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ABSTRACT

This thesis explores the commercial links between Scotland and France in the long seventeenth century, with a focus on the Scottish mercantile presence in France’s Atlantic ports. This study questions long-held assumptions regarding this relationship, asserting that the ‘Auld Alliance’ continued throughout the period, despite the widely held belief that it ended in 1560. Such assumptions have led scholars largely to ignore the continuing commercial relationship between Scotland and France in the long seventeenth century, focusing instead on the ‘golden age’ of the Auld Alliance or the British relationship with France in the eighteenth century. Such assumptions have been fostered by the methodological approaches used in the study of economic history to date. While I acknowledge the relevance of traditional quantitative approaches to economic history, such as those pioneered by T. C. Smout and which continue to be followed by historians such as Philipp Rössner, I follow alternative methods that have been recently employed by scholars such as Henriette de Bruyn Kops, Sheryllynne Haggerty, Xabier Lamikiz, Allan Macinnes and Steve Murdoch. These scholars have pioneered methodologies that prioritise private sources, allowing us to delve into the motivations and actions of the individuals who actually effected trade, be they merchants, factors, skippers or manufacturers. The core of my research has therefore entailed the discovery and use of previously untapped archival material including account books, letter books and correspondence, which illuminate the participation of these individuals in international trade. Such a study, while filling a specific gap in our understanding of Scotland’s overseas relations, applies a more social methodology to this topic, suggesting that scholars’ approaches need to be fundamentally altered if we are truly to understand the whole picture of Scotland’s, or indeed any nation’s, commercial relationships or wider economic position.
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STYLISTIC CONVENTIONS

Names of individuals and places discussed in this thesis often appear in inconsistent forms in the sources used. All names that are unambiguous have been rendered as the most commonly used modern version in discussion. In quoted sources, they have been left as written. Contemporary spellings in directly quoted French sources have not been modernised. In considering certain European conflicts that are referred to by interchangeable terms, the following terminology has been used: the Dutch War (also known as the Franco-Dutch war) to describe the 1672-1678 conflict and the Nine Years’ War (also known as the War of the League of Augsburg and the War of the Grand Alliance) to describe the 1688-1697 conflict. Where terminology is now erroneous but standard, this has been rendered as expected – for example, while the ‘Anglo-Dutch’ wars had an independent Scottish element, and although that element forms the core of discussion here, these conflicts have nevertheless been termed the Anglo-Dutch Wars in order to avoid unnecessary confusion.

When discussing British monarchs, the Scottish application has been used (for example, James VI, rather than James I or James VI and I). There are two exceptions to this. In discussions of William II and III, ‘William III’ has been used, despite this being the English application, as this is how he is most commonly described. The other exception is in the use of the Stuart Papers, within which James Francis Edward Stuart is referred to as ‘James III’, and the Earl of Mar styled the ‘Duke of Mar’. Where this source has been directly cited, this is the terminology adopted. The Privy Council and Parliament of Scotland have been referred to as simply ‘the Privy Council’ and ‘Parliament’, and when it is an English institution that is meant this has been stated. ‘The Reformation’ denotes the Scottish Reformation of 1560 unless otherwise specified. Dates in this period can offer a challenge as it is often unclear, particularly in the unofficial records used extensively throughout this thesis, whether the author used the Julian or Gregorian calendar. Where both alternatives have been given (for example, 7 January 1644/5) the Gregorian date has been cited (7 January 1645). When the calendar used has not been specified, dates have been cited as they appear in the sources. Weights and currencies have not been standardised as accurate conversion can be problematic. Further, in many of the accounts used here, the currency is not stated.

1 G. Black, The Surnames of Scotland: Their Origin, Meaning and History (Edinburgh, 2007) has been used as a guide.
(for example, whether pounds sterling or pounds scots). If a distinction has been made, this has been cited, otherwise references to monetary values are written exactly as they appear in original material. In some cases, to allow for comparison, conversions have been made as accurately as possible (for example, in Chapter 2, converting Spanish wine measurements from butts to tuns in order to compare quantities with French wine). In this and similar cases, Appendix II.i outlines the conversion rates used.
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INTRODUCTION

‘The onset of the Protestant Reformation [in Scotland] shattered Scotland’s close relationship with France (enshrined in the ‘Auld Alliance’).’

