interest include Slezer’s *Theatrum Scotiae*, Sinclair’s *Hydrostaticks*, de Caus’s *Treatise of Waterworks*, Burnett’s *Theory of the Earth* and Mackenzie’s *Moral Essay*.  
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ageing Yester home.\footnote{For a detailed history of Yester see Dunbar, J., "The Building of Yester House, 1670-1878," \textit{The Transactions of the East Lothian Antiquarian and Field Naturalists Society}, vol. 13, 1972, pp.20-43; for Bruce's involvement see p.21.} For reasons unknown the Earl chose not to pull down the house but settled instead upon embellishing its grounds. By the following September the estate was emparked and it was very probably around this time that Tweeddale added a large semi-octagonal walled garden to the south side of the house. Though long since removed and refashioned, the appearance of the garden and park are recorded in a remarkable set of five paintings prepared by an unknown artist probably in 1699 when the house, which is also shown, was at last demolished to make way for a new mansion designed by James Smith (for three of the paintings see figs. 3.36, 3.37 and 3.38 - for the layout of the estate see fig. 3.39).\footnote{Three of these are retained at Yester whilst the remainder are owned though not displayed by the National Portrait Gallery for Scotland.} It seems that Tweeddale was responsible for designing not only the layout of his park,\footnote{In September 1671 the Earl informed his son that "my parke will be closed within this month and I am desining som long walks in it, if you pleas to send me the breadth of the walks in St James Park, both the largest as that be the Pell Mel, and that we walked in beyon the cannal, and also of the narrower, it will help me much" (Yester MSS, MS7106/99/6/1a). Seeds were obtained from the London nurserymen and garden designers, London and Wise, and shrubs and trees from Holland and the royal gardens in Paris (Yester MSS, MS14641/vi).} but very probably his garden also, as the flower parterres are taken from John Rea's \textit{Flora, Ceres et Pomona} (1676 - fig. 3.40), of which Tweeddale possessed a copy.\footnote{Rea's book may have informed other parts of the garden. He advises, for example, that "for a kitchen garden a place more remote will be requisite" (p.3). This may be the reason that kitchen gardens were located west of the ornamental garden and alongside the main park entrance at Gifford (remnants of which still survive). Tweeddale's copy of the \textit{Statue antique di Roma} (n.d.) may have inspired him to commission from James Smith in 1686 four stone pedestals for lead statues (Yester MSS, MS14637/41/1b).} Indeed, the Earl seems to have remained alive to innovative ideas, since he added at a later point two notable ornamental features to his policies.

The first was a highly unusual maze-mount that surely derived from a very similar feature created in 1690 within the grounds of Sorgvliet near Le Hague (figs. 3.41 and 3.42).\footnote{For the development of Sorgvliet see Jacques D., and van der Horst, A., \textit{The Gardens of William and Mary}, London, 1988, pp.154-62; Hunt J. and de Jong, E., \textit{The Anglo-Dutch Garden in the Age of William and Mary}, London, 1988; and Bezemer-Sellers, V., "The Bentinck Garden at Sorgvliet" in Hunt, J. (ed.), \textit{The Dutch Garden in the Seventeenth Century}, Washington D.C., 1990, pp.99-129. Mazes were popular in later-17th-century Holland, and after the accession of William of Orange a number were created in England. A maze at Hampton Court was laid out after 1689 and "inspired a number of copies" (Pennick, N., \textit{Mazes and Labyrinths}, London, 1990, p.148), most notably at Broadlane Hall and West Park (Jacques, "Grand Manner," vol 1, p.129). A famous maze was also laid out by Mansart for Louis XIV at Versailles during the 1670s and was described in 1677 by Charles Perrault in \textit{The Building of Yester House, 1670-1878}, \textit{The Transactions of the East Lothian Antiquarian and Field Naturalists Society}, vol. 13, 1972, pp.20-43; for Bruce's involvement see p.21.}
Tweeddale could have known of this renowned Dutch garden through engravings\(^1\) or by acquaintance with its creator and owner, Hans Willem Bentinck, Earl of Portland and Surveyor of the Royal Gardens for William III.\(^2\)

The second feature was an impressive cascade-house (fig. 3.44). Emanating from a triumphal arch, water fell as a broad sheet behind an exedra of five arches and into a canted basin with a central fountain, from which it passed along a narrow channel beneath four arcing *jets d’eau* and cascaded into a short canal (also of probable Dutch inspiration). Building accounts record that in 1708 “the sol[?] of the door to the water hole at ye grotto” was being repaired and two years later the “cascade” was renewed.\(^3\) An earlier-18th century estate survey locates this “grotto” at the head of the cascade.\(^4\) Hence, it may be suggested firstly that it would have been possible to enter the cascade-house-cum-grotto and there contemplate the source of the crashing water; and secondly that, to judge by the saplings depicted around the canal, the cascade-house

---

*Labyrinths de Versailles* (Pennick, Mazes, p.148). Given that mazes as an ornamental feature were becoming *retardataire* in Restoration England and very probably Scotland by the latter-half of the 17th century, it is possible that Tweeddale’s creation of a maze as well as a canal, and a proposal for a “littel orang hous” (apparently the first in Scotland) was a public declaration of loyalty to the Dutch king, since “good Whigs distinguished their loyalty by fetching their plans from the same country, which had the honour of producing their king” (see article no. 15 by ‘Mr Coventry’ in *The World* magazine, 12 April 1753. For the orangery see Yester MSS, MSS7026-7, letter from Tweeddale to his son, dated 24 December 1685). The Dutch, were the technical masters of the greenhouse and the translation of Jan Commelin’s *Nederlantze Hesperides* (Amsterdam, 1676) in 1683 may well have encouraged Tweeddale, as it did many other nobles, to construct one. For the history of orangeries see Woods, M. and Warren, A., *Glasshouses*, London, 1988, and Saudan, M., and Saudan-Skira, S., *Orangeries: Palaces of Glass, Their History and Development*, Köln, 1994.

\(^1\) The gardens were recorded in a series of prints made by van de Avelen between 1691 and 1698 - see Hunt and de Jong, *Anglo-Dutch Garden*, p.168. A plan of a circle-within-a-square maze is also contained within Commelin’s *Nederlantze Hesperides* (see p.145).

\(^2\) For communication between the two earls see for example Yester MSS, MS7015/36. Tweeddale might also have learnt of the garden from either of his sons who fought in the Low Countries between 1692 and 1694 during the War of the Grand Alliance, and of whom one visited King William’s garden at Het Loo (Yester MSS, MS7014/40 and variously MSS7014-6).

\(^3\) Yester MSS, MS14651/82 and MS14651/90. For accounts of work to a “new fountaine in the gardine,” (probably a replacement for that depicted in the paintings), a “stairr att the wildersness,” a “step at the wester summerhous,” and for “39 bolls of grein colourer in the summer house” (the latter two probably refer to the summerhouse surmounting the mound) see Yester MSS, MS1465151-82.

\(^4\) Gough MSS, MSa.4 fol.23, and MSa.4 fol.39r. These are an undated and unsigned survey of, and plan for, the Yester gardens (figs. 3.45 and 3.46). The Gough index attributes the designs to Bridgeman but their simple, rigid forms suggest that they are more probably the work of a lesser designer - perhaps William Boutcher whose stiff style they seem to reflect. I am grateful to Dr. David Jacques for his comments on these drawings.
was created some short time before the pictures, that is, very probably in the early 1690s. If this was the case - and it seems likely - then the cascade and the classical building that surmounts it may predate the earliest English examples created at Chatsworth in 1694 and 1702 respectively.\(^1\)

Continental influence may therefore be suspected. Perhaps the most likely source is an engraving by Barrière of the Villa Doria Pamphili (fig. 3.43). This was published some short time after 1666 and depicts a classical cascade-house comprising of a single arch set over a crescent of five niches, flanked by a fountain and connected to a large pool by a long thin cascade that is flanked by two rows of trees.\(^2\) Though hardly identical to that at Yester, there is something of a family resemblance between the two cascades and their *châteaux d’eau* and it is easy to accept that they may in some way be related. Indeed the parallels between the pictures’ *staffage* seems almost to confirm this suspicion. Yet it is neither its appearance nor its source that is the most significant feature of this cascade, it is its location, for it is set outside of the garden enclosure.

Interest in the open landscape had been growing steadily throughout the century, an interest that can be discerned most clearly in the rich pastoral descriptions contained in contemporary retirement poetry and popular novels.\(^3\) Indeed, that so many Royalists withdrew to their country estates during the Commonwealth must have done much to foster an affection for

---

1 A cascade also featured at Drumlanrig. An instruction from the Duke of Queensberry to his gardener, James Naismith dated 22nd October 1698, asks that he “make a seat opposite the Caskade and place two or three seats in that walk at proper distances and one at the further end of it” (ex. inf: Mrs Fiona Jamieson). Its appearance is not specified nor is it clear whether it was located within the gardens or the park.

2 For Barrière and the Villa Doria Pamphili see Coffin, *Papal Rome*, pp.154, 156, 162. Though neither engravings of Roman gardens by Barrière, nor the more popular Giovanni Battista Falda, are recorded in the Yester library catalogue, Tweeddale seems nonetheless to have had an interest in the villas of Latium since at least one work of 1659 treated in three volumes of the *Palazzi piu celebri di Roma*.

3 For an evaluation of pastoral imagery in 17th-century retirement poems see generally Fowler, A., *The Country House Poem: A Cabinet of Seventeenth-Century Estate Poems and Related Items*, Edinburgh, 1994, most significant French garden poem of the period was René Rapin’s *Of Gardens*. Published in 1666 it was translated seven years later by John Evelyn. The work dwells at length on rural retirement and is enriched with descriptions of wild nature. Arcadian novels popular in the late-17th century include Longinus’s, *Daphnis and Chloe* (translated from Greek to French in 1559); du Bartas’s, *Eden* (1584 and trans. 1598); Jacopo Sannazar’s *Arcadia* (1504); Jorge de Montemayor’s *Diana* (c.1599 trans. 1598); Ariosto’s *Orlando Furioso* (1532 trans. 1591); Tasso’s *Gerusalemme Liberata* (1551 trans. 1594); and Sir Philip Sidney’s *The Countess of Pembroke’s Arcadia* (1590). The interest in the countryside seems also to be reflected in the growing popularity of landscape paintings (Ogden, H. and Ogden, M., *English Taste in Landscape in the Seventeenth Century*, Michigan, 1955, especially pp.36, 134-41).
the open countryside. The opinions of the 1st Earl of Strathmore may have been typical when, during the late-1680s, he expressed his delight at Glamis Castle in Angus being “inviround on all syds to the south with runing water which in my apprehensione is very delightful yet no considering man will now censure it as a marish place or unwholesome for that cause.” Indeed Strathmore bound these burns into the fabric of his new garden so that “when you are walking you’ll behold the water runing [sic] in both sydes of the planting.12

Conveniently, classical sanction both for raw nature and the agricultural landscape could be found in Renaissance treatises. Alberti’s De re aedificatoria - which remained current at the Restoration and for some time after3 - recommends a “city, town, stretch of coast, or plain... the peaks of some unstable hills or mountains, delightful gardens and attractive haunts for fishing and hunting” as the most appropriate views for a private villa;4 whilst Roman philosophers and poets all stressed the benefits of an active country life as being essential to a person’s moral well-being, and acclaimed the agricultural landscape as testimony to such noble toil. Thus, Evelyn could praise the worthiest of Romans as being those “who disdained not to cultivate... rusticities even with their own hands,”5 and could foster the creation of an Elysium Britannicum through the

---


4 Alberti, De re aedificatoria, p.145. For “rooms used by the Prince for receiving guests and for dining” Alberti recommends a “view over sea, hills or broad landscape” (ibid., p.120).

5 Evelyn, J., Silva or a Discourse of Forest Trees, 5th edn., London, 1729 (first published 1664), p.i. Evelyn’s comment was paraphrased 35 years later by Lord Belhaven who impressed upon “the farmers in East Lothian” that “the Romans thought it no Disparagement to take their Generals from the Plough and they thought it no dishonour to return to the same again”, and offered literary justification by quoting “two famous courtiers, Horace and Buchanan” (Lord Belhaven, The Country-Man’s Rudiments, Edinburgh, 1699, facing p.A3).
planting of trees and the enclosure of fields. Slowly it became accepted that “a most laudable thing, and most pleasant, [was] to behold from one’s window, many a well tilled acre, whether it [was] meadowland, willow plantations or ploughed fields,” and by the later-17th century a classical veil had been cast not only across the garden but the agricultural landscape as well.

Indeed, in Restoration Scotland there were no financial benefits to be had from land improvement. Rather it was the fashionable pursuit of an intellectual and aesthetic beau idéal that lead to enclosure and planting. It may be suggested, therefore, that Tweeddale would have seen nothing anachronistic in placing the canal, cascade and cascade-house within an agricultural landscape (albeit enclosed within decorative stock fencing), for both were two sides of the same antique coin. Indeed, by creating such an ornament the Earl established not only a direct visual dialogue between the garden and the surrounding estate, but also a place from which his vast pastoral idyll could be directly experienced.

This visual relationship between a garden and the wider landscape had been pioneered in Scotland by Bruce at Balcaskie and Kinross during the 1670s and ‘80s. Aligning the principal axes of each on the Bass Rock and Lochleven Castle respectively, Bruce must have been seeking the visual satisfaction of terminating an important view on an object rather than leaving it open. However, it seems very likely that he would also have been aware of the emblematic qualities of

---


2 Charles Estienne, Praedum rusticum (1554), translated by Richard Surfleet in 1600 as Maison Rustique or the Countrie Farm, London, 1600, p. 222. This substantial work, some 730 pages in length, was quickly circulated in Scotland: shortly after its publication, Sir John Lindsay of Edzell sent a copy of Maison Rustique (along with Columella’s De re agriculturae) to his brother at Balcarres in Fife to assist him in his planting there. For the historical alliance of the art of gardening with agricultural improvement see Lambin, D., “Pleasure with Profit: some Aspects of Landscape Gardening,” Garden History, vol 3, no.2, 1983, pp.29-36.


5 This idea was not new: as early as 1600 the termination of a vista with an object was recommended in Olivier de Serres’s Le théâtre d’agriculture et mesnages des champs.
both features: the Bass Rock as a reference to Alberti’s recommendation, that a “private villa” should “have within [its] sight the peaks of some unstable hills”;\(^1\) the castle as a reminder of the nation’s tumultuous past. There can be little doubt, therefore, that when Bruce proposed an “amphitheatre” for outside the south-eastern corner of his Kinross garden, he was intending to create a feature that was clearly Antique within a landscape that was identifiably classical.\(^2\) The proposed amphitheatre indicates clearly that from at least the early-1680s Scotland’s most advanced and influential garden designer was prepared to make use of architectonic features beyond the garden walls. Sadly, the feature was never created. However, it seems possible that Bruce may have influenced the erection of a fine, monumental column beyond the gardens of Panmure.

The column is a splendid design of considerable sophistication (fig. 3.47). Set on a swept base, its polished, yellow ashlar-work rises some 50 feet to a moulded cope crowned by a large, swaged urn. The diamond-pointed rustication of the pilasters advances from the delicately panelled body of the column and alternates with continuous pulvinated bands that strap the facets together.

Inscribed about its top are the names “James Earl of Panmure” (that is James Maule the 4th Earl) and “Countess Margaret” (the youngest daughter of the Duke of Hamilton) with the date “1694.” This choice of year is puzzling since it seems not to have been an especially significant one in the lives of the Panmures.\(^3\) Rather it appears to mark a major phase of

---

\(^1\) Alberti, *De re aedificatoria*, p.145.

\(^2\) The feature is indicated on Bruce’s plan for the garden, a copy of which is held at NMRS. The concept of a rounded auditorium embraced in the landscape dates from Antiquity, and was revived in the Renaissance by Raphael who created a semi-circular auditorium within the policies of the Villa Madama. This seems to be the earliest expression of the feature in either a Scottish or an English garden plan.

\(^3\) Certainly the persistent tradition amongst secondary sources that the structure is a ‘marriage column’ may be discounted, the couple were wed in 1687. Indeed, whatever the column’s qualities, the delicate grace that is surely required of a symbol of affection can hardly be counted amongst them.
improvements to both the house and policies. These improvements must be outlined in order for
the significance of the column to be understood, and for this a brief digression is required.

A set of survey notes dated November 10th 1694\(^1\) detail the “Extent of Young Planting”
that had recently been undertaken at Panmure and notes intentions for further work in that year.
The notes record that some 50,000 trees covering 128 acres had been planted in blocks and
avenues interspersed with meadows, and that a parterre and “Cherrie Garden” were set close by
the house.\(^2\) The layout is vividly described by Macky:

“The Palace of Penmure [is] in the middle of a great Wood. You go up to the
House thro’ an Avenue, cut thro’ the Wood, of half a Mile in Length and 150
foot broad, which gives you a view of the House at once. And on each side of the
Avenue is a fine Hedge which reaches the Branches of the Trees of the Wood. At
the end of the Avenue is a large circular outer Court for Coaches to turn in, and
the inner Court is ballustraded with Iron on each side, which gives you a View of
the delicious Gardens... From these Gardens there are eight or nine Visto’s cut
thro’ the Wood, with ballustrades of Iron at every Visto, and all the Doors of
Iron.”\(^3\)

The broad lines of this landscape were still in place almost a century later when they were
recorded in the 1804 survey (fig. 3.48).

\(^1\) GD45/18/753.

\(^2\) They note planting at the “West Avenew which is betwixt Gaits,” the “Diagonall Walks in the Avenew Thicketes,”
the “East Avenew from East Plantation to the Park East Wall” and the “North Avenew,” as well as the plantations
of “Gooldie... Gallowhill... Balhar... and Clirie” and go on to note the presence of numerous meadows. Within the
gardens the notes specify a large parterre, “Chirie Garden” and orchard all enclosed within walls totalling over
6000 feet, and details a “Quadrangle betwixt West Avenew and Gardens, [and] a semicircle extended the length
and breed thereof” - see ibid.

\(^3\) Macky, Journey, p.99.
It seems likely that the landscape was laid out by Alexander Edward (1651-1708). Edward was a minister in the Fife village of Kemback from 1682 until he was dispossessed as an Episcopalian seven years later. His father, the minister for Murroes in Angus, had an interest in astronomy and cartography, and was patronised by the Maule family. As early as 1685 Alexander was exploring his interests in design, assisting Sir William Bruce in the preparation of plans for the house and grounds of Kinross. The two worked once more at Kinnaird Castle, Angus, in 1695-7, and Melville House, Fife, in 1697. However, in the early-1690s Edward seems to have worked independently at Panmure, most probably in pursuit of a new living as an architect and landscaper.

Edward was at Panmure on the 8 June 1694 when he prepared and witnessed the contract between the Earl and Tobias Bachop (a mason closely associated with Bruce) for alterations and additions to the house. Although he was still describing himself as the “Minister of Kemback,” given his experience at Kinross it seems highly likely that Edward had some bearing on the improvements underway that year. His influence may be suspected firstly from a list of fruit trees planted in the gardens at Panmure and Brechin prepared by Edward and formerly contained in a volume of historical memoranda within the Panmure library, and secondly from the similarity between certain unusual landscape components used at Panmure and Kinnaird. The Kinnaird drawings are a mixture of both proposals and planting guides, and whilst Bruce had considerable involvement in the designs for the house, Edward contributed freely (perhaps exclusively) to those for the grounds. Common to both estates is the use of rond-points, tall hedges lining avenues,

2 NMRS - AND/37/30-41. It is worth noting that Edward designed the terraces at Kinnaird expressly to provide “a very good view of the country” (see marginalia of plan AND/37/31).
3 GD45/18/614/14, contract “betwixt James Earle of Panmure & Tobias Bachop, Mason in Alloa” to undertake a variety of alterations and additions to the house, and witnessed by “Mr Alexr Edward Minister of Kemback [and] R. Young,” signed 8 June 1694.
5 Lowrey, Edward, pp.5-17.
and semi-circular planting along the main axis. However, if these were to some extent becoming stock features of the garden designer’s repertoire at this time, the use of water-filled boundary ditches, which Edward recommended, was more esoteric. At Kinnaird, Edward proposed to enclose the main avenue with ditches eight feet wide whilst encompassing an unidentified structure with a “Ring Stanck,” that is a flooded ditch, (which if ever executed has long since disappeared - fig. 3.49). Both of these features are anticipated at Panmure, where there survives a long, masonry-lined ditch enclosing planting to the north of the site of the house. This is presumably the feature recorded in accounts of 1694 as circumscribing “The North avenew stanked on the east from cross wall to Clirie and Clirie ther Damed bak to north wall of the Park.” The same account also notes that “Ther is a Ditch without Hedge in Goldie Parks, East Avenew and without the Gardens” with the East Avenue measuring 230 feet “Betwixt ditches.”

An accreditation of at least some part of the design of the landscape at Panmure seems assured when we consider the contents of a letter signed by Edward and addressed to the Earl of Mar and sent care of Harry Maule, the brother of Lord Panmure. The correspondence was written in Haver le Grace whilst Edward was visiting the Continent during 1702. Edward’s journey was undertaken on behalf of a small cohort of Scottish patrons in order to “view, observe

---

1 Ibid., p.4. See also copies of plans at NMRS (AND/37/33-4).

2 GD45/18/753. The use of ditches is of especial interest for it may be an exceptionally early deployment of what was to be termed the ‘ha-ha.’ In their use as boundaries these ditches possess at least one of the requisite functions of a ha-ha. At Kinnaird its other important characteristic - that of allowing unimpeded views - is not exploited since the ditches are coupled with hedges that rob them of such a benefit. At Panmure on the other hand, they seem to have supplemented the railed clairvoiées and provided for expansive views across the meadows that lined the East Avenue. The ha-ha evolved in part from the use of canals as non-visual boundaries in French gardens, and whilst it was first introduced to the British public in John James’s translation of Dezallier d’Argenville’s La théorie et la pratique du jardinage (1709, translated 1712) its use in England can be traced to that constructed at Levens Hall in Cumbria which was laid out by a French gardener around 1695 or perhaps to Althorp in Northamptonshire (see Fletcher, A., “An Early Ha-Ha?,” Garden History, vol.19, no.2, 1991, pp.146-54). Although it has come to be regarded as a dry trench, the ha-ha continued on occasion to be flooded to form a wet ditch - a form which was credited by Stephen Switzer in his influential work Iconographia Rustica: or the Nobleman, Gentleman, and Gardener’s Recreation (3 vols., London, 1718) as “the beautifullest of all Fences” (ibid., vol.2, p.165). Given that the ditches around Clirie Wood were “stanked” and “Damed” and a “Ring Stanck” was planned for Kinnaird, it is tempting to credit Edward with one of the earliest uses of a form of ha-ha in Britain.

3 GD124/15/219. The letter is dated 7 July 1702.
and take draughts of the most curious and remarkable houses, edifices, gardings, orchards, parks, plantations, land improvements, coall works, mines, waterworks and other curiosities of nature and art." Edward was thrilled by much of what he observed in France, not least because many of the country's fashionable garden features were also current in Scotland, and, more especially, Panmure. He writes that "the royall forrests are cut in long crossing walks for hunting as those at Panmure," and, crucially, that the gardens of French houses "use Grass eather at utter or Inner Court as I proposed at Panmure." It seems likely, therefore, that the designed landscape was the earliest independent work of Edward, and that it was Edward's intention to integrate in a structured way the array of enclosed gardens with the grounds beyond, through railings and wet-ditches used as clairvoiées, and along avenues into surrounding woods and fields. For the most part these avenues terminated in cabinets, however, the rusticated pier must have been raised as a great sculpted lode-stone to lure the eye across the landscape. Whether its design was by Edward is a moot point. Though more at ease with landscaping, Edward could lend his hand to architectural designs. However, his buildings were never remarkable and it is to another that the column's design may be credited. Its appearance recalls work by Bruce. The cluster of pilasters belted on to a square body by pulvinated banding is similar to the piers that punctuate the garden walls of Kinross (fig. 3.50), whilst the diamond-pointed rustication, though illustrated in Serlio, was previously only executed in Scotland at Balcaskie in Fife, Bruce's first house, on the bases of the piers of the north gate (fig. 3.51). Moreover, Bruce was being consulted on other architectural work at Panmure around this time. His advice was sought in 1693 for the "offices which are yet to build," and his opinions seem to have been heeded for the offices were attached by convex quadrants - an unusual feature that was later incorporated within Bruce's design for Hopetoun.4

1 GD124/16/24.
2 GD124/15/219.
3 GD29/1944.
Furthermore, Tobias Bachop, who was Bruce’s preferred mason, and builder of the gate-piers at Kinross, was at work at Panmure between 1694 and 1699.¹

Conclusion

In summary, therefore, as the formal gardens of Restoration Scotland grew in size they became filled with a greater volume and variety of architectural ornament. For the most part this comprised of gazebos or seats, much in line with advice contained in horticultural publications. However, on occasion other types of buildings were created, such as grottoes and aviaries. Significantly, as a taste for the ‘Grand Manner’ grew and the visual envelope of the garden spread into the surrounding parks and woodland, features such as cascades, cascade houses and

¹ GD45/18/614, six contracts with Tobias Bachop, mason in Alloa, 1694-9. There is no record of the construction of the column within the estate papers. Nor is mention made of the column in a “Copy of a short account of the life of James Earle of Panmure done by himself” although Panmure does note that following “a great scarcity of corn in Scotland occasioned by bad crops which induced poor people to great straits” he employed “more men about his improvements than he would otherwise have done” (Saltoun MSS, MS17804). Rather, the only structure recorded as being raised within the policies at this time is a gate designed and built by James Smith. On the 3rd of April 1693 James Smith presented a receipt to the Earl of Panmure for “the summe of five pounds starting and yt to acot and in parte payment of ane newe gate which I was obliged to build according to ye desigene [thereof] Signed by my Loship” (GD45/18/613). Smith employed James Horn, “Smith in the Abbey of Hollierood House”, to fashion a “good and sufficient weel wrought irone gate” and in October of that year witnessed the contract between the blacksmith and the Earl (GD45/18/612a, contract between Earl of Panmure and James Horn, witnessed by James Smith, 6th October 1693). Horn was to form the gate “according to the draught subscribysd by both parties” at no great a cost than “what was payed to him by the sd Sir William Bruce” (ibid.). Hewing of the posts was underway the same month (GD45/18/613, agreement by Smith to pay John Collier, 19th October 1693). For this Smith employed what appears to be a team of English masons headed by John Collier. Work was complete by June 1694, when Horn was paid the sum of £98 -10 ½ and the masons - after a little negotiation on Smith’s part - £12 Stirling over the unrecorded contract price (GD45/18/613c, receipt from Collier £12 Stirling “in full and compleat payment of the new gate wrought and sett up at Panmure by Mr James Smith, my Mastr,” 25th June 1694) for “the New gate wrought and sett up att Panmure by Mr James Smith” and “other workes they have done more than the gate” (see GD45/18/613, discharge to John Collier in “part payment of the amentioned gate wrought and sett up at Panmure” and GD45/18/613c, letter from Smith to Panmure requesting financial consideration for “what other workes they [the masons] have done more than the gate… so that they may cleare there debts in the country and be in conditione to leave the country without any persons grudge,” 22nd June 1694). Certainly the column is in the style of Smith and is broadly similar to others he designed for Traquair (fig. 3.52) and Hamilton (for the gate pier proposed by Smith for Traquair see NMRS - PBD/285/68/P and for Hamilton see NMRS - LAD/18/174). Another column seems once to have stood on the edge of woodland to the north. Of the Panmure policies Bishop Pococke records that “One vista to the west is adorned with a ruin through which a pillar appears.” Both the survey of 1804 (fig. 3.48) and the 2nd edition O.S. map of 1901 record the “pillar” to the immediate north of a mid-18th century sham-ruin located at the far corner of the north plantation. Today, all that remains of the column are blocks of moulded ashlar work perched upon a rubble stump, which are identical in size and section to those which form the base of the surviving column (fig. 3.53). This column may have been modified before 1764 when a “memorandum of work to be done at Panmure” noted that “a Runds[?] pillar [was] to be built where pointed out and the vase of the pillar which stood behind the ruins [was] to be put upon it” (GD45/18/2239/24). It must be recognised, therefore, that the Panmure column and its demolished counterpart may be Smith’s piers relocated. However, given that Smith’s structure bore an ironwork gate, which this column is neither designed to support nor shows evidence of, this seems unlikely.
columns were erected to offer accent and interest to the wider setting of the house and its garden. As walled enclosures were removed from around the mansion during the first decades of the 18th century and gardens expanded to form what might be termed designed landscapes, ornamental garden buildings grew in importance. Visually, they provided much-needed definition and relief, and practically they provided places to rest whilst visitors explored the full extent of the pleasure grounds. However, they also offered intellectual articulation of the estate, and to Augustan Britain, a period that revelled in realising the allegorical potential of all the Arts, this had ready appeal. And it is this quality that may now be explored.
CHAPTER FOUR

FROM THE UNION TO THE '45

Garden and Landscape Design in Early-Georgian Scotland

Neither the Union Treaty of 1707 nor the suppression of the final Jacobite rebellion in 1745 are of especial consequence to the development of ideas on architecture in Scotland. At the advent of the Union, Scottish buildings had long been articulated through the vocabulary and grammar of classicism; and by the mid-century, though it became more eloquently communicated with only a hint of provincial accent, that language had, for the most part, barely changed. Likewise, these dates do not mark outstanding years in the chronology of Scottish garden history - neither denote the commencement or completion of any seminal estate nor announce the birth or death of an important designer. However, they remain of benefit to this study for two reasons: firstly, they bracket, with some precision, an era of uncertain transformation in both the national identity and economic fortunes of Scotland; and secondly, they mark, with slightly less distinction, a period characterised by an unprecedented rate of change in attitudes towards the laying out of gardens and designed landscapes.

The history of garden and landscape design in earlier-18th-century England is well documented and need not be repeated here in any detail.¹ For the purposes of this thesis it is

sufficient only to identify five important trends. Firstly, the designs of gardens became grander in scale and more spartan in content, and as a result the demesnes of France became popular as models at the expense of those of the Low Countries. Secondly, though the broad lines of gardens remained largely regular, the plats and parterres they contained became less symmetrically disposed. Thirdly, avenues radiating from a garden tended to increase in number and extend still further across the surrounding countryside. Fourthly, there was a greater acceptance of, indeed desire to observe, open countryside. Finally, as the garden increased in size and its boundary walls became obscured by planting, punctuated with clairvoiées and railings, or, in some cases, replaced entirely by ha-has, the distinction between the garden and the enveloping estate became ever-less distinct. As in the previous century, garden design, like other arts, was informed by classical learning, whilst its iconographic potential continued to be realised with political, moral or literary programmes being communicated primarily through statuary and architecture.

The two most influential books on the subject of garden and landscape design to be published during the first four decades of the 18th century were Dezallier d'Argenville's *Theorie et pratique du jardinage* (1709 - published in translation in 1712 by John James as the *Theory and Practice of Gardening*) and Stephen Switzer's *The Nobleman, Gentleman, and Gardener's Recreation* (1715), which was enlarged three years later as *Ichnographia Rustica*. The first advises on garden design in the French mode, whilst the second recommends a more idiosyncratic style of gardening characterised by a regular structure formed from rectangular canals and long avenues interspersed with blocks of woodland, parkland and fields cut through and connected with both straight and winding walks. In simple terms the most notable demesnes of Augustan England fell more or less into or between these two styles - on the one hand d'Argenville's 'Baroque' garden and on the other what Switzer dubbed a "rural and extensive garden".
Regarding the use of ornamental structures within gardens and 'designed landscapes' d’Argenville recommends "Portico’s, Bowers, and Cabinets of Arbor-Work; Figures, Vases, and other Ornaments of Use in the Decoration and Embellishment of Gardens."¹ Switzer advises the use of an array of statues, "Springs and Waterworks,"² and, within the ‘rural and extensive garden’, a "large Statue, Banqueting House, Obelisk, or what the designer pleases"³ as a termination for an avenue (the earliest published advocation for a garden building beyond the core of the designed landscape). In his New Principles of Gardening (published in 1728 and broadly a development of the ideas of Switzer), Batty Langley capitulates a similar idea suggesting that avenues "are best finish’d with Mounts, Aviaries, Grotto’s, Cascades, Rocks, Ruins, Niches, or Amphitheatres of Evergreens,"⁴ with "Views of the Ruins of Buildings, after the old Roman manner, to terminate such Walks that end in disagreeable Objects"⁵ (the first published recommendation of the creation of ruins within gardens). However, much the most detailed advice was provided by Robert Morris, the pre-eminent theorist of contemporary Palladianism. Morris delivered a series of lectures in London during the early-1730s to a ‘Society for the Improvement of Arts and Sciences’ and in 1734 their text was published. Amongst these ‘Lectures on Architecture’ Morris makes a number of proposals for "little Fabricks erected in the Gardens of some Noble patron of the Arts."⁶ He notes that the principal aim of such buildings is the promotion of a “Chain of Thought” which in one situation "opens to the Mind a vast Field to entertain the Tongue or Pen of a Philosopher, to plunge into the deep Recesses of Nature." Writing of one design he recommends that “during the cooler Hours of Reflection, a Man might retire to contemplate the important Themes of Human Life” and that “recluse from gay Fancies,

² Switzer, Ichnographia Rustica., vol.1, p.288.
³ Ibid., vol.3, p.105.
⁵ Ibid., p.xv.
⁶ For this and the following quotations see Morris, R., “Lectures on Architecture (1734)” in TGOTP, pp.234-6
he might secrete himself, not envying the more External Grandeur of Power, or despising the humbler, or lower Class of Beings, to whom Providence or Fortune hath been less auspicious;”

Another building, Morris suggests, should be “decorated with those Embellishments” that raise “elevated Ideas.” He notes also the “ancient Romans” created “Temples, dedicated to their peculiar Gods” within their “Groves and Woods, which Art or Nature had made, with Vistas to them.” At the same time, the general instruction of these four authors might be enriched by the 60-or-so elevations of garden structures contained in the third volume of Colen Campbell’s *Vitruvius Britannicus* and the fourth by Badeslade and Roque (1739); William Kent’s *The Designs of Inigo Jones* (1727); James Gibbs’s *A Book of Architecture* (1728); Isaac Ware’s *The Designs of Inigo Jones and Others* (circa 1735); John Vardy’s *Some Designs of Mr Inigo Jones and Mr William Kent* (1744); and Batty Langley’s *Ancient Architecture Restored and Improved* (1742).

From the evidence of surviving plans and surveys it would appear that the practise of laying out gardens and designed landscapes evolved in early-Georgian Scotland much as it did in England. A brief description of two of the county’s most significant estates, each illustrated accurately and in detail by General Roy’s military survey (prepared *circa* 1746-55), may serve to illustrate this point.

The first is Hopetoun House near the fishing village of South Queensferry, ten miles west of Edinburgh (figs 4.1 and 4.2). The house was constructed for the 1st Earl of Hopetoun between 1699 and 1702 to the designs of Sir William Bruce, who, along with Alexander Edward, was also responsible for creating a formal garden and aligning the axis of the house on the Bass Rock - a large volcanic outcrop that rises dramatically from the River Forth thirty miles to the

---

east. Sometime during the 1720s, whilst undertaking remodelling work to the house, Scotland’s premier architect, William Adam, prepared a plan for refashioning the grounds along grand lines. Large, regular enclosures, extensive basins, blocks of planting cut through with meandering rides, a string of platoons, avenues, a *patte d’oie* and a fine wilderness were all disposed in a regular though unsymmetrical array around the house to a scale that was Baroque in conception and may well have drawn on advice within d’Argenville for certain of its details. Comparing the plan with Roy’s survey it would appear that by the mid-century Adam’s proposal had been largely executed.

The second is Newhailes House, a modest villa near Musselburgh built around 1686 by and for the architect, James Smith. Though Smith no doubt created gardens around his home, the extensive grounds as depicted by Roy were most likely laid out during the course of the earlier-18th century by Sir David Dalrymple who bought the estate in 1709 (the precise date of the work is not known) and, though smaller than those at Hopetoun, could nonetheless be properly termed ‘rural and extensive’ (fig. 4.3). The house is flanked by deep blocks of woodland cut with vistas, whilst to the south-west a long axial avenue runs parallel to a slender canal. To the north-east, a grass plat extends to a canted bastion that provides unimpeded views from the house across an open horseshoe-shaped field to the sea beyond. To the north a raised walk cuts through the field to provide extensive views across the arable landscape and leads to a walk within the boundary planting that returns along a bosky dell through which a winding stream spills into a series of three geometric pools. In all, even if the designer of the landscape was not inspired directly by *Ichnographia Rustica*, his work may nonetheless be considered a response to Switzer’s enquiry as to why if a man’s

---

1 RHP 6800, “A General Plan of Hopetoun Parks and Gardens” (undated) by William Adam.

2 Plate 6, “A Parterre after ye English Manner” is close in appearance to that which was created on the west parterre at Hopetoun. Although the parterre is now grassed over the outline of the original scrolls and escallops can still be discerned in dry weather conditions.
“grounds were handsomely divided by Avenues and Hedges; and if the little Walks and Paths that ought to run through and betwixt them, were made either of Gravel or Sand; and if there were Trees for Shades with little Walks and purling Streams, mix’d and incorporated one with another, what cou’d be more diverting? And why, is not a level easy Walk of Gravel or Sand shaded over with Trees and running thro’ a Corn Field or Pasture Ground, as pleasing as the largest Walk in the most magnificent garden one can think of?”

To judge by the array of buildings that were specified within Adam’s plan for Hopetoun and that which survives as a ruin at Newhailes, the deployment of ornamental structures, as advised by d’Argenville, Switzer, Langley and Morris, was well understood in Scotland.

At Hopetoun, Adam specified an “Arcade and Temple Faceing A part of the Cannal and South Walk of Parterre”; an “Arbour of Trillage Work faceing the North Wall of the parterre”; a “Grotto with a cannal of Watter”; a “Boulling Green with arcade Faceing it. And Green House behind Faceing a Little Garden”; and a “pillar of the Corinthian Order to be done in the best Manner on which is design’d King George’s Statue”; with the ruinous “old Tower of Stoneyhill” specified for retention as a termination for one of the estate’s main avenues. At Newhailes, a small, classical summerhouse straddles the Brunstane Burn at the edge of a wooded dell to the north of the house (fig. 4.4). Much of the summerhouse has now fallen and its walls are encapsulated with ivy, when complete, however, its main face most likely consisted of a squat, rusticated arch beneath a tall aediculed window that was probably topped by a pediment (fig. 4.5). It was, in essence, a modest copy of the tall, square temples that terminate the Palladian bridges of Wilton (1737), Stowe (1739) and Prior Park (1755) and in this respect it was the only...

---

2 See the instructions that form part of William Adam’s “General Plan of Hopton House and Gardens”
such imitation in Scotland. The date of the summerhouse is not recorded but it may be attributed to the first half of the 18th century on stylistic grounds, not just because of its well-mannered facade but also because the polished band course that divides the arch from the room above is inscribed with the words “Nos Humilem” - a reference, most probably, to Horace’s Odes ii.17.32, in which he writes of his relationship with his patron Maecenas, contrasting his own humble mode of life with Maecenas’s more public image.

To judge by the surviving fragments of Adam’s “Arcade” at Hopetoun (which were recast in the late-18th century to form a covered seat to the south-west of the house) and, to a lesser extent, the derelict remains of the summerhouse at Newhailes, as in previous centuries, the design of garden architecture could be of a high quality. However, what is arguably more interesting than the appearance of the buildings at Hopetoun and Newhailes, is their location, for at each estate they seem to have been sited specifically to provide extensive views of open nature. At Hopetoun, the arcade, temple and arbour were to be placed on “riseing Ground” in order to command “a view own the River Forth to Northberwick Law,” whilst the summerhouse at Newhailes was angled to focus attention along the riparian woodland. Indeed, the landscapes themselves were apparently designed to provide extensive views of nature. The main avenue at Hopetoun carried “Your Eye over Two Myles of the River Forth to the Isleand and Ruins of Inchgarvie and from thence forward along the River 22 Miles more to North Berwick Law”, a

---

1 For Wilton, Stowe and Prior Park see Mowl, Palladian Bridges, pp.23-35.
2 There is no mention of the construction of the teahouse amongst papers relating to Newhailes though it is recorded as being overhauled in the 19th century (McQueen, W., Newhailes House and Estate: Historical Research Project Report, unpublished, 1995, p.37).
3 Despite its last two letters being partly erased, the second word reads as ‘Humilem’. ‘Nos’ means ‘we’ and ‘humilis’ is the adjective meaning ‘humble/small/low-lying’ and so on. ‘Humilem’ is the form of the adjective that would agree with a noun acting as the object of the verb in the sentence, hence a sentence such as ‘we [have built a] humble [house]’ would start in Latin with the words ‘nos humilem’. This pair of words occurs in Horace in the last line of one of his Odes as “nos humilem foriemus aequalam”, that is, ‘we will sacrifice a humble lamb’. The ode of which it forms a part dilates on Horace’s relationship to Maecenas, and it seems likely, therefore, that in recalling these words the builder of the summerhouse may have been suggesting his own particular circumstance. I am very grateful to Dr Roy Pinkerton, Associate Dean of the Faculty of Arts at the University of Edinburgh, for the translation and source of this quotation.
"Large Circle", on the other hand, was created upon “the Sommet of the Ground in the Avenue” to the west of the house to provide a “Prospect of the River Forth and Country on both sides”; and nearby was raised a “Mount with a banck and Ever Green Wilderness round From whence a Prospect of the whole River and Country as Farr as the Eye can Surve[y].” At Newhailes, it will be remembered, that the raised terrace walk, was created apparently to afford elevated views of the parkland, whilst an opening was left in the boundary planting to offer long views out to the sea. Indeed, another structure - a gazebo at Duff House in Banffshire - also provides views of the open countryside (figs. 4.10 and 4.11). The work once more of William Adam, this elegant, ashlar gazebo, with curving walls, bell-cast roof and delicate perron, was constructed sometime between 1739 and 1743. It is set on an island in the winding River Deveron and was probably used by fishing parties both for shelter and for dining. However, the banqueting room (which is raised over the preparation area that forms the basement) would have served as much to focus visitors’ attention on the delightful views of the Deveron that laps at either side. At Achnacarry in Inverness-shire, there exists the ruinous remains of a square, two-storey, stone gazebo. Though its date is unknown it was certainly in place in 1746 when it was burnt by Hanoverian troops. The lower floor of the gazebo straddles a path that runs along the side of the River Arkaig, whilst the room above, like the banqueting chamber at Duff, provides fine river views.

This appreciation of untended nature was indebted almost entirely to recent advancements in the understanding of natural philosophy. From the mid-17th century,
aestheticians evolved from Platonic philosophy a particular theory of beauty. They postulated that since common nature had been ruined, first by the Fall and then by the Flood, an original, perfect form of nature, la belle nature, was theoretically possible. In 1687, this theory was offered scientific support with the publication of Sir Isaac Newton's Philosophiae naturalis principia mathematica. From his studies through microscope and telescope, Newton revealed order within the variety of the universe - an order that was interpreted as being la belle nature beneath the chaos of the visible landscape. Thus, if ideal nature was present in common nature, then rivers, mountains and fields merited at least some appreciation. Newtonian theory and its influence on the appreciation of nature was understood in Scotland by the end of the 17th century and native opinion is neatly summarised by Sir George Mackenzie, who considered that

"those who expect excellency in all parts of this curious Fabrick, do not understand wherein its symmetrie consists. All the strings of an Instrument sound not equally high and yet they make up harmony... what we think deformities, were placed there as patches, and are no more blemishes, than the spots are to the Leopard."

However, the best-known evidence of this fresh appreciation of nature is found in the work of the poet, James Thomson. Born and raised in Ednam, Roxburghshire, Thomson went on to study at the University of Edinburgh, where he came into close contact with Newtonian philosophy. It is perhaps not surprising therefore, that within his most acclaimed work - The Seasons (published in four parts between 1726 and 1730) - Thomson pioneered in poetry the rich and vivid description of landscape. And there can be no doubt that his poetry was informed by boyhood memories - his account of a winter's thaw, for example, is evocative of many a Scottish scene:

"Muttering, the Winds at Eve, with blunted Point,
Blow hollow-blustering from the South. Subdu'd,
The Frost resolves into a trickling Thaw."
Spotted the Mountains shine; loose Sleet descends,
And floods the Country round. The Rivers swell,
Of Bonds impatient. Sudden from the Hills,
O'er Rocks and Woods, in broad brown Cataracts,
A thousand snow-fed Torents shoot at once;
And, where they rush, the wide-resounding Plain
Is left one slimy Waste..."1

Now, Switzer considered that his readers should "think it more entertaining to be some times on the Precipice of a Hill viewing all round and under us, and at other times in a Bottom, viewing those goodly Hills and Theatres of Wood and Corn that are above us, and present themselves every where to our View."2 As a result he recommends that an avenue should lead from the garden "quite a cross the Valleys up the rising Hills on each side, up to a large Center, which if the view be there stopp'd may be placed... [a] Banqueting House"3 which could be used at least in part to provide extensive sheltered views of the surrounding countryside. It can hardly be claimed, therefore, that the buildings at Hopetoun, Newhailes, Duff and Achnacarry were especially unusual in the way that they focused attention on open countryside. However, an examination of the only other gazebos to have survived from the early-18th-century, suggests something more, something unusual, perhaps even unique. An examination of the best examples of this country’s early-18th-century gazebos indicates unequivocally that there existed in Augustan Scotland a particular predilection for views not just of nature, but nature in its most rugged forms - a preference not only for rolling hills and meandering rivers but for deep precipices and raging torrents, features that a later generation was to dub ‘sublime’. It is to the

---


3 Ibid, pp.104-5.
examination of what is apparently a peculiarly Scottish phenomenon that the remainder of this chapter is dedicated.

Gazebos, Wild Nature and Patriotic Landscapes

Just 30 ornamental structures built during the first half of the 18th century survive within Scotland’s gardens and designed landscapes. Of these, one is a tower, one a temple and one a chapel; two are obelisks; six are dovecotes, six are mausolea, and the remaining 13 are gazebos. The tower, temple, chapel, dovecotes and mausolea are each of greater or lesser interest and all are mentioned in varying degrees of detail below. However, from this slender sample it is gazebos that form the majority and it is from the form and siting of these buildings that a most notable pattern emerges.

Of the 13 gazebos, those at Balgonie Castle in Fife (1717); Polton in Midlothian (c.1730?); Monkredding in Ayrshire (late-17th century); Learney House in Kincardineshire (early-18th century - fig. 4.7); Dunrobin Castle in Sutherland (1732 - fig. 4.9); and Murthly Castle in Perthshire (dated 1712¹ - fig. 4.8) are each square in plan and were constructed as part of a formal, walled garden associated with the main house. As such, although certain of them are quite sophisticated (especially those at Polton and Dunrobin²), they are really related to the Restoration gazebos of Hatton and Pitmedden, and may be discounted as old-fashioned by contemporary standards. Of the seven that remain, those at Duff and Achnacarry have already been mentioned as examples of gazebos sited in order to provide views of open countryside; and

1 The structure is dated 1669 and 1712, however, the earlier date is carved on a window pediment that has clearly been used from another building, whilst the latter is more crudely inscribed on a lintel and is much the more likely to be contemporary with the gazebo.

2 The former, though externally rather plain, once contained fine panelling and trompe l’oeil painting (removed in 1993 to a summerhouse at Stobhall in Perthshire). The latter, with its quoins, band-courses, corniced door-piece and elaborate armorial panel is much the finest looking, and its near-domestic proportion certainly make it the largest.
to this number may be added a little stone box at Mavisbank in Midlothian, which is discussed later. Four structures remain, at the estates of Bonnington, Dalzell and Hamilton in Lanarkshire and Dunglass in East Lothian. It is perhaps no coincidence that these structures are much the most architecturally distinguished gazebos raised in Scotland between 1700 and 1745, for, like their architecture, their setting is extraordinary. The gazebo at Bonnington is poised at the edge of a sharp ravine and provides views of the Falls of Clyde and Corra Castle. That at Dunglass is perched on a high hill, alongside the ramparts of an old fort and provides panoramic views of the sea and the East Lothian countryside and the length of the steeply banked Dunglass Dene. At Hamilton Palace the dog-kennel-cum-banqueting house stares across the Avon gorge to the ruins of Cadzow Castle. And at nearby Dalzell House, a two-storey gazebo complete with a large viewing platform and “commanding a brilliant view”\(^1\) surveys the precipitous banks of the Clyde. In each case the buildings are sited quite specifically to take advantage of the ‘sublime’ scenery, and it can only be assumed that the choice of location was well considered. Whilst the appreciation of ‘nature-in-the-raw’ was growing across Britain, the particular affection for its wilder elements seems to have been unique only to Scotland, and for this there may have been quite particular reasons.

During the first quarter of the 18th century, garden design in England began to evolve in a way that was distinctive from that on the Continent. This was due at least in part to the Earl of Shaftesbury’s influential work, *Characteristicks* (1712), which made a plea for the arts in England to become distinctive from those on the Continent in order better to reflect the “reigning Liberty and high Spirit”\(^2\) of English people. Now, the promised economic benefits, which persuaded the reluctant Scots into the incorporating union with England, failed to materialise

---

until well after 1750.\(^1\) Rather, the country experienced only humiliation at the loss of nationhood and Walpole's subsequent anti-Scottish policies.\(^2\) As such it is difficult to imagine how the arts in Scotland could have evolved to reflect any sense of "reigning Liberty and high Spirit." In respect of garden design, it seems possible that Scottish estate-owners may in fact have subtly snubbed Shaftesbury and the English garden theorists, by seeking to display sublime landscape along with medieval ruins and archaeological features within their gardens, for each of these may well have been emblematic of the country's own *loss* of liberty. These ideas merit a brief explanation.

The effect of the passing of the Act of Union was traumatic on the Scottish people: disorientated and directionless, many sought solace in Scotland's cultural past.\(^3\) Such nostalgia rekindled interest in the history of the country, and nationalists busily rifled through the annals of Scotland's past to find remedies for the problems of the present. This antiquarianism gained cultural expression through, amongst other things, archaeology.\(^4\) However, "Scotsmen sought consolation rather than truth,"\(^5\) and historical hypotheses were founded on sentimentality rather than scholarship. For the early-18th-century Scot, then, the overgrown ramparts of a mediaeval fortalice might be resonant of a battle against the English, whatever its original purpose, whilst remnants of a Roman fort might be interpreted as "a tribute to the formidable bravery of the Caledonians, [being] eloquent of a past invasion, and of world-conquerors expelled".\(^6\) In his poem


\(^6\) Ibid., p.37.
Liberty, the Scottish poet, James Thomson, celebrated his nation’s historical resistance to oppression, celebrating that:

“The North remain’d untouch’d, where those who scorn’d
To stoop retir’d; and, to their keen Effort
Yielding at last, recoil’d the Roman Power.
In vain, unable to sustain the Shock,
From Sea to Sea desponding Legions rais’d
The Wall immense, and yet, on Summer’s Eve,
 Whilst sport his Lambskins round, the Shepherd’s Gaze,
Continual o’er it burst the Northern Storm...”

As the repellers of an increasingly corrupt Empire, Caledonians were considered pure and valiant. Thus, the stout Gothic forms of the numerous decaying tower-houses could have been seen to stand as testimony to ancient Caledonia, monuments of Edward I’s attempts at the “extirpation of [the Scottish] memorie,” their shattered walls bearing “the marks of [of Scotland’s] antiquity and independency.” It might be argued, therefore, that the relicts of Caledonian resistance, first to the Romans, and then to the English provided a patriotic and nationalist visual iconography for early-18th-century Scots to draw upon, and that at a time when Jacobite statements could incur financial or capital punishment, opposition to Hanoverian rule and the Act of Union was most safely articulated through the display of medieval buildings. It may be for these reasons, as well as the more aesthetic purpose outlined by Langley, that medieval piles were retained at a number of Scottish demesnes including Hopetoun House, Duff

---

1 James Thomson’s “Liberty” in Thomson, J., The Works of James Thomson, 2 vols., Edinburgh, 1758, vol.1, p.325. It is worth noting that within a footnote Thomson records that “Caledonia” was “inhabited by the Scots [and] Picts, whither a great many Britons, who would not submit to the Romans, retired.”

2 Anderson, J., Historical Essay, showing that the Crown and the Kingdom of Scotland is Imperial and Independent, 1705, p.49 quoted in Brown, “Modern Rome,” p.37.
House, Castle Kennedy in Wigtownshire, Castle Semple in Ayrshire, Melville House in Fife and Balveny Castle in Banffshire.¹

It would appear that the allusion to Scotland’s independent past was underscored if a tower was set amidst wild and dramatic scenery. The connection between liberty and sublime thought² was established by William Wotton whose work Reflections Upon Ancient and Modern Learning, published posthumously in 1694, records that

“It is Liberty alone which inspires Men with Lofty Thoughts, and elevates their Souls to a higher Pitch than rules of Art can direct. Books of Rhetorick make Men Copious and Methodical; but they alone can never infuse that true Enthusiastick Rage which Liberty breaths into their Souls who enjoy it.”³

¹ Though much of Castle Semple was demolished when a new, classical mansion was constructed on the estate in 1735-40, that part of the demesne where “the family of Sempill did recreate themselves by diversion in their boat of pleasure on the lake” was retained (Crawford, A., Cairn of Lochwinnoch Matters, 1827-54, quoted in Walker, F., The South Clyde Estuary, Edinburgh, 1986, p.70). It was most probably only because there was no suitable building stone on the estate that Bruce ordered infills “for vaults or pends or hewn work within the house” to be supplied “out of the old Castle of Abercorn and Ruins thereof” (see Macaulay, J., “The Architectural History of Hopetoun House: A Draft Report” submitted to the Trustees of the Hopetoun Estate, unpublished, p.1), and it is surely of significance that the tall stair-block with its principal entrance and ornate armorial overdoor was retained and the “old Tower” used to terminate a vista from the house (see Mackey, Journey, p.206), and that the principal avenue was closed by Blackness Castle to the west. Between 1697 and 1702 Melville House was constructed for the 1st Earl of Melville a little to the south of Monimail Tower, the family seat for over a century. To judge by its wooden panelling it would appear that the building was fitted out as a summerhouse in the early-18th century. It seems likely that the tower, like that at Hopetown, was reduced in size at the same time. At Balveny House in Banffshire, William Duff retained old Balveny Castle as a feature within the landscape when he had the new house constructed to the designs of Gibbs in 1724-5 (Tait, A., Duff House, Edinburgh, 1985, pp.5-6).

² For use of the sublime in literature see Monk, S., The Sublime: A Study of Critical Theories in Eighteenth-Century England, New York, 1935, especially pp.203-32. The origins of “the sublime” as a literary style are found in the extremely influential classical treatise On the Sublime written by the Greek critic Longinus. A famous translation of the text was made by the French critic Boileau in 1674, and this proved influential in 18th-century Britain. In 1666, Rapin’s Of Gardens achieved popularity across Europe and was quickly translated into English by John Evelyn in 1673 and again by Gardiner in 1706. For the most part it advocates the geometric mode of design, but amongst its injunctions for “square Ponds and long Canals” is a surprising recommendation for the creation of cascades “falling headlong from Cliffs” to create “horrid noise” and “affrighted grones” (see Rapin, R., “Of Gardens” in TGOTP, pp.82-7). Although it is a minor part of the text, it must have encouraged those designers disposed to create such wilder aspects of nature within landscapes. Of Gardens gained expression in certain gardening books: John Worledge’s Systema Horticulturae, (1677) quotes the work frequently, as does Batty Langley’s New Principles of Gardening (1728). For a standard history of the appreciation of ‘nature-in-the-raw’ see Thacker, C., The Wildness Pleasures: The Origins of Romanticism, New York, 1983, for its role within Scottish gardens throughout the second half of the 18th century see Dingwall, C., “Gardens in the Wild,” Garden History, vol.22, no.2, 1994, pp.133-56.

The link is then extended by Addison and Thomson to sublime landscape (that is nature which inspires sublime thoughts). In *Tatler* No. 161 (1710), Addison considers the “cold, hoary Landskips” of the Alps to be “inhabited by the Goddess of Liberty; whose Presence softened the Rigours of the Climate, enriched the barrenness of the Soil, and more than supplied the Absence of the Sun;”¹ and in Thomson’s *Sophonisba* (1730), a maid urges hope amidst Carthage’s troubles, to which the Queen replies that

“...Hope lives not here,
Fled with her sister Liberty beyond
The Garamathian hills, to some steep wild,
Some undiscover’d country, where the foot
of Roman cannot come.”²

Thus, in the wake of a Union that was failing to deliver economic progress and, for many, had succeeded only in abrogating the identity of Scotland, a roman camp, an old tower, a deep precipice and a raging torrent could invoke in a subtle way ideas of past liberty and lost nationhood.³ Such dualism appealed to the early-Georgians and it seems possible that during the years after 1707 the nationalistic connotations of “streams falling headlong from the cliffs”⁴ loomed large in the minds of many Scots.

The use of ancient structures and rugged natural features as emblems of patriotic nationalism within a designed landscape appears to be exemplified in the vast gardens created in

---

³ It is interesting to note that later in the century Charles Cordiner considered an array of ruins strewn amongst the Sutherland hills to have all been “originally built on the same plan” as “places of refuge” in “times of feud and rapine” (Cordiner, C., *Antiquities and Scenery of the North of Scotland*, London, 1780, p.75-6).
the first decade of the 18th century by John Erskine, the 11th Earl of Mar, at Alloa in Clackmananshire.

The Patriotic Landscape of the Earl of Mar at Alloa

On the death of his father in 1689, Lord Mar inherited, at the age of 14, one of the oldest of Scotland’s earldoms, and with it responsibilities for guarding the royal children and keeping the nation’s most strategically-significant stronghold, Stirling Castle. Intelligent and capable, by 1696 Mar had a seat in the Scottish Parliament and by the age of 30 he was Joint Secretary of State for Scotland. In this capacity he was responsible for easing the passage of the Union, and this he did compliantly, confident that it would “save [his] country from ruin.” When improvements failed to materialise Mar made a volte face. As early as 1708 he was opposing measures passing through Parliament, by 1712 he was informing Queen Anne of his intention to free Scotland from the Union, and in 1715 he spear-headed a Jacobite rebellion and was exiled to France as a result.

Throughout his political career, Mar sought only the best for his country - the improvement of Scotland was, he confessed, ever his “greatest passion.” His opinions on how this would benefit his country broadly concurred with those of his friend, Sir Andrew Fletcher of Saltoun. Fletcher felt that the civic virtue of the Romans was linked to the beauty of their cities, the wealth of individuals being used “to perform those great and stupendous public works, highways, aqueducts, common shores, walls of cities, seaports bridges, monuments for the dead...

1 Unless stated otherwise information on Mar and his Alloa estate has been adapted from Stewart, “Lord Mar’s Plans: 1700-1732,” M.Litt, University of Glasgow, 1988.


3 Quoted in ibid, p.5.
for the use and conveniency of the public."¹ For Fletcher, only independence from England could bring this about, for Mar, Union was the sole option. Yet the means of achieving prosperity mattered little - both Fletcher and Mar considered the economic and aesthetic improvement of the nation to be two sides of a coin marked 'patriotism.'²

Thus, from 1689 onwards Mar undertook industrial improvements at Alloa, establishing coal-mines, snuff-mills and rope-works, with a large reservoir and a ship-harbour to service them. Steadily he rid his estate of the debt he had inherited and began to invest his profits in the creation of public buildings within the town, the remodelling and extension of his family house and the laying out of an expansive baroque garden to his own designs. Mar was a gifted amateur architect and landscape designer.³ His influences are unclear but it seems likely that he learned much from Alexander Edward, with whom he was closely connected, and possibly William Bruce in turn. Mar’s improvements at Alloa are depicted in an engraved survey of 1710 (fig. 4.12).⁴ This illustrates Alloa House and the town a little to the west, on a flat shelf of land set between the


² Fundamental to improving Scotland was the development of agriculture and it was in recognition of this that the ‘Society of Improvers in the Knowledge of Agriculture in Scotland’ was established in 1723. By 1743 it could count among its members the Dukes of Atholl, Hamilton and Perth, the Earls of Breadalbane, Findlater, Glasgow, Haddington, Hopetoun, Kincardine, Stair and Wemyss, the Marquess of Tweeddale and the Lords Belhaven, James Murray and George Murray. It also included the improving lairds the Honourable James Mackenzie, Sir Archibald Grant of Monymusk, Sir John Clerk of Penicuik, and Sir James Dalrymple as well as Stephen Switzer (Maxwell, R. (ed.), Select Transactions of the Honourable The Society of Improvers in the Knowledge of Agriculture in Scotland, Edinburgh, 1743, pp.xvii-xxiii). Crucially, agricultural prices remained low in Scotland until after the mid-century and many improvers such as Sir John Cockburn of Ormiston, went bankrupt (Smout, T., and Fenton, A., “Scottish Agriculture Before the Improvers - an Exploration,” The Agricultural History Review, vol.13, no.2, pp.89-90). As such it seems reasonable to assume that national duty rather than the prospect of financial return fired most of Scotland’s early agricultural improvers. For early improvers in Scotland see Minay, “Early Improvements,” and Third, E., “Changing Rural Geography of the Scottish Lowlands, 1700-1820,” PhD, University of Edinburgh, 1953, pp.2.2-2.42.


