



HAL
open science

The Auld Alliance: A Fraying Fabric? The Trade of Textile, Dress and Related Goods from France to Scotland in the 17th Century

Méline Potoczny

► **To cite this version:**

Méline Potoczny. The Auld Alliance: A Fraying Fabric? The Trade of Textile, Dress and Related Goods from France to Scotland in the 17th Century. Linguistics. 2024. <dumas-04830832>

HAL Id: dumas-04830832

<https://dumas.ccsd.cnrs.fr/dumas-04830832v1>

Submitted on 11 Dec 2024

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire HAL, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.



Distributed under a Creative Commons CC BY-NC-ND 4.0 - Attribution - Non-commercial use - No Derivative Works - International License

UNIVERSITÉ RENNES 2

Mémoire de recherche

Master 2 Recherche

• Master LLCER Études Anglophones

Études écossaises

**The Auld Alliance : A Fraying Fabric ?
The Trade of Textile, Dress and Related Goods
From France to Scotland in the 17th Century**

Méline POTOZNY

Sous la direction de Valérie CAPDEVILLE

Année 2023- 2024



Acknowledgments

First, I would like to thank my supervisor, Valérie Capdeville, for her feedback and trust in my work, as well as Sophie Mesplède and Emma Renaud who guided me during the first year of this research. I am much obliged to Sir Robert M. Clerk, owner of John Clerk of Penicuik's papers, and Crispin Powell, archivist for the Buccleuch Living Heritage Trust – which owns the Buccleuch papers –, for allowing me to work on and quote the documents. My kindest regards go to the historians, curators and archivists I met along the way for their tips and words of encouragement. I am most grateful to Morvern French for her numerous and extensive pieces of advice, her proofreading and her support, both as historian and friend. I extend my gratitude to Dr Lucinda Dean, to whom I owe my introduction to trade history and early modern Scotland. I would also like to thank the National Records of Scotland and National Library of Scotland staff members for their help, along with the PEB department of Rennes2 University Library without which this dissertation would most definitely never have seen the light of day, given the book raid they helped me carry on other French and foreign libraries. From these acknowledgments I could not omit Stephanie Croizet, who introduced me to *Zotero* and *Lean Library*, for it is beyond my understanding how people manage to write their dissertations without them. Finally, I thank my friends on both sides of The Channel for their support throughout the researching and writing of this dissertation, my parents for their unfailing encouragement and eternal confidence in my choices – although they did not always remember what my dissertation was about –, my flatmate for the laughs and decadent number of times we ate pasta with pesto, and my best friend for the years of mutual support and understanding, for being by my side as we are finishing this chapter of our lives.

Table of contents

| | |
|--|----|
| Acknowledgments..... | 2 |
| Writing conventions..... | 6 |
| INTRODUCTION..... | 7 |
| • A brief political context..... | 9 |
| • The object of study..... | 10 |
| • The historiographical approach..... | 12 |
| • The chronological boundaries..... | 13 |
| • Presentation of the sources..... | 15 |
| • Structure and choices..... | 18 |
| PART I/ A Substantial Trade : John Clerk of Penicuik and the Blackwoods' Account Books.. | 20 |
| 1.1 A Great Variety of Goods..... | 21 |
| • Classification choices..... | 21 |
| • Haberdashery..... | 22 |
| • Fabric yardage..... | 23 |
| • Accessories..... | 24 |
| • Clothes..... | 26 |
| • Décor..... | 27 |
| • Leather and luggage..... | 28 |
| • Concluding remarks..... | 29 |
| 1.2 "Black cullort I say off ritche Balck dyst voeluit" : Luxurious Materials for Luxurious Fashions..... | 30 |
| • Silk..... | 30 |
| • Lace..... | 31 |
| • Dyed materials..... | 32 |
| 1.3 French vs. Dutch and English Imports..... | 34 |
| • A comparative inventory of the 1647 and 1650 account books..... | 34 |
| • The Blackwoods' business..... | 38 |
| • "Colbertisme", demand, and Scottish merchants in between..... | 39 |
| PART II/ "This I am certain there was never anything yett of the kind so good in Scotland": Shopping and Showing..... | 44 |
| 2.1 Commissions to Merchants and Purchase from Relatives..... | 45 |
| 2.2 What Better Place to Get French Goods than France Itself?..... | 48 |

| | |
|--|-----|
| • Bringing home knowledge ... and a new wardrobe..... | 48 |
| • Shopping beyond The Channel..... | 51 |
| 2.3 A Question of Demand and Display..... | 54 |
| • On consumption..... | 54 |
| • Rank consciousness..... | 56 |
| • Sources limitations..... | 59 |
| PART III/ “Our Sovereign Lord, with Advice and consent of the Estate of Parliament, Doth strictly Prohibit and Forbid”: The Parliament as Arena for interests..... | 63 |
| 3.1 The Context of the Debate: Mercantilist Scotland..... | 64 |
| • A weakening economy..... | 64 |
| • Towards the Union..... | 69 |
| • What about textile and the law?..... | 78 |
| 3.2 The Governmental Response: A Strategy of prohibition..... | 82 |
| • The goods targeted..... | 82 |
| • Means of restriction..... | 86 |
| • Targeting and dissuading people..... | 89 |
| • Motivations for legislation..... | 92 |
| 3.3 A Well-tailored Rhetoric: Civil Society and the Law..... | 94 |
| • Petitions for “the General Good of the Kingdom” ... so they claim..... | 94 |
| • The issue of “excessive Vanity and Folly”: the moral argument..... | 101 |
| • Consumption race and the crisis of the system..... | 104 |
| • A new order: government and consumption..... | 111 |
| CONCLUSION..... | 116 |
| BIBLIOGRAPHY..... | 122 |
| GLOSSARY..... | 134 |

Writing conventions

Abbreviations:

OED: Oxford English Dictionary.

NRS: National Records of Scotland

NLS: National Library of Scotland

CNRTL: Centre National de Ressources Textuelles et Lexicales

Writing Conventions:

- The names of historical figures have been written in their native form, i.e. non-British names have not been anglicised. *ex. Philippe Duke of Orleans = Philippe Duc d'Orléans*
- “Manufacture” has been used to refer to manufactured goods, “manufactory” for the establishment where such goods were made, and “manufacturer” for the owner of manufactories, along with their corresponding plural forms, except in quotes.
- The type of documents known as “draft of an act of parliament” has been referred to as “draft of an act”, “draft for an act” or “draft”, and their corresponding plural forms.
- The historical ‘f’ has been replaced by an ‘s’ in quotes to avoid any confusion with the letter ‘f’.
- Chapters and paragraphs have been used instead of pages to reference Hobbes’s *De Cive* and *Leviathan* in the footnotes. *ex. Chap.XVII, 87*

INTRODUCTION

The Auld Alliance has remained this almost – not to say entirely – mystified connection between France and Scotland: a link over The Channel, over English soil, beyond the very pragmatism of military and diplomatic treaties. The English Wikipedia page on the Auld Alliance even introduces the terminology for “auld” as a now “partly affectionate term for the long-lasting association between the two countries”, while Elizabeth Bonner wrote in 1999: “Notwithstanding the end of formal treaties between France and Scotland, there has persisted to the present day a sense of understanding, of friendship, and comradeship, of shared cultural and social links”.¹ Despite this affectionate eye on Franco-Scottish relations, many academic writings on the Auld Alliance mark the end of the connection with the Treaty of Edinburgh and state that “bygone was the Auld Alliance”.² Siobhan Talbott’s research has proved otherwise. The Treaty of Edinburgh imposed the withdrawal of the French and English troops from Scotland, ordered Mary Queen of Scots to give up the self-proclaimed title of sovereign of England in favour of Elizabeth I, and entrusted some councils jointly to the Scottish parliament and Queen Mary.³ Although the Treaty of Edinburgh did change the nature of Franco-Scottish relations, “there was no provision until as late as the twentieth century for the formal revocation of the Auld Alliance”.⁴

The Auld Alliance began as a mutual defensive/offensive alliance between France and Scotland against the common enemy: the English. The first evidence of this alliance is dated back to 1295. Renewed over the centuries, it reached its apex in the 16th century. Despite the Treaty of Perpetual Peace between England and Scotland having been signed in 1502, the Scottish troops fought alongside the French during the Anglo-French War of 1512-1514.⁵ The 16th century highlights that the Auld Alliance was much more than a military alliance: James V married two French wives – Madeleine de Valois in 1536 and Marie de Guise-Lorraine in 1538-, and Mary Queen of Scots married the French Dauphin in 1558– soon to become François II. This last union led to the union of the French and Scottish crowns.⁶ The Treaty of

1 ‘Auld Alliance (English Page)’, in *Wikipedia*, 13 March 2023, https://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Auld_Alliance&oldid=1144432475; Elizabeth Bonner, ‘Scotland’s “Auld Alliance” with France, 1295-1560’, *History* 84, no. 273 (January 1999): p.6, <https://doi.org/10.1111/1468-229X.00097>.

2 Christian Civardi, *L’Écosse depuis 1528* (Gap Paris: Ophrys, 1998), p.15.

3 Norman Macdougall, *An Antidote to the English: The Auld Alliance, 1295-1560*, Scottish History Matters (East Linton: Tuckwell Press, 2001), p.142.

4 Siobhan Talbott and Steve Murdoch, ‘Transcript of the Podcast “The End of the Auld Alliance? Franco-Scottish Relations, 1560-1713”’, n.d., p.2.

5 Bonner, ‘Scotland’s “Auld Alliance” with France, 1295-1560’, p.22.

6 Bonner, pp.27-9.

Edinburgh which sent French soldiers back home did weaken the military alliance but did not end the French connection: Mary Queen of Scots remained the French dowager Queen, in 1646 the Act of the Council State reaffirmed the friendship between the two countries and another royal marriage happened in 1661 between Henrietta Anne of England and Philippe Duc d'Orléans.⁷ Besides, cultural links and influences persisted: France was a favoured destination for Scots going on a Grand Tour or studying abroad, while the Stuart monarchs were Francophile.⁸ The Exhibition “French Connections: Scotland and the Art of France” held at the Royal Scottish Museum in 1995 only supports the continuity of cultural links between the two auld allies.⁹

These different elements point out two important aspects: first, the alliance went beyond geopolitics and foreign policies in that it was directly part of people's everyday life – and still is –, and not just that of monarchs and military men; second, objects have played an important part in the continuity of the alliance in both its legislatively-sanctioned manifestation, as in its romanticised and imagined assertion. When a continuity of the Auld Alliance beyond the Treaty of Edinburgh is acknowledged, mainly through cultural ties, the 17th century appears to be whisked away. In the review of *The Auld Alliance: France and Scotland over 700 years*, a collection of papers published to celebrate the 700th anniversary of the Auld Alliance, Mike Rapport highlights the disparity in treatment of the Alliance: “most of the early essays naturally focus on the diplomacy of the Auld Alliance between 1295 and 1513, while much of the second part of the collection, which begins in the eighteenth century, [...] has more of a cultural dimension.”¹⁰ In addition to debunking the official ending of the Auld Alliance in 1560, S. Talbott has highlighted the wider manifestation of the alliance, in particular through trade continuities and how trading networks perceived and used the Franco-Scottish alliance during the early modern period and after.¹¹

My study finds its place in this wider consideration of the Auld Alliance. I am focusing mainly on the mid- to late 17th century, which places this study almost a century after the Reformation and Treaty of Edinburgh, which, as mentioned above, were considered and

7 Talbott and Murdoch, ‘Transcript of the Podcast “The End of the Auld Alliance? Franco-Scottish Relations, 1560-1713”’, p.3; Bonner, ‘Scotland’s “Auld Alliance” with France, 1295-1560’, p.30.

8 Keith M. Brown, *Noble Society in Scotland: Wealth, Family and Culture from Reformation to Revolution* (Edinburgh: University Press, 2004), p.191; Maria Hayward, *Stuart Style: Monarchy, Dress and the Scottish Male Elite* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2020), p.10.

9 Royal Scottish Museum, *French Connections: Scotland and the Arts of France [Leaflets Produced to Accompany the Exhibition]* (Edinburgh: Royal Scottish Museum, 1985).

10 Mike Rapport, review of *Review of The Auld Alliance: France and Scotland over 700 Years*, by James Laidlaw, *The Scottish Historical Review* 80, no. 210 (2001): pp.272-3.

11 Talbott and Murdoch, ‘Transcript of the Podcast “The End of the Auld Alliance? Franco-Scottish Relations, 1560-1713”’.

are even still considered by some as having marked the official – if not practical – end of the Auld Alliance. The intent of this study is not to question whether the political and religious changes undermined the other ramifications of the Franco-Scottish alliance, trade in particular, for S. Talbott has already proved otherwise. The aim is to look at one specific aspect and see how it fits within this continuity of the Auld Alliance. My subject of interest is still in the realm of trade and exchange but focuses on specific goods: textile, dress and related items. Textile and dress have been important commodities throughout history and the 17th century is no exception.¹² It is characterised by changing ideas on and manifestations of consumption, manufacturing, trade etc., and overall cultural changes, all dealing with textile and dress at some point. These aspects cannot be ignored and it would be extremely naive – to say the least – to think that they did not impact how France and Scotland were related/connected, how it impacted their exchanges regarding textiles, items of dress and related items specifically, and from a wider perspective, how it fitted within the overall political, social and economic context. This study attempts at offering the beginning of an answer to these questions.

• A brief political context

Seventeenth-century France was mainly characterised by a centralisation and the reinforcement of the monarchy, culminating with Louis XIV's personal reign. From the beginning of Marie de Medicis's regency to the death of Mazarin, and throughout Richelieu's position, power was centralised around the monarch and its closest advisers, the "principal ministre" (chief minister) in particular. Continuity characterised its organisation and decision-making mechanisms, despite the regular uprisings, first from the nobility, then from the population. Overall, Louis XIII's reign and the two regency periods which framed it paved the way for the absolutist State.¹³ The reign of Louis XIV was characterised by his insatiably seeking for glory, both regarding monarchical power and on a European level, and so by all means possible. At home, the beginning of his personal reign was but the first step of an increasingly centralised power in his hand. Through diplomacy, warfare – with the war of Devolution (1667-68) or the Franco-Dutch War (1672-78) to name just two examples –, trade, and art – epitomised by Versailles –, he aimed at becoming Europe's greatest power.¹⁴ Across the Channel, Scotland's political development was linked to the wider movements of the other

¹² see Nicole Renau, *L'Étoffe: au fil des civilisations* (Aix-en-Provence: Édisud, 2000).

¹³ Joël Cornette, *Histoire de la France: 1492-1652. affirmation de l'État absolu*, 9e édition revue et augmentée., Carré Histoire 21 (Vanves: Hachette supérieur, 2016), pp.239, 246 & 265.

British crowns – England’s in particular – in tension between royalist and parliamentary ideologies. After having brought the English crown and its own together under James VI & I in 1603, Scotland was involved in civil war, was forced into a common government with Cromwell’s Commonwealth and the Protectorate (1653-58), to eventually return to a monarchical power structure simply united with England by a Common King through the Restoration in 1660.¹⁵

Seventeenth-century Europe was shaken by religious changes and clashes, from which neither France nor Scotland were spared. The calm brought by the Edict of Nantes in 1598 which granted religious toleration towards Protestants, would be overthrown by Louis XIV in 1685 as Christian divisions rose in the country, and Louis XIV was asserting himself as defender of Catholicism.¹⁶ Scotland also went through decades of religious conflicts. The British Isles were shaken by divisions between Catholics and protestants, as much as within these branches of Christianity. The opposition between Charles II and the Presbyterian elite lead to the Bishops Wars (1639-40). The Catholic uprising in Ireland, in which Scotland got involved, triggered a period of civil war in which religious divisions merged with the cleavage between royalists and supporters of stronger parliamentary power until 1653.¹⁷ The religious questions in both countries – like for other European ones – did influence, if not motivated, the different conflicts of the century, as well as migration patterns.¹⁸

• The object of study

Before entering into this study, it is necessary to define what exactly is taken into account when considering textile and dress and to define a clear frame of analysis. ‘Dress’ refers to “An outer garment or suit of garments”.¹⁹ Interestingly the OED definition specifies that it is “appropriate to a particular occasion, function, profession, etc., and generally serving a decorative as well as a social function”. The term ‘fashion’ is also interesting to look at. ‘Fashion’ is a general term, encompassing many dimensions including, the process of making something or the characteristics of something, as much as anything “with regard to apparel or

14 François Lebrun, *Le 17e siècle*, Collection Poche (Paris: A. Colin, 2013), chap. 9: Louis XIV et l’Europe, de 1661 à 1688; Joël Cornette, *Histoire de la France: 1652-1783. Absolutisme et Lumières*, 8e édition revue et augmentée., Carré histoire 23 (Vanves: Hachette supérieur, 2016), pp.61-6.

15 Stéphane Lebecq et al., *Histoire des îles Britanniques*, 3e édition., Savoirs (Paris: PUF, 2022), pp.323-38.

16 Cornette, *Histoire de la France*, 2016, p.49.

17 Lebecq et al., *Histoire des îles Britanniques*, pp.320-8.

18 Lebrun, *Le 17e siècle*, pp.280-3 & 319-21.; T. C. Smout, ‘The Culture of Migration: Scots as Europeans 1500-1800’, *History Workshop Journal*, no. 40 (1995): pp.108-17 & 115.

19 ‘Dress, n. II.’, in *OED Online*, accessed 21 May 2024, https://www.oed.com/dictionary/dress_n.

personal adornment”.²⁰ The terms dress and dressmaking are preferred for these aspects, and encompass raw materials, embellishments, as much as all the accessories which participate in putting together an attire. Yet, the social dimension of the term is of great relevance, with the idea of the 'fashionable' which is defined as what is “conformable to fashion; in accordance with prevailing usage; of the kind in vogue among persons of the upper class”.²¹ This idea of certain standards regarding objects, is necessarily connected to the people who make use of these objects. The notion of “following *the fashion*; dressing or behaving in conformity with the standard of elegance current in upper-class society” also plays a part in the understanding of consumption of dress and any object.²²

Textile is, a priori, an easy notion to define. Yet, the *Oxford English Dictionary* (OED) first defines textile as “that [which] has been or may be woven. Also, of or pertaining to a man-made fibre or filament, not necessarily woven” and then as “a woven fabric; any kind of cloth”.²³ Neither the criterion of being woven nor that of the materials from which a fabric is made is really restrictive. Fibres are defined as “thread-like filaments of organic structure”. The main difficulty here is whether leather should be taken into account. The decision made has been to consider leather, not for its nature as material, but for its pertinence to the analysis of dress as it is a recurrent mention for objects which were worn as part of apparel and for objects very similar to textile counterparts. Besides, they are often embellished with textiles making them fashionable. I have therefore included in the analysis woven and non-woven fabrics of diverse fibres and materials, in addition to leather and leather-based objects. In addition to dress and textile, I have used the notion of “textile-related” goods, for three reasons: 1/ to avoid confusion and highlight the fact that this study is not restricted to dress and raw materials; 2/ some objects which are primarily made of other materials do have textile elements; 3) there are objects connected to textile not through their materials but because they are used in the making of textile-based objects. These, therefore, include many objects of everyday life, such as items of décor and objects related to crafts dealing with the aforementioned materials.

20 ‘Fashion, n.’ entry 8.c., in OED Online (Oxford University Press), accessed 6 April 2023, <https://www.oed.com/view/Entry/68389>.

21 See ‘Fashion, n.’ entry. 9.a.; ‘Fashionable, Adj. and n.’, in *OED Online* (Oxford University Press), accessed 23 April 2023, <https://www.oed.com/view/Entry/68392>.

22 ‘Fashionable, Adj. and n.’ (italics are in the original definition)

23 ‘Textile, Adj. and n.’ entry B.1.a., in OED Online (Oxford University Press), accessed 21 May 2023, <https://www.oed.com/view/Entry/200011>.

• The historiographical approach

Economic and trade connections between Scotland and the rest of Europe have been widely covered by Scottish historians. So has the relationship between France and Scotland: the "Auld Alliance". However, once these two approaches combined, some remaining gaps can be observed. First, the products are seldom the focus of study. The works of historians like Thomas C. Smout or S. Talbott are either briefly mentioning the goods or offer a very broad description.²⁴ In her PhD thesis, S. Talbott highlights one reason why previous works on Franco-Scottish trade missed on some goods imported from France, that reason being historians having relied on legal and official sources, rather than documents produced by the merchants themselves.²⁵ Her observation, and the research she then conducted, has revealed much more varied exchanges and has more particularly revealed the exchange of luxury goods, including items of dress. Yet, only a short subpart is dedicated to what commodities were traded without ever entering into details – the subpart is actually mostly providing a new definition of a commodity.²⁶ Second, the work of historians on Franco-Scottish trade relations focuses on the means of trade – the routes, networks, strategies etc. – and the legal background of such trade – the privileges and restrictions on trade. The latest article by T.C. Smout, though entitled “Making and Trading Dress and Décor in Seventeenth-century Scotland” is slightly more detailed on the types of goods exchanged given the length of the article compared to S. Talbott in her PhD, but still gives more importance to the economic system and the geography of trade – places of production and routes of sale.²⁷

The analysis developed in this dissertation aims at offering a deeper look into and analysis of Franco-Scottish trade by focusing on one type of product: textile and items of dress. Though my research is in continuity with the most recent historiographical approach to trade history in that the documents considered are private sources, the attitude towards those differ.²⁸ I decided to depart from a more traditional approach to trade history and leave trade

24 T. C. Smout, *Scottish Trade on the Eve of Union: 1660-1707* (Edinburgh London: Oliver & Boyd, 1963), pp.169-72; Siobhan Talbott, ‘An Alliance Ended? Franco-Scottish Commercial Relations, 1560-1713’ (Thesis, University of St Andrews, 2011), <https://research-repository.st-andrews.ac.uk/handle/10023/1999>; Bonner, ‘Scotland’s “Auld Alliance” with France, 1295-1560’.

25 Talbott, ‘An Alliance Ended?’, pp.14-6 & 21-3.

26 Talbott, pp.63-8.

27 T. C. Smout, ‘Making and Trading Dress and Décor in Seventeenth-Century Scotland’, *The Scottish Historical Review* 100, no. 3 (December 2021): 419–36, <https://doi.org/10.3366/shr.2021.0538>.

28 For instance, see the work of Henryette de Bruyne on 17th century wine trade, or Sheryllyne Haggerty’s work on 18th century British-Atlantic trade.

routes and networks aside.²⁹ I have, instead, favoured historical research through material culture. This approach considers objects as evidence of the past, but most importantly as both “symbols and tools of culture”.³⁰ Considering objects in their original context of production and consumption enables an understanding both of their physical and practical attributes, as well as meaning in their spatio-temporal frame of existence.³¹ By turning to material culture, I intend to put commodities at the forefront of the study and, therefore, suggest a bridge between trade/economic and material history. This paper offers a tightly focused examination of a few sources which belonged to two different actors: two account books and a selection of accounts from a Scottish merchant trading in and with France, and a few accounts of expenses from a Scottish noble family member who visited France. The accounts detailed in this paper aim at showing the range of commodities that were exchanged within the frame of textile and dress. Besides, the analysis is centred on French exports to Scotland, and not the other way round, and is intended as a case study and starting point for further research.

• The chronological boundaries

Though the Early Modern times are a period of analysis much loved by historians, not all centuries are treated equally. Much has been published about and debated on the political upheavals, conflicts, and power structures of the 17th century. This observation is particularly true for French historiography, which is mainly centred around questions of power and geopolitics, and hardly touches on economic questions. The very title of such books show this tendency: Joel Cornet, who is considered the reference on 17th century French history, published *Affirmation de l'État absolu* (The assertion of the absolutist state) for the 1492-52 period, and *Absolutisme et Lumière* (Absolutism and Enlightenment) for the 1652-1789 years, while Lucien Bély's history of 17th century France is entitled *Puissance de l'État, contrôle de la société* (Power of the state, control of society).³² In those three books, the economic and commercial questions hardly appear, often only looking at taxation and agriculture.³³

29 Siobhan Talbott, ‘Beyond “the Antiseptic Realm of Theoretical Economic Models”: New Perspectives on Franco-Scottish Commerce and the Auld Alliance in the Long Seventeenth Century’, *Journal of Scottish Historical Studies* 31, no. 2 (2011): 149–68, <https://doi.org/10.3366/jshs.2011.0019>; Steve Murdoch, ‘Scotland, Europe and the English “Missing Link”’, *History Compass* 5, no. 3 (May 2007): pp.896-9, <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1478-0542.2007.00434.x>.

30 Richard Grassby, ‘Material Culture and Cultural History’, *The Journal of Interdisciplinary History* 35, no. 4 (2005): p.592, <https://doi.org/10.1162/0022195043327426>.

31 Grassby, pp.591-603.

32 Cornette, *Histoire de la France*, 2016; Cornette, *Histoire de la France*, 2016; Lucien Bély, *La France au XVIIe siècle: puissance de l'État, contrôle de la société* (Paris: Presses universitaires de France, 2009).

33 Bély, *La France au XVIIe siècle*; Cornette, *Histoire de la France*, 2016, pp.602-7.

Regarding consumption, trade and material history, few if hardly any works can be found contrary to the 18th century, which is highly covered in that regard. For example, major publications on consumption and material culture only partially cover the 17th century, when they do not skip it entirely. In Maxine Berg and Helen Clifford's collection *Consumers and Luxury Culture in Europe: 1650-1850*, more than half of the chapters cover the 18th century.³⁴ Robert S. DuPlessis tends to treat the early modern period as a "long sixteenth century" and a "long eighteenth".³⁵ French historians also tend to look at other periods, as reflected in Natacha Coquery and Alain Bonnet's book on luxury trade, which is covering a period from the Middle-Ages to this day but does not look into the 17th century.³⁶

Moreover, Scottish historians tend to give greater importance to trade and economic questions for the early modern period. Steve Murdoch, in his chapter on Scotland's relations to Europe in the second volume of *Scotland: The Making and Unmaking of the Nation, c.1100-1707* considers political, military and economic aspects almost to equal extent, while *The Oxford Handbook of Modern Scottish History* contains several pages on the historiographical debates surrounding the state of Scotland's economy before and after the 1707 Union on Scotland's including the effects on trade.³⁷ Moreover, French historians working on Scotland, tend to leave these question aside, and to a greater extent for the 16th and 17th century.³⁸ The political and geopolitical dimension of the changing relations between Scotland and England, but also those of England and France under the reign of Louis XIV, and more globally his relation with the whole of Europe, make the end of the 17th century a period of great interest for historians, but often give less importance to other aspects of these relations. François Lebrun in his global history of the 17th century allots five out of the twelve chapters solely to European political structures and relations in addition to subparts in other chapters also touching on those aspects.³⁹ The Industrial Revolution, the development of a

34 Maxine Berg and Helen Clifford, 'Introduction', in *Consumers and Luxury: Consumer Culture in Europe 1650-1850*, ed. Maxine Berg and Helen Clifford (Manchester: University Press, 1999).

35 Robert S. DuPlessis, *Transitions to Capitalism in Early Modern Europe: Economies in the Era of Early Globalization, c. 1450-c. 1820*, Second edition., New Approaches to European History (Cambridge: University Press, 2019), p.275.

36 Natacha Coquery and Alain Bonnet, *Le commerce du luxe: production, exposition et circulation des objets précieux du Moyen Âge à nos jours [textes issus d'un colloque tenu à Lyon, aux musées Gadagne les 21, 22 et 23 novembre 2012]* (Paris: Mare & Martin, 2015).

37 Steve Murdoch, 'Scotland and Europe', in *Scotland: The Making and Unmaking of the Nation, c.1100-1707*, ed. Bob Harris and Alan R. MacDonald, vol. 2 Early modern Scotland: c.1500-1707 (Dundee: Dundee University Press, 2007), 126–44; Karin Bowie, 'New Perspectives on Pre-Union Scotland', in *The Oxford Handbook of Modern Scottish History*, ed. Thomas Martin Devine and Jenny Wormald, Oxford Handbooks (Oxford [etc.: Oxford University Press, 2012), 303–19.

38 Michel Duchéin, *Histoire de l'Écosse: des origines à nos jours*, Édition augmentée et mise à jour., Texte le goût de l'histoire (Paris: Tallandier, 2013); Civardi, *L'Écosse depuis 1528*.

39 Lebrun, *Le 17e siècle*, chaps 3, 5, 6, 9, and 10 & sections 1.1, 11.3, and 11.4.

colonial economy, and therefore the radical changes in good production and its impact on trade, appears to act as a similar 'historian magnet', leading to a greater amount of publications on trade for the second half of the 18th century. Michel Duchein in his *Histoire de l'Écosse* only touches on Scotland's 17th century economy by briefly mentioning the "bourgeoisie commerçante" of Scottish towns, whereas several pages are dedicated to agriculture, the development of different industries and trade for the 18th century.⁴⁰ Quite justly, David Stevenson opened one of his books pointing this disinterest for 17th century Scotland:

"The seventeenth century in Scotland has had few friends. Traditionally, since the eighteenth century, it has been interpreted as a particularly unhappy age in Scotland's turbulent story, marked by cultural decay, political violence and corruption, lacking any clear positive identity to offset these negative characteristics."⁴¹

In addition to that, and as previously mentioned, many publications are now outdated and have been highly put into question.⁴² This study aims at – partially – filling this gap and scratching a bit of the gloominess attributed to 17th century Scotland. Because this paper focuses on material culture and does not offer a general analysis of the period, no precise chronological boundaries related to a broader context have been established. The dates of the primary sources on which it is based are nevertheless comprised between the 1640s and 1700s included.

• Presentation of the sources

As suggested above, this study is in keeping with the more recent approach to Scottish trade history, by using private sources rather than official ones. Many documents produced by Scottish merchants, French shopkeepers, or Scottish nobles have survived. As S. Talbott highlights, those documents benefit from an assurance of neutrality, for they were produced for a functional purpose. Account books, accounts, receipts and bills are particularly useful in that regard and are sometimes even abundant among some families' papers. The corpus of this study is made up of such sources. This paper also takes a look at legal papers. The corpus examined here is therefore based on three sets of sources: the merchants and professionals' documents, the family papers and parliamentary papers. The first one is a selection of

⁴⁰ Duchein, *Histoire de l'Écosse*, pp.429 & 500-5.

⁴¹ David Stevenson, *Union, Revolution, and Religion in 17th-Century Scotland*, Collected Studies; CS570 (Aldershot, Great Britain ; Brookfield, Vt., USA: Variorum, 1997), p.37.

⁴² Bowie, 'New Perspectives on Pre-Union Scotland'; Thomas Martin Devine, 'Reappraising the Early Modern Economy, 1500-1650', in *The Oxford Handbook of Modern Scottish History*, ed. Jenny Wormald and Thoma Martin Devine, Oxford Handbooks (Oxford [etc.: Oxford University Press, 2012), 236–50.

documents produced by and addressed to different merchants: John Clerk of Penicuik, a Scottish Merchant Burgess of Edinburgh who was first based in France, and Paris in particular, between 1634 and 1646, and the Blackwoods, who were Edinburgh merchants in the second half of the century, seemingly specialised in silk and cloth, and a tailor from Edinburgh.⁴³ John Clerk had a wide network and traded with several French cities, such as Rouen and Dieppe.⁴⁴ Thanks to his trade, he “gained, for those days, a considerable fortune”, which enabled him to purchase the barony of Penicuik in 1654.⁴⁵ His success exemplifies the rise of the middle rank in the 17th century.⁴⁶ The sources he produced or received which have survived have been of major help in re-evaluating Franco-Scottish trade and understanding the commercial networks on which it relied.⁴⁷ From his papers, two trade account books have been used, one from 1647 mainly on his trade in France and another one from 1650 on his trade in London, as well as some letters and accounts.⁴⁸ The Blackwoods’ accounts used in this paper cover the year 1666-1688 and consign imports and commissions from France, but also Holland and England, which enables us to compare imports.⁴⁹

The second is made of family papers. The papers of the Earls of Breadalbane, a branch of the Campbell family are an important resource. John Campbell, “fiar of Glenorchy”, inherited from debts, mortgaged lands and struggling tenants when he took over his father in 1657. Yet he was made Earl of Breadalbane in 1677 and the family recovered ; his son eventually “raised to the peerage, and bec[a]me one of the wealthiest and most powerful

43 Talbott, ‘An Alliance Ended?’, pp.84-86; Although the NRS description of the GD1/564 only refers to Robert Blackwood, the account book of James Nimmo refers to a “Jim” and a “William” Blackwood as fabric suppliers, NRS, ‘GD1/564 Miscellaneous Small Collections of Family, Business and Other Papers, Blackwood of Pitreavie, Fife’, accessed 16 January 2024, <https://catalogue.nrscotland.gov.uk/nrsonlinecatalogue/details.aspx?reference=GD1%2f564&st=1&tc=y&tl=n&tn=n&tp=n&k=blackwood&ko=a&r=GD1%2f564&ro=s&df=1600&dt=1700&di=y>; ‘Miscellaneous Papers, James Nimmo, James, Tailor in Edinburgh, RH15/148’ (1696-1740), NRS.

44 Talbott, ‘An Alliance Ended?’, pp.84-6.

45 Sir John Clerk, *Memoirs of the Life of Sir John Clerk of Penicuik: Baronet, Baron of the Exchequer, Extracted by Himself from His Own Journals, 1676-1755*, ed. John M. Gray (Printed at the University Press by T. and A. Constable for the Scottish history society, 1892), pp.4-5.

46 Lorna Weatherill, *Consumer Behaviour and Material Culture in Britain: 1660-1760*, 2nd ed. (London: Routledge, 1996), pp.13-4.

47 National Records of Scotland, ‘GD18/ Papers of Clerk Family of Penicuik, Midlothian, 1373-1966’, accessed 21 May 2023, [https://catalogue.nrscotland.gov.uk/nrsonlinecatalogue/details.aspx? REF. GD18/2357-2567](https://catalogue.nrscotland.gov.uk/nrsonlinecatalogue/details.aspx?REF.GD18/2357-2567) in particular.

48 ‘Account Book of Merchandise Brought to Leith from the Continent, John Clerk of Penicuik, GD18/2483’ (account book, 1647-1649), pp.18-42, NRS; ‘Account Book in London, John Clerk of Penicuik, GD18/2482/1’ (1647-1650), NRS; ‘“Accounts Skrols & Divers Memoirs”, John Clerk of Penicuik, GD18/2381’ (1636-1649), NRS; ‘Account of Commissions Entrusted to John Clerk of Penicuik, Papers of the Kerr Family, Marquises of Lothian, GD40/2/18/1’ (1647-1649), NRS; ‘Account from James Movat, Tailor in Paris, GD18/2484/3’ (1647), NRS.

49 ‘Account Book, Blackwood of Pitreavie, Fife, GD1/564/2’ (1666-1681), NRS; ‘Account Book or Ledger, Blackwood of Pitreavie, Fife, GD1/564/4’ (1681-1688), NRS.

Scottish nobles.” The latter, made its place at James II and VII’s court and became an influential member of the Privy council of Scotland.⁵⁰ The collection of the Earls of Breadalbane’s sources extends from the early 14th century to the 20th century, and comprises a great variety of documents including accounts of the family’s expenses, miscellaneous receipts, as well as accounts of European travels.⁵¹ This study is focused on the financial accounts of the travels in France of Lord Sinclair, son of the Earl of Breadalbane.⁵² The papers of the Montgomerie family, – the Ross of Halkhead branch in particular – are another important resource. Many accounts of disbursement in France have been preserved and have been used for this dissertation.⁵³ The analysis is also based on a set of private sources from varied authors and decades. It includes: a Letter from Lord Lothian to Lady Lothian; an account of disbursements from Lord William Hamilton; accounts of household and tailoring expenses from the Drummond Family, Earls of Perth; bills, receipts and accounts of Sir Alexander Brand of Brandsfield; estate accounts of the Castlemilk family.⁵⁴

The third set of sources is comprised of a selection of supplementary parliamentary papers from the Edinburgh Parliament mostly covering the years between 1698 and 1705.⁵⁵ Three main types of documents are used in this analysis: legislative drafts, addresses to the

50 William A. Gillies, *In Famed Breadalbane : The Story of the Antiquities, Lands and People of a Highland District* (Strathgairn : Clunie Press, 1980), pp.156-7 & 163, <http://archive.org/details/infamedbreadalba0000gill>; James Balfour Paul, *The Scots Peerage : Founded on Wood’s Ed. of Sir Robert Douglas’s Peerage of Scotland; Containing an Historical and Genealogical Account of the Nobility of That Kingdom* (Edinburgh : D. Douglas, 1904), p.203, <http://archive.org/details/scotspeeragefoun02pauluoft>.

51 NRS, ‘GD112/ Papers of the Campbell Family, Earls of Breadalbane (Breadalbane Muniments) 1306-20th Century ; NAS Catalogue - Catalogue Record’, accessed 6 April 2023, <https://catalogue.nrscotland.gov.uk/nrsonlinecatalogue/details.aspx?reference=GD112&st=1&tc=y&tl=n&tn=n&tp=n&k=&ko=a&r=GD112&ro=s&df=&dt=&di=y>.

52 ‘Documents from Lord Sinclair’s European Travel, GD112/54’ (1678-1681), a selection from files 7,9,10 & 13 (see bibliography), NRS.

53 NRS, ‘GD3/13/2 Papers of the Montgomerie Family, Earls of Eglinton, Relating to Ross of Halkhead, Personal Accounts’, accessed 16 January 2024, <https://catalogue.nrscotland.gov.uk/nrsonlinecatalogue/details.aspx?reference=GD3%2f13%2f2&st=1&tc=y&tl=n&tn=n&tp=n&k=&ko=a&r=GD3%2f13%2f2&ro=s&df=1600&dt=1700&di=y>.

54 ‘Lord William Hamilton’s Account of the 1000 Livres He Spent in France, GD406/1/6302’ (10 August 1679), NRS; ‘Letter from Lord Lothian to Lady Lothian, GD40/2/18/2/19’ (1673), NRS; ‘Accounts Mainly Household and Tailoring, of the Drummond Family, Earls of Perth (Drummond Castle Papers), GD160/180’ (1662-1673), NRS; ‘Receipts, Accounts, Precepts and Bills of Sir Alexander Brand of Brandsfield, RH15/53/23’ (1675-1698), NRS; ‘Estate Accounts of Castlemilk, Kept by James Stuart of Torrance as Executor to His Brother, Archibald Stuart of Castlemilk , MS 8218 (Folios 1-74)’ (1643-1659), NLS.

55 Scotland Privy Council, ‘Proclamation; Import or Wearing of Lace Prohibited, RH14/103’ (16 March 1682), NRS; ‘Supplementary Parliamentary Papers, PA7/16’ (1698-1699), fol. 14,28, 86(1,2 & 3) & 87, NRS; ‘Draft Act Prohibiting the Import of Silk Stuffs Etc, PA7/17/1/92’ (31 January 1701), NRS; ‘Supplementary Parliamentary Papers, PA7/17/2’ (1700 1701), NRS; ‘Supplementary Parliamentary Papers, PA7/18’ (1702 1703), fol. 27(2), NRS; ‘Supplementary Parliamentary Papers, PA7/19’ (1704 1705), fol. 52(1,2,6,7 & 8), 63, 64, 81(1), 83(1), 86, 103(1 & 2), 140(2) & 166, NRS; ‘Printed Petitions, Memorials and Other Representations Addressed to the High Commissioner and Estates of Parliament, GD124/10/444’ (1705), fols 81 & 83, NRS.

parliament and memorials or answer to a memorial. The first category gathers drafts of acts of parliament and overtures – “a proposal for consideration by a legislative body; spec. a bill placed before the Scottish Parliament or Convention of the Estates for enactment”.⁵⁶ The second is concerned with petitions – “a formal written application made to a court, setting out facts on the basis of which the petitioner seeks to some legal remedy or relief” – and its variations such as representations or proposals.⁵⁷ Finally, the last category is focused on two documents, a memorial – “A statement of facts forming the basis of or expressed in the form of a petition or remonstrance to a person in authority, a government, etc.” –, and an answer to another memorial.⁵⁸ Finally, a poem in the shape of a petition is also taken into account in the analysis.⁵⁹

• Structure and choices

As previously stated, this study aims at filling some gaps in the current historiography surrounding Franco-Scottish relations and Scotland’s trading activities in the 17th century. Hence the choice to divert from more common approaches to the subject, a position reflected in the structure of this paper. This dissertation is comprised of three main parts, which both look at different aspects of the subject and rely on different tools of analysis. PART I is an extensive analysis of three account books, detailing a list of goods imported from France to Scotland, along with contextual elements concerning the economic features which explain the content and primary conclusions from this archival work. PART II focuses on the actors and sheds light on the reasons and means of consumption. PART III is concerned with the wider politico-economic context and considers the phenomena analysed beforehand from a wider perspective, in addition to looking at how Franco-Scottish trade fitted within European geopolitical dynamics. This last section is also concerned with the position of the Scottish state as institution and its relation to the Scottish people, through the analysis of legal documents. There are three reasons for this choice. First, the unfolding of the overall argument corresponds to the thought process from which this work was born. The analysis and orientation of this study stemmed from archival research, extended to questions of

56 ‘Overture, I.4.a’, in *OED Online*, accessed 19 January 2024, https://www.oed.com/dictionary/overture_n?tab=meaning_and_use#32696647.

57 ‘Petition’, in *OED Online*, accessed 23 January 2024, https://www.oed.com/dictionary/petition_n?tab=meaning_and_use#31049971.

58 ‘Memorial, 5.a’, in *OED Online*, accessed 19 January 2024, https://www.oed.com/dictionary/memorial_adj?tab=meaning_and_use#37227751.

59 ‘Undated Printed Poem Entitled "The Ladies Petition to the Parliament against the Passing of the Sumptuary Act, GD150/3377’ (probably 1698), NRS.

consumption, craft and social class, to eventually consider legal, political and philosophical aspects. Second, there is a structural continuity to the overall argument, which unfolds from the most concrete, specific and ordinary dimension of this study – the objects – to the most abstract and general one – political philosophy. Third, the decision to begin with the most material angle is a stance I take as researcher. As previously explained, this work has been heavily influenced by material and dress history, a field often ignored if not looked down upon within the historical community. By beginning my study with a focus on documents which belonged to individuals and are about objects of the everyday life, I state that the past was, first and foremost, about everyday life, about the clothes one wore, the objects one used, the people one met and interacted with. This study therefore aims at offering an analysis of the phenomena, upheavals and tensions linked to and comprising Franco-Scottish trading relations in the wide perspective of the socio-politico-economic context, while anchoring it to the everyday, the ordinary and the material dimensions inherent to textile, dress and such related goods.

PART I/ A Substantial Trade : John Clerk of Penicuik and the Blackwoods' Account Books.

As already discussed, both older and recent historiography concerned with Scottish trade for the 17th century make little account of the goods exchanged, focusing on the means and geography of trade. Yet, in her PhD thesis, S. Talbott has debunked the idea that the Auld Alliance ended in 1560 and that, from then on, the Scots were no longer concerned with France in terms of commerce, but focused on developing trade with England – except for wine maybe. She shows how active and diverse Franco-Scottish trade was, and how varied the goods exchanged were. She acknowledges the importance of luxury goods, and most importantly for our study, that cloth dominated such imports, which she quotes and enumerations she uses illustrate. She departs from the quantitative approach of previous historians for a social one, which enabled her to unveil the greater extent to which Franco-Scottish trade was organised and revealed the presence of luxury goods.¹ This social approach also implied that her focus was on people rather than objects. My study, as seen above, rather focuses on the later, yet borrows from both the older and more recent historiographies, in that my method is quantitative but is applied to private sources instead of official ones. The analysis in this first part relies on four primary sources: two account books kept by John Clerk of Penicuik and two kept by the Blackwoods. The first book considered concerns a shipment of goods from the port of Hamburg reaching Leith on 8th March 1647.² Yet, from page 18 to 42 of the said account, all goods were imported from France and were seemingly all bought in Paris. This is confirmed by the heavy use of French words to refer to goods, the addresses of the shops where the goods were bought, as well as those of the owners themselves. The other account used dates between 1649-1650 and accounts for John Clerk's purchases in London.³ The latter is used in a comparative way to the former, which in return is used comparatively to the Blackwoods accounts which cover the years 1681 to 1688.⁴ It is important to note that the analysis is restricted to three accounts kept by one merchant and two associates, each for one year only. The other sources developed later in this paper, also participate in highlighting the importance of textile in this trade. The development which follows is mainly an in-depth collection, classification and analysis of the goods listed in the accounts.

1 Talbott, 'An Alliance Ended?', pp.65-72.

2 'NRS, GD18/2483', pp.18-42.

3 'NRS, GD18/2482/1'.

4 'NRS, GD1/564/2'; 'NRS, GD1/564/4'.