In 1634 the Scot John Clerk travelled to France as the apprentice of the Edinburgh merchant John Smith. In 1646 he returned to Scotland to live in the barony of Penicuik, an estate he had purchased with the fortune he made on the continent. While he lived in Paris Clerk operated within a wide network of merchants, factors, manufacturers and skippers – some he knew personally, others he did not, and these individuals were both British and European. This network traded in a wide variety of goods, including standard fare such as salt and wine but also diamonds, luxury cloths, atlases and book-bindings. Clerk is one example of a host of individuals who pursued Franco-Scottish commerce during a century characterised by conflict and ostensibly hostile to trade, and facilitated commerce along routes that were often officially closed due to war or political or economic policy. The activities of such individuals and the networks within which they operated adds to new perspectives on international commercial relations which have recently come to the fore in economic studies, but within a geographical sphere that has not yet received due attention. By examining the actions of individual merchants, factors, skippers and manufacturers and the relative parts they played in these relationships, it has been possible to demonstrate that at times when official records seem to suggest that certain routes stagnated, commercial agents were in fact able to adapt their trading methods to allow them to continue to flourish.

I. HISTORIOGRAPHY

The lack of attention paid to these trading routes is symptomatic of several scholarly traditions. The first is the long-held assumption that the Auld Alliance ended in 1560 with the Scottish Reformation, the Treaty of Edinburgh and the removal of French

---

1 J. Ohlmeyer, ‘Seventeenth Century Ireland and Scotland and their wider worlds’ in T. O’Connor and M. Lyons (eds.), Irish Communities in Early Modern Europe (Dublin, 2006) 459
troops from Scotland, a tradition that has been passed down through generations of scholarship. In her 1986 article ‘The Scottish Export Trade 1460-1599’ Isobel Guy does not mention France even in passing, and such omissions are not uncommon in both British and French historiography for the period. Some research has recently investigated the continuing Franco-Scottish relationship in the military and intellectual spheres, but no sustained attempt has been made to question the validity of such claims in the commercial sphere. The second tradition that has fostered this neglect lies in the methodologies adopted by historians in addressing economic issues. In the last half century, our understanding of Scotland’s overseas trade and commercial interests has improved dramatically. The pioneering studies of Edgar Lythe and Christopher Smout have had stunning results both for our understanding of Scotland’s economic position in Europe and in the proliferation of subsequent works inspired by them. Many of these subsequent investigations have undoubtedly widened our knowledge of Scottish trading links in Europe, but have adopted Lythe’s and Smout’s methodologies to do so – that is, largely focusing on official records, on customs figures, port books and government legislation.

---

4 Ohlmeier, ‘Seventeenth Century’, 476, for example, recognises that trade links with France continued after 1560, but does not elaborate or consider the effect of the Reformation on them. French literature has either overlooked the relationship with Scotland completely or afforded it scant attention: E. Levasseur, *Histoire du Commerce de la France*, 2 volumes (Paris, 1911) I, 600 mentions relations with England, but does not mention Scotland in this context; R. Gascon, *Grand Commerce et vie Urbaine au XVe siècle: Lyon et ses Marchands*, 2 volumes (Paris, 1971) I, 85 mentions Scotland only in passing.
5 M. Glozier, *Scottish Soldiers in France in the Reign of the Sun King* (Leiden, 2004); M. Glozier, ‘Scots in the French and Dutch Armies during the Thirty Years’ War’ in S. Murdoch (ed.), *Scotland and the Thirty Years’ War* (Leiden, 2001); M. Tucker, *Maitres et étudiants écossais à la Faculté de Droit de l’Université de Bourges 1480-1703* (Paris, 2001); M. Tucker, ‘Scottish Students and Masters at the Faculty of Law of the University of Bourges in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries’ in T. van Heijnsbergen and N. Royan (eds.), *Literature, Letters and the Canonical in Early Modern Scotland* (East Linton, 2002)
The Auld Alliance has been extensively researched, as has the supposed ‘end’ of this relationship after 1560 and particularly 1603. Assertions that ‘the onset of the Protestant Reformation [in Scotland] shattered Scotland’s close relationship with France (enshrined in the ‘Auld Alliance’)’ are representative of a wide range of literature that builds on a long tradition of scholarship, believing that ‘a significant element [of the Reformation of 1560] was rejection of the long-established association with France’.