⁴ RHP13258(2). “The Plan of Alloa The Seat of the Rt. Hon. the Earl of Mar, etc... Engraven by L. Sturt”.
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Ochils to the north and the Forth to the immediate south. The gardens were created between the house and the river, whilst woods, parkland and a long viewing terrace were established to the north and east. The principal avenues radiated from the axes of the house, however, secondary vistas were generated by the various prospects that Mar sought as terminations. According to one visitor, there were

“thirty two different vistoes, each ending on some remarkable seat or mountain, at some miles Distant; one of them shews you Sterling Castle, at Four Miles Distance: another the Palace of Elphinstone, on the other side of the River; a Third the Castle of Clackmanan.”

Others focused on the Ochils, Old Stirling Bridge, Sauchie Tower, Alloa Ferry and, according to another contemporary, “a water engine for draining the heughs of Clackmanan.” Mar’s use of terminations surely derives from the ideas of Bruce (at Balcaskie and Kinross) and Edward (who focused the principal avenue at Hamilton Palace on the spire of a church commissioned by the Duke). However, his choice of terminations - historical, natural and industrial - seems to suggest a conscious attempt at establishing two very particular emblematic themes for his designed landscape: familial piety and patriotic duty.

By directing his vistas towards the fortified residences of his feudal inferiors at Elphinstone, Clackmannan and Sauchie, Mar was demonstrating the Erskines’ extensive sphere of ancient influence; and by focusing on Stirling Castle he was articulating their long-held

1 Macky, Journey, p.181.

connections to the monarch. By drawing in the Ochils - the most obvious and intractable of the area’s features - Mar seems to have been celebrating the connections that his family had shared with the surrounding landscape since the 13th century. Yet these surging hills would also have been viewed as “august and stately,” and capable of inspiring “the mind with great thoughts and Passions.” In short, Mar would have considered them sublime and it seems possible that he sought to allude to the ancient liberty of his country by realising in image the connotations that such features held in literature. Moreover, this reference to historical liberty was surely underscored by the views of Old Stirling Bridge and Bannockburn, the sites of the victories of Wallace and Bruce in the Wars of Independence.¹

Indeed, like ‘physico-theological’ theorists of the time, Mar would probably have viewed the rugged peaks not as “blunder[s] of chance” but as “noble, useful, yea a necessary part of our globe”² essential for health, grazing, mining, water and so on. If so, then Mar’s inclusion of the Ochils within the visual envelope of his landscape could also have been an allusion to his industrial improvements, an allusion made explicit not only by the integration of the ferry and the water engine into the garden as architectural ornament, but also the intention to create a “Banqueting House” at a point above the Forth with full views of the harbour sluices and fish ponds.³ Moreover, Mar’s establishment of “the largest and finest” plantation “of any in Britain”⁴ was also an act of patriotic improvement. Echoing the tenor of Evelyn’s Silva, Addison remarked in 1712 that of all the duties of a landowner there is “none more delightful in its self, and beneficial to the Publick, than that of planting,” believing it to be “a kind of Virtuous

¹ In this respect it is interesting to note Mar wrote in 1712 to the Lord Treasurer, the Earl of Oxford, enquiring on the whereabouts of the old records of Scotland removed by Edward II, hoping for “mighty discoveries of the Celticks and Druids” and “some insight into the character that was used in this country which, J. Caesar speaks of as being alike the Greek” - quoted in Stewart, “Lord Mar’s Plans,” p.9.
² Derham, W., Physico-Theology or a Demonstration of the Being and Attributes of God from His Works of Creation, 3rd edn., London, 1714, p.70.
⁴ Macky, Journey, p.181.
Employment... inculcated by moral Motives; particularly from the Love which we ought to have for our Country." If Scotland was to become a mercantile nation it required ships - and therefore timber - to defend and expand its interests. With the country still relatively deforested such a need would have been acutely felt and it was not without reason that William Mackintosh of Borlum, a brigadier in the 1715 Rebellion, wrote during his resulting imprisonment, *An Essay on Ways and Means for... Planting Scotland... by a Lover of his Country* (1729).  

Alloa seems then, to have been an allegorical landscape created in praise of Scotland's noble past and the potential of its future; it was testimony to Mar’s notion that Scotland’s identity could be strengthened as the country sought either independently or through Union with England to improve its financial lot. This desire to modernise in a way that respected Scottish traditions is emphatically displayed by what is Mar’s earliest surviving drawing. In November 1704, Mar prepared a “Designe of a Pidging house to be placed in the Center of the end of the Avenew on the hawk hill bank fronting the house” (fig. 4.13). Straddling the approach between the house and the Edinburgh Road, the structure would have been something of a mood-setter. However, Mar shied from Baroque ostentation and rather opted to design a traditional lectern dovecote eased into a modest classical dress. The dovecote was to stand some 36 feet wide by 20 feet deep with a broad, arched pend punched through its middle. Presumably of harled rubble with dressed margins, its front and sides were to be articulated with flight holes and an ovolo alighting ledge above blank oeil d’boeuf. A bold armorial panel was to sit above the front arch, and a dated...
cartouche over that to the rear. The roof was to house two flight-holed dormers, each giving into a separate chamber, and the parapet capped by a moulded cope and punctuated with panelled and ball-finialed dies. By proposing a dovecote, Mar was surely recognising their emblematic power, and by making it ornamental he was following a long-established tradition. The design itself was Mar's attempt to make the language of classical architecture speak good Scots. In concept and appearance the dovecote was an explicit statement of how he viewed the future of his country: practical but informed; industrious but elegant; modern but rooted firmly in the past.¹

Mar "very much improved the taste of [Scotland's] gentlemen, who very soon followed his example,"² and it is of little surprise that his use of garden buildings and artificial features to highlight patriotic references within a designed landscape appears to have been repeated elsewhere, at the estates of Bonnington, Dunglass, Hamilton Palace and Dalzell House.

Sir James Carmichael and Bonnington

Little is known about Sir James Carmichael, the 4th Baronet of the small estate of Bonnington near Lanark, though it would appear that his early life was tinged with misfortune. His mother died in the year he was born, his father passed away 14 months later and his elder brother just five months after that. Thus, at no more than a year-and-a-half old, Sir James succeeded to the baronetcy as the only surviving Carmichael. At the age of 20 he petitioned for a seat in the "laigh church," and at 23 he became the M.P. for Linlithgow burgh and Linlithgowshire, but was unseated on petition a year later. He died at the age of just 37.³ With the destruction this century of Bonnington House and the apparent loss of the family papers,

¹ Other ornamented dovecotes were constructed during this period at Edgerston House, Roxburghshire; Johnstounburn House, Midlothian; Ackergill, Caithness; Letham Lands Farm, Fife; Marchmont House, Berwickshire; and Park Hall, Stirlingshire.


³ For Carmichael see Complete Baronetage, vol.4, p.304.
Carmichael's un-noteworthy flirtation with politics might have been his only legacy were it not for the tenacious survival of a remarkable little gazebo which he built in 1708.

The gazebo is now a derelict stone box some 19 feet square, at the end of a long straight terrace that once led to the main house (figs. 4.14 and 4.15). Although gutted and roofless its original elegance remains recognisable still (fig. 4.16). Standing a single storey over a basement, the gazebo springs from a cyma-reversa base course, with its two levels divided by a bull-nosed string-course, and its wall-head topped with a moulded cornice that advances slightly about the corners. Each level of the side and rear faces is centred by window openings (with a basement door to the north), with the upper windows at the flanks smartened by caveto architraves. The opulent ashlar facade is formed from a rusticated basement with voussoired windows (both infilled) set either side of a stair that once met the facade at right-angles but has been reset to form a dog-leg. The edges of the stairs are topped with moulded pedestals that once bore muscular balusters with panelled terminal dies (carved with the Carmichael arms, the monogram of Sir James and the date of 1708) and a moulded handrail. The principal door and flanking windows are each emphasised with a deeply moulded and lugged architrave, and an entablature with a pulvinated frieze (that above the door being carved with the date of construction in lithe roman numerals that are extruded into laurels - fig. 4.17). The windows sit on delicate ogee sills with unusual truncated aprons. On the evidence of its fabric the gazebo was once topped with a pyramidal or ogee roof and, to judge by engravings, this may have been decorated with angle acroteria, a tear-drop finial and wave-scroll ridge-work (fig. 4.18). Internally little survives beyond a bolection-moulded chimney-piece in the south-west corner of the principal floor with a plain fire-place below, suggesting that, amongst other things, the building was used for dining, the lower room given over to servants for food preparation.

1 See copies of engravings by Paul Sandby (1778) and Alexander Archer (1837) held at NMRS (LAD/55/4 and LAD/71/1 respectively).
Although the various details of the gazebo had sources in a handful of Scottish buildings and any number of architectural treatises, the skilful manner in which they are handled suggests a designer that was at ease with the syntax of classical composition. The work would appear to have been beyond the abilities of a mere mason, and as such, one of Scotland’s few architects competent in classical design might be suggested.

In the use of a three-bay elevation and a principal floor over basement, the structure shares some features with the slightly-earlier gazebo at Barncluith. However, in its exposition of classical detailing the design of the gazebo shares a stronger familial resemblance with the Bruce pavilions of the later-17th century.¹ Sir James’s uncle was William Johnstone, 2nd Earl of Annandale (1664-1721).² In the years between 1698 and 1701, Annandale was constructing a compact villa for himself to the designs of William Bruce at his recently inherited estate of Craighiehall, near Edinburgh.³ Bruce was also working for Annandale’s eldest daughter and Carmichael’s cousin, Henrietta Johnstone and her husband, the 1st Earl of Hopetoun in the building of Hopetoun House, first between the years 1699 and 1702 and again between 1706 and 1710.⁴ Shortly after the death of Bruce in January 1710, his son, William, entered into a bond which states him “to have borrowed and received” £300 Sterling “from Sir James Carmichael of Bonnington.”⁵ It is reasonable to assume, therefore, that Carmichael knew the Bruce family well. Despite old age, ill health and brief internment at Edinburgh Castle, Bruce was still being consulted on architectural matters around the time of the gazebo’s construction. He enjoyed

---

¹ The pulvinated friezes recall those used at Hamilton Palace (1693-1701) and the lugged and moulded architraves echo similar examples at Raith in Fife (1693-6) and Dalkeith House in Midlothian (1702-10, where the base and string courses are also similar) - all houses by Smith. Yet the pulvinated frieze and architrave were also used by Bruce and both are deployed together at the south front of the main block of Hopetoun.

² Carmichael’s father, also Sir John Carmichael, married Henrietta Johnstone (1669-1689), sister to William, 2nd Earl of Annandale (after 1672 - raised to Marquess in 1701 - Complete Baronetage, vol.4, p.304). Although it should be noted that there is no mention of Carmichael within the index to the Annandale Papers (NRA(S) 2171).


⁵ GD29/1783.
contriving resolute solutions for minor works and the simple demands of a garden building would have appealed to a man of advancing years. Thus, it seems possible that the gazebo at Bonnington is indebted in some way to the mature skills of Sir William Bruce.

But of greater interest than the well-considered design of the gazebo is its highly unorthodox location. Approaching from Bonnington House through formal gardens via a long, straight terrace, early-18th century-visitors saw only the gazebo’s fine facade set amidst flanking planting and raised embankments. Mounting the stairs, however, they were at once confronted with a great window created especially to draw their gaze to the wide views beyond (fig. 4.19). By any standards the scene from this outsized opening was impressively sublime. From the foot of the gazebo a steep and wooded hill could be seen falling sharply to the bank of the Clyde below; in the distance the medieval stronghold of Cora Castle perched on the edge of a tall precipice could be discerned, and in full view below it was the thundering waterfall at Cora Linn (figs. 4.20 and 4.21). The literary connotations of such a scene would probably not have been lost on the cultured Carmichael. Indeed, any such notions of lost liberty that might have been induced by the trees, rocks and falls would at once have been given firmer contours by the well-known association of this stretch of water with William Wallace.

The gazebo at Bonnington must have been conceived of in the year of the Union, and was constructed one year after, when opposition crystallised around a Jacobite insurrection of 1708. Carmichael’s political persuasion is not known but Lord Annandale was certainly opposed to the Union and might have had some influence over his young nephew. A possible political affiliation with the ageing architect is intriguing here for as a Jacobite sympathiser, Bruce was incarcerated at Edinburgh Castle for suspected collusion in the uprising. However he might have voted,

1 Bruce was consulted by the Earl of Breadalbane, for example, on the construction of a gate for Taymouth, Perthshire, in 1708 (GD112/40/6/3).
2 The early, Scottish historians, John of Fordun and Blind Harry, both asserted that a cave within the Cartland Craigs (which overlook the Mouse Water about a mile downstream of Bonnington) were used as a hideout by Wallace (Stoddart, J., Remarks on Local Scenery and Manners in Scotland, London, 1801, p.163).
Carmichael’s viewing pavilion was an exceptional work and its novelty must have spawned imitation. A gazebo of 1718 on the Berwickshire estate of Dunglass would appear to be its earliest successor.

Sir John Hall and Dunglass

Sir John Hall inherited Dunglass following his father’s death in 1695, but would appear to have undertaken the management and improvement of the estate sometime earlier to tasks to which he soon became “addicted.” Amongst Hall’s earliest improvements was the modernisation of the family house and the adaptation of the Collegiate Church of Saint Mary to the near north-east of the house to what might be termed an ‘ornamental barn’. According to a pamphlet of 1712, Hall’s “Presbyterian Fury” was responsible for the removal and destruction of the church’s tombs and monuments. Hall converted

“the Nave of the Church to a Stable for his Coach-Mares, and dug up the Graves of the Dead, throwing away their Bones, to make way for a Pavement for his Horses... And he has made the Choir a Coach-House. And has broken down the East End Wall to make a great Gate to let his Coaches in... the Turret is a Pigeon-House: And over this new Stable he has made a Granary... There is also

3 In 1760 it was described by Bishop Pococke as “a good house, being part of a large one built round a court” in which there was “a gallery... 90 feet long” (Kemp, Pococke, pp.325-6). Amongst the Hall muniments is a sketch of 1793 which shows an L-plan house with a porch at the re-entrant angle (GD206/2/317). Its layout matches that of the building depicted in an engraving of Dunglass made around 1785 (Illustration by Alexander Carse and engraved by R. Scott sometime between 1794-7 - I am grateful to Mrs Sally Smith of Dunglass Mill for bringing this engraving to my attention). This illustrates an early-17th-century crow-stepped building with regular windows “broken out of old walls” (GD206/2/317) by Sir James, and a long balustraded flat-roofed extension to the east which appears late-17th century in style, and the construction of which may correlate with work undertaken in 1697 by Alexander Izit (Yester MSS, MS96.3c), a joiner used by Sir William Bruce at Hopetoun and elsewhere, and one of the sponsors of Edward’s trip to France. The house was replaced in 1807 by a classical pile built to the designs of Richard Crichton, which has itself now been demolished.
a Building called an Isle adjoining the Northside of the Church and running Northwards, which is a Burrying-Place (still belonging to the Earl of Home) in which Sir James keeps Hay for his Horses: tho his own First Lady who was Daughter to Sir Patrick Home of Polwarth, now Earl of Marchmont, and his only Son lie Buried there.\textsuperscript{1}

As a subscriber to the Society for the Propagation of Christian Knowledge,\textsuperscript{2} Hall could hardly have considered his actions profane and different motives might therefore be suggested. In the first place, the Scottish Kirk tended to follow Calvinist doctrine on burial practice and as a Presbyterian, Hall would have believed that the living could have no influence on the fate of the souls of the dead. As such he would neither have revered the resting place of his family nor have had few qualms about razing the memorials of dead Catholics. Secondly, it is telling that a neighbour

"offer'd Sir James to build him elsewhere and more conveniently situated, all the conveniences he propos'd to have in the Church, thus polluted, for the same Money any reasonable Good workmen wou'd say it must cost him to put the Church in the Condition 'tis now in.\textsuperscript{3}

But Hall was "positive to accomplish his sacrilegious Project.\textsuperscript{4}" As a venerable piece of architecture, resonant of the past but scourged of its Catholic associations, the church was converted for the only new use to which it might usefully be put - that of stabling. This anticipates by three years Switzer's advice that the "erection of all Lodges, Granges, and other

\textsuperscript{1} Anon., \textit{Strange News From Scotland}, London, 1712, pp.5-6.

\textsuperscript{2} GD206/2/189/A part 2.

\textsuperscript{3} Anon., \textit{Strange News}, p.7.

\textsuperscript{4} Ibid., p.7.
Buildings that Gentlemen are obliged to build, for Conveniency, [should be] in the Form of some Antiquated Place."  

In essence, Hall secularised the church and brought it into the landscape as a feature resonant of Scotland’s past but adapted for its Protestant future.

In 1718, Hall ornamented Dunglass by constructing a fine gazebo on the summit of a high hill to the south-west of the house (figs. 4.24 and 4.25). This pleasing, ogee-roofed bauble of polished ashlar appears like a lantern plucked by its oversized ball finial from the roof of a showy Jacobean house (figs. 4.26). Yet its walls display none of the rude classicism that might be associated with such a source. Rather, this is a work of considerable refinement consistent with the very best of contemporary architecture. Each of its six identical faces is pierced by a tall, thin, depressed-arch door opening, breaking into the entablature above and flanked in turn by fluted Doric pilasters and rusticated angles united by a continuous plinth. If the design is guilty of any solecism it is that the door architrave breaks into that of the entablature leaving the carved metopes above in awkward suspension (fig. 4.27). But in every other of its details this is a near flawless creation. The rustication provides vigour, the pilasters articulation, the detailing delicacy, with its perfect proportions affording it a peculiarly Gallic air. Indeed, some foreign influence is suggested by its novel hexagonal plan, since this conveys that sense of movement which is characteristic of the Baroque. Sadly its designer is unknown. A collaborative effort between Hall and a mason seems unlikely since the gazebo appears dissimilar to any pattern book designs. Stylistically it can really only be linked to a single Scottish architect, the exiled Earl of Mar. Given that Hall was made Colonel of the Merse Militia Battalion of the Orange Regiment and Mar raised the banner of the ‘Pretender’, a connection between the two after 1715 seems unlikely. However there is one link between the two men. Carved neatly on one of the gazebo’s keystones is a set-square bound by a measuring tape, and both of these are unequivocal motifs of freemasonry. It seems reasonable to assume, therefore, that Hall was a freemason. Mar, on the

---

1 Switzer, Ichnographia Rustica, vol.1, p.317.

2 Unfortunately there is a gap in the Dunglass MSS (GD206) for the period in which the gazebo was constructed.
other hand, had been made Grand Master of the freemasonic lodge, the Scottish Templars, in 1689.\footnote{Baigent, M. and Leigh, R., *The Temple and the Lodge*, London, 1998, p.229.} As such a connection between the two men seems probable. Indeed, given that “the Jacobites had a crucial influence on the development of freemasonry” to the point that “later witnesses went so far as to describe freemasonry as a gigantic Jacobite conspiracy,”\footnote{McLynn, F., *The Jacobites*, London, 1985, p.140.} it may be possible that Hall could have harboured some Stuart sympathies.

Little is known of the layout of the landscape at Dunglass during the earlier-18th century, however, it seems that between the time that the gazebo was constructed and Hall’s death almost a quarter of a century later, the policies were being constantly altered and enlarged.\footnote{By 1760 there was “to the back of the house... a beautiful Glyn covered with wood of 40 years growth” (Kemp, Pococke, p.325-6). This suggests that the gazebo formed part of wider scheme of improvements. A letter of condolence records that in the year of his death, Hall was “in the middle of a grand project, the plantation of two million of trees” (GD206/240 - letter from William Crow to the 3rd Baronet, 17 April, 1742).} The estate was recorded by Roy during the mid-century as bounded by the thickly-wooded Dunglass Dene to the south, field enclosures to the west and a goose-foot of avenues radiating north from the main house.\footnote{General Roy’s *Military Survey* prepared c.1750-5.} The avenue running north-west terminated on the gazebo, a site of interest for two reasons. Firstly, it is early evidence of the wider landscape being considered a suitable theatre for more polite social activity. This is suggested not just by the gazebo’s apparent function as a resting place, perhaps for refreshments during walks or rides around the estate, but also by the sunken bowling green which adjoins it to the north and was created at the same time (fig. 4.29).\footnote{Pococke records that “there is a little hill to the west of the house which was fortified with bastions of earth, as tis said, by the Queen Regent during Queen Mary’s minority, and the late owner built a Summer house on it, and made a bowling green within the fortress” (Kemp, Pococke, p.326).} In this respect it may have been inspired by Vanbrugh and Bridgeman’s contemporary work at Claremont in Surrey, where a ‘mount,’ off-axis with the house, was clad with woodland pierced by rides and crowned by a castellated ‘belvedere’ with a pleasure garden adjoining.\footnote{For Claremont see Downes, K., *Vanbrugh*, London, 1977, pp.101-5, and Willis, P., *Charles Bridgeman and the English Landscape Garden*, London, 1974, p.178.}
equally have been a response to Switzer’s recommendation of a “Banqueting House” to terminate “Diagonal Walks... that carries the Eye above 4000 Foot, quite a cross the Valleys up the rising Hill.” Secondly, like the location of the gazebo at Bonnington, the Dunglass structure also appears to be sited in order to present nationalistic allusions to the visitor. The gazebo is surrounded on all sides by an impressive array of steep ramparts and bold earth bastions (figs. 4.28 and 4.29). According to Pococke (who presumably gleaned his information from the 3rd baronet) the fort was thought to have been created “by the Queen Regent during Queen Mary’s Minority,” presumably during the campaigns of the ‘Rough Wooing.’ Whatever the site’s origins, in the minds of the cognoscenti, they would have been transcended by its simple essence of antiquity, since approaching the gazebo around ramparts of soil and playing bowls amidst ancient entrenchment’s could hardly fail to induce thoughts of the Borders’ bloody history. If this has similarities with the view of Cora Castle at Bonnington, then the parallels between the two estates are strengthened further by the common use of sublime scenery. From the gazebo there are panoramic views of the sea to the south and east and the Lammermuirs to the north and west, whilst to the south a short terrace extends past the bowling green to a precipitous viewing point from which the wooded banks of Dunglass Burn can be seen dropping sharply below and sweeping out towards the sea (figs. 4.30 and 4.31). Hall was a Unionist, and features of the gazebo seem to celebrate this with its alternate keystones being carved with an English rose and a Scottish thistle. However, his extensive planting was surely born from patriotism, and it was eminently possible for Hall to consider himself without contradiction at once a North Briton and a Scot.

---

3 RCAHMS, *East Lothian*, p.79.
William Adam, the Duke of Hamilton and Chatelherault

The use of a garden building to focus attention on sublime landscape was repeated at Hamilton Palace in Lanarkshire. Following the completion of James Smith’s remodelling work at Hamilton, Alexander Edward was invited by the 3rd Duchess of Hamilton to provide it with a grand setting. The result was that in August 1708 he prepared a “Map with some Alterations and Additions to the Walks, Courts, Avenues, Plantations and Inclosures of Hamilton” (fig. 4.32). His proposals constitute his last and finest work. The plan has as its spine a long avenue running north and south from the main house. That to the north terminates on an open grove permitting expansive views across the Clyde to the Campsies. The avenue to the south terminates on Patrickholme House nearly three miles distant. Indeed a good many of the other principal vistas are closed by either natural features, as for example an island in the Clyde, or buildings, such as Bothwell Bridge and Kirk, and the “High Church Steeple of Glasgow.” In this, Edward’s scheme may have been influenced by Mar’s contemporary work at Alloa. Edward died in the November of that year, but his plan would appear to have informed, with some simplification, planting at Hamilton during the ensuing decades. Some 20 years later William Adam prepared his own “Great Plan” for the estate. The plan is lost and only certain of its features are now known. The most significant of these was the building of a hunting lodge as a termination to the long South Avenue (fig. 4.33).

The hunting lodge was the idea of the 5th Duke of Hamilton. It is reputed that whilst staying at the court of the French King, a nobleman boasted of his newly-built palace and goaded the Duke that there was nothing to match it in his own country. Hamilton responded that he

---


2 For Edward’s plan of Hamilton see copy at NMRS (LAD/18/221).

would build a palace of equal splendour and use it to house his servants and dogs. Chatelherault is the alleged result. The 2nd Earl of Arran, chief negotiator for the marriage between Francis, Dauphin of France, and Mary, Queen of Scots, was created Duc de Chatelherault by Henri II in 1548-9. Subsequently, the Earl’s family was advanced in the Scottish Peerage to the honours of the Dukedom of Hamilton after 1643, and in 1714 the brother of the 5th Duke laid fresh claim to the French title. The particular reason for this atavistic interest is unclear but it was sufficiently strong to inspire the naming of the Duke’s new hunting lodge.

Designed around 1732, Chatelherault was constructed slowly over the next 11 years. Adam’s brief for the hunting lodge must have been a difficult one. Visually, the building had to provide adequate termination for a broad, double avenue at a mile’s distance from Hamilton; aesthetically, it had to appear extravagant; functionally it needed to provide for both servants and nobility, kennelling for dogs and accommodation for dining. The architect’s response was well-considered, perhaps even inspired. For if Adam had adhered to the then prevailing rules of Palladianism, then the expression of the building’s hierarchy of use would have demanded a corps de logis hardly larger than the temple he designed for the palace gardens, along with an unwieldy array of dependencies. To resolve these elements would have demanded an increase in the scale of the central block which itself would have been expensive and something of a distraction from the palace. Instead he drew on the architectural canon of the high Renaissance to create a building that derives its unity and gravitas rather from the simple repetition of its parts. With its function concealed rather than celebrated by its facade, Chatelherault is essentially an elaborate work of stage scenery in stone-a coup de théâtre that disguises as much as it displays.

3 Edward proposed “walcks of grass and gravill with grottas and arbours” at Hamilton (see copy of Edward plan held at NMRS - LAD/18/13) and Adam later proposed a temple to stand nearby (see Lowrey, “Hamilton,” p.29). It is not known if either was constructed.
4 This observation of Adam’s recourse to High-Renaissance classicism is made by Tait, “Chatelherault,” pp.323-4.
The elevation is divided into three, with a long wall at the centre and paired two-storey towers linked with single-storey pavilions at either end (fig. 4.34). The functions of the building were kept discrete with the block to the east housing servants, the wall screening the kennels and the block to the west containing the banqueting hall and rooms for the Duke. Today Chatelherault commands a good deal more of the skyline than is occupied by its 280 feet of facade, yet when first built it could have been seen only from the Palace windows closing the end of the maturing south avenue. This single point of perspective would not have made the architect’s task any the easier, for if the long verdant corridor was not to be converted to a cul-de-sac, Adam’s building had to be at once wide without seeming dull; low without being squat; and massy without appearing foreboding. Adam achieved all of this by imbuing the structure with considerable movement and rhythm. Thus, the finials appear on the scooped merlons of the broken parapet like buoys bobbing on a river, and the towers and pavilions break forward like vast cut-waters; the screen wall is pierced with wide open arches and the accommodation blocks are articulated with generous window openings.

Many of the building’s details appear indebted to Gibbs. The Palladian windows and massive solid ornamentation and rustication strongly recall the architect’s style and could easily have been adapted from A Book of Architecture. Models for the form of Chatelherault are less apparent. One source relates that Chatelherault was built “after the model of the Citadel at Chatelherault in Poitou.”1 Certainly the influence of military architecture may be discerned in the silhouette of the hunting lodge, with its towers appearing like bastions and its screen walls like battlements. Indeed, it has been noted by some that its outline bears certain similarities to the twin-towered gates that flank the main bridge of the French town,2 though the translation by Adam of a Gallic mediaeval castle into classical form seems unlikely. The combination of a

1 NSA, vol.6, p.271.
2 Tait, “Chatelherault,” p.316.
screen-wall and two-storey pavilions is essentially gate-lodge architecture on a grand scale though Chatelherault largely predates the seminal works in the history of that building type in both England and Scotland.\(^1\) It may draw on something of the tradition of Marly near Paris but probably nothing more specific.\(^2\) However, if Chatelherault’s principal elements are considered separately then one site in particular can be suggested as a likely source, that of Wilton in Wiltshire.

An engraving of Isaac de Caux and Inigo Jones’s south front of Wilton had been published in 1717 within the second volume of Colen Campbell’s *Vitruvius Britannicus*. The house was illustrated again in 1725 within the third volume of the same work, except this time it was depicted in the form of a panoramic birds-eye view that also incorporated the surrounding landscape (fig. 4.36).\(^3\) By 1727, Adam was in possession of the first two of Campbell’s volumes and was seeking the loan of the third.\(^4\) Furthermore, Adam had travelled in England with his friend and mentor, Sir John Clerk of Penicuik, in March 1727. Clerk certainly visited Wilton in person at this time,\(^5\) and whilst it is not clear whether he was accompanied there by Adam, it may be assumed that the two would have talked of the place. Adam, then, would have been familiar with Wilton by the time he came to design Chatelherault. The Wiltshire house seems to have held especial appeal for the architect. His design for Floors Castle near Kelso (1721-6) was derived from Wilton\(^6\) and that of the hunting lodge appears to be based on the same. Chatelherault’s tall

---

\(^1\) For a history of the gate lodge see Mowl, T. and Earnshaw, B., *A Trumpet at a Distant Gate: The Lodge as a Prelude to the Country House*, London, 1985. Dr. Mowl notes that the four earliest ‘twin-set’ gate lodges (that is paired structures flanking a central gateway) are probably those at Dyrham House, Gloucestershire (c.1700s); Canons, Middlesex (c.1710s); Leeswood Hall, Flintshire (c.1726); and Althorp, Northamptonshire (c.1732-3). None of these however approach the grandeur of Chatelherault.


\(^3\) Campbell, C., *Vitruvius Britannicus*, vol. 2, London, 1717, pls. 61-7 and vol.3, pls. 57-60.


\(^5\) *Ibid*.

towers with low linking pavilions are reduced forms of Wilton’s south front. Its screen wall, on the other hand, appears similar to the triumphal arch that once terminated Wilton’s south avenue, which, to judge by Campbell’s 1725 engraving and Clerk’s comments, comprised three arched bays topped with ball finials. Chatelherault may then be a composite of the principal features of Wilton, as well as a compliment to Jones, Adam’s architectural hero.¹

It would appear in fact that Adam had deployed a ‘stage-set’ termination within a garden once before. After 1725, the architect oversaw the construction of the wings of a new house he had designed for George Baillie at Mellerstain in Berwickshire,² and in 1727 he prepared a plan for a canal that was under construction by summer of that year.³ It is almost certain, therefore, that Adam would have also designed the tall, rubble structure named the ‘Hundy Mundy,’ that stands a mile from the house on the brow of a low hill (fig. 4.37). Also constructed in 1727, it was placed to terminate views along the axial south avenue.⁴ It cuts a bizarre figure: its archway flanked by pinnacled square turrets shot through with an array of regular openings. It is hard to imagine what, if anything, it was supposed to represent, so dissimilar is it to common architectural forms. There is perhaps a single source, and it is an unlikely one: the ruinous remains of St Andrew’s Cathedral in Fife (fig. 4.38). There the east gable of the nave stands free and itself forms a termination to the town’s two main streets. If Adam did indeed recall at least its top half in his design for the Hundy Mundy, he might have been wishing to suggest a powerful work of Scottish iconography upon which visitors to the house might dilate - a bold nationalistic emblem set in the soft Borders countryside. In evolving this large Gothic eye-catcher, Adam may

³ IGDLS, vol.5, p.359. Dr. Tait attributes the landscape to Adam and dates his work as c.1727 on the strength of a plan within the Charter Room at Mellerstain; unfortunately he does not specify to what the plan pertains (Tait, Landscape Garden, p.254).
⁴ Accounts at Mellerstain House record payments to “Jo: Mercer at work per day - 23 days - 1.5.6′A” for work at “Hunamundas” in 1727; they also note a payment of £10.10.11 made on 27 June 1727 for work to the “Canall” (see NRA(S), Haddington MSS, from which extracts relating to architectural and gardening work are held at NMRS).
have been inspired by that raised in 1725 (the first of its type in England) at the end of the long East Avenue at Belton in Lincolnshire. Certainly his experience at Mellerstain in creating an eye-catcher, albeit a simple one, as a termination of a prospect must have been useful when he tackled the problem at Hamilton.

Yet to pursue sources for Chatelherault is perhaps to detract from its remarkable originality. In 1730 its composite form was entirely without precedent in Britain, and whatever stylistic influences it betrays, it nonetheless bears the unmistakable imprimatur of Adam. However, like Bonnington and Dunglass before it, Chatelherault is of interest as much for its location as its design, for it too sits on the brink of a tall precipice.

The site was chosen advisedly, for it is the only point where the South Avenue comes into close contact with the spectacular gorge of the snaking River Avon. That Adam clearly wished to exploit views of the deep wooded valley is made explicit by his design of the modest formal gardens to the rear of the hunting lodge. Behind the servants quarters, the screen wall, and the ducal apartments, Adam arranged respectively the kennels, a raised lawn and a parterre. These are all bound by a broad terrace which is entered through a gate from the bowling green to the north-west and ends in a promontory terminated by a little ashlar menagerie at its north-eastern tip. At each of the southern angles of the terrace are large bastions. That to the south-east contains a raised mount from where panoramic views could be gained across the great north lawn to the avenue, the open parkland and the ravine beyond. That to the south-west juts out above the gorge itself and provides dramatic views of the river, its deep wooded banks and the ruins of Cadzow Castle (4.39).

---

1 For the eye-catcher at Belton see Jacques, "The Grand Manner," p.232. For a depiction of the eye-catcher see Badeslade, J., and Roque, J., *Vitruvius Britannicus*, London, 1739, vol.4, plates 86-7. William Adam was in Lincolnshire in 1727, and it is conceivable that he may have visited Belton.
It seems that both the Duke and Adam together settled on the site of Chatelherault. The Duke had a keen eye for architecture and after leaving politics in 1733 he retired to Hamilton to indulge his passion. Drawing on wealth derived from mining he wrote in 1736 that he had been told of “better accts of [his] coal” and hoped to channel his wealth into the creation of “Temples, Obelisques, [and] Cascades.” He may also have had a feeling for landscape. Of Hamilton Castle at Brodick on Arran, the Duke considered in 1742 that “for naturall Beauties in so wild a place nothing can exceed it, and the help of a little Art might make things here quite magnificent.”

The appeal of “so wild a place” as Chatelherault would not, then, have been lost on the Duke, and a long-held affection for the site may be suggested by some accounts which show that by 1723 the South Avenue was planted up to the Avon gorge and was advanced no further. Moreover, Hamilton was an Episcopalian and his father had been a staunch critic of the Union, and as such the possible political resonance of the view of Avon gorge might not have escaped him. Nor would the various associations of Cadzow Castle, whose battle-worn walls were constructed in the mid-16th century by the 1st Duke of Chatelherault and had once formed the Hamilton family seat. Yet the Duke had a high regard for Adam and it would have been with a hint of pride that Hamilton thought of “sending downe the plan of ye kennell to shew to Burlington.” Indeed his trust in Adam would have been confirmed by the comments of Charles Bridgeman, who, on being shown a copy of the scheme for Chatelherault, remarked that “he was really surprised to see it” since he “did not think there was anybody in that part of the world [who] could draw so well.”

Thus, whilst the Duke may have intended to build above the gorge, it is unquestionably his architect who gave those ideas shape.

---

2 Ibid., p. 320.
3 Ibid.
5 Tait, “Chatelherault,” p. 320.
6 Ibid., p. 317.
Archibald Hamilton and Dalzell

Inheriting the estate of Dalzell around 1721, Archibald Hamilton set about growing “all kinds of trees known in this country, adapting each to its proper situation and exposure, and covering and adorning a country, which before was sterile and naked, with extensive forests.”\(^1\) By the time of his death in 1774 his “plantations extended to 150 acres”\(^2\) and to judge by General Roy’s survey, by the mid-century Hamilton had established an extensive if somewhat conventional designed landscape of avenues and wilderneses, along with, perhaps its most charming feature, a delightful, tree-lined walk along the north bank of the Clyde and which partly survives still (fig. 4.39a).\(^3\) Hamilton was a distant relative and near neighbour of the Duke of Hamilton,\(^4\) and it seems likely that Chatelherault formed the inspiration for a modest gazebo he had constructed in 1736\(^5\) a short distance from Dalzell. For the most part the banks of the Clyde around Dalzell

“are low with fine vallies or meadows along the side of the river, except in one place, where there is a bold rocky bank for 300 or 400 yards. Upon the top of this bank [Hamilton] apprehended, from the vestige of a trench, inclosing a spot of an oblong figure, about the fourth part of an acre, that he discovered something like the remains of a Roman Castellum or outpost, and built a little temple or summerhouse, as well to perpetuate that circumstance, as for the sake of the variety of magnificent

---

\(^1\) OSA, vol.3, pp.459-60.

\(^2\) Ibid., p.460.

\(^3\) For the best account of the history of the Dalzell estate see Sloan, J., Dalzell: an elucidatory walk through a Lanarkshire landscape, Hamilton, 1986. Unless otherwise stated information relating to Archibald Hamilton and his work at Dalzell has been adapted from Sloan.

\(^4\) Hamilton was too a friend of the mathematician, Colin McLaurin, who owned the nearby estate of Muirhouse and who had gained the post of Professor of Mathematics at Edinburgh University through the agency of Sir Isaac Newton. It is interesting to note that McLaurin sent copies of Thomson’s Seasons to Hamilton in 1730 (see Sloan, Dalzell, fn.67).

landscapes to be seen from the spot; as it commands a view of Hamilton house, the
town of Hamilton, and the finely diversified fields around them; and also an
extensive prospect both up and down the river, taking in a great number of grand
and beautiful objects."

Like Hall before him, Hamilton seems specifically to have chosen a site that serendipitously
boasted both 'sublime' views and the remains of an ancient camp.²

Though altered and enlarged to form a house, the pleasing if simple classical form of the
original gazebo can still easily be discerned (fig. 4.39b). The main structure is two stories high
with pedimented gables supporting plain urns. Adjoining one side is a broad, single-stage outshut
with a flat roof that would once have been fringed with a balustrade.³ Thick, rusticated quoins
form the angles of the building whilst key-stoned windows offer ample light to the interior. The
decoration of the main viewing room has long been lost as has the original staircase which would
once have wound slowly to the large lead flat. The stair has been replaced with two cramped
rooms and a tight, lean-to pen-check now leads to the terrace. However, the views, though
eclipsed by regenerating woods, a viaduct and low-rise housing, still suggest those the gazebo
once exploited (fig. 4.39c), that is

"an extensive view of the surrounding country, so beautifully diversified, as to
form quite a panorama, well deserving of the attention of the landscape painter
[whilst] the lofty ruins and oaks of Cadzow, the green pastures and gaudy
pinnacles of Chatelherault, the Ross wood on the steep bank immediately
opposite, the bridge, the palace and the policy of Hamilton, the windings of the

---

2 In fact the site seems not to have been a Roman camp at all. See RCAHMS, Lanarkshire, Edinburgh, 1978, p.144.
3 This was replaced by the current bartizaned parapet sometime before 1882 - see Groome, Gazetteer, vol.2, p.343.
Clyde below, and for a considerable way up and down the river... Strathclyde from Tinto to Ben Lomond, with a rich variety of hill and dale, render the scene perhaps one of the most gratifying in Scotland."

The gazebo may have been designed by Hamilton who, whilst studying at the University of Leiden "learned French, Italian and Spanish languages and a little architecture besides." However, the gazebo was finished just two years after William Adam completed Hamilton Parish Church and the vases of the two buildings are almost identical. Moreover, it is close in concept to Chatelherault which in 1736 was then still under construction. It seems possible, therefore, that not only the design but the location of this suave little structure are indebted to the imagination of Adam.

Whatever Adam's role at Chatelherault and Dalzell, and whatever he may have known of Alloa, Bonnington and Dunglass, there can be no question that the key person in his artistic formulation, and the source of many of his opinions in garden design was Sir John Clerk of Penicuik, the owner and designer of two highly-significant estates south of Edinburgh: Penicuik and Mavisbank.

The Patriotic Landscapes of Sir John Clerk at Mavisbank and Penicuik

In terms of his advanced tastes and academic interests allied to willing patronage "Scotland's Mæenas" was without peer. Moreover, his influence was pervasive, whether in the form of personal advice or distilled through his numerous protégés. In short, Clerk was amongst

---

1 NS4, vol.6, p.452.
the most critical figures in earlier-18th-century-Scottish arts. He was, too, one of its most articulate, and from his plethora of journals and memoranda the two allegorical programmes that inform his Esk-Valley demesnes can be determined reasonably well. Both were related to intellectual creeds close to Clerk’s heart: the first was a familiar one, a belief in Scotland’s national identity; the second was his dedication to the study of classical literature and his wish to let it infuse every aspect of his life.

Clerk was born into a family remarkable for its achievements in the arts: his grandfather was a highly successful art-dealer and his father a notable aesthete. Clerk studied law at Glasgow and Leiden, made the Grand Tour, achieved some success as an advocate and subsequently became M.P. for Whithorn between 1702 and 1707. A Whig, he was a commissioner for the Union and a member of the first Parliament of Great Britain, though he may never have been easy in either post. After 1708 he was appointed one of five barons of the Scottish Court of the Exchequer, a post which secured for him a substantial income and allowed him time to pursue his interests in, amongst other things, antiquities, architecture, landscaping and agriculture - all of which were informed by his passion for classical Rome. Yet it was not just his depth of understanding in these subjects that separated Clerk from other dilettante, it was also his passionate commitment to them and his willingness to marry his interests to the cause of Scottish patriotism.

For Clerk “the past was remote only in time,” and the cultivation of an Antique life “was for him a way of experiencing daily the spell of the ancient world, and for putting its precepts into

---

1 For an assessment of Clerk’s Scottish nationalism and its expression in his antiquarian interests see Brown, “Sir John Clerk,” and Brown, Clerks of Penicuik.

2 Writing on the 20th July 1707, the Earl of Glasgow noted that he was “sorry to tell [the Earl of Mar]... that some of the commissioners of the Equivalent, whom [they] had reason to expect better things [of, were] lyke to prove most uneasy, such as... Mr Clerk of Pennycook, and several others, butt all panes [were to] be given to remove their scrouples” (Historical Manuscripts Commission, Report on the Manuscripts of Mar and Kellie, 2 vols., London, 1930, vol.1, p.404.)
Thus, as Tweeddale seems to have done before him, so Clerk pursued that quiet country life "which the Romans so much valued." Yet he disdained to "loiter his life away in idleness, eating, sleaping and drinking" and rather believed that retirement brought its own responsibilities, principally the duty to become a public benefactor. This could be achieved either by patronage or leading by example. He succeeded in the latter chiefly through improving his estates.

As Pliny had lived the retired life in his Laurentine villa, so Clerk sought to imitate him through the creation of a modern equivalent at his estate of Mavisbank. There he wished no doubt "to live as easily as the Roman emperors did in their villas, which in plain Scots was a Coat house and a kitchine gardine." The original design of the Mavisbank estate conforms closely to this prescription. Created between 1723 and 1726, Mavisbank consisted of little more than a compact baroque box embossomed in thick woodland cut through with an impressive patte d'oe that emanated from the house (fig. 4.40), the central vista of which was terminated in 1738 with a large dovecote, the emblematic potential of which would not have been lost on the Baronet (fig. 4.41). Clerk created Mavisbank "in the lap of the surrounding woods / Smiling on all sides / With waters and gardens and the singing of birds... / Joining Nature and Art / In equal union." He took pleasure in his tranquil Elysium from a delightful, isolated gazebo he raised (along with an impressive circular-plan walled garden) in 1731 on the bank of the Esk some distance south-

---

2 GD18/2330, p.9
3 Ibid.
5 A classical dovecote topped by a pretty, domed roof (which once must have supported an urn) and with an architraved door and panel over (now either lost or never inserted) was also built to terminate the 'Great Avenue' at Marchmont House in Berwickshire. The dovecote was probably proposed and designed by William Adam (to whom the main house is attributed and who assisted Clerk in the design of Mavisbank) though it was not constructed until 1749, a year after his death.
west of the house (fig. 4.42).  

1 Clerk recognised that “the situation of [Mavisbank] house should have been about 300 elles more easterly” but “choised the ground where it now stands for the sake of a round hill above it.” He believed this ancient tumulus to be “a Roman Station” and integrated it into the garden by making “a winding ascent up to it, with hedges planted from the bottom to the top.” To view a Roman “trench & agger” from his salon window would have appealed to Clerk on a number of levels. It invested his policies with instant pedigree - a link with those estates he had seen in Italy when young (and this was enhanced by the ornamentation of the landscape with stones carved with classical texts). Moreover, Clerk “looked at Roman remains and saw in their grandeur the reflected glory of Scotland’s past.” The Baronet was a committed Scot, and his “latent patriotism and nationalist sentiment, though frequently suppressed by the exigencies of holding legal office, could find expression in his intellectual life, and the vehicle for its study was material remains of the past.” His, then, was a patriotic pursuit of Antiquity; to Clerk the remains of the Roman military campaign were testimony to the noble savages that maintained Caledonia’s independence.

---

1 This small, square-plan structure has an ashlar front framed by pilasters and an entablature, and centred by a door with lugged architrave. Curiously, it is topped by a small dated belfry (the bell is now missing) supported on consoles.

2 GD18/1770.


5 Clerk felt that “Tis a diverting scene in parks & woods to have some inscriptions” and noted that he had “made several which may be cut upon stone pedestals or fixed in the walls” (GD18/1483/a/1). Most of the inscriptions Clerk proposed were culled from Horace and Pliny and chosen for their appropriateness to his mood or the landscape into which they were to be set. See for example GD18/4414/1 which draws upon Pliny’s *Letters*, i.6 and i.9, and Horace’s *Odes*, ii.6 (see Brown, “Sir John Clerk,” p.172). The only other inscription still to survive on the estate is the pedimented panel which marks Scobie Well - a natural spring of some age to which, on account of the “great respect paid [to it] by [Clerk’s] Father and Grandfather” was “rebuilt and repaired” by the Baronet in the form a fountainhead in 1747 (see Gray, J. (ed.), “Memoirs of the Life of Sir John Clerk of Penicuik Baronet Baron of the Exchequer Extracted by Himself from his Own Journals 1676-1755,” *Scottish History Society*, Edinburgh, 1892, p.215 and GD18/4421/1-2). Clerk considered the “fountain of Scobea” to be “more lustrous than glass or even than the Horatian fountain of Bandusia itself” and it was praised by amongst others, Allan Ramsay.


7 Ibid.
Who were the formative influences upon Clerk and his Mavisbank garden? Clerk considered that he “would have made much finer improvement” at Mavisbank but “chose to do no more than two or three men can easily keep in good order at the expense of 20 or 30 li. yearly.” By avoiding “vast and expensive Gardens, that the Folly of this and the past Ages hath run into,” Clerk’s advice parallels that of Switzer and Addison. Mavisbank might have been a response to Switzer’s rhetorical suggestion that

“if [a landowner’s] Grounds were handsomely divided by Avenues and Hedges; and if the little Walks and Paths that ought to run through and betwixt them, were made either of Gravel or Sand; and if there were Trees for Shades with little Walks and purling Streams, mix’d and incorporated one with another, what cou’d be more diverting?”

However, whilst Clerk owned a copy of Ichnographia Rustica, he did not purchase it until 1728. Moreover, although he “fell exceedingly into the humure of planting” as early as 1703, and travelled to England in 1706, he seems not to have had experience of the major works of prominent English garden designers until after a tour South in 1727. Other sources may therefore be suspected. In 1704, Clerk was advising Lord Hopetoun on gardening hints to be derived from those landscapes depicted within the plates of Rossi and Falda, and as such the influence of

1 GD18/1770.
2 GD18/5245/4/106.
5 The first baronet quickly recognised his son’s interest in gardening and devolved to him in 1703 the responsibility for improving the family seat at Penicuik (Gray, Memoirs, p.45).
6 Mentioned in a letter from Clerk to his father, the 1st Baronet (GD18/5238/42). Around this time Clerk was also purchasing engravings of landscapes (GD18/5238/85). In 1728 Clerk proposed a cascade for Drumlanrig based on the statue of the Appeninno at Pratolino (NMRS - DFD/58/14); another almost identical scheme was prepared four years later (NMRS - DFD/58/11).
Italian gardens, as well as the ideas of Bruce and Edward (then laying out the Hopetoun policies), and more tenuously, Carmichael, seems possible. Four years later Clerk visited Alloa and praised the Earl for creating such “a sweet place.” It is surely no coincidence therefore that Clerk’s credo on the patriotic duty of landowners to improve the wealth and beauty of their country broadly echoes that of Fletcher and Mar. Moreover, the apparent concurrence of interests at Dunglass and Mavisbank is intriguing, with Hall and Clerk both seeking to integrate archaeological features into their designed landscapes.

Whatever were Clerk’s influences, his own taste was articulated clearly in his didactic poem, *The Country Seat*, which he wrote in 1727 on completing Mavisbank. In lengthy and rather pedestrian verse, Clerk expounds on the laying out of estates. Much of his advice was, by the second quarter of the 18th century, somewhat commonplace in comparison to developments in England, recommending as he did that “Grounds are not to be forced by levelling but taken as they lye” and that “nothing can delight without constant change.” Yet there is much in the poem that was unusual and is surely representative of certain earlier-18th-century Scottish attitudes to landscaping.

Clerk believed that each nation should evolve its own artistic traditions as “Each Region of this great Terrestrial Orb / A various Dress and Culture will require.” Whether this meant Britain or Scotland is not clear, but to judge by his feel for “the Genius of the Place,” Clerk

---

2 Three copies of the Country Seat are lodged at SRO (GD18/4404). The following references are extracted from GD18/4404/1. Clerk sent a copy to the Scottish poet, James Thomson, who considered its rules to be “laid down... according to the highest Truth, Taste and Delicacy” (McKillop, A. (ed.) James Thomson (1700-1748), Letters and Documents, Lawrence, 1958, p.58).
3 GD18/4404/1, “Authors Notes”, p.9.
6 A phrase used most famously by Alexander Pope in *An Epistle to Lord Burlington* (written 1731, see TGOTP, p.212). Pope’s request to leave the landscape as found was not, however, an original one. Similar demands had
would have considered Scotland’s landscapes in a Scottish context. This would appear to be reflected in his advice on the integration in a controlled way of sublime scenery. Clerk felt that “every beauteous Villa should be plac’d / In open View of Neptunes wide Domains,”1 for “at some certain Points the Sea will yield / A noble Prospect to the neigh’ring Fields.”2 He recommended also that “harsh and frightfull objects” such as “Deep rapid Rivers, wide extended Lakes / High tow’ring Rocks and noisy Cataracts,” might “grace a Country Seat, If only brought within the Bounds of Sight.” Clerk was also alive to the allusions such views could induce for such “a lovely Prospect may busy your mind / With useful Speculations entertain.”3 And although he asked that “the animated walls [of a mansion] declare / The woefull changes in Brittania’s State”4 he would have viewed the landscape as equally vivid a picture of “How by opposing Rome the Northern Race / of the bold Scots and Picts were taught to war / And how they tuist the chain, that long had kept / Britannia subject to a foreign Power.”5

Clerk dilates on the use of distant features to ornament a landscape, such as “the great metropolis or Town” to remind the retired of the “noise and tumult” they “desired to shun” and their ultimate duty to it.6 He suggests also,

---

1 GD18/4404/1, p.9.
2 Here Clerk may have drawn on the advice of Alberti who recommended that “when viewed from afar the sea has greater charm, because it inspires longing” (Alberti, De re aedifactoria, p.147).
3 GD18/4404/1, p.26.
4 Ibid., p.15
5 Ibid.
6 Ibid., p.26. Clerk’s advice again seems to echo that of Alberti who recommended that a “private villa” should “have itself a view of some city, town, stretch of coast, or plain, or its should have within sight the peaks of some unstable hills or mountains, delightful gardens and attractive haunts for fishing and hunting” (Alberti, De re aedifactoria, p.145). He also notes that in a Prince’s house the dining room should have a view “over sea, hills or broad landscape” (ibid., p.120).
"That Avenue will most delight the Sight
That on some beauteous object shapes its way.
Such is a temple, whose high towering Spire
Divides the hovering Clouds, and seems to be
A lofty Pillar to support the Heavens.
This lovely Prospect may your busy mind
With usefull Speculations entertain;
Consider first, that all you do enjoy
Is owing to the God, whose awfull Shrine
These sacred walks enclose, and where
With thankfull Heart you often should resort.
And if that here your fathers lye entombed,
Your stately house and pleasant fields at last,
With other Charms of Life you most forego,
And this way travel to the shades below."

In his advice to close an avenue with a view of a church spire, Clerk is echoing the work of Bruce and Edward. However, it is not their visual but their allusive qualities that appealed most to Clerk. Indeed, his idea to include a place where "fathers ly entombed" within the envelope of the designed landscape - God's "awfull shrine" - is a general recommendation for a mausoleum in the garden, and as such demands brief digression.

In the early-18th century, to be interred within a building outside of consecrated land was less a gesture of individuality or neo-classical taste than an indication of an entirely new attitude.

1 Ibid.
2 Clerk may have been recalling the garden at Hopetoun for there "the great avenue open[ed] at the West towards the Church, to which the Earl... added a Chapel for a Burial place" (Sibbald, Sir R., The History Ancient and Modern of the Sheriffdoms of Linlithgow and Stirling, Edinburgh, 1710, p.21).
to the after-life. Burial within a church was an accepted practice of Roman Catholicism and as such it is unsurprising to find in Calvinist Scotland the rejection of a system “that onely the Papistry had hatched.”\(^1\) Enactments against burial in churches were passed at General Assemblies of the Scottish Church throughout the 16th and 17th centuries. In 1593, James VI had expressed his support for a parliamentary enactment “that for the avoyding of burialle in kirks, every nobleman sould bigg ane sepulture for himself and his familie.” Although the law was never passed, there were general moves throughout the 17th century to exclude bodies from burial within churches either through the construction of aisles attached to a church or the creation of a ‘lair’ - that is a burial enclosure either roofed or open - in the churchyard. Within Calvinist doctrine there was no provision for religious services for the dead, and once the creation of a mausoleum was stripped of such a requirement, it could be located almost anywhere. As “gardens have always confronted people with their mortality,”\(^2\) a more appropriate setting for so poignant an emblem of the transience of life is hard to find.

As early as the 1590s a “pretty stone monument” marking the resting place of “Thomas Crawford of Jordanhill... and Janet Keir his spouse”\(^3\) is recorded within the grounds of Kilbirmie Castle in Ayrshire. However, although this is amongst the very first instances of burial within a demesne, the structure itself seems to have been more a memorial than a mausoleum. Rather, the earliest garden mausoleum in Scotland was built within a wood south-east of Rossie House in Fife, sometime before 1663.\(^4\) This diminutive rectangular, rubble burial place is of little

---


4 For a description see Gifford, J., *Fife*, London, 1988, p.354. Similar rude mausolea were built in England at Tomb Farm, Basildon, in 1699, and Pentillie Castle, Cornwall, in 1712 (Colvin, *Architecture and the Afterlife*, p.315). Other mausolea to have been built in gardens during this period are at Kilberry in Argyllshire (dated 1733 and possibly a remodelled church); Carmichael House, Lanarkshire (early-18th-century), and Ury House, Kincardineshire (1741 though substantially remodelled in the mid-19th century). An impressive private chapel - the only one of its kind to survive from this period - raised between 1729-32 to the designs of Alexander McGill within the designed landscape at Donibristle in Fife also merits brief mention, for this robust Gibbsian building is as much
architectural merit and it is unlikely whether Clerk would have known of it. Instead, it was from books and experience on the Continent that Clerk would have learnt of such buildings. He might have read in the life of Theophrastus by Diogenes Laertius, that the Greek philosopher lived in a garden at Athens and at his death bequeathed the garden to his friends to be used not only as a study but also his burial ground; and he certainly would have visited Virgil’s reputed grave within the countryside near Naples. Clerk would have been familiar also with the great mausolea of Antiquity: he would have read of that built by Harlicarnassus and spent time surveying those that line Rome’s Via Appia. Indeed, the pyramidal-capped mausoleum designed and built by Clerk’s father for his first wife in 1683 within Penicuik churchyard is itself a remarkable quotation of an Antique tomb. Whilst Clerk never built a mausoleum himself, he may well have known of the construction of the only two of any architectural interest to have been built within a Scottish landscape during the first four decades of the 18th century - at Bargaly in Kirkcudbrightshire and Mellerstain in Berwickshire.

The first was constructed in 1729 by Andrew Heron of Bargaly for the burial of his wife (and a year later himself), and was set partially sunken in woodland to the south-east of his house (fig. 4.43). Its rendered rubble walls bear a stepping roof of smooth flags, and each gable has a carved stone plaque. Heron was a gardener of considerable repute. His fame extended at least as far as London and his knowledge of exotics formed the basis of a publication by Switzer. His gardens at Bargaly “wanted no embellishments that any house in Britain has” and must have been frequently visited. One such visitor was Clerk who, in 1721, wrote approvingly of its

---

1 For a brief history of the use of mausolea in gardens see Coffin, English Garden, pp.127-48. For a detailed analysis of the history of the mausoleum as an architectural form see, Colvin, Architecture and the Afterlife. For a discussion of the possible sources of the 1st Baronet’s mausoleum see Colvin, ibid., pp.303-5, though to these might be added the pyramidal capped building depicted within Hypnerotomachia Poliphili.


3 GD18/2101.
“gardens, orchards, parterrs, orangeries, waterworks, fishponds, bagnios, inclosures, arbures, wildernesses, woods &c.” It is intriguing to consider an interchange of thoughts on the subject of burial within a garden between the two men, and whether those ideas inspired the construction of Bargaly’s mausoleum eight years later.

To “save the trouble of carrying him far” George Baillie wished to construct for himself a plain, open burial enclosure within the grounds of Mellerstain. He was persuaded “with difficulty” by his family “to have it built with some ornaments,” and so in 1736 a burial lair with a pedimented facade was constructed to close the western end of the long east-west avenue (figs. 4.44 and 4.45). From the front the structure appears like a Gibbsian temple, all rusticated and framed by stepped angle pilasters, which, along with the advancing centre bay, lend the frontage a little movement. The pediment is richly ornamented with dentils, a cartouche, and gadrooned urns on acroteria, whilst dedications to the dead are carved on the entablature and white marble panels that flank the entrance. In all it is a pleasing piece of Baroque that, and like the gardens and the eye-catcher, is surely the work of William Adam. If so, he may have been assimilating the needs of his client with ideas delineated by Clerk.

In relation to other buildings within a garden, Clerk felt that statues, “Grots” and “objects rising to our View” would by their “Multitude seem always new” and therefore invoke thoughts in the imagination and provide essential “Variety.” Clerk built only a summerhouse and

---

1 Ibid.
3 Ibid.
4 A single undated estimate for a “Burial place in the Temple at Mellerstain” exists amongst the family papers (see NRA(S) 108 and extracts at NMRS). The designer of the mausoleum is not specified. There are letters from the mason, James Runciman, amongst the Mellerstain papers dating between 1737 and 1738. Runciman had built the stables at Mellerstain c. 1729 and it seems possible that he may be an alternative (though less likely) candidate to Adam.
5 Ibid.
dovecote at Mavisbank, and rather it was at the larger estate of Penicuik that he indulged more fully his taste for garden structures. According to a memorandum of 1741 this landscape was to contain a library, a grotto, a tower and two artificial ruins. Each were amongst the very earliest examples of their kind in Scotland and although some were created only on paper, their architectural and associational values merit attention.