1.1 A Great Variety of Goods

• Classification choices

Among the overall variety of commodities in John Clerk of Penicuik's 1647 account book, textile-and dress-related goods are a particularly important category both in terms of number of items and recurrence in the account book. Such goods can be further categorised through an inventory of the document, and a detailed analysis of the products it contains. The objects have been classified at two levels : general categories characterised by the purpose of the objects included – with one exception – and subcategories. These are then cross-analysed.

Some goods could fit into multiple categories. This is the case with lace, which could be considered as both fabric yardage or haberdashery. The width of laces – as well as fabrics – is never specified in the account book, which rules out such a criterion. The choice made, therefore, is that of purpose : like ribbons or fringes, lace was worn on top of fabric, as embellishment or to make ruffs, but not as main material for the making of dress. The embellishing dimension is predominant, hence its definition as haberdashery. For the clarity of understanding and to avoid confusion, what we nowadays only refer to as ‘laces’ is mentioned as ‘lacing’ in the rest of this study – except for quotes –, for “lace” in the early modern period, like today, would have also referred to any cord, ribbon or string used to close a garment by lacing it up or down.⁵

Some goods are difficult to sort into any category but remain important to the analysis. As will be shown later on, some dressmaking and leather work tools are to be found in the account book. Though leather and textile-related goods have been separated in the general classification, tools for dressmaking and leather-work have been counted in a single subcategory within haberdashery. Such choices of categorisation are debatable – e.g., tools could have been considered independently and skins along with fabric yardage in a general "material" category – but remain pertinent and enlightening. I defined purpose as my main criterion of classification, hence dressmaking and leather-work tools being found together and leather gloves lined with textile being classified as accessories. I separated textile, i.e. woven fabric, from leather, first because leather and textile production are very different crafts; second, to avoid making several small categories containing too few items when they have leather in common and/or serve the same purpose – e.g., separating leather-based pieces of

5 ‘Lace, n. and Adj.’, entries A.1a & A.5a in OED Online (Oxford University Press), accessed 23 April 2023, <https://www.oed.com/view/Entry/104786>.

luggage from textile-based ones. The six general categories used are : haberdashery, fabric yardage, accessories, clothes, décor, and leather and luggage. Their analysis is organised by types: dressmaking goods first, garment items in second, and household items and leather in third. To evaluate the importance of each category, the number of entries to which they each amount has been used, an entry being one mention of a good – e.g., one good mentioned three times accounts for three entries. While keeping in mind the fact that a few entries account for several goods at different prices, this data still gives us an impression of what types of goods were exported from France to Scotland, as well as their proportions.

Because the approach to the sources is quantitative and comparative, measure units are used, ‘ells’, or ‘aune’ in French in particular. In all his documents, John Clerk hardly ever specifies whether he is using French ells (1,3 yards or 1,2 meters), or Scottish ells (1 yard or 91,5 cm).⁶ Because those specifications are very much rare, and to avoid over-interpreting the sources, I chose to consider all measures with the smallest measure unit – Scottish ells – to still have a general idea of the amounts we are dealing with.

• Haberdashery

This category encompasses all articles used for the embellishing, trimming, finishing, and closing of garments and objects made of textile, as well as the tools used for the making of such objects. Comprising 96 entries, haberdashery is by far the most important type of commodity in the account book, and ranges from articles for sheer embellishment to more practical items for dressmaking purposes.⁷ Smaller items are found along with embellishments and trimmings bought by the “aune” (ell).⁸ The former encompasses satin and taffeta roses, either to adorn shoes or attire “women's breasts”, as well as “glands” (tassels).⁹ Trimmings are rather substantial as they amount to at least 18 ells of embellishing materials, since some items have no specific measures attributed to them. Among those trimmings are “dantel” [lace], “gallon”, – “A kind of narrow, close-woven ribbon or braid, of gold, silver, or silk thread, used for trimming articles of apparel” –, “pearling” – “A kind of lace of thread or silk,

6 ‘aune’, in *Le dictionnaire de l'Académie françoise, dédié au Roy. ...* (Veuve de J. B. Coignard & J. B. Coignard, 1694); ‘Pouce, II.A.1’, in *CNRTL*, accessed 30 May 2023, <https://www.cnrtl.fr/definition/pouce>; ‘Pied, 2ème Section’, in *CNRTL*, accessed 30 May 2023, <https://www.cnrtl.fr/definition/pied>; ‘Ell, n.1’, in *OED Online* (Oxford University Press), accessed 19 April 2023, <https://www.oed.com/view/Entry/60511>.

7 ‘NRS, GD18/2483’, pp.18-42.

8 ‘Ell, n.1’.

9 ‘NRS, GD18/2483’, pp.23,31,38 & 40.

used for trimming the edges of garments”– and “pearl bands”.¹⁰ Ribbons, mainly of satin, are the most extensively bought items of haberdashery, of which John Clerk bought more than 277 ells in addition to 343 dozen pieces.¹¹ “Cordon[s]” are also a recurring item, and like ribbons, were purchased by the ells as much as by the dozen, but also by the ounce.¹² Though most were made of silk or gold and/or silver threads, one entry mentions “4 cordons d'or & cheveux”, meaning made of gold thread and hair.¹³ John Clerk additionally obtained 2,5 ounces of stuffing for lacing for gloves.¹⁴ For a more practical purpose, he purchased 30 ells of edging.¹⁵ The account also mentions 12 fabric straps made of cambric known as “toile de batiste” in French, cambric being a fine linen.¹⁶ Beyond items meant to become garments or objects, tools for the making of dress and décor as for leather-work were purchased from France. In John Clerk's 1647 account, these include 3 dozen thimbles, 5 pairs of shears, 2 upholsterer's hammer, a cobbler's knife, 8 long needles and a pair of “ciseaux pomson gauffre”, which likely refers to a pinking punch used for cutting out pieces in a specific shape – as pinking shears were not invented until the 19th century.¹⁷ In addition to being voluminous, items of haberdashery were also extremely varied.

• Fabric yardage

Though this category does not record the highest number of entries in John Clerk's 1647 account book, it still represents a substantial portion of his merchandise. Overall, he purchased more than 750 ells, plus 35 pounds worth of fabric.¹⁸ Silks clearly predominate with more than 368 ells, 18 quartiers, 15 pounds and 12 ounces. Among these, different types of silks are found including: satin, taffeta, tabby and velvet, as well as other silks the type of which is not specified.¹⁹ Tabby, or “tabis” in French, is that which comes up the most. This fabric is a type of thick taffeta which has been pressed between tubes engraved with a wave-

10 ‘NRS, GD18/2483’, pp.24-27,37 & 38; ‘Galloon, n.’, in *OED Online* (Oxford University Press), accessed 23 April 2023, <https://www.oed.com/view/Entry/76344>; ‘Pearling, n.1’, in *OED Online* (Oxford University Press), accessed 23 April 2023, <https://www.oed.com/view/Entry/139336>.

11 ‘NRS, GD18/2483’, pp.24,29,31,34,37-9 & 42.

12 ‘NRS, GD18/2483’, pp.30-1.

13 ‘NRS, GD18/2483’, pp.30-1.

14 ‘NRS, GD18/2483’, p.30.

15 ‘NRS, GD18/2483’, p.38.

16 ‘NRS, GD18/2483’, p.39; ‘Batiste, n.’, in *OED Online* (Oxford University Press), accessed 5 April 2023, <https://www.oed.com/view/Entry/16183>; ‘Cambric’, in *OED Online*, accessed 23 January 2024, https://www.oed.com/dictionary/cambric_n?tab=meaning_and_use#10244388.

17 ‘NRS, GD18/2483’, pp.22 & 41; ‘Punch, n.1’, in *OED Online* (Oxford University Press), accessed 4 April 2023, <https://www.oed.com/view/Entry/154558>.

18 ‘NRS, GD18/2483’, pp.18-42.

19 ‘NRS, GD18/2483’, pp.25-7,29,33 & 38-9.

like pattern. Such a process created an uneven thickness to the silk, which enabled the light to reflect in such a way that it glistened.²⁰ Taffeta is “a fine, crisp, and usually lustrous fabric of a plain weave in which the weft threads are thicker than those of the warp, originally of silk”.²¹ Woollens are mostly divided between “serge de chalon” and “drap de Berrie”.²² The former is a “cloth made of fine wool, & thicker than that of England”, while the latter is “a common light cloth of woven wool.”²³ Yet, Furetière adds that “some serge are sometimes made of silk and are very lustrous”.²⁴ It is, however, very likely that John Clerk would have specified it if it were such kind of serge he had purchased. Among these, he bought what he wrote “drap de Sceau”.²⁵ This type of cloth is what Furetière refers to as “drap d'Usseau” in his dictionary, which he explains has been misleadingly understood to be named 'de sceau' in reference to the king's seal – “sceau” in French – which was once put on this fabric. “Drap d'Useau” is a cloth manufactured near Carcassone in the Languedoc region.²⁶ The only linen to be found is an ell of “toile de batiste”.²⁷ Finally, some “toile de princesse” and “denaple” are mentioned, but I have so far neither been able to identify what kind of fabric these refer to, nor of what fibre they would have been made.²⁸ It is clear that the fabrics sought for were either silk-based or fine cloth of other fibers.

• Accessories

Small articles used to complement the main garment, either for useful or fashionable purposes have been considered as accessories. Leather-based items, apart from gloves, are treated in a different category. Accessories amount to 89 entries and are the second most numerous type of commodity in the account book.²⁹ They can be separated into two groups : those made of textile and the others. The latter is less consistent and less varied, with almost only metal objects, among which are spurs and jewellery.³⁰ Spurs were “a device for pricking

20 Antoine Furetière, ‘Tabis’, in *Dictionnaire Universel*, 1690, database ‘Classiques Garnier Numérique’.

21 ‘Taffeta or Taffety (Scottish)’, in *OED Online*, accessed 23 January 2024, https://www.oed.com/dictionary/taffeta_n?tab=meaning_and_use#19141066.

22 ‘NRS, GD18/2483’, pp.28,32-3 & 35.

23 I translated from Antoine Furetière, ‘Drap’, in *Dictionnaire Universel*, 1690, database ‘Classiques Garnier Numérique’; I translated from Antoine Furetière, ‘Serge’, in *Dictionnaire Universel*, 1690, database ‘Classiques Garnier Numérique’.

24 I translated from Furetière, ‘Drap’.

25 ‘NRS, GD18/2483’, pp.32 & 35.

26 Furetière, ‘Drap’.

27 ‘NRS, GD18/2483’, p.23.

28 ‘NRS, GD18/2483’, pp.23 & 29.

29 ‘NRS, GD18/2483’.

30 ‘NRS, GD18/2483’, pp.20,22-5,37-8 & 42.

the side of a horse in order to urge it forward, consisting of a small spike or spiked wheel attached to the rider's heel.”³¹ Sometimes bought by the dozen, 77 pairs were recorded in the account.³² Though earrings, “pendant[s] d'oreille”, are the most important type of jewels, a few rings, “cachets” – a seal sometimes on a ring – and armbands, as well as a chain, a medal with “the Queen on 1 Syde, the King on the other” and a steel and gold watch were bought.³³ As for the fans mentioned in the account book, they make up an important portion of accessories with 54 items for 7 entries, though information on their material is lacking.³⁴

In addition to being substantial (368 items for 51 entries), textile accessories are varied in kind.³⁵ From Monsieur Le Maire, John Clerk bought 21 pairs of gloves of varying styles and materials – including leather –, some with gallons, others with lace, fringes or pearling.³⁶ In addition to these elaborate gloves made for everyday wear, he also bought three black fencing gloves from Mr Pierre Forbeseur along with “épées” (swords).³⁷ Manchets, “small ornaments made of cloth and worn at the wrist at the bottom of the sleeves”, either simple or double, and cravats, either fastened or not, are amounting to respectively 84 pairs and 36 items.³⁸ Along these, 36 pairs of “devant” are mentioned.³⁹ Though there is no exact match for such a term in either the *OED* or the 1690 *Dictionnaire Universel* of Antoine Furetière, 'devant' could be some sort of abbreviation of “devanteau” which in Furetière's dictionary is defined as an “old word which once meant apron, & which is no longer in use but among ordinary folks.”⁴⁰ To these must be added “mouchoir” & “mouchoir de deux tiers”, together amounting to 36 items.⁴¹ Identifying to what John Clerk exactly referred here is once again difficult, for “mouchoir” could have been a “cloth worn in the pocket to blow one's nose, wipe oneself clean. A tissue with tassels, with lace” or “mouchoir de col”, meaning a “cloth usually embellished with exquisite laces, which Ladies use to hide or don their throat.” The account also mentions 6 “rabats” of “thoile de baptist”.⁴² Though not defined as an element of garment

31 ‘Spur, n.1’, in *OED Online* (Oxford University Press), accessed 3 April 2023, <https://www.oed.com/view/Entry/187954>.

32 ‘NRS, GD18/2483’, pp.22-4 & 37.

33 ‘NRS, GD18/2483’, pp.20,25,37-8 & 42; Antoine Furetière, ‘Cachet’, in *Dictionnaire Universel*, 1690, database ‘Classiques Garnier Numérique’.

34 ‘NRS, GD18/2483’, p.25.

35 ‘NRS, GD18/2483’, pp.21,23-4,28,30-2,34-5 & 39.

36 ‘NRS, GD18/2483’, p.21.

37 ‘NRS, GD18/2483’, p.35.

38 I translated from Antoine Furetière, ‘Manchette’, in *Dictionnaire Universel*, 1690, database ‘Classiques Garnier Numérique’; ‘NRS, GD18/2483’, pp.23-4,34 & 39.

39 ‘NRS, GD18/2483’, p.34.

40 I translated from Antoine Furetière, ‘Devanteau’, in *Dictionnaire Universel*, 1690, database ‘Classiques Garnier Numérique’.

41 ‘NRS, GD18/2483’, p.34.

42 I translated from Antoine Furetière, ‘Mouchoir’, in *Dictionnaire Universel*, 1690, database ‘Classiques Garnier Numérique’; ‘NRS, GD18/2483’, p.23.

in the *Dictionnaire Universelle* but as a type of dying treatment, a “rabat” is the French term for a 'band', which was a large ornamented collar or neck-band.⁴³ Another substantial type of accessories listed is that of head coverings, which reaches 150 entries. There is no mention of the shapes or designs of the head coverings, them being mainly referred to by their material.⁴⁴ Hence the mention of “demi wigoinge”, “wigoinge”, “castor” or “demi-castor” – ‘demi’ meaning, made of mixed materials.⁴⁵ Apart from the six “callo[s]” and only “bonnet” – that is caps (probably) and beanie –, other head coverings are mentioned under very general denominations such as “chapeau” (hat) or “coiffe” (headdress).⁴⁶ A single mention for a dozen gold and silver hatbands is also recorded.⁴⁷ In addition to head coverings, hairstyling items are mentioned such as hair strings and hair bands “a filet” (with a net).⁴⁸ Finally, masks appear in the list, though without any precision on what material they are made of or whether they are embellished in some way or other.⁴⁹ Such imports, we can conclude, were characterised by their diversity both in terms of type of object and materials.

• Clothes

Only a few items of clothing were bought.⁵⁰ Canions are clearly predominating, as they approach three quarters of all the items in that category.⁵¹ Canions, also written “canon”, referred to either “tubular shaped extensions to men's trunk hose, designed to cover the lower thighs and knees, and to fill the gap between trunk hose and stockings” or “ornamental rolls or frills worn around the knees, either as the termination of stockings or attached to breeches”.⁵² Some have their material specified: “batiste” or “bukram”, a linen or cotton fabric on the coarser side and sometimes stiffened, and some are described as “a double languet”, “simple languet”, as well as “faconné”. Yet it is not specified to which type of canions they belonged –

43 ‘Band, n.2’, in *OED Online* (Oxford University Press), accessed 17 April 2023, <https://www.oed.com/view/Entry/15113>; Antoine Furetière, ‘Rabat’, in *Dictionnaire Universel*, 1690, database ‘Classiques Garnier Numérique’.

44 ‘NRS, GD18/2483’, pp.23,28,31-2 & 39.

45 ‘NRS, GD18/2483’, pp.23 & 28; Antoine Furetière, ‘Vigogne’, in *Dictionnaire Universel*, 1690, database ‘Classiques Garnier Numérique’.

46 ‘NRS, GD18/2483’, pp.23 & 31-2; Antoine Furetière, ‘Calotte’, in *Dictionnaire Universel*, 1690, database ‘Classiques Garnier Numérique’.

47 ‘NRS, GD18/2483’, p.39.

48 ‘NRS, GD18/2483’, p.30.

49 ‘NRS, GD18/2483’, p.39.

50 ‘NRS, GD18/2483’, pp.18-42.

51 ‘NRS, GD18/2483’, pp.23-4 & 38-9.

52 ‘Canion, n.’, in *OED Online* (Oxford University Press), accessed 5 April 2023, <https://www.oed.com/view/Entry/27057>; ‘Breeches are distinguished from trousers by coming only just below the knee’ ‘Breeches’, in *OED Online*, accessed 23 January 2024, https://www.oed.com/dictionary/breech_n?tab=meaning_and_use#14291580.

extensions to men's trunk hose or ornament worn around the knees.⁵³ Along these are three pairs of hose, which were leg coverings, either rather like a legging or a pair of knee-high stockings.⁵⁴ Finally, there are mentions of 6 shirts and a half-shirt – “A shirt of shorter than normal length. A day shirt, as opposed to the longer nightshirt; a short shirt worn underneath a longer shirt or nightshirt.”⁵⁵ These would likely have been made of linen.⁵⁶ Practicality is probably cause for the small amount and type of clothes found in the account book: non of these goods needed to be fitted to the wearer’s shape and size, and could suit most people.

• **Décor**

This type of items, though broad in what it encompasses, comprises no more than a couple of items distributed into 12 entries in the account book.⁵⁷ Some 'drap d'Usseau' is found again, but purchased for bedding and seemingly already sewn, or at least cut to size, as it is referred to as “1 bed of drap de Sceau”.⁵⁸ Cloth is mentioned without further indication of its fibre, proprieties or eventual purpose.⁵⁹ For cloth tended to refer to a fabric used for domestic purposes rather than clothing, I have thus counted it as décor.⁶⁰ Another rather unclear occurrence is that of “furnishing”.⁶¹ Referring to both décor in general and articles of furniture, this mention is rather difficult to apprehend for it can both refer to objects not involving textile as much as it could refer to one made of textile entirely or partially. Such an instance reveals an obstacle sometimes encountered when working with such sources: as this account was meant for no one but himself, John Clerk, it seems, did not feel the need to specify to what he was precisely referring, for he himself knew. The account mentions 3 carpets, twice 60 ells of “tapisserie carré” – the tapestry being bought by the square meter in this case – 4 “tapis for table”, which were elaborate pieces of cloth used as elements of décor

53 ‘NRS, GD18/2483’, pp.23-4 & 38-9; ‘Buckram, n.’, in *OED Online* (Oxford University Press), accessed 17 April 2023, <https://www.oed.com/view/Entry/24204>.

54 ‘NRS, GD18/2483’, p.24; ‘Hose, n.’, in *OED Online* (Oxford University Press), accessed 17 April 2023, <https://www.oed.com/view/Entry/88711>.

55 ‘NRS, GD18/2483’, p.23; ‘Half Shirt, n.’, in *OED Online* (Oxford University Press), accessed 5 April 2023, <https://www.oed.com/view/Entry/83511>.

56 ‘Shirt | Clothing | Britannica’, in *Encyclopaedia Britannica (Online)*, accessed 21 May 2023, <https://www.britannica.com/topic/shirt>.

57 ‘NRS, GD18/2483’, pp.18-42.

58 ‘NRS, GD18/2483’, p.35.

59 ‘NRS, GD18/2483’, p.24.

60 ‘Cloth, n.’, in *OED Online* (Oxford University Press), accessed 17 April 2023, <https://www.oed.com/view/Entry/34649>.

61 ‘NRS, GD18/2483’, p.35.

such as curtains, table cloth, carpets etc.⁶² The account also mentions a blanket.⁶³ Regardless of the obstacles inherent to the type of source, it is however clear that textile items imported from France were not restricted to dress.

• Leather and luggage

Accounting for 27 entries, I divided this category into two types of goods: objects meant to pack and/or carry other items, and pieces of leather.⁶⁴ The former subcategory comprises objects made of different kinds of leathers, such as a hat case, 26 small cases – plus two with no precision on their material –, a box for a ring and one for a watch.⁶⁵ Along these are purses of unspecified material and embellished coffers.⁶⁶ Then, there are more than a dozen leather straps and skins of varying animals including chamois and calf.⁶⁷ A substantial mention is that of “boderier” – either made of maroquin or bull leather – which, like other utterances in the account has no direct match in the *OED*.⁶⁸ However, the phonetic proximity with the French word “baudrier” suggests that John Clerks referred to a baldric, which is defined as “a belt or girdle, usually of leather and richly ornamented, worn pendent from one shoulder across the breast and under the opposite arm, and used to support the wearer's sword, bugle, etc.”⁶⁹ Another interesting utterance is that of a “pack lyke a cuchon monted with grenn silk – gray pau & gray maroquin”.⁷⁰ Although it is rather unclear what the purpose of such object could have been – though probably a cushion of some kind –, we are at least provided with the materials it is made of: silk, “maroquin” – which was “a kind of leather made from goatskin, originally produced in Morocco” –, and “pau”, which is very likely a different spelling of the word “peau”, meaning skin in French.⁷¹ As for textile based items, it seems that leather imports were mostly concerned with specific items and raw materials.

62 ‘NRS, GD18/2483’, pp.18,39 & 42; ‘Tapis, n.’, in *OED Online* (Oxford University Press), accessed 5 April 2023, <https://www.oed.com/view/Entry/197710>.

63 ‘NRS, GD18/2483’, p.24.

64 ‘NRS, GD18/2483’, pp.18-42.

65 ‘NRS, GD18/2483’, pp.24,26 & 34.

66 ‘NRS, GD18/2483’, pp.24-6.

67 ‘NRS, GD18/2483’, pp.23 & 34.

68 ‘NRS, GD18/2483’, p.23.

69 ‘Baldric, n.’, in *OED Online* (Oxford University Press), accessed 5 April 2023, <https://www.oed.com/view/Entry/14849>; Antoine Furetière, ‘Baudrier’, in *Dictionnaire Universel*, 1690, database ‘Classiques Garnier Numérique’.

70 ‘NRS, GD18/2483’, p.24.

71 ‘NRS, GD18/2483’, p.24; ‘Maroquin, Adj. and n.’, in *OED Online* (Oxford University Press), accessed 17 April 2023, <https://www.oed.com/view/Entry/114288>.

• Concluding remarks

The variety of goods listed above shows the extent to which textile and items of dress were imported from France to Scotland. They covered many uses encompassing items which, at first glance, have little in common. Hence hammers, spurs and coffers being found along with delicate silks and laces, elaborate gloves and tapestries. Practical objects stand alongside raw materials and elaborate items, including embellishing articles in particular. Yet rich ones dominate. Commodities related to dress and dressmaking are considerably represented, with 85% of the total entries (292), among which materials and tools for dressmaking represent half of the entries.⁷² Already made clothes are of much lesser importance and are rather simple and basic items of garment and undergarment.

Beyond the materials and objects themselves, a French connection could have been found at all the steps of a product or gown's life, from the very material made in French manufactories, to their making with tools made in France as well as to their transportation in cases also made in France and of French leather. In the account, there is an entry for a “manteau” with payments “for mounting it & putting corde on it”, “for skins and serge to make a house to it & for making it” and “for a fin caisse to put it in” with “golde gallon to put on the bar”.⁷³ Such an instance shows that Scottish imports from France related to textile and dress were: first, all but restricted to raw materials or clothes, and extended to items for their making and transportation such as cases and sheers; second, were not restricted to fabrics and clothes sent from a point A to a point B, but also implied more subtle connections and exchanges through those other items. More broadly speaking, such a variety of goods within textile and dress implied that they were disseminated in many aspects of everyday life – though not for all social categories as will be discussed later on –, for elements of décor and basic everyday items such as coffers and beddings were also imported from France, thus creating an underlying connection between France and Scotland beyond trade routes and commercial networks. Within the realm of textile and dress alone, there was a link between the two countries and their people through the lives of the objects themselves.

72 ‘NRS, GD18/2483’, pp.18-42.

73 ‘NRS, GD18/2483’, p.26.

1.2 "Black cullort I say off ritch Balck dyst voeluit" : Luxurious Materials for Luxurious Fashions

• Silk

Silk was an expensive commodity because its fabrication process implies many steps and much attention. To begin with, breeding silkworms calls for specific conditions in terms of temperature and humidity. The worms have to be controlled several times a day to make sure all the conditions are maintained. In parallel to breeding, important plantations of mulberry trees are necessary for it is the only plant they feed on. Many steps are necessary to make silk. The cocoons must be dried, sorted first to get rid of those damaged, and then to sort them by size, after which they are “cooked”, i.e. soaked into water. This step is very delicate in that slightly too much or too little time spent in the bath ruins the cocoons for good. Finally the cocoons are “reeled”, i.e. unwounded to form threads made of a few filaments, threads which are eventually twisted to reach the desired size and strength.⁷⁴ In addition to the making process from cocoons to thread, the properties of silk made it an expensive product to dye. To reach as deep a colour as wool, silk requires twice the amount of pigments.⁷⁵

French silks also benefited from a reputation acknowledged throughout Europe. France had been producing silk-based items as early as the 13th century – mainly ribbons and haberdashery – and had kept growing for centuries before it became the highly renowned producer with great silk manufacturing centres.⁷⁶ The manufactories in Lyon in particular especially took off in the last three decades of the 17th century which paved the way for its renown in the 18th century. Thanks to its designers – between 80 and 100 in the early 18th century – the silks it produced were varied and innovative. In a context of expansion of international trade in regard to textile and the increasing competition of cotton in the later decades, innovation was a way to remain attractive and on the market. Lyon heavily relied on innovation – and the reputation which would ensue from it – to grow and become competitive, eventually producing the greatest variety of silk fabrics among all European silk manufacturing centres by the turn of the 18th century.⁷⁷ In addition to its reputation, the manufactories benefited from the annual fashion cycles. With lace, silk was the field of

⁷⁴ Mary Schoeser, *Silk* (New Haven, CT ; London: Yale University Press, 2007), pp.61-5.

⁷⁵ Schoeser, p.240.

⁷⁶ Schoeser, p.46.

⁷⁷ Lesley Ellis Miller, ‘Making a Reputation from Innovation: Silk Designers in Lyon, 1660-1789’, in *Fashioning the Early Modern: Dress, Textiles, and Innovation in Europe, 1500-1800*, ed. Evelyn S. Welch, First Edition., Pasold Studies in Textile History 18 (Oxford: University Press, 2017).

production Colbert aimed at improving to compete with Italy: the annual cycles were a way to promote French silks on a European level.⁷⁸ It is therefore no surprise that French silks and silk-based items are heavily found in the account book of John Clerk of Penicuik. The variety above mentioned is reflected in the diverse entries in the account book, which comprise satin, tabby, taffeta and even velvet.

• Lace

From the 16th century, lace was an essential feature of European fashion, for both men and women. Although not all social classes could afford to embellish their garments with yards of lace, the middle and upper class definitely could. 17th century dress is characterised by, among other features, cuffs and collar or neck ornaments. More than a simple band of linen or silk, the finishing of sleeves was often ornamented with gathered or pleated lace. In the early decades of the 17th century, ruffs were an essential element of dress. They were wide collars made of very precisely pleated lace, which was stiffened – a process called starching.⁷⁹ In the later decades, while flat collars, followed by lace cravats or “jabot”, replaced ruffs, for men’s clothes, the opening and widening of women’s collars lead to an increasingly important use of lace picking through at the collar and sleeves.⁸⁰ Comparing the portraits of Charles the I and William of Orange, or Margaret Graham, Lady Napier and Mary II, for instance, shows these changes in fashion.⁸¹ Changes in fashion heavily influenced European lace industries, including France’s. In addition to changes in neckwear, fabric preferences also changed between the 16th and early 17th centuries. Velvet was replaced by plain or lightly patterned silks. Contrast was no longer created by the heavy embroideries or patterns emblematic of the

78 Corinne Thépaud-Cabasset, ‘A Glittering Reputation: Gaultier’s Retailing Innovations in Seventeenth-Century Paris.’, in *Fashioning the Early Modern: Dress, Textiles, and Innovation in Europe, 1500-1800*, ed. Evelyn S. Welch, First Edition., Pasold Studies in Textile History 18 (Oxford: University Press, 2017), pp.37 & 44-5.

79 ‘Ruff, n.3’ entry 2.a., in OED Online (Oxford University Press), accessed 21 May 2023, <https://www.oed.com/view/Entry/168561>; ‘Starch, v.’, in OED Online (Oxford University Press), accessed 21 May 2023, <https://www.oed.com/view/Entry/189093>.

80 Laver James, *Histoire de la mode et du costume*, trans. Michèle Hechter, Christine Chareyre, and Christian-Martin Diebold, Nouvelle édition revue et augmentée., L’univers de l’art 83 (Paris: Thames & Hudson, 2003), pp.112 & 116.

81 *Charles I, 1600 - 1649. Reigned 1625 - 1649*, After 1626, Oil on canvas, 74.30 x 62.20 cm, After 1626, National Galleries Scotland, accession nbr. PG 306; *William III, 1650 - 1702. Reigned 1688 - 1702*, After 1690, Oil on canvas, measurements: 76.20 x 63.50 cm, After 1690, National Galleries Scotland, accession nbr. PG 807; Adam de Colone, *Margaret Graham, Lady Napier, d. c 1626. Sister of 1st Marquess of Montrose and Wife of 1st Lord Napier*, 1626, Oil on canvas, 109.30 x 81.00 cm, 1626, National Galleries Scotland, accession nbr. PG 2608; J.J. Bakker, *Mary II, 1662 - 1694. Reigned Jointly with William III, 1688 - 1694*, after 1690, Oil on canvas, 126.40 x 101.60 cm, after 1690, National Galleries Scotland, accession nbr. PG 1533.

16th century, but obtained through lace.⁸² Though lace production was important from the earliest years of the 17th century and did expand, French lace production was a major one throughout the century, and even before Colbert's enterprises of development. It was characterised by its variety both in terms of designs and materials, including thread, silk and metal.⁸³ Baroque lace was developed in Italy in the earlier decades, but would soon find competition from French manufactories as from the 1660s. This date also coincides with a decreasing use of embroidery in embellishment, from which lace production benefited. In the same decades, silk and metal lace were also extensively made in France and used throughout Europe.⁸⁴ The 1647 account already reflected the importance of lace in dress for the century despite it not yet being at its peak, with more than 50 ells of lace divided into 11 entries recorded.⁸⁵ It is important to keep in mind that lace was expensive because of the materials involved – for silk and metal lace in particular – but most importantly because of the time and skills necessary to its making. 'Bobbin lace' (a type au lace), which was widespread for most decades of the 17th century could involve between 5 and 600 bobbins depending on the complexity of the design desired. The making of lace implied planning, mathematical skills and great dexterity.⁸⁶

• Dyed materials

When considering the colour palette of the items from the 1647 account book, two shades regularly come up: black and red, each respectively accounting for 41 and 23 entries. While some shades such as yellow only rarely appear, black and red are found in almost all categories.⁸⁷ For instance, clothes include 3 scarlet hose and 4 black buckram canons, while accessories account for 3 hair strings and 3 hairbands "a filet", both black, as well as a velvet cap of nacarat shade – a light red, leaning to orange –, numerous gloves with black or red lining and/or black "dantel" [lace], as well as black fencing gloves.⁸⁸ Haberdashery is far from outdone, with 33 ells of black or red ribbons in addition to 10 ells of bicolour black and nacarat ribbons, 84 dozens of ribbons and cordons and 18 ells of lace of black colour.⁸⁹ Yet the

82 Santina M. Levey, *Lace: A History* (London: Victoria & Albert Museum, 1983), p.23.

83 Levey, pp.26-7.

84 Levey, pp.31-7.

85 'NRS, GD18/2483', pp.27 & 37.

86 Kassia St Clair, *The Golden Thread: How Fabric Changed History* (New York: Liveright Publishing Corporation, 2019), pp.139-43.

87 'NRS, GD18/2483', pp.18-42, 21 for yellow mention.

88 'NRS, GD18/2483', pp.21,24,30-1 & 35; Antoine Furetière, 'Nacarat', in *Dictionnaire Universel*, 1690, database 'Classiques Garnier Numérique'.

89 'NRS, GD18/2483', pp.29,37 & 39.

most impressive category remains that of fabric bought by the yard with more the 340 ells all fibres combined, which represents more than 44% of the overall fabrics purchased.⁹⁰ More strikingly maybe, silks of a black or red shade reach 80% of overall silk fabrics.⁹¹ There might have been even more items of the sort considering that the length acquired for some mentions – such as black taffeta – is imprecise, while the colour of some other items is not specified, meaning they could have included a red shade – especially for those described as “de couleur”.⁹²

Among all dyes, black and red were the most expensive, because their harvesting, production and use were both time-consuming and difficult to achieve. Chemical dyes being invented later, shades of red and black were mainly obtained with madder root and cochineal, in addition to indigo for black.⁹³ Madder was grown in England, but imports from France and most importantly Holland ensured that the demand from all of Europe could be satisfied. Not without a cost however. The three years necessary before the first harvest in addition to the numerous steps needed to make a dye ready to use from the plant, and the loss of 7/8 of the original substance in that process impacted the price. Similar difficulties and repercussions were encountered with cochineal, which enabled a great variety of tints and shades from orange, toned browns and red to black.⁹⁴ Moreover, the very process of dyeing a fabric red was difficult, and therefore costly. Varying substances such as urine or mercury were used in order to reach the desired shade and to make sure the dye would fix or set on the fabric. Besides, not all fabrics react the same way to the same dyes and some require more toxic compounds and more steps. Silk for instance, had to be boiled in alum and could necessitate 30 steps.⁹⁵

Once taken into consideration, all these elements can only justify the label “luxurious” for textiles imported from France to Scotland in the 17th century, in the continuity of previous centuries, as Maria Hayward’s work on the colour red at the court of Henry VIII shows.⁹⁶ In addition to the very type of fabric – silk in particular – which was expensive, their colouring treatment added to their value. John Clerk of Penicuik did not solely import textiles, he imported a textile whose making required skills, various materials, and time, and so for no

90 ‘NRS, GD18/2483’, pp.26-7,29,32-3,35 & 38.

91 ‘NRS, GD18/2483’, pp.26-7,29 & 38.

92 ‘NRS, GD18/2483’, pp.24, 31,34 & 42; 31.

93 Stuart Robinson, *A History of Dyed Textiles: Dyes, Fibres, Painted Bark, Starch Resist, Discharge, Tie-Dye, Further Sources for Research*, Studio Vista London (London, 1969), p.29.

94 Maureen Daly Goggin, ‘The Extra-Ordinary Powers of Red in Eighteenth- and Nineteenth-Century English Needlework’, in *The Materiality of Color: The Production, Circulation, and Application of Dyes and Pigments, 1400-1800*, ed. Andrea Feeser, Beth Fowkes Tobin, and Maureen Daly Goggin, *Histories of Material Culture and Collecting, 1700-1950* (Farnham: Ashgate, 2012), p.31.

95 Goggin, p.32.

96 Maria Hayward, ‘Crimson, Scarlet, Murrey and Carnation: Red at the Court of Henry VIII’, *Textile History* 38, no. 2 (1 November 2007): 135–50, <https://doi.org/10.1179/004049607x229142>.

practical reason but for sheer aesthetic – as well as symbolic reasons as will be developed later on.

1.3 French vs. Dutch and English Imports

• A comparative inventory of the 1647 and 1650 account books

Both of John Clerk's 1647 French account book and 1650 London account book record items of dress and textile. Yet, major differences can be observed both in terms of content and amounts. Interestingly enough, the overall numbers of entries for textile, items of dress and other related items for both accounts are almost equal: 290 entries for France and 289 for London.⁹⁷ Yet, the share of each category drastically differs, between the two accounts. Clothes, for instance, account for 15 entries and 37 items in the 1647 account book, but reach 121 entries and 674 items in that of 1650.⁹⁸ Beyond the numerical difference, the types of clothes are completely different. While canions, along with a few shirts, made for most of the French imports, English ones were overwhelmingly dominated by leg- and footwear, with 100 entries and 617 pairs of hose, socks and stockings.⁹⁹ They were of both silk and wool, though the proportion cannot be determined for, in many cases, the fibre is not mentioned. Also purchased were a few elaborate capes of vivid colours and often embellished with lace, and clothes for children such as a "skord", which very likely refers to a skirt, a "biais peticot" and a "biais barrous".¹⁰⁰ There are two possibilities as to what this "barrous" refers to. It can be an alternative spelling for 'barras', a coarse linen fabric.¹⁰¹ It could also likely refer to a barrow, which was a "long sleeveless flannel garment for infants".¹⁰² Though the OED does not mention any use of the term prior to the 19th century, the example they give is taken from the *Dictionary Archaic & Provincial Words*, in which the entry for "barrow" specifies that the word is used in Northumbrian dialect, which originally was the northern dialect of Old English., i.e. long before our period of analysis.¹⁰³ Therefore, it seems plausible

97 'NRS, GD18/2483', pp.18-42; 'NRS, GD18/2482/1'.

98 'NRS, GD18/2483', pp.23-4 & 38-9; 'NRS, GD18/2482/1'.

99 'NRS, GD18/2483', pp.23-4 & 38-9; 'NRS, GD18/2482/1', pp.7 to entry 8/04/1650 'John Andersone'.

100 'NRS, GD18/2482/1', pp.7,15 & 38, entry 4/04/1650 'Mr Archebald Campbels wyffe'.

101 'Barras n 2', in *A Dictionary of the Older Scottish Tongue (up to 1700)*, accessed 7 June 2023, https://dsl.ac.uk/entry/dost/barras_n_2.

102 'Barrow, n.4', in *OED Online* (Oxford University Press), accessed 19 April 2023, <https://www.oed.com/view/Entry/250994>.

103 'Barrow, n.4'; 'Old English—an Overview', Oxford English Dictionary, 16 August 2012, <https://public.oed.com/blog/old-english-an-overview/>.

that “barrow” had remained in use in 17th century Scotland, and that it be found in an account book. The account book also mentions 9 “pair[s] of Balin Bodies”, two of them with “stomachers” – a triangle-shaped piece worn behind lacings or pinned down on the chest.¹⁰⁴ “Bodies” would refer to any garment covering the upper-body, including undergarments referred to as “pairs of stays” latter in the century.¹⁰⁵ French clothing items imported from France are less numerous than English ones, as well as less elaborate than some English items. The opposite can be observed concerning accessories, which are also far more varied in the French account. Of the 288 items from London, 97% are gloves, 2,5% are garment accessories and 0,5% are head coverings.¹⁰⁶ In the French account, gloves represent only 6,5% of the 374 items, while head coverings reach 40%, garment accessories reach 51,5%, the final 2% covering hair and face accessories.¹⁰⁷ Gloves are a striking example. Though London imports cover a greater variety of ‘types of gloves’, French ones are aesthetically more diverse, with coloured linings and, almost systematically, embellishments of varied types such as “galloun”, “fringe”, “perling”, “rubens” and “dantel”.¹⁰⁸ Besides, they are almost all lined with black or red silks and the embellishments are either made of gold and silver or are of black colour, except one with “cullort rubens”.¹⁰⁹ As seen above, such materials and dyes were expensive and increased the value of objects. Concerning non-textile accessories, none are accounted for in the 1650 account book, while the 1647 account book does record many such items, with jewellery in particular.¹¹⁰

Despite the few rich capes, bodies and hoods, which account for less than 10% of clothing items, few other imports from London, except hose, are made of expensive fabric.¹¹¹ Although both have a bonnet made of velvet, the 1647 account book also has head coverings made of silks and/or more expensive wool – as suggested in the *Dictionnaire Universel* –: vigogne.¹¹² More strikingly, maybe, French imports have a greater ostentatious dimension. They are centred around items which enhance an ensemble, which make it more fashionable. A cravat does not keep you warm, a scarf does. A wool cap keeps you as warm as a castor or vigogne hat, but it is not as fine and expensive. Objectively, rings and earrings have no

104‘NRS, GD18/2482/1’, entries for 4/04/1650 & 15; ‘Stomacher, n.1’, in *OED Online* (Oxford University Press), accessed 20 April 2023, <https://www.oed.com/view/Entry/190742>.

105‘Body, n.II.4.C’, in *OED Online* (Oxford University Press), accessed 20 April 2023, <https://www.oed.com/view/Entry/20934>; ‘Stay, n.2’, in *OED Online* (Oxford University Press), accessed 21 May 2023, <https://www.oed.com/view/Entry/189407>.

106‘NRS, GD18/2482/1’, pp.7-17,33 & 38 + entries 8/04/1650 ‘John Andersone’, 03/01/1649.

107‘NRS, GD18/2483’, pp.21,23-4,28,30-2 & 39.

108‘NRS, GD18/2482/1’, pp.7-17 & entry 8/04/1650; ‘NRS, GD18/2483’, p.21.

109‘NRS, GD18/2483’, p.21.

110‘NRS, GD18/2483’, pp.20,22-5,37-8 & 42.

111‘NRS, GD18/2482/1’, pp.7 & entries 4/04/1650, p.7 to entry 8/04/1650.

112‘NRS, GD18/2482/1’, entry 4/04/1650 ‘Mr Archebald Campbels wyffe’; ‘NRS, GD18/2483’, pp.23 & 31.

practical use and are only adornments – with all the symbolic dimension it implies. A pair of gloves is simply nicer if embellished with rich trimmings, but likely to be more readily damaged than plain leather gloves. The ‘fashionable’ aspect of goods imported from France in John Clerk of Penicuik’s account book is to be considered in a context of France, and more particularly Paris, developing as centre for European fashion. The capital was becoming a place of consumption for the upper class, including royalty through the growing number of shops and the importance shopkeepers, merchants and retailers put on specialising and being able to offer products resulting from manufacturing skills.¹¹³ Though studies emphasise this reputation of Paris for the 18th century, it was already the case as from the 1670s.¹¹⁴ Even before the beginning of the reign of Louis XIV and his politics of glory, Paris benefited from other European capital losing their momentum, and its influential middle class. This Parisian excitement launched new practices regarding dress, and was crucial to the success of Colbert’s policy.¹¹⁵ The reputation of the Rue St Honoré for silk and fashionable dress retailing, has been highlighted for the 18th century.¹¹⁶ In the 1647 account book, John Clerk mentions the Rue St Honoré only once.¹¹⁷ Yet the Rue St Denis comes up many a time for the purchase of such items, therefore establishing the existence of a similar phenomenon in the 17th century.¹¹⁸

The fashionable and luxurious dimension of French imports is made even more striking when looking at dress-making materials. First, the London account lists fewer entries: 64 for haberdashery and 22 for fabric yardage, while the French account reaches 88 and 53 respectively.¹¹⁹ The gap widens when comparing the actual quantities of materials. Apart from trimmings, all sub-categories are in greater length or amount, except for ribbons, since the length of one piece of ribbon is never specified. For instance, the 1647 account records 47,5 ells of lace, 774 ells of fabric and 474 pieces of cord and lacing, while that from 1650 only account for 20 yards of lace, 108 ells of fabric and a lengthwise unspecified but single entry for lacing. Regardless which ells John Clerk used, there still was a considerable difference between the French and English imports. Though there is more trimming lengthwise, non are

113Carolyn Sargentson, *Merchants and Luxury Markets: The Marchands Merciers of Eighteenth-Century Paris*, Victoria and Albert Museum Studies in the History of Art and Design (London: Victoria & Albert Museum, 1996), p.1.

114Thépaut-Cabasset, ‘A Glittering Reputation: Gaultier’s Retailing Innovations in Seventeenth-Century Paris.’, p.169.

115Jacques Ruppert et al., *Le costume français*, Tout l’art Encyclopédie (Paris: Flammarion, 1996), p.83-4.

116Sargentson, *Merchants and Luxury Markets*, p.2.

117‘NRS, GD18/2483’, p.22.

118‘NRS, GD18/2483’, pp.23,25,28,30 & 41.

