



Provided by the author(s) and University of Galway in accordance with publisher policies. Please cite the published version when available.

Title	Lord Bute and eighteenth-century science and patronage
Author(s)	Gillan, Caroline
Publication Date	2018-08-03
Publisher	NUI Galway
Item record	http://hdl.handle.net/10379/10036

Downloaded 2024-04-24T08:46:03Z

Some rights reserved. For more information, please see the item record link above.



Lord Bute and Eighteenth-Century Science **and Patronage**

Caroline Gillan, B.A. MPhil

Thesis submitted in fulfilment of the requirements of the PhD degree, Department of
History, College of Arts, Social Sciences & Celtic Studies, National University of
Ireland, Galway

August 2018

Supervisor: Dr. Niall Ó'Ciosáin

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Acknowledgements	ii
List of Tables	iii
Introduction: Fostering Patronage	1
1. Bute and Science	43
2. Bute as a Royal Client, 1750-1772	91
3. Bute as Political Patron, 1761-1767	121
4. Bute's Personal Patronage, 1766-1790	152
Conclusion	198
Appendices: (1) A complete list of dedications and authors (2) Half-man, half-boar: A satire on the Earl of Bute	
Bibliography	

Acknowledgements

I would like to express my special appreciation and thanks to my advisor Dr. Niall Ó'Ciosáin and to Dr. Aileen Fyfe for encouraging my research.

I would especially like to thank the archivist at Mount Stuart, Barbara McLean and the British Society of the History of Science for their support.

A special thanks to my family.

List of Tables

Table 1: Number of plants introduced by plant-collectors into Britain

Table 2: List of all dedications by subject

Table 3: Nationality of all known dedicators

Table 4: List of authors looking for royal patronage

Table 5: List of authors looking for political patronage

Table 6: List of mock dedications, 1763-1770

Table 7: List of personal dedications

Table 8: Clients who benefitted from the patronage of the Earl of Bute

INTRODUCTION: FOSTERING PATRONAGE

A BRIEF BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH OF JOHN STUART, THIRD EARL OF BUTE

John Stuart, third Earl of Bute, was born in May 1713 at Parliament Square, Edinburgh, the eldest son of James, second Earl of Bute (1689/90-1723), and his wife, Lady Anne Campbell (1692-1736). The second Earl was a supporter of the Hanoverian succession; he was elected as a representative peer for Scotland in 1715 and rewarded with a place at the court of George I (1660-1727) with his appointment as a Lord of the Bedchamber in 1721.¹ He retained these influential positions until his premature death in 1723.² After the death of his father, the young Earl was brought up in England under the guardianship of his maternal uncles, John Campbell, second Duke of Argyll (1678-1743), and Archibald Campbell, Earl of Ilay (1682-1761).

Ilay was a notable collector of natural philosophical instruments who had interests in botany, chemistry, astronomy, and mathematics. His vast library contained over 12,000 volumes, with five hundred works on botany alone. Ilay was a well-known eighteenth-century plant-collector who purchased seeds and plants from plant-hunters such as Mark Catesby (c.1682/3-1749) and John Bartram (1699-1777), as well as specimens from collectors in Aleppo, China, Brazil, New York and Russia.³ These plants, shrubs and trees were cultivated on his estate at Whitton Park, which became one of the great botanical centres in England. Ilay believed that experiments in areas such as agriculture would result in economic benefits and built several chemical laboratories for that purpose – at Whitton and The Whim in Peebles-shire.⁴ Based on the archival sources, it is apparent that Bute inherited his uncle's enthusiasm for botany, plant-collecting, agricultural improvements, and chemistry.

Bute was educated at Eton College, and between 1730 and 1734, pursued a civil law degree at the Dutch universities of Groningen and Leiden. After leaving university, he returned to his estate of Mount Stuart on the Isle of Bute, and married Mary Wortley Montagu (1718-1794), the daughter of the English writer, Lady Mary Wortley Montagu

¹ Romney Sedgwick, *Letters from George III to Lord Bute 1756-1766*, (Connecticut, 1981), p. xliii

² Francis Russell, *John 3rd Earl of Bute: Patron and Collector*, (London, 2004), p. 4

³ Roger L. Emerson, *An Enlightened Duke: The Life of Archibald Campbell (1682-1761), Earl of Argyll, 3rd Duke of Argyll*, (Kilterran, 2013), p. 157

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 139

(1689-1762), and Edward Wortley Montagu (1678-1761) in 1736. His mother's family, the Campbells, were a powerful Scottish family and through his nearly forty year control over the royal patronage of Scotland, the Earl of Ilay became one of the most important politicians of his time. Bute was nominated by Ilay as one of his electoral candidates and was appointed as a Scottish representative peer and a Commissioner of Police for Scotland in 1737.⁵ However, he went against his patron's wishes when he entered opposition, and Ilay withdrew his support. As a result, Bute was not re-elected to Parliament in 1741.⁶ Though only twenty eight, he remained excluded from Parliament for the next twenty years, and returned to his home on the isolated Isle of Bute.

During this period of solitude, Bute studied botany and agriculture, corresponded with other naturalists (including the Dutch botanist, Johan Frederik Gronovius, 1686-1762), and made improvements to his estate. He devoted a large amount of time on his studies, adding to his botanical library, and acquiring seeds and plants from around the world to cultivate in his gardens at Mount Stuart.. After spending four years in seclusion, Bute decided to move his family to London in 1745 in search of new opportunities for advancement. His financial position, which had previously been precarious, improved in 1747 after the abolition of hereditary jurisdictions in Scotland supplemented his income by over £2000. Additionally, Ilay (now the third Duke of Argyll) sold a half share of his estate of Cane Wood, near Hampshire to his nephew. The Bute family would remain in residence at Cane Wood until 1754.⁷

It was a fortuitous meeting with Frederick, Prince of Wales (1707-51), at the Egham races in 1747 that was a defining moment of Bute's life. The races had stopped due to the rain, and a person of sufficiently high rank was needed to play cards at the same table as Prince Frederick. The Earl was lucky enough to be in the right place at the right time. A friendship between Frederick and Bute developed from this chance encounter, and the Earl became a member of the Prince's Leicester House Circle. Leicester House was the London residence of the Prince of Wales and served as the political headquarters of the "Prince's Party", a faction who provided a focus of opposition to the King's court at St. James. Bute and

⁵ Alexander Murdoch, 'Lord Bute, James Stuart Mackenzie, and the Government of Scotland', in Karl W. Schweizer's *Lord Bute: Essays in Re-interpretation*, (Leicester, 1988), p. 120; J.A. Lovat-Fraser, *John Stuart, Earl of Bute*, (Cambridge, 1912), p. 4

⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 120

⁷ Russell, *John 3rd Earl of Bute: Patron and Collector*, p. 17

Frederick shared many of the same interests, including art, gardening, theatre, and architecture. When Frederick began cultivating the gardens at Kew in 1731, he turned to his friend for assistance in developing the botanical garden. To oversee its progress, Bute acquired a house on Kew Green in 1754, where he built an extension to contain his ever expanding scientific library.⁸ He was rewarded for loyalty in 1750 when he was appointed Lord of the Bedchamber to Frederick. This position also improved his finances as the post was worth £600 annually.⁹ However, the unexpected death of Frederick in 1751 was a setback for Bute, both financially and socially. He lost his post as Lord of the Bedchamber, and the influential support of his patron. Fortunately, for Bute, Frederick's widow, Princess Augusta (1719-1772), interceded on his behalf and he was able to retain his influence with the royal family and at Kew.¹⁰

After spending a further four years in relative obscurity, Bute was selected by Princess Augusta as a suitable finishing tutor for the heir to the throne, Prince George. The following year in 1756, Bute was chosen by the young Prince as his Groom of the Stole. This post effectively put him in charge of the Prince's finances, and enabled him to influence future royal and political appointments.¹¹ As a result, Bute recommended the nomination of his brother, James Stuart Mackenzie (1719-1800), as Minister of Turin in 1758.¹² It was also during this time that the Earl of Bute emerged as a major figure in the political world. His role in the Prince's inner circle inevitably led to the expansion of his own establishment, and many now looked to Bute for his patronage. Among those who benefitted during this period was the Scottish playwright, John Home (1722-1808), whom he employed as his private secretary.

After Prince George's elevation as King George III in October 1760, Bute's star continued to rise. Two days after the accession, the Earl became a member of the Privy Council. In March 1761, he became Secretary of State for the Northern Department, before becoming Prime Minister in May 1762. From the outset, Bute's rapid political ascendancy created confusion and strife among senior cabinet ministers who resented his lack of political experience, and both envied and distrusted, his close relationship with the King. The Whigs

⁸ Royal Botanic Gardens, Kew, 'Historical Account of Kew to 1841', *Bulletin of Miscellaneous Information (Royal Gardens, Kew)*, Vol. 1891, (1891), p. 290

⁹ Russell, *John 3rd Earl of Bute*, p. 19

¹⁰ David P Miller, "'My favourite studdys": Lord Bute as naturalist', in Karl W. Schweizer's *Lord Bute: Essays in Re-interpretation*, (Leicester, 1988), p. 220

¹¹ Romney Sedgwick, *Letters from George III to Lord Bute 1756-1766*, (Connecticut, 1981), p. li

¹² Russell, *John 3rd Earl of Bute*, p. 29

had dominated politics since the Hanoverian succession in 1714, and with the appointment of Bute, a Tory, their monopoly on government had ended. Now, there was an opportunity for those who had previously been excluded from political office, or who had fallen out of favour, to apply to Bute for patronage. Therefore, the great Whig politicians like the former Prime Minister, Thomas Pelham-Holles, the first Duke of Newcastle (1693-1768), were among the Earl of Bute's staunchest opponents.¹³ Those who applied to Bute for patronage during his term as Prime Minister in 1762, included William Franklin (1730-1814) who asked to be appointed secretary of South Carolina; Samuel Johnson (1709-1784), and Charles Wyndham, second Earl of Egremont (1710-1763) who applied for his earldom to be raised to a marquissate.¹⁴

Bute's tenure as Prime Minister was relatively short, and one of the most difficult tasks of his premiership was to bring an end to the expensive Seven Years' War (1756-1763). The peace negotiations were under way by the spring of 1761 but Secretary of State for the Southern Department, William Pitt (1708-1778) and his supporters, attacked the terms of the peace in the press, opposing the return of the newly required territories to France and Spain. The Peace of Paris was passed by Parliament in December 1762 and signed in February 1763. The strains of political life had adversely affected the Prime Minister's health and Bute resigned shortly afterwards in April 1763. George III had reluctantly accepted his resignation, and continued to seek Bute's advice for the next number of years. However in 1766, the king formed a political alliance with William Pitt, which excluded Bute and most of his friends from cabinet. Extremely angry, the Earl wrote a bitter letter of condemnation to the King which ended their friendship and his intervention in royal in political matters.¹⁵ Even after his estrangement with the King, Bute enjoyed the friendship of Princess Augusta and continued to be involved in the development of Kew Gardens. After withdrawing from political life, Bute spent three years on a Grand Tour with his son, Charles (1753-1801), in an effort to improve his fragile health. After the death of Lady Bute's father in 1761, she inherited his large fortune thus making the Earl of Bute one of the richest men in Britain.¹⁶ He spent his retirement years

¹³ Frank O' Gorman, 'The Myth of Lord Bute's Secret Influence', in Karl W. Schweizer's *Lord Bute: Essays in Re-interpretation*, (Leicester, 1988), p. 57

¹⁴ R. C. Simmons, 'Colonial Patronage: Two letters from William Franklin to the Earl of Bute, 1762', *The William and Mary Quarterly*, Vol. 59 (2002), p. 131

¹⁵ Sedgwick, *Letters from George III to Lord Bute 1756- 1766*, p. xviii

¹⁶ Peter, D. Brown, 'Bute in Retirement', in Karl W. Schweizer's *Lord Bute: Essays in Re-interpretation*, (Leicester, 1988), p. 242

purchasing and renovating the estates of Luton Hoo in Bedfordshire, and Highcliffe in Dorset. Both these properties had extensive gardens and benefited from his botanical expertise. Bute spent the remainder of his life at Highcliffe where he continued his botanical studies; collected books, prints, and scientific instruments; and devoted himself to the patronage of science and the arts.

Several articles and books have been written on the Earl of Bute, the majority of which focus on his short political career and relationship with George III. Alice Coats's *Lord Bute: An Illustrated life of John Stuart, third Earl of Bute 1713-1792*, and J.A Lovat Fraser's *John Stuart, Earl of Bute*, give a brief biographical sketch of Bute's life, and concentrate on his role as advisor to George III and his term as Prime Minister.¹⁷ Works by John Brewer, Romney Sedgwick, John L. Bullion, and Karl W. Schweizer also examine this time period, 1756-1766. Brewer's, 'The Misfortunes of Lord Bute: A Case-Study in Eighteenth-Century Political Argument and Public Opinion', catalogues the hostile attacks on the Earl by the London mob, and discusses the many reasons for his unpopularity.¹⁸ These reasons include his position as favourite of the King; his nationality; and his perceived favouritism and patronage of Scotsmen over Englishmen. Brewer details the Earl of Bute's employment of literary writers to promote the government's policies in print. Despite a vigorous press campaign, the Prime Minister was unable to sway public opinion. Brewer concludes that 'few politicians can have been as maligned, insulted and manhandled' as Bute.¹⁹

Sedgwick examines the three hundred and thirty nine letters between George III and Bute, discusses their friendship, and the influence it had on state policies and politics. These letters reveal the nature of their friendship; their attitude towards constitutional monarchy; and feelings towards some of the cabinet ministers. Sedgwick believes that in matters of science, as well as in matters of state, Bute had profound influence on the King. Schweizer's *Essays in Re-interpretation* contains a number of articles by different authors which aim at providing a more comprehensive overview of Bute's ministry and scientific interests.²⁰ Bullion's essay, 'Securing the peace: Lord Bute, the plan for the army, and the origins of the American Revolution', argues how the future military and security concerns of the British

¹⁷ J.A. Lovat-Fraser, *John Stuart, Earl of Bute*, (Cambridge, 1912); Alice. M. Coates, *Lord Bute: An Illustrated life of John Stuart, third Earl of Bute 1713 -1792*, (Aylesbury, 1975)

¹⁸ John Brewer, 'The Misfortunes of Lord Bute: A Case-Study in Eighteenth-Century Political Argument and Public Opinion', *The Historical Journal*, Vol.16 (1973), pp. 3-43

¹⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 3

²⁰ Karl W. Schweizer. ed., *Lord Bute: Essays in Re-interpretation*, (Leicester, 1988)

colonies in North America influenced the Paris peace negotiations of 1762.²¹ Bullion accepts that the stationing of large numbers of troops, (which the colonists had to pay for through taxation), ultimately led to the American Revolution.²² Schweizer's own essay, 'Lord Bute and the Press', looks at the press war of 1762, which occurred after the resignation of William Pitt. Bute's peace policy and his political allies were lambasted by Pitt's supporters in the press. This resulted in the employment of literary writers, and the founding of two weekly newspapers, in an attempt to create a favourable press, and to counter arguments and claims made by the opposition. Schweizer concludes that these methods were ultimately unsuccessful.

Russell's, *John 3rd Earl of Bute: Patron and Collector*, gives a more detailed account of Bute's life and reputation as a patron, and examines the careers of some of his clients. Russell primarily discusses Bute's literary and artistic clients, and his extensive collection of paintings, drawings, and books. However, there is little reference in the current literature in relation to Bute's scientific patronage with the notable exceptions of works by M. D Eddy, Roger L. Emerson, and David P Miller. Miller's "'My favourite studdys": Lord Bute as naturalist' deals with the Earl's scientific interests; including some of his botanical correspondence; his role in the development of Kew Gardens; and his career of one of his scientific clients, Sir John Hill (1714-1775). Miller does not reveal the extent of Bute's involvement at Kew; whether he donated any of his own collection of seeds and plants; or lists the number of scientific clients that he supported. Eddy's 'Scottish Chemistry, Classification and the Early Mineralogical Career of the 'Ingenious' Rev. Dr. John Walker (1746 to 1779)' gives an account of Bute's patronage of John Walker. Eddy describes how Bute sent seeds, plants, and books to the Scottish naturalist, along with permitting access to his London library, and mineralogical collection.²³

Emerson discusses Bute's patronage of the Scottish universities in 'Lord Bute and the Scottish universities, 1760-1792', and in a chapter entitled, 'The Age of Lord Bute and the Moderates' in his book *Academic Patronage in the Scottish Enlightenment*.²⁴ Emerson

²¹ John L. Bullion, 'The Prince's Mentor: A New Perspective on the Friendship between George III and Lord Bute during the 1750s', *Albion*, Vol. 21 (1989), pp. 34-55

²² John L. Bullion, 'Securing the peace: Lord Bute, the plan for the army, and the origins of the American Revolution', in Karl W. Schweizer's *Lord Bute: Essays in Re-interpretation*, (Leicester, 1988)

²³ M. D Eddy, 'Scottish Chemistry, Classification and the Early Mineralogical Career of the 'Ingenious' Rev. Dr. John Walker (1746 to 1779)', *The British Journal for the History of Science*, Vol. 35 (2002), pp. 411-438

²⁴ Roger L. Emerson, *Academic Patronage in the Scottish Enlightenment: Glasgow, Edinburgh and St. Andrews*

examines the appointments that Bute and his brother Mackenzie during their tenure in charge of university patronage. For example, in 1761 Bute appointed Dr. John Hope (1725-1786) to the Professorship of Botany and Materia Medica in Edinburgh, and William Leechman (1705-1785) as Principal of Glasgow University. Finally, Gerard L'E Turner's article, 'The Auction Sales of the Earl of Bute's Instruments 1793', provides an account of the scientific instruments from Bute's private collection that were sold after his death.²⁵ From these catalogues we know that Bute had a very extensive collection of minerals, and a library which included many works on natural history and botany. My research aims to complement the existing works on the Earl of Bute, and to provide a comprehensive list of all those that benefited from his scientific patronage, along with the type and nature of this support.

The majority of the manuscripts used as evidence in this thesis are housed in the Mount Stuart Archive and they provide a new perspective on Bute, as the the majority of the material has not been used previously by historians. The Bute Archive has remained in the possession of the family, and this vast collection contains the third Earl of Bute's papers and correspondence relating to family, social, collecting, political, and royal matters. The sheer volume of historical documents in the third Earl of Bute archive has meant that many of the manuscripts have not received much attention. There are thousands of historical documents which the archive has divided into more searchable categories. These categories include general political papers (1728-1793); specific political correspondence (1755-1767); royal correspondence (1756-1766); general and miscellaneous correspondence (1737-1790); scientific and botanical papers (1771-1786); botanical (c.1778-1794); botanical prints (c.1780-1785); botanical notebooks (c.1780); scientific papers (c.1764-1770); scientific notebooks (c.1765-1778); family papers; travel journals (1769-1771); and legal, financial and estate matters.

There are hundreds of documents in each of these categories. The general political papers (1728-1793) relate to matters in the royal household, as well as military, political, diplomatic, and family concerns. This bundle of material contains letters of congratulations on Bute's appointment as Groom of the Stole and Secretary of State for the Northern Department; correspondence with his estate manager, William Mure (1718-1776),

Universities, (Edinburgh, 2008); Emerson, 'Lord Bute and the Scottish universities, 1760-1792', in Karl W. Schweizer's *Lord Bute: Essays in Re-interpretation*, (Leicester, 1988)

²⁵ Gerard L'E. Turner, 'The Auction Sales of the Earl of Bute's Instruments, 1793', pp. 213-242 in *Scientific Instruments and Experimental Philosophy 1550-1850*, (Hampshire, 1990)

in regards to improvements on the Isle of Bute; notes on the purchase of various artwork, books, paintings, and drawing by the royal librarian, Richard Dalton (c.1715-1791) on behalf of Bute and Prince George; and requests seeking the royal patronage. Bute's more specific political correspondence (1755-1767) refers to notes and letters sent and received from William Pitt, William Petty, second Earl of Shelburne (1737-1805), Henry Fox, first Baron Holland (1705-1774), and his secretary and future first Earl of Liverpool, Charles Jenkinson (1729-1808). This material covers topics such as the Treaty of Paris (1762); the proposed cider tax (1763); vacancies in government and royal household departments; and army movements on the continent during the Seven Years' War. There is also a collection of statements and letters concerning the libel case that was brought against John Wilkes (1725-1797) for his political essay criticising the royal speech by George III that praised the Treaty of Paris in no.45 of the *North Briton*.

The notes and letters in the category of royal correspondence (1756-1766) have been printed in Romney Sedgewick's *Letters from George III to Lord Bute*. Not all of these letters are dated and there are a small number of draft letters written by Bute on behalf of Prince George to his grandfather, George II. One of these letters states the prince's desire that Bute 'might be plac'd in some principal situation about my person'.²⁶ There are notes on general gossip and health matters (his own and his family); thoughts on the British constitution; and the proposed marriage of Princess Charlotte of Mecklenburg-Strelitz (1744-1818). The largest bundle of historical documents is in the general and miscellaneous correspondence (1737-1790). There are well over a thousand documents in this grouping, which is arranged chronologically and by surname initial, and contains letters to a number of correspondents on various matters and subjects. There is a letter from Jan Frederick Gronovius concerning botanical matters; a note to Joseph Banks (1743-1820), thanking him for sending seeds; letters regarding the election of Dr. William Robertson (1721-1793) as Principal of Edinburgh University; and a request for support from William Hamilton (1730-1803) seeking to become ambassador in Naples.

The notes, letters, and manuscripts that are examined in this thesis are found in the Earl of Bute's scientific and botanical papers. However, it is evident from the inventory of the archive that very few botanical and scientific papers before the 1770s survive. This material

²⁶ BUJ/108/7 (*Royal Correspondence: George III, 09 June 1756 - 12 July 1766*)

was lost after it was given to Sir John Hill to use during the writing of *The Vegetable System*. The remaining documents in Bute's scientific and botanical papers (1771-1794) and botanical (c.1778-1794) sections cover topics such as botany, minerals, fossils, shells, rock formation and volcanoes; volumes relating to Bute's botanical system; and the coloured plates drawn by Johann Sebastian Muller or John Miller(1715-1790). In the botanical printed proofs (c.1780-1785), there are over two hundred engravings of various botanical illustrations by Miller that were used in the Earl's *Botanical Tables*. The surviving botanical notebooks written in c.1780 include Bute's paper on the *Observations on plants* that was compiled at Cane Wood. In the bundle of scientific papers (c.1764-1770), there are notes and descriptions related to fossils and other geological matters including archaeology, geometry, animals, starfish, and crustaceans. Bute's scientific notebooks (c.1765-1778) showcase his interests in geology, botany; with 'minutes of Burnett's theory of the earth'; diagrams and notes on earth quakes; and direction for collecting, preserving and send plants, fruits and seeds.

The Earl of Bute's series of travel journals (1769-1771) were written in his own hand and composed during his Grand Tour. These travel journals include descriptions of architecture (including sites of antiquity), plant life, history, geology and works of art, as well as observation of Pompeii (with diagrams of buildings), Mount Vesuvius, and Naples. The final categories of the archive are separated into legal, financial and estate matters (1722-1795). These documents relate to planting and other gardening work at Mount Stuart; daily observations on the weather and flowering of plants; a letter from John Hope with 'remarks made by James Robertson (1740-1796) on the island of Bute along with a list of plants found on the island; and receipts which give an account of purchases for the Mount Stuart gardens, and bills concerning building work undertaken at Luton Hoo and Highcliffe House. Even though the Earl of Bute's botanical and scientific papers are not extant, they can be used to provide a more detailed account of his interest in science, which will add to the literature that has already been written.

'FOSTERING PATRONAGE'²⁷

In 1760, the ornithologist and artist George Edwards (1694-1773) wrote it was 'Your Lordship's great love of, and encouragement given to Natural History, that emboldened' him to dedicate *Gleanings of Natural History* to John Stuart, third Earl of Bute (1713-1792).²⁸ Edwards' address was one of twenty eight works that were dedicated to the Earl of Bute between 1757 and 1790. The purpose of his inscription was to show gratitude to his patron for purchasing his collection of drawings and to express his sincere wish that Bute would become a great patron to a new generation of scientific practitioners. One of the reasons why Earl of Bute was chosen as the recipient of this dedication was his genuine interest in science, and his meteoric rise in position and power. His role as royal favourite and, after 1760 when his pupil acceded to the throne as George III, his positions as Keeper of the Privy Purse (1760-1763) and Prime Minister of Great Britain (April 1762-May 1763), allowed him to influence and direct royal and political patronage.²⁹

In the eighteenth century, and in the absence of positions in scientific institutions and universities, men of science were largely dependent upon patronage for advancement, social mobility, and financial security. Therefore, the patronage system continued to play an important and vital role in the lives of many scientific practitioners. Bute dispensed patronage as Minister of Scottish Affairs (1761-1767), and with his support, Dr. John Hope secured the Professorship of Botany and *Materia Medica* at Edinburgh University in 1761. Bute's considerable wealth meant that he could employ scientific assistants, like the chemist and mineralogist Peter Woulfe (1727?-1803), to conduct experiments in his laboratory at Luton Hoo. However, it must be noted that patronage was voluntary on the part of the patron which meant that the terms of contract between a patron and a client might be explicit or informal. This resulted in the instability of personal patronage for many clients. For example, Sir John Hill suffered financially, including a loss of reputation, when Bute failed to provide adequate funding for publishing the later volumes of *The Vegetable System* (1759-1775). Therefore, an in-depth look at the structure and effects of patron-client relationships

²⁷ William Dodd, *Reflections on Death*, (London, 1763), p. iii

²⁸ George Edwards, *Gleanings of Natural History*, vol. 2, (London, 1760), p. ii

²⁹ As Keeper of the Privy Purse, Bute was responsible for the financial management of the royal household

will lead to a greater understanding of how the patronage system worked in the eighteenth century.

My interest in the topic of scientific patronage originates from reading an article by Steven Pumfrey and Frances Dawbarn on 'Science and Patronage in England, 1570-1625'.³⁰ The focus of their three year study was the application of patronage studies to the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries, which they believed to be a neglected period of English science. Their research reveals a contrast between the utilitarian forms of science that were practiced in England and ostentatious science, (i.e. chiefly concerned with developments that would enhance a patron's self-image and reputation), performed in the European courts of Italy and Germany. There were a number of reasons for preferment of utilitarian rather than ostentatious in England. The Elizabethan court lacked the financial resources of its European counterparts; its chief concerns were agricultural breakthroughs, developments in fortifications, navigational aids, and improvements in scientific instruments such as compass design, which would ultimately provide more accurate maps, and aid in the charting of new territories abroad. These economical and military advances had implications for territorial expansion, and would prove of great benefit to the continuing welfare of the English state. Furthermore, natural philosophers operating in England during the sixteenth century were dependent on small group of courtier politicians such as William Cecil, first Baron Burghley (1520/1-1598) and Robert Dudley, first Earl of Leicester (1532/3-1588) for patronage.

These patrons of utility expected results - Burghley wished to stimulate the economy by investing in new manufacture practices but this fell far short of his architectural and political patronage, and Leicester patronised Thomas Digges (1545/6-1595), not in his preferred subject of astronomy, but in the military arts.³¹ There were few sixteenth-century patrons, with the exception of Henry Percy, ninth Earl of Northumberland (1564-1632), who conducted experiments, had intellectual interests in some aspects of science, along with his notable client, the mathematician and natural philosopher, Thomas Harriot (c.1560-1621). Harriot had a wide range of interests in areas such as astronomy, navigation, optics, and mathematics. Northumberland was not an influential patron, or politician, in Elizabethan

³⁰ Stephen Pumfrey and Frances Dawbarn's 'Science and Patronage in England, 1570-1625: A Preliminary Study', *History of Science*, Vol. 42 (2004), pp. 137-188

³¹ *Ibid.*, pp. 151 & 161

England. He was from Catholic family and was suspected of involvement in the Gunpowder Plot, which resulted in his imprisonment in the Tower of London from 1606-1621. Harriot published no work during his lifetime. He was seemingly uninterested in establishing his reputation, and was financially secure with an annual pension of £100 from Northumberland. His papers were rediscovered in the eighteenth century and there has been some debate over his contribution to sixteenth-century natural philosophy.³²

This thesis will build upon Pumfrey and Dawbarn's research to develop a deeper understanding of how the patronage system continued to operate in eighteenth-century Britain by examining the patronage and science of one of the principal patrons, the Earl of Bute. One of the aims of my research is to investigate whether aristocratic patrons in Britain continued to focus on practical science. For example, utilitarian science is evidenced in the conscious effort made by the landlords to improve agriculture in Scotland, the formation of a number of agricultural societies (including The Honourable the Improvers in the Knowledge of Agriculture in Scotland), and the reflection of aristocratic scientific interest in university appointments. This culminated in the endowment of the first chair of agriculture in the University of Edinburgh by Sir William Pulteney (1729-1805) in 1790. Bute was one of the few aristocratic scientific practitioners of the eighteenth century who conducted their own research, performed chemical experiments, and published his botanical work, *Botanical Tables Containing the Families of British Plants*, in 1785. He patronised, made contributions, and worked closely with Hill in publishing the early volumes of *The Vegetable System*. He supported utilitarian science and commissioned the instrument maker, David Lyle (fl.1762), to produce a new set of mathematical instruments for use by George III.³³ He also encouraged his family physician, Sir William Fordyce (1724-1792), to publish his treatise on the benefits of muriatic acid in the treatment of fevers in 1790, which he credited with his son's recovery.³⁴ There has been a lack of studies of science in the eighteenth century and the patronage system, with many historians concentrating on ostentatious science, the fascinating lives and marvellous discoveries made by practitioners such as Galileo Galilei (1564-1642) and Tycho Brahe (1546-1601). This has been to the neglect of practical or utilitarian science, and as

³² Ibid., p. 163

³³ David Lyle, *The Art of Short Hand Improved, Being an Universal Character Adapted to the English Language*, (London, 1762), p. vi

³⁴ Sir William Fordyce, *A Letter to Sir John Sinclair Concerning the Virtues of the Muriatic Acid or Spirit of Sea-Salt, in the Cure of Putrid Diseases*, (London, 1790)

many of these practitioners were not learned humanists, and came from the lower social orders, very little is known about them.

Bute's scientific interests can be discussed alongside developments in science, such as the craze for plant-collecting, breakthroughs in geology, and the introduction of a new classification system for plants. As his scientific activities and patronage span six decades, and to provide structure to the thesis, I will examine his patronage under three headings – royal, political, and personal.³⁵ His appointment as tutor to George III in 1756, and his role as botanical advisor to Princess Augusta at Kew Gardens (c.1752-1772), allowed Bute to recommend his own candidates and influence royal patronage. As Minister of Scottish Affairs, and Prime Minister of Great Britain (1762-1763), he dispensed political patronage and was responsible for university appointments in Scotland. From the 1730s onwards, he was a participant in different facets of science, used his personal wealth to support clients and develop his own interests, and build up a significant collection of manuscripts, minerals, scientific instruments, and paintings. His collection of scientific instruments was believed to rival that of George III.³⁶

This chapter will provide an explanation of the origins of the thesis's three categories of patronage (royal, political and personal), discuss the historiography of science and the history of patronage; examine the developments in eighteenth-century history of science; define the different forms of patronage, and consider how the patronage system benefitted both patrons and clients. I will examine the history and developments in patronage prior to the eighteenth century, refer to the debate surrounding the decline in aristocratic patronage in eighteenth-century Britain, and investigate the scientific developments of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, such as the foundation of the Royal Society, the rise of scientific journals, and the establishment of the coffeehouses, all of which transformed the existing forms of patronage. Finally, I will list the aims and structure of this thesis.

THE HISTORIOGRAPHY OF SCIENCE

There has been a series of debates surrounding the different methods of explaining scientific change in the history of science over the past fifty years. From the 1930s, until around the

³⁵ The origins of these headings will be explained further on in the chapter

³⁶ Gerard L'E. Turner, *Scientific Instruments and Experimental Philosophy 1550-1850*, (Hampshire, 1990), p. 215

end of the Cold War, the “externalism-internalism debate” dominated the history and sociology of science. Historians of science situated important factors in theories of scientific change and development as either internal or external. Internalists believed that scientific discoveries were developed wholly in the scientific world, largely independent of external factors, and based on observation and experimentation. Externalists considered scientists’ activities as members of a larger scientific community and emphasised the importance of intellectual, social, economic, and political factors in scientific change.

There are historians and historiographical schools more receptive to the social role of science, the impact of science on society, and the impact of society on the development of science in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries.³⁷ This led to more of a focus on external factors, as patronage is a social phenomenon and a wholly internalist account will fail to adequately explain scientific progress. Marxists historians and theorists claimed that science and society have worked in mutually beneficial ways since the arrival of the ‘New Science’ in the seventeenth century, and that the Scientific Revolution could no longer be seen as a small group of great minds working in isolation. Marxists viewed science as a progressive force that required the protection of the state and a favourable environment for discussion and publication.³⁸ The continuing exploration of new worlds in the eighteenth century brought about the discovery of unknown plant species, which not only contributed to natural knowledge, but to new economic and imperial opportunities. This link, between the growth of British imperial power and science as the wealth of the empire, was largely due to the wealth associated with plants such as cotton, sugar, tea, coffee, tobacco, and spices. In the late eighteenth century, the Director of Kew Gardens, Joseph Banks, recognised the economic significance of crops such as the breadfruit which he attempted to introduce to Tahiti as a cheap source of food for slaves.³⁹ Banks employed hundreds of plant-hunters to acquire plant specimens which might advance British economic and scientific interests. As his predecessor at Kew, the Earl of Bute began the process of cultivating new species at Kew, and transforming the gardens into permanent and expandable collection of exotic plants from overseas colonies.

³⁷ Roy Porter, “The History of Science and the History of Society” in the *Routledge Companion to the History of Science*, p. 33

³⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 34

³⁹ John Gascoigne, *Joseph Banks and the English Enlightenment: Useful Knowledge and Polite Culture*, (Cambridge, University of Cambridge Press, 1994), p. 40

The Anglo-American history of science of the 1950s renounced Marxists attempts to use social factors to link science and society. They believed that scientific achievements were largely the work of individual intellectuals. Historians such as A. Rupert Hall, I. B. Cohen, Marshall Clagett, R.S Westfall, A. C. Crombie, and C. C. Gillispie, continued to champion the 'internalist' history of science with Hall declaring that scientists were not 'puppets' of external forces.⁴⁰ They saw scientific ideas, and the intellectual challenges posed by science, taking place wholly in the scientific world - separate from external political and social forces. My research will reveal that Bute's patronage is more reminiscent of aristocratic patronage performed by Henry Cavendish (1731-1810) – a noble gentleman who conducted experiments in his laboratory for his own amusement and curiosity, and without thought of publication or legacy. Unlike other eighteenth-century scientific practitioners, Bute and Cavendish were both financially independent, not reliant on patronage, and under no obligation to publish. The majority of Cavendish's manuscripts were not published during his lifetime which meant that his scientific reputation was based on contemporary accounts. His legacy has been reassessed after his scientific papers were discovered in the nineteenth century. In a study of Bute's scientific interests and patronage, there is a need to examine his unpublished papers, his *Botanical Tables* (as only twelve copies were published), alongside the wider social and political influences for a more extensive and comprehensive study.

In 1931, the British historian of science, Herbert Butterfield, coined the phrase the Whig interpretation of history. This was a progressive, Protestant viewpoint, saw science as a series of successes and failures leading to the current state of opinion. Butterfield maintained that biographies of the great intellects of history such as Francis Bacon, Galileo Galilei, and William Harvey, and their achievements, had dominated the history of science.⁴¹ For a more comprehensive study, he proposed research on less well-known individuals, or scientific practitioners from the lower social classes. This would include individuals who pursued science but whose contributions have been largely ignored, were unpopular, or overshadowed by notable eighteenth-century figures but which still had an effect on the progress of science. For example, the Earl of Bute's ideas on classification theory and contribution to the development of Kew Gardens has not received much attention, with current histories focused on the achievements of both Carl Linnaeus (1707-1778) and Joseph Banks.

⁴⁰ Porter, "The History of Science and the History of Society", p. 36

⁴¹ Herbert Butterfield, *The Origins of Modern Science, 1300-1800*, (The Free Press, New York, 1965), p. 8

The impact of science on society can be seen through the improvements in farming and the transformation of Scottish agriculture that occurred in the eighteenth century. The Honourable the Improvers in the Knowledge of Agriculture in Scotland (HIKAS) was established in 1723 and its membership included prominent members of the nobility, including the Earl of Ilay. There were a number of societies and formal institutions in the eighteenth century, including the Royal Society of Edinburgh (1783) that covered agrarian topics such as rural management that aimed to improve the agriculture and economy in Scotland. Although Bute was a member of Royal Society of Edinburgh, it has not been established whether he embraced new agricultural practices on his own estates, or whether he was a member or patron of any other agricultural society.

To situate and understand eighteenth-century scientific advancements, it is important not only to focus on great intellects and published sources, but to examine individuals from different social classes and unpublished works. It is also valuable to examine inaccurate or mistaken hypotheses, forgotten theories, and not to judge their intellectual merit purely in terms of the contribution they made (or did not make) to scientific progress. In his scientific papers, Bute examined the extremely controversial topic of the history, or theory, of the earth. He accepted that the geological evidence supported the theory that the world had once been entirely covered by the sea but despite his considerable scientific knowledge, his religious beliefs meant that he believed implicitly in the miracle of creation and accepted that the flood was caused entirely by the hand of God.

Recent historical research by John Brewer, Dorinda Outram, and Jeremy Black have focused on the social and cultural context in which ideas originated, with few historians of science now assessing the relationship between "internal and external factors".⁴² Brewer demonstrates the impact of the expanding economy on politics, society and culture, the influence of the press and the role of booksellers and publishers in eighteenth-century Britain. Outram examines the social basis of the Enlightenment and addresses the relationship between science and religion and covers the role of the coffeehouses, gender, and the effect of exploration and cross-cultural contact on Europe. Outram acknowledges that only a few men in the eighteenth century were employed in full-time scientific work or

⁴² Dorinda Outram, *The Enlightenment*, (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge 2011); John Brewer, *The Pleasures of the Imagination: English Culture in the Eighteenth Century*, (Routledge, New York, 2013) and William Clarke, Jan Golinski and Simon Schaffer, *The Sciences in Enlightened Europe*, (Chicago University Press, Chicago, 1999)

teaching science, which resulted in scientific practitioners continuing to rely on patronage for financial support.⁴³ Roger Emerson has criticised recent works (especially Outram) for covering fashionable topics such as salons, and the public sphere, without reference to patrons and to the system of patronage. Paul Langford devotes only a few pages to patronage in his lengthy *A Polite and Commercial People: England 1727-1783* and does not examine the relationship between patrons and their clients.⁴⁴

Jeremy Black's *Culture in Eighteenth-Century England* considers eighteenth-century patronage, before looking specifically at books and newspapers and changes in artistic styles.⁴⁵ He reveals that the royal patronage of the Hanoverian kings was small in scale and was dependent on the personality and interests of each monarch.⁴⁶ Frederick, Prince of Wales, displayed his 'rebellion' by his patronage and support of opposition plays in the Lincoln's Inn Fields theatre, a rival to George II's theatrical politics.⁴⁷ George III patronised architecture, gardens, science, theatre, and music which were also supported by his royal favourite, Bute. The Earl of Bute is credited with fostering the King's interest in gardening and science. However, Black maintains that the latter half of the eighteenth century was a period of decline for royal patronage and that the new major forces in artistic patronage were the landed elite and the middling orders, not the monarchy. This was due to the expansion of the middle class who grew in importance during the eighteenth century. They were not able to provide sustained patronage, more so for literature rather than architecture.⁴⁸ He maintains that writers benefited from a larger readership during this period and were not dependent on a distinguished list of subscribers, or on political patronage.⁴⁹

Emerson believes that Enlightenment studies particularly lack accounts of patrons who found it in their interest to promote and support the careers of their clients, and to further the work of improvers. It is important to note that these intellectuals were working in an aristocratically structured society in eighteenth-century Britain, and relied on the support of patrons for church and university patronage.⁵⁰ Emerson's study on the leading eighteenth-century Scottish politician, the Earl of Ilay, third Duke of Argyll, is largely a political narrative

⁴³ Ibid., p. 99

⁴⁴ Paul Langford, *A Polite and Commercial People: England 1727-1783* (New York, Oxford University Press, 1998)

⁴⁵ Jeremy Black, *Culture in Eighteenth-Century England*, (Hambledon Continuum, New York, 2001) p. x

⁴⁶ Ibid., p. 31

⁴⁷ Ibid., pp. 32-33

⁴⁸ Ibid., pp. 101-102

⁴⁹ Ibid., p. 152

⁵⁰ Roger Emerson, *Academic Patronage*, pp. 3-4

that focuses on his lengthy and substantial political career. This is not surprising given that Ilay's lengthy career as principal manager of Scottish politics.⁵¹ Emerson describes patronage as primarily a political system, and in his capacity as a patronage broker, Ilay cultivated the art of politics to advance both the interests of his family and of Scotland. He had an interest in agricultural improvements which would stimulate and benefit the Scottish economy, and involved in the establishment in 1727 of Board for Fisheries and Manufactures in Scotland and the Royal Bank of Scotland. Ilay's network of patronage connected all social groups and institutions – the Kirk and universities, the civil administration and court, the burghs and counties, and many civil institutions.⁵² During his tenure as principal manager, Ilay is estimated to have 'settled fifty-four thousand individuals in civil and military employments – a figure that Emerson believes possible.⁵³ Emerson also reveals in his study that Ilay's intellectual interests and played a vital role in the development of the Scottish Enlightenment – by 1760 he had appointed over half of the professors in Scottish universities.⁵⁴ His scientific activities are not neglected, and three of the eighteenth chapters that make up *An Enlightened Duke* focus on his library, his expertise in the field of practical mathematics, medicine, chemistry and botany. It is clear that many of Bute's scientific pursuits mirror many of Ilay's and there is even a parallel between the close political relationship between Bute and his brother, James Stuart Mackenzie, and the political connection between the second and third Dukes of Argyll, including the delegation of the responsibility for Scottish affairs.⁵⁵

Fredrik Albritton Jonsson's *Enlightenment's Frontier* tells the story of how the mountains and peat mosses of Scotland became a laboratory for the Enlightenment.⁵⁶ After the loss of the American colonies improvers in Scotland looked to internal colonisation and the promotion of spade husbandry and wasteland reclamation, as they recognised the close alignment of agricultural improvement and natural history. Naturalists conducted surveys on resources and the population of the Highlands and these improvements required precise natural knowledge of northern soils, climate, native, plants, and traditions. Walker was urged by Carl Linnaeus to make a botanical survey of the north and west of Scotland and to make

⁵¹ Emerson, 'An Enlightened Duke: The Life of Archibald Campbell (1682-1761)', p. 7

⁵² Ibid., p. 349

⁵³ Ibid., p. 7

⁵⁴ Roger L. Emerson, 'Lord Bute and the Scottish universities 1760-1792', in Karl W. Schweizer's [ed] *Lord Bute: Essays in Re-interpretation*, (Leicester, 1988), p. 151

⁵⁵ Ibid., p. 5

⁵⁶ Fredrik Albritton Jonsson, *Enlightenment's Frontier: The Scottish Highlands and the Origins of Environmentalism*, p. 1

an inventory of all plants. During his 1764 tour, Walker travelled over 3,000 miles, and in total made five trips to the Highlands, the last in 1786.⁵⁷ There was the belief among improvers that plants with no apparent utility might one day prove useful or profitable. Walker investigated the prevailing conditions of soil, fertility, the ration of arable and pasture land, levels of precipitation, and other characteristics of local climates. James Robertson was sent by John Hope in 1768 to inventory all the plant species found on the Isle of Bute.⁵⁸ His entitled *Remarks made by James Robertson on the Island of Bute* were sent by Hope to the Earl of Bute in London, and which can be found in the Mount Stuart Archive.

THREE CATEGORIES OF PATRONAGE - ROYAL, POLITICAL AND PERSONAL

In the writing of the thesis, it became apparent that the majority of Bute's patronage can be classified under three categories – personal, royal, and political. This division of the types of patronage of the Earl of Bute provides a clearer structure to the thesis, which is why they have been separated into these three distinct categories. Bute's personal patronage looks specifically at where he spent his own money. It begins after his return to the Isle of Bute and the commencement of his plant-collecting activities; his scientific correspondence with the Gronovius; his participation in different facets of scientific activity; and his response to the debate surrounding the origin and purpose of volcanoes that erupted in Europe during the 1770s and 1780s. His personal clients include Lancelot 'Capability' Brown (1716-1783), who developed and transformed the gardens of his estates of Luton Hoo and Highcliffe estates. Bute's personal patronage is also identified by dedications that were addressed to the nobleman without reference to his royal or political positions. This will answer the question of whether there was any connection between the clients who were supported from his own pocket, and if, like most great eighteenth-century noblemen, he was a great builder and patron of the arts. The inheritance that Bute's wife received in 1761, allowed him to support clients, build laboratories, develop his own interests, and build up a significant collection of manuscripts, minerals, scientific instruments, and paintings.

⁵⁷ Charles W. J. Withers, 'A Neglected Scottish Agriculturalist: The 'Georgical Lectures' and Agricultural Writings of the Rev Dr John Walker (1731-1803), *The Agricultural History Review*, Vol. 33, No.2 (1985), p. 134

⁵⁸ J.H Dickson, 'James Robertson and the botany of Bute, 1768', *Watsonia*, 16, 65-74 (1986), p. 65

The period of Bute's royal patronage commenced with his appointment in 1750 as Gentleman of the Bedchamber and continued until the death of Princess Augusta in 1772. There are two aspects to Bute's royal patronage – the benefits he received as a royal client and the influence he had on the patronage of both George III and Princess Augusta. He experienced a temporary loss of position and influence after Frederick's unexpected death in 1751 until his appointment in 1756 as Groom of the Stole. This marked Bute's emergence as a major figure in the political world. His botanical expertise was utilised in his unofficial position as manager of Kew Gardens, and in his role as botanical advisor to Princess Augusta. He was also appointed Ranger for Richmond Park in 1761.⁵⁹ Bute was prominent in securing a position at Kew and royal favour for the Scottish architect, Sir William Chambers (1734-1796). The influx of plants and seeds from around the globe to Kew foreshadows the imperial strategy employed by Joseph Banks in the second half of the eighteenth century. Bute's royal patronage is identified by inscriptions addressed to his royal position, or his role as tutor to Prince George, and focuses on patronage performed on behalf of his royal patrons. The playwright, Arthur Murphy (1727-1805), opens his dedication in *The Orphan of China* by addressing Bute as 'Groom of the Stole to his Royal Highness the Prince of Wales'.⁶⁰ A client's dedication to his patron is an important way of publicly signalling a connection. It was necessary to honour one's patron (or patrons), not least because public gratitude was the price of continued support. Clients who benefited from royal patronage were the instrument-maker, David Lyle (fl.1762), and the architect, Joshua Kirby (1716-1774), who was selected by Bute as a drawing master for Prince George.

Bute's political patronage spans from 1760 to until his falling out with the George III in 1767, when he retired from the Privy Council and as Keeper of the Privy Purse. His brother, Mackenzie, benefited from political patronage – he was appointed Minister of Turin in 1758. Clients who secured political patronage could benefit from annual pensions and government positions. The death of Ilay, and the succession to the management of the affairs of Scotland, dramatically increased his influence. However, Bute had no personal wish to build up an electoral interest like Ilay, and the management of his Scottish interests was left to his brother and Andrew Fletcher, Lord Milton (1691/2-1766). He employed literary writers as Prime Minister in an attempt to create a favourable press for his government. The historian

⁵⁹ Russell, *John 3rd Earl of Bute: Patron and Collector*, p. 53

⁶⁰ Arthur Murphy, *The Orphan of China*, (London, 1759), p. iii-iv

and political writer, James Ralph (d.1762), who had received a pension in 1760, was employed to write pro-government pamphlets.⁶¹ The aim of many of the writers inscribed their work to Bute was to secure a lucrative appointment or pension. One of his Scottish clients, David Mallet (1701/2-1765), was awarded an annual pension of £300.⁶² In his capacity as Minister of Scottish Affairs, the Earl of Bute was responsible for selecting and supporting candidates to fill vacancies in the universities in Scotland. In 1762, Bute supported the candidacy of the historian, William Robertson for the post of Principal of Edinburgh University. However, he did not have the same impact on the Scottish universities as Ilay. An examination of Bute's political patronage can be examined in contrast to the political patronage of other eighteenth-century patrons.

These three categories are not entirely unique, and in previous patronage studies reference has been made to recipients of political and royal patronage. Roger Emerson's study on Argyll is largely a political narrative, which is unsurprising given his substantial political career and the decades he was in charge of Scottish patronage. In comparison, Bute's political career, and his control of political patronage, were relatively short in duration. In Emerson's study of Argyll, it is nearly impossible to separate his political from his personal patronage, as the majority of his personal papers are missing which mean his motivations are open to interpretation. Bute's personal papers and correspondence are available to researchers in the Mount Stuart Archives and it is not as arduous a task, as it would be for Argyll, to categorise and examine his political patronage. This will be the first study where the activities of a major patron will be clearly described as personal, royal, or political patronage. In previous histories on Bute (with few exceptions), the focus is always on his position as royal tutor and his ministry.⁶³ It was therefore important to examine whether in his position as a royal client, or control of political patronage, had any impact on the clients and subject areas that benefited from his personal patronage.

The introduction of these categories was to determine whether Bute's scientific interests or personal patronage influenced his political and royal patronage or vice versa. Was his patronage influenced by his own royal patron, and designed to appeal to the taste

⁶¹ Karl W. Schweizer's [ed] *Lord Bute: Essays in Re-interpretation*, Karl W. Schweizer, 'Lord Bute and the Press', pp. 87-89

⁶² *London Evening Post*, (London, England), February 3, 1763-February 5, 1763; Issue 4598; Jung, *David Mallet, Anglo-Scot: Poetry, Patronage, and Politics in the Age of Union*, p. 158

⁶³ Schweizer's *Lord Bute: Essays in Re-interpretation*; Emerson's *Academic Patronage in the Scottish Enlightenment: Glasgow, Edinburgh and St. Andrews Universities*, and Russell's *John 3rd Earl of Bute: Patron and Collector*

of George III, focusing on science, architecture, art, and gardening? Not all aristocratic patrons would benefit from royal patronage, and Bute was a recipient of this form of patronage (on and off) from 1751 to 1772. It is important to examine whether in his position as a royal client, or control of political patronage, had any impact on the clients and subject areas that benefited from his personal patronage. For example, Bute supported William Chambers' appointment as architectural tutor to Prince George in 1755, and worked alongside him in the development of Kew, but did not employ Chambers' in a personal capacity, reserving his patronage for the landscape gardener, 'Capability' Brown and the Scottish architect, Robert Adam (1728-1792). The time periods for his personal (c.1730s-1791), royal (1750-1772), and political (1761-1767) patronage overlap each other, and subject areas of science and literature can fall under all three categories. James Macpherson (1736-1796) benefited from Bute's personal support for his *The Works of Ossian* (1765) and by his political patronage when he received an annuity for life in 1766.⁶⁴

THE RISE OF SCIENTIFIC INSTITUTIONS

There was a relatively small group of scholars interested in natural philosophy in the seventeenth century and their writings reached a very small audience. During this period, the blanket term for various combinations of scientific disciplines was 'natural history' and the aim of natural historians was the study and understanding of natural knowledge.⁶⁵ The late seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries saw the rise of organisations of scientists and others interested in natural philosophy, the foundation of scientific journals, and the popularisation of the coffeehouses. The eighteenth century was a time of economic expansion, overseas colonies, increasing urbanisation, rising population, and improving communications in Britain. By the turn of the eighteenth century, London had grown to be the largest city in Europe, and Britain had become the most prosperous nation. There was a widening public interest in science with developments in the areas of chemistry, mathematics, botany, physics, and astronomy, and scientific knowledge was made in many

⁶⁴ James Porter, "'Bring Me the Head of James Macpherson": The Execution of Ossian and the Wellsprings of Folkloristic Discourse', *The Journal of American Folklore*, Vol. 114, No. 454, James Macpherson and the Ossian Epic Debate (Autumn, 2001), p. 402

⁶⁵ Susan McMahon, 'Boundary Work: "National Quarrels and Party Factions" in Eighteenth-Century British Botany' in *Science and Beliefs* edited by David M. Knight and Matthew D. Eddy, p. 43

different sites – practiced in observatories, botanical gardens, universities, scientific institutions, and organisations.⁶⁶

There had been scientific societies before, most notably the Accademia dei Lincei in Italy, (of which Galileo had been a member), but these organisations had been temporary and often revolved around a single patron.⁶⁷ The Royal Society of London for Improving Natural Knowledge (founded in London in 1660) was the first permanent scientific institution in England.⁶⁸ It was influenced by the ‘new science’ promoted by Francis Bacon and was granted a Royal Charter in 1662.⁶⁹ The architects of the Royal Society had many aims including the wish to create a national institution that focused on scientific enterprise and experimental learning; to promote a formalised way of debating ideas; to advocate Bacon's beliefs and works; and to complete an investigation into nature which centered on natural and mechanical problems.⁷⁰ In charge of the Society's correspondence and responsible for communicating with scientists both in England and abroad was Henry Oldenburg (c. 1619-1677).

Oldenburg acted as an intermediary between scientists, disseminated new scientific discoveries, and motivated men of science to publish their work.⁷¹ There were a number of advantages to maintaining a network of scientific correspondents from around the world, especially as printed books took years to publish. Oldenburg was kept apprised of scientific discoveries occurring elsewhere, revealed what was happening in England to scientists abroad, and encouraged others to claim ownership of their inventions or findings.⁷² Many of these letters with reports of scientific novelties and breakthroughs were read and discussed during Society meetings. Scientific correspondence was not the only way of diffusing

⁶⁶ Maurits H. Van den Boogert's *Aleppo Observed*, p. ii

⁶⁷ The founder of the Academy was Federico Angelo Cesi (1585-1630). See Alan Cook's 'Rome and the Royal Society, 1660-1740', *Notes and Records of the Royal Society of London*, Vol. 58, No. 1 (Jan., 2004), pp. 3-19.

⁶⁸ Stephen Shapin, 'The House of Experiment in Seventeenth-Century England', *Isis*, Vol. 79 (1988), pp. 373-404; A. Rupert Hall and Marie Boas Hall, 'The Intellectual Origins of the Royal Society, London and Oxford', *Notes and Records of the Royal Society*, Vol. 23, No. 2 (Dec., 1968), pp. 157-168

⁶⁹ E.S. De Beer, 'The Earliest Fellows of the Royal Society', *Notes and Records of the Royal Society of London*, Vol. 7, No. 2 (Apr., 1950), p. 172

⁷⁰ Hall and Hall, 'The Intellectual Origins of the Royal Society, London and Oxford', p. 166; De Beer, 'The Earliest Fellows of the Royal Society', p. 172; R. H. Syfret, 'The Origins of the Royal Society', *Notes and Records of the Royal Society of London*, Vol. 5, No. 2 (Apr., 1948), p. 85; Michael Hunter, *Science and Society in Restoration England*, (Cambridge, 1981), p. 35

⁷¹ Marie Boas Hall, 'Oldenburg and the Art of Scientific Communication', *The British Journal for the History of Science*, Vol. 2, No. 4 (Dec., 1965), p. 277

⁷² Marie Boas Hall, 'The Royal Society's Role in the Diffusion of Information in the Seventeenth Century', *Notes and Records of the Royal Society*, Vol. 29, No. 2 (mar., 1975), p. 181

information, and Oldenburg became the founder of the Society's journal, the *Philosophical Transactions*, in 1665. Men of science who could not attend Society meetings, or were living elsewhere, relied upon the *Philosophical Transactions* as a pivotal source of scientific and bibliographical news.⁷³ In eighteenth century, the *Philosophical Transactions* continued to be circulated to a wide audience outside the scientific community. A letter from John Walker to Bute regarding the 'extraordinary irruption of Solway-moss' was communicated to the Royal Society in February 1772, and subsequently published in the *Philosophical Transactions*.⁷⁴

There was also a rise in the number of scientific institutions and organisations of science in the provincial areas, e.g. the Lunar Society in Birmingham, and the Manchester Literary and Philosophical Society (1785). The activities of the Royal Society in the eighteenth century have attracted little attention among scholars.⁷⁵ This period saw a change in the social makeup of the Society, with noblemen mixing with instrument-makers, artists, school teachers, and physicians with a noticeable shift away from the mathematical natural philosophy and experimental philosophy performed by Isaac Newton (1642-1727), Robert Hooke (1635-1703), and Robert Boyle (1627-1691).⁷⁶ Palmira Fontes da Costa has written on the general interest in 'monsters' and other forms of curiosity that were exhibited in the Royal Society of London in the early eighteenth century.⁷⁷ Society members became more concerned with natural and artificial 'curiosities' and experimental displays, such as anatomical specimens, exotic animals, and plant minerals, which were often seen as more appropriate with the emerging coffeehouse culture.⁷⁸ Da Costa contends that there was an important place for 'monsters' in the Royal Society with curiosity being classified as the

⁷³ Ibid., p. 185

⁷⁴ John Walker, 'Account of the Irruption of Solway Moss in December 16, 1772; In a Letter from Mr. John Walker, to the Earl of Bute, and Communicated by His Lordship to the Royal Society', *The Philosophical Transactions (1683-1775)*, Vol. 62, (1772), pp. 123-127

⁷⁵ David Philip Miller, 'Into the Valley of Darkness': Reflections on the Royal Society in the Eighteenth Century', *History of Science*, Vol. 27 (2) (1989), p. 156

⁷⁶ Patricia Fara, 'A Treasure of Hidden Vertues': The Attraction of Magnetic Marketing', *The British Journal for the History of Science*, Vol. 28, No. 1, Science Lecturing in the Eighteenth Century (Mar., 1995), p. 9

⁷⁷ Palmira Fontes da Costa, 'The Culture of Curiosity at the Royal Society in the first half of the eighteenth century', *Notes and Records of the Royal Society of London*, Vol. 56, No. 2 (May, 2002), pp. 147-166

⁷⁸ Andrea Rusnock, 'Correspondence Networks and the Royal Society, 1700-1750', *The British Journal for the History of Science*, Vol. 32, No. 2, Did the Royal Society Matter in the Eighteenth Century? (Jun., 1999), p. 155; Richard Sorrenson, 'Towards a History of the Royal Society in the Eighteenth Century', *Notes and Records of the Royal Society of London*, Vol. 50, No. 1 (Jan., 1996), p. 29; P. Fontes Da Costa, 'The Culture of Curiosity at The Royal Society in the First Half of the Eighteenth Century', *Notes and Records of the Royal Society of London*, Vol. 56, No. 2 (May, 2002), p. 149

'passion for inquiry and the desire to learn about rare, new or remarkable things'.⁷⁹ These reports on monstrous births and extraordinary pregnancies, rare medical and surgical occurrences, unusual astronomical observations, and other curious observations were often sent by physicians who formed the highest membership in the Royal Society during the period. These reports and specimens were not only forms of entertainment, they promoted inquiry, where society members could act as witnesses and attest to their validity.

Bute was at most a semi-detached participant in these forms of scientific sociability. He was invited to become a member of the Royal Society in 1760, but he declined, and was not an active participant in any scientific society, despite his membership of both the Royal Philosophical Society of Edinburgh and Society of Antiquities.⁸⁰ However, some of his clients, Peter Woulfe (who was awarded the Copley Medal in 1768), and John Strange were members of the Royal Society. In contrast, the scientific practitioner and aristocrat, Henry Cavendish, was a participant in several scientific organisations, became a fellow of the Society in May 1760, and received the Copley Medal for his publication on "factitious airs" in 1766.⁸¹ Cavendish was an active member of the Royal Society and was tasked alongside other fellows of the Royal Society to inspect the meteorological instruments of the Royal Greenwich Observatory.⁸² However, Cavendish was not a participant in politics. Bute's refusal to join the Royal Society in 1760 may be due to his role in government. However, this does not explain why Bute did not seek to become a member of the Royal Society after his retirement from politics in 1766.

The Society's curators of experiments at the beginning of the eighteenth century were John Theophilus Desaguliers (1683-1744), and Francis Hauksbee (1660-1713), who supplement their income by lecturing and performing experiments in the London coffeehouses.⁸³ Desaguliers used his lectures in 1715 to promote and advance Newtonian natural philosophy ensuring it reached a much wider audience, and also allowed him to increase in income by charging an entrance fee for his lectures.⁸⁴ The development of public

⁷⁹ Ibid., p. 148

⁸⁰ Russell, *John 3rd Earl of Bute: Patron and Collector*, p. 59

⁸¹ Christa Jungnickel and Russell McCormach, *Cavendish - The Experimental Life*, (Berlin, Max Planck Institute for the History of Science, 2016), p. 183

⁸² Ibid., p. 109

⁸³ Coata, 'The Culture of Curiosity at The Royal Society in the First Half of the Eighteenth Century', p. 153; Gerard L'E. Turner, 'Presidential Address: Scientific Toys', *The British Journal for the History of Science*, Vol. 20, No 4 (Oct., 1987), p. 378

⁸⁴ Larry Stewart, 'The Selling of Newton: Science and Technology in Early Eighteenth-Century England', *Journal of*

lecturing created a new etiquette for scientific discussion that was financially beneficial to natural philosophers, publishers, lecturers, and instrument-makers, and combined natural philosophy with commerce. They were able to enhance their social and financial positions by securing a new audience, showcasing their inventories in front of potential patrons, as well as the sale of books and instruments.⁸⁵ Due to the public demand, natural philosophers and mathematicians used the coffeehouses as a site to give practical and useful public lectures.

The Royal Society may have desired a more utilitarian science but they were unable to produce much in the way of useful knowledge for the benefit of the public. The coffeehouse culture was more successful in combining the emerging experimental science with commerce. The coffeehouse is closely associated with the new public sphere, and unlike the Royal Society, coffeehouses welcomed all members of society. They were venues where clients could meet and converse with a variety of potential patrons.⁸⁶ The first coffeehouses which emerged in the 1660s were usually frequented by a small number of the English virtuosi. These virtuosi, (characterised by their interest in a variety of diverse subjects from anatomy to antiquities), were responsible for the initial interest in coffee, and the development of the coffeehouse as a significant social space. These coffeehouses were more like private clubs, and an alternative place outside of the universities and the Royal Society for the virtuosi to meet, read, discuss ideas, and debate with each other, offering a different space for the discussion of the new experimental philosophy. Within a few years, the coffeehouse clientele had transformed from a relatively restricted circle of virtuosi, to a much broader public. Coffeehouses abandoned the protocols of recognising rank and precedence, and were a wholly new and distinct social venue. Coffeehousing took place in a public space that allowed and encouraged equal status between its patrons.

Larry Stewart has argued that coffeehouses served as the perfect location for the transfer of natural philosophy, from the restricted sites of the Royal Society, into a more public space. The eighteenth century saw an increase in the number of people who could

British Studies, Vol. 25 (1986), p. 179

⁸⁵ Fara, 'A Treasure of Hidden Vertues': The Attraction of Magnetic Marketing', p. 5

⁸⁶ Larry Stewart, 'Other Centres of Calculation, or Where the Royal Society Didn't Count: Commerce, Coffee-Houses and Natural Philosophy in Early Modern London', *British Journal for the History of Science*, Vol.32 (1999), pp. 133-153; Larry Stewart, *The Rise of Public Science: Rhetoric, Technology, and Natural Philosophy in Newtonian Britain, 1660-1750*, (New York, 1992); Steve Pincus, 'Coffee Politicians Does Create: Coffeehouses and Restoration Political Culture', *The Journal of Modern History*, Vol. 67, (1995), pp. 807-834; Bennett Alan Weinberg and Bonnie K. Bealer, *The World of Caffeine: The Science and Culture of the World's Most Popular Drug*, (New York, 2002); Brian Cowan, *The Social Life of Coffee: The Emergence of the British Coffeehouse*, (YaleUniversity Press, New Haven, 2005)

read or write fluently as well as upsurge in the numbers of books, newspapers, journals, and pamphlets printed and purchased in this period.⁸⁷ This reading revolution was facilitated by the switch from Latin to English, and other European languages which helped many to read, especially women. The coffeehouse culture did not diminish the patronage system as it was a venue which allowed clients to meet potential patrons without a letter of introduction, a broker, or by trying to establish a connection through a dedication. It was quite possible to meet a member of the nobility in a London coffeehouse. James Brydges, first Duke of Chandos (1673-1744), the prominent scientific patron, recorded in his journal some of the two hundred and eighty visits that he made to coffeehouses between 1697 and 1702.⁸⁸ Chandos was one of Desaguliers's patrons and in his journal records meeting the owner of some ancient manuscripts in one coffeehouse. It was entirely possible to meet more than one patron at a coffeehouse, and it was a venue in which to establish a learned reputation, in person rather than in print. There is no evidence that Bute ever frequented any coffeehouses prior to his appointment as Prime Minister but by 1761 his unpopularity, and public hostility, ensured that he could not safely visit any of the London coffeehouses without causing a riot. However, coffeehouses were spaces where literary writers, (James Ralph, d.1762, Israel Manduit and David Mallet), employed by Bute's ministry could gauge public opinion and support for the government.

It has been believed that the rise of middle class patronage, the new coffeehouse culture, the rise of scientific institutions, and the increase of subscription publishing led to a decline of royal and aristocratic patronage in the eighteenth century. However, members of the nobility became patrons of these new spaces of scientific activity - the Duke of Chandos embraced the coffeehouse culture; the Earl of Macclefield became President of the Royal Society (1752-1764); and Henry Home, Lord Kames (1696-1782) was an enthusiastic supporter of agricultural improvement policies in Scotland.⁸⁹ The acceptance, and support, of these new forms of patronage did not mean that older structures of patronage vanished. The role of wealthy aristocrats as patrons and leaders of fashion continued to play a crucial role in eighteenth-century patronage. A study of the patronage of the Earl of Bute reveals an eighteenth-century aristocratic patron who was not a supporter of coffeehouses (there is no

⁸⁷ Outram, *The Enlightenment*, p. 14

⁸⁸ Brian Cowan, *The Social Life of Coffee: The Emergence of the British Coffeehouse*, (Yale University Press, New Haven, 2005), pp. 109-110

⁸⁹ *Ibid*

evidence of his visits); an inactive member of any scientific institutions either in London or Scotland; and a reluctant minister of Scottish affairs.

He did, however, have an active network of correspondents, and his scientific correspondence reveals a great deal regarding his scientific interests. He corresponded with Peter Collinson to order seeds and plants from America, and with Gronovius who sent books and specimen along with keeping him apprised of scientific news from the Continent. This was especially important when Bute was living in the remote Isle of Bute from 1732 to 1745. During the 1770s and 1780s, Bute was in correspondence with the English diplomat, art collector, and geologist, John Strange, who purchased books and collections of minerals in Europe to be sent back to London. The networks and correspondence between botanists in different parts of the world, and the exchange of ideas and specimens, enabled the enormous expansion in knowledge of the plant world to take place. Sarah Easterby Smith examines the correspondence between French and British scholars in the latter half of the eighteenth century, and remarks that the commercial context of botanical scholarship has not received much attention. This scholarly community comprised of botanists, traders, people known as 'the curious' or 'amateurs' and the notable rise in the participation of women.⁹⁰ Botany was considered one of the few sciences appropriate for women of the nobility. It was for this reason, and to explain the taxonomic system, that Bute presented seven of the twelve sets of the *Botanical Tables* to women. He felt that this "delightful part of nature" was peculiarly suited to the attention of the "fair sex".⁹¹ The role of plant merchants, and plant nurseries, played an essential role in the development of botanical science. It was an extremely profitable enterprise and they acquired large quantities of exotic plants for members of the nobility, botanists, medical practitioners, and gardeners whose demand for new species ranged from the aesthetic to the scientific. In 1734, Bute records in his planting notebook setting the enormous amount of thirty thousand scotch firs at Mount Stuart.

In *The Brokered World*, historians of science examine the role of the broker, or go-between, for the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries with India the focus of many

⁹⁰Sarah Easterby-Smith, 'Cross-Channel Commerce: the Circulation of Plants, People and Botanical Culture between France and Britain c. 1760 – c. 1789', in Lise Andries, Frédéric Ogée, John Dunkley and Darach Sanfey (eds.), *Intellectual Journeys. The translation of ideas in Enlightenment England, France and Ireland*, Studies on Voltaire and the Eighteenth Century 2013:12 (Oxford: Voltaire Foundation, 2013), p. 217

⁹¹ John Stuart, Earl of Bute, *Botanical Tables, Containing the Different Familys of British Plants*, vol. 1 (London, 1785), p. i

of the articles.⁹² The dominance of the East Indian Company ensured that there were opportunities in the colonies for go-betweens. The brokers who operated in India were not aristocratic and they tended to operate in more limited fields of influence. Nevertheless, they were responsible for transmitting information between cultures, disciplines, and geographical areas. The Scottish scientific instrument-maker, James Dinwiddle (1746-1815), was a teacher of Western science in India who acted as go-between and translated knowledge between two cultures. Robert Liss challenges the view that Tokugawa Japan was a closed society and reveals the importance of foreign traders and Japanese translators of Western books in Japan. The author emphasizes that the eighteenth-century was not the only period in history where brokerage was vital but what makes this era different is that the translations between cultures caused new knowledge to arise, particularly in the sciences. A key broker in Elizabethan England was Michael Hicke, (dates unknown), who was secretary to William Cecil, Lord Burghley. Burghley was chief advisor to Elizabeth I and a politically dominant and important patron in the Elizabethan court.⁹³ Similarly, the Earl of Bute acted as a patronage broker between the architect Sir William Chambers and George III, and in 1755 supported Chambers' appointment as architectural tutor to Prince George.⁹⁴ John Home also acted as go-between when he recommended Adam Ferguson (1723-1816) for the position of tutor to the Bute's sons in 1758.