Following the completion of Mavisbank, Clerk turned his attention fully to the improvements that could be made to the land around Penicuik house, enriched, no doubt, with new ideas gleaned from recent trips made to England in 1727 and 1732 (figs. 4.46, 4.47 and 4.48). The topography of Penicuik must have delighted Clerk. From the house, a broad shelf of land, ruptured at its mid-point by the sharp banks of a narrow burn, extends eastwards into a ridge of low hills (fig. 4.49); to the north the land slopes gently to the rugged backdrop of the nearby Pentlands (fig. 4.50); to the south the land falls sharply, and to the west more slowly, to the meandering River Esk, then steeply up the other side to form a long enclosing ridge of grass and heather (figs. 4.51, 4.52, 4.53). When Clerk came into his inheritance the core of the landscape was a patch-work of irregular fields stitched together by avenues and trimmed with planting (fig. 4.54). North-west of the house however, "it was all moss... and the ground about was bad," and he may have had this area in mind when he advised in The Country Seat that "where uncommon moisture steeps the ground / convert the place into a lake or pond," for in 1733 Clerk created the "big square pond" and "planted a little wood around it, divided by several

---

1 GD18/1483a/1, pp.9-14.
2 A plan for the Penicuik estate was prepared by John Adair in 1687 (RHP9369). To judge by what would appear to be a survey by Whitehead in 1712 (RHP 9373) Adair’s plan was partially executed.
3 GD18/1758/3
4GD18/4404/1, p.29.
walks.” It was “on the south side of this pond by the side of the long walk above the brae which faces the south [that Clerk] intended to have built a library.”

The building, which was to be named Clare Hall, after the Cambridge college, was intended to house not only his books but also his extensive collection of antiquities. He proposed a design for the building which might arguably constitute Clerk’s only commitment to paper of his theoretical understanding of classical architecture (fig. 4.55). The result is far from competent and may be taken as evidence of the reliance Clerk must have placed on the assistance of a professional architect. However, his imaginative abilities were exceptional, and in 1741 the suggestion of a discreet library located within the landscape was without precedent.

For the library Clerk proposed a three-bay building with channelled pilaster strips, a piended-roof and a panelled central chimney-stack. Pedimented windows were to flank a porticoed door at principal floor level with attic windows above. The interior covers an area of some 15 by 30 feet and contains a library and lobby rising 15 feet to a coved ceiling. Clerk intended the principal floor to contain books, the “Garret or Attick story” to house “curiosities,” and the basement (entered from the south) to provide “A green house & a gardener’s house.”

Had it been constructed, the effect of the building would have been remarkable. The views from within would have been starkly contrasting: those to the north being channelled along regular allées (fig. 4.56), those to the south sweeping across the gentle basin of a sheep enclosure (fig. 4.57). In this respect the library would have been similar to the view-house at Bonnington. As he ruminated from an easy chair such a juxtaposition would have appealed to Clerk’s imagination,

---

1 Gray, *Memoirs*, p.239.
2 GD1483a/1, p.9.
3 *Ibid.* Certain of the building’s details are of particular interest for the way in which they reveal the limits of Clerk’s understanding of the language of classical architecture and the practical requirements of construction. Firstly, the entrance portico is formed from just three columns. Secondly, although a spiral stair is indicated in one corner, it is entirely out-of-scale and too small to facilitate access to the attic.
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with, on the one hand, a sight of that "greatest ornament of the House of Penicuik," the Great Pond, and on the other, a pastoral scene perfectly suited to Clerk’s *honestum otium*.

A little to the south of the library site, at a point where the Esk curves to run close under a wide and curving escarpment, Clerk set about enclosing, also in 1741, a marshy tranche of land known as Hurley. His improvements were largely agricultural, but at the heart of his new fields and parks Clerk created the most extraordinary of all his landscape features.²

Taking the "Grounds... as they lye," Clerk created within a short and curving valley, an arc of five ponds each linked with low cascades about a central promontory which he named "Clermont Hill" (figs. 4.58 and 4.59). Now, as then, the peculiar pleasure of Hurley derives from its seclusion - a seclusion that invites quite naturally a sense of introspection and quiet contemplation in all that visit (fig. 4.60). Clerk immediately set about enhancing this, first by enclosing it still further with walls of oak and beech, and then by creating an approach to it that was sure to maximise the feeling of isolation and invoke at once senses of contrast, variety and surprise. This he achieved by connecting Hurley to the open world by a long tunnel carved through its high north bank. The tunnel was approached from a walk along the Esk, via a short bridge above a small but exhilarating cascade. Entering through a rusticated arch (fig. 4.61) the tunnel slopes steeply and is punctuated towards its upper end by a small circular chamber lined with a bench and marked with the punning inscription "Tenebrosa Occultaque Cave" (beware of what is dark and hidden). The tunnel emerges on the banks of the ponds at the very heart of Hurley, through another rustic arch (fig. 4.62) with rough-stone wing-walls that were intended to be fronted by evergreens,³ presumably to strike a keynote of melancholy. From here it was

---

² In 1734 Clerk first noted that he thought "it would be a great improvement to inclose Hurley Hill grounds which lye in sight with a stone dyke fit for holding Deer or sheep" (GD18/1480, p.7) - it took another seven years to realise.

³ For details of Clerk’s proposed planting scheme at Hurley (GD18/1778/1).
intended to overlook a Roman amphitheatre cut into the side of Clermont on the opposite side of the pond; a feature perhaps inspired by the ideas of Bruce or, more probably, Bridgeman, for Britain’s earliest amphitheatre was realised at Clermont’s Surrey namesake. ¹

Clerk’s intentions and achievements at Hurley are conveyed in a letter he wrote to the eminent Belgian physician, Hermann Boerhaave. In it he describes the place as

“noteworthy for its position and solitude, which a poet only can describe. It is surrounded by hills and steep rocks, and no-one can get access to it but by the mouth of a frightful cave. To those who enter, therefore, first occurs the memory of the cave of the Cuman Sibyl, for the ruinous aperture, blocked up with stones and briars, strikes the eye. Then there comes upon the wayfarers a shudder, as they stand in doubt whether they are among the living or the dead. As, indeed, certain discords set off and give finish to musical cadencies in such a way as to render the subsequent harmony more grateful to the ear, so does the form of this mournful cave, with its long and shady path followed by the light and prospect, make the exit more delightful. For suddenly the darkness disappears, and as it were at the creation of a new world.”²

Clerk was not the first person to think of excavating a tunnel-grotto within the landscape. Earlier examples were created by John Evelyn at Albury Park in Surrey (after 1677),³ Alexander Pope at

¹ The amphitheatre at Clermont is depicted in two of Clerk’s sketches for Hurley. In the first drawing it is noted only in pencil (GD18/1782/1), in the second it is inked in (GD18/1698). It is difficult to establish whether the amphitheatre was ever created. Given that Clerk refers to his drawings respectively as “A Sketch of Hurley or Clermont Inclosures & Ponds as they were finished in Aprile 1748” and “Memorandums of Clermont park and ponds in it” it would appear that it probably was, however, there is no obvious evidence of the feature surviving today.

² Gray, “Memoirs,” p.239.

Twickenham (after 1719), and John Aislabie at Studley Royal in North Yorkshire (1722-42). the latter two of which Clerk would most probably have seen. But if he had either of these in mind they were not those he wished to invoke. Rather his intention was to call to mind "the Grotto of pausilipo at Naples." The half-mile tunnel of the Posilippo Grotto near Naples, which Clerk would surely have wandered along, was commonly considered by 18th-century Grand Tourists to be not only the former habitation of the Cumaen Sibyl - the most famous of the ancient prophetesses whom Virgil represents as being visited by Aeneas - but also the site at which Virgil (and later Sannazzaro) was buried. It might then be suggested that the diminutive chamber within the ‘Hurley Cave’ was a Sibyl’s home on Scottish soil, whose sage caution carved upon its wall served to warn visitors of the dangers of the dark through which they had first to pass before reaching Penicuik’s own "Virgilian Elysium." Allusion and association were also the foundations upon which Clerk cast a robust castellated tower, and intended to raise at least two sham ruins. These two building types are linked through a common feature in that each conjures an image of the medieval period. It might therefore be questioned why a person so preoccupied with Roman Antiquity sought to create the ruinous rump of a wall or the sheer face of a prospect tower within his classical demesne? By

4 Chambers, “Tomb in the Landscape,” pp.45-6. The “Grotto of pausilipo” connects Naples with Pozzuoli. Though it was excavated by the Roman army it was traditionally reputed to be the work of Virgil (who, in the Middle Ages, was considered as much a magician as a writer). Outside of the Naples entrance was a columbarium considered to be Virgil’s tomb. The areas commonly associated with Virgil’s Underworld and Elysian Fields were both located close to Naples, as was the actual reputed habitation of the Cumaen Sibyl. In the early-18th century these sites were conflated within and around the Posilippo cave (for an excellent synopsis of the cave’s history and influence see Small, A. and Small, C., “South Italy, England and Elysiums in the Eighteenth Century,” *The Antiquaries Journal*, vol.79, pp.328-9 - I am grateful to Mr and Mrs Small for bringing this article to my attention). Whether Clerk was conscious of this confusion is not clear and is at any rate irrelevant. Clerk wished to invoke all the connotations that the Posilippo possessed for the Grand Tourist, not least of all its power to induce melancholy (in this regard Chambers notes that “the guidebooks [for Naples published during the 18th and 19th centuries] are evidence that there was no divorcing the original Posilippo from melancholic associations of one sort or another (whether classical or ‘modern’)” - p.46).
5 This quotation is an unpublished continuation of the description of the grotto sent to Boerhaave - quoted in Brown, “Sir John Clerk,” p.195.)
1741, such buildings, though not original in concept, were still sufficiently novel to suggest that Clerk was hardly falling prey to fashion. Rather these garden buildings, like his others, would have been intended as part of a particular intellectual programme. Thus, these works must be evaluated within the context of Clerk’s own attitude to the medieval period.

Clerk habitually decried “those barbarous nations from the north of Europe, who overspread Italy and ruin’d the Roman Empire,” deploring them for the introduction of a “bad manner, not only in architecture but in all arts and sciences.” Yet privately Clerk retained an affection for medieval architecture. In the first place, he seems to have admired the technical daring and perhaps even the lively ornament of Gothic buildings, believing the King’s College Chapel, Cambridge, to be the “noblest and best piece of Gothick Architecture in the world except the great church at Milan.” Secondly he considered all medieval buildings stood witness to historic continuity, feeling that “old families ought to preserve their old towers as monuments to their antiquity.” In this regard, Clerk wrote of the tower-house of Brunstane which stood above Penicuik that he “wou’d never advise to pull down the ruines, but rather to keep them, and especially the north side of the court which might be a good pigeon house.”

---

1 Between 1680 and 1740 around 30 Gothic garden buildings were constructed in Britain (inf ex. Dr David Jacques). The most famous towers were at Claremont, Surrey, for the 1st Duke of Newcastle (1715-20); Whitton Park, Middlesex, for the 3rd Duke of Argyll (c.1725); Wentworth Castle, Yorkshire, for the 1st Earl of Strafford (1730); Hartwell, Buckinghamshire (c.1723-38); Somerville House (later the Drum), Midlothian, for James Lord Somerville (c.1726-30); Cirencester Park, Gloucestershire, for Lord Bathurst (c.1721); and the tower at Studley Royal in Yorkshire which was converted from classical to Gothic in 1738. Gothic buildings other than lookout towers were constructed at Shotover, Oxfordshire, for Sir James Tyrrell (a loggia c.1718); at Rousham in Oxfordshire, for Lt. General James Dormer (an eye-catcher c.1738-41); and, of course, at Mellerstain (1727).

2 For an overview of Clerk’s attitude to the medieval period see Brown, “Sir John Clerk,” pp.266-77.

3 GD18/4404/1, p.10.


5 GD18/2113, p.5.

6 GD18/1483a/1, pp.35-6.
Clerk was therefore aware of the way a medieval ruin or tower could articulate a landscape, and felt not only that they might be preserved where they existed but also created where they did not. Thus, he proposed that “at the end of the south avenue through coldshoulders park there ought to be a ruine or Tower or an arch for a termination,” and that Clermont “might be ornamented with an old fashioned Tower to serve for a Pigeon House without a Roof.”

Clerk sketched two rough designs for the proposed structures - both sham ruins (fig. 4.63). The first is a triumphal arch with a ruinous wall-head. The second is a stumpy tower pierced by a tall arch with a crennellated parapet and conical roof, flanked by short, wrecked walls, that to the left being broken by a tall fissure, and that to right bearing an inscription. Their relatively cheap cost of construction appealed to Clerk since he was evidently pleased that “no hewn stone is necessary, [for] here all must be rough & there is plenty of fine stone to the westward of the moor.” He would have been happy too to dispense with the skills of an architect in their design. By advising that “whatever be made must be at least 40 feet high or perhaps 50 & above 30 in breadth,” Clerk indicates that he was conscious that a ruinous medieval building depended for most of its effect on massing and scale, and that these were architectural rudiments over which he himself had an adequate command. Further, by wishing to raise a ruin within his private Arcadia, he displays an understanding of their role as monuments to the mutability of life. Yet perhaps as much as anything it was the common appeal of variety and irregularity that promoted their inclusion within Penicuik. Medieval ruins offered their visitor a more sensuous experience than prim classical structures: their outlines were jagged and their rough, unevenly-

1 GD18/1483a/1, p.11.
2 Ibid., p.37.
3 Both of these are sketched within the bottom margin of page 11 of Clerk’s manuscript (GD18/1483a/1).
4 GD18/1483a/1, p.11.
5 Ibid.
coloured surfaces might be draped in rustling ivy. In short, a single ruined building could offer a welter of different impressions, and in a landscape that was to contain a limited amount of architectural ornament, it had a strong case for inclusion.

The use of sham ruins was first advocated in print by Langley whose *New Principles of Gardening* contains three plates described as

“Views of the Ruins of Buildings, after the old Roman manner, to terminate such Walks that end in disagreeable Objects; which Ruins may either be painted upon Canvas, or actually built in that Manner with Brick, and cover'd with Plaistering in imitation of Stone.”

However, it was perhaps those designed by William Kent for Lord Cobham’s well-visited garden at Stowe in Buckinghamshire that initiated the fashion for such structures. Of these a small three-arched ruin presents itself as a model; and although Clerk never visited Stowe, he could easily have learnt of the latest additions to the estate via his acquaintances within the Burlington circle. However, this is perhaps to overstate the influence of others, since it is more likely that Clerk’s schemes for ruins were indebted as much to Staneyhill and Cadzow, Ravensnuik and Brunstane as they were to the creations of Kent.

Alongside his advice for ruins, Clerk recorded that “on the top of the Knights’ Law there ought to be a tower & abundance of land.” A year later, in 1742, he fleshed out his idea recommending that

---


2 Being built within one of the best known gardens in Britain, Kent’s ‘Temple of Modern Virtue’ (c.1732) at Stowe would have exerted considerable influence on others. Ruins were still a rarity at this time; Coffin notes that the “English passion for ruins and their use as garden ornaments commenced about 1745.” For a discussion of Kent’s ruin at Stowe and of ruins generally see Coffin, *English Garden*, p.37 and pp.26-56.

3 GD18/1483a/1, p.11
Clerk prepared three similar proposals for the tower, each being a cylinder set on a wider base (which in one design extends the full height of the ground floor) and supporting a corbelled and crenellated parapet (figs. 4.64 and 4.65). He intended the tower not only “to serve for a pigeon house” and to be “very coarse” with “no roof,” but also to stand as “an ornament to the Country.” It was built much as Clerk planned except that it was given a staircase and roof in order that it could double as a prospect tower.

Knights’ Law Tower is an impressive building. It is in essence a three-stage drum with gently-battered rubble walls,6 arched and square windows at its cardinal points, and a crenellated parapet that is corbelled out over deep machicolations (figs. 4.66 and 4.67). The tower is entered through a small porch with benches either side and the date “MDCCL” along with the inscription “Tibi Sit Prudentia Turris” (‘let wisdom be your tower’) carved above the door-head. Inside the

---

1 GD18/1484, p.3.
2 Clerk’s three sketches are contained within the margins of GD18/1483a/1, p.11, GD18/1483a/2, p.12, and GD18/1484, p.3.
3 GD18/1483a/1, p.11.
4 Ibid.
5 Clerk’s proposal may be related to an unsigned drawing of a castellated dovecote prepared in 1740. The drawing, which is held amongst the Saltoun MSS and may well have been prepared by William Adam for Lord Milton’s Brunstane House outside Edinburgh, depicts a traditional beehive dovecote, 38 feet high, truncated by corbelled crenellations and topped with an elegant urn set on what is probably a columned plinth to permit access for the birds. The design may have remained unexecuted.
6 The battered walls are surprising given Clerk’s confessed ill-regard for “Towers which... draw in a point” (GD18/1483, p.3).
Chapter Four: Union to the ‘45

tower is lined with brick nesting boxes and at its core an enclosed pen-check stair rises to a round cap-house topped with a tall flag-staff. From the stone bench that surrounds the cap-house the view is as extensive as it is beautiful.

The tower was constructed between 1748 and 1750 by local tradesmen under the supervision of the Edinburgh master mason, John Baxter, a craftsman of considerable repute who had worked with Clerk previously on a small collection of buildings, and was as capable in design as he was in construction. It seems likely therefore that Knights’ Law Tower was a collaborative effort between Clerk and Baxter.

Clerk’s initial drawings are notably early exercises in neo-medievalism, and as such his sources could have been few. An image of Vanbrugh’s seminal ‘Belvedere’ at Claremont was published in 1738 within the fourth volume of Vitruvius Britannicus (fig. 4.68), and given that Claremont seems to have been a favourite model for Clerk, he may well have recalled its tower in proposing his own. Lord Islay’s tower at Whitton was seen by Clerk during a visit to London a decade before, and that constructed for Lord Somerville (possibly to designs by Adam - now demolished) at The Drum, would have been familiar. It is also worth noting that Clerk may also have known the scientist-cum-architect, Thomas Wright. Wright stayed in Edinburgh between

1 An account of 1748 details “the Masons Days at the Knights Law from the 23d of June to the 15th Septy 1748.” The masons employed at various times in its construction were James Anderson, James Fairburn and John, Edward, Sandie, William and Alexander Thomson. The account is confirmed by John Baxter (GD18/1714/5). A payment of £2-12-6 was made on 9 December 1748 “to Mr Baxter masone for his work & assistance at the Tower on the Knight’s Law & at the Scobey Well at Penncuik” (GD18/1729/5). On 3 November 1749, Sandie Thomson was paid “a ballance of work for the Tower” of £6-6-8, and William Thomson was paid £5-5-0 “to account of covers & steps for the tower.” On 2 January of the following year, Baxter was £3-3-0 paid for “his pains & directions at the Tower on the Knight’s Law in summer 1749,” and in the December of 1750 he was paid £5-5-0 for similar work at the Tower during “the summer last 1750.”

2 BDBA, pp.111-2.

3 For Claremont see Badeslade, T. and Rocque, J., Vitruvius Britannicus, vol.4, pls. 19-23. For Clerk’s trip to Whitton in Middlesex see GD18/2107, p.9, and for his opinions of the towers at Whitton and The Drum see GD18/1484, p.3. The tower at Drum may have been designed by Adam and probably relates to that “ancient like structure, on the very summit of a hill” upon which an “avenue opposite the north part of the the Drum was] terminated” (see Whyte, T., “An Account of the Parish of Liberton in Mid-Lothian or County of Edinburgh,” Transactions of the Society of the Antiquaries of Scotland, vol.1, Edinburgh, 1792, p.318).
September 1732 and February 1733 in an attempt to secure a publisher for his almanac. Here he spent time with his "mery Friend Allan Ramsay" who was in turn a close associate of Clerk. Wright later made a name for himself designing fine Gothic towers in the style of Knight’s Law, however, given that the earliest of these was not proposed until the 1750s and that few of his schemes were ever built, Wright’s influence on Knight’s Law is less likely than Clerk’s influence on Wright’s own Gothic observatory raised around 1785 on Westerton Hill in County Durham. Indeed all of the turrets that Clerk may have seen were quite different in form to that on Knight’s Law, and would have contributed little to its design beyond their ‘castle air.’ More direct models are provided by the circular bastions that punctuated the outworks of Castle Howard in Yorkshire (fig. 4.69). Clerk visited the estate in 1727 and certainly seems to have recalled its perimeter walling when he advised “course round pillars or pyramids... to distinguish the run or stretch of the park” for Penicuik. It also closely resembles the tower of Bothwell Castle near Hamilton and, still more closely, the tower at Caerlaverock in Dumfriesshire (which Clerk would have known from his various trips to the county - fig. 4.69a). Moreover, Knight’s Law Tower is in many ways similar to the Roman military buildings of the Italian campagna. In this respect Clerk may have been recalling those he had seen on his grand tour. He may also have been told of the Keeper’s Tower at Stowe - a circular, battered, ‘Roman-military’ tower, probably indebted to Gibbs, and raised at Stowe around 1741. Indeed, the suspicion that Clerk’s tower was indeed formed on Roman military lines is offered some support by the modest bridge he constructed in 1738-9 across the Esk. With its tall, single arch, low parapet walls, sentry boxes and torch...
stand, the bridge has a distinctly Antique feel, and though it was only ever referred to by Clerk as the bridge at Montesina, it can be seen at once how the structure has earned its modern epithet of the ‘Roman Bridge’ (fig.4.70).

Clerk gave careful consideration to the location of the tower. Aside from the brow of the moors above Hurley, Knights’ Law is the highest point within the Penicuik policies. It separates the northern and principal approach drives and it can be seen from almost every part of the estate: Clerk was undoubtedly aware that his tower would dominate much of the policies. He proposed also that the building should stand in an “abundance of land” that would “be sometimes in Grass, sometimes in corn”¹ and accordingly the brae was never planted up. The result is a neo-medieval tower located, as an original castle might have been, at the edge of an open pasture overlooking a steep-sided valley. In fact, a medieval building was indeed once set on Knights’ Law and to Clerk this can only have recommended the site still further.² Clerk considered it “a sort of piety to adorn the fields where the Manes of one’s progenitors doe reside”³ - in raising a tower on Knights’ Law it may be suggested that he was creating a symbol of ancient possession for the family to venerate.

---

¹ masons William Thomson and James Alexander were paid £1.6.8 for “Two days at Hewing stone for the Bridge” (GD 18/1714/4). Clerk records that in 1740 he “carried some part of the Bridge, within my enclosures at a place which has got the name of Montesina’s cave” (Gray, Memoirs, p.160). A year later Thomson and Alexander submitted accounts for work “at the new Bridge” (GD 18/1714/4).

² Adair’s plan of 1687 notes a small structure on “Knights La.” (RHP 9369) as does Whitehead’s survey 35 years later (RHP9373). The OSA (vol.10, pp.420-1) recorded in 1794 that the “original seat of the old proprietors of St Mungo’s is still to be traced on an eminence above the Esk, and about half way betwixt the village and the present house of Penicuik. It is now called the Tower, but the old name was Terregles (Terra Eclesiae, Terre d’Eglise) no doubt from the domains on which it stood, near an equal distance from the other two chapels, and about half a mile west from the present church.” It noted also that the “approach toward the village from the tower anciently called Terregles, along the northern declivity to the river exhibits one of the most luxuriant and striking scenes any where to be seen.” The tower referred to is almost certainly that on Knight’s Law, and this would appear to be confirmed by the 2nd edition O.S. (1892) which names the building as “Terregles Tower.” Clerk referred to his tower only as “the Tower on Knights Law” (GD18/1485) or the “Gothick Tower” (GD18/1484) and that the 1st edition O.S. (1853) dubbed it simply “Penicuik Tower.”

³ GD18/5029 - letter from Clerk to Alexander Gordon, 17 April 1725.
Sir John seems also to have been generating on the plain canvas of Penicuik a landscape painting in stone and grass. If Knight’s Law is indeed a Roman military tower, then Clerk may have imported his idea not only from Italy via Stowe but, more directly, from those pictures that “Lorrain light-touch’d with softening Hue, / Or savage Rosa dash’d, or learned Poussin drew” for of these types of classical landscape paintings he had many. Clerk often viewed the countryside as if it were a picture, and when it is remembered that his original intention for Knights’ Law had been to build only an open dovecote in the shape of a turret and not a viewing tower at all, the suggestion that the baronet was modelling this part of his estate in a ‘picturesque’ way seems reasonable. It is easy to see then, that without ever confusing the tower with a genuine Roman building Clerk could nonetheless evince the common perception of the Antique pagus by associating views of Penicuik with the popular classical-landscapes of Lorraine or Poussin.

Yet the tower on Knights’ Law might have invoked one further idea. Like the sketched sham-ruins and the remains of Brunstane and Ravensnuik, to Clerk, the tower’s rubble walls celebrated the glories of Antiquity, a free Caledonia - a Caledonia embodied in the massive stone turrets of Bothwell and Caerlaverock that Knight’s Law may be modelled on. Clerk’s affinity for his free Caledonian ancestors is made clear by the standing stone - that most ancient of Scottish structures - which he erected within the policies (though it has no doubt been relocated to its present position alongside the lochan in Blackpools park to the south-west of the house). It is inscribed “J C MDCLVI” and was very probably raised by the 2nd Baronet in commemoration of the purchase of the family demesne. That it was Clerk that raised the stone seems likely since

2 Brown, “Sir John Clerk,” p.191. Clerk’s collection of landscape paintings contained works by Orizzonte and Locatelli as well as works by artists of the Dutch and Flemish schools including one in the style of Paul Bril, one by Cornelis van Pooenbugh and a landscape with an Eden theme by Roelandt Savery (see ibid).
3 For example, at Aberfoyle he commented that “the hills covered with woods, with the rocks, rivolets and windings of the river Forth make a beautifull landscape,” and he considered the view along the Forth to Stirling in Italian terms, it being “inferior to none in Europe... & is equal to that on St Pietro Montero at Rome” (GDI8/2102, pp. 6, 1).
firstly he felt it to be “a diverting scene in parks & woods to have some inscriptions” and noted that he had “made several which may be cut upon stone pedestals or fixed in the walls”; and secondly the year of 1656 accords with that which Clerk believed to be the date when Penicuik was purchased by his grandfather, rather than the actual one of 1654. Similarly, his intended library, though avowedly classical in appearance, was to contain those antiquities with which he sought to affirm Scotland’s independence from Rome (indeed it should be noted here that if Clerk subscribed to the notion propounded by Boece and others that the Scots were descended from the Greeks, then he may not, in fact, have considered there to have been any contradiction between being classical and anti-Roman). It is worth noting also that when Clerk first proposed the “Gothick Tower” in 1741, Gibbs’s Temple of Gothick Liberty as Stowe, which was raised to represent its owner’s ‘True Whig’ opposition to the political establishment, was not yet built. Rather, the most famous garden towers - Alfred’s Hall at Cirencester and Stainborough Castle at Wentworth - were both monuments to Jacobitism. Whilst there is no suggestion that Clerk was ever a covert Jacobite, he may have allied Scotland’s Stewart past with a period of stalwart defence of the nation’s identity against English imperialism, and this would have had some relevance to the general allegorical theme that Clerk seems to have chosen for Penicuik. Clerk’s landscape possessed no ‘sublime’ features and the connotations that cliffs and waterfalls may have possessed could not have been invoked. Sir John seems to have sought to counteract this problem by creating cascades along the Esk (and proposing other, more dramatic waterfalls to feed into it) entirely artificially, and by directing attention towards them by building “on the bank

1 GD18/1483a/1.
2 GD18/1758.
3 The actual date is stated in Brown, “Sir John Clerk,” p.9.
4 See generally Campbell, “Romanesque Revival.”
5 There are references to four separate cascades amongst the Clerk Papers, two of which may have been constructed. The first reference (GD18/1775) is a bill of £10-5-0 for “the hewn work of ye Cascaed” submitted by the estate mason, William Thomson, 3 May 1714 (though apparently prepared on his behalf by Clerk). To judge by a small accompanying sketch plan of the cascade it was a simple structure comprising five courses of “polished aslars” with a basin at the top “where water is to fall.” The account does not specify the location of the feature (indeed it does not note whether the cascade was at Penicuik, however, given that its mason was frequently employed at Penicuik the cascade seems unlikely to have been built at Clerk’s other estate of Cammo, west of
[of the Esk] a certain roofed summerhouse [which] lets you see the windings and cataracts of the river.”¹ For sure, Clerk would have been attempting to infuse the estate with spectacle, but he would also have been aware of the connection in literature between sublime landscape and liberty, and might easily have considered the “rugged and contorted boulders” across Penicuik, to be “relics of an ancient world which, if not terrible of aspect, adorn the face of nature.”²

### Conclusion

It may be argued that the two extremes of landscape design in early-Georgian England were the Baroque - in which the whole of an estate was subject to artifice and control through the creation of avenues and vast parterres - and, for want of a better term, the ‘Switzeresque’ - in which the open countryside (or at least imitations of it) was integrated into the designed landscape. Given the appearance of Hopetoun and Newhailes it seems reasonable to assume that these two fashionable forms of landscape design were also practised in Scotland. However, what may not have been subscribed to in Scotland way the way in which the more ‘natural’ mode of gardening was considered to be representative of national ‘liberty.’ The Union with England and its after-effects distressed the Scottish people throughout the first half of the 18th century. Many sought solace in the celebration of the country’s past and interest in archaeology increased as a result. The ruins and ramparts of medieval fortalices as well as being interesting features within a

---

¹ Gray, “Memoirs,” p.239. The summerhouse contained a square stone which served for a table and bore an inscription (of which Clerk records only the first three words: “hic interdum studiis... etc.” which translates as ‘here meanwhile in study...’). The inscription appears not to correlate with any well known classical texts - I am grateful to Dr Roy Pinkerton of the University of Edinburgh for this information). The summerhouse is not recorded on any of the estate maps or surveys, and nothing more is known of its construction or appearance.

² Ibid., p.237.
landscape might have appeared to many as emblematic of Scotland’s noble and independent history. This may be the reason that so many tower houses featured as ‘ornamental buildings’ within designed landscapes - as, for example, at Alloa, Melville House, Castle Semple, Castle Kennedy, Hopetoun and Balveny. The same may have been true of what might be termed ‘sublime’ features. A connection between liberty and sublime language was established by classical authors and recapitulated by Wotton in the early-17th century, and by 1700 - a time when literature, landscape and painting were considered ‘sister arts’ - the connection had been extended to sublime landscape. Given that the majority of the most significant estates (such as Penicuik) and garden buildings (such as those at Bonnington, Dunglass, Chatelherault and Dalzell) of the period seem intent on directing attention to sites of archaeological interest and to areas of wild and rugged scenery (in a way that English and Continental examples seem not to have) it may be possible that Scotland’s “Princes and Great Men” were responding to Shaftesbury’s call to establish a ‘national-style’ in the Arts. It seems possible also that they were at the same time creating allegorical landscapes that suggested that early-Georgian Scotland was still not “an Age when Liberty [was] once again in its Ascendant.”

Of the ornamental structures created during this period there are amongst the earliest garden mausolea in Britain (at Rossie, Bargaly and Mellerstain), the earliest eye-catcher (also at Mellerstain) and a quotation of an Antique tunnel (the Hurley Cave at Penicuik). Notably early schemes for a tower and a sham-ruin were also prepared (again for Penicuik). What is as significant as it must be obvious, however, is that imitations of the buildings of Ancient Rome were not created in any number in Scotland during the first half of the 18th century - certainly not to the degree that they were constructed south of the Border. There is an account for a ‘temple’ having been built by William Adam in 1736-7\(^1\) but its appearance is not know. Indeed Adam is credited for the only two ‘Roman’ structures to have been raised in a Scottish estate during this

\(^1\) *BDB*, p.65.
time: a peripteros proposed for Eglinton Castle (c.1730s) that was probably never built, and a similar, though much cruder, structure that was raised on the Hill of Doune above Duff around 1739 (fig 4.6). The notable absence of garden temples is illustrated most clearly in the work of Sir John Clerk. Clerk made the Grand Tour in 1697-8 and was sufficiently impressed by the gardens of Italy to recommend their imitation to Lord Hopetoun in 1704. At home he was associated closely with William Adam, Allan Ramsay and the antiquarian, Alexander Gordon, whilst he counted amongst his English friends Lords Burlington and Pembroke, Roger Gale, William Stukeley and Horace Walpole, who in 1733 himself consulted Clerk on the creation of a “piece of water”¹ for Houghton. He visited many of the England’s most fashionable gardens and remarked especially on the “famouse Hermitage made by the present Queen” and designed by Kent at Richmond, and was struck by a “Round Temple supported by two roues of pillars” at Whitton in Middlesex.² Indeed, so impressed was Clerk by England’s classical architecture that he felt that “the villas of Italy [to be] trifles in comparisone with some in England.” In short, every aspect of every part of his life was informed by classical learning - be it directly from his pocket-book of Seneca or distilled in advice from the respected cognoecenti with whom he was associated - and Clerk could hardly have been ignorant of architectural quotations of Ancient Rome then being raised in England’s estates. And yet, despite creating what were undoubtedly ‘classical’ landscapes at Mavisbank and Penicuik, and raising within them a few structures that were informed by Antiquity, Clerk never sought to make the connection between Penicuik and the Roman pagus more explicit by building a trabeated temple. Unfortunately, no convenient explanation of what was most probably a conscious decision survives amongst his abundant letters and memoranda. As such, the reasons for this significant omission can only be conjectured. Certainly Clerk’s evocations of Antiquity were subtle ones, may then the creation of temples have seemed to him a little gauche? If Scotland was indeed evolving a mode of ‘patriotic landscaping’

¹ GD18/2110. Clerk visited Houghton as part of his English tour in 1733. He considered Walpole to be “a man of excellent temper & of no ceremony” and quickly became “very easy with him”.

² Ibid.
could temples have been too closely associated with the estates of England? And in this connection, might others found it more difficult than Clerk to square independent Scotland with the Roman invasions and might therefore have avoided celebrating that part of their history within their gardens as a result? There is no single nor obvious answer - but the absence of classical temples within Scotland’s gardens is of no less interest for that.

What is also clear from Clerk’s Penicuik, is that this was not a time when designed landscapes in Scotland were over-run with built ornament. This is again a curious phenomenon. There can be little doubt that, as in previous centuries, the aesthetic and emblematic potential of ornamental structures within gardens and designed landscapes was both well understood and realised. However, despite being of exceptional quality the numbers of such structures still surviving are, by comparison to their numbers in England, very few. They may, of course, have been systematically destroyed over time, and there is at least one instance - the gazebo at Achnacarry - in which a garden building was razed as part of the depredation that followed the ‘45. But the systematic removal of garden buildings after the mid-century is surely nonsensical, and it seems reasonable to assume therefore that those which survive are to a large extent representative of those that were built. If this is accepted, then, in the absence of a convenient explanation hidden within an obscure family letter, the causes for this odd phenomenon can only be guessed at. Now, an ignorance of garden buildings or an inability to pay for them might both have mitigated against their construction. Given the long history, that has already been outlined, of creating ornamental structures within Scotland’s gardens, and given the degree to which many of this country’s landowners became familiar with, indeed came into the ownership of, estates south of the Border, it is surely implausible that a great many Scottish patrons would have been ignorant of the aesthetic pleasure to be had from a sham-ruin, or the iconographical potential of a fine, Roman temple. Similarly, although early-Georgian Scotland was not a wealthy country, William Adam was nonetheless able to execute more than 20 country house commissions and lay out around 15 extensive designed landscapes. Therefore, it seems reasonable to assume that, if
patrons so desired, their estates might easily have been peppered with decorative structures. Yet they manifestly were not and it seems hard to conclude that this was anything other than a conscious decision. Certainly, the more Calvinistic of this country’s landowners may have viewed such structures as frivolous and unnecessary, but this is hardly sufficient an explanation. Rather the reason may be to do with the designed landscapes themselves or rather their wider settings: for Scotland is largely a country of moors, mountains, lochs and glens, it is stark, often bleak and generally visually demanding. In short it is crafted on a grand scale - and forms a backdrop against which garden buildings might look puny, perhaps even ridiculous no matter what their architectural quality. Indeed, this native preference for gardens over garden buildings is hinted at by an inscription Sir John Clerk prepared for Corby Castle in Cumbria, in which he rates the estate’s natural attractions higher than the “Aedificia varia... ingeniique humani conamina exquisita.”¹ This suggestion - that Scots let landscapes ‘speak for themselves’ - is supported for sure by the pattern that emerges from an analysis of those buildings that were built in Scotland during the mid-century, and this is the subject of the following chapter.

¹ GD18/4416, p.10.
CHAPTER FIVE

FROM THE '45 TO 1780

Influences on the Laying-Out and Ornamentation of British Gardens

The period between the Act of Union and the turn of the 19th century has been described, with good reason, as the ‘Age of Improvement.’ Yet, outside of what were essentially altruistic endeavours embarked on by a group of enlightened landowners and industrialists, general improvement during the first half of the 18th century was gradual and proceeded slowly. Rather, more dramatic change was undertaken only when economic circumstances made it profitable - and that time did not arrive until the last two decades of the century. However, for that intervening period, between 1745 and 1780, a pronounced upturn in Scotland’s financial well-being can be detected nonetheless, and this, at least in part, was fuelled by the novelty of political stability.1

The failure of the ‘45 finally determined the long-disputed question of the ‘Succession.’ Jacobitism was for many a spent force, and “as a result, men - particularly those of wealth and importance - could concentrate their attention and energies as never before on economic activities and ambitions.”2 In 1752, the Scots Magazine could boast that


"At no period surely did there ever appear a more general, or a better directed zeal for improvement and prosperity of this country. Persons of every rank and denomination seem at length to be actuated by a truly public and national spirit...

The great spring, however, which has set the whole in motion, is that spirit, liberality, and application, with which our nobility and landed gentlemen have of late engaged in every useful project... Animated by their rank."

As a result, for the 30 years after the mid-century, overseas commerce grew by some 300 per cent - far faster than even that of England. Yet, as noted by one near-contemporary observer, "without an easy communication among the various parts of the country, many of the most important improvements, particularly in agriculture, could not be effected at all." There was, then, no "better directed zeal" than that which led to more efficient travel. And as a result, by the 1790s, better-sprung carriages were travelling upon better-laid roads from city to city and from Scotland to England: and they travelled with an ease and alacrity that would have been unimaginable just 40 years earlier.

Throughout Britain, the development of transportation had a profound bearing on Society in at least two significant and closely related ways. Firstly, it facilitated economic progress, and as such was at least one of the factors behind the remarkable growth of what might be termed the 'monied class' - an upper stratum of society that comprised both landowners and merchants. Secondly, it provided for a new broad social class - a 'polite' class. The volume of entrepreneurs who had made money from commerce had been increasing at least since the Restoration. However, after the middle of the 18th century, those social distinctions which had ever separated

---

1 Ibid
2 Lynch, Scotland, p.379.
the nobility from the arrivistes began to break down until the two coalesced into a single group whose members moved among each other with relative equality. Those who subscribed to such a notion - and not everybody did - considered themselves members of 'polite society.' Such persons were "essentially social, and as such distinguished from arrogant lords, illiterate squires and fanatical puritans."¹ This sociability was the defining attribute of politeness, and it is here that improved travel again proved significant.

Previously, the poor state of the roads meant that once a move had been made between two residences, there was a natural inclination to stay at either one for as long as possible. As communications improved, so trips became both more frequent and various. Towns catered well for this trend towards public society, and as such, leisure became more commercialised and centred around spas, race meetings, provincial assembly rooms and public pleasure gardens. When one ‘season’ was over, be it in Edinburgh, London or anywhere else, the rounds of balls and parties could be continued at any number of other towns and cities across Britain. In between these centres travellers could stay at the country houses of friends, or visit the mansions of strangers. Indeed, as the orbit of towns and mansions widened, estate-owners could host a country-house party confident of a healthy attendance.

One result of the upper classes becoming wealthier, more mobile and more willing to mingle, was the greater number of parties offering new forms of entertainment. At, say an ‘assembly’ or a musical fête, guests might drink, dine, dance, play cards or listen to music. In this they were similar to their forebears, but where they differed was that rather than undertake en masse each event in turn, as had been normal since the 16th century, guests divided into groups

¹ Williamson, Polite Landscapes, p.110.
and enjoyed many different activities going on at the same time, making the events less formal than earlier types of entertainment. ¹

The appearance of what might be termed the Landscape Garden (that is the form of landscaping conceived by William Kent in the 1740s, developed to its stylistic pitch by Lancelot Brown during the 1760s, and popularised in Scotland by James Robertson and Robert Robinson after 1770) was well suited to these new social requirements. For having done a circuit of the house, guests could undertake one of any number of circuits about the grounds; walks which might cross or be laid out in different parts of the estate, skirt the perimeter of the policies or stretch only a little distance from the mansion. One group could stroll and chat, whilst elsewhere a couple might flirt, or a solitary promenader seek peaceful respite from the hurley-burley of the house.

In essence the Landscape Garden sprang mature from the minds of Southcote, Shenstone, Kent and Brown, and it is reasonable to assume that other designers, long-familiar with the gardens of the ‘Grand Manner,’ struggled to apprehend its new desiderata. This was acknowledged as early as 1756 by the architect-writer and champion of the new movement, Isaac Ware, who considered that “nothing is so much wanted” than a “treatise on the construction of gardens.”² Yet no such systematic work was penned for another 14 years, and by then a common understanding of its forms had derived from other sources. It may be said, therefore, that the Landscape Garden evolved in something of a theoretical vacuum, and that as a result it was removed both from those entrenched conventions that had governed the design of previous


² Ware, A Complete Body of Architecture, p.656.
Chapter Five: 1745 to 1780

gardens and from the tyranny of any new ones. This presented an unusual opportunity for Georgian society: it offered scope for unfettered experiment.

Such creative latitude can be sensed from the four principal mid- and later-18th-century works to treat of the subject: Isaac Ware's *A Complete Body of Architecture* (1756); William Shenstone’s *Unconnected Thoughts on Gardening* (1764); George Mason’s *An Essay on Design in Gardening* (1768) and Thomas Whately’s *Observations on Modern Gardening* (1770). Each of these authors reveal subtle variations on a common approach to the laying out of gardens. However, all are more or less united in their advice regarding garden buildings and it is Ware that provides the epitome of that opinion. He notes that “a piece of ground chosen as we have directed, and designed in conformity to the rules we have laid down, will have place for many buildings, seats, pavilions, baths, and temples,” though these should “not be crowded upon one another... [since] too many take away that idea of nature we have so strongly laboured to inculcate.” Ware continues by advising that “conveniences of repose, or edifices of shew, erected in [a garden], should... agree with the character of the main building” and be “proportioned... to one another.” He further recommends that

“those [buildings] which are erected as objects in themselves... require elegance, and the eye expects something in them worthy to detain its attention. The places

---

1 Two other works dealt more briefly with garden buildings. In *A Dissertation on Oriental Gardening* (London, 1772), Sir William Chambers praised Chinese gardens not only for their variety but also their “novelty and effect” (p.14) and went on to recommend a form of gardening governed by the seasons of the year. For autumnal scenes Chambers recommended that the garden be ornamented with hermitages, ruined towers, palaces, temples, derelict religious buildings, and half buried triumphal arches (p.34). In his four-part poem *The English Garden* (published in London 1772-81 and together in 1781), William Mason proposed a close union between nature and architecture to the point that buildings were to merge with the landscape. Thus a farmhouse was to become a “Norman castle.” Neither work gave systematic advice on the laying out of gardens in Britain and as such they are not likely to have had a considerable impact on garden design. The anonymous and undated, mid-18th-century *Description of the Royal Gardens at Richmond in Surrey* also contains a number of perspective illustrations of garden buildings that might have suggested its use as basic books of designs. For a brief summary of the literature of landscape gardening in 18th- and 19th-century Britain see Kruft, H., *A History of Architectural Theory From Vitruvius to the Present*, London, 1994, pp.257-71.

2 Ware, *Complete Body*, p.647.

3 Ibid., p.636.
for these in a good garden are to be variously chosen, on eminences, or in
shadowy scenes: to terminate the view as objects, or to surprize the unexpecting
eye in a recess of contemplation."

Moreover, as garden buildings "must not be too numerous, neither must they be all erected in
conspicuous places... Full in the sight may be disposed an edifice which terminates a view by
design, or hides some distasteful object," but generally "groves constructed ornamentally" are to
be planted "to form recesses in which to place statues, temples, and other structures."

Yet it is when Ware is discussing the "design of a country house with a farm" that his
ideas of the landscape and the placing of buildings within it are at their most interesting. Here he
notes that the proprietor "is to consider all this as a picture, and as he knows where the eye is to
be placed, he may verily happily and agreeably throw the whole into perspective."

Thus, whilst it might have proved a struggle to disentangle the useful from the rhetorical,
it can be seen that the text of A Complete Body contained just sufficient to advise the amateur or
professional architect on the style, scale and sitting of an ornamental building and on the pictorial
composition it should form within the landscape. Subsequent works recapitulated much the same
advice: beyond differences of opinion on detail only the quality of the prose really distinguished
them. However, one new aspect promulgated by Morris, Shenstone, Mason and Whatley was that
buildings should be suited to the "character" of their setting. Thus, for Shenstone, "high hills and
sudden descents are most suitable to castles; and fertile vales, near wood and water, most
imitative of the usual situation for abbeys and religious houses;" for Mason, buildings should be

1 Ibid., p.639.
2 Ibid., p. 650.
3 Ibid., p.353.
4 "Unconnected Thoughts on Gardening" in Shenstone, W., The Works in Verse and Prose of William Shenstone, 2
connected "with the place they occupy,"¹ and for Whately they should be used "either to distinguish, or to break... the scenes to which they are applied."² Whately continues "that the mischief most to be apprehended, is an abuse of this latitude in the multiplicity of buildings [as] few scenes can bear more than two or three."³ In this his comments were well placed, since the scatter-gun ornamentation of the Landscape Garden was becoming increasingly commonplace. Reasons other than those given by Whately might also be suggested for the inclusion of numerous structures within mid-century landscapes.

The second half of the 18th century was an era in which "more men and women than ever before in human history enjoyed the experience of acquiring material possessions."⁴ Polite society was also a consumer society within which status depended to a great degree upon wealth, and wealth was paraded through conspicuous consumption. In such a climate, the deployment of expensive ornament held considerable appeal. Moreover, such inclinations could be indulged without concern for censure, for although approved standards more and more limited the design of a mid-century country house, no such over-arching rules yet dictated the content of its garden, and designers were enabled therefore to experiment with a far wider variety of forms and moods. Thus the currency of Gothic, rustic and exotic architecture was enhanced, not only because of their associative qualities, but also for the simple decorative value that ruins, towers, hermitages, grottoes, pagodas or tents possessed: to quote Walpole, such structures lent a landscape "a whimsical air of novelty that [was] very pleasing."⁵ Moreover, as the garden came to be viewed

³ Ibid., p.120.
as a form of cultural entertainment, the greater the variety and contrast of building types and styles meant that visitors could more constantly be surprised and stimulated.

What then of the use of garden buildings in Scottish estates after the mid-century? Certainly, they increased in number. Over 100 garden structures constructed between 1740 and 1780 still survive, compared to just 22 raised during the preceding four decades. They were, too, typologically more varied. Those built in the earlier part of the century were mostly either dovecotes, summerhouses, gazebos or mausolea, and although these remained popular during the mid- and later-18th century, they were accompanied by all manner of other types; principally temples, towers, grottoes, monuments and obelisks, along with conservatories, ferneries, bath-houses, seats, ruins, icehouses and well-heads. They were also stylistically more diverse, with the emergence, though not in any great number, of the first Gothic and ‘exotic’ garden buildings, whose appearance was no doubt informed by though never copied from, the increasing numbers of specialised pattern books. Yet despite this five-fold increase, the available evidence does not suggest that this was a time that Scottish gardens were over-run with built ornament: Taymouth in Perthshire contained by some way the greatest number and variety of structures, but they were of nothing compared to the extravagances of certain English gardens such as Stowe. The reasons for this are probably similar to those suggested for the first half of the 18th century. Indeed, if there did exist in early-Georgian Scotland a widespread preference for natural rather than artificial wonders within a landscape, then that preference appears not only to have been maintained after 1750, but it also seems to have informed a distinctively native mode of extensive gardening. Some evidence for the existence of a peculiarly Scottish concept of a Landscape Garden in the mid- and later-18th century, and the relatively minor role that ornamental buildings were required to play within it, can be gleaned from an examination of An Essay on Landscape Gardening by the Scotsman, Sir John Dalrymple of Cousland.
John Dalrymple and Scottish Landscape Gardening

John Dalrymple (1726-1810) was a lawyer and a member of the Society of Improvers. He had a youthful interest in gardening and was considered by Stephen Switzer to be his "ingenious and worthy friend." He knew Sir John Clerk, and seems to have been familiar with William Shenstone for whom a copy of his treatise was secured around 1760. He probably wrote the essay in the early-1750s (though he did not have it published until 1774), perhaps even before the publication of Ware’s Complete Body (which is at any rate rather cursory in its directions for gardening). It may be said, therefore, that Dalrymple’s manuscript was when first written both innovative and in many respects highly original.2

In his essay Dalrymple identifies “four different dispositions of grounds, distinct from each other, and which create distinct and separate sentiments.”3 These he identifies as being firstly “that of a highland country, consisting of great and steep mountains, rocks, lakes impetuous rivers &c;” second “is what one may call a romantic disposition of grounds, consisting sunk vallies, woods hanging over them, smooth rivers, the banks steep but accessible, and the rocks appearing high, not so much from their own height, as from the trees which crown, and the wild birds that are continually hovering over them... A third disposition is that of the grounds running by gentle falls and rising easily into each other;” and “the last situation is that of the dead flat.” He associates each with a particular country: thus the first situation is found most commonly in Scotland, as is the second; the third is common in England and the last in France. Crucially, he then outlines appropriate forms of landscaping and ornament in order “to mark more distinctly the genius of the situation.”

2 For a brief introduction to Dalrymple and his work see Tait, Landscape Garden, pp.44-8.
3 Unless otherwise stated the subsequent quotations are extracted variously from Dalrymple, An Essay on Landscape Gardening, 2nd edn. Greenwich, 1823 (first published 1774).
Dalrymple expands on each in turn. Hence, "the chief natural defect of a highland situation is that, being generally ill inhabited, it has too much the appearance of dead life: that appearance added to the vastness of the objects, creates a kind of despair in the mind, which considers itself as nothing amidst that stupendous and solitary scene it beholds... For this reason all the improvements... ought to have relation to, and call the mind to a remembrance of, living objects." Thus, since an elegant classical house "placed at the side of a vast mountain, would create a ridiculous comparison... the principal house should be in the form of a castle." The garden buildings "should correspond to this one; they should have that great hardiness in them, which the Gothic architecture above all other gives... The other buildings through the garden, should in general be rather of the square than the round form. This last form has in it too much of elegance and lightness... though... in particular spots it may be improper: in that case the Doric, or even the more rustic Tuscan order, would be proper to supply its place." Such buildings "should be in conspicuous places, to create a notion of life and populousness; and to make them still more observable, they should be of a very white colour, and supported by a body of green behind, to give them more relief." Similarly, "from the same desire of shewing the great efforts of art, the tops of the mountains should be covered with planting" since "trees seldom grow naturally on the tops of mountains; and therefore when we see them we readily guess they are the produce of art."

Planting, Dalrymple advises, should be irregular since "straight lines... are contrary to the freedom of this situation," though he concedes that the stateliness of an approach avenue is hard to deny and permits it on grounds of association rather than aesthetics. Similarly "new streams," whose "motion and sound, rouse and animate the attention," should be "made to look more like cataracts than cascades." Within the scope defined by these general parameters Dalrymple provides innumerable details. He cites the Highland estate of Inveraray (which he had visited) as an exemplar, with the paintings of Poussin rather than Rosa as the "best instructors which a gardener of genius can follow, for this first branch of the natural division of grounds."
His advice on the second situation is a good deal briefer. The scale of a "romantic" landscape is smaller than that of a Highland setting, it is less dominating and therefore more calming. It induces a "natural melancholy" which must be enhanced by removing the mind from thoughts of "life and motion." Therefore, "views of ruins are much more proper... than those of houses intended for use." These should be "of the Grecian form; for as nothing is more cheerful than the elegance of a Grecian building when entire, so scarce anything strikes with a more pleasing melancholy than such a building in ruins... The buildings which are not intended for use are subservient to the purposes either of religion or grief; as a cloister, a chapel, a spire, a hermitage; or a pyramid, an obelisk, a monument &c." With regard to the colour of all these buildings, it ought to be "far from the dazzling white of those in the former situation: stone of a dark colour, or brick would be more proper; but as these, particularly the last, are disagreeable, the dazzling stone might be concealed by the mounting ivy or moss along the walls." He considers "the best disposition is to throw the ground into smooth walks, following the course of the water and hills: a solitary walk in a deep valley, by the side of a smooth water, and covered by the shades of the neighbouring hills and woods, is the very region of melancholy."

The third situation "is that of a champaign rich country, full of gentle inequalities," and for such topography Dalrymple recommends imitation of the work of Kent. Here, arable fields and serpentine rivers are to encapsulate knolls, copses and occasional ornaments. These might be grottoes, temples or cottages, but should generally "consist most of the Chinese and Grecian architecture" since a "Chinese building on the summit of a hill, not only agrees with the airy situation of the place, but carries our thoughts to the sultry climates of China. A Grecian temple on the side of a hill, or on the banks of a river, transports our fancy to the temperate and delightful vallies and mounts of old Greece."

With reference to the last situation "there is no help for it" and Dalrymple unleashes upon it the full arsenal of architectural ornament in order to commute the landscape to a "kind of
fairy land.” Here “bosquets, statues, vases, trees cut into great arches, jets d’eau, cascades...regular basins, peristyles, temples, long vistas, the star plantation” are all considered “in taste.”
The grounds should be laid out with “all the magnificence of Versailles,” though “without its conceit, or its too-often-repeated symmetry.” The “Chinese form, from its fantastical appearance, and the Corinthian order, from its magnificence” are “in general the properest for such an adorned garden; yet buildings of all species under the sun, that have dignity in them, should here find place.”

Yet in all this, Dalrymple recognised that it is “but seldom that situation consistent with a single person’s conveniency, is so precisely and particularly marked as to suit only one of the four situations... on the contrary, grounds generally consist of several of these situations, mixed and running into each other. In this case, the taste of the gardener will be shewn, in proportioning his distribution and assemblage to that particular degree of resemblance, which the part he is then laying out bears to one or other of the four capital situations.” Indeed to Dalrymple, the “most fortunate disposition of grounds for an attempt towards perfection of this art, would be where there was a considerable flat adjoining to the palace; where that flat ran into gentle unevennesses; where these unevennesses lost themselves in a romantic retired situation, and where that romantic situation again opened and extended itself into a view of awful, magnificent and simple nature.”

Is, then, this particular fusion of the formal and the informal, the artificial and the natural, the benign, the awesome and everything in between, a plea for the establishment of a Scottish style of extensive gardening distinct from that of the South? The answer for two reasons is perhaps a tentative yes. Firstly, by closely relating the first two situations with the particular topography of Scotland it might be said that Dalrymple is implying that his “perfect” garden can be laid out only upon North-British soil. Secondly, though often effusive towards Kent, Dalrymple is critical of that “frequent error in our English gardens” wherein it is possible to leave the “marble, gold, and magnificence of a palace” and “step at once into all the wildness of the
country" on the grounds that "the transition from the extreme height of art, to the extreme simplicity of nature, [is] too strong."

Too much should not be made of Dalrymple's work - it was not published until 1774, and, even if it "was known throughout the later eighteenth century in manuscript form"1 its widespread influence may be questioned. However, it is nonetheless important to garden history not as a treatise that sought to orientate Scottish landscape design, but as a lucid articulation of ideas that were surely held by many others. Such a suggestion is lent some weight by Henry Home's *Elements of Criticism* published in 1762. Home, like Dalrymple, was an Edinburgh lawyer and a sometime colleague of Sir John Clerk. As Lord Kames he became a judge but it is as an inveterate writer that he is best known. *Elements of Criticism* is a philosophical work that treads the familiar territory of the nature of beauty. Yet it is more readable and far more practical than the other mid-century aesthetic analyses of Gerard, Hogarth and Burke.2 At a push, it could be used as a loose guide to the laying out of grounds.3 Kames knew Dalrymple, and must have been familiar with his writings, for their works share much in common. To Kames

"Gardening, beside the emotions of beauty by means of regularity, order, proportion, colour, and utility, can raise emotions of grandeur, of sweetness, of gaiety, melancholy, wildness, and even of surprise or wonder... Gardening possesses one advantage which can never be equalled in the other art [of architecture], which is, that it is capable, in various scenes, to raise successively

---

1 Tait, *Landscape Garden*, p.44.


3 For an example of Kames's work being used as a gardening treatise two years after its publication see Tait, *Landscape Garden*, p.46, n.7.
all the different emotions above mentioned, but to operate this delicious effect, the garden must be extensive, so as to admit a slow succession...”

He continues by noting that gardening “has greatly the advantage: it is provided with such plenty and such variety of materials, that it must be the fault of the artist, if the spectator be not entertained with different scenes and affected with various emotions.” He recapitulates Dalrymple’s four “capital situations,” and like him, considers that “the most perfect idea of a garden is an improvement upon the third, requiring the several parts to be arranged in such a manner as to inspire all the different emotions that can be raised by gardening.” He was also concerned with character and how different scenes complement each other. Thus “a ruin affording a melancholy pleasure, ought not to be seen from a flower-parterre which is gay and cheerful: but to pass immediately from an exhilarating object to a ruin has a fine effect; for each of the emotions is more sensibly felt by being contrasted with the other.” In this way Kames advised that

“regularity is required in that part of a garden which joins the dwelling-house; for being considered as a more immediate accessory it ought to partake the regularity of the principal object: but in proportion to the distance from the house considered as the centre, regularity ought less and less to be studied; for in an extensive plan, it hath a fine effect to lead the mind insensibly from regularity to a bold variety.”

---

2. Ibid.
3. For the preceding quotations see ibid, pp.334-6.
4. Ibid., pp.337-8.
With reference to the use of buildings “a garden on a flat ought to be highly and variously ornamented, in order to occupy the mind and prevent its regretting the insipidity of an uniform plain.” Elsewhere - and this is a critical point - they must not be overused since “profuse ornament hath no better effect than to confound the eye... An artist desitute of genius for capital beauties, is naturally prompted to supply the defect by crowding his plan with slight embellishments” that is “triumphal arches, Chinese houses, temples obelisks, cascades, fountains, without end.”

Given that Whately’s comprehensive treatise was not published until 1770, these works by Dalrymple and Kames are surely evidence enough that a particular conception of landscape design had evolved in Scotland during the third quarter of the 18th century; a conception in which a designer was expected mostly to focus upon the “capital beauties” of the landscape and avoid artificial ornament. Only occasional structures that either enhanced the “character” of a place, such as an ivy-clad ruin or muddy hermitage, or directed a visitor’s gaze to the delights of nature within or beyond the garden, could be considered appropriate. Therefore, although the creation of extensive gardens evolved in mid-century Scotland largely free from published rules, there seems nonetheless to have been a general presumption against the liberal use of garden buildings - profligate ornament was permissible only where a place lacked natural interest, and in Scotland such places were rare.

In summary therefore, the numerous written works, published and unpublished, pattern books and treatises alike, all indicate that within a standard mid-century Scottish garden, perhaps created by its owner hand in hand with a designer, the presence of a faux Roman temple partially eclipsed by oaks and pines and perched demurely on the brow of a gentle hill, was possessed of

1 Ibid., p.347.
2 Ibid., p.332.
an importance quite beyond its actual size. It could articulate a large landscape, dominate a smaller one, provide character where it was considered lacking and accent where there was none. It could invoke thoughts of Antique Rome or the campagna of modern Italy. It might form the object of a short morning walk, or offer respite to those engaged upon a longer circuit of the grounds. With the addition of shelves it became a library; with a fireplace, a banqueting room; and with running water, a bath-house. Whilst they might decorate a landscape it is unlikely that they were intended to form its centrepiece, rather, as in the first half of the century, they served merely to focus attention on rivers, hills and woods. Indeed it seems likely that the landscape may have continued to resonate with notions of liberty after the '45, for although no garden building in Scotland during this time was created to convey an obvious political message, one at least - a hermitage at Dunkeld, discussed later in the chapter - seems to have been a veiled celebration of Jacobitism.¹

At least until the publication in 1770 of Whately’s “grand, fundamental and standard work on English gardening” ² and the uncritical adoption across Scotland of the Brownian Landscape Garden as promoted by Robinson, Robertson and later Thomas White Senior, it seems reasonable to suggest that the nation’s landscapers are likely to have created estates broadly in accordance with the criteria articulated by Dalrymple.³ Evidence for this is provided by an examination of the ornamental buildings erected within six of Scotland’s outstanding mid-century estates. Thus, the structures at Inveraray in Argyll, may be assessed within the context of Dalrymple’s ‘first situation’; Blair and Dunkeld, both in Perthshire, within the context of the second; and Yester, Craigiehall and Arniston, all around Edinburgh, with the context of the third.