119‘NRS, GD18/2482/1’, pp.7,15,17-8 & 38, entries for 10/02/1649, 04/04/1650, 28/07/50, 31/01/49, 8/04/1650 & 16/02/1649.

made of gold and/or silver. French ones, however are; and if not, they are made of “fyne cloth”.¹²⁰ Gold and silver are also found for lacing.¹²¹ The colour palette regarding ribbons is more diverse in the 1650 account than the 1647 one, while that for fabric is quite similar.¹²² Yet, French black fabrics amount to at least 240ells, all fibres considered, whereas those purchased in London hardly exceed 25 ells.¹²³ Moreover, fabrics acquired in France are almost equally spread between silks and woollens, unlike those from London which are mostly wools (minimum 65%).¹²⁴

Concerning leather based items, French and London exports are completely different. While the former are mainly made up of raw materials and items of luggage, the latter are almost entirely composed of shoes of different sorts – for children, for women, boots and “pantons” (a Scottish word for a slipper or soft shoe), etc. - and different colours – yellow, black and red.¹²⁵ The presence of leather goods in both accounts reflect the importance of the craft for the economy of both countries. In England, leather was one of the most important industries. It was the fourth largest employment provider, with major production centers. London, its main center, already employed three thousand shoemakers in the beginning of the 17th century.¹²⁶ In France, tanneries were found in almost all towns, some specialising in glove manufacturing, other being home to royal manufactories treating leather coming from Morocco, hence the “maroquin” items found in John Clerk’s 1647 account book, and overall leather items.¹²⁷ Finally, very few elements of décor are found in the 1650 account book, which only mentions table cloths and cots – mostly of serge. French imports, however, were mostly very specific items such as the “bed of drap de Sceau” (d’Usseau) or made of tapestry, which corresponds with the wide development of tapestry manufactories – the *Manufacture des Gobelins* and that of Bauvais in particular – by Colbert, and the numerous instances of tapestry imports found in other sources.¹²⁸

120‘NRS, GD18/2483’, pp.24-7 & 38.

121‘NRS, GD18/2483’, p.31.

122‘NRS, GD18/2482/1’, pp.7-38, entries 28/07/1650, 03/01/1649 & 16/02/1649; ‘NRS, GD18/2483’, pp.23-9, 31-5, 37-9 & 42.

123‘NRS, GD18/2483’, pp.27,29,33 & 38; ‘NRS, GD18/2482/1’, p.7 & entry 4/04/1650 ‘commission for the house of my mother’.

124‘NRS, GD18/2483’, pp.25-9,32-3,35 & 38-9; ‘NRS, GD18/2482/1’, pp.7-15.

125‘NRS, GD18/2483’, pp.23-6 & 34; ‘NRS, GD18/2482/1’, pp.7 & 15, entries 04/04/1650 & 04/04/1650 ‘Mr Archebald Campbels wyffe’; ‘Pantan, n.’, in *OED Online* (Oxford University Press), accessed 19 April 2023, <https://www.oed.com/view/Entry/137046>.

126L. A. Clarkson, ‘The Organization of the English Leather Industry in the Late Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries’, *The Economic History Review* 13, no. 2 (1960): pp.245-6, <https://doi.org/10.2307/2591181>.

127Paul Delsalle, *La France industrielle aux XVIe, XVIIe, XVIIIe siècles*, Synthèse [sigma] histoire (Gap: Ophrys, 1993), pp.36-7.

128‘NRS, GD18/2483’, pp.32,35 & 42; Fabienne Joubert, Amaury Lefébure, and Pascal-François Bertrand, *Histoire de la tapisserie: en Europe, du Moyen âge à nos jours* (Paris: Flammarion, 1995), pp.148-68; Smout, ‘Making and Trading Dress and Décor in Seventeenth-Century Scotland’, p.431.

• The Blackwoods' business

Account books of merchants involved in mercantile exchanges with France other than John Clerk of Penicuik's have been preserved. The Blackwoods are some of them, and they seem to have conducted trading activities of such kind over several decades of the later 17th century.¹²⁹ The two accounts I consulted cover the years between 1666 and 1688. The earliest one records the purchase made to foreign merchants during the years 1666-81.¹³⁰ The second contains the commissions, and covers the years 1681-88.¹³¹ Unlike John Clerk's accounts, the Blackwoods' show evidence of trading activities not reduced to one single country for a few years, but business being conducted with three countries simultaneously: France, England and Holland.¹³² This is no surprise, for, as S. Talbott highlighted in her PhD, it was common practice for Scottish merchants to diversify their providers and investments, for profits as much as safeguard in case of political upheavals.¹³³ But how do the French and Dutch imports compare? Although their overall imports focus on dress and textile like John Clerks', their imports from France were less diversified, focusing mainly on silks – such as taffeta, tabby, satin and lustring –, lace – “paris point band”, “point of Ledun” – and a few accessories – “castor hatts”.¹³⁴ A ‘point’ is a “lace named after the (actual, supposed, or original) place of manufacture”, such as “point de France”.¹³⁵ A few mentions of “Shalune searge” (serge de Chalon), “baize” – a coarse woollen fabric with a long nap¹³⁶–, “fans”, “Silver & Gold boan lace” and “wheat lace” are also recorded. Dutch imports, are also textile centred but mainly consist of length of fabric, “taffeta” in particular, as well as “holland” and “lining” fabric.¹³⁷ Besides, the colour pallet is more varied for the French fabrics, with “skarlet”, “pink”, “lemond”, “vermillon”, “yellow”, “clarit” etc., and black remaining the most purchased colour – commissions being no exception to the phenomenon.¹³⁸ It is also worth noting that the commissions recorded in the 1681-88 account do align with John Clerk's, as they comprise

129‘NRS, RH15/148’, see accounts Oct.1699-July 1700 & 1697; ‘NRS, GD1/564/2’; ‘NRS, GD1/564/4’.

130‘NRS, GD1/564/2’.

131‘NRS, GD1/564/4’.

132‘NRS, GD1/564/2’.

133Talbot, ‘An Alliance Ended?’, pp. 73-76 & 120.

134‘NRS, GD1/564/2’ see for example entries ‘At Rouan the 13th August 1674’ & ‘At Rouan the 26th Appryle 1675’.

135‘Point, n.³’, in *OED Online*, accessed 23 January 2024, https://www.oed.com/dictionary/point_n3?tab=meaning_and_use#29391569.

136‘Baize’, in *OED Online*, accessed 11 January 2024, https://www.oed.com/dictionary/baize_n?tab=meaning_and_use#29149269; nap: “The rough layer of projecting threads or fibres on the surface of a woollen or other textile fabric.” ‘Nap’, in *OED Online*, accessed 11 January 2024, https://www.oed.com/dictionary/nap_n2?tab=meaning_and_use#35313120.

137‘NRS, GD1/564/2’.

138‘NRS, GD1/564/2’, see entries between ‘6th July 1666’ & ‘18th Juny 1667’; ‘NRS, GD1/564/4’, see the 1881 entries for ‘Mr John Duncane’ and the ‘Laird of Ardmillan’ in particular.

silk fabric, ribbons and legwear. Yet the origin of these goods is not specified.¹³⁹ The content of the second account book suggest that to answer their clients' demand, they purchased French goods.¹⁴⁰ The fact that they did not write the origin of the goods could mean that the clients did not care about their fabrics or dress items coming from one specific country. There is, however, too little evidence to consider this interpretation as fact.

Looking at the whole account, the number of entries for French and Dutch imports are rather balanced. Yet, clear differences can be observed. The Dutch imports are quite diverse in terms of suppliers. The Blackwoods had quite a few different ones based in different towns. They however favoured two suppliers for French goods: "John Grouler & Stephen Ernault" based in "Rouan", and a "Robert Lairmont".¹⁴¹ Although they did not put all their eggs in one basket, the Blackwoods more heavily relied on their trading business with France. The Dutch imports were mostly comprised between 500 and 2000 livres. For instance, they bought 2,017 livres, 9 solds worth of mostly textile merchandise to "Peter Rogiers in Amsterdam" 1st June 1675 and paid 668 livres, 3 solds to "Nicolaes Longespee in Vaerlem" three days later. French imports, however, were easily above 2,000 livres, as exemplified by the 2,998 livres, 9 deniers worth of goods – including black silk lace – they bought from Robert Lairmont on the 4th of December; or the more impressive purchase made the 29th of May 1677 to John Grouler and Stephen Ernault reaching 8,188 livres, 2 solds, 10 deniers.¹⁴²

• "Colbertisme", demand, and Scottish merchants in between

The reason why silks and silk items, lace, and valuable textiles more generally speaking, were exported from France, and to be found in Scottish merchants' account books, is directly linked to changes in national production. The 17th century was a turning point for French textile production. Different sectors were already implanted on national territory in the mid-century, such as silk in the region of Tours and Lyon, tapestry in many towns such as Paris or Aubusson, and lace in the Normandy region.¹⁴³ Some manufacturing centres had known or were going through conversions, such as Nîmes, where the collapse of cloth manufacturing was soon replaced by hosiery.¹⁴⁴ On this foundation, Colbert launched a grand

139'NRS, GD1/564/4'.

140'NRS, GD1/564/2'.

141'NRS, GD1/564/2'.

142'NRS, GD1/564/2'.

143Delsalle, *La France industrielle aux XVIe, XVIIe, XVIIIe siècles*, pp.55-6; Joubert, Lefébure, and Bertrand, *Histoire de la tapisserie*, p.100; Levey, *Lace*, p.26.

144Michel Nassiet, *La France au XVIIe siècle: société, politique, cultures*, Belin sup Histoire (Paris: Belin, 2006), pp.42-3.

project of economic growth which relied on a mercantilist doctrine: hoarding wealth while spending as little as possible. In practice, it meant a reversal of the import-export balance, i.e. reaching a positive balance of trade through protectionist measures, monopolies and, most importantly, the large-scale development of high quality manufacturing.¹⁴⁵ Lyon was extensively developed, for Colbert's intention was to overtake Italy regarding fabric production, silk in particular, but more generally, he aimed at inciting national consumption and foreign trade.¹⁴⁶ The overall success of Colbert's enterprise has been heavily nuanced especially in regards to the two decades following his death, which was among others characterised by the decrease of exports of textile manufactures, silk, lace and tapestry leading the way.¹⁴⁷ Yet, its impact on European trade cannot be neglected, as well as the success of some centres such as Alençon or Sedan for lace, and Lyon, the silk production of which tripled between 1661 and 1690.¹⁴⁸ The improvement of France's economic situation by the 1680s heavily relied on textiles, which represented 81% of the overall goods exported at the end of the reign of Louis XIV.¹⁴⁹

Under Louis XIV, foreign policy was defined by the constant assertion and reinforcement of glory and power. It was sought through alliances, military campaigns, commerce and diplomacy.¹⁵⁰ Just as important, cultural influence was also exploited in this quest for influence and "magnificence", and was seen as a necessary element of state expansion, even prior to Louis XIV's personal reign and Colbert's enterprises.¹⁵¹ Textiles were a key diplomatic tool, as the recurrent presents from Louis XIV to members of European courts highlight.¹⁵² By developing silk manufacturing and dominating European productions, Colbert enabled the spread of French designs, and, to a greater extent, of French fashion. There was demand from a clientele who was aware of and following fashion trends.¹⁵³ The

145Guy Saupin, *La France à l'époque moderne*, 4e édition., Collection U Histoire (Paris: Armand Colin, 2020).p.37

146John Styles, 'Fashion and Innovation in Early Modern Europe', in *Fashioning the Early Modern: Dress, Textiles, and Innovation in Europe, 1500-1800*, ed. Evelyn S. Welch, First Edition., Pasold Studies in Textile History 18 (Oxford: University Press, 2017), pp.44-5.

147Lebrun, *Le 17e siècle*, pp.352-3.

148Paul-M. Bondonio, 'Colbert et l'Industrie de la Dentelle: Le "Point de France" à Reims et à Sedan d'après des documents inédits', *Revue d'histoire économique et sociale* 13, no. 4 (1925): 367-408; Nassiet, *La France au XVIIe siècle*, p.43.

149Lebrun, *Le 17e siècle*; Nassiet, *La France au XVIIe siècle*, p.48.

150Lebrun, *Le 17e siècle* see "Chapitre9: Louis XIV et l'Europe de 1661 à 1688", pp.287-314.

151Henry C. Clark, *Compass of Society: Commerce and Absolutism in Old-Regime France* (Lanham, Md. ; Plymouth: Lexington Books, 2007), pp.20-8.

152Maria João Ferreira et al., 'Les Textiles à La Période Moderne: Circulation, Échanges et Mondialisation: Une Discussion Entre Maria João Ferreira, Liza Oliver et Corinne Thépaut-Cabasset, Menée Par Maria Ludovica Rosati', *Perspective (Paris. 2006)*, no. 1 (2016): pp.23-4, <https://doi.org/10.4000/perspective.6287>.

153Philippa Scott, *Le livre de la soie*, trans. Juraver Patricia (Paris: Impr. nationale éd, 1993).p.168

importance of innovation, described above, was, of course, an important aspect in this dynamic of cultural influence.¹⁵⁴ Despite the English government's attempts to thwart the import of French silks by the end of the 17th century, French fashion had already taken roots in a growing number of social strata whose demand for such products grew, so much so that French silks were imported regardless of prohibition via illegal imports.¹⁵⁵

The Scottish elite was no stranger to Europe's cultural developments and fashion trends, and was strongly influenced by the French capital.¹⁵⁶ In that context, Scotland's imports of French textiles and items of dress directly participated in Colbert's strategy of state expansion, beyond the sheer increase of France's national wealth. Considering this Scottish involvement as an underlying continuity of the Auld Alliance would be over-interpreting the actual motivation behind the phenomenon and inventing a political motive to primarily mercantile motivations. Yet, Scottish merchants, through their imports of the symbolically powerful and economically innovative commodity of luxurious textile, were key intermediaries in the export of French fashion. They were, therefore, key intermediaries for the French cultural influence which would persist and, at least partially, shape the standards and symbolism of dress in Scotland during the 17th century.

While France was reinforcing its monarchical power and its place on the European chessboard through its textile manufactures, waging commercial war with legislations on textile imports and the promotion of exports, as well as a strategy of soft-power via fashion trends, Scotland also took part in European textile trade.¹⁵⁷ Yet, its own production specialised on rough linen and woollen cloths, which was consumed in Scotland but also exported, including to France. Scotland did not produce silks nor finer cloth, hence its imports from abroad.¹⁵⁸ Its lace production would not begin until the second half of the 18th century.¹⁵⁹ Despite being Scotland's closest neighbour, England was not favoured for the import of silks. To begin with, England only managed to successfully develop a silk industry by the end of the 17th century, though attempts had been made since the first decades under the Scottish King James VI and I. Imports of silk grew throughout the century motivated by the growing consumption of silk products and the need for raw silk to establish an English silk industry. In spite of attempts, mulberry trees on which silk worms feed never managed to grow, which imposed the import of raw silk from abroad – Virginia in particular – to produce fabric and

154Scott, p.184.

155Scott, p.208.

156Hayward, *Stuart Style*, p.10.

157Nassiet, *La France au XVIIe siècle*, pp.39-48 & 176.

158Smout, 'Making and Trading Dress and Décor in Seventeenth-Century Scotland', p.426.

159Levey, *Lace*, p.61.

threads in England. By the end of the century, imports of raw silk into England represented up to 29% of total value of import.¹⁶⁰ Moreover, England had a less developed dying industry. While Colbert was establishing restrictions and regulations on dying manufactures, in the mean time as he encouraged the scientific developments of dying techniques – which the *Academie des Sciences* conducted –, England had just stopped to rely on Holland to dye its cloth and began a transfer of skills from foreigners.¹⁶¹ While England was struggling with both silk making and dying processes, France was successfully developing the two, hence the latter being a favoured commercial partner of Scotland for silks.

At the same time, a complex and proactive network of Scottish merchants was established in France, who had access to silks both produced and woven in France, which they could directly export back home.¹⁶² Spread throughout the country and connected to Scotland, as well as intersecting with one another's network, these merchants were opportunist and knew how to adapt and make profit through the export of French goods, John Clerk of Penicuik being a perfect example.¹⁶³ Besides, they benefited from exemptions and privileges. In 1659, for instance, all foreign vessels trading to France had to pay a duty of fifty 'sous', but Scots were exempted. Although Colbert put an end to these exemptions in 1663, Scottish merchants kept asking for a renewal of privileges. The content of these privileges were not always clear for merchants and officials from both countries, often for lack of documents, which led to uneven enforcement. S.Talbott shows that even after Colbert's policies, "the actual terms seem not to have been as important as their [the merchants'] belief in an enduring Alliance", and favoured Scottish trade in and with France.¹⁶⁴ Wine often comes up in works dealing with Franco-Scottish trade, but textile did play an important role in the merchants' success.¹⁶⁵ As previously stated, textiles were the most important commodity for France's export, since it ensured its economic growth. John Clerk's 1647 account book reflects this importance. Scotland's lack of fine et valuable textile manufacturing, due to specialisation in coarse fabrics, paired with an active network of Scottish merchants who had found a profitable ground in France could only have led to important imports of fabrics, lace,

160Linda Levy Peck, 'Creating a Silk Industry in Seventeenth-Century England', *Shakespeare Studies* (0582-9399) 28 (January 2000): 225. pp.225-7

161Robinson, *A History of Dyed Textiles: Dyes, Fibres, Painted Bark, Starch Resist, Discharge, Tie-Dye, Further Sources for Research*, pp.31-2.

162Talbot, 'An Alliance Ended?', p.120.

163Talbot, 'An Alliance Ended?' See 'Chapter 3: This individual interest and that of the nation are opposed: Merchants and Commercial Networks', pp.83-120.

164Talbot, pp.56-9.

165Smout, *Scottish Trade on the Eve of Union*, 169–71; Talbot, 'An Alliance Ended?', 73–76.

trimmings, dress embellishments of all sorts, etc., which Scotland itself lacked in its own production.

PART II/ “This I am certain there was never anything yett of the kind so good in Scotland”: Shopping and Showing.¹

Now that an overview of what goods were imported from France and the context of their production and exchange have been established, the question of how they reached Scotland is to be addressed. The difference between what goods were imported depending on how they reached Scotland is also considered. As referenced several times above, the organisation of Franco-Scottish trade in the seventeenth-century, and of Scottish merchants' networks in France in particular, has been widely and in great detail examined by S. Talbott in her PhD thesis.² The intent here is to take a different approach and consider consumers in the analysis. Textile trade, like any trade, is of course developed and shaped by what is available in terms of material and technology, how it can circulate, its cost but also by its consumption potential, i.e., market. It is, therefore, important to look at textile imports within Scotland's social context, for as it has been previously established, textile products imported from France were expensive and leaning towards luxury. To understand these imports, we must look at who were the consumers, and why they purchased these textiles and items of dress. The analysis which follows is mainly based on two sets of documents. First, a selection of accounts and memoranda produced by John Clerk of Penicuik, between 1647 and 1649 ; second, another selection of accounts, this time from the Earl of Breadalbane on his sons' expenses while in Paris between 1678 and 1680.³ These two sets are interesting in that they enable us to cover a wider section of the century, but also because they were made with different intents and by different types of people. John Clerk's documents were made in a business frame, and record commercial transactions he made as a merchant. His aim was to make money and he was engaged in a continuous mercantile occupation. On the other hand, the Earl of Breadalbane's documents are records of personal consumption held by a Scot who was not in France on trading business but travelling. The expenses recorded are therefore exceptional, i.e. a once-in-a-lifetime experience, and were recorded to keep track of the budget.

1 'NRS, GD40/2/18/2/19'.

2 Talbott, 'An Alliance Ended?', chap. 3 (pp.83-120).

3 'NRS, GD40/2/18/1'; 'NRS, GD18/2381'; 'NRS, GD112/54', a selection from sections 7,9,10 & 13 (see bibliography).

2.1 Commissions to Merchants and Purchase from Relatives

The importance of commissions concerning the import of French goods to Scotland has been highlighted by S. Talbott.⁴ This practice in regard to John Clerk of Penicuik's remaining documents is also verified concerning textile and items of dress. As mentioned above, the restrained amount of documents used for this analysis do not allow for a global and precise comprehension of commissions concerning the commodities on which this study focuses. Yet we can already observe that two types of commissions were placed: goods and garments made by a tailor – and/or seamstress. Concerning the former, several orders of that sort placed to John Clerk are recorded in an account book containing commissions and purchases covering the years 1636-49. Though the front page of the account book reads “Accompts skrols & divers memoirs: Begun At my returne fra france to Scotland which wes on the 8th day off Marche 1647”, the commissions to John Clerk do not specify whether they are for goods from France, England or anywhere else.⁵ The important amount of hose recorded could suggest imports from England/London: the comparative analysis of the 1647 account book in France and that of 1650 in London showed a massive import of hose from London, but only a rare few mentions of such items in the French account. However, two other criteria lead me to think that these commissions would have been fulfilled through French imports. First, they begin in 1647, the same year of the French account book, which also corresponds to the year following John Clerk's return from France to Scotland. By that time, his network was widely established in France: he knew with whom to work, were to purchase and what he could find.⁶ Second, there are many mentions of goods found only the 1647 account– but not in the London one –, such as “cordevaus”, “demi-castor” hats, “Drap de Berrie”, the latter being a specifically French product.⁷

The goods commissioned through John Clerk which are not tailored garments are very similar in types to those found in the 1647 account book. Accessories encompass mostly leather gloves along with a few head covers like “castor hatt” and “hatt bands”.⁸ Some items of haberdashery also appear such as silk lacing, satin roses some pearling and lace.⁹ Clothes are however better represented compared to the account book, with numerous pairs of hose –

4 Talbott, ‘An Alliance Ended?’, p.68.

5 ‘NRS, GD18/2381’.

6 Talbott, ‘An Alliance Ended?’, pt. I, chap. 3/ ‘this individual interest and that of the nation are opposed: Merchants and Commercial Networks.

7 ‘NRS, GD18/2381’, sec. 30 May 1649, 22 March 1647.

8 ‘NRS, GD18/2381’, sec. 21 Juny 1649, 30 May 1649, 15 jully 1649, 20 May 1649, 2 October 1649, 22 march 1647.

9 ‘NRS, GD18/2381’, sec. Juny 1649, 10 August 1649 Wenlistown, 14 August 1649, 2 October 1649; ‘NRS, GD18/2483’, p.27.

some made of silk –, a cloak and a “chemisette de Satin Rouge brodée D'or” (a red satin shirt embroidered with gold).¹⁰ Fabric yardage mentions are rare and only silk.¹¹ Some items which were not in the 1647 account book are found as commissions, such as shoes. The Earl of Lothian commissioned “1 pair off boots & 1 pair off shoes from Mr Twidy” in May 1644 and twelve pairs of boots in January 1646, while, in the commission memoranda, two pairs of pantons and a pair of yellow shoes are recorded.¹² Leather based and luggage items are well represented with several cases and skins.¹³ The commissions also comprise more unique items every now and then, such as a “parasole de Thoille Cirée” (waxed fabric umbrella), “6 fyne russie Leather chyres”, and a “peice off Arras tapesserie”.¹⁴

Though most commissions are made of common independent items, one of the commissions encountered in John Clerk's account stands out. On November 9th 1649, the Earl of Lothian commissioned several materials and items to make up an interior ensemble made of a bed and eight chairs.¹⁵ In addition to the wood and chairs, it comprises: a piece of tapestry, 1 drap de d'Usseau for the bed, a “pallias of harden cloth”, 11 bukram “couverturs” for the 8 chaires, the “couvert of the bed” with a “gray dyed french Lining cloth”, 4 “poms” covered with cloth and lace, 2 pillow covers, a “courtin” for the head of the bed – i.e. a bed curtain – , a large blanket and a table cloth of drap de Sceau with a silk fringe, and 11 drap de Sceau “couverturs” mounted with silk fringe for the chaires.¹⁶ Such commissions were probably not that uncommon, for a few years earlier, an expensive commission was placed for “la garniture d'un carrosse” (the furnishing of a carriage).¹⁷ Though the bill was produced by André Portsins for Robert Murray, a merchant in Paris, I have no evidence on whose behalf that order was made, although other letters and accounts dated from the same time – spring 1644 – mention a “Lord Hadinton” and an “Earl of Balsloughs”.¹⁸ If the materials purchased

10 ‘NRS, GD18/2381’, sec. Lord Murray (undated), 22 March 1647, 15 July 1649, 30 May 1649, 7 Juny 1649, 8 August 1649, 7 August 1649, 10 August 1649, Hacket (undated), 27 October 1649); ‘Account of Commissions Entrusted to John Clerk of Penicuik, Papers of the Kerr Family, Marquises of Lothian, GD40/2/18/1/20’ (1647-1649), NRS.

11 ‘NRS, GD18/2381’, sec. Elizabeth Warwith (undated); ‘NRS, GD18/2483’, p.27.

12 ‘NRS, GD18/2381’, sec. Lord Murray (undated), 10 August Wenlistown; ‘Account of Commissions Entrusted to John Clerk of Penicuik, Papers of the Kerr Family, Marquises of Lothian, GD40/2/18/1/1’ (1647-1649), NRS; ‘Account of Commissions Entrusted to John Clerk of Penicuik, Papers of the Kerr Family, Marquises of Lothian, GD40/2/18/1/3’ (1647-1649), NRS.

13 ‘NRS, GD18/2381’, sec. 30 May 1649 Earl Batcleuch, Lord Murray, 12 July 1649, 16 July 1649, 24 July 1649, 10 August 1649 Wenlistown.

14 ‘NRS, GD40/2/18/1/20’; ‘NRS, GD18/2381’, sec. 18 September 1649, 14 August 1649.

15 ‘Account of Commissions Entrusted to John Clerk of Penicuik, Papers of the Kerr Family, Marquises of Lothian, GD40/2/18/1/7’ (1647-1649), NRS.

16 ‘NRS, GD40/2/18/1/7’.

17 ‘Miscellaneous Legal Papers and Letters of the Montague-Douglas-Scott Family, Dukes of Buccleuch, GD224/925/51’ (1644-1645), fol. 40, NRS.

18 ‘NRS, GD224/925/51’, fols 32, 33, 37.

are a clear sign of the luxurious nature of the commission, the 1535 livres, 16 solds they cost make it even more obvious. The bill describes all the materials and reads as follows:

“[...] deux aul $\frac{1}{4}$ de crespine pour les banier [bannière] du Carrosse e trois cartiers de plus petite pour limperial e vingt et une aul de frange de trois doigts et trente huit aul de frange de trois doigts et trente huit aul de mollet¹⁹ pour mettre aux Rideaux et au carosse. Huit aul de mollet double a quine aul de mollei sans loup a trant neuf aul de passiment a la haute lisse de [?] fassoy pour charamer le carosse le tout d’or & de Millay fesant ensemble deux Cent quinze once deux gros et Vingt cordons garny de quarante houpe coquille d’or de Millay et Soye Rouge [?] fesant ensemble avec douze houpe pour la tete à couverture des chevaux [...]et une cordon d’or fault et Soye Rouge Cramoisy pour fermer les carosse pesant soixante six once.”²⁰

Tailored items sometimes come up among commissions. In May 1647, James Movet, a tailor in Paris, was commissioned by John Clerk to make a coat.²¹ The receipt lists the materials he used, as well as “the making of the coat”.²² Similar mentions, “for making of the clock [cloak]” are found in the 1647 account book, but specify no name for either a client or a tailor.²³ A more impressive commission to a tailor in Paris was made by Lord Lothian for Lady Lothian in 1673, which he describes in his letter as:

“an Manteau de fame or platted gown made by the Queens Tailore of white Sattin painted with the pensil and lustring²⁴ of Lemon, [...] with counterfeit from upon the sleeves, [...]worne with black Lynings, but I know your [haviour?] eid it otherways, and it was much approved by the Taylour who says the Queen of France hath non frisher nor fashionable of the kynd”²⁵

Along with this gown, he sent enough white satin for her to have a similar gown made, two cotton night gowns and a purple gown with “counterfit Emeraulds Stones for the sleeves”.²⁶ The analysis above teaches us that the items commissioned were spread on a wide spectrum: specific, yet more ordinary items were commissioned, along with less recurrent, but more expensive, orders which were great displays of fashion and style. The Earl of Lothian’s commission, as well as other instances found in John Clerk’s documents, show that French textile-based elements of décor were not left out and were sought by the Scottish elite. Though most of the items commissioned correlate the observations of the 1647 account book, the letters and commission memoranda also reveal that commissions, both through a merchant

19 See “mollet” in glossary

20 ‘NRS, GD224/925/51’, fol. 40.

21 ‘NRS, GD18/2484/3’.

22 ‘NRS, GD18/2484/3’.

23 ‘NRS, GD18/2483’, p.27.

24 ‘A glossy silk fabric.’, ‘Lustring’, in *OED Online* (Oxford University Press), accessed 11 January 2024, https://www.oed.com/dictionary/lustring_n1?tab=meaning_and_use#38742223.

25 ‘NRS, GD40/2/18/2/19’.

26 ‘NRS, GD40/2/18/2/19’.

and ones relatives, enabled imports of personalised and more elaborate items of dress and décor.

2.2 What Better Place to Get French Goods than France Itself?

• Bringing home knowledge ... and a new wardrobe

Going abroad to see the continent and study was common among the Scottish elite. France was a destination of choice for both Catholics and Protestants, because they could find new academies – in Paris in particular – where they would get an in depth education on academic subjects.²⁷ However, their education was not restricted to purely academic teachings such as maths, history, languages or scriptures, but included other skills like riding, dancing and music.²⁸ This ‘Grand Tour’ was an occasion to learn courtly skills and be introduced to court society.²⁹ For about a year and ten months, Lord Sinclair, the son of the Earl of Breadalbane, travelled in France, between Paris and Angers.³⁰ Many accounts of his disbursements there have remained.³¹ Between the end of May 1678 and the 1st July 1679, dress represented 16,2% of his overall expenses – i.e. 806 livres, 17 solds, 6 deniers out of 4,989 livres, 10 solds, 6 deniers –, most of the rest covering his travelling, lodging and education.³² Yet it is impossible to establish a precise inventory of his expenses because the accounts held by his father, and which kept track of the expenses are both overlapping and often only provide broad determination such as “for lining, points & laces, with several necessaries”.³³ However, some more specific ones are found, in addition to some bills, which provide a glimpse of what he bought during his stay. Three main types of expenses can be identified: tailors’ and shoemakers’ accounts, specific purchases and clothes maintenance.

Several bills from tailors have survived, from one in particular: Mr James Marshall, a tailor in Paris.³⁴ The latter seems to have been of British origin, as both his name and the perfect English with which he wrote his bills suggest. Most of his bills exceed 200 livres and

27 Brown, *Noble Society in Scotland*, pp.191-2.

28 Margaret F. Moore, ‘The Education of a Scottish Nobleman’s Sons in the Seventeenth Century: II. Study in France’, *The Scottish Historical Review* 31, no. 112 (1952): p.106.

29 Brown, *Noble Society in Scotland*, p.192.

30 ‘Account of Lord Sinclair’s Disbursements in France, Discharged 1680, GD112/54/13/3’ (1680), NRS.

31 ‘NRS, GD112/54’.

32 ‘Account of Lord Sinclair’s Disbursements in France between the Last of May 1678 and 1 July 1679, GD112/54/9/2’ (1678-1679), NRS.

33 ‘NRS, GD112/54/13/3’.

34 ‘French Tailoring and Apothecary Accounts for Lord Sinclair, GD112/54/10’ (1679-1680), NRS.

seem to have been for suits.³⁵ The most impressive one dates from the 28th October 1679 and was completely discharged the 4th March 1680, and amounts to 550livres.³⁶ Two suits, shirts, a hat and a camisole were commissioned. The first suit ensemble is particularly striking by its richness. It is made of a shirt, half drawers, stockings, scarlet breeches, a suit vest, a suit belt and a hat.³⁷ The whole amounted to 438 livres and 6 solds.³⁸ As for all the bills, the making on its own is far from covering the greatest part of the budget. A bill for a suit commissioned to that same tailor on 7th May 1679 reached 202 livres, 7 solds recorded 9 livres “for the making of the suite”.³⁹ For the former, the making amounted to 11 livres, i.e. 2% of the overall cost.⁴⁰ Neither the complexity of the suit nor the time required for its making, therefore, are the reason for its expensiveness. As the details of the bill shows, the materials were cause for the cost. The base fabrics are silks: satin for the breeches, taffeta for the vest, tabby for the belt. But the materials to blame for the cost were embellishments, which are systematically of gold and silver, with one scarlet exception.⁴¹ The ribbons, the buttons, and even the thread for the button holes were of gold and silver.⁴² One particular elements of comparison can help to explain the flamboyance of the suit. The buttons on their own cost 16 livres, i.e. 5 livres more than the making of the whole suit and seven times more than the buttons for the other suit previously mentioned.⁴³ Besides, the breeches and stockings are of scarlet colour. These materials match with the inventory of John Clerk’s purchases in France more than three decades before.

In addition to gowns commissioned to tailors, Lord Sinclair also purchased many items. His father’s accounts and some bills tell us that he purchased clothes, materials and leather items. Basic clothes, like Holland shirts, socks and night caps, stand alongside more elaborate ones, like night gowns, an embroidered beret and matching vest, and a chamber-cape of black velvet.⁴⁴ “Mourning cloaths at Mr Douls buryal” are also recorded.⁴⁵ Gloves are

35 ‘Account for Lord Sinclair from James Marshall, Tailor in Paris, GD112/54/10/5’ (7 May 1679), NRS; ‘Account for Lord Sinclair from James Marshall, Tailor in Paris, GD112/54/10/10’ (28 October 1679), NRS; ‘Account for Textile and Tailoring Items for Lord Sinclair’, GD112/54/10/13’ (undated), NRS.

36 ‘NRS, GD112/54/10/10’.

37 ‘A short-legged loose-fitting item of underwear’ ‘Drawers (Pair of Drawers)’, in *OED Online*, accessed 23 January 2024, https://www.oed.com/dictionary/drawer_n?tab=meaning_and_use#1347897670.

38 ‘NRS, GD112/54/10/10’.

39 ‘NRS, GD112/54/10/5’.

40 ‘NRS, GD112/54/10/10’.

41 ‘NRS, GD112/54/10/10’.

42 ‘NRS, GD112/54/10/10’.

43 ‘NRS, GD112/54/10/10’; ‘NRS, GD112/54/10/5’.

44 ‘Account of Lord Sinclair’s Disbursements in France between Mid-July 1678 and 1 March 1679, GD112/54/9/1’ (1678-1679), NRS; ‘NRS, GD112/54/9/2’; ‘Account of Lord Sinclair’s Disbursements before His Arrival in London GD112/54/9/3’ (1680), NRS; ‘NRS, GD112/54/13/3’.

45 ‘NRS, GD112/54/13/3’.

mentioned several times, sometimes with precision on their design – with “gold and green fringe” – or purpose – “ryding gloves” –, so do shoes which are found under “slippers”, “boots” or simply “shoes”.⁴⁶ Some lace-based items are recorded, like “cravattes au point de france” or “une paire de menchette de poin ala rayne tres fin”, along with items of haberdashery and fabrics, including ribbons, taffeta, batiste etc.⁴⁷ In addition to these were clothes and shoes for his servants. Mentions of the kind are found in both of Lord Sinclair’s father accounts as well as in some tailors’ bills.⁴⁸ A 1678 bill from a tailor in Angers reads “pour Le laquais de milort Jay fait un Justacore” (for milord’s servant I made a justaucorps).⁴⁹ In the father’s account are found mentions of a “ryding coat for the lacquay”, “other necessaries as also for the equipping of his laquy-first when he entered his lords service”, and “mending servants shoes”.⁵⁰ Maintenance was the third type of expense related to textile during the young noble’s stay in France. A few mentions of the kind are found in the father’s accounts, including a discharge “to the laundress for two months” and another one “for mending laces [probably lace, rather than lacing]”.⁵¹

The overall expenses of Lord Sinclair, son of the Earl of Breadalbane, show that the purchase to textile and items of dress when on a grand tour would have encompassed simple and readily necessary items of clothing and footwear, as well as elaborate ones made of rich fabrics and heavily embellished materials. Although it is unlikely Lord St Sinclair crossed the Channel without extra clothes, the bills and accounts of his travels reveal that a great part of his clothes were actually purchased on site. He stayed on the continent only a year and half, and purchased for hundreds of livres – maybe even exceeding a thousand livres – worth of clothes, shoes and accessories during his stay, meaning that he very likely returned home with more in his luggage than when he left. The expenses of a young Scottish noble in France would have directly contributed to French economic growth in the frame of textile and dress. First, because clothes were not a neglected category of the budget, the related purchases therefore directly benefited the French textile and leather industries and, by extension, the monarchy’s coffer. As important an aspect, their stay impacted textile related employment. French workers would have benefited from these young Scottish nobles’ expenses and lifestyle. To begin with, the commissions supported the craftsmanship business of tailors and

46 ‘NRS, GD112/54/9/1’; ‘NRS, GD112/54/9/2’; ‘NRS, GD112/54/9/3’; ‘NRS, GD112/54/13/3’.

47 ‘NRS, GD112/54/13/3’; ‘Account for Lord Sinclair from Mademoiselle Chafteau, GD112/54/7/4’ (4 November 1678), NRS.

48 ‘NRS, GD112/54/9/1’; ‘NRS, GD112/54/9/2’; ‘NRS, GD112/54/10/10’.

49 ‘Account for Lord Sinclair from a Tailor in Angers, GD112/54/7/5’ (1678), NRS.

50 ‘NRS, GD112/54/13/3’.

51 ‘NRS, GD112/54/9/1’; ‘NRS, GD112/54/9/3’; ‘Memoire Pour Monsieur Ramize, GD112/54/10/4’ (12 June 1679), NRS.

shoemakers. The mending, maintaining and washing of these clothes and shoes also provided work for French laundresses, seamstresses and seamsters.

• Shopping beyond The Channel

Young nobles going on a continental tour were not the only ones who took advantage of their travels in France to purchase clothes. At the same time Lord Sinclair was in Paris (1679), Lord William Hamilton, from the Douglas Hamilton family – branch of the Dukes of Hamilton –, was also in the city.⁵² His account of expenses in Holland and in France indicates that he too, purchased many items of dress.⁵³ Alongside expenses for his accommodation, books, candles, luggage, transportation etc. are found similar clothes.⁵⁴ Shoes – for himself and his son –, gloves and stockings are recorded several times.⁵⁵ Though no mention of commissions to tailors are found, he noted a 67 livres and 10 solds disbursement for “a new stand of cloathes”.⁵⁶ Evidence of Scots buying items of dress and textile in France – and Paris in particular – is found throughout the 17th century. In the Early 1610s, Lord Ross – from the Ross of Halkhead family, a branch of the Montgomerie family, Earls of Eglinton – was in the capital and made some purchase. An account to a tailor and indweller, John Jackson, covering the years 1612 to 1614 amounts to 935 livres, 16 solds, among which are found buttons, drap de berrie, satin fabric, taffeta, parsement, tabis, camlet, a hat, some galons etc. Some entries were specifically purchased for the making of a doublet.⁵⁷ A 1612 account from that same tailor also mentions “a doublett”.⁵⁸ An account of his disbursement includes entries going as high as 3000 French livres.⁵⁹ Though the document does not specify what these expenses were for, it shows, along with the accounts of other Scots, that when in France, they made substantial spendings – if not had a shopping spree. Two other examples, concerning furniture this time, are a 1614 account of disbursement in Paris, probably for Lord Ross, which covers

52 ‘NRS, GD406/1/6302’.

53 ‘NRS, GD406/1/6302’.

54 ‘NRS, GD406/1/6302’.

55 ‘NRS, GD406/1/6302’.

56 ‘NRS, GD406/1/6302’.

57 ‘Account of Apparel and Furnishing Due by Lord Ross to John Jackson, Tailor and Indweller in Paris, GD3/13/2/6’ (1612-1614), NRS.

58 ‘Accounts of Clothes and Furnishings Purchased by Lord Ross in Paris from John Jackson, Tailor There, GD3/13/2/3’ (1612), NRS.

59 ‘Information for Lady Ross Concerning Lord Ross’ Disbursements in Scotland and France, GD3/13/2/67’ (undated [17th century]), NRS.

“furniture & apparel”, and a 1643 account for Lord Ross for furnishing cloth, bought to a merchant in Toulouse.⁶⁰

It may be worth asking what was different between shopping French goods in France and shopping similar items in London for instance. Lord Lothian’s 1673 letter to Lady Lothian gives us a clue. He sent back a “Manteau de fame or platted gown made by the Queens Tailor”, concerning which he makes three interesting remarks. First: “it was much aprouved by the Taylour who says the Queen of France hath non frisher nor fashionable of the kind”.⁶¹ Though it is likely these words were motivated by marketing intentions from the tailor, rather than being the result of an objective analysis based on actual knowledge of Marie-Thérèse d’Autriche’s wardrobe, they show us how the Scots must have perceived French fashion. The Queen of France was considered as the reference concerning what is new and fashionable in dress. By not referring to the Queen consort of England, Scotland and Ireland, Catherine of Braganza, a hierarchy was clearly established. Both the tailor and Scotsman agreed on the superiority of French fashion, over British and very likely European fashion, which coincided with Paris concurrently becoming the capital of fashion.⁶² Lord Lothian adds that “this I am Sertain there was never anything yett of the kinde so good in Scotland”.⁶³ These words also coincide with the above argument, though suggest that something was lacking regarding Scottish offer. The adjective “good” is likely to refer to the quality of the garment., as he insists on the materials in the letter, as much as the craftsmanship behind the making of this gown; the description of the gown indeed reads as follow: “white satin painted with the pensil and lustring of lemon [?] with conterfit from upon the sleeves”.⁶⁴ Finally, giving his own opinion, Lord Lothian describes the gown as “pretty and not ordinar, and will be very becoming”.⁶⁵ Such a comment suggests a difference in style, something unique about this gown, yet corresponding to the dress standards of Lady Lothian’s rank. To buy a garment or have one made to measure in France, is a way to stand out in a crowd of similar gowns. What these consumers looked for, it seems, was a ‘French touch’ which would have enabled them to display their status, while putting themselves slightly apart – in a good way – from the other members of that same rank.

60 ‘Account of Money Spent on Clothing Etc for “Johne the Cuik” at Paris, London and Edinburgh, GD3/13/2/12’ (1614), NRS; ‘Copy Account of Furnishing Taken for Lord Ross from the Merchant at Toulouse (Toullous) Paid by Dr Ross for Cloth, GD3/13/2/1/9’ (1643), NRS.

61 ‘NRS, GD40/2/18/2/19’.

62 Sargentson, *Merchants and Luxury Markets*, p.1; Thépaut-Cabasset, ‘A Glittering Reputation: Gaultier’s Retailing Innovations in Seventeenth-Century Paris.’, p.169.

63 ‘NRS, GD40/2/18/2/19’.

64 ‘NRS, GD40/2/18/2/19’.

65 ‘NRS, GD40/2/18/2/19’.

Another set of sources confirms this singularity and superiority of French fashion. Many household accounts and bills from the Buccleuch family have survived. The family was no stranger to the purchase of French goods, either from Scottish merchants or French ones. For instance, Robert Murray, a merchant in Paris, sent several “castor hatts”, “perruques” and other goods during spring 1644.⁶⁶ In many of the documents, however, the origin of the goods purchased is not mentioned. A selection of accounts for cloth, materials and buttons between 1625 and 1629 gives us much information as to the types of fabrics and textiles – with velvet, satin or taffeta being mentioned –, but hardly ever a clue as to the origin the goods. The only exceptions are one entry for “black paris tebell [probably taby]” and one of “Spanis taffeta” suggest France and Spain as countries of origin.⁶⁷ Yet, a selection of accounts of disbursements stand out. On the 20th April 1663, the young Anna, Duchess of Buccleuch married James, Duke of Monmouth, Earl of Doncaster, and Baron Scott of Tindall. With this marriage she became the “greatest heiress in Scotland”.⁶⁸ This wedding, therefore, had to be a statement of wealth and power. Interestingly, the accounts of disbursements related to dress expenses for the months before and after the wedding do include a great number of references to French goods. In July 1662, she purchased “french bleu ribands”.⁶⁹ Four months latter, she purchased a “corded French scarf”.⁷⁰ In March and April 1663 – the month right before, and that of the wedding – she bought “french wedding garters”, “a rich french fan”, “two french purses”, “french trimmed gloves e ribands [...] e silver lace” as well as “a pair of pendants from a french woman”, along with “two suit of ribands and trimmed gloves to ze french woman.”⁷¹ The other goods along with they are found are listed without any sign of an origin – of purchase or fabrication – in neither the larger entries for date of disbursement, nor the entries of the individual goods.⁷² The fact that Anna of Buccleuch purchased French goods during the months surrounding her wedding and had it specified in the accounts suggests that their French quality had an importance: these goods were given a special value, be it financial, aesthetical, symbolical or all of them at the same time.

66 ‘NRS, GD224/925/51’, fols 32 & 37.

67 ‘Tradesmen’s Acccounts for Clothes, Material, Buttons, Etc, Supplied to Walter, 1st Earl of Buccleuch, GD224/393/7’ (1625-1629), fols 8 & 10 for French and Spanish mentions, NRS.

68 Paul, *The Scots Peerage*, p.237.

69 ‘Miscellaneous Papers of the Buccleuch Family, GD224/906/59’ (1652-1705), fol. 8, NRS.