PATRONAGE IN BRITAIN IN THE EIGHTEENTH CENTURY

In Britain, there was a noticeable decline of royal patronage after the Restoration, as the Wars of the Three Kingdoms had severely impoverished the Privy Purse.⁹⁵ However, there were those among the nobility and the royal family who continued to support art, literature, and science. Some of the most significant patrons of the eighteenth century were members of the royal family including Prince Frederick and his son, King George III. Prince Frederick was a renowned patron of the arts, architecture, and gardening. He commissioned the famous architect and one of the originators of the landscape garden, William Kent (c.1685-1748), to lay out new gardens for his Carlton House residence, and to renovate the interior of Kew

⁹² Simon Schaffer, (ed.) *The Brokered World: Go-Betweens and Global Intelligence, 1770-1820*

⁹³ Pumphrey and Frances 'Science and Patronage in England, 1570-1625: A Preliminary Study', p. 145

⁹⁴ R.C. Bald, 'Sir William Chambers and the Chinese Garden', *Journal of the History of Ideas*, Vol. 11 (1950), p. 288

⁹⁵ Korshin, 'Types of Eighteenth-Century Literary Patronage', p. 454

House.⁹⁶ Bute's royal patron, George III, founded the Royal Academy of Arts in 1768, commissioned many royal portraits, and accumulated a sizable collection of scientific instruments. He was keenly interested in scientific matters, and undertook a major program of collecting, with particular enthusiasm for books, maps, paintings and drawings, and scientific instruments. He commissioned the instrument-maker, George Adams (1709-1772), to produce a set of instructing instruments for his family. Adam's instruments now form part of the 'King George III Collection' at the Science Museum in London. It is the most comprehensive collection of eighteenth-century instruments.

One of the most prominent scientific patrons of the late seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries was the Duke of Chandos. Chandos was a great patron of art, music, architecture, and science. He was patron to the Italian painters, Antonio Bellucci (1654-1726), and Francesco Sletter (1685-1775), whom he employed to decorate his magnificent estate, Cannons near Edgware in Middlesex.⁹⁷ Chandos was a major patron of the composer, George Frederic Handel (1685-1759), who whilst living at Cannons between 1717 and 1719, wrote the twelve 'Chandos Anthems'.⁹⁸ He also supported Desaguliers whom he employed as his private chaplain in Cannons, and encouraged his scientific experiments in water engineering. An example of Chandos's utilitarian science was his research into the development of a water pumping machine. For his experiments, Desaguliers was allowed to build reservoirs that collected spring water and which were fed through pipes to Cannons.⁹⁹

Philip Yorke, second earl of Hardwicke (1720-1790), was a renowned scientific patron, and was a leader of the 'Hardwicke Circle' that formed around a group of intellectuals who were prominent during the middle decades of the eighteenth century.¹⁰⁰ His clients included the antiquarian Daniel Wray (1701-1783), and the historian Thomas Birch (1705-1766). Wray benefited from Hardwicke's patronage and was appointed as Teller of the Exchequer in 1745, a post that he held until 1782. With his patron's continuing assistance, Wray became Vice-President of the Society of Antiquaries in 1775, and in 1765 was appointed one of Trustees of

⁹⁶ Kimberly Rorschach, 'Frederick, Prince of Wales (1707-51), as Collector and Patron', *The Volume of the Walpole Society*, Vol. 55 (1989/1990), p. 27

⁹⁷ Susan Jenkins, *Portrait of a Patron: The Patronage and Collecting of James Brydges, 1st Duke of Chandos (1674-1744)*, (Cornwall, 2007), p. 59

⁹⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 181

⁹⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 12

¹⁰⁰ David Philip Miller, 'The Hardwicke Circle: The Whig Supremacy and its Demise in the 18th Century Royal Society', *Notes and Records of the Royal Society of London*, Vol. 52, No. 1 (Jan., 1998), p. 73

the newly established British Museum.¹⁰¹ Birch was another client and friend of the 'Hardwicke Circle', obtained a number of clerical preferments and was appointed Secretary of the Royal Society from 1753 to 1765. Birch's historical work was financially supported by Hardwicke and he was granted access to his library to consult various manuscript sources. In return, Birch supplied Hardwicke with political, literary, scientific, and military intelligence, and reported on debates and court proceedings in the houses of parliament.¹⁰²

George Parker, second Earl of Macclefield (c.1696-1764), President of the Royal Society from 1752 until his death in 1764, was another important scientific patron. He was an astronomer and practitioner scientist, who in 1739 constructed an impressive observatory at his estate, Shinburn in Oxfordshire. Shinburn was equipped with the best instruments, including a 5-foot transit telescope and a quadrant by the celebrated instrument maker Jonathan Sisson (c.1690-1747), and where he kept a record of many of his astronomical observations.¹⁰³ This observatory was also used by the astronomer, James Bradley (1692-1762), who with Macclesfield's support became the Astronomer Royal in 1742.

Literary writers, such as Samuel Johnson and Oliver Goldsmith (1728-1774), spoke of a decline in patronage during the latter part of the eighteenth century, and such claims were commonplace in contemporary accounts.¹⁰⁴ These writers were vocal opponents of the patronage system and wrote of the many dangers of relying too much upon aristocratic support. Writers such as Alexander Pope (1688-1744), Jonathon Swift (1667-1745), John Arbuthnot (1667-1735), and John Gay (1685-1632) were also political opponents of the Hanoverian regime, and therefor resentful of their exclusion from royal patronage. They believed that traditional forms of patronage were antiquated and unreliable, instead encouraging writers to turn to other avenues of support including subscription publishing and the marketplace.

However, the role of wealthy aristocrats as patrons and leaders of fashion continued to play a crucial role in eighteenth-century patronage. The royal family, and members of the nobility, continued to employ writers as part of their households. These positions were not without their advantages. For example, John Gay, survived ruin after the South Sea Bubble in

¹⁰¹Ibid., p. 75

¹⁰² Ibid., p. 76

¹⁰³ Paul Quarrie, 'The Scientific Library of the Earls of Macclesfield', *Notes and Records of the Royal Society of London*, Vol. 60, No. 1 (Jan. 22, 2006), p. 10

¹⁰⁴ Oliver Goldsmith, *An Enquiry into the Present State of Polite Learning*, (London, 1774), pp. 93-94; Griffin's, *Literary Patronage in England 1650-1800*, p. 248

1720 as an employee of the Duke and Duchess of Queensbury. A number of notable writers were employed in lucrative government posts or were rewarded with royal pensions. There was fierce competition for government positions which only benefitted a small minority of authors. Literary writers, like Samuel Johnson, resisted a patron's intrusion upon their work and fiercely guarded their independence, even after accepting employment. However, after receiving a pension of £300 a year from George III in 1762, Johnson discovered that he had to compromise his independence. Literary writers, and recipients of political patronage, who were supported by the crown were expected to publish political work in favour of the government. During the eighteenth century, the balance of power between a patron and client slowly, but irreversibly, shifted in favour of the writer. This was due in part to the expansion of the middling class, the emergence of a broader reading audience, and a book trade regulated by market economies.

Richard B. Sher believes that the details and dynamics of the professionalisation and commercialisation of literature in the eighteenth century are not well understood. The often quoted claim that traditional patrons were being replaced by booksellers, or publishers, or the public whom they represent, is being continually repeated but there is little hard evidence to support it.¹⁰⁵ However, booksellers did benefit from the growth of the reading public as there was now an increasingly large and immediate readership. Boswell's attribution to Johnson of the view that booksellers were 'patrons of literature' is significant. He believed that Johnson's relationship, and difficulties with Chesterfield, show the sharp contrast of the false or superficial patronage of the nobility and the real patronage of the booksellers. As authors increasingly had alternative resources, they became financially less dependent on patronage. It did not mean that authors did not seek to secure aristocratic support. A patron could pay for the publication costs of a writer's work, and the greatest service a patron, whether aristocratic or not, could render an author was to laud his or her abilities and praise the writer's work in fashionable society. It was not until the middle of the nineteenth century that writers were able to live solely by their literary endeavours. Therefore, there was not a decline in patronage during the eighteenth century, but rather a transformation of the patronage system with new opportunities for clients.

¹⁰⁵ Richard B. Sher, *The Enlightenment and the Book, Scottish Author and Their Publishers in Eighteenth-Century Britain, Ireland, and America*, (London, 2006), p. 197

THE PATRONAGE SYSTEM – BENEFITS TO BOTH PATRON AND CLIENT

The patronage system can be explained as a means of support given by wealthy and influential individuals, such as nobles and princes (patrons), to advance or promote the careers of artists, writers, and natural philosophers (clients). It is usually easier to identify than define because there were many forms or types of support which patronage could embody. These different types of patronage could effectively be described as financial, intellectual, or social in nature. As most artists, writers, and natural philosophers were not independently wealthy, they relied upon patrons to support them. Before and during the eighteenth century, patrons in Britain were usually members of the aristocracy and royal family. However, the traditional centre of patronage, the royal court, steadily diminished in size from 1688 to 1760. This decline of the royal court resulted in high culture moving away from the confines of court and into the commercial centre of London – to coffeehouses, reading societies, debating clubs, galleries, and concert halls.¹⁰⁶ In the new commercial centre, science literature, art, music, and theatre developed into thriving and profitable enterprises. Those searching for advancement and patronage went to coffeehouses and other commercial venues, and not to the royal court.

These sites became centres of conversation and news, places of exchange, and spaces for clients to meet potential patrons. As the number of coffeehouses grew, they became more specialised, and fostered literary and scientific communities. These venues emerged as leading cultural patrons and helped shape eighteenth-century social and cultural life. The study of patronage is important to the history of science as many practitioners of science were unable to publish their work, or secure a salaried position such as a university appointment, without financial aid or support from a patron. The patronage system, as it was known, was mutually advantageous to both client and patron as it enabled them to benefit economically and intellectually from the arrangement.

Dustin Griffin examines the different types of financial support that a patron could provide to a client in *Literary Patronage in England 1650-1800*.¹⁰⁷ This support could range from money from their own pocket; a one-time gift in response to a dedication; an annual

¹⁰⁶ Ibid., p. 15

¹⁰⁷ For eighteenth-century literary patronage see Dustin Griffin's, *Literary Patronage in England 1650-1800*, (Cambridge, 2006); Korshin's, 'Types of Eighteenth-Century Literary Patronage', *Eighteenth-Century Studies*, Vol. 7 (1974), pp. 453-473; Michael Foss, *The Age of Patronage: The Arts in Society 1660-1750*, (London, 1971)

pension; a letter of credit to cover expenses; or a direct subsidy to a book seller.¹⁰⁸ Other types of assistance and support that could be granted by patrons included hospitality, familiarity, encouragement, protection, authority, introductions, and livings.¹⁰⁹ In 'The Economy of Scientific Exchange in Early Modern Italy', Paula Findlen discusses patronage as a system of exchange or gift-giving at the Medici court during the seventeenth century.¹¹⁰ The presentation by the client of a gift to the prospective patron was one way of encouraging and developing a patron-client relationship. These gifts could be books or instruments. Gifts were usually given at the start of a relationship and the acceptance of a gift usually implied that the patron would support the ambitions and future projects of his client. Therefore, gift-giving was a visible declaration of a client's worth and could be pivotal to his future career, financial prospects, and social advancement. For example, Galileo sent gifts of his telescopes to influential princes and clergy to establish himself as the inventor and improver of this newly discovered marvel, and to further his scientific reputation. After dedicating his astronomical discoveries of the four satellites of Jupiter in 1610 to the house of Medici, he was generously rewarded by Prince Cosimo II de' Medici (1590-1621) who granted him a salary of a thousand scudi.¹¹¹ These discoveries, and the subsequent patronage of the Medicis, propelled Galileo's scientific career and provided him with the financial and social opportunities to continue his studies.

The significance of literary dedications for the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries is considered by Pumfrey and Dawbarn.¹¹² Dedications were also an important branch of literature as well as an indicator of critical attitudes. There were several reasons why a writer would choose to dedicate a work to a particular individual – usually a prominent politician, clergyman, member of the nobility or royal family – as a writer may wish to attract a potential patron, or show their support or gratitude to a current sponsor. Bute was recipient of twenty eight literary dedications, the majority of which date from 1760-1763, when he was at the height of his political career. Many of these authors wished to benefit from the distribution of political patronage. David Mallet was one of Bute's literary writers and the dedicatee of his play *Elvira* (1763). Soon after its publication, Mallet was appointed Keeper of the book of

¹⁰⁸ Griffin, *Literary Patronage in England 1650-1800*, p. 18

¹⁰⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 13

¹¹⁰ Paula Findlen, 'The Economy of Scientific Exchange in Early Modern Italy', in Bruce T. Moran's *Patronage and Institutions: Science, Technology, and Medicine at the European Court 1500-1750*, p. 19

¹¹¹ Mario Biagioli, *Galileo Courtier: The Practice of Science in the Culture of Absolutism*, (Chicago, 1994), p. 37

¹¹² Pumfrey and Dawbarn, 'Science and Patronage in England, 1570-1625: A Preliminary Study', p. 152

Entries for ships in the Port of London, and awarded an annual pension of £300. These dedications were designed to flatter a patron by bestowing on them virtues which were currently fashionable in society, and to encourage continuing support.¹¹³ A patron benefited from the success of his client and received fame from these dedications with his name memorialised in print. A patron would no doubt want to impress his peers by publicising his aristocratic virtue and power. However, dedications would need to be carefully studied as a client presumably would write what a patron wishes to hear. In his 1775 inscription to *Flora Anglicana, or The English Flora*, the English botanist, Richard Weston (1753-1806), embellished and exaggerated the Earl of Bute's botanical achievements by claiming that 'it is universally allowed, that no one has contributed more than [Bute]' to the advancement of botany in Britain.¹¹⁴ Therefore, an analysis of the careers of eighteenth-century dedicators will ascertain how many of them were successful in gaining some form of patronage and would provide a valuable insight into the patronage system.

The bestowment of an annual pension from a wealthy or royal patron was also a means of ensuring continuing financial support. The poet and lexicographer, Samuel Johnson, endured many years of financial hardship before finally being endowed with a pension by George III in 1762.¹¹⁵ Some clients were compensated for their work as a patron usually paid the publication costs of a manuscript. Hospitality could range from a dinner invitation, lodgings, or the use of a laboratory or library in a patron's home. John Walker was granted access to the Earl of Bute's extensive library and mineralogical collection. In some instances, a client could be employed as a secretary, librarian, scientific assistant, or physician by a patron, and was therefore able to pursue their artistic, literary, or scientific efforts as part of their position. For example, the clergyman and chemist, Joseph Priestley (1733-1804), who was employed as a librarian and tutor by the second Earl of Shelburne was given a house and an annual pension of £250.¹¹⁶ These positions gave Priestley a measure of financial security and allowed him to conduct his scientific investigations in his free time. The playwright, John Home, secured the position of Bute's private secretary in 1757 and the performance of his play *Agis* was attended by the Prince of Wales.

¹¹³ Pumfrey and Dawbarn, 'Science and Patronage in England, 1570-1625: A Preliminary Study', p. 152

¹¹⁴ Richard Weston, *Flora Anglicana or The English Flora*, (London, 1772), p. i

¹¹⁵ Korshin, 'Types of Eighteenth-Century Literary Patronage', p. 470

¹¹⁶ Griffin, *Literary Patronage in England 1650-1800*, p. 18

There was an established hierarchy between patrons and clients, reflected by social status, but in some patron-client relationships a degree of familiarity was observed with an implied rise in status for the client. A lowly client could not approach a powerful patron directly, (especially a member of the royal family), and needed the support of an intermediary, or patronage broker, to secure an introduction. A patronage broker is someone who acted as an emissary between a great patron and a client who wished to be introduced to them. An introduction to another or greater patron could provide a client with resources and other avenues for advancement. The more prominent and influential the patron, the greater the potential benefits for the client. Even after receiving the Bute's patronage, the first volume of *The Vegetable System* was inscribed to George, Prince of Wales. There may be two reasons for this: Hill aspired for a more prestigious patron or that he wished to flatter Bute's powerful royal benefactor. A patron showed encouragement by expressing an interest in the work of a client, and if a client was fortunate, this encouragement was followed by financial support. However, in most cases encouragement never went any further than kind words. Receiving the protection of a patron could have two meanings – for the most part, 'protection' by a patron meant a defense against verbal attacks of rivals or critics, or could mean that a patron would secure and defend the property rights of their clients against the claims of the booksellers.¹¹⁷ If a patron gave a favourable opinion of a work, he provided his client with support against public criticism. The Earl of Bute and the Prince of Wales showed support to Home by attending two performances of *Agis*.

Patronage, especially royal patronage, meant that critics were even more careful when denouncing a particular work, and ensured that the work of a client, even controversial views, was legitimised by their patron. If a patron supported and promoted a particular work, and it proved successful, he was able to exercise an influence on the general culture. A patron's authority signified that by his birth, education, and taste he was better qualified than his inferiors to serve as a judge of artistic, literary, or scientific merit. If a client's work was endorsed by a noble patron, it generally sold more copies, thus enriching the client, and widening the readership of the work. A bookseller would be more likely to buy, or offer a good price for the work, if it was backed by an influential patron. However, lending his authority to a work was not entirely risk free for the patron. A patron needed to be cautious

¹¹⁷ Griffin, *Literary Patronage in England 1650-1800*, pp. 19-22

as the success or failure of a client's work reflected upon him. He would not want to give approval or defend a work in public which would adversely affect his taste and judgment.¹¹⁸

Powerful politicians had the privilege of directing the flow of patronage, and advisors to the king were able to dispense patronage on his behalf. Patrons in these positions of power were able to grant lucrative livings and valuable appointments to their clients. These livings and appointments included positions in the Church; royal pensions; posts such as Poet Laureate or Historiographer in the Lord Chamberlains' office; and positions such as Latin Secretary or a Gazette Writer in the Secretary of State's office.¹¹⁹ David Mallet was appointed librarian and undersecretary to the Prince of Wales, Prince Frederick in the 1730s, and secured other lucrative positions during the early reign of George III. During his term as Prime Minister, Bute supported the appointment of the historian William Robertson as chaplain-in-ordinary for Scotland in 1761; the Scottish architect, Robert Adam and William Chambers were both chosen as Surveyors to the King in 1761; and James Macpherson was appointed secretary to the Governor in West Florida in 1764 and received an annuity for life after his return to Britain in 1766.¹²⁰

A patron could insist upon a variety of services in return for their sponsorship, including entertainment, literary or professional services, fame, and the control of culture.¹²¹ A client could entertain a patron and his guests at a dinner party, and if novel experiments were carried out as part of this entertainment, could add to a patron's prestige. Joseph Priestley performed some of his chemical experiments for the amusement of his patron (Shelburne) and his companions.

It was essential for some patrons, especially political patrons, to acquire the services of a skilled writer. It was worthwhile to have such a writer available as they could provide a range of literary services, from editing journals, to writing pamphlets that defended the patron's political views, or which attacked his enemies. However, these writers were articulating the opinion of their patrons, not their own. For example, the philosopher John Locke (1632-1704) was employed as a physician to Anthony Ashley Cooper, first Earl of

¹¹⁸ Ibid., p. 24

¹¹⁹ Ibid., pp. 25-29 ; Korshin, 'Types of Eighteenth-Century Literary Patronage', p. 458

¹²⁰ Jeremy J. Cater, 'The Making of Principal Robertson in 1762: Politics and the University of Edinburgh in the Second Half of the Eighteenth Century', *The Scottish Historical Review*, Vol. 49, No. 147, Part 1 (Apr., 1970), p. 63; James Porter, "'Bring Me the Head of James Macpherson": The Execution of Ossian and the Wellsprings of Folkloristic Discourse', *The Journal of American Folklore*, Vol. 114, No. 454, James Macpherson and the Ossian Epic Debate (Autumn, 2001), p. 401

¹²¹ Griffin, *Literary Patronage in England 1650-1800*, pp. 29-44

Shaftesbury (1621-1683). In addition to his duties as a physician, he was also required to support, and defend his patron's political views in an anonymous pamphlet that attacked the policy of George II's chief minister, Thomas Osborne, first Earl of Danby (1632-1712). During his term as Prime Minister, Bute employed the literary services of a number of writers, including Tobias Smollett, Arthur Murphy, and Dr. John Campbell to support and defend the government and its policies.¹²² Therefore, it could be very advantageous for a patron, especially a politician, to employ an experienced writer to promote the policies and successes of his party. The bestowing of fame upon a patron by his client through praising and memorialising his achievements in print helped to enhance a patron's reputation among his contemporaries. Among the benefits was an increase in honour and status for a patron if a client's success, fame, and achievements reflected favourably upon his benefactor. Therefore, the patronage system could be advantageous to both patrons and clients.

There were vocal critics of the patronage system during the eighteenth century, many of which regarded it as an antiquated institution that was rapidly falling into disuse.¹²³ One of the potential pitfalls was for a client to put his entire financial, social, and literary or scientific hopes in the hands of one major patron, and if that patron stopped providing support or died suddenly, it could result in disaster and financial ruin. Sir John Hill was depended upon the patronage of the Earl of Bute when writing *The Vegetable System* and after this patron's interest in the project waned, Hill suffered financial hardship when adequate funding for publication failed to materialise.¹²⁴ There was an attempt during the latter part of the eighteenth century of replacing private patronage by the privileged few, to patronage by institutions and the public. However, patronage continued to be an important form of support throughout the eighteenth century, with emerging forms of commercial enterprise coexisting with traditional patronage.

Writers like Samuel Johnson turned to another form of patronage, subscription publishing, to finance their literary and scientific endeavours. The number of subscription volumes rose rapidly between the late seventeenth century and the 1730s, during the 1760s, and again during the last two decades of the century. Subscription publishing was a form of risk reduction and brought together the interests of the author, patron, and bookseller. The

¹²² Paul Langford, *A Polite and Commercial People: England 1727-1783*, (Oxford, 1998), p. 346

¹²³ Korshin, 'Types of Eighteenth-Century Literary Patronage', p. 468

¹²⁴ Lady Henrietta Hill, *An Address to the Public, by The Honble Lady Hill; Setting Forth the Consequences of the Late Sir John Hill's Acquaintance with The Earl of Bute*, (London, 1788), p. 10

majority of subscription publications included a list of subscribers along with the number of copies that they ordered.¹²⁵ This was a way of advertising the subscribers' beneficence, their willingness not just to purchase their own copy, but to circulate others among their influential friends. For the author, it helped to get into print works such as expensive and scholarly tomes which might otherwise never have been published. It was the main means of publishing a collected volume or volumes of a single author's works. A well-managed subscription could also prove sufficiently popular and profitable to secure an author's financial independence. For the subscriber, it was an opportunity to patronise and support an author without the difficulties of a more personal relationship between patron and client, and at less expense. For the publisher, not only was there a reduced risk, but the chance of additional sales by readers who were persuaded by the publicity provided by a list of distinguished subscribers. The income brought independence for an eighteenth-century man of letters and freedom from dependence on an individual patron.

However, not all authors were successful in securing subscriptions. In 1772, the English architect, Charles Cameron (1754-1812), placed an advertisement in *The Gazetteer and New Daily Advertiser* seeking subscriptions prior to publishing *The Baths of the Romans Explained and Illustrated, with the Restorations of Palladio Corrected and Improved*.¹²⁶ Unfortunately for the author, when it was published a month later, there was no list of subscribers, and *The Baths of the Romans* was deemed a relative failure.¹²⁷ A second edition published in 1775 was dedicated to Bute without a subscription list. Cameron soon found himself in financial difficulties and was imprisoned for debt in Fleet Street in June 1778.¹²⁸ Despite Johnson's criticisms of the institution of patronage, he nevertheless wrote prefaces and dedications for some of his friends with the purpose of securing financial rewards, or social advancement, from a patron.

¹²⁵ Griffin, *Literary Patronage in England 1650-1800*, p. 267

¹²⁶ Charles Cameron, *The Baths of the Romans Explained and Illustrated, with the Restorations of Palladio Corrected and Improved*, (London, 1775)

¹²⁷ *The Gazetteer and New Daily Advertiser*, (London, England), Friday, March 20, 1772; Issue 13 434; Alan Tait, 'Cameron and the Beginnings of Neo-Classicism in Russia', *AA Files*, No. 1 (Winter 1981-82), p. 86

¹²⁸ *London Gazette*, (London, England), June 2, 1778 - June 6, 1778; Issue 11880

SCIENTIFIC INTERESTS AND TOPICS OF DEBATE IN THE EIGHTEENTH-CENTURY BRITAIN

An examination of eighteenth-century scientific topics of debate and plant classification will reveal the extent of Bute's involvement and participation in these developments. The eighteenth century saw the growing specialisation of science. Natural history, and in particular botany, occupied a prominent place in British culture during this period. The increased exploration and overseas territories supplied increasing numbers of new species of plants and animals to Britain. This was the great age of classification systems which saw men of science preoccupied with the identifying and systematising natural history. The ordering of nature was one of the most problematic issues of the eighteenth century.¹²⁹ John Ray (1627-1705) and Joseph Pitton de Tournefort (1656-1708) made some progress in resolving the growing classification problem. However, there were too many methods of classification which made it confusing and difficult to become competent as a botanist. One of these was the struggle of naming specimens – the same plant might be called by a different name in different countries – which was especially troublesome for correspondence and publication. The Earl of Bute revealed his frustration in identifying the name of plants (even after consulting several botanical texts) in the planting notebooks where he recorded the species that he found in his gardens and in his correspondence with Peter Collinson.

A new classification system was urgently needed especially in the wake of the flood of new species of plants. Carl Linnaeus simplified and standardised the naming of plants, (binary nomenclature), that grouped animals or plants together in one genus which seemed to have something in common (usually a structure, a body shape, or some distinctive way of reproducing). The second part of the name, the species, emphasised the unique aspect of different members of the genus. This system was not universally accepted – arguments raged for most of the eighteenth century over the naming of plants and what constituted a species. This new method of classification began to transform the practices of natural history and led to a boom in plant-collecting. Bute was initially critical of the Linnean system, unhappy with the many Swedish names, but despite his reservations adopted Linnaean taxonomy.¹³⁰ This is

¹²⁹ Patricia Fara, *Sex, Botany and Empire: The Story of Carl Linnaeus and Joseph Banks*, (Cambridge, 2003); Andrea Wulf, *The Brother Gardeners: Botany, Empire and the Birth of an Obsession*, (London, 2008); Lisa Koerner, *Linnaeus: Nature and Nation*, (London, 1999)

¹³⁰ Sir James Edward Smith, *A Selection of the Correspondence of Linnaeus, and Other Naturalists*, in 2 volumes,

evidenced from his planting notebooks where he records the name of plants growing on his estates using the system of binomial nomenclature.

Andrea Wulf notes the “British obsession with plants and gardens” and the international community that was fostered by naturalists such as Carl Linnaeus, Hans Sloane (1660-1753), Joseph Banks, Peter Collinson and his American correspondent John Bartram (1699-1777).¹³¹ In the eighteenth century, British botany and horticulture was driven forward by gardeners like Philip Miller (1691-1771) at Chelsea Gardens. He ensured that Chelsea would ‘outvie all Gardens of that Kind the in Europe’.¹³² Miller’s *Gardener’s Dictionary* was an indispensable reference work for gardeners who could use it when tending their own gardens or discussing plants. The discovery of new species became a passion for gardeners and botanists, and a lucrative business for entrepreneurs. Plant-collectors such as Mark Catesby, John Bartram, Humphry Marshall (1722-1800), William Young and Thomas Blaikie (1750-1838) were employed to obtain plants and seeds for subscribers in Britain. The Bartram-Collinson partnership, (Bute and his uncle Argyll were subscribers to this scheme), established a lucrative trade in living plants and seeds and endured for many years. Collinson obtained payments from gardening enthusiasts and wealthy patrons. Plant-collecting became an imperial pursuit under the dictatorship of Joseph Banks who sent plant-hunters to every quarter of the globe searching for new discoveries, not only to advance botany, but for economic opportunities and building of the British Empire.

The primary sources for this thesis are the surviving botanical and scientific papers in the Mount Stuart Archive, and the dedications from Eighteenth Century Collections Online (ECCO). This material will provide a more comprehensive study of the science and patronage of the third Earl of Bute and challenge the prevailing view of historians regarding his patronage of Scottish clients and the extent of his patronage and his scientific knowledge. The main charge levelled at the Earl of Bute by his contemporaries was that his patronage and support was predominately reserved for clients and writers from Scotland. A list of Bute’s political, personal, and royal clients will make known if there any truth to this complaint.

(London, 1821), p. 33

¹³¹ Wulf, *The Brother Gardeners: Botany, Empire and the Birth of an Obsession*, p. 5

¹³² *Ibid.*, p. 44

Letters in the Bute Archive reveal the numerous requests and appeals for support that were made to the Earl of Bute; the number of his correspondents; and his scientific and botanical notebooks. It is evident that many of letters are addressed during the 1750s and 1760s when he was enjoying royal patronage from Augusta and George III. However, after his political retirement and royal estrangement, few clients wished to be publically associated with "the most hated man in Britain", especially after he lost the support of his royal patron. From a list of the dedications of the late 1760s onwards, and through his personal correspondence, we know that Bute continued to patronise clients, predominately in scientific subjects. The documents in the Mount Stuart Archive will challenge the view that Bute was not an active patron or collector during his retirement.

His notebooks and letters reveal his knowledge of plant classification systems, chemistry and geology, and his active participation in eighteenth-century scientific developments. It is clear from these sources that Bute had sufficient botanical expertise to be chosen as 'manager' of Kew. Many of the contemporary accounts of Bute's contribution to Kew Gardens have been unfavourable, influenced by the Scotophobia prevalent in eighteenth-century Britain and focus primarily on the supposed affair between the Earl and Princess Augusta. In the histories of Kew Gardens, many historians have contrasted Bute's achievements as "manager" to those of Joseph Banks. In considering his accomplishments, it should be remembered that in the establishment of the gardens, Bute acted as an advisor to Frederick and Augusta, who were not initially concerned with the economic and commercial benefits of importing plants into Britain, which dominated Banks's tenure in charge of Kew. This thesis will also examine if Bute was operating wholly in the scientific world or whether he was focused on the economic impact of science on society.

CHAPTER 1

'YOUR LORDSHIP'S GREAT LOVE OF, AND ENCOURAGEMENT GIVEN TO NATURAL HISTORY'¹

Bute was a learned gentleman, and scientific practitioner, whose interest in natural history is indicated by the contents of his library; his correspondence with other naturalists; his extensive collection of minerals and fossils; and notes he kept on chemistry and other scientific subjects. His passion for botany is underscored by his botanical and planting notebooks, which are held in the archive at Mount Stuart. We can establish from the various Auction Sale Catalogues of 1793 and 1794 that the Earl also had an impressive private collection of scientific instruments, manuscripts, paintings, and prints.

This chapter will discuss Bute's interest in natural history, in particular his enthusiasm for botany and plant-collecting, and demonstrate his active involvement in botanical pursuits. The Earl of Bute was not merely a patron but also a correspondent, collector, active garden-experimenter, and had interests beyond botany – in geology, scientific instruments, art and paintings. I will show that the influences in the Earl's early life fostered his keen interest in natural history, investigate his zeal for botanical studies, and explore the widespread eighteenth-century obsession for plant-collecting. I will determine the contribution Bute made to the development of the national gardens at Kew, his reaction to advances in botany, (including the introduction of a new system of plant classification), and his response to the debate surrounding the origin and purpose of volcanoes that erupted in Europe during the 1770s and 1780s. Finally, I will examine the Earl's own botanical research and experiments; examine the size and content of his collection from the Auction Sale Catalogues; and assess his scientific reputation.

¹ George Edwards, *Gleanings of Natural History*, (London, 1760), pp. 2-3

EARLY SCIENTIFIC INFLUENCES

Bute's enthusiasm for natural history, and in particular botany, was most likely influenced by his uncle, the Earl of Ilay.² Ilay was an amateur scientist whose interests included mathematics, chemistry, astronomy, and botany.³ He was also one of the central figures involved in an extensive plant-collecting and importation scheme that introduced exotic new plant species into Britain during the eighteenth century. Ilay was educated at Eton College, and after first attending Glasgow University for two years travelled to the Netherlands to study civil law at Utrecht University.⁴ However, Ilay abandoned his studies in the Netherlands and left Utrecht without first earning a degree. Instead he joined the army, which was seen as an appropriate profession for the younger son of a duke. Bute's educational path followed a somewhat similar route to that of his uncle and guardian. He left Eton College in 1730, and subsequently travelled to the Netherlands where he too pursued civil law, first attending Groningen University, before moving to Leiden University in 1732. After spending two years in Leiden, Bute left in March 1734 with a degree in civil law.⁵ It was not unusual for young noblemen to complete their education by a period of travel and study abroad, and from the seventeenth century onwards it became an increasingly common practice among the nobility. The Netherlands was not an unusual destination for young aristocrats. During the first half of the eighteenth century, universities in the Netherlands, especially Leiden, gained an international reputation, and a position of eminence in the fields of medicine, natural history, and legal studies.⁶ Therefore, it is not surprising that Scottish nobles such as Ilay and Bute chose to attend university there.

Leiden University acquired its prominence in botany and medicine due to its excellent botanical garden, anatomy theatres, chemical laboratories, and through the reputation of its distinguished professors such as Herman Boerhaave (1668-1738) and Adrian van Royen (1704-1779), who increased the fame and prestige of the university. Boerhaave was installed

² Archibald Campbell (1682-1761) became Earl of Ilay in 1706 and Duke of Ilay in 1742 when he succeeded his brother. I will refer to him throughout this thesis as Ilay to avoid confusion.

³ Roger L. Emerson, *An Enlightened Duke: The Life of Archibald Campbell (1682-1761), Earl of Ilay, 3rd Duke of Ilay*, (Kilterran, 2013)

⁴ Roger L. Emerson, 'The Scientific Interests of Archibald Campbell, 3rd Duke of Ilay (1682-1761)', *Annals of Science*, 59 (2002), p. 23

⁵ Francis Russell, *John 3rd Earl of Bute: Patron and Collector*, (London, 2004), pp. 3-5

⁶ Rab Houston and Manon Van Der Heijden, 'Hands across the Water: The Making and Breaking of Marriage between Dutch and Scots in the Mid-Eighteenth Century', *Law and History Review*, Vol. 15, No. 2 (Autumn, 1997), p. 215

as director of the botanical garden in 1709, and became Professor of Medicine and Botany the same year. By 1718, he additionally held the position of Professor of Chemistry.⁷ The botanical garden at Leiden, established in 1587, was the oldest in the Netherlands.⁸ Under Boerhaave's leadership the garden grew in importance and the number of plants in the garden increased dramatically. His 1710 catalogue of all the plant species in the garden, *Index plantarum quae in horto academic Lugduno Batavo repriuntur*, contains approximately 3,700 different species of plants. By the time the second edition of the catalogue was published in 1720, (now entitled *Index alter plantarum*), this number had risen to 5,846.⁹ This 60% growth in plant numbers reveals Boerhaave's success in managing Leiden's botanical collections.

Boerhaave employed a number of methods of increasing and enriching the gardens including a fee to collectors for each new plant specimen, building up an international network of plant-collectors who exchanged seeds and plants, and gaining the assistance of captains in the Dutch East India Company (VOC) who travelled all over the globe and could collect and transport new exotic plants. Boerhaave's international reputation was enhanced by his correspondence with botanists in other countries, who traded information and ideas on the cultivation of new plant species, along with exchanging specimens. Between 1712 and 1727, approximately fifty two correspondents sent seeds to Boerhaave, who presumably in return sent specimens from the botanical garden at Leiden. Doubtlessly drawn to the reputation of Boerhaave and the university, the famed botanist, Carl Linnaeus (1707-1778), was a resident of Leiden between 1735 and 1738.¹⁰ By 1729, Boerhaave was compelled to resign his professorships of botany and chemistry, due to ill-health, though he continued his teaching duties in medicine until his death in 1738. In 1730, Boerhaave's pupil, Van Royen, was chosen as his successor as director of the botanical garden and in 1732 was appointed Professor of Botany.¹¹

Van Royen is best remembered for his scientific relationships with both Linnaeus, and the merchant and governor of the VOC, George Clifford (1685-1760). Linnaeus was

⁷ William T Stearne, 'The Influence of Leyden on Botany in the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries', Vol. 1 (1962), p. 148

⁸ A.G. Morton, *History of Botanical Science*, (London, 1986), p. 144

⁹ Stearne, 'The Influence of Leyden on Botany in the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries', p. 148

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 150

¹¹ E. Ashworth Underwood, 'Boerhaave After Three Hundred Years', *The British Medical Journal*, Vol. 4 (1968), p. 821

employed as Cliffords's private physician, and became superintendent of his remarkable botanical garden at Hartekamp where he recorded the different species of plants. His catalogue of the garden, *Hortus Cliffortianus*, was published in 1738. It was during this period, surrounded by institutional and private gardens with exotic plant specimens from the overseas Dutch territories that Linnaeus expanded on his classification system of plants.

In 1737, Linnaeus stayed in the home of Van Royen, who became one of the early proponents of his plant classification system. Therefore, these renowned botanists (Boerhaave and Van Royen) were teaching at Leiden at the same time as Bute was studying there. It is not known whether he attended any botanical lectures whilst at the university, although we know from his library catalogue from Mount Stuart that he had acquired copies of Boerhaave's *Index alter plantarum quae in Horto Academico Lugduno* (1727) and *Historia plantarum* (1727) sometime before 1738 and was likely acquainted with Boerhaave's botanical work and scientific ideas.¹² Bute employed several of Boerhaave's methods to obtain new plant species, (including building up a network of correspondents and paying a fee to plant-collectors), to enrich his gardens.

There are very few surviving letters or papers for this period, but we know that the Earl made some important botanical contacts while studying in Leiden. After his return to the Isle of Bute, he corresponded with Dr. Isaac Lawson (d.1747), a fellow Scot, who was a student at Leiden University at the same time as Bute, and who studied medicine and botany under Boerhaave and Van Royen.¹³ Unfortunately, none of this correspondence survives, but from letters written by Bute to other botanists, we know that they were in contact. Lawson became an early proponent of the Linnaean system of classification and remained in Leiden until 1737. Along with the Dutch botanist and plant-collector, Johan Frederik Gronovius (1686-1762), Lawson paid for the publication of Linnaeus's *Systema naturae* (1735). Boerhaave, Van Royen, Clifford, and Gronovius contributed to the importance of Leiden a well-known centre for botany, and Gronovius, (who continued to reside in Leiden), would later become one of Bute's scientific correspondents. Even at his isolated estate of Mount

¹² Leigh and Sotheby, *A Catalogue of the Botanical and Natural History Part of the Library of the late John, Earl of Bute*, (London, 1794), pp. 19 & 25

¹³ David P. Miller, "'My favourite studdys': Lord Bute as naturalist", in Karl W. Schweizer's [ed.] *Lord Bute: Essays in Re-interpretation*, (Leicester, 1989), p. 215

Stuart, the Earl of Bute was kept informed of botanical developments which were occurring in the Netherlands and elsewhere on the continent.¹⁴

BOTANY AND GARDENS

Bute's scientific reputation rests on a number of factors - his involvement in the development of Kew Gardens; his correspondence and connections with other plant-collectors and botanists; his botanical research; the publication and reception of his only published scientific work (the *Botanical Tables*); and his role as a scientific patron which is the focus of this thesis. I will also examine the contents of his library and list some of the works on botany and gardening that he owned; provide a description of scientific instruments and laboratory equipment in his collection; discuss his extensive mineralogy collection; and examine his personal notes on botany and other scientific subjects. Despite his considerable scientific collections, and his reputation as a knowledgeable and well respected botanist, Bute's contributions have only merited a minor place in the histories of eighteenth-century botanical studies. Therefore, I aim to give a more comprehensive overview of his scientific achievements.

The Earl of Bute's best-known role in botany is his involvement in the development of Kew Gardens and its transformation into the Royal Botanic Gardens. His period of involvement at Kew began sometime around 1749 and lasted until 1772. Bute was instrumental in the development of the gardens and laid the foundation which his successor, Joseph Banks, would build upon.¹⁵ He transported some of Ilay's collection of shrubs and trees to Kew, but it is not certain whether Bute contributed some of his personal collection to the gardens. The Scottish head gardener, William Aiton (1731-1793), published *Hortus Kewensis, or Catalogue of the Plants Cultivated in the Royal Botanic Garden at Kew* in 1789, and credits the Earl with introducing a total of twenty-eight new plants into Britain between 1763 and 1783. The *Catalogue* is a more comprehensive inventory, listing and describing all the plants in cultivation at Kew, the country of origin, and who is credited with introducing each plant species into Britain. This manuscript lists over five thousand species. The majority of these new plants originated from the East and West Indies, including the Indian Bent-

¹⁴ Ibid., p. 216

¹⁵ Bute's role as manager of Kew is further explored in chapter 2

grass that was first introduced in 1773.¹⁶ This list is unusual in that the majority of the new plants introduced by Bute, (twenty-five), were introduced after 1772 when his official connection with Kew had ended. Furthermore, the first plant Aiton claimed that the Earl of Bute introduced was the *hircanicum* from Persia in 1763.¹⁷ Since we know the Earl had been importing plants and trees for his own estates from 1734 onwards, it seems unlikely that the first species that he is credited with introducing was in 1763. It is quite possible that neither Aiton nor Bute were sure of the exact date that the plant was first imported and therefore gave an approximate date of introduction.

The table below compares the number of new species of plants introduced by Bute with other major plant-collectors who appear in the *Catalogue*.

Joseph Banks	52
Earl of Bute	28
Peter Collinson	28
Earl of Ilay	16
John Bartram	9
Baron Petre	8
Mark Catesby	8

Table 1: Number of plants introduced by plant-collectors into Britain

These results show us that the great tree-planter Petre only introduced eight new species, and Catesby, (despite his travels), is credited with introducing the same number. If we take a closer look at the date of introduction for new plants imported by Petre, we see that the majority of these are dated after 1740. This is unusually low number as Petre had been plant-collecting since the 1730s and by 1740 had transformed his gardens and planted over ten thousand American trees. Aiton explains in the preface of the *Catalogue* that he did not have accurate introduction dates for some of these plants so he listed the majority of them as being first brought into Britain in 1742. However, all of Catesby's plants have dates from 1724 to 1726 which correspond with the dates for his second expedition to North America.

¹⁶ William Aiton, *Hortus Kewensis; or, A Catalogue of the Plants Cultivated in the Royal Botanic Garden at Kew*, (London, 1789), vol 3., p. 96

¹⁷ Aiton, *Hortus Kewensis*, vol 2., p. 278

The new plants that Aiton lists as being introduced by Ilay were mostly introduced after 1744 when he cultivated two North American plants, Carolina holly and Virginian itea, at Whitton. Aiton reveals that this information came from a former gardener at Whitton, James Lee, who 'remembers the gardens' well and 'furnished' him with a list.¹⁸ A list of plants that Collinson introduced to Britain was provided by his son, Michael. We do not know the name of the sources that provided Aiton with a list of plants for Petre, Catesby, Bartram, and Bute. When Aiton began compiling the *Catalogue* it was some years after the deaths of the majority of these plant-collectors, with only Bute and Banks still alive in 1789, which is a possible reason for the approximate dates for the introduction of some plants. At the time of publication Bute was 76 years old and in poor health. Overall, Bute is listed here among the great plant-collectors of the eighteenth-century and as having introduced the same amount of new species into Britain as that great middleman, Peter Collinson.

Bute's passion for gardening left its mark not only on Kew but on his estates. During the 1730s and 1740s, he made many improvements to the gardens at Mount Stuart. After Bute purchased the estate of Luton Hoo in 1762 and Highcliffe in 1773, he redirected most of his energy and financial resources to these estates.¹⁹ The house and the gardens of Luton Hoo are described in an article that appeared in *General Evening Post* on 18 November 1783.²⁰ The author begins by describing the library as the 'most magnificent receptacle for books which Europe can shew in the possession of any private individual'.²¹ He claims that its suite of three rooms was second only to the library at Blenheim Palace and that the contents were 'numerous, scarce and rare'.²² Next, the author describes the gardens, which were over 1400 acres, 100 acres of which were farmland, 70 acres formed part of an ornamental garden, and the botanical and kitchen gardens, both consisting of 4 acres. The river Lea flowed through the gardens and allowed the formation of two cascades, one 10 feet and the other 30 feet. The author comments that the width and colour of the river were 'both sufficiently good for the purposes of landscape decoration'.²³ The scale of the work is reflected in its cost – the landscape architect, Lancelot 'Capability' Brown (1716-1783), was

¹⁸ Aiton, *Hortus Kewensis*, vol 1., p. x

¹⁹ Coats, *Lord Bute*, p. 38

²⁰ 'Luton Hoo, the seat of the Earl of Bute', *The General Evening Post*, Nov. 18, 1783, pp. 63-66

²¹ *Ibid.*, p. 63

²² *Ibid.*

²³ *Ibid.*

paid the exorbitant amount of £10,000 for his work at Luton Hoo and Highcliffe²⁴ The author of the newspaper article claims that although the soil for planting was not particularly rich, the ground is 'well planted' and made the most of by Brown.²⁵

The botanical garden is described as being very complete, except for the morass and the aquatic plants, and the conservatory is perhaps 'the most perfect in the kingdom'.²⁶ Except for Kew, the author asserts that a botanical garden was 'peculiar' to this place. It was due to his 'liberal zeal for science' and for the benefit of visitors, that Bute ordered the garden open to all.²⁷ For the aid of students of botany, a catalogue was available of the plants, which were arranged according to the system of Linnaeus, with both the Latin and the common English names. The author concludes by disclosing that 'Bute's botanical skill was highly prized by Linnaeus'.²⁸ He spent most of his retirement years at Highcliffe, which looked towards the Isle of Wight, contained two libraries, a natural history and fossil room, and a laboratory. The estate also included a botanic garden towards the east of the house and high walls were built to protect the new plant specimens.²⁹ Both of these estates benefited from Bute's horticultural expertise and it is claimed that some of the trees were supplied from Kew.³⁰

'CULTURE OF PLANTS BOTH CURIOUS AND USEFUL': THE EIGHTEENTH-CENTURY OBSESSION WITH PLANT-COLLECTING³¹

As a gardener, planter, and botanist, Bute contributed to the exchange of seeds and plants with his correspondents, and cultivated these specimens in the gardens on his estates. This began in the 1720s, before his studies in Leiden, when he continued the planting work of his father at Mount Stuart. His time at Leiden, and his correspondence with the patrons of Linnaeus (Gronovius and Lawson), must have consolidated a more scientific attitude to plants and botany. This section examines the obsession for plant-collecting in Britain; the

²⁴ Joan Bassin, 'The English Landscape Garden in the Eighteenth Century: The Cultural Importance of an English Institution', *Albion*, Vol. 11, (1979), p. 24

²⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 66

²⁶ *Ibid.*

²⁷ *Ibid.*

²⁸ *Ibid.*

²⁹ Margaret Samuel, *Highcliffe Castle: Garden Journey*, (Dorest, 2010), p. 18

³⁰ Russell, *John 3rd Earl of Bute*, p. 176

³¹ Richard Weston, *Flora Anglicana or The English Flora*, (London, 1772), p. iii

introduction of exotic new plants that flooded the landscape; the role of botanical-hunters and their patrons; the establishment and popularity of botanic gardens; the emergence and popularity of the English landscape garden; and considers the preeminent aristocratic plant-collectors in eighteenth-century Britain. There has been some discussion by historians regarding the obsession for plant-collecting in Europe.³² This passion for plant-collecting first emerged during the age of exploration when an influx of new seeds, plants, flowers, herbs, fruits, shrubs, and trees from around the world began to flow into Europe. By the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries trading companies, such as the VOC and the British East India Company, collected, catalogued, and brought back many newly discovered species from their sea voyages and colonies abroad to collectors in Britain.³³

These newly imported specimens rapidly increased the list of all the known plant species and generated a renewed scientific interest in the potential medical benefits of plants. As most plants were believed to have some medicinal properties, many European universities, like Leiden University, established a physic or botanical garden to provide living specimens of plants both for research and the instruction of medical students.³⁴ In England, the oldest botanical garden was established at Oxford University in 1621, and the Apothecaries' Garden in London was founded in 1673. There was public interest regarding the economic benefits that cultivating new species from overseas colonies and other regions could contribute to the British economy. During the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, many botanic gardens were established in universities, cities, and the country residences of the nobility and royalty throughout Europe.

Members of the aristocracy and royal families were usually less concerned with the healing properties of plants. To impress their contemporaries, and enhance their status and reputations, many members of the nobility spent considerable sums of money on imported species plants and trees, which created more picturesque and exotic landscapes and transformed the gardens on their country estates. These grandiose gardens symbolised and displayed the wealth and power of the owner. For example, the Jardin du Roi in France, (founded in 1626), was associated with the royal and aristocratic grandeur of the Bourbon

³² See Andrea Wulf, *The Brother Gardeners: Botany, Empire and the Birth of an Obsession*, (London, 2008); Douglas Chambers, *The Planters of the English Landscape Garden: Botany, Trees, and the 'Georgics'*, (New Haven, 1993); Douglas Chambers, 'Painting with Living Pencils: Lord Petre', *Garden History*, Vol. 19 (1991), pp. 60-76; Richard Drayton, *Nature's Government: Science, Imperial Britain, and the 'Improvement' of the World*, (London, 2000)

³³ A.G. Morton, *History of Botanical Science*, (London, 1986), p. 146

³⁴ Drayton, *Nature's Government: Science, Imperial Britain, and the 'Improvement' of the World*, p. 192

royal family.³⁵ In Britain, there was an abundance of royal gardens, private gardens of the aristocracy, nurseries, and botanic gardens, which ensured there was a bustling and ever-growing market for exotic seeds and plants.

This expanding plant market led to the rise of plant-hunters and botanical adventurers who travelled the world collecting new plant species which they sent to collectors or botanical gardens, usually for a fee. Three well-known eighteenth-century plant-hunters were Mark Catesby (c.1682/3-1749), John Bartram (1699-1777), and William Houston (1695-1733). As these three botanical adventurers were all patronised by Bute, their activities, patrons, and the places they visited will be discussed in this section. Catesby and Bartram travelled throughout North America in search of new specimens to send to collectors in Britain. Plant-collectors in Britain desired North American plants, above species found in other South Africa and other tropical locations, because plants from North America could thrive outside, rather than be confined to hothouses. As a result, the efforts of these botanical adventurers, and the patrons who sponsored them, led to a rise in the number of North American species that were imported into Britain.

The patronage relationship between plant-hunters and their patrons was based on mutual obligation. The client would send plants, (with descriptions and drawings), and the patron would support his client either financially, with scientific advice, or aid their career. As plants were extremely valuable and sold commercially, their transport to Britain was a hazardous and expensive process as shipments could be lost or stolen.³⁶ The Englishman, Catesby, was involved in two plant subscription schemes in North America and the Caribbean between 1712 and 1726. He travelled to the West Indies and Virginia during his first expedition, cataloguing plants and animals, before returning to Britain with a small collection of dried plants in 1719. A second plant-collecting voyage was launched in 1722. For this expedition, Catesby was able to obtain the financial support and backing of Sir Hans Sloane (1660-1753) and other Royal Society subscribers, including the merchant and gardener Peter Collinson. Catesby visited Carolina, Florida, and the Bahaman Islands, returning in 1726 with seeds 'from a remote part of the country ... not before sent'.³⁷

³⁵ Ibid., p. 15

³⁶ Marie-Christine Skuncke, *Carl Peter Thunberg Botanist and Physician: Career-Building across the Oceans in the Eighteenth Century*, (Uppsala, 2014), p. 26

³⁷ British Library, Add. 28726/2

In a letter written to Collinson in January 1725, Catesby expresses his hope that this new collection of specimens would make 'no small addition to Natural History'.³⁸ However, he was concerned that it was no longer to his 'present advantage' to stay and travel throughout America unless more subscriptions were forthcoming.³⁹ Most plant-hunters were reliant on the generosity of their patrons and were expected to find, record, and draw new plant specimens to send to subscribers back in Britain. Catesby continued his travels to the Bahamas, before returning the following year, perhaps through a lack of funds. On his return, he sent a handful of seeds to Collinson in gratitude for his help in finding sponsors for the expedition.⁴⁰ The drawings that Catesby made during his travels form part of his best-known work, *The Natural History of Carolina, Florida, and the Bahama Islands*, which was published in 1731. The illustrations of plants and animals were beautifully illustrated by Catesby, and we know from the Auction Sale Catalogues that the Earl of Bute had a copy of this book in his library.⁴¹

The Scottish botanical adventurer and surgeon, William Houston, was employed by the British South Sea Company, and collected seeds and plants for the head gardener at Chelsea Physic Gardens, Philip Miller (1691-1771), and the collector, Sir Hans Sloane. Houston was a graduate of Leiden University and studied medicine under Boerhaave from 1727 to 1728. In Britain, plant hunting was supported by wealthy collectors who financed voyages to add valuable plant material to their own private gardens, botanic gardens, and commercial nurseries. Houston was commissioned by Sloane, (and other subscribers), in 1731, to travel to the West Indies on a three year voyage gathering botanical specimens. Unfortunately, he died in Jamaica the following year and his drawings, manuscripts, and collections were subsequently sent to Miller at Chelsea.⁴² As there was high risk of disease, plant-collecting in foreign territories could be a hazardous occupation, and Houston is believed to have died from either the extreme heat or tuberculosis.

Peter Collinson was instrumental not only in the plant-collecting scheme of Catesby, but in the subscription scheme he devised with John Bartram that dealt in the trade of exotic

³⁸ Ibid

³⁹ Ibid

⁴⁰ Alan W. Armstrong, *"Forget not Mee & My Garden...": Selected Letters 1725-1768 of Peter Collinson, F.R.S.*, (Philadelphia, 2002), p. 27

⁴¹ Leigh and Sotheby, *A Catalogue of the Botanical and Natural History Part of the Library of the late John, Earl of Bute*, p. 42

⁴² Chambers, 'Painting with Living Pencils: Lord Petre', p. 71

specimens from North America. Collinson's merchant business involved shipping cloth from all over the world, and his primary trade was with the colonies in North America where he used his business connections to search for plant-hunters who would send exotic seeds, plants, shrubs, flowers, and trees to Britain.⁴³ The substantial difference between the Bartram-Collinson scheme and those that came before was the size and commercial aspect of the enterprise. Before the 1730s, most North American plants and trees were extremely rare and highly coveted in Britain. Over the following three decades, the Bartram-Collinson scheme imported large quantities of North American species, which became more readily available to gardeners. Therefore, by the middle of the eighteenth century there were large numbers of North American plants and trees visible in the British landscape.⁴⁴

Prior to the development of the subscription scheme with Bartram, Collinson had imported seeds and living plants through his trading correspondents in North America. However, he encountered some difficulties in transporting plants across the Atlantic. The long and arduous sea voyage made it very difficult for living specimens to survive, especially if they were inadequately cared for and incorrectly packaged. There was also the risk of theft, as opportunistic sailors stole some rare specimens to either send to friends, or to sell.⁴⁵ Many of Collinson's correspondents did not know which species to send both because there were many different names for the same plant and 'what was common with them but rare with us they did not think worth sending'.⁴⁶ Therefore, it was imperative for Collinson to find a botanist in America, with an in depth knowledge of the indigenous species of plants, who was willing to send boxes of seeds to Europe.

Collinson became acquainted with the Pennsylvanian farmer, Bartram, through his involvement as an unpaid London agent for the subscription Library Company of Philadelphia. As a modest farmer, Bartram had neither the means nor the time to indulge his passion for botany.⁴⁷ As a result, an agreement was reached whereby Bartram dispatched boxes filled with seeds to Collinson, who would in turn distribute them to gardeners, nurserymen, and plant-collectors, in return for a negotiated fee. This commercial enterprise proved to be fair and profitable to both parties. Bartram sent boxes of seeds containing a

⁴³ Wulf, *The Brother Gardeners*, p. 20

⁴⁴ Mark Laird, *The Flowering of the Landscape Garden: English Pleasure Grounds 1720-1800*, (Philadelphia, 1999), p. 70

⁴⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 72

⁴⁶ Armstrong, "Forget not Mee & My Garden...": *Selected Letters 1725-1768 of Peter Collinson, F.R.S.*, p. 15

⁴⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 21

hundred and five varieties of trees and shrubs to collectors, who paid an annual sum of five guineas. Collinson also sent precise instructions to Bartram on how to store and transport the seeds so that they would survive the journey across the Atlantic. This careful packaging and storage of the shrubs and trees allowed Collinson to identify, and to request more of a particular plant or flower, if it proved popular among his clients.

Bartram travelled all over North America collecting specimens, including New York, the Catskills Mountains, Maryland, and Virginia. On his expedition to Maryland and Virginia, Bartram claimed to have trekked over eleven hundred miles in five weeks.⁴⁸ Between 1740 and 1767, there were more than one hundred subscribers for these five guinea boxes including collectors in Ireland, Scotland, France, and Germany. Among the wealthy and aristocratic subscribers to Bartram-Collinson scheme were the Earl of Ilay; Robert James Petre, eighth Baron Petre (1713-1742); Charles Lennox, second Duke of Richmond (1701-1750); and the Earl of Bute.⁴⁹ Philip Miller of Chelsea Physic Gardens was also a member of the scheme. As a direct result of this subscription scheme, Collinson is sometimes credited as the greatest introducer of new species into Britain during the first half of the eighteenth century.⁵⁰ In recognition of his botanical services, Bartram was royally rewarded in 1764 when he was named the king's botanist and received an annual annuity of £50.⁵¹

There were several aristocrats of the eighteenth century who spent considerable amounts of money in importing and cultivating new species of plants and trees, and remodelling and redeveloping their gardens. Some of the prominent plant-collectors and gentlemen gardeners of the eighteenth century were the Earl of Ilay, Baron Petre, and the Earl of Bute. However, the activity of plant-collecting was not confined to members of the upper classes and there were many gardeners of the middling class, including Peter Collinson, (who purchased plants for his own garden), and Philip Miller who acquired exotic specimens in his role as chief gardener at the Chelsea Physic Gardens. A comparison between estate and garden sizes; the number of imported plants and trees; involvement in various plant-subscription schemes; and other botanical interests between these aristocratic

⁴⁸ Ibid

⁴⁹ Michael Stymes, Alison Hodges, and John Harvey, 'The Plantings at Whitton', *Garden History*, Vol. 14, No. 2 (Autumn, 1986), p. 147

⁵⁰ Laird, *The Flowering of the Landscape Garden*, p. 63

⁵¹ Armstrong, "Forget not Mee & My Garden...", p. 25

collectors will be valuable in determining the Earl of Bute's role as a notable eighteenth-century plant-collector.

The Earl of Ilay, was regarded by Peter Collinson as the 'great patron of all planters', and he began extensively collecting exotic seeds and plants during the 1720s.⁵² In 1722, he purchased the estate of Whitton Park in Middlesex, and began accumulating the surrounding land until it encompassed fifty-five acres in 1750. Historians believe that the nursery at Whitton was 'without question one of the largest and best collections of trees and shrubs in the country at that time'.⁵³ It is extremely likely that Ilay received some of his early American specimens from the plant-hunters Mark Catesby and William Houston.⁵⁴ We also know that from 1748 to 1750, Ilay was a member of the North American plant subscription scheme of John Bartram and Peter Collinson.⁵⁵ Some of his plants and trees came not only from North American but also from Siberia, Nova Scotia, and Turkey. A surviving list of his dinner guests at Whitton shows that Ilay invited his fellow plant-collecting enthusiasts, Petre, Richmond, Philip Miller, along with his nephew, Bute.⁵⁶

Ilay first began to develop the garden around 1724/5, though he delayed the construction of a house on the site until c.1732 when the architect and builder, Roger Morris (1695-1749), built a Palladian villa.⁵⁷ It was quite unusual to plant a garden before constructing a residence, but Ilay justified his decision to Pehr Kalm (1716-1779), a botanical adventurer and pupil of Linnaeus, by declaring that 'Nature must have its time' and a house could wait because 'I can always build the most handsome Castle in one year'.⁵⁸ The garden was divided into two main sections, the ornamental pleasure garden and the nursery. Visitors to the ornamental garden would see such features as a canal, a raised gothic tower, and an aviary. Meanwhile, Ilay nurtured his astonishing collection of trees and shrubs in the nursery and it consisted of a considerable nine acres and visitors to Whitton were impressed by the large quantity of exotic trees.⁵⁹ Among the foreign species that could be found on the estate were the monkey puzzle tree from Chile, and the Kentucky coffee tree from North

⁵² Miller, "'My favourite studdys": Lord Bute as naturalist', p. 215

⁵³ Stymes, Hodges, and Harvey, 'The Plantings at Whitton', p. 143

⁵⁴ Laird, *The Flowering of the Landscape Garden*, p. 86

⁵⁵ Chambers, *The Planters of the English landscape Garden: Botany, Trees, and the 'Georgics'*, p. 112

⁵⁶ Emerson, *An Enlightened Duke: The Life of Archibald Campbell (1682-1761)*, p. 128

⁵⁷ Wulf, *The Brother Gardeners: Botany, Empire and the Birth of an Obsession*, p. 141

⁵⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 142

⁵⁹ Stymes, Hodges, and Harvey, 'The Plantings at Whitton', p. 147

American.⁶⁰ The nursery at Whitton was used as a storehouse for Ilay to cultivate plants and trees to refashion the gardens of his Scottish estates, and to send samples to some of his friends.⁶¹

After Ilay's death in 1761, the garden at Whitton Park experienced a sharp decline, and most of its stock was depleted and moved elsewhere. Bute transferred some of the rare trees and shrubs, including the mature trees, to Kew Gardens and some of these can be still seen in the gardens today.⁶² Fortunately, Whitton was not completely plundered of all its trees and many, unsuitable for removal because of their size, were left behind. Happily, we have some idea of the enormous range of species that were planted at Whitton from a 1765 catalogue compiled by the chief gardener at the estate, Daniel Crofts. This is not a complete listing as it was composed after some of the trees had been transferred to Kew, but it includes some three hundred and forty remaining species of plants and trees.⁶³ A number of the trees listed came from North America, including the Virginia ash and Virginia oak.⁶⁴

Bute's contemporary, Baron Petre, was a renowned aristocratic gardener and plant importer who began planting and cultivating trees from a very early age. He developed large gardens on his Essex estates of Ingatestone and later Thorndon Hall. His primary estate of Thornton Hall contained vast nurseries, and was considered to be one of the largest collections of exotic trees and plants from overseas that was established in the eighteenth century.⁶⁵ It is claimed that his nurseries were the most extensive private nurseries in the country and provided seeds, plants, and trees for his garden and park at Thornton.⁶⁶ Not just a plant-collector, Petre was closely involved in the planning, designing, planting, and embellishing of his gardens.⁶⁷ His drawing and designs for Thornton, which show his schemes for planting, demonstrate his concern with the overall picturesque effect of the garden, and his desire of letting nature reign.⁶⁸ He achieved this by planting rows of trees in the distance, allowing visitors to imagine that they were part of a larger landscape.⁶⁹

⁶⁰ Ray Desmond, *Kew: The History of the Royal Botanic Gardens*, (London, 1998), p. 41

⁶¹ Emerson, 'The Scientific Interests of Archibald Campbell, 3rd Duke of Ilay (1682-1761)', p. 30

⁶² Desmond, *Kew: The History of the Royal Botanic Gardens*, p. 41

⁶³ Stymes, Hodges, and Harvey, 'The Plantings at Whitton', p. 150

⁶⁴ *Ibid.*, pp. 151-168

⁶⁵ Chambers, 'Painting with Living Pencils: Lord Petre', p. 60

⁶⁶ Stymes and Harvey, 'Lord Petre's Legacy: The Nurseries at Thornton', p. 272

⁶⁷ Chambers, 'Painting with Living Pencils: Lord Petre', p. 68

⁶⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 64

⁶⁹ Armstrong, "Forget not Mee & My Garden...", p. 93

Petre, like Ilay, significantly contributed to the development of planting in Britain, especially through his extensive use of plant species imported from North America via Collinson and Bartram.⁷⁰ In 1735, Petre became the first subscriber to the Collinson-Bartram scheme and would eventually become their most important client. Among the plants that were sent to Petre in September 1736 were coffee trees, ephorbiiums (euphorbia), and java palm trees.⁷¹ In a letter to Collinson, dated 20 February 1737, he sent three guineas 'to yr Virginian collector' for seeds and plants.⁷² This collector was presumably Bartram. He kept a record of his planting experiments and by 9 May 1737, Petre wrote that the tulip seeds that he received last year were 'beginning to come up', and he was hopeful that 'we shall have a stock of them'.⁷³ On 18 December 1737, he received a shipment of Newfoundland plants which 'are very rare & beautyfull'.⁷⁴ He cultivated an enormous number of plants on his estate, and by 1740 the gardens at Thornton boasted over ten thousand American trees. This was only five years after first subscribing to Collinson-Bartram scheme so it is likely that Petre received seeds and plants from a number of different sources, including commercial nurseries. He planted these American trees alongside twenty thousand European and Asian varieties of trees.⁷⁵ Similarly to Ilay, Petre had been a member of the plant subscription schemes of Catesby and Houston. We know that he received seeds from Catesby as evidenced from a letter to Collinson written in 1736, where he states that he was 'very much oblig'd to Mr Catesby for yr seeds he was so good as to send to me'.⁷⁶

Among those who were employed in the garden at Thornton were Sir John Hill, an apothecary and later client of Lord Bute's, who assisted in developing the garden, and John Miller, Philip Miller's brother. In 1736, Petre commissioned Philip Miller to catalogue the plants that were growing at Thornton. Miller's catalogue included nearly seven hundred species. This catalogue listed many new American species including chestnut trees, and the Judas tree.⁷⁷ Full lists of these American importations are listed in a sixteen volume *Hortus siccus* dated c.1740.⁷⁸ Petre also corresponded with other gardening and botany enthusiasts

⁷⁰ Stymes and Harvey, 'Lord Petre's Legacy: The Nurseries at Thorndon', p. 272

⁷¹ British Library, MSS. 28726/17

⁷² British Library, MSS. 28726/21

⁷³ British Library, MSS. 28726/28

⁷⁴ British Library, MSS. 28726/38

⁷⁵ Chambers, 'Painting with Living Pencils: Lord Petre', p. 69

⁷⁶ British Library, MSS 28726/5

⁷⁷ Chambers, *The Planters of the English Landscape Garden*, p. 112

⁷⁸ Chambers, 'Painting with Living Pencils: Lord Petre', p. 71

including Collinson, Philip Miller, and the Duke of Richmond, calling them 'my brother Gardeners'.⁷⁹ Collinson was a frequent guest of Petre's and remarked after visiting Thornton that 'one cannot help thinking he is in North America'.⁸⁰ Like Ilay's Whitton estate, many of the mature trees and plants cultivated in the nurseries at Thornton were sold after Petre's premature death in 1742.⁸¹ He died, age 29, from small-pox, and his wife sold most of the estimated 219,925 stock in two sales, the first in December 1742, and the second occurring c.1747-8.⁸² The Duke of Richmond was among the buyers who purchased plants and trees and benefitted from these sales.

One of Petre's 'brother Gardeners', Philip Miller, was a well-known plant-collector who transformed the Chelsea Physic Gardens into a thriving botanical collection. The Chelsea Physic Gardens, (formerly The Apothecaries' Garden), was established in 1673 and is the second oldest botanic garden in Britain. It was one of the few botanic gardens founded in the seventeenth century that was not associated with a university.⁸³ However, by the early eighteenth century the Apothecaries' Physic Garden had run into serious financial difficulties. Fortunately for the future of the garden, Sir Hans Sloane purchased it in 1722, thereby saving it from financial ruin. Sloane was a passionate plant-collector and patron who gifted the use of the site to the Society of Apothecaries. In return for his generosity, the Society of Apothecaries would pay an annual fee of five pounds and send fifty new plant specimens to the Royal Society every year, 'ffor improving naturall knowledge', until the botanic garden contained two thousand species.⁸⁴ Miller was one of the leading gardeners of the eighteenth century and in 1722, through the intercession of Sloane, was appointed chief gardener of the Apothecaries' Physic Garden. Miller would remain in this post until shortly before his death in 1772.⁸⁵ During the course of the fifty years of his tenure, the Chelsea Physic Gardens amassed an impressive collection of new species from around the world and became one of the most stocked botanical gardens in Europe.⁸⁶

Miller was also a subscriber to the Collinson-Bartram scheme and received many new species of plants from North America that he cultivated at Chelsea Gardens. He first wrote to

⁷⁹ Armstrong, "Forget not Mee & My Garden...", p. 90

⁸⁰ Chambers, *The Planters of the English Landscape Garden*, p. 113

⁸¹ Stymes and Harvey, 'Lord Petre's Legacy: The Nurseries at Thorndon', p. 273

⁸² Ibid

⁸³ Stearn, 'The Chelsea Physic Garden 1673-1973', p. 68

⁸⁴ Wulf, *The Brother Gardeners*, p. 38

⁸⁵ Hazel Le Rougetel, 'Philip Miller/John Bartram Exchange', *Garden History*, Vol. 14, No. 1 (Spring, 1986), p. 32

⁸⁶ Ibid

Bartram in 1755 and used this correspondence to seek new or additional stock for the gardens, including requesting mountain magnolia.⁸⁷ In return, Miller assisted Bartram in understanding the Linnaean system of classification. Through his involvement in international network of plant-collectors and correspondents, Miller was able to build up the collection at Chelsea. Some members of this network were Sir Joseph Banks, Ilay, and Linnaeus. These men fostered an international community where seeds, plants, and observations among fellow botanists, plant-collectors, and gardeners could be exchanged across vast distances and oceans.⁸⁸ As a result, Chelsea Gardens became a storehouse for hundreds of imported plants. It supplied shrubs and trees to gardens throughout Britain, and was pivotal for the exchange of seeds and plants. Miller was generous in his gifts of rare plants, help, and advice and provided practical demonstrations for visitors at Chelsea. He also exchanged material with a great many estates in England, including Whitton.⁸⁹ Collinson maintained that by 1764 Miller had raised the reputation of the Chelsea Garden to excel all other botanic gardens in Europe.⁹⁰ Such was the reputation of Miller and Chelsea that many famous gardeners and botanists visited either to see the plants or talk to the chief gardener. Among these visitors was Linnaeus, who was among Miller's scientific correspondents.⁹¹

One of Miller's most enduring achievements was the publication of his *Gardeners Dictionary*, which is considered to be one of the most important botanical works of the eighteenth century. The first edition of the *Gardeners Dictionary* was published in 1731 and by the time of its final publication in 1768, it had gone through a remarkable eight editions.⁹² The *Dictionary* gave advice on a wide variety of subjects and provided gardeners across the country, with practical information on almost all the trees, shrubs, and flowers available in Britain. It became the standardised botanical text for all British gardeners. Its importance was reinforced when Bartram asking Collinson for recommendations on botanical texts that he should consult while gathering plants, responded that the *Dictionary* was 'a Work of the greatest use and no Lover ought to be without'.⁹³ Along with a list of all known plants in

⁸⁷ Ibid., p. 35

⁸⁸ Ibid., p. 39

⁸⁹ Hazel Le Rougetel, 'Philip Miller and the Promotion of Gardening Knowledge', *RSA Journal*, Vol.140, No. 54, 26 (February 1992), p. 185

⁹⁰ Ibid

⁹¹ Ibid; Sir James Edward Smith, *A Selection of the Correspondence of Linnaeus, and Other Naturalists*, in 2 volumes, (London, 1821), p. 34

⁹² Philip Miller, *The Gardeners Dictionary*, (Dublin, 1732)

⁹³ Wulf, *The Brother Gardeners*, p. 35

cultivation in Britain, the *Dictionary* gave each plant's country of origin, the year of introduction where possible, and some practical advice on cultivation. Miller provided advice on pest control, soils, propagation, and the dangers of wind and frost.⁹⁴ Many new plants were grown, studied, and recorded by Miller in the *Dictionary* and were beautifully drawn by the botanical artist Georg Dionysius Ehret (1708-1770).