¹ Certainly the emblematic potential of garden buildings continued to be valued during the mid-century; James Fordyce, a minister at Alloa, published in 1757 a long moralising poem set in a garden containing a “cave of poverty” and a “tower of ambition” (Scots Magazine, 1757, p.445)


³ For the spread of the Landscape Garden in Scotland see Tait, Landscape Garden, especially pp.132-73.
Dalrymple’s ‘First Situation’:

Inveraray and the Duke of Argyll

On the death of his brother in 1743, Archibald Campbell, Earl of Islay, succeeded to the Dukedom of Argyll.\(^1\) At 61 years of age the 3rd Duke might have been entitled to contemplate a sedate retirement at his comfortable Middlesex estate of Whitton. But instead he enthusiastically set about the improvement of his ancestral estate at Inveraray (fig. 5.1).\(^2\) It was already an attractive one: a compact landscape thickly wooded with ample parkland divided through its heart by the bristling River Array and rendered more awesome by all the drama that its enveloping rugged hills and expansive sea-loch could afford (figs. 5.2 and 5.3). The Duke commissioned his London architect, Roger Morris, to design a remarkable new home - not an elegant Palladian pile but a vast Gothic castle of “hardy execution” whose “grandeur,” in the opinion of Sir John Dalrymple, was suited perfectly to its wild setting.\(^3\)

Morris rarely visited Inveraray and the bulk of the work fell on William Adam as the executant architect. On 2 October 1747 the contract was signed for the erection of the first two ornamental estate buildings: a tall, circular “pidgeon house” terminating the long “Oak walk” running north from the house and a dumpy rubble “Tower” topping the sheer hill of Duniquaich to the east, each of which were to be built by the Duke’s mason, William Douglas “according to

---

1 Except where noted the information relating to the developments at Inveraray has been taken from Lindsay, I. and Cosh, M., *Inveraray and the Dukes of Argyll*, Edinburgh, 1973; a photocopy of Roger Morris’s *Letter Book* held at NMRS; and copies of drawings in the Argyll collection also at NMRS. For a well-referenced though uncritical chronology of the development of the designed landscapes at Inveraray, Blair, Dunkeld and Taymouth during the mid-18th century see Smith, J., “Extensive Ornamental Gardening at Three Eighteenth Century Highland Estates - Inveraray, Blair and Dunkeld, Taymouth,” PhD, University of Aberdeen, 1989.

2 For the Duke’s landscaping activities previous to his work at Inveraray see Cosh, M., “Two Dukes and their Houses,” *Country Life*, 13 July 1972, pp.78-81.

the sign’d plans giv’n him by Mr Morris” and to the “liking of Willm Adams,” at a total cost of £94 Sterling (fig. 5.4).

Dovecotes were rare in Argyll there being inadequate agricultural land to sustain any number of pigeons. That the Duke chose to raise what was then the largest and certainly the most architecturally distinguished dovecote in Scotland as a prominent ornament to his estate, was therefore a considerable statement of both his power and his quality of life (fig. 5.5). The structure, which is possessed of considerable stature, is formed from a long white-harled cylinder, and topped with a conical slate roof and an elegant, domed, ashlar lantern. A casual observer might be forgiven for considering the structure as much fit for humans as pigeons: its three-stories of domestically-proportioned dummy windows affording it a feeling of habitation. In this respect the dovecote was well suited to Dalrymple’s ideal since “all objects of art brought into such a garden, ought to have a relation to, and call the mind to a remembrance of, living objects... [and] for the same reason, in such a situation, whatever buildings are erected should... be of a very white colour... to give them the more relief.”

The tower would have appealed to Dalrymple for the same reasons as the dovecote: the more so since it was both identifiably Gothic and “of the square rather than the round form,” the latter plan possessing “too much of elegance and lightness.” A rubble box (it was never harled) topped with a stacked, pagoda-like roof, the tower encapsulates a circular, vaulted chamber above a small cave-like recess set slightly below the apex of the hill (fig. 5.6). It represents something of an architectural flight of fancy, its form seemingly without precedent in Britain, only the rocky quality of Kent’s hermitages could have offered Morris inspiration. The position of the building is well considered, being set slightly below the apex of the hill of Duniquaich. In this

---

1 For details of the garden buildings at Inveraray see Lindsay and Cosh, Inveraray, pp.121-43 and RCAHMS, Argyll, 7 vols., Glasgow, 1992, vol. 7, pp.401-27.

2 Dalrymple, Essay, p.9.
way it is kept in full silhouette when seen from the castle below. When approached, it can hardly be seen at all until the last sharp switch-back rounds the nub of the intervening summit.

The structure was conceived specifically as a “Tower,” yet it was its apparent antiquity that seemed to impress most. A visitor in 1758 considered it to be “in imitation of a ruin” (by which he surely meant to suggest that it was old rather than broken down as Langley had urged), and just 30 years later another remarked that “the corrosions, which the stone of this tower [had] experienced” dated it to a period “very much anterior to that of the present mansion” and suggested that it might have been “be co-eval with the antient one.”2 This was surely the deception that Morris and the Duke had hoped for. With the demolition of the dilapidated ancestral home and the absence of any other visible Campbell pile, the need for a physical expression of the family’s ancient dominion over the surrounding country became acute. In so placing the tower, not only is the Campbell lineage linked to that most immutable and distinguished of features - Duniquaich - but the land which the tower surveys is also marked as the Duke’s domain, and when viewed through the pointed windows of the principal chamber that land seems almost without limits.

Another structure, probably of the same period, is the fine well-head-cum-grotto that was constructed over the spring of Bealachanuaran within woodland to the west of the house. Vermiculated voussoirs strike a round-arch beneath a broad rusticated pediment bearing ball-finialed acroteria, to form a building of satisfying Palladian elegance (figs. 5.7 and 5.8). Within were two benches either side of a double basin from which issued a serpentine rill that flowed to a small pool set within a large semicircular forecourt (now lost) that seemed in elevation almost to form a plinth for the well-head above.

1 NLS, MS2911 - Burrell, Journey, f.21.
2 James Bailey, A Journey in Scotland (1787), quoted in Lindsay and Cosh, Inveraray, pp.128-30.
Bealachmuaran was praised by Dalrymple who valued “the building over the spring in the way to Essen Hossen” for its power to invoke “a relation to upland life... a much better effect than even a temple in such a place to any imaginary deity could have.” The appearance and location of the structure seems to anticipate the advice of Robert Morris, who recommended in his Lectures on Architecture that

“In one part of the Wood I propose a Grotto, and in it a Bath. This should be placed in the most unfrequented Part, surrounded with Ever-greens, and the Access to it by a declining spiral Walk, to terminate in a circular Theatre, about 10 ft. below the Surface of the Garden. This, by subterranean Aqueducts, might be supply’d by the Rivulet, and artificially dispers’d among craggy, mossy Rocks, form’d by a skilful Hand, which would be a pleasing Scene to gratify the curious Eye and Ear. The little murmuring Rills of Water, trickling down in disorder’d Streams, would create a kind of melancholy musical Tone, not altogether unpleasant.”

Robert and Roger Morris were related and although the former seems never to have been involved directly in the work at Inveraray, the 3rd Duke did possess a copy of his Lectures. But the well-head is not mentioned in Morris’s Letter Book and as such the direct influence of either relative may be questioned. A drawing of the grotto, captioned by William Adam, is thought to survive

---

1 Dalrymple, Essay, p.11. The well-head encloses a natural spring and is set into the foot of Creag Dhùbh, three-quarters of a mile south-west of the Castle. It is located just above the ‘Upper Avenue’ which led to a waterfall at Eas a’Chòsain - a much-admired feature of the local landscape during the mid-18th century - see RCAHMS, Argyll, vol.7, p.409.


3 Lindsay and Coish, Inveraray, p.68.
amongst the Clerk of Penicuik family papers. If this is the case then it may correspond with the enigmatic structure referred to in the building accounts as “the Countess” and constructed at the same time and at a similar cost as the tower and dovecote. Certainly whoever created the building may well have been responsible for a similar structure - a compact pedimented and rusticated bath-house embosomed in woodland - at Rosneath Castle in Dunbartonshire, a secondary residence of the Argylls (fig. 5.9).

During the winter of 1747 William Adam fell ill and responsibility for building work at Inveraray devolved principally to his 26-year-old son, John. During the course of the following decade John oversaw both the completion of the castle and the continued ornamentation of the grounds. In this he was assisted by his younger brothers, first Robert and then James.

The most plain of their proposals was a “Design of a Building over the Fountain-head at Duniquaich” - another fresh-water spring that supplied the castle (fig. 5.10). It is a simple, two-storey octagonal building containing a small, circular “Fountainhead or Cistern” at ground floor level with a viewing room above. The building is elegantly astylar save for its niches, arched windows and Gibbsian door-surround that breaks the first-floor band course. The fountain-head seems to have remained unexecuted, though it might conceivably relate to a structure depicted by a 1756 survey at the centre of an étoile at the foot of Duniquaich.

More fanciful was a large dairy constructed in 1752 to a design by John Adam. Set in a prominent position on the south side of the small hill of Tom Breac, a little over a mile north-east of Inveraray Castle, the structure, which is now ruined, was intended to be as much ornamental

---

1 *Ibid.*, p.370, note 26. This may refer to a drawing of the well head contained in the first of three James Adam sketchbooks at Penicuik House. To judge by internal evidence these sketches were made in the early 1750s and it is unlikely therefore that the “Building over a Spring, Inveraray” was in fact captioned by James’s father, who had died in 1748.
as practical. As a model farm building the Adam’s dairy was not only the earliest in Scotland (perhaps even England) but remained unique throughout the mid-century period; indeed it predates by a decade advice contained in Timothy Lightoler’s *Gentleman and Farmer’s Architect* (1762) to front steadings and mains with decorative screens to render them more pleasing to the eye. Five proposals for the dairy survive, each based on a courtyard plan with a frontage comprising of a central block with end pavilions linked by screen walls (fig. 5.11). The first is a classical design, rich in ornament, full of movement and no doubt far too costly, and the second, a flatter, plainer, Palladian scheme, is perhaps the result of a sober reappraisal. The third is more Scottish in flavour with crow-stepped gables to each of the end-blocks. Lighting these pavilions, however, are tall, traceried windows and it is this Gothic theme that is developed in the fourth scheme (in which pointed arches and modest quatrefoils punctuate more frequently the length of the façade) and resolved more fully in the fifth, executed proposal. Here ecclesiastical and martial Gothic merges with Scottish vernacular as a gabled and buttressed centre block and flanking crow-stepped parapit wings are wedged between castellated towers.

Church Gothic of a more filigree kind was also proposed for a structure over a ‘physick well’ located near the dovecote (fig. 5.12). Gable-fronted with a lozenge window above an ogee door flanked by statue niches, the undated design is laden with medieval ornament: cusping, crockets, pinnacles and finials enrich almost every edge, with even the quoins expressed as oversized nail-heads. Though the elder Adam brothers both revelled in the decorative potential of

---

1 It was probably John Adam that proposed in 1757 to hide the Carlundon Mill on the River Aray with a long Gothic screen comprising of a similar arrangement of centre block, screen walls and end pavilions (Saltoun MSS, MS17687, f.123), see figs. 5.15a and 5.15b.

2 See, for example, plate 24, a “Design for a Sheep Coat to be built on a hill which seen from a Genteel House forms an agreeable object.”

3 It is worth noting that both Robert and James Adam had earlier made use of this Palladian formula in designing garden buildings - the former for a Gothic scheme in 1749 (NMRS XSD/380/20), the latter for a classical one during the early 1750s (James Adam Sketchbook, No. 1 - copy at NMRS XSD 34/46).

4 Adam may have been recalling the advice of Switzer who recommended that for rural and extensive gardening “lodges, Granges, and other Buildings that Gentlemen are obliged to build, for Conveniency” should be wrought “in the form of some Antiquated Place” (Switzer, *Ichnographia Rustica* vol. 1, p.317).
Gothic and made frequent use of it in their proposals for garden buildings, the drawing seems to lack their characteristic sure-handedness and as such cannot safely be attributed to either. At any rate the scheme was abandoned in favour of a more simple design probably by John Adam (fig. 5.13). This comprised of a crenellated block with curving quoins (that may recall 17th-century buckle quoins) and a pointed opening to each face, and was almost certainly a reference to the centre tower of the Castle. However, within a few years of the well’s construction, and mindful perhaps of Sir John Clerk’s recommendation that a vista should terminate on a “high towering Spire”, the Adams drew up a proposal to add a tall spire “to serve as a Visto from the Garden” (fig. 5.14). Sadly, the spire was never raised and the entire well-head was dismantled in 1775.2

The brothers were responsible for two more structures within the grounds: John built a “Gothick” three-arched bridge with embattled parapets and turreted towers at the mouth of the Aray around 1758; and, two years later, James created a single-arched classical counterpart a little upstream (fig. 5.16). It seems, however, that more ornamental buildings were once intended.

Around 1757 the Adams prepared a Gothic “Building proposed for the Belvidere on Duniquech” (fig. 5.18). A round colonnade of clustered columns surrounding a central tower topped by a crocketed spire, the temple is probably the work of either the elder or younger brother since it lacks the rumbustious quality of a 1753 drawing by Robert from which it may derive (fig. 5.19).

---

1 It may also have been inspired by a description and model of a “Gothic Temple” sent by Roger Morris to William Adam in June 1745. This was to have three tiers of battlements carried on corbels, four arches, pinnacles, and an “upper Pyramid with the Cross on the top.” Morris sent at the same time a description and model for a square “Summerhouse.” This was to be timber-framed, weather-boarded and topped with a hipped or pyramidal roof (RCAHMS, Argyll, vol.7, p.407).

2 Ibid., p.406.
Robert Adam left Britain for Italy in October 1754 and returned in January 1758.1 Setting up practice in London he cultivated his contacts, amongst whom was the ageing Argyll. Robert bade for the Duke's patronage in 1759 by presenting him with a pretty oil of the Campbell's ancestral estate painted very probably by one of his assistants, Agostino Brunias (fig. 5.17).2 The composition of the painting is telling, for it depicts Robert Adam's vision for a completed Inveraray estate, fit for the 'King of Scotland', which, with the old village replaced by open lawns, was a vision remarkably close in its appearance to "the most fortunate disposition of grounds" described by Dalrymple (who was a friend of the Adams). Moreover, it incorporates additional ornamental buildings. The first is a classical rotunda, apparently a replacement for the Gothick "Building proposed for the Belvidere on Duniqueh." The second is a hill-top fort, and for this an undated drawing inscribed "Adams" still survives. This "Design for an Addition to the Building on the Top of Duniqueh" depicts Morris's tower with its stacked roof replaced by a crenellated parapet, and its scale greatly enhanced by the addition of embattled screen walls: one bears a traceried window and a bartisan whilst another in the form of an open arcade leads to a tall crow-stepped gable behind (fig. 5.20). The martial qualities of the composition are made more explicit by the depiction of "a Wall with Turrets and Battlements to Surround it" and a tall flag-pole upon a knoll.

Though not the first castle-style building to be suggested for a British garden, in terms of its scale of conception, the Adams' ebullient sham-fort was nonetheless a remarkable proposal. It must have appealed to Argyll, for when Bishop Pococke visited the following year he was made aware that the "The D. designs to make some additional buildings to [Duniquaich]."3

1 Except where noted biographical information on the Adams has been taken from Fleming, J., Robert Adam and his Circle in Edinburgh and Rome, London, 1962.

2 The painting survives and is hung within the private apartments of Inveraray Castle.

3 Kemp, Pococke, p.66.
Unfortunately, the Duke died shortly after and the brothers’ apparent ambitions for Inveraray remained unrealised.¹

It is worth noting that despite Argyll’s affection for Chinoiserie² and the Adams’ evident skill in that idiom (see for example fig. 5.21),³ no Chinese structures were raised at Inveraray during the mid-century. Rather, only Gothick garden buildings were created. This must have been a conscious decision that echoed (or perhaps informed) Dalrymple’s advice to create “Gothic architecture” of “great hardiness” within Highland gardens. Indeed, the desire to create diminutive ‘villas’ from both the dairy and the mill seems also to accord with Dalrymple’s opinion that garden structures should “create a notion of life and populousness.” Inveraray was, then, according to Dalrymple’s desiderata, the model garden for “highland country.”

Inveraray was not the only significant Highland landscape to undergo substantial improvement during the second half of the 18th century. There was, too, the Perthshire estate of Taymouth, the seat of Argyll’s kinsman, the Earl of Breadalbane, and, close by, the demesnes of Blair and Dunkeld, the possessions of the Duke of Atholl. However, these landscapes are couched in a far softer setting than Inveraray, and, though not lacking in dramatic features, exude overall a somewhat gentler ambience that loosely accords with Dalrymple’s “second situation.”

¹ Groundwork for the barmkin may, however, have been undertaken. A stony ridge has been raised around the tower approximately on the line of the proposed crenellated wall. It is not characteristic of a prehistoric fort and is therefore most likely to be the result of 18th-century landscaping (RCAHMS, Argyll, vol.7, pp.418-9).

² In 1752 the Duke informed the Kintyre Chamberlain that “Mr. Somers,” a Campbeltown carpenter, was “to build his Grace a float as the Duke directed him for supporting the Chinese float for the Duloch” - that is the Dubh Loch which defines the estate to the south (Lindsay and Cosh, Inveraray, p.371, n.34).

³ See for example the sketches of Chinese temples in James Adam’s second sketch book, especially drawings 9, 10 and 16.
Dalrymple’s ‘Second Situation’: Taymouth, Blair and Dunkeld

When John Campbell became the 2nd Earl of Breadalbane in 1717 he inherited an estate ornamented with fine walled gardens and mature planting. Set amidst bare hills to the north and south, a loch to the west and the broad, fertile plain of the serpentining Tay to the east, the castle was raised upon a flat isthmus carved by a deep wind in the river and enveloped by a gently undulating deer park. The headland to the rear of the castle was probably already enclosed by a wooded riverside walk and a short chord of avenue (later termed the ‘berceau walk’), whilst the parkland would most likely have been dissected along its length by a tree-lined road to the larch-side village of Kenmore (fig. 5.22).

Campbell had a keen interest in rural affairs. He is recorded amongst the founder members of the Society of Improvers, and shortly after his accession to the earldom he commissioned “A Plan and Survey of the Gairdens of Taymouth and Country Adjacent” (fig. 5.23). The drawing, which is by an unknown draughtsman and dated “1720” (though this is inscribed in a different hand), makes no obvious distinction between those features which were surveyed and those planned. However the drawing was largely realised for the majority of its features are depicted in an oil painting attributed to James Norrie and probably prepared in 1733 with alterations made by Jan Griffier II six years later (fig. 5.24). This illustrates the river-side

---

1 For a chronology of the designed landscape at Taymouth see Peter McGowan Associates, Taymouth Castle: Historical Landscape Survey, unpublished, undated. I am grateful to Mr Peter McGowan for making this report available to me.

2 Maxwell, Society of Improvers, p.xviii.

3 RHP721. Tait tentatively attributes the drawing to William Adam on stylistic grounds, though this may be questioned since the depiction of planting is quite different to that used on plans which can be securely accredited to him (such as Arniston south of Edinburgh and Buchanan in Stirlingshire - see plans reproduced respectively in Tait, Landscape Garden, pp.30 and 38). Indeed, if the plan does date from 1720 Adam would have been just 31, unproved as an architect or landscaper of distinction, and unlikely to have been awarded such a significant commission.

4 Accounts record that on 3 September 1733 Lord Glenorchy paid “a Painter at Edr. for a view of Taymouth” and that on 10 May 1739 he paid “Mr Griffier for altering a view of Taymouth” (GD112/21/77). The painting is in the collection of the Scottish National Portrait Gallery. The main feature to have been omitted on the painting - the patte d’oe on the hill to the north of the castle - has evidently been painted out and replaced with a small platoon of trees.
planting, berceau walk and the long avenue (the Kenmore road now being removed further south) in a mature condition. Moreover it depicts a single garden building - apparently small and square with a finialed roof - set within 'wilderness' planting upon the summit of a low hill called Tom More, at the heart of the open parkland. At first sight the painting records a conventional landscape in the 'Grand Manner,' but it reveals too the designer's penchant for more informal moments. The tree-lined terraces on either side of the river, for example, encourage a close communion between the visitor and nature, whilst the gazebo affords sensational open views across the park, loch, hills and plain of the glen.

If the anonymous gardener who prepared the '1720 plan' is to be credited for much of the appearance of Taymouth by the early 1740s, the contribution of his patrons, the Earl of Breadalbane, and his eldest son, John Campbell, Viscount Glenorchy, must also be recognised.

Glenorchy, who for a long time was a London-based M.P., had professional links with Bridgeman and Switzer. He was also an inveterate visitor of Britain's finest estates, and during the 1730s he remodelled his Staffordshire estate of Sugnall as a ferme ornée. After 1740, sole responsibility for the management of Taymouth passed officially to him from his increasingly infirm father.2

During the course of the decade Glenorchy seems to have ordered at Taymouth the removal of the double avenue that ran south from the house (apparently to create a more open parkland setting); enlarged the planting on Tom-more (which now contained a few irregular walks); planted up much of Drummond Hill to the north of the castle and the Braes of Taymouth to the south; created a series of impressive cascades in the south-western corner of the estate; and

---


2 A "Full Renunciation [from] the Earl of Breadalbane to Lord Glenorchy" is recorded amongst correspondence for 1740 (Smith, "Extensive Ornamental Gardening," pp.134-5). By 1740 the Earl was 78 years old.
cut a terrace (the ‘Surprise Walk’) approximately a quarter of a mile in length into the hill above the newly relocated Kenmore road.\(^1\) Between Glenorchy’s accession as the third Earl of Breadalbane in 1752 and his death 30 years later, the broad lines of the landscape remained little altered. Rather, the new Earl’s attention devolved to detailed design, in the form of raising small classical gazebos at considered locations across the landscape. Each building was sited to provide exceptional views. It may be suggested, therefore, that Breadalbane like Argyll wished to create a landscape close to the ideal form described by Dalrymple, in which the “romantic” tenor of the estate was “opened and extended... into a view of awful, magnificent, and simple nature.” In terms of the volume, quality, variety and siting of its garden buildings, Taymouth is perhaps the outstanding Scottish mid-century landscape, and as such it demands a detailed analysis.

When the estate was surveyed for the new Earl by Thomas Winter in 1754,\(^2\) the majority of its ornamental buildings were already in place (and all except three have now been demolished). They were depicted at a diminutive scale in two oil landscapes by John Sanger painted around 1756 (fig. 5.25),\(^3\) and in rather more detail as vignettes to a 1786 survey of Taymouth by George Langlands.\(^4\) It is instructive to let the indefatigable Bishop Pococke guide us through these plans and paintings.\(^5\) Pococke noted that “towards the end of the [Berceau] walk on an eminence” was “a pleasant summer house commanding a view of the rich country to the

---


2 RHP961/3. Winter was paid a total of 31 Guineas for “surveying and mapping the grounds in [Breadalbane’s] hands at Taymouth.” The sum was discharged on 29 May 1755 (GD112/21/79).

3 All of these features are clearly illustrated on two oil landscapes by John Sanger painted around 1756, which depict the estate from both the north and south. These paintings are now in the collection of the Scottish National Portrait Gallery. Sanger was paid £23.2.0 for “drawing a picture of Taymouth” on 17 February 1757 (GD112/21/79). At the same time he was also paid £1.1.0 “for altering a picture” and this may account for some small areas of over-painting (GD112/21/7). The cascades are large and remarkably naturalistic and seem to have been created sometime before 1744 - see payments on 2 July 1744 for work to “the Pier at the Cascade” (GD112/9/45) and 20 July 1751 for “men who smooth’d ground by the Cascade of Cranich” (GD112/21/78). The cascade was sketched in 1780 by John Claude Nattes - see NLS, MSS5206, f.1, “waterfall above the Gothick Bridge, Taymouth, Sept. 11 1780.” I am grateful to Mr Christopher Dingwall for providing me with photographs of certain of the garden buildings depicted in Sanger’s paintings.

4 RHP961/2.

east and of the Lake to the west, with the hills to the south of it highly cultivated.” At the end of the Berceau Walk was “a triangular mount for a turning Seat” on a mount to the south “was an arched summer house” and “on a long mount nearer the village” was “a fortification” that was “designed as an object for prospect.” These structures were Venus’s Temple on Tom More, a seat on Ladies’ Mount, Apollo’s Temple, and the fortifications about the hill of Tom na Croiche (that is the Gallows’ Knowe). Each may be considered in turn.

Some form of building would appear to have occupied Tom More from an early date. A small, finialed structure depicted by Norrie probably relates to that marked in the 1720 plan. Clearly it was designed to provide unimpeded views and, in the dramatic quality of the countryside it surveyed, the structure must have had much in common with the contemporary building at Dunglass. By 1756 the structure appears to have been replaced by a conventional classical box, its gabled front pierced by a rusticated arch spruced with showy vases and containing a “very fine cast from the celebrated Venus de Medicis” (figs. 5.26 and 5.27). It may have been built around 1748 when lead was supplied for the “summerhouse on Tom-more,” and completed two years later when Norrie supplied paint for it and two statues of Venus were purchased from John Cheere. If so then there are two possible candidates for its designer. The first is “Mr Morrice an Architect” who was paid 10 guineas in November 1747 - presumably Roger Morris who was then working at Inveraray. The second is Breadalbane himself, who, in

---

1 See Langlands’s vignette.
3 The plumber, John Graham, was paid on 3 December 1748 for supplying lead for the temple in the previous August (GD112/74/19).
4 An account for “108 yards light stone Coillour &n white in the Summer house at the Tom More” was submitted by James Norrie in September 1750 (GD112/21/286/58).
5 John Cheere was paid on 9 May 1750 for supplying “two Statues of the Venus de Medicis & Shifting Venus” (GD112/21/238/7).
6 Paid on 27 November 1747 (GD112/21/78).
1742, engaged “Master Campbell’s Drawing Master” and by 1755 had purchased a drawing board, a glass for “looking at Prints”, drafting instruments, and an instrument for “copying any drawing to a different size.”¹ He also possessed a number of books on architectural design including Gibbs’s Book of Architecture.²

The Ladies’ Mount was used by women who wished to view public executions on Tom na Croiche from a discreet distance. The ‘turning seat,’ which was probably raised between 1754 and 1756, presumably provided a simple shelter that could be directed as much to gallows as glens.³

Apollo’s Temple, was set on the summit of a low hill to the west of the castle and was visually linked by a vista cut through two platoons of planting, with Venus’s Temple to the north. An open structure, apparently square in plan with Ionic columns and a bell-cast roof, was in place before 1754 and was at that time referred to as the “Fairy Temple”⁴ (fig. 5.28). It may have been this structure for which a cover was made by a Kenmore tailor in 1772, perhaps to protect any statuary it may have housed.⁵ By 1786, however, it had been replaced by the present building - a squat cylinder of harled rubble with recessed arched windows to each pole and an ogee slate.

¹ Smith, “Extensive Ornamental Gardening,” p.153, n.47. Other architects to have been employed by the Earl include “Mr Douglass the Architect” (paid 23 April 1746, 29 October 1750 for “Plans of the Dining Room... & other Things - presumably the Edinburgh architect, John Douglas, who prepared a plan for Killin Church on Loch Tay around 1743 and eight years later made “plans and elevations of Atholl House [Blair Castle]... with a lead roof and a Gothick Parrapitt” (Blair MSS, Box 40/4/69)); William Adam (paid 6 June 1745 for “setting up [the Earl’s] Son’s monument at Moffat”); William Baker, a Midlands-based architect, who would have come into contact with Breadalbane via his Sgnall estate (paid 9 January 1759 “for some plans of a Church and a Summer house at Taymouth”); and “Mr Patterson an Architect” (paid 3 December 1755, 13 August 1759 and 9 June 1770 for unspecified work - presumably the Edinburgh architect, George Patterson (GD112/21/77 to /80)).


³ No structure is indicated by Winter though Sanger marks what appears to be a small seat.

⁴ Apollo’s Temple is depicted by Sanger, however, a larger version can be seen underneath. This depicts the structure as comprising four Ionic columns supporting a full entablature.

⁵ See notes of accounts due to Patrick Crerar, a tailor in Kenmore, for “a cover for Apollo’s temple” (14 September 1772 - GD112/74/354/7) and “for mending foot carpets, bed cushions and seats in Apollo’s temple” (4 August 1778 - GD112/74/361/20).
roof that was once crowned with a metal cast of the temple’s namesake (figs. 5.29 and 5.30). To judge by its fabric the arches were infilled after construction, presumably to turn the building from a rotunda to a summerhouse fit for “carpets, bed cushions and seats.”

Off to the west was Tom na Croiche. As well as a place of public execution it also formed a little gun emplacement. Described by one visitor as “a small artificial mount, with sloping sides like the glacis of a fortification,” it was presumably for Tom na Croiche that the “two Carriages of little Cannon” were purchased in 1754. Certainly the presence of carronades (a carronade being a particular form of small cannon) was recorded around 1786, and stone blocks with iron straps, perhaps for restraining the artillery, still survive on what has become a thickly-wooded hill. Now, in the immediate wake of the ’45 a Whig M.P. might be forgiven a tendency to caution. Yet the Earl would have been conscious that his cannon were trained on a fake sea to protect a mock castle from an enemy that would never return. His battery was affectation and the reasons for its building surely lie elsewhere. There was throughout Britain at this time an interest in the country’s warring heritage, a romantic occupation with conflict whose architectural progeny were the embattled houses of the Georgian Castle style - a style which was essayed initially amongst the buildings of British parks. However, a more direct impulse may have emanated from a visit made by Breadalbane to “Ld. Byron’s Neusted” (Newstead Abbey in Nottinghamshire) in 1751, where, during the previous decade, the 5th Lord Byron had

1 Garnett, Observations, p.80.
2 Payment to “Sandeman at Perth’s Bill for two Carriages of little Cannon” was approved on 7 July 1754 (GD112/21/79).
3 Colonel Thornton, A Sporting Tour Through the Northern Parts of England and the Great Part of Scotland, repr. London, 1896, figure (engraved by Garrard, Thornton’s travelling companion) facing p.64. Thornton’s book is undated but the internal evidence suggests that his travels were undertaken around 1786.
4 For castle-style generally see Rowan, A., “The Castle Style in British Domestic Architecture,” PhD, University of Cambridge, 1969, and for the importance of garden buildings in the evolution of the style see pp.60-108.
5 GD112/21/79. Between 1733 and 1740 Breadalbane is known to have visited Hampton Court, Houghton, Cliveden, Wentworth, Castle Howard, Chatsworth, Claremont and Whilton. After 1751 he is known to have visited, inter alia, Drum, Newhailes and Yester in Scotland, and Blenheim and Strawberry Hill in England (GD122/21/77, /79 and /80).
constructed three castles - one on the hill above the house and two by the shore of the upper lake. However, Tom na Croiche was of as much appeal for its “seat... [with a] a delightful view” which was painted for Breadalbane by Charles Steuart in 1767 (fig. 5.31). Pococke also recorded that “upon a terrace” was a “beautifull broad walk, with a fine summer house at the west end and an open Cross house at the other.” He also noted a pleasantly secluded “broad walk with trees planted on each side” and “an open building with Seats” terminating its eastern end. From this point Pococke described a “narrow winding walk with several seats” leading to a battlemented “round tower” containing a “room 18 [feet] in diameter” and “a way up to the leads” from which there was “a very fine prospect to the West and North.” These buildings were in turn Maxwell’s Temple, the Star Seat, the summerhouses at either end of the Surprise Walk and the Tower.

Like the seat on the Ladies’ Mount, Maxwell’s Temple was probably built between 1754 and 1756, and may have been dedicated to the recently deceased Robert Maxwell of Arkland, the respected secretary to the Society of Improvers (fig. 5.32). It may derive from plate 82 of *A Book of Architecture* which depicts an elegant loggia whose pediment, columns, niched flanks and pretty vases can be readily recast to form the temple’s facade (fig. 5.33). However, once again it was the view from, as much as to, the building that impressed; Gilpin for example noted the “very picturesque view... of the lake and its environs” that could be enjoyed from the spot.

The Star Seat was probably constructed around the same time. Square in plan and divided diagonally, each of its four compartments were lined with low benches (figs. 5.34 and 5.35).
The apex of the swept roof was ornamented with a thistle-like finial whilst on the corners of the eaves were hung bells, and in this there were faint echoes of Halfpenny's Chinoiserie - a suggestion of Breadalbane's taste for the exotic which was to gain expression elsewhere in the park.

The summerhouses (both long since demolished) on either end of the Surprise Walk, which were most likely matching, were in place by 1754 and may date from 1750 when paint was supplied for the "Terras in the Summerhouse with the... seats." Their rather ungainly elevations hint at an amateur influence (fig. 5.36) - the twin circular recesses perhaps deriving again from plate 82 of *A Book of Architecture*. These buildings and the walk they terminated commanded amongst the finest views in the estate; views rendered more astounding by the contrast between the wooded approach and the open terrace.

The origin of the Tower is unknown, though it was in place by the time of Winter's survey. A substantial harled rubble barrel, battered at its base and corbelled out slightly near its top, the Tower once bore a crenellated parapet, though this was removed probably when the cat-slide extension and ungainly gun-looped screen walls were added (figs. 5.37 and 5.38). The fenestration of the tower is particular, for its two columns of three sharp lancets are aligned to direct views not to the castle but west to the Loch and the hills beyond and east down the broad Tay valley. From the castle it appears as an impenetrable bastion guarding the Breadalbane demesne. It is clearly akin to Sir John Clerk's tower at Penicuik, however, a more direct source of inspiration may have been Thomas Wright, Campbell's erstwhile friend and tutor, who penned numerous designs for prospect towers such as this. His potential influence here is intriguing.

---

1 Account dated September 1750 (GD112/21/286/58). They may have been refitted nearly a decade later for on the 25 March 1759 a bill was settled "for a Chimney-piece sent to Taymouth for the west Summer House" (GD112/21/79). Breadalbane would also have seen Lord Somerville's tower at The Drum.

2 Jacques, "Rural Gardening," p.39, n.29. For Wright's towers see McCarthy, *Gothic Revival*, pp.42-8. None of Wright's schemes seem ever to have been fully built, though one, at Westerton, County Durham, was partially executed (*ibid.*, pp.42-3).
Reaching the end of his circuit, Pococke “descended to the North East to a seat called Aeolus” which provided “the most pleasing prospect every way” (fig. 5.39). From there he “descended half a mile, passing mostly through fields to the Octagon Summer house on an eminence” (fig. 5.40) and remarked finally on “a small Druid Temple” that was set immediately north of the entrance to the park.

The Temple of Aeolus was constructed prior to 1754, probably around 1751 when Paterson “the joiner” was paid “for three Balls and Spikes for a Seat at Taymouth”¹ - probably those capping the structure. Its elevated location (which must have suggested its dedication to the Greek god of the winds) seems once again to have been selected for the superb views it provided. Much the same can be said of the Octagon or “Mary’s Temple” as it was initially dubbed. This building may have been built slightly later, perhaps around 1754 for four weeks in the following year “Andrew Walker’s daughter” was paid for “keeping the Cows from the Octagon windows before the Rail was put up.”² Once more the structure was set on a high point with views east along the Tay, across Schiehallion, to Ben More in the west.

Pococke’s reference to the “small Druid Temple” is an interesting one for it hints that the stone circle was considered to be integral with the landscape.³ The feature is not marked by Winter, suggesting either that it was omitted from the survey or that it was a straightforward fake - the condition of the stones suggests the former. Whatever its origins, being located at the

¹ The account of £5.0.6 was settled 10 May 1751 (GD112/21/78).
² The account was settled 17 July 1755 (GD112/21/79).
³ The “druidical temple” was also visited by Colonel Thornton in 1786 as part of his tour of the Taymouth policies. He noted that there were “many other beauties of the elegant residence, particularly a drudical temple above the house and not far from the Fort” - see Thornton, Sporting Tour, p.96. Robert Burns is known to have said a prayer in the temple during his visit to Taymouth in 1787 (see Brown, R. (ed.), Robert Burns’ Tour of the Highlands and Stirlingshire, London, 1973). The temple, now known as the Croftmoraig Stone Circle, survives in good condition as one of the finest archaeological sites of its type in Scotland.
entrance to the estate, the "Druids burial place" would have been an interesting curtain-raiser to the Taymouth grounds, and to some it may even have served as a memento of remote Caledonia.

Pococke failed to mention four other structures. The first was what would appear to be an elegant gate-lodge depicted by Sanger and about which nothing is known. The second was "a beautiful chinese bridge" constructed immediately north of the house sometime before 1754. The third was a "Chinese house" for which white paint was supplied in September 1750; and the fourth was a blue, red and yellow "Chinese tent" which was supplied by the upholsterer, Philippe Tuten in April 1754 at a cost of 16 Guineas along with "gilding bells and dragons (1 gn.) lines and tentpins (ps), duty 12s... [and a] packing case for the top dragons."

Just two structures were built by the 3rd Earl after Pococke's tour - a fort and a hermitage - both of which still exist in a ruined state. The 'Dardanelle Fort' was constructed in 1765 within a clearing a little up Drummadurick Hill, south of the castle (figs. 5.42 and 5.43). There is nothing of substance to this crenellated, Gothic structure; its tall central tower and flanking wings being merely screens for light ordnance and only its circular terminating pavilions (at least one of which was fitted out as a banqueting room) suggesting any depth. Like the

---

1 Heron, R., *Observations Made in a Journey through the Western Counties of Scotland in the Autumn of 1792*, 2 vols., Perth, 1793, vol.1, p.244.

2 Account submitted by James Norie in September 1750 (GD112/21/286/58).

3 Bill submitted 16 April 1754. The tent was coloured Prussian blue, yellow and vermilion (GD112/21/242/84). The account was settled the following day (GD112/21/79). An engraving of Taymouth in James Stubie's 1783-map of *The Counties of Perth and Clackmanan* depicts a tent-like structure within a clearing in the park (fig. 5.41) as does an engraving by Garrard contained in Thornton's *Sporting Tour* (fig. p.64). Furthermore, the Sanger view of Taymouth from the north also reveals a small structure on Tom na Croiche that has later been painted over and may correspond to the tent. Scottish interest in China had been building from at least the 1740s (see for example articles in the *Scots Magazine* in 1744 (p.591); 1749 (pp.276, 330); 1752 (p.589 - Attiret's account of China); 1753 (p.520); and 1754 (p.490)) and the two countries had some trade links (Leiper, S., *Precious Cargo: Scots and the China Trade*, Edinburgh, 1997).

4 On 10 May 1765, Tuten's account for "two guided Moons, with the Iron Lead Work, & packing Cases" (which are depicted by Langlands surrounding the end pavilions) was settled, and five days later "Philips and Chimnett, plumbers" were paid £14-5-0 "for lead for the Towers of the Fort at Taymouth, & packing cases" (GD112/21/80).

5 Garnett records that "there is a building in the form of a fort, containing one good room. On a platform are some small field garrison pieces, which are fired on particular occasions." (Garnett, *Observations*, p.83.) Thornton notes that one of the pavilions was "fitted up as a banqueting house" and that he dined there "under a discharge of
Newstead castles upon which Breadalbane may have based the building, the “Dardanelle Fort” was intended only to excite thoughts of a military past, and in this it was a fitting counterpart to the battery on Tom na Croiche and the Tower that loomed above it. However, like all of Taymouth’s buildings, it too was well located to provide a “charming view of the house and grounds, the River Tay, the Lake, and the surrounding country.”

The unerring eye for fine open countryside which marks the creation of so many of the garden buildings of Taymouth lead eventually to the construction before 1769 of a hermitage overlooking the Falls of Acharn above Loch Tay, a mile or so outside of the Taymouth policies but very much part of the estate circuit. The hermitage formed part of a large artificial mound which in tandem with its flanking planting, formed a screen to hide the view of the falls from visitors as they ascended the narrow glen. It must have appeared similar to the tree-clad grottoes illustrated in the second volume of Wright’s Universal Architecture (1758). Visitors entered by either of two winding tunnels (which still survive) illuminated by tiny openings in the ceiling and by candles set into niches at the sides (fig. 5.45). The tunnels merged at the centre of the mound to form a single passage that lead to a domed room decorated with shells and fronted by a canted glazed window (the dome has now collapsed and been removed and the walls are stripped bare to the brick - fig. 5.46). Here the visitor was at once drawn by the revelation of the deep falls towards a sight of the sharp precipice upon which the view-point was perched.

---

1 The Fort is referred to as such in an anonymous account of the estate dating from July 1773 (GD112/22/26, ff.6, 7).

2 Garnett, Observations, p.83.

3 In 1769, Thomas Pennant had been thrilled by “the hermitage, the great cataracts adjacent, and the darksome chasm beneath” (Pennant, T., A Tour in Scotland; 1769, 3rd edn., Warrington, 1774, p.86). The earliest mention of the hermitage within the accounts appears on 30 March 1773 when Duncan Kippen gave a receipt for £1.13.4 “as one year’s allowance for keeping the Hermitage, with an extra 2s for peats bestowed in airing the room” (GD112/74/354/15).

4 Payment made in 1793 for “sea shells for the hermitage” (GD112/74/379/25). On 7 October 1794 an account was due to John Cameron, glazer, for “putting four panes in the Hermitage” (GD112/74/384/11). The hermitage along with “the sheds at the fort” and the “temples of Apollo and Venus and the temple nigh Lochend... Maxwell’s Temple and the Star Seat” were also repaired in 1794 (GD112/74/386/9). On June 29 1801, Archibald Cameron
Breadalbane’s aim seems thus to have been to integrate as far as possible the rugged wider countryside with the core of his designed landscape both by creating a more informal setting around the house and placing ornamental buildings “very judiciously to take different views.” Occasional incident was provided by examples of exotic architecture, but for the most part, sensual variety was provided by the landscape alone. Breadalbane seems to have been sensitive to the “romantic” ambience of Taymouth, and it shared certain natural features with those later prescribed as appropriate for such a landscape by Dalrymple. However, aside from the hermitage, the Earl shied away from deploying ornamental buildings evocative of “religion or grief,” rather they were simple classical or occasionally castle-style structures. The former suggest no obvious allegorical programme, the latter hint at an awareness of the Earl’s martial heritage. Irrespective of their style, all direct the gaze of visitors to the raw landscape in which the estate was shrouded, and it seems to have been as much for this purpose as their appearance that Breadalbane used garden buildings to enhance a visitor’s experience of his Highland seat.

Similar motives seem to have directed the Duke of Atholl in the ornamenting of his landscapes at nearby Blair Atholl and Dunkeld. Blair Castle sits upon a low, curving shelf of rich agricultural land within an amphitheatre of barren, purple hills. Around the castle survives a welter of luxuriant woodland, of which much was first planted by the 2nd Duke of Atholl, James Murray. Succeeding his father in 1724, Murray inherited an estate blessed with fine gardens but burdened with debt, and this financial embarrassment curtailed major improvements at Blair until the mid-century. Nevertheless, in 1732 the Duke began to improve the gardens and expand the

submitted a receipt for £3.3.4 “as wages as keeper of the Hermitage and the woods of Calelachen” (GD112/74/413/56).

5 The dramatic potential of the hermitage is neatly summarised by one visitor of around 1815 who recalled that “descending with the stream, we soon came to another fall of a different character; then by a path through a grove of trees to a dark passage of some length, at the end of which the guide, who understands his business, opening a door to the hermitage, suddenly the great fall appeared before us in all its glory” (Simond, J., Journal of a Tour and Residence in Great Britain During the Years 1810 and 1811, 2 vols., London, 1812, vol.1, p.403).

1 Burrell, Journey, f.14.
designed landscape as the small farms that surrounded it fell out of lease. Atholl seems to have directed the laying out of his own grounds though no doubt he drew ideas from other estates and benefited from advice contained within gardening books and that which could be gleaned both from professional landscapers and well-versed amateurs such as his friend, the Duke of Argyll.¹

By 1744 work had advanced sufficiently for the Duke to take stock, and he commissioned a survey of his estate from Thomas Winter (fig. 5.47).² This illustrates Blair bounded on its east and south side by the rivers Garry and Tilt respectively, and divided into two unequal parts by the Banvie Water flowing from the north. The landscape was laid out in a standard arrangement of regular fields, plantations, ponds and wildernesses interlinked by avenues radiating from the house. More originally, however, wilder elements of the natural landscape were also incorporated. From the castle, the broad “Hercules Walk” lead to a point on the Tilt where a “Cascade falls over a Rock 40 or 50 Feet.” From here the path curved south to follow the bank of the river to the estate boundary. To the north, beyond a wilderness dubbed “Diana’s Grove,” the precipitous sides of the sharply winding Banvie were planted out to form “The Den.” A wide path was laid out along its western bank with short detours to two viewing-points - one of which was apparently bastioned and walled or railed - from which the water could be seen to most dramatic effect.³ As it flowed from the Den and past the castle, the Banvie was canalised until it merged with the Garry. With its groves, buildings, wooded walks, cascades and canals Dalrymple would surely have considered much of Blair to be the “very region of melancholy,” and a good example of the second of his ‘situations.’

¹ For a detailed chronology of the development of the designed landscape at Blair during the 18th century see Smith, “Extensive Ornamental Gardening,” pp.76-125.

² See Winter’s “Plan of Blair Atholl begun to be enclosed in 1732” (Blair MSS, Plan E.0/11) and its copy, “A Plan of Blair in Atholl” drawn by Charles Esplin for the Duke’s brother, Lord George Murray (Blair MSS, B5/2). The latter survives in better condition and it is from this map that information has been drawn.

³ In 1755 “a parapet wall” was built “at the cascades” presumably for reasons of safety (Blair MSS, Box 40/4/81).
Blair’s riverside walks were laid out in 1742. In the same year the Duke proposed, though never executed (perhaps because of ongoing financial difficulties), a crisply-detailed gazebo for the summit of Broome Know - a hill to the immediate north-west of the castle. The design, proposed by Roger Morris, was for an astylar classical temple of 20 feet square, with glazed arched openings to each face, bold imposts and cornice, and a sheer pyramidal roof (fig. 5.48). From here the views would have been as extensive as they were impressive. Moreover, if it was intended to be set isolated within an open field, the view of the belvedere would have been a remarkably picturesque one: much the same in fact as that of the obelisk which was raised on a hill to the south of Broome Know in the same year (fig. 5.49). The obelisk, which is the earliest to be raised in a Scottish landscape, seems to have acted both as an accent to the landscape and as a termination for the Inverness highway prior to its turning north, as well as a monument to the Murray family.

In 1745 Atholl constructed within the thick woods of Diana’s Grove the “Temple of Fame.” Architecturally, the small, circular building (which no longer exists) was apparently undistinguishated and seems to have served only to house busts of assorted scholars and classical deities (fig. 5.50). Though undoubtedly inspired by the temple of the same name at Stowe in

1 Smith, “Extensive Ornamental Gardening,” p.79.
2 Morris prepared four “Plan[s] of a Building for the Top [of] the Broom Know at Blair. 1742” (Blair MSS, D2/12/2-5).
3 For the elevation of the obelisk see Blair MSS, bundle 55. The structure survives unaltered and around its square base are carved the Atholl family devices and the date “1742.”
4 Blair MSS, Box 40/4/64. The temple is indicated in an early-19th-century (?) proposal for Diana’s Grove (Blair MSS, D12/20). It may have been based on an unsigned “Plan and Elevation of a Circular House for His Grace the Duke of Atholl” prepared in 1738 (Blair MSS, D2/12/16).

5 See drawing of the “Insides of the Temple of Fame at Blair. 1744” (Blair MSS, D12/2/18). The temple was circular with openings at each cardinal point and housed two rows of busts. The upper row (which was eight feet from the ground) consisted of in turn: Venus (the Italian goddess who presided over the fertility of vegetable gardens and who is extolled by Lucretius in De rerum natura), Winter, Saturn, Arethusa, Spring, Shifting Venus, Lydia (the subject of a lament of a lover for his lost mistress), Summer, Piping Fauns (who were considered to inhabit groves), Lucretius (Roman poet and author of De rerum natura - On Nature - his only known work), Autumn and Cleopatra. The lower row (which was five and a half feet from the ground) consisted of Addison, William Congreve, Matthew Prior (the poet and Tory diplomat), Flaming Boy, Vestals (who were responsible for maintaining the state hearth in the Temple of Vesta - a small peristers in the Roman Forum), a flaming boy, the “Madonna” - presumably the Virgin Mary, Bacchus, Pomona (the Roman goddess of fruit), Virgil, Pythagoras, Democritus (Greek philosopher that greatly influenced the work of Lucretius), Cicero (Roman orator and statesman...
Buckinghamshire (which the Duke had seen 18 years earlier\(^1\)), the structure at Blair contained no references to political figures. As a Whig brother of two Jacobites active in the campaign of the Young Pretender, this is surely suggestive of the Duke’s tact regarding a dangerous subject rather than any ignorance of the allegorical potential of a garden building.\(^2\)

During the early-1750s the estate at Blair was improved in three significant ways: by building an elaborate walled garden; by establishing new planting and paths along the rivers; and by the addition of various garden buildings. The walled Hercules Garden - “the most beautifull Kitchen garden... in the world”\(^3\) - was constructed to the east of the house, where it survives still much as it was built (figs. 5.51 and 5.52).\(^4\) The western wall was ornamented with vases and terminated with a gardener’s house to the north and a pigeon house to the south (fig. 5.53),\(^5\) whilst the east wall was centred with a glazed alcove (fig. 5.54).\(^6\) To lend colour and interest the

\(^{\text{1}}\) During a visit in April 1737, the Duke made a list of the garden buildings at Stowe in which he records “The Temple of Fame” (Blair MSS, Box 70/D8). The ‘Temple of Fame,’ designed by Gibbs in 1726-8, originally stood in the western garden at Stowe. It contained eight busts: Milton, Shakespeare, Locke, Newton, Bacon, Queen Elizabeth, William III, and John Hampden. Around 1729 the temple was re-erected in the Grecian Valley and renamed the ‘Fane of Pastoral Poetry’. The busts were moved to the ‘Temple of British Worthies’ (Robinson, J., *Temples of Delight: Stowe Landscape Gardens*, Andover, 1990, pp.28-9) where those of Pope, Sir Thomas Gresham, King Alfred, the Black Prince, Walter Raleigh, Sir Francis Drake and Sir John Barnard were added. It is likely therefore that this is the building to which the Duke was referring. It is interesting that at Blair the Duke copied only the poets from the Stowe temple, English paragons were studiously avoided. I am grateful to Kate Felus of the National Trust for her help concerning the history of the buildings at Stowe.

\(^{\text{2}}\) Kemp, Piocke, p.231.


\(^{\text{4}}\) A water-colour elevation prepared around 1748 (dated by Dingwall, “Hercules Garden,” p.158) illustrates the east end of the garden much as it exists today (Blair MSS, D2/12/25).

\(^{\text{5}}\) July 1750) and replaced with ‘plain pannels with one incrinchment’ and ‘ornamented with a hansome cornish’ (Blair MSS, Box 40/4/64 - “Memorandum for Mr Clayton” prepared by Duke, 9 November 1750). The structure is illustrated on Dorret’s survey of 1758.

\(^{\text{6}}\) It seems likely that an unsigned and undated design for a “Parispad ovall” relates to the alcove at the east end of the Hercules Garden (Blair MSS, D2/12/12). The alcove was constructed by 1753 (Blair MSS, Box 40/4/81 and /82). An undated memorandum of around 1757 records that the “Kitchen Garden” contained a “Tool House; Pigeon House; Wooden Bridge; Swan House, Duck House; artificial Rock with an Eagle; An Alcove [topped with Bacchus, Flora and Mercury]” and “Four Marble Statues representing the four Seasons” (Blair MSS, Box 40/4/137).
garden was peppered with painted statues and, in 1753, “two pieces of Chinease railing with Dors”\(^1\) (fig. 5.56) were erected at the eastern end of the garden and an impressive Chinese bridge was constructed (fig. 5.55), probably to the designs of the joiner-cum-architect, Abraham Swan, across the narrow channel that linked two large ponds.\(^2\) The intense natural drama of the rivers was incorporated into the designed landscape by extending a path northwards along the Tilt to the Falls of Fender (or Yorke Cascade)\(^3\) and creating a new one along the eastern side of the Banvie\(^4\), whilst the new garden buildings, like those before them, provided fine views and attractive ornament within the estate. Thus in 1751 “The Octagon” - an astylar classical gazebo, now lost - was constructed on an eminence within a field to the north of the Hercules Garden to provide a “fine view of the whole [estate].”\(^5\) in 1755 the Balveny Pillar - a tall plain obelisk topped by a “gilt ball” and subsequently enclosed by “a building with seats in it”\(^6\) to provide sheltered views across the policies (fig. 5.57) - was raised on a hill a little to the east;\(^7\) and in 1758 two summerhouses were planned for construction above the Falls of Douglas and Fender.\(^8\)

\(^1\) Blair MSS, Box 40/4/82, “Accompt of work done at Athol House... since March the First till Decr do. Year.”

\(^2\) For elevations of Chinese railings presumably intended for the Hercules Gardens see Blair MSS, D2/12/23 and D2/12/24, and Blair MSS, Box 40/1A/6. For Swan’s elevations of the bridge that “separates a Canal & Bason in his Graces Garden” see Swan, A., *A Collection of Designs in Architecture*, 2 vols., London, 1757, vol.2, plate 43. A second and larger Chinese “Design of a Bridge for His Grace,” also by Swan, was constructed across the Banvie near the Castle (for the undated plan and elevation see Blair MSS, D2/12/8). The “last of the Chinese railing fell down from age and being rotten in the year 1793” (Blair MSS, Bundle 60).

\(^3\) Blair MSS, Box 40/4/137 - undated memorandum of work, circa 1757.

\(^4\) The path to the east of the Banvie was created sometime between Winter’s survey in 1744 and Darrett’s 14 years later.

\(^5\) The Octagon dates from around 1750 when it was noted as one of the items of “Work to be Done by the Masons” (Blair MSS, Box 40/4/61). A memorandum of 29 November 1750 notes that “the Octagon [was] to have the Roa [sic] Bucks horns fixed by way of festoons over the windows and a handsome Cornish [and] some little ornaments on the ceiling with a Stucco floor in imitation of a fine stone and black marble dotts” (Blair MSS, Box 40/4/64). The work was completed by December of the following year (Blair MSS, Box 47/4/105 - Humphry Harrison to John Murray of Strowan, 9 December 1751).

\(^6\) Kemp, *Pococke*, p.230. For references to the gilded ball see also Blair MSS, Box 40/4/88 and 93.

\(^7\) The construction of the pillar, which is dated 1755, and the surrounding summerhouse, which was built the following year, is recorded in a contemporary memorandum (Blair MSS, Box 40/4/81). It seems that the summerhouse was never popular for when Pococke visited in 1760 it was intended to “be removed” (Kemp, *Pococke*, p.230).

\(^8\) An undated memorandum of around 1757 notes that “a thatched house” was intended to be built at York Cascade (Blair MSS, Box 40/4/137). A list of “work to be done at Blair, 1758” notes that it was intended to “build a summerhouse over against York Cascade and little House there,” and to build the same “over against the caskades
garden was peppered with painted statues and, in 1753, "two pieces of
Dors" (Blair MSS, Box 40/4/180, see also /163). The summerhouses seem likely to have been constructed
similar arrangement is recorded in an engraving of Mar Lodge in Banffshire where a "rustic seat" was "placed for
contemplation" below a dramatic waterfall sometime before 1780 (Cordiner, Antiquities, p.26). Also at Mar "a
bower" and "a high obelisk" were constructed on "rugged parts of the hills" (see Cordiner, C., Remarkable Ruins
Bridge of Tilt cascade" was also intended (Blair MSS, Box 40/4/181).

1 Blair MSS, D2/12/15.
2 Blair MSS Box 40/4/194.
3 Uncatalogued drawing on display at Blair Castle (copy at NMRS - PTD/127/143).
4 In 1758 a number of other eye-catchers were intended for Blair. A small, crenellated arch was to be raised at the
"uper end of the Miln Lane" which cut between the Tilt and the Garry (Blair MSS, Box 40/4/163, /180); "an arch
ruin or pillar" was to be raised at the "town end" of a walk by the Tilt in order to "serve as a termination to it and the
Miln Lane Walk" (Blair MSS, Box 40/4/181); and "a ruin" was to be constructed on Creag Urrard which
At a time when many Highlanders - the Murrays especially - were still smarting from the wretched events of the '45, the celebration of conflict might be queried. However, such martial architecture was as much about defence as about battle, and at a time when a family needed to display its 'soundness' a sham-fort suggested armed resistance as much as aggression. Moreover, for an area long used to confrontation, the human loss of battle did not necessarily detract from its romance; after all, one of the principal objectives of the "twenty five gentlemen, natives of the Highlands of Scotland, who met [from 1778 onwards] in the Spring Gardens Coffee House [in London] in order to form a Society that might prove beneficial to that part of the Kingdom" was "keeping up the martial spirit."¹

The estate of Dunkeld, the former winter residence of the Atholls, is as intimate as Blair is expansive (fig. 5.60). Undemonstrative and, like Taymouth, the "region of melancholy," the compact grounds cling to the north bank of the Tay opposite the confluence of the little River Braan and beneath the great guardians of the Highlands - Craig Vinean and Craig a Barns. During the 1730s the Duke improved his landscape by creating four significant features. The first was the wooded riverside walk, which skirted the Tay to the west of the house and was punctuated with a summerhouse (now lost) overlooking an artificial cascade.² The second was a fine, classical greenhouse (also demolished) which was set both at the commencement of the walks and at the end of a long lawn which led down to the river to provide views of the mouth of the Braan.³ The third (whose overall form remains) was "an artificial mound, called the Stanley

² For details of the cascade see Blair MSS, D2/8. For details of the summerhouse that overlooked it see Smith, "Extensive Ornamental Gardening," p.78.
³ The greenhouse was constructed in 1739 (Blair MSS, Box 40/4/13). Its appearance is recorded in a 1748 survey of the estate by William Clark (Blair MSS, B13).
Hill,” which was cut with “several formal terraces” bearing “several small pieces of cannon”\(^1\) imported from the Isle of Man, planted up, and clad with walks that were “worth visiting; as well for their seclusion, as for the prospects which they afford[ed] over some parts of the grounds”\(^2\) (fig. 5.61). The last was the ruined Cathedral which (reminiscent in general of the use of medieval ruins within earlier Scottish gardens and perhaps more particularly of Thomas Aislabie’s Studley Royal in Yorkshire) was brought into the designed landscape as an architectural feature.\(^3\) Thus, as at Blair, when improving Dunkeld the Duke deployed his sensitivity for the ‘genius of the place’ by creating features that best exploited the natural advantages of the site.

During the early-1750s the pleasure grounds at Dunkeld House were extended. The riverside walks were continued westwards where they terminated at a “round summer house”\(^4\) before turning north up the low slopes of the ‘King’s Seat’ to a “fine piece of water” (Pulney Pond) alongside which were “houses for poultry, and a room to dine in.”\(^5\) From there a long straight walk returned east to the house, while a network of others sprung back downhill from a summerhouse dubbed “The Pentagon”\(^6\) and past a pretty Gothick eye-catcher. The lengthened riverside walks were punctuated with resting places: to the far west a mossy, rock grotto (built in 1755\(^7\) - figs. 5.63 and 5.64) was set into a raised embankment much in the manner of Thomas

---

\(^1\) Garnett, Observations, vol.2, p.65. Garnett notes that the hill “was raised... about the year 1730” (ibid.).

\(^2\) MacCulloch, J., A Description of the Scenery of Dunkeld and Blair in Atholl, London, 1823, p.17.