70 ‘NRS, GD224/906/59’, fol. 5.

71 ‘NRS, GD224/906/59’, fol. 6.

72 ‘NRS, GD224/906/59’, fols 5–8.

2.3 A Question of Demand and Display

• On consumption

During the 18th century, a general movement of increasing consumption was observed throughout Europe. The new consumer behaviours and relation to goods it induced had, however, already emerged, if had not been formed, in the previous century. One reason behind this phenomenon was the growth of the middle ranks. Between the lower classes with few possessions and those who owned the land and titles was an important category of workers, which in the late 17th century accounted for half of British households. Among them were shopkeepers, merchants, craftsmen, professionals etc.⁷³ These middle ranks had money to spend – a lot of money in some cases. The vivid trading activity and, therefore, the greater accessibility to new and foreign kinds of goods, favoured this movement of growing consumption and good ownership.⁷⁴ Lorna Weatherhill has observed that possessions were more systematically recorded from 1725 onwards, leaving historians with much documentation testifying to this movement in regard to the 18th century, as M.Berg's research have shown.⁷⁵ Yet, it is clear that this phenomenon of increased consumption had started beforehand. Though many works highlight the increasing consumption of many different goods, textile seems to be rather left aside in the analysis, once again often simply mentioned or treated in very general terms – even more so for the 17th century. For instance, in the collection of essays *Consumers and Luxury: Consumer Culture in Europe 1650-1850*, only the chapter on colour touches on textiles.⁷⁶ The whole network of trade and the success of merchants described by S. Talbott would not have progressed and successfully endured through the decades of conflicts which scattered the second half of the 17th century without enough demand at home for the products imported. The lack of works produced by historians of consumption on the 17th century and textiles is paired with even fewer studies on the subject looking at Scotland. Founding works on European and British consumption such as M. Berg's and H. Clifford's are the perfect example of this void.⁷⁷ The only instance I encountered in such works is now clearly outdated. Relying on the works of historians prior to

73 Weatherill, *Consumer Behaviour and Material Culture in Britain*, pp.13-4; Stana Nenadic, 'Middle-Rank Consumers and Domestic Culture in Edinburgh and Glasgow 1720-1840', *Past & Present*, no. 145 (1994): p.123.

74 Nenadic, 'Middle-Rank Consumers and Domestic Culture in Edinburgh and Glasgow 1720-1840', p.123.

75 See Maxine Berg, 'New Commodities, Luxuries and Their Consumers in Eighteenth-Century England', in *Consumers and Luxury: Consumer Culture in Europe 1650-1850*, ed. Maxine Berg and Helen Clifford (Manchester: University Press, 1999).

76 Maxine Berg and Helen Clifford, 'Introduction', in *Consumers and Luxury: Consumer Culture in Europe 1650-1850*, ed. Maxine Berg and Helen Clifford (Manchester: University Press, 1999). pp.103-119

the 2000s and not on the more recent approach to Scottish trade and economy, these analyses maintain a biased perception of Scotland's actual consumption. In the second edition of *Consumer Behaviour and Material Culture in Britain 1660-1760*, the following statement is made about Scotland:

“In the late Seventeenth century it was economically backward, and famine was experienced, even in the lowlands and even among the respectable tenants. It is in this context that limited consumption of domestic goods (and clothing) should be seen.”⁷⁸

The development of consumption is considered to have started later than 1725. The elements discussed above lead to a different conclusion. So does M. Hayward's study of the Scottish male elite's fashion under the Stuarts which paints a radically different picture and shows both that Scotland's upper class was influential and well-off and that they were paying great attention to – and much money for – dress.⁷⁹ T. C. Smout's most recent publication aligns with this analysis and confirms that wealth motivated consumption, and that of textile in particular. The “insatiable demand for foreign textiles” was such that it strained on the national balance of trade, so much so that legislation was implemented to limit imports and boost national production, as in 1681, with an act prohibiting the import of clothings and cloths with few exceptions. These attempts were actually ineffective, as proved by their having been implemented several times.⁸⁰

Another factor which contributed to the overall growing consumption and affected textile trade in particular was that of fashion trends. In the 1660s-70 a new dynamic emerged: the annual fashion cycle. This new rhythm of fashion trends was a strategy launched by Jean Baptiste Colbert, Controller-general of Finances for Louis XIV between 1665-83 to boost French exports, promote French manufactures and compete on the European market. New products benefited from their novelty and could be sold at a higher price, while those of the previous cycle could be sold for less on a different market. This dynamics of periodicity encouraged consumption, and therefore imports – from France especially because it would define the fashion based on its own production. These trends spread across western Europe through periodicals and publications, in which they were systematically promoted.⁸¹ Given the great mobility of Scots during the Early Modern Period and the important network of Scottish

77 Maxine Berg and Helen Clifford, *Consumers and Luxury: Consumer Culture in Europe 1650-1850* (Manchester: University Press, 1999); Weatherill, *Consumer Behaviour and Material Culture in Britain*.

78 Weatherill, *Consumer Behaviour and Material Culture in Britain*.

79 Hayward, *Stuart Style*, pp.12-4.

80 Smout, ‘Making and Trading Dress and Décor in Seventeenth-Century Scotland’, pp.429-31.

81 Miller, ‘Making a Reputation from Innovation: Silk Designers in Lyon, 1660-1789’, pp.34-45.

merchants in France, it is very likely these prints both reached Scotland, and circulated among the courts of the successive Stuart kings.⁸²

• Rank consciousness

The content of the commissions to both John Clerk and the French tailors suggest that the goods were for people from the middle to upper ranks, which the names of John Clerk's customers and of the author of the above-mentioned letter confirm. Many of John Clerk's commissions are from people with a title: the "Earl of Murray", the "Earl of Batcleuch", "Laird Wachton", etc. Most women are recorded as 'Lady': "My Lady Eglingtown", "My Lady Casils" and "Lady Kilsyth".⁸³ Middle class people are also found, such as "Sir William grays Lady".⁸⁴ The so-called William Gray probably refers to John Clerk's soon-to-be father-in-law.⁸⁵ He often resorted to John Clerk to obtain goods from Paris.⁸⁶ The Blackwoods' commission account also records customers mainly from the nobility, as the entries for "Lady Katharine Murray", "Lord Barganie" or "Laird Ardmillan" exemplify for the year 1681.⁸⁷ The social composition of the Scottish consumers of French goods has been mentioned in the previous part. The rise of a financially successful middle rank triggered an increasing consumption of foreign and luxurious goods.⁸⁸ Though the middle rank was the main market for imported goods, the names mentioned above point towards another stratum: the nobility.⁸⁹ Keith M. Brown's research on early modern Scottish nobility has shown that this portion of the population was influential and wealthy, wealthier than in the previous century even.⁹⁰ This meant that they could afford such goods. Yet the financial capacity on its own does not suffice to explain the consumption of luxurious clothing and textile items. This consumption must be looked at in consideration of Scotland's societal structure. Though nobility was primarily characterised by its relation to land, through feudal titles, privileges, and lineage, lifestyle and expenses were also key elements of their identity.⁹¹ Rank consciousness was at the heart of

82 T. C. Smout, 'The Culture of Migration: Scots as Europeans 1500-1800', *History Workshop Journal*, no. 40 (1995): 108-17; Talbot, 'An Alliance Ended?', part 1, chapter 3, pp.83-120.

83 'NRS, GD18/2381'.

84 'NRS, GD18/2381'.

85 'Ante-Nuptial Marriage Contract between John Clerk, Merchant in Edinburgh, and Mary Gray, Fourth Daughter of Sir William Gray of Pittindrume? GD18/1861' (6 May 1647), NRS.

86 'Letters, Accounts and Bills of Exchange Relating to Sums Disbursed by John Clerk, Merchant in Paris, France, on Behalf of Sir William Gray of Pittendrum, GD18/2378' (1636-1646), NRS.

87 'NRS, GD1/564/4'.

88 Nenadic, 'Middle-Rank Consumers and Domestic Culture in Edinburgh and Glasgow 1720-1840', 123.

89 Weatherill, *Consumer Behaviour and Material Culture in Britain*, p.14.

90 Brown, *Noble Society in Scotland*, p.272-3.

91 Brown, pp.3-7 & 71.

Scottish society, and dress was an essential social marker.⁹² Consequently, the 1603 union which led to the creation of new titles, in addition to the rising middle ranks, made dress a ground of choice for social display and rivalry. While the middling ranks aspired to nobility, the latter sought to maintain its standards and remain a separate group.⁹³ This idea corresponds to what Bourdieu defined as “distinction”, and which he has characterised as a vertical differentiation, found and sought on an economic, social and cultural level through lifestyle. “Domination, holism, elitism and objectivism” are the four main characteristics of this concept, and are all found in the act of display through dress and décor.⁹⁴

Dress was motivated by imperatives and symbolism. Your degree of influence, your wealth, and the stability of your lineage was reflected through how you dressed.⁹⁵ A change in status would have impacted how one dressed.⁹⁶ Sumptuary laws legislated on rank markers and defined who could wear what. They had a double purpose: first, setting clear boundaries between ranks by allowing only specific categories of the population, i.e. royalty and nobility, to wear certain clothes, colours, etc., to ensure visible class distinction; second, they aimed at preventing imports of foreign textiles, which strained on the national balance of trade.⁹⁷ As Keith M. Brown pointed out, these laws actually encouraged lower ranks to break them to appear of a superior status, while “most nobles spend more on cloth than paid taxes” to distinguish themselves higher up and keep the hierarchy distinctly visible.⁹⁸ All these aspects are found behind the goods imported from France by John Clerk and the Blackwoods. The cost of lace, and reasons behind it, has been established earlier on. Being able to wear lace meant living according to a certain standard, and the more you could afford, the higher up the social scale you seemed. The type of lace worn also participated in this distinction. For instance, members of the royal family were particularly keen on gold and silver ones, because they had the value and luxury of lace, in addition to that of the precious metal which covered its threads. Besides, beyond its cost when purchased, lace was expensive to maintain because of its delicateness and of the price of soap, which was heavily taxed, and because it had to be replaced when too worn out.⁹⁹ Colours were also a key social marker, with red at the forefront.

92 Brown, p.9 & 83.

93 Brown, 71.

94 Hervé Glevarec, ‘La Distinction n’est Pas Une Différenciation’, *Recherches Sociologiques et Anthropologiques [En Ligne]*, no. 51–1 (2020): pp.39-40.

95 Hayward, *Stuart Style*, p.15; Brown, *Noble Society in Scotland*, pp.271-73.

96 Hayward, *Stuart Style*, p.32.

97 St Clair, *The Golden Thread*, p.143; Brown, *Noble Society in Scotland*, p.83.

98 Brown, *Noble Society in Scotland*, p.83.

99 St Clair, *The Golden Thread*, pp.142-45.

In the early modern period, red was the colour of royalty and nobility, with sumptuary laws ensuring it. Wearing red was a clear statement of power and superiority.¹⁰⁰

The textile and items of dress John Clerk brought back from France were not valuable only because they were expensive: they bore an immaterial value. All the red silks and pairs of hose, and the gold and silver ells of cordings had a “symbolic capital”.¹⁰¹ The Scottish nobility and aspiring middle ranks found in France the items necessary to exhibit their success and power, and place themselves on the scale of Scotland’s social hierarchy. This dynamic of rank consciousness and social display invites us to rethink the notion of ‘luxury’ when looking at French goods. From a material perspective these goods are ‘luxurious’ because they are expensive to produce and purchase, and because their proprieties are primarily aesthetical, rather than attached to durability. For the lower rank, such items would have been luxuries, in that they are not indispensable to their lives. The OED defines a luxury as “something which conduces to enjoyment or comfort in addition to what are accounted the necessaries of life. Hence, in later use, something which is desirable but not indispensable.”¹⁰² Luxury, and personal adornment in particular, had long been theorised and criticised by philosophers and Christian thinkers.¹⁰³ In the early modern period, conspicuous consumption was seen as a prerogative of the aristocracy, but to the limits of modesty imposed by the Christian doctrine. Luxury was seen as the trespassing of the prerogative and moral code.¹⁰⁴ Hobbes advocated political frugality and considered luxury as a threat to stability and order, and, therefore, considered that “all inordinate expense, as well in meats as in clothes, and universally in all things which are consumed with usage, [should be] forbidden.”¹⁰⁵ In the context of growing accessibility to foreign goods and the increasing blur of the boundary between the lower nobility and upper middle rank, the line between rank prerogatives and inordinate expenses had kept rising up. The more the middle rank displayed its wealth, all the more so did nobility. What was at stake among the middle rank and nobility was not just a question of ‘enjoyment’ and ‘comfort’: it was about their place in society, where they situated themselves and where they situated the others.¹⁰⁶ Owning such goods as garments made of expensive dyed fabrics and trims fell under rank requirements and expectations for nobility.

100Goggin, ‘The Extra-Ordinary Powers of Red in Eighteenth- and Nineteenth-Century English Needlework’, p.30.

101Berg, ‘New Commodities, Luxuries and Their Consumers in Eighteenth-Century England’, 64.

102‘Luxury, n.’, in *OED Online* (Oxford University Press), accessed 23 May 2023, <https://www.oed.com/view/Entry/111515>.

103Leslie Shaw, ‘The Problem of Luxury from Montaigne to The Encyclopedie’, n.d.

104Shaw, p.59.

105Thomas Hobbes, *De Cive, or, The Citizen* (New York, Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1642), chap. XIII, 14., <http://archive.org/details/deciveorcitizen00hobb>.

106Brown, *Noble Society in Scotland*, pp.9-13 & 271.

For the middle rank, it fell under respectability and success. To wear, own, and be able to afford such ‘luxurious’ items of dress and textiles items had to do with social expectations, because the difference between the standards of living, and the visible distinction it should imply, were seen as guarantee of the social order. Dress and identity were closely connected. As M. Hayward has shown, dress was a means of communicating the monarchy’s stability and wealth and for it to be visible and dignified; a sense of self-worth shared by the Scottish elite.¹⁰⁷ A similar dynamic would have happened outside the court, making the consumption of such items of dress a key component of nobile and upper class identity. Therefore, if French goods were luxuries, as in superfluous, for the majority of the population, it was not for the 1%, which Scottish nobility represented at the turn of the 16th century, and who intended to “control the honours system”.¹⁰⁸ And doing so implied dressing the part.¹⁰⁹ Superfluous and extravagant consumption was, of course, no stranger to 17th century Scottish upper ranks, and some went bankrupt because of their grandiose way of life.¹¹⁰ The pleasure this group derived from its high interest for fashion trends is a reality not to be ignored.¹¹¹ Yet the consumption of these ‘luxury’ goods must not be restricted to this aspect. Talking about ‘luxury’ as category of analysis for the commodities identified in this study remains useful and enables historians to differentiate patterns of consumption. Yet, it is important not to apply a modern bias to the term and consider the consumption of French ‘luxury’ goods by the Scottish upper class as solely motivated by conceited ostentation and/or to satisfy materialist desires, but consider comfort and aesthetic in connection with the wider social norms and expectations of early modern Scottish society.

• Sources limitations

The connections made in this part are the product of archive analysis of numerous and varied sources crossed with an extensive corpora of historical works linked to trade, consumption and social realities. Interpretations have been drawn from scattered evidence of exchanges of French goods and their purchase and manipulation by Scots. The gaps identified in the “historiographical approach” are cause for this need to resort to a web-like strategy to

107Hayward, *Stuart Style*, p.15 & pp.25–6.

108Brown, *Noble Society in Scotland*, pp.14 & 17.

109Hayward, *Stuart Style*, p.28; Brown, *Noble Society in Scotland*, p.83.

110Brown, *Noble Society in Scotland*, pp.80-1 & 273.

111Weatherill, *Consumer Behaviour and Material Culture in Britain*, p.16.

reach conclusions. It is however necessary to keep in mind that there still are gaps, and obstacles which this study has not managed to overcome.

As previously mentioned, the Blackwoods' commission account records the goods commissioned without their origins. This phenomenon is found in many other sources listing dress and textile-related goods. Among the family papers which have been preserved are found bills, receipts, accounts as well as inventories. Bills and receipts can give a hint as to the origin of the goods purchased, thanks to a date and place written or the language in which they were written. For instance, a document from the papers of James, 3rd Earl of Perth reads "Account Lord Drummot (Paris 1668)" and begins with "Monsieur le Comte de Drumond, Doit le 29e, Septembre 1668", which leaves no doubt as to where the "etoffe rayé de Soye" (striped silk fabric) or "grande dentelle po. Lepied" (large lace [for?] the foot) which follow came from.¹¹² The same can be said for a receipt from the 10th of May 1675 which reads: "Mr Alexander Brand Merchant in Edinburgh Oweth to James Alexander for the following goods in the caisses imballé & corded marked A.B. sent to m. John Scoucher by the kairts of the Messagerie of Rouen".¹¹³

The household inventories and accounts are less generous, and often only provide us with dates and lists of goods. Mentions of origin do appear, but very rarely, and not in all accounts. Though the Montgomerie Family, Earls of Eglinton, papers do contain bills made in Paris, many other household and personal papers are eloquent examples of the goods' origins not being mentioned.¹¹⁴ The accounts of disbursement very much remind us of John Clerk's account books. A bill from the "6 Oct 1657" contains, "2 dosen of ribon", "silk", "galloun", "a pair of stockings", "3 dosen of ribon", to quote only a few items from the list.¹¹⁵ An account from 1660 records "3 ells of luping", "an ell of sarg." [sergé?], or "36 ells of riben".¹¹⁶ Nothing in these lists, however, assuredly tells us that these goods are indeed French ones. The 1657 document also mentions "ane ell and a fre. Quarters of tafto".¹¹⁷ The "fre." could be an abbreviation for "French", which its use for taffeta and the surrounding goods also reminiscent of French exports found in John Clerk's account books could very well support.¹¹⁸ Yet, we are quickly faced with a major problem: it is an isolated instance, which, therefore, does not tell anything as to the other goods listed. This taffeta might indeed come from

¹¹²'NRS, GD160/180', fol. 8.

¹¹³'NRS, RH15/53/23'.

¹¹⁴'NRS, GD3/13/2/12'; 'Eglinton Muniments, Montgomerie Family, Earls of Eglinton: Household and Personal Papers, GD3/6/22' (17th century), NRS.

¹¹⁵'NRS, GD3/6/22', fol. 3.

¹¹⁶'NRS, GD3/6/22', fol. 6.

¹¹⁷'NRS, GD3/6/22', fol. 3.

¹¹⁸'NRS, GD18/2483'.

France, but the “silk stockings” along which it is found could be from Paris as much as London, not to mention that silk fabrics, including taffeta, and stockings were imported from other place, such as Holland and England, as the Blackwoods’ account books show.¹¹⁹

This elusiveness as to the origin of the goods is an obstacle to interpretation. Because these consumers did not record from where the goods they bought were, it is difficult to establish a clear link between France and Scotland as regards to dress, textile and leather exchanges, outside of the merchants’ sources.¹²⁰ It limits the identification of the extent to which French goods were part of the Scottish elite’s and middle rank’s daily life. No proportion of any kind can be established, which prevents us from knowing whether French goods were an occasional or regular purchase, or if they were preferred over similar materials and items made in other countries. Moreover, it is an obstacle to establishing a social portrait of those consuming these goods. The merchants’ accounts and a few bills and receipts provide us with names, but tracing back their identities is not always possible, and the time-period covered by these sources do not allow for a long-term analysis.¹²¹ Similar problems and obstacles to interpretation are found when looking at tailors’ accounts. To begin with, these accounts are scarce. But, more annoying is the fact that they too, hardly ever record the origin of the materials they use. A selection of accounts for materials recorded by James Nimmo, a tailor in Edinburgh, have survived. Out off the two thirds I was able to consult, the documents between 1696-1708 record only one instance of French fabric, along with rare mentions of “Spanish” and “Persian” fabrics.¹²² It is very likely that more of his fabrics and haberdashery items came from France, for Robert, Jim, and William Blackwood are identified as three of his suppliers, but the lack of further information prevents us from identifying to what extent the tailors’ business relied on French imports.¹²³ This also makes it difficult to know what the raw materials became once imported.

As to why the origin is that rarely mentioned, three possible interpretations lie before us. First, it could mean that the fact that a goods came from a specific place had no impact on their value. Yet, there is evidence of a French origin being a token of style and richness. For a consumer, it meant that they looked for a specific style or quality.¹²⁴ The second possibility, is that they knew where the textiles and items came from, and therefore did not feel the need to

119‘NRS, GD3/6/22’, fol. 3; ‘NRS, GD1/564/2’ in particular see entries for ‘30th Junny 1669’ & ‘7th Junny 1675’.

120The estate papers of the castlemilk family are a perfect example, ‘NLS, MS 8218’.

121see ‘NRS, GD18/2483’.

122‘NRS, RH15/148’.

123‘NRS, RH15/148’ see entries for Oct. 1699-July 1700 & 1697.

124‘NRS, GD40/2/18/2/19’; ‘NRS, GD150/3377’.

record it. Finally, it could be related to the types of sources and their authors not needing to record this information in these specific documents. The inventories are particularly compatible with this interpretation. These documents aimed at recording the belongings of families, less then their value: what mattered was what the family owned quantitatively.¹²⁵

¹²⁵Michael Pearce, 'Vanished Comforts: Locating Roles of Domestic Furnishings in Scotland 1500-1650' (Doctoral, University of Dundee, 2016), p.30, <https://discovery.dundee.ac.uk/ws/portalfiles/portal/8956204/MichaelPearce2016.pdf>.

PART III/ “Our Sovereign Lord, with Advice and consent of the Estate of Parliament, Doth strictly Prohibit and Forbid”: The Parliament as Arena for interests.¹

The business and family papers – may they be bills, receipts, or account books– give us great insight as to which goods were involved in Franco-Scottish trade when looking at dress, textile and décor. It also informs us as to who was involved in the exchanges – merchants, members of the textile professions and consumers. Yet, they have their limits. These documents very much served a pragmatic purpose: keeping track of expenses, listing commissions, having proof of payment or non-payment etc. They provide us with reliable quantitative and qualitative information, but are of little use when looking at discourses and subjectivity. Letters sometimes give us a glimpse of thoughts, such as the uniqueness Scots looked for in a French gown. The numerous French goods bought right before Anna Buccleuch’s wedding suggest that French goods were considered of high fashion and symbolic value.² But little more can be deduced. That is why looking at more subjectively tinted sources is useful, hence my interest for parliamentary papers. A piece of legislation always reflects the challenges, preoccupations and mindset of the time at which it is written. Parliaments are a real arena where views, interests and ideologies come face to face. An Act of Parliament, although it is announced under the names of “Our Sovereign Lady [or Lord]” and that of the “Estates of Parliament”, is always the result of debates between individuals from more or less different backgrounds and with different approaches to society and ongoing changes. The very fact that such or such topic becomes a subject for the drafting of a petition or an act of parliament tells us much about what was considered a problem or challenge, or how it was thought it could or should be overcome.

S. Talbott, in her PhD thesis, took a deep dive into legislations related to Franco-Scottish trade. She worked on both Scottish and French legislation, and focused her analysis on France’s place in Scottish trade in regards to European foreign trades, and the overall motivations – political, social and economic reasons – as to why laws regulating trade were enforced, as well as the privileges of Scottish merchants in France.³ My approach is quite different. First, the constraint of this study has led me to restrict the number of documents and

1 ‘NRS, PA7/17/1/92’.

2 ‘NRS, GD224/906/59’, fols 5–8.

3 Talbott, ‘An Alliance Ended?’, pp.26-62.

the timespan over which they spread. All the documents used in this analysis are parliamentary papers produced between 1682 and 1705, either by/for the Scottish parliament or the Privy Council. Another major difference is that the very subject of this study led me to only work on documents related to textile, leather and/or dress. The main difference between S. Talbott's work and mine, lies in our respective approach to legal papers. Her work is mainly centred around the types of legislation that were passed and the governments' motivations – French and Scottish – for their passing, with a precise dissection of the financial and economic aspects.⁴ If this study is also concerned with such aspects – legislative strategy in particular –, it also looks at discourse analysis. The importance of rhetoric is emphasised, with a focus on the arguments of different actors, the rhetorical devices they each use, from where they speak – are they wearing their members of the trading community's hats or their Scottish citizen's hats, for instance. It is less the achievements and effective results of these debates and legislations that I am interested in – for several historians have already done it – than the perception of those involved in or with the legislative apparatus and concerned with textile- and dress-related questions.⁵ To do so, this analysis will also integrate elements of moral and political philosophy, Hobbes' in particular. As explained in the introduction, this dissertation considers a few different types of parliamentary papers, mainly drafts of acts of parliament, overtures, petitions, representations, proposals, a memorial, an answer to a memorial, as well as a poem.

3.1 The Context of the Debate: Mercantilist Scotland

• A weakening economy

The 1690s were rough years for Scotland – to say the least. Christopher A. Whatley summarises this period as “a nation in crisis”.⁶ Three events hit the country and its people during the two decades prior to the Union of 1707 and weakened Scotland's economy:

4 Talbott, pp.26-62.

5 see Talbott, pp.26/62; Maria Hayward, ‘Outlandish Superfluities: Luxury and Clothing in Scottish and English Sumptuary Law from the Fourteenth to the Seventeenth Century’, in *The Right to Dress: Sumptuary Laws in a Global Perspective, c. 1200-1800*, ed. Giorgio Riello and Ulinka Rublack (Cambridge: University Press, 2019).

6 Christopher A. Whatley, *The Scots and The Union: Then and Now*, Second edition. (Edinburgh: University Press, 2014), p.152.

Famine, a failed colonial attempt known as the Darien Scheme, and European geopolitics heating up, and therefore impacting Scotland's trade.

Land was at the heart of Scotland's economy – the fact that 80% of the Scots lived and worked in the countryside in 1700 is a revealing figure –, and 17th century Scotland saw agriculture becoming increasingly important for its economy. To generate estate incomes nobles and lairds had their estates improved reorganising them, introducing new techniques and turning more systematically to commercialisation. Concurrently, demand for grain, cattle, skins and wool was rising.⁷ Scotland's confidence in its agriculture was such that the Corn Bounty Act was passed in 1695, instituting export bounties on grain.⁸ However, the country was hit by what has been called "the ill years" in the late 1690s.⁹ Europe went through a "Little Ice Age", which struck agriculture yields because of the successive harvest failures.¹⁰ The ever-decreasing price of grain, suddenly rose, given that prices were determined by demand, to a point which made many people unable to support themselves with their wages – prices went as high as twice their levels before the crisis.¹¹ The blow was felt even more harshly, since the previous years had been characterised by surplus of grain.¹² Grain represented more than 80% of a Scot's calories intake and was used to feed livestock. Consequently, cattle was either eaten for survival or died of illness, which in return weakened the cattle economy and participated in reducing the farmers' incomes.¹³ Many of those relying on the land, died or migrated.¹⁴ The Scottish population declined, and because much land was left unfarmed and livestock had greatly diminished, it took years to rebuild a viable agricultural economy.¹⁵

The Scottish coffers were also badly hit by the crisis. "Completely unprepared for the crisis", the government had attempted to bring relief but had neither the structural nor the financial means to do so.¹⁶ A succession of measures were implemented, constantly going back and forth according to whether the situation improved or not. Duties on grain imports – from Ireland in particular – were lifted in December 1695, to be instituted again in July 1697, lifted once more in 1698 and eventually be replaced by a complete ban of foreign grains

7 Whatley, pp.119-20.

8 Karen J. Cullen, *Famine in Scotland: The 'ill Years' of the 1690s*, Scottish Historical Review Monographs Series; No. 16 (Edinburgh: University Press, 2010), p.65.

9 Thomas Martin Devine, *The Scottish Nation, 1700-2000* (London: Penguin books, 2000), p.49.

10 Bowie, 'New Perspectives on Pre-Union Scotland', p.316; Devine, *The Scottish Nation, 1700-2000*, p.49.

11 Cullen, *Famine in Scotland*, pp.55 & 188.

12 Devine, *The Scottish Nation, 1700-2000*, p.49.

13 Cullen, *Famine in Scotland*, p.55.

14 Bowie, 'New Perspectives on Pre-Union Scotland', p.316.

15 Cullen, *Famine in Scotland*, p.190.

16 Cullen, p.189.

imports.¹⁷ In addition to the money spent for the purchase of grain, £50,000 in grain import duties were lost during the ill years. The famine also impacted the revenues from trade, both agrarian and not.¹⁸ Scotland had also developed its manufacturing production, but the crisis curtailed demand for manufactured goods.¹⁹ The episode had lasting consequences on Scotland's economy, which stagnated during the pre-union years, ruining all the progress made throughout the 17th century.²⁰

Scotland had tried to enter the playground of colonial conquest several times during the 17th century, but with little success: Nova Scotia had been “sacrificed” by Westminster on diplomatic grounds, Cape Breton had been taken by the French and Stuart Town by the Spaniards.²¹ The Darien Scheme aimed at rectifying this situation and placing Scotland on the map while restoring the nation's wealth. Situated in the isthmus of Panama, the colony was to be “the world's entrepot”.²² On the one hand, Scotland would have a foot in the Americas where it could mine for silver and gold using slave labour. On the other hand, because it would offer an alternative route to the Strait of Magellan and Cape Horn for other European merchants, it would be able to trade and collect duties, as it would become an indispensable place to stop on long journeys from Europe to the far East.²³ Moreover, Scotland would put an end to Spanish monopoly in the region and take its place. The expectations were high for a country who, unlike many other European countries, had struggled to establish itself as a colonial power because of its size, financial limitations and minority status in the Union of the Crowns.²⁴

The high hopes of 1698, both at home and in the colony, were rapidly crushed as obstacles accumulated. Despite the finding of a seemingly perfect spot for a harbour able to shelter 1,000 ships, the area was characterised by mangroves, rivers and swamps overflowing during the rainy season, a lack of permanent inland paths, making any settlement difficult.²⁵ The very beginning of the endeavour set the tone for the rest of the project: supplies and food

17 Cullen, pp.66-71.

18 Cullen, p.189.

19 Whatley, *The Scots and the Union*, pp.119-20; Devine, *The Scottish Nation, 1700-2000*, p.49.

20 Cullen, *Famine in Scotland*, p.190; Whatley, *The Scots and the Union*, p.127.

21 Sophie Jorrand, ‘From “the Doors of the Seas” to a Watery Debacle: The Sea, Scottish Colonization, and the Darien Scheme, 1696–1700’, *Études Écossaises*, no. 19 (1 April 2017): p.2, <https://doi.org/10.4000/etudesecossaises.1184>.

22 Stewart J. Brown and Christopher A. Whatley, *The Union of 1707: New Dimensions*, *Scottish Historical Review* ; v. 87. 2008 (Supplement) (Edinburgh: University Press for The Scottish Historical Review Trust, 2008), p.14.

23 Brown and Whatley, p.14; Jorrand, ‘From “the Doors of the Seas” to a Watery Debacle’, p.4.

24 Brown and Whatley, *The Union of 1707: New Dimensions*, p.14; Jorrand, ‘From “the Doors of the Seas” to a Watery Debacle’, p.2.

25 Jorrand, ‘From “the Doors of the Seas” to a Watery Debacle’, pp.6-7.

were lacking and arduously obtained, many fell sick, the abounding seafood could not be enjoyed for lack of appropriate tools, and reinforcements arrived once the colony had been deserted.²⁶ One could have believed the ships cursed, for over the two expeditions two were wrecked, two sank, one burnt, two were diverted from their course and had either barely escaped wreckage or had to be abandoned, one was preyed on by the Spaniards, and the French vessel entrusted with the news of the successful arrival went shipwrecked.²⁷ Nature was no sole cause for the disaster, as Spain attacked the Scottish settlements twice: in 1699, but without anyone to fight against as the place had already been deserted, and in 1700, which led to New Edinburgh surrendering.²⁸ Neither the Company of Scotland Trading to Africa and the Indies nor the people who sets sail to establish themselves in the colony were prepared enough or had enough resources to succeed in this strategically questionable endeavour. As this stirring venture for colonial respectability and economic success turned into a “watery debacle” as Sophie Jorrand describes it, Scotland lost between a sixth and a quarter of its liquid capital, and its colonial company collapsed.²⁹

During the last decades of the 17th century, tensions between European powers were rising and war was raging. With England and France as main belligerents during the Nine Years’ War and the War of Spanish Succession – which together shook Europe over 25 years –, Scotland could only be affected. European nations resorted to tariffs and prohibition to finance their military endeavours, protect their national economy, and weaken their enemies.³⁰ By enforcing tariffs and bans, they aimed at limiting imports of manufactured goods, in favour of raw materials and develop a market for less costly substitutes.³¹ During the Nine Years’ War (1688-1697) William of Orange and Mary princess consort of Orange, together newly entrusted with the crown of England and Scotland, had many economic policies implemented: embargoes were voted with the French Trade Bill in 1690 and the Trade with France Prohibition Act in 1693; in 1689 shipping to France and Ireland was targeted, a piece of legislation renewed in 1691. However, these restrictions impacted English trade rather than Scotland’s.³² The War of Spanish Succession (1701-1714), would have a greater impact as the implementing of impeding foreign trade legislation escalated. In September 1701 France

26 Jorrand, p.8-9.

27 Jorrand, pp.10-11.

28 Jorrand, p.7.

29 Jorrand, p.4; Devine, *The Scottish Nation, 1700-2000*, pp.5 & 49.

30 Devine, *The Scottish Nation, 1700-2000*, p.49 & 53.

31 DuPlessis, *Transitions to Capitalism in Early Modern Europe*, p.283.

32 Talbott, ‘An Alliance Ended?’, pp.182 & 189.

responded to British pre-war imposition on alcohols with an *arrêt* targetting imports of manufactures from England. One month after the declaration of war in May 1702, new duties were raised on French goods, to which France retaliated by prohibiting trade with all those considered as enemies – Scotland included.³³ Privateering was another obstacle to trade. French and Irish goods and ships were made targets by the crown, as much as the French targeted those from England and Scotland.³⁴

Although these limitations were not systematically and strictly implemented, merchants were still impeded, and prohibitions, tariffs and the overall conflict still hit the linen, coal and salt exports vital to Scottish economy.³⁵ However, Scotland had neither the military nor the financial strength to fight back.³⁶ As Scottish manufacturers and traders were faced with increasingly important tariff walls, England, which represented approximately half of Scotland's imports at the end of the century, joined in and passed legislations attacking its northern neighbour's trade.³⁷ From the Glorious Revolution onwards, English privateering-like behaviour had been carried out by naval vessels, which interfered with, attacked and seized Scottish shippings – though the English Navy actually helped protecting Scottish merchants against French privateers during the War of Spanish Succession.³⁸ To prevent Scotland from joining the French side during the Nine Years' War, restrictions on commerce, communication and emigration north of the border were enforced. Scotland was “dragged into the conflict”.³⁹ In 1698, tariffs on Scottish linens were raised.⁴⁰ This English position towards Scotland was however not new. In 1651, the first Navigation Act of this century was implemented by the Commonwealth government and restricted imports from Asia, Africa and the Americas to ships flying the English flag and departing from England, as well as the import and export of several fishes. When re-enacted in 1660, the act enumerated colonial goods which could only be imported directly from the country of origin. The Navigation Act of 1664 prohibited direct export to English colonies by European countries. Despite sharing the same monarch, Scotland was considered a foreign country, and had to abide by the acts.⁴¹ If Charles II and James VII & II granted the right to trade with English colonies to some individual Scottish

33 Talbott, p.190.

34 Talbott, pp.189 & 192.

35 Talbott, pp.192; Christopher A. Whatley, ‘Economic Causes and Consequences of the Union of 1707: A Survey’, *The Scottish Historical Review* 68, no. 186 (1989): p.152.

36 Devine, *The Scottish Nation, 1700-2000*, p.53.

37 Whatley, ‘Economic Causes and Consequences of the Union of 1707’, p.151.

38 Brown and Whatley, *The Union of 1707: New Dimensions*, p.3; Whatley, *The Scots and the Union*, p.5.

39 Talbott, ‘An Alliance Ended?’, pp.181-2.

40 Bowie, ‘New Perspectives on Pre-Union Scotland’, p.316.

41 ‘Navigation Acts’, in *Encyclopaedia Britannica (Online)* (Encyclopaedia Britannica, Inc., 10 October 2023), <https://www.britannica.com/event/Navigation-Acts>.

merchants, many went around legislation regardless, in particular by relying on their networks or simply by breaking the law.⁴²

Despite the protectionist measures and the complicated position in which Scotland was in its triangular relationship with England and France, the latter remained a trading partner of choice.⁴³ Yet, the fact that luxurious goods were imported from France did not mean that Scotland had the resources to afford it, and the restricting measures implemented neither benefited the state through duties, nor actually managed to limit these imports in favour of new domestic productions in replacement.⁴⁴ Christopher A. Whatley analyses the large extent to which this type of goods was imported as a revealing sign of the under-developed state in which the country was, as did not manage to develop a competing industry and relied on imports to obtain these goods.⁴⁵ Although Scotland found alternative markets in the Baltic which alleviated the consequences of the French prohibitions, it did not suffice to recover from the 50%-loss on exports to England between 1698 and 1706. It is also worth noticing that these obstacles to Scottish trade and development coincide with the failure of the Drarian Scheme.⁴⁶

• Towards the Union

The “hammer blows” that the 1690s had delivered Scotland meant that the country, which was then deprived of most of the economic growth and development it had managed to build up, had to find a way to grow back its strength.⁴⁷ Although the 1707 union as we know it was not Scotland’s first choice to do so, it was eventually believed to be the only sensible alternative. The revival of a tightly-woven alliance with France was definitely not one of them, as will be shown below.

The thought of a possible renewal of the Auld Alliance, was nevertheless not unfounded. In fact some advocates for a redefinition of Scotland’s relation to England did support a (re)union with France.⁴⁸ To begin with, Scotland was always considered as a separate nation-state by France during the Nine Years’ War. Some punitive/protectionist measures implemented by Louis XIV did not include Scotland, but targeted England: during

42 Whatley, *The Scots and the Union*, pp.7 & 52.

43 Bowie, ‘New Perspectives on Pre-Union Scotland’, p.316.

44 Brown and Whatley, *The Union of 1707: New Dimensions*, p.12; Whatley, *The Scots and the Union*, p.8.

45 Whatley, *The Scots and the Union*, p.8.

46 Whatley, ‘Economic Causes and Consequences of the Union of 1707’, p.152.

47 Whatley, *The Scots and the Union*, p.128.

48 Brown and Whatley, *The Union of 1707: New Dimensions*, p.8.

the conflict, port legislation did not mention Scotland, Scots were granted passports to come to France regardless of legislation, and records of prizes sometimes mentioned no Scottish ship as opposed to English ones.⁴⁹ As seen above, William of Orange was concurrently implementing legislation which directly aimed at preventing its northern subjects from siding with his arch enemy.⁵⁰ Besides, Louis XIV was showing support to the Scots through the Jacobites. He backed James VII & II for the throne of England during the Glorious Revolution, and offered him and his son shelter.⁵¹ And though he took it back in 1697 for peace purposes, it was given again to his son later, whom he even recognised as James VIII & III in 1701.⁵² Yet, French support to the Jacobites was limited. In 1703-4 the promises of help were not fulfilled as the Allies – England, Austria, and the Dutch Republic, together also known as “the Grand Alliance” – started to take the upper hand in the war.⁵³ There were other reasons why many did not wish Scotland to turn to France to regain its strength.⁵⁴ As will be detailed anon, a key feature of the debate surrounding the union was the protection of Scottish law and parliament.⁵⁵ Given that France was an absolute monarchy, the extent to which Louis XIV would intrude into Scottish affairs in case of a closer relationship was feared. As he was annexing the Spanish Empire and land in the Mediterranean region, Flanders and America, a “near-obsessive fear – felt by many Scots as well as in England – of French universal monarchy” was felt.⁵⁶ An anti-absolutism and sometimes anti-French sentiment was found in many pamphlets describing the French monarch as a despot ruling by means of centralised bureaucracy, military conquest, and disregarding representative institutions. This feeling was even stronger since James VII & II’s attempts at a similar regime had left bitter memories.⁵⁷

Another key theme in this debate over alliance was religion. In 1701, when France and Spain entered into armed conflict with the “Grand Alliance”, it was first a succession problem. After the death of Carlos II, Spain was left without an heir. Both France and Austria had a legitimate successor to offer. Despite the 1698 and 1700 attempts at peaceful negotiations and the eventual signing of partition treaties under the moderation of England,

49 Talbott, ‘An Alliance Ended?’, pp.187-9.

50 Talbott, p.181-2.

51 Paul Langford, ‘The Eighteenth Century, 1688-1789’, in *The Oxford History of Britain*, ed. Kennet Owen Morgan, Revised edition. (Oxford New York, N.Y. Auckland [etc.: Oxford University Press, 2010), p.403; Whatley, *The Scots and the Union*, p.2.

52 Langford, ‘The Eighteenth Century, 1688-1789’, p.403; Whatley, *The Scots and the Union*, p.3.

53 Christopher Storrs, ‘The Union of 1707 and the War of Spanish Succession’, in *The Union of 1707: New Dimensions*, ed. Stewart J. Brown and Christopher A. Whatley, *Scottish Historical Review* ; v. 87. 2008 (Supplement) (Edinburgh: University Press for The Scottish Historical Review Trust, 2008), p.34.

54 Brown and Whatley, *The Union of 1707: New Dimensions*, p.7.

55 Colin Kidd, *Union and Unionisms: Political Thought in Scotland, 1500-2000* (Cambridge: University Press, 2008), pp.68-9.

56 Whatley, *The Scots and the Union*, p.4.

57 Storrs, ‘The Union of 1707 and the War of Spanish Succession’, p.36-7.

France chose not to honour them in favour of the original will of the deceased monarch.⁵⁸ Behind this antagonism within the House of Habsburg, lied a deeper European fracture: faith. The Reformation had allowed Protestantism to spread more widely and had become a defining element of many states, while on the other hand Catholicism was still important, and the counter-reformation participated in a similar movement of absorption of the church's prerogatives by the state.⁵⁹ Thanks to the Spanish succession crisis, France was becoming the main catholic power in Europe.⁶⁰ Had France won the war and placed one of his own on the Spanish throne, a gigantic Catholic Bourbon empire would have been formed, with incredible resources to dominate the geopolitical chessboard. At the time, The French kingdom comprised twenty million people, which gave it superior troop headcounts and represented four times England's demography and nine times that of the Low Countries. In addition to this, it had two hundred ships in its navy, while Scotland only had three.⁶¹ Concurrently in Scotland, a "nation-wide crusade" was taking place against episcopalians in order to bring Presbyterian conformity: in the years 1688-9, a quarter of ministers lost their positions in church offices and universities, and in 1695, blasphemy became a capital offence.⁶² The Presbyterian church used its wide system of courts and assemblies to be an authoritative power in the regulation of faith and to make sure that orthodoxy in both beliefs and behaviours was respected. This movement was motivated by the idea that the "great decay of piety" which had pervaded Scottish society was the result of Episcopalian domination prior to the Glorious Revolution.⁶³ The 1670s in particular were remembered as the "Killing Times" by Presbyterians, who had been persecuted with governmental support, and had gone through a purge within offices, had had their estates forfeited, had suffered judicial torture etc., with many having been sent to prison and banished to the colonies or forced into exile.⁶⁴ Since Louis XIV had been crowned, anti-protestants policies had been accumulating: first the *dragonnades* troops had to convert to Catholicism, the Edict of Nantes was overthrown, the Protestants from the neighbouring region of Piedmont were forced to leave etc.⁶⁵ Such religious policies combined with aggressive expansionism, were enough in themselves to dissuade the Scots from a closer relationship with France, but the prospect of that same

58 Storrs, p.32.

59 Eric Suiere, *Pouvoir et religion en Europe, XVIe-XVIIIe siècle* (Malakoff: Armand Colin, 2018), pp.159-72.

60 François Crouzet, *Britain, France and International Commerce: From Louis XIV to Victoria*, Collected Studies ; CS542 (Aldershot: Variorum, 1996), p.viii.

61 Whatley, *The Scots and the Union*, p.4.

62 Devine, *The Scottish Nation, 1700-2000*, p.64.

63 Devine, p.65.

64 Brown and Whatley, *The Union of 1707: New Dimensions*, p.8-9.

65 Storrs, 'The Union of 1707 and the War of Spanish Succession', pp.35-6.

project backed up by the military and financial power of a merged empire with Spain could only make them reject it entirely. Although Scotland was “not without the capacity to trouble others”, its state was “fragile, limited and increasingly unable to guarantee its own security”.⁶⁶ Who knows what would have happened to Scotland, its parliament, its Church and its people had a closer relationship with France been chosen over a Union with England.