THE PLANT-COLLECTING ACTIVITIES OF THE EARL OF BUTE

Like Petre and Ilay, Bute was a plant-collector who was involved in the importation of seeds and plants into Britain, and cultivated new species on his estates of Mount Stuart, Cane Wood in Hampshire, Luton Hoo in Bedfordshire, and Highcliffe in Dorset. After returning to Mount Stuart in 1734, Bute devoted a large amount of time to making improvements on his estate; collecting botanical texts for his library; and expanding and developing his garden by planting large numbers of trees and shrubs.⁹⁵ Like his 'brother gardeners', he catalogued his gardening experiments and improvements on his estates in *A Journal of the Planting & Executed att Mountstewart from the first laying out of the Gardens By My Father* and *Journal of John Stuart including Planting and Gardening Work 1718-1744*.⁹⁶ Bute began *A Journal of the Planting & Executed att Mountstewart* on 1 May 1737, and this manuscript details the changes made by his father from 1718-1723; the improvements made during his minority; and new developments from 1734-1737. His *Journal of John Stuart including Planting and Gardening Work* overlaps the earlier manuscript and includes some of the improvements made from 1718-1737. However, it also reveals more details of the Lord Bute's gardening practices and experiments, containing a description of the daily weather, and providing dates when each of the plants flowered.

Prior to building the house and garden at Mount Stuart, the second Earl and his family had lived in the nearby town of Rothesay, on the Isle of Bute. In 1718, he began construction on a new house and garden with views overlooking the Firth of Clyde on the sheltered east side of the island. From information gleaned in his father's papers, Bute catalogued the progress made at Mount Stuart from 1718 until 'that unhappy time' in 1723

⁹⁴ Desmond, *Kew: The History of the Royal Botanic Gardens*, p. 40

⁹⁵ Alice. M. Coats, *Lord Bute: An Illustrated life of John Stuart, third Earl of Bute 1713 - 1792*, (Aylesbury, 1975), p. 8

⁹⁶ BU/154, (*Estate Related Records*, c.1734 - 31 December 1744); BU/155, (*Estate Related Records*, 01 May 1737 - 30 November 1737)

when the second Earl died unexpectedly. Among these improvements was the laying out of the grounds and garden of approximately three hundred acres, and the planting of 'Scotch firr' on the south and north of coast in 1718. He ordered many of the seeds and plants from the nurseryman William Miller in Edinburgh (son of the Royal gardener at Holyrood Palace). In 1720, the second Earl planted the orchard, flowering shrubs that he brought from London, and most of the thickets. The lime hedge round the parterre, and the 'Narrow Beech Walk' planted with birch, elm, and alder were added in 1721.⁹⁷ In 1722, the labyrinth was finished, and 'the last thing my Dearest father did' was to plant the flowering shrubs in the Grove.⁹⁸ During his minority, some of the work that was carried out was the planting of the narrow walks with holly and hornbeam, the levelling of the Bowling Green, and planting the surrounding area with hornbeam in 1729.⁹⁹

From 1734 onwards, Bute began making his own modifications on the estate and garden by continuing planting large numbers of trees and shrubs. His *Journal* catalogues some of the planting experiments that he carried out at Mount Stuart, including planting rows of exotic plants and trees. One of the first experiments that he carried out in October 1734 was the planting of thirty thousand scotch firs below the bank and all along the sea. This number of scotch firs represented half the total number of these trees that were in his nursery, were approximately five or six years old, and Bute believed they were 'large' enough to thrive. Unfortunately, it ultimately proved to be a failed experiment, as the ensuing spring was very dry and he lost all the firs in February 1735.¹⁰⁰ That same February he planted ash, sycamore, and oak throughout the pleasure grounds and a row of flowering shrubs, laburnum, and horse chestnut.¹⁰¹ His *Journal* records that after his return from London in 1736, the Earl continued making gardening improvements and by October of the same year very few of the fifteen thousand plants remained in the nursery, except for a few in the North Garden.

The *Journal of John Stuart including Planting and Gardening Work* further details the extensive planting that occurred on the Mount Stuart estate from 1737 to 1744, the year before his move to London. Among the entries is a list of plants that he received from

⁹⁷ BU/154/1 & BU/154/2

⁹⁸ BU/154/3

⁹⁹ BU/154/5

¹⁰⁰ BU/154/6

¹⁰¹ BU/154/7

London in January 1741, although he does not record where he purchased them.¹⁰² Some of the plants which were sent were three American flowering maple, three Virginia flowering hornbeam, and twenty Persian jasmine. Bute planted some Virginia beech in March 1742, and in the April the same year he transplanted the Virginia *clematis* and *passion trees* from the Kitchen Garden. At the end of May 1743 he noted that he sowed some of the flowering seeds that he got from 'Mr Catesby', specifically some West Indian plants and perfumed ketmia. Regrettably, Bute reported that by October 1743 the seeds from Catesby had been kept too long and very few of them came up, and 'those that did seem to be destroy'd with the damp of the hot bed' despite all 'care'. Fortunately, some of the Indian cane had sprung up and appeared to be in good health.

In June 1743, the Earl received 'some hundred succulent greenhouse plants' from the 'Oxford Garden'.¹⁰³ This parcel contained specimens of aloes torch, melon thistles, prickly pears, Indian cane, spurges fig, and marigolds. Unfortunately, Bute does not record who sent him these seeds. From 1734 to 1747, the German botanist Johann Jacob Dillenius (1684-1747), was Sherardian Professor of Botany at Oxford University and in charge of the botanical garden in Oxford, so it is possible that he is the sender of these seeds. Sadly, Bute notes that these plants did not thrive and many perished. Along with some failures, there were also some successful planting experiments. In July 1743, he planted a large number of species, including Carolina poplar indigo and angelica, that germinated by October with shoots of several feet tall. The American fir, Virginian cedar, cedar of Lebanon, and New England fir trees that he also planted in July had come up 'nicely' by October. During July, August, and September 1743, he cultivated some American acorns chestnut sent by 'Mr. Stewart' from Virginia. During the final year of his *Journal*, Bute records the three different kinds of Jamaican seeds that he received four years ago, and the ten tamarind trees which he got from 'Mr. Collinson and doctor Lawson' in June 1744.¹⁰⁴ These *Journals* describe the vast planting network of individuals and institutions that sent seeds and specimens including the Oxford Botanic Garden, Catesby, Collinson, Lawson and a plant-hunter in Virginia named Mr. Stewart.

¹⁰² BU/154 (these pages are not numbered)

¹⁰³ BU/154

¹⁰⁴ Ibid

After the Earl and his family moved southward to London, the head gardener at Mount Stuart, Alexander McGregor, (dates unknown), sent weekly reports from 1746 to 1760 to Bute commenting on the weather and the level of rainfall.¹⁰⁵ The management of the estate was entrusted to his brother Mackenzie and although the trees matured, the following decades were not a productive time in the Mount Stuart gardens as no major work commenced. In 1770, Mackenzie wrote to Bute's Scottish manager, Baron William Mure (1718-1776), to inform him that his brother hoped to retrench 'the large Expenses He has been at there for some years past in Improvements'.¹⁰⁶ This is not surprising considering the large amounts of money that he was spending in the late 1760s and 1770s on his estates of Luton Hoo and Highcliffe. There was a period of cost cutting at Mount Stuart in 1774 with many of the gardeners were made redundant, and the grounds became somewhat neglected. It was not until after his death in 1792 that his son, the fourth Earl of Bute, reserved this neglect. After 1745, Bute confined his experiments and planting to Cane Wood, Luton Hoo, and Highcliffe.

Further botanical notebooks by Bute include, *A Catalogue of Plants with there time of Flowering 1777*, and a manuscript, dated c.1780, entitled *Observations on Plants, wherein I have inserted those made at Canewood, which were not given to Dr Hill. A Catalogue of Plants* briefly lists all the plants that flowered in the garden of his Luton Hoo or Highcliffe estate beginning on 31 May 1777 and ending on 23 April 1778.¹⁰⁷ His *Observations on Plants* refers to notes that he made regarding his Cane Wood (now called Kenwood) estate in Hampstead in London.¹⁰⁸ Bute moved to Cane Wood in c.1745 and remained there until 1754 when he sold the estate to William Murray, the first Earl of Mansfield (1705-1793). He bought two houses in London, one on Kew Green and the other on South Audley Street.¹⁰⁹ *Observations on Plants* was first compiled in 1753 and describes the origin and characteristics of the approximately forty five species of plants that were found in the garden at Cane Wood.¹¹⁰ His observations reveal his botanical knowledge as he commented that the tussilago and viola mortis plants had been well described by Linnaeus, but that Linnaeus's account of the

¹⁰⁵ BU/157/1, (*Estate Related Records*, 30 April 1746 - 30 December 1746)

¹⁰⁶ The National Library of Scotland, The Mure of Caldwell Papers, MS 4945/11

¹⁰⁷ BU/136/4, (*Scientific : notebooks*, 31 May 1777 - 23 April 1778)

¹⁰⁸ BU/130, (*Botanical notebooks*, c.1780)

¹⁰⁹ Coats, *Lord Bute: An Illustrated life of John Stuart, third Earl of Bute 1713 -1792*, p. 11

¹¹⁰ Russell, *John 3rd Earl of Bute*, p. 24

rhodora (rhodora) plant had been taken from the French botanist, Henri-Louis Duhamel du Monceau (1700-1782), as Swede had never seen a specimen of it.

The introduction to the *Observations* reveals why there are few surviving botanical notebooks from 1744 to the 1770s. To aid in his client's writing of *The Vegetable System*, Bute lent Sir John Hill all the notes he had accumulated before 1760 with a promise from the doctor 'to restore them, when a proper use had been made of them in the work I have given Him to execute'.¹¹¹ Regrettably, these papers were 'lost' after Hill's death. Lady Hill believed that Bute failed to properly compensate her husband for his work, so it is also possible that she refused to return any of his botanical papers.

THE RECEPTION OF CARL LINNAEUS'S SYSTEM OF CLASSIFICATION IN EIGHTEENTH-CENTURY BRITAIN

With the importation of large numbers of exotic new species, it became increasingly important for botanists to develop a system of classification to describe and catalogue all new plants. In botanical publications where plants were called by many different names, an all encompassing classification system would prevent confusion in naming a new species. The difficult of plant identification was extremely problematic for gardeners and botanists. Many naturalists, including the seventeenth-century botanists, John Ray (1627-1705) and Joseph Pitton de Tournefort (1656-1708), disagreed on a particular method for cataloguing plants and used a wide range of common characteristics in their classification schemes. The number of new schemes spiralled throughout the eighteenth century, and by 1799 there were over fifty different systems. As a result, the eighteenth century is often dubbed 'The Age of Classification'.¹¹² A number of classification systems were popular and in use during the eighteenth century, but the most enduring of these systems was Carl Linnaeus's system of classification which was first outlined in his *Systema Naturae* in 1735.

Systema naturae was first published in the Netherlands while Linnaeus was attending Harderwijk University. He travelled southward to Harderwijk in April 1735 to complete his medical degree because at that time doctoral degrees were not being granted in his native

¹¹¹ BU/130 (these pages are not numbered)

¹¹² Patricia Fara, *Sex, Botany and Empire: The Story of Carl Linnaeus and Joseph Banks*, (Cambridge, 2003), p. 20

Sweden.¹¹³ From 1735 to 1738, Linnaeus lived and studied in the Netherlands, made important botanical contacts, and published some of his work there. He was reliant on scientific patronage, and the publication of *Systema naturae* was paid for by Jan Frederik Gronovius and Dr. Isaac Lawson. In 1735, he acquired the patronage of a wealthy banker, George Clifford, who employed Linnaeus to catalogue his botanical collection on his Hartekamp estate. Clifford financed Linnaeus's trip to England in 1736 where he met with the English botanists while acquiring new seeds and plants for Clifford's estate.¹¹⁴ During this trip, Linnaeus met Sir Hans Sloane and introduced his new classification system to Philip Miller at Chelsea Gardens. He published a number of important works during this time in the Netherlands, including *Genera plantarum* (Leyden, 1737), *Hortus cliffortianus* (Amsterdam, 1737), and *Classes plantarum* (Leyden, 1738).¹¹⁵

The Linnaean taxonomy set forth in *Systema naturae* divided plants, animals, and minerals into classes, and subdivided these classes into orders, families, genera, and species. This process of grouping living things into defined hierarchies allowed botanists to identify, name, and classify plants more easily, seemingly bringing order to the chaotic world of nature. Along with this new classification system, Linnaeus introduced his system of binomial nomenclature in his 1751 publication, *Philosophia botanica*. This system of binomial nomenclature is still in use today. Binomial nomenclature gives each plant species two specific Latin names. The first name identifies the genus of the plant, while the second name identifies the plant species within the genus. Linnaeus grouped together plants based on their reproductive organs, i.e. the characteristics of the pistil and number and arrangement of the stamen. This resulted in each plant having a unique two word name.¹¹⁶ Previously, each plant had an extremely long Latin name that was mostly descriptive, and difficult to remember. Until his death in 1778, Linnaeus continued to publish many works outlining his new system of classification.

Linnaeus's system of classification was not entirely new, and incorporated ideas from the classification systems of the seventeenth century, namely those of Ray and Tournefort.¹¹⁷ Ray attempted to organise the natural world by grouping together plants which had the

¹¹³ Ibid., p. 39

¹¹⁴ Staffan Muller-Wille and Karen Reeds, 'A translation of the Carl Linnaeus's introduction to *Genera plantarum* (1737), *Studies in History and Philosophy of Biological and Biomedical Sciences*, 38 (2007), p. 570

¹¹⁵ Fara, *Sex, Botany and Empire: The Story of Carl Linnaeus and Joseph Banks*, p. 18

¹¹⁶ Lisa Koerner, *Linnaeus: Nature and Nation*, (London, 1999), p. 52

¹¹⁷ Ibid., p. 34

most characteristics in common. His *Historia plantarum*, published between 1686 and 1704, described all the known plants, (numbering over eighteen thousand), and grouped together plants based on similarities of the principal parts, i.e. fruit, flowers, shapes, seeds, and habitat. This approach had many disadvantages, including its very complexity, which required years of study and expert tuition to identify and categorise species of plants. Ray's lasting achievement was his concept and definition of a species. Tournefort's classification system was outlined in his *Elements of Botany* and published in 1694. *Elements of Botany* identified over ten thousand plants, and proposed an artificial system which grouped together plants according to the formation and shape of the flower petal. These systems were in use during the eighteenth century. However, Linnaeus's sexual system was easier to learn, and simpler to use, than either of the classification systems of Ray or Tournefort, and is one reason for its eventual acceptance among botanists.

Despite the best efforts of Linnaeus and his students to promote it, the Linnaean system was still controversial towards the end of the eighteenth century. Linnaeus encouraged other botanists to accept his new system by honouring discoverers of new species by naming a plant after them. This is another reason why many botanists embraced this new system. However, not all gardeners and botanists were impressed. For the first seven editions of the *Gardeners Dictionary*, Miller used the classification system of Tournefort. It was not until the final edition in 1768 that Miller finally adopted the Linnaeus's system.¹¹⁸ Though a supporter of Linnaeus, Collinson had his objections, and believed that it confused 'the delightful science of Botany' by changing the names of so many plants.¹¹⁹ Bute, too, was an early critic of the system. From the letters that survive between Bute and Collinson, we know a great deal regarding the Earl's thoughts on the Linnaean system, and his botanical interests.

In a letter dated 4 August 1753, Bute thanks Collinson for a specimen of apocynum which he says is certainly a new genus and gives a brief description of the purplish-flowering plant.¹²⁰ A few days later on the 10 August, Bute writes that there were many specific descriptions of plants that he was unsatisfied with and included descriptions of cytiscus and

¹¹⁸ Ibid., p. 39

¹¹⁹ Ibid., p. 34

¹²⁰ Sir James Edward Smith, *A Selection of the Correspondence of Linnaeus, and Other Naturalists*, in 2 volumes, (London, 1821), p. 26

colutea based on specimens he cultivated in his garden.¹²¹ He believed that some of these plants had not previously been described by either Linnaeus, Adrian van Royen, or Albrecht von Haller (1708-1777).¹²² Bute describes a plant which he calls *Cytisus neapolitanus*, an evergreen that was found in Italy, and that Collinson should 'know it well'. Unfortunately, he could not find an entry for by any author 'at least so as to make me certain of it'.¹²³ This illustrates the many difficulties that botanists had in identifying a specific plant as they would need to examine the texts of a few botanical authors in order to find a matching description. From these letters, we know that Bute was familiar with the botanical works of van Royen, Haller, and Linnaeus, and that the 'improved' plant descriptions that he made to Collinson were subsequently passed on to Linnaeus.

Although there are no known letters between Bute and Linnaeus, we know from Collinson's correspondence that he informed Linnaeus of his botanical observations. On 20 September 1753, Collinson wrote to Linnaeus regarding some 'very curious observations' of plants that he had made, and included remarks made by 'that great critic in Botany', Lord Bute.¹²⁴ Firstly, Collinson provided a brief description of the plant, *menispermum*, that he found in his garden and which he believed differed from the description provided by Johann Jacob Dillenius in his *Hortus Eltamensis*.¹²⁵ Secondly, Collinson forwarded Bute's comments on the *Cytisus* and *colutea* plants and added that it should be obvious to Linnaeus why new descriptions of these plants were needed. Finally, Collinson enclosed a copy of the Earl's remarks on *apocynum*, along with a cutting of the plant. Clearly, Collinson found Bute's botanical observations significant enough to pass send to Linnaeus.

In an undated letter to Collinson, Bute thanks him for the loan of Linnaeus's *Species plantarum*.¹²⁶ In his letter of 20 December 1754, the Earl declares that *Species plantarum* was the 'most careless of his performances' and that 'He seems so Vain as to imagine he can prescribe to all the World'.¹²⁷ He was unimpressed on a number of points. First, he was critical of the extensive changes that Linnaeus made in this book, and believes it would be of

¹²¹ Linnaean Correspondence, L5478 (Letter from Collinson to Bute)

¹²² Ibid

¹²³ Ibid

¹²⁴ Smith, *A Selection of the Correspondence of Linnaeus, and Other Naturalists*, p. 26

¹²⁵ Linnaean Correspondence, L1641 (Letter from Collinson to Linnaeus)

¹²⁶ Smith, *A Selection of the Correspondence of Linnaeus, and Other Naturalists*, p. 35

¹²⁷ Ibid., p. 36

little use to botanists until he published a new edition of the *Genera*.¹²⁸ Secondly, Bute was distressed by the number of 'barbarous Swedish names' flinging away all those that were 'fabricated in this country'. He continues by admitting his surprise that all of Europe would 'suffer these impertinences', and lamented that in a few years 'Linnaean Botany will be a good Dictionary of Swedish proper names'.¹²⁹ Thirdly, Bute was concerned with the 'bold coalitions of genuses' and the connections that Linnaeus had made between some of the plants, declaring that 'we shall have more confusion with order than we had formerly with disorder'.¹³⁰ Despite his reservations Bute adopted Linnaean taxonomy, which is evidenced from his planting notebooks where the names of plants growing on his estates were recorded using the system of binomial nomenclature.

In order to promote his new system, Linnaeus needed the approval of influential botanists and asked Collinson for a list of leading English botanists. Collinson reply of 10 April 1755 reveals Bute as 'First in Rank' of the English botanists and that he was 'a perfect Master of your Methode'.¹³¹ Collinson further states that although great numbers of the gentry and nobility knew plants very well, very few make 'Botanic Science their Peculiar Study'.¹³² There is no evidence that the other great plant-collectors, Petre, Argyll, or Richmond, were concerned with the classification of plant species. Bute's correspondence with Collinson reveals his growing reputation as an important figure in British botany in the 1750s. In 1753, Mark Catesby wrote to Linnaeus and asked that a plant should be named after 'a Lord Bute of Scotland, an ingenious Gentleman'.¹³³ Linnaeus obliged and the genus *Stewartia* (despite the incorrect spelling of Stuart) is named after him. It is an American shrub that had first bloomed in England in 1742.

BOTANICAL TABLES, CONTAINING THE DIFFERENT FAMILYS OF BRITISH PLANTS **(1785)**

By 1785, Bute's gardens had provided him with abundant material for the botanical observations which he recorded in his *Botanical Tables, Containing the Different Familys of*

¹²⁸ Ibid., p. 33

¹²⁹ Ibid

¹³⁰ Ibid

¹³¹ Ibid

¹³² Ibid

¹³³ Coats, *Lord Bute: An Illustrated life of John Stuart*, p. 10

British Plants.¹³⁴ *Botanical Tables* contained nine volumes and were illustrated by the artist and engraver, Johann Sebastian Mueller (1715-1790). It contains over six hundred illustrations, in accordance with the Linnaean system and includes mosses, grasses, flowers, and trees and has detailed drawings of every listed plant. The twelve copies were privately printed at an expense estimated between £1000 -£12,000 and most sets were bound with the Bute coat of arms. The two sets gifted to the royal family do not have the family coat of arms and are set in red goatskin edged in gold. The recipients included Queen Charlotte, Catherine II, Empress of Russia (1729-1796), Joseph Banks, Comte de Buffon, his sister-in-law Lady Elizabeth Mackenzie (1721/2), his sister Lady Jane Ruthven (?- 1786), his daughter Lady Jane Macartney (1742-1828), Lady Margaret Cavendish, Duchess of Portland (1715-1785), Mrs. Jane Barrington (?-1807), and Louis Dutens (1730-1812).

Botanical Tables was dedicated to Queen Charlotte and although Bute was estranged from George III, he sought royal support for its publication. He was desirous of explaining the taxonomic system to women, as he felt that this 'delightful part of nature' was suited to the attention of 'of the Fair Sex'.¹³⁵ He hoped botany would become a fashionable female amusement and as a result, seven of the twelve copies were gifted to women. Like her mother-in-law, Charlotte was extremely interested in botany and this dedication indicates her support of botany as a subject for female study. This was important at a time when it was controversial for women to study botany as 'wanton' language was employed to compare botanical terms to human sexuality. In the *Botanical Tables*, Bute argued that the sexual language was not necessary and that the names of some plants 'cannot be repeated in decent company', especially in front of the women. He believed that the Linnaean system could be understood with referring to male or female parts of plants.¹³⁶ Therefore, one of the aims of the *Botanical Tables* was to make botany more accessible to women, without causing offense and as the 'Fair Sex' was the intended audience, Bute did not want any 'improper expression' to be found in it.¹³⁷ For example, the word *complete* was proposed instead of

¹³⁴ John Stuart, Earl of Bute, *Botanical Tables, Containing the Different Familys of British Plants*, vol. 1 (London, 1785)

¹³⁵ *Ibid.*, p. i

¹³⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 10

¹³⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 11

hermaphrodite.¹³⁸ The Earl hoped that by renaming the 'wanton' language, plants could be classified in a more systematic and scientific manner.

Bute was aware that he courted the censure of peers for revealing his reservations regarding Linnaeus's system of classification. He was mindful of the great advances made in botany and his belief that 'we are now approaching' the end of our intended plan when all British plants will be arranged in their respected tables, and the improvements made by Linnaeus had rendered this branch of Natural History a new science.¹³⁹ Despite the misgiving of the author, the *Botanical Tables* praises his botanical client, Sir John Hill, by telling readers that a detailed list of all the herbaceous plants in Britain can be found in that 'great work' of that 'excellent' naturalist.¹⁴⁰ The *Botanical Tables* were Bute's attempt to realise his 'great plan' in presenting a fully generalised system of classification that would extend from plants to the plant kingdom as a whole. He believed that one of the great difficulties in Linnaeus's publications was the translating of botanical terms into a modern and accessible language, and this was something that he wished to explore in *Botanical Tables*. In the 1750s, criticism of Linnaeus was shared by other botanists, (including Albrecht von Haller), but by the 1780s the Linnaean system was widely accepted by the botanical community. This meant that he found little support for his views. As only twelve copies were ever published, and its proposed method was never intended for a large audience, it could have little impact among botanists and the public. His successor at Kew, Joseph Banks, published very little. Indeed, few aristocratic patrons made classification theory, or the 'higher level' of work ordering the numerous specimens of animal, vegetable, and mineral their particular study. Despite being well-respected as a botanist by Gronovius and Collinson in from the 1740s to 1760s, the Earl of Bute was not accepted by the British botanical community, and was not invited to become of the Linnaean Society in 1788. This may be due in part to his public notoriety, or his criticism of Linnaeus in the *Botanical Tables*. The overall impression of the *Botanical Tables* was 'as a showy work, rather than useful'.¹⁴¹

¹³⁸ Ibid., p. 11

¹³⁹ Earl of Bute, *Botanical Tables*, pp. 2-3

¹⁴⁰ He is referring to *The Vegetable System*

¹⁴¹ Coats, *Lord Bute*, p. 44

THE SCIENTIFIC INTERESTS AND CORRESPONDENCE OF THE EARL OF BUTE

The correspondence between Bute and some of the leading botanists of the eighteenth century discloses a great deal regarding his scientific interests. Correspondence between men of science was important in relaying news, transmitting discoveries and ideas, and actively advancing science. Bute's correspondents include the Dutch botanist Johan Frederik Gronovius, the plant-collector Peter Collinson, and the English diplomat, art collector and geologist, John Strange. There are four letters between Gronovius and Bute in the Mount Stuart archives, but from the content of these letters we know that others have not survived. Gronovius was a pupil of Hermann Boerhaave at Leiden University, and a patron and correspondent of Linnaeus. In the 1730s, the colonial plant-collector, John Clayton (1693-1773), sent seeds and plants from Virginia to Gronovius, who in turn sent these specimens to Linnaeus for identification. Gronovius published his *Flora Virginia* based on these North American specimens between 1739 and 1743. This correspondence reveals the frequent exchange of books, information, and plant and mineral specimens between these two men.

The first letter was written by Bute from Mount Stuart on 11 July 1745 and sent to Gronovius who was still living in the important centre of botany, Leiden.¹⁴² It is obvious from this letter that they had been communicating for quite some time. Bute begins by thanking Gronovius for the trouble that he taken on his behalf, his 'oblidging letter last week' which contained 'seeds & dry'd plants', which may have included some North American specimens.¹⁴³ He expresses his disappointment in the letter's delay as it took 'several months coming here'.¹⁴⁴ This is not surprising considering the isolated location of the Isle of Bute, and letters in the eighteenth century could take up to six months to reach their destination. This letter reveals that Bute was in correspondence with his 'worthy Friend Dr Lawson', and confirms that Lawson was responsible for 'procuring me the amiable correspondence of one of your Learning and communicative temper'.¹⁴⁵ His friendship with Gronovius would ensure that even after Lawson's death in 1747, Bute continued to receive news and specimens from Leiden. He expresses his gratitude to Gronovius for providing a new method of preparing a

¹⁴² BU/116/2, (*General and Miscellaneous Correspondence*, Letter to Jan Frederick Gronovius, Leyden, concerning botanical matters, dated at Mount Stuart, 11 July 1745)

¹⁴³ Ibid

¹⁴⁴ Ibid

¹⁴⁵ Ibid

dry herbal (*hortus siccus*) and this method of preservation made it possible to study the herbs for a longer period of time. A *hortus siccus* is a collection of dried plants mounted on a sheet of paper and was used for scientific study, and Bute believed that the Gronovius's method was 'so elegant' and greatly excels any other kind he 'ever saw'.¹⁴⁶ From the Auction Sale Catalogues of 1794, we know that after Gronovius's death Bute purchased the two hundred and fifty volumes of his *hortus siccus*.

Bute continues his letter by confessing that Gronovius had sent him 'a great treasure in seeds' and that he was familiar with some of these specimens, like the Liberian kinds, and appeals to him to send the offered seeds from his garden.¹⁴⁷ In exchange for Gronovius's gift of seeds, Bute sends specimens that he collected from the Isle of Bute but apologises for the rather meagre offerings, lamenting that there were no 'very uncommon' plants, and that those that were peculiar to the sea were 'mostly if not all In Holland'. Instead, he offers to send a few shells that he thought were worth looking at, and which he promised to dispatch via his middleman in London, Peter Collinson.¹⁴⁸ Bute asks Gronovius for news on recent publications by Linnaeus and references a letter that he wrote to Lawson, expressing his desire of seeing soon the publication of the '*Philosophia Botanica* of the Prince of Botanists'.¹⁴⁹ As Gronovius did not mention its publication in his letter, it surmised that it must be 'not so near the light'.¹⁵⁰ His fears were justified as Linnaeus's *Philosophia Botanica* (1751), which gave a more detailed account of his binomial nomenclature, and was not published for another six years. In this letter, Bute was full of praise for Linnaeus and believes that *Philosophia Botanica* will 'see the remaining Hereticks in botany converted to His doctrine', and that the 'Prince of Botanists 'has in such a short period 'done more to embellish that lovely science, than all the united'.¹⁵¹ It is clear that Bute was an initial supporter of Linnaeus's advances in botany, but we know from later correspondence that he had some serious reservations about the Linnaean method, especially with extensive use of so many Swedish names and 'wanton' language.

¹⁴⁶ Ibid

¹⁴⁷ BU/116/2/2

¹⁴⁸ BU/116/2/3

¹⁴⁹ BU/116/2/2

¹⁵⁰ Ibid

¹⁵¹ Ibid

Gronovius's reply is dated 3 June 1746, and written eleven months after Bute's letter.¹⁵² He thanks Bute for his correspondence and his relief that the seeds he sent were 'acceptable'.¹⁵³ He provides news of Linnaeus's *Suecica* (1741) which lists 'a large number of new characters of plants, including a plant named after Bute - *Stewartia*'.¹⁵⁴ At this time, the Earl was sufficiently well-known in botanical circles and a supporter of Linnaeus to have a plant named after him (even if the spelling is incorrect). The letter also reveals that a new edition of Linnaeus's *System Naturae* was published in Paris in November 1744 that used French, rather than Swedish names. Gronovius had purchased the French edition two months prior and hoped to buy another copy for Bute, but was prevented by the 'present war (as they call it)'.¹⁵⁵ Therefore, it is apparent from this letter that Gronovius was supplying him with copies of Linnaeus's manuscripts and the difficulties of sending letters and specimens during wartime.

There is a nine year gap between the second and third letters – this letter is dated 10 July 1755 and penned by Bute after he moved to London. He had been living in the capital since 1745 and he informs Gronovius that he has 'left the country entirely' for the sake of his children's education.¹⁵⁶ The Jacobite Rising in Scotland in 1745, combined with the opportunities for advancement, were other reasons why the Bute family settled in London. The Earl reveals his opinions on recent scientific publications – he discusses the naturalist John Ellis's (c.1710-1776) *An Essay Towards a Natural History of the Corallines* (1755); Gronovius's *Flora Orientalis* (1755), and Laurens Theodorus Gronovius's (1730-1777) *Museum Ichthyologicum* (1754). John Ellis was elected to the Royal Society in 1754, and argued that sponges and corals were plants, rather than being a link between animals and plants. Bute admits that he had some reservations with this theory, and believes that Ellis did not supply 'sufficient conviction; to make me exclude coralls ... from the race of vegetable entirely'. Instead, he concludes that corals are 'the joint Product of the vegetable & animal life'.¹⁵⁷ Gronovius's *Flora Orientalis* was based on the oriental specimens collected by Leonhard Rauwolf in his eastern travels (1573-1575), which Bute believes was a valuable addition to

¹⁵² Ibid

¹⁵³ BU/98/1/18, (*General Political Papers*, Letter to Johann Frederick Gronovius, discussing botanical matters, Leiden, Holland, 3 January 1746 - 21 December 1756)

¹⁵⁴ Ibid

¹⁵⁵ This was most likely referring to the War of the Austrian Succession (1740-1748).

¹⁵⁶ BU/116/4/3, (*General and Miscellaneous Correspondence*, Letter to Jan Frederick Gronovius, regarding further botanical matters, 10 July 1755)

¹⁵⁷ BU/116/4/3

natural knowledge. Through Gronovius's intervention the works of Rauwolf being revived and becoming 'familiar to us'.¹⁵⁸ Finally, he thanks Gronovius for a copy of *Museum Ichthyologicum*, which contains a proposal for a new system of characterising amphibians and indicates that Gronovius's son was emulating his 'worthy Father' in 'cultivating so usefull so agreeable a study'.¹⁵⁹ Bute gratefully received Gronovius's gift and derived the 'greatest pleasure' from that that 'the Piece of Natural History'.¹⁶⁰ The final brief letter between Bute and Gronovius is dated 21 December 1756.¹⁶¹ Gronovius had sent a 'packet' with the second part of the *Museum Ichthyologicum* to Collinson in Grace Church Street that was to be forwarded to Bute on South Audley Street with his hopes that Bute would find its contents 'acceptable'.¹⁶²

The correspondence between Collinson and Bute reveals a significant amount of information regarding latter's scientific activities. These two letters reference the plant-subscription scheme of Collinson and Bartram and there are other surviving published letters between the pair.¹⁶³ The first letter written by Bute from Mount Stuart on 7 March 1745 reveals that they had been correspondents for some time.¹⁶⁴ Bute confesses that he would 'have answer'd your former oblidging letter' long ago but had waited until he had 'gott together specimens of all the shells this island affords'. Unfortunately, the specimens that he collected are 'so common and trifling' that he was 'asham'd to send so poor a Collection'. However, he hopes that there are different shells on the west Coast of Scotland that he can send and that would allow Collinson to 'best ... see all the shores afford'.¹⁶⁵ He divulges that Lady Bute has one of Martin Lister's (1639-1712) *Concha Candidata* in her collection, which is 'beautifully variegated with purple' but unfortunately no more have been found on the island.¹⁶⁶ Bute expresses his dismay and astonishment that although 'every country fellow

¹⁵⁸ BU/116/2; This was Leonhard Rauwolf (1535-1596), the German botanist who was famous for his travels through Syria and Mesopotamia and who published his '*Dr. Leonhart Rauwolf's Travels into the Eastern Countries*'.

¹⁵⁹ BU/116/4/2

¹⁶⁰ BU/116/4/2

¹⁶¹ BU/98/1/104, (*General Political Papers*, Letter to Johann Frederick Gronovius, discussing botanical matters, Leiden, Holland, 3 January 1746 - 21 December 1756)

¹⁶² Ibid

¹⁶³ These letters can be found in The Linnean Society of London and Alan W. Armstrong's "*Forget not Mee & My Garden...": Selected Letters 1725-1768 of Peter Collinson, F.R.S.*

¹⁶⁴ British Library, Add. 28726/154

¹⁶⁵ Ibid

¹⁶⁶ Add. 28726/155

can name the different shells found nigh his dwelling, the Learned have proper names for very few, but are oblidg'd in latin to describe them'.¹⁶⁷

Bute seizes the opportunity of requesting a box of seeds from Collinson and for the first shipment he chooses 'a small one' and will 'leave itt to your correspondent' to send what he can. He acknowledges that after receiving the first box he will be in a better position 'to judge; of what to write for again'.¹⁶⁸ This appeares to be the first box of seeds that Bute has requested from the Bartram-Collinson subscription scheme. He expresses the 'infinite obligation, all Lovers of Planting have to your good nature' and it delights him 'to see so generous an ardour for increasing the knowledge of Nature'. His closing remarks delcare that knowledge of nature 'infallibly brings a Good man to that of His Great Maker' and as a hobby is so easy an amusement that 'brings no care of trouble with it', and 'wonderfully calms the mind; subduing the fiercer passions, softens the heart and leaves the soul at safety'.¹⁶⁹ Finally, knowledge of nature exerted its 'greatest power, in thankfull acknowledgements to the bountiful hand who for Mans sole pleasure; has lavished myriads of beautys, over the whole Creation'.¹⁷⁰

A second letter Bute sent to Collinson is dated 4 March 1746 and was sent from Twickenham. He begins by expressing his gratitude and pleasure at the seeds he received and hopes that a comprehensive list of the seeds can be provided.¹⁷¹ He confesses that he has not written earlier as 'had so litle to say from a place like this'. However, he was pleased to receive from Gronovius a method of making an elegant *hortus siccus* before he left Scotland, and which he intends to 'labour at itt this summer'. He finishes the letter by asking for Dr. Lawson's address.¹⁷² This scientific correspondence reveals Bute's botanical interests, shows how well-connected he was in scholarly circles, and demonstrates how seriously he was taken as a botanist.

¹⁶⁷ Ibid

¹⁶⁸ Ibid

¹⁶⁹ Add. 28726/156

¹⁷⁰ Add. 28726/156

¹⁷¹ Add. 28726/159

¹⁷² Ibid

BUTE'S CORRESPONDENCE WITH STRANGE AND THE EIGHTEENTH-CENTURY DEBATE ON THE ORIGIN OF VOLCANOES

Bute's scientific interests shifted to geology, the study of fossils, and volcanoes after his return from the Grand Tour in 1771. During the 1770s, the English diplomat, John Strange, became one of his correspondents.¹⁷³ Strange was appointed British Ambassador to Venice in 1773, and facilitated the exchange of information, botany and mineral specimens, and art between Britain and Italy throughout the 1770s and 1780s.¹⁷⁴ Strange left England in 1757 on his Grand Tour and travelled throughout Italy before visiting Tuscany and remaining there until 1764.¹⁷⁵ This began his long association with Italy. He maintained a lifelong interest in archaeology and geology, especially in the various regions which he visited, and authored a number of manuscripts on these subjects that were published both in Britain and Italy.¹⁷⁶ As a traveller-naturalist, Strange supported the use of maps and illustrations in research, and emphasised the importance of having accurate depictions of both objects and archaeological sites in the areas he visited. During his Grand Tour of Italy Strange travelled to Rome and Naples, collected volcanic shells, established a reputation as a virtuoso among his European colleagues, and became a member of a number of prominent Italian academies.¹⁷⁷

As a result of his scientific accomplishments on the continent, and after his return to England, Strange was elected to both the Society of Antiquities and to the Royal Society in 1766.¹⁷⁸ In 1768, he published an account of Roman remains in South Wales that was read at the Society of Antiquaries between 13 and 20 April 1769.¹⁷⁹ Strange returned to Italy again in 1771, and remained there until 1786. He spent his first year studying extinct volcanoes in Veneto and the Euganean Hills, and visited northern parts of Italy. In 1773, and with Bute's support, he was appointed British Ambassador in Venice and his duties and responsibilities

¹⁷³ G. R de Beer, 'John Strange, F.R.S (1732-1799), *Notes and Records of the Royal Society of London*, Vol. 9, No. 1 (Oct., 1951), p. 96

¹⁷⁴ Lucia Ciancio, *A Calendar of the Correspondence of John Strange F.R.S (1732-1799)*, (London, 1995), p. 23

¹⁷⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 12

¹⁷⁶ These include *An Account of a Curious Giant's Causeway, or Group of Angular Columns, Newly Discovered in the Euganean Hills, near Padua, in Italy*, (Venice, 1775) and *An Account of Several Sepulchral Inscriptions and Figures in Bas-Relief, Discovered at Bonn In Lower Germany*, (London, 1770)

¹⁷⁷ Ciancio, *A Calendar of the Correspondence of John Strange F.R.S (1732-1799)*, pp. 13-19; Strange became a member of the Botanical Societies of Florence and Cortona and in 1763 was elected to the Bologna Academy of Sciences

¹⁷⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 20

¹⁷⁹ John Strange, *An Account of Some Remains of Roman and Other Antiquities in and near Brecknock, in South Wales*, (London, 1769)

meant that he had to spend considerably less time in the Italian countryside. His interest in natural history did not wane, and he employed local naturalists to survey and catalogue notable geological and archaeological sites. In 1774, Strange employed one of these local naturalists, Alberto Fortis (1741-1803), whom he met in 1771, to carry out geological research. Fortis had previously been one of the Earl of Bute's scientific clients and sponsor of the naturalist's expedition to Cherso and Dalmatia in 1770.¹⁸⁰

Over the course of his scientific career, Strange corresponded with a number of eminent British and Italian naturalists. Among his Italian correspondents were Charles Bonnet (1721-1793) and Giovanni Arduino (1713-1795), who is considered the father of Italian geology. Strange acted as a go-between and negotiated the exchange of seeds from Joseph Banks in London to the botanists Giovanni Targioni Tozzetti (1712-1783) and Giovanni Antonio Scopoli (1723-1783) in Italy.¹⁸¹ He assisted the English botanist Thomas Martyn (1735-1825) by purchasing specimens for his natural history collection at Cambridge University.¹⁸² Strange also acted as broker for his clients, including Bute, by purchasing scientific collections and works of art on the continent that he later sent to Britain. His position as Ambassador was ideally suited to his role as a scientific and art collector.¹⁸³

Bute and Strange were most likely introduced prior to Strange's second Italian tour in 1771.¹⁸⁴ His appointment as Ambassador two years later provided an annual salary of £1500 and allowed him to remain in Italy, patronise local naturalists, and build up his own collection of minerals and art.¹⁸⁵ Strange became one of his closest scientific advisors and literary contacts and procured books for Bute on all aspects on natural history. It is estimated that Bute bought approximately 3,000 volumes in Venice through Strange.¹⁸⁶ He relied upon Strange to keep him informed of mineral and fossil collections for sale and of any recent publications from continental naturalists in mineralogy and natural history. In return, Bute sent collections of specimens and news from Britain.¹⁸⁷ Some of their correspondence from 1771 survives where Strange wrote of his 'desire and zeal to serve you' and to 'communicate

¹⁸⁰ See chapter 4

¹⁸¹ Ciancio, *A Calendar of the Correspondence of John Strange*, p. 34

¹⁸² Lucia Ciancio, 'The correspondence of a "virtuoso" of the late Enlightenment: John Strange and the relationship between British and Italian naturalists', *Archives of Natural History*, (1995) 22 (1), p. 119

¹⁸³ Miller, "'My favourite studdys": Lord Bute as naturalist', p. 223

¹⁸⁴ Russell, *John 3rd Earl of Bute*, p. 96

¹⁸⁵ Ciancio, *A Calendar of the Correspondence of John Strange F.R.S (1732-1799)*, p. 29

¹⁸⁶ Russell, *John 3rd Earl of Bute*, p. 96

¹⁸⁷ Miller, "'My favourite studdys": Lord Bute as naturalist', p. 223

to you such particulars of Litterary news as have occurred since my last'.¹⁸⁸ He requests Bute send mineral specimens, common in Britain but not native to Italy, to the naturalist Dr. Antonio Mastini (1717-1801).¹⁸⁹ Strange informs the Earl that he had paid all of his outstanding debts owed to Mastini and the naturalist and collector, Girolamo Festari (1738-1801). When the Earl of Bute's collections were sold after his death Strange purchased some specimens from his mineralogical collection.¹⁹⁰

By 1767, Bute was suffering from ill-health and melancholy and was persuaded by his brother Mackenzie to travel to a warmer climate for his well-being, and to restore his flagging spirits.¹⁹¹ From 1768 to 1771, Bute undertook his own Grand Tour, and his travels on the continent both revived his health and his furthered his interest in natural history.¹⁹² Travelogues, or travel literature, became extremely popular in the eighteenth century and Bute's travel diaries recount journeys through Barèges and the Pyrenees in 1768, and Venice, Holland, and Germany in early 1769. In 1771, he was in France and later travelled to Rome and Naples. Bute's notes, and 'trifling observations', on aspects of natural history in the regions he visited were recorded in a notebook, which he later presented to his son Charles who had accompanied him on some of his travels.¹⁹³ These travel diaries reveal Bute's 'predilection' for natural history and his belief that very few travel writers have 'a turn to this beautiful science'.¹⁹⁴ They record his interest in the minerals, fossils, and botanical treasures that he encountered. However, his poor health meant that many of his observations were written 'in my Chaise'.¹⁹⁵ After Bute's return to London, his ties at Kew Gardens were severed by Princess Augusta's death, and throughout the 1770s, Bute's scientific interests increasingly turned to geological matters.¹⁹⁶

Bute's interest in geology was stimulated by the specimens and reports on new discoveries provided by Strange. This included works on the study of volcanoes which was a topic of particular interest to natural historians in the latter half of the eighteenth century. This enthusiasm for volcanoes was heightened by the eruptions of Vesuvius (in 1760 and

¹⁸⁸ Mount Stuart Archives BU/123/1

¹⁸⁹ Ibid

¹⁹⁰ Ciancio, *A Calendar of the Correspondence of John Strange*, p. 37

¹⁹¹ National Library of Scotland, The Mure of Caldwell Papers, MS 4944/120. Letter from Mackenzie to Mure on the 9 July 1768.

¹⁹² Miller, "'My favourite studdys": Lord Bute as naturalist', p. 222

¹⁹³ Cambridge University Archives, Add. 8826, p. 2

¹⁹⁴ Ibid., pp. 29-30

¹⁹⁵ Ibid

¹⁹⁶ Miller, "'My favourite studdys": Lord Bute as naturalist', p. 222

1779), and it sparked an increased interest in geology, the nature of the Earth, its origins, and components of the Earth's crust. Strange had examined extinct volcanoes in northern Italy and published two works on this topic in the *Philosophical Transactions* that were well-received among natural historians.¹⁹⁷ Many naturalists encountered difficulties in understanding the formation of volcanoes and reconciling the violent, and often destructive, properties of volcanic activity within the established order of nature.¹⁹⁸ Most argued that volcanic formations were caused by either water or by a 'central heat'.¹⁹⁹ Some naturalists believed that volcanic eruptions were a necessary part of the natural order because despite the obvious destructive properties, the aftermath of a volcanic eruption increased soil fertility and led to regeneration of the region.²⁰⁰ Eighteenth-century naturalists like William Hamilton (1731-1803) and James Hutton (1726-1797), began to study the makeup of the earth in a systemic manner with the aim of uncovering the origins and purpose of volcanic eruptions. This led to a renewed debate on history of the earth.

The history, (or theory of the earth,) was an extremely controversial topic during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries and hundreds of works were published on this subject. The chronology proposed by Archbishop James Ussher (1581-1656), which was widely accepted calculated in the eighteenth century, calculated that the earth was created on the 23 October 4004 BC.²⁰¹ Naturalists, including William Hamilton, James Hutton, and Georges-Louis Leclerc, Comte de Buffon (1707-1788), rejected the Ussher chronology as recent geological discoveries, and evidence, effectively disputed this timeline. The Comte de Buffon published his *Historie Naturelle* and attacked the popular Biblical accounts given by William Whiston (1667-1752) and other ecclesiastical theorists of the history of the earth. From experimentation with cooling globes, he found that the age of the Earth was not only 4,000 or 5,000 years as inferred in the Bible, but rather 75,000 years. By the mid-eighteenth century, it became increasingly acceptable to question the age of the Earth from a scientific perspective without religious preconceptions.

Naturalists became more concerned with mineralogy and the chemical analysis of minerals, and attempted to establish a more comprehensive chronology of Earth's past that

¹⁹⁷ Ciancio, 'The correspondence of a "virtuoso" of the late Enlightenment', p. 119

¹⁹⁸ Mary Ashburn Miller, *A Natural History of Revolution: Violence and Nature in the French Revolutionary Imagination, 1789-1792*, (New York, 2011), p. 142

¹⁹⁹ Ibid

²⁰⁰ Ibid., p. 145

²⁰¹ Cian Duffy, *The Landscapes of the Sublime 1700-1830: Classic Ground*, (New York, 2013), p. 70

brought bringing together evidence drawn from the diverse intellectual fields, including a study of the Bible. The British Ambassador in Naples, Hamilton, wrote reports on the eruptions of Edna and Vesuvius and sent them to the Royal Society. His *Observations on Mount Vesuvius, Mount Etna, and other volcanoes, in a series of letters addressed to the Royal Society* was published in 1772.²⁰² He maintained that rather than being remnants of a flood, volcanoes had an inherent heat and played a crucial part in the creation, destruction, and regeneration of the earth. This viewpoint became extremely popular in France during the 1780s.²⁰³ Strange and Bute were both engaged in the debate on volcanoes and the history of the earth. Strange believed the Ussher chronology had to be rejected based on the paleontological observations he made in Britain and Italy. For his part, in 1781, Bute began to compile a critical review of the existing literature, and attempted to establish which theory best fitted the geological facts but was also compatible with his religious beliefs. He agreed for the most part with Strange, and commented diligently upon the work of other students of volcanoes such as Fortis.²⁰⁴ Bute's *Observations on the Natural History of the Earth* was a critical review of the existing literature that was never published.²⁰⁵ He accepted that the geological evidence supported the theory that the world had once been entirely covered by the sea but had 'the greatest difficulty' in imaging how this 'astonishing change' and subsequent withdrawal of the waters had occurred.²⁰⁶ Bute's preferred theory of the earth was put forward by Jean André de Luc (1727-1817).²⁰⁷

De Luc did not support the Ussher chronology and instead proposed that the seven days of creation actually corresponded to seven vast periods of time. For the most part, Bute supported this theory, but they differed over the cause of the biblical flood. He believed that the flood was a miracle caused entirely by the hand of God, whereas de Luc considered it the result of natural events. Despite his considerable scientific knowledge, and his chemical experiments, Bute implicitly believed in the miracle of creation.²⁰⁸ Despite their differing

²⁰² Sir William Hamilton, *Observations on Mount Vesuvius, Mount Etna, and other volcanoes, in a series of letters addressed to the Royal Society*, (London, 1772)

²⁰³ Miller, *A Natural History of Revolution: Violence and Nature in the French Revolutionary Imagination, 1789-1792*, p. 143

²⁰⁴ Miller, "My favourite studdys", p. 224

²⁰⁵ Cherry L.E. Lewis, "'Our favourite science": Lord Bute and James Parkinson searching for a Theory of the Earth', *Geological Society, London, Special Publications 2009*; v. 310; p. 112

²⁰⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 113

²⁰⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 115

²⁰⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 116

opinions, de Luc revealed in his *Geological Travels* that he stayed with the Earl at Highcliffe though failed to record any topic of conversation.²⁰⁹

Bute and Strange had a mutually beneficial patron-client relationship. Initially, Bute was responsible for securing Strange's appointment as Ambassador, and this provided Strange with a sufficient income to amass his own art and science collections and to patronise local naturalists. In return, Bute relied upon Strange to purchase books, mineral collections, art, and to report on new developments and publications on natural history. After his 'retirement' from Kew in 1772, Strange became a significant correspondent and source of information. Strange's natural history collection, like Bute's, was considered to be 'one of the most extensive (private) collections in Europe with some valuable pieces of art.'²¹⁰ Strange's collections were sold after his death, and the enormity of his library was confirmed when it was auctioned in 1801 and sold over twenty-nine days.²¹¹

BUTE'S SCIENTIFIC LIBRARY AND THE AUCTION-SALE CATALOGUES, 1793-1794

There were a number of aristocrats, or wealthy individuals, during the eighteenth century who had the means and ability to indulge their intellectual curiosities, and amassed large private collections of shells, minerals, fossils, scientific instruments, and libraries. A number of these private collections from the eighteenth century still survive, which is extremely rare. These include Sir Hans Sloane's cabinet of curiosities that formed the basis of the British Museum in 1753, and George III's collection of scientific instruments at the Science Museum in London.

Sir Hans Sloane's large collection of curiosities of approximately 80,000 items, and additional 50,000 books and manuscripts, was amassed between the 1680s and 1740s. Sloane became a member of the Royal Society in 1685, serving as Secretary and finally, President of the organisation. His activities as a collector began when he travelled to Jamaica as the personal physician of Christopher Monck, second Duke of Albemarle (1653-1688), and began to accumulate a diverse collection of natural history items including shells, insects, and plants from the Island.²¹² After his return to England, he purchased collections from

²⁰⁹ Ibid., p. 117

²¹⁰ Ciancio, *A Calendar of the Correspondence of John Strange F.R.S (1732-1799)*, p. 38

²¹¹ Ibid

²¹² Marjorie Swann, *Curiosities and Texts: The Culture of Collecting in Early Modern England*, (Philadelphia, 2001), p.

other enthusiasts, including James Petiver's (c.1665-1718) natural history collection (for which he paid £4000), and botanical specimens by Nehemiah Grew (1641-1710). Fearing that his substantial collection would be dispersed upon his death, and hoping that the King or Parliament would purchase it for the nation, his Trustees offered to sell the entirety for £20,000, which was approximately a quarter or fifth of its true value.²¹³

Like his tutor, George III was keenly interested in scientific matters, and the 'King George III Collection' of scientific instruments is on show at Science Museum in London. The collection contains two different sets of instruments - one by the instrument-maker George Adams (c.1709-1772), and other by the public lecturer, Stephen Demainbray (1710-1782). In 1760, the King commissioned Adams to produce a set of instructing instruments for his family. These instruments are extremely ornate and include an extravagant silver covered microscope. Demainbray's apparatus were less elaborate and expensive and used in his natural philosophy lectures, both to members of the Royal Family and to the public. The 'King George III Collection' is the most comprehensive collection of eighteenth-century instruments and contains well over a thousand objects.²¹⁴ George III also had a significant personal library which was donated to the British Museum by his son, George IV (1762-1830), in 1823. It contained over sixty-five thousand volumes and nineteen thousand unbound pamphlets, besides a large collection of maps and charts.²¹⁵

There were significant collections of the eighteenth century that unfortunately do not survive, including the large scientific library and collection of instruments of the Earl of Ilay, and the Earl of Bute's impressive collection of minerals, philosophical instruments, and scientific books and manuscripts, which were both sold after their deaths. Bute's scientific collection was said to have rivalled George III's, but he instructed his family to sell the majority of objects after his death – most likely because of the space required to house the collection, and the expense of maintaining it. A number of documents still survive which reveal the extent his scientific library and collection of instruments. Firstly, there is a *Catalogue of the Library of the third Earl of Bute* at Mount Stuart that was compiled c.1738.²¹⁶ Secondly, there is a twelve page catalogue of items which Bute purchased from the Argyll

196

²¹³ Ibid., p. 198

²¹⁴ Gerard L'E. Turner, *Scientific Instruments and Experimental Philosophy 1550-1850*, (Hampshire, 1990), p. 215

²¹⁵ John Brooke, 'The Library of King George III', *The Yale University Library Gazette*, Vol. 52, No. 1 (July 1977), p. 42

²¹⁶ Mount Stuart Archive, MS/41

estate after the death of his uncle in 1761.²¹⁷ Finally, there is the Auction Sale Catalogues of 1793-1794 which list the many items sold after his death.²¹⁸

Bute wrote the *Catalogue of the Library* sometime around 1738. It lists all the works that were in the library before this date, and details the manuscripts that he acquired between 1738 and 1759. Many gentlemen stocked their private libraries with a great many texts that covered a wide range of subjects, and the *Catalogue* contains 271 pages, and divided into various subject headings, including theology, geography, mathematics, chemistry, botany, and horticulture. It also lists the place and year of publication for each work. There are approximately four thousand works in total. Approximately five hundred of these were on botany and horticulture, with a further six hundred and twenty manuscripts on natural history. There are two distinct types of handwriting which indicate texts that were purchased before 1738, and those bought between 1738 and 1759. There are a number of texts in his library that were essential for any eighteenth century botanist, including Linnaeus's *System Natura* (1735) and *Hortus Cliffortanus* (1737); Boerhaave's *Index alter plantarum quae in Horto Academico Lugduno* (1727); and Tournefort's *Institutiones rei Herbarial* (1719) all acquired before 1738.

The majority of the horticultural texts were added before 1738, possibly purchased by Bute's father, and very few horticultural works were acquired after this date. Therefore, the library reflects the interests of each owner. Among the natural history works in the Mount Stuart library were Ellis's An Essay Towards a Natural History of the Corallines (1755) which he commented upon in a letter to Gronovius. As an avid plant-hunter, the Earl has a copy of Catesby's *The Natural History of Carolina, Florida, and the Bahama Islands* (1731), and many editions of Miller's *Gardener's Dictionary*. We also see works by his clients, including Hill's *Mederia Medici* (1751) and Chambers's *Treatise on Civil Architecture* (1759).²¹⁹ We can infer

²¹⁷ Mount Stuart Archive, BU/153

²¹⁸ See Thomas King, *A Catalogue (Part First) of Duplicates of Ores, Petrifications, Spars, Gems, Crystals, and Other Articles of Natural History, Selected from the Extensive and Valuable Collection of the Late Right Honourable John Earl of Bute*, (London, 1793); Thomas King, *A Catalogue (Part the Second) of Duplicates of Ores, Petrifications, Spars, Gems, Crystals, and Other Articles of Natural History, Selected from the Extensive and Valuable Collection of the Late Right Honourable John Earl of Bute*, (London, 1793); Thomas King, *A Catalogue (Part the Third and Last) of Duplicates of Ores, Petrifications, Spars, Gems, Crystals, and Other Articles of Natural History, Selected from the Extensive and Valuable Collection of the Late Right Honourable John Earl of Bute*, (London, 1794); Hassil Hutchins, *A Catalogue of the Extensive and Capital Collection of Prints, Of the Rt. Hon. the Earl of Bute*, (London, 1794); Leigh and Sotheby, *A Catalogue of the Botanical and Natural History Part of the Library of the Late John, Earl of Bute*, (London, 1794)

²¹⁹ MS/41/149; MS/41/145; MS/41/188; MS/41/184; MS/41/207

from this *Catalogue* that nearly half the total works on botany were added after 1738, and that the majority of the manuscripts that Bute purchased between 1738 and 1759 were in the subjects of botany and natural history.

Since Ilay had no legitimate children, his English possessions were left to his mistress, Elizabeth Ann Williams (d.1762). Her son, Colonel William Williams (later Campbell), sold Ilay's books, maps, prints, pamphlets, and instruments to Bute on her behalf. This catalogue is entitled *An Inventory of Sundry, Tables, Bookshelves of his Grace the Duke of Argyle deceased at his graces House in Argyle Building Appraised the 4th September 1761*.²²⁰ The library contents were appraised by David Wilson and Thomas Payne, and the instrument collection by George Adams. *An Inventory* gives a list of some of the instruments that Bute acquired along with a list of prices he paid for the collections. In total, he paid £86 7/= for the furniture in the library, and a further £3605 9/= for the collections of manuscripts, books, prints, and pamphlets in the library room.²²¹ Unfortunately, the *Inventory* does not give us an account of the titles or number of manuscripts that were sold. Roger Emerson estimates that the total cost of Ilay's London library could not be less than £6000 /=, and if that is true that Bute acquired over half of his manuscripts.²²²

However, we are more fortunate in having a complete list of the instruments, clocks, and seals that Bute purchased. These include a three-and-half foot orrery by Thomas Wright (1711-1786); an astronomical quadrant by Richard Glynn (1681-1755); a small wainscot camera; a 21 inch Gallilean telescope; an old James Wilson microscope; and a hollow cylindrical dial by Peter le Mairs at Paris.²²³ The instruments in the *Inventory* were valued by George Adams at £388 2 6/=, though Bute did not purchase all of Ilay's instruments. He paid a further £12 9/= for his uncle's map collection, and £523 1 6/= for his collection of clocks and watches.²²⁴ Bute was able to afford to spend such a significant sum after his wife inherited the bulk of her father's estate in January 1761. In total, he paid in excess of £4000/= for part of his uncle's collection.

There were a number of auction sales between 1793 and 1794 which sold the majority of Bute's collection of scientific instruments, minerals, natural history and botanical

²²⁰ BU/153, (*Legal/Financial: Estate of 3rd Duke of Argyll*, 04 September 1761 - 19 November 1761)

²²¹ BU/153/2

²²² Emerson, 'The Scientific Interests of Archibald Campbell, 3rd Duke of Ilay (1682-1761)', p. 28

²²³ BU/153/3

²²⁴ BU/153/8

texts, and prints. We can compare the extent of Bute's collection at his death with another significant eighteenth century natural history, the 'cabinet of curiosities' that was accumulated by Margaret Cavendish-Harley, the Duchess of Portland.²²⁵ Her collection was sold, over thirty-eight days in 1786, in order to restore the family fortunes as the Duchess had spent a considerable sum in amassing the collection.²²⁶ There are a few striking similarities between the Duchess of Portland and Bute. They were both from noble families with interests in science. The Duchess's father was Edward Harley, second Earl of Oxford (1689-1741) and his collection was sold to the nation for £10,000, (also at a fraction of its value), and became part of the British Museum. She was a patron of arts and sciences, and counted among her clients the botanical illustrator, Georg Dionysius Ehret and Daniel Solander (1733-1782), and like Bute, she had the wealth to indulge her passion for collecting. However, she was primarily a collector-patron and did not publish any scientific works. As botany was considered an acceptable activity for aristocratic women she was one of the recipients of Bute's *Botanical Tables*.

The Duchess of Portland's 'cabinet of curiosities' was located in her London residence at Whitehall and on her Bulstrode estate in Buckinghamshire, with many contemporaries visiting her collections and marvelling at the shells, porcelain, and artwork. It contained objects from around the world and the majority of the Duchess's collection that was sold (90%) was natural history items and pieces of porcelain. The Duchess of Portland's collection contained over five thousand items - four thousand natural history objects (that took twenty nine days to sell), and one thousand porcelain pieces from exotic locations such as Japan and China.²²⁷

How does the Earl of Bute's collection compare with the Duchess of Portland's? We know the extent of Bute's collection because there were a number of separate auctions which took place between 1793 and 1794. The first of these was the sale of his extensive collection of optical, mathematical, and philosophical instruments that took place between the 5 and 7 of February 1793. There were a total of 264 lots. Like King George III, Bute acquired a number of instruments by George Adams, some of which were covered in silver

²²⁵ Stacey Sloboda, 'Displaying Materials: Porcelain and Natural History in the Duchess of Portland's Museum', *Eighteenth-Century Studies*, Vol. 43, No. 4 (Summer, 2010), pp. 455-472

²²⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 455; Skinner and Co. *A Catalogue of the Portland Museum, lately the property of the Duchess Dowager of Portland, Deceased*, (London, 1786)

²²⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 456

and featured the 'best finishing and mounting'.²²⁸ An architectural sector, (an instrument invented by Bute), also by Adams, is described as weighting of 24oz of silver, and was sold for £6/=.²²⁹ Alongside these lavishly decorated instruments were less ornate and functional objects, such as a microscope for specifically viewing fossils and hundreds of boxes with microscopic specimens of seeds, moss, and woods.²³⁰ An auction of the apparatus and contents of his laboratory at Luton Hoo occurred on 3 June, with 19 lots. Bute employed the chemist Peter Woulfe to conduct experiments in his laboratory and among the items sold at auction were phials, jars, an incomplete air-pump, black-pot furnace, and boxes of 'substances used in chemistry'.²³¹ The total raised was £1337 9/=. Next was the sale of Bute's extensive and valuable mineral collection, which due to its enormity took thirteen days to sell.

Bute's collection of minerals contained 1578 lots and sold for approximately £1225/=.²³² In the advertisement of *A Catalogue of Duplicates of Ores, Petrifications, Spars, Gems, Crystals, and Other Articles of Natural History*, the auctioneer revealed why lots of this history mineral collection were described as *duplicates*. Initially, some of these specimens were categorised as inferior or duplicates, though after careful examination the auctioneer explains that very few of the minerals are of a poor quality. Included in this sale was furniture and cabinets from the Earl's library; carvings in ivory; boxes containing corals and fossils of a number of species; a large quartz crystal; goose dung silver ore; and a selection of Egyptian pebbles.²³³ This sale included an entire collection of minerals, consisting of four hundred specimens systematically arranged in a neat mahogany cabinet, with twenty two glazed drawers with all the specimens labelled and individually described in a catalogue belonging to the collection.

There was a further auction was the collection of paintings and prints on the 31 of March 1794 and which took a total of sixteen days to sell. There were 1560 lots and the total value of the sale was £2790 16 6/=. The final auction was of Bute's botanical and natural history library and this lasted ten days. The total of 1257 lots sold for £3470 3 6/=. The auction of Bute's botanical and natural history library we can ascertain the extent of Bute's

²²⁸ Turner, *Scientific Instruments and Experimental Philosophy 1550-1850*, p. 230

²²⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 234; *The Gentleman's Magazine*, vol. Lxxviii, p. 5

²³⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 231

²³¹ *Ibid.*, p. 241

²³² King, *A Catalogue (Part Second)*, p. 60; King, *A Catalogue (Part Third)*, p. 46

²³³ Turner, *Scientific Instruments and Experimental Philosophy 1550-1850*, p. 214

scientific library and some of books and manuscripts that he acquired from 1759 onwards. According to the *Catalogue*, Bute owned three volumes of Catesby's *The Natural History Carolina* and two of his drawings of flowers.²³⁴ Unfortunately, the catalogue does not give a description of these drawings so we do not know what they were. His extensive library contained many of Philip Miller's publications, including *Catalogus Plantarum in Horto Botanica Chelseano* (1730), *Figures et Plants described in his Gardiner's Dictionary* (1760), and *Illustration of the Sexual System of Linnaeus and the Termini Botanici* (1779, 89).²³⁵

Contained in Bute's collection was a book of drawings of plants by Miller, including five volumes containing 910 figures of plants sketched and coloured by J. Miller.²³⁶ Bute had many of Linnaeus's works, including eight editions of *Genera Plantarum*, and a *Hortus Siccus of Linnaeus*, which is undated.²³⁷ Lot 1241 of the auction was a *Tabulae Plantarum*, compiled and arranged by the Earl and containing a 'complete' collection of botanical history with drawings by different artists and forming fifty-two volumes.²³⁸ Other items which were sold were some seed and plant catalogues from Kew including, 'Exotic Plants from the Royal Gardens at Kew'; Hill's *Hortus kewensis* (1769); Aiton's *Hortus Kewensis* (1789); and Taylor's drawing of plants from Kew. As a prominent botanical figure and patron, he supported individuals like Hill and William Curtis. He owned copies of Hill's *Eden* and *Vegetable System*, and a copy of Curtis's *Flora Londinensis*.

In all, Bute's collection contained 4,678 items and was valued at £7,486/=. In comparison, the Duchess of Portland collection was sold for over £10,974 5 6/= and consisted of 4,156 items. This difference in value between the collections can be explained by the sale of various antiques and jewels sold as part of the Portland Museum. This part of the collection raised over £3,000/= and included a Roman vase (the famous Portland vase at the British Museum) that sold for £1,029/= and bought by the Duchess's son, the third Duke of Portland. In comparison, there were no antiques or jewels in Bute's collection.

What else do these catalogues reveal regarding Bute's collection? The manuscripts of the optical, mathematical, and philosophical instruments are kept in the British Library and are discussed by Gerard Turner in his *Scientific Instruments and Experimental Philosophy*

²³⁴ Leigh and Sotheby, *A Catalogue of the Botanical and Natural History part of the Library of the late John, Earl of Bute*, p. 42 & 46

²³⁵ *Ibid.*, pp. 13 & 36 & 41; Mount Stuart Archive, MS 41/188

²³⁶ Leigh and Sotheby, *A Catalogue of the Botanical and Natural History*, p. 52

²³⁷ *Ibid.*, pp. 33 & 64

²³⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 53

1550-1850. In these catalogues is a list of individuals who purchased some of the instruments and what was the price they paid. Among the lots sold were two 18 inch Galilean telescope, (one of these may have been from the Ilay collection), and a three-and-a-half foot Jesse Ramsden (1735-1800) telescope.²³⁹ Some of Bute's clients purchased items. Tiberius Cavallo (1749-1809) bought a number of telescopes by Peter Dollond (1731-1821) costing £42 /=-, and Bute's physician, Dr. George Fordyce, bought a microscope by Benjamin Martin (1794-1782) for £5 5/=-.²⁴⁰ There was an ivory one foot perspective sector mounted in silver in the collection by Joshua Kirby, who was a scientific client of Bute's and later became a client of George III, and which was sold to Joseph Huddart (1741-1816).²⁴¹ A four feet orrery by Thomas Wright (possibly from the Ilay collection) was sold to William Jones and cost £68 5 /=-²⁴² Among the objects that were sold during the laboratory sale in June was lot 251 that contained three portions of a large tusks from a mammoth found near Ohio and was very rare, along with a letter from Collinson.²⁴³

A collection of reflects the wealth and particular curiosities of its owner, and the Earl of Bute's collection is vast in quantity and kind. There are manuscripts, books, paintings, shells, corals, ores, minerals, crystals, exotic insects, English insects, fine old China, rare old gold and Silver from Japan, snuff boxes, fishes, bird's eggs, crabs, optical instruments, mathematical instruments, philosophical instruments, and laboratory apparatus. The wealth of the collection's owner is apparent in the elegant instruments made in silver – an architectonic sector and universal pocket sun-dial made for Charles II – auctioned alongside many practical and useful instruments, such as magnifiers, lens, microscopes, and reading glasses. The collection reveals as a scholar-collector, many of the instruments and laboratory apparatus were practical for use in experiments and study. Bute's library contains lists some of the most well-known scientific works of the eighteenth century along with catalogues, lectures on botany, and more obscure works - Miller's catalogue of Chelsea Gardens (1730) and John Martyn's first lecture on a course of Botany (1729). It also informs us that Bute was still purchasing botanical works in the late 1780s – there is a copy of Erasmus Darwin's poem

²³⁹ Turner, *Scientific Instruments and Experimental Philosophy 1550-1850*, pp. 229-230

²⁴⁰ *Ibid.*, pp. 230-231

²⁴¹ *Ibid.*, p. 234

²⁴² *Ibid.*, p. 238; This item may have been sold to William Jones (1762-1831) the instrument maker.

²⁴³ *Ibid.*, p. 241

Botanic Garden (1789) and the botanist, Charles Louis L'Héritier de Brutelle's *Sertum Anglicum* (1788).

Bute was one of the great eighteenth-century aristocratic plant-collectors along with the Earl of Ilay, Baron Petre, and the Duke of Richmond. He imported many new species of trees and plants into Britain, and helped to transform Kew Gardens into the National Botanic Gardens. The number of new species that he introduced to Britain is evident from William Aiton's *Hortus Kewensis* where he ranks alongside the great importer of American trees, Peter Collinson. Unlike his 'brother gardeners', Bute was interested in the 'higher level' work of plant classification and was sufficiently regarded as a botanist by Collinson and Linnaeus to exchange information and specimens and to have a plant named after him. He was part of a European botanical network that included Collinson and the patrons of Linnaeus - Isaac Lawson and Jan Frederik Gronovius. Despite Bute's role as a scientific patron and plant-collector, he was never elected to either the Royal Society or the Linnaean Society. His unpopularity in the press, the many years spent in retirement, and his criticism of Linnaeus in the 1780s may help to explain some of the reasons why Bute is not counted as an influential eighteenth-century botanist. His only published work, *Botanical Tables*, had a very small circulation and little impact in the botanical world. As a scientific collector of minerals, instruments, and manuscripts, his collection rivalled or exceeded that of Argyll's and was equal to that of the Duchess of Portland. However, due to his contemporary reputation, Bute's contributions to botany and Kew have been discounted or forgotten.