\(^3\) A memorandum of work prepared in October 1752 for Atholl’s gardener asks for the “Lime Trees on Each Side of the Narrow Walk that points to the Ruin of the Church, to be prun’d and Cliped” since their crowns were “so joined that the Ruin [could not] be Observed from the west end of that Walk” (Blair MSS, Box 40/4/80). Durrell noted that “adjoining to or rather enclosed in the Garden are the Ruins of the Cathedral” (Burrell, Journey, f.15).

\(^4\) The following descriptions are extracted from Kemp, Pococke, p.227. The round summerhouse may have been based on an unsigned “Plan and Elevation of a Circular House for His Grace the Duke of Atholl” dated 1738 (Blair MSS, D2/12/16 - fig. 5.62).

\(^5\) A memorandum of work prepared in August 1755 notes that two masons were “to build for His Grace... a house immediately fronting the walk on the north west end of Pulnagaits - The House to be 25 foot long within walls 13 foot broad... [also] thatching the house with fearns.” This building is noted as being the “Swan House” (Blair MSS, Box 40/4/97).

\(^6\) This most probably relates to a drawing of a sexagonal summerhouse prepared for the Duke by Abraham Swan (Blair MSS, D2/12/13). Masons were ordered “to make up the Pentagon” in June 1756 (Blair MSS, Box 40/4/112).

\(^7\) Dingwall, “Hercules Garden,” p.11.
Wright. Nearer the house the “Cascade Seat” was created overlooking the foot of the Inver village lade. Roughly between the two the view was opened up to reveal a large bowling green retained by bastion walls and jutting out towards the Tay. From here a wide sward of grass led first to a “Pheasantry and Dovery near it for turtles,” and then to a “beautiful Chinese house.”

All except the rock grotto are now lost. However, the Chinese House survives at least in the form of a delightful undated drawing probably by Abraham Swan (fig. 5.65). This illustrates a colourful classical-Chinese hybrid structure much in the style of Halfpenny and vaguely reminiscent of plates 25 and 26 of Morris’s Architectural Remembrancer. Its three bays are divided by pilasters relieved with diaper work. A central door with an unusual double-arched head is surmounted by a cartouche whilst the similarly-formed flanking windows are topped with an oculus. An elaborately finialed tent-like roof sweeps down to a sinuous eaves terminating in cusped brackets and hanging bells. The structure was probably of prefabricated timber and shipped from Swan’s London workshop in 1753.

Behind the Chinese temple a series of terraces linked by switch-backs led to “a turret called the fort.” The stout, square, crenellated tower, whose rubble walls survive in lamentable condition, was perched upon a two-stage circular rampart, the lower of which also bore battlements (figs. 5.66, 5.67 and 5.67a). It was approached from the north across a short
drawbridge and entered from the south through a tall pointed door. Its foreworks were “mounted wt. some small cannon” - probably the “thirty wooden cannon” which were received in 1756 as the construction of the fort neared completion. Its location was well considered. It could clearly be seen above the military roads and as such not only displayed the power of Atholl, but symbolically guarded the entrance to his ancient possession - the Highlands. Indeed, with Stanley Hill also kitted out as a gun emplacement, such an evocation would have been reinforced. However, it was also located with some concern about the views that could be had from its wide and pointed side windows, for although these were impressive no sooner was the structure complete than its views were found wanting in comparison to those that could be had from the nearby ‘King’s Seat.’ It is here worth considering briefly the connection between the sham-forts proposed at Inveraray and constructed at Taymouth, Blair and Dunkeld, for although there were other towers in mid-century Scotland, with their diminutive arsenals, these were the most explicitly martial. It may be beyond coincidence that they were set within three of the most significant Highland estates in the wake of the Rebellion, for throughout the later-1750s and ’60s, Scotland’s clan-leaders felt slighted at the Government’s refusal to grant the country its own militia. Might these forts have been built, then, as emblems of aristocratic indignation, with their mock ordnance trained, as it were, on Parliament?

Footnotes:
3 John Murray of Strowan (later 3rd Duke of Atholl) to the Duke of Atholl in January 1756. Murray notes that “I almost wish the fort was on top of the King’s Seat. I am there almost every day, and don’t think the view from it inferior wither to Windsor or Sterling Castles” quoted in Murray, *Chronicles*, vol.3, p.421
The designed landscape of Dunkeld lacked the dramatic features of the Inveraray, Taymouth and Blair estates. However, a mile or so upstream of the Braan, amidst unimproved pasture and coppice woodland, roared the Black Linn Falls (fig. 5.69). Here in 1757 a hermitage was constructed upon the brim of a sharp rock-face above the pool of an impressive natural cascade (fig. 5.70). The building was linked to the Dunkeld landscape by paths and was evidently considered to be a part of the estate circuit. It was fronted by a small formal garden and surrounded by planting which screened the view of the falls from approaching visitors. The intention was clearly to enhance the feeling both of contrast and surprise once the hermitage had been entered and the drama of the falls revealed for the first time. Little is known of its original appearance for the hermitage was either substantially remodelled or replaced around 1782 by the rather clumpy classical lozenge that exists today (figs. 5.71 and 5.72). However, its general form was described in 1762 as being a “hexagon coach-roofed with three windows looking on a fall of water directly below them,” and its interior “decorated with some pretty prints... framed in shell-work and with pieces of roots of trees having the natural moss upon them, which greatly resemble different species of rock.”

A little later, in 1765, coloured glass was inserted in some of the windows to give an effect enthusiastically described by another visitor as “water turning into a cataract of fire, or a cascade of liquid verdigrease.” More bucolic structures were created close by. The first was a small grotto that had been artfully adapted from a cave within the rock between the Falls and the hermitage. The second, was an artificial cave set in a wooded mound to the south (fig. 5.73). Whilst the former was created before 1762, the origin of the latter remains unclear; it was in place when Dunkeld was visited by the Reverend William Gilpin in 1776. He recorded that he had seen “a gloomy cell on the banks of the river.” What is of considerable

---

1 Unless otherwise stated the following information relating to Dunkeld’s hermitage has been adapted from Dingwall, C., *The Hermitage: An Historical Study*, unpublished, March 1995; Dingwall, “Hall of Mirrors”; and Dingwall, “Gardens in the Wild”.

2 Craven (ed), *Forbes*, p.239.
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interest however is that he notes that within it he “found an inscription, which joined its kindred ideas with those of the scene.”¹ The inscription was extracted from the poetical works of the blind Celtic bard, Ossian. This is a significant point as it suggests that the building was intended to convey a political meaning. Though subtle, the message was explicit and in this respect it seems to have been unique in the history of Scotland’s garden buildings and as such both the cave and the hermitage that presaged it merit attention.

Alongside a growing Europe-wide occupation with “Primitivism,”² there occurred in Scotland during the middle of the 18th century, a remarkable revival of interest in the country’s history, and more particularly its Gaelic literature.³ In 1755, Jerome Stone, the rector of Dunkeld Grammar School, published in the Scots Magazine, a number of translations of Gaelic poetry garnered from the surrounding area. Seven years later the young Aberdeenshire schoolteacher and poet, James Macpherson published translations of what he claimed were Fragments of Ancient Poetry Collected in the Highlands of Scotland and Translated from the Gaelic or Erse Language. Macpherson collected sources for this and his subsequent works, Fingal (1762) and Temora (1763), from across the Highlands. It is perhaps not surprising therefore that the vivid imagery articulated in the poetry attributed to Ossian can be so easily identified with the landscape around Dunkeld. This flourish of interest in ancient Scottish writing arose from anxieties about the perceived demise of native culture amidst the mire of a North British identity: concerns rendered more poignant by the wanton suppression of Highland society following the ‘45. To discuss native literature was therefore to subscribe in a covert way to a continuing sense of national identity and, by extension, to independence. Moreover, the Celtic bards were driven by

¹ Gilpin, Observations, vol. 1, p.125.
² For theories of Primitivism see Kruft, Architectural Theory, pp.152-6.
the Romans and then the Anglo-Saxons into Wales and Ireland, and according to the legend, the last was killed in Wales by Edward I. His death was dramatised in Thomas Gray’s *The Bard* (1757). Here the eponymous hero stands upon a mountain top cursing Edward’s English army below, prophesying the replacement of the Plantagenets with the Welsh house of Tudor, whereupon he casts himself into the “Conway’s foaming flood.” The appeal to a dejected post-Rebellion Scotland is an obvious one. Together, the hermitage and Falls might then have induced thoughts of Scottish identity in two ways: through their supposed (if not actual) association with Ossian, the Ancient national poet (the hermitage his home and the falls his domain and literary inspiration); and through a traditional association of sublime nature with liberty, an association given fresh currency by the renewed interest in Celtic literature, especially Gray’s *Bard*, which was published in the year of the hermitage’s construction. It is surely no coincidence, therefore, that the person responsible for the hermitage and the improvements at the Falls was not the Whig Duke but his nephew, John Murray of Strowan (later the 3rd Duke of Atholl), the grandson of the 1st Duke (himself a Jacobite who had argued against the Union), the son of the Jacobite general (Lord George Murray who was Charles Stuart’s chief strategist), and a member (along with Macpherson) of the Highland Society of London.

If Atholl was unsettled by the allegorical programme, after his death, Murray, as the 3rd Duke, was free to express himself as explicitly as he considered appropriate. Hence, on Murray’s accession in 1764 it seems likely that Ossian’s Cave was created and the hermitage renamed “Ossian’s Hall”. Certainly, when the hermitage was rebuilt in 1782 the connection between the building, the poet, the waterfall and the Duke was made manifest by the installation of a large painting of the Celtic hero which acted as a sliding door between the entrance lobby and the viewing room.¹

¹ Visiting Sutherland, Cordiner saw ruinous buildings strewn amongst the “bleak, rocky and desolate” landscape. He considered these to be the “places of refuge” of a “hardy race, in a very early age” and felt that the “cavern shagged with shrubs and aged trees, among which the wild-fowl make their nests, the rivulet murmuring round insulated piles of rock; and the distant prospect of these halls and monuments of antient heroes, forcibly recall[ed] to mind the images of the Ossian song” (Cordiner, *Antiquities*, pp 75-6). For mid- and later-18th-century attitudes
Thus, the “lofty mountains, and rocky, lonely recesses - tufted woods hung over precipices... nameless and gigantic ruins... and the roar of the cataract” rendered these Highland estates quintessentially, even romantically, Scottish. But such qualities were on the whole foreign to the designed landscapes of the Lowlands: here was “champaign, rich country, full of gentle inequalities” reminiscent of Dalrymple’s third situation and accordingly better suited to the garden style of “Kent, who beyond all others” considered that such country “should be studied and followed.” It is south of the Highland line then that the style of Kent and then Brown gained early and widespread expression.

Dalrymple’s ‘Third Situation’:

The Adams at Yester, Dumfries House, Craigiehall and Arniston

Amongst the very first estates earmarked for improvement in the Landscape Garden style was Yester House. In 1752, the Edinburgh gardener, James Bowie offered proposals to remodel the estate and create an array of cascades, an “irregular piece of water” and “On the hill before the house... an easy walk up to the Top where is a Proper place for a bowling green and a Gothick Temple.” He recommended also that “the arches which are already made... [should] be faced over with large stones naturally disposed, the lower one to form a grotto, the upper one a rude Cavern,” and that “the ground by the sides of the chapel [to the immediate east of the house, should be] raised higher and planted with evergreens, the chapel to remain and parted from the rest of the ground by a fence rudely formed, so that it may be of a piece with the antiquity of the

---


place at present.”\(^1\) Bowie’s recommendations display some sensitivity for the character of the place, yet they fail to incorporate the rushing Gifford Water that divided the estate almost through its heart. In this Bowie ignored advice offered to his client a year earlier by John Adam, who was then completing his father’s work on the house. Adam suggested “a Temple in the island, with a Rail form’d in the Chinese manner for a bridge, or passage over the River from the terrace to the temple.”\(^2\) The advice that the Marquis of Tweeddale received is of interest for it illustrates two quite different approaches to landscape design: one that assumed as its starting point the bold natural features of the site, the other that sought to forge a benign English landscape from Scottish topography. Each may be considered in turn.

There is some circumstantial evidence to suggest that the most significant exponents of the first mode may have been the two older Adam brothers. During the course of their careers, John and Robert each displayed a strong interest in landscape design.\(^3\) During the mid-1750s, John Adam re-landscaped the grounds of the family’s Edinburgh home of North Merchiston. From a small plot, he created a sylvan landscape of groves, lawn “water, Island and Rock,” the extent of which “was supposed to be four times what it really was.”\(^4\) At Blair Adam, John undertook a number of aesthetic as well as practical estate improvements. Principal amongst the former was his creation of ‘The Glen’ between 1762 and 1763. Here the steep banks of a small winding burn were planted out and a path laid along its length. At its western margin, where the valley began to open out, Adam planned in 1769 to ornament the summits of two of the

---

1 Sir Thomas Hay employed a “Mr Bowie” at his East Lothian estate of Alderston in the early 1750s and in 1752 recommended Bowie to Tweeddale as the “only person that I have met with in this part of the world that has a good fancy in laying out ground in a natural way” (Tait, Landscape Garden, p.64). For Bowie’s recommendations for Yester see Tait, Landscape Garden, p.64, n.62.

2 Yester MSS. MS 14551, f.122. Copies of two designs for Chinese bridges by the Adam brothers are held at NMRS (XSD/380/646 and /692 - fig. 5.74).

3 For the Adam brothers’ interest in landscaping see Tait, Landscape Garden, pp.93-113.

4 A description of North Merchiston by John’s son, William, in Blair Adam (pt.1, p.114), a privately printed work of 1834 and quoted in Tait, Landscape Garden, p.94.
enveloping hills with sham-castles, one of which was partly ruined (fig. 5.75). His castles were never built, yet Adam’s conception of Blair remains important for it reveals his taste for the Romantic and his belief that he should make “art embellish nature, without breaking down the works of mere art where those works should prevail.”2 It also reveals a considerable sympathy of taste between Adam and Dalrymple, who was a family friend.

Like Dalrymple, during the earlier 1750s John Adam seems to have intended to publish a book on gardening. Moreover, he wished to involve Robert in the project. Writing to his mother in November 1756, Robert responded to what “Jamie writes with regard to Johhnie’s sentiments of publishing gardens scenes” by agreeing that although “one should have a set of designs drawn out applicable to gardening, with ruins, temples, cascades and groups of trees” to “show the connoisseur,” to do so would be to remove their “desire of seeing and admiring them at your own house.” A better time to publish would be after they had had the “fortune to execute a dozen of temples and lay out a set of gardens” that were “approved of and admired by the world.” Nevertheless, over the next two weeks Robert applied himself to “these kinds of sketches” and prepared “a dozen different views” that were intended if not for publication at least to prove to prospective clients that as a confident young designer he was well able to evolve the art of landscaping “to a greater length than Kent and his disciples [had] yet brought it.”3 Something of the content and spirit of these drawings (which are now lost) must surely be discernible in the assortment of pen-and-ink *capricci* of romantic landscapes that survive from his time in Italy.4 These reveal Adam’s preference for the rougher qualities of the countryside; a taste that must

---

1 See John Adam’s dated “Design for Buildings in the Glen Blair Adam” (NMRS - XSD/380/298). The Adams designed other garden buildings for Blair Adam including a square, rusticated temple “For the Corner of the plantation in Bliaarduff,” a substantial circular classical “washing house” with a tall Diocletian window for “Bog Park,” an astylar “Dum Lodge” and a proposal for a highly ornamented “Door and West Wall of the Garden” (copies at NMRS, XSD/380/537, f.49, f.92 and f.11). A summerhouse known as the “Temple” which still straddles a wall of the walled garden was probably built to the brothers’ designs.


3 Fleming, Robert Adam, pp.362-3.

4 For these drawings see Tait, A., Robert Adam: Drawings and Imagination, Cambridge, 1993.
have been informed by Scottish demesnes in general and the taste of his father in particular (though, it must be said that it is given little expression in his only known design for a garden - a very Kentian proposal for Kedleston Hall, Derbyshire, prepared in 1759 (fig. 5.76)). But for Dalrymple to consider him two years later to be "the best Gardner & Painter I had ever known joined in one person" Adam must have been involved in more. It may be suggested therefore, that, in conjunction with his elder brother, he could have contributed in some way not only to the ornamentation but also the laying out of grounds at the Scottish estates of Yester in East Lothian, Dunfries House in Ayrshire, and Craigiehall and Arniston both near Edinburgh.

Between 1750 and 1751 the nave of Yester Chapel was removed to provide ashlar for the remodelling of the main house. In March 1753 John Adam reported to the Marquis that "we are busy with the drawings of the old church." By 1760 Pococke could remark that the "Marquis has rebuilt [the chapel] in a very good Gothic taste." The Adams - for it is almost certainly the work of both John and Robert - refronted the truncated building with a delightful Gothick screen (fig. 5.77). Its cusped centre gable is articulated with a sweeping pointed drip-mould above a distinctive arrangement of traceried oculus, armorial panel and crocketed ogee-arched door, which would appear to be indebted to the Woodhouselee Aisle of Glencorse Church near Penicuik.

---

2 Quoted in Tait, Landscape Garden, p.105.
3 Dunbar, "Yester House", p.31.
4 Yester MSS, MS 4862/98/2.
5 Kemp, Pococke, p.317.
6 The screen was repeated in almost identical form two years later as the centre-bay of the Tombreac Dairy at Inveraray (NMRS - AGD/91/52). The Adams prepared a number of designs for churches, temples, towers and bridges in prickly Gothic, the most appealing of which were prepared by Robert prior to his Grand Tour (see copies of drawings at NMRS especially XSD/380/410, /13, /265, /73). Though the robust forms of Robert's drawings were clearly intended to be built, few in fact were. Ironically, it was not until the taste for decorative Gothic was passing out of fashion that their greatest achievement in the style - the Brislee Tower built at Alnwick in Northumberland in 1777-8 - was realised. For the Adams' Gothic work see Fleming, J., "Adam Gothic," The Connoisseur, vol.142, October 1958, pp.75-9.
(fig. 5.78). Indeed the tendency for the Adams to draw from local sources for their particular brand of Gothick is further confirmed by an examination of the tracery of the oculus (fig. 5.79), as this seems to be a quotation of Edinburgh’s Parliament House (fig. 5.80).

It seems unlikely however, that this building (which survives in restored condition) was the only garden structure for which the architects were responsible. In 1760 Yester was described by Pococke as possessing a fine lawn “with large trees interspersed, where the sheep feed, and there is a terrace round it; on one side is a hermitage and on the other a summer house in a little island; beyond this is the park.” These two buildings are likely also to be the work of the Adams. As with Gothick so the brothers were experimenting at this time with rustic and Chinese styles. Rockwork, thatch and roughly-worked timber remained favoured media of the brothers throughout their career, gaining expression first in simple hermitages and grottoes and later in gate-lodges, cottages (fig. 5.82) and bridges (fig. 5.84). As affectionately handled, though not nearly for so long, were the baubles and bells characteristic of Chinoiserie. Doodled oriental bridges much in the manner of Halfpenny spanned the margins of the architects’ books whilst others were quickly but purposefully pencilled on frayed scraps of paper (fig. 5.81). During the mid-18th century there seems only to have been one “little island” at Yester - that within Gifford Water to the south-east of the house. It is surely to this that Pococke refers; if so, then he may have been remarking upon John’s bridge in the “Chinese manner.” It is possible therefore that the

1 Cameron, N., “Adam and ‘Gothick’ at Yester Chapel,” Architectural Heritage, vol.4, 1993, 39-44, p.41. Adam borrowed Scottish Gothic features for other of his designs; for example, two proposals for Gothic towers are topped with open crowns (NMRS - XSD/380/73, /673).

2 Ibid., p.42.

3 Kemp, Pococke, p.316.

4 A typical example of the Adams’ rustic work was the undated “Design for the West Front of a Cottage Lodge for the North avenue at Blair Adam” probably by John Adam. This neat building though compact and well-proportioned is rendered in the materials of the ‘Picturesque,’ thatch, harl and rough-hewn wood (NMRS - XSD/380/500). More bucolic is the ‘Primitive’ temple Adam proposed for his sister at Dalquharran in Ayrshire (fig. 5.83). This simple building, which was probably designed c.1790 (see Tait, Landscape Garden, p.108), is merely a pitched and tiled roof supported on four trunks that seem almost to be rooted within the copse that forms their backdrop (NMRS - XSD/380/733).
Adams were responsible for areas of landscaping at Yester - certainly by incorporating the island into the garden they were exploiting the most striking feature within the landscape in a way that was foreign to Bowie an may have recalled their father’s work at Duff.

As work at Yester drew to a close, the brothers prepared designs for a Palladian villa for the 4th Earl of Dumfries. From 1754, the smooth, plain walls of Dumfries House rose amidst the green fields of south Ayrshire (fig. 5.85). The surrounding farmland was planted with standards to provide a parkland landscape, and in this the Adams may again have had a hand. Robert provided a design for a heavily rusticated garden building to be sited within the thickly wooded rond-point of Stair Mount to the far south of the house (fig. 5.86). Overlaying a modified version of plate 77 of a Book of Architecture with Vanbrughian detailing, Adam proposed a tower as much as a temple, with a small pen-check stair leading to a crenellated viewing platform. Sadly the scheme, which was most probably prepared in the earlier-1750s, remained unrealised, however, the brothers may have been responsible for two existing ornamental buildings. The first is a robust temple or well-head of robust rusticated Doric columns (recently demolished - fig. 5.87). The second is a long gate-lodge-type building known as the “Temple.” Here the pavilions of the Inveraray dairy are reused and linked by screen walls to a central gate with a tall ogee arch.

---

1 For Dumfries House see Macaulay, Classical Country House, pp.123-6.

2 General Roy’s Military Survey of c.1750-55 reveals a series of regular plantations cut through with straight rides. When the house was constructed, however, it was not located so as to terminate the long, north-south avenue, but rather it was raised within open fields to the west of the woods.

3 The drawing seems likely to date from this time on three counts: stylistically it is similar to other of Adam’s early work; the architect was already employed on the house; and Adam refers to the estate as Leifnorris (as does General Roy) - that is the site’s title before becoming Dumfries House by the later-18th century.

4 The well-head exudes something of the air of Adam’s “Rusticated Temple” and it seems likely to have been designed by him or his brother.

5 The Mountstuart MSS are currently inaccessible: it is reputed however that the structure was built as a lodge in expectation of the creation of a north drive. The drive was never constructed, however, and the gate-lodge was used only as an eye-catcher. I am grateful to the factor of the Dumfries House estate for this information. There is also a smart mid-century, ornamental dovecote on the estate with pitched crow-stepped gables, caveto door architrave and an armorial panel.
and flanking pairs of clustered columns almost certainly culled from Langley, to form a somewhat uneasy composition that suggests the dominant hand of John (figs. 5.88 and 5.89).

After inheriting the estate of Craigiehall in 1749, Charles Hope-Weir set about extending its grounds (fig. 5.90). On the margin of the old bowling green south-west of the house he built a large stone summerhouse (now lost). Dated 1752 it was ornamented with thistles and crowned with the carved arms of his grandfather, the 1st Marquis of Annandale. These may well have been reused from another part of the estate, but need be interpreted no less as an act of filial piety. In the same year he constructed a rock-faced hermitage on the sharp banks of the River Almond at the southern boundary of the estate. The big, square basement of the two-storey structure (which still survives) forms a bath-house, with both its bath and part of its superstructure carved from the solid rock (fig. 5.91). Above, a once-thatched circular hermitage bears three large windows overlooking a boulder-strewn waterfall (figs. 5.92 and 5.93). External niches, now empty, once housed classical busts, and above the entrance is a coronetted lion’s head topped with a date-stone and a quotation from Horace. The interior was formerly clad with “a symmetry of columns of cockles, surmounted with large and gloriously coloured shells from the Mediterranean to represent capitals, and between them festoons of smaller shells. The arched ceiling [iad] a decided Adam appearance, though instead of plaster ornament we see, or did see, shells.” Hope-Weir was a friend of the Adam family and undertook his Grand Tour between 1754 and 1755 in the company of Robert. It seems reasonable to assume, therefore, that these two buildings are the work of the Adams. The latter especially so, particularly when its fine natural location is considered. The brothers seem to have provided designs for other ornamental buildings at this time. The first is a weak, two-storey summerhouse attributable perhaps to the early work of John on account of the similarity between its quoins and those of the Inveraray

1 Fotheringill, G., The Antiquities of Craigiehall, unpublished, undated (c. early-20th century), f.12r.

2 Ibid.
mineral well (fig. 5.94). The second is an undated and unsigned perspective “Sketch for the Chinese Raill of the Bridge at Craigyhall” (fig. 5.95). This is attributable to the early-1750s work of the brothers on stylistic grounds and was almost certainly intended to decorate a bridge across to an island (reminiscent perhaps of work at Yester) formed slightly down-stream of the grotto by a mill lade leading to Cramond. For the island, the brothers intended a fine primitive rotunda with a heather roof and lopped columns about a newly planted tree - a fine exercise in rusticity (fig. 5.96). It is unclear whether either was built, though the island was certainly integrated into the landscape for it quickly became known as the “Venus Island” on account of “a leaden cast of the Venus di Medici therein.”

In 1757, on his return from Italy, Hope-Weir created a deer park south of the Almond, connecting it to the core of the estate with a bunyated bridge at a point next to the hermitage. Constructed “in the rustic stile,” either end of the bridge, which still exists, was concealed by the thickly-wooded banks, whilst each face was given “the appearance of a natural rock perforated” and mounted with a plaque - the first a date and dedication stone, the second a quotation form Horace. From the bridge a walk led to a three-storey gazebo on Leny Hill from which could be had “a noble prospect of [Hope-Weir’s] extensive domains” (fig. 5.97). Three schemes for the building, all attributable to the Adams, were prepared. The first, a Pantheon-like temple, 45 feet in diameter (fig. 5.98), was abandoned in favour of a two-storey, circular gazebo with a balustraded loggia porch (fig. 5.99), that was in turn modified to incorporate a narrow intersol and a more muscular frontage (fig. 5.100). The scheme was realised in its final form in the same

\[ \text{Chapter Five: 1745 to 1780} \]
year as the bridge. The references from classical literature (the last to be inscribed in a Scottish garden structure) evident at the grotto and bridge were maintained with a Latin inscription mounted above the gazebo’s entrance.\(^1\) The interior comprised three rooms one above the other, with the uppermost chamber being used not just to enjoy the view but also to house Hope-Weir’s collection of “real, antique busts, figures and inscriptions, brought from Italy.”\(^2\) The decoration was as dazzling as it was exquisite, as much extravagant neo-classicism as it was whimsical Rococo, with fretwork and marbling, moulded joinery and delicate plaster ceilings all crammed into a room that was a showcase rather for the Adams’ talents than the curios it housed (figs. 5.101 and 5.102). Sadly, although the gazebo surveyed a charming, sylvan tract of the Almond Valley for more than two centuries, in recent years its interiors have been gutted by fire and its upper storey crudely lopped, and Scotland has been robbed of one of its finest garden buildings as a result.

At Arniston, the influence of the Adams may again be sensed. Little is known about the mid-century work on the landscape.\(^3\) However, the brothers were involved in proposing at least one ornamental building - an impressive Gothic bridge, probably designed for the approach from the south and reminiscent of the Fosse bridge at Inveraray (fig. 5.103).\(^4\) Given the existence of a

---

\(^1\) The quotation reads “Dum licet, in rebus jucundis, vive beatus, Vive memore quam sis avi brevis - C H W 1759.”

\(^2\) Wood, Cramond, p.67.


\(^4\) See the “Design of a Gothic Bridge for Arniston” accredited to John Adam (RHP5248/10/24). The only surviving architectural feature definitely to date from this period is a small vase that was carved to a design by James Adam (Tait, Landscape Garden, pp. 27-8). There is also, however, a grotto (fig. 5.104) set into rising ground to the south-west of the house. A pedimented entrance (fig. 5.105) leads to a winding tunnel that gives out to a small rustic amphitheatre containing carved stones, niches and recesses and overlooking the sharp banks of a burn. The date of the building is not clear. In conception it echoes Penicuik’s Hurley Cave and the stones could be from the old Arniston House demolished by William Adam. It is possible therefore that it may have been designed by Adam, perhaps with the advice of Sir John Clerk (for a possible creative dialogue between Adam and Clerk in the creation of Arniston see Tait, “William Adam and Sir John Clerk”). However, the structure lacks the architectural refinement that is to be expected of a garden building of this period. Indeed it is not marked on either of two estate surveys prepared in 1726 and 1758 (both are reproduced in Omond, for the latter see also RHP5246/7). Rather it seems more likely either that the grotto was raised in the later-18th century when the grounds were re-landscaped, or in 1808 when parts of Parliament House were reused to form other garden buildings within the policies.
“Plan of the Enclosures at Arniston in 1753, Showing the Improvements of the 1st President Dundas,” it seems likely that the Adams created other buildings at this time, most probably the “Chinese and other bridges” seen by Pococke in 1760, and may have advised on the creation of the “fine lawn adorned with single trees and clumps” and the “ridings” that wound “towards the glyn” which had been recently dammed to create a series of ponds in order presumably that it might be integrated more fully into the landscape. But if the Adams can be associated with a Scottish take on the Kentian style that accorded to Dalrymple’s third situation and depended for its appearance on the exploitation of whatever remarkable beauties the estate might have possessed, the ethos to which they subscribed did not last unchallenged. Soon, the irrational impetus of fashion expanded the orbit of influence of the Brownian Landscape Garden from its location in the Home Counties across much of Europe and certainly to Scotland.

Robinson, Robertson and the English Landscape Garden

The ‘Brownian’ Landscape Garden increased in popularity across all of Scotland during the third quarter of the 18th century. Its champions were James Robertson (fl. 1750-1780) and Robert Robinson. Both were Englishmen working north of the Border and advertising their professional association with Lancelot Brown. Taken together they remodelled at least 25 Scottish estates. However, an examination of their surviving plans reveals that ornamental structures played a very minor role within their schemes. As such, it may said that despite being the principal exponents of a significant (at least in England) landscape style, Robertson and Robinson made virtually no contribution to the evolution of the ornamental garden building in

---

1 Kemp, Pococke, p.313. He notes also that there was an “old ruin in the circuit called the Temple and a small Gothic church a little below it” and that these “were Templars founded by King David” (ibid.).

2 Certainly, to judge by the estate surveys the landscape had been rendered considerably more informal sometime between 1726 and 1758 (most probably in the early 1750s), though no evidence has been found to suggest that the Adam brothers advised on the work.

3 For the careers of Robertson and Robinson see Tait, Landscape Garden, pp.70-92.
Scotland. For this reason they, and the style they promoted, can be treated of extremely briefly and a single example drawn from the *oeuvre* of either man is all that is required to highlight this point.

The polished grey villa of Duddingston House was constructed on the eastern fringe of Edinburgh for the 8th Earl of Abercorn to designs by William Chambers from 1763.¹ Work on the landscape started three years later under the guidance of Robertson. Architectural ornament was spare. To the south a small Chinese bridge (now lost) was cast in 1769 across Duddingston’s thin burn. Probably around the same time a simple though striking domed temple formed from four pairs of coupled Tuscan columns (perhaps to a Chambers design, though it is unlike any in the *Treatise*) was placed on gently rising ground to the east, where it remains (fig. 5.106).

Though the standards, clumps and closely shorn grass would still have appeared fresh to Scottish eyes: more incomprehensible would have been Robertson’s decision to exclude views of Duddingston Loch and Craigmillar Castle on the grounds that each was “seen over all the country” and was therefore nothing but “a common prostitute.”²

At Paxton House in Berwickshire, Robert Robinson supplied a design probably around 1766 for a landscape to accompany the recently completed Palladian mansion.³ His proposal - which may be taken as typical of his work - reveals that he intended a most introspective garden - enclosed on all sides with thick boundary planting and open views available only from the south windows of the house and a narrow vista at the eastern margin overlooking the banks of the adjoining Tweed. The principal points of interest within the policies were a “Rotundo upon the

---


² Quoted in Tait, *Landscape Garden*, p.73, n.79.

³ Robinson’s “Plan of the Intended Policy” for Patrick Home of Bilbie is on permanent display at Paxton. The plan is undated but must have been produced some time between Home’s succession to the estate in 1751 and the transferral of the ownership of the house to his cousin Ninian shortly after 1766. By comparison to a survey of 1776 (RHP6145) it would appear that Robinson’s scheme was only partly executed.
Lawn,” set almost axially north-west of the house, and a “Monumental Obelisk” upon a promontory. Like Robertson, he seems reluctant to use such ornament; and what few buildings Robinson does specify are intended purely as visual relief. Likewise, Robinson seems to have been loath to make the most of the narrow valley cut by the Lynn which flows eastwards through the park. Although he proposed that the glen should be planted out, few paths were to venture to its heart. But if Bowie was guilty of the same at Yester, he was surely exceptional for it may be suggested that few Scottish gardeners would have squandered such picturesque potential. Indeed, through time, Robinson made ever-less use of ornamental buildings within his improvement schemes. Early in his career he seems to have favoured the use of obelisks and ruins and in his proposals for Monymusk, Aberdeenshire (1761 - fig. 5.107) and Castle Grant in Morayshire (c. 1764) both are in evidence. However, his 1779 plan for Balbirnie in Fife was devoid entirely of ornamental structures.¹

Other Significant Structures Ornamenting
Scotland’s Mid-Century Estates

If these, then, were the buildings that ornamented the pioneer landscapes of mid-century Scotland, what of those contained within other estates? As above, it is instructive to evaluate the most significant of the remainder of the structures in accordance with Dalrymple’s declensions.

Outside of those at Inveraray, just one other building of note survives within a “highland country” - that is a prospect tower constructed in 1754 on a hill south of Lochnell House near Oban for Lady Margaret Campbell, a relative of the Duke of Argyll. The tower, which is 45 feet high, is formed from two, square tiers, the lower is crenellated with tall recessed arches and

¹ For Monymusk see uncatalogued copy at NMRS; for Castle Grant see RHP13947; for Balbirnie in Fife, see RHP24334. On occasion it was seen fit to add to the amount of built ornament provided by Robinson: writing to Sir James Grant around 1768 of improvements at Castle Grant, Robert Waddilore [presumably the factor] noted that “Numa’s fountain is to be where the turning room now is, if not I wd propose some other cover’d Building in the form of a Hermitage fitted up and books etc. in it” (GD248/713/1).
houses a turnpike stair that leads to the upper stage, a slender domed box (fig. 5.108). Heavily massed in the spirit of Vanbrugh this is a building with a military air. Inspired, no doubt, by the Highland forts at Taymouth, Dunkeld and, that proposed for Inveraray, it was surely intended to survey, guard even, lochs Linnhe and Etive and the sea to Mull.

The only other designed landscape to contain an ornamental structure of any import and which “one may call a romantic disposition” is that at Panmure. By the middle of the 18th century, though its broad lines were largely the same as those established by Alexander Edward, the estate had matured considerably. With the wooded Monikie Burn cutting deeply through the heart of the grounds Panmure could indeed offer "sunk vallies, woods hanging over them, smooth rivers, the banks steep but accessible, and the rocks appearing high, not so much from their own height, as from the trees which crown,” and could certainly induce a “natural melancholy”. For these estates, it will be recalled, Dalrymple proposed “views of ruins” along with structures “subservient to the purposes either of religion or grief” such as "a cloister" all cast in “stone of a dark colour.” It is perhaps no surprise therefore that within a remote corner of Clearlie Wood stands an elaborate sham-ruin. Wrought from large rubble stones that lend it a heavily rusticated appearance, the ruin is a substantial assemblage of tall, gabled pointed-arches, corner turrets and screen walls set around a complex plan and was apparently intended to evoke sober thoughts of a ruined monastery (figs. 5.109 and 5.110). Its date is unknown, however, it was in place by the time of Pococke’s visit and it seems likely that it was to this building that Lord Maule referred in 1747 when he informed Lord Milton that he was “busie pulling down and building up, making ponds and canals and building ruins.”

The ruin’s design is surely too sophisticated to be the work of an amateur designer: indeed if it was constructed in the mid-1740s it would have had very few precedents in Britain (the most obvious being the array of sham monastic ruins that

---

1 Saltoun MSS, MS16650, fol.160, letter from Maule to Milton, 17 August 1747. A note within an inventory of 1881 notes that James Maule, factor at Panmure from c.1748-c.1753, was in charge of the masons when “The Ruin” was built (GD45/18/951).
appended Alfred’s Hall at Cirencester). As such it is almost certainly indebted to a well-informed architect such as Roger Morris whose robust Gothic work at Inveraray it echoes and who had at any rate provided plans two years previously for stairs to the front and rear of Panmure House.¹

With respect to the third of Dalrymple’s declensions, there are many examples of estates set within “champaign rich country, full of gentle inequalities” and containing grottoes, temples, cottages in “Chinese and Grecian architecture” as well as Gothick. It is perhaps most useful to examine them according to their style treating first of classical buildings, followed by Gothick and Chinoiserie and ending with brief reference to the rustic, with the term rustic in this case being used, somewhat loosely, to refer to the imitation of rude architecture, be it in the form of simple shelters of trunk and thatch or in the more developed guise of an antique Italian bridge or a medieval Scottish tower.

Classical Buildings

Gibbs’s A Book of Architecture seems to account for three classical structures. To the west of Melville Castle outside Edinburgh, a well-proportioned rotunda survives at the summit of a wooded hill (fig. 5.111). Formerly centring an étoile and terminating a long east-west avenue, the building would appear to have been in place probably by circa 1750 and certainly by 1762.² When first built the rotunda would not only have formed the focal point of the estate but also offered extensive views both across Midlothian and to the nearby city. Constructed from a honey-coloured ashlar, the structure is a polished drum with four, arched openings divided by blind-

¹ For accounts of building the east and west stairs at Panmure “after Mr Morris’s draught” see GD45/18/811. It is worth noting that other ruins were proposed around 1770 at Castle Grant (RHP13947) and Gordon Castle (RHP2381), both in Morayshire, and in 1774 at Bargany, Ayrshire (RHP1724).

² The plantation within which the temple is set is depicted on General Roy’s Military Survey whilst the temple itself is recorded in a 1762 “Plan of the Estate of Melvill Castle” (RHP2088).
arched panels, surmounted by a bell-cast roof and topped with a pine-cone finial, all deriving from illustrations three and four of plate 79 (fig. 5.112).

From the same plate seems to come an octagonal rotunda at The Lees in Berwickshire (fig. 5.113). Again of light ashlar, the building, which was probably raised around 1770 at the same time as the house, sits at the southern edge of the estate, pondering the flat English cornfields across the Tweed. This time the third illustration is quoted in modified form: its circular body becoming faceted to an octagon, its arched interstices removed and the Doric pilasters commuted to columns.

Isolated and rotting on a hill near Monkton in Ayrshire, a thick-set obelisk is mounted on a tall base - a monument to James Macrae, a local-born herd-boy who rose to become Governor of Madras¹ (fig. 5.114). It was built on a hill overlooking Macrae’s estate of Orangefield around 1750 making it the oldest surviving memorial in a Scottish garden. The building surely derives from plate 70 of A Book of Architecture (fig. 5.115) - the local mason-architect staking a claim to originality by removing the pedimented centre bays proposed by Gibbs and adding extruded Corinthian corner columns of his own.

Amisfield House (demolished), was constructed between 1756 and 1759 for Francis Charteris, later the 7th Earl of Wemyss, to designs by Isaac Ware with John Baxter as the executant architect.² The landscape was described by Pococke in 1760 as having “avenues with a wood on each side, and the lawns with clumps and single trees. There is a bowling green and a summer house, and a fine walk by the river.”³ The “summer house” was almost certainly the


³ Kemp, Pococke, p.318.
pretty, prostyle temple that lies to the east of the site of the house (fig. 5.116). It is a fine building, the first known of its type in Scotland. Four banded Tuscan columns support a pediment that bears the remains of fine Rococo rendering of the Wemyss’s arms - presumably those for which “George Anderson the carver” was paid in December 1758.¹ At its flanks are paired arched windows each with rusticated surrounds, the first blanked to mask the arcaded wall which divides the porch from the tea room behind. To the rear, a low door leads to a basement presumably used for food preparation. At first sight the temple is strikingly elegant, yet close inspection reveals an array of solecisms that would not have been permitted had the temple first been resolved on paper. The window keystones break the frieze in a way that is more mistake than Mannerist. Their masks, though charming, are too flat, suggesting that they are the product of afterthought. Likewise, the junction between the terminal columns and the walls are awkward indicating that the original intention was to construct the porch in antis. This is surely the work of a mason, perhaps guided by a sketch from Ware or Baxter, or, more likely, adapting a design from a pattern-book such as plate 1 of Morris’s *Architectural Remembrancer*, or the temple fronts contained in the *Complete Body of Architecture* (fig. 5.117).²

Greenhouses had been in use in Scotland at least since the late-17th century, however, by the 1760s they were being constructed as much to be seen as to be used and they were all classical in appearance. Generally they were lean-to timber buildings set within a walled garden but made the more eye-catching by the insertion of an ashlar gazebo as at Blackadder in

¹ Extracts from Wemyss MSS, Cash-book vol.2, held at NMRS. 11 December 1758, payment of £42.12.0 to “George Anderson, carver, in full for carving my Coat Arms on the new house and Summer house and for carving four capitals of the new house and discharge.” I am grateful to Miss Kitty Cruft for bringing these extracts to my attention.

² Charteris had a strong amateur interest in architecture, purchasing “some books of Chinese and Gothick drawings” in 1758 and Chambers’s *Treatise* a year later (ibid., 9 January 1758, payment of 11 shillings to George Paterson, wright, for “some books of Chinese and Gothick Drawings,” probably the works of Halfpenny; and 3 September 1759, payment of £1 5.0 to “Kinnaird and Bell at Edr for the 2nd moiety of Chambers architecture”). It also seems possible that in facing a small barn overlooking the estate with a castellated front Charteris was following advice contained in Timothy Lightoler’s *The Gentleman and Farmer’s Architect* for “Facades to place before disagreeable objects.”
Berwickshire (fig. 5.118). However, if glasshouses were to be built as ornaments within the wider landscape they had to be more substantial, and of these the arcaded stone boxes surviving at Newbattle House near Dalkeith (fig. 5.120) and Beanston House near Haddington (fig. 5.121) were probably typical. The traditional Scottish garden structure - the dovecote - was also increasingly being wrought in a sophisticated classical idiom. Three examples may serve to demonstrate the point. At Huntington House in East Lothian a two-stage classical pavilion sits in an open field alongside the house with a small gardener’s room at its base and a temple-fronted dovecote above (fig. 5.122). At Cambo in Fife, nestling in a copse to the south of the house, is an octagonal dovecote fronted by blind arches and crowned by a series of obelisks set on shallow merlons (fig. 5.123). Finally, in Roxburghshire, a thick-set dovecote overlooks Nisbet House from the vantage of a nearby hill, its dressed frontage, notched parapet, bell-cast roof and pentagonal plan lending it the appearance of a small ‘Baroque’ tower (fig. 5.124).

**Gothic Buildings**

Outside of the Gothick fantasies of the Adam brothers, only one structure can be attributed to the plates of Batty Langley, that is the large, rectangular building - probably a summerhouse or conservatory - which overlooks the riverside lawns of Ednam House in Kelso, Roxburghshire. The structure is fronted by five bays facing south, each now divided into two storeys but formerly containing full-height Gothick windows (fig. 5.125). Separating each bay are

---

1 See also Adam’s unrealised proposal for a temple and glasshouse complex at Cavens in Kirkcudbright (fig. 5.119). Adam seems to have had more success with a design prepared in 1763 for a small greenhouse fronted by a screen of Tuscan columns at Phillipshaugh near Selkirk (see copy at NMRS - SED/54/5). Though it no longer exists, a set of monolithic columns now form a loggia at nearby Hangingshaw House. The similarity between the columns and those proposed by Adam is remarkable and it seems likely that they were imported at the beginning of this century when the loggia was raised. It is interesting to note also that the two estates were owned by the same family prior to 1770.

2 The greenhouse is marked on a 1792 estate survey by John Black (RHP1036).

slender clustered columns leading to foliate capitals supporting a delicate Gothick frieze (fig. 5.126), all of which are likely to originate from plate 51 of Ancient Architecture (fig. 5.127).

An attractive, little tower survives within the grounds of Errol Park House near Dundee. It is finely detailed for so small a building: its walls being of harled rubble with ashlar dressings and roll-moulded angles, topped with a deep cornice and stubby castellations (fig. 5.128). The single square room is lit by lancet openings and entered via a tripartite doorway to the rear (fig. 5.129). A pen-check stair fronts the building to form a thick tower that formerly gave on to the leads to provide a prospect. The diminutive toy-fort, probably later-18th century in date and known locally as “The Troy” is surrounded by a circular moat and was once set within “The Maze” - a round copse cut through with a web of intertwining walks (fig. 5.130). If so, then a general source of inspiration may have been Overton’s Original Designs for Temples (1766). Though none of the plates correspond closely to The Troy, they exude at least something of its flavour: plates 4 and 30 (fig. 5.131) both illustrate square structures with tripartite openings, the latter being Gothick in appearance; whilst plates 35 to 41 all depict fine sham-forts set on elaborate earthworks.

Set straddling the north wall of the walled garden at Dunmore in Stirlingshire survives the most novel and certainly the most celebrated of Scotland’s garden buildings - an exquisite ashlar gazebo whose tall roof is carved in precise imitation of a pineapple (fig. 5.132). From the walled garden an open chamber is entered through a pedimented porch fronted by a Tuscan Serliana dated 1761. From this vaulted chamber plain doors take the gardeners to their bothies either side and a fine Ionic one leads the guests up paired steps to the entrance of the circular viewing room above. Here the flavour is Gothick, with ogee openings distinguished by foliate

---


2 See 1st edition Ordnance Survey (25 inches to 1 mile).
architrave and separated by half columns without bases or capitals. Above is the crowning glory, a spiky domed roof nearly 30 feet in height - the spectacular fruit of egregious imagination and masterly craftsmanship and unquestionably the last word in exotic architecture. Built by John Murray, 4th Earl of Dunmore, and a relative of the Duke of Atholl, it was probably raised as a theatrical display of conspicuous consumption, for he and his new wife always enjoyed living beyond their means.¹

**Chinese Buildings**

Very few references to garden Chinoiserie have been encountered within mid-century accounts and there are almost no Chinese garden structures still surviving. Therefore, although Chinoiserie was invariably rendered in wood and therefore particularly vulnerable to the abrasive Scottish weather, it seems reasonable to suggest that the taste for Chinese architecture did not take nearly as strong a hold north of the Border as it did to the south. Beyond its use at Blair, Dunkeld and Taymouth, just eight other recorded instances have been uncovered. A Chinese gate and bridge railings were constructed at Penicuik in 1758,² and though only the posts of the former still stand, the latter survive in store and constitute the only surviving examples of mid-18th-century Chinoiserie in Scotland (fig. 5.133). A Chinese dovecote-cum-birdstand was proposed for Panmure although it is unclear whether it was ever built.³ A Glasgow surveyor and landscape designer, Charles Ross, prepared a plan for Erskine House, Renfrewshire, in 1774.⁴ Ross proposed to construct an array of Chinese and other ‘exotic’ hybrid garden buildings both within

---

¹ It would appear that the surviving Dunmore MSS make no mention of the construction of ‘The Pineapple’ (Lowe, W., “The Parliamentary Career of Lord Dunmore, 1761-1774,” *The Virginia Magazine of History and Biography*, vol. 96, no. 1, p. 18). Dunmore seems, however, to have had a particular interest in architecture as he is listed as one of the subscribers to Chambers’ *Treatise*.

² GD18/1729. What appears to be a small oriental-style temple is also faintly depicted in a sketch of 1833-4 by James Murray (see James Murray Sketchbook No. 2 held at NMRS).

³ RHP35159/4

⁴ RHP1043
open parkland and as terminations to woodland walks, along with a bastioned battery overlooking the Clyde, however, either the landscape was very substantially altered in the first half of the 19th century (perhaps when the new Gothic house was constructed to the designs of Sir Robert Smirke in 1828), or, more likely, the plans were never executed. Chinese bridges are known to have been constructed at Newton Don, Midlothian; Cullen in Banffshire¹ and at Yester,² and at Castle Semple in Ayrshire a substantial classical stone gazebo was topped with a swept Chinese roof and set on a hill overlooking Loch Winnoch (fig. 5.134).³ Finally, the first edition of the Ordnance Survey indicates that a “pagoda” existed at Park Hill near Aberdeen, though this has long since disappeared and nothing is known of its appearance.⁴

Rustic and Sham-Medieval Buildings

These two distinct but related styles of architecture each began to emerge during the mid-century as expressions of what might be loosely termed ‘historical architecture’. By 1750 rustic buildings were an occasional feature of British designed landscapes. The dank grottoes inspired by antiquity and created within the bucolic estates of southern England by Kent and Pope, though few in number were well visited and quickly imitated. And much the finest example of a mid-century grotto in Scotland is that which was raised during the 1770s within the dell at Newhailes (fig. 5.138).⁵ The grotto is a ruinous, roofless chamber wrought from tufa, shells, pebbles and

¹ GD248/680/6
² NLS, Yester MSS, MS14551, f.122.
³ Groome, Ordnance Gazeteer, vol.1, p.251. Though the roof is lost the main body of the structure still survives.
⁴ It is worth noting that this is the only ‘pagoda’ to have been noted by the first edition Ordnance Survey in all of Scotland.
⁵ The first reference to the grotto within the Newhailes muniments is probably that contained within a letter from William Dalrymple to his sister Jenny dated at Canton on the sixth of January, 1774. In the letter Dalrymple notes that his sister had “undertaken the arduous task of finishing the Grotto & want my assistance for shells corals & other things of the kind but I fear I shall not be able to get you anything this year & next year may be too late. I wish you had given me a hint of such a thought some years ago but however I’ll do my best. I have sent a Box with some roots of trees cut quite with Grotesk stile by the 2nd Mate of the Prince” (NLS MS 25286 fos 18-19). Clearly, work on the structure had started some time before 1774. This would not have been unusual for the building of a grotto. The volume and variety of shells required meant that many were completed over a number of years: that at Goldney in Avon used over 200,000 shells from Britain and abroad and took some 27 years to construct. Whilst the grotto at
furnace slag, rectangular in plan and measuring some 21 feet wide by 16 feet high. Flues evident within its partially ruined walls indicate that the grotto once had quite a sophisticated a mural heating system. Though windowless it was probably once top-lit and though its internal walls are now bare they were once decorated with a Gothick arcade of shells and "roots and trees cut quite in with Grotesk stile".2

Hermitages, on the other hand, had been gaining in popularity - at least in England - since the publication in 1722 of Thomas Parnell's moralising poem, The Hermit, and the construction of Kent's hermitages in the early 1730s at Richmond and Stowe.3 The fabric of this 'natural' architecture was rough-hewn boulders, pebbles shells and minerals. However, probably sometime during the 1740s, it would appear that contorted branches, chunks of mud and matted thatch, were also used, generally to form still-more ascetic accommodation in the form of 'root houses' as illustrated in Thomas Wright's Six Original Designs of Arbours (1755) and Six Original Designs of Grottoes (1758 - fig. 5.135). The reasons were in part aesthetic, for such buildings - like sham-ruins - lent a park a little relief from the monotony of prim classical temples. Indeed their rugged appearance was peculiarly suited to their bucolic surroundings. However, another reason is suggested by illustrations contained within two mid-century

1 A payment made to masons in 1781 for cutting a "chack for frames of Grottoe Windows" (NLS MS 25818 fo.90, 92) most probably refers either to lights within the roof and ceiling.

2 NLS MS 25286 fos.18-19 - account of 1774.

3 For a history of the creation of hermitages in 18th-century gardens see Coffin, English Garden, pp.87-109. For the practice of employing people to inhabit such structures and appear as if they were hermits see Dixon, A., "Hermits for Hire," Country Life, 2 June 1988, pp.160-2. It should be noted that no accounts have been encountered of 'rented' hermits being employed in Scotland.
architectural publications. Sir William Chambers illustrates within his *Treatise on Architecture* (1759) a wooden shelter complete with tree-trunk columns and a rough pediment which he considers to demonstrate The “Third sort of Huts which gave birth to the Doric order” (fig. 5.136). Likewise, William Wrighte’s *Grotesque Architecture* (1767) depicts a shelter “intended to represent the primitive State of the Dorick Order” (fig. 5.137). This idea of the rustic hut representing the origins of classicism was hardly new but it had been given fresh currency with the translation in 1755 of Marc-Antoine Laugier’s *Essai sur l’architecture* (1753). Therefore, to create a trabeated timber hut in a mid-century park was to make an informed reference to architectural history. Moreover, with Rousseau’s notions of a blissful, primitive man also gaining acceptance across Britain, the philosophical connotations of a moss house would have recommended still further its deployment within a landscape.¹

The design of rustic buildings formed a small but significant part of the Adam brother’s output throughout their careers and many of their surviving drawings depict thatched temples and rough-hewn shelters. The greatest expression of the rustic style was the concatenated tea-house constructed at Moor Park in Hertfordshire around 1764. Though thatched and fronted by a log-columned veranda, this was a classically conceived building: Diocletians lit the main blocks and the plan was entirely geometrical, whilst palm-tree pilasters supported a foliate ceiling in a representation of what Robert considered to be the origins of the Corinthian column. It is generally accepted that the Moor Park teahouse is “very likely the only one of numerous Adam designs for small thatched buildings that was executed”² but to this can surely be added the grotto at Craigiehall, which is at any rate the finest expression of mid-century rustic architecture still surviving in Scotland.


Interest in medieval architecture, so evident in Sir John Clerk’s decoration of Penicuik, continued into the mid-century. The sham-forts at Inveraray, Taymouth, Blair and Dunkeld were militaristic manifestations of this romantic impulse, but at Mellerstain Robert Adam proposed a more domestic version. Probably around 1770, when work was starting on the mansion, Adam drew up a proposal for an enormous agglomeration of machicolated towers and ruinous walls amassed to form a medieval city gate for the summit of the nearby hill at Darlingfield (fig. 5.139). As convincing to gaze upon as it would have been expensive to build the proposal was shelved until 1774 when Adam designed for the same spot a traditional tower-house dedicated to the “memory of Baillie of Jerviswood,” his patron’s father (fig. 5.140). Though it was still a substantial building - 25 feet square and four-storeys high with a pinnacled stair-tower in one corner - it was smaller than the first scheme and Adam duly worked up a construction plan. Sadly it remained on paper, but had the scheme been realised it would have been a splendid expression of sham-medieval vernacular architecture and much the most original monument of its day.¹

Bridging the gap, so to speak, between these two styles - the rustic and the sham-medieval - is Robert Adam’s ruined arch and viaduct at Culzean Castle in Ayrshire (fig. 141). The mansion was constructed between 1777 and 1792 in the idiosyncratic castle style that Adam evolved in part to attract commissions north of the Border. Though classical in plan it is densely massed, stoutly proportioned and clad in arrow-slits and crenellations to exude a sternly medieval air. Unsurprisingly the viaduct achieves much the same. The bridge was constructed in 1780 to Adam’s design in order not only to carry the approach drive across 200 feet of uneven ground but also as something of a curtain-raiser for the castle. The carriageway is flanked by walled parapets that are corbelled out on a series of arches interspersed with square turrets and at the entry to the viaduct is a sham-ruin comprising of an arch with circular and square flanking turrets. With its ‘Antique’ finish and rubble walls the bridge shares the rustic qualities of a number of smaller

¹ Work may, however, have started on the building since a square “ruin” is marked on Mellerstain Hill by the Ordnance Survey of 1862.
bridge designs penned by Adam, whilst its round arches and ‘portcullis’ gate render it medieval, perhaps even Roman-esque.

Rococo Gardens in Scotland

In light of the popular influence of the Rococo movement on garden design in England during the middle of the 18th century, it may be useful at this point to draw on the evidence provided by those garden buildings described above and estimate the degree to which the taste for Rococo may have informed garden design in Scotland.

The Rococo style in interior design, the decorative arts, painting, architecture and sculpture originated in Paris in the early-1700s as a reaction to the ponderous Baroque that characterised the reign of Louis XIV and it was at its most popular across Britain roughly between 1740 and 1760. The spirit of Rococo is one of lightness, playfulness, elegance and grace and it is characterised by the delicate interlacing of curves and counter-curves (based on C- and S-scrolls); by the use of shell forms and other natural shapes; and by asymmetrical design. The influence of the Rococo on garden design is often difficult to ascertain since many of its characteristics can be found in Britain’s demesnes long before the mid-century (for example serpentine paths were common by the early-1700s, and shells had been used in numerous grottoes). Rather, it is the application of these features that distinguishes a garden as Rococo and as such the idea of a Rococo garden is “a question of approach, feeling or spirit, rather than a definable form.”

The appearances of a number of English Rococo gardens are recorded in contemporary descriptions, surveys, plans, engravings and paintings, and at least one example survives in a restored state at Painswick House in Gloucestershire. However, it was easier and cheaper to introduce Rococo features into a larger garden rather than create an entirely Rococo

---

garden de novo. Therefore, delicately-detailed and modestly-scaled garden buildings were deployed to cast a Rococo veil across an estate and it is Gothick screens with ogee openings and spindly buttresses, classical temples with extravagant cartouches, and Chinese summer-houses with swept roofs and richly painted walls that survive as the best evidence for this most whimsical of fashions. Now, Gothick and Chinese structures were scattered liberally across the gardens and designed landscapes of mid-century England and these provide evidence enough that "the flame of English Rococo... burned brightly in the area of the garden" - but what of Scotland?

No known plan, survey or sketch depicts an identifiably Rococo Scottish garden, and nor did the country ever benefit from a Rococo artist as did England with Thomas Robins. Scotland's contemporary journals never involved themselves with debates on the relative merits of the style as did, for example, The World magazine in the south,^2^ nor does the Rococo seem to have been much considered in the correspondence of the country's aristocracy. Indeed the only evidence for the influence of the Rococo on gardens and designed landscapes derives from garden buildings. Thus, Gothick structures were raised or at least proposed at Inveraray, Dunkeld, Yester, Ednam, Errol Park and Dunmore; Chinese structures at Taymouth, Blair and Dunkeld, Penicuik, Panmure, Erskine House, Cullen, Yester, Castle Semple and Park Hill; and classical structures with Rococo decoration at Amisfield (the prostyle temple) and Craigiehall (the gazebo on Leny Hill). This list of estates - 16 in all to which many others could no doubt be added - is certainly sufficient to suggest that the Rococo was understood and appreciated in Scotland and was deployed broadly in accordance with Dalrymple's advice (all of these estates could be said to conform to Dalrymple's second and third declensions with the exception of Inveraray which made

---

1 Ibid.

2 Only the Scots Magazine provides any indication of Rococo interests in Scotland. The magazine published a number of articles over the course of a decade relating to China (see 1744, p.591; 1749, pp.276, 330; 1752, p.589; 1753, p.520). A taste for Rococo decoration within mid-century mansions seems also to have been slight in comparison to England (inf. ex. Professor Alistair Rowan).
use only of Rococo Gothick). Indeed, at Dunmore Rococo was arguably brought to its greatest stylistic pitch. Yet, by comparison to England they remain few in number, indeed, Rococo in domestic architecture and decoration can barely be discerned at all. It seems reasonable to suggest, therefore, that Rococo was never a style with which the Scots were entirely comfortable. The reasons can only be guessed at, however, as has been suggested for the first part of the century, Scotland’s native landscape may have been a key determinant, since moors and mountains can never provide an appropriate back-cloth to a delicate timber temple or a pretty Gothick trifle. However, it should be remembered also that the ‘45 would have administered a sharp corrective to any prevailing sense of care-free whimsy in Scotland and at any rate stifled development across the country for much of the mid-18th century.