Trade was both at the heart of the union question and also adding to the list of arguments against a closer relationship with France. As previously seen, Scotland was badly hit by several crisis during the 1690s. Its finances were so low, that it could not provide for its army, civil establishment, or government: “an independent Scotland was not financially viable.”⁶⁷ Most importantly, trade with its southern neighbour was vital to maintaining its balance of trade. England represented half of its linen and cattle exports, the two main commodities in its trade.⁶⁸ Scotland was increasingly relying on English market, so much so that by 1700, England was the only country with which it had surplus.⁶⁹ Besides, France had banned Scotland’s woollen cloth in 1690.⁷⁰ It is also worth noting that the members of the growing lesser nobility, who was greatly preoccupied by its interest in increasing the benefits from their estates, would be particularly affected. And since they were part of the landed-interest which dominated parliament, this argument had weight.⁷¹ Scotland had also developed its manufacturing sector, and that of textile in particular: by the end of the 17th century, plaids and woollen stockings were Scotland’s second most profitable trade in 1701, and thousands of pounds had been invested in workshops, which sprung up here and there – like the silk-dye manufactory in Glasgow – and employed between 500 and 1500 people each.⁷² Taking the risk of loosing its main market, especially after the crisis of the last decade, was unimaginable.

All the reasons cited above, explain why France was not seen as the ally offering the best solution for Scotland to regain its strength, and why England was. Yet, this does not mean that Scotland threw itself on England’s mercy. There were many grudges between the two

66 Brown and Whatley, *The Union of 1707: New Dimensions*, p.6; Laura A. M. Stewart, ‘The “Rise” of the State?’, in *The Oxford Handbook of Modern Scottish History*, ed. Thomas Martin Devine and Jenny Wormald, Oxford Handbooks (Oxford [etc.: Oxford University Press, 2012), p.233.

67 C.A. Whatley citing & quoting L.A. Murray in ‘Economic Causes and Consequences of the Union of 1707’, p.157.

68 Brown and Whatley, *The Union of 1707: New Dimensions*, p.20.

69 Whatley, ‘Economic Causes and Consequences of the Union of 1707’, p.151; Bowie, ‘New Perspectives on Pre-Union Scotland’, p.315; Whatley, *The Scots and the Union*, p.173.

70 Whatley, *The Scots and the Union*, p.173.

71 Whatley, pp.115-6.

72 Whatley, pp.127-8.

nations which made the union happen in 1707 and the way it did. Indeed, there was a strong anti-English sentiment. To begin with, there was England's habit of interfering in Scottish affairs. As previously mentioned, Scottish merchants were harassed on trade routes, but most importantly, the English did not support the Darien expedition.⁷³ Although, mismanagement was to blame for such disaster, the Scots believed that England saw a rival in the imperial race in the Caribbean, especially given that many merchants lead very successful businesses in the colonies.⁷⁴ Petitions from the African Company directly accused the King of having betrayed the Darien Colony. That of March 1700 gathered 21,000 signatures.⁷⁵ Fears of interference was also found concerning the independence of parliament. With the Restoration in 1660, Ireland, Scotland and England had distinct parliaments, but because they were all royal institutions and shared the same monarch, they were no proper counterweights and their meetings were at the monarch's will.⁷⁶ Under Queen Anne, England indeed interfered to a greater extent with Scottish affairs.⁷⁷ The Parliament had become the heart of Scotland's political existence. As Clare Jackson puts it:

“The considerable extent to which conceptions of the nation, as embodied in an ancient free and independent Scots regnum, commanded consensus. [...] The Scots Parliament increasingly came to be regarded as the main institutional focus for national loyalties after the Williamite Revolution of 1689.”⁷⁸

In 1703, Fletcher of Saltoun addressed his fellow members of Parliament defending a reshaping of the regal union to set boundaries to a regal system, which, he maintained, was de facto favouring pro-English policies.⁷⁹ During the years before the Act of Union, the Country Party, which advocated a redefinition of the regal union into a federal one, had numerous pamphlets and discourses printed using the Darien Incident to attack the ongoing Anglo-Scottish relationship. They described Scottish kings as “prisoners of English interests”, and defended lesser powers to the Crown in favour of the Scottish Parliament.⁸⁰ Many Scots feared that with a further union Scotland would become a prey to England's imperial tendencies, with, in case of conflict of interest, England's wishes being systematically

73 Brown and Whatley, *The Union of 1707: New Dimensions*, p.3.

74 Kidd, *Union and Unionisms*, p.65; Whatley, *The Scots and the Union*, p.7.

75 Karin Bowie, ‘Public Opinion, Popular Politics and the Union of 1707’, *Scottish Historical Review* 82, no. 214 (2003): p.232, <https://doi.org/10.3366/shr.2003.82.2.226>.

76 Michael J. Braddick, *The Oxford Handbook of the English Revolution*, Oxford Handbooks (Oxford: University Press, 2015), p.243.

77 Brown and Whatley, *The Union of 1707: New Dimensions*, p.7.

78 Clare Jackson, ‘Conceptions of Nationhood in the Anglo-Scottish Union Debates of 1707’, in *The Union of 1707: New Dimensions*, ed. Stewart J. Brown and Christopher A. Whatley, *Scottish Historical Review*; v. 87. 2008 (Supplement) (Edinburgh: University Press for The Scottish Historical Review Trust, 2008), p.64.

79 Kidd, *Union and Unionisms*, pp.70-1.

80 Bowie, ‘Public Opinion, Popular Politics and the Union of 1707’, pp.229 & 231.

granted.⁸¹ Although the Glorious Revolution had reinforced the status and prerogatives of parliament – parliamentary involvement becoming an obligation to the monarch –, the English declared war against the French in 1702 without consulting the Scottish Parliament.⁸² The increasing involvement of England in European relations coupled with an absentee monarch participated in fuelling the grudge.⁸³ This claim for a return of sovereignty was also found in the tension around succession. Since there was no natural heir to succeed to Queen Anne and that a very legitimate successor could therefore be the catholic Old Pretender, England passed the Act of Settlement to ensure that the succession would be Protestant, and that the deposed Catholic Stuart line would not be restored.⁸⁴ It was decided that Sophia, the electress of Hanover, being of Stuart descent, cousin to Charles II and, most importantly, Protestant, would take over. Yet, it was imposed on the Scottish parliament which retaliated with the Act of Security in 1703 establishing that Scotland would decide who would wear the Crown of Scotland.⁸⁵ Pushing for its vision of succession, England targeted Scotland's weak point to get the upper hand and resorted to "what was in effect economic blackmail".⁸⁶ Westminster threatened to pass the Alien Act in 1705, which would have built a massive tariff wall on black cattle, coal and linen. If implemented, "Scottish trade would have been decapitated".⁸⁷

The fact that England had to come to such a move does not mean that the Scots were completely opposed to the idea of a renewed relationship between the two countries. Truth be told, there had been several attempts at redefining it since 1603. James VI & I had wished to do so, and even changed his title from 'King of England, Scotland, France and Ireland' to 'King of Great Britain'.⁸⁸ Two proposals for a commercial union failed in 1668 and 1669.⁸⁹ With the Glorious Revolution, voices defending an incorporating union rose, leading to commissioners being appointed by the crown to decree on the matter.⁹⁰ All these attempts show that the regal union was not working, and it was recognised "a general consensus"

81 Kidd, *Union and Unionisms*, pp.56 & 69-70.

82 Brown and Whatley, *The Union of 1707: New Dimensions*, p.16; Roger A. Mason, 'Debating Britain in Seventeenth-Century Scotland: Multiple Monarchy and Scottish Sovereignty', *Journal of Scottish Historical Studies* 35, no. 1 (1 May 2015): p.20, <https://doi.org/10.3366/jshs.2015.0138>.

83 Jackson, 'Conceptions of Nationhood in the Anglo-Scottish Union Debates of 1707', p.69.

84 Whatley, *The Scots and the Union*, p.1; Kidd, *Union and Unionisms*, p.66.

85 Whatley, *The Scots and the Union*, pp.2-3.

86 Whatley, 'Economic Causes and Consequences of the Union of 1707', p.157.

87 Whatley quoting T.C. Smout in p.153.

88 Kidd, *Union and Unionisms*, pp.54-5.

89 Whatley, *The Scots and the Union*, p.6.

90 Brown and Whatley, *The Union of 1707: New Dimensions*, p.10.

among the Scots as the question was back on the table.⁹¹ Although some previous proposals – then rejected – were very similar to the Treaty of 1707, the latter did happen because of a very different context – as seen above – and England needing the union to solve some of its own problems.⁹²

War, economy and religion were the three main preoccupations of the English at the turn of the 18th century, and all were intertwined during the War of Spanish Succession. First and foremost, England was leading the Protestant cause in Europe.⁹³ As seen above, the prospect of the return of a Catholic monarch was unimaginable. Were Scotland and England to become separate monarchies again, Scotland might have been neutral, as much as it could have been Jacobite and forged an alliance with France and/or Irish Jacobites.⁹⁴ Moreover, this latter conjecture could imply a front line along the northern border, which the country, already fighting on the continent, could not afford.⁹⁵ Besides, this also meant that England could not play the military-subjection card to get Scotland to cooperate.⁹⁶ Such worries were also induced by the passing of the Act of Security in 1703, which involved the creation of a Scottish militia. That this act was encouraging the Jacobites to take up arms and directly threatening England was strongly believed in Westminster.⁹⁷ The only place where armed Scots were needed were among English ranks, for victory in the conflict depended in part on the size of the army.⁹⁸ Union would strengthen the Protestant force against French Catholicism. There was nothing new in this argument: after the Reformation, the regal union already intended to “cleanse Scotland of old-style Catholicism, to purge Scotland of obnoxious French influence and to inaugurate an era of peace between the Scots and the English.”⁹⁹ Economic ambitions were also at heart of the conflict. If French prospects in several parts of the world were causes of worries, so were the Scots’. Regardless of the Navigation act, they had successfully developed trading activities, in the colonies in particular.¹⁰⁰ To some, a closer union could turn the threat into an asset.¹⁰¹ Most importantly, military involvement was

91 Kidd, *Union and Unionisms*, p.68.

92 Brown and Whatley, *The Union of 1707: New Dimensions*, p.6; Whatley, *The Scots and the Union*, p.6.

93 Whatley, *The Scots and the Union*, p.5.

94 Storrs, ‘The Union of 1707 and the War of Spanish Succession’, p.34; Brown and Whatley, *The Union of 1707: New Dimensions*, p.3.

95 Brown and Whatley, *The Union of 1707: New Dimensions*, p.18.

96 Storrs, ‘The Union of 1707 and the War of Spanish Succession’, p.35.

97 Brown and Whatley, *The Union of 1707: New Dimensions*, p.3.

98 Storrs, ‘The Union of 1707 and the War of Spanish Succession’, p.38; Whatley, *The Scots and the Union*, p.9.

99 Kidd, *Union and Unionisms*, p.47.

100 Brown and Whatley, *The Union of 1707: New Dimensions*, p.18; Whatley, *The Scots and the Union*, p.53.

101 Whatley, *The Scots and the Union*, p.7.

becoming a burden for English finances: the national debt was skyrocketing and London was getting short of species.¹⁰²

England's position meant that Scotland had leverage in the negotiation.¹⁰³ And Scotland had many demands. To begin with, there were demands concerning the Presbyterian Kirk. Presbyterians were mostly pro-union, as they supported an "ecclesiastical integration of British people", yet they feared the Anglican Church would take precedence.¹⁰⁴ The question of parliamentary sovereignty was also a key issue. Many recognised that, although the two countries had common interests, some differed.¹⁰⁵ In particular, Scotland defended its right to declare war and peace, advocated for a redefinition of the hierarchy between monarch and parliament, and stressed the importance of legitimacy concerning matters of accession and succession to the throne.¹⁰⁶ The fact that England interfered on several matters while keeping its distance on others – materialised by an absentee monarch – was felt as a direct encroachment on Scottish sovereignty, and by extension on Scottish nationhood.¹⁰⁷ Among the questions brought to the table by the union was "whether such civic identity was compatible with incorporating union with England or, conversely, whether sacrifice of the independent *regnum* entailed a concomitant loss of nationhood."¹⁰⁸ Although incorporation would eventually be achieved, many argued in pamphlets for a reshaping of the union with separate parliaments, with greater prerogatives, and a federal union.¹⁰⁹

Yet, the aspect which carried the most weight in the final decision was economic matters. As previously mentioned, Scotland was struggling to fill its coffers.¹¹⁰ The famine, tariffs raised by European countries, perturbation due to warfare and the Darien Incident were causes to the struggle.¹¹¹ But another key element came into play: Scotland had been asking for free-trade – including access to English colonies – for a long time.¹¹² To begin with, its economy had taken a turn from agriculture and raw material based, to manufacturing oriented. Linen trade was becoming central – with England as important consumer –, and Glasgow was getting attractive with an increasing share of merchants involved in luxury trades or employed in related activities such as silk weaving, glove or wig making. Yet, for the

102Storrs, 'The Union of 1707 and the War of Spanish Succession', p.38.

103Kidd, *Union and Unionisms*, p.66.

104Kidd, p.75; Brown and Whatley, *The Union of 1707: New Dimensions*, p.22.

105see in particular the position of James Hodge in Kidd, *Union and Unionisms*, pp.68-70.

106Brown and Whatley, *The Union of 1707: New Dimensions*, p.17.

107Jackson, 'Conceptions of Nationhood in the Anglo-Scottish Union Debates of 1707', pp.61,69 & 70.

108Jackson, p.65.

109Bowie, 'Public Opinion, Popular Politics and the Union of 1707', p.238.

110Cf paragraphs above

111Brown and Whatley, *The Union of 1707: New Dimensions*, p.24.

112Brown and Whatley, p.24.

manufacturing sector to be profitable and develop, a market was necessary. England was that market, in part thanks to hundreds of Scottish merchants conducting business in London.¹¹³ Scotland had already been involved in free-trade with France – along with reciprocal nationality – during the 16th century following the marriage between Mary Stuart and the Dauphin.¹¹⁴ Given the context, early 18th century Scotland would under no circumstance give in to union with England without similar advantages. In 1703, the parliament voted two acts whose messages were that Scotland was to defend its economy and not be under England's thumb: the Wine Act allowed continuation of wine trade with France and the Security Act established “free communication of trade [...] and the liberty of plantations” as prerequisites to agreeing with the Hanoverian line succeeding to Queen Anne's.¹¹⁵ Scotland's pressure to “squeeze economic concessions” worked in spite of the Alien Act, and England eventually agreed to pay £398,085 10s sterling to compensate for the investment losses in the Darien Scheme and the closing of the Company of Scotland, to pay the overdue salaries of government officials, to support some of the country's industries, and to ease the pressure of future taxes.¹¹⁶ Free-trade was nevertheless not unanimously prayed: prior to the Act of Union worries concerning the “burden of taxation” and the imbalance between exports to and imports from England were voiced, and even merchants did not collectively agree on the matter.¹¹⁷ An agreement was eventually found, and out of the twenty-five articles defining the union, fifteen were economic measures.¹¹⁸ Most importantly, Scotland was granted “full Freedom and Intercourse of Trade and Navigation [...] within the united Kingdom” and was now included within the Navigation Act.¹¹⁹

As Christopher A. Whatley pointed out, economic motivations were disregarded by historians for decades given the outcome of the union.¹²⁰ England's industry was at a much higher state of development than Scotland's and new taxation, loss of duty money on linens, along with competition in the wool trade downplayed the advantages of free trade.¹²¹ Yet, the extent to which these aspects would come into play were either unknown or unanticipated,

113Whatley, *The Scots and the Union*, pp.120-24.

114Smout, *Scottish Trade on the Eve of Union*, p.167.

115Devine, *The Scottish Nation, 1700-2000*, pp.5-7.

116Whatley, *The Scots and the Union*, p.9; NRS, ‘Union of 1707 - Making the Treaty - The Articles of Union’, Scottish Archives for Schools, accessed 31 March 2024,

<https://www.scottisharchivesforschools.org/union1707/chapter3-3.asp>, ‘Rules of Trade’ article 15.

117Brown and Whatley, *The Union of 1707: New Dimensions*, p.23; Bowie, ‘Public Opinion, Popular Politics and the Union of 1707’, pp.231 & 235.

118NRS, ‘Union of 1707 - Making the Treaty - The Articles of Union’.

119Whatley, *The Scots and the Union*, p.51; Devine, *The Scottish Nation, 1700-2000*, p.54.

120Whatley, *The Scots and the Union*, p.51.

121Devine, *The Scottish Nation, 1700-2000*, p.54.

and the commissions established by the parliament concerning the country's financial and economic issues were in favour of a union with England.¹²² In a nutshell:

“As the Scottish parliament had little option but to surrender to what was in effect economic blackmail, it does not seem surprising that these issues did not dominate the negotiations. There was nothing to discuss; continued trade with England in the key commodities of linen and black cattle was assured as long as the Scots played ball.”¹²³

Economic questions were a key driving force in Europe at the time, and Scotland was not exempted. In an age of aggressive mercantilism and expansionism, questions of sovereignty, nationhood, religion and international relationships were defined and constrained by economic prerogatives, and trade was affected by the politicisation of economic questions this phenomenon implied.¹²⁴ The union debate and outcome perfectly illustrate this.

• What about textile and the law?

The 17th century was, for Europe at least, the peak of the mercantilist age. It was believed that money equalled power, and that, therefore, the amount in your coffers determined your place on the European hierarchy.¹²⁵ This meant that a state's power was proportional to its wealth. Wealth allowed countries to fund their military forces, by investing into vessels, recruiting mercenaries and pay for all the expenses inherent to any armed conflict. Given the numerous wars which littered the century, important financial means were necessary. For instance, the French armed forces went from about 148,000 men in the 1640s to 400,000 at the end of the century.¹²⁶ Warfare-related expenses amounted to 75% of the French state's revenues, and 90% for England under Cromwell. King William and Queen Anne resorted to the Bank of England to borrow money.¹²⁷ It was also necessary to conduct expansionist policies, either on the continent or elsewhere. Scotland's incapacity to fund the Darien Scheme, is the shining example that money was a prerequisite to any colonial endeavour.¹²⁸ As developed in a previous chapter, wealth was also a means of social display: for royals and nobles, apparel, property, furniture etc. were signs of stability and power, and

¹²²Whatley, *The Scots and the Union*, pp.51-2; Brown and Whatley, *The Union of 1707: New Dimensions*, p.24.

¹²³Whatley, 'Economic Causes and Consequences of the Union of 1707', p.157.

¹²⁴Whatley, *The Scots and the Union*, pp.5 & 52.

¹²⁵Whatley, p.52.

¹²⁶Lucien Bély, *Les relations internationales en Europe XVIIe-XVIIIe siècles*, 4ème édition, Thémis Histoire (Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 2007), p.311.

¹²⁷Bély, p.315.

¹²⁸Jorrand, 'From "the Doors of the Seas" to a Watery Debacle'.

money was the means to achieve its display.¹²⁹ The mercantilist system in which states – and people – evolved could be described as follows:

“To foster both economic development and national power and plenty, officials, businessmen, and publicists proposed measures with several related objectives: expanding domestic industry, capturing larger shares of foreign trade, augmenting bullion stocks, and assuring favourable commercial balances.”¹³⁰

Textile was at the heart of this system since it was Europe’s first industry.¹³¹ Different strategies were implemented by European parliaments and monarchies to reach their mercantile goals through textile. Tariffs, as has been previously touched upon, were particularly common and resorted to by Scotland, England and France. They mainly aimed at providing state incomes and protecting national productions from competition.¹³² A striking example of how far this practice could go is the “calico crisis”.¹³³ Calicoes, known as “indiennes” in France, were cotton fabrics on which layers of colours were applied with a brush or engraved wooden plates, before soaking the cloth into a bath of specific substances which made the cloth more resistant to washing and exposure to light.¹³⁴ These fabrics imported from Asia, challenged the economy of all European countries.¹³⁵ In England for instance, they reached 25% of textiles imports by the end of the century.¹³⁶ Thanks to the East Indian Company, which encouraged the purchase of calicoes, this increase in import skyrocketed from a few thousand pieces in the mid-century to 860,000 pieces in the early 18th century.¹³⁷ For a country whose textile industry relied on export and domestic consumption to be beneficial, such a growth in import was both detrimental and alarming.¹³⁸ English cotton and silk industry was developing thanks to the transformation of raw fibres from the colonies, which limited imports from foreign countries. Yet, England’s main textile was wool: relying entirely on domestic production, this branch of textile manufacture was quantitatively more

129Brown, *Noble Society in Scotland*, pp.9-13 & 271.

130Robert S. DuPlessis, ‘Mercantilism’, in *Encyclopedia Of The Renaissance*, 1999, p.2, <https://works.swarthmore.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1409&context=fac-history>.

131DuPlessis, *Transitions to Capitalism in Early Modern Europe*, p.279.

132DuPlessis, p.283.

133Chloe Wigston Smith, “‘Calico Madams’: Servants, Consumption, and the Calico Crisis’, *Eighteenth-Century Life* 31, no. 2 (2007): 29–55.

134Sophie Delbrel, ‘Prohibition et Liberté Dans Le Commerce Des Toiles Peintes: L’exemple de La Généralité de Bordeaux Au XVIII e Siècle’, *Revue Historique de Droit Français et Étranger (1922-)* 86, no. 4 (2008): p.539.

135Patrick O’Brien, Trevor Griffiths, and Philip Hunt, ‘Political Components of the Industrial Revolution: Parliament and the English Cotton Textile Industry, 1660-1774’, *The Economic History Review* 44, no. 3 (1991): p.400, <https://doi.org/10.2307/2597536>.

136O’Brien, Griffiths, and Hunt, p.396.

137DuPlessis, *Transitions to Capitalism in Early Modern Europe*, p.334.

138O’Brien, Griffiths, and Hunt, ‘Political Components of the Industrial Revolution’, pp.396-7.

important than the silk one, and impacted England's home economy on a larger scale.¹³⁹ Since silk and wool were two of the most important manufactures in England the threat of Asian textiles had important consequences. Reports to parliaments, along with pamphlets and petitions, pointed out the drain on the monetary reserves, unemployment and the risk of emigrations as a consequence, as well as England's incapacity to compete – especially given the lack of experienced manufacturers.¹⁴⁰ Facing discontent from the wool and silk interests, the English parliament implemented a series of legislations on calico trade. Duties were increased by 10% in 1685, by 20% in 1690, by 5% in 1697 and another 5% between 1704-5.¹⁴¹ Concurrently, legal restrictions regarding exports of raw wool to the continent and woollens made in the colonies were implemented.¹⁴²

Similar worries were found in Scotland and France, although they more readily turned to sumptuary laws.¹⁴³ Sumptuary laws were implemented to keep national manufacturing systems and/or moral economies in check. They established a more or less limiting frame within which social display and trade could evolve by implementing restrictions on commodities and festivities.¹⁴⁴ Although the question of calicoes competing with domestic manufactories was already subject to debate in the English parliament in 1667, Scotland was the first to directly legislate against calicoes: in 1681 the parliament voted in favour of prohibiting the wearing of calicoes and cotton blends.¹⁴⁵ Linen, like wool, was exposed to this competition, and Scotland could not afford it.¹⁴⁶ France started enforcing anti-calico legislation five years after Scotland: between 1686 and 1688 the production of printing plates along with the printing of linen, hemp and white cotton fabric was forbidden, and imports of calicoes and Chinese silks were banned except for re-export.¹⁴⁷ Other restrictions were enforced during the following years until the prohibition of direct trade of all cloths and fabrics from the Indies.¹⁴⁸ Although these legislations aimed at protecting the home

139Jonathan P. Eacott, 'Making an Imperial Compromise: The Calico Acts, the Atlantic Colonies, and the Structure of the British Empire', *The William and Mary Quarterly* 69, no. 4 (2012): p.738, <https://doi.org/10.5309/willmaryquar.69.4.0731>.

140O'Brien, Griffiths, and Hunt, 'Political Components of the Industrial Revolution', p.402; Eacott, 'Making an Imperial Compromise', p.738.

141O'Brien, Griffiths, and Hunt, 'Political Components of the Industrial Revolution', p.400 in footnotes.

142Eacott, 'Making an Imperial Compromise', p.734.

143O'Brien, Griffiths, and Hunt, 'Political Components of the Industrial Revolution', p.400.

144Giorgio Riello and Ulinka Rublack, *The Right to Dress: Sumptuary Laws in a Global Perspective, c. 1200-1800* (Cambridge: University Press, 2019), pp.4-6.

145Eacott, 'Making an Imperial Compromise', p.734; O'Brien, Griffiths, and Hunt, 'Political Components of the Industrial Revolution', p.400.

146Hayward, 'Outlandish Superfluities: Luxury and Clothing in Scottish and English Sumptuary Law from the Fourteenth to the Seventeenth Century', p.112.

147Delbrel, 'Prohibition et Liberté Dans Le Commerce Des Toiles Peintes', p.540-1; O'Brien, Griffiths, and Hunt, 'Political Components of the Industrial Revolution', p.400.

148Delbrel, 'Prohibition et Liberté Dans Le Commerce Des Toiles Peintes', p.541.

manufactories of silk and lace, Richelieu tried to emulate a substitute cotton industry, by reducing duties on imports of raw materials and those on exports of finished goods.¹⁴⁹ France actually became the first European country to manufacture calicoes.¹⁵⁰ Despite having chosen a tariff-based strategy – among other reasons to protect its trading interests in the colonies – England also enforced sumptuary laws: in 1700-1 the first Calico Act banned the retailing and consumption of all silks from most of Asia, as well as that of cotton calicoes coloured in those same regions.¹⁵¹

Protectionist measures and sumptuary laws did not appear with the calico crisis, and many other instances can be found in Scotland's earlier history. Scotland resorted to protectionist measures several times throughout the 17th century – and before. In 1593, the export of animal skins was forbidden¹⁵² By 1625, James VI & I had granted 700 monopolies to help Scotland's commercial development.¹⁵³ Sumptuary laws were also very common. From the latter middle ages onwards, the enacting of such laws are found in Scotland alongside the whole of Europe.¹⁵⁴ For instance, in 1543 France, gold and silver cloths, embellishments and embroideries became privileges of the monarch, Dauphin and Duc d'Orléans.¹⁵⁵ Concerning Scotland, expensive silks, linens, cambrics, trims and fringes were restricted to the monarch in 1581, and in the later years of the 16th century additional restrictions were enacted to “curb the excesses of the nobility and emphasise the majesty of the royal court”.¹⁵⁶ Although sumptuary laws were abolished in England in 1604, they remained in place until 1701 in Scotland.¹⁵⁷ Legislation on textile remained important, and many instances can be found throughout the 17th century. In 1617, restrictions on pearling and ribbons on ruffs, skirts, napkins and socks were passed. These same trims were legislated on again in 1621, this time limiting their use for shirts and body linens to pearling and ribbons “made within the kingdom of Scotland”, alongside gold and silver cloths being from then on

149O'Brien, Griffiths, and Hunt, 'Political Components of the Industrial Revolution', p.400.

150Delbrel, 'Prohibition et Liberté Dans Le Commerce Des Toiles Peintes', p.540.

151Eacott, 'Making an Imperial Compromise', p.732; O'Brien, Griffiths, and Hunt, 'Political Components of the Industrial Revolution', p.404 & 413-4.

152Talbot, 'An Alliance Ended?', p.31.

153Talbot, p.39.

154Lucinda H. S. Dean, ““Richnesse in Fassone and in Fairness”: Marriage, Manhood and Sartorial Splendour for Sixteenth-Century Scottish Kings’, *The Scottish Historical Review* C,3, no. 254 (December 2021): p.379, <https://doi.org/10.3366/shr.2021.0536>.

155Dean, p.394.

156Dean, p.391 & 393.

157Hayward, ‘Outlandish Superfluities: Luxury and Clothing in Scottish and English Sumptuary Law from the Fourteenth to the Seventeenth Century’, pp.96-7.

restricted to the king and his family only.¹⁵⁸ In 1681, along with the anti-calico bill, the parliament passed restrictions on “all flowered, stripped, figured, chequered, painted or printed silk stuff or ribbons (in no way comprehending changing coloured or watered stuff or ribbons)”.¹⁵⁹ A ban was also voted on:

“all wearing of clothes made abroad, for men, women, or children (excepting wearing clothes and linen brought home by persons of their own use who have been abroad and used by them, and made of such cloths, stuff and furniture as are by this act allowed to be worn within this kingdom)...”¹⁶⁰

These laws necessarily had an impact on Scotland’s trade, including its trade with France, but the motivations were varied, and not systematically political. The 1593 act on skins aimed at providing clothes for the poor.¹⁶¹ When high tariffs were implemented in 1681, it was primarily to reverse the country’s trade deficit by protecting domestic linen and cotton productions rather than to damage that of foreign ones.¹⁶² Social and economic motives were often intertwined with political ones for, as above-mentioned, the mercantilist system in which Scotland was taking part made it practically impossible to separate them. Yet the purpose was often different from the actual outcome and side-effects, and the countries affected were not necessarily targeted and/or enemies.¹⁶³

3.2 The Governmental Response: A Strategy of prohibition

• The goods targeted

As seen above, the difficulties Scotland was facing in the last decades before the Union of 1707 had a direct impact on the country’s economy, and therefore, meant that the Parliament had to take measures to limit the crisis. Considering the drafts of acts of parliament and the overtures, it is clear that, concerning textile and dress, propositions were pointing directly at the origin of the domestic capital flight. It is worth comparing their content to the 1647 account book of John Clerk, which comprised his purchases in France. As

158 Hayward, p.111; Dean, “‘Richnesse in Fassone and in Fairness’: Marriage, Manhood and Sartorial Splendour for Sixteenth-Century Scottish Kings’, p.391.

159 Hayward, ‘‘Outlandish Superfluities: Luxury and Clothing in Scottish and English Sumptuary Law from the Fourteenth to the Seventeenth Century’, p.109.

160 Hayward, p.112.

161 Talbott, ‘An Alliance Ended?’, p.31.

162 Hayward, ‘‘Outlandish Superfluities: Luxury and Clothing in Scottish and English Sumptuary Law from the Fourteenth to the Seventeenth Century’, p.112; Talbott, ‘An Alliance Ended?’, p.40-1.

163 Talbott, ‘An Alliance Ended?’, pp.35 & 62.

stated in the first part of this paper, silk-based items were over-represented in the account books, whether they were yards of fabric, lace or ribbons.¹⁶⁴ Unsurprisingly, silk is also the main focus of the parliamentary documents. Although not all years seem to have held debates on the legislation of textile, those which did systematically comprised one or several documents with concerns for silk: three overtures in 1698 and one in 1701, along with a draft of an act in both 1701, 1704 and 1705.¹⁶⁵ A similar parallel can be drawn between the account books and the parliamentary papers regarding lace, with overtures and drafts of acts found for the years 1698, 1701 and 1705, and indirect mentions via those concerned with “silver or gold”.¹⁶⁶ Cotton is also targeted, with recurring references to “caligoes”, alongside silk in particular.¹⁶⁷ Another particularly important interest for legislation is wool.¹⁶⁸ Other items of dress and textiles are found, but to a lesser extent. Embellishments are mentioned with references to “ribbons”, “imbroidery” or “fringes”, and varied ways in which “Silver or Gold” can be used.¹⁶⁹ Some rare accessories and clothes such as “gloves” “stockings” and “hats” are also found.¹⁷⁰ “Hair” is mentioned once.¹⁷¹ Leather and furniture items are rare but appear here and there, with entries such as “skins” or “Tapestry, and Hangings”.¹⁷² The single mention of “Dyes” is also worth noting.¹⁷³

Although the above listing shows that these pieces of legislation left no aspect of dress and textile aside, some observations can be made. First, the focus of almost all the proposed legislations is materials rather than shape: it is specific materials in all their shapes and uses rather than specific items of dress and décor that the papers target. Formulations like “Stuffs of any kind”, “any manufacturies wherin there is”, or “all sorts of” are found throughout and show this focus.¹⁷⁴ For instance, silk, is considered as material for fabric yardage as much as material for varied elements of haberdashery and embellishment. In a draft of an act from August 1705 one can read:

“Our Sovereign Lady with advice and consent of the Estates of parliament,
prohibits & Discharges ye using or wearing in apparell of all sorts of Silk Stuffs &

164‘NRS, GD18/2483’.

165‘NRS, PA7/16’, fols 28, 86(2) & 87; ‘NRS, PA7/17/1/92’; ‘NRS, PA7/19’, fol. 52(8), 103(1) & 83.

166‘NRS, PA7/16’, fols 28 & 86(2); ‘NRS, PA7/17/1/92’; ‘NRS, GD124/10/444’, fol. 83.

167‘NRS, PA7/17/1/92’; ‘NRS, PA7/19’, fol. 81(1), 103(1) & 52(8).

168‘NRS, PA7/16’, fol. 86(1 & 2) & 87; ‘NRS, PA7/19’, fol. 52 (1,2 & 7) & 103(1); ‘NRS, GD124/10/444’, fol. 83.

169‘NRS, PA7/16’, fols 28 & 86 (1,2 & 3).

170‘NRS, PA7/16’, fol. 87; ‘NRS, PA7/19’, fol. 103(1); ‘NRS, GD124/10/444’, fol. 83.

171‘NRS, PA7/17/1/92’.

172‘NRS, PA7/16’, fol. 86(2); ‘NRS, GD124/10/444’, fol. 83.

173‘NRS, PA7/16’, fol. 86(2).

174‘NRS, PA7/17/1/92’; ‘NRS, PA7/19’, fol. 52(1 & 8), 81(1), 103(1), 166; ‘NRS, GD124/10/444’, fol. 83.

Velvets and all sorts of Cloaths, Droggat Stuffs & Stockings forraign or made within this Kingdome, wherin there is any Silk...”¹⁷⁵

Second, silk, lace, gold and silver, and cotton are the focus of these legislations because they are all materials and goods for which Scotland relied on imports, and which were expensive to obtain. Scotland’s textile production relied on coarse woollen cloth and linens, for its shortage of skilled labour prevented it from developing a profitable industry for fine cloths and luxurious textiles, so much so that it would be without domestic lace manufactories until the second half of the 18th century.¹⁷⁶ The French account book agrees with this analysis, with more than half of the fabrics recorded being silks, and laces, ribbons, cordings, and lacings of silk and/or gold and silver reaching hundreds of ells and dozens of items.¹⁷⁷ The interest for cotton in the parliamentary documents coincides with the calico crisis.¹⁷⁸ These expensive foreign textiles were an important cause of the negative balance of trade.¹⁷⁹ They were therefore identified as a problem to be remedied through their prohibition.

Interestingly, these proposals for prohibitions and limitations do not target goods from specific countries, except in a few documents from the selection. One document is specifically forbidding imports of a selection of textiles and pieces of furniture from England, another one forbids that of silks from the Indies.¹⁸⁰ Only two overtures specifically target French imports – although not restricted to textiles –, one specifying that France has blocked exchanges “directly or virtually by imposition equivalent to an prohibition”.¹⁸¹ All the papers mention no origin, only the materials or items to be restricted. France is therefore hardly ever directly pointed at. It actually seems that the members of parliament had little idea as to the existence, or at least proportions, of the French imports of textiles, dress and décor. An “Overtures For Promoting the Trade of the Nation” from 1704, gives us interesting insight.¹⁸² The document draws an overview of Scotland’s foreign trade, successively addressing exchanges with the “*Baltick* Sea”, the “*Straits*”, some Lower Countries, England and France.¹⁸³ Concerning the latter, the author states:

¹⁷⁵‘NRS, PA7/19’, fol. 103(1).

¹⁷⁶Smout, ‘Making and Trading Dress and Décor in Seventeenth-Century Scotland’, 421–23 & 426; Levey, *Lace*, p.61.

¹⁷⁷‘NRS, GD18/2483’.

¹⁷⁸Smith, ‘Callico Madams’.

¹⁷⁹Brown, *Noble Society in Scotland*, p.83; Smout, ‘Making and Trading Dress and Décor in Seventeenth-Century Scotland’, p.430.

¹⁸⁰Scotland Privy Council, ‘A Proclamation Anent the Sumptuary Law. (Digital Copy)’ (Edinburgh, 1686), NLS; ‘NRS, PA7/19’, fol. 140(2) & 52(8).

¹⁸¹‘NRS, PA7/16’, fol. 86(1 & 2).

¹⁸²‘NRS, GD124/10/444’, fol. 83.

¹⁸³‘NRS, GD124/10/444’, fol. 83.

“[France] Tends much to our Disadvantage in Trade: For they prohibite, under Forfeiture of Ship and Cargo, and Importing our Herring, and all our Manufactures: And we expend vastly for their Salt, Wine, brandy &c. The two last take above 30000 *l. Sterling per annum* ; whereas we may sufficiently provided from other Countries with Liquors, by our own product.”¹⁸⁴

Imports of textiles are absent, as if trade with France was restricted to edible commodities. And although we could give the author the benefit of the doubt and assume that the ‘&c.’ [etc.] encompassed textiles, the fact that these were not named alongside the other commodities suggests that it was not seen as a major import. This hypothesis is all the more believable, since the following paragraph on “*Portugal, Spain, and all the Straits*” states that this region “Whose Product is Silk, Wool, Basile-Sugar, several sorts of Wine and Fruits, Rice and Oyl: They allow us the Freedom of Trading with them, not so much to our Loss”.¹⁸⁵ Similar observations are made in another document entitled “Some Positions for clearing the Case of our Trade with France”. According to this author, imports from France are restricted to “Salt, Hopes and Rosine” and, most importantly, “Wine”.¹⁸⁶ Once again, textiles are absent. Historians themselves, were tricked to believe that Scotland mostly imported consumables, with textiles and items of dress and décor only representing a small share.¹⁸⁷ Yet, more recent research – such as S. Talbott’s work – and this paper have shown otherwise.¹⁸⁸ Although France was an important producer of textile and textile manufactures, it was less the specific origin from those goods than their foreign nature which mattered. Regardless whether the members of parliament had identified where those expensive textiles and items came from or not, they had to find a way to keep them from entering Scottish burghs, shops and homes. These products had a cost for the nation as they were exchanged for money.¹⁸⁹ Money which in addition to participating in funding the development of foreign nations, was not spent on domestic manufactures, whose market needed funds and demand to grow.¹⁹⁰ Moreover, in this mercantilist age, flight of capital equalled weakening power.¹⁹¹ Those who proposed legislation were very much aware of these aspects and of Scotland’s difficulties and weakened position in European trade dynamics, as well as of the connection between imports of

184‘NRS, GD124/10/444’, fol. 83.

185‘NRS, GD124/10/444’, fol. 83.

186‘NRS, PA7/17/2’, fol. 155(2); ‘hopes’ probably refers to “a circular band or ring of metal, wood, or other stiff material; esp. a circle of wood or flattened metal for binding together the staves of casks, tubs, etc.” ‘Hoop, n.1’, in *OED Online*, accessed 22 April 2024, https://www.oed.com/dictionary/hoop_n1.

187see T. C. Smout, *Scottish Trade on the Eve of Union, 1660-1707* (Edinburgh & London: Oliver & Boyd, 1963); Royal Scottish Museum, *French Connections*.

188Talbott, ‘An Alliance Ended?’

189A proclamation from 1682 at some point states that these imports have ‘exceedingly exhausted the money of this Kingdom’, Scotland Privy Council, ‘NRS, RH14/103’.

190DuPlessis, *Transitions to Capitalism in Early Modern Europe*, pp.275 & 283; DuPlessis, ‘Mercantilism’, p.2.

191Whatley, *The Scots and the Union*, p.52.

luxurious textiles and national economic growth. A “PROCLAMATION Discharging Silk Lace White Lace, and Point to be imported or vvorn upon Apparel” from March 1682 states this very facts in its opening lines:

“Forasmuch, as We, out of our Princely care for the Wealth and Flourishing of this Our Kingdom, By the twelfth Act of Our present current Parliament, did give, and grant several privileges [...], and made a stop to the import of divers expensive, a,d superfluous commodities, exprest in the said Act: which had exceedingly exhausted the money of this Kingdom ; and hightned the exchange to forraign places, which is now much fallen...”¹⁹²

• Means of restriction

To restore the ‘wealth and flourishing’ of Scotland, the members of parliament resorted to a strategy of outright prohibition instead of dissuasion. The latter was often resorted to by European states – in combination with bans –, and relied on increasing duties to limit both exports of national production and imports of foreign ones.¹⁹³ Out of the seventeen overtures, proclamations and drafts of acts consulted for this study and concerned with dress and textile, sixteen of them “prohibite”, “Discharge”, “Prohibites and Discharges” or “Forbid” ; the remaining one actually “annuls” an act formerly passed which “impos[ed] a duty”.¹⁹⁴ The prohibitions could point at the consumers by forbidding the “wearing and using” of specific goods, and providers could have their activities restricted via bans on imports and exports.¹⁹⁵ Although the period on which this study focuses for its legislative approach is quite short, interesting evolutions can be noted.

Between 1682 and 1705, the different textiles legislated upon are almost all faced with prohibition on their wearing in one way or other. To list but a few examples, were proposed for restrictions in apparel: “any Apparel, or Cloaths upon which there is any Silk Lace, White Lace of threed or Point in 1682 ; “embroideries” and patterned fabrics in 1686 ; “silk cloaths or stuff”, “bodily habits wherein ther shall be any embroder silk or thread”, “silver or gold wears”, “velvet”, “gloves” or “stockings”, in 1698; “Cotton, Hair or Silk” in 1701, “silkstuffs” and “caligoes” in 1704 ; “all other Sorts of linnen made oft flax, hemp or Cottoune” in 1705.¹⁹⁶ Yet, as from 1701, bans more systematically extend to the “use” of these

¹⁹²Scotland Privy Council, ‘NRS, RH14/103’.

¹⁹³DuPlessis, *Transitions to Capitalism in Early Modern Europe*, p.283.

¹⁹⁴Scotland Privy Council, ‘NRS, RH14/103’; Scotland Privy Council, ‘A Proclamation Anent the Sumptuary Law, NLS’; ‘NRS, PA7/16’, fols 28, 86(1-3) & 87; ‘NRS, PA7/17/1/92’; ‘NRS, GD124/10/444’, fol. 83; ‘NRS, PA7/19’, fol. 52(1,7 & 8), 81(1), 103(1), 140(2) & 166.

¹⁹⁵see for instance ‘NRS, PA7/19’, fol. 81(1).

¹⁹⁶Scotland Privy Council, ‘NRS, RH14/103’; Scotland Privy Council, ‘A Proclamation Anent the Sumptuary Law, NLS’; ‘NRS, PA7/16’, fols 28, 86(2) & 87; ‘NRS, PA7/17/1/92’; ‘NRS, PA7/19’, fol. 52 (8) & 81(1).

materials.¹⁹⁷ Décor becomes a greater area of interest, some drafts even giving more specific instructions, such as a 1701 draft from the committee of trade on silk stuffs stating that the prohibition applies to the “wear or use [of] the same in Apparel, Houshold-furniture or otherways”.¹⁹⁸ Over this short period, we can also see the strengthening of the measures proposed for enforcement. The earlier restrictions were either more specific or comprised various exceptions. The 1682 declaration restricting lace still allowed for the “wearing of White Lace of threed, or Point upon Rufles, Cravats, Bands, Handkirchifs, and night Linens”.¹⁹⁹ The 1686 “PROCLAMATION Anent the Sumptuary Law”, although it limited “the wearing of all Dropped, Spotted, Figured and Chequered Stuffs within this Kingdom”, “penalty or Hazard” would not have been faced if “the same doth not exceed Seven Shillings Sterling the Yard, at most”.²⁰⁰ Restriction on length and value is also found in an overture from 1698 for silk allowing its wearing up to “ten shilling sterling price” and its use for the “lyning of cloaths” as long as they “do not exceed two third parts of the outside” with exceptions for some plain outerwears.²⁰¹ That same year, another overture on gold and silver, and foreign linens, wools, silks, stockings and gloves allowed one to wear such goods brought home from abroad for half a year.²⁰² Exceptions for apparel and furniture purchased abroad are found once in 1701, but never again afterwards. As a matter of fact, from 1701 onwards, exceptions are scarce and limited to a few almost exactly similar uses. In a 1701 draft of an act on silk, one can read “excepting musline, and all plain Black-Silk-Stuffs and Velvets for Womens Hoods and Scarffs only; and also, Velvets for Pales, Mort-Cloaths, Foot-mantles, and the Robes of such publick Officers who are in use to wear velvet upon them”.²⁰³ One from 1704 on calicoes and silks leaves “Ribbons Hoods & Scarfs” off restrictions.²⁰⁴ The following year another draft on silk and velvet makes an exception for “all plain Black silk stuffs for womens hoods & scarfes only, and velvet & [?] Silk Stuffs for seats & Chairs of state and for pales mort cloaths foot-mantles and the Robes of such publick officers who are in use to wear velvet upon them”.²⁰⁵ The black goods for women were most likely excluded from prohibition because they would doubtlessly have been important items of mourning dress.²⁰⁶ As for the

197‘NRS, PA7/17/1/92’; ‘NRS, PA7/19’, fol. 52(2), 81(1) & 103(1); ‘NRS, GD124/10/444’, fol. 83.