CHAPTER 2

'SUPPORTED BY POWERFUL PATRONAGE': BUTE AS ROYAL CLIENT, 1750-1772'¹

This chapter will focus on the Earl of Bute's position as a royal client and his role as a patronage broker between Princess Augusta, George III and their clients. The role of patronage broker would enhance a client's status as they could control royal patronage and divert some of it for their own use. This is a role where a person could play more than one role at a time and be a patron, a broker, or client simultaneously. This chapter will assess Bute's role as an intermediary between clients and his royal patrons, and whether the clients he introduced to Princess Augusta and George III were successful in search for patronage as well as the benefits that he received as a royal client. This chapter will examine if Bute aided his own clients by arranging an introduction to either of his royal patrons; and whether he provided patronage to any of these royal clients.

A client would seek patronage from a member of the royal family to benefit from employment opportunities, pensions, and a rise in social status. Prior to his friendship with Prince Frederick, and entrance into royal circles, Bute's unremarkable political career was cut short after he failed in his re-election bid in 1741. An impoverished Scottish nobleman, he moved his family to London in 1745 to search for social and financial advancement. His royal friendship led to Bute's salaried position as a Lord of the Bedchamber in 1750 – a role that provided regular access to Prince Frederick and his family. After Frederick's unexpected death in 1751, Bute maintained his relationship with Augusta to become Groom of the Stole to Prince George in 1756. He used his influence as favourite to act as a broker between clients, Augusta and George. Augusta utilised her client's botanical knowledge to recruit staff and improve, stock, and extend the gardens at Kew. The first section of this chapter looks at the gardeners, architects, and botanical artists who were employed at Kew Gardens during Bute's tenure as 'unofficial manager' to determine the influence (if any) he had on their employment and careers.

The second part of this chapter will examine dedications (1751-1765) that were addressed to Bute solely because of his royal friendships, and positions within the royal

¹ Anonymous, *The Art of Conversing; Translated from the French*, (London, 1777), p. i

household – Lord of the Bedchamber to Prince Frederick, tutor and Groom of the Stole to Prince George. This period of royal influence coincides with his political career and the twenty dedications during this time frame will be divided into examples of royal or political patronage. This section will discuss nine works by authors who dedicated scholarly work in anticipation, or after receiving, royal patronage. A study of these dedications will uncover whether works were purposely inscribed to Bute because of his position as educator to the heir to the throne, or whether writers appealed to his scientific interests. An examination of the careers of these authors will reveal how many were awarded with royal patronage.

ROYAL CLIENT AND MANAGER OF KEW GARDENS

Bute's role as botanical advisor at Kew Gardens (c.1752-1772) and his position as royal tutor, allowed him to recommend his own clients, thereby directly influencing royal patronage. Kew became an important national site in the eighteenth century showcasing exotic plants from around the world and was a testimony to Britain's emergence as a leading colonial power. Visitors at the gardens were greeted by William Chambers' architectural monuments symbolising the power and glory of Britain. The conversion of Kew from a pleasure garden into the Royal Botanic Gardens first began in the 1731 when Prince Frederick purchased large areas of land around the existing gardens in Richmond.² At that time, and unlike other European capitals, there was no great national botanic garden in London. Frederick embarked on developing Kew by expanding the gardens, remodelling the existing buildings and structures, and employing large numbers of gardeners and architects, (among them the famous gardener William Kent), to redesign and transform the gardens. Frederick's contributions include the increase in the number of plant species in the gardens and the commissioning of new architectural monuments and buildings.

In c.1749, and as a result of their shared botanical interests, Frederick turned to his friend for advice in developing the gardens. Bute was a suitable choice as an advisor as he spent many years improving the gardens at Mount Stuart, was involved in importation schemes that brought new seeds and plants into Britain, and corresponded with well-respected botanists, Jan Fredrik Gronovius and Peter Collinson. Frederick also shared his

² Ray Desmond, *Kew: The History of the Royal Botanic Gardens*, p. 22

enthusiasm for gardening with his wife Augusta, who after Frederick's death continued his plans for Kew. Bute retained his position as botanical mentor and in 1754 purchased a house on Kew Green to oversee improvements. He was unofficial manager of the gardens during the 1750s and 1760s/.³ Augusta continued to depend on Bute for advice on landscaping, the acquisition of plants and trees for the gardens from around the world, and in recruiting members of staff.⁴ It is not surprising given his botanical experience and reputation that Bute was given such an important position as manager at Kew.

Some staff members employed at Kew during this period, and who worked alongside Bute in developing the gardens, were the Scottish gardener, William Aiton and the architect William Chambers. The head gardener of Kew at this time was the Englishman, John Haverfield. Aiton began his gardening career in 1755 as assistant to Philip Miller at Chelsea Physic Gardens. He was recommended by Bute to Augusta and was placed in charge of the newly created physic garden in 1759, which is the official date for the establishment of the Royal Botanic Gardens.⁵ Aiton assumed responsibility for the nine-acre herbaceous plant garden and the arboretum, which he organised according to the Linnaean classification system.⁶ He directed the scientific work at Kew and cultivated plants from different climates in the newly constructed greenhouse, measuring 114 feet. After the death of Augusta in 1772, Bute was deprived of the support of his patron and retired from his managerial role at Kew. George III assumed control of the gardens and appointed Sir Joseph Banks as his royal advisor and director. Aiton's status as a royal client ensured that despite upheavals in management of the gardens, he was appointed as 'His Majesty's Principal Gardener of Kew'. The inventories of plants at Kew reveal the extent of the plant-collecting activities. The first inventory of plants at Kew (1768) was compiled by Bute's scientific client, Dr. John Hill, and listed a total of 3,389 species. This figure had risen to 5,535 by the time of the publication of Aiton's *Hortus Kewensis* (1789).

Between 1757 and 1763, the Swedish born Scottish architect, William Chambers, was employed by Augusta to work on decorative gardening at Kew. Bute was instrumental in obtaining a position and royal favour for Chambers. In 1755, he supported Chambers'

³ John Russell, *John 3rd Earl of Bute*, p. 19

⁴ David P. Miller, "'My favourite studdys': Lord Bute as naturalist", p. 220

⁵ Vanessa Berridge, *The Princess's Garden: Royal Intrigue and the Untold Story of Kew*, (Gloucestershire, 2015), p. 177

⁶ Alice M. Coats, *Lord Bute: An Illustrated life of John Stuart, third Earl of Bute 1713-1792*, p. 221

appointment as architectural tutor to Prince George.⁷ At Kew, Chambers was commissioned by Augusta to design twenty structures to ornament the gardens. Many of these structures were to commemorate the victories in the Seven Years' War and to draw attention to beginning of British dominance outside Europe.⁸ These included the great or old stove (1760), the orangery (1761), and the pagoda (one of two structures erected in the Chinese style), along a pavilion in the centre of the lake near the menagerie.⁹ He was instrumental in the revival of interest in Chinese designs and taste. After he had completed much of his architectural work, Chambers published *Plans, Elevations, Sections and Perspective Views of the Gardens and Buildings at Kew* in 1763.¹⁰ His manuscript received royal approval and was published at the expense of Augusta. He used *Plans* to publicly acknowledge 'the great botanical learning' of the 'principal manager' [Bute] and predicted 'that in a few years Kew will have 'the amplest and best collection, in Europe'.¹¹ Despite benefitting from royal patronage, Aiton and Chambers were not employed by Bute in a personal capacity.

The Earl of Bute was active in stocking Kew Gardens with exotic species and corresponded with plant-collectors in Asia, Africa, America and Europe.¹² In 1761, Peter Collinson, also referred to Bute's plant-collecting activities, and believed that 'from his Lordships great knowledge in the Science of Botany the Gardens at Kew have been furnish'd with all the Rare Exotick Trees & Flowers that could be procured'.¹³ There are rare species that were transferred from the Earl of Ilay's Whitton estate that still survive at Kew today – the Ginkgo biloba, Robinia pseudoacacia and Sophora japonica.¹⁴

Despite Bute's twenty year tenure at Kew, his contribution to the gardens has been overshadowed by Joseph Banks' later achievements. In 1773, Banks replaced Bute as "manager" when he was appointed by George III as his scientific advisor. He was granted the title of manager in 1797 that he held until his death in 1820.¹⁵ Bute may have begun the process of importing foreign species but the number of plant species at Kew dramatically increased during Banks' long tenure as manager. Banks was chiefly concerned in economic

⁷ R.C. Bald, 'Sir William Chambers and the Chinese Garden', *Journal of the History of Ideas*, Vol. 11 (1950), p. 288

⁸ Berridge, *The Princess's Garden: Royal Intrigue and the Untold Story of Kew*, p. 169

⁹ Bald, 'Sir William Chambers and the Chinese Garden', p. 290

¹⁰ 'Historical Account of Kew to 1841', *Bulletin of Miscellaneous Information (Royal Gardens, Kew)*, Vol. 1891, (1891), p. 292

¹¹ *Ibid.*, p. 290

¹² Berridge, *The Princess's Garden: Royal Intrigue and the Untold Story of Kew*, p. 170

¹³ Alan W. Armstrong, "Forget not Mee & My Garden...": *Selected Letters 1725-1768 of Peter Collinson, F.R.S.*, p. 229

¹⁴ Berridge, *The Princess's Garden: Royal Intrigue and the Untold Story of Kew*, p. 182

¹⁵ Andrea Wulf, *The Brother Gardeners: Botany, Empire and the Birth of an Obsession*, p. 46

botany, and the transfer and cultivation of profitable plants, which resulted in the transfer of 2,000 Tahitian breadfruit plants to the Caribbean. He replaced random acquisition that occurred during Bute's term as manager with more purposeful collecting. His royal patron, George III, was convinced by the commercial value of botany consented to pay professional plant-hunters to travel across the globe searching for new specimens. These botanical adventurers were paid an annual salary of £100, (plus up to £200 in expenses). During his lifetime Banks received seeds and living plants from more than a hundred and twenty plant-hunters.¹⁶ Quite rightly, Banks is credited with transforming the gardens into 'a great botanical exchange house for the empire'.¹⁷

The managerial differences between Banks and Bute at Kew, may be due to the interests of their royal patrons – Princess Augusta's aim for the gardens was to combine the practical (physic garden) and the ornamental, whereas George III was persuaded to embrace the commercial aspects of botany. Moreover, by the 1760s, Bute's political responsibilities, his ambitious building projects, and increasingly ill-health, all served to draw his attention away from his duties at Kew. The majority of contemporary accounts focus on the unpopularity of both Bute and Augusta, (who were accused in the press of having an affair), and images satirising their relationship, and connecting routes between their houses at Kew, were printed. This ensured that the contribution of Bute and Augusta to the early development of the gardens is often overlooked. However, it is evident that Bute began the process of transforming Kew into the botanical centre of the British Empire.

During his tenure at Kew, Bute was responsible for patronising a number of botanical artists, or illustrators, to record the large collection of rare plants, and his personal collection. The botanical artists employed by the Earl of Bute were George Dionysius Ehret, Simon Taylor (1742-1772/1796), and Johann Sebastian Müller (Miller). The influx of new plant species in the eighteenth century coincided with a golden age of botanical illustration as many artists travelled with explorers and scientists on overseas voyages to catalogue, and depict, new flowers and plants. Botanical artists, such as Mark Catesby and John Bartram, were employed to provide drawings for accompaniment in herbals, seed catalogues, and works of natural history. These illustrations were essential for scientific accuracy and the study of botany. It was important to have an accurate and detailed depiction of a plant

¹⁶ Ibid., p. 220

¹⁷ Ibid., p. 140

because it allowed botanists to identify the species, settle any doubts or arguments, and could be used as a reference guide for a non-scientific audience. Some plant drawings were not always exact copies of nature and could include several stages of development in the life cycle of a plant, along with some exaggerated plant features for the benefit of other botanists and the public.¹⁸ Bute's patronage of botanical artists was well-known, and Peter Collinson remarked that he was 'the only great man that encourages ingenious men in painting botanical rarities'.¹⁹

George Dionysius Ehret was a German born gardener and artist who became one of the greatest botanical illustrators of the eighteenth century. He produced high quality illustrations for plant collectors and various publications. Despite Collinson's assertion that few 'great' men encouraged and supported botanical artists, Ehret benefited from the patronage of a number of prominent individuals and institutions. He could count among his patrons Christoph Joseph Trew (1695-1769), the Duchess of Portland, Sir Hans Sloane, and George Clifford. These wealthy plant-collectors commissioned Ehret to help catalogue, document, and publish their collections, and record the newly imported species in their ever expanding gardens. Ehret was originally trained as a gardener, before starting his career as a painter and engraver of botanical and zoological works. His first and greatest patron was the German physician and botanist Christoph Joseph Trew. Ehret's illustrations are contained in Trew's *Plantae Selectae* (1750-1773) and *Hortus Nitidissimus* (1750-1786). He visited Paris and the Jardin des Plantes before travelling to England in 1735, where he met President of the Royal Society, Sir Hans Sloane, and Philip Miller.²⁰ Ehret was employed by the Royal Society to illustrate some of the rare plants at Chelsea Gardens and contributed some drawings to Miller's *Gardeners Dictionary*. His drawings of over twenty different species of the aloe plant were presented to the Royal Society in 1737.²¹ He frequently contributed drawings of plants to the Royal Society, which were featured in the *Philosophical Transactions*.²²

¹⁸ Kärin Nickelson, *Draughtsmen, Botanists and Nature: The Construction of Eighteenth-Century Botanical Illustrations*, (Dordrecht, 2006), p. 11

¹⁹ Coats, *Lord Bute: An Illustrated life of John Stuart, third Earl of Bute 1713-1792*, p. 39

²⁰ Ruth Stungo, 'Recording the Aloes at Chelsea. A Singular Solution to a Difficult Problem', *Notes and Records of the Royal Society of London*, Vol. 50, No. 1 (Jan., 1996), p. 49

²¹ Ibid

²² Gronovius and George Dionysius Ehret, 'An Account of a Species of Ophris, Supposed to be the Plant, Which is Mentioned by Gronovius in the *Flora Virginica*, *Philosophical Transactions* (1683-1775), Vol. 53 (1763), pp. 81-83; George Dionysius Ehret, 'An Account of a New Peruvian Plant, Lately Introduced into the English Gardens; the

Ehret's patrons were some of the leading botanists of his day. In 1736, he spent three months in the Netherlands where closely worked with Linnaeus. Linnaeus provided an introduction to George Clifford who commissioned Ehert to sketch plants on his estate.²³ Ehert painted twenty plates of rare plants that were later published in Linnaeus's *Hortus Cliffortianus*. He also contributed an engraving of a table showing Linnaeus's system of plant taxonomy in *Genera Plantarum*. Ehert was a promoter of Linnaeus's system of classification and because his drawings include the dissected parts of the flower, his botanical art is referred to as the Linnaean style.

After his return to England, Ehret married Philip Miller's sister-in-law in 1738. He provided sixteen plates for Miller's *Figures of the Most Beautiful, Useful and Uncommon Plants* in 1760.²⁴ He supplemented his income by teaching flower painting to aristocratic wives and daughters and by fulfilling commissions for wealthy patrons.²⁵ Ehret was employed by the Duchess of Portland to engrave the plants in her gardens, and to teach drawing to her daughters. His other patrons include one of Princess Augusta's scientific advisors, Stephen Hales (1677-1761), and even Sir John Hill occasionally used Ehert's drawings for his botanical works.²⁶

Therefore, by the time he was commissioned by Bute to produce a number of drawings at Kew, in particular the exotic plants that were arriving in Europe, Ehert's reputation as a botanical illustrator was well established. These drawings are a record of plants thriving under Bute's management at Kew. Separately, Ehert was employed to provide plant illustrations for his patron's private collection. Ehert was fortunate to benefit from both his role at Kew and from Bute's personal patronage. The Auction Sale Catalogues (1794), list one hundred and thirty two illustrations by Ehert that Bute had in his collection, along with three volumes of '*Ehert's Plants, Flowers, and Fruits, beautifully executed on vellum*'.²⁷

It was in response to the increasing number of rare plants at Kew, that Simon Taylor was hired in 1760 to work alongside Ehert, and to sketch Bute's personal collection. Taylor

Several Characters of Which Differ from All the Genera Hitherto Described; Presented to the Royal Society by George Dionysius Ehret, *Philosophical Transactions* (1683-1775), Vol. 53 (1763), pp. 130-132

²³ Nickelson, *Draughtsmen, Botanists and Nature: The Construction of Eighteenth-Century Botanical Illustrations*, p. 25

²⁴ Penelope Hunting, 'Isaac Rand and the Apothecaries' Physic Garden at Chelsea', *Garden History*, Vol. 30, No. 1 (Spring,2002), pp. 1-23

²⁵ Stungo, 'Recording the Aloes at Chelsea. A Singular Solution to a Difficult Problem', p. 49

²⁶ George Rousseau, *The Notorious Sir John Hill: The Man Destroyed by Ambition in the Era of Celebrity*, p. 242

²⁷ George Leigh and John Sotheby, *A Catalogue of the Botanical and Natural History, part of the Library of the Late John, Earl of Bute*, pp. 47-55

was only seventeen when he first began working at Kew, and was employed for his artistic ability rather than having any interest in botany.²⁸ He was educated at The Society for the Encouragement of Arts, Manufactures and Commerce where his artistic skill was recognised at an early age and won prizes for his drawings.²⁹ Taylor became the main botanical artist at Kew after Ehert's death in 1770. However, there were many who lamented that there was 'nobody to take to supply his [Ehert's] place in point of elegance. We have a young man, one Taylor who draws all the rare plants of Kew Garden for Lord Bute; he does it tolerably well'.³⁰ It would be difficult to compare Taylor with Ehert who was trained as a gardener, sketched plants in many famous European gardens, and was a proponent of Linnaeus's classification system. Nevertheless, Taylor was an accomplished botanical illustrator and his patrons included John Ellis, John Fothergill (1712-1780), and Ralph Willett (1719-1795). Ellis commissioned several drawings, and the London physician and botanist, Fothergill, had a sizable collection which was sold after his death to the Empress of Russia.³¹ Very little is known about Taylor's life and career but we know that, unlike Ehert, he did not correspond with botanists or publish any work. It is uncertain whether he had a personal interest or passion for botany.³² Taylor was employed to record plants from Bute's botanical collection until 1780 but it is not known whether he continued working at Kew.³³ Bute's Auction Sale Catalogues record a total of fifteen volumes containing six hundred and eighty four drawings of plants (mainly from Kew), which were drawn by Taylor.³⁴

The date of Taylor's death is unclear, but we know that he was not employed to engrave the illustrations for Bute's *Botanical Tables Containing the Families of British Plants*, (1785).³⁵ This task fell to the German born engraver and botanist, John Miller, whose prints are included in Chambers' *Plans, Elevations, Sections and Perspective Views of the Gardens and Buildings at Kew*. However, Miller was not one of the principal botanical artists employed at Kew. His botanical illustrations can be found in Philip Miller's *Figures of the Most Beautiful, Useful and Uncommon Plants* (1760). In 1779, Miller published his own botanical work *An*

²⁸ Russell, *John 3rd Earl of Bute*, p. 40

²⁹ W. L. Tjaden, 'Drawings at Kew by Simon Taylor (1742-c.1796)', *Kew Bulletin*, Vol. 26, No. 1 (1971), p. 169

³⁰ Sir James Edward Smith, *A Selection of the Correspondence of Linnaeus, and Other Naturalists*, Vol. 1 (London, 1821), p. 255

³¹ Tjaden, 'Drawings at Kew by Simon Taylor (1742-c.1796)', p. 168

³² *Ibid.*, p. 169

³³ *Ibid.*

³⁴ Leigh and Sotheby, *A Catalogue of the Botanical and Natural History, part of the Library of the Late John, Earl of Bute*, p. 60

³⁵ Russell, *John 3rd Earl of Bute*, p. 133

Illustration of the Sexual System of Linnaeus by John Miller.³⁶ In the preface, he wrote that in Britain 'natural knowledge, and Botany in particular, has long been cultivated with uncommon success' with several of the nobility and private individuals have greater botanical collections than some of the public 'Gardens of Europe'.³⁷ Miller was employed by the owner of one of these great private botanical collections, and was responsible for engraving some six hundred and fifty four plates for the *Botanical Tables*.³⁸ For botanical artists like Taylor and Miller, wealthy plant-collectors and owners of vast private gardens would provide employment opportunities, and in return these artists served an important role in cataloguing botanical collections and recording new plant species imported into Britain.

THE SIGNIFICANCE OF EIGHTEENTH-CENTURY DEDICATIONS

A study of dedications made to the Earl of Bute, and an examination of his clients, is crucial in determining the role (if any) played by dedications in securing patronage. The study of dedications is of importance in ascertaining whether there was an increase in the number of dedications made during Bute's political career and period of influence with the royal family; uncovering which subject areas he directed most of his funding; discovering how many authors who dedicated scholarly work to him were successful in gaining his support; establishing if there was any connection between these authors; comparing the number of dedications made to the Earl of Bute with other eighteenth-century patrons; and analysing the image of Bute as patron that was fashioned by these dedications. Dedications were an important component of the patronage system and formed part of a campaign on the client's behalf to secure the support of a patron. If a dedication proved favourable, an author could expect a financial reward, or other benefits in return. A work with an inscription to a noble patron, and which earned their approval, usually sold more copies.³⁹

The wording and content of these dedications will closely examine the words used by an author when composing a dedication; whether the petitioner is telling the truth;

³⁶ John Miller, *An Illustration of the Sexual System of Linnaeus by John Miller*, Vol. 1 (London, 1779)

³⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 3

³⁸ 'Earl of Bute's Botanical Tables', *Bulletin of Miscellaneous Information (Royal Gardens, Kew)*, Vol. 1892, No.72, (1892) p. 308

³⁹ Dustin Griffin, *Literary Patronage in England 1650-1800*, p. 24

determine if an author is speaking his own sentiments, or is he writing what a potential patron wishes to hear; and finally, if is he following eighteenth-century conventions in writing his inscription. The history of dedications has shown that authors have been inscribing work since the first books were written. This has not ceased during any period of literary history. According to the historian, Mary Elizabeth Brown, the practice of dedications was at its zenith during the sixteenth and early part of the seventeenth century in England, and in France under Louis XIV.⁴⁰ Some historians have suggested that there was a decline in patronage during the eighteenth century and dedications were not in fashion in Britain. However, as we will see in this chapter a large number of authors continued to dedicate their work to noble patrons.

Besides the desire to express gratitude to a particular patron or institution, there were other reasons for an author to dedicate their work. Since writers borne some, or all, of the cost of publishing their work and they hoped for some sort of remuneration from the dedicatee. These dedicatees were usually wealthy, socially, and political well-connected, and who could afford to award an author with money, a pension or a living. Usually, a patron did not have to be associated with a particular subject area to have a book dedicated to them. For the most part, an author was more likely to be reimbursed, or supported, if the patron had an interest in a particular field, or had a history of patronising writers in that area. Bute had a lifelong interest in botany, and other scientific subjects, so we might assume that a large portion of works dedicated to him would be in the sciences.

The most popular patrons of the eighteenth-century were members of the royal family; the aristocracy; leading and popular politicians; institutions like the Royal Society; and established literary writers like Alexander Pope. In his article on book dedications, Pat Rogers estimates that over 14% of all inscriptions in the eighteenth century were made to a member of the royal family.⁴¹ The leading royal dedicatees of this period were George II, Prince Frederick, George III and his wife, Queen Charlotte.⁴² For example, Bute dedicated his scientific work, *Botanical Tables* (1785), to Queen Charlotte. Many writers sought the patronage of the royal family because the financial rewards were usually greater, and there

⁴⁰ Mary Elizabeth Brown, *Dedications: An Anthology of the Forms used from the Earliest Days of Book-Making to the Present Time*, (New York, 1913), p. i

⁴¹ Ray Rogers, 'Book Dedications in Britain 1700-1799: A Preliminary Study', *British Journal for Eighteenth Century Studies*, Vol. 16, (1993), p. 221

⁴² *Ibid.*, p. 222

was the possibility of a court position, or promise of an annual pension. This would bring greater financial security, especially if an aristocratic, political, or literary patron lost power, influence, or wealth. However, it was more difficult to dedicate to a member of the royal family as formal permission was required. Before its publication, Queen Charlotte had to first approve the inscription in *Botanical Tables*. Therefore, many authors would dedicate a work to a royal favourite because he was in a position to influence the King's patronage and able to use the crown's resources to reward friends and clients. Through the intercession of Bute, Joshua Kirby, became teacher of perspective and fortifications to the Prince of Wales in 1756.⁴³ In gratitude, Kirby named Bute as the dedicatee in the second edition of his *Dr. Brook Taylor's Method of Perspective Made Easy* (1765).⁴⁴

In the eighteenth century, Philip Dormer Stanhope, fourth Earl of Chesterfield (1694-1773), and George Lyttleton, first Baron of Lyttelton (1709-1773) were considered as leading patrons among the nobility. Samuel Johnson dedicated his *The Plan of a Dictionary of the English Language* to Chesterfield in 1747, and the novelist, Henry Fielding (1707-1754), inscribed his *The History of Tom Jones, A Foundling* to Lyttleton in 1749.⁴⁵ Robert Walpole and Thomas Pelham-Holles, first Duke of Newcastle (1693-1768), were among the century's most influential politicians. Fielding addressed his comedy, *The Modern Husband* to Walpole in 1733, and the historian and political writer, James Ralph (d.1762), dedicated his poem *Zeuma: Or the Love of Liberty* to Newcastle in 1729.⁴⁶ Samuel Johnson and other prominent literary writers were the recipients of many literary dedications. An author could not expect much in the way of financial rewards by writing an inscription to a relatively poor writer like Johnson, but the approval of such an established and successful author could lead to public recognition, fame, and increased sales and profits. The Irish writer, Oliver Goldsmith (1728?-1774), inscribed his comedy *She Stoops to Conquer: Or, The Mistakes of A Night* to Johnson in 1773.⁴⁷ In the latter part of the eighteenth century, the President of the Royal Society and Manager of Kew Gardens, Joseph Banks, received many scientific dedications. In 1794, the

⁴³ Russell, *John 3rd Earl of Bute: Patron and Collector*, p. 29

⁴⁴ Joshua Kirby, *Dr. Brook Taylor's Method of Perspective Made Easy; Both in Theory and in Practice: In Two Books*, (London, 1765)

⁴⁵ Samuel Johnson, *The Plan of a Dictionary of the English Language; Addressed to the Right Honourable Philip Dormer, Earl of Chesterfield; One of His Majesty's Principal Secretaries of State*, (London, 1747); Henry Fielding, *The History of Tom Jones, A Foundling*, 4 vols., (London, 1749)

⁴⁶ Henry Fielding, *The Modern Husband; A Comedy*, (London, 1732); James Ralph, *Zeuma: Or the Love of Liberty*, (London, 1729)

⁴⁷ Oliver Goldsmith, *She Stoops to Conquer: Or, The Mistakes of A Night*, (London, 1773)

botanical and medical writer, Robert James Thornton (1768-1837), addressed his *Medical Extracts* to Banks.⁴⁸

There were critics who were opposed to the widespread practice of writing dedications, and believed that a writer was selling his praises to the highest bidder. Chief among these opponents was Alexander Pope (1688-1744). In an article written for *The Guardian* in 1713, Pope criticises 'the common practice of dedications' that he believes was a kind of 'prostitution' and many of which were bestowed upon the 'undeserving'.⁴⁹ He felt that many writers who were dependent upon patronage for their livelihood were reluctant to express their own sentiments in regards to their patron because they felt they would be accused of dishonesty and excessive flattery. In the study of dedications we need to consider that although a writer may wish to please the person to whom he dedicates his work, we should not always assume that he is not speaking the truth, and may have his own reasons for expressing his gratitude.

IN ANTICIPATION OF ROYAL PATRONAGE – DEDICATIONS INSCRIBED TO THE EARL OF BUTE

An examination of the scholarly work dedicated to Bute can largely be completed through the 17th-18th Century Burney Collection Newspapers, and Eighteenth Century Collections Online (ECCO). According to these sources, there were twenty-eight works dedicated between the years 1751 and 1790. There were two inscriptions which are not true dedications, and therefore are not counted in the overall total. These mock dedications ridicule the practice of dedicating books to patrons, and the system of patronage, so these inscriptions and their authors are considered separately. This list shows that with one exception, these works were published in English, and were either short pamphlets or larger manuscripts. It reveals that there is one anonymous and twenty-six known authors who dedicated work to Bute. This total number includes the translators of non-English works, and dedications which were made in the second or later edition of a particular work. It is important to review later editions of works addressed to Bute to observe if there was a

⁴⁸ Robert James Thornton, *Medical Extracts: Being a Concentrated View of Some Late Discoveries in Chemistry, and the New Theory and Practice of Physic, Thereby Introduced*, (London, 1794)

⁴⁹ Alexander Pope, *The Works of Alexander Pope, Esq.* 6 vols., (London, 1764), p. 237; Griffin, *Literary Patronage in England 1650-1800*, p. 130

change in dedicatee. This practice of substituting a new dedicatee in later editions of the same work was widespread in the eighteenth century. Like Samuel Johnson, if an author inscribed a work to a potential patron, and financial support was not forthcoming, they could approach a different patron to support a later edition. Throughout his career, a writer could have dedicated works to a multitude of people in influential positions. The first (1759) and second (1768) editions of Sir William Chambers' *A Treatise on Civil Architecture* were dedicated to Bute.⁵⁰ However, the third and final edition of the work, which was published in 1791, after the Earl had fallen from royal favour and just a year before his death, was dedicated to the King George III.

The dedications to Bute are divided into the areas of literature, science, architecture, history, religion, and philosophy.⁵¹ A review of the years of these dedications reveals the majority of dedications were received in 1763, (the year he was Prime Minister), and the second most prevalent year, 1761, when he was appointed Secretary of State for the Northern Department. Table 2, shows that the most popular subject area was literature, followed by science. Ray Rogers notes that approximately 33% of the 933 eighteenth-century dedications examined in his article were literary in nature; therefore, it is not surprising that the majority of inscriptions made to Bute in the years from 1751 to 1790 were in the area of *belles lettres*.⁵² Dustin Griffin has argued that literary patronage throughout the eighteenth century was always political in nature, and we can see from the table that the majority of literary works were inscribed during Bute's political ascendancy.⁵³ We know that two of the dedicators, Arthur Murphy and David Mallet, were employed by the Earl to write in his pro-government periodicals. The last literary dedication was published the year following his exit from the political stage, and no works of literature were inscribed after his withdrawal from public life. However, Bute did not only patronise political writers and his support of the theatre and Scottish poetry is evident from his patronage of John Home, Arthur Murphy, and James Macpherson.

The eight scientific dedications were in the subject areas of botany, chemistry, and a travel account by Alberto Fortis on his observations of the natural history of Dalmatia. The

⁵⁰ William Chambers, *A Treatise on Civil Architecture*, (London, 1759)

⁵¹ A complete list of all the dedications, the name of the authors, year of publication, nationality of the author and subject area is found in the appendices.

⁵² Rogers, 'Book Dedications in Britain 1700-1799', p. 220

⁵³ Griffin, *Literary Patronage in England 1650-1800*, p. 45

majority of scientific dedications, (6 in total), fall under the category of Bute's personal patronage. This is not surprising considering his love of science. The Earl of Bute has often been accused by contemporary critics of using patronage to support mainly Scottish rather English clients. In table 3, we can see that the majority of inscriptions came from English writers, closely followed from those in Scotland.

Literature	11
Natural History	8
History	3
Architecture	3
Religion	2
Philosophy	1

Table 2: List of all dedications by subject

English	9
Scottish	8
Irish	1
Italian	2
Unknown	6

Table 3: Nationality of all known dedicators

Title	Year	Subject	Author
<i>An Oration... Occasioned by the Death of his Royal Highness the Prince of Wales</i>	1751	Literature	Unknown
<i>The Orphan of China</i>	1759	Literature	Arthur Murphy (1727-1805)
<i>The Art of Short Hand Improved</i>	1762	Literature	David Lyle (fl.1762)
<i>Reflections on Death</i>	1763	Literature	William Dodd (1729-1777)
<i>Elements of the Theory and Practice of Chymistry</i>	1758	Science	Andrew Reid (d.1767)
<i>Gleanings of Natural History, vol. ii</i>	1760	Science	George Edwards (1694-1773)
<i>Treatise on Civil Architecture</i>	1759	Architecture	Sir William Chambers (1734-1796)
<i>Dr. Brook Taylor's Method of Perspective Made Easy; Both in Theory and in Practice</i>	1765	Architecture	Joshua Kirby (1716-1774)
<i>The Divine Admonition, or Plan of Government, Given to David upon his Ascending the Throne of Israel</i>	1761	Religion	Leonard Howard (1698/9-1767)

Table 4: List of authors looking for royal patronage

Literature

This section will look at the nine dedications made by authors who wished to either secure royal patronage, or to publicly show their gratitude to a member of the royal family for their support. Literature is the subject area that received the most royal dedications. The first literary dedication was *An Oration ... Occasioned by the Death of his Royal Highness the Prince of Wales* (1751) by an anonymous author.⁵⁴ This literary work was one of the many odes that reflected on his life and character of Frederick, Prince of Wales, after his premature death.⁵⁵ Like the early death of the heir to the throne in 1612 of Henry Stuart, Prince of Wales (1594-1612), Frederick's unexpected demise provoked a great number of patriotic and poetic laments from those who had lost a major patron.⁵⁶ He was a great patron of the arts, music, literature, and gardening, and had established a party of opposition, a government-in-waiting, to challenge the government and ministers who supported his father, George II. Those who had fallen out of favour, or others just looking for advancement, aligned themselves with the Leicester House Circle. As a result, some of the writers who wrote odes to Frederick were reflecting upon the great sense of regret and uncertainty that his death inspired, and the loss of their influence and position.⁵⁷ Bute was one of those who attached himself to the Leicester House Circle, and who now lost his post as Lord of the Bedchamber after his patron's death. Therefore, it is not completely unexpected that a work commemorating the Prince of Wales was dedicated to a friend and royal client. However, in 1751, Bute was a poor, relatively obscure Scottish lord, who was not in a position to influence political appointments, or dispense patronage, so it seems unlikely that this anonymous author was looking to the Earl as his new patron.

An Oration reveals the sorrow and regret expressed by Frederick's death, and the title page contains a quote from Horace often used for an eighteenth-century obituary or funeral sermon – 'what bounds shall we set to our grief, on losing an individual so intimately and

⁵⁴ Anonymous, *An Oration, as it was Spoken at the Robin-Hood, Monday the 22d of April, to a Splendid Audience; Occasioned by the Death of his Royal Highness the Prince of Wales; In which his Character is Pourtray'd*, (London, 1751)

⁵⁵ Thomas Hudson, *An Ode on the Death of His Royal Highness Frederick Prince of Wales*, (London, 1751); William Dunkin, *An Ode on the Death of His Royal Highness Frederick, Prince of Wales, Translated from the Latin*, (Dublin, 1752)

⁵⁶ Paul Langford, *A Polite and Commercial People: England 1727-1783*, (New York, 1998), p. 221

⁵⁷ Robin Eagles, "'No more to be said'? Reactions to the death of Frederick Lewis, prince of Wales', *Historical Research*, Vol. 80, Issue 209 (2007), pp. 346-367

justly esteemed'.⁵⁸ Bute is not the only dedicatee of this work, and the author also addresses 'the Publick' who were mourning the loss of a popular and well-liked future king.⁵⁹ The writer uses flattering language and 'humbly' addresses his *An Oration*, thereby acknowledging the difference in social positions between the writer and dedicatee.⁶⁰ Did the author believe that as a patron and judge of literary merit, Bute's opinion was equal to that of 'the public', or was he looking for both aristocratic and public approval? We cannot be sure, but first we need to clarify who the author meant by 'the public'. In the eighteenth century, 'the public' referred to the reading public and those who bought newspapers, periodicals, or books.⁶¹ There was a growth in the book market at the beginning of the eighteenth century that led to an increase in the reading public as volumes of printed materials, (provincial newspapers, and monthly periodicals like the *Gentleman's Magazine* and the *London Magazine*), became available.⁶² The rise in the number of works that were inscribed to 'the public' also relates to the assumption that during this period there was a shift away from aristocratic patronage, to patronage by the public. These new patrons of literature included booksellers, who took on the responsibility of providing authors with support, which was formerly supplied by noble patrons.

As literary writers were usually poorly compensated, booksellers provided another means of support that meant writers were not completely depended on a patron's largesse. Alexander Pope is sometimes referred to as the first independent professional writer who was not reliant on aristocratic patronage. This was due to Pope's diligence in setting up a profitable subscription scheme, utilising the services of a printer and bookseller to produce his work, bargaining with booksellers, and keeping control of copyright.⁶³ Samuel Johnson was equally dismissive of aristocratic patronage, especially as the fourth Earl of Chesterfield refused to carry out his promise of supporting Johnson's *Dictionary*. Some booksellers took great financial risks to produce books that might not make any profit, like the group led by

⁵⁸ D. E. MacDonnell's *Dictionary of Quotations, from the Latin, French, Greek, Spanish, and Italian Languages*, (London, 1858), p. 290

⁵⁹ Anonymous, *An Oration, as it was Spoken at the Robin-Hood*, p. ii-iii

⁶⁰ *Ibid*, p. ii

⁶¹ Richard B. Sher, *The Enlightenment and the Book: Scottish Author and Their Publishers in Eighteenth-Century Britain, Ireland, and America*, (London, 2006), p. 201;

⁶² Langford, *A Polite and Commercial People: England 1727-1783*, p. 91; James Van Horn Melton, *The Rise of the Public in Enlightenment Europe*, (Cambridge, 2001), p. 86

⁶³ Griffin, *Literary Patronage in England 1650-1800*, p. 123

Robert Dodsley (1704-1764), who commissioned the *Dictionary*.⁶⁴ The growing importance of public opinion was signified by their ability to 'judge' whether a work or author had merit, and their favourable support could lead to increased book sales and profit for an author. As a result, there was an increase in the number of dedications made to 'the public' in eighteenth-century Britain.

The role of booksellers, and 'the public' as patrons of literature, did not mean that there was a decline in aristocratic patronage. Some critics believed that a bookseller could not be a worthy patron because they supported writers in return for profit, whereas the elevated rank of aristocrats ensured they were the most qualified judges of literary merit. Therefore, noble patrons continued to support literary writers, though they were now less likely to retain authors in their households or fund subscriptions and publications directly, preferring to support clients with academic positions, church livings, and other public roles.⁶⁵ The author of *An Oration* reveals that after putting forth his work for public approval, it was his intention and desire that 'some distinguished Genius' would celebrate and panegyrisé the virtues' of the Prince of Wales.⁶⁶ As the writer is anonymous we cannot be certain of his reasons for inscribing this work to Bute and whether he is speaking his own sentiments. The writers of similar orations were published under their own names – the Reverend Thomas Hudson (dates unknown), and William Dunkin (1706/7-1765). Therefore, we can only speculate why Bute was chosen as the dedicatee – perhaps it was due to his close friendship with Frederick and the author's desire to sympathise on the loss of a great patron.

The second literary dedication, *The Orphan of China* (1759), was by the Irish playwright and actor, Arthur Murphy and a translation of Voltaire's *L'Orphelin de la Chine*.⁶⁷ It is recognised as a pro-Bute political and patriotic play that was critical of the absolutist monarchy in France and performed during the Seven Years' War when British and French armies competed for territories and trade abroad.⁶⁸ The play's subject matter aimed to flatter both the Earl and his royal patron with the role of mentor to the exiled prince was played by the famous actor and theatre manager, David Garrick (1717-1779). Murphy opens his

⁶⁴ Richard B. Sher, *The Enlightenment and the Book: Scottish Authors and their Publishers in Eighteenth-Century Britain, Ireland and America*, (Chicago, 2006), p. 198

⁶⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 204

⁶⁶ Anonymous, *An Oration, as it was Spoken at the Robin-Hood*, pp. 4-5

⁶⁷ George Taylor, *Plays by Samuel Foote and Arthur Murphy*, (Cambridge, 1984), p. 18

⁶⁸ Hsin-yun Ou, 'Gender, Consumption, and Ideological Ambiguity in David Garrick's Production of "The Orphan of China" (1759)', *Theatre-Journal*, Vol. 60, No. 3, Feminism and Theatre, Redux (Oct., 2008), p. 384

dedication by addressing the 'Groom of the Stole to his Royal Highness the Prince of Wales', a position that afforded Bute entry into the royal circle, and the opportunity of influencing the patronage of Prince George. He praises his patron's 'innate partiality for every endeavour in the polite arts'.⁶⁹ This refers to Frederick and Bute's shared fondness for acting as they staged several performances at Cliefden and Kew. The author publicly thanks the 'generous concern' showed 'for the anxieties of a young Author' who at that time was 'wholly unknown' to him.⁷⁰ After Frederick's death, Bute continued to support the arts and Murphy was not the first of Bute's literary clients. In 1757, he supported the theatrical career of Scottish playwright, John Home, by promoting and revising *Douglas* for the stage in London, before employing him as his private secretary.⁷¹ Bute provided similar support to Murphy and *The Orphan of China* underwent a series of revisions before it was staged at Drury Lane. When it was first written in 1756, Garrick refused to stage the play without major revisions. For the next two years, the tragedy was edited by Murphy and others (including Garrick with input from Bute).⁷²

Murphy acknowledges the 'encouragement' and approval received from his patron and believed that it was a strong assurance of the play's success.⁷³ In recognition of his support, the author uses his dedication to defend Bute's role as a judge of literary merit, and assure his patron that his 'authority' was not misplaced, as the public's reaction had 'far outgone' his 'most sanguine hopes'.⁷⁴ The reception and success of the play played a part in Bute's role and reputation as a cultural patron. Murphy's dedication was written nine days after the play's first performance and *The Orphan of China* proved to be a success. The writer uses his address to encourage Bute's continuing patronage and protection of the 'industry' of playwrights.⁷⁵ This statement is at odds with Johnson's desire to end a writer's dependence on aristocratic patronage. However, Murphy was financially indebted to the patronage system, and later in 1762, was employed as an editor of the Earl's weekly periodical, *The Auditor*. Murphy used his literary skills to promote and defend the government against attacks from rivals including, John Wilkes (1725-1797), and Charles Churchill (1732-1764),

⁶⁹ Arthur Murphy, *The Orphan of China*, (London, 1759), p. iii-iv

⁷⁰ Arthur Murphy, *The Orphan of China*, (London, 1759), p. iii-iv

⁷¹ Bute's patronage of John Home will be examined in chapter 4.

⁷² Ou, 'Gender, Consumption, and Ideological Ambiguity in David Garrick's Production of "The Orphan of China" (1759)', p. 384

⁷³ *Ibid.*, p. iv

⁷⁴ Murphy, *The Orphan of China*, p. iv

⁷⁵ Murphy, *The Orphan of China*, p. iv

who wrote in the rival newspaper, the *North Britain*.⁷⁶ It is apparent that the purpose of the author's dedication was to show his gratitude for his patron's ongoing financial support.

There is no obvious connection between the authors of *The Orphan of China* and *The Art of Short Hand Improved* (1762). *The Art of Short Hand Improved* was published by the stenographer and instrument maker, David Lyle (fl.1762).⁷⁷ There is little information available in relation to the life and work of David Lyle and the *Dictionary of National Biography* surmises that he earned his degree in Scotland, although his name does not appear on any graduate records at Cambridge, Oxford, Dublin, or Edinburgh.⁷⁸ *The Art of Short Hand Improved* was written some years prior to publication and the reason for publication is the author's desire to publically acknowledge and praise Bute for taking notice of his 'endeavours'.⁷⁹ Lyle was requested by the Earl to design a new set of silver drawing instruments 'for the use of his Majesty'.⁸⁰ The enthusiastic scientific instrument collector, George III, had previously instructed George Adams to complete a set instruments for his children in 1760. It is not certain whether Lyle was also commissioned to complete a set of scientific instruments for Bute, and none are mentioned in the Auction Sale Catalogues of 1793-4. In appreciation of his role as a go-between, Lyle commends Bute's scientific abilities, boasting that his mathematical knowledge and superior ability in determining how each of the instruments worked, was more 'than any person I ever met with'.⁸¹

Like Murphy, Lyle uses his dedication to encourage patrons to continue to support the arts, which 'are the true sources of the humanity, the wealth, and power of a nation'.⁸² He declares that without patrons, and 'the indulgent care of those to whom the direction of public affairs is committed', the arts would soon languish and decay.⁸³ These 'generous' patrons, (like Bute and the King), have set such a noble example and have the invention and progress of arts most at heart'.⁸⁴ The author uses this platform to make a pro-Bute political statement by promoting the peace efforts and claiming that the 'future happiness of these

⁷⁶ The 'newspaper war' of 1762-3 will be examined in chapter 3.

⁷⁷ David Lyle, *The Art of Short Hand Improved, Being an Universal Character Adapted to the English Language*, (London, 1762)

⁷⁸ Leslie Stephen and Sidney Lee, *Dictionary of National Biography*, Vol. 12 (London, 1909), p. 326

⁷⁹ *Ibid.*, p. viii

⁸⁰ Lyle, *The Art of Short Hand Improved*, p. vi

⁸¹ *Ibid.*, pp. iv-v

⁸² *Ibid.*, p. i

⁸³ *Ibid.*, p. ii

⁸⁴ *Ibid.*

Kingdoms' is dependant on the Earl of Bute's management of the government.⁸⁵ He draws parallels between the the abilities and qualifications that made the Bute such an exceptional tutor, will aid in fulfilling the duties of such an important office at a time when Britain is at a critical juncture in the war against France. The author argues that the 'art of war' is only commendable when it is in the interest of the nation, but as Britain has achieved all it has hoped for in the war, it is now time to secure a lasting peace.⁸⁶ This dedication was written during the press war of 1762 when Bute and his peace efforts were being attacked by the opposition. Therefore, the 'true happiness and future security of these kingdoms' is cultivated by promoting 'the arts of peace'.⁸⁷ Lyle is not listed as one of Bute's political writers, but he used his dedication to show his support and obligation to his patron by promoting and defending the decision to bring an end to the Seven Years' War.

The final literary dedication, *Reflections on Death*, was written in 1763 by the Church of England clergyman and writer, William Dodd (1729-1777).⁸⁸ Dodd wrote numerous literary and theological works, and *Reflections on Death* discusses the events surrounding death by examining the encroaching moment when we stand in judgment before God. Dodd presents his work to Bute, which he believes deserves some merit because of the 'Suitableness to my Profession and from the Importance of its Subject'.⁸⁹ He was a popular preacher both at St James Garlickhythe, and St Olave, Hart Street, and earned the nickname the 'Macaroni Parson' due to fondness for fashion and propensity for high society. Dodd tells the reader that he has chosen Bute as the dedicatee because of his 'undissembled' respect for the nobleman, and claims there was no one with greater propriety that he could inscribe a work of this nature.⁹⁰ The author was seeking royal patronage as he was habitually short of funds, and frequently in debt, and doubtlessly selected Bute as the dedicatee because of his desire to secure a more lucrative appointment. Dodd calls his dedicatee the most appropriate recipient because his regard for works of literature has always been 'eminent and consistent', and of the favourable attention he has given to men of science and learning.⁹¹

Dodd refers to Bute's position as tutor and mentor to George III, and his role in

⁸⁵ Ibid., p. vii

⁸⁶ Ibid., p. iii

⁸⁷ Ibid., p. iii

⁸⁸ William Dodd, *Reflections on Death*, (London, 1763)

⁸⁹ Ibid., p. i

⁹⁰ Ibid., p. ii

⁹¹ Ibid

'forming the Royal Mind to Virtue'.⁹² He is showing support to the 'favourite' during a time of increasing hostility and anti-Scottishness in the press. Dodd claims that writers 'cannot but flourish under your discerning Eye and the fostering Patronage of our beloved Monarch'.⁹³ As one of the most influential patrons of the eighteenth century, George III patronised many in the areas of science and the arts, and was able to appoint candidates to one of the many offices under his control. Dodd again makes reference to the royal friendship, ('Happy in your Prince's Favour'), with the hope that the Bute would intercede on his behalf with the King.⁹⁴ In the final part of the dedication, Dodd uses excessively flattering language as he claims that the dedicatee's name will be placed high in that 'Temple of true Glory' where his achievements will finally be acknowledged, and where the 'Whispers of Malevolence' and 'Envy' will not be permitted.⁹⁵ This is reference to the Peace of Paris and Bute's "triumph" in putting an End to a War, uncommonly wide and expensive, and of restoring Peace to an exhausted and depopulated World'.⁹⁶

Reflections on Death proved to be an extremely popular literary work which went through twenty-six editions during the next sixty years.⁹⁷ Its success, combined with Dodd's flowery praise and flattery, bore fruit and he received a royal appointment, Chaplain-in-Ordinary to the King in 1763.⁹⁸ There is no evidence in the literature to suggest that Bute acted as a broker on Dodd's behalf. Despite his successful appeal for support, Dodd's career is an example of the fickle nature of patronage, and the alarming fate for those who lived beyond their means in the eighteenth century. The author had previously dedicated works to prominent government figures – *Beauties of Shakespear* (1752) was inscribed to Sir George Lyttleton, and *The Hymns of Callimachus* (1755) to the Duke of Newcastle.⁹⁹ He used the practice of dedications to attract the attention of powerful patrons in order to provide him with a more lucrative parish livings and support his extravagant lifestyle.¹⁰⁰ Dodd's sad tale

⁹² Ibid., p. iii

⁹³ Ibid

⁹⁴ Ibid., p. iv

⁹⁵ Ibid., p. v

⁹⁶ Ibid

⁹⁷ A. D. Barker, 'The Early Career of William Dodd', *Transactions of the Cambridge Bibliographical Society*, Vol. 8, No. 2 (1982), p. 234

⁹⁸ William Dodd, *Thoughts in Prison: in five Parts*, (London, 1777)

⁹⁹ William Dodd, *Beauties of Shakespear*, (London, 1752); William Dodd, *The Hymns of Callimachus*, (London, 1755)

¹⁰⁰ Barker, 'The Early Career of William Dodd', p. 228; Claude-Anne Lopez, 'Benjamin Franklin and William Dodd: A New Look at an Old Cause Célèbre', *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society*, Vol. 129, No. 3 (Sep., 1985), p. 261

ends in 1777, when desperate for money he forged the signature of Philip Stanhope, fifth Earl of Chesterfield (1755-1815), on a bond worth £4,200 to prevent his imminent arrest for debt. The unlucky clergyman's theft was detected over a stray inkblot, and he was arrested and charged with forgery, which a capital offense in the eighteenth century. Despite appeals for clemency, Dodd was hanged on the 27 June 1777.

Science

There are two scientific dedications which are examined under the heading of royal patronage - *Elements of the Theory and Practice of Chymistry* (1758) published by the Scottish editor and author, Andrew Reid (d. 1767), and the second edition of *Gleanings of Natural History* (1760) by the English ornithologist and artist, George Edwards. *Elements of the Theory and Practice of Chymistry* was a translation of Pierre Joseph Macquer's *Elemens de Chymie Theorique* (1749).¹⁰¹ This work is an example of a royal dedication as Reid claims in his inscription to have been petitioned by Bute to undertake this translation 'with the sole View of rendering some small Service to my Country'.¹⁰² It was not an uncommon practice during the eighteenth century for writers to depend on translating for some part of their income. There are a number of reasons why Bute may have been chosen as the dedicatee – his position within the royal household, his enthusiasm for scientific subjects, or his acknowledged support of fellow Scotsmen, John Home and Adam Ferguson. Reid's aim in translating Macquer's *Elemens* is to facilitate 'the Study of a Science' that had been 'too much neglected in this Island'.¹⁰³ There is evidence in the dedication that the author received some form of patronage from Bute. Firstly, Reid counts himself 'very happy in seeing' approval for 'this Design' and secondly, he was bolstered by the 'Honour' bestowed upon him 'in condescending to take it under [his] Protection'.¹⁰⁴ Reid claims that Bute's reputation as a cultural patron, coupled with the protection of patronage, will ensure the success of *Elements*.¹⁰⁵

However, the third edition of *Elements of the Theory and Practice of Chymistry*,

¹⁰¹ Andrew Reid, *Elements of the Theory and Practice of Chymistry*, (London, 1758); Pierre Joseph Macquer, *Elemens de Chymie Theorique*, (Paris, 1751)

¹⁰² Reid, *Elements of the Theory and Practice of Chymistry*, p. ii

¹⁰³ *Ibid.*, pp. ii-iii

¹⁰⁴ *Ibid*

¹⁰⁵ *Ibid*

published in 1768 after Reid's death, has a different dedicatee – 'To the Students of the University of Edinburgh and all other Lovers of Chymistry'.¹⁰⁶ This inscription was written by one of the leading booksellers in Edinburgh, Alex Donaldson (1727-1794), who was the publisher of the third edition.¹⁰⁷ This address was written the year after Bute's final break with the King and the loss of influence in Scotland. There is no correspondence between Reid and the Earl of Bute, but we know that there is a connection between the author and the botanist Dr. Stephen Hales. Hales was both friend to Bute and chaplain and botanical advisor to Princess Augusta. In 1747, Reid wrote *The Nature of Tar, and a Method of Obtaining its Medical Virtues*, which was published alongside Hales's *An Account of Some Experiments on Tar-Water*.¹⁰⁸

The only work on botany that falls under the category of royal patronage is Edwards' *Gleanings of Natural History*, which was published in three volumes, between 1758 to 1764. It contains hundreds of engravings and previously unrecorded descriptions of uncommon birds, insects, and plants. Each of the three volumes were inscribed to a different person or institution. The first volume is addressed to the newly appointed Trustees of the British Museum, and the final volume to Washington Shirley, fifth Earl of Ferrers (1722-1778). Although Bute's name is on the list for second volume, he did not subscribe to the other volumes.¹⁰⁹ It was the usual practice for clients to ask permission from a patron before printing a dedication but Edwards confesses that he did not ask for approval. He asks the dedicatee to 'forgive my presumption' in inscribing this work without his 'knowledge or consent'.¹¹⁰ The author outlines some of the reasons why he chose to inscribe this particular volume to Bute. Firstly, he refers to his 'great love of, and encouragement given to Natural History'.¹¹¹ This was the period when Bute was patronising Hill's *Vegetable System* and botanical advisor to Augusta at Kew. Secondly, his role as a patron would protect 'all who sincerely endeavour, with strict truth, to bring new and undiscovered subjects in Nature to light'.¹¹² It was Edwards's plan that the Earl would continue to be a powerful patron who

¹⁰⁶ Reid, *Elements of the Theory and Practice of Chymistry*, (Edinburgh, 1768), p. i; Sher, *The Enlightenment and the Book: Scottish Authors and their Publishers in Eighteenth-Century Britain, Ireland and America*, p. 215

¹⁰⁷ Sher, *The Enlightenment and the Book*, p. 216

¹⁰⁸ Stephen Hales, *An Account of Some Experiments on Tar-Water*, (London, 1747)

¹⁰⁹ George Edwards, *Gleanings of Natural History*, vol.2 (London, 1760), p. 5

¹¹⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 3

¹¹¹ *Ibid.*, pp. 3-4

¹¹² *Ibid.*

supports the useful studies of 'the rising generation'.¹¹³

In the preface, Edwards reveals why he felt it was necessary for new major patron of natural history to emerge. He believed that he was fortunate in his career to have the 'great honour, happiness, and pleasure of being patronised by four Gentleman, who were, perhaps, the greatest promoters of learning, science, and arts, of any present age'.¹¹⁴ He names these chief patrons as the second Duke of Richmond, Sir Hans Sloane, Richard Mead M.D (1673-1754), and Martin Folkes (1690-1754). He publicly praises the contributions these patrons made to the promotion of science, and claims that he owes his position as Librarian at the Royal College of Physicians to 'the goodness and free generosity of [these] friends'.¹¹⁵ So, if Bute was not one of Edwards's chief patrons, why dedicate this volume to him? It was because by 1760 all these great patrons of science were dead, and Bute's acknowledged passion for science made him an ideal patron for future students of the subject. Finally, the author applauds Bute's role in encouraging Prince George's 'fine taste and genius for the Sciences'.¹¹⁶ The purpose of Edwards' dedication was to show his gratitude to the dedicatee for purchasing his portfolio of over nine hundred pictures, which costed £300. In the preface, the author discloses all of his 'original drawings are sold to a generous purchaser' and are now the 'property of the Noble Earl'.¹¹⁷ He alleges that these drawings were bought as a gift for the King. However, we cannot be certain as there is no record of any prints or drawings by Edwards listed in the Auction Sale Catalogues and they are not listed in the Royal Collection.¹¹⁸

Architecture

There is a connection between the two authors of the architectural dedications, as they both obtained positions in the royal household. William Chambers was a royal architect, and Joshua Kirby was the Prince's teacher in perspective and fortifications. Bute acted as a go-between Chambers, Kirby, and his royal patrons. A *Treatise on Civil Architecture* is a discussion on the principles of architecture and argues for the superiority of Roman over Greek

¹¹³ Ibid., p. 4

¹¹⁴ Ibid., p. ii

¹¹⁵ Ibid

¹¹⁶ Ibid

¹¹⁷ A. S. Mason, *George Edwards: The Bedell and his Birds*, (London, 1992), p. 46

¹¹⁸ Ibid., p. 46

architecture. This work is illustrated with fifty copper plates, and includes ideas from the works of many sixteenth and seventeenth century French and Italian architects, like Vincenzo Scamozzi (1548-1616), Giacomo Barozzi da Vignola (1507-1573), and Claude Perrault (1613-1688). The author was able to promote the works of these architects who not well-known in Britain during the middle half of the eighteenth century.¹¹⁹ Chambers's aim was to incorporate into one volume the many dispersed concepts, from the mountains of 'promiscuous materials', and to render the study of architecture 'more frequent, and consequently good Taste more universal'.¹²⁰ The architectural styles of the eighteenth century, (Palladian and Neo-Classical), were promoted by many noblemen who went on the Grand Tour, and students of architecture who travelled to Italy. They returned to Britain with an enthusiasm for design and classical architecture. Chambers was a proponent of Neo-Classicism along with his rival Robert Adam, another of Bute's personal clients. He travelled to Paris, Italy, and China with the Swedish East India Company where he studied the architecture of these countries, and is chiefly remembered for his contribution to the fashion of oriental art, architecture, and gardens in eighteenth-century Britain.

A *Treatise on Civil Architecture* is simply inscribed and humbly dedicated to 'John Earl of Bute, Groom of the Stole'.¹²¹ Despite the very brief address, the title page, subscribers list, and preface reveal some important details. The list of two hundred and sixty three subscribers acknowledge the royal support of Princess Augusta, Prince George, and the patronage broker, who introduced Chambers to the royal family. Three of the Bute clients - Joshua Kirby, Andrew Reid, and Robert Adam are present on the subscribers page. The author acknowledges that he secured the coveted position of architect to Prince George and Princess Augusta with Bute's support.¹²² The second unchanged edition of a *Treatise* was published in 1768. However, the third edition (1791) contains a new introduction, a revised perface, and amended sections. It was renamed the *Treatise on the Decorative Part of Civil Architecture* and dedicated to the King.¹²³ It is obvious that Chambers dedicated *Treatise on Civil Architecture* in recognition of Bute's support in securing royal patronage. A further two manuscripts on oriental design, *Designs of Chinese Buildings, Furniture, Dresses, Machines,*

¹¹⁹ Ibid., p. 9

¹²⁰ Ibid., p. iii

¹²¹ William Chambers, *A Treatise on Civil Architecture*, (London, 1759)

¹²² Ibid., p. 1

¹²³ William Chambers, *A Treatise on the Decorative Part of Civil Architecture*, (London, 1791)

and Utensils and *A Dissertation on Oriental Gardening*, were dedicated to George III.¹²⁴ Chambers was appointed alongside Robert Adam as an Architect of the Works, and his achievements in this capacity include the refashioning of Buckingham House from 1762 to 1773.¹²⁵ The Earl of Bute's role as a patronage broker brought Chambers into royal favour that he enjoyed for the rest of his life. However, it is important to note that Bute never employed Chambers in a personal capacity, instead reserving his architectural patronage for Chambers' rival, Robert Adam.

The third edition of *Dr. Brook Taylor's Method of Perspective Made Easy; Both in Theory and in Practice* (1765) by the English born artist and architect, Joshua Kirby, was inscribed to Bute. The author's work on linear perspective was based on mathematics of Dr. Brook Taylor (1685-1731).¹²⁶ His interpretation of Taylor's linear perspective was clear and instructive in comparison with the original, which was so mathematical in its structure and so abstruse that 'only perfect masters of the science' could understand it.¹²⁷ *Dr. Brook Taylor's Method of Perspective Made Easy* achieved a wide circulation and secured personal advancement for the author. The first edition was published in 1754 and was inscribed to the English painter and engraver, William Hogarth (1697-1764), who had contributed a comic frontispiece. It proved so popular that a second edition was published the following year, with Bute listed as a subscriber in the 1755 edition.

After Hogarth's death, the third edition of *Dr. Brook Taylor's Method of Perspective Made Easy* was addressed to Bute. In his dedication, the author refers to the dedicatee as 'so noble a Patron of Arts and Sciences'.¹²⁸ At the time of this publication in 1765, Bute still enjoyed the friendship of the King. The author uses this address to demonstrate his gratitude to his dedicatee who was 'the most benevolent Friend, even to me, who had little Reason to expect it'.¹²⁹ Through the Earl's intercession, Kirby was appointed to a number of positions. The first edition of *Dr. Brook Taylor's Method of Perspective Made Easy* (1754) was 'the

¹²⁴ William Chambers, *Designs of Chinese Buildings, Furniture, Dresses, Machines, and Utensils*, (London, 1757); William Chambers, *A Dissertation on Oriental Gardening*, (London, 1772)

¹²⁵ Bald, 'Sir William Chambers and the Chinese Garden', *Journal of the History of Ideas*, Vol. 11 (1950), p. 287

¹²⁶ Joseph Jopling, *Dr. Brook Taylor's Principles of Linear Perspective*, (London, 1835), p. viii; Edward Edwards, *A Practical Treatise of Perspective on the Principles of Dr. Brook Taylor*, (London, 1806)

¹²⁷ Edwards, *A Practical Treatise of Perspective on the Principles of Dr. Brook Taylor*, p. xi

¹²⁸ Joshua Kirby, *Dr. Brook Taylor's Method of Perspective Made Easy; Both in Theory and in Practice: In Two Books* (London, 1765), p. iv

¹²⁹ *Ibid*

fortunate Means of obtaining your Lordship's Favour and Protection'.¹³⁰ The 'more perfect Edition of my Book upon Perspective' was inscribed 'to Your Lordship'.¹³¹ In 1756, Kirby became the teacher of perspective and fortifications to the Prince George.¹³² After moving to a house in Kew in 1759, he obtained the important office of Comptroller of the Works from his patron.¹³³ He was appointed as 'Designer in Perspective to their Majesties' and was fortunate to obtain the patronage of the King for two more of his architectural works, *The Description and Use of a New Instrument* and *The Perspective of Architecture upon Dr. Brook Taylor's Method* (1761). The former publication contains no inscription but was dedicated to George III because it 'began by command of his present Majesty when Prince of Wales'.¹³⁴ It includes a plate entitled 44 House with a Colonnade, which was drawn by the King, who paid for the illustrations and was closely involved in the publication. It also has a lengthened description of the 'Architectonic Sector', an instrument that was invented by Bute.¹³⁵ Kirby, alongside his son William, was appointed as joint clerks of the works at Kew and Richmond. Therefore, the author publicly declares 'that the utmost of my Ambition is to shew myself not wholly unworthy of the Favours I have received'.¹³⁶

Religion

The only religious dedication was *The Divine Admonition, or Plan of Government, Given to David upon his Ascending the Throne of Israel* (1761) by the English clergyman and writer, Leonard Howard (1698/9-1767). This sermon was preached on 7 June from the writer's parishes of St Magnus the Martyr in London Bridge, and St George the Martyr in Southwark. It was ode upon the occasion and in honour of first anniversary of George III's ascension to the throne.¹³⁷ The title refers to the plan of government given to King David by God at the beginning of his reign, which would assist him through the many difficulties of governing an Empire. The aim of the sermon was to draw a portrait and character of a good prince that

¹³⁰ Ibid

¹³¹ Kirby, *Dr. Brook Taylor's Method of Perspective Made Easy; Both in Theory and in Practice*, p. iv

¹³² Russell, *John 3rd Earl of Bute: Patron and Collector*, p. 29

¹³³ John Freeman, *Life of the Rev. William Kirby*, (London, 1852), p. 9

¹³⁴ Kirby, *The Description and Use of a New Instrument Called, an Architectonic Sector*, p. 3

¹³⁵ Freeman, *Life of the Rev. William Kirby*, (London, 1852), p. 9

¹³⁶ Ibid

¹³⁷ Leonard Howard, *The Divine Admonition, or Plan of Government, Given to David upon his Ascending the Throne of Israel*, (London, 1761)

promoted the welfare and felicity of both the ruler and his subjects.¹³⁸ In order to be a good ruler, the prince must have affection for his subjects, strict regard for public virtue (manifested by his own example), and should 'rule justly over Men'.¹³⁹

Howard begins his dedication by declaring that a good education has the ability to tender the 'brain to virtue', and when given to a prince it will form 'the Foundation of that *just Rule over Men*'.¹⁴⁰ As a result, he inscribes his sermon to Bute because he believes that its content has 'some Claim to your Lordship's Patronage and Protection'.¹⁴¹ Firstly, Howard refers to the 'Improvements and Embellishments of Literature' that the King received from the dedicatee's 'great Reading and Knowledge'.¹⁴² Secondly, he claims Bute's private tuition and instruction to the King were amply rewarded by his appointment to the public councils where the monarch could continue to receive the 'Benefit and Service' of his judgement.¹⁴³ Finally, the author discloses that although he wishes to praise and panegyric recipient's many virtues and great merits, he fears that it would appear like flattery and invite too much criticism. Therefore, he believes that Bute's station and political achievements will soon allow the world to witness his many talents 'in a more striking Light'.¹⁴⁴ Like previous dedicators, the Howard is emphasising his position as tutor and educator to the King. The Earl of Bute was among a number of dedicatees that Howard inscribed work to between 1742 and 1765. He published approximately twelve sermons, and six of these were dedicated to different members of the nobility and the public. As Howard was chaplain to Augusta, it not wholly unexpected that the author would address this sermon in honour of the King to his chief advisor.

Bute's role as Lord of the Bedchamber, tutor, and manager of Kew Gardens provided regular access to members of the royal family. He not only benefited from royal patronage but acted as a go-between between clients, Princess Augusta and George III. From his house on Kew Green, Bute oversaw the early expansion of the Royal Botanic Gardens and his contribution

¹³⁸ Ibid., p. 3

¹³⁹ Ibid., p. 5

¹⁴⁰ Ibid., p. ii

¹⁴¹ Ibid

¹⁴² Ibid., p. iii

¹⁴³ Ibid

¹⁴⁴ Ibid

include the establishment of the botanical garden, and beginning the process of introducing large number of plants and trees from around the world. He was involved in the recruitment of staff, securing the appointments of William Chambers, George Ehret, and Simon Taylor. Chambers benefited greatly from royal patronage – he was architectural tutor to Prince George, primary architect at Kew Gardens, Architect of the Works, and his manuscripts were published at expense of Augusta. His dedication of *Treatise on Civil Architecture* was an acknowledgement of Bute's role to openly thank him for his support. The botanical artists, Ehert, and Taylor, spent many years employed at Kew cataloguing the rare species, and recording Bute's private collection of plants.

There are nine dedications classified as royal in nature. They reveal eight authors, all received some form of royal patronage. The only writer to seek patronage through an inscription is William Dodd who later that same year secured the position as Chaplain-in-Ordinary to the King. The remaining seven dedicators used their address to publicly thank Bute for his role in securing royal patronage. As chaplain to Augusta, Leonard Howard's *The Divine Admonition* is considered a royal, rather than a political, dedication, because it examines the qualities that enable Bute to be an effective and capable educator to the King. Bute revised Arthur Murphy's *The Orphan of China*, and acted on behalf of George III to commission Lyle to design scientific instruments. Murphy received further employment as one of his literary writers during his patron's term as Prime Minister. In their dedications, Murphy and Lyle refer to the importance of patronising the fine arts and make an appeal to their patron to continue his support of literature. Even though Lyle was not employed as a literary writer, he added a political element to his address to promote the Peace of Paris which would bring an end to the Seven Years' War.

The authors of the scientific dedications, Andrew Reid and George Edwards make a similar plea to Bute with the aim of encouraging his patronage of science – both to strengthen the George's scientific education, and to aid future students of science. As recipients of royal patronage – Reid was asked to translate Pierre Joseph Macquer's *Elemens de Chymie Theorique*, and Bute purchased Edwards' prints as a gift for the King. Joshua Kirby was the beneficiary of considerable royal patronage and his position as teacher of perspective and fortifications to Prince George would not have been possible without Bute's intercession. As all the authors were reliant on patronage, the image of Bute that we can gleam from these dedications is wholly positive – both as a patron and the influence he had

on the young King. This is in sharp contrast to with the negative depiction of the Earl of Bute in the press, especially after 1761.

CHAPTER 3

AN EXAMINATION OF POLITICAL DEDICATIONS AND BUTE'S SUPPORT OF SCOTTISH INSTITUTIONS AND UNIVERSITIES, 1761-1767

As Prime Minister of Great Britain, and Minister for Scottish Affairs, the Earl of Bute was in a unique position to influence political patronage. The eight political dedications made to Bute from 1761 to 1767, and his role in patronising Scottish universities and institutions are the two topics that are covered in this chapter. Despite the short time period, there were a high number of political dedications, which is not surprising considering many authors inscribed their work to prominent political figures with the aim of securing lucrative government appointments, or receiving an annual pension. As Prime Minister, Bute established two newspapers, the *Auditor* and the *Briton*, and utilised the services of a number of literary writers to promote his political policies and defend his ministry in the press. After the death of Ilay in 1761, the post of the Minister of Scottish Affairs fell to a reluctant Earl of Bute. The second part of this chapter examines his influence as Minister of Scotland and his role in selecting candidates to fill vacancies arising in the Scottish universities.