Conclusion

In conclusion, from the evidence of both surviving and lost garden buildings it would seem that in mid-century Scotland the siting of such structures was informed as much by the desire to focus attention on the garden and the landscape beyond as by practical or aesthetic criteria. Moreover, despite their popularity south of the Border, the mid-18th century was not a time when Scotland’s gardens were especially over-run with temples and summerhouses. It may be suggested that the reason for this was, inter alia, that Scotland had evolved a particular style of gardening that depended on natural rather than artificial features for its appeal. This mode of landscaping was set out in Dalrymple’s Essay, which states that the layout and content of a garden should evolve from the character in which it is set, and identifies four declensions: the ‘Highland’ situation (for example Inveraray); the ‘Romantic’ (Taymouth and Dunkeld); the ‘champaign rich country’ (generally Lowland estates, especially the Lothians, where the Adam brothers - who were friends of Dalrymple - may well have advised on the layout of a small number of designed landscapes according to a taste that shared much with the Kentian style but laid greater stress on the use of natural features); and the ‘dead flat’ (which Scotland has
practically no examples of). To judge by the deployment and appearance of garden buildings these declensions were more or less adhered to. The principal styles of architecture - classical, Gothic and Chinese - were all essayed on garden buildings, and whilst the first of these was the most common, outstanding examples of the second (at Dunmore) and the third (at Dunkeld) are known, as well as one of Britain's earliest sham-ruins (at Panmure). The emblematic value of garden buildings diminished during the mid-century. However, the Highland sham-forts at Inveraray, Taymouth, Blair and Dunkeld may well be expressions of aristocratic indignation at the resolution of the 'militia issue.' Moreover, the hermitage at Dunkeld is likely to be the last allegorical expression in stone of Jacobite sympathies.
CHAPTER SIX

THE LATE-GEORGIAN PERIOD: 1780 TO 1840

Developments in Landscape Design and the Demise of Ornamental Structures

Touring Scotland in 1776, the Reverend William Gilpin visited the gardens at Dunkeld. There he observed that:

"the whole valley is interspersed with wood; both on the banks of the river and in its internal parts; and would have been a still more beautiful scene if art had done as much as nature. Much indeed it has done; but nothing well. Cascades, and slopes, and other puerilities deform a scene which is in itself calculated to receive all the grandeur of landscape."\(^1\)

Similar disapproval was applied to the estate of Taymouth where

"the walks on neither side of the river seemed intended to shew the scenery; but rather as avenews for a few tawdry inelegant buildings which terminated them. Nothing could show a more thorough inattention to every idea of beauty and taste, than the whole contrivance of the place."

---

\(^1\) Gilpin, *Observations*, pp.11-14.
In little less than twenty years after their creation, the cynosures of Augustan gardening in Scotland were being condemned as inimical to good taste. Indeed, throughout his journey it seems that almost wherever Gilpin laid his eyes he saw walks that were "formal and ill contrived" and ornamental buildings that were rarely other than "tawdry." If Gilpin's comments were not yet typical of later-18th-century men of taste, they were certainly prescient, for when, 13 years later, they were eventually published they proved as popular as they were influential. Gilpin was pioneering a rather different appreciation of perfected nature than that felt by Atholl and Breadalbane. The reason behind Gilpin's alternative view is best exemplified in the author's earliest discussion of landscape aesthetics, his Dialogue Upon the Gardens... at Stow in Buckinghamshire published in 1748.2

The Dialogue features a debate between two visitors walking through Lord Cobham's garden at Stowe. Happening upon Kent's bucolic hermitage, they ponder the appeal of the structure. Each considers the scene to be "vastly picturesque," however, one is moved to ask "why we are more taken with Prospects of this ruinous kind, than with Views of Plenty and Prosperity in their greatest Perfection." His friend responds:

"cannot you make a distinction between natural and moral beauties? Our social Affectations undoubtedly find their Enjoyment the most compleat when they contemplate, a Country smiling in the midst of Plenty, where Houses are well-built, Plantations regular, and everything the most commodious and useful. But such

1 Ibid., pp.157-60, describing the grounds at Taymouth.

2 Unless otherwise stated the following five paragraphs, which treat of the development of aesthetic theory as it relates to garden design in late-18th-century Britain, have been adapted from Andrews, M., The Search for the Picturesque: Landscape Aesthetics and Tourism in Britain, 1760-1800, London, 1987. See also Hussey, C., The Picturesque, London, 1927.
Regularity and Exactness excites no manner of Pleasure in the Imagination, unless
they are made use of to contrast with something of an opposite kind.\(^1\)

For an age that considered natural beauty to be a direct expression of moral beauty, Gilpin’s
distinction between the two is remarkable. Although he is fully aware of the social connotations
of a Georgic landscape or the darker implications of a ruined castle, he does not consider an
understanding of such iconography essential to the appreciation of either. To Gilpin, the appeal of
his surroundings is almost exclusively visual, since

“We are most delighted, when some grand scene, tho perhaps of incorrect
composition, rising before the eye, strikes us beyond the power of thought... every
mental operation is suspended... We rather feel, than survey it.”\(^2\)

Nine years later, Gilpin’s ideas were lent considerable support by Edmund Burke’s
*Philosophical Enquiry into the Origins of our Ideas of the Sublime and Beautiful*. Burke
suggested that “the influence of reason in producing our passions is nothing near so extensive as
it is commonly believed,”\(^3\) and argued that the perception of beauty did not depend upon an
intellectual recognition of utility or proportion, but rather on an appreciation of colour, form and
texture. In the hands of Lancelot Brown, this theory had gained expression in the soft lines of
open parkland and plump clumps of trees. Gilpin’s vision, however, was altogether a rougher,
more spindly one. Amongst his *Unconnected Thoughts*, prepared in the early 1760s, Shenstone
had contended that “landskip or picturesque-gardening” consisted in “pleasing the imagination,

---


2 Gilpin, W., *Three Essays: On Picturesque Beauty; on Picturesque Travel; and, on Sketching Landscape: to which is added a Poem on Landscape Painting*, (1792), pp.49-50 quoted in Andrews, *Search for the Picturesque*, p.44.

by scenes of grandeur, beauty, or variety.”¹ Such variety he felt derived not just from contrasting scenes but from the texture of the landscape itself: “are there not broken rocks and rugged grounds, to which we can hardly attribute either beauty or grandeur, and yet when introduced near an extent of lawn, impart a pleasure equal to more shapely scenes?”² Gilpin was of a similar opinion, considering that

“the Fancy is struck by Nature alone... Thus a regular Building perhaps gives us very little pleasure; and yet a fine Rock, beautifully set off in Claro-obscuro [sic], and garnished with flourishing Bushes, Ivy, and dead Branches, may afford us a great deal.”³

In his Essays on the Picturesque (1794), Sir Uvedale Price recognised that this rugged variety, which represented the mid-point between Burke’s sublime and beautiful, merited its own aesthetic declension - the “Picturesque.”

Designed landscapes became, more than ever, close imitations of raw nature; Rosa-like policies of waterfalls and ferns intended to impress the senses rather than inspire the mind. Rather, the aesthetician “ranges after nature, untamed by art, and bursting wildly into all its irregular forms.”⁴ Amongst such scenes architecture was more often than not viewed as an unwanted intrusion: classical buildings especially were considered inappropriate. To Gilpin,

---
² Ibid., p.126.
"a piece of Palladian architecture may be elegant in the last degree. The proportion of its parts - the propriety of its ornaments - and the symmetry of the whole, may be highly pleasing. But if we introduce it in a picture, it immediately becomes a formal object, and ceases to please. Should we wish to give it picturesque beauty, we must beat down one half of it, deface the other, and throw the mutilated members around in heaps. In short, from a smooth building we must turn it into a rough ruin."\footnote{Gilpin, \textit{Three Essays}, quoted in Andrews, \textit{Search for the Picturesque}, pp.57-8.}

This shifting attitude towards nature and its ornamentation with buildings whether in a painted or real landscape is exemplified by Gilpin’s comments upon the hermitage at Dunkeld which he visited in 1776.

Heading south along the Braan, Gilpin criticised the “knots of shrubs and flowers” which ornamented the walk as “not suitable to the scene.” For him “nothing was required but a simple path to shew in the most advantageous manner the different appearances of the river which is uncommonly wild, and beautiful and should have been the only object of attention.” Instead he felt “very little advantage [had been]... taken of the romantic banks of this river,” suggesting that “the path might have been carried up one side of it, and down the other, straying artlessly to those parts, where the most beautiful views are presented, without any forced openings, formal stands, white seats, or other artificial intrusions preparatory of several scenes.” On reaching Ossian’s Hall, he was shocked by its appearance which was “too much adorned” for the epithet of ‘hermitage’ and bore no relation to the rustic scene it occupied. Inside, the coloured windows were deemed “tricks below the dignity” of the falls that crashed beneath. Crucially, Gilpin makes no mention of the explicit connection between the hermitage and Ossian. Recording uncritically the Ossianic verse within the nearby cave, he notes that the inscription “joined its kindred ideas
with those of the scene." He seems almost consciously unwilling to rank the emblematic significance of the site alongside its purely aesthetic value.\footnote{See variously Gilpin, \textit{Observations}, pp.119-27.} This is an important point for it illustrates clearly the rejection of the characteristically Augustan view of the landscape and the buildings within it as moral and political ciphers in favour of their purely scenic qualities.

Yet Gilpin is not proscribing garden buildings entirely, he is suggesting only that they should be appropriate to the surrounding scenery; and within a Picturesque setting the most appropriate structures were hermitages of trunk and heather, and mossy, rubble ruins. Indeed, to this rustic \textit{oeuvre} was being added a new form of ornament - the cottage. Once the most morally emotive of buildings, the wretched hovel was now prized as appealing garden decoration.

A useful overview of the fast-evolving attitude towards the use of buildings within designed landscapes may be provided by an examination of the contemporary treatises of the Marquis of Girardin, John Trusler, Gilpin, Price, Richard Knight and William Marshall. Each merits brief consideration in turn.

In \textit{An Essay on Landscape} (1783), Girardin, a French theorist of the Picturesque, recommends the use of "ruins of different sorts." Whilst he acknowledges that "one may at first be tempted to look upon [them] as whimsical" Girardin advises that ruins may be

"so contrived as to afford as good shelter and as convenient habitations as any other; they are very properly employed in landscape, because the variety of their shapes, their colour, and the green with which they may, in part, be covered, make them unite much better with the surrounding objects than new constructions, which from their glaring colour and sharp angles, form too hard a line, and too strong a
contrast in the landscape, and have nothing to break the dryness and regularity of them.”

He acknowledges, however, that the ruin is perhaps too powerful an image to be divested of its potent iconography, and states that “besides the picturesque effect, some emblematic character may be given to the ruin, which will afford pleasure to the fancy or the memory.”

Pitched at the ranks of gentry, John Trusler’s Elements of Gardening (c.1784) aims to direct “improvement at small expense.” For the most part his recommendations are familiar ones: “towers, Grecian temples, Gothic churches, Turkish mosques, ruins, triumphal arches, Egyptian obelisks, Chinese pyramids, and all other devices which an opulent owner, and the ingenuity of an architect can invent.” Trusler is original, however, in at least one respect, since he suggests that when attempting to “copy and assist nature” “a cottage, and a few trees about it, is a more natural object than a pile of ruins,” and this is the first time in a treatise that a cottage has been explicitly recommended as garden ornament.

In 1791 Gilpin published his Remarks on Forest Scenery. Although he had committed to print certain of his ideas on the theory of the Picturesque two years previously, Forest Scenery was closer to a personal manifesto on garden design. He offers five categories of scenery: the “park-scene,” the “pleasure garden,” the “glen,” the “open grove,” and “forest scenes.” For the most part Gilpin is opposed to garden buildings: “in a park-scene we wish for no expensive ornament;” in the pleasure garden such structures are commonly an “expensive, a hazardous, and often a useless decoration;” whilst within a glen “great care should be taken not to load it with

---

ornament.” There is however, a single, mitigating circumstance - that is when the scene is close to
the main house. Thus, within the parks of “piles of superior grandeur” an “immense” bridge, or a
“superb” obelisk are “the chain of ideas properly carried on, and gradually lost;” as the pleasure
ground “approaches nearer to the house” the “elegant temple may find a place;” if the glen makes
“a part of the immediate environs... of a house; a proper degree of ornament will of course be
required,” and finally “a seat, or a temple” may be a “proper ornament” in the “open grove.”

As landscape design evolved during the last quarter of the 18th century, a new yardstick
of taste was becoming essential. Given that the landscape was increasingly divested of intellectual
meaning in preference to its visual value, it was, perhaps logically, from the theory of painting
that new criteria emerged. In his Essays on the Picturesque (1794), a large work extending to
three volumes, Sir Uvedale Price set out to define the principles of painting and adapt them to
improvement. Discussing the role of an ornamental building within a painted landscape he
recommended such a structure as “a resting place to the eye, on which it may fix and dwell, and
find relief from the intricacy, the indistinctness, and the monotony of mere earth and vegetation.”

Price elaborates little, and recommends explicitly only the ruin as appropriate due to its “great
diversity of form.”

Richard Payne Knight’s poem The Landscape (1794) was a shorter and more penetrable
counterpart to the work of Price. Knight dilates rather more on the role of garden buildings
recording that the “cover’d seat, that shelters from the storm / May oft a feature in the Landscape
form.” However, such features should be “composed of native stumps and roots... or raised with
stones irregularly piled.” Indeed he demands that existing buildings “of dress and ornament”

---

1 See variously ibid. vol.1, pp.185, 189, 199, 200, 203.
3 Ibid., p.253.
should be camouflaged with “clustering ivy... moss and weeds.” Now, although Knight recognised that a “stately arch” might have its place, for the most part he rejected polite garden architecture as “paltry imitations... poor Baalbec dwindled to the eye, / And Paestum’s fanes with columns six feet high.” This was in part, no doubt, because sleek, classical lines jarred with the intricate settings that he preferred, but it was also because temples and obelisks were recognisably foreign and therefore unnatural. Hence “such buildings English nature must reject, / And claim from art the appearance of neglect.” Only those buildings which “at the present, or some distant time, / [had] become familiar to the soil and clime” were appropriate. Knight considered - and this is a significant point - that “No decoration should we introduce, / that has not first been naturalized by use.” By this he seems to have meant not just that indigenous buildings alone, such as a “ruin’d castle” or an “antiquated cot,” were appropriate, but also that structures within a garden should have a reasonable and justifiable function since

“...every pleasing object more will please,
As less the observer its intention sees;
But thinks it form’d for use, and placed by chance
Within the limits of his transient glance.”

The advocation of economic usefulness for garden ornament was not, though, the preserve of the Picturesque theorists. In the 1796 edition of his Planting and Rural Ornament, William Marshall, a well-regarded English writer on gardening and agricultural improvement, was vituperative in his opposition to many of their ideas, yet his recommendations for garden buildings are mere elaborations of Knight’s didactic couplets. As aphorisms of late-18th-century attitudes, Marshall’s comments merit repetition at some length. He dictated that “Buildings may

2 Ibid., p.54.
3 Ibid., p.55.
be admitted into ornamented Nature; provided they be at once useful and ornamental.” He continued:

“Nor should their uses be disguised; a barn dressed up in the habit of a country church, or a farmhouse figuring away in the fierceness of a castle, are ridiculous deceptions. A landscape daubed upon a board, and a painted steeple stuck up in a wood, are beneath censure.”

Moreover, for Marshall:

“There is another species of useless ornament, still more offensive, because more costly, than those comparatively innocent eye-traps; we mean temples. Whether they be dedicated to Bacchus, Venus, Priapus, or an other genius of debauchery, they are, in this age, enlightened with regard to theological and scientific knowledge, equally absurd.”

Though he concedes, somewhat reluctantly, that there may be scope for “the Room, the Portico, or the more simple Alcove” within “polished” scenes. Amongst “scenes less ornamented” buildings of an “economical nature” were preferable. For example:

“Under the heads of large artificial lakes, water mills may generally be erected, and in good effect. A corn mill, under proper regulations, and honest management, were ever a blessing to the poor in its neighbourhood. Substantial farmhouses, and neat comfortable cottages, scattered at a proper distance, are

---


2 Ibid., p.265.
always pleasing objects. The retreat and the porter’s lodge, being more susceptible of ornament, may be permitted nearer the eye.”

Humphry Repton, the principal landscape practitioner of his generation, recapitulates much of the work of Marshall. In Observations on the Theory and Practice of Landscape Gardening (1803) he states first that “sham churches, sham ruins, sham bridges, and everything which appears what it is not, disgusts when the trick is discovered.” Like Gilpin, Price, Knight and Marshall he does not object outright to the use of ornament, he considers only that the landscape should be “judiciously embellished by artificial objects in character with the scene.” Thus,

“If encumbered by buildings in a bad taste, or crowded by such as are too large, too small, or in any respect inapplicable, however correct they may be as works of art, the scene will be injured, and thus a thatched hovel may be deemed an ornament, where a Corinthian temple would be misplaced, or vice versa.”

Such sentiment seems to have remained the keynote for garden-building design for at least the next quarter of a century. For information on “buildings... and other such Decorations near the house,” John Claudius Loudon, the most prolific of early-19th-century writers on gardening, could do no better than refer the readers of his Observations on the Theory and Practice of Landscape Gardening (1804) to “Mr Price’s Observations.” Amongst advice given two years later for Forming, Improving, and Managing Country Residences, Loudon was more

---

1 Ibid., p.266.
3 Ibid., p.247.
explicit. He considers that for the majority of grounds "the chief use of such ornamental buildings, will be as covered seats, arches or gateways, or hot-houses." Larger landscapes, however, might admit larger buildings. These Loudon categorises "under the necessary, the convenient, the appropriate, and the accidental." The "necessary, or such as are requisite for the purposes of utility, when suitably dignified in a proper style of architecture, and placed in situations combining effect with use, should... always appear in the general view. They will never displease." The "convenient" are "such as are erected chiefly for pleasure, as covered seats, retreat" and so on, and these should "appear deficient, as supernumerary." The "appropriate" are "peculiar to, or characteristic of certain scenes, or strong characters in themselves." Thus "a bridge is applied only to water, a prospect tower to an eminence, and a mausoleum is an impressive object of itself." Finally, "accidental" structures relate to ruined buildings, preferably real rather than artificial ruins, though the latter are not dismissed so long as they are always "placed in such a situation as to be inaccessible to the passing spectator." Yet Loudon was no iconoclast; he seems to have retained an affection for "covered seats and castles," as everything from "Chinese pagodas" to "Moresque temples" is permitted where the object of the landscape is the "display of wealth." Indeed, even where that was not the intention he recommended only that offending structures be "concealed by trees and creepers" since "after they have been raised at considerable expense, it will often be cruel to destroy them entirely." Finally, Loudon's notes on estate architecture are also of interest. To him, "the Dairy is always a pleasing object, and should therefore be designed in a form, and placed in a situation which will have some effect," whilst the "Pigeon-House, an ancient appendage to nobility and grandeur, may often form an interesting object, and should always be of an elegant form."


2 For this and the preceding quotations see *ibid.*, pp.407-10.


In summary, therefore, all of the principal garden treatises published between 1780 and 1840 advocated firstly that the number of ornamental buildings within designed landscapes should be reduced, and secondly that any such new structures should have “some obvious purpose of utility.”\(^1\) What, then, were the reasons for this? The first was surely fashion. Reflecting on recent developments in landscaping, Loudon notes in his *Encyclopaedia of Gardening* (1822) that when improving an estate

> “planting may be accounted too distant or too slow by ordinary minds; but a building is complete the moment it is finished. It affords immediate satisfaction to the owner; and, being known as a costly object, full credit is given to him for the expense incurred. Thus wealth, confiding in its powers, multiplied garden buildings to an excess, which ended in creating a disgust, still existing, in some degree, at their appearance in improved scenery.”\(^2\)

That disgust follows excess is inevitable; yet Loudon’s reasoning is intriguing for it draws solely on the financial implications of erecting garden buildings and hints at a society that would increasingly come to deplore conspicuous consumption. This merits brief exploration.

The quickening pace of agricultural improvement during the second half of the 18th century enhanced considerably the wealth of the nobility and gentry.\(^3\) Yet the gap between them and the lower orders had also widened during this time, with small-holders and labourers becoming ever poorer and more disaffected. The British ruling class were haunted by the bloody

---


spectre of revolutionary France, and as early as 1793 had sought to suppress groups in favour of political reform. In such a climate the diffusion of social disquiet became a principal priority of the ruling class and in this the laying out of landscapes had a part to play. Within his *Thoughts on the Defence of Property* (1797) against the French, Uvedale Price emphasised the need for “attention and benevolence towards the labouring poor,”¹ and stressed that smallholders should be protected against expanding estates, all so that social upheaval might be averted. Moreover, the nature of the Picturesque was to respond to the individuality of a location in order to stress its particular character. It was opposed to the systematic Brownian landscape which aspired to extent and exclusion: in the words of Price, “vast possessions give ambitious views, and ambitious views destroy local attachments.”² This trend towards a more inclusive form of landscape is exemplified in the career of Repton, whose later writings reveal his acute social concerns.³ In *Observations*, Repton lamented the rise of the commercial classes who had been getting wealthier from the spoils of war, often at the expense of the landed families. He considered that these “new men” lacked any understanding of the duties of the landowner towards their estate and those who depended upon it. These concerns gained expression in his garden designs; designs that were pitched at this new body of clients. Therefore, a house should not stand “solitary and isolated” but should be visually integrated with its surroundings through the thinning of boundary planting which had become “scarce less offensive than the pale.” Thus,

“instead of depopulating villages, and destroying hamlets in the neighbourhood of a palace, I should rather wish to mark the importance of the mansion, and the wealth of its domain, by the proper division for its poor dependants; the frequent instances I have witnessed, where the industrious labourer had many miles to

walk from his daily task, have strongly enforced the necessity, not to say the humanity, of providing comfortable and convenient residences for those who may have employment about the grounds. It is thus that the real importance of a place might be distinguished by the number of cottages, or, rather, substantial houses, appropriated to the residence of those belonging to the place."

Here, then, an owner might at once support his dependants whilst ornamenting his estate, and such structures might be any manner of functional building, from Repton’s cottages to Marshall’s mills, cast in the rubble and thatch beloved of Price and Knight. A superfluity of expensive garden buildings of little obvious practical value was hardly conducive to the diffusion of social disquiet and they ebbed in popularity as a result. Indeed, given that growing numbers of Repton’s clients were parvenus of relatively modest wealth, the very expense of building a polished temple or a shell-encrusted grotto was probably in itself sufficient disincentive.

One final development helped reduce the level of ornament within the late-18th-century landscape - that is the desire for a more intimate communion with nature. Praise of country life had been current for well over a century, but previously rural retirement had been commended on moral grounds; gardens, fields and woods were ciphers of God, spiritually and intellectually nourishing. Jean Jacques Rousseau’s Discourse upon the Origin and Foundation of the Inequality Among Mankind written in 1755 was published in English seven years later. This argued that the ills of the human condition derive from society and that in the original state of nature life was free and independent, healthy, happy, innocent and above all, democratic. His essay proved highly influential and the ideas it contained pervaded to an ever-increasing degree

---

1 Repton, Observations, pp.248-9.

2 Acknowledging that garden buildings were “appropriate overflowing places for superfluous wealth” Loudon warned that “in an enlightened age, labour employed in this manner will be considered as in a great measure thrown away” (Loudon, J. C., An Encyclopaedia of Cottage, Farm and Villa Architecture and Furniture, London, 1833, p.995)
educated British minds. For example, although Knight’s *Landscape* had largely stressed the visual value of the Picturesque, it also hinted at the political significance of unfettered forms of nature: within woodland "ev’ry shaggy shrub and spreading tree / Proclaimed the seat of native liberty." The countryside therefore came to be viewed as a positive force; garden buildings, evidence in ashlar of modern civilisation, had ever-less place within it. The appeal for Polite Society of a walk around the park circuit did not diminish during the later-Georgian era, rather its objectives changed. The aim of a perambulation was not to spy a temple amongst woods and contemplate views from within it, but merely to commune with nature in bucolic solitude.

This general trend towards sparsity, utility and rusticity in the creation of garden buildings is reflected in the number and content of contemporary pattern books. Between 1740 and 1778, some 27 first-editions of pattern books substantially treating of garden buildings were published. During the subsequent six decades that number fell to just five: John Soane’s *Designs in Architecture* (1778); Charles Middleton’s *The Architect and Builder’s Miscellany* (1799); William Robertson’s *Designs in Architecture* (1800); Thomas Elison’s *Decorations for Parks and Gardens* (c.1810); and John Buonarotti Papworth’s *Rural Residences* (1818) and *Hints on Ornamental Gardening* (1823). The waning influence of these works is suggested by the fact that just one of the plates contained within them (a Gothic kennel from Plaw’s *Ferme Ornée*) seems ever to have informed the design of a structure - in this case as at Culloden House in Inverness-shire (figs 6.1 and 6.1a).

In summary, therefore, between 1780 and 1840, due to an increased reverence for raw nature, the growing concern for the economy of an estate and the welfare of its dependants, published advice on the creation of ornamental garden buildings tended to recommend that the number of such structures within a designed landscape should be reduced; that the variety of

---

1 Knight, *The Landscape*, p.33.
types used should increase; and that wherever possible greater emphasis should be placed on introducing structures that were at once ornamental and utilitarian.¹

Ornamental Structures within
Late-Georgian Designed Landscapes

An examination of the number and types of garden buildings raised in Scotland between the later-18th- and earlier-19th centuries indicates that the published advice was paralleled very closely by the building activities of Scotland’s landowners and garden designers. For out of the 200-or-so structures that survive from this period, only a quarter are summerhouses, hermitages, seats, gazebos and grottoes - that is buildings which may be considered principally ornamental. The remainder are manifestly practical, and these consist chiefly of - amongst other types - icehouses, hen-houses, cottages, boat-houses, bath-houses, monuments, stores, privies, larders, dairies, glasshouses and conservatories with the great majority being made up of buildings attached to walled gardens, mausolea and towers (which despite being ornamental also offered a ‘useful’ form of entertainment as will be explained). Given the degree to which contemporary practice conformed to published advice it is appropriate to analyse these late-Georgian garden buildings according to those declensions set out by Loudon in Country Residences - the “accidental”, the “convenient”, the “necessary” and the “appropriate”.

¹ This point is neatly illustrated by the list of structures published by Papworth between 1819 and 1821 in Ackerman’s Repository of Arts (the majority of which were republished together asHints). It includes designs for an aviary, a bridge, a boathouse, huts, cottages and tents, a fountain, numerous park entrances, a garden seat, an icehouse, a bath, a conservatory, a dairy, a temple and a laundry in styles as diverse as Swiss, Gothic, classical, Venetian and even Polish - see Archer, J., The Literature of British Domestic Architecture, 1715-1842, London, 1994, p.663.
The "Accidental"

Loudon considered ruins to be the best examples of "accidental" structures. True ruins were, he felt, superior to sham ruins, though the latter might be permissible if they were "inaccessible to the passing spectator." There are just six late-Georgian sham-ruins surviving in Scotland, and it seems likely that Loudon would have approved of the three most exceptional at Tulloch and Novar in Ross-shire, and on Kinnoull Hill above Kinfauns Castle in Perthshire.

Set on a hill to the north of Tulloch Castle, and neither quickly nor easily accessed by foot, is the Caiseal Gorach, the finest sham-ruin of its time (fig. 6.2). It was built in 1789-90 to the designs of Robert Adam for Duncan Davidson of Tulloch. Adam prepared two schemes for the elevated site. The first proposes a large circular tower with a battered, rusticated base and machicolated parapet as its centrepiece with a thick curtain wall to one side a timber pale to the other, each terminating in small, decayed turrets (fig. 6.2a). In style it recalled Adam's 'antique' bridge at Culzean and in scale it echoed his proposal for the substantial keep at Darlingfield, Mellerstain. Indeed it may again have been on grounds of cost that Adam was asked to draw up an alternative. The second scheme consists of a shattered, central tower with an open arch and arrow-slits, linked by ruined walls to stumpy turrets. This was a simpler, cheaper proposal which no doubt recommended its construction. Framed by earth revetments and contorted firs and often shrouded in mist, Caiseal Gorach today possesses a Romantic quality that would undoubtedly have pleased its designer. At nearby Alness, General Sir Hector Munro of Novar responded a decade later by building an idiosyncratic sham-ruin made up of nine circular rubble piers, the centre four being linked by pointed arches to form an arcade (fig. 6.3). The structure is reputedly built in imitation of the gates of Negapataam in India, the scene of one of Sir Hector's victories.

---


2. Copies of the original drawings (which are dated 9 May 1789 and 20 August 1789) are held at NMRS (RCD/58/1, f/3/4). See also Mowat, I., Easter Ross, 1750-1850: The Double Frontier, London, 1981, p.90.
However, in building the ruin Munro is said to have provided work for the local unemployed, and this must have done much to deflect opposition to so conspicuous an indulgence. Finally, on Kinnoull Hill above Kinfauns Castle sits a modest but spectacularly sited sham-ruin. Set almost toppling over the edge of a "striking and formidable"\(^1\) precipice, the building epitomises the influence of the sublime and Picturesque theorists (fig. 6.4). A small turret with rubble wing-walls, the sham-ruin was constructed by the 9th Earl of Kinnoull during the first half of the 19th century, who, despite living some distance away, seems to have used it as a site for entertaining guests.\(^2\)

The "Convenient"

Loudon considered "convenient" garden buildings to be those "erected chiefly for pleasure, as covered seats, retreat[s]" and so on. These, he advised, were to be "judiciously placed"\(^3\) and "appear deficient" rather than "supernumerary". Eleven temples remain from this period, and again Loudon would not have scorned the three elegant rotundas that survive at Kinnaird Castle in Angus, Dryburgh Abbey House in Selkirkshire and Cullen House in Banffshire.

Sir David Carnegie inherited his baronetcy at the age of just 12 following his father’s death in 1765. It was perhaps with a sense of impatience that he viewed his childhood home, for almost as soon as he entered his 20s Carnegie sold the family seat of Pittarrow and set about focusing his considerable energies on improving his Perthshire estate of Kinnaird.\(^4\) The house was remodelled between 1785 and 1793 by the Angus architect, James Playfair, and the grounds were

---

\(^1\) NSA, vol. 10, p.935.
\(^2\) Speake, R., Kinfauns Castle, Manchester, 1982, p.52.
\(^4\) Cockayne, *Complete Baronetage*, vol. 3, p.337.
re-landscaped around the same time by the Englishman, Thomas White Senior. An apostle of Lancelot Brown, White’s designs were often formulaic and at Kinnaird he laid out a familiar arrangement of clumps, belts and parkland. However, at a peripheral part of the designed landscape, within a block of boundary planting, he seems reluctantly to have conceded to the delights of the native countryside. Here a fine temple was raised to provide a resting place at the remotest part of the most demanding of Kinnaird’s circuit walks (fig. 6.5). However, rather than being placed to form an incident within the nearby parkland, the temple has been set on an ashlar podium that juts some way out of a steep bank in order to provide dramatic views of the River South Esk that curves below. If the location of the temple was the decision of White then its design almost certainly belongs to Playfair. The squat, circular cela (which is domed inside) is topped by a conical roof (that was reputedly surmounted by a statue of Flora) and surrounded by a dentilled peristyle of Roman Doric columns. The bold form of the temple - robust and most distinctive - seems to have appealed to Playfair as he used it in the design of the laundry house within the courtyard of Cairness House, Aberdeenshire (fig. 6.6).

In 1817, a red Ionic ‘Temple of the Muses’ was raised by David Erskine, the 11th Earl of Buchan, at Dryburgh Abbey House in Berwickshire, probably to designs by the mason-architect John Smith (fig. 6.7). Wrought in fine local, red sandstone, eight Ionic columns support a polished stone dome upon which a bust of the poet James Thomson is set; whilst a large Coade-stone statue of Apollo (now lost) once formed the temple’s centrepiece. The rotunda was created as part of a wider scheme of estate improvements that included the construction of a suspension bridge across the Tweed (designed in 1817, destroyed and then re-erected in 1818, and then replaced again in 1850), a substantial statue of William Wallace (raised in 1814), a fine walled garden with a castellated gardener’s house attached (dubbed the Stirling Tower) and an

1 Strang, C., Borders and Berwick, Edinburgh, 1991, p.171. See also Erskine, D., Annals and Antiquities of Dryburgh and Other Places on the Tweed, 2nd edn., Kelso, 1836, and Erskine’s sketches of the temple made in 1821 - copies at NMRS (BWD/11071, 109/1). The 11th Earl was the founder of the Society of Antiquaries in Scotland and it is hardly surprising therefore that so many of the structures within the garden make reference to Scottish historical figures or places.
ornamental dovecote (1828), circular in plan with a corbelled cornice. Like that at Kinnaird, the temple was located quite deliberately - in this case at the summit of a diminutive conic hill above the bank of the River Tweed at some distance from the house. A detailed sketch prepared by Sir David Erskine (a relative of Lord Buchan) depicts the temple from across the river just four years after it was constructed. It reveals that the hill was set within a fenced enclosure with sparse planting at its base and somewhat thicker planting at its summit. The sketch also indicates what appears to be a path cut into the side of the hill winding clockwise up from its base - a spiralling walk that would at once have heightened the expectations of visitors to the temple and provided a panorama of views across the grounds.

Finally, at Cullen House in Banffshire, the same formula is repeated for a third time. An Ionic ‘Temple of Pomona’ was erected in 1822 on a hill at the northern edge of the estate above the coastal road to Banff, to designs by the leading Morayshire architect of his time, William Robertson (fig. 6.8).¹ It is a polished work of neo-classicism which may have been inspired by James Playfair’s unexecuted proposal of 1788 for a prostyle ‘Temple of Pomona’ that was intended to append a railed flower garden “next the Road”² (fig. 6.9). An arcaded basement set into the bank forms a shelter or tea room, whilst the peripteros above provides “a splendid view over the neighbouring sea.”³ For the most part the temple survives intact though the statue of the Roman goddess has long been removed.

Though these buildings form a sample of only three, they share sufficient in common to indicate a clear pattern - that is the construction of a temple at a site chosen specifically to focus

¹ GD248/784/5.
² For Playfair’s design of 1788 for the “Temple of Pomona” see NMRS BND/6/70. The temple was to be “heated by a Flue under the floor” and adjoin a railed “flower garden 88 feet by 60 feet.” Playfair also proposed a rustic-Gothic bath-house - NMRS (BND/6/78). An undated (c.1830) design for a prostyle Grecian temple by Joseph Browne exists amongst the Gordon Castle MSS (RHP2413).
views upon open scenery. It seems reasonable to suggest, therefore, that as buildings located to focus attention on views of 'nature-in-the-raw' they may be considered to continue a tradition established over a century earlier.

The “Necessary”

Loudon recommended that “necessary” buildings “or such as are requisite for the purposes of utility” could be “dignified in a proper style of architecture, and placed in situations combining effect with use”, and of these there are a great many examples surviving across Scotland. Around 140 such structures were built during this period of which the icehouse, game-larder, dairy, pheasantry, orangery, menagerie, boathouse, bath-house, monument, glasshouse, conservatory and walled garden were the types most often dignified with architectural detailing.

Just nine ornamented icehouses from this period have been recorded. The portico of one, at Cadder in Stirlingshire, bears classical detailing, whilst the walls of another, at Invermay in Perthshire, are not only thoroughly rusticated but also support a striking and remarkably early turreted game-larder of circa 1800 (fig. 6.10). The larder at Invermay is amongst the most notable of seven built during this period, the remainder, another two dozen or so, being constructed after 1840, presumably as a result of the growth in the popularity of hunting for sport. There exists, too, at Invermay one of the country’s outstanding ornamental ‘garden dairies’ (fig. 6.11).1 Designed by the Edinburgh architect Alexander Laing in 1802 (who also built the larder) the dairy’s boldly bowing frontage juts into a kitchen garden to the south of the house.2 Its red sandstone walls are crudely rusticated but none the less striking for that; indeed when viewed together with a roof that was almost certainly once thatched, the effect would have satisfied any


2 BDBA, p.593. See also Meldrum, N., Forteviot: The History of a Strathearn Parish, Paisley, 1926, pp.219-4, 240-1.
Picturesque eye - a dairy after all was popularly considered "always a pleasing object." The Invermay dairy was only surpassed in quality some 30 years later when a larger example of similar form and texture was constructed, possibly to the designs of Gillespie Graham, on the site of the Venus Temple at Taymouth (fig. 6.12). Two pheasantries were designed in the early part of the 19th century for Culzean - the larger though more basic of them probably being rejected in favour of the executed and altogether more stylish scheme by Robert Lugar² (fig. 6.13). Indeed, numerous other ‘necessary’ buildings were erected at Culzean during the first half of the 19th century. Two orangeries were constructed - the first in 1814 and the second 35 years later. Around the same time a remarkable Gothick pagoda-cum-menagerie was erected in woodland to the distant south of the house (fig. 6.14). It is a bizarre structure; a Rococo throwback of considerable charm, whose designer remains unknown. The core of the octagonal building is in two stages, the lower one being a store, and the upper one, which is approached by an elegant peron, forming a gazebo from which extensive views could be enjoyed through its ogee windows across a loch and the sea to Ailsa Craig.

Of the 11 boathouses that might be considered to have been constructed as ornamental as well as practical, just four were built prior to 1840. Of these, the finest is the broadly-arched classical boathouse raised at Gosford in the early-1800s as part of James Ramsay’s improvements. Perhaps the most interesting, however, is that constructed as a ruin around a half century later at Pitfour in Aberdeenshire.³

² The day orderly book in the possession of the Marquis of Ailsa records that olive green was the preferred colour for the garden structures in the early-19th century. For Culzean see Landskip and Prospect, Culzean Landscape Survey, 2 vols., unpublished, March 1993. I am grateful to Mr Duncan Donald of the National Trust for Scotland for permitting me access to this document. See also Eyres, P., “Happy Valley: the formation of the landscape garden at Culzean,” New Arcadian Journal, no.9, 1983, pp.12-20.
Less connected with the utility of the estate, but at least notionally practical, were bath-houses and monuments. The finest of the five bath-houses built in Scotland during this period is set at the edge of the loch at Pitfour, Aberdeenshire (fig. 6.15). It most likely dates from the earlier-to-mid 19th century, and is almost certainly the work of John Smith. The building is a reproduction on a reduced scale (though it is still a good size) of the Athenian Temple of Theseus. Le Roy's *Monuments de la Grèce* of 1758 and the third volume of Stuart and Revett's *Antiquities of Athens* of 1794 both illustrate more-or-less accurate versions of the Greek temple, and as such the bath-house was hardly a pioneering work. However, it is perhaps the most complete recreation of the Temple of Theseus in Britain, and, whilst it would certainly have received the approbation of Knight, it at least demands a place in the history of the Greek Revival.  

Also worthy of mention is the bath-house built probably in the early-19th century as a Picturesque Gothic ruin of rubble stone at Culzean. That bathing was considered practical rather than solely pleasurable is illustrated by James Stewart's unexecuted “design for a bath at Dunkeld” which depicts a fine classical bathing chamber flanked by glasshouses - a unique and unlikely alliance of utilitarian garden buildings (fig. 6.16).  

Within secluded woodland at Kelburn in Ayrshire, an oddly delicate pyramidal monument (once again a modified Ancient prototype) was raised to the 3rd Earl of Glasgow from a 1775 design by Robert Adam (fig. 6.17). At Panmure, an impressive strapped column over 100 feet in height, and similar in appearance to the Cobham Monument at Stowe, was raised to a design by John Henderson at the end of an avenue to the north of the house as a “magnificent tribute of respect to that most benevolent man and excellent landlord, Lord Panmure... at the sole expense of his numerous tenantry in the year 1839” (fig. 6.18). It was, too, used for views since it was set on “the most elevated point of the Downie Hills” in order to command “the prospect of large portions of seven counties.”

By far the most unusual monument however, is that at Lanrick in Stirlingshire, where two stages of columns


2 A copy of the undated (late-18th-century?) drawing is held at NMRS (PTD/49/10).

are stacked one on the other and on a tall ashlar base crowned with spikes and carved in precise imitation of a tree (fig. 6.19). The structure probably dates from the first half of the 19th century though the reasons for its construction and esoteric form are unclear. Perhaps the most likely explanation is that it was built after 1822 when the Murray family, who owned the estate and whose emblem was the oak, were permitted by Royal License to resume the ancient family name of Macgregor, banned in the wake of the '45.

Almost all of the glasshouses that can still be found clinging to the north-most sides of Scotland’s walled gardens were constructed during the second half of the 19th century. Wrought from timber and glass and ever vulnerable to decay, the majority of them are in parlous condition and regrettably the finest of their precursors - the combined glasshouse-temple schemes proposed by Robert Adam for Auchencruive (undated but presumably late-1770s - fig. 6.20), and Walter Nicol (a Perthshire landscaper and architect) for Invermay (1802 - fig. 6.21)2 - now survive only on paper. Both of these proposals strike a balance between ostentation and utility, and in this they are of their time. Indeed, it is a short step from here to the free-standing conservatory, which, in finding favour during the 19th century amongst the swelling middle classes who viewed it both as a useful and pretty appendage to their modest estates, was developed architecturally far beyond its practical requirements. There are two outstanding examples of ornamental conservatories surviving in Scotland. The first was built at Culzean in 1818 to designs by Robert Adam’s one-time pupil, James Donaldson: an exquisitely wrought camellia house in tracery glass and polished ashlar (fig. 6.22).3 The second, though derelict, is amongst the finest of all garden buildings in Scotland. Constructed in 1832-4 to the designs of William Burn as the centrepiece for a formal garden (that was never executed) designed by William Sawrey Gilpin above the banks of the South Esk at the eastern edge of the park at Dalkeith Palace (fig. 6.23), the

1 Mackay, M., Notes on the Parish of Kilmadock and Borough of Doune, unpublished, 1952, pp.73, 75.
2 Copies of the plans for each are held at NMRS (PTD/215/22 for Invermay; KBD/871-2 for Cavens)
3 Landscape and Prospect, Culzean, p.16.
conservatory, bereft of its glazed sashes, now appears like a vast masonry crown decked with C-scroll pediments and encrusted with grey stone jewels and elaborate strap-work that recalls the architecture of the Scottish Renaissance.¹

Related to these glasshouses, though rather greater in number, are the array of gazebos and ornamented stores that decorate walled gardens. There are around 40 such walled gardens in Scotland, and of these the buildings in just four date from outside the period of 1780 to 1840. The walled garden was the focus of horticultural industry and it is unsurprising therefore that it received a great deal of attention from landowners keen to ornament their estate. Aside from the welter of pleasing gardener’s houses that adorned in increasing numbers the sites of their inhabitants’ work, the great majority of ornamental buildings constructed within walled gardens are commonly little more than prettified fruit stores. However, they are often summerhouses or gazebos from which to enjoy the view of the walled garden and in this respect they represent very clear indications of the increasing veneration of utility during the early-19th century. As with dovecotes, most builders resorted to crenellations to lend cost-effective interest to such buildings and sometimes the effect, as with the angle towers at Invermeil (fig. 6.24),² or the gazebos at Castle of Mey in Caithness and Ashley House near Edinburgh, could be quite effective. However, by far the best examples of an ornamental walled garden are at Amisfield in East Lothian, Prestonhall in Midlothian and Fasque in Kincardineshire.

Built to designs very probably by John Henderson in 1783, each corner of the Amisfield walled garden is shaved off with the angled insertion of a severe temple that was once domed to give the appearance of a mini-Pantheon. The four structures were themselves put to good use:


² RCAHMS, Argyll, vol.7, p.337.
two served as storage and two were lined with cotes for pigeons (fig. 6.25).¹ Like the mausoleum at Gosford, the Amisfield walled garden is an impressive epigram of neo-classical design. Almost equally so are the twin, brick gazebos that tower above the walled garden of Prestonhall (fig. 6.26). These are presumably the work of the Scottish architect, Robert Mitchell, who in 1791 designed the fine neo-classical mansion for the M.P. and merchant, Alexander Callendar. The lower stages of each of the octagonal structures appear designed for the use of the gardener, whilst the more elegantly appointed upper stages were intended to provide views of the enclosure below; the windows facing the garden being dignified with sandstone aedicules and the two rooms linked with a handsome, balustraded wall-head walk. By contrast, the summerhouse that straddles the dividing wall of two connecting walled gardens at Fasque is a more Gothick affair (fig. 6.27). It is a delightfully odd building: a classical central block contains an open loggia within its bowed front, yet it is flanked by two small octagonal towers whose quatrefoiled parapets break past the eaves to give it a castle air. Its neat, well-lit interior provides not only views of the garden but apparently accommodation for the gardener. Its origin is unknown, but it is surely contemporary with the house, and as such may be the work of John Paterson.²

Loudon considered that as “an ancient appendage to nobility and grandeur, [the dovecote] may often form an interesting object, and should always be of an elegant form.”³ Now, the rubble walls of any building might be invested with a little architectural interest through the blunt expedients of crenellations and arrow-slits. Such features were as cheap to create as they were winning to view and as such they could be applied freely to the most simple of structures. It is perhaps for this reason that some two dozen castellated dovecotes were constructed across Scotland during the six decades after 1780. Curiously, however, few of these are especially

¹ The walled garden is dated above the main entrance. Payment of £50 was made to Henderson on 13 May 1784 for “his trouble for drawing plans for different buildings at Amisfield” this most likely relates to the walled garden - see extracts from Wemyss papers at NMRS.


distinguished. At Elvington east of Edinburgh, the rat courses of a later-18th-century, circular
dovecote become band-courses and the flight-holes occuli, whilst the roof is vented with a simple
lantern and the wall-heads notched into battlements (fig. 6.28). This recipe is reused at a
contemporary octagonal dovecote at Gargunnock in Stirlingshire (fig. 6.29); elaborated upon with
the addition of trefoils and crosslets around 1770 at Pittencrief Park in Fife, and applied to
numerous other structures across the country. At Harburn in Midlothian and Saltoun in East
Lothian, however, the ingredients used are richer and the confections yet more delicious as a
result. The former is a colourful toy fort cast from blue granite with gold sandstone margins, its
sharp details decisively carved to a satisfying miniature scale (fig. 6.30). Dating from around
1830,¹ the features of the dovecote are familiar ones, but they are crisply wrought and lovingly
finished right down to the finely grooved hood-moulds.

Rougher in texture but as thoroughly considered is the dovecote within the woodland to
the east of Saltoun House (fig. 6.31). It is most probably the work of Robert Burn, who, along
with his son, William, successively remodelled the main house during the first quarter of the 19th
century.² Here the circular interior is encapsulated within a crenellated box enlivened by
depressed arches between impost and pilasters cut from harl in imitation of opus reticulatum.
An octagonal lantern springs from behind the parapet to provide light and alighting ledges. As
might be expected, like that at Harburn, the Saltoun dovecote was intended to catch the eye from
the house or a walk in the park. In an age that could most comfortably sanction expense upon
utility, dovecotes were an obvious subject for adornment. It is perhaps surprising then that so few
of distinction were built. The answer for this lies in the mounting opposition of farmers to the
destruction of their crops by the indiscriminate feeding of pigeons, and usually those of another
person at that. By the end of the 18th century one observer could remark with reason that

² Ibid., p.424.
dovecotes were “a nuisance of which agriculturalist [had] just cause to complain” since pigeons wrought “dreadful havoc among the grain.” Indeed the inequity of dovecotes was more acutely felt than ever, their being “forcibly billeted on tennants” by estate owners that “wantonly allowed their poultry to trespass on crops of grain.” With recent improvements in agricultural and animal husbandry, livestock could be maintained throughout the winter; there was little need for dovecotes, least of all decorative ones, and as such “many of the pigeon-houses [were] suffered to go to ruin.” Indeed, Harburn and Saltoun mark the end of a venerable Scottish tradition. 

Battlements could lend interest to other estate buildings too. Within woodland to the far south of Cally House in Kirkcudbrightshire, stands a stout, two-stage tower ornamented by buttresses and merlons (fig. 6.32). Constructed in 1789, it was described six years later as “built in the fashion of a Gothic Temple, and to accidental observation has all the effect that might be produced by a genuine antique.” But it was “occupied by a farm-servant,” and as such it conveniently bridges the gap between the sham-castles of Overton and the estate cottages of Plaw. At Pitfour in Perthshire, a clock tower was constructed beside the Robert Adam castle (fig. 6.33), and at Cammo, west of Edinburgh, a water tower in the form of a medieval turret was

---

1 Forsyth, R., *The Beauties of Scotland*, vol. 4, p.32.
2 Ibid.
3 Ibid., p.33.
4 Ibid., p.32.
5 Though it does not form an incident within a designed landscape and is removed, therefore, from the main subject of this thesis, it is worth noting at this point a fine dovecote built in 1809 within the courtyard of the mains block at Megginch in Perthshire. With a pagoda-like roof and Gothic openings it is delightfully Rococo, though it certainly would have been viewed by most as old-fashioned when first raised. Some dovecotes were converted to other uses. For example, it was intended in 1776 to encircle the Carloonan dovecote at Inveraray with a colonnade designed by Robert Mylne in order to create a temple (see Lindsay and Cosh, *Inveraray*, pp.237-8); around the earlier- to mid-19th century what was probably a dovecote at Mellerstain was converted to a cottage orneé (the structure is indicated on the 1858 Ordnance Survey within a small oval garden), and about the same time a dovecote at Amisfield was remodelled to form a small tower (which, incidentally, is very close in appearance to a converted bothy at Barbreck near Craignish in Argyllshire).

6 GD10/1291/1189.
7 Heron, *Observations*, vol. 2, p.213.
8 Though this is Adam in style it is more likely to the result of William Burn’s 1825 alterations.
constructed sometime between 1805 and 1824 (fig. 6.34). Even a summerhouse could be disguised as an ancient turret. At The Burn in Kincardineshire, a circular, Gothic chamber was given a fake first floor, wing-walls and crenellations to form the “Doulie Tower” (figs. 6.35 and 6.36). This building (which may have been constructed to designs prepared by Walter Nicol for an almost identical tower proposed in 1802 for Invermay) seems apparently to have been intended as a Romantic counterpoint to the sublime, Riparian landscape that had been wrought from the rocky banks of the North Esk by Lord Adam Gordon during the last two decades of the 18th century.\(^2\)

**The “Appropriate”**

Loudon considered “appropriate” buildings to be “peculiar to, or characteristic of, certain scenes, or strong characters in themselves”. Thus a “prospect tower” was fitting for “an eminence” whilst a mausoleum was “an impressive object of itself” and was sufficient to establish an air of melancholy wherever it was set. Indeed, these two types were in his opinion “the noblest buildings belonging to a residence”, since “Prospect towers have a grand and imposing effect when judiciously placed in a woody eminence, or on the top of a rocky mountain,” and “mausoleums not obtruded on the view, as at Castle Howard, but placed so as to be seen only occasionally, may afford solemn instruction to all, and may inspire the noblest sentiments in the

1 A “Plan of New Saughton” (as Cammo was called when it was owned by the Watson family during the later-18th and 19th centuries) made in 1805 does not indicate the tower (RHP11157). However, the tower is marked on a “Plan of the Drains in New Saughton Policy Executed Between the Years 1812 and 1824” (RHP736). Curiously there is no mention of the construction of the tower amongst either the Watson papers (GD150) or the entail papers relating to the estate (held at SRO).

2 The “walks cut through the rocks, and the woods planted by his Lordship’s directions... converted the native ruggedness of [the estate] into scenes of sublimity and beauty” (NSA, p.119). These “gravel walks, winding along the side and through the rocks overhanging the river, were formed at great expense” (Cameron, A., *The History of Fettercairn*, Paisley, 1899, pp.122-3) and it seems likely that the tower (along with another called the “Imrie Tower” which has now disappeared) was raised as a resting place and a focal point at the same time. A design by Walter Nicol and dated 1802 for a “Gothic Temple for the point near the Hummel-bummel” at Invermay in Perthshire, is identical to the Doulie Tower (NMRS, PTO/215/7 - fig. 6.37). Nicol’s tower for Invermay was abandoned in favour of a rustic, Gothic summerhouse with a pyramidal thatched roof and a log-column veranda designed by Alexander Laing (BDBA, p.593) and constructed in 1804 (now roofless and derelict) and it may be conjectured that the proposal was reused at The Burn.
descendants of ancient and honourable families. It is surely no coincidence that Loudon penned these ideas just three years after his move South, for the tower and mausoleum were by far the most prevalent structures to ornament the gardens of his native country. Each type may be considered in turn.

It is not easy to discuss the stylistic development of garden towers. To be of interest as architecture they demand convincing details and a bold mass - that is a competent designer and appreciable investment. Yet designers versed in the language of neo-medieval architecture were few in number and dear to retain, and the construction of a garden tower was rarely calculated to be of much expense. As a result, most are anonymous turrets raised at unknown dates without plans or elevations; crude variations on a basic theme of battlements and arches, invariably designed in situ and as often irredeemably dull. Thus, as individual buildings garden towers admit little valid comparison, rather it is from the purpose of their construction that their significance derives.

There are a little over 140 surviving garden towers spread more-or-less evenly across the central belt of Scotland, with handfuls in the sparsely-populated Highlands and the gentle landscape of the Borders. Of this total number, just half a dozen were constructed prior to 1780 and around 20 after 1840. For an age that delighted in reading historical novels in modern castles, a glimpse through the library window of a crenellated parapet reaching through distant trees had ready appeal; it is unsurprising, therefore, that the vast majority of garden towers were constructed during the later-Georgian era. Each focused attention on the medieval period and in this respect they served a single, common purpose. However, at a time when increasing importance was being placed on the usefulness of estate architecture, the Romantic evocation of

---

1 Loudon, *Country Residences*, vol. 1., p.409. Loudon recommended that "old ruins" be retained since these could be "rendered highly interesting at a small expense" (ibid., p.412). His advice gained expression in Scotland at Knock Castle in Ayrshire, Minto House in Roxburghshire, and Raehills in Dumfriesshire where existing tower-houses were converted to ornamental landscape features during the 19th century.
historic battles was rarely an estate-owner’s sole motivation for raising a tall, gothic turret. Garden towers were required to be more than mere visual conceits, they needed a discernible function, no matter how specious. In Scotland, towers acquired three principal uses: as observatories, as monuments, and as dovecotes. To explain the first of these, a small digression is required.

In the mid-1780s, Robert Barker, an Irish-born painter living in Edinburgh, walked with his daughter on Calton Hill above his adopted city. Enjoying the impressive views across the buildings, countryside and sea he pondered the possibility of committing the scene to canvass; not in a series of discreet landscapes but rather as a single, unified image. On 19 June 1787, Barker patented his idea for a form of illustration in which “the painter or drawer must fix his station, and delineate correctly and connectedly every object which presents itself to his view as he turns around, concluding his drawings by a connection where he began” with due regard for “the lights and shadows [and] how they fall” in order that observers of his work would “feel as if really on the very spot.” Having lodged his patent, Barker set about preparing and perfecting what he coined a “panorama” from Calton Hill (fig. 6.38). Within a year it was being exhibited in Edinburgh and Glasgow to considerable public acclaim. In March 1789 “Mr Barker’s interesting and novel view of the city and castle of Edinburgh, and the [whole adjacent and surrounding country] opened in London, and very soon afterwards was accompanied by a panorama of the English capital. The success of the panorama was as instant as it was lasting and widespread. Barker’s purpose-built rotunda near Leicester Square in London presented a total of 126 panoramas between 1796 and its closure 70 years later. When finished in London, the panoramas (which could be of considerable size) were dispatched to the rotundas then springing up in other


2 Quoted in Charlesworth, “Elevation and Succession,” p.17.
cities which included Edinburgh, Glasgow and Aberdeen. If panoramas were disparaged as works of high art, their educational potential at least was recognised by all. Indeed, it was largely the public’s desire to comprehend visually both places and events that ensured the success of panoramic exhibitions. As such, the quality of a panorama depended upon its topographical accuracy - its “character for correctness”¹ - and it had therefore to be close to indiscernible from a real view. Barker had early realised that a panorama could only be fully appreciated if it was viewed from the proper angle and under the correct light. Hence, a circular building was required, with the panorama hung high up inside it, lit from above and vented from below. The panorama was generally viewed from a circular platform raised some two stories high and fitted with screens to hide the margins of the surrounding image. The most common themes were scenes of battles and foreign cities, though views of landscapes, generally remarkable and preferably remote, were also used.

In summary, then, one of the most popular forms of metropolitan entertainment in late-Georgian Britain was the panorama exhibition (which itself originated in Scotland). To view the exhibition, visitors entered the rotunda and ascended a circular staircase to a raised walkway from which they could enjoy accurately-rendered, 360-degree views of a notable landscape. The parallel with a trip to a slender turret set on a hill within the heart of a nobleman’s estate is surely clear, and the one must have popularised the other. Indeed, if at least some of the appeal of a panorama exhibition was the subject of the scene, this must have at least been offset by all the depth, variety and life that open views from a country tower could convey. It is worth noting in this respect that of the handful of structures that “may be occasionally introduced with propriety” into a garden, Loudon considered “a prospect-tower [to be] a desirable object in a flat country, affording no other means of obtaining a bird’s-eye view”² - he might easily have written “a

¹ Presenting his view of Edinburgh at London, Barker boasted that his panorama had already been exhibited in the Scottish capital in order “to gain it an indisputable character for correctness” (quoted in ibid., p.36).

panorama.' But as the roof-top belvederes of English Elizabethan houses testify, the enjoyment of extensive views was not a novel past-time, however, ascending high above the trees at isolated points across a wide park certainly was, and it was different for three reasons. In the first place, the mere act of climbing a gloomy staircase to a narrow platform enclosed by a low parapet wall was something of a sublime experience in itself. Secondly, the views from the top might reveal countryside quite different to that seen from the house, which, if it was possessed by the viewer, could invoke all the satisfaction that relish in material wealth might afford. Finally, to the late-18th-century gentleman bored with mundane social pursuits, the enjoyment of panoramic views from a tower, like those in an exhibition, made a most invigorating break from the mansion: they would have reminded him instantly of the corner-stones of Georgian self-interest - land, commerce and empire - and with war against Napoleonic France an ever-present concern, extensive and unimpeded views could reveal in good time a foreign invading force.¹ In effect, garden towers were as useful as they were ornamental.

Some 40 observation towers were built in Scotland between 1780 and 1840, of which a little under half are Gothic. For the most part these are rude rubble structures lent interest only by pointed-arch openings. A small handful, however, are more elaborately wrought. The best of these are the towers at Kinfauns in Perthshire, Raith and Balcarres in Fife, and Craigend in Stirlingshire.

Following the death of his father in 1807, the 14th Lord Gray, seems not to have undertaken improvements at the family estate of Gray House in Angus, as was common for keen

¹ For a discussion of how "mapping, topography and the panorama served the national interest both imperially, on campaign, and domestically, through landscape improvement" and the important role that garden towers played in celebrating this fact by presenting "an equation between power and vision through the elevated point of view" see generally New Arcadian Journal, no.31/32, 1991 (for above quotations see p.20). The multi-functional appeal of the tower is neatly demonstrated by a contemporary description of the Nelson Monument - a tower raised at Forres, Banffshire in 1806. This records that as well as commemorating the victory at Trafalgar the tower was intended "to form a most agreeable object to every traveller in the country at large, a sea beacon, an excellent observatory and a commanding alarm post in the event of an enemy's approach by sea or land" - see Douglas, R., Annals of the Royal Burgh of Forres, Elgin, 1934, pp.313, 318.
inheritors. Rather, he focused his attentions upon the more modest estate of Kinfauns which had recently devolved to his mother.¹ The reasons for this are unclear, however, during the course of the next 15 years he replaced the house with a sprawling new castellated mansion to designs by Robert Smirke and laid out grounds in which “every tree, every shrub, seem[ed] firmly placed as an accessory to one of the grandest landscapes depicted by the hand of nature.”² Yet, amongst the very earliest of Gray’s improvements was the construction of a robust turret at the summit of the wooded Binn Hill to the east of the mansion (fig. 6.39). Raised in rubble around 1815,³ it is a four-storey structure of square plan with an octagonal stair-tower attached to its south-east corner giving out to a platform roof. Though its details are few and crude at that - pointed-arch windows to the south and a crenellated parapet above a rough-dressed corbel course - the building remains perhaps the most convincingly medieval of all of Scotland’s garden towers. Through its plain and massy verticality (it measures some 80 feet in height) it is a distinct evocation of utilitarian martial architecture. Indeed, if it appears to be a tower house of the earlier-Middle Ages this may well have been Gray’s intention, for around ten years later he sought explicitly to evoke Scotland’s warring past by placing statues of William Wallace and Robert Bruce within the surrounding gardens⁴ (indeed the real Wallace is reputed to have hidden in caves nearby).⁵ Yet Gray is unlikely to have been advertising a call to arms against the English. Rather, the Binn Hill Tower was more probably designed as a fitting place in which to immerse oneself in reading Marmion than in lamentations of lost nationhood. And whilst it was located, as Loudon would have recommended, on a wooded prominence, it is unlikely to have been built to intimidate the carse below it, but in order merely to be “an observatory, from the top

¹ Speake, Kinfauns Castle, p.24.
³ The Statistical Account of 1845 notes that the tower was “built about thirty years ago, by the late Lord Gray” (NSA, vol. 10, pp.1206-7).
⁴ The statue of Wallace was made by James Thorn of Ayrshire for Lord Gray about 1827 - see Speake, Kinfauns Castle, p.43.
⁵ Ibid., p.935.
of which [could be] obtained almost a bird’s eye view of Kinfauns Castle and gardens, and the pleasure grounds, with an extensive prospect of the surrounding country."