198‘NRS, PA7/17/1/92’.

199Scotland Privy Council, ‘NRS, RH14/103’.

200Scotland Privy Council, ‘A Proclamation Anent the Sumptuary Law, NLS’.

201‘NRS, PA7/16’, fol. 86(2).

202‘NRS, PA7/16’, fol. 87.

203‘NRS, PA7/17/1/92’.

204‘NRS, PA7/19’, fol. 52(8).

205‘NRS, PA7/19’, fol. 103(1).

206Michelle Iwen, ‘Reading Material Culture: British Women’s Position and the Death Trade in the Long Eighteenth-Century’, in *Women and the Material Culture of Death*, ed. Maureen Daly Goggin and Beth Fowkes Tobin (Farnham: Ashgate Publishing, 2013), p.11 (in PDF),

clothes of public officers, their status as state representatives very likely legitimated such privilege.²⁰⁷

Members of the trading community were not left off the hook when it came to legislation, and restrictions on exchanges were also extensively proposed for implementation. One proposal from 1698 interestingly combines dissuasive and prohibitory measures. On the one hand “all foreign Linnen cloath” are proposed to be imposed at a “hundred percent” and “woolen manufactures” at “fourtie percent” or “entirely prohibited” ; on the other hand, it suggests to “prohibite the import” of thread and silk laces as well as that of leather and skins manufactures, along with “a strict prohibition of import of anie french Commodities which shall exceed the loat product of fish, coal and woolen manufacturies, which shall be exported from Scotland to France as provision for buying the said French goods”. Yet it leaves many goods such as “Dyes”, “Silk”, “Thread” or “yearn” free of custom and excise if “brought from the places were they grow”. In order to restrict foreign imports without resorting to outright prohibition, the author of this overture had to come up with an extremely complex piece of legislation. Other overtures on trade the same year made no attempt to leave room for loopholes.²⁰⁸ Neither did those in the following years. Prohibitions on “wearing” were most of the time combined with prohibition on imports. Twelve out of the sixteen drafts and overtures consulted for this study prohibit imports of some goods.²⁰⁹ In a draft of an act from July 1705, it is specified that one shall be liable to penalty if resorting to “Importing Selling buying Wearing or using” the prohibited goods.²¹⁰ Implementing a ban on the using and wearing, as well as on imports allowed for a more efficient blockade. A simple prohibition on imports would have had no effect on individuals bringing back purchase from abroad or merchants resorting to illegal trades. Conversely, a simple prohibition on wearing and using was no guarantee for a full-fledge implementation and respect of the law, especially since the restrictions from several of the overtures and drafts do not apply to goods “imported by the Company of *Scotland* trading to *Africa* and the *Indies*” or “made or to be made within this Kingdom[Scotland]”.²¹¹ How could a fabric or item made in Scotland be distinguished from one made in France for instance, even more so once on a gown or a piece of furniture? These

https://www.researchgate.net/profile/M_Iwen/publication/282575317_Reading_material_culture_British_women's_position_and_the_death_trade_in_the_long_18th_century/links/568ac6ff08ae1e63f1fbf3b1/Reading-material-culture-British-womens-position-and-the-death-trade-in-the-long-18th-century.pdf.

207 This aspect is analysed in the subsequent section “Targeting and dissuading people”

208 ‘NRS, PA7/16’, fols 28, 86(1 & 3) & 87.

209 Scotland Privy Council, ‘NRS, RH14/103’; Scotland Privy Council, ‘A Proclamation Anent the Sumptuary Law, NLS’; ‘NRS, PA7/16’, fols 28, 86(1 & 2) & 87; ‘NRS, PA7/17/1/92’; ‘NRS, PA7/19’, fol. 52(1 & 8), 81(1) & 140(2); ‘NRS, GD124/10/444’.

210 ‘NRS, PA7/19’, fol. 81(1).

211 ‘NRS, PA7/16’, fols 28, 86(2 & 3) & 87; ‘NRS, PA7/17/1/92’; ‘NRS, PA7/19’, fol. 52(8).

loopholes would therefore leave the floodgates opened for foreign textiles. In resorting to double interdictions, the whole system of consumption would have been under scrutiny, and should therefore have given less leeway for backdoor practices. As will be discussed later on, this double ban did not sufficed to put an end to the inflow of merchandise and outflow of Scottish money.²¹²

• Targeting and dissuading people

As previously highlighted, the problematic goods were clearly identified and were therefore the focus of the proposed legislations. It is also clear that both providers and consumers were seen as cause of the problem, and that both were targeted through restrictions. Not all drafts and overtures specifically mention people, some only stating what was to be allowed or forbidden, and sometimes the penalty for circumventing the law.²¹³ Those which do, however, show two different strategies. On one hand, no distinction could have been made and all were considered to be concerned with the legislation at hand, hence the references to “Our Subjects”, “whatsoever person”, or “any of her maȝ: [majesty’s] Subjects or others dwelling and Residing within this Kingdome”.²¹⁴ On the other hand, specific groups of people are mentioned. The providers of goods are usually referred to as “all merchants” or “importer”.²¹⁵ The 1701 draft is however particularly detailed.²¹⁶ The author went to great pains to make an exhausted list of all those who made the circulation of these foreign commodities on Scottish soil possible. The document reads:

“And it is hereby Statute and Declared, That all Importers, Resettlers, Collectors or Farmers of the Customs, Surveyers or Waiters, who shall assist, concur or connive at the importing of the said prohibited Manufacture, and Carriers who shall import the samen by land, and Masters of Ships who shall import the same by Sea, and all who buy or sell or wear or use the same in Apparel, Household-furniture or otherways, and the Taylors and others imployed in making Apparel or Houshold-furniture thereof, that they shall be fined separatly without relief...”²¹⁷

This extract highlights the extent of the phenomenon. Foreign textiles had penetrated the whole of Scottish society, and their circulation was not limited to a merchant-consumer

²¹²Brown, *Noble Society in Scotland*, p.83.

²¹³‘NRS, PA7/19’, fol. 52(1,7 & 8) & 140(2); ‘NRS, GD124/10/444’, fol. 83.

²¹⁴Scotland Privy Council, ‘A Proclamation Anent the Sumptuary Law, NLS’; ‘NRS, PA7/16’, fol. 86(3); ‘NRS, PA7/19’, fol. 103(1).

²¹⁵Scotland Privy Council, ‘NRS, RH14/103’; ‘NRS, PA7/16’, fol. 86(2); ‘NRS, PA7/17/1/92’; ‘NRS, PA7/19’, fol. 81(1).

²¹⁶‘NRS, PA7/17/1/92’.

²¹⁷‘NRS, PA7/17/1/92’.

relationship, but implied a multiplicity of actors, and therefore an extensive national and international network. This also suggests the difficulty with which such goods could be tracked down as they changed hands. In the same manner members of parliament resorted to both the ban of use and wear and that of trade and commerce of foreign textiles and items of dress, pointing at both the people of business and the consumers aimed at leaving no link in the chain of consumption exempted from restriction.

A quick note on the mentions of consumers is also necessary. If they are mostly referred to under general determinations such as “the wearer” or “user”, a few interesting mentions point at more specific groups of people.²¹⁸ The 1682 proclamation on lace specifies that “all Noblemen, Gentlemen or others” are discharged from having “up their liveries any Lace made of Silk”, while “allowing Servants to wear their Masters or Mistrises old Cloaths”.²¹⁹ This extract raises two points: first, men are considered to be the principal consumers of these goods, not women – a point also raised by M. Hayward in her research – ; second, the members of upper ranks – nobility in particular – are identified as the main cause of the flight of capital through the import of “expensive” commodities.²²⁰ Another category of people is also alluded to several times. An overture from 1698 prohibiting “the wearing by whatsoever person in any place at any tyme after the first of October next of any thing [foreign] made of Silver or Gold threedwear philigrane or plate”, makes an exception for “the foot mantls of Noblemen for Parliament”.²²¹ Another that same year states that silver or gold in apparel shall be prohibited “excepting what is worn on the Gowns of the Extraordinarie lords of session, Herals coat, King trompeters”, and that for silk the prohibition shall not extend to “noblemens foot mantles for parliament”.²²² In both 1701 and 1705 two draft of acts, make special mention of “publick officers” who are granted the right to wear velvet for their robes.²²³ The authors of these documents defend a clear separation between personal and state representation. As much as dress and décor are a direct reflection of one’s social status, with one’s belonging to a certain rank implying aesthetic requirements, the appearance of the members of state and all those who represent the state reflect the power and stability of the said state.²²⁴ The exceptions found in those overtures show exactly that. In a sense, as Henry VIII relied on luxurious goods only “when stressing royal authority really mattered”, but

218‘NRS, PA7/16’, fol. 28; ‘NRS, PA7/17/1/92’.

219Scotland Privy Council, ‘NRS, RH14/103’.

220Scotland Privy Council; Hayward, ‘Outlandish Superfluities: Luxury and Clothing in Scottish and English Sumptuary Law from the Fourteenth to the Seventeenth Century’, p.116.

221‘NRS, PA7/16’, fol. 86(3).

222‘NRS, PA7/16’, fol. 86(2).

223‘NRS, PA7/17/1/92’; ‘NRS, PA7/19’, fol. 103(1).

224Hayward, *Stuart Style*, p.15; Brown, *Noble Society in Scotland*, p.271-3.

favoured a form of frugality otherwise, so should the members of parliament.²²⁵ While the Scottish state could no longer afford the losses caused by the imports and purchase of foreign textiles and items of dress by its people, its legitimacy and authority could nonetheless not be diminished. In that sense, moderation was expected from nobles when they were mere subjects of the kingdom, but they had to reflect the greatness of the state when they acted as its representatives and servants.

To further prevent the trade and consumption of foreign textiles, penalties were provided for – although not systematically it seems.²²⁶ While the proposals were increasingly restrictive as years went by, such an evolution is not found concerning the penalties for evading the law. Most overtures and drafts rely on a fine, often of “500 merks Scots money *toties quoties*” and the “confiscation” of the prohibited goods.²²⁷ Two harsher penalties are found in two different overtures from 1698: one imposed a fine of a thousand merks for the importers of silk stuffs and the other, the “burning and destroying of what shall be imported”.²²⁸ The 1701 “Draught of an Act brought in from the Committee of Trade, prohibiting the Importation of Silk-Stuffs, &c.” however, is far more punitive than the others: importers found in position of prohibited silks, hair, cottons and calicoes, would have these “seized and brought before some of the next adjacent Magistrats [...] and they shall burn and destroy all the said Goods, having first Inventared them, and given a Declaration on the saids Inventar” ; anyone either providing or obtaining the goods would be “fined seperatly [...] the value of the prohibited Goods imported, or five hundred Merks” and the seized goods would be burnt ; masters of ships importing the said goods would have their ship confiscated and sold, while seamen conducting such illegal trading activities would “be lyable to six Months Imprisonment”.²²⁹ These penalties were part of the strategies employed to try and solve the problem that was the extensive consumption of foreign textiles via legislative means. Once again, these dissuasive measures did not have the intended effect and the law was very much evaded.²³⁰

225 Hayward, ‘Outlandish Superfluities: Luxury and Clothing in Scottish and English Sumptuary Law from the Fourteenth to the Seventeenth Century’, p.103.

226 since some documents are handwritten copies, it is nevertheless not excluded that the ‘penalty’ dimension would have been added in a later version. See for instance ‘NRS, PA7/19’, fol. 52(1,7 & 8) & 140(2); and ‘NRS, PA7/16’, fol. 86 (1,2 & 3).

227 Scotland Privy Council, ‘NRS, RH14/103’; ‘NRS, PA7/19’, fol. 81(1) & 103(1); ‘NRS, PA7/16’, fols 28, 87.

228 ‘NRS, PA7/16’, fols 28 & 87.

229 ‘NRS, PA7/17/1/92’.

230 Brown, *Noble Society in Scotland*, p.83.

• Motivations for legislation

The constraints of this study both in terms of time and access to sources have limited the time-frame and number of documents which have been used for the analysis. With one exception, all the documents used in the legislative section of this dissertation are from the NRS and were chosen from a combined search in the online database of chronological boundaries covering the years between the regal and parliamentary unions, and individual keywords such as ‘textile’, ‘silk’, ‘France’ etc. From this database search were kept almost all the results. It is obvious that not all legal documents concerned with textiles and dress under the care of the NRS are equally detailed in the catalogue, yet an overview of the entries for the earlier Supplementary papers (PA7/1 to PA7/15) – these entries being as detailed as those for PA7/16 to PA/19 – still attests to the accumulation of textile- and dress-related proposals for legislation in the later years, i.e. 1698-1705.

The context of overall crisis which struck Scotland at the turn of the 18th century and the major economic difficulties Scotland faced as a consequence coincide perfectly with the above-mentioned time-frame. The Famine, the Darien Scheme, the European conflicts and England’s pressure for an agreement on succession and union all fit within this period. It is of even greater interest to look more precisely at the specific dates of the proposed legislations on dress and textile, for most instances are concomitant with key national and international events. In 1698, five overtures for restrictions in trade and wear of luxurious and foreign textiles and items of dress are proposed.²³¹ That same year, Scotland – still going through famine – was forced to lift import duties on grain, the Darien Scheme was launched, the Nine Years’ War began, and England raised its tariffs on imported linens from Scotland, which marked the beginning of great losses for Scottish exports on its market south of the border.²³² In 1701, as the crisis of the Spanish Succession was about to turn to open warfare, probably the most restrictive and dissuading draft for an act on silk, hair, cotton and calicoes was submitted by the Committee of trade.²³³ Three years later, on the 5th of August, the Act of Security was passed, and twenty days later, an overture and two drafts for acts were written or submitted.²³⁴ Besides, the trade imbalance had reached two million Scots that year.²³⁵ In 1705 four drafts for acts and one overture are recorded, altogether asking for restrictions on nothing

231 ‘NRS, PA7/16’, fols 28, 81(1,2 & 3) & 87.

232 Cullen, *Famine in Scotland*, p.71; Jorrand, ‘From “the Doors of the Seas” to a Watery Debacle’; Bowie,

‘New Perspectives on Pre-Union Scotland’, p.316; Devine, *The Scottish Nation, 1700-2000*, p.54; Whatley,

‘Economic Causes and Consequences of the Union of 1707’, p.152.

233 Talbot, ‘An Alliance Ended?’, p.190; ‘NRS, PA7/17/1/92’.

234 ‘NRS, PA7/19’, fol. 52(1,7 & 8).

235 Whatley, *The Scots and the Union*, p.210.

less than silk, wool, cotton, calicoes, velvet, muslin, yarn, thread, lace, stockings, hats, skins, hangings and furniture.²³⁶ In February, Westminster had resorted to open threat with the passing of the Alien Act.²³⁷

The parallel drawn above shows that the interest for legislating on those foreign textile was driven by very pragmatic worries regarding the state of Scotland's trade, manufactories and economy at large. In the 1682 proclamation on the import and wearing of lace, the opening lines stress the need to "erect, and set up Manufactories" and make "a stop to the import" of such commodities.²³⁸ The fact that several of these documents make exception for manufactures "made within this Kingdome" or specify that those prohibited are "forreign", highlights the economic motivations behind the prohibitions.²³⁹ Though most documents consider only textiles or specific items of dress and décor, a few touch onto other types of goods. A 1705 overture "For Promoting the Trade of this Nation" suggests prohibitions regarding the import of "powder and Fire-Arms", "Earthen and Glass Ware", "Soap", "Starch", "Cheese and Butter" – among others – along with "Stockings", "Points and Laces", "Woolen Manufactures" or "Tapestry, and Hangings", and prohibition regarding the export of "Skins" and "Wool, as much as "Talow", "Wax" or "Brass and old Copper".²⁴⁰ Similarly, an overture from 1698 defends "that hundred percent be imposed on all foreign Linnen cloath, on all work, all forreign drink made of malt, all made Timber work, all work made of pewter or lead".²⁴¹ The purpose of those pieces of legislation was to regulate the trade and balance of trade of the country, and therefore limit disadvantageous commerce to stimulate domestic economy. The 1705 overture for trade very clearly explains that implementing such restrictions would benefit the country as it would encourage the migration of "skilful artificers" and help establishing manufactories, which would also provide poor relief as it would have "all Hands Vertuously employed".²⁴²

As was mentioned earlier on, Scotland's economy was changing, turning from a mainly agrarian nation to a manufacturing one by developing its wool and linen sectors in particular.²⁴³ In the face of the economic crisis, these industries had to be protected and

236 'NRS, PA7/19', fol. 81(1), 103(1), 140(2) & 166; 'NRS, GD124/10/444', fol. 83.

237 NRS, 'Union of 1707 - Scotland 1689 - 1707', accessed 24 April 2024,

<https://www.scottisharchivesforschools.org/union1707/chapter2-3.asp>; Whatley, 'Economic Causes and Consequences of the Union of 1707', p.153.

238 Scotland Privy Council, 'NRS, RH14/103'.

239 'NRS, PA7/16', fol. 86(2) & 87; 'NRS, PA7/17/1/92'; 'NRS, PA7/19', fol. 81(1); 'NRS, GD124/10/444', fol. 83.

240 'NRS, GD124/10/444', fol. 83.

241 'NRS, PA7/16', fol. 86(2).

242 'NRS, GD124/10/444', fol. 83.

243 Whatley, *The Scots and the Union*, pp.119-21.

supported. Restrictions on both trade and consumption of foreign textiles, had two main objectives. First, textiles such as linens and wools made at home would see their competition limited and become commodities of choice for the Scottish market. Second, it would force a displacement of consumption, with some textiles such as silks or cottons, being replaced by domestically manufactured clothes made of different fibres, wool in particular. For that very reason, the proposed legislations often take wool into account and forbid the import of foreign wool and/or woollen manufactures.²⁴⁴ Similar mentions for leather and linens are also found.²⁴⁵ Encouraging the Scottish elite to wear home-made woollens instead of foreign silks was no new phenomenon in the late 17th century, but the economic conjecture made it especially necessary, and legal constraint seems to have been the means of choice to make it happen.²⁴⁶

3.3 A Well-tailored Rhetoric: Civil Society and the Law

• Petitions for “the General Good of the Kingdom” ... so they claim²⁴⁷

Members of civil society could address the Scottish parliament via petitions, representations or proposals, to complain about a situation or piece of legislation, or suggest the passing of one.²⁴⁸ Professional craftspeople and manufactories owners from the leather and textile sector as well as merchants were no stranger to this practice at the end of the 17th century. As the parliament debated and voted the passing of acts to regulate the trade and consumption of items of dress, textiles and fibres, Scottish makers and merchants reacted to parliament decisions, hence several demands directly referring to acts and proposals for legislation. For instance a petition from 1703 refers to an act of parliament stopping import, while a petition from 1705 refers to an overture previously mentioned in this paper concerning the prohibition to use and wear silk stuffs, velvets and droggats, both native- and foreign-made.²⁴⁹ Their discourse systematically and almost only relied on a nationalist line of argument. The eight petitions, representations and proposals on which this study relies contain

244‘NRS, PA7/16’, fol. 86(1 & 2) & 87; ‘NRS, PA7/19’, fol. 52(1) & 166; ‘NRS, GD124/10/444’, fol. 83.

245‘NRS, PA7/16’, fol. 86(2) & 87; ‘NRS, PA7/19’, fol. 81(1) & 166; ‘NRS, GD124/10/444’, fol. 83.

246Hayward, *Stuart Style*, pp.119 & 169.

247‘NRS, GD124/10/444’, fol. 81.

248‘Petition’; ‘Representation, n.¹ II.10.a’, in *OED Online*, accessed 1 May 2024,

https://www.oed.com/dictionary/representation_n1.

249‘NRS, PA7/18’, fol. 27(2); ‘NRS, PA7/19’, fol. 103(1 & 2).

the word ‘nation’ or its derivative adjective ‘national’ at least once, and all but one the word ‘kingdom’, reaching 21 mentions for the former and 19 for the latter in total.²⁵⁰ Some make great use of these terms, such as a representation from Edinburgh tanners which accounts for six use of ‘nation’ and ‘national’ in a one page-long document, or one for the silk manufactures using the word “kingdom” eight times in a two pages-long document.²⁵¹ Interestingly, these terms are used in a great variety of ways. The nation or kingdom, is sometimes presented as the beneficiary of the proposed measure, sometimes as the victim of a situation to be remedied by voting or changing legislation; sometimes it is an entity to serve, act for, or to speak on the behalf of.²⁵² The nation is therefore, “highly concerned”, seeking “Stability and Wisdom”, is “baffled”, threatened of “Ruine”, as much as it would be “greatly benefited” or find “many advantages” were the suggested legislations passed.²⁵³ The Scottish nation here is considered in both its abstract, personified and concrete dimensions. It is both Scotland as state, idea and people.

This choice comes as no surprise in this context of economic struggle and debates over a reshaping of the Anglo-Scottish union. The Scots were aware of the issues facing their country and of parliamentary discussions. Prints, manuscripts or oral information were easily accessed, especially since the book trade had much grown, and that these political materials were more easily spread to localities outside Edinburgh than before.²⁵⁴ The arguments developed in the different petitions, proposals and representations are all based on the overall national and international instability affecting Scotland’s economy. The question of the weakening of trade and overall economic losses linked to it comes up in several documents. The tanners’ representation reads:

“That where the Wisdom of the Nation at all occasions, Signalized themselves for encouraging Trade and Societies within this Kingdom ; yet notwithstanding of all such Honourable Endeavours, there is a very great decay of Trade, which causes a great scarcity of Money...”²⁵⁵

This extract shows that the authors were very much aware that, in spite of it's attempts to develop a profitable manufacturing sector and trade, the government struggled to reverse the trend. Behind an author’s promise to make goods “to as great perfection and as cheap” as those made abroad lies the problem of competition, which, as previously stated, was not in

250‘NRS, PA7/16’, fol. 14(1); ‘NRS, PA7/18’, fol. 27(2); ‘NRS, PA7/19’, fol. 52(2 & 6), 83(1), 86 & 103(2); ‘NRS, GD124/10/444’, fol. 81.

251‘NRS, PA7/19’, fol. 83(1); ‘NRS, GD124/10/444’, fol. 81.

252‘NRS, PA7/18’, fol. 27(2); ‘NRS, PA7/19’, fol. 52(2 & 6), 83(1), 86 & 103(2); ‘NRS, GD124/10/444’, fol. 81.

253‘NRS, PA7/18’, fol. 27(2); ‘NRS, PA7/19’, fol. 52(6), 83(1), 86 & 103(2); ‘NRS, GD124/10/444’, fol. 81.

254Bowie, ‘Public Opinion, Popular Politics and the Union of 1707’, pp.227-8.

255‘NRS, PA7/19’, fol. 83(1).

Scotland's favour concerning textiles.²⁵⁶ Some were more direct – and dramatic – accusing the import of such textiles to cause the “Ruine of the Kingdom”.²⁵⁷ The Darien Scheme is also mentioned in two documents. A Proposals in favour of woollen manufactories from 1704 opens on the deception of the failed endeavour and states:

“This Nation had lately a prospect of recovering itself from that poverty and contempt, which the scarcity of some years bygone, and decay of Trade has brought us under: By settling a Collony abroad; But providence having blown upon that Design; The only way that seems now to be left us, is the erecting and encouraging Manufactories...”²⁵⁸

A petition from August 1704, asking for the an act allowing the export of wool not to be voted, makes an even more subtle reference to the event. Stating that such a measure would cause an “irrapairable prejudice”, the proof of which was that “there cannot be be one single instance given of any Nation in *Europe*, that ever made a Law for Exportation of Wooll, which is so usefull if manufactured at home”, the authors still say otherwise concerning the Spanish and depreciate their character. The quote continues: “Yea the *Spainiards* who are naturally leasie, do at most at this day but connive at the exportation”.²⁵⁹ One cannot help but feel the authors' resentment concerning the Spanish attacks against the colony behind such words. The tanners' representation makes allusion to privateers and the disturbances which took place in the European seas during the War of Spanish Succession, defending that relying on national leather production would avoid the “hazard of Sea-Risque, or trouble in export”.²⁶⁰ Several documents also speak of domestic concerns, and point at poverty and unemployment.²⁶¹

As they point at all these issues of national importance, the authors present themselves and their businesses as the solution to these problems. Concerning poverty and unemployment, they present their manufactories as means of poor relief as, they defend, they “imploy the idle and unprofitable Hands, and furnish them Bread, who otherwise must live at the Nations charge”, their doing so by “making Looms, Harnesses, reeds, and other Furniture belonging thereto, Throwing, Winding, Dying, Warping, Weaving, and Callendering”.²⁶² As previously mentioned the famine had long lasting consequences, especially since the government had struggled to bring proper relief, and employment providing people with

256‘NRS, PA7/19’, fol. 103(2).

257‘NRS, PA7/18’, fol. 27(2).

258‘NRS, PA7/19’, fol. 52(2).

259‘NRS, PA7/19’, fol. 52(6).

260‘NRS, PA7/19’, fol. 83(1).

261‘NRS, PA7/19’, fol. 52(2) & 103(2); ‘NRS, GD124/10/444’, fol. 81.

262‘NRS, PA7/19’, fol. 52(2); ‘NRS, GD124/10/444’, fol. 81.

wages was much needed.²⁶³ Thanks to the work they would provide, the manufactories would limit emigrations motivated by poor living conditions and encourage immigration from skilled workers such as “Families, who make broad silks, and many Forraign Weavers”, in the same way France did with Italian and Flemish lace makers for example.²⁶⁴ The growth of Scotland’s textile sector, would also have major benefits for the country’s trade. The manufactories owners would provide great quantities of goods offering “a Subject for Trade” and resolve the problem of beneficial exchanges by making “the Ballance turn upon our[Scotland’s] side”.²⁶⁵ Indeed, this improved production would turn imports into exports, in addition to meeting domestic demand for goods similar as those imported, so that “the Nation may be sufficiently served and the product of our own Manufactories exported”.²⁶⁶ The main difficulty the Scottish industry was facing was competition. Foreign cloths were of better quality, and home made silks were far from meeting the demand.²⁶⁷ The petitioners assure that they could remedy that problem. The Edinburgh tanners assert that Scottish “Learther for Boots and Shoes of all sort, Calves Skins, and Marikin-Skins of all sorts and colours [to be], as good as any that ever came from Abroad”, while those involved in the silk industry and trade assert that Scotland makes silks “to as great perfection” as found in England.²⁶⁸ The latter assures that the progress since the beginning of their enterprise is incomparable, so much so that they “in [the?] compass of three years have come to such an Extraordinary perfection as noe nation can show to have happened in soo [?] a time”.²⁶⁹ As to the price of such goods, wool and silk producers assure that they could be as competitive and “furnish the Nation full as cheap as ever Goods of that kind were sold in *Scotland*”, and a cabinet maker states he could make oils “as cheap and cheaper then the same can be Imported form abroad”.²⁷⁰

Great attention was put into using verbs at a conditional form in the previous paragraph, for the reader must not forget that under the guise of “their Duty for the General Good of the Kingdom”, what all the authors attempted by writing these documents was, first and foremost, to try and influence the Scottish parliament into making decisions in favour of their businesses.²⁷¹ What these petitions, representations and proposals asked for were specific

263 Cullen, *Famine in Scotland*, p.189.

264 ‘NRS, PA7/16’, fol. 14(1); ‘NRS, GD124/10/444’, fol. 81; St Clair, *The Golden Thread*, p.147.

265 ‘NRS, PA7/19’, fol. 52(2); ‘NRS, GD124/10/444’, fol. 81.

266 ‘NRS, PA7/19’, fol. 83(1).

267 Whatley, *The Scots and the Union*, p.177; Hayward, *Stuart Style*, p.171.

268 ‘NRS, PA7/19’, fol. 83(1) & 103(2).

269 ‘NRS, PA7/19’, fol. 103(2) the left-hand side of the document was tucked in the binding of the folder, hence the blanks.

270 ‘NRS, PA7/18’, fol. 27(2); ‘NRS, PA7/19’, fols 86 & 103(2); ‘NRS, GD124/10/444’, fol. 81.

271 ‘NRS, GD124/10/444’, fol. 81.

measures to be taken, and not simply for the parliament to pay attention to foreign competition, unemployment and national economics as a whole. They all had interests to defend and businesses to keep running. Delegates from the wool and silk manufactories asked for a renewal of the sumptuary laws forbidding the wearing and using of foreign manufactures in 1703-4.²⁷² In 1705 petitioners on behalf of the members of the silk industries asked for the overture prohibiting the consumption of silks and silk stuffs not to be passed, as it would “overturn” the accomplishment of the recent manufactories which would “come to that Undeniable Perfection”.²⁷³ Many also demanded regulations on imports and exports. They mostly called for a ban on imported goods similar to their manufactures and/or of the same fibre or material.²⁷⁴ Hence a proposal from 1704 “in favours of the Woolen Manufactories, and particularly that of Glasgow” asking that:

“an Act be made not only ratifying the Laws and Acts of Parliament prohibiting the Importation of all foreraign woolen-Manufacture, or wherein there is Wool used: But [...] that the Exportation of Wool and Woolen-Yarn be effectually restrained, and for that end that all such as are concerned in the Wool-Manufactories, may be allowed to pursue such as are guilty of Exportation before any inferior judge or Magistrat in whose bounds they dwell or reside...”.²⁷⁵

That same year, on the 25th of August, a petition from representatives of the wool manufacturing industry, clearly shows their conflict with the wool producers. As the “Wooll Masters” presented “an Act of Parliament allowing the Exportation of Wooll”, the “masters of Manufactories” objected that such a measure was against the “former Laws” encouraging the erecting of manufactories –which is specified, they did “at great charge” –, in addition to increasing the cost of raw materials necessary to their industry, for they assert that “if Merchants buy it for Exportation, will any man get an Ounce weight of it without paying double Price”.²⁷⁶ This petition perfectly shows that those who petitioned the parliament were defending their own interests, above those of the nation. Indeed, the same day, an overture was presented to the parliament to allow the export of wool fibers, which conversely asserted that exports were needed. As the representatives of the manufactories asserted that this material was “so usefull if manufactured at home” and that exporting it would “be found an irreparable prejudice”, the overture states that:²⁷⁷

“the wooling Manufactor[ies] have come so far short of what was expected in manufacturing the Wool of the Natione, That there be a Wool-hal established to

272 ‘NRS, PA7/18’, fol. 27(2); ‘NRS, PA7/19’, fol. 52(2).

273 ‘NRS, PA7/19’, fol. 103(2); ‘NRS, GD124/10/444’, fol. 81.

274 ‘NRS, PA7/18’, fol. 27(2); ‘NRS, PA7/19’, fol. 52(2 & 6), 83(1) & 86.

275 ‘NRS, PA7/19’, fol. 52(2).

276 ‘NRS, PA7/19’, fol. 52(6).

277 ‘NRS, PA7/19’, fol. 52(6 & 7).

which every proprietor of Wool may bring what Wool he cannot sell or dispose of otherways...”²⁷⁸

Interestingly enough, the money obtained from the exporting of the wool aimed at establishing a fund to help developing national manufactories. Confronting these two documents, we understand that the difficulties faced by the wool manufactures were less caused by the supply of fibres, than an overall weakness of the industry at the different stages from production to consumption. The demands for funds and monopolies make even more blatant the individualistic dimension of these petitions. The petition from two merchants having obtained an authorisation to establish a silk manufactory state that they “expected a Reimbursement of the necessar Charges and Expenses, that usually attend such undertakings in the beginning”.²⁷⁹ The cabinet maker previously mentioned, in his petition for the production of oils and the building of appropriate mills, asked to be allowed “the Sole priviledge of making the Saids oils for some competent number of years Excluding all others during that tyme for compensing the great Expences I will be put to in Erecting the said Miles”.²⁸⁰ The 1704 proposal for the woollen manufactories, although presented as defending the whole branch by asking for imports and exports of wool stuffs to be restricted, was nevertheless demanding specific and extensive privileges for specific manufactories:

“That the Woolen Manufactory erected at Glasgow by William Cochran of Ochiltre, John Alexander of Blackhouse and partners, and the other Manufactories erected there, and which are declared such by His Majesties privy Council, shall enjoy all Immunities, priviledges and Freedoms granted by any former Laws or Acts of parliament, or that shall be hereafter granted to any Manufactory both as to the Stock and persons employed, or that shall happen to be employed hereafter by the said Manufactories...”²⁸¹

There is no doubt that these addresses to the parliament were blatant pieces of rhetoric promoting the interests of specific members of Scotland’s industry, rather than recollections of unbiased facts expounding the strengths and weaknesses of the country’s trade and manufacturing sector, alongside proposals considering all aspects of the crisis. Yet the authors were very much aware of the socio-economic and political aspects of Scotland’s situation, which heavily nourished their arguments. Their discourse comprises all the elements previously referred to and which explain Scotland struggles at the turn of the century. Merchants and manufactory owners had to convince a parliament which was in the middle of

278‘NRS, PA7/19’, fol. 52(7).

279‘NRS, PA7/16’, fol. 14(1).

280‘NRS, PA7/19’, fol. 86.

281‘NRS, PA7/19’, fol. 52(2).

a power struggle with its southern neighbour and had to quickly find measures to efficiently restore the country's economic and social situation. The government could not afford any more failure or losses, and would not give away the little money it had left so easily.²⁸² Being much aware of the debates between and positions of the members of parliament, the authors based their rhetoric on the very concern they unanimously shared: improving Scotland's economy. Interestingly, very few foreign nations are named in these documents, although all have at their heart the problem on foreign competition. England and Ireland are specifically mentioned a few times – England in particular –, along with a mention of the Spanish, but other countries are referred to via general phrases such as “Nation in *Europe*” and “Neighbouring Countrys” or behind references to “Foreign Manufacture” or goods that “came from Abroad”.²⁸³ France is not mentioned once. It is difficult to say whether the merchants, craftspeople and manufactory owners knew about French trade and/or its extent or not, and if they did, if omitting that fact from their petitions was a deliberate choice. The following hypothesis could however be made. First, the fact that the nations mentioned were all involved in Scotland's recent and ongoing political struggles – i.e the Spanish for the Darien Scheme and England and Ireland for the negotiations around succession and the union –, could very much have been intentional, insinuating that the country could not or did not need to rely on England or colonies to obtain such goods but could very well have them manufactured at home.²⁸⁴ In doing so, the authors could have appealed to the idea of leverage in the negotiations for union, efficiently making all members of parliament feel concerned regardless of their opinion in the debate. The idea of economic self-sufficiency in textile production would not have upset anyone, while still touching on the burning issues that were foreign trade, the negative balance of trade and Scotland's relation with England. Second, if France was not targeted in these documents, it is probably because it was less the country's trading links with other Europeans than foreign trade as a whole that was a problem. Textile trade with France was known among Scots, because many bought French textiles and items of dress, which involved merchants and many other actors of commerce, crafts and doubtlessly of domesticity.²⁸⁵ But it did not really support their arguments to specifically point at the auld ally. The debates were about Scotland, so their argument were Scotland-centered. It is therefore not surprising that the authors made themselves rather discreet in their petitions,

282 See subpart 3.1 above for detailed explanations and references.

283 ‘NRS, PA7/18’, fol. 27(2); ‘NRS, PA7/19’, fol. 52(6) & 83(1); ‘NRS, GD124/10/444’, fol. 81.

284 ‘NRS, PA7/19’, fol. 52(6), 83(1) & 103(2); ‘NRS, GD124/10/444’, fol. 81.

285 see in particular the reference to ‘Taylors’ and ‘Wives, Children, or Servants, or others’ in ‘NRS, PA7/19’, fol. 63.

in favour of a more generic voice: that of concerned citizens writing on behalf of the Nation.²⁸⁶

• **The issue of “excessive Vanity and Folly”: the moral argument²⁸⁷**

One could have expected to primarily read words deploring the moral decadence of the Scots indulging into consumption and appearances. Yet, as seen above, the petitioners’ discourse focused on national economy. The moral question was nevertheless not absent from parliamentary discussions and some authors resorted to arguments of that sort. Such criticisms are sporadically found in the legislative papers and petitions: the 1682 Proclamation on lace, describes these commodities as “superfluous”, a petition from 1703 designates the consumption of foreign fabric as an act of “Vanity and Folly”, and a representation for the silk manufactories qualifies the importation of foreign silks as “Pernicious”.²⁸⁸ A memorial and an answer to a memorial (document referred to as ‘answer’ from now on) both from 1703 or 1704, however, more heavily rely on morality as key element of discourse.²⁸⁹ It is worth comparing all these different documents, for it reveals that some words are common to them. The petition and the memorial use the word “pernicious”, the proclamation and answer use the word “superfluous”, the term “luxury” is found in the memorial and the answer, the allocation of “Folly” and “Vanity” is found in both the petition and the answer, and while the memorial mentions things being purchased for “more than necessary”, the answer states that losses of money to England are due to “unnecessary Commodities”.²⁹⁰ From these wordings, we already understand that moral perversion and behaviours of excess are pointed at. The memorial and answer particularly dwell on these aspects. The memorial provides an overview of “The State of the Manufactures before and since the Year 1700, at which time the Laws concerning Trade and Manufactures were Revived and Increased”, along with “Remarks upon the Arts used for Eluding these Laws”.²⁹¹ The answer, is a reply to a memorial “given in by the Merchants Retailers in Edinburgh, with relation to the law anent Trade”.²⁹² Before diving deeper into this analysis, I would like to point out that I believe the authors from the two documents to be one and the same: great similarities are found in both their arguments, as

²⁸⁶see in particular: ‘NRS, PA7/19’, fol. 103(2).

²⁸⁷‘NRS, PA7/18’, fol. 27(2).

²⁸⁸Scotland Privy Council, ‘NRS, RH14/103’; ‘NRS, PA7/18’, fol. 27(2); ‘NRS, GD124/10/444’, fol. 81.

²⁸⁹‘NRS, PA7/19’, fols 63 & 64.

²⁹⁰Scotland Privy Council, ‘NRS, RH14/103’; ‘NRS, PA7/18’, fol. 27(2); ‘NRS, PA7/19’, fols 63 & 64; ‘NRS, GD124/10/444’, fol. 81.

²⁹¹‘NRS, PA7/19’, fol. 63.

²⁹²‘NRS, PA7/19’, fol. 64.

almost all the aspects exposed bellow are found in the answer and the memorial, along with phrases or words common to both, like “humour” used in collocation with “Modes” or “Luxurie”, or the adjective “thieving” to qualify trade.²⁹³

The accusations in these two documents are obviously developed within a religious framework. To begin with, the importance of work ethic, and loss thereof, is an important feature. Although merchants are the primary target of this accusation, the whole branch of trade is pointed at, with “Taylors”, “Retailers” or “Importers” being mentioned.²⁹⁴ In the Memorial, it is stated that “The want of commerce has also produced another Fatal and too visible Effect, our Merchants and Tradesmen are superficial, and less sincere and punctual in their Dealing”.²⁹⁵ To the representative of the merchant retailers in Edinburgh, who defends that the retailers “*break the Law for necessity to get bread*”, the author in his answer perfectly replies that, their sole doing is to corrupt the profession and besmirch all ethic:

“And nothing did more feed the excessive Folly and Vanity of wearing Forreign Manufactures than the industry of Retailers, [...] our Merchants did Trade with actual Money, and made their Returns with such things only, as were fit for Luxury, so that the Spirit and Design of Trade was lost, [...] and even Book-keeping was lost, and with these, the Reputation of fair Dealing”²⁹⁶

The protestant idea according to which work is an act of faith ruled by moral conduct is made even more visible behind accusations of sinful behaviour: the members of the trade are accused of theft and greediness.²⁹⁷ Their activities “steals from the Rich, and starves the Poor”, “and if any of them got a Fortune, it was not by fair Dealing with Strangers, but of their Countrey-men, if they got Bread, it was by taking it out of their Countrey-mens Mouths”, when they did not “sunk in Credit”.²⁹⁸ The whole trade is presented as nothing but “a Thieving Traffick”, for which “the Publick [is] defrauded”.²⁹⁹ Consumers have their share of accusations as, it is pointed out, they return from abroad “flocked for several Years with Forreign Cloaths” and purchase “more than is necessary for their Residence”. This analysis extends to the use of some words which bear similar connotations. “Folly”, denotes ideas of wrongdoing, evil or sin, as do “Malice and “envy”.³⁰⁰ Interestingly, a representation also

293‘NRS, PA7/19’, fols 63 & 64.

294‘NRS, PA7/19’, fols 63 & 64.

295‘NRS, PA7/19’, fol. 64.

296‘NRS, PA7/19’, fol. 64.

297Catharina Lis and Josef Ehmer, ‘Introduction: Historical Studies in Perceptions of Works’, in *The Idea of Work in Europe from Antiquity to Modern Times*, ed. Josef Ehmer and Catharina Lis (England: Ashgate Publishing Limited, 2009), pp.16-7.

298‘NRS, PA7/19’, fol. 64.

299‘NRS, PA7/19’, fol. 63.

300‘Folly, n.’, in *OED Online*, accessed 4 May 2024, https://www.oed.com/dictionary/folly_n1; ‘Malice’, in *OED Online*, accessed 6 May 2024, https://www.oed.com/dictionary/malice_n; ‘Envy’, in *OED Online*, accessed 6 May 2024, https://www.oed.com/dictionary/envy_n.

accused merchants of such ill, stating that “the Great Reason” of contempt of the law is “the Envy of some Merchants who repine against these concerned in the Manufactory”.³⁰¹ The adjective “pernicious”, which is found a few times, also denotes ideas of evil things or doing.³⁰² It is worth noting that this moral decadence is, in addition to tradespeople, also attributed to the youth, “a Vain and Idle Generation, who prefer the Luxurie and Humor of their Cloaths, to the Wealth and Interest of their Country”, the problem of which shall be remedied by “Nurseries of young Tradesmen and Merchants, who shall not prey upon Bowels of the Country by a pernicious Commerce”.³⁰³ This importance of work and virtue were already found in the draft of acts and overture stating that the “idle and unprofitable Hands” had to be “Vertuously employed”.³⁰⁴ We see a clear opposition between virtuous work and idle consumption being drawn by the author.

The other great argument presented in these documents is that these retailers, traders, merchants etc., are directly “Preying [...] upon the Nation”.³⁰⁵ It is a criticism of individualism over “Publick Good” that is denounced, the quest for “personal happiness” over “the Universal happiness of our Native Countrey, wherein every particular Person ought to be more concerned”.³⁰⁶ Consumers, “the Nobility and Gentry going Abroad” providing itself “with much more than necessary” in particular, are accused of indulging into “luxury and Itch”, to a point that they “Starve and Discipate the People at home, and also brought Forreign Debt upon the Nation”; merchants conducting “that kind of Commerce, which our Author [the one replied to in the answer] imagines will pass for Trade, was little better than Stealing from our Native Countrey”.³⁰⁷ Their doings cause direct harm to the Nation. In addition to that, the answer stresses the immorality of the person our author answers to, in his disregard for parliamentary authority. He is said, to:

“reproach former Parliaments, and diminish the Authority of their Acts by Insinuations, as if these Acts had proceeded from any other occasion than the publick Good; or that the Parliament had proceeded without Consideration”³⁰⁸

Under the wording “unpardonable Breach of Modesty and good Manners”, it is actually the questioning of the parliament’s integrity that is exposed and criticised. During the years prior to the Union of 1707, the Scottish parliament became an increasingly important institution in

301 ‘NRS, GD124/10/444’, fol. 81.

302 ‘Pernicious, Adj.’, in *OED Online*, accessed 4 May 2024, https://www.oed.com/dictionary/pernicious_adj1.

303 ‘NRS, PA7/19’, fols 63 & 64.

304 ‘NRS, PA7/19’, fol. 52(2); ‘NRS, GD124/10/444’, fol. 83.

305 ‘NRS, PA7/19’, fol. 63.

306 ‘NRS, PA7/19’, fols 64 & 63.

307 ‘NRS, PA7/19’, fols 63 & 64.