The patronage of universities is considered to be political as the Minister for Scottish Affairs exercised the Crown's legal right to fill positions in the Scottish universities and most of the other livings in Scotland's public office. As Minister, Bute was able to appoint candidates who shared his religious, political, and scientific concerns, thereby shaping the future of the Scottish universities. With the Earl of Bute's support, Dr John Hope was appointed Professor of Botany and *Materia Medica* at Edinburgh University. A study of these appointments and candidates will uncover the extent of Bute's university patronage and his contribution to Scottish cultural history.

Political dedications, 1761-1767

Title	Year	Subject	Author
<i>The English Verb; A Grammatical Essay</i>	1761	Literature	James White (fl.1761)
<i>Elvira</i>	1763	Literature	David Mallet (1701/2-1765)
<i>The Universal Mentor</i>	1763	Literature	Sir John Fielding (1721-1780)
<i>The Aeneid of Virgil</i>	1767	Literature	Alexander Strahan (dates unknown)
<i>Dialogues in the Elysian Fields, Between Cardinal Wolsey, and Cardinal Ximenes</i>	1761	History	Joseph Grove (d.1764)
<i>An Authentic Journal of the Expedition to Belleisle, and of the Siege of the Citadel of Palais</i>	1761	History	William Smith (dates unknown)
<i>The Republic of Plato</i>	1763	Philosophy	Henry Spens (1714-1787)
<i>A Dissertation on Miracles: Containing an Examination of the Principles Advanced by David Hume</i>	1762	Religion	George Campbell (1719-1796)

Table 5: List of authors looking for political patronage

THE PATRONAGE OF POLITICAL WRITERS, 1761-1762

After Scotland became part of the Union in 1707, there was a rise in anti-Scottish sentiment in England, especially after the Jacobite Rising in 1715, and Rebellion of 1745. In British society, the prevalent view was that the Scots were a destabilising force, and as fervent supporters of the ousted Stuart dynasty, their loyalty was questionable. There was also the belief that cultural achievements in Scotland were inferior to those in England, and suffered from poor agricultural output because they failed to embrace the new farming innovations that were being practiced in the south. There were many Scots who resented this marginalisation and wished to benefit from Scotland's position within Britain, particularly as the Empire grew larger and trade dramatically increased. These Scots promoted Scottish cultural and economic achievements, pointing to the success of John Home's *Douglas* and James Macpherson's *Ossian*, which they claimed showcased Scotland's great literary tradition.

Prior to George becoming King in 1760, there was little public interest in Bute. His appointment as Secretary of State for the Northern Department in March 1761 increased his public profile, and he became not only a powerful government figure, but a person of interest in the press.¹ Public hostility rested on a number of factors – his nationality, surname, his close relationship with George III, his lack of political experience, and the allegation that he was the lover of Princess Augusta. One of the aims of George III's new reign was to bring to a close the expensive Seven Year's War. However, it was difficult to mobilise public support for an end to the most successful war Britain had ever fought that heightened national prestige and imperial power. Bute's political rival, William Pitt, was a well-liked public figure, a 'patriot', who supported the war and the economic opportunities and benefits of accumulating overseas territories. His resignation from government in October 1761, only boosted his popularity with the public with his supporters believing that he was a victim of court politics. Bute was eager to dispel the idea that Pitt had been expelled from his post and employed the services of several literary writers to refute these allegations. These literary writers defended the government and its policies, including the prevention of war with Spain (which Pitt supported), and demonstrated that the Bute administration was indeed capable of vigorously pursuing the war.²

Bute employed the services of one of his close friends, Dr. John Campbell, to write a pamphlet in support of the ministry that was critical of Pitt.³ They argued that Pitt had resigned voluntarily and was rewarded for his distinguished service by his acceptance of an annual pension of £3000 and a peerage for his wife. This had the effect of damaging Pitt's reputation as a 'patriot' and his supporters attacked Bute, his administration, and policies.⁴ By the early summer of 1762, the political nation was engaged in a full-scale press war that would last until the end of the decade.⁵

Bute responded to these verbal attacks by establishing his own pro-government newspapers, the *Briton* in May, and the *Auditor* in June 1762.⁶ Some of the writers who were

¹ John Brewer, 'The Misfortunes of Lord Bute: A Case-Study in Eighteenth-Century Political Argument and Public Opinion', *The Historical Journal*, Vol. 16, No. 1 (mar., 1973), p. 3

² Karl W. Schweizer, 'Lord Bute and the Press', in Karl W. Schweizer's [ed] *Lord Bute: Essays in Re-interpretation*, (Leicester, 1988), p. 83

³ Brewer, 'The Misfortunes of Lord Bute', p. 14

⁴ Marie Peters, 'Pitt as a foil to Bute: the public debate over ministerial responsibility and the powers of the Crown', in Karl W. Schweizer's [ed] *Lord Bute: Essays in Re-interpretation*, (Leicester, 1988), p. 100

⁵ Brewer, 'The Misfortunes of Lord Bute', p. 12

⁶ Ibid

employed to publish pamphlets and contribute to these newspapers were James Ralph (1724-1762), Tobias Smollett, Arthur Murphy, William Guthrie (1708-1770), Hugh Baillie, Israel Manduit (1708-1787), and Dr. John Campbell.⁷ The main undertaking of these writers was to construct an adequate defence of the government and its policies, to provide commentaries on the political situation, and to develop public support for an end to the war abroad.⁸ They were keen to show that taxation needed to support war loans bore heavily on the land and adversely affected trade.⁹ Smollett became editor of the *Briton* and Murphy was appointed editor of the *Auditor*. The historian and political writer, James Ralph, who received a pension in 1760, was also employed to write pro-government pamphlets.¹⁰ Guthrie and Baillie wrote letters defending Bute in the *Gazetteer* that stressed the need for immediate peace, and Manduit wrote *Occasional Thoughts on the Present German War* which argued that the war was not beneficial to Britain.¹¹ Manuit was the grateful recipient of a government postition.¹² These writers responded to new crises and issues, and in 1763 Campbell argued in favour of a moderate peace in *A Description and History of the New Sugar Islands in the West Indies*, which was a major justification of Bute's Peace of Paris.¹³

Unfortunately for Bute, his literary advocates Murphy and Smollett, were no match for the popularity and wit of John Wilkes.¹⁴ Wilkes played upon popular anti-Scottish prejudices and his *North Briton* began a campaign of anti-Bute propaganda directed at his administration, his friends, and his clients.¹⁵ There was a widespread belief that the large numbers of Scots moving to London in search of greater opportunities in London were given places and pensions by Bute's government.¹⁶ Wilkes and his supporters resented the rise of these Scottish clients and attacked the Earl as an exemplar of that unnatural and constitutional subversive figure, the favourite, or over-mighty subject.¹⁷ They shared a belief that Bute was abusing his power and monopolising the affections of the Crown, diverting

⁷Ibid., p. 14

⁸ Schweizer, 'Lord Bute and the Press', p. 90

⁹ Paul Langford, *A Polite and Commercial People: England 1727-1783*, (Oxford, 1998), p. 346

¹⁰ Schweizer, 'Lord Bute and the Press', pp. 87-89

¹¹ Langford, *A Polite and Commercial People: England 1727-1783*, p. 347; Brewer, 'The Misfortunes of Lord Bute', p. 14

¹² Schweizer, 'Lord Bute and the Press', p. 88

¹³ Ibid

¹⁴ Schweizer, 'Lord Bute and the Press', p. 90

¹⁵ Brewer, 'The Misfortunes of Lord Bute', p. 12

¹⁶ Linda Colley, *Britons: Forging the Nation 1707-1837*, (Reading, 2005), p. 124

¹⁷ Brewer, 'The Misfortunes of Lord Bute', p. 23

patronage from the public to private ends.¹⁸ Bute's experiences at the hands of the press were far from unique and the mobbing of politicians was an enduring feature of eighteenth-century political life. Robert Walpole sponsored writers and eight newspapers during the early eighteenth century and spent well over £50,000 on them.¹⁹ Walpole's reputation suffered during the Excise Crisis in 1733, and the Duke of Bedford was hissed by the mob on leaving the country to negotiate the Peace of Paris in 1762.²⁰ These press attacks played an important role in this almost universal hatred and rejection of Bute which lasted long after his resignation.

POLITICAL DEDICATIONS, 1761-1767

Literature

There are four literary dedications that are categorised under the heading of political patronage – James White's *The English Verb; A Grammatical Essay* (1761); *Elvira* (1763) by David Mallet; *The Universal Mentor* (1763) by Sir John Fielding and Alexander Strahan's *The Aeneid of Virgil* (1767). James White's (fl.1761) *The English Verb; A Grammatical Essay* examines the different tenses, voices, and conjugations of the English verb, with the aim of making a significant contribution towards the formation of English grammar.²¹ Almost nothing is known regarding the life and works of James White, whether he published any more essays, or if obtained the patronage of Bute. The only information provided is his ten years of experience in a 'Practical Course of Education'.²² His motivation for inscribing *The English Verb*, or selection of dedicatee is not known, but it may be due to the Bute's prominence as a well-known political figure – the address is to 'One of His Majesty's Principal Secretaries of State'.²³ White compliments the 'High and Amiable Character' of his prospective patron and praises Bute's role as 'the most Eminent Judge and Impartial Patron

¹⁸ Ibid., p. 24

¹⁹ Simon Targett, 'Government and Ideology during the Age of Whig Supremacy: The Political Argument of Sir Robert Walpole's Newspaper Propagandists', *The Historical Journal*, Vol. 37, No. 2 (jun., 1994), p. 290

²⁰ Brewer, 'The Misfortunes of Lord Bute', p. 8

²¹ James White, *The English Verb; A Grammatical Essay, in the Didactic Form*, (London, 1761)

²² Ibid., p. xi

²³ Ibid., p. ii

of Literary Merit'.²⁴ As befitting his social status and political position, the writer identifies Bute as an arbiter of taste and judgment, which was the reason the author felt 'Imbolden'd' to submit his manuscript before his lordship for his inspection and support.²⁵ In appealing for patronage, White pays tribute to the dedicatee as another Maecenas who patronises every 'Elegant or Useful Work of Art and Science'.²⁶ This image of Bute as an eighteenth-century Maecenas closely resembles Arthur Murphy and David Lyle's royal dedications. As the author applauds Bute's generosity (which exceeded his expectations) for a work that was presented to him 'without any other Circumstance to recommend it', we have reason to believe that the received some financial aid in return for his dedication.²⁷ As he is not named as one of the government's literary writers and James White is not listed as having published any other works, it appears likely that Bute's patronage did not extend beyond a once off payment for *The English Verb*.

The second literary dedication was the play *Elvira* by the Scottish poet and playwright, David Mallet.²⁸ This was not the author's first attempt to secure Bute's patronage, and his poem *Truth, in rhyme: addressed to a certain noble Lord* (1761) refers to 'The Monarch's and the Muse's Friend'.²⁹ It is clear that *Elvira* met with Bute's approval as it was 'under the sanction of [his] name'. The play was produced by David Garrick and staged at Drury Lane.³⁰ Mallet declares that his dedication 'bears no immediate relation to public affairs' and is addressed to the private nobleman, rather than the Minister of State.³¹ He echoes the sentiments of previous writers by calling Bute 'a friend to all the liberal arts', praising his abilities as a 'Patron as well as a Judge', and his talent in perceiving the genuine beauty and utility of the works which are presented to him.³² This may be a reference to the success of the plays of John Home and Arthur Murphy, confirming dedicatee's role as a

²⁴ Ibid., p. iii

²⁵ Ibid

²⁶ Ibid

²⁷ Ibid

²⁸ David Mallet, *Elvira*, (London, 1763); *London Evening Post*, (London, England), January 27, 1763-January 29, 1763; Issue 4595

²⁹ David Mallet, *Truth, in rhyme: addressed to a certain noble Lord*, (London, 1761), Jung, *David Mallet, Anglo-Scot: Poetry, Patronage, and Politics in the Age of Union*, p. 158

³⁰ Mallet, *Elvira*, p. i

³¹ Mallet, *Elvira*, p. i

³² Ibid., p. ii

patron of taste and judgement. With deference to his patron, Mallet humbly acknowledges that this praise scarcely does 'scanty justice to the Man'.³³

Despite his assertion that he was dedicating *Elvira* to the nobleman rather than the statesman, the author claims that he would be amiss if he did not mention the services that Bute performs for 'the welfare of Britain' and the 'happiness of a whole people'.³⁴ This was the Prime Minister's efforts in bringing an end to the 'long and consuming tho' successful war'.³⁵ By 1762, the cost of war had spiraled, and the national debt stood at £150 million.³⁶ There was a strong opposition to the peace as many were opposed the lenient terms given to France and the return of conquered territories to Spain and France. Bute and his supporters believed that many overseas colonies would be too difficult and costly to govern, and would leave Britain perilously overstretched and unable to adequately defend all er territories. Mallet uses his address to appeal to the public that an end to the war is good for the nation, and for 'the present and future interests of their country'.³⁷ The author tries to dismiss the allegation that Bute was an over-mighty subject and insists that he is not swayed by wealth, titles or power, that 'no popularity can give' and 'no temporary want of it can destroy'.³⁸ This defense of the government and Bute, is hardly surprising given that Mallet was one of the writers employed to sway public opinion. However, no amount of persuasion could overcome Bute's position as favourite, or his Scottishness, and he remained one of the most hated figures in eighteenth-century Britain.

A literary writer could have a few significant patrons over the course of his lifetime and Mallet's career is an example of the fickleness of patronage. In 1742, he was first appointed as under-secretary to Prince Frederick, receiving an annual salary of £200. However, when his patron, Baron Lyttelton, joined the opposition and fell from favour in 1744, Mallet lost his post and financial security.³⁹ His second attempt at securing a pension was his dedication of *Elvira*. Mallet was rewarded for his literary service when seven days after the publication of *Elvira* he was appointed Keeper of the book of Entries for ships in the

³³ Ibid

³⁴ Ibid

³⁵ Ibid

³⁶ John M. Cardwell, *Arts and Arms: Literature, Politics, and Patriotism During the Seven Years War*, (Manchester, 2004), p. 250

³⁷ Mallet, *Elvira*, p. iii

³⁸ Ibid

³⁹ Sandro Jung, *David Mallet, Anglo-Scot: Poetry, Patronage, and Politics in the Age of Union*, (New Jersey, 2008), p. 137

Port of London, and awarded an annual pension of £300.⁴⁰ He continued to receive his pension until his death in 1765.

Sir John Fielding's *The Universal Mentor* is the second literary dedication of 1763.⁴¹ Fielding was the half-brother of the novelist, Henry Fielding (1707-1754), who was a magistrate and founder of London's first police force, the Bow Street Runners. John Fielding followed the career of his half-brother, first becoming his assistant, and later a Justice of the Peace for Westminster. He was deeply involved in a number of charities, including the Marine Society (est. 1756), which entered boys into the navy, and the Female Orphan Society (est. 1758). He believed that these charities would prevent poorer children leading a life of crime in the future. *The Universal Mentor* describes the duties of a magistrate, and policies that would result in the peace, good order, and the happiness of society. These duties were to instruct the ignorant, correct those who were misled, the reformation of youthful errors, and the execution of the laws themselves.⁴² As the Bow Street Runners were funded by the government, throughout the late 1750s and early 1760s, Fielding was frequent in his requests for financial support for policing in London, first appealing to the Lord of the Treasury, the Duke of Newcastle in 1757. He also lobbied the government for a knighthood that he received in 1761.

It is most likely for these reasons that Bute was chosen as the dedicatee for *The Universal Mentor*. The topic of crime and prevention was an important one, and a victim of mob violence would surely welcome a better equipped and more effective police force. As the knighthood was bestowed during Bute's ministry, Fielding both acknowledges his debt 'for a favour received' and uses this dedication to repay this 'obligation'.⁴³ He expresses his gratitude 'for the kind notice with which you have honoured my slender endeavours to serve my country, and to request the favour of inscribing this little work to your Lordship's patronage'.⁴⁴ The author claims that he does not want to embellish or 'absurdly attempt to

⁴⁰ *London Evening Post*, (London, England), February 3, 1763-February 5, 1763; Issue 4598; Jung, David Mallet, *Anglo-Scot: Poetry, Patronage, and Politics in the Age of Union*, p. 158

⁴¹ Sir Henry Fielding, *The Universal Mentor; Or, Entertaining Instructor. Consisting of Essays on the most Important Subjects in Life; Selected from the most Approved Historians, Biographers, and Moral Writers, Ancient and Modern*, (London, 1763); John Styles, 'Sir John Fielding and the Problem of Criminal Investigation in Eighteenth-Century England', *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*, Fifth Series, Vol. 33 (1983), pp. 127-149 ; J. M. Beattie, 'Sir John Fielding and Public Justice: The Bow Street Magistrates' Court, 1754-1780', *Law and History Review*, Vol. 25, No. 1 (Spring, 2007), pp. 61-100

⁴² Fielding, *The Universal Mentor; Or, Entertaining Instructor*, p. ii

⁴³ *Ibid.*, p. iii

⁴⁴ *Ibid.*, p. ii

gain credit, by painting your Lordship's virtues larger than the life, or weakly seek to secure your friendship and protection, by false and abject flattery'.⁴⁵ However, his language is flattering when he praises Bute's personal virtues and as 'a wise and able Statesman' he would recognise the benefits to society and to the government, of inspiring youth to nobler sentiments and away from a life of crime.⁴⁶ Fielding ends his address humbly – calling the Earl 'a good Man, and an able Statesman', and hopes he may long retain these great characteristics for the advantage and happiness of King and country.⁴⁷ However, the pressure and strain of political life proved too much and Bute resigned from the government in May 1763.

Hymn to the Power of Harmony (1763) by the Scottish lawyer and antiquary, John Callander (c.1721-1789), was 'humbly' inscribed to Bute.⁴⁸ This author is best remembered for the controversy and accusations of plagiarism surrounding his historical and explanatory notes on Milton's *Paradise Lost*. He was found to have borrowed heavily sections of his work from Patrick Hume's (fl.1695) edition of *The Poetical Works of Mr John Milton*. We know Callander was a supporter of 'the ingenious Mr Macpherson' (Bute's client, James Macpherson) who rescued 'from the oblivion' the immortal poems of Ossian.⁴⁹ His short hymn is one of the few dedications published in Edinburgh. The author's short inscription refers to Bute as 'belov'd of Science'.⁵⁰ There is no discernible connection between Bute and Callander during the 1760s when the dedication was made, but in 1781 they were both members of the newly established Society of Antiquaries of Scotland.⁵¹ Bute became President of the Society and Callander was appointed Secretary for Foreign Correspondence in April 1781.⁵² A second edition of his poem was published in 1788, containing the same inscription.⁵³

The final literary dedication comes from Alexander Strahan (dates unknown) who

⁴⁵ Ibid., p. i-ii

⁴⁶ Ibid

⁴⁷ Ibid., p. iv

⁴⁸ John Callander, *Hymn to the Power of Harmony*, (Edinburgh, 1763)

⁴⁹ John Callander, *Speedily will be published, Bibliotheca septentrionalis, or, an universal dictionary, containing everything relative to the northern nations, from The Sources of the Danube and Rhine, to The Extremities of Iceland and Greenland*, (Edinburgh, 1778), p. 8

⁵⁰ Ibid., p. 10

⁵¹ Bute's involvement in the Society of Antiquaries of Scotland is discussed in chapter 4.

⁵² William Smellie, *Account of the Institution and Progress of the Society of the Antiquaries of Scotland*, pp. 30-46

⁵³ *London Chronicle*, (London, England), October 6, 1789-October 8, 1789; Issue 5178

inscribed his translation of the *The Aeneid of Virgil* (1767).⁵⁴ There is no entry in the *Dictionary of National Biography* for Alexander Strahan, though there are a few newspapers articles which provide some information regarding his life and works. He published an English translation of the first book of the *Aeneid* in 1739 with the sixth book appearing in 1753.⁵⁵ An article in April 1767 in the *Public Advertiser* reports the death of Strahan who was 'upwards of eighty years of age' and 'a Gentleman of distinguished Parts and Learning'.⁵⁶ *The Aeneid of Virgil* was published after the author's death and the advertisement states that it had been revised and corrected by 'the late David Mallet'. This dedication may have been presented to Bute before the deaths of Mallet and Strahan. We know that some type of support was forthcoming as Strahan conveys his thanks for his 'condescension' in permitting him to dedicate this English translation of Virgil's *Aeneid*. Reference is made to Bute's authority as a cultural patron and the author hopes that his 'efforts' have not rendered it unworthy 'of the Acceptance of so great a Man, and so great a Judge'.⁵⁷ Strahan praises Bute's abilities, and proficiency in literature and science, which have resulted in 'our most accomplished Writers to shelter their Performance under your Patronage'.⁵⁸ He concludes by acknowledging the great 'honour your have done me' in receiving his protection and how fortunate he was in finding 'a Maecenas' like his favourite writer.⁵⁹

History

There were two dedications in history in 1761 - *Two Dialogues in the Elysian Fields, Between Cardinal Wolsey, and Cardinal Ximenes* by the English biographer and attorney, Joseph Grove (d.1764) and William Smith's *An Authentic Journal of the Expedition to Belleisle, and of the Siege of the Citadel of Palais*. Grove's *Two Dialogues in the Elysian Fields* contains a very short dedication to Bute and addresses him as 'One of His Majesty's Principal Secretaries of State'.⁶⁰ The preface was written on 25 March 1761, the same day as his appointment as

⁵⁴ Alexander Strahan, *The Aeneid of Virgil. Translated into Blank Verse, by Alexander Strahan*, (London, 1767)

⁵⁵ *Daily Post*, (London, England), Tuesday, July 10, 1739; Issue 6188; *Public Advertiser*, (London, England), Monday, May 14, 1753; Issue 5785

⁵⁶ *Public Advertiser*, (London, England), Tuesday, April 14, 1767; Issue 10093; *Gazetteer and New Daily Advertiser*, (London, England), Tuesday, April 14, 1767; Issue 11 890

⁵⁷ *Ibid.*, pp. i-ii

⁵⁸ *Ibid.*, p. ii

⁵⁹ *Ibid.*, p. iii. Maecenas was the patron of both Virgil and Horace.

⁶⁰ Joseph Grove, *Two Dialogues in the Elysian Fields, Between Cardinal Wolsey, and Cardinal Ximenes*, (London,

Secretary of State for the Northern Department. Grove humbly lays this work before Bute with all 'Veneration and Respect'.⁶¹ The preface also reveals the author's motivation for publishing *Two Dialogues*. His aim was to narrate the true historical facts and to do justice to Cardinal Wolsey, that 'eminent statesman', who the Grove considers as 'one of the greatest Patrons and encouragers of Learning' in the sixteenth century.⁶² As Lord Chancellor to Henry VIII, Wolsey was often portrayed as an over-powerful minister whose rapid advancement from humble origins earned him many enemies. Similiar comparisions were made to Bute's spectacular rise from obscure Scottish politician to favourite of George III. Grove claims previous biographies of Wolsey were biased and should be consigned to oblivion, and his intention was to restore the Cardinal's tattered reputation.

Therefore, it would not be unreasonable to assume that Bute would have an interest in rehabilitating the reputation of such an unpopular minister as Wolsey. The author draws parallels between the 'golden age' of art and science in the sixteenth century, with the present age, when the Learned 'had all the Reason in the World to expect to meet with the Royal Patronage and Encouragement from a truly Magnanimous King'.⁶³ He cites his purpose in writing *Two Dialogues* was from 'Duty and Affection' to King and country, and since he was 'so advanced in years' did not expect any particular advantage.⁶⁴ Nevertheless, Grove concludes the preface by expressing his hope that a complete history of Britain would be undertaken and written under royal patronage in honour of George III. Despite his age, the author may be announcing his willingness to write this 'History of England'. The project of compiling the 'History of Britain' fell not to Grove, but to the Scottish historian, William Robertson, who was first instructed by Bute to write a history of Scotland in 1759. By 1761, this project had evolved to a government-sponsored 'History of England' but Robertson's 'History' was never completed.

Grove's historical biography on *The History of the Life and Times of Cardinal Wolsey, Prime Minster to King Henry VIII* was a four volume work, published between 1742 and 1744.⁶⁵ Each volume was inscribed to a different influential member of government: Henry

1761), p. ii

⁶¹ Ibid

⁶² Ibid

⁶³ Ibid., p. iv

⁶⁴ Ibid., p. vi

⁶⁵ Joseph Grove, *The History of the Life and Times of Cardinal Wolsey, Prime Minster to King Henry VIII in 4 vols*, (London, 1742-44); Joseph Grove, *The Lives of All the Earls and Dukes of Devonshire*, (London, 1764); *Gazetteer and*

Pelham (1694-1754), Arthur Onslow (1691-1768), Sir Matthew Decker (1679-1749), and William Stanhope, first Earl of Harrington (1683?-1756). There is very little surviving information concerning the life of Joseph Grove and whether he had any connection to Bute. Since *The History of the Life and Times of Cardinal Wolsey* was addressed to well-known members of government, it is likely that Grove continued this tradition in his dedication of *Two Dialogues*.

In June of 1761, a British army volunteer called William Smith published *An Authentic Journal of the Expedition to Belleisle, and of the Siege of the Citadel of Palais*.⁶⁶ This was published a few short weeks after the capture by the British army of the island of Belleisle (or Belle Île) off the coast of Brittany. During this six week siege (22 April to 8 June) of the Seven Years' War, the British seized the island's main citadel of Le Palais. Smith's *An Authentic Journal of the Expedition* includes a map of the island for the reading public and recollects the expedition and subsequent siege. This dedication is jointly addressed to the Secretaries of State, William Pitt and the Earl of Bute. Smith congratulates the secretaries on 'this great and glorious event' and 'the first fruits of your joint labours'.⁶⁷ The author may praise the collaboration of Pitt and Bute but the truth was that they strongly disagreed over how the war should be fought and the requirements for peace. The expedition to capture Belleisle was originally proposed by Pitt and its capture strengthened Britain's position in the peace negotiations.

The author maintains that during this present conflict, the British army 'raised immortal trophies of conquest and honour in the four quarters of the globe'.⁶⁸ He believes the troops were inspired to victory 'by your councils' which are 'distinguished above all others'.⁶⁹ Smith was a supporter of carrying on the war effort as he voices his fervent desire for further victories and conquests so that the annals may be filled with these 'great and glorious events'.⁷⁰ The victory and possession of Belleisle was 'of the utmost importance' during a time of war' where the British army was 'long accustomed to triumph'.⁷¹ Bute was fearful that Britain could not effectively govern these newly acquired territories and did not

New Daily Advertiser, (London, England), Thursday, May 10, 1764 (Issue 10971)

⁶⁶ *Public Advertiser*, (London, England), Friday, June 19, 1761; Issue 8303

⁶⁷ William Smith, *An Authentic Journal of the Expedition to Belleisle, and of the Siege of the Citadel of Palais*, (London, 1761), p. ii

⁶⁸ *Ibid*

⁶⁹ *Ibid.*, p. iii

⁷⁰ *Ibid*

⁷¹ *Ibid*

want to aggravate France towards another war. He took a moderate approach by showing a willingness to compromise through bargaining and diplomacy.⁷² On the other hand, Pitt argued that Britain should have exclusive control over the valuable fisheries in North America. He was unwilling to negotiate any concessions. Therefore, the author may have dedicated the work to Bute but he was a supporter of Pitt's policy of continuing the war.

Smith concludes his dedication with his belief that this administration would 'become the favourite era of the historian, and the darling theme of applause and admiration to the latest posterity'.⁷³ This was the beginning of the era of Britain's dominance outside Europe. In August 1761, France signed The Bourbon Family Compact with Spain to strengthen their negotiating position, and put pressure on Britain to concede to their demands. Pitt believed a war with Spain was inevitable and urged the government to launch a pre-emptive attack. His motion was defeated and Pitt resigned on 5 October 1761.⁷⁴ Belleisle was occupied by the British for two years and was returned to France in exchange for Minorca, after the Treaty of Paris in February 1763. The *An Authentic Journal of the Expedition to Belleisle* was Smith's only publication and apart from his position as a volunteer in the army, nothing else is known about the author.

Religion

The only religious dedication under the heading of political patronage is George Campbell's (1719-1796) *A Dissertation on Miracles: Containing an Examination of the Principles Advanced by David Hume*.⁷⁵ This religious tract was delivered as a sermon in 1760 and written in belated response to David Hume's (1711-1776) extremely controversial essay *Of Miracles* (1748).⁷⁶ *Of Miracles* claims that it was unreasonable to believe in miracles because our knowledge comes from the unreliable testimony of people who 'allegedly' witnessed a miracle. He argues that the Scriptures were based on the testimony of the Apostles and no

⁷² Karl W. Schweizer, 'Lord Bute, William Pitt, and the peace negotiations with France April-September 1761', in Karl W. Schweizer's [ed] *Lord Bute: Essays in Re-interpretation*, (Leicester, 1988), pp. 43-45

⁷³ Ibid

⁷⁴ John M. Cardwell, *Arts and Arms: Literature, Politics, and Patriotism During the Seven Years War*, (Manchester, 2004), pp. 250-251

⁷⁵ George Campbell, *A Dissertation on Miracles: Containing an Examination of the Principles Advanced by David Hume, Esq.; in An Essay on Miracles*, (Edinburgh, 1762)

⁷⁶ David Hume, *Philosophical Essays Concerning Human Understanding*, (London, 1748)

one can be certain of the truth of their testimony.⁷⁷ Therefore, Hume declaration that miracles are a violation of the laws of nature, and since testimony is full of errors and mistakes, it cannot be counted as proof of the existence of miracles.⁷⁸ The arguments raised in *Of Miracles* were widely debated throughout eighteenth-century Britain and brought Hume into conflict with the Church of Scotland.⁷⁹ As a result, Campbell's essay refutes the 'reasoning and objections' of Hume in regard to miracles, and declares that *Of Miracles* 'deserves to be consider'd, as one of the most dangerous attacked that have been made on our religion'⁸⁰

Campbell's sermon was originally preached before the synod of Aberdeen, and he reveals in the advertisement that he was encouraged to publish his response to Hume. The author argues that testimony was sufficient proof of the existence of religious miracles, and that this testimony was credible unless it could be proven otherwise.⁸¹ In the advertisement for *A Dissertation on Miracles* that was published in the *Public Advertiser* on 21 May 1762, the author states that Bute approved of its inscription.⁸² Therefore, Campbell's rebuttal of Hume's *Of Miracles* had the support of the Prime Minister of Great Britain. He claims to have addressed this work to the Premier as it was 'in defence of a religion of which he [Bute] is an eminent patron and example'.⁸³ Bute was considered to be very devout in his religious beliefs and was a member of the Scottish Episcopal Church. On the title page, Campbell refers to his position as Principal of Marischal College and had been appointed to this post in 1759 through the influence of his distant cousin, the Earl of Ilay, third Duke of Argyll.⁸⁴ Campbell was dedicating *A Dissertation on Miracles* to Bute who was both Chancellor of Marischal College and the new Minister for Scottish Affairs. The second (1766) and third (1796) editions of this popular work were likewise inscribed to Bute. In a letter written to Bute on 30

⁷⁷ Ibid., pp. 173-174

⁷⁸ Ibid., p. 180

⁷⁹ Jeffrey M. Sudermann, *Orthodoxy and Enlightenment: George Campbell in the Eighteenth-Century*, (Quebec, 2001), p. 124; Tony Pitson, 'George Campbell's Critique of Hume on Testimony', *The Journal of Scottish Philosophy*, Vol. 4 (1) 2006, pp. 1-15

⁸⁰ Campbell, *A Dissertation on Miracles*, p. v-vi

⁸¹ Ibid., p. 7

⁸² *Public Advertiser*, (London, England), Friday, May 21, 1762; Issue 8595

⁸³ Campbell, *A Dissertation on Miracles*, p. ii

⁸⁴ Arthur E. Walzer, *George Campbell: Rhetoric in the Age of Enlightenment*, (New York, 2003), p. 8; Sudermann, *Orthodoxy and Enlightenment George Campbell in the Eighteenth-Century*, p. 21

September 1762, Campbell expresses his thanks of 'the notice which your Lordship took of my late application'.⁸⁵

Philosophy

The only philosophical dedication, *The Republic of Plato*, was dedicated by the Scottish minister and classicist, Henry Spens (1714-1787).⁸⁶ *The Republic of Plato* was the first English translation of *The Republic* from the original Greek, and it was originally published in Glasgow. At this time, Spens was rector in the parish of Wemyss where he was minister for thirty-five years. The author justifies his reasons for addressing the work to Bute by declaring that 'the dignity of the subject makes me presume to inscribe the following translation to your Lordship'.⁸⁷ His aim in publishing this translation was for Plato and his writings to become more accessible to readers, and to encourage the spirit of inquiry into ancient learning. Spens asserts that 'there is a peculiar pleasure in the study of ancient manners and Plato's description of them is both entertaining and instructive'.⁸⁸ He also states that *Republic* gives a 'masterly' sketch of education, politics, philosophy, and the fine arts.⁸⁹ Plato claims that education is the foundation of government, and that the fine arts are 'the handmaids of virtue'.⁹⁰ The author believes that this translation of *The Republic* and Plato's teachings will 'promote the taste for true politeness' and may ultimately 'give us the knowledge of ourselves'.⁹¹ It is his fervent hope that by obtaining the patronage of the great and powerful they would recommend the philosophy of Plato to all 'our countrymen'.⁹²

Spens continues his dedication by describing the role of the patriot-minister as delineated by Plato, who first suggested the idea of a patron in *The Republic*. The patriot-minister embodies all the characteristics of statesman and philosopher in harmonious union. These characteristics include the ability and integrity of perform duties which are both

⁸⁵ Aberdeen University, Special Libraries and Archives, MSM 370

⁸⁶ Henry Spens, *The Republic of Plato; In Ten Books. Translated from the Greek by H. Spens, D.D. With a Preliminary Discourse Concerning the Philosophy of the Ancients by the Translator*, (Glasgow, 1763)

⁸⁷ *Ibid.*, p. i

⁸⁸ *Ibid.*

⁸⁹ *Ibid.*, p. ii

⁹⁰ *Ibid.*

⁹¹ *Ibid.*

⁹² *Ibid.*

important and critical to the well-being of the state'.⁹³ The author concludes his inscription by testifying in this very public manner of the great 'respect and gratitude' for Bute.⁹⁴ He sought permission for his inscription and used this dedication to attempt to gain support from Bute in order to obtain an academic position for his brother, Robert. However, it seems that support was not forthcoming and Robert failed in obtaining a post.⁹⁵ Spens was more successful in his future employment, and was appointed to the chair of Divinity at St. Andrews in 1779. He was supported in his candidacy by a friend and client of Bute's, William Robertson.

Mock dedications

Title	Year	Subject	Author
<i>The Fall of Mortimer</i>	1763	Literature	William Hatchett (dates unknown) and dedication by John Wilkes (1725-1797)
<i>The Favourite: An Historical Tragedy</i>	1770	Literature	Francis Gentleman (1728-1784)

Table 6: List of mock dedications, 1763-1770

During the eighteenth century, an attack on patrons and the patronage system, could take the form of a mock dedication. The goal of authors of mock dedications was not to seek patronage. The two mock inscriptions by John Wilkes and Francis Gentleman (1728-1784) criticising both Bute and his government.⁹⁶ The first of these by Wilkes was written in a new edition of the tragic play *The Fall of Mortimer* by the English writer, actor, and bookseller William Hatchett (dates unknown).⁹⁷ Hatchett is best-known as the companion and collaborator of the novelist Eliza Haywood (c.1693-1756).⁹⁸ This edition of *The Fall of Mortimer* was first revised by Hatchett and performed in 1731, with a new edition published on 1 April 1763.⁹⁹ Wilkes was a well-known vocal opponent of the Earl of Bute and his ministry. His

⁹³ Ibid., p. iii

⁹⁴ Ibid., p. iv

⁹⁵ Roger L. Emerson, *Academic Patronage in the Scottish Enlightenment: Glasgow, Edinburgh and St. Andrews Universities*, (Edinburgh, 2008), pp. 155-156

⁹⁶ Sainsbury, *John Wilkes: The Lives of a Libertine*, (Hampshire, 2006), p. 64

⁹⁷ William Hatchett, *The Fall of Mortimer. An Historical Play*, (London, 1763)

⁹⁸ Kirsten T. Saxton and Rebecca P. Bocchicchio, *The Passionate Fiction of Eliza Haywood: Essays on Her Life and Work*, (Kentucky, 2000), p. 6

⁹⁹ *Lloyd's Evening Post*, (London, England), April 1, 1763-April 4, 1763; Issue 893

periodical *North Briton* (referring to Scotland) was a satirical take on the *Briton*. The sole aim of Wilkes's *North Briton* (published between July 1762 and April 1763) was to denounce Bute's administration. Wilkes supported both Pitt and Britain's involvement in the Seven Years War, and used his periodical to attack the 'malign' influence of the Prime Minister. He labelled Bute as the 'favourite' and as an 'over-mighty subject' who owed his position to his sexual relationship with the Princess Augusta. Wilkes was also incensed at what he perceived as the generous peace terms with France, and the use of national patronage to support Bute's many 'perceived' Scottish associates.

The inscription in *The Fall of Mortimer* compares Bute to to the lover of Queen Isabella, Roger Mortimer. Mortimer, the over-mighty subject, with Queen Isabella, usurped royal power and overthrew the rightful ruler, Edward II. After a short three year reign they were ousted by Edward III in 1330, and Mortimer executed as a traitor shortly afterwards. *The Fall of Mortimer* is Wilkes's humble offering to the 'Shrine of Bute'.¹⁰⁰ The author uses this dedication to ridicule the government and patronage of the Prime Minister. Wilkes expresses his outrage at the perceived connection between the story of Mortimer and Bute, and claims that 'history does not furnish a more striking contrast'.¹⁰¹ He elaborates on their many differences by describing the many abuses suffered by those under Mortimer's rule. These offenses included the usurpation of royal power and the captivity of Prince Edward, the exclusion of the English nobility from the King's Council, and the treatment of members of the Royal Family, who were insulted and forced to depend 'on the caprice of an insolent favourite'.¹⁰² The author then compares those dark days with the 'halcyon' reign of George III.

As the reverse is true of statements made in mock dedications, Wilkes whole heartedly believes that Prince George was held in a form of captivity and none of nobles have access to him. Secondly, that court favour is confined to one particular man, and thirdly, that all members of the Royal Family were treated disrespectfully. He praises the Duke of Cumberland (1721-1765) for 'his valour in extinguishing a foul rebellion' and decisively defeated the Jacobite army of Charles Edward Stuart (1721-1788) at the Battle of Culloden in 1746.¹⁰³ As a Stuart and a Scotsman, Bute was continuously under suspicion as a supporter House of Stuart (he was not) and the exiled Bonnie Prince Charlie. The many accusations

¹⁰⁰ Hatchett, *The Fall of Mortimer*, p. i

¹⁰¹ *Ibid.*, p. ii

¹⁰² *Ibid*

¹⁰³ *Ibid.*, pp. iii-iv

levelled at Bute include the 'harmful' influence that he exuded over the King, and the exclusive control that he had over royal patronage, which he allegedly used for his Scottish friends. Wilkes and his supporters believed that matters of national importance were being shaped by the 'arbitrary decision' of one man who was not the King, and that many members of his council were excluded from power.¹⁰⁴ Wilkes continues his address by commenting upon the relationship between England and Scotland, both during the reign of Edward III and George III. He describes the Scots as 'our cruel enemies' during Edward III's reign and sardonically calls them now 'our dearest friends'.¹⁰⁵ He argues that the peace negotiated by Mortimer in 1328 between England and Scotland (when Scottish independence was recognised) was humiliating, and through Mortimer's own ambitions and greed he had 'sacrificed all the glories of a successful war'.¹⁰⁶ He compares this shameful peace with the peace negotiated by government and was highly critical of Bute's role believing the terms to be overly generous to the French.

The author attacks Bute's reputation as a patron of the arts and sciences. He mockingly calls John Home and David Mallet (Scottish and Bute's clients) 'men of genius'.¹⁰⁷ Wilkes criticised Mallet as 'author of many forgotten poems and plays' and Home was a playwright who only produced one 'tolerable piece' (*Douglas*) and then disappeared into relative obscurity.¹⁰⁸ He claims that Bute's detractors (and Wilkes supporters) Charles Churchill and John Armstrong (1708/9-1779), were unable to secure political patronage as it was being dominated by Scottish clients.¹⁰⁹ As co-author of *The North Briton*, Churchill shared Wilkes's anti-Scottish views. However, as Armstrong was Scottish, their friendship did not survive past the ridicule and abuse that was poured forth upon Scotland and Scottishness in *The North Briton*.

Wilkes refers to the charge that the advancement of science in Britain had 'become the jealousy of Europe', and that under Bute's 'auspices *Botany* and *Tragedy* have reached the utmost height of perfection'.¹¹⁰ He is referring to *The Vegetable System* which had been

¹⁰⁴ Ibid., p. v

¹⁰⁵ Ibid., p. ii

¹⁰⁶ Ibid., p. iii

¹⁰⁷ Ibid., p. vi

¹⁰⁸ John Wilkes, *The North Briton, Issues 1-46*, (London, 1769), p. lxviii

¹⁰⁹ Hatchett, *The Fall of Mortimer*, p. vi

¹¹⁰ Ibid., p. vii

completed by the joint labours of the dedicatee and 'the great Dr. *Hill*'.¹¹¹ The author makes the ironic statement that tragedy in this present age, under Mallet and Home, rivalled the tragedies of ancient Greece. He indicates that another literary client of Bute's, Arthur Murphy, 'has the additional merit of *acting* no less than of *writing*, as to touch in the most exquisite manner all the fine feelings of the human frame'.¹¹² Wilkes ridicules Bute's interest in acting, and his performances at the residence of Catherine Hyde, Duchess of Queensbury (1701-1777), which he claims were so great and superior that they surpassed those of Murphy 'as well as by all who have ever appeared on the great stage of the world'.¹¹³ This outrageous statement was followed by Wilkes's praise of Bute's role in *Hamlet* where he pours fatal poison into the ear of the King – again referring to his perceived harmful influence on George III. Wilkes concludes his dedication by stating, that 'it is the warmest wish of my heart that the Earl of Bute may speedily compleat the story of Roger Mortimer'.¹¹⁴

The second mock dedication was from the Irish essayist and playwright, Francis Gentleman, who in 1770 published *The Favourite: An Historical Tragedy*.¹¹⁵ Gentleman was the prolific author of several plays and dramatic works, and *The Favourite* was an adaptation of Ben Jonson's *Sejanus* first published in 1603. *Sejanus* is a tale of political intrigue during the reign of the Emperor Tiberius, and details the scheming and duplicity of the Emperor which ultimately results in his downfall. The play had originally been published in 1752 under the title *Sejanus* but had been rejected for the stage by David Garrick. Gentleman opens his address by declaring that 'favouritism is a rock, upon which, in all ages and nations, especially where any trace of liberty remains, many political leviathans have been wrecked'.¹¹⁶ He lists some infamous royal favourites who spectacularly fell from grace – Piers Gaveston, Roger Mortimer, and Thomas Wolsey. The author states that it a matter of 'great astonishment, that any man, who has the least degree of regard to his own ease or safety, should push himself into a station so obnoxious and perilous'.¹¹⁷ Gentleman looks to other favourites throughout history and claims that that nearly all these monopolisers of royal

¹¹¹ Ibid

¹¹² Ibid

¹¹³ Ibid., p. viii

¹¹⁴ Ibid., p. xiii

¹¹⁵ Francis Gentleman, *The Favourite, An Historical Tragedy*, (Dublin, 1770)

¹¹⁶ Ibid., p, i

¹¹⁷ Ibid

favour have 'brought ruin upon' themselves.¹¹⁸ They are received by the public with suspicion and dislike and their actions, even good intentions, could be misinterpreted. Gentleman further claims that if he were to court 'a dangerous excess of glory', then he too would bring ruin upon himself.¹¹⁹

Gentleman's inscription differs with that of Wilkes in *The Fall of Mortimer* as it was written after Bute's fall from royal favour when he no longer retained any political position or influence. Therefore, it is probable that Gentleman was celebrating his downfall, especially as he concludes his dedication by declaring that he has never nor does he wish to 'taste a favour at your lordship's hand'.¹²⁰ Gentleman's address is dated November 1769, which was an unusual time to inscribe a work to Bute who spent the years 1768 to 1771 travelling on the Grand Tour.¹²¹ Writing in 1775, Gentleman states that at this time he had expectations that John Manners, Marquis of Granby (1721-1770), would provide him with support, and so travelled to London. Regrettably, Granby's death robbed him 'of my foremost hope'.¹²² Therefore, it is likely at the time of writing his dedication to Bute that Gentleman was anticipating some form of support from Granby. The nature of patronage can be fickle and unable to acquire aristocratic support, Gentleman's later years were fraught with financial difficulties, and he spent the last seven years of his life in Ireland in 'extreme sickness and want'.¹²³

MINISTER FOR SCOTTISH AFFAIRS AND PATRONAGE OF THE UNIVERSITIES IN SCOTLAND, 1761-1767

This section will assess Bute's role as Minister of Scottish Affairs and determine whether he continued his predecessor's policy of supporting clients of merit; the role of sub-ministers in London and in Scotland who acted as intermediaries on his behalf; the extent of his involvement in selecting candidates; if his supported candidates will similar scientific interests; and whether any of his personal clients were successful in any of the vacancies in the Scottish universities.

¹¹⁸ Ibid., p. ii

¹¹⁹ Ibid

¹²⁰ Ibid., p. v

¹²¹ Ibid., p. vi

¹²² Francis Gentleman, *The Modish Wife*, (London, 1775), p. 21

¹²³ Leslie Stephen and Sidney Lee, *Dictionary of National Biography*, Vol. 7 (London, 1908), p. 1009

Bute's uncles – John Campbell, Duke of Argyll and Archibald Campbell, Earl of Ilay – dominated Scottish politics during the first half of the eighteenth century, and anyone looking for advancement had to appeal directly to them.¹²⁴ The Campbells were responsible for selecting candidates for commissions in the Army and Navy, with Ilay raising highland regiments for George II during the Seven Years War.¹²⁵ They were largely responsible for university patronage, and by 1760 over half of the professors owed their appointments to Ilay.¹²⁶ It was not inevitable or expected that Bute would follow his uncles as the chief distributor of Scottish patronage. Firstly, there was no natural successor to Ilay and the title passed to a cousin, General John Campbell who was sixty eight when he inherited the dukedom. Secondly, Bute did not spend many years living in Scotland and was not familiar with the dynamics of Scottish politics. His first retirement from politics occurred in 1741 when he refused to support Ilay, and permanently left Scotland with his family in 1745. Thirdly, as the tutor and advisor of Prince George, Bute was no longer reliant on the goodwill or support of Ilay for political advancement, and by the late 1750s his attention was centred on the court in London.

When Ilay died in April 1761 Bute was initially hesitant to assume responsibility of Scottish patronage. However, he was finally persuaded to act in order to protect the interests of his friends and halt the rise of government opposition in Scotland.¹²⁷ As his attention was centred on London and George III, he was isolated from the developments of contemporary Scotland, and relied heavily on his advisors. These principal advisors included William Mure (1718-1776), Andrew Fletcher, Lord Milton (1691/2-1766), Sir Gilbert Elliot, third Baronet of Minto (1722-1777), and his brother James Stuart Mackenzie. Mure had studied law at Edinburgh and Leiden before returning to Scotland and successfully standing for election as MP for Renfrewshire in 1742. He became manager of Bute's business and political interests in the west of Scotland in 1757 (his estate was near Beith, North Ayrshire), and was a close friend of David Hume.¹²⁸ When Bute came into power in 1761, Mure resigned his seat in

¹²⁴ Alexander Murdoch, 'Lord Bute, James Stuart Mackenzie, and the government of Scotland', in Karl W. Schweizer's *Lord Bute: Essays in Re-interpretation*, (Leicester, 1988), p. 119

¹²⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 122

¹²⁶ Roger L. Emerson, 'Lord Bute and the Scottish universities 1760-1792', in Karl W. Schweizer's [ed] *Lord Bute: Essays in Re-interpretation*, (Leicester, 1988), p. 151

¹²⁷ Murdoch, 'Lord Bute, James Stuart Mackenzie, and the government of Scotland', p. 124

¹²⁸ Jeremy J. Cater, 'The Making of Principal Robertson in 1762: Politics and the University of Edinburgh in the Second Half of the Eighteenth Century', *The Scottish Historical Review*, Vol. 49, No. 147, Part 1 (Apr., 1970), p. 66;

Parliament to become one of the Barons of the Exchequer, becoming Baron Mure, and sub-minister for Scottish Affairs.¹²⁹ He was the chief advisor and was responsible for carrying out Bute's demands for distributing patronage in Scotland.

Andrew Fletcher, Lord Milton, who also studied law at Leiden in 1714 was a founding member of the Royal Bank of Scotland in 1727, and appointed Lord Justice Clerk in 1735. He was an advocate for improving agriculture and trade in Scotland and had been Ilay's sub-minister in Scotland for many years. Therefore, Milton was extremely knowledgeable regarding the main political contenders and distributing university patronage in Scotland. He was the conduit between the Ilay's network of followers and clients and Bute, and ensured that this network supported the government in return for patronage.¹³⁰

Sir Gilbert Elliot was educated at the universities of Edinburgh and Utrecht and was elected as an MP for Selkirkshire in 1753 with Ilay's support. He appointed Lord of the Admiralty in 1756, and was a proponent for the establishment of a militia in Scotland and founder member of the Poker Club.¹³¹ Elliot had assumed control over Scottish business after Ilay's death and became Bute's London manager for Scotland.¹³² In 1758, Mackenzie became envoy-extraordinary to the King of Sardinia and whose aim was to pursue a diplomatic career. However, requested by Bute to return to England, Mackenzie resigned his posting in Venice to come back and help his brother manage Scottish Affairs, taking over from Elliot as London manager at the end of 1761. Mackenzie was appointed Lord Privy Seal of Scotland in 1763, and was active in the administration of university patronage until 1767, even after Bute's resignation.¹³³ When Bute and his faction took control over Scottish Affairs, they continued Ilay's policy for distributing patronage by appointing gentlemen who could safeguard and defend Bute's interests, and elect university professors who shared his scientific outlook. He followed his uncle's system of management of Scotland and was

Henry L. Fulton, 'Private Tutoring in Scotland: The Example of Mure of Caldwell', *Eighteenth-Century Life*, Vo. 27, No. 3 (2003), p. 59

¹²⁹ Fulton, 'Private Tutoring in Scotland: The Example of Mure of Caldwell', p. 58

¹³⁰ Cater, 'The Making of Principal Robertson in 1762: Politics and the University of Edinburgh in the Second Half of the Eighteenth Century', p. 68

¹³¹ The aim of the Poker Club was to establish a permanent national militia in Scotland.

¹³² Emerson, *Academic Patronage in the Scottish Enlightenment: Glasgow, Edinburgh and St. Andrews Universities*, p. 150

¹³³ J.A. Lovat-Fraser, *John Stuart, Earl of Bute*, (Cambridge, 1912), p. 68

emphatic that university appointments would be based on merit and known achievement, rather than political claims or personal friendships.¹³⁴

During his tenure in charge of patronage in Scotland, Bute was responsible for filling a number of academic appointments. He played a prominent role in securing the Edinburgh Professorship of Botany and *Materia Medica* (the branch of medical science concerning the study of drugs used in the treatment of disease) in April 1761 for one of his scientific clients, Dr John Hope.¹³⁵ The position of Professor of Botany and *Materia Medica* became vacant in November 1760 after the death of Charles Alston (1685-1760). His appointment as Professor of Botany at Edinburgh University provided financial security in the form of an annual salary of £50. Hope was appointed the King's Botanist in Scotland and superintendent of Edinburgh University's botanical gardens. He claimed that his candidature was successful due to Bute's intercession, and was one of a number of Scottish individuals who owed their academic appointment to him.¹³⁶

Hope began his career by studying medicine at Edinburgh University before travelling to Paris in 1748 and continuing his botanical studies under Bernard de Jussieu at the Jardin du Roi. In 1750, he was awarded his MD from Glasgow University. Over the course of his career, Hope made a significant contribution to the advancement of medicine and botany in Scotland. He was a member of several Scottish societies including the Royal College of Physicians in Edinburgh, the Royal Society of Edinburgh, and the Edinburgh Philosophical Society (of which Bute was also a member). In 1754, Hope was a founder member of the Select Society along with Adam Ferguson, William Robertson, and Allan Ramsay (1713-1784), who would all become clients of Bute's. Hope's scientific activity was not confined to Scotland, and in 1767 he was appointed a Fellow of the Royal Society of London.

In 1768, Hope persuaded the Edinburgh Town Council to separate the chairs of Botany and *Materia Medica*. Hope had been teaching *Materia Medica* in the summer and Botany in the winter, and he believed that as the subject was becoming more mineral based it required a competent chemist to teach it.¹³⁷ The post was therefore divided and Hope remained Professor of Medicine and Botany until his death. Hope was one of the early supporters of Linnaeus, and alongside Thomas Martyn at Cambridge University, was the first

¹³⁴ Emerson, 'Lord Bute and the Scottish universities 1760-1792', p. 151

¹³⁵ Bute's patronage of Dr John Hope is examined in chapter 4.

¹³⁶ Emerson, *Academic Patronage in the Scottish Enlightenment*, p. 277

¹³⁷ Ibid

to teach the Linnaean system in Britain. He was also responsible for the establishment of a new botanical garden in Edinburgh located north of Leith Walk in 1763. This new botanical garden was necessary for Edinburgh University because The Royal Abbey Garden and the Town Garden at Trinity Hospital had become too overcrowded and polluted. It was funded by Treasury grants and the garden was laid out by Hope. The rarer plants from the old sites were transferred to Leith Walk, and the plants were arranged according to the Linnaean system. A third of this new botanical garden was comprised of medicinal plants while the remainder was a miniature landscape garden.

In an effort to increase the number of seeds and plants in this newly formed garden, Hope formed the Edinburgh Seed Society, with the aim of importing new specimens from all over the world.¹³⁸ He maintained a wide correspondence with plant-collectors, patrons, and former students who kept him informed of developments in botany and sent exotics and newly discovered plants. In 1766, Hope travelled to England where he visited some of the great gardens of England, including Whitton Park, and met the custodian of Chelsea Gardens before returning to Edinburgh with newly acquired seeds for the botanical garden. Hope's botanical correspondents included members of the Royal Society of London, Joseph Banks, and the Earl of Bute. On 14 February 1767, Hope wrote to Banks and asked if he would send the report of his trip to Labrador which listed the botanical treasures of that region. Furthermore, Hope would find it 'most acceptable' if Banks could 'spare a few seeds'.¹³⁹ Under the guardianship of Hope the Royal Botanic Garden of Edinburgh flourished and increased its collection of foreign seeds.

Before and after his appointment as a Fellow of the Royal Society of London, Hope sent members of the society drawings and descriptions of rare plants, some of which had not previously been described. He wrote to Sir John Pringle (1707-1782) on 24 September 1765 to give an account of the propagation of 'true' rhubarb seeds which he had received and planted in the open ground at Leith Walk. In spite of bad weather, the seeds flourished and this was the first time that 'true' rhubarb had been successfully cultivated in Britain. Hope had received the seeds in 1763 from the Scottish naturalist James Mounsey (1790/10-1773) who was a physician to Tsar Peter III (1728-1762) and acquired the seeds from the St.

¹³⁸ Ibid

¹³⁹ Averil M. Lysaght, *Joseph Banks in Newfoundland and Labrador, 1766: His Diary, Manuscripts, and Collections*, (London, 1971), p. 238

Petersburg Apothecaries' Garden. Hope's aim was to grow and sell it in Britain. During the eighteenth century rhubarb was used as a purgative and was imported from Asia at considerable expense. After successfully cultivating this profitable plant, Hope distributed some cuttings to friends and fellow plant-collectors. In his account to the Royal Society Hope included several drawings of the blooming rhubarb by the American physician, Samuel Bard (1742-1821).¹⁴⁰

Hope gave a report and drawings of another rare herb, *asa foetida*, in a letter to Banks on 18 August 1784. He received the roots from another of his botanical correspondents in Russia, Matthew Guthrie (1743-1897), who in turn was given the roots by the zoologist and botanist Peter Simon Pallas (1741-1801). Pallas claimed that *asa foetida*, which originated in the mountains of Ghilan in Persia, had not been successfully cultivated in Europe.¹⁴¹ Therefore, Hope planted two roots, one of which flourished, and sent drawings by one of his students, Andrew Fyfe (1754-1825), and a description to Banks which was read before a meeting of the society. In letter to another Royal Society member, Sir William Watson on 10 April 1769, Hope provided an account of another rare drawing of a plant that was found on the Isle of Skye. He claimed that this plant, *ericaulon decangulare* (or bog button), was either previously undiscovered and constituting a new genus or had not been accurately described before. Therefore, Hope wished to present his findings before the society.¹⁴² Hope wrote to Bute on 21 August 1769 and included a description of *ericaulon decangulare*.¹⁴³ This uncommon plant was found by another of Hope's students, the artist James Robertson (1740-1796).

Robertson was the nephew of the chief gardener at the Royal Botanic Garden of Edinburgh, John Williamson (d.1780).¹⁴⁴ Hope supported Robertson's appointment to the Board of Annexed Estates and was employed to travel throughout most of Northern Scotland and the Western and Northern Isles, prepare detailed accounts of his observations, search for new or rare plants, and provide complete botanical, topographical, and

¹⁴⁰ John Hope, 'Extract of a Letter from Dr. John Hope, Professor Medicine and Botany in the University of Edinburgh, to Dr. Pringle; Dated Edinburgh, 24 September, 1765', *Philosophical Transactions (1683-1775)*, Vol. 55 (1765), pp. 290-293

¹⁴¹ John Hope, 'Description of a Plant Yielding *Asa Foetida*. In a Letter from John Hope, M.D.F.R.S. to Sir Joseph Banks, Bart. P.R.S.', *Philosophical Transactions (1785)*, Vol. 75 (1765), p. 39

¹⁴² John Hope, 'A Letter from John Hope, M.D.F.R.S. Professor of Physic and Botany in the University of Edinburgh, to William Watson, M.D.F.R.S. on a Rare Plant Found in the Isle of Skye', *Philosophical Transactions (1683-1775)*, Vol. 59 (1769), p. 242

¹⁴³ Francis Russell, *John 3rd Earl of Bute: Patron and Collector*, p. 88

¹⁴⁴ J.H. Dickson, 'James Robertson and the botany of Bute, 1768', *Watsonia*, 16, 65-74 (1986), p. 65

mineralogical surveys of the Highlands.¹⁴⁵ In 1768, Robertson visited the Isle of Bute and wrote an account of his trip entitled *Remarks made by James Robertson on the Island of Bute*.¹⁴⁶ He spent eighteen days touring the island and recorded a total of 445 plant species. Conscious of the importance and relevance of Robertson's botanical account, Hope sent it to Bute.¹⁴⁷ Even after the Earl moved to London in 1745, he continued to receive gardening, weather, and estate reports from Mount Stuart and therefore would have most likely welcomed a detailed list of the plants found on the island.

His client-patron relationship with Bute continued throughout the 1760s and 1770s and was not limited to supporting Hope's appointment as Professor of Botany at Edinburgh. They exchanged letters and plant specimens. Mackenzie wrote to his brother on 12 July 1779 and gave an account of his meeting with Hope in Edinburgh where he gave the botanist mango seeds from Bute.¹⁴⁸ From this letter we know that Bute sought to employ Hope for an unspecified project at Luton Hoo. Mackenzie related that Hope 'had no thoughts of going to London', unless he was sent for, and that if 'he had no call of that kind' he would accept an invitation to go to Jamaica.¹⁴⁹ This invitation to visit Jamaica was most likely made by the one of his former pupils, the surgeon and botanist, Dr. John Lindsay (d. 1803), who was living there at the time. However, Hope stated he would 'be very well pleased to be settled at Luton on a half a crown a day for his appointment'.¹⁵⁰ It is not clear from this letter why Bute was seeking to employ Hope, though it is possible that he needed help compiling his great work on botany, the *Botanical Tables*. We do not know whether Hope ever took up the position at Luton Hoo but he never undertook the journey to Jamaica.

A university vacancy occurred in June 1761 on the death of Neil Campbell, the Principal of Glasgow University. At the beginning of the selection process for a new principal there were a number of serious contenders. Mure wrote to Bute and recommended two candidates – his former tutor and Professor of Divinity, William Leechman and his distant cousin William Rouet (fl. 1730-1767) – to fill the vacant position.¹⁵¹ Leechman had been fulfilling many of the duties of the principal throughout Neil Campbell's long illness. Rouet,

¹⁴⁵Hope, 'A Letter from John Hope, M.D.F.R.S. Professor of Physic and Botany in the University of Edinburgh, to William Watson, M.D.F.R.S. on a Rare Plant Found in the Isle of Sky', p. 241

¹⁴⁶ Dickson, 'James Robertson and the botany of Bute, 1768', p. 65

¹⁴⁷ Ibid

¹⁴⁸ BU/162/7/33, (*Bute Estate*, 18 July 1777 - 13 November 1778)

¹⁴⁹ Ibid

¹⁵⁰ Ibid

¹⁵¹ Fulton, 'Private Tutoring in Scotland: The Example of Mure of Caldwell', p. 58

on the other hand, had left his post in 1759 as Professor of Ecclesiastical History at Glasgow University, without permission, to become tutor to the Earl of Hopetoun's son. Hopetoun had offered the university £400 for Rouet to take a leave of absence for four years, but was refused. Bute's reply on 2 July 1761 reinforced his determination to appoint a worthy candidate and rebuked Mure for nominating a relative claiming, that 'merit and efficiency will ever weigh with me for publick office before private consideration'.¹⁵² He urged his chief advisor not to make the same mistake again. Bute accepted Leechman's nomination and he became Principal of Glasgow University on 6 July 1761. After being absent from his post for nearly three years, Rouet resigned in December 1761.

In February 1762, after the death of John Gowdie (1682-1762), the post of Principal of Edinburgh University became vacant, and Bute announced his intention of supporting the candidacy of the historian, William Robertson. Robertson was a member of the Select Society and in 1757 spoke up in defence of John Home's play *Douglas*. The Church of Scotland minister and a client of Bute's, Home was criticised by Church authorities who were opposed his literary endeavours. Robertson was also in favour of a Scottish militia and a member of the Poker Club. Robertson's *History of Scotland during the Reigns of Queen Mary and James VI* was published in 1759, and afterwards he was asked by Bute to write a modern account of the early history of Scotland.¹⁵³ Robertson was initially receptive to the project and the Scottish clergyman and chronologist, John Blair (d.1782), enclosed Robertson's reply to the proposal in a letter to Bute in August 1759.¹⁵⁴ Blair was the author of *The Chronology and History of the World* in 1754 that covered the history of mankind beginning in 4004 B.C., was appointed chaplain to Princess Augusta in 1757 and mathematical tutor to her son, Prince Edward. He declared that after considering the matter for some weeks and conferring with friends, Robertson was reconciled to the scheme and believed that he could 'execute such a work perhaps with more advantages than any other man'.¹⁵⁵ Robertson wanted to give a 'complete History of a Nation from the Period when its Story became known down to its Extinction' or union with England.¹⁵⁶ Bute 'would be glad to know' that he was considering

¹⁵² National Library of Scotland, Manuscript Collection, Mure of Caldwell Papers, MS 4942/24 (Letter from Bute to Mure, 2 July 1761)

¹⁵³ Cater, 'The Making of Principal Robertson in 1762', p. 63

¹⁵⁴ BU/98/4/151 (*General Political Papers*, Letter from Blair to Bute, 16 August 1759)

¹⁵⁵ Ibid

¹⁵⁶ Ibid

undertaking the project and that Robertson hoped 'by the next letter shall find he is actually set about it'.¹⁵⁷

This project was never completed but nevertheless, Bute continued his patronage of Robertson by supporting his appointment as chaplain-in-ordinary for Scotland in 1761.¹⁵⁸ Bute amended his initial proposal in 1761 by requesting that Robertson write a government-sponsored official 'History of England' to coincide with the completion of Hume's *History of England*. In return, Robertson was to be provided with a post in London in order to complete the plan but he refused to leave Scotland. Alternatively, Mure suggested that Robertson should be made principal of Edinburgh or Glasgow University, whichever fell vacant first.¹⁵⁹ His patron agreed, and wrote to Mure stating 'that, from the minute I first fixed on him for our great undertaking, I determined to assist him in obtaining the principal's chair either in Edinburgh or Glasgow and by this Post acquainted Ld Milton, with my wishes, and I make no doubt but Dr Robertson character; with the assistance of His friends will make the choice easy'.¹⁶⁰ Robertson was elected Principal of Edinburgh University on 10 March 1762, with Bute's support, and was granted a further appointment as Historiographer Royal for Scotland in 1763. These posts had a combined annual income of £500.¹⁶¹ His 'History of England' project was abandoned after Bute's resignation and he began working on a *History of Charles V* that was published in 1769.¹⁶² Nonetheless, Robertson was sufficiently grateful to Bute that on a visit to London in 1763 believed it was 'his duty' to call upon the Earl.¹⁶³

Bute supported John Millar (1735-1801) who became Regius Chair of Civil Law at Glasgow University in 1761, and appointed Hugh Blair (1718-1800) to the newly created chair of Regius Professor of Rhetoric and *Belles-Lettres* at Edinburgh University in 1762. Bute's academic patronage was not confined to the universities of Edinburgh and Glasgow, and he succeeded Ilay as Chancellor as Marischal College in Aberdeen in 1761. His contribution to Marischal was more extensive than in Glasgow or Edinburgh and he remained in this post as Chancellor until his death in 1792. In this capacity Bute encouraged the advancement of

¹⁵⁷ Ibid

¹⁵⁸ Cater, 'The Making of Principal Robertson in 1762', p. 63

¹⁵⁹ Ibid., p. 64

¹⁶⁰ National Library of Scotland, Manuscript Collection, Mure of Caldwell Papers, MS 4942/81 (Letter from Bute to Mure, 27 February 1762)

¹⁶¹ The principalship was approx. £300 p.a. and the post of historiographer royal was an additional £200 p.a.

¹⁶² Richard B Sher and M. A Stewart, 'William Robertson and David Hume: Three letters', *Hume Studies*, 10th Anniversary Issue, (1984), p. 79

¹⁶³ BU/118/10/69 (*To Lord Bute*, c. 11 March 1757 - 16 December 1765)

science at the college, and promoted several scientific candidates including George Skene (1742-1803), Robert Hamilton (1743-1829), and Patrick Copeland (1748-1822).¹⁶⁴ He made several substantial donations to Marischal in the 1780s. In 1780, the Professor of Philosophy, Patrick Copeland began a subscription fund to build and equip the Castlehill Observatory at Aberdeen with the highest quality of instruments – including an orrery, a quadrant, and an astronomical clock-for teaching the principles of navigation and other branches of science.¹⁶⁵ It was the first publicly funded astronomical observatory in Scotland and raised almost £400. Bute offered two telescopes and other instruments in 1781, including a transit telescope by Ramsden (made in 1780) and an equatorial instrument by Sisson and Ramsden (made about 1770-1773), which were worth nearly £500.¹⁶⁶ However, as evidenced from the Auction Sale Catalogues of 1793-4, and considering his extensive collection of scientific, this was a rather small donation but nevertheless important in establishing the Castlehill Observatory. The Ramsden transit telescope has since been lost, but Marischal still have in their collection the Sisson and Ramsden equatorial surveying telescope. The Observatory stood until 1796 when it was transferred to Marischal College. Bute made a further donation to the college in 1786 when he gifted 1,300 volumes of scientific and medical texts, including many rare works. These were a more substantial contribution and formed part of the medical library at Marischal.¹⁶⁷

Bute's period of greatest influence in Scotland ended in 1763, and control of Scottish Affairs passed to Mackenzie whose management lasted from 1763-1765, and from 1766-1767.¹⁶⁸ Milton and Mure continued on as his advisors, and Bute secured for Mackenzie the office of Lord Privy Seal in 1763, a post worth £3,000 annually. In 1765, the Prime Minister George Grenville (1712-1770) refused to continue his ministry unless Mackenzie was dismissed from his post and wanted the abolition of the post of minister of Scottish Affairs.¹⁶⁹ Mackenzie wrote to Mure, that the King 'has no less goodness for me than he had before and that my dismissal was absolutely contrary to His Majesty's Inclination'.¹⁷⁰ He asked that 'you let this matter be known to every body that I may not be plagued with

¹⁶⁴ Emerson, 'Lord Bute and the Scottish universities 1760-1792', p. 162

¹⁶⁵ J. S. Reid, 'The Castlehill Observatory Aberdeen', *Journal for the History of Astronomy*, Vol. 13, (1982), p. 84

¹⁶⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 88

¹⁶⁷ Emerson, 'Lord Bute and the Scottish universities 1760-1792', p. 162

¹⁶⁸ Emerson, *Academic Patronage in the Scottish Enlightenment*, p. 156

¹⁶⁹ National Library of Scotland, Manuscript Collection, Mure of Caldwell Papers, MS 4943/179 (Mackenzie to Mure, 23 May 1765)

¹⁷⁰ *Ibid*

solicitations no longer in my power to grant'.¹⁷¹ When Pitt was returned to office in 1766, Mackenzie was restored to the Office of Privy Seal on 27 August 1766 but was not entrusted with the management of Scotland. He was not disappointed and told Mure that 'I am very happy in having no concern with my former Department of the affairs of Scotland'.¹⁷² Therefore, after 1767, Bute and Mackenzie had very little influence in Scottish Affairs.

The authors who wrote political dedications had varying reasons for inscribing their work to the Earl of Bute and not all were successful in receiving support. Joseph Groves and Henry Spens were unable to secure any form of political patronage; James White and Alexander Strahan most likely only received the cost of publication; the purpose of Sir Henry Fielding dedication was to thank Bute for his knighthood; while Bute's Scottish client, David Mallet obtained both an annual pension and position as Keeper of the book of Entries for ships in the Port of London.

During his term in government, Bute employed literary writers, such as James Ralph and Israel Manduit, to write pamphlets in defence of the government and its policies, including an end to the costly war, and responding to anti-Scottish attacks in the press from John Wilkes and his supporters. These writers were duly compensated, with Ralph receiving a government pension and Manduit obtaining a government post. The purpose of Wilkes and Francis Gentleman's mock dedications were to attack the government and ridicule Bute. Wilkes makes a number of allegations – that Bute was using government patronage to support his Scottish friends (David Mallet and John Home); influence over the King was 'harmful'; and the peace terms negotiated in the Treaty of Paris were overly generous to the French. Gentleman's comments upon other royal favourites throughout history, and remarks that despite any good intentions they have all 'brought ruin upon' themselves. This mock dedication was made after Bute's fall from royal favour.