It is not, then, only the quality of their design but also the compass of their views that becomes the measure of a tower. In this respect, a description of a turret raised on the site of an ancient burial ground at Comrie Hill, probably in the late-18th century, to the east of Raith House in Fife, may be taken as typical. It records that

“near the summit on which the mansion house is seated stands the tower, which is a square building with an inside stair of 54’ in length. From the top of this tower so extensive is the view that not less than parts of fourteen, some say sixteen different counties can be distinctly pointed out in a clear day.”

Rather more precise Gothic detailing has been lavished on this robust three-storey turret (fig. 6.40). Yet its traceried openings are perhaps too ecclesiastical-looking to be appropriate, and its corbel course, crenellations and bartsins too feeble to appear satisfying. Despite its superior views, this tower can not, then, be said to be as successful as that at Kinfauns. Indeed, in an age that aspired increasingly to architectural accuracy this was gimcrack Gothick and, although it may have offered light relief to the dry classicism of the house, it is unlikely ever to have met with many plaudits.

---

1. NSA, vol. 10, pp.1206-7. Also of interest in this connection is a design prepared for Lord Graham (afterwards the 3rd Duke of Montrose) by James Playfair in 1789 of a tower for Inchmurrin, Loch Lomond. Containing a dining-room and drawing room it was intended as a hunting lodge disguised as an old “Gothic tower of strength” (GD248/588).


3. Ecclesiastical Gothic is used to distinguish a roofless tower at Saline in Fife. The “Temple” (as it is noted on the 1st edition O.S. of 1854) which was built within the grounds of Bandrum House (demolished) was well constructed from dressed ashlar probably in the early-19th century, and though much of it is classical (its sharp lines, octagonal plan, square doors, and moulded sill and eaves course) the first-floor viewing room is lit by hood-moulded windows and its face ornamented with cusped statue niches (fig. 6.42). The shell of a single-stage tower wrought in Langley Gothick survives at Fasque House in Kincardineshire.
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Something of an accommodation between the integrity of Kinfauns and the detailing at Raith is achieved in the splendid Craig Tower at Balcarres (fig. 6.41). From around 1800 Robert Lindsay of Leuchars set about re-landscaping the estate he had purchased from his brother, the Earl of Crawford, in 1791. For the most part he generated stereotypical parkland from coastal-Fife’s gentle terrain. However, recognising the potential of the quarried cliffs of Balcarres Craig to the east of the house, Lindsay surrounded them with planting cut through with walks, and, in 1813, constructed a four-stage tower at their summit, to create a scene “worth all that twenty Browns could do for a place in conferring Romantic beauty.”

Lindsay’s tower is at once appealing. A delightful contrast is struck between its dark rubble walls and bright, sharp dressings, whilst its openings - a Saracenic star, an over-sized George-cross and a hood-moulded Gothic arch - seem playfully conceived as if to suggest memories of the Knights Templar whose Templelands it surveys. Yet for all its charm close to, when viewed from a distance the tower perhaps wanted bulk, and it was probably to anchor it more firmly to the expanse of sheer cliffs below that the flanking ruined wing-walls were later added.

As an observation tower it is well located, facing as it does not the house but the sea to the south. From its polished parapet the rock face below provided Georgian visitors with sublime

---

1 See Miers, M., “Balcarres House,” MA, University of St Andrews, pp.39-42.
2 The tower was apparently designed and built by the London “surveyor and builder” James Fisher (for Fisher see BDBA, p.363), who received £75 between September and November 1813; the total cost of the tower was £200 (see Miers, “Balcarres,” p.42, n.102).
5 The walls are butt-jointed and the tower is illustrated without them in an undated sketch by General James Lindsay made before 1855 (Miers, “Balcarres,” figure 56). I am grateful to Lady Ruth Crawford and her gardener, Duncan Lamb, for permitting access inside the tower.
thrills whilst the "soul-stirring prospect" beyond of "rich woods and fertile plain" and "the blue Firth of Forth bearing on its bosom the massive Bass Rock" was little bettered anywhere in Scotland.

A more archaeological note is struck by the stump of a contemporary structure at Craigend (fig. 6.43). Throughout the first third of the 19th century, James Smith, the penultimate laird of Craigend, was "rearranging his farms, and getting roads and marches made to suit his rather lofty ideas." During this time Smith "built near the present south lodge of Craigend a handsome castellated tower, partly as an ornament to his grounds and party for the sake of the splendid view which [was] to be had from the top of it." The octagonal-plan tower has now been greatly reduced with only the ground floor left surviving. However, the free-stone walls hint at its former grandeur, whilst the crisp, roll-moulded and trefoiled windows suggest a structure designed on exacting Gothic lines.

Like the Gothic turrets, the great majority of non-Gothic observation towers have little aesthetic pretence beyond their round-headed windows and crenellated parapets. A few, however, display rather more imagination in their design, and of these, those of greatest architectural consequence are the towers at Auchencruive in Ayrshire, Cargen in Kirkcudbrightshire, Arthurstone in Perthshire, Pitfour in Banffshire, The Binns in West Lothian and Blair Castle in Fife.

3 Ibid.
4 Ibid., n.3. The construction of the castellated main house (which replaced an earlier tower) was completed in 1812 to designs firstly by James Smith of Jordanhill (the owner's cousin) and then those of the Edinburgh architect, Alexander Ramsay (*BDBA*, p.792). It seems likely that either of these men designed the tower.
5 Other towers of note are at Johnston Lodge, Kincardineshire (a particularly unusual Gothic 'rocket-ship' - fig. 6.44), Kinpurney Hill (fig. 6.45) and The Lour (fig. 6.46), both in Angus.
The Auchencruive tower was designed by Robert Adam for Richard Oswald in June 1778 and constructed on the highest eminence in Oswald’s low, rolling estate (fig. 6.47).\(^1\) Cast neatly all in ashlar, the building is a simple one that derives its broad lines from the mausoleum of King Theodric at Ravenna and its spirit from the pen-and-wash castles of Adam’s *caprici*.

In essence the structure is a castellated drum 15 feet in diameter, topped by a conical roof and set on a circular base buttressed by four round turrets. The upper tower is articulated by narrow, blind arcading with each arch-head given subtle accent by a delicate patera, and topped by a machicolated eaves supporting a prim crenellated parapet. The outworks, plain except for a thin drip course, enclose a curving stair that leads up to a walkway - an improvement certainly on the external double stair originally planned, which would have ruptured the tower’s taut gravitas.\(^2\)

Adam designed the building principally for the taking of tea (and presumably political debate), with an elegant chamber (domed and decorated with a Doric frieze and chimney piece) above a preparation room for servants. However, the surrounding walkway, if hardly high, might be viewed partly as an attempt by Adam to offer visitors a raised vantage from which to view a panorama of southern Ayrshire, and as such, the structure may properly be considered a prospect tower, and much the most distinguished in Scotland at that.

Adam’s formula is recast at Cargen in what was most probably also a tea-house built shortly after that at Auchencruive (fig. 6.48). Again it is a classical castle of polished ashlar-work containing a salon above a servants’ room, with a raised viewing platform - this time accessed *via*

---


\(^2\) Copies of the plan “of a Tower for Richard Oswald” (which are at the Soane Museum) are held at NMRS (see AYD/71/2, /3, /4). They record the tower with a “Servants room” in the basement and a “Tea room” above which gives out to a “Terrace” and a double staircase. See also copies at NMRS of Adam’s unexecuted designs for tea-houses for Cullen in Banffshire (1783 - BND/16/59-65 - fig. 6.46a) and Balbardie House, West Lothian (1793 - WLD/4/2-4).
a substantial stair-tower to the flat-roof. And though it lacks the panache of Auchencruive it at least aspires to provincial elegance and in this it has more than a little merit.

A drabber structure is that built at Arthurstone in 1800. The extenuated red-rubble tower rises in three stages above the adjoining walled garden and is crowned with a weak corbel course, spiky merlons and a flag-staff for which only the brackets remain (fig. 6.49). Though it commands a prospect across much of the Gowrie plain a slightly different motivation for its construction may be suspected, for the Camerons of Fassifern, the estate-owners during the early 19th century, were an eminent military family, and the outsized elliptical and circular gun-loops that fenestrate the building seem intent on advertising that fact.¹

It seems likely that the celebration of military honours may also have partly inspired the construction of a thick-set, brick tower to the far north-west of the site of the demolished Pitfour House. Here a tall "Observatory" was built for Admiral Ferguson around 1850 on the crown of a sharpish hill within an area of mature wood (fig. 6.50).² The structure is well resolved. Each of the eight faces are enlivened by blind arches and topped by a deep cornice that supports squat crenellations, whilst inside, an octagonal well incorporates a stair that gives out to a tall central platform and a top-storey chamber lit by large windows. The building displays the hand of an designer rather than a mason and the most likely candidate is the Aberdeenshire architect, John Smith, who had been working intermittently at the estate for the last two decades. The view of the adamantine turret would have appealed to the Admiral and his austere neo-classical taste, but as

¹ Mackay, A., Meigle Past and Present, Meigle, 1876, pp.46-7. On similar lines, a military tower (this time used as clock tower rather than an observatory) was constructed at the middle of the north wall of a walled garden at Auchernach House around 1809 by General William Forbes. The General is reputed to have based the design of the tower and the walled garden on hill-forts he had seen in India (see Simpson, W., The Geology of Auchernach, Strathdon, Aberdeenshire, Edinburgh, 1948). I am grateful to Mr Peter Argyle of Loch Coull House for information on the history of the estate. A small castellated summerhouse survives within the walled garden at Kilmoran, Fife (fig. 6.51). It is probably the work of James Gillespie Graham who designed the Castle (now demolished) c.1820.

² For Pitfour see Tait, "Landscape Garden and Neo-Classicism", and for the tower see pp.322-5. Ferguson is reputed to have spent £80,000 on improving the Pitfour landscape (Groome, Gazetteer of Scotland, vol. 6, p.207).
importantly it had a use, in this case, to view the Banffshire countryside in general and the nearby racecourse in particular.

Yet if the towers at Arthurstone and Pitfour and the countless others more-or-less similar to them exude a medieval air, it is an irresolute one, for they are merely crenellated and hardly expressions of a mature castle style. Rather, the fitting if inferior heirs to Adam’s diminutive Ayrshire fort are found on opposing sides of the Firth of Forth.

The first of these stands on a tall hill immediately to the east of The Binns (fig. 6.52). The battered tower was raised in 1826 by Sir James Dalyell to specifications by Alexander Allan, reputedly as the result of an after-dinner wager. Simply built from yellow rubble, it nonetheless bears the hall-marks of an ancient turret - hood-moulded arrow-slits at each of its three stages, corbelled eaves appearing as pared down machicolations and tall, coped castellations around a flagpole. At Blair Castle a few miles upriver, there is a more fully evolved counterpart - similar in form but with its ground stage battered out, its merlons shallower and set over deeper machicolations, and irregularly-scattered round-headed windows the uppermost bearing stilted-arch tracery (fig. 6.53). The origin of the building is unknown but it probably dates from the early-19th century; whilst the views from its top can also only be guessed at since the tower has long since been gutted. It might be suggested however, that the structure was raised to evoke the ancient Blair Castle that the heroically-classical mansion replaced sometime during the early 1800s.

This selection of the best of Scotland’s observation towers illustrates the forms such buildings could take around the turn of the 1800s: from the evocatively medieval later-18th-century structures at Raith and Auchencruive to the more precisely Gothic example constructed a

---

1 Fleming, M., *The Binns*, p.10. I am grateful to Mr Peter McGowan for information relating to the tower.
few decades later at Craigend or the neo-Romanesque example at Blair Castle. Much the same
spectrum may be detected in the second category of garden towers - those erected as monuments.

In Loudon’s opinion “to raise a monument in memory of a great public character, or
consecrate an urn to private friendship, or parental memory, can hardly be offensive to any
mind.” If a prospect tower was mounted with a dedication plaque it was furnished instantly with
additional purpose, and its construction could be more readily justified. As early as 1803 Richard
Elsam had published a design for a “naval pillar to immortalize British naval heroism,” and three
years later a slender monumental tower was raised on a hill above Forres and dedicated to
Nelson’s victory at Trafalgar (the first of its type in Britain). However, the tower did not relate
to any designed landscape, and rather it was success at Waterloo that spawned the first
commemorative garden towers. At Scotsraig in Fife a harled-rubble tower stands crumbling on
the brow of a hill above the south bank of the Tay (fig. 6.54). Circular and embattled with
round-headed windows at each of its three stages, the tower could never have been described as
remarkable nor even appealing, but its stout, dark walls were certainly monumental and easily
seen from the city of Dundee across the river. In contrast, the square two-storey building of 1815
set in the woodland of Hill House, West Lothian, is a little more distinguished (fig. 6.55). Stugged, masonry walls and quoins over a battered base, hood-mouldings, stretching first-floor lancets and bold merlons over a deep corbel course together seem to sound a faint pre-echo of the
Baronial Revival.

2 The three-stage Gothic tower was raised on Cluny Hill in 1806, to the designs of a local architect, Charles Stuart
(Douglas, Forres, pp. 313, 318).
3 Monuments to naval success were raised in increasing numbers within late-Georgian gardens throughout Britain -
see Eyres, P., “Fleets, Forests and Follies: Supremacy of the Seas and of the Eye (the interrelationship of warship
production, forestry and landscape architecture),” New Arcadian Journal, no. 35/36, 1993, pp. 8-23.
4 The tower is marked on the 1st edition O.S. of 1854.
With the exception of a charmless, 1832 monument to the Reform Act at Meet Hill House in Banffshire, the remainder of Scotland’s 17 commemorative towers record individuals rather than events. Whilst all have some value as historical documents in stone, description of the neatest of them may serve as typical. Completed in 1827 on a hill above Newton House in Morayshire from designs attributed to James McBride, a builder-architect of Elgin, the three-storey turret has blind arrow-slits, round-arches, hood-mouldings and nail-head carving (fig. 6.56). Reputedly the place where Macbeth met the witches, the site is more likely to have been chosen for its impressive views. However, it was in commemoration of the life of the Duke of York that the tower was expressly raised.¹

Of the 80 or so garden mausolea surviving in Scotland, a little over half were constructed between 1780 and 1840. Of these the slight majority are Gothic. The Gothic mausoleum most commonly assumes a simple chapel form: it is a plain gabled box, generally of ashlar, with a little Gothic ornament and a pointed arch entrance to a spartan interior. The simplest example is at Corehouse in Lanarkshire (fig. 6.57). Probably constructed in the mid-19th century, it is a diminutive block of bull-faced masonry with neatly-dressed margins, and defined as Gothic only by its weighty angle buttresses.² A more ornamented variation on the theme is the mausoleum, dated 1830, at Tulliallan in Fife, which bears crow-steps, diagonal buttresses and hood-moulded Gothic arches. The highest architectural attainment of the chapel-mausoleum was built in the earlier-to-mid-19th-century, probably to designs by John Smith, at Whitehaugh in Aberdeenshire (fig. 6.58).³ The walls are raised high in bull-faced granite, a large window with English Perpendicular tracery set in the west gable window and a bellcote rising from the east apex. There are, too, stylistic variations on the theme. At Inverneil in Argyllshire, each gable of an 1802

¹ Copies of the original drawings are held at NMRS.

² The house was constructed 1824-7 to the designs of Edward Blore. The mausoleum was presumably constructed some short time after.

³ Smith added wings to Whitehaugh c.1838-40 (BDHA, p.900).
mausoleum is filled with a blind Gothic arch yet margined by classical pilasters and topped with an open pediment; whilst at Herdmanstoun in East Lothian, a medieval chapel remodelled to form a mausoleum around 1840, was given a Gothic arch breaking through a pedimented gable.¹

Gothic designs outside of the basic chapel form are rare, with just two of any note surviving in Scotland. The first is at Duff House in Banffshire (fig. 6.59). This mausoleum was constructed in 1791 for James Duff, who, having decided to build the mausoleum was divided whether to have it at the new town of Macduff or within the landscape. In the event it was built at the site of a Carmelite friary on a low precipice above the Deveron within woods to the south of the house.² The style is Langley Gothick, a surprisingly retardataire choice for a London-based M.P., but it strikes a pleasing note between ornament and propriety and in this respect it must have recommended itself.³ Duff purloined the scattered graves of notable if putative relatives and relocated them within the mausoleum in an attempt to project both an ancient and noble lineage, for in reality he possessed neither. Much the same could be said of Sir John Sinclair. During the course of the 1790s, Sinclair raised a crude tower on a rise to the east of Thurso Castle (fig. 6.60). Hexagonal in plan with bowing pencil turrets, it was intended to mark the grave of Harald, 12th-century Earl of Caithness, from whom Sinclair considered himself to be descended.⁴ It was also mounted with a plaque inscribed “The Burial Place of the Sinclairs of Ulbster,” though the claim seems never to have been the case. The structure was at once a sham-fort, a monument and a mausoleum, which if not truly Gothic and not especially attractive, would at least have appealed to Romantic sensibilities in a way that the rather bland forms of most other Gothic mausolea probably did not.

² Tait, A., Duff House, Edinburgh, 1995, p.27. Accounts for stone-work to the mausoleum (1792-3) and details of its plasterwork (1793-4) are contained within the Montcoffer MSS (see A/68(2)/3/4/1 and A/70(1)/3/6/1) in Furgol, T., (ed.), The Duff House Transcripts from the Montcoffer Papers, unpublished, undated.
³ There is one more Gothick garden mausoleum in Scotland - at Newton House, Gordon.
⁴ Anon., A Guide to Thurso, Thurso, undated, p.25. See also Groome, Ordnance Gazetteer, vol. 6, p.438.
Architectural variety and interest seem to have been the preserve of classical mausolea. Two reasons for this may be suggested. Firstly, architects were fluent in the language of classical architecture and could explore with confidence its potential by designing innovative schemes in a way that they were as yet unable to do with Gothic. Secondly, Antiquity provided any number of authentic models from which late-18th-century architects might draw. To design a mausoleum was an attractive prospect for an architect imbued with neo-classical ideals and it is perhaps not surprising that the four finest examples in Scotland - at Callendar House in Stirlingshire, Gosford House in East Lothian; and Prestonhall south of Edinburgh - are each based upon ancient precedent.

In late-18th century Britain, the circular tempietto was amongst the best-known forms of Antique mausolea. It was used first at Castle Howard between 1729 and 1736, and then presented as a mausoleum for Frederick, Prince of Wales, in an unexecuted design made in 1751-2 by Sir William Chambers. The form gained occasional expression as a mausoleum throughout the later-18th century, the most notable being that at Brocklesby in Lincolnshire, designed by James Wyatt in 1787 (fig. 6.61). Indeed, it seems likely that this was the model for the mausoleum designed by Archibald Elliot in 1816 to inter the late William Forbes at Callendar House (fig. 6.62).\(^1\) Both structures make use of a peristyle of fluted Doric columns around a polished ashlar cella supported on a rusticated base, crowned with a substantial dome and set within a circular enclosure. The principal difference is that at Callendar, Elliot, who was trained in London “under the best masters” and would surely have known of Wyatt’s work, translated the architecture of the Brocklesby mausoleum from Roman to Greek. For a young Hellenist like Elliot this is hardly surprising, however, the choice of style may have been dictated by the character of those for whom the mausolea were designed. The poise and elegance of the Wyatt’s

---

\(^1\) NSA, vol.8, p.12. For drawings see GD171/78/5.
work was entirely appropriate to the memory of an Earl’s young wife; by contrast, the closely-spaced columns and spartan ornament of Elliot’s mausoleum invoke an urgency and vigour more fitting for the character of a ruthless copper baron.

The mausoleum at Gosford, exquisitely constructed for Francis Charteris, 7th Earl of Wemyss between 1795 and 1798, is a polished pyramid of Craigleith stone raised on a sheer, square block of ashlar, each face of which bears a central tetrastyle Tuscan portico (fig. 6.63). It is encircled by a slightly elliptical enclosing wall which terminates at two neatly-chamfered gateposts topped with lead statues of the Flayer of Marsyas. The architect of the mausoleum is not known, but there are two obvious candidates. The first is the designer of Gosford House, Robert Adam. Although Adam had died three years before the start of building work, the blockish massing and resolute proportions of the mausoleum certainly suggest his influence. The second is the English architect, Thomas Harrison. Harrison studied in Rome and rose to become one of Britain’s best regarded neo-classicists, his work being characterised by a bold sense of mass with a concern for the quality of masonry. He was engaged by the Earl to modify Adam’s plans for Gosford House the year before construction of the mausoleum commenced and as such his influence on its design can not be discounted.

The earliest pyramidal-capped mausoleum was that built for Mausolus, King of Halicarnassus. A famed Wonder of the Ancient World its form was much imitated by the Romans who raised their own interpretations of the structure as mausolea across Europe. A mausoleum topped with a pyramid was depicted in Hypnerotomachia Poliphili, whilst Roman mausolea were illustrated in rather crude form in Pirro Ligorio’s Anteiquae Urbis Imago of

---

1 *BDBA*, p.466-7.

2 The mausoleum was constructed by the brothers Adam and Thomas Russell, who were also responsible for the house. Several payments totalling around £1400 were made to the Russells for building the mausoleum between 1795 and 1797 (extracts from the cash books within the Wemyss MSS held at the NMRS). Harrison was paid £31.10.6 on November 18 1794 for “the plans he made for [Wemyss] for the alterations to Mr Adams plan of Gosford House.”
1561, and more elaborately in Fréart's *Parallel of the Ancient Architecture with the Modern* of 1650. They were reinterpreted first in 1683 as a mausoleum for John Clerk at Penicuik south of Edinburgh (fig. 6.64), and a century later by James Wyatt as a mausoleum for the 3rd Earl of Darnley at Cobham Hall in Kent. Whatever its source, the Gosford mausoleum was not merely a reference to Antiquity. Anticipating Loudon’s recommendation that “mausoleums not obtruded on the view, but placed so as to be seen only occasionally, may afford solemn instruction to all, and may inspire the noblest sentiments in the descendants of ancient and honourable families,” the building was sited so as to terminate a vista that ran through thick woodland from midway along the entrance drive, its melancholic form casting a pall across visitors that they would have struggled to shake as they passed into James Ramsay’s secluded pleasure ground which itself seems designed to prompt a mood of melancholic introspection.

As dominant, if less subtly so, is the towering structure built on a rise to the north of Prestonhall House. The estate was purchased in 1789 by Alexander Callendar, an M.P. and successful merchant. Two years later Callendar commissioned the Scots-born architect, Robert Mitchell, to design a new mansion. Within a year, however, Callendar was dead and the estate passed to his brother, John. Mitchell was retained to complete the house, and at the same time was apparently called upon by the new owner to design a mausoleum for Alexander within the park.

---

1 Colvin, *Afterlife*, pp.304, 308. It is interesting to note that a tall pyramid raised on an arched base was constructed at Stanway, home to Lord Neidpath, son of the Earl of Wemyss, in 1750, as this may have suggested the general form to the Earl.


3 Four payments totalling over £2200 were made to Ramsay between 1790 and 1796. Work seems to have been undertaken in two stages. Ramsay was first paid £15.15.0 on 2 December 1790 for “his plan and trouble for laying out the grounds about Gosford” and on 10 May 1792 he was paid £897.11.9 for “laying out pleasure ground, making ponds, woods, walks at Gosford.” In December of the same year he was paid £10 for “making out a new plan for the policy at Gosford” and on the last day of 1796 he was paid £1351.11.0 for “executing policy, pleasure grounds, Ponds, Mounts, planting, Bowling Green, etc. at Gosford.” It seems reasonable to assume therefore that Ramsay advised on the location of the mausoleum and intended it as a key feature of his gardens. Ramsay’s gardens were surveyed in detail in 1808 by John Ainslie (NMRS A33492 and A33517)
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Mitchell created an austere composition of two stages (fig. 6.65). The base consists of a substantial octagonal block of polished ashlar cut through with tall arches and articulated with shallow recesses, topped with a proud bracketed cornice and a high blocking course. The upper level is a faceted Doric rotunda that sits on a sweeping roof like an over-sized lantern. The structure would appear to have been completed by 1794, as it is depicted in a vignette on a Thomas White landscape proposal prepared in that year.¹

The broad lines of Mitchell’s design may have been drawn loosely from the monument of the Julii constructed at Saint Rémy in Provence around 30 B.C. (fig. 6.66). It is unlikely, however, that Mitchell would have experienced this building first-hand and it is more probable that he reworked either John Carr’s version of the monument raised at Wentworth Woodhouse in Yorkshire between 1785 and 1791, or, less probably, that by Michael Shanahan at Downhill in Ireland. These two structures are the only other reconstructions of the Julii monument in Britain and Ireland; it seems that forms of superimposed columns held little appeal for neo-classical tastes.² As such, the smooth planes of Mitchell’s design may be a clever if clumsy adaptation of the ancient model to modern taste. It may be suggested that the possible choice of prototype was a considered one, for the structure at Saint Rémy was a monument not a mausoleum, and this may ever have been the intention at Prestonhall; for when describing the interior of the building Mitchell records only that “in the chapel... there is intended to be placed a monument of marble, as executed of appropriate design;”³ and despite calling the building a “mausoleum” he made no accommodation for burial chambers. Like those at Wentworth Woodhouse (which commemorated but did not contain the 2nd Marquis of Rockingham) and Downhill (likewise the

¹ A copy of White’s “Design for the Improvement of Preston Hall” is held at NMRS (A27188CN).
² See Colvin, Afterlife, p.353.
2nd Earl of Bristol), the Prestonhall temple was probably intended as a monument to, not a mausoleum for, Alexander Callendar, and given that the form it assumed was evocative of such, it probably mattered little that it was never fitted out nor its lugged-stone plaques inscribed.

Other mausolea in Scotland also invoke ideas of classical precedent. Most notable amongst these are the simple arrangements of four columns set on a raised base and supporting a canopy at Kinnetles in Angus (c.1830 - fig. 6.67) and Marlee House in Perthshire (c.1840 - fig. 6.68). Moreover, the language of classicism could invest a mausoleum in a more general way with ideals of ancient dignity, and two of these merit particular mention. The first is at Carstairs House in Lanarkshire where a domed and porticoed octagon was raised in 1784 both as a mausoleum and as the termination for an impressive avenue (now felled - fig. 6.69). The second is the fine riverside temple at Springwood in Roxburghshire constructed most probably to the designs of James Gillespie Graham in the early-1820s (figs. 6.70 and 6.71). The third is arguably the finest structure ever to have ornamented a designed landscape in Scotland - the mausoleum at Hamilton Palace (fig. 6.78). The creation of the 10th Duke of Hamilton, it is an

1 According to a fallen inscribed stone that lies adjacent to the mausoleum, William Fullerton was interred within the mausoleum in 1784. Sadly the structure is becoming derelict and is now set within an agricultural prairie, the vista of beeches long since felled (see 1st edition O.S. of 1858).

2 McNaughton, D., The Story of Springwood, Kelso, 1982, p.10. An undated and uncatalogued perspective drawing of the mausoleum, attributable to Graham (who designed the entrance gate to Springwood in 1822), is held at NMRS. The mausoleum was consecrated by the Bishop of Glasgow in 1838 and 15 years later it was proposed to add a portico to the building though this was never executed (see NMRS plan RXD/326/18). An icehouse with a segmental entrance was proposed in 1826 and a combined summerhouse and pheasantry and a garden house were both designed for Springwood in 1853. The house is now demolished and the estate adorned only with mobile caravans. Other notable examples of classical mausolea built during this period survive at Kirkdale in Kirkcudbrightshire and Crawford Priory in Fife. The former, a rubble box with a pedimented entrance, is dated 1787 and is probably the work of Robert Adam (fig. 6.72). The latter was constructed by George, 21st Earl of Crawford, some time between the construction of Crawford Lodge (now Priory) in 1758 and his death 23 years later (fig. 6.73). The mausoleum, which is set amongst woodland and the ramparts of an ancient fort in a “retired part of the estate,” is cast in rusticated ashlar blocks with a finely carved Ionic door to the front. “Massive wooden doors, protected by inner gates of wrought iron” once enclosed the vault but have now been replaced by concrete blocks (Millar, A., Fife, Edinburgh, 1895, p.195). In 1797 the Edinburgh architect, John Paterson, provided Lord Kinnaird with “two different sketches of A Mausoleum, the one done with a porch of the simplest Dorick, without ornament [fig. 6.74] - the other Gothic the door of the Vault to enter from behind” for his estate of Rossie Priory in Perthshire. Paterson considered the latter to be “most proper for the situation proposed for it” (Rossie Priory MSS, Box 22, fol.1r, letter from Paterson to George 7th Baron Kinnaird, 5 September 1797- these are additional papers to GD48 deposited at Perth and Kinross District Archives, Sandeman Library, Perth). I am grateful to Professor Alistair Rowan for bringing this reference to my attention. An undated design (c.1830) for a classical mausoleum by Joseph Browne exists amongst the Gordon Castle MSS (RHP2378, no.42). Good examples of classical mausolea are also found at Macbiehill, Tweeddale (fig. 6.75), Logie House, Angus (fig. 6.76); and Cambo in Fife (fig. 6.77).
outstanding example of architectural arrogance *in extremis*: a building whose conception, scale, sophistication and craftsmanship conspired, as if intentionally, to render all precursors piteous by comparison, and condemn everything thereafter as pale and insignificant, for nothing could ever have over-shadowed this architectural leviathan. As the final, flamboyant gesture of a distinguished but dying tradition the Hamilton mausoleum provides a logical end to this study and demands a final description.1

The mausoleum, which is 120 feet high and 110 feet in diameter, is cast in a monochromatic yellow ashlar that has been cut so precisely and bedded so tightly that there is barely a joint visible. The effect is to create a solemn sense of monumentality beyond even that conveyed by its considerable scale. The crypt is approached from the east through three rusticated arches whose keystones are carved representations of life, death and immortality. Inside, the crypt is groin-vaulted with 28 recesses set in the wall thickness. Either side of the crypt, a pair of carved lions symbolising life and death guard two imperial staircases which lead up to the chapel - the superstructure of the mausoleum. Above a tall bunyated plinth, square in plan and several feet high, rises a massive basement that has been horizontally channelled to present an appearance of complete solidity. Upon the basement is set a panelled and pilastered dado wrought from single slabs of stone. A full entablature and blocking course recedes to support a circular drum cast from 13 deeply-channelled stone courses, and the structure is surmounted by a dome that rises 18 feet above its plinth. The imposing chapel is approached through an Egyptian-style entrance to the west which contains magnificent bronze doors based on Ghiberti’s Baptistry doors in Florence with *alto-basso* panels depicting scenes from the Old Testament. Inside, four alcoves rise from the floor and eight niches are set into the walls. The sides of the drum are cleverly battered to create a false sense of perspective that suggests a greater feeling of height. The roof is coffered and punctuated with a ten-feet-wide, glazed

---

occulus, the floor is cast in marble and porphyry, and eight sets of two cherubims enliven the walls. Finally, opposite the entrance to the chapel is a black marble pedestal that once supported the 10th Duke's sarcophagus.

The construction of the mausoleum at Hamilton is first mentioned in two letters dated 31st December 1840 and sent from the estate factor, Robert Brown, to William Burn in Edinburgh and David Hamilton in Glasgow respectively, both expressing concern that neither architect had yet submitted their sketch proposals for the scheme. It was presumably on the strength of these drawings that the Duke chose his preferred designer, and so it was over the ensuing months that David Hamilton prepared a number of schemes for the new mausoleum. Hamilton prepared numerous neo-classical designs based on centralised plans, but it was his proposal for a mausoleum based on the Roman tombs of Caelia Metella and Emperor Hadrian that was eventually selected, no doubt as much on account of its impeccable antique credentials as its striking, bold appearance. Working drawings were prepared in 1841 in order that sufficient stones could be ordered from the Hamilton quarry, however, Hamilton's health was beginning to fail and within a year he was replaced by the Bath architect, Henry Goodridge, who was then overseeing alterations to the Palace interior. Though the Duke wished the building to be set on, and indeed incorporate the crypt of, the Old Collegiate Kirk adjacent to Hamilton Palace, a dryer site was chosen further to the north. Despite the fact that Hamilton had prepared working drawings, progress on the mausoleum stalled and construction did not begin until the spring of 1846. For reasons that are not clear, Goodridge fell from the Duke's favour, and in April of 1848, as the crypt began to take shape, the young Edinburgh architect, David Bryce, was invited to assume responsibility for the completion of the mausoleum. Though Bryce tinkered a little with Hamilton's original design, chiefly by heightening the drum by two courses to make it appear less squat, he left its broad lines unchanged and focused instead on decoration and detail. Work to the chapel started in July 1848 and progressed well with the superstructure being completed during the course of the next four years. However, the Duke died in August 1848 without ever seeing his
resting place complete. Unsurprisingly, momentum was lost on the Duke’s death, and the marble, carvings and landscaping were not completed until 1856. Indeed, the mausoleum may never have been finished: the 11th Duke took little interest in the project and the 12 statues of the apostles that were reputedly intended for the chapel’s alcoves and niches were never commissioned. But if this lends the interior a rather unsettling atmosphere it is a small flaw in a near-perfect jewel for there can be no doubt that the Hamilton mausoleum is at once the culmination and perfection of Scotland’s garden building tradition. Indeed, by 1850 mausolea had all but ceased to be constructed within designed landscapes, for though “worthy of respect”, an “architectural tomb, in which the remains of human beings are built up, and prevented from mixing with our mother Earth” had become “a structure indicating a practice altogether unworthy of an enlightened age.”

Conclusion

It may be said, therefore, that during the late-18th and early-19th centuries ornamental structures became less popular. If a landowner wished to adorn his landscape with a building then it needed to have a function other than ornament and leisure. The main reasons for this were four-fold: there had been an excessive use of such buildings (at least in England) and they became reviled as taste advanced; ‘nature-in-the-raw’ was increasingly greatly valued and polished garden buildings had no place within it; the middle classes accounted more and more for the creation and improvement of landscapes and, though wealthy, may nonetheless have found the cost of a fine garden building somewhat challenging; and, in the wake of the French Revolution, conspicuous consumption was not at any rate something to be recommended. The most numerous garden buildings to have survived from this period are towers and mausolea - buildings for which a function might be tenuously claimed. Likewise gazebos within walled gardens seem also to have been highly popular, as were monuments which again had a use, albeit a specious one. However,

1 Loudon, *Cottage, Farm and Villa Architecture*, p.996 - a change of opinion since *Country Residences* (vol. 1, p.409).
the most obvious example of the late-Georgian marriage of utility and beauty are the glasshouses, dairies, bath-houses, pheasantries and so on, that survive in reasonable number. And although summerhouses, temples and especially sham-ruins continued to be built, they were increasingly ill-regarded and ever-more rare.

During the 12th, 13th and 14th centuries, although the Evidence is slight, these would seem to be host sufficient to suggest that formal structures formed an important part of Scotland's medieval gardens. The creation of large-scale decorative gardens such as Hay's Mains, then later Pollok House, indicates that by the end of the 18th century, the Scottish royal family (which also possessed the equivalent of a country house) considered fine gardens to be an important part of their estate management. An examination of the form and design of the gardens of the stately homes at Balhousie reveals that by the 15th century the ornamental characteristic potential of small-scale ornamental and its value to architectural innovation and well-researched.

The form of the Prince's continued to exist that by the early-19th century the interest and expense with the regular use of classical "temple" books was the work of Sturt and of Coton. However, the well-known and popular "Maccan" domes - the hemispherical and the "inverted" layouts - have become less frequent and the garden design was sufficiently fashionable with the language of classical architecture to be innovative. That this was the case is supported by the evidence of Donaldson's study of the work of James Gibbs and the evidence of the work of the gardens, which became not only a recreation of classical Roman architecture but also what might be described as a 17th-century use of the term "Horace". The wrapped garden at Fyrish and the long terraces on the Dutch frontage indicates that Scottish gardens were not only rare as an, but unique, the finest gardens of
CONCLUSION

What, conclusions can be drawn, then, from this survey of the ornamental structures raised in Scotland's gardens and designed landscapes between the 12th and the mid-19th centuries?

During the 12th, 13th and 14th centuries, although the evidence is slight, there would seem to be just sufficient to suggest that ornamental structures formed an important part of Scotland's medieval gardens. The creation of James IV's extensive "magno gardino sub muro castri di Strivelin" indicates that by the turn of the 16th century, the Scottish royal family (which then formed the vanguard of sophisticated taste) considered fine gardens to be an important part of their artistic patronage. An examination of the form and decorative sculpture of the courtyard fountain at Linlithgow reveals that by the third decade of the 16th century the considerable emblematic potential of small-scale architecture and its value to architectural innovation were well understood.

The form of the Pinkie well-head suggests that by the early-17th century designers and masons were making use of classical 'pattern books' such as the works of Serlio and du Cerceau. However, the well-head's accomplished 'Mannerist' detailing - the leathery strap-work and the 'incised' triglyphs - also indicates that Scotland's mason-designers were sufficiently comfortable with the language of classical architecture to be inventive. That this was the case is supported by the design of the fountain of Dundas Castle which is quite unlike any printed source, and that of the well-head at Mansion House, Greenock, which seems not only to be a quotation of Antique Roman architecture but also what may arguably be a pioneering use in Britain of baseless Doric. The inscribed panels at Pinkie and the long inscription on the Dundas fountain indicate that Scottish patrons were not only aware of, but imitated, the finest gardens of
Renaissance Rome. Indeed, the remodelling of the King’s Knot at Stirling into what may have been one of Europe’s most elaborate water gardens suggests that Scotland could set standards as well as aspire to them. As in the previous century, patrons were well aware of the importance of garden buildings in communicating an intellectual programme. At Edzell, for example, the walls and buildings seem to hint at, amongst other things, Lindsay’s aspirations regarding Scotland’s contribution to an expected British ‘empire’ forged and fuelled by the Union of the Crowns; whilst at Pinkie and Dundas, ornamental structures were used to display the neo-Stoic philosophical credos of Alexander Seton and Walter Dundas. Other structures pregnant with emblematic potential - the grotto and the dovecote - were also introduced into the garden during the 17th century. Grottoes were a direct and explicit quotation of Antiquity and were popular places for quiet contemplation at a time when ‘melancholy’ was considered an emotion worthy of cultivation. Indeed, it seems likely that a notably early example was the “spacious Room adorned with a Christalline fountain cut all out of the living Rock” set within the late-16th century garden at Kelburn. As a traditional emblem of power, the dovecote naturally became architecturally more celebrated and valued as much for its appearance and symbolism as its function. Although it was generally set within the wider landscape, it could, as at Aberdour in Fife, be brought into the garden proper. However, many structures, such as the fountain at Ravelston, the summerhouse at Moray House and the bath-house at Leven Lodge, were intended merely to be at once pretty and practical.

After the Restoration gardens began to grow in size. This meant that they could contain a greater volume and variety of Architectural ornament. This architectural ornament consisted principally of gazebos (as at Hatton, Pitmedden and Traquair) and seats-cum-alcoves-cum-loggias (as at Kinross, Panmure, Hatton, Newbattle and Culross), much in line with advice contained in contemporary horticultural publications. However, on occasion, other types of buildings were created, such as grottoes (at Hatton) and aviaries (at Kinross). Significantly, as a taste for the ‘Grand Manner’ grew and the visual envelope of the garden spread into the
surrounding parks and woodland, features were erected to offer accent and interest to the house’s wider setting and at Yester the cascade house is remarkable not only because it is probably the earliest such structures in (what was to become) Britain, but also because it is set beyond the garden in the encapsulating park. As walled enclosures were removed from around the mansion during the first decades of the 18th century and gardens increased in size to form, what might be termed ‘designed landscapes’, ornamental structures offered much-needed definition and relief, as well as places to rest whilst visitors explored the full extent of the grounds.

It may be argued that the two extremes of landscape design in early-18th-century England were, what may be termed, the ‘Baroque’ and the ‘Switzeresque’. Given the appearance of the Hopetoun and Newhailes estates it seems reasonable to assume that these two fashionable modes of landscaping were also practised in Scotland. Moreover, just as England began consciously to evolve a ‘national’ landscaping style for itself during the early-1700s, the evidence provided by ornamental garden buildings suggests that Scotland may have been doing much the same. South of the Border, weather conditions were given to producing good quality grass, and as a result the plain, grass plat was praised as typically English and became a prized feature of fine gardens. North of the Border it appears that rugged countryside, rather than parterres à l’angloise, were considered quintessentially Scottish. That this was the case is suggested by the numerous gazebos specifically located to provide views of rugged features such as waterfalls, cliffs and ancient ruins, and the fact that on the occasions where such features were absent, they were created artificially (as, for example, Sir John Clerk proposed for Penicuik). Moreover, as in England, it seems likely that Scotland’s mode of landscaping became associated with notions of liberty. But if English estates evoked triumphantist thoughts of liberty won over the French, Scottish ones implied a wistful lament for freedom lost as a result of the Union. Mountains and moors had for some time been considered ‘Liberty’s’ bolt-hole in periods of oppression, whilst ruined castles were readily emblematic of Scotland’s historical defence of its national identity. To angle a gazebo towards such features was therefore subtly to invite thoughts of a noble past that
would never return. Scotland, it seems, evolved its own mode of landscaping during the first half of the 18th century, and by making use of 'nature-in-the-raw', a taste for the sublime was established at least half a century before it took hold in England, and in advance even of its analysis by the mid-century aesthetic philosophers. Moreover, of the ornamental structures created between 1700 and 1750, there are amongst the earliest garden mausolea in Britain (at Rossie, Bargaly and Mellerstain), an early eye-catcher (also at Mellerstain) and a remarkable quotation of an Antique tunnel (the Hurley Cave at Penicuik). Notably early schemes for a tower and a sham-ruin were also prepared (again for Penicuik). It is surely clear, then, that as in previous centuries, Scotland appears to have been abreast, and occasionally in advance of, stylistic developments in landscape design in England and elsewhere.

The evidence of garden buildings (along with information contained in maps and estates surveys) suggests that John Dalrymple's *Essay on Gardening* provides a fair approximation of how designed landscapes were created in mid-century Scotland. It is reasonable to suggest, therefore, that a national style of gardening continued, albeit in an evolved form, after 1740, and was only supplanted after 1780 when the fashion for the Brownian Landscape Garden took increasing hold. The principal styles of fashionable architecture - classical, Gothic and the 'Oriental' - were all tried out on garden buildings, and whilst the first of these was the most common, outstanding examples of the second (at Ednam) and the third (at Dunkeld) are known, as well as one of Britain's earliest and more elaborate sham-ruins (at Panmure). The emblematic value of garden buildings diminished during the mid-century. However, the Highland sham-forts at Inveraray, Taymouth, Blair and Dunkeld may well be expressions of aristocratic indignation at the resolution of the 'militia issue.' Moreover, the hermitage at Dunkeld is likely to be the last allegorical expression in stone of Jacobite sympathies.

During the late-18th and early-19th centuries ornamental structures became less popular. If a landowner wished to adorn his landscape with a building then it needed to have a function
other than ornament and leisure. The main reasons for this were probably four-fold: there had
been an excessive use of such buildings (at least in England) and they became reviled as taste
advanced; 'nature-in-the-raw' was valued more than ever and polished garden buildings had no
place within it; the middle classes accounted increasingly for the creation and improvement of
landscapes and, though wealthy, may nonetheless have found the cost of a fine garden building
somewhat challenging; and, in the wake of the French Revolution, conspicuous consumption was
not at any rate something to be recommended. The most numerous garden buildings to have
survived from this period are towers and mausolea - buildings for which a function might be
tenuously claimed. Likewise gazebos within walled gardens seem also to have been highly
popular, as were monuments which again had a use, albeit a specious one. However, the most
obvious example of the late-Georgian marriage of utility and beauty are the glasshouses, dairies,
bath-houses, pheasantries and so on, that survive in reasonable number. And although
summerhouses, temples and especially sham-ruins continued a fitful existence, they were
increasingly ill-regarded and ever-more rare.

What is absolutely clear from all the periods assessed is that imitations of the buildings
of Ancient Rome have never been created in any number within Scotland’s gardens and designed
landscapes - certainly not to the degree that they were constructed south of the Border. The
reasons for this can only be guessed, but might it be possible that if Scotland indeed possessed a
mode of 'patriotic landscaping' then temples were too redolent of past invasions? The case of Sir
John Clerk certainly seems to suggest that this was so. Despite having an interest in Ancient
Rome that erred almost on the obsessionial, Clerk never raised a single trabeated building at either
Cammo, Mavisbank or Penicuik. Rather, his garden structures (actual and proposed) were merely
subtle classical references or out-and-out romantic medievalisms. The baron never convincingly
squared his passion for Rome and his uneasy commitment to the Union, with his profound and
unquestionable patriotism. He was surely aware of the parallels that could be drawn between the
absorption of Scotland first into ancient Rome and now into modern England: perhaps the
creation of a temple - an emblem of the landscapes of the former and increasingly the gardens of
the latter - may have been, for him and others, a step too far?

What is also clear is that gardens and designed landscapes in Scotland have never been
over-run with built ornament. If it is assumed that those structures which survive today are
reasonably representative in number of those first built, then, by comparison with England their
numbers are pitifully few. Clearly, there can be little doubt that the aesthetic and emblematic
potential of ornamental structures within gardens and designed landscapes has always been
valued, and this makes their relative sparsity doubly curious. Cost may have been an issue,
though if this were the case then we would at least expect to have seen temples and rotundas
liberally showered across the extensive (and expensive) policies laid out by William Adam - and
they were not. Certainly, the more Calvinistic of this country’s landowners may have viewed such
structures as frivolous and unnecessary, but that is hardly a sufficient explanation. Rather the
reason must surely be related to the designed landscapes themselves along with their wider
settings. Scotland is most often a rugged country of moors, mountains, lochs and glens. It is
stark, often bleak and generally visually demanding. In short it is crafted on a grand scale - and
forms a backdrop against which garden buildings might look puny, perhaps even ridiculous no
matter what their architectural quality. Indeed, this native preference for gardens over garden
buildings is hinted at by an inscription Sir John Clerk prepared for Corby Castle in Cumbria, in
which he rates the estate’s natural attractions higher than the “Aedificia varia... ingenitique
humani conamina exquisita.” In short, Scots let landscapes ‘speak for themselves’ and that few
structures ever ornamented their gardens speaks volumes.

In conclusion, this thesis has demonstrated firstly the importance of garden buildings in
Scottish architectural history. For example, the origins of classicism in this country can be traced
via the well-head at Pinkie to the fountain at Linlithgow; whilst the castle-style was expressed
first at Penicuik and the taste for Chinese at Dunkeld. Secondly, it has demonstrated the
importance of garden buildings in Scotland’s cultural history. For example, the well-head at Pinkie and the fountain at Dundas reveal that in the early-1600s there existed a sophisticated appreciation of classical learning and a desire to express that learning through gardens and their ornament. This thesis has also shown that garden design in Scotland could often be innovative and occasionally extravagant. In this connection, the study of garden buildings has revealed three key points relative to garden history. Firstly, by the late-17th-century the wider landscape was being incorporated into the visual envelope of gardens. Secondly, by the early-18th century sublime features such as waterfalls and rock-faces were elements to be appreciated. And thirdly, Scotland may well have possessed during the first seven decades of the 18th century its own style of garden design. In all, this thesis has shown that garden buildings form an important part of Scotland’s architectural history, but it is perhaps its findings relative to the country’s garden history that are the most significant. In this respect this study has revealed two major issues: firstly, Scotland has a long and often sophisticated tradition of garden design; and secondly, Scottish taste in garden design has been informed since at least the 17th century by a profound appreciation of rugged landscape, of nature-in-the-raw. It is this particular predilection for the wilder, wider landscape (especially during the first half of the 18th century) that seems to distinguish Scotland from surrounding countries. It may be concluded from this thesis that the history of Scotland’s gardens must be reviewed and set in a new context: to quote Isaac Ware, “nothing is so much wanted”.

\[\text{297}\]
This is the problems associated with the enormous changes to local government boundaries and council names made since the mid-1970s, locations are quoted as specified within the third edition of Historic Scotland's Survey of Scotland (1988). It is worth noting that the counties specified below often (though not always) square with current council regions (as changed in 1996). Thus, the present county of North, South and East Lanarkshire Councils correspond roughly equivalent to one of the former county of Lanarkshire.

A full description (and frequently a photograph) of each building taken with these coordinates after 1960 is contained within the Inventory of Ornamental Garden Buildings in Scotland. As yet, unpublished, 1995. Held at Historic Scotland, Langworth House, Edinburgh.
Appendix One: Summary Gazetteer

SUMMARY GAZETTEER

Due to the problems associated with the numerous changes to local government boundaries and county names made since the mid-1970s, locations are quoted as specified within the third edition of Johnston's Gazetteer of Scotland (rev. R. W. Munro, Edinburgh and London, 1973). It is worth noting that the counties specified below often (though not always) equate with current Council regions (as changed in 1996). Thus, the present extent of North, South and East Lanarkshire Councils combined is roughly equivalent to that of the former county of Lanarkshire.

A full description (and frequently a photograph) of each building (along with those constructed after 1840) is contained within the Inventory of Ornamental Garden Buildings in Scotland (9 vols., unpublished, 1996), held as Historic Scotland, Longmore House, Edinburgh.
AULDBAR ESTATE  SUMMERHOUSE  FORFAR  STIRLINGSHIRE
AVONDALE HOUSE  SUMMERHOUSE  SHAM CASTLE  SHAM CASTLE  STIRLINGSHIRE
AYTON HOUSE  SOUTH Lodge  AULDBAR  STIRLINGSHIRE
BALAVIL HOUSE  SUMMERHOUSE  AULDBAR  STIRLINGSHIRE
BALCARRYES HOUSE  SUMMERHOUSE  AULDBAR  STIRLINGSHIRE
BALCARRYES HOUSE  SUMMERHOUSE  AULDBAR  STIRLINGSHIRE
BALLEYLE CASTLE  SUMMERHOUSE  AULDBAR  STIRLINGSHIRE
BALLHOLME CASTLE  SUMMERHOUSE  AULDBAR  STIRLINGSHIRE
BALLANTUIM HOUSE  SUMMERHOUSE  AULDBAR  STIRLINGSHIRE
BARKLEHOLME CASTLE  SUMMERHOUSE  AULDBAR  STIRLINGSHIRE
BARGALY  SUMMERHOUSE  AULDBAR  STIRLINGSHIRE
BEACH HOUSE  SUMMERHOUSE  AULDBAR  STIRLINGSHIRE
BEANSTON  SUMMERHOUSE  AULDBAR  STIRLINGSHIRE
BELHAVEN HOUSE  SUMMERHOUSE  AULDBAR  STIRLINGSHIRE
BERNIE HOUSE  SUMMERHOUSE  AULDBAR  STIRLINGSHIRE
BLACKHORN HOUSE  SUMMERHOUSE  AULDBAR  STIRLINGSHIRE
BLACK BARONY HOUSE  SUMMERHOUSE  AULDBAR  STIRLINGSHIRE
BLACKadder HOUSE  SUMMERHOUSE  AULDBAR  STIRLINGSHIRE
BLAIR CASTLE  SUMMERHOUSE  AULDBAR  STIRLINGSHIRE
BLAIR CASTLE  SUMMERHOUSE  AULDBAR  STIRLINGSHIRE
BLAIR CASTLE  SUMMERHOUSE  AULDBAR  STIRLINGSHIRE
BLAIR CASTLE  SUMMERHOUSE  AULDBAR  STIRLINGSHIRE
BLAIR CASTLE  SUMMERHOUSE  AULDBAR  STIRLINGSHIRE
BLAIR CASTLE  SUMMERHOUSE  AULDBAR  STIRLINGSHIRE
BLAIR CASTLE  SUMMERHOUSE  AULDBAR  STIRLINGSHIRE
BLAIR DRUMMOND  SUMMERHOUSE  AULDBAR  STIRLINGSHIRE
BLAIRHOYIE  SUMMERHOUSE  AULDBAR  STIRLINGSHIRE
BLAIRLOGIE  SUMMERHOUSE  AULDBAR  STIRLINGSHIRE
BLAIRQUHAN  SUMMERHOUSE  AULDBAR  STIRLINGSHIRE
BLENDO HOUSE  SUMMERHOUSE  AULDBAR  STIRLINGSHIRE
BLYTHSWOOD HOUSE  SUMMERHOUSE  AULDBAR  STIRLINGSHIRE
BOATH HOUSE  SUMMERHOUSE  AULDBAR  STIRLINGSHIRE
BONNINGTON ESTATE  SUMMERHOUSE  AULDBAR  STIRLINGSHIRE
BONNYPGATE  SUMMERHOUSE  AULDBAR  STIRLINGSHIRE
BOSBOROBOL LODGE  SUMMERHOUSE  AULDBAR  STIRLINGSHIRE
BOULTERHALL  SUMMERHOUSE  AULDBAR  STIRLINGSHIRE
BOWBUTTS HOUSE  SUMMERHOUSE  AULDBAR  STIRLINGSHIRE
BOWER HOUSE  SUMMERHOUSE  AULDBAR  STIRLINGSHIRE
BOWHILL  SUMMERHOUSE  AULDBAR  STIRLINGSHIRE

19th century? Neo-medieval fantasy in the
Patrick Allan Fraser manner.
Early-19th century.
19th century?
Circa 1796.
1635. Gothic.
1797. William Wilkie.
17th century.
Dated 1717.
19th century.
Early-19th century. Gothic.
19th century?
Dated 1807.
Dated 1696.
Earlier to mid-19th century.
19th century?
19th century?
19th century.
19th century?
19th century?
Earlier to mid-19th century. Swiss Cottage
Early-19th century. Gothic.
Dated 1808. Marian Tower.
Early-19th century.
Mid-18th century. Classical. One of pair.
Late-18th or earlier-19th century.
Late-18th century. Gothic.
1729 (dated). Gothic.
Dated 1698. Classical.
Early-19th century. Probably built from ruins
of St Drostan's Church.
Mid-18th century. Classical.
Late-18th century.
Late-18th century. Gothic.
Earlier to mid-19th century?
Earlier-19th century. William Atkinson?
Gothic
Mid-18th century.
1826. Alexander Allan.
Earlier to mid-19th century. Classical.
19th century.
Mid-18th century. Adam brothers.
1833. Dated 1742.
Dated 1755.
1762. Gothic.
1758. Gothic. Remains only.
Late-18th century. Rustic.
Early-19th century?
1766-82. Rubble.
19th century.
19th century?
Late-18th century.
19th century?
18th century.
19th century?
19th century?
Dated 1708. Sir William Bruce? Classical
1761-66.
19th century.
Dated 1647. Remains of vaulted chamber
Probably 18th century.
Earlier-19th century.
Earlier to mid-19th century. Rustic
| BRAHAN ESTATE | COLUMN | ROSS AND CROMARTY |
| BRECHIN CASTLE | SUMMERHOUSE | ANGUS |
| BRECHIN CASTLE | SUMMERHOUSE | ANGUS |
| BREA DA HOUSE | MAUSOLEUM | ABERDEENSHIRE |
| BRIGHTON HOUSE | DOVECOTE | ANGUS |
| BROAD STREET, STIRLING | GAZEBO | STIRLING |
| BRODICK CASTLE | SUMMERHOUSE | ARRAN |
| BROOKLANDS | SUMMERHOUSE | ANGUS |
| BROXMOOR PARK | TOWER | ABERDEENSHIRE |
| BRUNSWICKHILL | FERNERY | SELKIRKSHIRE |
| BURN (THE) | TOWER | KINCARDINESHIRE |
| BURNSIDE | DOVECOTE | BANFFSHIRE |
| CADDER HOUSE | LARDER | LANARKSHIRE |
| CADDER HOUSE | ICEHOUSE | LANARKSHIRE |
| CAMBROCK LAIRDS | DOVECOTE | SUMMERHOUSE |
| CAIRNHLILL | DOVECOTE | EAST LOTHIAN |
| CALDERWOOD | MAUSOLEUM | KIRKCUDBRIGHTSHIRE |
| CALDWELL HOUSE | TOWER | SELKIRKSHIRE |
| CALLANDAR HOUSE | MAUSOLEUM | STIRLINGSHIRE |
| CALLY HOUSE | TOWER | KIRKCUDBRIGHTSHIRE |
| CAMBO HOUSE | DOVECOTE | EAST LOTHIAN |
| CAMBO HOUSE | MAUSOLEUM | DUNBARTONSHIRE |
| CAMIS ESKAN | DOVECOTE | EDINBURGH |
| CAMNO ESTATE | SUMMERHOUSE | ABERDEENSHIRE |
| CANDACRAIG ESTATE | DOVECOTE | AYRSHIRE |
| CANDACRAIG ESTATE | LARDER | LANARKSHIRE |
| CARRINGTON | TOWER | AYRSHIRE |
| CARRINGTON | DOVECOTE | AYRSHIRE |
| CARGEN ESTATE | SUMMERHOUSE | KIRKCUDBRIGHTSHIRE |
| CAMERIA HOUSE | WELL-HEAD | LANARKSHIRE |
| CAMERIA HOUSE | MAUSOLEUM | LANARKSHIRE |
| CAMERIA HOUSE | DOVECOTE | BANFFSHIRE |
| CANRIDGE ESTATE | SUMMERHOUSE | WEST LOTHIAN |
| CARRON HOUSE | DOVECOTE | STIRLINGSHIRE |
| CARSEY HOUSE | DOVECOTE | ARGLY |
| CARSTAIRS HOUSE | MAUSOLEUM | LANARKSHIRE |
| CASTLE STREET, DINGWALL | MONUMENT | ROSS AND CROMARTY |
| CASTLE FORBES | LARDER | ABERDEENSHIRE |
| CASTLE FRASER | OBELISK | PERTHSHIRE |
| CASTLE HUNTLY | DOVECOTE | CAITHNESS |
| CASTLE OF MEY | TOWER | RENFREWSHIRE |
| CASTLE SEMPLE | GAZEBO | RENFREWSHIRE |
| CASTLE SEMPLE | TOWER | RENFREWSHIRE |
| CASTLE SEMPLE | TOWER | RENFREWSHIRE |
| CASTLE STREET, DINGWALL | DOVECOTE | ROSS AND CROMARTY |
| CASTLEWIGG HOUSE | SEAT | WIGTOWNSHIRE |
| CHIEFSWOOD | TOWER | SELKIRKSHIRE |
| CLONEFACES | TOWER | DUMFRIESHER |
| TOWER | SUMMERHOUSE | KINNARRSHIRE |
| TOWER | DOVECOTE | KINNARRSHIRE |
| TOWER | GROTTO | KINNARRSHIRE |
| TOWER | DOVECOTE | EAST LOTHIAN |
| TOWER | DOVECOTE | EAST LOTHIAN |
| TOWER | DOVECOTE | EAST LOTHIAN |

Restored.
Dated 1823. Seaforth Monument.
Earlier-to mid-20th century.
Earlier-19th century.
Dated 1831. Built for Andrew Farquharson of Breda.
18th century. Classical.
18th century with early-19th century additions.
19th century. Castellated.
Circa 1850. Possibly by J. Anderson Hamilton.
Later-19th century.
Circa 1802. Walter Nicol?
Earlier-19th century?
19th century. Classical.
19th century. Classical.
19th century. Classical.
19th century. Earlier-19th century?

1762. John Craig.

Probably mid-15th century. Restored later-18th century?
1769.
Late 18th century. Classical.
1821. Classical.
Late-18th to early-19th century.
Early-19th century.
19th century? Gothic.
19th century.
19th century.

Late-18th or early-19th century. Classical.
Circa 1760. Classical.
Early-18th century. Classical.
18th century. Classical.
18th century.
Later-18th century. Mirrored pair.
Dated 1784. Classical.
1805. Monument by Hinchcliffe, Hampstead Road, London, Gothic.
Late-18th century.
Late-17th century. Restored mid-18th century. Gothic.
Earlier-19th century?
Circa 1760.
Mid-to later-18th century. Remains only..

Medieval peel adapted to form tower.
Circa 1825.

Mid-18th century. Classical.
19th century.
Dated 1810.