308 ‘NRS, PA7/19’, fol. 64.

terms of national identity. As C. Jackson puts it, it became the “institutional embodiment of Scots nationhood” after the Williamite Revolution.³⁰⁹ An interesting, yet discreet, rhetorical device is used to expose this tension between the individuals and the government. In both documents the word “Humor” is used: once associated with “Luxurie” and once with “Modes”, but each time when talking about the consumption of clothes.³¹⁰ The theory of humours, was a medical belief according to which the proportion and condition of four fluids existing in the human body determined one’s health and temperament.³¹¹ The word “pernicious”, which is here used a few times to qualify trading activities, was often used to describe a particularly harmful disease. The author therefore seems to rely on a bodily image. Consumers and tradespeople are part of the body which could be very well understood as the nation, and are therefore not acting with reason. The trade and consumption of foreign fabric is a disease that literally “starve[s]” by taking “Bread” out of “Mouths”.³¹² The government, on the contrary has “wisdom”.³¹³ The whole answer is in itself a display of organised reasonable thinking against “Calumny” and “indiscreet Falshood”.³¹⁴ The author defends a parliament which proceeds with “due consideration” against the “angry memorial” of a person putting forward arguments “contrary to the force and current of all his Reasonings”.³¹⁵ One must not forget that this answer was written about fifty years after Descartes’ *Meditation on First Philosophy*, defining a “real distinction between Mind and Body”, and putting reason above all that is matter, including the body.³¹⁶

• Consumption race and the crisis of the system

Despite all the rhetorical devices, arguments and pleas, despite the overtures, petitions and acts of parliament, foreign fabrics kept entering Scotland. Many historians have pointed out the ineffectiveness of the law.³¹⁷ The parliament and privy council continuously voted old measures again or implemented new ones. Merchants resorted to several strategies to evade customs and prohibition, and relied on alternative routes and ways to continue their business

309 Jackson, ‘Conceptions of Nationhood in the Anglo-Scottish Union Debates of 1707’, pp.70-7.

310 ‘NRS, PA7/19’, fols 63 & 64.

311 ‘Humour | Humor’, in *OED Online*, accessed 4 May 2024, https://www.oed.com/dictionary/humour_n.

312 ‘NRS, PA7/19’, fols 63 & 64.

313 ‘NRS, PA7/19’, fol. 63.

314 ‘NRS, PA7/19’, fol. 64.

315 ‘NRS, PA7/19’, fol. 64.

316 René Descartes, *Meditations on First Philosophy* (Broadview Press, 2013), p.78-90.

317 see Talbott, ‘An Alliance Ended?’; Whatley, *The Scots and the Union*, pp.175-201; Smout, ‘Making and Trading Dress and Décor in Seventeenth-Century Scotland’, pp.426-36.

and meet the demands of insatiable nobles and wealthy professionals.³¹⁸ Trade with France was conducted in both discreet illegality and plain sight, even during periods of conflict.³¹⁹ The worries and determination of the member of parliament did not suffice to efficiently solve the problem, for “plain incompetence” and “personal abuse” had crept into the state apparatus.³²⁰ Recipes, bills and accounts from the period only align with this analysis. During the Nine Years’ War, although trade with France was officially prohibited, a tailor in Edinburgh, James Nimo, sold two ells of “french worsten cloth” to a client.³²¹ Household papers from the Buccleuch family reveal several purchases clearly bypassing the law. Velvet and silk caps were purchased in April 1703, two tailor’s bill from 1703-4 have an entry “for making a pair of french canvas bodys”, in November 1704, they purchased half a yard of “fine french quilt”, and a memoire in French from 1704, probably for gloves, is also found among the papers.³²² People broke the law, and the parliament knew. Both the memorial and answer stress this point. It is acknowledged that the “Law has to little Effect”.³²³ Denouncing a lack of ethic from professionals in the textile sector, the author states that “The Liberty taken by the *Taylor*s in making Cloaths of Goods, is a great cause of the Contempt of the Law” and that “the Reason why so many various Laws have been made is, because the Retailers have always had Wit enough to disappoint the effect of former Laws”.³²⁴ Besides, his answer to the argument according to which those who “*break the Law for Necessity to get Bread*” are more harshly prosecuted reveals that the members of parliament were aware of how inefficient law enforcement was.³²⁵

“But to this it is Answered, That the Societies who undertook the trouble of prosecuting Offenders, have met with so much Reproach and Discouragement, so many Arts have been used to elide the Law that is a grearer wonder that any thing is done by far, then that any thing is left undone”³²⁶

The practical impossibility to put an end to this inflow of foreign fabrics and their increasing consumption was fuelled by another phenomenon: urbanisation. Like other European countries, Scotland became increasingly urban, and with it, centers of consumption

318 Whatley, *The Scots and the Union*, p.175; Smout, ‘Making and Trading Dress and Décor in Seventeenth-Century Scotland’, pp.426, 430 & 435-6; Talbott, ‘An Alliance Ended?’, pp.68 & 185-6.

319 Talbott, ‘An Alliance Ended?’, pp.185-6 & 201.

320 Whatley, *The Scots and the Union*, pp.179 & 201.

321 Talbott, ‘An Alliance Ended?’, pp.185-6; ‘NRS, RH15/148’, fol. account to George Nicole, February 1698-March 1699.

322 ‘Vouchers of Accounts, Montague-Douglas-Scott Family, Dukes of Buccleuch, GD224/307/5’ (1704 1705), fols 31, 36, 45 & 50, NRS.

323 ‘NRS, PA7/19’, fol. 63.

324 ‘NRS, PA7/19’, fols 63-4.

325 ‘NRS, PA7/19’, fol. 64.

326 ‘NRS, PA7/19’, fol. 64.

developed.³²⁷ Glasgow and Edinburgh expanded, with economies surrounding the commerce and making of luxurious goods growing.³²⁸ Edinburgh's crafts related to dress, textile and leather represented half of the adult population, with 311 tailors, 156 cordiners, 110 weavers, 16 tanners, 3 bonnet makers, to name just a few examples.³²⁹ The majority of tailors in Scotland for the elite were in Edinburgh.³³⁰ The wealthy and influential elite was over represented in cities, amounting to about 10% in the capital.³³¹ Cities were "places of consumption, learning and civility", and consequently of display.³³² Money favoured the purchase of luxurious commodities, but also the hiring of servants and cleaners.³³³ Given this economic and demographic context, there is little doubt that most people knew about the import of French textiles and manipulated them. Once again, members of parliament were not oblivious. The answer specifically targets Edinburgh. Replying to the complain that "*att the Prosecution which have been made for Transgression of that Act of Parliament, Edinburgh has suffered most*", the author replies that "there could be nothing more reasonably devised, then the punishing of Retailers, and that of *Edinburgh* chiefly", to which he adds:³³⁴

"of all Retailers, those about the Town of Edinburgh needed the strictest search ; seing it is from Edinburgh that the rest of the Nation take their Modes and Humours of Cloaths and furniture: and if the Retailers about the Town had not been most guilty, they had not been prosecute."³³⁵

The wide and concentrated network of people involved in the circulation of French textiles and leather goods self-nourished itself: providers, transformers, consumers and intermediaries reached larger scales and incredible proximity in those centers, which made their commerce and access easy. This multiplicity of actors and the rapidity with which the goods doubtlessly circulated probably also made penalties difficult to implement and individual law breakers harder to target and catch.

327DuPlessis, *Transitions to Capitalism in Early Modern Europe*, p.278; Hayward, "Outlandish Superfluities: Luxury and Clothing in Scottish and English Sumptuary Law from the Fourteenth to the Seventeenth Century", p.113.

328Whatley, *The Scots and the Union*, pp.122-4.

329Helen M. Dingwall, *Late Seventeenth-Century Edinburgh: A Demographic Study* (Aldershot: Scolar, 1994), pp.134-6 & 146-7.

330Hayward, *Stuart Style*, pp.187-8.

331Hayward, "Outlandish Superfluities: Luxury and Clothing in Scottish and English Sumptuary Law from the Fourteenth to the Seventeenth Century", p.113; Dingwall, *Late Seventeenth-Century Edinburgh*, pp.35 & 71.

332Whatley, *The Scots and the Union*, pp.122-3; Hayward, "Outlandish Superfluities: Luxury and Clothing in Scottish and English Sumptuary Law from the Fourteenth to the Seventeenth Century", p.112.

333Whatley, *The Scots and the Union*, p.175.

334'NRS, PA7/19', fol. 64.

335'NRS, PA7/19', fol. 64.

In a previous chapter, the notion of luxury has been debated, and the importance of social display through dress and textiles for the Scottish nobility has been stressed.³³⁶ This aspect must be considered when discussing legislation. Beyond the importance of dressing the part as element of class identity, lies the closely-linked notions of power and order. Dress and décor formed what Michael Pearce calls a “network of intentionalities” which implied “response”, “behaviour” and “expectation”.³³⁷ Dress is hardly a matter of “functionalism” but, as Christopher J. Berry states, “only exists within a concrete cultural setting”.³³⁸ To this I would add that dress only exists as dress – which I would differentiate from clothing, which stresses this idea of functionalism – through perception. Dress is intertwined with interpersonal relations. The need to be recognised as belonging to such or such category implies a specific structure of relationship, and for this study in particular, a hierarchy: there is a specific order of things, which is guaranteed by practices. This structure cannot be considered without the notion of power, since the very essence of this social division is a distribution of power: power – and therefore control – over land, resources, people.³³⁹

Yet, in a mercantilist age when power and wealth became ever more inseparable, the association of rank and power was put into question. Beyond claiming ones belonging to a certain rank, the display of luxurious textiles, items of dress and décor “demonstrate[s] and construct[s] power relationships.”³⁴⁰ Consequently, I would argue that French textiles in their capacity of luxurious, valuable items, were more than means of power, but were in themselves a form of non-verbal power. To wear or own such items was possible only because the owner or wearer had the power to do so, and because the perception of such items triggered a reaction, a posture from the people perceiving, who would consequently allow or keep themselves from behaving in certain way. Consequently, the middling rank which started buying and wearing these items, in doing so also infringed upon noble power by way of appropriation. What was inherited from lineage, could now be obtained via mercantile success. The socio-biological heritage defended by the elite was challenged by the mercantilist conception of the professional rank: the whole structure of power was put into question, and therefore, so was its legitimacy.³⁴¹ The question of access to silks, laces, fine

336 See part “2.3 A Question of Demand and Display”

337 Pearce, ‘Vanished Comforts: Locating Roles of Domestic Furnishings in Scotland 1500-1650’, p.8.

338 Christopher J Berry, *The Idea of Luxury: A Conceptual and Historical Investigation*, Ideas in Context (Cambridge New York [etc.: Cambridge university press, 1994), p.29.

339 for the definition of power as control see ‘Power, n.¹ I.2.a’, in *OED Online*, accessed 16 May 2024, https://www.oed.com/dictionary/power_n1.

340 Pearce, ‘Vanished Comforts: Locating Roles of Domestic Furnishings in Scotland 1500-1650’, p.118.

341 see in particular Hayward, *Stuart Style*, p.15; Pearce, ‘Vanished Comforts: Locating Roles of Domestic Furnishings in Scotland 1500-1650’, p.118; Brown, *Noble Society in Scotland*, pp.3-4 & 7.

gloves etc. which France produced and exported finds its place within this overall restructuring and redefinition of power relations. The very continuation of noble rank is put into question. A poem taking the form of a petition stresses this particular aspect. In the poem, the female author(s) argument against the passing of a sumptuary law (see footnote).³⁴² Interestingly, while the parliamentary documents never mentioned France in relation to textile, it is the only country that comes up in the poem:

“ Since our Apparel’s costly from abroad
And Fashions brought from *France* all A-la-mode
Which spends our Money, makes our nation poor
Therefore our suite we may not well procure:
This is objected, read our just Defence”³⁴³

Their argument connects apparel, especially from France, with access to marriage, which suggests the question of the continuity of lineage. They/she argue[s] that if they “must not want [their] fashions out of France”, they “must live Maidens, never Wives”. The discourse is built so as to make men feel concerned about what is at stake if they cannot dress according to their status and “Fortune”, and therefore cannot secure a marriage: nobility as a whole, as social class high up in the power-structure, is threatened. It is the very structure of power, the whole system, which could be jeopardize without marriages to ensure heirs:

“ Consider likewise Nobles of renown,
And Knights of Garter Guardians of the Crown
That your great loss will be for want of Vests,
[...]
The great misfortune that herein doth ly
That Thousands of us must unmarri’d dy.”³⁴⁴

From a gender perspective, this poem gives us great insight into the importance of display and means and form of power. The author(s) carefully navigate(s) between gender, and moral expectations and representations to build a rhetoric that serves women’s interest. It is agreed that “ ‘Tis true that we must hate Extravagance”, aligning with the protestant view favouring plainness – which did not exclude expensive dyes and embellishments – over the

342 It has been assumed that the author(s) was/were female because of the subtle criticism of men in the poem via the attribution of female qualities. It is however important to note that because of the absence of information regarding the author(s), this interpretation must be regarded as a working hypothesis, not truth. For mention of male authorship passing as female see for instance Michael North. ‘Le Débat Sur La Mode Française et Anglaise Au XVIIIe Siècle En Allemagne’. In *Les Réseaux de Sociabilité Dans La Culture Des Lumières. Circulations, Échanges et Transferts*, edited by Vanessa Alayrac-Fielding and Sophie Mesplède, pp.341-72. Éditions Le Manuscrit, 2022.

343‘NRS, GD150/3377’.

344‘NRS, GD150/3377’.

“opulence” associated with catholic dress.³⁴⁵ However they/sh highlight(s) the fact that, their condition as female noble depends on how they dress.³⁴⁶ Both class and gender intertwine in this argument:

“A Man of wit and reason will enquire
 (Before he come a Woman to admire)
 What race and of what persons she descend
 And make his reason quadrate with the end.
 If Men deceive themselves by finer Dress
 And doubtless think our Fortune is no less
 Than may maintain such grandour as we keep
 Let such as are beguil’d have time to weep
 If Silks and Stuffs be hind’red to be sold,
 Their loss is great, but ours cannot be told
 They lose their *Goods*, but we must lose our *lives*.”³⁴⁷

Perception is at the heart of this poem. So is power. It is clear from the reading that the author[s] – and by extension all noble women – had a clear understanding of their position and the degree and form of the power they wielded. Their strength rested on them comprehending how they were perceived, and using it by performing accordingly. To begin with, since they were perceived as aesthetic being defined by “Beauty”, whether they were “Bony” or not, by their “outward Garb” and “Rich Apparel”, then their appearance could have been – and doubtlessly would have been - used as form of non-verbal power. Because they had little leeway outside the physical and visual space to control their matches, given the character of men who tend to “deceive themselves by finer dress”, they had to evolve within this frame.³⁴⁸ Noble women’s control over their own appearance implied control over their own status. Power is by essence “control or authority over others”.³⁴⁹ Therefore, the signs inherent to the representation people have of a person, if controlled and used by the so-called person, then, how people will perceive that person in real life is necessarily affected. And since perceptions affect behaviours, then the presence of specific signs will trigger or encourage a certain response, a certain behaviour. We come back to the “network of intentionalities” mentioned above.³⁵⁰ Displaying signs associated with “Fortune” is more likely to encourage men to “enquire” and “admire” a woman, for her to eventually “be Woo’d” and hopefully marry well.³⁵¹ Yet, if this control over apparel is taken away, they have

345‘NRS, GD150/3377’; Hayward, *Stuart Style*, p.35.

346‘NRS, GD150/3377’.

347‘NRS, GD150/3377’.

348‘NRS, GD150/3377’.

349‘Power, n.¹ I.2.a’.

350Pearce, ‘Vanished Comforts: Locating Roles of Domestic Furnishings in Scotland 1500-1650’, p.8.

351‘NRS, GD150/3377’.

little power left over their securing of a good match, granting therefore even more power to men in the matter.

This understanding of perception and representation also nourishes the rhetoric of the poem, for more than a piece of literature, this poem is a political text, defending a group's interest as the title indicates: "THE LADIES PETITION TO THE PARLIAMENT Against the Passing of the SUMPTUARY ACT".³⁵² The author(s) cleverly conform(s) to gender expectations to defend her/their interests. The argument relies on superficiality and suggested inferiority. Expenditure on dress is never presented as consumption or the satisfaction of desire but as necessity because of natural constraint. On the one hand, they expose physical inequalities: "This we must do, because kind Nature's framework / Hath made some Bony, others not the same" ; on the other hand, it is inequalities between men that is pointed out, between those "of wit and reason" and those who "deceive themselves by finer Dress".³⁵³ Simultaneously, men and women are opposed – although not without witty irony. Description of the former reads:

“ So we poor shallow Women have no Wyles
No Rhetorik, no Flatery no Smiles,
No tears which Nilus Crocadies do use”

They remain alien to the mind and restricted to the physical, the appearances. Interestingly, although men are associated with words related to the mind – “think”, “wit and reason” – , they are still “deceived”, and are the ones who are deceitful and dishonest as the use of the negation in the above-extract suggests.³⁵⁴ They conform to representation, and *represent* themselves as naïve, harmless, with no other interest than their appearance and marriage, when they are actually defending their share of agency in match-making and an important share of their power. Contrary to what is stated, they “have” rhetoric and extensively use it to make the reason-denying discourse on women serve a different and seemingly contradictory interest. To convince men, they have to beat them at their own game in a way, and use the rules defined by representation to keep their share of power and get politically involved. Beyond advocating for the non-passing of the Act, and preventing “Silks and Stuffs [to] be hind’red to be sold”, the poem aimed at protecting female nobles’ non-verbal power through display, and enabled a feminine political voice to be heard.³⁵⁵

352‘NRS, GD150/3377’.

353‘NRS, GD150/3377’.

354‘NRS, GD150/3377’.

355‘NRS, GD150/3377’.

Both forms of power revealed by this document – verbal via the text and rhetoric, and non-verbal via the argumentation on apparel – show the importance of perception and power for the period. A similar type of dynamics is at play from the perspective of rank. The appropriation of the system of signs formed by apparel and décor by the middling ranks also deprived the nobility from that form of non-verbal power which had so far been theirs. Beyond this aspect, the challenging of the social hierarchy by that of the sign system is an overall threat to order. These signs – i.e. luxurious items of dress and décor such as were imported from France – were supposed to be made use of only by members of the nobility. They were established, known, stable. The privileges and prerequisite of nobility being appropriated by inferior rank was a direct challenge to the very principle of the system. Given the great diversity among nobility, with some professionals being wealthier than some lower nobles, you would have non-nobles who looked more nobile than actual nobles.³⁵⁶ We can talk about a crisis of the system here. There is a schism between the signifier – i.e. specific items such as red silk – and the signified – i.e. this person belongs to nobility. What was perceived in apparel and décor could no longer be interpreted via the reference system. Rich apparels, silks, laces, red and black textiles etc. were no longer signs of rank but of wealth. As exposed earlier on in this paper, this phenomenon led to a consumption race. This can be interpreted as a reaction to this destabilisation. This socio-demographic reworking which led to the crisis of the sign system was questioning an order of things. The buzzing activity around textile and the concentration of nobile and professional circles in cities, favoured display and the escalation of consumption between the two groups, which in return encouraged such commerce.³⁵⁷ This conjecture only favoured the development of a successful trade for merchants – who took part in this race –; and this trade made the escalation possible as much as it nourished it. Merchants were part of this competing middle rank who tried to legitimate its success via the appropriation of the sign system.³⁵⁸ The wealthier these professionals became, the more foreign fabrics the nobility purchased, giving the former ever more resources to compete. This vicious circle nourished the crisis of the representation system.

356 Weatherill, *Consumer Behaviour and Material Culture in Britain*, pp.13-4; Nenadic, 'Middle-Rank Consumers and Domestic Culture in Edinburgh and Glasgow 1720-1840', p.123; Brown, *Noble Society in Scotland*, p.71; Whatley, *The Scots and the Union*, p.175.

357 Dingwall, *Late Seventeenth-Century Edinburgh*, pp.35,71 & 146-7; Whatley, *The Scots and the Union*, pp.122-4 & 175.

358 Whatley, *The Scots and the Union*, p.175.

• A new order: government and consumption

The system, along with the order and stability it implied, was challenged by sumptuary laws – as seen in the poem –, which invites us to consider this question of stability from the government’s perspective. As established earlier on, Scotland was going through a major economic and political crisis at the turn of the century.³⁵⁹ As seen above, to remedy this problem, sumptuary laws and trade legislations quickly became part of the solution to limit capital flight. These pieces of legislation targeted specific goods and sometimes specific locations. What they did not do, however, was targeting specific people *per se*.³⁶⁰ As seen in the overtures, proposals and drafts, it was the consumption and trade of expensive foreign textiles and goods which were proposed for prohibition or limitation. Given the rise of the middle rank, such legislations applied to both nobles and non-nobles. While sumptuary laws had previously been a guarantee of nobile privileges and established the prerequisites of the rank, they were, from then on, becoming a threat.³⁶¹ It was all those involved in the consumption of these goods which were concerned with restrictions, regardless of their rank and/or activities. These legislative choices are not compatible with an idea of the state defining relationships of power according to a hierarchy with multiple ranks. The question of rank and privilege is excluded, in favour of a state-citizen structure. This analysis is coherent with the exception found in some of the earlier parliamentary documents discussed in this study, which allowed the wearing of prohibited goods only in cases involving state representation.³⁶²

This understanding of national power structure and of the place and role of the state perfectly fits within Hobbes’ theory of government. To guarantee a state of security for all, citizens have transferred all their rights to the sovereign – but that to judge whether one is in mortal peril and act on it for self-preservation – forming therefore a “common-wealth”.³⁶³ In doing so, individuals renounce their rights to all things.³⁶⁴ This renouncing implies that the sovereign is entitled and expected to do anything to preserve peace both against other nations

359 Whatley, *The Scots and the Union*, chapters 4 & 5.

360 See analysis above

361 on sumptuary laws as guarantee see Brown, *Noble Society in Scotland*, p.71; AND Hayward, ‘Outlandish Superfluities: Luxury and Clothing in Scottish and English Sumptuary Law from the Fourteenth to the Seventeenth Century’, p.97.

362 ‘NRS, PA7/17/1/92’; ‘NRS, PA7/19’, fol. 103(1).

363 Thomas Hobbes, *Leviathan*, ed. Richard E. Flathman and David Johnston, Norton Critical Edition (New York & London: W.W. Norton & Company, Inc, 1651), chap. XVII,87 & XXI,110.

364 Tom Sorell, ‘Hobbes’s Moral Philosophy’, in *The Cambridge Companion to Hobbes’s Leviathan*, ed. Springborg Patricia, Cambridge Companions to Philosophy (Cambridge New York Melbourne: Cambridge University Press, 2007), p.129.

and between citizens of the commonwealth, including regulating economy.³⁶⁵ Among the key aspects which ensure the preservation of peace is self-sufficiency.³⁶⁶ To do so, the sovereign decides which commodities are to be imported or exported, which markets are beneficial and therefore allowed for conducting trading activities, what should be done to encourage national industry.³⁶⁷ The passing of sumptuary laws targeting expensive foreign fabrics such as silk or domestic woollens fitted within this dynamics, as the stability and strength of the country depended on its capacity to sustain itself.³⁶⁸ The very concept of liberty or freedom is redefined. It is not to be understood as the “Liberie of Particular men; but the Libertie of the Common-wealth”.³⁶⁹ Individuals’ freedom equally “lyteth therefore only in those things, which in regulating their actions, the Sovereign has præmitted”.³⁷⁰ In their renouncing to their rights to preserve peace, citizens have created “an Artificial Man, which we call common-wealth”, and who, as such, has the civil laws applied to all who make him, i.e. all those who have agreed to its creation by “mutual covenants”.³⁷¹ This approach to government has two major consequences of interest for this study. First, the very contract – covenant – made between citizens and the central political authority excludes privileges and a hierarchy between citizens, as the second law of nature which establishes the contract as means for peace is inherently equalitarian: as a man “lay down this right to all things”, he ought to “be contented with so much liberty against other men, as he would allow other men against himselfe”.³⁷² This implies equality in the face of the law, including regarding taxes.³⁷³ Hobbes, indeed points out that “it is an easy thing, for men to be deceived, by the specious name of Libertie; and for want of Judgement to distinguish, mistake that for their Private Inheritance, and Birth right”.³⁷⁴ Second, frugality and excess are not a matter of morally good or bad as according to the Christian doctrine, but a matter of moral requirement in regards to the most fundamental law of nature which guides and motivates all decisions: seeking and preserving

365Hobbes, *Leviathan*, chap. XVII, 88 & XVIII, 90–1; E. Paul Colella, ‘Mercantilism and Hobbes’ “Leviathan”, *Journal of Thought* 17, no. 2 (1982): p.90.

366Tom Sorell, ‘Hobbes on Trade, Consumption and International Order’, *The Monist* 89, no. 2 (2006): pp.245-6.

367Hobbes, *Leviathan*, chap. XXIV, 129 & XXX, 181; Colella, ‘Mercantilism and Hobbes’ “Leviathan”, pp.94-6.

368Hobbes, *De Cive, or, The Citizen*, chap. XIII, 14.

369Hobbes, *Leviathan*, chap. XXI, 110.

370Hobbes, chap. XXI, 109.

371Hobbes, chap. XXI, 108–9.

372Hobbes, chap. XIV, 65.

373Hobbes, chap. XIV, 65 & XXX, 181 This question of equality between citizens is reflected in Hobbes’ consistent use of the term ‘subject’ throughout the text without making any distinction. Sorell, ‘Hobbes’s Moral Philosophy’, p.131.

374Hobbes, *Leviathan*, chap. XXI, 110.

peace.³⁷⁵ Hence Hobbes defending imposition “upon those things which men consume”, which while protecting the fruit of people’s labour also avoids the state to be “defrauded, by the luxurious waste of private men”.³⁷⁶ The less is needed, the less the commonwealth has to rely on imports and foreign trade, and the less it puts itself in a position of competition with other nations, and therefore is less likely to get involved in any kind of conflict.³⁷⁷ Beyond foreign relations, excessive wealth and consumption from citizens is a threat to domestic peace as those in such position, may become arrogant and believe themselves above the law.³⁷⁸

In the face of the economic crisis, the Scottish government as central political authority had all the rights to restrict sumptuary consumption the way it did and to the extent it did. The nation’s peace was threatened by its economic imbalance, pressure and economic blackmail from England, monetary losses due to the failed Darien Scheme and the Famine, along with the constant flight of capital caused by the increasing conspicuous consumption from the nobility and professionals.³⁷⁹ The subjects’ liberty is never, in Hobbes’ theory, a priority or a requirement from the government. Peace is.³⁸⁰ The sovereign – or parliament in Scotland’s case – defines how much liberty is compatible with the overall state of the country and can, as deemed necessary, restrict these liberties. It is clear that two conceptions of stability and order are opposed. On the one hand, the nobility sought stability by a continuation of an order based on social differences defined by hierarchy in the form of ranks and relying on an established system of privileges, expectations and representation. On the other hand, a new approach embodied by the government sought stability through self-sufficiency and national welfare, a goal to be achieved via restrictions, taxation and equal consideration of citizens. This latter conception is all the more opposed to the former as it does not prevent citizens from acquiring wealth as long as it is the product of work. The securing of peace aims at providing safety, which in *De Cive* is defined as comprising:

“1. That they [the citizens] be defended against foreign enemies. 2. That peace be preserved at home. 3. That they be enriched as much as may consist with public security. 4. That they enjoy a harmless liberty. For supreme commanders can confer no more to their civil happiness, than that being preserved from foreign and

375Sorell, ‘Hobbes’s Moral Philosophy’, pp.134 & 140.

376Hobbes, *Leviathan*, chap. XXX, 181.

377Sorell, ‘Hobbes on Trade, Consumption and International Order’, pp.245-6 & 252; Colella, ‘Mercantilism and Hobbes’ “Leviathan”’, p.97.

378Aaron Levy, ‘Economic Views of Thomas Hobbes’, *Journal of the History of Ideas* 15, no. 4 (1954): p.593, <https://doi.org/10.2307/2707677>.

379 See part 3.1 on the political and economical context for references

380Hobbes, *Leviathan*, chap. XVIII, 88.

civil wars, they may quietly enjoy that wealth which they have purchased by their own industry.”³⁸¹

Although the members of the professional ranks were to abide by the law in every respect, their success was perfectly compatible with the nation’s welfare, as much as them consuming, as long as it fitted within the legislative framework. The structure defended by the nobility was completely put into question with the increasing consideration of wealth as key driving force of society, international relations and legislative decisions. This new power structure both deprived the nobility from the status of privilege or prerogatives of certain practices, such as conspicuous consumption of expensive textiles, as much as it legitimated their appropriation by the rising middle rank. Yet, if we come back to our primary subject of interest, i.e. the import of French textiles, items of dress and décor to Scotland, neither nobility nor the professionals were allowed from a legislative point of view to trade and/or consume most of these goods during the years prior to the union of 1707.³⁸² In practice, however, both did. These frictions between the theoretical frameworks and practices highlights the pivotal moment at which Scotland found itself. Pushed by rather extraordinary conjectures, two inherently contradictory ideas and their respective systems tried to cohabitate in vain. The nobility rejected the Hobbesian state which prioritised economic welfare according to mercantile principles by limiting sumptuary liberties and promoting entrepreneurial endeavours – especially in times of crisis –, which inevitably participated in the rise of the middle rank, while this same nobility needed the trading economy which derived from it to sustain the representation system that defined its superior status and supposedly guaranteed its power. The middling rank thrived on the intensification of trade and prioritisation of economic matters which enabled its success and wealth, while it needed the representation system to legitimate its success. Foreign trade, was an important link in between, with textiles and items of dress and décor, including French ones, in particular. French goods nourished the representation system, fuelled the merchants, tailors, retailers and other textile and leather related craftsmen's businesses, but concurrently damaged the country’s economy.

381Hobbes, *De Cive, or, The Citizen*, chap. XIII, 6.

382Talbot, ‘An Alliance Ended?’, pp.185-6, 190-1; Hayward, ‘Outlandish Superfluities: Luxury and Clothing in Scottish and English Sumptuary Law from the Fourteenth to the Seventeenth Century’, p.112; Smout, ‘Making and Trading Dress and Décor in Seventeenth-Century Scotland’, pp.430-1 & 435-6.

CONCLUSION

European fashion was not only about trends and influences: it was mainly about everyday life. Fashion is nothing without dress, without the material dimension which supports it. Trade and exchange are the necessary link between the two. Making an exhaustive list of goods was essential to apprehend the extent to which textile and items of dress were exchanged between France and Scotland in the 17th century. Because of the variety of items imported from France in terms of dress, textiles and décor, French objects were used and/or manipulated everyday by many Scots. In that way, their everyday lives were partially shaped by French productions and, therefore, maintained a connection. I would also argue that objects are not just objects. They connect people as intermediaries between the makers and the owners. The object works as some sort of receptacle of skills, knowledge, connections and exchanges. A gown made in France and commissioned by a Scot involved the skills and time of many French workers who produced or harvested the raw materials, who made the buttons, the lining, the outer fabric, the thread, embellishments etc., as well as those of the tailor and/or seamstress who sewed it. In between was a wide network of French merchants, but also of Scottish merchants, who gathered the materials for the maker, commissioned the garment and had it sent back to Scotland, maybe in a coffer made in France with French leather. Objects crystallise the traces of all this. Because the Auld Alliance cannot be reduced to its political and military dimension, and encompasses a cultural and social dimension, the textiles and items of dress and décor which were made in France and imported to Scotland participated in maintaining an underlying connection, and therefore continuing the Auld Alliance. Individuals like John Clerk of Penicuik were key intermediaries in this continuity, because their businesses kept privileges and memories linked to the Auld Alliance very much alive among the Scottish merchants communities in France, but also because they made possible, if not favoured, the exchange of French goods.

The notion of influence is particularly important when looking at the 17th century, and even more so when dealing with textiles and dress. Cultural influences were at the heart of European dynamics, with Louis XIV at the forefront. Under his reign, France became the most influential power in Europe and he intended it to remain so. He and his Controller-General of Finances, Colbert, understood that, beyond war, economic strength and cultural influence were crucial to achieve such a goal. Textile manufacturing and fashion trends were important pawns on the chessboard of European power dynamics as means of soft power.

With the dynamic activity of Scottish trading networks and imports of French textiles, fashionable goods and other related items, Scotland was integrated into this dynamic. Scottish fashion, trends and styles in dress and décor would not have been what they were without the influence of France and the materials it produced. The exchange was mutual. If France benefited from these exports, both financially and symbolically, the Scottish elite took advantage of this trade to serve its interests. In France, Scottish nobles and the wealthier middle rank found goods which were not produced on national ground, and which would convey a message of expense and fashion, and therefore of social success. The goods imported were rich textiles and embellishments made with precious materials, elaborate accessories, flamboyant gowns and ensembles in some cases, of colours expensive to obtain, and even renowned for their quality, designs and the skills of their makers. These qualities attributed to French fashion and dress gave it a strong symbolic value and uniqueness ranked above Scottish- and probably even English-made equivalents. Because of the very nature of the goods they produced, the French dress and textile industries directly participated to the social apparatus and structural evolution of Scottish society, in that it served to maintain the wealthier upper class's position, while serving the social aspiration of the successful middle ranks. The latter included Scottish merchants trading in and with France, like John Clerk, who built their fortune through their successful businesses, which relied in part on French textiles, items of dress and décor, at the same time as they relied on French textiles and fashion to display that same success.

The elite would have had access to England and London in particular since the regal union of 1603 and the transfer of the court to the English capital.¹ Yet, the analysis of the Blackwoods' and John Clerk's account books seems to show that France was still a favourite for the purchase of luxurious textile and items of dress and décor for the Scottish elite. The Auld Alliance had been an "antidote to the English" for centuries, as Norman MacDougall described it.² To consider this consumption of French textile, items of dress and décor, and other textile-related items as a remnant of an anti-English sentiment or the expression of an attachment to the auld ally, would be going too far though. The account book in London testifies to active trading links between England and Scotland. So do receipts and bills of noble families. The main reasons behind the importance of imports of textile, and items of dress and décor from France were: first, the network of Scottish merchants in place which had

1 Hayward, *Stuart Style*, p.23.

2 Macdougall, *An Antidote to the English*.

kept these exchanges active regardless of the diplomatic and military relations between France and Scotland; second, a long-lasting cultural influence which attracted Scots to France to study and/or travel, as much as to consume products of dress and décor. Besides, Scotland's exchanges are to be considered in the wider context of French influence in fashion and style throughout Europe. Moreover, both France and Scotland passed legislation which, in theory more than practice, should have been obstacles to Franco-Scottish textile trade. The sumptuary laws on one side aimed at limiting the imports of foreign textiles, from France included, while the mercantilist legislation of the other aimed at depriving foreign merchants from privileges, the Scots being a privileged target. If this trade had intended to be anti-English, such legislation against each other's interests would probably not have been implemented, or at least not in that shape. Finally, the union of 1707 with England, and the non-renewal of closer links with France at the turn of the century only confirms this analysis.

This legislation was motivated by national economics imperatives. The several events affecting Scotland from the 1690s to the union of 1707, lead to years of deep crisis, during which the country struggled, although not without resisting. The Parliament took measures and legislated on foreign textiles whose trade and consumption both participated in capital flight and weakened the overall national industry. Faced with economic decline and political challenges, proposals for legislation and acts were a reaction to this state of emergency and explain the parliament resorting to outright bans on trade and consumption targeting expensive materials in all their shapes and types specifically, and affecting all actors involved in their circulation from merchants to consumers via tailors or retailers. Although the goods legislated upon do compare to those found in John Clerk's and the Blackwoods' account books, French textiles were not specifically targeted, but comprised in the overall ban of foreign goods. There are two reasons to this aspect: first, the legislation was hardly a matter of diplomacy but of general economic necessity; second, it seems that officials did not know or at least grasp the extent of this aspect of Franco-Scottish trading activities. Legislating on silks, lace, and other expensive foreign fabrics was seen as a necessary and urgent solution to the national economic conjecture, and means to encourage national production to fill the state's coffers and have weight in the negotiations with England.

The members of the Scottish textile- and leather-related industries were much aware of these aspects and used it as key element of their rhetoric to defend their interests. As they also suffered from these imports, they developed a discourse in which their individual interests were extended to those of the nation, presenting themselves as concerned citizens devoted to

the welfare of the nation. This aspect is particularly interesting in the political context of the union, and the philosophical context of Hobbes' theory of government. What prevailed behind legislation on luxurious foreign textiles such as were imported from France was the question of the nation, both as identity in opposition to or differentiated from the English, and concerning the individuals' relation to the state. What transpires from the parliamentary papers is the pre-eminence of the group: the Scottish nation – from the petitioners' point of view – and the citizens expected to equally answer to the government – from the latter's point of view in the proposals, drafts of acts and acts of parliament.

This aspect sheds light on an important phenomenon happening in 17th century Scotland: a clash on the understanding of power structures. It has been previously highlighted that the nobility sought these French textiles for motives that went beyond comfort and aesthetic pleasure, but fitted within the frame of rank requirement. Having access to these textiles and goods was considered a social necessity as display, as long-established system of representation, was a reflection, a guarantee and means of their status. The new sumptuary legislations instead of safeguarding their identity and power directly threatened it. The feudal heritage which had established and defined the nobility as rank, was incompatible with and challenged by the contemporary politico-economic structure which was taking place. Although it relied on the increasing trading activity permitted and encouraged by mercantilism, the protectionist dimension of it became an obstacle. Considering this phenomenon in parallel to the redefinition of the relationship between state and people, the trade and consumption of French textiles and items of dress and décor was a factor of instability for both Scotland and as state and nation, and for the Scottish elite and the power structure on which it depended and in which it existed. The mercantilist context in which this branch of Franco-Scottish trade existed both fuelled the previous structure by providing materials for its culture of rank and associated system of representation, and shaped the new one by encouraging national welfare via a centrally regulated economy. This change in paradigm also altered the definition of justice. Behind the “just defence” of the lady's petition lied the idea of justice as fulfilment of the heritage of the feudal system combined to religious doctrine, i.e. an established hierarchy imposing clear sumptuary distinctions between ranks, although without sinking into opulence. On the opposite side, the Hobbesian concept equals justice with the law. Is just anything in accordance to the law, and all subjects are equal before it. Consequently, the sumptuary laws preventing the purchase of French textiles were considered as unjust by one side, and just by the other. These opposing forces, might explain why the 17th century is often omitted from analyses, in favour of the “long 16th century and

long 18th century”.³ Yet it still covers decades and should, I defend, be rather seen as a transitional period: a perseverance of the feudal framework cohabited with the setting in of new political foundations, both being linked by mercantilism.

The continuity of the Auld Alliance from the perspective of the trade of textile, dress, décor and related items was much more of an underlying connection made of mutual influence and bilateral exchange. Scotland’s elite and the wealthier portion of its population, through its dress and décor, shone with splendour using French textiles, materials and designs, while France benefited from this consumption through the duties, purchase money, incomes and employments it provided. The mercantile benefit on one side of this trade served the social benefits of the other side, as much as it was a threat. Franco-Scottish trade in the 17th century can, therefore, be seen as part of the weave of the Auld Alliance: each country’s contribution being the interlacing warp and weft of a cloth on which the original design had started to fade. Though the colours of military and diplomatic ties were losing their shades, the weave had not been worn out. The fabric of the Auld Alliance had not been torn apart by the Treaty of Edinburgh in 1560: the threads of dress, décor and textile trade were still strongly woven. The cultural influence was still a strong seam of the alliance in the 17th century, and the changing socio-politico-economic conjectures imprinted new motifs on the existing weave. The events at the end of the century, however, intensified the tension to which it was submitted and new tears appeared, the union of 1707 probably being the largest one.

The analysis and conclusion developed above show the extent of the subject. The use of private and parliamentary sources on which this work relies has proved much fruitful and promising. By focusing on a tight selection of documents and actors, this study has been but an introduction to the question. John Clerk’s 1647 account book and those of the Blackwoods covering later decades are but a glimpse of the share textiles, and items of dress and décor represented in the overall exports and imports conducted by Scottish merchants in and with France. These business documents, along with varied personal papers, such as the travel accounts of Lord Sinclair, son of the Earl of Breadalbane, as well as Lord Lothian’s documents or the Buccleuch papers, give but an insight into the research potential of the subject. Are the tendencies observed in this paper valid at a larger scale, throughout the century? Do they evolve? What becomes of the dressmaking materials imported? How did

3 DuPlessis, *Transitions to Capitalism in Early Modern Europe*, p.275.

French fashion influence Scottish style? Can the sources limitation encountered in the writing of this paper be overcome? Many other aspects involved in this continuity of the Auld Alliance through textile, dress and décor are worth investigating.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

PRIMARY SOURCES

NRS: Business papers

- ‘Account Book, Blackwood of Pitreavie, Fife, GD1/564/2’, 1666-1681. NRS.
- ‘Account Book in London, John Clerk of Penicuik, GD18/2482/1’, 1647-1650. Property of Sir Robert M. Clerk, NRS.
- ‘Account Book of Merchandise Brought to Leith from the Continent, John Clerk of Penicuik, GD18/2483’. Account book, 1647-1649. Property of Sir Robert M. Clerk, NRS.
- ‘Account Book or Ledger, Blackwood of Pitreavie, Fife, GD1/564/4’, 1681-1688. NRS.
- ‘“Accounts Skrols & Divers Memoirs”, John Clerk of Penicuik, GD18/2381’, 1636-1649. Property of Sir Robert M. Clerk, NRS.
- ‘Miscellaneous Papers, James Nimmo, James, Tailor in Edinburgh? RH15/148’, 1696-1740. NRS.

NRS: Family papers

- ‘Account for Lord Sinclair from a Tailor in Angers, GD112/54/7/5’, 1678. NRS.
- ‘Account for Lord Sinclair from James Marshall, Tailor in Paris, GD112/54/10/5’, 7 May 1679. NRS.
- ‘Account for Lord Sinclair from James Marshall, Tailor in Paris, GD112/54/10/10’, 28 October 1679. NRS.
- ‘Account for Lord Sinclair from Mademoiselle Chafteau, GD112/54/7/4’, 4 November 1678. NRS.
- ‘Account for Textile and Tailoring Items for Lord Sinclair , GD112/54/10/13’, undated. NRS.
- ‘Account from James Movat, Tailor in Paris, GD18/2484/3’, 1647. NRS.
- ‘Account of Apparel and Furnishing Due by Lord Ross to John Jackson, Tailor and Indweller in Paris, GD3/13/2/6’, 1612-1614. NRS.
- ‘Account of Commissions Entrusted to John Clerk of Penicuik, papers of the Kerr Family, Marquises of Lothian, GD40/2/18/1’, 1647-1649. NRS.
- ‘Account of Commissions Entrusted to John Clerk of Penicuik, papers of the Kerr Family, Marquises of Lothian, GD40/2/18/1/1’, 1647-1649. NRS.
- ‘Account of Commissions Entrusted to John Clerk of Penicuik, papers of the Kerr Family, Marquises of Lothian, GD40/2/18/1/3’, 1647-1649. NRS.
- ‘Account of Commissions Entrusted to John Clerk of Penicuik, papers of the Kerr Family, Marquises of Lothian, GD40/2/18/1/7’, 1647-1649. NRS.
- ‘Account of Commissions Entrusted to John Clerk of Penicuik, papers of the Kerr Family, Marquises of Lothian, GD40/2/18/1/20’, 1647-1649. NRS.
- ‘Account of Lord Sinclair’s Disbursements in France between Mid-July 1678 and 1 March 1679, GD112/54/9/1’, 1678-1679. NRS.
- ‘Account of Lord Sinclair’s Disbursements in France between the Last of May 1678 and 1 July 1679, GD112/54/9/2’, 1678-1679. NRS.
- ‘Account of Lord Sinclair’s Disbursements in France, Discharged 1680, GD112/54/13/3’, 1680. NRS.
- ‘Account of Lord Sinclair’s Disbursements before His Arrival in London GD112/54/9/3’, 1680. NRS.