As Minister of Scottish Affairs, and in control of university patronage in Scotland from 1761-1767, Bute was responsible for filling a number of academic appointments. His aim was to continue the precedent of his uncle Argyll and appoint candidates based on merit rather than family connections. This is evident in Bute's letter to William Mure, where he

¹⁷¹ Ibid

¹⁷² William Mure, *Selections from the Family Papers preserved at Caldwell*, Vol. II (Glasgow, 1854), p. 89

reprimanded his Scottish advisor for nominating his cousin, William Rouet, for the post of Principal of Glasgow University. As Chancellor of Marischal College from 1761-1792, Bute contributions were more lasting. He provided scientific instruments, including two telescopes, to the Castlehill Observatory, and donated some 1,300 volumes of scientific and medical texts to Marischal in 1786.

CHAPTER 4

'MOST FAVOURABLE ATTENTION TO MEN OF SCIENCE AND LEARNING': AN EXAMINATION OF BUTE'S PERSONAL PATRONAGE FROM 1757-1790¹

This chapter will investigate the three different facets of the Earl of Bute's personal patronage – (i) the dedications addressed to the nobleman rather than to Prime Minister or Groom of the Stole; (ii) a list of his personal clients who received patronage directly and (iii) Bute's involvement in eighteenth-century clubs and scientific societies. This patronage is considered to be personal because the authors of these inscriptions appealed to Bute's enthusiasm for science, architecture and literature, with the majority of inscriptions written after his political retirement when he was no longer a royal favourite. This chapter will examine if any of the authors of these dedications were successful in gaining patronage.

A list of the Earl of Bute's clients reveals the areas where he spent the majority of his money - science, literature, architecture, and art. His clients received differing amounts of financial support ranging from publishing costs (James Macpherson), to the sponsorship of an expedition crossing the Adriatic Sea (Alberto Fortis), and employment as an assistant in his laboratory at Luton Hoo (Peter Woulfe). It will determine the main beneficiaries of Bute's patronage and the overall impact that it had on their careers. Finally, I will demonstrate how the culture of the Scottish Enlightenment led to an increase in the number of clubs and societies in Scotland, examine the full extent of Bute's contribution and involvement, and investigate his membership (or non-membership) of various English institutions and societies.

There are eight inscriptions that are categorised as personal dedications and these are ordered in the next section by subject area. The language of these addresses to the Earl of Bute will reveal whether there were any similarities or differences between personal, royal or political dedications.

¹ William Dodd, *Reflections on Death*, (London, 1763), p. ii

Personal dedications, 1757-1790

Title	Year	Subject	Author
<i>Eden, or, a Compleat Body of Gardening</i>	1757	Science	Sir John Hill (1714-1775)
<i>Saggio d'osservazioni sopra l'isola di Cherso ed Osero</i>	1771	Science	Alberto Fortis (1741-1803)
<i>Flora Anglicana or The English Flora</i>	1775	Science	Richard Weston (1753-1806)
<i>Travels into Dalmatia; Containing General Observations on the Natural History of that country and the Neighbouring Islands</i>	1778	Science	Alberto Fortis (1741-1803)
<i>An Essay on the Theory and Practice of Medical Electricity</i>	1780	Science	Tiberius Cavallo (1749-1809)
<i>A Letter to Sir John Sinclair Concerning the Virtues of the Muriatic Acid</i>	1790	Science	Sir William Fordyce (1724-1792)
<i>Temora</i>	1763	Literature	James Macpherson (1736-1796)
<i>The Works of Ossian</i>	1765	Literature	James Macpherson (1736-1796)
<i>The Baths of the Romans Explained and Illustrated, with the Restorations of Palladio Corrected and Improved</i>	1775	Architecture	Charles Cameron (1754-1812)
<i>The History of Mexico</i>	1787	History	Abbé Francesco Saverio Clavigero(1731-1787). Translator Charles Cullen (dates unknown)

Table 7: List of personal dedications

Science

From 1757-1790, there were ten dedications, made by eight authors, who sought to secure Bute's personal patronage, or to publicly thank their patron for his support. From the table below, we can see that the majority of these were scientific dedications. The first of these was a scientific dedication by Sir John Hill, *Eden, or, a Compleat Body of Gardening*, a work on natural history. Hill's *Eden* was a practical guide for gardeners containing useful advice for raising seeds, fruits, and plants. In the preface, the author acknowledges the many existing works on gardening, but claims some of these are antiquated and deficient in explaining modern improvements. For example, many of newly discovered plants from America and

Aisa were not 'found in any Book on this subject'.² Furthermore, Hill reveals that since the introduction of the Linnaean system of classification, no book on gardening has been written that incorporated these changes.³ The aim of *Eden's* author is for 'the unlearned' to become proficient in understanding this new botanical system.⁴

Hill begins by exclaiming that 'he cannot fear the Censure of the World, who may address to your Lordship's most distinguished Name his Labours'.⁵ This was the first dedication made after Bute's appointment as tutor and Groom of the Stole and there was a steady increase in dedications due to his newly elevated position. This dedication is considered a personal dedication because Hill is appealing to his interest in science, rather than his position as mentor to George III. The author continues by describing botany as 'one of the most useful among the Sciences, and of all the most delightful', and praises the dedicatees endeavours in this area.⁶ For instance, the author comments upon his role as a plant-collector, and we know that Bute was a member of several plant subscription schemes from the 1730s onwards. Hill also applauds the 'free Patronage you are pleased to give to all who cultivate true Knowledge'.⁷ However, there is no evidence that Bute was employing or recommending scientific clients before 1757, especially as he was still a relatively poor nobleman, and would remain so until his wife received an inheritance in 1761.

Next, Hill refers to the study of botany that he claims has previously neglected, but was currently experiencing a period of rejuvenation. This revival was due to the increase in new exotic plants from around the world and botany was now 'larger than all the *Grecian* Studies knew'.⁸ The author believes that under the auspice patronage of his patron, botany would be pursued until 'not a Flower of the East or Western World shall be wanting in our Gardens'.⁹ Hill maintains with new revelations from the natural world - the advances of Linnaeus, and the patronage of Bute - will result in stripping away all errors until botany is raised towards the 'Perfection' and for the glory of Britain.¹⁰ The author uses his inscription to praise Bute's botanical accomplishments, to appeal for his patronage, and tackle the

² Sir John Hill, *Eden: or, A Compleat Body of Gardening*, (London, 1757), p. iii

³ *Ibid.*, pp. iii-iv

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. iv

⁵ *Ibid.*, p. i

⁶ *Ibid.*

⁷ *Ibid.*, pp. ii-iii

⁸ *Ibid.*, p. i

⁹ *Ibid.*, p. ii

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, p. iii

outstanding projects he listed in his dedication. Hill's petition bore fruit, and he was commissioned by the Earl of Bute in 1759 to write a complete work on botany called *The Vegetable System*. *The Vegetable System* eventually ran to twenty-six volumes and would remain unfinished at the author's death.

The remaining seven personal dedications were all published after Bute's political retirement when his focus was solely on scientific matters. The Venetian writer, naturalist, and cartographer, Alberto Fortis addressed two scientific works, *Saggio d'osservazioni sopra l'isola di Cherso ed Osero* and *Travels into Dalmatia; Containing General Observations on the Natural History of that country and the Neighbouring Islands* to Bute. Dalmatia was a historical region on the eastern coast of the Adriatic Sea which now forms part of Croatia. *Travels into Dalmatia* provides a general description on the natural history of the country, observations of the neighbouring islands, and documents the art, manners and customs of the natives. Fortis travelled to Dalmatia from 1770 to 1774 and was accompanied in his expeditions by the English historian, John Symonds (1730-1807), a botanist from Naples, Domenico Cirillo (1739-1799), and Frederick Hervey, the Bishop of Londonderry (1730-1803), later the fourth Earl of Bristol.¹¹ The author begins his dedication by telling his readers that his travels started under the 'Auspices' of Bute.¹² Fortis's Adriatic expeditions were sponsored by the patronage of the English diplomat, John Strange and Bute. Fortis published an essay of observations of the island of Cres and the nearby connected island of Osero in 1771. This work, *Saggio d'osservazioni sopra l'isola di Cherso ed Osero*, was published in Venice and dedicated to Bute.¹³ His *Viaggio in Dalmatia dell' Abate Alberto Fortis* was originally published in 1774, before translating into English in 1778, and entitled *Travels into Dalmatia*.¹⁴ This manuscript was illustrated with twenty copper plates and included letters written to Fortis's two patrons. His letter to Bute contains observations on the Natural History of Dalmatia and the neighbouring islands.

In his inscription, Fortis echoes the sentiments of the previous authors by calling 'Natural History, Your [Bute's] Favourite Study'.¹⁵ He uses this dedication to show his gratitude

¹¹ Trevor R. Shaw, *Foreign Travellers in the Slovene Karst 1486-1900*, (Ivančna Gorica, ZRC Publishing, 2008), p. 120

¹² Alberto Fortis, *Travels into Dalmatia; Containing General Observations on the Natural History of that country and the Neighbouring Islands*, (London, 1778), p. iii

¹³ Alberto, Fortis, *Saggio d'osservazioni sopra l'isola di Cherso ed Osero*, (Venice, 1771)

¹⁴ Larry Wolff, *Venice and the Slavs: The Discovery of Dalmatia in the Age of Enlightenment*, (Stanford, 2001), p. 86

¹⁵ Fortis, *Travels into Dalmatia*, p. iii

for Bute's patronage, and respectfully expresses his 'earnest desire ... of making known to the World, how much I esteem and honour Your Lordship'.¹⁶ The author acknowledges the 'many ties of particular gratitude' that he owes his patron, and in thanks gives 'public Testimony of it, in the only Way that Fortune usually offers to Men of Letters'.¹⁷ There is a connection between Fortis's two patrons. John Strange became Ambassador to Venice in 1773, with Bute's support, and was one of his scientific clients and correspondents on the continent.¹⁸ In 1774, Strange employed Fortis to carry out geological research in the Italian countryside. Fortis flatters Bute in his dedication by extolling his many virtues. Firstly, his 'beneficent Genius' in promoting the improvements in the Arts and Sciences, especially natural history. Secondly, his shows his 'learned curiosity and Munificence' by encouraging Fortis's travels and supporting his desire of crossing the Adriatic.¹⁹ The author lets his audience know that the reason for this expedition, and subsequent publication of *Travels into Dalmatia*, was 'to enquire into the Truth of the prevailing Report concerning the extensive Strata of Fossil Bones on the Islands of Liburnia and along the Coasts of Dalmatia'.²⁰ After his return from the Grand Tour in 1771, Bute's scientific interests shifted to geology and the study of fossils. It was also by his patron's 'desire' that Fortis reduce 'into some 'Form the particular Observations that he made'.²¹ Therefore, the author was hopeful that the efforts that he was undertaken will be received 'with Indulgence' and acceptance by his patrons.²²

In 1775, the English botanist, Richard Weston, inscribed *Flora Anglicana or The English Flora*.²³ He was the author of a number of gardening works, including *The Universal Botanist and Nurseryman*, published in four volumes from 1770 to 1777.²⁴ In his address, Weston acknowledges 'the great encouragement, Botany has received from the Nobility of the Kingdom'.²⁵ There were many noble collections of plants across the countryside that led to Britain boasting a superiority in botany over other countries of Europe.²⁶ He claims that among the members of aristocracy, no one has contributed more to botany than the

¹⁶ Ibid

¹⁷ Ibid

¹⁸ The relationship between Bute and Strange is discussed in chapter 3.

¹⁹ Fortis, *Travels into Dalmatia*, p. iv

²⁰ Ibid

²¹ Ibid

²² Ibid

²³ Richard Weston, *Flora Anglicana or The English Flora*, (London, 1775)

²⁴ Richard Weston, *The Universal Botanist and Nurseryman*, (London, 1770)

²⁵ Ibid., p. i-ii

²⁶ Ibid

dedicatee in giving Britain 'this flattering ascendancy'.²⁷ These contributions include his involvement in plant-collecting schemes and transformed the gardens on his estates and Kew Gardens. Bute provided support for a number of scientific clients and 1775 saw the publication of the final volume of Sir John Hill's *The Vegetable System*.

Weston appeals to other members of the nobility to follow Bute's 'laudable example' in cultivating 'curious and useful' plants, so that Britain might shortly claim the 'the exclusive honour of uniting, in her Gardens, the native beauties of every part of the globe'.²⁸ The author describes his motivation in inscribing this 'little' work to the dedicatee. He believes it was the duty of botanical writers to pay homage to Bute because of the attention he has bestowed upon the science.²⁹ He hopes that *The English Flora* would be useful as it contains 'A Catalogue of the Vegetable Beauties contained in our Gardens'.³⁰ He further states that if the current plan of arranging the plants, (the Linnaean system), at Kew Gardens continues, 'the plan will be greatly facilitated by exhibiting at one view, all the Varieties that can be collected'.³¹ By 1775, Bute's interests increasingly turned to geological matters, and the management of Kew was left in the hands of Sir Joseph Banks, who became a great scientific patron of the last quarter of the eighteenth century.³² There is no evidence that Weston received any form of patronage, and he continued to publish works on gardening and botany, none of which were dedicated to Bute.

An Essay on the Theory and Practice of Medical Electricity by the Italian natural philosopher, Tiberius Cavallo (1749-1809), was inscribed to Bute in 1780.³³ Cavallo was originally from Naples and moved to London sometime around 1772. He made improvements to scientific instruments and developed an interest in electrical experiments. His first publication in 1777, *A Treatise in Electricity in Theory and Practice*, was dedicated to the physician and natural philosopher, Sir William Watson (1715-1787).³⁴ A member of the Royal Society, and colleague of Benjamin Franklin, Watson was known for his experiments in

²⁷ Ibid., p. ii

²⁸ Ibid

²⁹ Ibid., p. iii

³⁰ Ibid

³¹ Ibid

³² Rogers, 'Book Dedications in Britain 1700-1799', p. 230

³³ Tiberius Cavallo, *An Essay on the Theory and Practice of Medical Electricity*, (London, 1780)

³⁴ Tiberius Cavallo, *A Treatise in Electricity in Theory and Practice*, (London, 1777)

electricity,, and some of his electrical displays were witnessed by Prince Frederick.³⁵ A contributor to the Royal Society, Watson previously read Cavallo's paper on 'Extraordinary Electricity of the Atmosphere Observed at Islington on the Month of October, 1775' at a meeting on 12 March 1776.³⁶ Cavallo's dedication in *An Essay on the Theory and Practice of Medical Electricity* is simply inscribed 'to the right honourable Earl of Bute'.³⁷ The second edition, published in 1782, was also inscribed to the same dedicatee. Bute was an unusual choice of dedicator as he was not a member of the Royal Society, does not appear to be one of his correspondents, and there is no indication that they met while he was on his Grand Tour. Cavallo was admitted to the Royal Society on 9 December 1799, three days before Bute's son John, Lord Mountstuart (1744-1814).³⁸

The final scientific dedication to Bute in 1790 was by the Scottish physician, Sir William Fordyce (1724-1792), who published *A Letter to Sir John Sinclair Concerning the Virtues of the Muriatic Acid*.³⁹ This letter was addressed to the politician Sir John Sinclair (1754-1835). While travelling in Russia, Sinclair had sent reports to Fordyce chronicling the treatment of plague in Moscow during the outbreak of 1778.⁴⁰ The reporting of this epidemic 'awakened' the author's desire to investigate every possible method of treatment. Through his investigations, Fordyce found that muriatic acid was 'the most efficacious medicine hitherto used for stopping the progress of the putrid disorders'.⁴¹ The purpose of *A Letter to Sir John Sinclair Concerning the Virtues of the Muriatic Acid* was to communicate his discoveries and to transmit his results to Prince Grigory Potemkin (1739-1791) in Petersburg via Sinclair.⁴²

This treatise also contains a letter from Bute's son, the Reverend William Stuart (1755-1822), who wrote to Fordyce on 1 March 1788 concerning the benefits of inoculating against smallpox. He claims inoculation was successful against the outbreak of 1787 in his parish of

³⁵ J. L. Heilbron, *Electricity in the 17th and 18th Centuries: A Study of Early Modern Physics*, (London, 1979), pp. 297-298

³⁶ Tiberius Cavallo and William Watson, 'Extraordinary Electricity of the Atmosphere Observed at Islington on the Month of October, 1775. By Mr. Tiberius Cavallo and communicated by William Watson, M. D. V. P. R. S.', *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society of London*, Vol. 66 (1776), pp. 407-411

³⁷ Cavallo, *A Treatise in Electricity in Theory and Practice*, p. i

³⁸ John Nicholas, *Literary Anecdotes of the Eighteenth Century*, (London, 1814), p. 120

³⁹ Sir William Fordyce, *A Letter to Sir John Sinclair Concerning the Virtues of the Muriatic Acid or Spirit of Sea-Salt, in the Cure of Putrid Diseases*, (London, 1790)

⁴⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 1

⁴¹ *Ibid.*, p. v

⁴² *Ibid.*, p. vi

Luton, and believes the results might 'excite imitation'.⁴³ This epidemic claimed the lives of half the population, despite the preventative measures which were taken. These precautions included cleanliness, appropriate medicine, and separation of patients from the town.⁴⁴ Stuart reports that out of 1,215 individuals who were inoculated over the course of three days, only five died.⁴⁵ Therefore, he was advocating for the annual inoculation of every parish, and for the expense to be borne by that parish. The author is certain that the price of inoculations would be less than the amount spent each year on treating the sick, and paying for families forced into the workhouse.⁴⁶ This idea of inoculating against smallpox was not new and William Stuart's maternal grandmother, Lady Mary Wortley Montagu, witnessed the practice during her stay in Istanbul between 1716 and 1718. She was one of the early advocates of the procedure and inoculated her own children, with her grandson was continuing to promote variolation sixty years later.

Fordyce's praises his patron's 'zeal and liberality in patronising every discovery, or attempt, which may conduce to the promotion of the sciences and arts'.⁴⁷ The author claims that this is not 'the language of flattery, or compliment, but the honest dictate of truth and justice'.⁴⁸ However, Fordyce may be biased as he was employed as a physician in the Stuart household. He was honoured by the 'generous confidence' shown by Bute in his abilities, and 'particularly in your last malignant fever'.⁴⁹ He treated members of the family during the 1780s, including Lady Bute for gout, and William Stuart for symptoms consistent with a putrid fever.⁵⁰ Fordyce's treatment was a combination of muriatic acid and other medicines that he alleges resulted in his patient's recovery within a few days.⁵¹ After witnessing the miraculous recovery of his son, Bute 'expressed an earnest wish' to see the powers of muriatic acid made public.⁵² It was for this reason, and his interest in the 'advancement of knowledge and the welfare of mankind', that the author inscribed this treatise to Bute. There is a further connection between this patron and client, as Fordyce's brother, James Fordyce (1720-1796), was a neighbour of the Earl of Bute in Hampshire and who was a frequent

⁴³ Ibid., p. vii

⁴⁴ Ibid., p. 24

⁴⁵ Ibid., p. 265

⁴⁶ Ibid., p. 28

⁴⁷ Ibid., p. iii

⁴⁸ Ibid

⁴⁹ Ibid., pp. iii-iv

⁵⁰ Fordyce, *A Letter to Sir John Sinclair*, p. 14

⁵¹ Ibid., p. 14

⁵² Ibid

visitor to his library. In 1786, James addressed an epistle to Bute after he had been presented with a valuable telescope.⁵³

Literature

One of the most famous literary debates of the eighteenth century surrounded the authenticity of James Macpherson's (1736-1796) Gaelic poems.⁵⁴ Macpherson, a Scottish writer and translator, collected Gaelic manuscripts and oral versions of songs and ballads during his travels in the Scottish Highlands, and alleges that he found material from the third century Gaelic poet called Ossian. Macpherson was fortunate in being first introduced to the Bute family tutor, the Scottish historian Adam Ferguson, before meeting the his private secretary, John Home, in Moffat in 1759.⁵⁵ After showing some of the fragments of ancient poetry to Home (who did not understand Gaelic), he was persuaded to transcribe the poems, and published an English translation, called *Fragments of ancient poetry* (1760). The poems began to generated an interest in Gaelic literature, and at this time there was a general acceptance of the authenticity of these ancient poems. Dr Hugh Blair, another member of the Scottish intellectual circle, raised a subscription to allow Macpherson to tour the Highlands to collect further examples of ancient Gaelic literature.⁵⁶ Both supporters of Macpherson, Blair provides a critical dissertation in the preface of *The Works of Ossian* (1765), while Ferguson was a major influencer and collaborater in the production of the Ossianic poems.

Macpherson's, *The Works of Ossian* (1765), was a collective edition of the *Ossian* cycle of poems, that featured ancient Gaelic heroes and recounts tales of Scotland's glorious past. Macpherson dedicated two of his literary works, *Temora* (1763) and *The Works of Ossian* (1765), to Bute.⁵⁷ The author humbly acknowledges in his brief inscription in *Temora* that it had been translated from the original Gaelic by his patron's 'command'.⁵⁸ Macpherson travelled to London in 1761, most likely at the invitation of his patron, and *Temora* was

⁵³ James Fordyce, *Poems by James Fordyce, D.D.* (London, 1786), p. 94

⁵⁴ Howard Gaskell (ed.), *The Reception of Ossian in Europe*, (London, 2004)

⁵⁵ R. George Thomas, 'Lord Bute, John Homes and Ossian: Two Letters', *Modern Language Review*, Vol. 51 (1956), p. 74

⁵⁶ Thomas M. Curley, *Samuel Johnson, the Ossian Fraud, and the Celtic Revival in Great Britain*, (Cambridge, 2009), p. 30

⁵⁷ James Macpherson, *The Works of Ossian, the Son of Fingal*. 2 vols., (London, 1765); James Macpherson, *Temora, an ancient epic poem, in eight books: together with several other poems, composed by Ossian, the son of Fingal*, (London, 1763)

⁵⁸ Macpherson, *Temora*, p. i

published entirely at the Bute's expense.

In *The Works of Ossian*, Macpherson begins his address by revealing that these poems had 'been honoured' with Bute's support, and had also been 'received with applause by men of taste throughout Europe'.⁵⁹ He acknowledges in the opening sentences of his inscription the controversy that surrounded the publication of the poems, and declares that this address was 'not an endeavour to secure the continuance of the public favour through the sanction of your name'.⁶⁰ The veracity of these translations had been questioned by those who believed that the poems were completely fabricated by Macpherson, or those who believed in the ancient origins of these poems. The controversy continued for many years, and the authenticity of the poems was challenged by Samuel Johnson and other critics, many of whom could not speak Gaelic.⁶¹ They believed that Macpherson had largely written the tales himself, incorporating little from the fragments of poems and stories, and Gaelic critics were equally unhappy that the author did not provide an accurate translation, or produce the ancient manuscripts for examination.⁶²

Macpherson continues his address by claiming that he is not concerned about his reputation, as he has 'met with your favour and protection', which would help defend against critics.⁶³ Macpherson believes that Bute's patronage is an honour 'which will be envied me'.⁶⁴ The publication of the Ossianic epics, coincided with hostile anti-Scottish attacks in the press led by John Wilkes and Charles Churchill in the *North Britain*, who were angered over the favouritism shown by Bute's ministry to Scottish writers and academics.⁶⁵ As Macpherson's Gaelic poems were commissioned and promoted by a group of influential Scottish intellectuals, Wilkes used the opportunity of denouncing the poems launching an attack on Bute on his use of political and literary patronage. Wilkes and his supporters were outraged by the granting of pensions to Bute's fellow Scotsmen, including John Home and David Mallet.⁶⁶

⁵⁹ Macpherson, *The Works of Ossian, the Son of Fingal*, p. i

⁶⁰ Ibid

⁶¹ James Porter, "'Bring Me the Head of James Macpherson": The Execution of Ossian and the Wellsprings of Folkloristic Discourse', *The Journal of American Folklore*, Vol. 114, No. 454, James Macpherson and the Ossian Epic Debate (Autumn, 2001), p. 398

⁶² Ibid

⁶³ Macpherson, *The Works of Ossian, the Son of Fingal*, p. i

⁶⁴ Ibid

⁶⁵ Dafydd Moore, 'The Reception of *The Poems of Ossian* in England', in Howard Gaskell's *The Reception of Ossian in Europe*, (London, 2004), p. 23

⁶⁶ Philip Connell, 'British Identities and the Politics of Ancient Poetry in Later Eighteenth-Century England', *The*

Referring to the rather tarnished reputation of his patron among his contemporaries, Macpherson believes that 'there is a great debt of fame owing to the Earl of Bute', which 'hereafter will be amply paid'.⁶⁷ He hopes that in less prejudiced times in the future *Ossian* will be bestowed with a more deserving reputation. However, it is generally accepted today that the majority of the tales of Ossian were largely invented by Macpherson. This debate had the positive effect of igniting a surge of interest in Gaelic culture, and the collecting of Gaelic manuscripts that continued right into the nineteenth century. Macpherson concludes his inscription by embracing 'this opportunity of testifying in public' his gratitude to his patron.⁶⁸ Despite the criticism of his earlier epics, these poems were a commercial success and Macpherson earned the impressive sum of £1200.⁶⁹ Further rewards followed for Macpherson, and in 1764 he was appointed secretary to Governor George Johnstone (1730-1787) at Pensacola, West Florida. He returned to England in 1766 and received an annuity for life.⁷⁰

Architecture

In 1775 the English architect, Charles Cameron (1754-1812), inscribed *The Baths of the Romans Explained and Illustrated, with the Restorations of Palladio Corrected and Improved*.⁷¹ The first edition of *The Baths of the Romans* appeared in 1772, and in an advertisement dated the 15 February 1772 Cameron makes an appeal for subscriptions.⁷² However, when it was published on 20 March there was no list of subscribers, and *The Baths of the Romans* was deemed a relative failure.⁷³ It was described as an outdated Palladian publication, merely a compilation of the works of others, and an abortive attempt to imitate the work of the royal architect and client of Bute's, Robert Adam.⁷⁴ Cameron had studied with the accomplished

Historical Journal, Vol. 49, No. 1 (Mar., 2006), pp. 168-170

⁶⁷ Macpherson, *The Works of Ossian, the Son of Fingal*, p. ii

⁶⁸ Ibid

⁶⁹ Porter, "Bring Me the Head of James Macpherson", p. 407

⁷⁰ Ibid., p. 402

⁷¹ Charles Cameron, *The Baths of the Romans Explained and Illustrated, with the Restorations of Palladio Corrected and Improved*, (London, 1775)

⁷² *Gazetteer and New Daily Advertiser*, (London, England), Saturday, February 15, 1772; Issue 13 405

⁷³ *Gazetteer and New Daily Advertiser*, (London, England), Friday, March 20, 1772; Issue 13 434; Alan Tait, 'Cameron and the Beginnings of Neo-Classicism in Russia', *AA Files*, No. 1 (Winter 1981-82), p. 86

⁷⁴ Frank Salmon, 'Charles Cameron and Nero's Domus Aurea: 'Una piccola esplorazione'' *Architectural History*, Vol. 36 (1993), p. 84

architect, Isaac Ware (1704-1766), and after his death continued with the project of publishing a version of Palladio's original sketches of the Roman Baths.⁷⁵ Like many architects of the eighteenth century, he travelled to Rome in 1768 in order to draw the ancient monuments and conduct archaeological research, and remained there until 1770. He was resident in Italy at the same time as Bute, but there is no evidence that they ever met or corresponded. This architectural volume is one of four such works, published in Britain in the second half of the eighteenth century that described Roman rather than Greek ancient sites.⁷⁶

Cameron begins his dedication by declaring that Bute 'should not be surprised in seeing this Volume' addressed to you 'for the Arts naturally fly to their Admirers & Friends'.⁷⁷ The author claims that Bute is drawn to the 'innate Worth and Beauty' of the arts and was for this reason that he 'presumed to ask your protection for the following sheets'.⁷⁸ It was during this time that the Earl was spending large sums of money on building and remodeling two country houses in England. Unfortunately, the author of *The Baths of the Romans* soon found himself in financial difficulties and is listed as being imprisoned for debt in Fleet Street in June 1778.⁷⁹ Unable to gain recognition in Britain, Cameron was invited to the court of Catherine the Great (1729-1796) in 1778 and became the personal architect to the Empress. Cameron is credited with shaping the course of Russian Neo-Classicism and brought to the Imperial Court his interpretation of the 'anglicised' Palladianism.⁸⁰ His masterpieces in Russia include the Agate pavilion over the cold baths, and the Gallery at Tsarskoe Selo. Cameron spent the remainder of his life working at the Imperial Court, dying in 1812.

History

In 1787, Charles Cullen (dates unknown), published *The History of Mexico*, which was a translation of Abbé Francesco Saverio Clavigero's (1731-1787) *La Historia Antigua de México*, originally published Italy in 1780.⁸¹ Clavigero was an Italian Jesuit priest who had spent a

⁷⁵ Ibid., p. 71

⁷⁶ Ibid

⁷⁷ Cameron, *The Baths of the Romans Explained and Illustrated*, p. i

⁷⁸ Ibid

⁷⁹ *London Gazette*, (London, England), June 2, 1778 - June 6, 1778; Issue 11880

⁸⁰ Tait, 'Cameron and the Beginnings of Neo-Classicism in Russia', p. 84

⁸¹ Charles Cullen, *The History of Mexico. Translated from the Original Italian*, (London, 1787); *London Chronicle*,

number of years teaching in the Spanish colonies of South America. His extremely popular history of Mexico was based on ancient manuscripts and paintings of the Indians which gave descriptions of the religion, customs, politics, and warfare of the inhabitants. The author begins his dedication by acknowledging his 'Obligation' to Bute for acquainting him with the original manuscript.⁸² It seems that Cullen was instructed by the dedicatee to translate Clavigero's *La Historia Antigua de México*. The author reveals to his readers that he lent his 'Industry' to this work in order to assist 'an Avocate in the Cause of Truth, who saw her Interests abandoned, and felt for her Oppression'.⁸³ He hopes his efforts in translating *The History* are both 'pleasing and instructive'.⁸⁴ Cullen concludes that even though *The History of Mexico* may have 'easily have fallen into abler Hands, I dare freely appeal your Lordship for the Fidelity of my Labours'.⁸⁵ Very little is known regarding the author but he is the only historian personally patronised by Bute, although the Scottish historian, William Robertson, was a beneficiary of political patronage.

A LIST OF CLIENTS WHO BENEFITTED FROM THE PATRONAGE OF THE EARL OF BUTE

Before and during his term in government, the Earl of Bute supported a number of literary clients but after his retirement from public life, with the exception of James Macpherson, he did not patronise any more literary authors. The same cannot be said of his patronage of science and his scientific clients. This section will primarily focus on the individuals who benefited from Bute's patronage and examine whether there is any evidence to criticism that him primarily supported clients in scientific disciplines. I will discuss the clients who received patronage; establish whether his patronage contributed significantly to the career and financial well-being of his clients; determine if he was a significant or lesser patron; and finally, discover whether a client or particular subject area benefited most from the Bute's patronage.

(London, England), February 22, 1787 - February 24, 1787; Issue 4722

⁸² Ibid., p. i

⁸³ Ibid., p. ii

⁸⁴ Ibid

⁸⁵ Ibid

Bute's Personal Clients

Name	Nationality	Profession
Sir John Hill	English	Botanist
Thomas Worsley (1711-1778)	English	Architect
Lancelot 'Capability' Brown (1716-1783)	English	Landscape Architect
Sir Joshua Reynolds (1723-1792)	English	Artist
John Home (1722-1808)	Scottish	Playwright
John Walker (1731-1803)	Scottish	Mineralogist and Botanist
Robert Adam (1728-1792)	Scottish	Architect
Allan Ramsay (1713-1784)	Scottish	Artist
Johann Zoffany (1733-1810)	German	Artist
Peter Woulfe (1727-1803)	Irish	Chemist
Etienne Liotard (1702-1789)	Swiss-French	Artist

Table 8: Clients who benefitted from the patronage of the Earl of Bute

The Church of Scotland minister, John Home, was a lifelong friend and client of Bute. The Earl of Ilay was initially responsible for introducing Home to Bute sometime in 1757.⁸⁶ Home was a member of the Select Society, and part of a Scottish intellectual circle that included William Robertson, Hugh Blair, Adam Ferguson, and Alexander Carlyle – who would all benefit from Bute's patronage.⁸⁷ He was also responsible for introducing James Macpherson to his patron in 1759. Patron and client shared similar interests including a love of acting and theatre, and after their introduction Bute actively promoted and encouraged the young playwright.⁸⁸

Home began his literary career while being employed as a minister in Athelstoneford in East Lothian, Scotland. His Home's play *Douglas* was performed in Edinburgh in December 1756, after first being rejected by David Garrick as not ready for the London stage.⁸⁹ Fortunately for the future of his theatrical career, *Douglas* earned universal approval from the Scottish public. Due to its popularity in Scotland, Home revised the play with the help of Bute, and in March 1757 it was performed in Covent Garden. By June 1757, and despite his literary success, Home was forced to resign his position as minister because the Church

⁸⁶ Russell, *John 3rd Earl of Bute*, p. 26

⁸⁷ Richard B. Sher, "'The Favourite of the favourite': John Hume, Bute and the politics of patriotic poetry', in Karl W. Schweizer's *Lord Bute: Essays in Re-interpretation*, (Leicester, 1988), p. 182

⁸⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 196

⁸⁹ Lisa A. Freeman, 'The Cultural Politics of Antitheatricality: The Case of John Home's *Douglas*', *The Eighteenth Century*, vol. 32, no. 3, p. 210

authorities were extremely disapproving of his theatrical ambitions and plays.⁹⁰ Home remained in London and was subsequently employed as Bute's private secretary and advisor, remaining in this post until the resignation of his patron in 1763.⁹¹ In 1757, for his literary endeavours and with Bute's support, Home was rewarded by Princess Augusta with an annual pension of £100.⁹²

Bute further demonstrated his support for Home by involving himself in the writing and revision of *Agis* and *The Siege of Aquilea*, and by bringing his own patron Prince George, to see several performances of *Agis* when it was staged in 1758.⁹³ In gratitude, Home dedicated his *The Dramatic Works of John Home* to Prince George in October 1760.⁹⁴ As Bute's private secretary, Home was in a position to influence appointments, and with many Scottish intellectuals gravitating towards London, he was responsible for introducing many of his friends and countrymen to his patron. Home even suggested Adam Ferguson as a tutor for Bute's children.⁹⁵ Furthermore, he introduced William Robertson to Bute, and was the chief promoter of MacPherson's *Ossian*.⁹⁶ However, an opponent and critic at the advancement of so many unknown Scots, John Wilkes, was incensed when Home's pension was increased from £100 to £300 in 1761.⁹⁷ Even after Bute's retirement, Home remained a friend and correspondent.⁹⁸

The naturalist, Sir John Hill, was the chief recipient of Bute's scientific patronage. He was a prolific author who published a total of seventy-six works on a variety of subjects, the majority of which were on botany. He started his botanical career by travelling around Britain collecting plant specimens for Baron Petre and the Duke of Richmond. He was initially employed by Petre in 1737 as an gardening assistant on his Thornton estate, and later hired by Richmond at Goodwood to arrange the Duke's collection of dried plants.⁹⁹ His scientific career faltered after the early and unexpected deaths of his patrons, (Petre died in 1742 and

⁹⁰ Ibid., p. 211

⁹¹ Richard B. Sher, *The Enlightenment and the Book: Scottish Author and Their Publishers in Eighteenth-century Britain, Ireland, and America*, p. 205

⁹² Sher, "The Favourite of the favourite", p. 184

⁹³ Ibid

⁹⁴ Ibid

⁹⁵ John Russell, *John 3rd Earl of Bute*, p. 41

⁹⁶ Sher, "The Favourite of the favourite", p. 183

⁹⁷ Ibid., p. 193

⁹⁸ J.A. Lovat-Fraser, *John Stuart, Earl of Bute*, p. 91

⁹⁹ George Rousseau, *The Notorious Sir John Hill: The Man Destroyed by Ambition in the Era of Celebrity*, p. 16

Richmond in 1750), and Hill turned to other professions to earn a suitable income to support his family. Throughout the 1740s and 1750s, Hill received money by writing pamphlets on a range of topics including medicine and literature. In a further effort to supplement this income he became an actor and published a number of plays, including *The Actor* in 1750.¹⁰⁰ He continued his interest in botany by authoring a number of scientific publications such as *The Useful Family Herbal or, An Account of all those English Plants* in 1755.¹⁰¹ However, Hill could not support his growing family on writing alone and established an apothecary shop in London where he sold herbal remedies.

Hill attempted to solicit support for his work by writing a number of dedications to various members of the nobility. Luckily for Hill, he was eventually rewarded for his efforts in 1756 when one of his dedicatees, Hugh Percy the first Duke of Northumberland (1712-1786), introduced Hill to his most important and enduring patron, the Earl of Bute. Northumberland had recommended Hill's *British Herbal* to Bute sometime in April or May 1757.¹⁰² By 5 November 1757, Hill had dedicated his gardening treatise *Eden* to Bute and received both encouragement and the promise of future support.¹⁰³ This was the beginning of a patron-client relationship that would span eighteen years and last until Hill's death in 1775. The surviving correspondence between Hill and Bute reveals a great deal concerning their patron-client relationship and the botanical project they undertook together.

In one of Hill's early letters to his patron on 8 November 1758, he declares 'that it would look like flattery, if I should say but a small part of what I think concerning the great plan your Lordship has been pleased to put into my Hands'.¹⁰⁴ Hill is referring here to Bute's proposal that he would write a complete work of botany. This ambitious project, which would be entitled *The Vegetable System*, would comprise twenty-six volumes and was published between 1759 and 1775. It was a project that would dominate the rest of Hill's life and would eventually lead to major hardship and financial disaster for the author and his family. However, in 1758 Hill must have believed that this project, spanning years, would provide a suitable and steady income, and was therefore conveyed his gratitude that Bute would

¹⁰⁰ Sir John Hill, *The Actor*, (London, 1750)

¹⁰¹ Sir John Hill, *The Useful Family Herbal or, An Account of all those English Plants*, (London, 1755)

¹⁰² G.S. Rousseau, *The Letters and Papers of Sir John Hill, 1714-1775*, (New York, 1982), p. 72

¹⁰³ Sir John Hill, *The British Herbal*, (London, 1756), p. i

¹⁰⁴ BU/98/3/167, (*General Political Papers*, 03 January 1758 - 31 December 1758)

consider him 'worthy to undertake the Execution' of such a great botanical venture.¹⁰⁵ He assures his patron that he would keep him apprised of his progress but that initially it would take some time to 'digest the first materials' of this 'vast' project.¹⁰⁶ Referring to his own botanical talents, Hill claims that much of this work 'may be done even by a moderate genius who proceeds regularly and slowly'.¹⁰⁷ The study of botany 'has always been my [Hill's] favourite study' and he was confident that 'for one who has already spent his Life in the Science' he had the ability to complete the proposed project.¹⁰⁸

Although Hill is the sole author of *The Vegetable System*, the majority of information that was considered for inclusion appears to have been closely monitored by Bute. Hill wrote reports outlining his progress and drawings of plant specimens were sent to his patron for approval. This constant supervision had the effect of delaying publication, with Hill declaring that after the plans were approved of 'a great part of the work will go on easily'.¹⁰⁹ However, despite sending materials and drawings to Hill, the full extent of Bute's involvement in the composition and publication of *The Vegetable System* is not known. When the first volume was published in 1759, it was not dedicated to Hill's patron as you would expect, but rather to George, Prince of Wales. It would appear that Hill aspired to a more prestigious patron than Bute and was eager to flatter his own patron's powerful royal benefactor. In Hill's dedication he justified his appeal for royal patronage because he was 'conscious of the Difficulty of this Subject, and of [his] unequal Talents' in the area of botany.¹¹⁰ However, his request for royal support was not granted.

It was not the first time that Hill petitioned for royal patronage for one of his publications. On 11 December 1758, he wrote to Bute and asked if he would intercede on his behalf and submit a copy of his work on exotic and Chinese plants before the Prince of Wales 'whose protection has never been denied any thing that deserves encouragement'.¹¹¹ Hill was keen to emphasise that this publication did not 'interfere with that great work your Lordship has been pleas'd to mark out for me'.¹¹² He defended his request for royal patronage by

¹⁰⁵ Ibid

¹⁰⁶ Ibid

¹⁰⁷ Ibid

¹⁰⁸ Ibid

¹⁰⁹ Rousseau, *The Letters and Papers of Sir John Hill, 1714-1775*, p. 102

¹¹⁰ Sir John Hill, *The Vegetable System*, (London, 1759), p. i

¹¹¹ BU/98/3/191, (*General Political Papers*, 03 January 1758 - 31 December 1758)

¹¹² Ibid

claiming that 'the expense of this [work] has outrun my slender fortune'.¹¹³ However, when Hill's work on exotic and Chinese plants was published in 1759 it was entitled *Exotic Botany, illustrated in thirty-five Figures of curious and elegant Plants*, and was inscribed to the Duke of Northumberland. Therefore, it is reasonable to assume that Bute had either failed to intervene with the Prince of Wales on his behalf, or the Prince was not interested in supporting Hill's botanical endeavours. Despite Hill's efforts, the Earl of Bute remained his most influential patron. It is usually a sign of a lack of effective patronage that Hill continued to dedicate work to other members of the nobility and the Royal Family. Perhaps he was looking for an annual annuity, or salaried position from Prince George that would provide security for his family and alleviate some of his financial difficulties. Whatever the reason, Hill continued to look for royal patronage and *The Vegetable System* was dedicated to the Prince of Wales. Even after securing the patronage of Bute, Hill continued his practice of addressing his botanical work to other aristocratic patrons.

In 1758, Hill's *An Idea of a Botanical Garden in England* was addressed to the then Prime Minister, William Cavendish, fourth Duke of Devonshire (1720-1764).¹¹⁴ The aim of this work was to obtain Devonshire's support in planning and developing a national botanical garden in England. As there was no national botanical garden in England at this time and Bute was devoting all his energies to Princess Augusta's private gardens at Kew, Hill was attempting to garner support for this undertaking by appealing to other prominent patrons. Unfortunately for Hill, no aid was forthcoming from the Duke, and until the National Botanic Gardens at Kew were opened to the public in 1840 there was no national botanical garden in England. It is possible that Hill wished to be involved in the establishment of a new national garden which would create employment opportunities that he could capitalise upon. According to *An Address to the Public* by Lady Henrietta Hill, her husband was employed at Kew shortly after his introduction to Bute in 1757, and was given the task of superintending the gardens.¹¹⁵ However, this post and his role as a gardening assistant at Kew and in Kensington Gardens was mostly informal, and it appears that he never received any official appointment. By 1759, the position of chief gardener at Kew had been granted to William Aiton.

¹¹³ Ibid

¹¹⁴ Sir John Hill, *An Idea of a Botanical Garden in England*, (London, 1758)

¹¹⁵ Lady Henrietta Hill, *An Address to the Public, by The Honble Lady Hill; Setting Forth the Consequences of the Late Sir John Hill's Acquaintance with The Earl of Bute*, (London, 1788), p. 5

Despite failing to receive preferment at Kew, Hill continued to petition Bute for further favours and employment. In 1759, the British Museum sought to employ a full-time naturalist and Hill appealed to his patron to intercede on his behalf with the Museum Trustees. Bute was unwilling to recommend Hill for the post, and instead supported Daniel Solander's (1733-1782) candidature.¹¹⁶ When another post at the Museum fell vacant in 1762, Hill claimed that 'the least word from your Lordship would determine it in my favour'.¹¹⁷ His patron again refused to endorse Hill's application by writing to the Duchess of Portland who was filling the position. There are a few possible reasons which could explain why Hill was passed over for official salaried positions. Firstly, Bute may have feared that one of these appointments would interfere with the writing and publication of *The Vegetable System*. Secondly, Hill's scandalous behaviour, quarrelsome nature, and propensity for writing satirical pamphlets earned him many enemies and critics, and could have hindered his employment opportunities.

Hill's disagreeable temperament and unflattering satires prevented his election to the Royal Society and also led to a disagreement with the manager of the Drury Lane theatre, David Garrick. Hill had attended meetings of the Royal Society from 1745 onwards, but he was unable to become a member (despite having sufficient scientific publications) after he failed to obtain the requisite number of sponsors for his nomination. Although he had the support of the President of the Society, Martin Folkes (1690-1754), Hill attacked the Royal Society in two satires which effectively ended all hopes of membership.¹¹⁸ Furthermore, Hill blamed Garrick for the failure of his play *The Rout* in 1759 that ended their theatrical association and friendship. Bute was aware of Hill's difficult temperament and in 1774 (the year before Hill's death) confessed in a letter to the diplomat John Strange that 'Hill is the only naturalist I have made of a rule, never to talk with Him on any Subject but what he is employed in' because he had 'heard so much of his vanity & imprudence'.¹¹⁹ Between 1760 and 1761, and despite his reservations, Bute employed Hill in a literary capacity to write pro-ministry pamphlets for his administration.¹²⁰ This was due to the overwhelming hostility in

¹¹⁶ Rousseau, *The Notorious Sir John Hill*, p. 249

¹¹⁷ Rousseau, *The Letters and Papers of Sir John Hill, 1714-1775*, p. 127

¹¹⁸ Rousseau, *The Notorious Sir John Hill*, p. 249; Sir John Hill, *A Dissertation on Royal Societies*, (London, 1750), p. 45

¹¹⁹ David P. Miller, "'My favourite studdys': Lord Bute as naturalist", in Karl W. Schweizer's [ed] *Lord Bute: Essays in re-interpretation*, p. 220

¹²⁰ Rousseau, *The Notorious Sir John Hill*, p. 255

the press and his keenness in overturning public opinion.

At the beginning of their patron-client relationship Hill wrote on 11 August 1759 that he was fortunate for the support he had received and was therefore unafraid to undertake *The Vegetable System* 'alone'.¹²¹ However, their relationship began to deteriorate throughout the 1760s, likely due to Bute's retirement from public life and Hill's troublesome nature. Nevertheless, he continued to provide support and request additional volumes of *The Vegetable System*. In her *An Address to the Public* published in 1788 (thirteen years after his death), Lady Hill alleges that while Bute had supported and encouraged her husband in writing *The Vegetable System*, he did not provide adequate funds for its publication. She argues that the expense and the stress of the numerous volumes eventually killed her husband.¹²² She was incensed that her husband was requested by his patron to produce another volume months prior to his death in 1775. Lady Hill makes the claim that Bute promised Hill that his income 'would not be injured by the undertaking' but she insists that her husband was forced to finance the botanical work himself, even though the Earl had commissioned it.¹²³ Therefore, her *Address* was an appeal for the outstanding money she felt was owed to her husband. She was angered by Bute's request that several of Hill's books should be donated to the universities in Scotland.¹²⁴ It is likely that Bute requested the return of papers, manuscripts, and books that he had been given to Hill during the course of writing *The Vegetable System*. Despite her petition, Lady Hill's plea for compensation was unsuccessful. For his part Bute believed that he had sufficiently paid what was owed and that it was financial mismanagement by Hill that had caused his debts.

The truth most likely lies somewhere in the middle. In a letter dated 11 August 1759, Hill laments that the 'Readers in Science' in England are so few that booksellers were unwilling to 'engage in the expense of that great work'.¹²⁵ A further reason for Hill's dwindling income was the time and expense involved in engraving the plates for *The Vegetable System*. He was unable to afford high quality engravings in later volumes and these drawings were heavily criticised for their inferior quality, reflecting in poor reviews and sales. Hill never received additional support or a pension from the Bute ministry which might have

¹²¹ BU/98/4/141, (*General Political Papers*, 04 January 1759 - 31 December 1759)

¹²² Lady Hill, *An Address to the Public*, by *The Honble Lady Hill*, p. 10

¹²³ *Ibid.*, p. 11

¹²⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 19

¹²⁵ BU/98/4/141, (*General Political Papers*, 04 January 1759 - 31 December 1759)

eased his financial situation, and he died heavily in debt. His talents can be summed up by expressing 'admiration at the unremitted industry of Dr. Hill' though 'we have not always been able to extol the fruits of his labour. Some of his productions have undoubtedly merited praise, while others have equally deserved the censure, which, in justice to the public, we could not with-hold'.¹²⁶ Hill's scientific achievements were not widely recognised in England during his lifetime and the knighthood which he received in 1774 was granted by the King of Sweden. Even after successfully receiving support from a powerful patron, Hill's scientific career never reached the great heights that he longed for; the later volumes of his *magnum opus* were poorly received; and without the benefit of a annual pension or salaried position, his dependence on the goodwill of one patron meant that his financial status was always precarious.

One of the clients who Bute supported after his retirement was the Scottish mineralogist and botanist John Walker (1731-1803). However, Bute can only be considered as one of Walker's minor patrons and scientific correspondents. Walker was one of the central figures of the Scottish Enlightenment, a proponent of agricultural reforms, and like Bute, an enthusiastic collector of minerals. Walker was a student at Edinburgh University before being ordained a minister in the Church of Scotland. Despite his clerical duties, Walker maintained an interest in several scientific subjects, particularly mineralogy, and in 1753/4 he presented two marl and manure collections to the Edinburgh Philosophical Society. He was awarded two medals from the society and published an article in the *Philosophical Transactions* regarding these collections in 1757.¹²⁷

Walker's first major patron was the chemist William Cullen (1710-1790), who was a key figure in the Enlightenment, and he became one of his students. In 1755, Cullen became Professor of Chemistry and Medicine at Edinburgh University and incorporated many agricultural topics into his chemistry lectures.¹²⁸ After Cullen's death Walker purchased his mineralogy collection for the Edinburgh History Museum.¹²⁹ Cullen introduced Walker to his second major patron Henry Home, Lord Kames (1696-1782). Kames was also an important

¹²⁶ *The Monthly Review or Literary Journal*, Vol. XX, (London, 1759), p. 369

¹²⁷ Matthew D. Eddy, 'Scottish Chemistry, Classification and the Early Mineralogical Career of the 'Ingenious' Rev. Dr. John Walker (1746 to 1779)', *The British Journal for the History of Science*, Vol. 35 (2002), p. 416

¹²⁸ Charles W. J. Withers, 'William Cullen's Agricultural Lecture and Writings and the Development of Agricultural Science in Eighteenth-Century Scotland', *The Agricultural History Review*, Vol. 37, No. 2 (1989), p. 148

¹²⁹ Eddy, 'Scottish Chemistry, Classification and the Early Mineralogical Career of the 'Ingenious' Rev. Dr. John Walker (1746 to 1779)', p. 419

figure in the Scottish Enlightenment and was a founding member of the Philosophical Society of Edinburgh, established in 1783. Walker's scientific career flourished under the patronage of Cullen and Kames, and he was selected by The Board for Annexed Forfeited Estates (nominated by Kames) for a tour of the Hebrides in 1764. The aim of the Board was to implement new cultivation practices and changes in farming that would result in overall agricultural improvements in the Highlands, and to transform Scotland into a modern commercial nation like England.¹³⁰ The land in the Hebrides was poor and underdeveloped, and Walker was sent to make observations and to take notes on the minerals, plants, and climate of the region.¹³¹ He was commissioned to make a report and his notes on the rural economy were important in highlighting the areas that would benefit most from agricultural reforms. During his 1764 tour, Walker travelled over 3,000 miles, and in total made five trips to the Highlands, the last in 1786.¹³² Cullen even accompanied Walker on one of his tours.¹³³ A detailed account of his tours was published posthumously in 1808 and was entitled *An Economical History of the Hebrides and Highlands of Scotland*.¹³⁴

Walker's interest in agricultural reforms and the exploitation of natural resources was shared by Kames. Kames was an 'improving' landlord, a member of the Edinburgh Society for Encouraging Arts, Science, Manufactures, and Agriculture in Scotland, and in 1776 published his practical observations on improving agriculture in Scotland in *The Gentleman Farmer being an attempt to improve Agriculture, by subjecting it to the Test of Rational Principles*.¹³⁵ Landowners were continuously looking for new ways of managing and increasing agricultural productivity and as a result there was an increase in the number of societies and pamphlets outlining new methods of husbandry and practices.¹³⁶ These societies and pamphlets were important ways of disseminating new knowledge and techniques in ploughing, crop rotation, and methods of nutrition.¹³⁷ Therefore, Walker acted as a correspondent to farmers, miners,

¹³⁰ John R. R. Christie, 'Ideology and Representation in Eighteenth-Century Natural History', *Oxford Art Journal*, Vol. 13, No. 1 (1990), p. 5

¹³¹ Eddy, 'Scottish Chemistry, Classification and the Early Mineralogical Career of the 'Ingenious' Rev. Dr. John Walker (1746 to 1779)', p. 428

¹³² Charles W. J. Withers, 'A Neglected Scottish Agriculturalist: The 'Georgical Lectures' and Agricultural Writings of the Rev Dr John Walker (1731-1803)', *The Agricultural History Review*, Vol. 33, No.2 (1985), p. 134

¹³³ Christie, 'Ideology and Representation in Eighteenth-Century Natural History', p. 6

¹³⁴ John Walker, *An Economical History of the Hebrides and Highlands of Scotland*, (Edinburgh, 1808)

¹³⁵ Henry Homes, Lord Kames, *The Gentleman Farmer*, (Edinburgh, 1776)

¹³⁶ Withers, 'A Neglected Scottish Agriculturalist: The 'Georgical Lectures' and Agricultural Writings of the Rev Dr John Walker (1731-1803)', p. 132

¹³⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 135

and improving landowners throughout Scotland. He was a scientific advisor to a number of Scottish nobles and major landowners including Bute and John Hope, the second Earl of Hopetoun (1704-1781). Many landowners were interested in mineralogy and chemistry because of their close links to mining and land improvement, and in this capacity Walker visited Hopetoun's mines at Wanlock and Leadhills to study the underground minerals.¹³⁸ As a result Walker amassed a large collection of minerals.¹³⁹

Walker gave lectures on agriculture at Edinburgh University that stressed the importance of new ways of land improvement.¹⁴⁰ Kames also supported Walker's appointment as Professor of Natural History at the Edinburgh University in 1779.¹⁴¹ Walker's wide network of correspondents included many eminent botanists such as Linnaeus, John Ellis, John Hope, Joseph Black, and Emanuel Mendez da Costa (1717-1791).¹⁴² He was introduced to Bute sometime before 1764 and travelled to London the following year to visit the Earl's library.¹⁴³ This is hardly unsurprising as Bute had the largest mineralogical collection in Europe, which was reputed to contain well over a hundred thousand specimens.¹⁴⁴ Walker's relationship with Bute continued into the 1770s, and in 1771 he visited the Isle of Bute. He wrote to Bute on 30 January 1772 to give an account of the 'extraordinary irruption of Solway-moss' that he witnessed on his travels in December 1771. Walker described an event where, due to heavy rain and flooding, a deluge of moss 'poured its contents' onto the plain below covering houses, dispossessing thirty-five families, and eventually covering over four hundred acres.¹⁴⁵ This report was then communicated to the Royal Society on 13 February 1772.¹⁴⁶ On 25 March 1772, Bute wrote to his Scottish agent, Baron Mure, and related that he had sent a box of books to Walker.¹⁴⁷

¹³⁸ Eddy, 'Scottish Chemistry, Classification and the Early Mineralogical Career of the 'Ingenious' Rev. Dr. John Walker', p. 431

¹³⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 437

¹⁴⁰ Roger L. Emerson, 'The Scottish Enlightenment and the End of the Philosophical Society of Edinburgh', *The British Journal for the History of Science*, Vol. 21 (1988), p. 59

¹⁴¹ *Ibid.*, p. 38

¹⁴² Withers, 'A Neglected Scottish Agriculturalist', p. 133

¹⁴³ *Ibid.*

¹⁴⁴ C. L. E. Lewis, 'Our favourite science': Lord Bute and James Parkinson searching for a Theory of the Earth', in *Geology and Religion: A History of Harmony and Hostility*, (London, 2009), p. 112

¹⁴⁵ Withers, 'A Neglected Scottish Agriculturalist', p. 125

¹⁴⁶ John Walker, 'Account of the Irruption of Solway Moss in December 16, 1772; In a Letter from Mr. John Walker, to the Earl of Bute, and Communicated by His Lordship to the Royal Society', *The Philosophical Transactions (1683-1775)*, Vol. 62, (1772), p. 123

¹⁴⁷ The National Library of Scotland, The Mure of Caldwell Papers, MS 4945/146

Walker was a key figure in the Scottish Enlightenment, and in 1782 was one of the leading figures in plans for 'a Society for the Advancement of Learning and Useful knowledge' which was established in 1783 as the Royal Society of Edinburgh.¹⁴⁸ He was also a founder member of the Edinburgh Agricultural Society in 1790.¹⁴⁹ Walker's major patrons, Cullen and Kames who were both living in Scotland, had a major impact on his career and were vital to his appointment by The Board of Annexed Estates and his post as Professor of Natural History at the Edinburgh University. In contrast, Bute was a minor patron and correspondent living in London, and by 1767 his power in Scotland had dramatically diminished when he lost the ability to influence university appointments. However, he supported Walker by allowing him access to his library and mineral collection, and sent works on natural history and mineral specimens. In return for his patronage, Walker sent natural history reports to his patron and observations that he had taken on the Isle of Bute.

Bute employed chemists in a personal capacity and to work in his laboratory at Luton Hoo. One of these clients was the Irish chemist and mineralogist Peter Woulfe. Woulfe's origins are obscure but we know that he studied chemistry with Guillaume Francois Rouelle (1703-1770) at the Jardin du Roi. Rouelle was teacher of chemistry from 1742 to 1768 and his public and private chemistry courses were extremely popular and attended by many notable eighteenth-century chemists, including Antoine Laurent de Lavoisier (1743-1794).¹⁵⁰ Woulfe was elected to the Royal Society in 1767 for his paper on *Experiments on the Distillation of Acids, Volatile Alkalies, and other Substances*. He invented a method of making gases pass through a small glass tube of water thereby eliminating harmful 'fumes' and which was subsequently called 'Woulfe's bottle'.¹⁵¹ For his scientific achievements, Woulfe was awarded the society's Copley Medal in 1768. Woulfe continued his association with the Royal Society and gave three Bakerian Lectures on the nature of mineral substances at the Royal Society from 1775 to 1777.¹⁵² The Bakerian Lectures were the result of a bequest left to the society by a former member, Henry Baker (1698-1774), and recipients received a hundred pounds for lectures on natural history or experimental philosophy.

¹⁴⁸ Emerson, 'The Scottish Enlightenment and the End of the Philosophical Society of Edinburgh', p. 33

¹⁴⁹ Withers, 'A Neglected Scottish Agriculturalist', p. 133

¹⁵⁰ Rhoda Rappaport, 'G. F. Rouelle: An Eighteenth-Century Chemist and Teacher', *Chymia*, Vol. 6 (1960), p. 76

¹⁵¹ Peter Woulfe, 'Experiments on the Distillation of Acids, Volatile Alkalies, and Shewing How They May be Condensed without Loss, and How thereby We May Avoid Disagreeable and Noxious Fumes', *Philosophical Transactions (1683-1775)*, Vol. 57 (1767), p. 517

¹⁵² G L. E. Turner, 'Henry Baker F.R.S.: Founder of the Bakerian Lecture', *Notes and Records of the Royal Society*, Vol. 29, No. 1 (Oct., 1974), p. 53

Woulfe is best known for his work as a scientific assistant and he performed experiments for a number of notable eighteenth-century figures such as Bute, John Ellis, Joseph Priestley, Charles Hatchett (1765-1847), and John Strange.¹⁵³ Ellis's paper on the nature and genus of zoophytes (invertebrate animals resembling a plant like corals) formed the basis for his award of the Copley Medal.¹⁵⁴ Ellis's experiments aimed to prove that zoophytes were animal rather than vegetable. He was responding to one of his critics, Peter Simon Pallas, who argued that zoophytes were vegetable based because they did not contain either animal or volatile salts.¹⁵⁵ Therefore, in an effort to prove zoophytes were animal based (Ellis believed they had a very different smell) and to dissuade 'such plausible arguments from misleading mankind', Ellis proposed that fair and accurate experiments be performed before the Royal Society.¹⁵⁶ To that end, Ellis sent specimens to 'a gentleman distinguished for his great knowledge in chemistry', namely Peter Woulfe.¹⁵⁷ His demonstrations revealed that zoophytes did contain volatile salts and uncovered great differences between zoophytes and vegetable substances and Woulfe's findings were published alongside Ellis's letter to the society.¹⁵⁸

Woulfe's scientific expertise was called upon again in a disagreement between Priestley and Bryan Higgins (1741-1818) over whether the earth contained air. Priestley concluded that he was 'perfectly satisfied' that Woulfe's testimony fully supported his argument that earth is convertible into air. He claimed that Woulfe was 'unquestionably one of the ablest and most judicious chemists of the age'.¹⁵⁹ It is evident that Woulfe was greatly respected by many leading eighteenth-century chemists. Sometime after 1764, Woulfe was employed by Bute to carry out chemical experiments on minerals in his laboratory at Luton Hoo.¹⁶⁰ Bute considered 'chymistry a most interesting branch of natural philosophy' and some of his personal papers contain notes written by Woulfe.¹⁶¹ However, none of the

¹⁵³ Mark Peplow, 'History of Science: Elements of Romance', *Nature*, 493 (7434), p. 606

¹⁵⁴ Roy A. Rauschenberg, 'John Ellis F.R.S.: Eighteenth Century Naturalist and Royal Agent to West Florida', *Notes and Records of the Royal Society of London*, Vol. 32, No. 1 (Mar., 1978), pp. 149-164

¹⁵⁵ John Ellis and Peter Woulfe, 'Extract of a Letter from John Ellis, Esquire, F.R.S. to Dr. Linnaeus, of Upsal, F.R.S. on the Animal Nature of the Genus of Zoophytes Called Corallina', *Philosophical Transactions (1683-1775)*, Vol. 57 (1767), p. 410

¹⁵⁶ *Ibid*

¹⁵⁷ *Ibid*

¹⁵⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 411

¹⁵⁹ A. N. Meldrum, 'Lavoisier's Early Work in Science 1673-1771', *Isis*, Vol. 20 (Jan., 1934), p. 418

¹⁶⁰ Lewis, 'Our favourite science': Lord Bute and James Parkinson searching for a Theory of the Earth', p. 112

¹⁶¹ BU/132/1, (*Scientific: papers*, c.1764 - 1770)

experiments which they performed were ever published and were most likely performed for Bute's amusement. One of these experiments on 'how to make nitrous Aether whereby a greater quality of the aether is obtained with less trouble' is preserved in the Mount Stuart Archives.¹⁶² In his later scientific career, Woulfe became an assistant to Charles Hatchett. Hatchett is best known as the discoverer of a new element which he extracted from a mineral sample and called columbrian, now niobium.

Unfortunately, as very little known regarding Woulfe so it is extremely difficult to ascertain Bute's overall contribution to his career. Woulfe was employed as his patron's chemical assistant for a number of years and he may have received a daily wage similar to that of Hope of a daily half a crown. He would have also had access to Bute's extensive library, laboratory, and mineralogical collection whilst at Luton Hoo. His talent and reputation meant the Woulfe was employed as a demonstrator by a number of leading eighteenth-century chemists.

ARCHITECTURE, ART AND LANDSCAPE GARDENING

Bute was involved in several substantial buildings projects that commenced after his wife received a large inheritance from her father, Sir Edward Worley Montagu, in 1761. These included Bute House on Berkeley Square, Luton Hoo in Bedfordshire, Highcliffe in Hampshire, along with improvements to his ancestral home of Mount Stuart on the Isle of Bute. Stately homes and landscaped gardens which dominated the landscape were a testimony to the wealth and status of their owners. The main architect that Bute employed was the Scotsman, Robert Adam. Thomas Worsley (1711-1778), was another of his architectural clients. Worsley and Bute attended Eton together and were lifelong friends. Worsley was an architect and equestrian who was equerry-in-ordinary to George II from 1742 to 1760. He was involved in the design and construction of his home, Hovingham Hall in Yorkshire from 1750 to 1770, during a time when architecture was seen as an appropriate subject and pursuit for members of the aristocracy. Bute was responsible for his friend's

¹⁶² BU/132/8, (*Scientific: papers*, c.1764 - 1770), a description (with diagrams) of how to make 'nitrous Aether' by Peter Woulfer F.R.S.

appointment as Survey-General of the Works in 1760, a post Worsley retained until his death.¹⁶³

In 1761, Bute employed Robert Adam to design a house on Berkeley Square, which was to be called Bute House.¹⁶⁴ Adam had studied at Edinburgh University and went on the Grand Tour from 1755 to 1757, to receive further architectural instruction.¹⁶⁵ Alongside his brother John, Robert Adam was one of the premier architects in Britain during the eighteenth century. He was also a cousin of the historian William Robertson. After returning to England in 1758, Adam established an architectural office in London. He became a member of Society of Arts in 1758 and a member of the Royal Society in 1761. Adam was involved in the design, remodelling, and construction of a large number of stately homes throughout Britain and some of his patrons included the Earl of Dumfries, Baron Harewood, Earl of Mansfield, and Baron Scarsdale.

Bute's patronage was important during Adam's early career. Along with his commission for Bute House, he nominated Adam as candidate for one of two vacant posts as Architect of the Works, a position with a salary of £300 per annum.¹⁶⁶ In 1761, Adam and Sir William Chambers were both chosen as Surveyors to the King. Adam commenced work on Bute House in 1762 but as it was in a central location and facing continuing extreme hostility and abuse from the public, his patron was forced to sell the mansion after his resignation and move further away from London. In 1765, it was sold to the Earl of Shelburne and it was renamed Lansdowne House. When it was completed in 1768, Lansdowne House was one of London's most magnificent mansions.¹⁶⁷ After looking for a new home outside the city Bute purchased the estate of Luton Hoo in 1762, and again commissioned Adam to remodel and enlarge the existing house. Luton Hoo was the largest house that Adam ever worked on and it was designed in the neo-classical style.¹⁶⁸ Work began in 1767, but progress was slow, and the house remained unfinished in 1774. A tower was built at one end but there was no corresponding tower at the other, and Adam's design was never fully carried out.¹⁶⁹

¹⁶³ Russell, *John 3rd Earl of Bute*, p. 26

¹⁶⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 151

¹⁶⁵ A. A. Tait, 'Reading the Ruins: Robert Adam and Piranesi in Rome', *Architectural History*, Vol. 27, Design and Practice in British Architecture: Studies in architectural History Presented to Howard Colvin (1984), pp. 524-533

¹⁶⁶ Stana Nenadic, 'Architect Builders in London and Edinburgh, c. 1750-1800, and the Market for Expertise', *The Historical Journal*, Vol. 55 (Issue 3) September 2012, pp. 597-617

¹⁶⁷ Russell, *John 3rd Earl of Bute*, p. 153

¹⁶⁸ Coats, *Lord Bute: An Illustrated life of John Stuart, third Earl of Bute 1713-1792*, p. 37

¹⁶⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 38

Nevertheless, Adam and his brother, John, expressed their gratitude for the Bute's protection and friendship in *The Works in Architecture* by claiming they 'never ceased to feel for the protection, favour, and friendship with which we have always been honoured by his Lordship'.¹⁷⁰ Adam made further improvements to Bute's house on South Audley Street in London. After his return from the continent, Bute purchased some land near Christchurch in Hampshire and enlisted Adam to build a villa on the site which he called Highcliffe.¹⁷¹ Bute employed Adam exclusively and he benefitted from the patronage of a number of the patron's close associates, John Home at Kilduff, and William Mure at Caldwell.¹⁷² Adam had a notable influence on Charles Cameron who would later dedicate his *The Baths of the Romans Explained and Illustrated* to the Earl of Bute in 1775.

Bute employed the services of the landscape architect Lancelot 'Capability' Brown to plan and design the gardens at Luton Hoo and Highcliffe. Brown was the most celebrated landscape gardener in England during the eighteenth century and designed over one hundred and seventy gardens and parks. Brown apprenticed under William Kent (the originator of the landscape garden) and popularised the introduction of natural landscapes instead of formal gardens. He created these natural landscapes by removing fences, lines of trees, hedgerows, high garden walls, and all signs of industry. Brown transformed the grounds with serpentine lakes, sweeping lawns, lines of trees, and by replacing old-fashioned water features and damming small rivers to form lakes.¹⁷³ The new trees imported from around the world greatly increased the number of trees, shrubs, and flowers which could be planted. These new large open spaces which carefully designed to look more natural, instead of artificial, but were extremely labour intensive and expensive.¹⁷⁴

Brown accepted commissions throughout the English countryside and his most important clients were Bute and George Spencer, fourth Duke of Marlborough (1739-1817). He worked with Robert Adam on a number of projects including at Harewood House in Yorkshire the home of Edwin Lascelles, first Baron Harewood (1713-1795) from 1758. Brown was commissioned by Bute to landscape the park at Luton Hoo in 1764, before the

¹⁷⁰ Peter D. Brown, 'Bute in retirement', in Karl W. Schweizer's [ed] *Lord Bute: Essays in re-interpretation*, p. 260

¹⁷¹ Coats, *Lord Bute*, p. 41

¹⁷² Russell, *John 3rd Earl of Bute*, p. 154

¹⁷³ Kate Felus, 'Boats and Boating in the Designed Landscape, 1720-1820', *Garden History*, Vol. 34, No. 1 (Summer, 2006), p. 34

¹⁷⁴ Andrew M. Wild, 'Capability Brown, the Aristocracy, and the Cultivation of the British Landscaping Industry', *Enterprise & Society*, Vol. 14, No. 2, June 2013, p. 241

construction of the house and to transform the 1,200 acres. One of the features of the gardens is the damming up the small river Lea to create a lake.¹⁷⁵ From 1764 to 1779, Bute paid Brown the enormous sum of £13,290.¹⁷⁶ Only the Duke of Marlborough at Blenheim exceeded this amount by paying Brown a total of £21,500.¹⁷⁷ Bute's eldest son, John Stuart, Lord Mountstuart, also employed Brown in 1777 to redesign the gardens on his Cardiff estate. Mountstuart spent a total of £4,000 in 1778, and by 1782 had paid £9,000 for work completed.¹⁷⁸ Brown was royally rewarded and was appointed as 'Surveyor to His Majesty's Gardens and Waters at Hampton Court' and 'Gardener' at St. James's in 1764.¹⁷⁹

Bute was an enthusiastic art collector as evidenced from his patronage of artists and by his vast collection of prints that was sold in 1794.¹⁸⁰ He patronised a number of artists including Allan Ramsay (1713-1784), Sir Joshua Reynolds (1723-1792), Jean-Etienne Liotard (1702-1789), and Johann Zoffany (1733-1810). Bute commissioned portraits of himself, his wife and children, and members of the royal family including George III and Princess Augusta. Throughout the eighteenth century it was important for members of the aristocracy to commission portraits to decorate their large houses; to record family history; to illustrate their refinement and taste; to demonstrate their elevated social position; to advertise a new appointment or rise in status; to endorse their political ambitions; and to capture their image for posterity.¹⁸¹ For example, during his political rise in 1758, Bute employed the Scottish artist Allan Ramsay to capture his image wearing the Order of the Thistle in a grandiose portrait. The Earl was appointed to the Scottish chivalry order after his election to the Scottish Parliament in 1738 by George II and this painting reflects his previous political experience and allegiance to the Hanoverian dynasty.