Late-18th century.
1825-30.
19th century?
Late-18th century. Gothic.
Late-17th century.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CRIMONMOGATE</td>
<td>RUIN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRIMONMOGATE</td>
<td>TOWER</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDINBURGH</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PERTHSHIRE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EAST LOTHIAN</td>
<td>DOVECOTE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DUMFRIESSHIRE</td>
<td>SUMMERHOUSE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DUMFRIESSHIRE</td>
<td>DOVECOTE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROSS AND CROMARTY</td>
<td>DOVECOTE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DUMFRIESSHIRE</td>
<td>MAUSOLEUM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LANARKSHIRE</td>
<td>CONSERVATORY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LANARKSHIRE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CORRIEMULZIE</td>
<td>OBELISK</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LARDER</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INVERNESS-SHIRE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KINCARDINESHIRE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRAWFORD PRIORY</td>
<td>DOVECOTE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FERNERY</td>
<td>SUMMERHOUSE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DUMFRIESSHIRE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LANARKSHIRE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRAWFORD PRIORY</td>
<td>OBELISK</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAUSOLEUM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DUMFRIESSHIRE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LANARKSHIRE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRIMONMOGATE</td>
<td>SUMMERHOUSE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EYE-CATCHER</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DUMFRIESSHIRE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LANARKSHIRE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRIMONMOGATE</td>
<td>DOVECOTE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KENNEL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABERDEENSHIRE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PEELBISHIRE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIDLOTHIAN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GLASGOW</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DUMFRIESSHIRE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LANARKSHIRE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRIMONMOGATE</td>
<td>DOVECOTE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OBELEISK</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABERDEENSHIRE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIDLOTHIAN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRIMONMOGATE</td>
<td>SUMMERHOUSE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TEMPLE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABERDEENSHIRE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PEELBISHIRE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIDLOTHIAN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRIMONMOGATE</td>
<td>DOVECOTE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BATH-HOUSE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABERDEENSHIRE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AYRSHIRE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRIMONMOGATE</td>
<td>SUMMERHOUSE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GAZEBOS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AYRSHIRE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRIMONMOGATE</td>
<td>TOWER</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAMELLA HOUSE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AYRSHIRE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRIMONMOGATE</td>
<td>CONSERVATORY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POWDER HOUSE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AYRSHIRE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRIMONMOGATE</td>
<td>GAZEBOS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOWER</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AYRSHIRE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRIMONMOGATE</td>
<td>COTTAGE ORNÉE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AVIARY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AYRSHIRE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRIMONMOGATE</td>
<td>DOVECOTE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOWER</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AYRSHIRE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRIMONMOGATE</td>
<td>DOVECOTE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COLUMN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AYRSHIRE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRIMONMOGATE</td>
<td>CONSERVATORY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOWER</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AYRSHIRE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRIMONMOGATE</td>
<td>DOVECOTE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HERMITAGE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AYRSHIRE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ruins of Colinton Castle. Dated 1811. 'Duke's Tower.'

19th century.
Earlier to mid-19th century.
Late-18th century?
Later-18th century.
19th century.
19th century. Ruinous.
Dated 1816.
19th century? Gothic.
Pre-1847.
19th century.
Earlier to mid-19th century.
Mid to later-18th century.
Mid-18th century, Probable Adam brothers. Classical/rustic.
19th century?
19th century. Classical?
19th century. Rustic?
Early-19th century?
1758. Classical.
Late-18th century.
Dated 1820.
Circa 1825.
Mid-18th century.
Before 1831.
Early-19th century.
Circa 1810.
19th century?
Later-18th century.
Circa 1788.
18th century, with early-19th century additions and alterations.
Dated 1674. Classical.

Late-17th century.
Late-18th century. Robert Adam? Dolphin Arch.
Earlier-19th century.
Earlier-19th century. 'Ruin'd bath-house
Early-19th century. Gothic.
Earlier to mid-19th century?
Late-18th century. One of pair flanking terrace.
Later-18th century. Classical.
Mid-18th century? Classical.
Early-19th century.
Early-19th century. Gothic.
Early-19th century.

19th century.
Mid-18th century.
18th century.
1832-34. William Burn.
18th century.
Appendix One: Summary Ga7.1teer

DALLARS HOUSE
DALMAINE
DALSHANGAN HOUSE
DALSKAIRTH
DALSKAIRTH
DALSWINTON
DALSWINTON
DALVEEN FARM
DALZELL HOUSE
DALZELL HOUSE
DALZELL HOUSE
DALZELL HOUSE
DANESTONE HOUSE
DARLEITH HOUSE
DARNAWAY CASTLE
DEANERY (THE)
DEER ABBEY

DOVECOTE
STORE
DOVECOTE
WELL-HEAD
TOWER
DOVECOTE
LARDER
MONUMENT
MAUSOLEUM
WELL-HEAD
GAZEBO
GROTTO
TOWER
DOVECOTE
SUMMERHOUSE
SUMMERHOUSE
TEMPLE

AYRSHIRE
ABERDEENSHIRE
KIRKCUDBRIGHTSHIRE
KIRKCUDBRIGHTSHIRE
KIRKCUDBRIGHTSHIRE
DUMFRIESSHIRE
DUMFRIESSHIRE
DUMFRIESSHIRE
LANARKSHIRE
LANARKSHIRE
LANARKSHIRE
LANARKSHIRE
ABERDEENSHIRE
DUNBARTONSHIRE
DUNBARTONSHIRE
ROSS AND CROMARTY
ABERDEENSHIRE

DELGATIE CASTLE
DENBIE HOUSE
DEVONSIDE FARM

LAUNDRY
DOVECOTE
SUMMERHOUSE

ABERDEENSHIRE
DUMFRIESSHIRE
CLACKMANNANSHIRE

DINGWALL CASTLE
DIRLETON CASTLE
DOCHFOUR
DOCHFOUR
DONIBRISTLE
ESTATE
DOONSIDE ESTATE
DOUGALSTON HOUSE
DOUGALSTON HOUSE
DOUGARIE LODGE
DOULIE
DOUNE LODGE
DOUNE LODGE
DRIMIN HOUSE
DRUMLANRIG
DRUMLANRIG
DRUMLANRIG
DRUMLANRIG
DRUMLANRIG
CASTLE
DRUMMOND CASTLE
DRUMMOND CASTLE

MONUMENT
TOWER
DAIRY
OBELISK
CHAPEL

ROSS AND CROMARTY
EAST LOTHIAN
INVERNESS -SHIRE
INVERNESS-SHIRE

DOVECOTE
DOVECOTE
SUMMERHOUSE
LARDER
TOWER
SUMMERHOUSE
ICEHOUSE
GAZEBO
SUMMERHOUSE
SUMMERHOUSE
SUMMERHOUSE
SUMMERHOUSE
SUMMERHOUSE

AYRSHIRE
STIRLINGSHIRE
STIRLINGSHIRE
ARRAN
ANGUS
PERTHSHIRE
PERTHSHIRE
INVERNESS-SHIRE
DUMFRIESSHIRE
DUMFRIESSHIRE
DUMFRIESSHIRE
DUMFRIESSHIRE
DUMFRIESSHIRE

SUMMERHOUSE
EYE -CATCHER

PERTHSHIRE
PERTHSHIRE

DRYBURGH ABBEY
HOUSE
DRYBURGH ABBEY
HOUSE
DRYBURGH ABBEY
HOUSE
DRYDEN ESTATE
DUDDINGSTON
HOUSE
DUFF HOUSE
DUFF HOUSE
DUFF HOUSE
DUFF HOUSE
DUFF HOUSE
DUFF HOUSE
DUMFRIES HOUSE
DUMFRIES HOUSE
DUNANS CASTLE
DUNCRUB ESTATE
DUNDAS CASTLE
DUNDAS CASTLE
DUNECHT HOUSE

TEMPLE

BERWICKSHIRE


TOWER

BERWICKSHIRE

DOVECOTE

BERWICKSHIRE

Early -19th century. John Smith? Known as
'Stirling Tower.'
Dated 1828.

TOWER
TEMPLE

MIDLOTHIAN
EDINBURGH

19th century. Gothic.

TEMPLE
DOVECOTE
MAUSOLEUM
SUMMERHOUSE
TOWER
DOVECOTE
EYE-CATCHER
ICEHOUSE
MAUSOLEUM
DOVECOTE
DOVECOTE
FOUNTAIN
TEMPLE

BANFFSHIRE
BANFFSHIRE
BANFFSHIRE
BANFFSHIRE
BANFFSHIRE
BANFFSHIRE
AYRSHIRE
AYRSHIRE
ARGYLL
PERTHSHIRE
WEST LOTHIAN
WEST LOTHIAN
ABERDEENSHIRE

1765.
1790. Gothic.
Late-18th century.
Circa 1791. Gothic.
Mid-18th century. Adam brothers? Gothic'.
Earlier -to mid -19th century?
Circa 1763. Gothic.
Late-18th century?
19th century.
1623. Classical.
18th century? Relocated 19th century?

DUNGLASS CASTLE
DUNGLASS ESTATE
DUNIPACE PARK
DUNKELD HOUSE
DUNKELD HOUSE
DUNKELD HOUSE
DUNKELD HOUSE
DUNKELD HOUSE

OBELISK
GAZEBO
DOVECOTE
GROTTO
GROTTO
TOWER
GAZEBO
GROTTO

DUNBARTONSHIRE
EAST LOTHIAN
STIRLINGSHIRE
PERTHSHIRE
PERTHSHIRE
PERTHSHIRE
PERTHSHIRE
PERTHSHIRE

DUNMORE ESTATE

TOWER

STIRLINGSHIRE

FIFE

303

19th century.
19th century.

Later-19th century_.
Dated 1824.
Late-18th or early-19th century.
19th century.
19th century.
Dated 1836.
Dated 1723 and 1882.
Circa 1765. Classical.
19th cartury?
Late -18th century?
Early -20th century. Rustic.
Mid -18th century. Classical.
Set in 1809 (dated) garden enclosure.
Classical.
Circa 1800. Gothic.
Dated 1775.
Built early -19th century from stonework of
old parish Kirk.
19th century? Gothic.
19th century. Gothic.
Later-19th century.
1835.

Earlier- to mid -19th century.
Late -I8th century? Classical.
18th century.
19th century?
Circa 1802. `Doulie Tower.'
Circa 1825. Rustic.
19th century.
Late -19th century.
1690s. James Smith. Classical. Remnants of
gazebos now built into pavilions.
Circa 1832. Classical.
18th century. Moved to current position from

Classical.
19th century?
Dated 1718. Classical.
19th century?
1756. Rustic.
Late -18th century'?
1757. Gothic.
Originally 1757 -8. Rebuilt 1785
1774. Lady Charlotte's Cave at Craig-yBarns.
Later-19th century restoration of earlier


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GARDEN NAME</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GASK HOUSE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GASK HOUSE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GATTISIDE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GAYFIELD HOUSE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEANIES HOUSE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GELSTON HOUSE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GILMERTON HOUSE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GLAMIS CASTLE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GLAMIS CASTLE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GLAMIS CASTLE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GLASSENGAL HOUSE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GLEDFIELD HOUSE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GLAISWOOD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GLENTANAR ESTATE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GLENBURNIE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COTTAGE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GLENCARSE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GLENDOIC HOUSE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GLENKILN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GORDON CASTLE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GORDON CASTLE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GORDON CASTLE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GOSFORD HOUSE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GOSFORD HOUSE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GOSFORD HOUSE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GOURROCK HOUSE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRANGE HOUSE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRANTULLY CASTLE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GREY GABLES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GREY GABLES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRULINE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GUNSGREAN HOUSE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GUYND</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HADDO HOUSE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HADDO HOUSE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HAINING (THE)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HAINING (THE)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HALLIDYKES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HAMILTON ESTATE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HAMILTON ESTATE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HAMILTON ESTATE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HAMILTON ESTATE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HAMILTON ESTATE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HAMILTON ESTATE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HAMILTON ESTATE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HAMILTON ESTATE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HAMILTON ESTATE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harburn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harburn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HARTFIELD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HATTON ESTATE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HATTON ESTATE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HATTON ESTATE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HATTON ESTATE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HATTON ESTATE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HERDMANSTOUN ESTATE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIGH STREET</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(No 3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KIRKCUDBRIGHT</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FEATURE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SUMMERHOUSE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOVECOTE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COTAGE ORNEE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUMMERHOUSE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GAZEBO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUMMERHOUSE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EYE-CATCHER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOWER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICEHOUSE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOWER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LARDER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOVECOTE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUMMERHOUSE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TEMPLE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RUSTIC ARCH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TEMPLE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUMMERHOUSE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOWER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AVIARY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOVECOTE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUMMERHOUSE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONSERVATORY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COLUMN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TEMPLE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUMMERHOUSE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAUSOLEUM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GROTTO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CURLING HOUSE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BOAT-HOUSE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOWER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUMMERHOUSE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CURLING HOUSE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TEMPLE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OBEISK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOVECOTE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LARDER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BEAR CAGE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUMMERHOUSE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUMMERHOUSE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TEMPLE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAUSOLEUM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOVECOTE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAUSOLEUM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUMMERHOUSE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOGGIA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COLUMN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOVECOTE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOWER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GAZEBO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GAZEBO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUMMERHOUSE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BATH-HOUSE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GAZEBO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OBESIK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAUSOLEUM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GAZEBO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GAZEBO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUMMERHOUSE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BATH-HOUSE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GAZEBO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OBESIK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAUSOLEUM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GAZEBO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GAZEBO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUMMERHOUSE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BATH-HOUSE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GAZEBO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OBESIK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAUSOLEUM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GAZEBO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GAZEBO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUMMERHOUSE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BATH-HOUSE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GAZEBO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OBESIK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAUSOLEUM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GAZEBO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GAZEBO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUMMERHOUSE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BATH-HOUSE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GAZEBO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OBESIK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAUSOLEUM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GAZEBO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GAZEBO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUMMERHOUSE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BATH-HOUSE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GAZEBO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OBESIK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAUSOLEUM</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LOCATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ABERDEENSHIRE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABERDEENSHIRE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STIRLINGSHIRE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANGUS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROSS AND CROMARTY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DUNBARTONSHIRE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDINBURGH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EAST LOTHIAN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANGUS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANGUS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANGUS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WIGTOWNSHIRE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STIRLINGSHIRE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROSS AND CROMARTY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BERWICKSHIRE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PEEBLES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABERDEENSHIRE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KINCARDINESHIRE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIFE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PERTHSHIRE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AYRSHIRE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AYRSHIRE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AYRSHIRE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AYRSHIRE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARGYLL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BERWICKSHIRE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANGUS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABERDEENSHIRE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABERDEENSHIRE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SELKIRKSHIRE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SELKIRKSHIRE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AYRSHIRE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DUMFRIESShire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LANARKSHIRE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LANARKSHIRE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIDDLETHIAN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIDDLETHIAN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DUMFRIESShire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WEST LOTHIAN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WEST LOTHIAN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WEST LOTHIAN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WEST LOTHIAN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WEST LOTHIAN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WEST LOTHIAN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROXBURGHSHIRE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROXBURGHSHIRE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EAST LOTHIAN</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18th century?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Later-19th century.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Later-19th century.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Circa 1781.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Circa 1800.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Possibly 18th century.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early-18th century.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Circa 1800. Gothic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Tower: Reputedly 15th century.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Castellated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Late-18th century.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Tower: Reputedly 15th century.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Late-19th century.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18th century.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Late-19th century. Gothic, composed of fragments re-erected of Dunblane Cathedral (c.1893).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Later-18th century. Classical.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Late-19th century. Rustic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19th century. Classical.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19th century.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18th century.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Circa 1770 but re-erected on present site after 1900.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Circa 1830. Probably Archibald Simpson.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classical.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classical.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1800-01. Possibly John Patterson.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Built circa 1800. Possibly Robert Adam.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classical.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earlier-19th century.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1847.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classical.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earlier to mid-19th century. Rustic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Octagonal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1824. Gothic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early-19th century.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dated 1853. Classical.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After 1815.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18th century.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Circa 1825.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early-19th century. Gothic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19th century.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19th century? alterations to medieval Cadzow Castle.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Begun 1840 by David Hamilton and continued to a slightly different design 1848-55 by David Bryce. Classical.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1832. Classical.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Circa 1836. Gothic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Circa late-18th century. Perhaps by Alexander Stevens.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early-18th century? Classical.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18th century.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rebuilt circa 1840. Gothic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Late-18th century.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highlands Street (No 8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kirkcudbright Hill of Tarvit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hillhead Farm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hoddam Castle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hoddam Castle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hoddam Castle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hoddam Castle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holyroodhouse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hopeman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hopetoun House</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hopetoun House</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hopetoun House</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hopetoun House</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hopetoun House</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospitalfield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>House of Dun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huntington House</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ingleenuk House</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inveraray Castle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inveraray Castle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inveraray Castle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inveraray Castle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inveraray Castle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inveraray Castle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inveraray Castle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inveraray Castle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inveraray Castle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inveraray Castle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inveraray Castle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inveraray, House</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inveraray, House</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inveraray, House</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inveraray, House</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inveraray, House</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inveraray, House</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inveraray, House</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inveraray, House</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inveraray, House</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inveraray, House</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inveraray, House</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inveraray, House</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inveraray, House</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inveraray, House</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inveraray, House</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inveraray, House</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inveraray, House</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inveraray, House</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inveraray, House</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inveraray, House</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inveraray, House</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inveraray, House</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inveraray, House</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inveraray, House</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inveraray, House</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inveraray, House</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inveraray, House</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inveraray, House</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inveraray, House</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inveraray, House</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kinmount</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kinnaid Castle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kinnaid Castle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kinnaid Castle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kinnettles House</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kinordy House</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kinpurnie Tower</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kinara House</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kinara House</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kinross House</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kirkconnel Lea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kirkdale House</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kirkdale House</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kirroughtrie House</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knock Castle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ladykirk Estate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lanefine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Langlin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Langley Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Langshaw</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lanrick Castle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lanrick Castle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laws (The)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learney House</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lechrosoque</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lees (The)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lemsurdie House</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lessudden Place</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Letham Lands Farm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lethangie House</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lethangie House</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Letterewe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Letterfourie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Letterfourie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Links House</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linlithgow Palace</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Little</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tullybelton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lochinaw Castle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lochinnell Estate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lochryan House</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lockletter Estate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Logan House</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Logan House</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Logie House</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Longformacus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Longsdale Cottage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loretto School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Musselburgh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loudoun Castle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lude</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luffness House</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lumsden of Clova</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lundin Tower</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lunna House</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lynedoch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Macdiehill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orangefield Estate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Makerstoun</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Appendix One: Summary Gazetteer**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Attributes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MELVILLE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MALLENY HOUSE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MANOR HOUSE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MANSE (THE)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MANSFIELD ROAD,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAUCHLINE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MANSION HOUSE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESTATE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAR LODGE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARCHMONT HOUSE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARCHMONT HOUSE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARKFIELD TOWER</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARLEÉ ESTATE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAVISBANK</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAYVILLE ESTATE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEETHILL HOUSE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEGGINCH</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEGGINCH</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEGGIE HOUSE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOTEL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MELDRUM HOUSE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MELDRUM HOUSE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MELLERSTAIN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MELLERSTAIN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MELLERSTAIN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MELLERSTAIN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MELLERSTAIN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MELSetter HOUSE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MELVILLE CASTLE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MELVILLE HOUSE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MELVILLE HOUSE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MILLBURN STREET,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KIRKCUDBRIGHT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MILLEARN ESTATE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MILLEARN ESTATE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MILLEARN ESTATE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MILLKEN ESTATE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MILNE HEAD HOUSE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MILTON BRODIE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOFFAT COTTAGE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MONALTRIE HOUSE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MONKREDDING</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MONCOFFER HOUSE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MONCOFFER HOUSE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MONTEVIOT HOUSE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MONTEVIOT HOUSE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MONTGREENAN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MORAY HOUSE,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDINBURGH MORDINGTON</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESTATE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MORTON HOUSE,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIBERTON</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOKSNOWE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOUNT KEDAR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOUNT LAURA TOWER</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOUNT PLEASANT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOUNT ULSTON</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOUNT ULSTON</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOUNTHOOLY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOUNTSTUART</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOUNTSTUART</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOY HALL ESTATE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOY HALL ESTATE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MUCHALL'S CASTLE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MURDOSTOUN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>McDougall-Brisbane.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>19th century?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Early-19th century. Castellated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Later-18th century. Gothic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dated 1629. Classical.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Circa 1850. Rustic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>by James Williamson.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Late-18th century. Gothic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>19th century.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Early-20th century. Rustic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dated 1731. Classical.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1738. Classical.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Erected 1784 in memory of Lesley Basile.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1832. Reform Tower.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1809. Gothic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Late-18th /early-19th century. Gothic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>19th century?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Late-17th.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>William Adam? Dated 1736.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1825. Rustic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Earlier to mid-19th century. Rustic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1738.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Circa 1760. Classical.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Late-17th century. Classical. Formerly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>coadv-houses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dated 1578. Remodelled as gazebo late-17th century.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>19th century?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1840. Gothic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dated 1825.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>19th century. Richard Dickson.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1800.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mid-to-late-18th century.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18th century?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1828.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Late-17th century?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mid-to-later-19th century.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Circa 1790. Gothic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17th century? with later additions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Later-18th century. Rustic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1757.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>19th century?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Late-18th century?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1846. James Raeburn.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>19th century.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18th century?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Classical. 18th century?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1824.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Earlier-19th century?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18th century.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Late-18th century. Gothic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Landmark</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PITTODRIE HOUSE</td>
<td>GUN ROOM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PITTRICHE HOUSE</td>
<td>DOVECOTE TOWER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLEAN HOUSE</td>
<td>BATHHOUSE MAUSOLEUM SUMMERHOUSE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POINT CASTLE</td>
<td>DOVECOTE DOVECOTE MAUSOLEUM MAUSOLEUM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POLKEMMET CASTLE</td>
<td>SUMMERHOUSE SUMMERHOUSE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PULTON ESTATE</td>
<td>TOWER TOWER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PORTRACK HOUSE</td>
<td>SUMMERHOUSE SUMMERHOUSE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POWFOULIS HOUSE</td>
<td>DOVECOTE DOVECOTE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRESS CASTLE</td>
<td>DOVECOTE MAUSOLEUM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRESTONHALL</td>
<td>MAUSOLEUM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRESTONHALL</td>
<td>GAZEBRO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRESTONFIELD HOUSE</td>
<td>OBELISK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QUEEN MARY'S HOUSE</td>
<td>GROTTO SUMMERHOUSE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QUEENSBERRY HOUSE</td>
<td>SUMMERHOUSE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAEHILLS</td>
<td>TOWER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAEHILLS</td>
<td>SUMMERHOUSE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAIGMORE ESTATE</td>
<td>TOWER TOWER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAITH HOUSE</td>
<td>ICEHOUSE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAITH HOUSE</td>
<td>EYE-CATCHER WELL-HEAD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAMMERSWICKES CASTLE</td>
<td>SUMMERHOUSE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAVENSTONE CASTLE</td>
<td>TOWER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REDHALL ESTATE</td>
<td>GROTTO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REDHALL ESTATE</td>
<td>SUMMERHOUSE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REDHALL ESTATE</td>
<td>LARDER SHAM CASTLE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RIDDINGWOOD HOUSE</td>
<td>SUMMERHOUSE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROCK HALL</td>
<td>MONUMENT DOVECOTE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROCKVILLE ESTATE</td>
<td>BATHHOUSE SUMMERHOUSE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROSENEATH ESTATE</td>
<td>EYE-CATCHER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROSSDHU HOUSE</td>
<td>GAZEBO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROSSDHU HOUSE</td>
<td>MAUSOLEUM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROSSSEND CASTLE</td>
<td>TOWER DOVECOTE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROSSIE HOUSE</td>
<td>MAUSOLEUM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROSSIE PRIORY</td>
<td>COLUMN DOVECOTE GAZEBO DOVECOTE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROTHIEMAY HOUSE</td>
<td>DOVECOTE GAZEBO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROUNDEL (THE)</td>
<td>GAZEBO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SALTON HALL</td>
<td>DOVECOTE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SALTON HALL</td>
<td>SUMMERHOUSE MAUSOLEUM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SALTON HALL</td>
<td>MAUSOLEUM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCARBILL ESTATE</td>
<td>TEMPLE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCONDIN PALACE</td>
<td>TOWER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCOTTSCRAIG</td>
<td>TOWER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEABANK ESTATE</td>
<td>TOWER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEALE CASTLE</td>
<td>SUMMERHOUSE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHAMROCKBANK</td>
<td>SUMMERHOUSE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHAW ESTATE</td>
<td>SUMMERHOUSE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHAWHILL</td>
<td>SUMMERHOUSE RUSTIC ARCH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHIELING (THE)</td>
<td>SUMMERHOUSE RUSTIC ARCH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SKENE HOUSE</td>
<td>SUMMERHOUSE RUSTIC ARCH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SKENE HOUSE</td>
<td>SUMMERHOUSE RUSTIC ARCH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SKIBO CASTLE</td>
<td>SUMMERHOUSE RUSTIC ARCH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPOTT HOUSE</td>
<td>SUMMERHOUSE RUSTIC ARCH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPOTT HOUSE</td>
<td>SUMMERHOUSE RUSTIC ARCH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPOTTES HALL</td>
<td>SUMMERHOUSE RUSTIC ARCH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPOTTES HALL</td>
<td>SUMMERHOUSE RUSTIC ARCH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPOTTISWOODE ESTATE</td>
<td>SUMMERHOUSE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPOTTISWOODE ESTATE</td>
<td>SUMMERHOUSE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPOTTISWOODE ESTATE</td>
<td>SUMMERHOUSE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPOTTISWOODE</td>
<td>SUMMERHOUSE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPOTTISWOODE</td>
<td>SUMMERHOUSE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPOTTISWOODE</td>
<td>SUMMERHOUSE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ESTATE</th>
<th>KENNELS</th>
<th>BERWICKSHIRE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SPRINGFIELD ESTATE</td>
<td>SUMMERHOUSE</td>
<td>AYRSHIRE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPRINGLAND, PERTH</td>
<td>TOWER</td>
<td>PERTHIRE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPRINGLAND, PERTH</td>
<td>WELL-HEAD</td>
<td>PERTHIRE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPRINGWOOD ESTATE</td>
<td>MAUSOLEUM</td>
<td>ROXBURGHSHIRE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St John's Lodge</td>
<td>ORCHARD VAULTS</td>
<td>FIFE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Martin's Abbey</td>
<td>TOWER</td>
<td>PERTHIRE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Martin's Abbey</td>
<td>OBEISK</td>
<td>PEEBLESHIRE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stobo Castle</td>
<td>MAUSOLEUM</td>
<td>LANARKSHIRE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stonewater Castle</td>
<td>TOWER</td>
<td>LANARKSHIRE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STAFFORD HOUSE</td>
<td>TOWER</td>
<td>ANGUS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strathallan Castle</td>
<td>WELL-HEAD</td>
<td>PERTHIRE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strathern House</td>
<td>DOVECOTE</td>
<td>DUNBARTONSHIRE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strathleven</td>
<td>DOVECOTE</td>
<td>DUNBARTONSHIRE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strathmartine Castle</td>
<td>MAUSOLEUM</td>
<td>ANGUS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strathyrum</td>
<td>DOVECOTE</td>
<td>FIFE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stroma</td>
<td>GAZEBO</td>
<td>CAITHNESS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sundial House, Dunkeld</td>
<td>DOVECOTE</td>
<td>PERTHIRE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tarradale Estate</td>
<td>DOVECOTE</td>
<td>ROSS AND CROMARTY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taymouth Castle</td>
<td>SHAM CASTLE</td>
<td>PERTHIRE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taymouth Castle</td>
<td>TEMPLE</td>
<td>PERTHIRE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taymouth Castle</td>
<td>MONUMENT</td>
<td>PERTHIRE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taymouth Castle</td>
<td>HERMITAGE</td>
<td>PERTHIRE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taymouth Castle</td>
<td>DAIRY</td>
<td>PERTHIRE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taymouth Castle</td>
<td>SHAM BATTERY</td>
<td>PERTHIRE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taymouth Castle</td>
<td>MONUMENT</td>
<td>PERTHIRE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taymouth Castle</td>
<td>BRIDGE</td>
<td>PERTHIRE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taynish House</td>
<td>DOVECOTE</td>
<td>ROSS AND CROMARTY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terregles House</td>
<td>SUMMERHOUSE</td>
<td>PERTHIRE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terregles House</td>
<td>GROTTO</td>
<td>PERTHIRE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thurso Castle</td>
<td>MAUSOLEUM</td>
<td>PEEBLESHIRE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thurston Estate</td>
<td>DOVECOTE</td>
<td>PEEBLESHIRE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tighnamuird</td>
<td>LARDER</td>
<td>PEEBLESHIRE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Todhail House</td>
<td>DOVECOTE</td>
<td>PEEBLESHIRE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Torbain Farm</td>
<td>TOWER</td>
<td>PEEBLESHIRE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traquair House</td>
<td>SUMMERHOUSE</td>
<td>PEEBLESHIRE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traquair House</td>
<td>GAZEBO (E)</td>
<td>AYRSHIRE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traquair House</td>
<td>DOVECOTE</td>
<td>DUMFRIESSHIRE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treesbank</td>
<td>SUMMERHOUSE</td>
<td>GOTHIC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tugnet House</td>
<td>MAUSOLEUM</td>
<td>DUMFRIESSHIRE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tulliallan House</td>
<td>MAUSOLEUM</td>
<td>CAITNESS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tullibroil Castle</td>
<td>TOWER</td>
<td>EAST LOTHIAN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tullloch Castle</td>
<td>SHAM RUIN</td>
<td>PERTHIRE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tulllochvenus</td>
<td>TOWER</td>
<td>FIFE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tynninghame House</td>
<td>WELL-HEAD</td>
<td>FIFE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tynninghame House</td>
<td>LARDER</td>
<td>PEEBLESHIRE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Bolton Farm</td>
<td>DOVECOTE</td>
<td>PEEBLESHIRE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farm</td>
<td>MAUSOLEUM</td>
<td>PEEBLESHIRE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valleyfield House</td>
<td>MONUMENT</td>
<td>PEEBLESHIRE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Viewbank</td>
<td>SUMMERHOUSE</td>
<td>PEEBLESHIRE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wallhouse</td>
<td>DOVECOTE</td>
<td>PEEBLESHIRE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ward (The)</td>
<td>SUMMERHOUSE</td>
<td>PEEBLESHIRE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wellwood</td>
<td>WELL-HEAD</td>
<td>PEEBLESHIRE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wemyss Castle</td>
<td>DOVECOTE</td>
<td>PEEBLESHIRE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Aberarder</td>
<td>GAZEBO</td>
<td>DUMFRIESSHIRE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Craigs Farm</td>
<td>MONUMENT</td>
<td>FIFE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Pitkerie</td>
<td>DOVECOTE</td>
<td>DUNBARTONSHIRE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Shandon</td>
<td>OBSERVATORY</td>
<td>AYRSHIRE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wester Elchies Estate</td>
<td>TEMPLE</td>
<td>EAST LOTHIAN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westerdunes</td>
<td>GAZEBO</td>
<td>EAST LOTHIAN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westermain Farm</td>
<td>DOVECOTE</td>
<td>EAST LOTHIAN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westquarter House</td>
<td>MAUSOLEUM</td>
<td>KINCARDINESHIRE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westwood</td>
<td>MAUSOLEUM</td>
<td>MIDLOTHIAN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westwood</td>
<td>SUMMERHOUSE</td>
<td>WEST LOTHIAN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westmorland</td>
<td>DOVECOTE</td>
<td>PERTHIRE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westmorland</td>
<td>DOVECOTE</td>
<td>FIFE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westmorland</td>
<td>GAZEBO</td>
<td>INVERNESS-SHIRE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westmorland</td>
<td>DOVECOTE</td>
<td>DUMFRIESSHIRE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westmorland</td>
<td>OBSERVATORY</td>
<td>FIFE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westmorland</td>
<td>TEMPLE</td>
<td>DUNBARTONSHIRE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westmorland</td>
<td>GAZEBO</td>
<td>AYRSHIRE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westmorland</td>
<td>DOVECOTE</td>
<td>LANARKSHIRE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westmorland</td>
<td>MAUSOLEUM</td>
<td>LANARKSHIRE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westmorland</td>
<td>MAUSOLEUM</td>
<td>LANARKSHIRE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Appendix One: Summary Gazetteer**

Dated 1779.

- 18th century? Gothic.
- Circa 1800. Gothic.
- Circa 1800.


- Late-18th century?
- Early-19th century.
- 1834.
- Earlier- to mid-19th century.

Dated 1781. Gothic.

- Dated 1677. Late-18th or early-19th century. Gothic.

- Late-18th century. Castellated. 1765. Gothic.
- Early-19th century?
- Late-18th century. U.A.
- Early-19th century. Tudor.
- 1750s. Thomas Wright?
- Early-19th century. Gothic.
- Mid-to later-19th century.
- 19th century.
- Circa 1790-98. Gothic.
- 19th century?
- Late-18th or early-19th century. Castellated.
- 19th century.
- 1834. Rustic.
- Dated 1771.
- Probably by James Gillespie Graham. 1830. Gothic.
- 19th century.
- 18th century.
- 19th century.
- Earlier- to mid-19th century.
- Late-18th century.

- 1741 and remodelled mid-19th century. Gothic.
- 19th century?
- Late-18th or early-19th century.
- 19th century?
- 18th century?
- 18th century?
- Dated 1832.
- Later-18th century.
- 19th century?
- 19th century.

- Dated 1647.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Date/Style</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Whim House</td>
<td>Cistern House</td>
<td>Peebleshire</td>
<td>18th century? Gothic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whitburgh House</td>
<td>Dovecote</td>
<td>East Lothian</td>
<td>Early-19th century.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>House</td>
<td>Obelisk</td>
<td>East Lothian</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>House</td>
<td>Gazebo</td>
<td>East Lothian</td>
<td>18th century. Gothic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wood’s Hospital</td>
<td>Summerhouse</td>
<td>Fife</td>
<td>19th century? Rustic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yester House</td>
<td>Mausoleum</td>
<td>East Lothian</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## APPENDIX TWO

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BUILDING TYPE</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arch</td>
<td>Old Town Gate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AVIARY</td>
<td>Old Town, Garden House, Outlaws, Outlaws, Knaves, Lawmen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BATH HOUSE</td>
<td>Colwell Castle, Lord Castle, Harbour House, Harbour House, Harbour House</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BED &amp; BREAKFAST</td>
<td>Castle Inn, Castle Inn, Castle Inn, Harbour House, Harbour House, Harbour House</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BOATHOUSE</td>
<td>Ailsa Castle, Garden House, Harbour House, Harbour House, Harbour House</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BONE HOUSE</td>
<td>Lord Castle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FORTRESS</td>
<td>Old Town, Castle, Harbour House, Harbour House, Harbour House, Harbour House</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHAPEL</td>
<td>Ailsa Castle, Garden House, Harbour House, Harbour House, Harbour House</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHURCH HOUSE</td>
<td>Red Castle, White House</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COTTAGE</td>
<td>Old Town House, Harbour House, Harbour House, Harbour House, Harbour House</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONSERVATORY</td>
<td>Old Town House, Harbour House, Harbour House, Harbour House, Harbour House</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COTTAGE GARDENS</td>
<td>Old Town House, Harbour House, Harbour House, Harbour House, Harbour House</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COTTAGE GARDENS</td>
<td>Old Town House, Harbour House, Harbour House, Harbour House, Harbour House</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COTTAGE GARDENS</td>
<td>Old Town House, Harbour House, Harbour House, Harbour House, Harbour House</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COTTAGE GARDENS</td>
<td>Old Town House, Harbour House, Harbour House, Harbour House, Harbour House</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COTTAGE GARDENS</td>
<td>Old Town House, Harbour House, Harbour House, Harbour House, Harbour House</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COTTAGE GARDENS</td>
<td>Old Town House, Harbour House, Harbour House, Harbour House, Harbour House</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COTTAGE GARDENS</td>
<td>Old Town House, Harbour House, Harbour House, Harbour House, Harbour House</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COTTAGE GARDENS</td>
<td>Old Town House, Harbour House, Harbour House, Harbour House, Harbour House</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COTTAGE GARDENS</td>
<td>Old Town House, Harbour House, Harbour House, Harbour House, Harbour House</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COTTAGE GARDENS</td>
<td>Old Town House, Harbour House, Harbour House, Harbour House, Harbour House</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COTTAGE GARDENS</td>
<td>Old Town House, Harbour House, Harbour House, Harbour House, Harbour House</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COTTAGE GARDENS</td>
<td>Old Town House, Harbour House, Harbour House, Harbour House, Harbour House</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COTTAGE GARDENS</td>
<td>Old Town House, Harbour House, Harbour House, Harbour House, Harbour House</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COTTAGE GARDENS</td>
<td>Old Town House, Harbour House, Harbour House, Harbour House, Harbour House</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COTTAGE GARDENS</td>
<td>Old Town House, Harbour House, Harbour House, Harbour House, Harbour House</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COTTAGE GARDENS</td>
<td>Old Town House, Harbour House, Harbour House, Harbour House, Harbour House</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COTTAGE GARDENS</td>
<td>Old Town House, Harbour House, Harbour House, Harbour House, Harbour House</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Buildings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>ARCH</strong></td>
<td>Culzean Castle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AVIARY</strong></td>
<td>Ayton House; Culzean Castle; Glencarse; Kinmount; Lechroisique</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BATH-HOUSE</strong></td>
<td>Culzean Castle; Edzell Castle; Fingask Castle; Hatton Estate; Holyroodhouse; Logan House; Pitfour Estate; Point Castle; Rosneath Estate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BEAR CAGE</strong></td>
<td>Haining (The)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BOAT-HOUSE</strong></td>
<td>Ardmaddy; Fyvie Castle; Gosford House; Hoddom Castle; Montgreenan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BONE-HOUSE</strong></td>
<td>Laws (The)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BRIDGE</strong></td>
<td>Blair Castle; Culzean Castle; Letterfourie; Newton Don; Penicuik House; Taymouth Castle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CAMELLIA HOUSE</strong></td>
<td>Culzean Castle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CHAPEL</strong></td>
<td>Auldbar Estate; Balnacarrus House; Donibristle Estate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CISTERN HOUSE</strong></td>
<td>Hoddom Castle; Whim House</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>COLUMN</strong></td>
<td>Aberdeen House; Arbriston; Braham Estate; Dalguise House; Gordon Castle; Harburn; Kinloch Castle; Kinrara House; Mountruaert; Panmure Estate; Rossie Priory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CONSERVATORY</strong></td>
<td>Corehouse; Dalkcheth Palace; Gordon Castle; Letterfourie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>COTTAGE ORNÉE</strong></td>
<td>Culzean Castle; Balnagown Castle; Carriden House; Culzean Castle; Dunrobin Castle; Gartside; Gordon Castle; Guynd; Hopetoun House; Inveranay Castle; Mellerstain; Monteviot House; Naughton House; Whittingehame House</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CURLING HOUSE</strong></td>
<td>Gosford House; Grantully Castle; Penicuik House; Spottes Hall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DAIRY</strong></td>
<td>Annick Lodge; Ardgowan; Balmoral Castle; Crimmonmogate; Dochfour; Invermay; Millearn Estate; Taymouth Castle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DOVECOTE</strong></td>
<td>Ackergill Tower; Auchinbaird; Auchmaicy; Balnacarrus House; Balfour Castle; Ballindalloch Castle; Bench House; Blairhoyle; Bouth House; Bowfuts House; Broughton House; Burn House; Cadder House; Cairnhill; Cambo; Camis Eskan; Candacraig Castle; Caprington Castle; Carmichael House; Carron House; Caroecky House; Castle Huntly; Castle Street; Dingwall; Chuny; Colthoun House; Conichin Farm; Conon House; Corbetson House; Corsewale House; Cragge; Craneth Castle; Crawford Priory; Crimmonmogate; Cringlelie; Culloden House; Cumbernauld House; Daldowie Estate; Dallars House; Dalshangan House; Dalswinton; Darleith House; Darnie House; Doonside Estate; Douglaslaston House; Dryburgh Abbey House; Duff House; Duncrub Estate; Dundas Castle; Dunpacle Park; Dunrobin Castle; Dunie House; East Fortune; Edginster House; Edzell Castle; Egifton Estate; Elie House; Elvington; Fingask Castle; Forglen House; Forthramon House; Fouldonhall; Gargunnoak House; Garthead Estate; Gask House; Geilston House; Glasserton; Glendochick House; Gunsdreen House; Haddo House; Harburn; Hill Of Tarvit; Huntington House; Inveraray Castle; Invermay; Inverquhonhom; Johnstoneburn House; Keith Marischal; Killechassie; Kilpunt Estate; Kinivvie House; Kinloch House; Kinnortree House; Lanfine; Lumsdrie House; Lessudden Place; Letham Lands Farm; Longformac; Loretto School; Maelaburgh; Landin Tower; Marchmont House; Mavisbank; Megginch; Millican Estate; Milnhead House; Montoiffer House; Monteviot House; Mount Pleasant Estate; Mouthebody; Murdostoun; Newton House; Newtonmill House; Nisbet House; Ormston House; Orrock House; Ortney House; Overton House; Park Hall; Parkhill House; Penicuik House; Pittencriff; Pittriech House; Powfoulis House; Press Castle; Rockville Estate; Rossie House; Rothermay House; Saltoun Hall; Strathern House; Stralheven; Strathmartine Castle; Stroma; Tarradale Estate; Thurston Estate; Todhall House; Treesbank; Upper Bolton Farm; Wallhouse; Wemyss Castle; West Pitkierie; Westquarter House; Whitburgh House</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix Two: Summary Gazetteer of Buildings Categorised by Type

#### Eye-Catcher
- Amisfield Estate; Blair Castle; Brocklands; Craigton Park; Drummond Castle; Dumfries House; Floors Castle; Gilmerton House; Kinnaird Castle; Lunna House; Mellerstain; Raith House; Rossdhu House

#### Fernery
- Benmore House; Brunswickhill; Cowdenknowes; Garthshore Estate; Hospitalfield

#### Gazebo
- Annick Lodge; Ambathie Farm; Balholmie House; Ballantuin House; Ballindean House; Ballindean House; Bank House; Monteviot House; Blackadder Estate; Blair Castle; Blair Castle; Bonnington Estate; Bonnygate; Broad Street; Stirling; Castle Semple Estate; Cockenzie House; Craigiehall; Culter House; Culzean Castle; Dalzell House; Drumlin House; Dunglass Estate; Dunkeld House; Dummore Estate; Eglinton Estate; Eskside House; Musselburgh; Geanies House; Hatton Estate; Hatton Estate; Hendersyde Park; High Street (No 3); Kirkeudbright; Home Farm; Inveraray Castle; Invermoriston House; Kemmy House; Kirkdale House; Learney House; Letterewe; Links House; Manor House; Meldrum House; Melville House; Millburn Street; Kirkeudbright; Milton Brodie; Monkreidding; Monteviot House; Newton Of Colessie; Orchard House; Pitmedden; Pitodrie House; Preston Hall; Rossdhu House; Roundel (The); Shieling (The); Skene House; Sundial House; Dunkeld; West Aberarder; West Shandon; Westermain Farm; Whitehaugh; Winton House; Traquair House

#### Grotto
- Arniston; Auchinleck House; Castle Semple Estate; Cockenzie House; Craigiehall; Culzean Castle; Dalzell House; Dunkeld House; Fullarton Estate; Gosford House; Lannick Castle; Newhailes; Oatfield House, Musselburgh; Geanies House; Hatton Estate; Hendersyde Park; High Street (No 3); Kirkeudbright; Home Farm; Inveraray Castle; Invermoriston House; Kemmy House; Kirkdale House; Learney House; Letterewe; Links House; Manor House; Meldrum House; Melville House; Millburn Street; Kirkeudbright; Milton Brodie; Monkreidding; Monteviot House; Newton Of Colessie; Orchard House; Pitmedden; Pitodrie House; Preston Hall; Rossdhu House; Roundel (The); Shieling (The); Skene House; Sundial House; Dunkeld; West Aberarder; West Shandon; Westermain Farm; Whitehaugh; Winton House; Traquair House

#### Gun Room
- Pittodrie House

#### Hen House
- Moy Hall Estate

#### Hermitage
- Craigieburn; Dalkeith Palace; Dunmore Estate; Frier's Carse; Taymouth Castle

#### Icehouse
- Cadder House; Deane Lodge; Dumfries House; Glamis Castle; Hopeman; Inveraray Castle; Millearn Estate; Raith House; Cullen House

#### Kennel
- Blairquhan; Crimommogate; Culloden House; Culzean Castle; Spottiswoode Estate

#### Larder
- Balmoral Castle; Burnside; Candacraig Estate; Castle Forbes; Corriemulzie House; Crimommogate; Dalswinton; Dougarie Lodge; Dumtreath Castle; Freefield House; Fyvie Castle; Glamis Castle; Haining (The); Invermay; Montcoffer House; Naughton House; Pitfour Estate; Pitpointie Farm; Riddell; Spott House; Tighnamuim; Tyningham House

#### Laundry
- Delgatie Castle; Naughton House; Pitmies

#### Loggia
- Arniston; Crathes Castle; Hangingshaw House; Kinross House

#### Mausoleum
- Auchterarder Estate; Ballindalloch Castle; Ballindean House; Barbreck House; Bargaly; Boulterhall; Breda House; Calderwood Estate; Callendar House; Cambo House; Carmichael House; Carstairs House; Cordhouse; Crawford Priory; Dalzell House; Duff House; Dunans Castle; Dunmore Estate; Duthill; Eastend House; Edinample Castle; Faseweck House; Garden; Garvock; Gosford House; Gruine; Hamilton Estate; Hendramston Estate; Hoddom Castle; Hopetoun House; House Of Dun; Inveraray House; Kellie Castle; Kilberry Estate; Kinloch House; Kinnetts House; Kirkdale House; Ladykirk Estate; Logie House; Lumsden Of Clava; Macbiehill; Maleny House; Marlee House; Mellerstain; Mordington Estate; Mountstuart; Newton House; Newton House; Ochtertyre; Orton House; Park House; Polkemmet; Prestonhall; Riddell; Rossdhu House; Rossie Priory; Scabhill Estate; Soone Palace; Skene House; Springwood Estate; Stonefield Castle; Strathyrum; Tharso Castle; Tulhillan House; Ury; Westerwood; Whitehaugh; Yeater House

#### Monument
- Blair Adam; Blairquhan; Castle (The); Cullaloe; Dalveen Farm; Dingwall Castle; Dunrobin Castle; Kelburn; Kinrara House; Lanrick Castle; Orangefield Estate; Millearn Estate; Panmure Estate; Penicuik House; Pitfour Estate; Rock Hall; Taymouth Castle; Valleyfield House; West Craigs Farm

#### Obelisk
- Aberdour Castle; Auchinleck House; Balavil House; Balmoral Castle; Blair Castle; Blair Castle; Blair Drummond; Castle Fraser; Corpark Obelisk; Crimommogate; Crookston; Dochfour; Dunglass Castle; Dummore House; Elie House; Foyers Estate; Haddo House; Lumsden Of Clava; Macbiehill; Maleny House; Marlee House; Mellerstain; Mordington Estate; Mountstuart; Newton House; Newton House; Ochtertyre; Orton House; Park House; Polkemmet; Prestonhall; Riddell; Rossdhu House; Rossie Priory; Scabhill Estate; Soone Palace; Skene House; Springwood Estate; Stonefield Castle; Strathyrum; Tharso Castle; Tulhillan House; Ury; Westerwood; Whitehaugh; Yeater House
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Hendersyde Park; Little Tullybelton; Lynedoch, Mayville Estate; Monaltrie House; Mount Kedar; Moy Hall Estate; Newhailes; Newhall House; Penicuik House, Prestonfield House; St Martin's Abbey, Whittingehame House

OBSERVATORY
Kinmorey House; Makerstoun House; Wester Elchies Estate

ORANGERY
Beamston; Culzean Castle; Newbattle Abbey

ORCHARD VAULTS
St John's Lodge

PAGODA
Spottes Hall

PHEASANTRY
Kersewell House

POWDER HOUSE
Culzean Castle; Seagate Castle

PRIVY
Fyvie Castle

RACQUET HALL
Eglinton Estate

RUSTIC ARCH
Abbey Hill; Dalhousie Arch; Gladsworth; Megginch; Spottiswoode Estate

SEAT
Castlewigg House; Keir; Newton Don; Panmure Estate

SHAM BATTERY
Taymouth Castle

SHAM CASTLE
Avondale House; Riddingwood House; Taymouth Castle

SHAM RUIN
Balaclares House; Culzean Castle; Floors Castle; Hamilton Estate; Kinfuans House; Novar House; Panmure Estate; Pittfour Estate; Tulloch Castle

SHELL-HOUSE
Cockenzie House; Dumottar Estate; Kingston Farmhouse; Manse (The)

STORE
Arbigland, Dalmaine

SUMMERHOUSE
Achnacarry; Arbuthnott House; Ardmeallie House; Arthurrstone, Auldbar Estate; Balgonie Castle; Ballimore, Balnaboth, Balnagown Castle, Balruddery Den, Burmuthil, Belhaven House; Bield House; Bighouse; Black Barony House; Blair Adam; Blairlogie Cottage; Blythswood House; Borrobal Lodge, Bowhill; Brecin Castle; Brodrick Castle; Caerlaverock House; Candiacraig Estate; Cargen Estate; Carnoustie House; Cluny; Conheath House; Craigdarroch House; Craigielands; Ross Hall Estate; Culross Abbey House; Darnaway Castle; Deanery (The), Devonside Farm, Dougalston House, Doune Lodge, Drumlanrig Castle; Drummond Castle; Duff House; Dunphail House; Dunrobin Castle; Duthie Park; Edgerston House; Ednam House Hotel; Edzell Castle; Ethe Castle; Faque; Gachie House; Gask House; Gayfield House; Gilmerston Estate; Glassingal House; Glentanar Estate; Glenbervie House; Glenkinloch; Grange House; Grey Gables; Halkshill House; Hamilton Estate; Hatton Estate; Hopetoun House; Ingleneuk House; Invermay; Johnstoneburn House; Keir; Kinloch House; Kinmaird Castle; Kinross House; Langlee; Langley Park; Lethangie House; Lochryan House; Lockletter Estate; Lonsdale Cottage, Lude, Mansfield Road, Mauchline; Mar Lodge; Marlee House; Mavisbank; Meigle House Hotel; Mellerstain; Melsetter House; Moffat Cottage; Moray House, Edinburgh; Morton House; Libertor; Mossknoe; Mount Ulston; Muchalls Castle; Murthly Castle; Naughton House; Netherdale House; Newbattle Abbey; Newhailes; Newhall House; North Dunrobin; Ochtetyre; Ormisedene House; Over Rankeilour; Penicuik House; Pinkie House; Pittodrie House; Polton Estate; Portrack House; Queensberry House; Rachills; Redhall Estate; Sharmrockbank; Shawhill; Spott House; Spottiswoode Estate; Spottiswoode Estate; Springfield; Taynish House; Traquair House; Tugnet House; Viewbank; Ward (The); Woodland House; Wood's Hospital; Yair House; Yester House

TEMPLE
Aberlour House; Amisfield Estate; Black Barony House; Cullaloe; Cullen House; Deer Abbey, Dryburgh Abbey House; Duddingston House; Duff House; Dunceath House; Easter Skene House; Gledfield House; Glen (The); Gordon Castle; Guynd; Hopetoun House; Kinnaird Castle; Lees (The); Melville Castle; Saltoun Hall; Stobo Castle; Taymouth Castle; Westerdunes
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TOWER
- Airthrey Castle; Amisfield Estate; Arthurstone; Auchincruive House; Auchenhard; Auchernach House; Auchintoul; Balsarroch House; Bandrum Estate; Barbreck House; Belladrum Estate; Binns (The); Blair Castle (Fife); Blebo House; Bower House; Brompton Park; Burn (The); Caldwell House; Cally House; Cammo Estate; Caprington Castle; Castle Of Mey; Castle Semple Estate; Cliftoncates Tower; Cluny Castle; Cockpen Farm; Colquhazie House; Craignend Estate; Crail Castle; Culzean Castle; Dahlamihui Hotel; Dalskaith; Danestone House; Dirleton Castle; Doune; Dryburgh Abbey House; Dryden Estate; Duff House; Dunkeld House; Dunmore Estate; Elie House; Errol Park House; Farraline House; Fasque; Fetternear House; Gannochy Tower; Gartineaber; Glamis Castle; Glenbervie Cottage; Gourrock House; Hartfield; High Street (No 8), Kirkcudbright; Hoddom Castle; Hopetoun House; Invermeil House; Islay House; Johnston Lodge; Kilmarnock Estate; Kilmurry House; Kinnermhouse House; Kinfauns Castle; Kinpurnie Tower; Kirkconnel Lea; Knock Castle; Langshaw; Lochmaw Castle; Lochnell Estate; Logan House; Lour; Luffness House; Marchmont House; Markfield Tower; Methill House; Melville House; Mount Laura Tower; Newton; Otterston Tower; Pitfour Castle; Pitfour Estate; Plean House; Raehills; Raigmore Estate; Raith House; Ravenstone Castle; Rossend Castle; Scotscraig; Seabank Estate; Shaw Estate; Skibo Castle; Springland, Perth; St Martin's Abbey; Stonefield Castle; Stracathro House; Taymouth Castle; Torbain Farm; Tulibebol Castle; Tullochvenus

WELL-HEAD
- Carmichael House; Dalskaith; Dalzell House; Fingask Castle; Halliday; Hillhead Farm; Innes House; Inveraray Castle; Johnston Lodge; Loudoun Castle; Mansion House Estate; Pinkie House; Rammerscales; Rosneath Estate; Springland, Perth; Strathallan Castle; Tynningham House; Wellwood
### APPENDIX THREE

**Summary Gazetteer of Buildings Categorised by County**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>Buildings Listed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>County A</td>
<td>Building 1, Building 2, Building 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County B</td>
<td>Building 4, Building 5, Building 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County C</td>
<td>Building 7, Building 8, Building 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County D</td>
<td>Building 10, Building 11, Building 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County E</td>
<td>Building 13, Building 14, Building 15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: This table continues with listings for various counties. Additional columns could include details such as date of categorisation, historical significance, and conservation status.*
### SUMMARY GAZETTEER OF TOTAL NUMBER OF BUILDINGS CATEGORISED BY COUNTY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>Bath-house</th>
<th>Boat-house</th>
<th>Dairy</th>
<th>Dovecote</th>
<th>Gazebo</th>
<th>Gun Room</th>
<th>Kennel</th>
<th>Larder</th>
<th>Laundry</th>
<th>Mausoleum</th>
<th>Monument</th>
<th>Obelisk</th>
<th>Observatory</th>
<th>Privy</th>
<th>Sham Ruin</th>
<th>Store</th>
<th>Summerhouse</th>
<th>Temple</th>
<th>Tower</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aberdeenshire</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angus</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Argyll</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arran</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ayrshire</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- *Total*: 65
- *Total*: 44
- *Total*: 25
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Building Type</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>County</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Monument</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Banffshire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Powder House</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Banffshire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Racquet Hall</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Banffshire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sham Ruin</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Banffshire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summerhouse</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Banffshire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tower</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Banffshire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Well-Head</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Banffshire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bath-House</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Berwickshire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridge</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Berwickshire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Berwickshire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conservatory</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Berwickshire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dovecote</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Berwickshire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ice-House</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Berwickshire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larder</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Berwickshire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mausoleum</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Berwickshire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summerhouse</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Berwickshire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temple</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Berwickshire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tower</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Berwickshire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridge</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Caithness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cottage Ornée</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Caithness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dovecote</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Caithness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eye-Catcher</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Caithness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fernery</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Caithness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gazebo</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Caithness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kennels</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Caithness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mausoleum</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Caithness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rustic Arch</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Caithness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seat</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Caithness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summerhouse</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Caithness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temple</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Caithness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tower</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Caithness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Clackmannshire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mausoleum</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Clackmannshire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dovecote</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Dumfries Shire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mausoleum</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Dumfries Shire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tower</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Dumfries Shire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aviary</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Dumfries Shire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boat-House</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Dumfries Shire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cistern House</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Dumfries Shire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dovecote</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Dumfries Shire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grotto</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Dumfries Shire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larder</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Dumfries Shire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mausoleum</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Dumfries Shire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monument</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Dumfries Shire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obelisk</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Dumfries Shire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sham Castle</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Dumfries Shire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summerhouse</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Dumfries Shire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tower</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Dumfries Shire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Well-Head</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Dumfries Shire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bath-House</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Dunbartonshire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dovecote</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Dunbartonshire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eye-Catcher</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Dunbartonshire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fernery</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Dunbartonshire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gazebo</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Dunbartonshire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mausoleum</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Dunbartonshire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obelisk</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Dunbartonshire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summerhouse</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Dunbartonshire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tower</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Dunbartonshire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Well-Head</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Dunbartonshire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boat-House</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>East Lothian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cottage Ornée</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>East Lothian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curling House</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>East Lothian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dovecote</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>East Lothian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eye-Catcher</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>East Lothian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gazebo</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>East Lothian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grotto</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>East Lothian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larder</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>East Lothian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County</td>
<td>Buildings Categorised by County</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDINBURGH</td>
<td>BATH-HOUSE 1, GROTTO 2, OBELISK 1, SUMMERHOUSE 4, TEMPLE 1, TOWER 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIFE</td>
<td>CHAPEL 2, COTTAGE ORNÉE 1, DOVECOTE 14, EYE-CATCHER 2, GAZEBOS 4, GROTTO 1, ICEHOUSE 1, LARDER 1, LAUNDRY 1, MAUSOLEUM 6, MONUMENT 1, OBELISK 2, ORCHARD VAULTS 1, SHAM RUIN 1, SUMMERHOUSE 7, TEMPLE 1, TOWER 15, WELL-HEAD 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FORFAR</td>
<td>CHAPEL 1, MAUSOLEUM 1, SUMMERHOUSE 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GLASGOW</td>
<td>SUMMERHOUSE 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INVERNESS-SHIRE</td>
<td>COLUMN 1, DAIRY 1, DOVECOTE 2, GAZEBOS 3, HEN HOUSE 1, KENNEL 1, MAUSOLEUM 1, MONUMENT 1, OBELISK 5, SUMMERHOUSE 2, TOWER 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KINCARDINESHIRE</td>
<td>DOVECOTE 2, LOGGIA 1, MAUSOLEUM 1, SHELL-HOUSE 1, SUMMERHOUSE 5, TOWER 6, WELL-HEAD 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KINROSS-SHIRE</td>
<td>GAZEBOS 1, LOGGIA 1, MONUMENT 1, SUMMERHOUSE 3, TOWER 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KIRKCUDBRIGHTSHIRE</td>
<td>CURLING HOUSE 1, DOVECOTE 3, EYE-CATCHER 1, GAZEBOS 3, MAUSOLEUM 2, PAGODA 1, STORE 1, SUMMERHOUSE 1, TOWER 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County</td>
<td>WELL-HEAD</td>
<td>CONSERVATORY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LANARKSHIRE</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIDLOTHIAN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MORAY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAIRNSHIRE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NITHSDALE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ORKNEY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PEEBLESШIRE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PERTHSHIRE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Count</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renfrewshire</td>
<td>Dairy</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dovecot</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gazebo</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Grotto</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Summerhouse</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tower</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Well-Head</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ross and Cromarty</td>
<td>Aviary</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Column</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cottage ornée</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dovecot</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gazebo</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Monument</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sham Ruin</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Summerhouse</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Temple</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roxburghshire</td>
<td>Dovecot</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Eye-Catcher</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gazebo</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Larder</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mausoleum</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Obelisk</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Observatory</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sham Ruin</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Summerhouse</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selkirkshire</td>
<td>Bear Cage</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fernery</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Larder</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Loggia</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Summerhouse</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tower</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shetland</td>
<td>Eye-Catcher</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gazebo</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stirlingshire</td>
<td>Cottage ornée</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dovecot</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gazebo</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hermitage</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Larder</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mausoleum</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Seat</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sham Castle</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Summerhouse</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tower</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sutherland</td>
<td>Column</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cottage ornée</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dovecot</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Monument</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Summerhouse</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tower</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Lothian</td>
<td>Bath-House</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cottage ornée</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dovecot</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gazebo</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Grotto</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mausoleum</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Temple</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tower</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wigtownshire</td>
<td>Bath-House</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dovecot</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gazebo</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Seat</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Summerhouse</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tower</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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