- ‘Account of Money Spent on Clothing Etc for “Johne the Cuik” at Paris, London and Edinburgh, GD3/13/2/12’, 1614. NRS.
- ‘Accounts Mainly Household and Tailoring, of the Drummond Family, Earls of Perth (Drummond Castle Papers), GD160/180’, 1662-1673. NRS.
- ‘Accounts of Clothes and Furnishings Purchased by Lord Ross in Paris from John Jackson, Tailor there, GD3/13/2/3’, 1612. NRS.
- ‘Ante-Nuptial Marriage Contract between John Clerk, Merchant in Edinburgh, and Mary Gray, Fourth Daughter of Sir William Gray of Pittindrume? GD18/1861’, 6 May 1647. Property of Sir Robert M. Clerk, NRS.
- ‘Copy Account of Furnishing Taken for Lord Ross from the Merchant at Toulouse (Toullous) Paid by Dr Ross for Cloth, GD3/13/2/1/9’, 1643. NRS.
- ‘Documents from Lord Sinclair’s European Travel, GD112/54’, 1678-1681. NRS.
- ‘Eglinton Muniments, Montgomerie Family, Earls of Eglinton: Household and Personal Papers, GD3/6/22’, 17th century. NRS.
- ‘Information for Lady Ross Concerning Lord Ross’ Disbursements in Scotland and France, GD3/13/2/67’, undated [17th century]. NRS.
- ‘French Tailoring and Apothecary Accounts for Lord Sinclair, GD112/54/10’, 1679-1680. NRS.
- ‘Letter from Lord Lothian to Lady Lothian, GD40/2/18/2/19’, 1673. NRS.
- ‘Letters, Accounts and Bills of Exchange Relating to Sums Disbursed by John Clerk, Merchant in Paris, France, on Behalf of Sir William Gray of Pittendrum, GD18/2378’, 1636-1646. Property of Sir Robert M. Clerk, NRS.
- ‘Lord William Hamilton’s Account of the 1000 Livres He Spent in France, GD406/1/6302’, 10 August 1679. NRS.
- ‘Memoire Pour Monsieur Ramize, GD112/54/10/4’, 12 June 1679. NRS.
- ‘Miscellaneous Legal Papers and Letters of the Montague-Douglas-Scott Family, Dukes of Buccleuch, GD224/925/51’, 1644-1645. Property of the Buccleuch Living Heritage Trust, NRS.
- ‘Miscellaneous Papers of the Buccleuch Family, GD224/906/59’, 1652-1705. Property of the Buccleuch Living Heritage Trust, NRS.
- ‘Receipts, Accounts, Precepts and Bills of Sir Alexander Brand of Brandsfield, RH15/53/23’, 1675-1698. NRS.
- ‘Tradesmen’s Accounts for Clothes, Material, Buttons, Etc, Supplied to Walter, 1st Earl of Buccleuch, GD224/393/7’, 1625-1629. Property of the Buccleuch Living Heritage Trust, NRS.
- ‘Vouchers of Accounts, Montague-Douglas-Scott Family, Dukes of Buccleuch, GD224/307/5’, 1704-1705. Property of the Buccleuch Living Heritage Trust, NRS.

NRS: Parliamentary papers

- ‘Draft Act Prohibiting the Import of Silk Stuffs Etc, PA7/17/1/92’, 31 January 1701. NRS.
- ‘Printed Petitions, Memorials and Other Representations Addressed to the High Commissioner and Estates of Parliament, GD124/10/444’, 1705. NRS.
- Scotland Privy Council. ‘A Proclamation Anent the Sumptuary Law. (Digital Copy)’. Edinburgh, 1686. NLS.
- . ‘Proclamation; Import or Wearing of Lace Prohibited, RH14/103’, 16 March 1682. NRS.
- ‘Supplementary Parliamentary Papers, PA7/16’, 1698-1699. NRS.
- ‘Supplementary Parliamentary Papers, PA7/17/2’, 1700-1701. NRS.

‘Supplementary Parliamentary Papers, PA7/18’, 1702-1703. NRS.

‘Supplementary Parliamentary Papers, PA7/19’, 1704-1705. NRS.

NRS: other

‘Undated Printed Poem Entitled "The Ladies Petition to the Parliament against the Passing of the Sumptuary Act, GD150/3377’, probably 1698. NRS.

NLS

‘Estate Accounts of Castlemilk, 1643-1659, Kept by James Stuart of Torrance as Executor to His Brother, Archibald Stuart of Castlemilk (Folio 1), MS 8218’, 1643-1659. NLS. Scotland Privy Council. ‘A Proclamation Anent the Sumptuary Law.’ (Digital Copy). Edinburgh, 1686. NLS.

Portraits (mentioned)

Bakker, J.J. *Mary II, 1662 - 1694. Reigned Jointly with William III, 1688 - 1694.* after 1690. Oil on canvas, 126.40 x 101.60 cm. National Galleries Scotland. Accession number PG 1533.

Charles I, 1600 - 1649. Reigned 1625 - 1649. After 1626. Oil on canvas, 74.30 x 62.20 cm. National Galleries Scotland. Accession number PG 306.

Colone, Adam de. *Margaret Graham, Lady Napier, d. c 1626. Sister of 1st Marquess of Montrose and Wife of 1st Lord Napier.* 1626. Oil on canvas, 109.30 x 81.00 cm. National Galleries Scotland. Accession number PG 2608.

William III, 1650 - 1702. Reigned 1688 - 1702. After 1690. Oil on canvas, measurements: 76.20 x 63.50 cm. National Galleries Scotland. Accession number PG 807.

Others

‘Auld Alliance (English Page)’. In *Wikipedia*, 13 March 2023.

[https://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Auld Alliance&oldid=1144432475](https://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Auld%20Alliance&oldid=1144432475).

Clerk, Sir John. *Memoirs of the Life of Sir John Clerk of Penicuik: Baronet, Baron of the Exchequer, Extracted by Himself from His Own Journals, 1676-1755.* Edited by John M. Gray. Printed at the University Press by T. and A. Constable for the Scottish history society, 1892.

Descartes, René. *Meditations on First Philosophy.* Broadview Press, 2013.

Hobbes, Thomas. *De Cive, or, The Citizen.* New York, Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1949.

<http://archive.org/details/deciveorcitizen00hobb>.

———. *Leviathan.* Edited by Richard E. Flathman and David Johnston. Norton Critical Edition. New York & London: W.W. Norton & Company, Inc, 1997.

SECONDARY SOURCES

AULD ALLIANCE

- Bonner, Elizabeth. 'Scotland's "Auld Alliance" with France, 1295-1560'. *History* 84, no. 273 (January 1999): 5–30. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1468-229X.00097>.
- Macdougall, Norman. *An Antidote to the English: The Auld Alliance, 1295-1560*. Scottish History Matters. East Linton: Tuckwell Press, 2001.
- Moore, Margaret F. 'The Education of a Scottish Nobleman's Sons in the Seventeenth Century: II. Study in France'. *The Scottish Historical Review* 31, no. 112 (1952): 101–15.
- Murdoch, Steve. 'Scotland and Europe'. In *Scotland : The Making and Unmaking of the Nation, c.1100-1707*, edited by Bob Harris and Alan R. MacDonald, 2 Early modern Scotland: c.1500-1707:126–44. Dundee: Dundee University Press, 2007.
- . 'Scotland, Europe and the English "Missing Link"'. *History Compass* 5, no. 3 (May 2007): 890–913. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1478-0542.2007.00434.x>.
- Rapport, Mike. Review of *Review of The Auld Alliance: France and Scotland over 700 Years*, by James Laidlaw. *The Scottish Historical Review* 80, no. 210 (2001): 272–73.
- Royal Scottish Museum. *French Connections: Scotland and the Arts of France [Leaflets Produced to Accompany the Exhibition]*. Edinburgh: Royal Scottish Museum, 1985.
- . 'The Culture of Migration: Scots as Europeans 1500-1800'. *History Workshop Journal*, no. 40 (1995): 108–17.
- Talbott, Siobhan. 'An Alliance Ended? Franco-Scottish Commercial Relations, 1560-1713'. Thesis, University of St Andrews, 2011. <https://research-repository.st-andrews.ac.uk/handle/10023/1999>.
- . 'Beyond "the Antiseptic Realm of Theoretical Economic Models": New Perspectives on Franco-Scottish Commerce and the Auld Alliance in the Long Seventeenth Century'. *Journal of Scottish Historical Studies* 31, no. 2 (2011): 149–68. <https://doi.org/10.3366/jshs.2011.0019>.
- Talbott, Siobhan, and Steve Murdoch. 'Transcript of the Podcast "The End of the Auld Alliance? Franco-Scottish Relations, 1560-1713"', n.d.

GENERAL and POLITICAL HISTORY

- Bély, Lucien. *La France au XVIIe siècle: puissance de l'État, contrôle de la société*. Paris: Presses universitaires de France, 2009.
- . *Les relations internationales en Europe, XVIIe-XVIIIe siècles*. 4ème édition. Thémis Histoire. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 2007.
- Braddick, Michael J. *The Oxford Handbook of the English Revolution*. Oxford Handbooks. Oxford: University Press, 2015.
- Civardi, Christian. *L'Écosse depuis 1528*. Gap Paris: Ophrys, 1998.
- Cornette, Joël. *Histoire de la France: 1492-1652. affirmation de l'État absolu*. 9e édition revue et augmentée. Carré Histoire 21. Vanves: Hachette supérieur, 2016.
- . *Histoire de la France: 1652-1783. Absolutisme et Lumières*. 8e édition revue et augmentée. Carré histoire 23. Vanves: Hachette supérieur, 2016.
- Devine, Thomas Martin. *The Scottish Nation, 1700-2000*. London: Penguin books, 2000.
- . and Wormald Jenny. *The Oxford Handbook of Modern Scottish History*. Oxford Handbooks. Oxford [etc.: Oxford University Press, 2012.
- Duchemin, Michel. *Histoire de l'Écosse: des origines à nos jours*. Édition augmentée et mise à jour. Texto le goût de l'histoire. Paris: Tallandier, 2013.

- Langford, Paul. 'The Eighteenth Century, 1688-1789'. In *The Oxford History of Britain*, edited by Kennet Owen Morgan, Revised edition. Oxford New York, N.Y. Auckland [etc.: Oxford University Press, 2010.
- Lebecq, Stéphane, Bensimon Fabrice, Lachaud Frédérique, Ruggiu François-Joseph, and Dunyach Jean-François. *Histoire des îles Britanniques*. 3e édition. Savoirs. Paris: PUF, 2022.
- Lebrun, François. *Le 17e siècle*. Collection Poche. Paris: A. Colin, 2013.
- Mason, Roger A. 'Debating Britain in Seventeenth-Century Scotland: Multiple Monarchy and Scottish Sovereignty'. *Journal of Scottish Historical Studies* 35, no. 1 (1 May 2015): 1–24. <https://doi.org/10.3366/jshs.2015.0138>.
- Nassiet, Michel. *La France au XVIIe siècle: société, politique, cultures*. Belin sup Histoire. Paris: Belin, 2006.
- Saupin, Guy. *La France à l'époque moderne*. 4e édition. Collection U Histoire. Paris: Armand Colin, 2020.
- Stewart, Laura A. M. 'The "Rise" of the State?' In *The Oxford Handbook of Modern Scottish History*, edited by Thoma Martin Devine and Jenny Wormald. Oxford Handbooks. Oxford [etc.: Oxford University Press, 2012.
- Suire, Eric. *Pouvoir et religion en Europe, XVIe-XVIIIe siècle*. Malakoff: Armand Colin, 2018.

THE UNION OF 1707

- Bowie, Karin. 'New Perspectives on Pre-Union Scotland'. In *The Oxford Handbook of Modern Scottish History*, edited by Thomas Martin Devine and Jenny Wormald, 303–19. Oxford Handbooks. Oxford [etc.: Oxford University Press, 2012.
- . 'Public Opinion, Popular Politics and the Union of 1707'. *Scottish Historical Review* 82, no. 214 (2003): 226–60. <https://doi.org/10.3366/shr.2003.82.2.226>.
- Brown, Stewart J., and Christopher A. Whatley. *The Union of 1707: New Dimensions*. *Scottish Historical Review* ; v. 87. 2008 (Supplement). Edinburgh: University Press for The Scottish Historical Review Trust, 2008.
- . and Christopher A. Whatley, eds. 'Conceptions of Nationhood in the Anglo-Scottish Union Debates of 1707'. In *The Union of 1707: New Dimensions*. *Scottish Historical Review* ; v. 87. 2008 (Supplement). Edinburgh: University Press for The Scottish Historical Review Trust, 2008.
- Jackson, Clare. 'Conceptions of Nationhood in the Anglo-Scottish Union Debates of 1707'. In *The Union of 1707: New Dimensions*, edited by Stewart J. Brown and Christopher A. Whatley. *Scottish Historical Review* ; v. 87. 2008 (Supplement). Edinburgh: University Press for The Scottish Historical Review Trust, 2008.
- Kidd, Colin. *Union and Unionisms: Political Thought in Scotland, 1500-2000*. Cambridge: University Press, 2008.
- Stevenson, David. *Union, Revolution, and Religion in 17th-Century Scotland*. Collected Studies; CS570. Aldershot, Great Britain ; Brookfield, Vt., USA: Variorum, 1997.
- Storrs, Christopher. 'The Union of 1707 and the War of Spanish Succession'. In *The Union of 1707: New Dimensions*, by Scottish Historical Review Trust, edited by Stewart J. Brown and Christopher A. Whatley. *Scottish Historical Review* ; v. 87. 2008 (Supplement). Edinburgh: University Press for The Scottish Historical Review Trust, 2008.
- Whatley, Christopher A. 'Economic Causes and Consequences of the Union of 1707: A Survey'. *The Scottish Historical Review* 68 part 2, no. 186 (October 1989): pp.150-181.

———. *The Scots and The Union: Then and Now*. Second edition. Edinburgh: University Press, 2014.

TRADE and ECONOMY

- Bondois, Paul-M. ‘Colbert et l’Industrie de la Dentelle: Le “Point de France” à Reims et à Sedan d’après des documents inédits’. *Revue d’histoire économique et sociale* 13, no. 4 (1925): 367–408.
- Bowie, Karin. ‘New Perspectives on Pre-Union Scotland’. In *The Oxford Handbook of Modern Scottish History*, edited by Devine Thomas Martin and Wormald Jenny, 303–19. Oxford Handbooks. Oxford [etc.: Oxford University Press, 2012.
- Clark, Henry C. *Compass of Society: Commerce and Absolutism in Old-Regime France*. Lanham, Md. ; Plymouth: Lexington Books, 2007.
- Clarkson, L. A. ‘The Organization of the English Leather Industry in the Late Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries’. *The Economic History Review* 13, no. 2 (1960): 245–56. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2591181>.
- Coquery, Natacha and Alain Bonnet. *Le commerce du luxe: production, exposition et circulation des objets précieux du Moyen Âge à nos jours [textes issus d’un colloque tenu à Lyon, aux musées Gadagne les 21, 22 et 23 novembre 2012]*. Paris: Mare & Martin, 2015.
- Crouzet, François. *Britain, France and International Commerce: From Louis XIV to Victoria*. Collected Studies ; CS542. Aldershot: Variorum, 1996.
- Cullen, Karen J. *Famine in Scotland: The ‘ill Years’ of the 1690s*. Scottish Historical Review Monographs Series; No. 16. Edinburgh: University Press, 2010.
- Delsalle, Paul. *La France industrielle aux XVIe, XVIIe, XVIIIe siècles*. Synthèse [sigma] histoire. Gap: Ophrys, 1993.
- Devine, Thomas Martin. ‘Reappraising the Early Modern Economy, 1500-1650’. In *The Oxford Handbook of Modern Scottish History*, edited by Wormald Jenny and Thomas Martin Devine, 236–50. Oxford Handbooks. Oxford [etc.: Oxford University Press, 2012. <https://www.oed.com/view/Entry/68392>.
- DuPlessis, Robert S. ‘Mercantilism’. In *Encyclopedia Of The Renaissance*, pp.114-5, 1999. <https://works.swarthmore.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1409&context=fac-history>.
- . *Transitions to Capitalism in Early Modern Europe: Economies in the Era of Early Globalization, c. 1450-c. 1820*. Second edition. New Approaches to European History. Cambridge: University Press, 2019.
- Jorrand, Sophie. ‘From “the Doors of the Seas” to a Watery Debacle: The Sea, Scottish Colonization, and the Darien Scheme, 1696–1700’. *Études Écossaises*, no. 19 (1 April 2017). <https://doi.org/10.4000/etudeseccossaises.1184>.
- ‘Navigation Acts’. In *Encyclopaedia Britannica (Online)*. Encyclopaedia Britannica, Inc., 10 October 2023. <https://www.britannica.com/event/Navigation-Acts>.
- Peck, Linda Levy. ‘Creating a Silk Industry in Seventeenth-Century England’. *Shakespeare Studies (0582-9399)* 28 (January 2000): 225.
- Sargentson, Carolyn. *Merchants and Luxury Markets: The Marchands Merciers of Eighteenth-Century Paris*. Victoria and Albert Museum Studies in the History of Art and Design. London: Victoria & Albert Museum, 1996.
- Smout, T. C. ‘Making and Trading Dress and Décor in Seventeenth-Century Scotland’. *The Scottish Historical Review* 100, no. 3 (December 2021): 419–36. <https://doi.org/10.3366/shr.2021.0538>.
- . *Scottish Trade on the Eve of Union: 1660-1707*. Edinburgh London: Oliver & Boyd, 1963.

Thépaut-Cabasset, Corinne. 'A Glittering Reputation: Gaultier's Retailing Innovations in Seventeenth-Century Paris.' In *Fashioning the Early Modern: Dress, Textiles, and Innovation in Europe, 1500-1800*, edited by Evelyn S. Welch, First Edition. Pasold Studies in Textile History 18. Oxford: University Press, 2017.

SOCIAL HISTORY and CONSUMPTION

- Berg, Maxine. 'New Commodities, Luxuries and Their Consumers in Eighteenth-Century England'. In *Consumers and Luxury: Consumer Culture in Europe 1650-1850*, edited by Maxine Berg and Helen Clifford. Manchester: University Press, 1999.
- Berg, Maxine, and Helen Clifford. *Consumers and Luxury: Consumer Culture in Europe 1650-1850*. Manchester: University Press, 1999.
- . 'Introduction'. In *Consumers and Luxury: Consumer Culture in Europe 1650-1850*, edited by Maxine Berg and Helen Clifford. Manchester: University Press, 1999.
- Brown, Keith M. *Noble Society in Scotland: Wealth, Family and Culture from Reformation to Revolution*. Edinburgh: University Press, 2004.
- Dingwall, Helen M. *Late Seventeenth-Century Edinburgh: A Demographic Study*. Aldershot: Scolar, 1994.
- Iwen, Michelle. 'Reading Material Culture: British Women's Position and the Death Trade in the Long Eighteenth-Century'. In *Women and the Material Culture of Death*, edited by Maureen Daly Goggin and Beth Fowkes Tobin. Farnham: Ashgate Publishing, 2013.
https://www.researchgate.net/profile/M_Iwen/publication/282575317_Reading_material_culture_British_women's_position_and_the_death_trade_in_the_long_18th_century/links/568ac6ff08ae1e63f1fbf3b1/Reading-material-culture-British-womens-position-and-the-death-trade-in-the-long-18th-century.pdf.
- Nenadic, Stana. 'Middle-Rank Consumers and Domestic Culture in Edinburgh and Glasgow 1720-1840'. *Past & Present*, no. 145 (1994): 122–56.
- Shaw, Leslie. 'The Problem of Luxury from Montaigne to The Encyclopedie', n.d.
- Weatherill, Lorna. *Consumer Behaviour and Material Culture in Britain: 1660-1760*. 2nd ed. London: Routledge, 1996.

DRESS and MATERIALS

- Dean, Lucinda H. S. "'Richnesse in Fassone and in Fairness": Marriage, Manhood and Sartorial Splendour for Sixteenth-Century Scottish Kings'. *The Scottish Historical Review* C,3, no.254 (December 2021): 378–96. <https://doi.org/10.3366/shr.2021.0536>.
- Delbrel, Sophie. 'Prohibition et Liberté Dans Le Commerce Des Toiles Peintes: L'exemple de La Généralité de Bordeaux Au XVIII e Siècle'. *Revue Historique de Droit Français et Étranger (1922-)* 86, no. 4 (2008): 539–55.
- Eacott, Jonathan P. 'Making an Imperial Compromise: The Calico Acts, the Atlantic Colonies, and the Structure of the British Empire'. *The William and Mary Quarterly* 69, no. 4 (2012): 731–62. <https://doi.org/10.5309/willmaryquar.69.4.0731>.
- Ferreira, Maria João, Liza Oliver, Maria Ludovica Rosati, and Corinne Thépaut-Cabasset. 'Les Textiles à La Période Moderne: Circulation, Échanges et Mondialisation: Une Discussion Entre Maria João Ferreira, Liza Oliver et Corinne Thépaut-Cabasset, Menée Par Maria Ludovica Rosati'. *Perspective (Paris. 2006)*, no. 1 (2016): 21–32. <https://doi.org/10.4000/perspective.6287>.

- Goggin, Maureen Daly. 'The Extra-Ordinary Powers of Red in Eighteenth- and Nineteenth-Century English Needlework'. In *The Materiality of Color: The Production, Circulation, and Application of Dyes and Pigments, 1400-1800*, edited by Andrea Feeser, Beth Fowkes Tobin, and Maureen Daly Goggin. Histories of Material Culture and Collecting, 1700-1950. Farnham: Ashgate, 2012.
- Hayward, Maria. 'Crimson, Scarlet, Murrey and Carnation: Red at the Court of Henry VIII'. *Textile History* 38, no. 2 (1 November 2007): 135–50. <https://doi.org/10.1179/004049607x229142>.
- . 'Outlandish Superfluities: Luxury and Clothing in Scottish and English Sumptuary Law from the Fourteenth to the Seventeenth Century'. In *The Right to Dress: Sumptuary Laws in a Global Perspective, c. 1200-1800*, edited by Giorgio Riello and Ulinka Rublack. Cambridge: University Press, 2019.
- . *Stuart Style: Monarchy, Dress and the Scottish Male Elite*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2020.
- Joubert, Fabienne, Amaury Lefébure, and Pascal-François Bertrand. *Histoire de la tapisserie: en Europe, du Moyen âge à nos jours*. Paris: Flammarion, 1995.
- Laver, James. *Histoire de la mode et du costume*. Translated by Hechter Michèle, Chareyre Christine, and Diebold Christian-Martin. Nouvelle édition revue et augmentée. L'univers de l'art 83. Paris: Thames & Hudson, 2003.
- Levey, Santina M. *Lace: A History*. London: Victoria & Albert Museum, 1983.
- Miller, Lesley Ellis. 'Making a Reputation from Innovation: Silk Designers in Lyon, 1660-1789'. In *Fashioning the Early Modern: Dress, Textiles, and Innovation in Europe, 1500-1800*, edited by Evelyn S. Welch, First Edition. Pasold Studies in Textile History 18. Oxford: University Press, 2017.
- O'Brien, Patrick, Trevor Griffiths, and Philip Hunt. 'Political Components of the Industrial Revolution: Parliament and the English Cotton Textile Industry, 1660-1774'. *The Economic History Review* 44, no. 3 (1991): 395–423. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2597536>.
- Pearce, Michael. 'Vanished Comforts: Locating Roles of Domestic Furnishings in Scotland 1500-1650'. Doctoral, University of Dundee, 2016. <https://discovery.dundee.ac.uk/ws/portalfiles/portal/8956204/MichaelPearce2016.pdf>.
- Renau, Nicole. *L'Étoffe: au fil des civilisations*. Aix-en-Provence: Édisud, 2000.
- Riello, Giorgio, and Ulinka Rublack. *The Right to Dress: Sumptuary Laws in a Global Perspective, c. 1200-1800*. Cambridge: University Press, 2019.
- Robinson, Stuart. *A History of Dyed Textiles: Dyes, Fibres, Painted Bark, Starch Resist, Discharge, Tie-Dye, Further Sources for Research*. Studio Vista London. London, 1969.
- Ruppert, Jacques, Madeleine Delpierre, Renée Davray-Piécolek, and Pascale Gorguet-Ballesteros. *Le costume français*. Tout l'art Encyclopédie. Paris: Flammarion, 1996.
- Schoeser, Mary. *Silk*. New Haven, CT ; London: Yale University Press, 2007.
- Scott, Philippa. *Le livre de la soie*. Translated by Juraver Patricia. Paris: Impr. nationale éd, 1993.
- 'Shirt | Clothing | Britannica'. In *Encyclopaedia Britannica (Online)*. Accessed 21 May 2023. <https://www.britannica.com/topic/shirt>.
- Smith, Chloe Wigston. "'Callico Madams': Servants, Consumption, and the Calico Crisis'. *Eighteenth-Century Life* 31, no. 2 (2007): 29–55.
- St Clair, Kassia. *The Golden Thread: How Fabric Changed History*. New York: Liveright Publishing Corporation, 2019.

Styles, John. 'Fashion and Innovation in Early Modern Europe'. In *Fashioning the Early Modern: Dress, Textiles, and Innovation in Europe, 1500-1800*, edited by Evelyn S. Welch, First Edition. Pasold Studies in Textile History 18. Oxford: University Press, 2017.

PHILOSOPHY

- Berry, Christopher J. *The Idea of Luxury: A Conceptual and Historical Investigation*. Ideas in Context. Cambridge New York [etc.: Cambridge university press, 1994.
- Colella, E. Paul. 'Mercantilism and Hobbes' "Leviathan"'. *Journal of Thought* 17, no. 2 (1982): 89-99.
- Glevarec, Hervé. 'La Distinction n'est Pas Une Différenciation'. *Recherches Sociologiques et Anthropologiques [En Ligne]*, no. 51-1 (2020): pp.39-59.
- Lis, Catharina, and Josef Ehmer. 'Introduction: Historical Studies in Perceptions of Works'. In *The Idea of Work in Europe from Antiquity to Modern Times*, edited by Josef Ehmer and Catharina Lis. England: Ashgate Publishing Limited, 2009.
- Levy, Aaron. 'Economic Views of Thomas Hobbes'. *Journal of the History of Ideas* 15, no. 4 (1954): 589-95. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2707677>.
- Sorell, Tom. 'Hobbes on Trade, Consumption and International Order'. *The Monist* 89, no. 2 (2006): 245-58.
- . 'Hobbes's Moral Philosophy'. In *The Cambridge Companion to Hobbes's Leviathan*, edited by Springborg Patricia. Cambridge Companions to Philosophy. Cambridge New York Melbourne: Cambridge University Press, 2007.

OTHERS

- Gillies, William A. *In Famed Breadalbane: The Story of the Antiquities, Lands and People of a Highland District*. Strathtay : Clunie Press, 1980.
<http://archive.org/details/infamedbreadalba0000gill>.
- Grassby, Richard. 'Material Culture and Cultural History'. *The Journal of Interdisciplinary History* 35, no. 4 (2005): 591-603. <https://doi.org/10.1162/0022195043327426>.
- NRS. 'GD1/564 Miscellaneous Small Collections of Family, Business and Other Papers, Blackwood of Pitreavie, Fife'. Accessed 16 January 2024.
<https://catalogue.nrscotland.gov.uk/nrsonlinecatalogue/details.aspx?reference=GD1%2f564&st=1&tc=y&tl=n&tn=n&tp=n&k=blackwood&ko=a&r=GD1%2f564&ro=s&df=1600&dt=1700&di=y>.
- . 'GD3/13/2 Papers of the Montgomerie Family, Earls of Eglinton, Relating to Ross of Halkhead, Personal Accounts'. Accessed 16 January 2024.
<https://catalogue.nrscotland.gov.uk/nrsonlinecatalogue/details.aspx?reference=GD3%2f13%2f2&st=1&tc=y&tl=n&tn=n&tp=n&k=&ko=a&r=GD3%2f13%2f2&ro=s&df=1600&dt=1700&di=y>.
- . 'GD18/ Papers of Clerk Family of Penicuik, Midlothian, 1373-1966'. Accessed 21 May 2023. <https://catalogue.nrscotland.gov.uk/nrsonlinecatalogue/details.aspx?reference=GD18&st=1&tc=y&tl=n&tn=n&tp=n&k=&ko=a&r=GD18&ro=s&df=&dt=&di=y>.
- . 'GD112/ Papers of the Campbell Family, Earls of Breadalbane (Breadalbane Muniments) 1306-20th Century ; NAS Catalogue - Catalogue Record'. Accessed 6 April 2023. <https://catalogue.nrscotland.gov.uk/nrsonlinecatalogue/details.aspx?reference=GD112&st=1&tc=y&tl=n&tn=n&tp=n&k=&ko=a&r=GD112&ro=s&df=&dt=&di=y>.

- . ‘Union of 1707 - Making the Treaty - The Articles of Union’. Scottish Archives for Schools. Accessed 31 March 2024.
<https://www.scottisharchivesforschools.org/union1707/chapter3-3.asp>.
- . ‘Union of 1707 - Scotland 1689 - 1707’. Accessed 24 April 2024.
<https://www.scottisharchivesforschools.org/union1707/chapter2-3.asp>.

Oxford English Dictionary. ‘Old English—an Overview’, 16 August 2012.
<https://public.oed.com/blog/old-english-an-overview/>.

Paul, James Balfour. *The Scots Peerage : Founded on Wood's Ed. of Sir Robert Douglas's Peerage of Scotland; Containing an Historical and Genealogical Account of the Nobility of That Kingdom*. Edinburgh : D. Douglas, 1904.
<http://archive.org/details/scotspeeragefoun02pauluoft>.

GLOSSARY & DEFINITIONS

OED

- ‘Baize’. In OED Online. Accessed 11 January 2024.
https://www.oed.com/dictionary/baize_n?tab=meaning_and_use#29149269.
- ‘Baldric, n.’ In OED Online. Oxford University Press. Accessed 5 April 2023.
<https://www.oed.com/view/Entry/14849>.
- ‘Band, n.2’. In OED Online. Oxford University Press. Accessed 17 April 2023.
<https://www.oed.com/view/Entry/15113>.
- ‘Barras n 2’. In A Dictionary of the Older Scottish Tongue (up to 1700). Accessed 7 June 2023. https://dsl.ac.uk/entry/dost/barras_n_2.
- ‘Barrow, n.4’. In OED Online. Oxford University Press. Accessed 19 April 2023.
<https://www.oed.com/view/Entry/250994>.
- ‘Batiste, n.’ In OED Online. Oxford University Press. Accessed 5 April 2023.
<https://www.oed.com/view/Entry/16183>.
- ‘Body, n.’ In OED Online. Oxford University Press. Accessed 20 April 2023.
<https://www.oed.com/view/Entry/20934>.
- ‘Breeches’. In OED Online. Accessed 23 January 2024.
https://www.oed.com/dictionary/breech_n?tab=meaning_and_use#14291580.
- ‘Buckram, n.’ In OED Online. Oxford University Press. Accessed 17 April 2023.
<https://www.oed.com/view/Entry/24204>.
- ‘Calico, 2.a’. In OED Online. Accessed 24 May 2024.
https://www.oed.com/dictionary/calico_n.
- ‘Cambric’. In OED Online. Accessed 23 January 2024.
https://www.oed.com/dictionary/cambric_n?tab=meaning_and_use#10244388.
- ‘Canion, n.’ In OED Online. Oxford University Press. Accessed 5 April 2023.
<https://www.oed.com/view/Entry/27057>.
- ‘Cloth, n.’ In OED Online. Oxford University Press. Accessed 17 April 2023.
<https://www.oed.com/view/Entry/34649>.
- ‘Cordovan, Adj. and n.’ In OED Online. Oxford University Press. Accessed 19 April 2023.
<https://www.oed.com/view/Entry/41477>.
- ‘Drawers (Pair of Drawers)’. In OED Online. Accessed 23 January 2024.
https://www.oed.com/dictionary/drawer_n?tab=meaning_and_use#1347897670.

- ‘Droggat’. In OED Online. Accessed 4 April 2024.
<https://www.oed.com/search/dictionary/?scope=Entries&q=droggat>.
- ‘Ell, n.1’. In OED Online. Oxford University Press. Accessed 19 April 2023.
<https://www.oed.com/view/Entry/60511>.
- ‘Envy’. In OED Online. Accessed 6 May 2024. https://www.oed.com/dictionary/envy_n.
- ‘Fashion, n.’ In OED Online. Oxford University Press. Accessed 6 April 2023.
<https://www.oed.com/view/Entry/68389>.
- ‘Fashionable, Adj. and n.’ In OED Online. Oxford University Press. Accessed 23 April 2023.
<https://www.oed.com/view/Entry/68392>.
- ‘Folly, n.’ In OED Online. Accessed 4 May 2024. https://www.oed.com/dictionary/folly_n1.
- ‘Galloon, n.’ In OED Online. Oxford University Press. Accessed 23 April 2023.
<https://www.oed.com/view/Entry/76344>.
- ‘Half Shirt, n.’ In OED Online. Oxford University Press. Accessed 5 April 2023.
<https://www.oed.com/view/Entry/83511>.
- ‘Hoop, n.1’. In OED Online. Accessed 22 April 2024.
https://www.oed.com/dictionary/hoop_n1.
- ‘Hose, n.’ In OED Online. Oxford University Press. Accessed 17 April 2023.
<https://www.oed.com/view/Entry/88711>.
- ‘Humour | Humor’. In OED Online. Accessed 4 May 2024.
https://www.oed.com/dictionary/humour_n.
- ‘Lace, n. and Adj.’ In OED Online. Oxford University Press. Accessed 23 April 2023.
<https://www.oed.com/view/Entry/104786>.
- ‘Lacing n.’ In OED Online. Accessed 23 May 2024.
https://www.oed.com/dictionary/lacing_n.
- ‘Lustring’. In OED Online. Oxford University Press. Accessed 11 January 2024.
https://www.oed.com/dictionary/lustring_n1?tab=meaning_and_use#38742223.
- ‘Luxury, n.’ In OED Online. Oxford University Press. Accessed 23 May 2023.
<https://www.oed.com/view/Entry/111515>.
- ‘Malice’. In OED Online. Accessed 6 May 2024. https://www.oed.com/dictionary/malice_n.
- ‘Maroquin, Adj. and n.’ In OED Online. Oxford University Press. Accessed 17 April 2023.
<https://www.oed.com/view/Entry/114288>.
- ‘Memorial, 5.a’. In OED Online. Accessed 19 January 2024.
https://www.oed.com/dictionary/memorial_adj?tab=meaning_and_use#37227751.
- ‘Nap’. In OED Online. Accessed 11 January 2024. https://www.oed.com/dictionary/nap_n2?tab=meaning_and_use#35313120.
- ‘Overture, I.4.a’. In OED Online. Accessed 19 January 2024.
https://www.oed.com/dictionary/overture_n?tab=meaning_and_use#32696647.
- ‘Pantan, n.’ In OED Online. Oxford University Press. Accessed 19 April 2023.
<https://www.oed.com/view/Entry/137046>.
- ‘Pearling, n.1’. In OED Online. Oxford University Press. Accessed 23 April 2023.
<https://www.oed.com/view/Entry/139336>.
- ‘Pernicious, Adj.’ In OED Online. Accessed 4 May 2024.
https://www.oed.com/dictionary/pernicious_adj1.
- ‘Petition’. In OED Online. Accessed 23 January 2024.
https://www.oed.com/dictionary/petition_n?tab=meaning_and_use#31049971.
- ‘Plaid, n.¹’. In *OED Online*. Accessed 24 May 2024.
https://www.oed.com/dictionary/plaid_n1.
- ‘Point, n.3’. In OED Online. Accessed 23 January 2024.
https://www.oed.com/dictionary/point_n3?tab=meaning_and_use#29391569.

- ‘Power, n.¹ I.2.a’. In *OED Online*. Accessed 16 May 2024.
https://www.oed.com/dictionary/power_n1.
- ‘Punch, n.1’. In *OED Online*. Oxford University Press. Accessed 4 April 2023.
<https://www.oed.com/view/Entry/154558>.
- ‘Ruff, n.3’. In *OED Online*. Oxford University Press. Accessed 21 May 2023.
<https://www.oed.com/view/Entry/168561>.
- ‘Spur, n.1’. In *OED Online*. Oxford University Press. Accessed 3 April 2023.
<https://www.oed.com/view/Entry/187954>.
- ‘Starch, v.’ In *OED Online*. Oxford University Press. Accessed 21 May 2023.
<https://www.oed.com/view/Entry/189093>.
- ‘Stay, n.2’. In *OED Online*. Oxford University Press. Accessed 21 May 2023.
<https://www.oed.com/view/Entry/189407>.
- ‘Stomacher, n.1’. In *OED Online*. Oxford University Press. Accessed 20 April 2023.
<https://www.oed.com/view/Entry/190742>.
- ‘Taffeta or Taffety (Scottish)’. In *OED Online*. Accessed 23 January 2024.
https://www.oed.com/dictionary/taffeta_n?tab=meaning_and_use#19141066.
- ‘Tapis, n.’ In *OED Online*. Oxford University Press. Accessed 5 April 2023.
<https://www.oed.com/view/Entry/197710>.
- ‘Textile, Adj. and n.’ In *OED Online*. Oxford University Press. Accessed 21 May 2023.
<https://www.oed.com/view/Entry/200011>.

DICTIONNAIRE UNIVERSEL, Antoine Furetière, 1690

- ‘Baudrier’. In *Dictionnaire Universel, 1690*, database ‘Classiques Garnier Numérique’. Accessed 23 May 2024.
- ‘Cachet’. In *Dictionnaire Universel, 1690*, database ‘Classiques Garnier Numérique’. Accessed 9 January 2024.
- ‘Calotte’. In *Dictionnaire Universel, 1690*, database ‘Classiques Garnier Numérique’. Accessed 9 January 2024.
- ‘Devanteau’. In *Dictionnaire Universel, 1690*, database ‘Classiques Garnier Numérique’. Accessed 9 January 2024.
- ‘Drap’. In *Dictionnaire Universel, 1690*, database ‘Classiques Garnier Numérique’. Accessed 9 January 2024.
- ‘Jabot’. In *Dictionnaire Universel, 1690*, database ‘Classiques Garnier Numérique’. Accessed 23 May 2024.
- ‘Manchette’. In *Dictionnaire Universel, 1690*, database ‘Classiques Garnier Numérique’. Accessed 23 May 2024.
- ‘Mollet’. In *Dictionnaire Universel, 1690*, database ‘Classiques Garnier Numérique’. Accessed 23 May 2024.
- ‘Mouchoir’. In *Dictionnaire Universel, 1690*, database ‘Classiques Garnier Numérique’. Accessed 23 May 2024.
- ‘Nacarat’. In *Dictionnaire Universel, 1690*, database ‘Classiques Garnier Numérique’. Accessed 19 April 2023.
- ‘Rabat’. In *Dictionnaire Universel, 1690*, database ‘Classiques Garnier Numérique’. Accessed 23 May 2024.
- ‘Serge’. In *Dictionnaire Universel, 1690*, database ‘Classiques Garnier Numérique’. Accessed 23 May 2024.
- ‘Tabis’. In *Dictionnaire Universel, 1690*, database ‘Classiques Garnier Numérique’. Accessed 23 May 2024.

‘Vigogne’. In Dictionnaire Universel, 1690, database ‘Classiques Garnier Numérique’.
Accessed 23 May 2024.

CNRTL

‘Pied, 2ème Section’. In CNRTL. Accessed 30 May 2023. <https://www.cnrtl.fr/definition/pied>.
‘Pouce, II.A.1’. In CNRTL. Accessed 30 May 2023. <https://www.cnrtl.fr/definition/pouce>.

DICTIONNAIRE DE L’ACADEMIE FRANÇOISE DÉDIÉ AU ROY, 1694

‘aune’. In *Le dictionnaire de l’Académie françoise, dédié au Roy. ...*, Tome Premier: p.70.
Veuve de J. B. Coignard & J. B. Coignard, 1694.

GLOSSARY

AUNE

Measure unit mainly used for lengths of fabrics. Scottish ell: 1 yard OR 91,5 cm; French ell: 1,3 yards or 1,2 meters.

BAIZE

A coarse woollen stuff, having a long nap.

BALDRIC

A belt or girdle, usually of leather and richly ornamented, worn pendent from one shoulder across the breast and under the opposite arm, and used to support the wearer's sword, bugle, etc.

BAND

see 'rabat'.

BARRAS

A coarse linen fabric.

BRROW

A long sleeveless flannel garment for infants.

BATISTE

see 'cambric'

BAUDRIER

see 'baldric'

BODY / BODIES

Any garment covering the upper-body, including undergarments.

BREECHES

Breeches are distinguished from trousers by coming only just below the knee.

BUCKRAM

A linen or cotton fabric on the coarser side and sometimes stiffened.

CAMBRIC

A kind of fine white linen, originally made at Cambay in Flanders.

CACHET

A seal sometimes on a ring.

CALOTTE

A small cap or headdress made of leather, satin, or other cloth, which covers the top of the head.

CALLO

probably a calotte.

CALICO

Any cotton cloth imported from the Asia. Printed calicoes had layers of colours applied with a brush or engraved wooden plates, before the cloth being soaked into a bath of specific substances which made the cloth more resistant to washing and exposure to light.

CANIONS / CANONS

Tubular shaped extensions to men's trunk hose, designed to cover the lower thighs and knees, and to fill the gap between trunk hose and stockings; or ornamental rolls or frills worn around the knees, either as the termination of stockings or attached to breeches.

CLOTH

In a general sense, any fabric. Often, simply referring to a woollen fabric.

CORDOVAN

Made of or pertaining to Cordova; made of the leather there manufactured.

DEVANTEAU

Old word which once meant apron, & which is no longer in use but among ordinary folks.

DRAP DE BERRY

A common light cloth of woven wool.

DRAP d'USSEAU

A cloth manufactured in the Languedoc region, near Carcassone.

DRAWERS (pair of..)

A short-legged loose-fitting item of underwear or similar article of clothing covering the lower torso and upper part of the legs; underpants.

DROGGAT / DRUGGET

A heavy cloth of wool, or of a mixture of wool and silk or wool and linen, used chiefly for clothing; a piece or length of this cloth.

ELL *see 'aune'.*

GALLON

A kind of narrow, close-woven ribbon or braid, of gold, silver, or silk thread, used for trimming articles of apparel.

HALF-SHIRT

A shirt of shorter than normal length. A day shirt, as opposed to the longer nightshirt; a short shirt worn underneath a longer shirt or nightshirt.

HOSE

Leg coverings, either rather like a legging or a pair of knee-high stockings.

JABOT

A lace cravat.

LACE

A delicate ornamental open fabric, typically of cotton or silk, made by twisting, looping, or knotting thread in patterns, or by embroidering similar designs onto net.

Or see 'lacing'

LACING

A cord, lace or string used for closing or fastening an item of clothing or footwear.

LUSTRING

A glossy silk fabric.

MANCHET

A small ornaments made of cloth and worn at the wrist at the bottom of the sleeves.

MAROQUIN

A kind of leather made from goatskin, originally produced in Morocco.

MEMORIAL

A statement of facts forming the basis of or expressed in the form of a petition or remonstrance to a person in authority, a government, etc.

MOLLET

A small fringe as large as a finger length used to embellish furniture. They can be made of gold, silk, & wool.

MOUCHOIR

Cloth worn in the pocket to blow one's nose, wipe oneself clean. A tissue with tassels, with lace" or "mouchoir de col", meaning a "cloth usually embellished with exquisite laces, which Ladies use to hide or don their throat.

NACARAT

A light orange-red colour.

NAP

The rough layer of projecting threads or fibres on the surface of a woollen or other textile fabric.

OVERTURE

Scottish. A proposal for consideration by a legislative body; spec. a bill placed before the Scottish Parliament or Convention of the Estates for enactment.

PANTAN / PANTONS

Scottish word for slipper or soft shoe.

PEARLING

A kind of lace of thread or silk, used for trimming the edges of garments.

PETITION

(Originally Scots Law). A formal written application made to a court, setting out facts on the basis of which the petitioner seeks to some legal remedy or relief.

PIED

Measure unit, 0,324 meter.

PINKING PUNCH

Small tool used to cut out pieces in a specific shape.

PLAID

A twilled woollen cloth, usually with a chequered or tartan patten. A length of such fabric.

POINT DE...

Denoting lace named after the (actual, supposed, or original) place of manufacture. ex. "*point de France*".

POUCE

Measure unit, about an inch.

RABAT

A type of dying treatment, or French term for a 'band', which was a large ornamented collar or neck-band.

RUFF

Wide collars made of very precisely pleated dautel, which was stiffened – a process called starching.

SERGE DE CHALON

Cloth made of fine wool, & thicker than that of England. Some serge are sometimes made of silk and are very lustrous.

SPUR

A device for pricking the side of a horse in order to urge it forward, consisting of a small spike or spiked wheel attached to the rider's heel.

STARCH

To stiffen (cloth, clothes, etc.) with starch..

STAYS (pair of)

A laced underbodice, stiffened by the insertion of strips of whale-bone (sometimes of wood) worn by women (sometimes by men) to give shape and support to the figure.

STOMACHER

A triangle-shaped piece worn behind lacings or pinned down on the chest. (Women's dress)

TABBY / TABIS

A type of thick taffeta which had been pressed between tubes engraved with a wave-like pattern. Such a process created an uneven thickness to the silk, which enabled the light to reflect in such a way that it glistened.

TAFFETA

Or 'taffety' in Scottish. A type of thick taffeta which had been pressed between tubes engraved with a wave-like pattern. Such a process created an uneven thickness to the silk, which enabled the light to reflect in such a way that it glistened.

TAPIS

Elaborate pieces of cloth used as elements of décor such as curtains, table cloth, carpets etc.

TEXTILE

That has been or may be woven. Also, of or pertaining to a man-made fibre or filament, not necessarily woven.

VIGOGNE

Sheep breed from Peru, whose wool is particularly valued and is used to make good quality hats, similarly referred to as vigogne. The wool of that sheep.