A series of five paintings by Allan Ramsay still adorn the dining room at the stately home of Mount Stuart. These include portraits of George III as Prince of Wales (1757-8), John, Lord Mountstuart, in the uniform of the Harrow Archers (1758-9), Bute's cousin Lady Mary Coke (1762), Princess Augusta, and a portrait of Bute (1758). Ramsay's father, also

¹⁷⁵ Felus, 'Boats and Boating in the Designed Landscape, 1720-1820, p. 25

¹⁷⁶ Russell, *John 3rd Earl of Bute*, p. 168

¹⁷⁷ Ibid

¹⁷⁸ Peter Willis, 'Capability Brown's Account with Drummonds Banks, 1753-1783', *Architectural History*, Vol. 27, Design and Practice in British Architecture: Studies in architectural History Presented to Howard Colvin (1984), p. 388

¹⁷⁹ Russell, *John 3rd Earl of Bute*, p. 50

¹⁸⁰ Hassil Hutchins, *A Catalogue of the Extensive and Capital Collection of Prints, Of the Rt. Hon. the Earl of Bute*, (London, 1794)

¹⁸¹ Jeremy Black, *Culture in Eighteenth-Century Britain: A Subject of Taste*, (London, 2005), p. 56

called Allan Ramsay (1686-1758) was the author of the famous pastoral play *The Gentle Shepherd* in 1725.¹⁸² Ramsay first became an apprentice of the Swedish painter Hans Huyssing (1678-1752?) in London before travelling to Naples and Rome in 1736 and studying under the Baroque artist Francesco Solimeno (1657-1747).¹⁸³ During the eighteenth century, Rome was the capital of the art world and many artists visited the city to study under the Italian masters, and to sketch and engrave famous paintings which they could later sell to patrons or the public. Bute's collection of prints included copies of works by Rubens, Titian, and Rembrandt.¹⁸⁴ Ramsay would make a total of four trips to Italy, the last just before his death in 1784.

Ramsay returned to Edinburgh in 1738 and one of his early paintings was a full length portrait of the second Duke of Argyll and his wife in 1739.¹⁸⁵ He was a prolific and well sought after artist who completed commissions for a variety of patrons including Dr. Richard Mead (1739), the Duke of Roxburghe (1742), the Earl of Loudoun (1747), the Earl of Stanhope (1749), the third Duke of Argyll (1749).¹⁸⁶ In 1750 with Bute's recommendation, Ramsay was tasked with painting the portrait of Prince Frederick shortly before his death.¹⁸⁷ Over the next few years he travelled between Edinburgh and London, and in 1754 was a founder member of the Select Society. He visited Italy again from 1754 to 1757 and on his return settled with his family in London. Ramsay received another royal commission in 1757 when he was employed to paint the portrait of the Prince of Wales. The following year Ramsay painted the full length portrait of Bute, and Princess Augusta's portrait was commissioned around this time. He produced several copies of Augusta's painting and one forms part of the Bute Collection.¹⁸⁸

George III's new reign created a vacancy for a portrait painter whose role was to produce large numbers of royal portraits for palaces, as gifts, and for overseas territories.¹⁸⁹ This was a profitable and prominent position and there were several candidates vying for the

¹⁸² James L. Caw, 'Allan Ramsay, Portrait Painter, 1713-1784', *The Volume of the Walpole Society*, Vol. 25 (1936-1937), pp. 33-81; Iain Gordon Brown, 'Allan Ramsay's Rise and Reputation', *The Volume of the Walpole Society*, Vol. 50 (1984), pp. 209-247; Douglas Fordham, 'Allan Ramsay's Enlightenment: Or, Hume and the Patronizing Portrait', *The Art Bulletin*, Vol. 88, No. 3 (Sep., 2006), pp. 508-524

¹⁸³ Caw, 'Allan Ramsay, Portrait Painter, 1713-1784', p. 41

¹⁸⁴ Hutchins, *A Catalogue of the Extensive and Capital Collection of Prints, Of the Rt. Hon. the Earl of Bute*, pp. 3-8

¹⁸⁵ Caw, 'Allan Ramsay, Portrait Painter, 1713-1784', p. 46

¹⁸⁶ *Ibid.*, pp. 47-48

¹⁸⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 59

¹⁸⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 60

¹⁸⁹ Black, *Culture in Eighteenth-Century Britain: A Subject of Taste*, p. 25

post including Ramsay and Joshua Reynolds. In 1761, and with Bute's support, Ramsay was appointed as first Painter to His Majesty, receiving an annual pension of £200.¹⁹⁰ His appointment was not without controversy as supporters of Joshua Reynolds believed Ramsay had only been selected because of his nationality. This resulted in anti-Scottish hostility and cries of favoritism.¹⁹¹ Ramsay produced many versions of the coronation portraits of King George III (1761) and Queen Charlotte (1761-2), and he was commissioned for a series of paintings of the royal family. This proved to be an extremely well-paid post, and from 1761 to 1784 Ramsay and his pupils created approximately eighty-six pairs of coronation portraits, receiving eighty six guineas per painting.¹⁹²

After he became Painter to His Majesty, Ramsay rarely painted any new portraits. After John Shackleton's death in 1767 the position of Principal Painter to the King fell vacant, and Ramsay and Reynolds were both contenders for position.¹⁹³ Ramsay was again successful and thanked Bute 'for the generous part you have taken in my protection'.¹⁹⁴ Ramsay was among several members of the Select Society that benefitted from Bute's patronage. However, he was not the only portrait painter who was patronised by the Earl.

In 1763, Bute commissioned the Swiss-born painter, Jean-Etienne Liotard, to paint a portrait of his eldest son, Lord Mountstuart, who was in Geneva on his Grand Tour. Liotard was an 'itinerant' court painter and a widely travelled artist who visited Paris, Vienna, London, Holland, and Turkey.¹⁹⁵ He was first apprenticed to the Swiss miniaturist Daniel Gardell (1673-1753) before continuing his training in Paris under Jean-Baptiste Massé (1687-1753) in 1723.¹⁹⁶ He became an important artist at the French court and was commissioned to paint the portraits of Louis XV and his five daughters in 1749.¹⁹⁷ In 1751, with his reputation already established, Liotard travelled to London and was employed by Princess Augusta to produce paintings of her late husband and his family.¹⁹⁸ Although Bute was so pleased with

¹⁹⁰ Caw, 'Allan Ramsay, Portrait Painter, 1713-1784', p. 63; Russell, *John 3rd Earl of Bute*, p. 230

¹⁹¹ Brown, 'Allan Ramsay's Rise and Reputation', p. 212

¹⁹² Fordham, 'Allan Ramsay's Enlightenment: Or, Hume and the Patronizing Portrait', p. 520

¹⁹³ Russell, *John 3rd Earl of Bute*, p. 77

¹⁹⁴ *Ibid* [Letter dated 13 March 1767]

¹⁹⁵ Marcel Roethlisberger, 'Jean-Etienne Liotard as a Painter of Still Lifes', *The J. Paul Getty Museum Journal*, Vol. 13 (1985), p. 109

¹⁹⁶ François Marandet, 'The Formative Years of Jean-Etienne Liotard', *The Burlington Magazine*, Vol. 145, No. 1201 (Apr., 2003), p. 297

¹⁹⁷ Marandet, 'The Formative Years of Jean-Etienne Liotard', p. 299

¹⁹⁸ N. S. Trivas, 'Liotard's Portraits of Frederick Lewis, Prince of Wales, and His Family', *The Burlington Magazine for Connoisseurs*, Vol. 68, No. 396 (Mar., 1936), p. 117

Liotard's painting that he paid twice the agreed upon price, it was the only painting that he commissioned from the artist.¹⁹⁹

The German artist, Johann Zoffany, master of the theatrical conversation piece, was first employed by Bute before being brought to the attention of George III. Like Ramsay, Zoffany travelled to Rome in 1750 and apprenticed under the artist Agostino Masucci (c.1691-1758) becoming a court painter on his return in 1757.²⁰⁰ Looking for new and prosperous opportunities, Zoffany travelled to London in 1760 and set up his own studio in Covent Garden. He was employed by David Garrick to produce several conversation pieces and theatrical scenes of the actor with his friends in various roles. Through Garrick, Zoffany was introduced to Bute who commissioned a portrait of Lord Mountstuart (1763-4) in masquerade costume. He completed two other paintings of Bute's younger sons and daughters (1763-4) and which are now on display at the Tate Gallery and Bute was responsible for recommending Zoffany to the royal family.²⁰¹ In 1764, Zoffany was employed by Queen Charlotte to paint portraits of her two eldest sons. He painted a number of royal portraits over the next few years and enjoyed royal patronage until 1777.²⁰²

Zoffany was personally nominated by George III for membership of the Royal Academy of Arts and bypassing the usual requirement of election by the fellows.²⁰³ He travelled to Italy in 1772 with letters of introduction from Queen Charlotte and commissioned to paint the great works of art at the Tribuna of the Uffizi Gallery in Florence.²⁰⁴ The painting was an astonishing accomplishment but Zoffany fell from royal favour by including too many English travellers on the Grand Tour in the picture, and by taking too long to complete the commission.²⁰⁵ This ended his association with the royal family and any hopes of future employment. In 1783, he left London for India to make his fortune in the East India Company. This proved to be a profitable venture and he returned to London in 1789.²⁰⁶

¹⁹⁹ Russell, *John 3rd Earl of Bute*, p. 63

²⁰⁰ William L. Pressly, 'Genius Unveiled: The Self-Portraits of Johan Zoffany', *The Art Bulletin*, Vol. 69, No. 1 (Mar., 1987), p. 89

²⁰¹ Simon Schama, 'The Domestication of Majesty: Royal family Portraiture, 1500-1850', *The Journal of Interdisciplinary History*, Vol. 17, No. 1 The Evidence of Art: Images and Meaning in History (Summer, 1986), p. 170

²⁰² Pressly, 'Genius Unveiled: The Self-Portraits of Johan Zoffany', p. 89

²⁰³ Schama, 'The Domestication of Majesty: Royal family Portraiture, 1500-1850', p. 173

²⁰⁴ Pressly, 'Genius Unveiled: The Self-Portraits of Johan Zoffany', p. 90

²⁰⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 99

²⁰⁶ *Ibid.*

Bute also commissioned portraits from Ramsay's rival for the position of Painter to His Majesty, Joshua Reynolds. The English-born Reynolds was one of the most sought after portrait painters in Britain during the eighteenth century. He was apprenticed to the fashionable portrait-painter, Thomas Hudson (1701-1779).²⁰⁷ Reynolds spent three years in Rome before returning to London in 1752.²⁰⁸ In 1759, he painted a portrait of the Prince of Wales and sought royal patronage and a court position.²⁰⁹ Although unsuccessful in gaining the position, Reynolds was approached to become the first President of the Royal Academy of Arts when it was established in 1768. George III supported the Royal Academy with patronage and financial support.²¹⁰ The aim of the Royal Academy was to raise the professional status of the artist and promoting the arts by establishing an arts schools and exhibition centre. Zoffany painted *The Academicians of the Royal Academy* (1771-2), which depicted almost all the founding members. It was most likely commissioned by the King and exhibited at the Academy in 1772. On the death of Ramsay in 1784, Reynolds was appointed Principal Painter in Ordinary to the King.²¹¹

Reynolds painted two portraits of Bute, one in 1763 with his private secretary Sir Charles Jenkinson (1727-1808), and the other in 1773. The King commissioned the portrait of 1763 and on the 7 December paid the sum of £210 to Reynolds.²¹² The second painting is a formal and grand full length portrait of Bute wearing the Order of the Garter. Bute commissioned a painting of his wife by Reynolds in 1777, and this portrait is more informal and shows her with her dog and a parasol in her hand.²¹³

The Scottish engraver, Sir Robert Strange (1721-1792), is an example of an artist whose career suffered after incurring the displeasure of two prominent patrons, George III and Bute. Strange fought on the losing side in 1745 Rebellion and spent some time in hiding after the Battle of Culloden before appearing before the Hanoverian court in 1750. In 1758, Strange was approached by Ramsay to engrave his portraits of Bute and the Prince of Wales. After some consideration, Strange refused on the basis that he was currently completing a

²⁰⁷ Allan Gwynne-Jones, 'The Life and Works of Sir Joshua Reynolds, P.R.A', *Journal of the Royal Society of Arts*, Vol. 104, No. 4985 (31st August, 1956), p. 795

²⁰⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 798

²⁰⁹ Christopher Hibbert, *George III: A Personal History*, (London, 1998), p. 65

²¹⁰ *Ibid*

²¹¹ Russell, *John 3rd Earl of Bute*, p. 104

²¹² Malcolm Cormack, 'The Ledgers of Sir Joshua Reynolds', *The Volume of the Walpole Society*, Vol. 42 (1968-1970), p. 112

²¹³ *Ibid.*, p. 147

commission, was due to travel to Italy, and felt that the money proposed was not adequate.²¹⁴ In 1775, he published *An Inquiry into the Rise and Establishment of the Royal Academy of Arts* - his account of how his career had suffered after earning the disapproval of the King and his favourite.²¹⁵ Firstly, Strange defended his decision to refuse the commission by stating that the engraving process would last two years rather than the proposed few months and that the payment offered was not sufficient.²¹⁶ However, eager not to cause offense to such noble patrons and in an attempt to rectify any insult, Strange requested an audience with Bute. He was refused admittance and a letter later sent to Bute went unanswered.²¹⁷

Strange was approached by Sir William Chambers on behalf of the King to engrave the portraits, but again declined.²¹⁸ He was informed that the King was so angry at his refusal that his name could not be mentioned in his presence and Bute was heard to reply that 'it is a thing we are determined never to forgive him'.²¹⁹ The engravings he later published were harshly criticised, and his difficulties continued after Strange left London for Italy. In 1763, Strange was in Bologna where he met the King's librarian Richard Dalton and the painter Francesco Bartolozzi (1727-1815).²²⁰ Strange was asked by Dalton and Bartolozzi which paintings he wished to engrave while in Italy, and replied works by Guercino (1591-1666) and Guido Reni (1575-1642).²²¹ He later accused Dalton of employing Bartolozzi to make drawings of the very pictures that Strange told him were the objects of his journey.²²² Strange was careful not to make any direct accusation against the King but rather stated his belief that Dalton acted on his own and with the knowledge of his patron.²²³

After his return to London, Strange attempted to exhibit some of his drawings at the Royal Academy but was denied by the directors.²²⁴ He compared the harsh treatment he received in London with the reception in Paris where he was invited to become a member of

²¹⁴ Caw, 'Allan Ramsay, Portrait Painter, 1713-1784', p. 60

²¹⁵ Sir Robert Strange, *An Inquiry into the Rise and Establishment of the Royal Academy of Arts*, (London, printed for E. And C. Dilly, 1775)

²¹⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 3

²¹⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 14

²¹⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 6

²¹⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 15

²²⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 20

²²¹ *Ibid.*, p. 21

²²² *Ibid.*, p. 22

²²³ *Ibid.*, p. 32

²²⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 49

their Academy.²²⁵ The purpose of *An Inquiry* was to justify his decision to refuse the royal commission by revealing that William Wynne Ryland (1738-1783), which took four years to complete the engraving and to reveal the consequences of upsetting a royal patron.²²⁶ Strange's ostracism lasted until 1780 when he was offered the commission of engraving a portrait of Charles I. In 1784, he presented the drawing to the King and Queen and received a knighthood in 1787. However, despite their disagreement Bute owned over forty five of Strange's engravings alongside works by Bartolozzi and Dalton.²²⁷

THE SCOTTISH ENLIGHTENMENT AND THE RISE OF CLUBS AND SCIENTIFIC SOCIETIES IN EIGHTEENTH-CENTURY SCOTLAND

As societies and institutions were dependent on the fees of its members, their aim was to attract members of the aristocracy, men of wealth, or members of the royal family to win public and political support. This section is captured under the heading of personage patronage because Bute was not an active participant in any scientific society or institution and did not attempt to form a controlling group in the Royal Society like the second Earl of Hardwicke. Bute was a member in name only and did not try to direct topics for discussion or publication or promote his own clients for positions within these societies.

Although Bute was a well-known amateur botanist, correspondent, and patron, he was not a member of either Royal Society or the Linnean Society, the preeminent scientific institutions based in London. Not long after he became Prime Minister, Bute was asked to become a member of the Royal Society of London, but declined 'at present'.²²⁸ Even after his retirement he did not seek membership despite many of his scientific clients being members – John Walker, John Hope, and Peter Woulfe – to name but a few. Despite permanently residing in London after 1745, and election as a Trustee of the British Museum, Bute's overall patronage of English societies and institutions was limited. This is in contrast to his membership and patronage of a number of Scottish societies, (the Philosophical Society of

²²⁵ Ibid., p. 50

²²⁶ Ibid., p. 7

²²⁷ Hutchins, *A Catalogue of the Extensive and Capital Collection of Prints, Of the Rt. Hon. the Earl of Bute*, pp. 97-8, p. 13 & p. 116

²²⁸ Francis Russell, *John 3rd Earl of Bute: Patron and Collector*, (London, 2004), p. 59

Edinburgh and The Society of Antiquaries of Scotland), and his significant role in dispensing academic patronage in Scotland from 1761 onwards.

The Scottish Enlightenment was an intellectual movement encompassing a wide range of subjects in Scotland during the second half of the eighteenth century, and formed part of a wider European movement. The Enlightenment in Scotland influenced culture in a number of areas including literature, science, medicine, history, architecture, art, and philosophy. It produced some of the most notable intellectuals of the age and some of the major contributors and critical thinkers were William Cullen (chemistry), James Hutton (geology), William Robertson (history), Robert Adam (architecture), and David Hume (philosophy). The Scottish Enlightenment could not have existed without these great figures, and they participated in a cultural and intellectual environment that enabled them to develop their ideas and bring about great changes in society. The Enlightenment was not possible without a transformation of the Scottish universities, especially Edinburgh and Glasgow, in the years after 1688. Despite being on the periphery of Europe, the Scottish universities were not isolated from their continental counterparts and the arts faculties in the universities in Scotland were modelled on the Dutch universities. University chairs were founded in new fields and there was a particular emphasis on the subjects of science and medicine.²²⁹ They became receptive to new ideas in philosophy, theology, law, and mathematics and the nearly all of Enlightenment thinkers held professorships in one of the Scottish universities.

There were a variety of locations, clubs, societies, and supporting institutions that became notable cultural and intellectual spaces for the progression of the Scottish Enlightenment. However, there was a primary focus on the city of Edinburgh. The Select Society (1754-1764) was a debating society committed to social improvement, and after its demise members formed other clubs and societies in Edinburgh, including the 'Edinburgh Society for the Encouragement of Arts, Sciences, Manufactures, and Agriculture in Scotland' (1755). The 'Edinburgh Society for the Encouragement of Arts, Sciences, Manufactures, and Agriculture in Scotland' was focused on widespread economic and technological improvements which could be of benefit to Scotland. Other notable societies included the 'Edinburgh Society for Improving Arts and Sciences, and particularly Natural Knowledge'

²²⁹ Hugh Trevor-Roper, *History and the Enlightenment*, (London, 2010), p. 27

(1737), the Society of Antiquaries of Scotland (1780), and the Royal Society of Edinburgh (1783), and were devoted to the advancement of learning. Not all leading societies were confined to Edinburgh, with several forming in the important cultural centres of Glasgow and Aberdeen. The Aberdeen Philosophical Society or Wise Club was established in 1758 by the philosopher Thomas Reid, and in Glasgow the membership roll for the Literary Society (1753) included the Church of Scotland minister, William Leechman and the philosopher and economist, Adam Smith. These clubs and societies were a central feature of the Scottish Enlightenment and provided a space for discussions and debates with gentlemen from the different social classes, and membership had a tendency to overlap.²³⁰ They were also venues where political and religious differences could be forgotten, and notes and reports were published in society journals and transmitted to England and beyond.²³¹ The very first agricultural society in Europe was the Society of Improvers in the Knowledge of Agriculture in Scotland (1723).

The Society of Antiquaries of Scotland

The Society of Antiquaries of Scotland was founded on 14 November 1780 by David Steuart Erskine, eleventh Earl of Buchan (1742-1829). The aim of the Society was to promote antiquarian research and to collect and preserve materials, books, and objects pertaining to the history of Scotland. It was based on the Society of Antiquaries in London (1707), and in 1764 Buchan became a member of both the Society of Antiquaries and Royal Society. There at been a previous attempt to establish a society for antiquarian research in Scotland at the beginning of the eighteenth century by Sir Robert Sibbald (1641-1722) and Sir Andrew Balfour (1630-1694), but this had been mostly informal and did not continue after their deaths.²³² There was no storehouse for antiquities in Scotland and collections which had been bequeathed to universities, such as the Balfour and Sibbald collections to Edinburgh University had been broken up and scattered by the time of the Society of Antiquaries

²³⁰ Alexander Broadie, *The Scottish Enlightenment: An Anthology*, (Edinburgh, 1997), p. 17

²³¹ Roger L. Emerson, 'Sir Robert Sibbald, Kt, the Royal Society of Scotland and the Origins of the Scottish Enlightenment', *Annals of Science*, Vol. 45, Issue 1, 1988, p. 42

²³² Roger L. Emerson, 'Sir Robert Sibbald, Kt, the Royal Society of Scotland and the Origins of the Scottish Enlightenment', *Annals of Science*, Vol. 45, Issue 1, 1988, p. 46

formation.²³³ Buchan hoped to rectify this by establishing a permanent home for Scottish collections.²³⁴ He believed that antiquarian research had been somewhat neglected and that other societies, like the Philosophical Society of Edinburgh did not devote much attention to antiquities. Therefore, there was a need for a society to encourage and develop antiquarianism within Scotland.

Buchan outlined his aims and ambitions in his *Discourse ... for the purpose of promoting the institution of a society for the investigation of the history of Scotland, and its antiquities* in 1778.²³⁵ He lamented that 'it has long been a subject of reject, that no regular Society for promoting antiquarian researches has subsisted in this part of Great Britain' and that the Society of Antiquaries of Scotland would lay a foundation of acquiring new and useful collections.²³⁶ Buchan referred to past historians and antiquarians and claimed that Sibbald's Society failed because it had no storehouse or museum for their collections.²³⁷ He provided a list of ancient topics which he hoped the Society would investigate and report upon, including the manners, customs, dress, amusements and music of people; the state of agriculture; the language of the inhabitants; and unpublished manuscripts like *Ossian*.²³⁸ Despite the problematic authenticity of *Ossian*, Buchan maintained that he 'cannot doubt of the general truth of the ground-work of these beautiful compositions'.²³⁹ He also wished to encourage a topographical survey of Scotland and a mineral map of the coal country.²⁴⁰

In the establishment of the Society of Antiquaries, Buchan became Vice-President and persuaded Bute to act as President. As Bute was a significant and wealthy collector, Buchan may have been hoping for either a monetary donation or a gift of antiquities. Other members of the society included Lord Kames and the biographer, James Boswell (1740-1795). In 1781, William Smellie (1740-1795) was appointed as the Keeper of the Antiquaries' Museum, and published his *Account of the Institution and Progress of the Society of the*

²³³ Hugh Cheape, 'The Society of Antiquaries of Scotland and their Museum: Scotland's National Collection and a National Discourse', *International Journal of Historical Archaeology*, Vol. 14, No. 3 (June 2010), p. 368; Steven Shapin, 'Property, Patronage, and the Politics of Science: The Founding of the Royal Society of Edinburgh', *British Journal for the History of Science*, Vol. 7 (1974), p. 21

²³⁴ Rosemary Sweet, *Antiquaries: The Discovery of the Past in Eighteenth-Century Britain*, (London, 2004), p. 272

²³⁵ David Steuart Erskine, Earl of Buchan, *Discourse, delivered by the Right Honourable the Earl of Buchan, at a meeting for the purpose of promoting the institution of a society for the investigation of the history of Scotland, and its antiquities, November, 14 1778*, (London, 1778)

²³⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 3

²³⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 20

²³⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 28

²³⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 7

²⁴⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 28

Antiquaries of Scotland the following year.²⁴¹ Smellie ended the account by listing the donations of members. Dr. John Hope gifted the Society with a silver Charles II silver coin worth seven shillings and a bronze French medal.²⁴² Buchan bestowed a *hortus siccus* of six hundred Jamaican plants collected by William Wright (1735-1819), a *hortus siccus* of Scottish plants, and a collection of ancient Greek and Roman coins.²⁴³ Bute's contribution to the Society was a gift of £100 on 14 April 1781.²⁴⁴ His donation was twice the amount provided by noblemen of similar rank like John Campbell, fifth Duke of Argyll (1723-1806) and Alexander Duff, third Earl of Fife (1731-1811).²⁴⁵

The Philosophical Society of Edinburgh and Royal Society of Edinburgh

In 1737 the Edinburgh 'Society for Improving Arts and Sciences, and particularly Natural Knowledge' was established as an offshoot of the Medical Society of Edinburgh.²⁴⁶ The Professor of Mathematics at Edinburgh University, Colin Maclaurin (1698-1746) wanted to remodel the Medical Society into a literary and scientific forum and increase membership of university professors to include professional and landed classes.²⁴⁷ It was renamed the Edinburgh Philosophical Society in 1738, and its aim was to promote the natural knowledge and antiquities of Scotland.²⁴⁸ It encouraged and published works on agriculture, botany, and medicine that would have social, cultural, and economic benefits to Scotland.²⁴⁹ The first President of the Philosophical Society was James Douglas, fourteenth Earl of Morton (1702-68) who was an amateur astronomer and patron of science. He was one of the first Trustees of the British Museum, and President of the Royal Society of London from 1764-1768.²⁵⁰

From its inception, the Philosophical Society, and later the Royal Society of Edinburgh, was a space where a variety of topics could be discussed ranging from farming

²⁴¹ William Smellie, *Account of the Institution and Progress of the Society of the Antiquaries of Scotland*, (Edinburgh, 1782); Steven Shapin, 'Property, Patronage, and the Politics of Science: The Founding of the Royal Society of Edinburgh', *British Journal for the History of Science*, Vol. 7 (1974), p. 18

²⁴² *Ibid.*, p. 40

²⁴³ *Ibid.*, pp. 61 & 70

²⁴⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 46

²⁴⁵ *Ibid.*, pp. 51 & 91

²⁴⁶ The Medical Society of Edinburgh was founded in 1731

²⁴⁷ Shapin, 'Property, Patronage, and the Politics of Science', p. 7

²⁴⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 8

²⁴⁹ Roger L. Emerson, 'The Philosophical Society of Edinburgh 1748-1768', *The British Journal for the History of Science*, Vol. 14 (1981), p. 134

²⁵⁰ Shapin, 'Property, Patronage, and the Politics of Science', p. 8

techniques and the analysis of plants and soil to improve fertilisers to new improvements in medicine. New agricultural developments that were being discussed were both of concern to landowners and improvers and were of economic benefit to Scotland.²⁵¹ The Philosophical Society played an important role in Edinburgh and wider Scottish society by providing a forum for distinguished men like Joseph Black, James Hutton, and William Cullen to present papers, discuss scientific issues, and meet potential patrons.²⁵² Its membership was composed of a mixture of university professors such as John Walker and William Robertson, professionals, and nobility like Lord Kames and Lord Hopetoun.²⁵³ It had an international membership with the Comte de Buffon elected in 1781. It provided a space where members could communicate and present papers in front of patrons who encouraged scientific interest in matters of cultural or economic importance.²⁵⁴ These members were able to enhance their status through membership and legitimise their scientific pursuits.

The agricultural improver, Lord Kames was President of the Society from 1768 to 1782 and presented a paper to the Society that advocated the use of oxen, rather than horses, as being more economical that was later sent to Benjamin Franklin in Philadelphia.²⁵⁵ Kames was also on the Board of the Annexed Estates and was able to grant patronage to a number of individuals. In 1743 the Professor of Chemistry in Edinburgh University, Andrew Plummer announced a scheme for landowners where mineral samples could be analysed by qualified members of the Society.²⁵⁶ These landowners who invested in improvements could expect and certainly hoped to profit from them. Lord Hopetoun provided clerical livings for two members, including John Walker, and the Earl of Bute was involved in the university appointments of Hope, Adam Ferguson, and William Robertson.²⁵⁷ Bute and Mackenzie became members of the Society in 1762.

By the 1760s, agricultural concerns gave way to advancements in mining, canal building, geology, and botany.²⁵⁸ A list of subscribers for the Clyde Canal Company (whose aim was to construct a canal linking Glasgow with the east coast) in 1768 include Bute,

²⁵¹ *Ibid.*, p. 137

²⁵² Shapin, 'Property, Patronage, and the Politics of Science', p. 2

²⁵³ Emerson, 'The Philosophical Society of Edinburgh 1748-1768', p. 136

²⁵⁴ Shapin, 'Property, Patronage, and the Politics of Science', p. 10

²⁵⁵ Emerson, 'The Philosophical Society of Edinburgh 1748-1768', p. 157

²⁵⁶ Shapin, 'Property, Patronage, and the Politics of Science', p. 9

²⁵⁷ Emerson, 'The Philosophical Society of Edinburgh 1748-1768', p. 163

²⁵⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 274

Mackenzie, and Hopetoun.²⁵⁹ Carl Linnaeus was invited to become a member by Walker and was duly elected in June 1762.²⁶⁰ Professor John Hope presented several botanical papers to the Society and his exchange of seeds and information which led to the formation of the 'Edinburgh Society for the Importation of Foreign Seeds and Plants' in 1764. The 'Seed Society' c.1764-1770 was promoted and advanced by John Walker, the physician and botanist, David Skene (1731-1770) and Bute.²⁶¹ Skene was one of the founder members of the Aberdeen Philosophical Society and was elected Dean of Faculty of Marischal in 1767. Walker and Hope published short description of plants and were both interested and involved in a botanical survey of Scotland.²⁶² In the middle decades of the eighteenth century, the fortunes of the Philosophical Society of Edinburgh rose and fell. After 1760 there was a change in the social composition of the Society and there was a decline in the number of aristocratic members. It became more specialised and there was an increase in professional and university educated men whose trade or profession was closely related to science.²⁶³ By 1783, the only related aristocrats on its membership list seem to have been Lord Bute and Mackenzie.²⁶⁴ There was an increase in the number of new specialised societies in Edinburgh, with botanists and gardeners becoming members of the 'Edinburgh Society for the Importation of Foreign Seeds and Plants', and the foundation of the Agricultural Society in 1790 by Walker.²⁶⁵

Bute's involvement in societies and institutions in England

The Linnean Society of London was established in London in 1788 by James Edward Smith (1759-1828). After the death of Linnaeus's son in 1783 the great botanist's library, manuscripts, herbarium, and natural history collection was offered to Joseph Banks for 1000 guineas. Banks declined, but advised his friend Smith to buy the collection.²⁶⁶ Smith attended

²⁵⁹ The Scots Magazine, Vol. 30, (Edinburgh, 1768), p. 289

²⁶⁰ Emerson, 'The Philosophical Society of Edinburgh 1748-1768', pp. 152-153

²⁶¹ Ibid., p. 156

²⁶² Ibid

²⁶³ Ibid., p. 139

²⁶⁴ Emerson, 'The Philosophical Society of Edinburgh 1768-1783', p. 272

²⁶⁵ Roger L. Emerson, 'The Scottish Enlightenment and the End of the Philosophical Society of Edinburgh', *The British Journal for the History of Science*, Vol. 21 (1988), p. 50

²⁶⁶ Paul White, 'The Purchase of knowledge: James Edward Smith and the Linnean collections', *Endeavour*, Vol. 23 (3) 199, p. 126

Edinburgh University and had studied botany under Dr John Hope.²⁶⁷ The Empress of Russia was also interested in purchasing the collection. Nevertheless, the complete contents arrived in Britain in 1784, and would provide the basis for the advancement and acceptance of the Linnean system in Britain. The Linnean Society convened at Smith's residence on Great Marlborough Street in 1788 with 20 fellows, 39 foreign members and 11 associates.²⁶⁸ The first President was Smith, and the aim of the Society was to categorise the different items that Linnaeus had described along with correcting and improving any mistakes or errors.²⁶⁹

Smith's ownership of an unrivalled scientific collection and associated library led him being consulted by numerous botanists and horticulturalists both at home and abroad.²⁷⁰ Throughout his later life he was able to build up by purchase, exchange and bequest a comprehensive personal herbarium, the Smith Herbarium.²⁷¹ Despite being highly regarded as a botanist, Bute may have been excluded from the Linnean Society due to the criticisms that he made against the Linnaean system of classification. A Fellow of the Linnean Society, Dr Richard Pulteney (1730-1801) visited Bute's botanical library herbarium at Highcliffe shortly after his death in 1792 when the Earl's collection was still intact. Pulteney gave a brief description of what he found and made several interesting observations. The library was well stocked and 'very rich in books and dried specimens as well as in volumes of painting of plants'.²⁷² It was obvious that Bute had continued his botanical collection and studies right up until his death, and his library contained 'all the latest expensive works'.²⁷³ There were more than three folios of botanical works some from very old authors and 'some very scarce ones'.²⁷⁴ A three hundred long foot conservatory was filled with plants and flourishing in the soil rather than pots like an Indian grove.²⁷⁵

Bute was a member of at least one London institution when in 1765 he was appointed one of the Trustees of the British Museum. He made several donations in the 1760s to the Museum. His brother-in-law, Edward Wortley Montagu (1713-1776) had sent Egyptian artefacts (including a mummy) to Bute which he presented to the King, who in turn

²⁶⁷ John Edmondson and Claire Smith, 'The Linnean Society's Herbarium: A Resource for Eighteenth-Century Research', *Garden History*, Vol. 27, No. 2 (Winter, 1999), p. 244

²⁶⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 127

²⁶⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 128

²⁷⁰ Edmondson and Smith, 'The Linnean Society's Herbarium', p. 244

²⁷¹ *Ibid.*

²⁷² Lady Smith, *Memoir and Correspondence of the Late Sir James Edward Smith, M.D.*, Vol. 1 (London, 1832), p. 402

²⁷³ *Ibid.*

²⁷⁴ *Ibid.*

²⁷⁵ *Ibid.*

gifted them to the Museum.²⁷⁶ Other items which were given by the Earl in 1767 were a figure of Isis sitting on the ground, a sphinx without wings, and an Egyptian bas-relief consisting of a double range of figures and found near Sakkara.²⁷⁷ Overall, Bute contributed to the Museum a small collection of Egyptian items.

Some historians have claimed that the Royal Society of London went into decline in eighteenth century after the death of Newton in 1727 and until the election of Joseph Banks in 1778.²⁷⁸ There was rather a shift in focus from experimental philosophy to networks of correspondence, and interest in natural and artificial 'curiosities' which acquired an increasingly prominent role within the Royal Society.²⁷⁹ The Society was also concerned with developments in the navigation, trade, natural philosophy, and benefits to empire. There was an increase in membership from 131 in 1700 to 531 in 1800 and a change in the social makeup of the Society. In the seventeenth century there were no members who were no surgeons, apothecaries, or instrument makers' but by the eighteenth century the Society's membership included men of lower social or intellectual status.²⁸⁰ Election to the Royal Society was automatic for aristocrats, privy councillors, and foreign diplomats.²⁸¹ Neither Bute nor Mackenzie were members of the Royal Society. However, correspondents in geographically remote locations were communicating and sending reports to members. It cultivated the practice of collecting information, like the discovery of newly discovered plants, from botanists who were based outside London or on the continent.²⁸² Dr John Hope and John Walker were part of a correspondent network and reported botanical observations to the Royal Society. It is possible that Bute's continuing patronage of Sir John Hill throughout the 1760s and 1770s was be one of the reasons that he did not become a Royal Society member.

Bute's participation and contribution to Scottish universities and societies was more substantial than his association with similar institutions in England. He built upon the legacy

²⁷⁶ *Synopsis of the Contents of the British Museum*, 7th ed., (London, 1814), p. xii

²⁷⁷ *Ibid.*, pp. 104-108

²⁷⁸ Richard Sorrenson, 'Towards a History of the Royal Society in the Eighteenth Century', *Notes and Records of the Royal Society of London*, Vol. 50, No. 1 (Jan., 1996), p. 29

²⁷⁹ Andrea Rusnock, 'Correspondence Networks and the Royal Society, 1700-1750', *The British Journal for the History of Science*, Vol. 32, No. 2, Did the Royal Society Matter in the Eighteenth Century? (Jun., 1999), p. 168; David Philip Miller, 'Into the Valley of Darkness': Reflections on the Royal Society in the Eighteenth Century', *History of Science*, Vol. 27 (2) (1989), p. 157

²⁸⁰ Sorrenson, 'Towards a History of the Royal Society in the Eighteenth Century', p. 33

²⁸¹ *Ibid*

²⁸² Rusnock, 'Correspondence Networks and the Royal Society, 1700-1750', p. 156

and patronage of Argyll and Ilay in Scotland, and although his involvement in the patronage of Scottish universities may have been short-lived, his insistence that only the best qualified candidate was appointed was admirable. His gift of books and instruments were important in the development of science and medicine at Marischal College. Bute acceptance of the presidency of the Society of Antiquities along with his large financial donation aided the establishment of the Society, and his involvement and contribution to the 'Edinburgh Society for the Importation of Foreign Seeds and Plants' led to the importation of exotic new species and transformed the British gardens. He provided patronage to a Scottish network to men of science and literature and actively promoted and encouraged their careers ensuring that worthy candidates were elected to professorships in the universities in Scotland. In contrast, he declined membership of the Royal Society of London and was not invited to be a member of the Linnean Society of London. This may be due to a number of reasons, including his extreme unpopularity in England and vilification in the press. Many Scots in London and elsewhere looked to Bute for advancement as he was responsible for distributing academic patronage in Scotland, but did not wield the same power in England. However, it is surprising that after his retirement when Bute was devoting most of his time to scientific pursuits, that he did not become a member of a society that was in such close proximity. After his withdrawal from society he continued to correspond with his scientific clients, the majority of whom were from Scotland or living on the continent.

The type and amount of support offered by Bute varied among his personal clients. Four of the eight dedicators were successful in receiving some form of patronage. The main beneficiary of Bute's scientific patronage was Sir John Hill. Hill was tasked with writing pro-ministry pamphlets for Bute's administration, and the publication of *The Vegetable System* would not have been possible without the Earl's support. However, when Bute's scientific interests turned to geological matters, his financial support of *The Vegetable System* dwindled, and Hill was forced to partially fund the project himself. Another recipient of Bute's scientific patronage was Alberto Fortis, whose Adriatic expeditions were sponsored by the patronage of both John Strange and the Earl. Fortis's observations on the natural history of Dalmatia and the neighbouring islands were sent back to London, and facilitated Bute's study into the formation of volcanoes and the theory of the earth. John Walker was one of Bute's

correspondents who received books and access to the library and mineral collection of his patron. In return, Walker sent observations on natural history and a report of the botanical specimens found on the Isle of Bute. The chemical experiments that Bute performed at Luton Hoo with Peter Woulfe were never published and were conducted solely for Bute's amusement. The Stuart family physician, Sir William Fordyce, used his connection to publish his treatise on the benefits of muriatic acid in treating patients and also included a letter from Bute's son, William, on the benefits of inoculating against smallpox.

The main beneficiaries of Bute's literary patronage were the Scottish writers John Home and James Macpherson. In the case of Home, the Earl was involved in the redrafting and promotion of his plays, employed him as his secretary, and was likely involved in bestowing a sizable annual pension. Bute further demonstrated his support for Home by involving himself in the writing and revision of *Agis* and *The Siege of Aquilea*, and by bringing his own patron Prince George, to see several performances of *Agis*. Macpherson also benefited from the Bute's patronage and his Gaelic epic *Temora* was financed by the Earl. In acknowledgement of his support, Macpherson dedicated *The Works of Ossian* to Bute in 1765. Macpherson's financial security was secured by the granting of an annual pension in 1766. Bute's literary patronage effectively ceased after 1766 and his retirement from politics, and his support moved to art, architecture, and science.

Bute spent a vast amount of money on his building projects that began after 1761. He commissioned Robert Adam to remodel and expand the existing house at Luton Hoo and build a villa at Highcliffe. Adam benefited from Bute's patronage and became an Architect of the Works, a position with an annual salary of £300. The gardens on these estates were transformed by Capability' Brown, and between 1764 and 1779, the landscape architect was paid a total of £13,290. In 1764, Brown received a royal appointment as 'Surveyor to His Majesty's Gardens and Waters at Hampton Court' and 'Gardener' at St. James's. Bute's patronage of art and artists continued throughout his life, and soon after his appointment as tutor, he commissioned a number of portraits of his family, Prince George, and Princess Augusta. This series of portraits were by the Scottish artist Allan Ramsay and they continue to decorate the dining room at Mount Stuart. Ramsay was seen as one of Bute's many Scottish clients and his patronage of the artist drew criticism from the portrait-painter Joshua Reynolds. This was due to Ramsay's appointment as first Painter to His Majesty in 1761, and

Principal Painter to the King in 1767, the latter position that Reynolds hoped to secure for himself.

Bute was not a major figure in eighteenth-century scientific institutions in either Scotland or England. Despite his extensive collection of scientific instruments, manuscripts, maps, and natural history objects, Bute's single contribution to the Society of Antiquities in Scotland (of which he was President) was a single donation of £100. As a Trustee of the British Museum, his donation was a modest collection of Egyptian artefacts, including a mummy and a sphinx without wings, which he received from his brother-in-law, Edward Wortley Montagu.

CONCLUSION

'SO GREAT A MAN, SO GREAT A JUDGE' - THE ROLE OF LORD BUTE AS PATRON AND SCIENTIFIC PRACTITIONER¹

The aim of this thesis was to examine the patronage and science of the Earl of Bute; to provide a comparison with similar eighteenth-century patrons; and to place his patronage within the longer history of science. The question was raised of whether the rise of new scientific institutions and organisations in the eighteenth century corresponded with a decline in aristocratic patronage in Britain, and evidence was provided to refute this statement. In spite of the new spaces of scientific activity, which were supported by some members of the aristocracy, this study of Bute's patronage demonstrates that the older structures of patronage did not disappear. As has been mentioned, one of Bute's critics, John Wilkes argued that during his term as Prime Minister, public patronage was being diverted to support hack-writers from Scotland who he felt had too much power at Westminster. This thesis critically examines the dedications made to Bute along with a list of his personal and political clients. Following this, it appears that there is truth to the charge levelled by his critics that Bute predominantly supported those from Scotland.

Many of Bute's favoured clients were Scottish (John Home, Robert Adam, Allan Ramsay, John Hope, Adam Ferguson, William Chambers and James Macpherson), and they benefited greatly from royal, political or personal patronage. The principal architects that he employed at Bute House and Luton Hoo were the Scottish brothers, Robert and John Adam. It has been noted that Bute's private secretary, John Home, acted as a broker between Scottish intellectuals and his patron, and nominated Adam Ferguson as tutor to Bute's sons; provided an introduction for the historian William Robertson, and was a promoter of James Macpherson's *Ossian*. It has been established that the Scottish painter Allan Ramsay was promoted over his English rival Joshua Reynolds, and this sparked anti-Scottish hostility in the 1760s. Therefore, the evidence presented has shown that there was favouritism and advancement of Bute's Scottish clients during his control of political and royal patronage.

¹ Alexander Strahan, *The Aeneid of Virgil*, (London, 1767), p. 3

This study is structured around three distinct headings of royal, political and personal to examine Bute's patronage and science. Bute was a royal client, a political patron, and scientific practitioner, and the purpose of these headings was to examine if there were any similarities or differences in these types of patronage. The second part of the thesis investigated Bute's manuscripts (both published and unpublished) and his auction sale catalogues, and the research shows that his scientific interests in the areas of plant-collecting, botany, chemistry and geology were shared by contemporary aristocratic patrons like the Duchess of Portland and the Earl of Ilay. However, it is clear that Bute was unusual in his acceptance and understanding of classification theory.

BUTE AS A LATE EXAMPLE OF ARISTOCRATIC PATRONAGE

Samuel Johnson, and other eighteenth-century writers argued, that for men of letters to be impartial they needed to be independent and free from aristocratic patronage. His definition of a patron was "a wretch who supports with insolence, and is paid with flattery". Johnson had reason to be critical – after unsuccessfully applying to Lord Chesterfield for support he remained short of funds while writing his *Dictionary*. It is evident that despite subscription publishing and a larger readership, the patronage system was utilised by both patrons and clients in eighteenth century Britain due to a lack of positions in universities and institutions. This was also true for men of science who were reliant upon royal, political, or private patronage for career advancement, financial support, recognition, introductions to other patrons, and publishing costs.

The botanical artist, George Dionysius Ehret, was dependent on the patronage of a number of wealthy plant-collectors including the Duchess of Portland, Sir Hans Sloane, George Clifford, and Bute. The patron-client relationship between Bute and Sir John Hill demonstrates that patrons actively influenced the work undertaken by their clients along with proposing topics of inquiry and avenues for research. However, the consequences of over-reliance and the fickle nature of personal patronage meant that a client suffered financial hardship if they fell from favour or a patron refused to provide an adequate income.

The aristocracy continued to be the most influential patrons of the eighteenth century and like many of his contemporaries, Bute directed most of his money on architecture, portraiture, and landscape gardening. These were the areas that emphasised

the power and taste of the ruling elite. His wife's inheritance meant that Bute had the financial means to build (or remodel) three magnificent houses – Bute House, Luton Hoo and Highcliffe. They were a conspicuous display of his wealth, political, and social status and were designed by Robert Adam. However, Bute House (1762-1768) on Berkeley Square was one of the city's grandest eighteenth-century mansions and an obvious target for an irate mob after Grub Street writers claimed it had been paid for by French bribes. The gardens surrounding these house were all beautifully landscaped, and Luton Hoo and Highcliffe were transformed by Lancelot 'Capability' Brown. It has been shown that landscape gardening was also closely linked to wealthy landed patronage. It was not unusual for members of nobility to spend large amounts of money on art and architecture and we can conclude that in these areas (at least), Bute's interests were aligned to those of his peers.

Bute's enthusiasm for art is evidenced from his patronage of notable eighteenth-century artists (Allan Ramsay, Sir Joshua Reynolds, Jean-Etienne Liotard, and Johann Zoffany); and by the collections of paintings and prints listed in the auction sale catalogues. The image that he wished to portray to the public is evident from the famous paintings of Bute by Allan Ramsay and Joshua Reynolds. The portrait by Ramsay (1758) is a regal full-length picture of Bute wearing his peer's robes with the collar of the Order of the Thistle, and showcasing his famous legs.

Reynolds' portrait of Bute and his secretary, Charles Jenkinson (1763), reference his ministerial career and his control of government finances is depicted by a purse clutched in his hand. For his opponents, the Earl of Bute's control of government expenditure was used to accuse him of buying off his critics and purchasing votes to pass the Peace of Paris. During the press war of the 1760s, there was an abundance of satirical prints, poems and cartoons lambasting Bute. The satirical prints by Paul Sandby were aimed against the pro-Bute prints by William Hogarth and criticising his alliance with the Prime Minister. In one of the prints, the city of London is depicted as holding a "petition rejected" sign in protest against the Treaty of Paris (which they believed was detrimental to trade) with Bute portrayed as a Scotswoman. It has been shown that he was not the first Prime Minister or politician satirised in print by the opposition. However, these cartoons were more vulgar, grotesque, and crude than those published during the ministry of Robert Walpole, with a focus on Scottish stereotypes and references to sexual misconduct with Princess Augusta.

There were many aristocratic patrons who were supporters of utilitarian science in eighteenth-century Britain. Ilay was a member of the Honourable the Improvers in the knowledge of Agriculture (HIKAS). Lord Kames was an improving landlord who recognised the link between chemistry, mineralogy and land improvement; searched for agricultural reforms that would stimulate and benefit the Scottish economy; and sought to disseminate this knowledge through the establishment of societies and periodicals. He published a treatise on new ways of improving agricultural productivity. This thesis asked whether Bute followed the example of Scottish nobles and whether any of his patronage was in the area of utilitarian or public science. The research shows no evidence that he was a patron of any agricultural society and Bute's papers contain no unpublished work on agriculture.

However, documents show that Bute was interested in land improvement. We know that he is named on a list of subscribers for the Clyde Canal Company (whose aim was to construct a canal linking Glasgow with the east coast) along with Mackenzie, and the Earl of Hopetoun in 1768. He was a patron and correspondent of the mineralogist John Walker. Walker was a scientific advisor to many influential Scottish landowners including Kames and Hopetoun and a visitor to Bute's London library which contained many works on agriculture alongside his extensive mineralogy collection. There is a letter (c.1757-8) from his estate Manager, Baron Mure, in the Bute Archive that outlines proposals for improving trade, agriculture, and the fishery on the Isle of Bute. This demonstrates that while he may not have been involved in large-scale agricultural reform, he initiated schemes of improvement on his estate. A surveyor by the name of John Foulis was tasked with surveying the island searching for natural resources with an additional letter in the archive revealing that no coal was found on the estate. In addition, a receipt from 1769 reveals that he was active in experimental farming and reorganised his estate by enclosing and subdividing the farms. The long term goal of enclosure was increased productivity and profits. Therefore, we can conclude that Bute was concerned with new techniques of land management, and agricultural developments that produce lasting improvements to his estate.

Another example of Bute's practical scientific outlook is his encouragement of William Fordyce's work on the benefits of muriatic acid, alongside his son's (William Stuart) letter against smallpox inoculation.

Unlike many of his contemporaries, Bute did not partake in the coffeehouse culture (after 1760, this may be explained by fear of the London mob) nor was he actively involved in

any public scientific institution. These institutions were spaces where people could share and discuss scientific ideas, and disseminate new knowledge, and despite his interests in botany, chemistry and geology, Bute declined to become a member of the Royal Society. His fellow plant-collectors (the Duke of Richmond, Baron Petre, Peter Collinson and Philip Miller) were fellows of the Royal Society. Even the reclusive Henry Cavendish was a member and contributor of the Royal Society. However, it should be noted that Henry Cavendish followed in the footsteps of his father, Lord Charles Cavendish (c.1693-1783), and accompanied him to meetings of the Royal Society and the Royal Society Club. We know from the literature that Bute was not interested in controlling the topics or publications of any scientific society or institution, and emulated his uncle Ilay who was also not a member of the Royal Society.

Bute's overall contribution to science includes his involvement in eighteenth-century developments such as vogue for travelogues, plant-collecting, plant and animal classification, and debates concerning the history of the earth. There was a large travel industry during the second half of the eighteenth century and these written descriptions of people, places and natural history greatly increased the knowledge of a region among the reading public. Travellers' recorded, translated, described and collected valuable items including plants and minerals both to enhance their reputation and profit from the publication of their travel account. Bute wrote a travel account of his Grand Tour and after his return to London was sufficiently interested in the genre that he sponsored Alberto Fortis's Adriatic expedition (1771-1774). He was the dedicatee of Fortis's *Travels into Dalmatia* and sponsored Charles Cullen's translation of Abbé Francesco Saverio Clavigero's *La Historia Antigua de México* which provided descriptions of the religion, customs, politics, and warfare of the inhabitants of Mexico.

He was among a number of notable eighteenth-century plant-collectors (including the Dukes of Argyll and Richmond, Baron Petre, Peter Collinson, and Philip Miller) who spent sizable sums of money on plant-subscription schemes. Bute's interest in plant-collecting and the importation of trees was another important activity for a member of the aristocracy. This thesis has shown that he was encouraged in his botanical studies at an early age by his father's program of planting work at Mount Stuart, and his attendance of Leiden University and proximity to Herman Boerhaave and Adrian van Royen. Moreover, Bute closely followed Boerhaave's method of obtaining new plant species by building up a network of correspondents, thus enriching his gardens and those of Kew. We can understand Bute's

interest in plant-collecting and his planting experiments from his *Journals* (1734-1744). His *Journals* describe the vast planting program at Mount Stuart, catalogue the number and species, and list the names and institutions that sent him seeds and plants. Even after his move to London, Bute continued to receive daily weather reports from his head gardener which illustrates the care and attention that he took in developing his gardens, even when he never again returned to Mount Stuart.

In the eighteenth century, the establishment of British Museum and other cultural institutions signaled the decline of 'cabinets of curiosities' as they were too expensive to maintain. However, it is evident from chapter one of this thesis that private collectors continued to play an important role in the eighteenth century. A list of the contents of some of these great collections (like those of the Duchess of Portland and the Earl of Bute) can be seen from the public auctions of the eighteenth century. Bute's Auction Sale Catalogues reveal the systematic classification of natural and artificial curiosities (e.g. coral, shells, medals) which were arranged in the same cabinet. His collection contains widely diverse objects, an extensive collection of minerals and fossils, his botanical and natural history library, and laboratory apparatus. *Bute was* one of the few aristocratic scientific practitioners (*along with Henry Cavendish and Ilay*) who installed laboratories in their residences and performed chemical experiments. This is another example of Bute's interest in utilitarian science, and items used by Bute and Woulfe in their experiments were sold at auction, such as a brass furnace and a large quantity of jars, and vials.

THE DIFFERENT FORMS OF PATRONAGE, E.G. PERSONAL, POLITICAL AND ROYAL AND THEIR POSSIBLE APPLICATION TO OTHER EIGHTEENTH-CENTURY PATRONS.

The chapter on Bute's royal patronage (1751 to 1772) is separated into two sections – (i) the benefits Bute received as a royal client and (ii) his influence in directing the patronage of Princess Augusta and George III. Prior to his chance meeting with Prince Frederick in 1747, Bute was an impoverished and obscure Scottish lord renting a house in the unfashionable area of Twickenham, and out of political favour. This meeting and friendship with Frederick altered the course of his life as they bonded over their shared interests in art, architecture, theatre and gardening. There has been no previous discussion as to the extent Bute tailored his interests to secure and maintain his position at court and become a member of

Frederick's inner circle. His mother-in-law, Lady Mary Wortley Montagu, recognised the benefits of cultivating a friendship with the future king and queen and certainly believed that he took the advice of Ilay that "whoever expected advancement should appear much in public". This approach does not take into account his reputation as a well-known and respected botanist, so it is altogether surprising that Frederick and Augusta would rely on his advice and expertise in developing Kew Gardens. We do need to take into account that for Bute to retain the patronage of Augusta until her death required a great deal of flattery and self-promotion along with the additional financial and social benefits of royal patronage.

Bute was instrumental in aiding Augusta to stock and landscape Kew Gardens (which formally date from 1759). There was great activity in the gardens during the late 1750s and early 1760s and his achievements at Kew include the recommendation of staff (William Aiton, John Haverfield and Sir William Chambers); corresponding with plant-collectors in America, Asia, Africa and Europe in acquiring plants and trees; recruiting botanical artists (George Dionysius Ehret and Simon Taylor) to catalogue the collection of plants; and organising the transfer of some of Argyll's trees from the Whitton estate. Bute's legacy at Kew does not match that of Joseph Banks who after the death of Augusta employed hundreds of plant-hunters to search for valuable plants that had economic benefits, and established the gardens as a storehouse of the British Empire. However, we can definitely state that from humble beginnings, Bute was instrumental in its early history by importing large quantities of exotic plants and beginning the transforming of Kew Gardens.

Bute's political patronage (1761-1767) focused on university patronage in Scotland; political dedications; and the literary writers who were employed during his term as Prime Minister. The first question to be answered is the extent of Bute's university patronage. The impact of his university patronage could not compare to Ilay whose political power lasted thirty-six years in comparison to Bute's six years in control of Scottish Affairs (his period of greatest influence ended in 1763). Ilay is considered as one of the leading architects of the Scottish Enlightenment who reshaped the universities by choosing candidates for their merit and those who shared his scientific interests. As Ilay's successor, Bute was initially reluctant in taking control of the administration of Scotland as his focus was not solely on Scotland and living in London meant he was far removed from developments. His advisors were all connected to Ilay and Bute did continue his uncle's policy of appointing candidates based on merit, rather than family or other considerations. This is apparent from a letter rebuking

Mure for nominating a relative for the Principal of Glasgow University. Bute was responsible for appointing and patronising leading Enlightenment figures such as William Robertson and although his involvement in the patronage of Scottish universities may have been short-lived, his insistence that only the best qualified candidate was appointed was admirable.

During his term as Prime Minister, Bute used political patronage to hire literary writers to defend against opposition attacks in the press, and a review of dedications from his period show the writers support for government policies and his ministry. The anonymous author, William Smith's inscription in *An Authentic Journal of the Expedition to Belleisle* (1761) defended the government's war offensives. David Mallet (one of Bute's literary writers) wrote in favour of the peace negotiations with France in his dedication to *Elvira* (1763) and one of his scientific clients, David Lyle, drew parallels between the abilities and qualifications that made Bute an exceptional tutor would also enable him as Prime Minister to be effective in leading the nation to victory. Of course, it is therefore difficult to measure the sincerity of inscriptions composed by grateful clients as the purpose of the dedications by Mallet and Lyle was to flatter and publically demonstrate support for their patron and his patronage. However, these dedications were important in compiling a list of Bute's clients as evidence of patronage can be gleaned from the inscriptions.

The objective of his political writers (James Ralph, Tobias Smollett, Arthur Murphy, William Guthrie, Hugh Baillie, Israel Manduit and Dr. John Campbell) was to comment upon the political situation; mobilise public support for an end to the costly Seven Years' War; and construct a defense of government cautious policy towards Spain. There were a number of reasons for public hostility – his position as royal favourite; his nationality and surname (he was believed to be a supporter of the House of Stuart); his political inexperience and the popularity of rival, William Pitt. Bute's pro-government newspapers, *The Briton* and *Auditor*, were incapable of appealing to public opinion or supplying a satisfactory explanation to the public for giving up considerable military gains in exchange for peace. Despite the salary and pensions given to these writers, they were subjected to personal attacks in the press and public attacks like their patron.

The personal patronage (c.1730s-1792) of Bute includes the areas where he spent the majority of his money; the clients he funded from his own pockets; and his scientific interests. The support offered to clients of personal patronage range from the considerable expense of funding Hill's *Vegetable System*, to a once off payment of £300 to George

Edwards for his natural history drawings, and employing Peter Woulfe as his chemical assistant. In 1757, when the *Vegetable System* was conceived, both client and patron had grand ambitions for the project. For Bute, who carefully monitored the material for inclusion in the early volumes it would be the first complete work of botany by an English author. He was invested in this botanical project to the extent that he lent Hill all his botanical notes accumulated prior to 1760. For Hill, it would be the culmination of years of struggle as he sought patronage and protection. It represented financial security for Hill, recognition of his botanical achievements, and the possibility of further opportunities and positions.

Bute lost interest in the project, however, there are several reasons why this may have happened – Bute’s attention was increasingly focused on politics; he suffered ill-health and retreated to his country estates after his retirement in 1763; his focus turned to geology after his Grand Tour of 1768-1771; and the difficult temperament of his client who had public disagreements with the Royal Society and David Garrick. When suitable positions arose (head gardener of Kew; full-time naturalist at the British Museum in 1759; and a second Museum vacancy in 1762), Bute failed to put forward Hill for consideration, even after repeated requests. To secure one of these posts would have resulted in his independence from personal patronage and the rewards of an annual income. Bute may have believed that another appointment would hinder writing and publication of *Vegetable System*, but in a letter to John Strange in 1774, Bute admitted that “I have made of a rule, never to talk with Him on any Subject but what he is employed in, I heard so much of his vanity and imprudence”. The end of Hill’s career reveals the problems associated with a dependence on personal patronage – without adequate financial support he was unable to afford high quality engraving leading to negative reviews and poverty. The souring of the patron-client relationship led to the loss of decades’ worth of botanical notes which Bute had entrusted to Hill. However, despite its lack of commercial success, the *Vegetable System* is remembered as the first vernacular account of the plant kingdom that adopted Linnaean generic names and binary nomenclature.

BUTE WAS BOTH A PRACTITIONER AND A PATRON OF SCIENCE – WAS THIS UNUSUAL?

His letters to Collinson and Gronovius, and his *Botanical Tables*, reveal that Bute was not only a plant-collector but greatly concerned with scientific developments, including the introduction of Linnaeus's classification system and the accurate categorisation of plants. His passion for plant-collecting was shared by other aristocratic patrons; it has been shown that few aristocratic patrons made botany their particular study. The importation of large numbers of new species made it increasingly difficult for plant-collectors, gardeners, and botanists to describe and catalogue all these new plants, and required a new all-encompassing system of plant classification. The problem of identifying a specific plant is evident in Bute's correspondence with Collinson where he describes his frustration after he is unable to identify a specimen in his garden, even after reading all the botanical works of Carl Linnaeus, Van Royen, or Albrecht von Haller. It is clear from his scientific correspondence that he was well-connected in scholarly circles and that he was taken seriously as a botanist. The evidence shows that Collinson respected Bute's botanical observations enough that he sent his comments on the cytisus and colutea plants to Linnaeus, with his note that these plants needed new descriptions.

Two of the principal issues that generated the most controversy and discussion in botany were the classification and standardisation of terminology, and that the sexual terminology used by Linnaeus was inappropriate for women. For the material available, we know that Bute had a thorough understanding of Linnaeus's classification theory. He was initially critical of the confusing connections the author had drawn between some of the plants and too many Swedish plant names. It is possible that he adopted an nationalistic attitude of believing that English should be the native standard for clarity for plant classification and may be one of reasons for his patronage of the *Vegetable System*. However, and despite his reservations, we know from his planting notebooks, the catalogue of plants at Luton Hoo, the *Vegetable System* and the *Botanical Tables*, that Bute adopted Linnaean taxonomy.

As a resident on an isolated island and far from botanical centres, it was extremely important that Bute formed a network of scientific correspondents (Collinson, Lawson, Gronovius and Strange). It allowed Bute to communicate and exchange information,

observations, and specimens with plant-collectors and botanists in London and on the continent. His reaction to scientific news and developments can be found in his letters. He expresses his desire of soon seeing Linnaeus's *Philosophia Botanica* and his reservations in relation to Ellis's belief that corals were vegetable rather than animal and he believed that corals were the joint product of vegetable and animal life. A study of Bute's letters also demonstrate the difficulty and delay (especially during periods of war) in communicating in eighteenth-century Europe as it took months to receive a letter from Leiden. His papers are not complete, many of his letters missing or lost, and there is no correspondence with his fellow Scot and botanist, Isaac Lawson which may have shed some light on his years in the Netherlands. The letters written by Bute in the late 1770s and 1780s are difficult to decipher and there is a marked deterioration in his writing that may be due to age or illness.

Bute's *Botanical Tables* written during his retirement in 1785 was the result of more than twenty years' study. This was his only publication with an aim of explaining the principles of Linnaeus's controversial taxonomic system to a very specific readership – aristocratic women. The study of botany was fashionable, and royal and aristocratic ladies were encouraged to collect and identify plant specimens, taking lessons in botanical drawing and read suitable textbooks. However, they were excluded from the intellectual and professional participation in botany. The Linnaean system sorted plants by the type and number of their sexual organs (pistils and stemens) and there was a growing sense that this inappropriate language would disqualify women from studying botany. This language likening botanical terms to human sexual organs became an issue and it was suddenly controversial for a woman to study botany. By the end of the century, botanical works were aimed at women with a discreet censorship of the more questionable terms.

In his *Botanical Tables*, Bute substituted what he believed were distasteful or 'wanton' words that were offensive to women e.g. the use of 'complete' rather than 'hermaphrodite'. His dedication is significant – both recognising Queen Charlotte's patronage and support for botany as a subject suitable for female study and his possible and hints at attempts at rehabilitation and reconciliation with the George III. As Bute's work was privately printed, it had a limited circulation and meant the *Botanical Tables* had very little influence in Britain, or elsewhere.

Bute differs from other eighteenth-century aristocratic patrons as he held multiple roles at the same time – he was a patron; a royal client; a go-between or broker for George III; a dispenser of political patronage as Prime Minister; and in charge of Scottish patronage. His personal wealth allowed him to privately support clients and pursue his interests in botany, art, and architecture. During his lifetime, he was a client of three royal patrons (Frederick, Augusta and George), and his salary as Gentleman of the Bedchamber brought financial security for Bute and his family after his move to London. In the development of Kew Gardens, he was able to indulge his passion for botany and plant-collecting, oversaw its layout and began the process of importing exotic new species. His contribution can still be seen by visitors today - trees transported from Whitton and some of Chambers' structures are still visible. He was responsible for introducing clients to his royal patrons and encouraged and supporting George III's collection of scientific instruments. The 'King George III Collection' at the Science Museum in London is now the most complete collection of eighteenth-century instruments.

His vocal critics and contemporaries viewed his close royal friendships with suspicion and envy and he became a notorious figure who was jeered at when he travelled in London. This has adversely affected his reputation and legacy. His letters and papers demonstrate his continuing interest in science and support of clients even after his retirement, when he directed his focus to the collecting books, scientific instruments and minerals; supported personal clients; and wrote geogical *Observations on the Natural History of the Earth* and his contribution to eighteenth century botany – the *Botanical Tables*.

Bute shared similar interests with other aristocratic patrons in the areas of plant-collecting, architecture, portraiture, and landscape gardening. However, a study of the patronage and science of Bute reveals that he does not fit into current narrative of a typical aristocratic patron. He was a practitioner and a scientific patron and his vast knowledge is evident from his letters and writings. Currently, he is merely a footnote in studies of eighteenth-century botany. The reasons for this – his criticism of Linnaeus, the small print run of the *Botanical Tables* and the reputation of his client, Hill, and the underwhelming reception of the *Vegetable System*. Bute was uninterested in his own scientific reputation and legacy and for that reason did not publish any of his botanical or geological manuscripts; was not a contributor to any of the scientific societies; and his chemical experiments were performed for his curiosity and amusement and were not intended for publication. The

overall aim of this thesis to reassess his scientific reputation; his role as a patron and in the early establishment of Kew; and his contribution to botany so that it may be included in future histories of science.

List of Dedications and Name of Authors

Year	Title	Subject	Author	Nationality
1751	<i>An Oration ... Occasioned by the Death of his Royal Highness the Prince of Wales</i>	Literature	Unknown	Unknown
1757	<i>Eden, or, a Compleat Body of Gardening</i>	Science	Sir John Hill (1714-1775)	English
1758	<i>Elements of the Theory and Practice of Chymistry</i>	Science	Andrew Reid (d.1767)	Scottish
1759	<i>Treatise on Civil Architecture</i>	Architecture	Sir William Chambers (1723-1796)	Scottish
1759	<i>The Orphan of China</i>	Literature	Arthur Murphy (1727-1805)	Irish
1760	<i>Gleanings of Natural History, vol. ii</i>	Science	George Edwards (1694-1773)	English
1761	<i>Dialogues in the Elysian Fields, Between Cardinal Wolsey, and Cardinal Ximenes</i>	History	Joseph Grove (d.1764)	English
1761	<i>The English Verb; A Grammatical Essay</i>	Literature	James White (fl. 1761)	Unknown
1761	<i>An Authentic Journal of the Expedition to Belleisle, and of the Siege of the Citadel of Palais</i>	History	William Smith (dates unknown)	Unknown
1761	<i>The Divine Admonition, or Plan of Government, Given to David upon his Ascending the Throne of Israel</i>	Religion	Leonard Howard (1698/9–1767)	English
1762	<i>A Dissertation on Miracles: Containing an Examination of the Principles Advanced by David Hume</i>	Religion	George Campbell (1719-1796)	Scottish
1762	<i>The Art of Short Hand Improved</i>	Literature	David Lyle (fl. 1762)	Unknown
1763	<i>The Republic of Plato</i>	Philosophy	Henry Spens (1714-1787)	Scottish
1763	<i>Elvira</i>	Literature	David Mallet (1701/2-1765)	Scottish
1763	<i>The Universal Mentor</i>	Literature	Sir John Fielding (1721-1780)	English
1763	<i>Temora</i>	Literature	James Macpherson (1736-1796)	Scottish
1763	<i>The Fall of Mortimer</i>	Mock dedication	William Hatchett (dates unknown) and	English

		(Literature)	dedication by John Wilkes (1725-1797)	
1763	<i>Reflections on Death</i>	Literature	William Dodd (1729-1777)	English
1765	<i>The Works of Ossian</i>	Literature	James Macpherson (1736-1796)	Scottish
1765	<i>Dr. Brook Taylor's Method of Perspective Made Easy; Both in Theory and in Practice</i>	Architecture	Joshua Kirby (1716-1774)	English
1767	<i>The Aeneid of Virgil</i>	Literature	Alexander Strahan (dates unknown)	Unknown
1770	<i>The Favourite: An Historical Tragedy</i>	Mock dedication (Literature)	Francis Gentleman (1728-1784)	Irish
1771	<i>Saggio d'osservazioni sopra l'isola di Cherso ed Osero</i>	Science	Alberto Fortis (1741-1803)	Italian
1775	<i>The Baths of the Romans Explained and Illustrated, with the Restorations of Palladio Corrected and Improved</i>	Architecture	Charles Cameron (1754-1812)	English
1775	<i>Flora Anglicana or The English Flora</i>	Science	Richard Weston (1753-1806)	English
1778	<i>Travels into Dalmatia; Containing General Observations on the Natural History of that country and the Neighbouring Islands</i>	Science	Alberto Fortis (1741-1803)	Italian
1780	<i>An Essay on the Theory and Practice of Medical Electricity to</i>	Science	Tiberius Cavallo (1749-1809)	Italian
1787	<i>The History of Mexico</i>	History	Abbé Francesco Saverio Clavigero's (1731-1787) - translator, Charles Cullen (dates unknown)	Unknown
1790	<i>A Letter to Sir John Sinclair Concerning the Virtues of the Muriatic Acid</i>	Science	Sir William Fordyce (1724-1792)	Scottish

Engraved for the Gentleman's Museum.



A curious Animal that was seen in the Gardens near Richmond.

Shirley

MANUSCRIPT SOURCES

Aberdeen University, Special Libraries & Archives

MSM 370 (Principal George Campbell: autograph letter)

British Library, Manuscript Collections

Add. 3401 (Birch Collection, Letters to Dr. Birch)

Add. 4301 (3rd Earl of Bute: Letter to John Miller from Thomas Birch circ. 1755)

Add. 28545 (Letters to A. B Lambert, Presented by the Earl of Derby)

Add. 28726 (Letters to Peter Collinson 1725 - 1790, Vol. 1)

Add. 36797 (Copies of Letters of the Earl of Bute 1756 - 1765)

Add. 38200 (Liverpool Papers Vol. XI)

Add. 39311 (Berkeley Papers Vol. VIII, Correspondence 1710 - 1776)

Eq. 1970 (Letter to John Strange British Resident at Venice, 1778 - 1787, Vol II.)

Eq. 2182 (Letters of Statesmen and authors to Bishop Douglas 1748 - 1813)

Cambridge University, Manuscript Collections

Add. 8826 (3rd Earl Of Bute: Travel Journal & Essays on Travel Writing 1768-c.1787)

Add. 9399 (3rd Earl Of Bute: Account Book 1764-67)

Mount Stuart Archives, Isle of Bute

MS/41

BU/98/1/18 (*General Political Papers*, Letter to Johann Frederick Gronovius, discussing botanical matters, Leiden, Holland, 3 January 1746 - 21 December 1756)

BU/98/104 (*General Political Papers*, Letter to Johann Frederick Gronovius, discussing botanical matters, Leiden, Holland, 3 January 1746 - 21 December 1756)

BU/108/7 (*Royal Correspondence*, George III, 09 June 1756 - 12 July 1766)

BU/116/2 (*General and Miscellaneous Correspondence*, Letter to Jan Frederick Gronovius, Leyden, concerning botanical matters, dated at Mount Stuart, 11 July 1745)

BU/116/4 (*General and Miscellaneous Correspondence*, Letter to Jan Frederick Gronovius, regarding further botanical matters, 10 July 1755)

BU/130 (*Botanical notebooks*, c.1780)

BU/132/1 (*Scientific: papers*, c.1764 - 1770)

BU/132/8, (*Scientific: papers*, c.1764 - 1770), a description (with diagrams) of how to make 'nitrous Aether' by Peter Woulfer F.R.S.

BU/136/4 (*Scientific: notebooks*, 31 May 1777 - 23 April 1778)

BU/153 (*Legal/Financial*: Estate of 3rd Duke of Argyll, 04 September 1761 – 19 November 1761)

BU/157/1 (*Estate Related Records*, 30 April 1746 - 30 December 1746)

BU/154 (*Estate Related Records*, c.1734 - 31 December 1744)

BU/155, (*Estate Related Records*, 01 May 1737 - 30 November 1737)

BU/162/7/33, (*Bute Estate*, 18 July 1777 - 13 November 1778)

National Archives of Scotland

GD32/25/100 (3rd Earl of Bute: 1761-1762 correspondence with Charles Erskine)

National Library of Scotland, Manuscript Collection

MSS 4941-46 (Letters to Mure of Caldwell)

The Linnaean Correspondence

L5478 (Letter from Collinson to Bute)

L1641 (Letter from Collinson to Linnaeus)

National Newspapers

Daily Post

Gazetteer and New Daily Advertiser

General Evening Post

Lloyd's Evening Post

London Chronicle

London Evening Post

Public Advertiser

Whitehall Evening Post or London Intelligencer

World Newspaper

PRINTED PRIMARY SOURCES

Aiton, William. *Hortus Kewensis; or, A Catalogue of the Plants Cultivated in the Royal Botanic Garden at Kew*, (London, printed for George Nicol, bookseller to His Majesty, 1789)

Bevis, John. 'Observations of the Last Transit of Venus, and of the Eclipse of the Sun the Next Day; Made at the House of Joshua Kirby, Esquire, at Kew', (*The Philosophical Transactions*, Vol. 59, London, 1769)

Buchan, David Steuart Erksine, Earl of. *Discourse, delivered by the Right Honourable the Earl of Buchan, at a meeting for the purpose of promoting the institution of a society for the investigation of the history of Scotland, and its antiquities, November, 14 1778*, (London, 1778)

Bute, John Stuart, Earl of. *Botanical Tables, Containing the Different Familys of British Plants*, (London, 1785)

Callander, John. *Hymn to the Power of Harmony*, (Edinburgh, printed by A. Donaldson and J. Reid, 1763)

Cameron, Charles. *The Baths of the Romans Explained and Illustrated, with the Restorations of Palladio Corrected and Improved*, (London, printed for S. Leacroft and J. Mathews, 1775)

Campbell, George. *An Address to the People of Scotland, upon the Alarms that have been Raised in Regard to Popery*, (Aberdeen, printed by J. Chalmers and Co., 1779)

Campbell, George. *A Dissertation on Miracles; Containing an Examination of the Principles Advanced by David Hume, Esq.; in An Essay on Miracles*, (Edinburgh, printed for A. Kincaid & J. Bell, 1762)

Campbell, George. *The Character of a Minister of the Gospel as a Teacher and Pattern; A Sermon Preached before the Synod of Aberdeen, at Aberdeen April 7, 1752*, (Aberdeen, printed by James Chalmers, 1752)

Campbell, George. *The Four Gospels; Translated from the Greek. With Preliminary Dissertations, and Notes Critical and Explanatory*, (London, printed for A. Strahan and T. Cadell, 1789)

Campbell, George. *The Happy Influence of Religion on Civil Society: A Sermon, preached at the Assizes at Aberdeen, Sunday, May 23, 1779*, (Edinburgh, printed for William Creech, 1779)

Campbell, George. *The Nature, Extent, and Importance, of the Duty of Allegiance: A Sermon Preached at Aberdeen, December 12, 1776, Being the Fast Day Appointed by the King, on Account of the Rebellion in America*, (Aberdeen, printed by J. Chalmers and Co., 1777)

Campbell, George. *The Philosophy of Rhetoric*, (Edinburgh, printed for W. Creech, 1776)

Campbell, George. *The Spirit of the Gospel neither a Spirit of Superstition nor of Enthusiasm: a Sermon, Preached before the Synod of Aberdeen, April 9. 1771*, (Edinburgh, printed for A. Kincaid & W. Creech, 1771)

Campbell, George. *The Success of the First Publishers of the Gospel a Proof of its Truth; A Sermon, Preached before the Society in Scotland for Propagating Christian Knowledge, at their Annual Meeting, Edinburgh, Friday, June 6, 1777*, (Edinburgh, printed by A. Murray, 1777)

Cavallo, Tiberius. *A Treatise in Electricity in Theory and Practice*, (London, printed for the author, 1777)

Cavallo, Tiberius. *An Essay on the Theory and Practice of Medical Electricity*, (London, printed for the author, 1780)

Cavallo, Tiberius and William Watson. 'Extraordinary Electricity of the Atmosphere Observed at Islington on the Month of October, 1775', *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society of London*, Vol. 66 (1776), pp. 407-411

Chambers, William. *A Treatise on Civil Architecture*, (London, printed by J. Haberkorn, 1759)

Chambers, William. *A Treatise on the Decorative Part of Civil Architecture*, (London, printed by Joseph Smeeton, 1791)

Chambers, William. *A Dissertation on Oriental Gardening*, (London, printed by W. Griffin, 1772)

Chambers, William. *Designs of Chinese Buildings, Furniture, Dresses, Machines, and Utensils*, (London, printed by Mr. Dodsley, 1757)

Chambers, William. *Plans, Elevations, Sections, and Perspective Views of the Gardens and Buildings at Kew in Surry the Seat of Her Royal Highness The Princess Dowager of Wales*, (London, printed by John Haberkorn, 1763)

Cullen, Charles. *The History of Mexico; Translated from the Original Italian*, (London, printed for G. G. J. and J. Robinson, 1787)

Curtis, William. *A Catalogue of the British, Medicinal, Culinary, and Agricultural Plants, Cultivated in the London Botanic Garden*, (London, sold by B. White, 1783)

Curtis, William. *Proposals for Opening by Subscription, a Botanic Garden, to be called the London Botanic Garden; Designed for the Use of the Physician, the Apothecary, the student in Physic, the Scientific Farmer, the Botanist, (particularly the English Botanist,) the Lover of Flowers, and the Public in General*, (London, printed by J. Andrews for the author, 1778)

Curtis, William. *The Subscription Catalogue of the Brompton Botanic Garden, for the Year 1790, the First of its Institution*, (London, printed by W. Curtis, 1790)

Dodd, William. *Beauties of Shakespear*, (London, printed for T. Waller, 1752)

Dodd, William. *Reflections on Death*, (London, printed by Jacob Johnson & Co., 1763)

Dodd, William. *The Hymns of Callimachus*, (London, printed for T. Waller, 1755)

Dodd, William. *Thoughts in Prison: in five parts*, (London, printed for Edward and Charles Dilly, 1777)

Dodington, George Bubb. 'A Poetical Epistle from the Late Lord Melcombe to the Earl of Bute', (London, printed for T. Beckett, 1776)

Dunkin, William, *An Ode on the Death of His Royal Highness Frederick, Prince of Wales; Translated from the Latin*, (Dublin, printed by George Faulkner, 1752)

Edwards, George. *A Natural History of Birds*, 4 vols. (London, printed for the author, at the Royal College of Physicians, 1743-1751)

Edwards, George. *Gleanings of Natural History*, 3 vols. (London, printed for the author, at the Royal College of Physicians, 1758-1764)

Ellis, John and Peter Woulfe. 'Extract of a Letter from John Ellis, Esquire, F.R.S. to Dr. Linnaeus, of Upsal, F.R.S. on the Animal Nature of the Genus of Zoophytes Called Corallina', *Philosophical Transactions (1683-1775)*, Vol. 57 (1767), pp. 404-427

Fayerman, Richard. *Contemplation, a Poetical Essay, on the Works of Creation*, (Norwich, printed by W. Chase, 1776)

Fielding, Henry. *The Modern Husband; A Comedy*, (London, printed for J. Watts, 1732)

Fielding, Sir John. *The Universal Mentor; Or, Entertaining Instructor and Consisting of Essays on the most Important Subjects in Life; Selected from the most Approved Historians, Biographers, and Moral Writers, Ancient and Modern*, (London, printed by T. Evans, 1777)

- Fordyce, James. *Poems by James Fordyce, D.D.* (London, printed by T. Spilsbury, 1786)
- Fordyce, William Sir. *A Letter to Sir John Sinclair; Concerning the Virtues of the Muriatic Acid or Spirit of Sea-salt, in the Cure of Putrid Diseases*, (London, printed by T. Spilsbury and Son, 1790)
- Fordyce, William Sir. *A New Inquiry into the Causes, Symptoms, and Cure, of Putrid and Inflammatory Fevers*, (London, printed for T. Cadell, 1773)
- Fortis, Alberto. *A Poetical Sketch of the Revolutions that have Happened in the Natural History of Our Planet; Intended as a Specimen of a Philosophical and Theological Poem*, (London, printed by B. White, 1786)
- Fortis, Alberto. *Saggio d'osservazioni sopra l'isola di Cherso ed Osero*, (Venice, printed by Gaspare Storti, 1771)
- Fortis, Alberto. *Travels into Dalmatia; Containing General Observations on the Natural History of that country and the Neighbouring Islands; The Natural Productions, Arts, Manners And Customs Of The Inhabitants: In a Series of Letters from Abbe Alberto Fortis, to the Earl of Bute, the Bishop of Londonderry, John Strange, Esq.* (London, printed for J. Robson, 1778)
- Franklin, Benjamin. *An Account of the New Invented Pennsylvanian Fire-Places*, (Philadelphia, printed and sold by B. Franklin, 1744)
- Gentleman, Francis. *Sejanus, a Tragedy*, (London, printed for R. Manby and H.S. Cox, 1752)
- Gentleman, Francis. *The Favourite, an Historical Tragedy*, (Dublin, printed by James Williams, 1770)
- Gentleman, Francis. *The Modish Wife*, (London, printed for T. Evans and J. Bell, 1775)
- Goldsmith, Oliver. *An Enquiry into the Present State of Polite Learning*, (London, printed for J. Dodsley, 1774)
- Goldsmith, Oliver. *She Stoops to Conquer: Or, The Mistakes of A Night. A Comedy.*, (London, printed by F. Newbery, 1773)
- Grove, Joseph. *Two Dialogues in the Elysian Fields, between Cardinal Wolsey, and Cardinal Ximenes*, (London, printed for the author by D. Leach, 1761)
- Grove, Joseph. *The History of the Life and Times of Cardinal Wolsey, Prime Minster to King Henry VIII in 4 vols*, (London, printed by J. Purser, 1742-44)

Grove, Joseph. *The Lives of all the Earls and Dukes of Devonshire*, (London, printed by J. Nourse, 1764)

Hales, Stephen. *An Account of some Experiments and Observations on Tar-Water: wherein is Shown the Quantity of Tar that is therein*, (London, printed for R. Manby and H. S. Cox, 1747)

Hatchett, William. *The Fall of Mortimer; an Historical Play*, (London, printed for G. Kearsly, 1763)

Hill, Henrietta, Lady. *An Address to the Public, by The Honble Lady Hill; Setting Forth the Consequences of the Late Sir John Hill's Acquaintance with The Earl of Bute*, (London, printed for J. Bell, Bookseller to his Royal Highness, the Prince of Wales, 1788)

Hill, John, Sir. *A Dissertation on Royal Societies*, (London, printed for John Doughty, 1750)

Hill, John, Sir. *An Idea of a Botanical Garden in England*, (London, printed for R. Baldwin, 1758)

Hill, John, Sir. *Eden: or, A Compleat Body of Gardening*, (London, printed for T. Osborne, T. Trye, S. Crowder and Co., and H. Woodgate, 1757).

Hill, John, Sir. *The Actor*, (London, printed for R. Griffiths, 1750)

Hill, John, Sir. *The British Herbal*, (London, printed for T. Osbourne and J. Shipton, 1756)

Hill, John, Sir. *The Useful Family Herbal or, An Account of all those English Plants*, (London, printed for W. Johnston, 1755)

Hill, John, Sir. *The Vegetable System*, (London, printed at the expense of the author, and sold by R. Baldwin, 1759 - 1775)

Howard, Leonard. *Miscellaneous Pieces in Prose and Verse*, (London, 1765)

Howard, Leonard. *Sermons on Several Occasions*, (London, printed for the author, and sold by J. Hodges, 1742)

Howard, Leonard. *The Divine Admonition, or Plan of Government, Given to David upon his Ascending the Throne of Israel*, (London, printed for the author, 1761)

Howard, Leonard. *The Newest Manual of Private Devotions*, (London, printed for S. Crowder, 1760)

Howard, Leonard. *The Religious and Politick Prudence of Hezekiah*, (London, printed for the author, 1759)

Hudson, Thomas. *An Ode on the Death of His Royal Highness Frederick Prince of Wales*, (London, printed by J. Swan, 1751)

Hume, David. *Philosophical Essays Concerning Human Understanding*, (London, printed by A. Millar, 1748)

Hutchins, Hassil. *A Catalogue of the Extensive and Capital Collection of Prints, Of the Rt. Hon. the Earl of Bute*, (London, 1794)

Johnson, Samuel. *The Plan of a Dictionary of the English Language; Addressed to the Right Honourable Philip Dormer, Earl of Chesterfield; One of His Majesty's Principal Secretaries of State*, (London, printed by J. and P. Knapton, T. Longman and T. Shewell, C. Hitch, A. Millar, and R. Dodsley, 1747)

Johnson, Samuel. *The Poetical Works of S. Johnson, LL.D'* (London, Cooke's edition, 1797)

Keith, George Skene. 'Lectures on Ecclesiastical History', and an Essay on Christian Temperance and Self-Denial by the Late George Campbell, D.D, (Aberdeen, by Bye and Law, Clerkenwell, 1800)

King, Thomas. *A Catalogue (part first) of Duplicates of Ores, Petrifications, Spars, Gems, Crystals, and Other Articles of Natural History, Selected from the Extensive and Valuable Collection of the Late Right Honourable John Earl of Bute*, (London, 1793)

King, Thomas. *A Catalogue (part the second) of Duplicates of Ores, Petrifications, Spars, Gems, Crystals, and Other Articles of Natural History, Selected from the Extensive and Valuable Collection of the Late Right Honourable John Earl of Bute*, (London, 1793)

King, Thomas. *A Catalogue (part the third and last) of Duplicates of Ores, Petrifications, Spars, Gems, Crystals, and Other Articles of Natural History, Selected from the Extensive and Valuable Collection of the Late Right Honourable John Earl of Bute*, (London, 1794)

Kirby, Joshua. 'An Historical Account of the Twelve Prints of Monasteries, Castles, Ancient Churches, and Monuments, in the County of Suffolk, which were Drawn by Joshua Kirby', (Ipswich, printed by W. Craighton, 1748)

Kirby, Joshua. *Dr. Brook Taylor's Method of Perspective Made Easy; both in Theory and in Practice*, (Ipswich, printed by W. Craighton, 1754)

Kirby, Joshua. *The Description and Use of a New Instrument Called, an Architectonic Sector*, (London, printed by R. Francklin, 1761)

Kirby, Joshua. *The Perspective of Architecture, A Work Entirely New; Deduced from the Principles of Dr. Brook Taylor*, (London, printed by R. Francklin, 1761)

Leigh, George and John Sotheby. *A Catalogue of the Botanical and Natural History, part of the Library of the Late John, Earl of Bute*, (London, 1794)

Lockman, John. *Ode to the Earl of Bute*, (London, printed by R. and J. Dodsley, 1758)

Lockman, John. *Truth: A Vision and most Humbly Addressed to the Prince of Wales: on His Royal Highness's Birth-Day, June 4, 1758*, (London, printed by R. and J. Dodsley, 1758)

Lyle, David. *The Art of Short Hand Improved; being an Universal Character Adapted to the English Language*, (London, printed by A. Millar, 1762)

Macpherson, James. *Temora, an ancient epic poem, in eight books: together with several other poems, composed by Ossian, the son of Fingal*, (London, printed for T. Becket and P.A De Hondt, 1763)

Macpherson, James. *The Works of Ossian, the Son of Fingal in 2 vols.*, (London, printed by T. Becket and P. A. Dehondt, 1765)

Macquer, Pierre Jean. *Elemens de Chymie Theorique*, (Paris, printed by Jean Thomas Herissant, 1751)

Mallet, David. *Elvira*, (London, printed for A. Millar, 1763)

Mallet, David. *Truth, in rhyme: addressed to a certain noble Lord*, (London, printed for A. Millar, 1761)

Martyn, Thomas. *A Short Account of the Late Donation of a Botanic Garden to the University of Cambridge by the Revd Dr. Walker, Vice-Master of Trinity College; with Rules and Orders for the Government of it*, (Cambridge, printed by J. Bentham, 1763)

Miller, Philip. *The Gardeners Dictionary*, (Dublin, printed by S. Powell, 1732)

Mure, William. *Selections from the Family Papers preserved at Caldwell*, Vol. II (Glasgow, 1854)

Murphy, Arthur. *The Orphan of China*, (London, printed by P. Vaillant, 1759)

Pope, Alexander. *The Works of Alexander Pope, Esq.* 6 vols., (London, printed by A. Millar, R. Tonson, H. Lintot, and C. Bathurst, 1764)

Ralph, James. *Zeuma: Or the Love of Liberty*, (London, printed by C. Ackers, 1729)

Reid, Andrew. *A Letter to the Reverend Dr. Hales, Concerning the Nature of Tar, and a Method of Obtaining it's Medical Virtues, Free from its Hurtful Oils*, (London, printed for R. Manby and H.S. Cox, 1747)

Reid, Andrew. *And Abstract of Sir Isaac Newton's Chronology of Ancient Kingdoms*, (London, printed for William Innys, 1732)

Reid, Andrew. *An Essay on Logarithms Deducing the Whole Doctrine Concerning them from Pure Arithmetical Principles*, (London, printed for A. Millar, 1767)

Reid, Andrew. *Elements of the Theory and Practice of Chymistry; Translated from Éléments de Chymie-pratique and Éléments de Chymie Théorique by Pierre Joseph Macquer*, (London, printed for A. Millar, and J. Nourse, 1758)

Reid, Andrew (ed.) *The Present State of the Republick of Letters*, 18 vols., (London, printed for William and John Inny, 1728-1736)

Robson, James. *Some Memoirs of the Life and Works of George Edwards, Fellow of the Royal and Antiquarian Societies*, (London, printed for J. Robson, 1776)

Skinner and Co. *A Catalogue of the Portland Museum, lately the property of the Duchess Dowager of Portland, Deceased*, (London, 1786)

Smellie, William. *Account of the Institution and Progress of the Society of the Antiquaries of Scotland*, (Edinburgh, printed by William Creech and Thomas Cadell, 1782)

Smith, William. *An Authentic Journal of the Expedition to Belleisle, and of the Siege of the Citadel of Palais*, (London, printed for G. Woodfall, 1761)

Spens, Henry. *The Republic of Plato; Translated from the Greek by H. Spens, D.D. with a Preliminary Discourse Concerning the Philosophy of the Ancients by the Translator*, (Glasgow, printed by Robert and Andrew Foulis, 1763)

Strahan, Alexander. *The Aeneid of Virgil; Translated into Blank Verse, by Alexander Strahan*, (London, printed by A. Millar, T. Cadell, T. Payne, 1767)

Strange, Sir Robert. *An Inquiry into the Rise and Establishment of the Royal Academy of Art*, (London, printed for E. and C. Dilly, J. Robson, J. Walter, 1775)

Taylor, Brook. *Linear Perspective: Or, A New Method of Representing Justly all Manner of Objects as they Appear to the Eye in all Situations*, (London, printed for R, 1715)

Thornton, Robert James. *Medical Extracts, Being a Concentrated View of Some Late Discoveries in Chemistry, and the New Theory and Practice of Physic*, (London, printed by Robinson, Johnson, Dilly, Owen and Cox, 1794)

Walker, John. 'Account of the Irruption of Solway Moss in December 16, 1772; In a Letter from Mr. John Walker, to the Earl of Bute, and Communicated by His Lordship to the Royal Society', *The Philosophical Transactions (1683-1775)*, Vol. 62, (1772), pp. 123-127

Walker, John. *An Economical History of the Hebrides and Highlands of Scotland*, (Edinburgh, University Press, 1808)

Weston, Richard. *Flora Anglican or The English Flora*, (London, printed by J. Millan, 1775)

Weston, Richard. *The Universal Botanist and Nurseryman*, (London, printed for J. Bell, 1770)

Wilkes, John. *The North Briton, Issues 1-46*, (London, printed for W. Bingley, 1769)

White, James. *The English Verb; A Grammatical Essay, in the Didactic Form*, (London, printed by A. Millar, 1761)

Woulfe, Peter. 'Experiments on the Distillation of Acids, Volatile Alkalies, and Shewing How They May be Condensed without Loss, and How thereby We May Avoid Disagreeable and Noxious Fumes', *Philosophical Transactions (1683-1775)*, Vol. 57 (1767), pp. 517-536

A Proposal for an Annual Subscription, for the Support of the Botanic Garden at Cambridge, (Cambridge, printed by J. Bentham, 1765)

An Oration, as it was Spoken at the Robin-Hood, Monday the 22d of April, to a Splendid Audience; Occasioned by the Death of his Royal Highness the Prince of Wales; In which his Character is Pourtray'd, (London, printed by J. Swan and M. Cooper, 1751)

Synopsis of the Contents of the British Museum, 7th ed., (London, printed by Cox and Baylis, 1814)

The Art of Conversing; Translated from the French, (London, printed by T. Lewis and J. Bew, 1777)

The Blood-Hounds; a Political Tale, Inscribed to the Earl of Bute, (London, printed by W. Griffin, 1763)

The British Poets; including Translations, Vol. 67, John Armstrong and Charles Churchill, (Chiswick, printed for C. Whittingham, 1822)

The Correspondent; A Selection of Letters, (London, printed for T. Cadell, Jun. and W. Davies, 1796)

The True-Born Scot; Inscribed to John Earl of Bute, (Dublin, printed for P. Wilson, S. Price, J. Potts, J. Williams, 1764)

When Dr. Walker founded a Botanic Garden, in the Year 1760, there was no Provision in the University of Cambridge for the Study of Natural History in any of its Branches, Except the Woodwardian Collection of Fossils, (Cambridge, 1773)

'Earl of Bute's Botanical Tables', *Bulletin of Miscellaneous Information (Royal Gardens, Kew)*, Vol. 1892, No.72, pp. 306-308

'Historical Account of Kew to 1841', *Bulletin of Miscellaneous Information (Royal Gardens, Kew)*, Vol. 1891, (1891), pp. 179-327

SECONDARY SOURCES

Albritton Jonsson, Fredrik. *Enlightenment's Frontier: The Scottish Highlands and the Origins of Environmentalism*, (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2013)

Allan, David. 'The Scottish Enlightenment and the Politics of Provincial Culture: The Perth Literary and Antiquarian Society, ca. 1784-1790', *Eighteenth-Century Life*, Vol. 27, No. 3 (2003), pp. 1-29

Allan, D.G.C. and Robert E. Schofield. *Stephen Hales: Scientist and Philanthropist*, (Scholar Press, 1980)

Armstrong, Alan. W. 'Forget not Mee & My Garden...' *Selected Letters, 1725-1768 of Peter Collinson, F.R.S.* (Philadelphia, American Philosophical Society, 2002)

Azzolini, Monica. 'Anatomy of a Dispute: Leonardo, Pacioli and Scientific Courtly Entertainment in Renaissance Milan', *Early Science and Medicine*, Vol. 9, (2004), pp. 115-135

Baird, Rosemary. *Goodwood: Art and Architecture, Sport and Family*, (London, Francis Lincoln Limited, 2007)

Baker, David Erskine. *Biographia Dramatica; or, a Companion to the Playhouse*, 2 vols., (London, printed by Mess. Rivingtons; T. Payne and son; L. Davis; T. Longman; G. Robinson; J. Dodsley; J. Nichols; J. Debret; and T. Evans, 1782)

Bald, R.C. 'Sir William Chambers and the Chinese Garden', *Journal of the History of Ideas*, Vol. 11 (1950), pp. 287-320

Blanning, T.C.W. *The Culture Of Power And The Power Of Culture: Old Regime Europe, 1660-1789*, (Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2003)

Barker, A. D. 'The Early Career of William Dodd', *Transactions of the Cambridge Bibliographical Society*, Vol. 8, No. 2 (1982), pp. 217-235

Barker, Hannah. *Newspapers and English Society 1695-1855*, (New York, Routledge, 1999)

Bassin, Joan. 'The English Landcape Garden in the Eighteenth Century: The Cultural Importance of an English Institution', *Albion*, Vol. 11, (1979), pp. 15-32

Bayly, Christopher. *Imperial Meridian: The British Empire and the World, 1789-1830*, (New York, Routledge, 2016)

Beattie, J. M. 'Sir John Fielding and Public Justice: The Bow Street Magistrates' Court, 1754-1780', *Law and History Review*, Vol. 25, No. 1 (Spring, 2007), pp. 61-100

Beatty, F. M. 'The Scientific Work of the Third Earl Stanhope', *Notes and Records of the Royal Society of London*, Vol. 11, (1955), pp. 202-221

Bedini, Silvio A. *Patrons, Artisans and Instruments of Science 1600-1750*, (Hampshire, Ashgate Publishing Limited, 1999)

Belden, Louise Conway. 'Humphry Marshall's Trade in Plants of the New World for Gardens and Forests of the Old World', *Winterthur Portfolio*, Vol. 2 (1965), pp. 106-126

Bellis, Vincent. 'John Lawson's Plant Collections from North Carolina 1710-1711', *Castanea*, 73 (4): 376-389, December 2009.

Benedict, Barbara M. 'Collecting Trouble: Sir Hans Sloane's Literary Reputation in Eighteenth-Century Britain', *Eighteenth-Century Life*, Volume 36, Number 2, Spring 2012, pp.111-142

Bermingham, Ann and John Brewer. *The Consumption of Culture, 1600-1800: Image, Object, Text*, (New York, Routledge, 1997)

Berridge, Vanessa. *The Princess's Garden: Royal Intrigue and the Untold Story of Kew*, (Amberley Publishing, 2015)

Biagioli, Mario. 'Etiquette, Interdependence, and Sociability in Seventeenth-Century Science', *Critical Inquiry*, Vol. 22 (1996), pp. 193-238

Biagioli, Mario. *Galileo Courtier: The Practice of Science in the Culture of Absolutism*, (Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 1994)

Biagioli, Mario. *Galileo's Instruments of Credit: Telescopes, Images, Secrecy*, (Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 2006)

Birkbeck Hill, George. *Boswell's Life of Johnson*, 6 vols., (New York, Bigelow, Brown & Co., Inc, 1887)

Black, Jeremy. *Culture in Eighteenth-Century Britain: A Subject of Taste*, (London, Hambledon Continuum, 2005)

Black, Jeremy. *The British Abroad: The Grand Tour in the Eighteenth Century*, (The History

Press, 2011)

Bohls, Elizabeth A. and Ian Duncan. *Travel Writing 1700-1830: An Anthology*, (Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2005)

Bowler, Peter J. and Morus, Iwan Morus. *Making Modern Science: A Historical Study*, (Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 2005)

Brewer, John. 'The Misfortunes of Lord Bute: A Case-Study in Eighteenth-Century Political Argument and Public Opinion', *The Historical Journal*, Vol.16 (1973), pp. 3-43

Brewer, John. *The Pleasure of the Imagination: English Culture in the Eighteenth-Century*, (New York, Routledge, 2003)

Broadie, Alexander. *The Scottish Enlightenment: An Anthology*, (Edinburgh, Canongate Classics, 1997)

Brooke, John. 'The Library of King George III', *The Yale University Library Gazette*, Vol. 52, No. 1 (July 1977), pp. 33-45

Brown, Iain Gordon. 'Allan Ramsay's Rise and Reputation', *The Volume of the Walpole Society*, Vol. 50 (1984), pp. 209-247

Brown, Janet. 'Botany for Gentlemen: Erasmus Darwin and "The Loves of the Plants"', *Isis*, Vol. 80 (1989), pp. 593-621

Brown, Mary Elizabeth. *Dedications: An Anthology of the Forms used from the Earliest Days of Book-Making to the Present Time*, (New York, Burt Franklin, 1913)

Buchtel, John A. 'Book Dedications and the Death of a Patron: The Memorial Engraving in Chapman's Homer', *Book History*, Vol. 7 (2004), pp. 1-29

Bullion, John L. 'Security and Economy: The Bute Administration's Plans for the American Army and Revenue, 1762-1763', *The William and Mary Quarterly*, Vol.45 (1988), pp. 499-509

Bullion, John L. 'The Prince's Mentor: A New Perspective on the Friendship between George III and Lord Bute during the 1750s', *Albion*, Vol. 21 (1989), pp. 34-55

Burnett, Linda Andersson. 'An Eighteenth-Century Ecology of Knowledge: Patronage and Natural History', *Culture Unbound*, Volume 6, 2014: 1275-1297

Cantor, G.N. J.R.R. Christie, M.J.S. Hodge and R.C. Olby (eds.), *Companion to the History of Modern Science* (London, Routledge, 1996)

Cardwell, John M. *Arts and Arms: Literature, Politics, and Patriotism during the Seven Years War*, (Manchester, Manchester University Press, 2004)

Cater, Jeremy J. 'The Making of Principal Robertson in 1762: Politics and the University of Edinburgh in the Second Half of the Eighteenth Century', *The Scottish Historical Review*, Vol. 49, No. 147, Part 1 (Apr., 1970), pp. 60-84

Caw, James L. 'Allan Ramsay, Portrait Painter, 1713-1784' *The Volume of the Walpole Society*, Vol. 25 (1936-1937), pp. 33-81

Chambers, Douglas. *The Planters of the English Landscape Garden: Botany, Trees, and the 'Georgics'*, (New Haven, Yale University Press, 1993)

Chambers, Douglas. 'Painting with Living Pencils: Lord Petre', *Garden History*, Vol. 19 (1991), pp. 60-76

Cheape, Hugh. 'The Society of Antiquaries of Scotland and their Museum: Scotland's National Collection and a National Discourse', *International Journal of Historical Archaeology*, Vol. 14, No. 3 (June 2010), pp. 357-373

Clark, H. F. 'Eighteenth Century Elysiums: The Role of "Association" in the Landscape Movement', *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes*, Vol. 6, (1943), pp. 165-189

Clark, Ian D. L. 'From Protest to Reaction: The Moderate Regime in the Church of Scotland 1752-1805', in Nicholas T. Phillipson and Rosalind Mitcheson (eds.) *Scotland in the Age of Improvement: essays in Scottish history in the eighteenth century*, (Edinburgh, Edinburgh University Press, 1970)

Clark-Kennedy, A.E. *Stephen Hales, D.D. F.R.S; An Eighteenth Century Biography*, (New Jersey, The Gregg Press, 1965)

Clayton, John, John Bartram, Peter Collinson, William Byrd, and Isham Randolph. 'Letters of John Clayton, John Bartram, Peter Collinson, William Byrd, Isham Randolph', *William and Mary Quarterly*, Second Series, Vol. 6. No. 4 (Oct., 1926), pp. 303-325

Chase, Isabel W. 'William Mason and Sir William Chambers' Dissertation on Oriental Gardening', *The Journal of English and Germanic Philology*, Vol. 35, No. 4 (Oct. 1936), pp. 517-529

Coats, Alice M. *Lord Bute: An Illustrated life of John Stuart, third Earl of Bute 1713-1792*, (Aylesbury, Shire Publications Ltd., 1975)

Coffey, David R. 'Venus in the Eighteenth-Century English Garden', *Garden History*, Vol. 28 (2000), pp. 173-193

Colley, Linda. *Britons: Forging the Nation 1707-1837*, (London, Yale University Press, 2005)

Connell, Philip. 'British Identities and the Politics of Ancient Poetry in Later Eighteenth-Century England', *The Historical Journal*, Vol. 49, No. 1 (Mar., 2006), pp. 161-192

Cook, Alan. 'Rome and the Royal Society, 1660-1740', *Notes and Records of the Royal Society of London*, Vol. 58, No. 1 (Jan., 2004), pp. 3-19

Cormack, Malcolm. 'The Ledgers of Sir Joshua Reynolds', *The Volume of the Walpole Society*, Vol. 42 (1968-1970), pp. 105-169

Cowan, Brian. *The Social Life of Coffee: The Emergence of the British Coffeehouse*, (New Haven, Yale University Press, 2005)

Cremers, C. M., 'Our Heritage: The Dutch Garden, an Introduction to Its History', *Garden History*, Vol. 2 (1973), pp. 10-29

Crosland, Maurice. 'Relationships between the Royal Society and the Acadmie des Sciences in the Late Eighteenth Century', *Notes and Records of the Royal Society of London*, Vol. 59, No. 1 (Jan. 22, 2005), pp. 25-34

Curley, Thomas M. *Samuel Johnson, the Ossian Fraud, and the Celtic Revival in Great Britain*, (Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 2009)

Da Costa, P. Fontes. 'The Culture of Curiosity at The Royal Society in the First Half of the Eighteenth Century', *Notes and Records of the Royal Society of London*, Vol. 56, No. 2 (May, 2002), pp. 147-166

Da Costa, P. Fontes. 'The Making of Extraordinary Facts: Authentication of Singularities of Nature at the Royal Society of London in the first half of the Eighteenth Century', *Studies in History and Philosophy of Science*, 33 (2002), pp. 265-288

Da Costa, P. Fontes. 'The Understanding of Monsters at the Royal Society in the first half of the Eighteenth Century', *Endeavour*, Vol. 24(1) 2000, pp. 34-39

Dawbarn, Frances. 'Patronage and Power: The College of Physicians and the Jacobean Court', *The British Journal for the History of Science*, Vol. 31, No. 1 (Mar., 1998), pp. 1-19

De Beer, E. S. 'The Earliest Fellows of the Royal Society', *Notes and Records of the Royal Society of London*, Vol. 7, No. 2 (Apr., 1950), pp. 172-192

Devine, T.M. *The Transformation of Rural Scotland: Social Change and the Agrarian Economy, 1660-1815*, (Edinburgh, John Donald Publishers Ltd., 1999)

Davis, Leith. *Acts of Union: Scotland and the Literary Negotiation of the British Nation 1707-1830*, (Stanford, Stanford University Press, 1998)

Desmond, Ray. *Kew: The History of the Royal Botanic Gardens*, (London, The Harvill Press, 1998)

Drayton, Richard. *Nature's Government: Science, Imperial Britain, and the 'Improvement' of the World*, (London, Yale University Press, 2000)

Dwyer, John. *Virtuous Discourse: Sensibility and Community in Late Eighteenth-Century Scotland*, (Edinburgh, John Donald Publishers, 1987)

Eagles, Robin. 'No more to be said'? Reactions to the death of Frederick Lewis, prince of Wales', *Historical Research*, Vol. 80, Issue 209 (2007), pp. 346-367

Easterby-Smith, Sarah. 'Reputation in a box. Objects, communication and trust in late 18th-century botanical networks', *History of Science*, Vol. 53, Issue 2, pp.180-208

Easterby-Smith, Sarah. 'Selling Beautiful Knowledge: Amateurship, Botany and the Market-Place in Late Eighteenth-Century France', *Journal for Eighteenth-Century Studies*, Vol. 36, No. 4 (2013)

Easterby-Smith, Sarah and Emily Senior. 'The Cultural Production of Natural Knowledge: Contexts, Terms, Themes', *Journal for Eighteenth-Century Studies*, Vol. 36, No. 4 (2013), pp. 471-476

Eddy, Matthew D. and David M. Knight. *Science and beliefs: from natural philosophy to natural science, 1700-1900*, (Aldershot, Ashgate, 2005)

Eddy, Matthew D. 'Scottish Chemistry, Classification and the Early Mineralogical Career of the 'Ingenious' Rev. Dr. John Walker (1746 to 1779)', *The British Journal for the History of Science*, Vol. 35 (2002), pp. 411-438

Ede, Andrew and Lesley B. Cormack. *A History of Science in Society: From Philosophy to Utility*, (Toronto, Broadview Press, 2004)

Edmondson, John and Claire Smith. 'The Linnean Society's Herbarium: A Resource for Eighteenth-Century Research', *Garden History*, Vol. 27, No. 2 (Winter, 1999), pp. 244-252

Edwards, Edward. *A Practical Treatise of Perspective on the Principles of Dr. Brook Taylor*, (London, Leigh & Sotheby, 1806)

Ellis, Markman. *Eighteenth-Century Coffee-House Culture, vol.4 Science and History Writings*, (Pickering & Chatto, 2006)

Emerson, Roger L. *Academic Patronage in the Scottish Enlightenment: Glasgow, Edinburgh and St. Andrews Universities*, (Edinburgh, Edinburgh University Press, 2008)

Emerson, Roger L. *'An Enlightened Duke: The Life of Archibald Campbell (1682-1761), Earl of Ilay, 3rd Duke of Argyll*, (Kilterran, Humming Earth, 2013)

Emerson, Roger L. 'Sir Robert Sibbald, Kt, the Royal Society of Scotland and the Origins of the Scottish Enlightenment', *Annals of Science*, Vol. 45, Issue 1, 1988, pp. 41-72

Emerson, Roger L. 'The Philosophical Society of Edinburgh 1748-1768', *The British Journal for the History of Science*, Vol. 14 (1981), pp. 133-176

Emerson, Roger L. 'The Philosophical Society of Edinburgh 1768-1783', *The British Journal for the History of Science*, Vol. 18 (1985), pp. 255-303

Emerson, Roger L. 'The Scientific Interests of Archibald Campbell, 3rd Duke of Argyll (1682-1761)', *Annals of Science*, 59 (2002), pp. 21-56

Emerson, Roger L. 'The Scottish Enlightenment and the End of the Philosophical Society of Edinburgh', *The British Journal for the History of Science*, Vol. 21 (1988), pp. 33-66

Endersby, Jim. 'A Garden Enclosed: Botanical Bater in Sydney, 1818-39', *The British Journal for the History of Science*, Vol. 33 (2000), pp. 313-334

Endersby, Jim. *Imperial Nature: Joseph Hooker and the Practices of Victorian Science*, (Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 2008)

Fara, Patricia. 'A Treasure of Hidden Vertues': The Attraction of Magnetic Marketing', *The British Journal for the History of Science*, Vol. 28, No. 1, Science Lecturing in the Eighteenth Century (Mar., 1995), pp. 5-35

Fara, Patricia. *Sex, Botany and Empire: The Story of Carl Linnaeus and Joseph Banks*, (Cambridge, Icon Books Ltd., 2003)

Felus, Kate. 'Boats and Boating in the Designed Landscape, 1720-1820', *Garden History*, Vol. 34 (2006), pp. 22-46

Fordham, Douglas. 'Allan Ramsay's Enlightenment: Or, Hume and the Patronizing Portrait', *The Art Bulletin*, Vol. 88, No. 3 (Sep., 2006), pp. 508-524

Foss, Michael. *The Age of Patronage: The Arts in Society 1660-1750*, (London, Hamish Hamilton Ltd., 1971)

Franklin, Robert. *The Stuarts of Highcliffe*, (Dorest, Natula Publications, 1998)

Fraser Kevin J. 'John Hill and the Royal Society in the Eighteenth Century', *Notes and Records of the Royal Society of London*, Vol. 48, No. 1 (Jan., 1994), pp. 43- 67

Freeman, John. *Life of the Rev. William Kirby*, (London, Wilson and Ogliviv, 1852)

Fulton, Henry L. 'Private Tutoring in Scotland: The Example of Mure of Caldwell', *Eighteenth-Century Life*, Vo. 27, No. 3 (2003), pp. 53-69

Furniss, Tom. 'James Hutton's Geological Tours of Scotland: Romanticism, Literary Strategies, and the Scientific Quest', *Science and Education*, (2014) 23: 565-588

Gascoigne, John. *Joseph Banks and the English Enlightenment: Useful Knowledge and Polite Culture*, (Cambridge, University of Cambridge Press, 1994)

Gascoigne, John. 'Politics, Patronage and Newtonianism: The Cambridge Example', *The Historical Journal*, Vol. 27 (1984), pp. 1-24

Gascoigne, John. 'The Royal Society and the Emergence of Science as an Instrument of State Policy', *The British Journal for the History of Science*, Vol. 32, No. 2, Did the Royal Society Matter in the Eighteenth Century? (Jun., 1999), pp. 171-184

Gaskill, Howard., (ed.). *The Reception of Ossian in Europe*, (London, Thoemmes Continuum, 2004)

Gibson, Susannah. *Animal, Vegetable, Mineral? How Eighteenth-Century Science Disrupted the Natural Order*, (Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2015)

Glickman, Gabriel. 'Parliament, the Tories and Frederick, Prince of Wales', *Parliamentary History*, Vol. 30, pt. 2 (2011), pp. 120-141

Golinski, Jan. *Making Natural Knowledge: Constructivism and the History of Science*, (Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1998)

Golinski, Jan. *Science as Public Culture: Chemistry and Enlightenment in Britain, 1760-1820*, (New York, Cambridge University Press, 1999)

Gooding David, Trevor Pinch, and Simon Schaffer. *The Uses of Experiment: Studies in the Natural Sciences*, (New York, Cambridge University Press, 1993).

Gribbin, Mary and John Gribbin. *Flower Hunters*, (New York, Oxford University Press, 2008)

Griffin, Dustin. *Literary Patronage in England 1650-1800*, (Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1996)

Griffith, Samuel B. *The War for American Independence: From 1760 to the Surrender at Yorktown in 1781*, (Chicago, Illinois University Press, 2002)

Guerra, Corinna. 'If You Don't Have a Good Laboratory, Find a Good Volcano: Mount Vesuvius as a Natural Chemical Laboratory in Eighteenth-Century Italy', *Ambix*, 62 (3), 2015, pp. 245-265

Gwynne-Jones, Allan. 'The Life and Works of Sir Joshua Reynolds, P.R.A', *Journal of the Royal Society of Arts*, Vol. 104, No. 4985 (31st August, 1956), pp. 793-807

Hall, A. Rupert. *Isaac Newton: Eighteenth-Century Perspectives*, (New York, Oxford University Press, 1999)

Hall, A. Rupert and Marie Boas Hall. 'The Intellectual Origins of the Royal Society, London and Oxford', *Notes and Records of the Royal Society*, Vol. 23, No. 2 (Dec., 1968), pp. 157-168

Hall, Marie Boas. 'Oldenburg and the Art of Scientific Communication', *The British Journal for the History of Science*, Vol. 2, No. 4 (Dec., 1965), pp. 277-290

Hall, Marie Boas. 'The Royal Society's Role in the Diffusion of Information in the Seventeenth Century', *Notes and Records of the Royal Society*, Vol. 29, No. 2 (mar., 1975), pp. 173-192

Hallock, Thomas. 'Male Pleasure and the Genders of Eighteenth-Century Botanic Exchange: A Garden Tour', *The William and Mary Quarterly*, Vol. 62 (2005), pp. 687-718

Hankins, Thomas L. *Science and the Enlightenment*, (New York, Cambridge University Press, 2007)

Haycock, David Boyd. *William Stukeley: Science, Religion and Archaeology in Eighteenth-Century England*, (New York, The Boydell Press, 2002)

Heilbron, J. L. *Electricity in the 17th and 18th Centuries: A Study of Early Modern Physics*, (London, University of California Press, 1979)

Hibbert, Christopher. *George III: A Personal History*, (London, Penguin, 1998)

Hickman, Clare. 'The garden as a laboratory: the role of domestic gardens as places of scientific exploration in the long 18th century', *Post-Medieval Archaeology* 48/1 (2014), pp. 229-247

Hill, Arthur W. 'The History and Functions of Botanic Gardens', *Annals of the Missouri Botanical Garden*, Vol.2 (1915), pp. 185-240

Higgitt, Rebekah. 'President, Patron, Friend and Lover: Charles Montagu's Significance to the History of Science', *Notes and Records of the Royal Society of London*, Vol. 59, (2005), pp. 155-170

Houston, Rab and Manon Van Der Heijden. 'Hands across the Water: The Making and Breaking of Marriage between Dutch and Scots in the Mid-Eighteenth Century', *Law and History Review*, Vol. 15, No. 2 (Autumn, 1997), pp. 215-242

Hunt, John Dixon and Peter Willis. *The Genius of the Place: The English Landscape Garden 1620-1820*, (London, MIT Press, 1988)

Hunter, Michael. *Establishing the New Science: The Experience of the Early Royal Society*, (Woodbridge, The Boydell Press, 1989)

Hunter, Michael. *Science and Society in Restoration England*, (Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1981)

Hunter, Michael. *Studies of Intellectual Change in Late 17th Century Britain: Science and the Shape of Orthodoxy*, (Woodbridge, The Boydell Press, 1995)

Hunting, Penelope. 'Isaac Rand and the Apothecaries' Physic Garden at Chelsea', *Garden History*, Vol. 30 (2002), pp. 1-23

Irving, Sarah. 'Public Knowledge, Natural Philosophy, and the Eighteenth-Century Republic of Letters', *Early American Literature*, Volume 49. Number 1, pp. 67-88

Jardine, Lisa. *Ingenious Pursuits: Building the Scientific Revolution*, (London, Little, Brown and Company, 1999)

Jenkins, Susan. *Portrait of a Patron: The Patronage and Collecting of James Brydges, 1st Duke of Chandos (1674-1744)*, (Cornwall, Ashgate Publishing Limited, 2007)

Jopling, Joseph. *Dr. Brook Taylor's Principles of Linear Perspective; or; The Art of Designing upon a Plane the Representation of all Sorts of Objects, as they Appear to the Eye*, (London, M. Taylor, 1835)

Jungnickel, Christa and Russell McCormmach. *Cavendish - The Experimental Life*, (Max Planck Institute for the History of Science, 2016)

Jung, Sandro. *David Mallet, Anglo-Scot: Poetry, Patronage, and Politics in the Age of Union*, (New Jersey, Associated University Presses, 2008)

Kaufman, Robert R. 'The Patron-Client Concept and Macro-Politics: Prospects and Problems', *Comparative Studies in Society and History*, Vol. 16, (1974), pp. 284-308

Kinch, Michael P. 'The Meteoric Career of William Young Jr. (1742-1785), Pennsylvania Botanist to the Queen', *The Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography*, Vol. 110 (1986), pp. 359-388

Klein, Ursula and E.C Spary. *Materials and Expertise in Early Modern Europe: Between Market and Laboratory*, (Chicago, The University of Chicago Press, 2010)

Knoeff, Rina. *Herman Boerhaave (1668-1738): Calvinist Chemist and Physician*, (Amsterdam, Koninklijke Nederlandse Akademie van Wetenschappen, 2002)

Koerner, Lisa. *Linnaeus: Nature and Nation*, (London, Harvard University Press, 1999)

Kolbl-Ebert, M. *Geology and Religion: A History of Harmony and Hostility*, (London, The Geological Society of London, 2009)

Korshin, Paul J. 'Types of Eighteenth-Century Literary Patronage', *Eighteenth-Century Studies*, Vol. 7 (1974), pp. 453-473

Kuhn, Thomas S. *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*, (Chicago, The University of Chicago Press, 1996)

Laird, Mark. *The Flowering of the Landscape Garden: English Pleasure Grounds 1720-1800*, (Philadelphia, University of Pennsylvania Press, 1999)

Langford, Paul. *A Polite and Commercial People: England 1727-1783*, (New York, Oxford University Press, 1998)

Leonard, Dick. *Eighteenth-Century Premiers: Walpole to the Younger Pitt*, (New York, Palgrave Macmillan, 2011)

Lewis, Cherry L.E. "'Our favourite science": Lord Bute and James Parkinson searching for a Theory of the Earth', *Geological Society, London, Special Publications 2009*; v. 310; pp. 111-126

Lindsay, Ann. *Seeds of Blood and Beauty: Scottish Plant Explorers*, (Edinburgh, Birlinn Limited, 2005)

Lingburg, David C. and Ronald L. Numbers. *God and Nature: Historical Essays on the Encounter between Christianity and Science*, (London, University of California Press, 1986)

Lingburg, David C. and Robert S. Westman. *Reappraisals of the Scientific Revolution*, (Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1990)

Liu, Yu. 'The Importance of the Chinese Connection: The Origin of the English Garden', *Eighteenth-Century Life*, Vol. 27, No. 3 (Fall 2003), pp. 69-98

Lopez, Claude-Anne. 'Benjamin Franklin and William Dodd: A New Look at an Old Cause Célèbre', *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society*, Vol. 129, No. 3 (Sep., 1985), pp. 260-267

Lovat-Fraser, J.A. *John Stuart, Earl of Bute*, (Cambridge, 1912)

MacDonnel, D. E. *Dictionary of Quotations, from the Latin, French, Greek, Spanish, and Italian Languages*, (London, E.T Gover, 1858)

Malloch, William. 'The Earl of Bute's Machine Organ: A Touchstone of Taste', *Early Music*, Vol. 11 (1983), pp. 172-183

Marandet, François. 'The Formative Years of Jean-Etienne Liotard', *The Burlington Magazine*, Vol. 145, No. 1201 (Apr., 2003), pp. 297-300

Marotti, Arthur F. 'Patronage, Poetry, and Print', *The Yearbook of English Studies*, Vol. 21, Politics, Patronage and Literature in England 1558-1658 (1991), pp. 1-26

Martin, Floyd W. 'Sir Joshua Reynolds's "Invention": Intellectual Activity as a Foundation of Art', *Art Education*, Vol. 40, No. 6 (Nov., 1987), pp. 6-15

Mason, A. S. *George Edwards: The Bedell and his Birds*, (London, Royal College of Physicians of London, 1992)

McClellan III and Francois Regourd. 'The Colonial Machine: French Science and Colonisation in the Ancien Regime', *Osiris*, Vol. 15 (2000), pp. 31-50

McKelvey, James Lee. *George III and Lord Bute: The Leicester House Years*, (Durham, Duke University Press, 1973)

Meldrum, A. N. 'Lavoisier's Early Work in Science 1673-1771', *Isis*, Vol. 20 (Jan., 1934), pp. 396-425

Miller, David Philip. 'Into the Valley of Darkness': Reflections on the Royal Society in the Eighteenth Century', *History of Science*, Vol. 27 (2) (1989), pp. 155-166

Miller, David Philip. 'The Hardwicke Circle: The Whig Supremacy and its Demise in the 18th Century Royal Society', *Notes and Records of the Royal Society of London*, Vol. 52, No. 1 (Jan., 1998), pp. 73-91

Miller, David Philip. 'The Usefulness of Natural Philosophy: The Royal Society and the Culture of Practical Utility in the Later Eighteenth Century', *British Journal for the History of Science*, Vol. 32, (Jun., 1999), pp. 185-201

Moran, Bruce T. *Patronage and Institutions: Science, Technology, and Medicine at the European Court 1500-1750*, (The Boydell Press, Suffolk, 1991)

Morton, A.G. *History of Botanical Science*, (London, Academic Press, 1986)

Muller-Wille Staffan and Karen Reeds. 'A translation of the Carl Linnaeus's introduction to *Genera plantarum* (1737)', *Studies in History and Philosophy of Biological and Biomedical Sciences*, 38 (2007), pp. 563-572

Nicholas, John. *Literary Anecdotes of the Eighteenth Century*, (London, printed by Nicholas, Son, and Bentley, 1814)

Peplow, Mark. 'History of Science: Elements of Romance', *Nature*, 493 (7434), p. 606

Percy, Thomas. *Letters from Thomas Percy, D.D Afterwards Bishop of Dromore, John Callander of Cragforth, David Herd, and Others, to George Paton*, (Edinburgh, printed for John Stevenson, 1830)

Pincus, Steve. 'Coffee Politicians Does Create: Coffeehouses and Restoration Political Culture', *The Journal of Modern History*, Vol. 67, (1995), pp. 807-834

Pitson, Tony. 'George Campbell's Critique of Hume on Testimony', *The Journal of Scottish Philosophy*, Vol. 4 (1) 2006, pp. 1-15

Potter, Jennifer. *Strange Blooms: The Curious Lives and Adventures of the John Tradescants*, (London, Atlantic Books, 1996)

Porter, David. *The Chinese Taste in Eighteenth-Century England*, (New York, Cambridge University Press, 2010)

Porter, Roy. *The Cambridge History of Science: Volume 4, Eighteenth-Century Science*, (Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 2003)

Porter, James. "'Bring Me the Head of James Macpherson": The Execution of Ossian and the Wellsprings of Folkloristic Discourse', *The Journal of American Folklore*, Vol. 114, No. 454, James Macpherson and the Ossian Epic Debate (Autumn, 2001), pp. 396-435

Pressly, William L. 'Genius Unveiled: The Self-Portraits of Johan Zoffany', *The Art Bulletin*, Vol. 69, No. 1 (Mar., 1987), pp. 88-101

Pumfrey, Stephen and Frances Dawbarn. 'Science and Patronage in England, 1570-1625: A Preliminary Study', *History of Science*, 42 (2004), pp. 137-88

Pyenson, Lewis and Susan Sheets Pyenson. *Servants of Nature: A History of Scientific Institutions, Enterprises and Sensibilities*, (London, Fontana Press, 1999)

Quarrie, Paul. 'The Scientific Library of the Earls of Macclesfield', *Notes and Records of the Royal Society of London*, Vol. 60, No. 1 (Jan. 22, 2006), pp. 5-24

Raj, Kapil. *Relocating Modern Science: Circulation and the Construction of Knowledge in South Asia and Europe, 1650-1900*, (New York, Palgrave Macmillan, 2007)

Rappaport, Rhoda. 'G. F. Rouelle: An Eighteenth-Century Chemist and Teacher', *Chymia*, Vol. 6 (1960), pp. 68-101

Rauschenberg, Roy Anthony. 'Daniel Carl Solander: Naturalist on the "Endeavour"', *Transactions of the American Philosophical Society*, New Series, Vol. 58, (1968), pp. 1-66

Rauschenberg, Roy Anthony. 'John Ellis F.R.S.: Eighteenth Century Naturalist and Royal Agent to West Florida', *Notes and Records of the Royal Society of London*, Vol. 32, No. 1 (Mar., 1978), pp. 149-164

Reid, J. S. 'The Castlehill Observatory Aberdeen', *Journal for the History of Astronomy*, Vol. 13, (1982), pp. 84-96

Roberts, Lissa. 'The Death of the Sensuous Chemist: The "New" Chemistry and the Transformation of Sensuous Technology', *Studies in History and Philosophy of Science*, 26, No. 4, (1995), pp. 503-529

Roberts, Lissa. 'Situating Science in Global History: Local Exchanges and Networks of Circulation', *Itinerario*, Volume 33, Issue 1, March 2009, pp. 9-30

Roethlisberger, Marcel. 'Jean-Etienne Liotard as a Painter of Still Lifes', *The J. Paul Getty Museum Journal*, Vol. 13 (1985), pp. 109-120

Rogers, Ray. 'Book Dedications in Britain 1700-1799: A Preliminary Study', *British Journal for Eighteenth Century Studies*, Vol. 16, (1993), pp. 213-233

Romaniello, Matthew P. 'True rhubarb? Trading Eurasian botanical and medical knowledge in the eighteenth century', *Journal of Global History*, (2016), 11, pp. 3-23

Rorschach, Kimberly. 'Frederick, Prince of Wales (1707-51), as Collector and Patron', *The Volume of the Walpole Society*, Vol. 55 (1989/1990), pp. 1-76

Rousseau, G.S. *The Letters and Papers of Sir John Hill, 1714-1775*, (New York, AMS Press, 1982)

Rousseau, George. *The Notorious Sir John Hill: The Man Destroyed by Ambition in the Era of Celebrity*, (Plymouth, Lehigh University Press, 2012)

Rusnock, Andrea. 'Correspondence Networks and the Royal Society, 1700-1750', *The British Journal for the History of Science*, Vol. 32, No. 2, Did the Royal Society Matter in the Eighteenth Century? (Jun., 1999), pp. 155-169

Russell, Francis. *John 3rd Earl of Bute: Patron and Collector*, (London, Merton Press, 2004)

Samuel, Margaret. *Highcliffe Castle: Garden Journey*, (Dorset, Natula Publications, 2010)

Sainsbury, John. *John Wilkes: The lives of a Libertine*, (Hampshire, Ashgate Publishing Limited, 2006)

Salmon, Frank. 'Charles Cameron and Nero's Domus Aurea: 'Una piccola esplorazione'' *Architectural History*, Vol. 36 (1993), pp. 69-93

Sarasohn, Lisa T. 'Nicolas-Claude Fabri de Peiresc and the Patronage of the New Science in the Seventeenth Century', *Isis*, Vol. 84, (1993), pp. 70-90

Sarasohn, Lisa T. 'Thomas Hobbes and the Duke of Newcastle: A Study in the Mutuality of Patronage before the Establishment of the Royal Society', *Isis*, Vol. 90, (1999), pp. 715-737

Saxton, Kirsten T. and Rebecca P. Bocchicchio. *The Passionate Fiction of Eliza Haywood: Essays on Her Life and Work*, (Lexington, The University Press of Kentucky, 2000)

Sedgwick, Romney. *Letters from George III to Lord Bute 1756-1766*, (Westport, Connecticut, Greenwood Press, 1981)

Schaffer, Simon, Lissa Robert, Kapil Raj and Jame Delbourgo (eds). *The Brokered World: Go-Between and Global Intelligence, 1770-1820*, (Sagmore Beach, MA, Science History Publications, 2009)

Schaffer, Simon. 'The Show That Never Ends: Perpetual Motion in the Early Eighteenth Century' *British Journal for the History of Science*, Vol.28 (1995), pp. 157-189

Schama, Simon. 'The Domestication of Majesty: Royal Family Portraiture, 1500-1850', *The Journal of Interdisciplinary History*, Vol. 17, No. 1 The Evidence of Art: Images and Meaning in History (Summer, 1986), pp. 155-183

Schweizer. Karl W. ed., *Lord Bute: Essays in re-interpretation*, (Worcester, Leicester University Press, 1988)

Schweizer, K. W. and John Stuart. 'A Lost Letter of John Stuart, 3rd Earl of Bute, to George Grenville, 13 October 1761', *The Historical Journal*, Vol. 17 (1974), pp. 435-442

Shapin, Steven. 'Property, Patronage, and the Politics of Science: The Founding of the Royal Society of Edinburgh', *British Journal for the History of Science*, Vol. 7 (1974), pp. 1-41

Shapin, Steven. 'The House of Experiment in Seventeenth-Century England', *Isis*, Vol. 79 (1988), pp. 373-404

Shapin, Steven and Simon Schaffer. *Leviathan and the Air-Pump*, (New Jersey, Princeton University Press, 1985)

Shaw, Trevor R. *Foreign Travellers in the Slovene Karst 1486-1900*, (Ivančna Gorica, ZRC Publishing, 2008)

Sher, Richard B. *Church and University in the Scottish Enlightenment: The Moderate Literati of Edinburgh*, (Edinburgh, Edinburgh University Press, 1985)

Sher, Richard B. *The Enlightenment and the Book: Scottish Author and Their Publishers in Eighteenth-Century Britain, Ireland, and America*, (London, University of Chicago Press, 2006)

Sher, Richard B and M. A Stewart. 'William Robertson and David Hume: Three letters', *Hume Studies*, 10th Anniversary Issue, (1984), pp. 69-86

Simmons, R. C. 'Colonial Patronage: Two letters from William Franklin to the Earl of Bute, 1762', *The William and Mary Quarterly*, Vol. 59 (2002), pp. 123-134

Smellie, William. *Account of the Institution and Progress of the Society of the Antiquaries of Scotland*, (Edinburgh, published by William Creech, 1782)

Smith, Lady. *Memoir and Correspondence of the Late Sir James Edward Smith, M.D.*, 2 vols. (London, printed for Longman, Rees, Orme, Brown, Green, and Longman, 1832)

Smith, Sir James Edward. *A Selection of the Correspondence of Linnaeus, and Other Naturalists*, in 2 vols. (London, printed for Longman, Hurst, Hees, Orme, and Brown, 1821)

Smout, T. C. 'A New Look at the Scottish Improvers', *The Scottish Historical Review*, Vol. XCI, No. 231 (April 2012), pp. 125-149

Sloboda, Stacey. 'Displaying Materials: Porcelain and Natural History in the Duchess of Portland's Museum', *Eighteenth-Century Studies*, Vol. 43, No. 4 (Summer, 2010), pp. 455-472

Solomon-Godeau, Abigail. 'Jean-Etienne Liotard: Facing the Enlightenment', *Art in America*, Nov 2006, Vol. 94 Issue 10, pp. 148-155

Sorrenson, Richard. *Perfect Mechanics: Instrument Makers at the Royal Society of London in the Eighteenth Century*, (Boston, Docent Press, 2013)

Sorrenson, Richard. 'Towards a History of the Royal Society in the Eighteenth Century', *Notes and Records of the Royal Society of London*, Vol. 50, No. 1 (Jan., 1996), pp. 29-46

Spary, E.C. *Utopia's Garden: French Natural History from Old Regime to Revolution*, (Chicago, Chicago University Press, 2000)

Spector, Robert D. *Political Controversy: A Study in Eighteenth-Century Propaganda*, (Los Angeles, Greenwood Publishing Group, 1992)

Stafford, Fiona J. *The Sublime Savage: A Study of James Macpherson and The Poems of Ossian*, (Edinburgh, Edinburgh University Press, 1988)

Stewart, Larry. 'Other Centres of Calculation, or Where the Royal Society Didn't Count: Commerce, Coffee-Houses and Natural Philosophy in Early Modern London', *British Journal for the History of Science*, Vol.32 (1999), pp. 133-153

Stewart, Larry. 'Public Lectures and Private Patronage in Newtonian England', *Isis*, Vol. 77 (Mar., 1986), pp. 47-58

Stewart, Larry. *The Rise of Public Science: Rhetoric, Technology, and Natural Philosophy in Newtonian Britain, 1660-1750*, (New York, Cambridge University Press, 1992)

Stewart, Larry. 'The Selling of Newton: Science and Technology in Early Eighteenth-Century England', *Journal of British Studies*, Vol. 25 (1986), pp. 178-192

Stearn, William T. 'The Chelsea Physic Garden 1673-1973: Three Centuries of Triumph in Crises. A Tercentenary Address', Vol. 3 (1975), pp. 68-73

Stearn, William T. 'The Influence of Leyden on Botany in the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries', Vol. 1 (1962), pp. 137-158

Stephen, Leslie and Sidney Lee (ed.). *Dictionary of National Biography*, (London, Smith, Elder & Co., 22 vols., 1908-1909)

Styles, John. 'Sir John Fielding and the Problem of Criminal Investigation in Eighteenth-Century England', *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*, Fifth Series, Vol. 33 (1983), pp. 127-149

Stymes, Michael and John H. Harvey. 'Lord Petre's Legacy: The Nurseries at Thorndon', *Garden History*, Vol. 24 (1996), pp. 272-282

Stymes, Michael, Alison Hodges, and John Harvey. 'The Plantings at Whitton', *Garden History*, Vol. 14, No. 2 (Autumn, 1986), pp. 138-172

Sudermann, Jeffrey M. *Orthodoxy and Enlightenment: George Campbell in the Eighteenth-Century*, (Quebec, McGills-Queen's Press, 2001)

Swann, Marjorie. *Curiosities and Texts: The Culture of Collecting in Early Modern England*, (Philadelphia, Pennsylvania University Press, 2001)

Sweet, Rosemary. *Antiquaries: The Discovery of the Past in Eighteenth-Century Britain*, (London, Palgrave Macmillan, 2004)

Syfret, R. H. 'The Origins of the Royal Society', *Notes and Records of the Royal Society of London*, Vol. 5, No. 2 (Apr., 1948), pp. 75-137

Tait, Alan. 'Cameron and the Beginnings of Neo-Classicism in Russia', *AA Files*, No. 1 (Winter 1981-82), pp. 84-88

Taylor, George. *Plays by Samuel Foote and Arthur Murphy*, (Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1984)

Terrell, Mary. *Catching Nature in the Act: Réaumur and the Practice of Natural History in the Eighteenth Century*, (Chicago, The University of Chicago Press, 2014).

Teute, Fredrika J. 'The Love of Plants; or, the Cross-Fertilization of Science and Desire at the End of the Eighteenth Century', *Huntington Library Quarterly*, Vol. 63 (2000), pp. 319-345

Thomas, Peter D. G. *George III: King and Politicians, 1760 – 1770*, (Manchester, Manchester University Press, 2002)

Thomas, R. George. 'Lord Bute, John Homes and Ossian: Two Letters', *Modern Language Review*, Vol. 51 (1956), pp. 73-75

Tombs, John. *Club Life of London with Anecdotes of the Clubs, Coffee-Houses and Taverns of the Metropolis During the 17th, 18th, and 19th Centuries*, (London, published by Richard Bentley, 1866)

Tjaden, W.L. 'Drawings at Kew by Simon Taylor (1742-c.1796)', *Kew Bulletin*, Vol. 26 (1971), pp. 167-169

Trevor-Roper, Hugh. *History and the Enlightenment*, (London, Yale University Press, 2010)

Trivas, N. S. 'Liotard's Portraits of Frederick Lewis, Prince of Wales, and His Family', *The Burlington Magazine for Connoisseurs*, Vol. 68, No. 396 (Mar., 1936), pp. 116-119

Turner, Gerard L'E. 'Henry Baker F.R.S.: Founder of the Bakerian Lecture', *Notes and Records of the Royal Society*, Vol. 29, No. 1 (Oct., 1974), pp. 53-79

Turner, Gerard L'E. *Scientific Instruments and Experimental Philosophy 1550-1850*, (Hampshire, Variorum, 1990)

Turner, Gerard L'E. 'Presidential Address: Scientific Toys', *The British Journal for the History of Science*, Vol. 20, No 4 (Oct., 1987), pp. 377-398

Underwood, E. Ashworth. 'Boerhaave: After Three Hundred Years', *The British Medical Journal*, Vol. 4 (1968), pp. 820-828

Van den Boogert, Mauritis. *Aleppo Observed: Ottoman Syria Through the Eyes of Two Scottish Doctors, Alexander and Patrick Russell*, (Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2010)

Van Horn Melton, James. *The Rise of the Public in Enlightenment Europe*, (Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 2001)

Voss, Paul J. 'Books for Sale: Advertising and Patronage in Late Elizabethan England', *Sixteenth Century Journal*, Vol. 29 (1998), pp. 733-756

Waller, John C. 'Gentlemanly Men of Science: Sir Francis Galton and the Professionalization of the British Life-Sciences' *Journal of the History of Biology*, Vol. 34, (2001), pp. 83-114

Walzer, Arthur E. *George Campbell: Rhetoric in the Age of Enlightenment*, (New York, University of New York Press, 2003)

Weinberg, Bennett Alan and Bonnie K. Bealer. *The World of Caffeine: The Science and Culture of the World's Most Popular Drug*, (New York, Routledge, 2002)

West, Shearer. 'Wilkes's Squint: Synecdochic Physiognomy and Political Identity in Eighteenth-Century Print Culture', *Eighteenth-Century Studies*, Vol. 33 (1999), pp. 65-84

Westfall, Richard S. 'Science and Patronage: Galileo and the Telescope', *Isis*, Vol. 76 (1985), pp. 11-30

Wheatley, Henry B. *The Dedication of Books to Patron and Friend: Chapter in Literary History*, (London, Elliot Stock, 1887)

White, Gerry. *London in the 18th Century: A Great and Monstrous Thing*, (London, Vintage Books, 2013)

White, Paul. 'The Purchase of knowledge: James Edward Smith and the Linnean collections', *Endeavour*, Vol. 23 (3) 199, pp. 126-129

Williams, Roger L. *French Botany in the Enlightenment: The Ill-fated Voyages of 'La Perouse' and His Rescuers*, (Dordrecht, Kluwer Academic Publishers, 2003)

Willis, Kathy and Carolyn Fry. *Plants: From Roots to Riches*, (London, John Murray Publishers, 2015)

Wind, Edgar, 'Shaftesbury as a Patron of Art', *Journal of the Warburg Institute*, Vol. 2 (1938), pp. 185-188

Withers, Charles W. J. 'A Neglected Scottish Agriculturalist: The 'Georgical Lectures' and Agricultural Writings of the Rev Dr John Walker (1731-1803), *The Agricultural History Review*, Vol. 33, No.2 (1985), pp. 132-146

Wolff, Larry. *Venice and the Slavs: The Discovery of Dalmatia in the Age of Enlightenment*, (Stanford, Stanford University Press, 2001)

Wulf, Andrea. *The Brother Gardeners: Botany, Empire and the Birth of an Obsession*, (London, William Heinemann, 2008)

Wulf, Andrea. *The Invention of Nature: The Adventures of Alexander Von Humboldt The Lost Hero of Science*, (London, John Murray Publishers, 2015)