The retrospective knowledge that 43 years later Scotland and England were to be united in the Union of Crowns (and again a century later in the Union of Parliaments) has led historians to see 1560 as not only a move away from France, but also a move towards Protestant England, as ‘the progress of Protestantism, meat to the Scottish Anglophile party, was poison to the French alliance’. The assertion that an Anglo-Scottish relationship replaced a Franco-Scottish one has been projected despite, in 1560, both French and English forces being asked to leave Scotland; if anything, at this juncture France still held the advantage in the form of the French dowager queen, Mary Stuart. Scotland’s ostensibly closer relationship with England following 1560, coupled with an emphasis on the significance of both the 1603 and 1707 Unions, has led to acceptance that Scotland’s trade interests became governed by English concerns. This has subsequently tended to dominate discussions of Scotland’s commercial position in Europe, leading to the supposition that after 1560, and especially 1603 and 1707,

---


9 Ohlmeyer, ‘Seventeenth Century Ireland and Scotland’, 459

10 Whyte, Scotland before the Industrial Revolution, 92. This opinion has been espoused by many scholars, including: M. Lynch, Scotland, A New History (London, 1992) 209; J. Burton, The Scot Abroad, 2 volumes (Edinburgh/London, 1864) I, 226; T. Keith, Commercial Relations of England and Scotland, 1603-1707 (Cambridge, 1910) 47; N. MacDougall, An Antidote to the English, 3

Scotland no longer pursued independent trading links. Moreover, beyond Scottish scholarship, the kingdom has seldom been viewed as a country in her own right, with ‘Great Britain’ often being a veritable pseudonym for ‘England’. Yet Scotland, as will be demonstrated throughout this thesis, was not subordinate to England and continued to pursue her own agendas in both commercial and political spheres.

Some historians have noted continuing Franco-Scottish commercial activity in this period. Theodora Keith acknowledged that this activity continued through the first half of the seventeenth century, but asserted that after Colbert’s mercantilist system was implemented in France ‘the exemptions which the Scots had formerly enjoyed were gradually disregarded’ and that Scottish trade with both the French and the Dutch ‘suffered severely’. Professor Christopher Smout has also held that French protectionist policy in the mid-seventeenth century ‘deprived the Scots of the last of their ancient privileges in France’. More recently, Elizabeth Bonner has suggested that while ‘it has been generally held that the ‘Auld Alliance’ ended’ in 1560, in fact it did not ‘entirely disappear’. Instead, Bonner argues, the Auld Alliance ‘fell into abeyance’ during the second half of the sixteenth century, only to be ‘picked up with renewed vigour’ during the reign of Henri IV once James VI had reached his majority. She argues that the Auld Alliance experienced a gradual decline only after the Union of Crowns in 1603, and that its decline became more rapid following the Parliamentary Union of 1707; buying into the notion that a closer relationship with England emerged


14 T. Keith, ‘The Economic Causes for the Scottish Union” in English Historical Review, XXIV (1909) 50

15 Smout, Scottish Trade, 240
which precluded continuing links with France.\textsuperscript{16} Andrew Drummond and Isobel Grant have also accepted the continuation of commercial links, but such realisations have not yet been satisfactorily pursued,\textsuperscript{17} and while some welcome preliminary work considering Scotland’s continuing connections with France has recently been undertaken this is confined to Bordeaux and as much concerned with politics as trade.\textsuperscript{18} Not even the most up-to-date research has addressed this historiographical gap. A conference held in Paris in January 2008 entitled \textit{Interactions et transferts entre la France et les îles Britanniques, 1640-1660}, while containing a panel entitled ‘Franco-Scottish Relations’, mentioned nothing of the commercial relationship.\textsuperscript{19}

Furthermore, new publications concerning Scotland’s overseas relations have often re-covered ground which has already been well trodden. The 2007 volume \textit{Irish and Scottish Commercial Networks in Europe and Overseas in the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries} comprises a number of well researched and convincingly argued essays, yet although connections between Ireland and France are covered over two chapters Scotland’s relations with France are not considered in this detail; where they are mentioned, it is in the context of the eighteenth-century Atlantic wine trade.\textsuperscript{20} This volume concentrates instead on figures such as Thomas Cunningham at Veere and Scotland’s entrepreneurs in eighteenth-century Sweden, particularly Colin Campbell. Such research builds on already established premises, rather than tackling those areas of Europe in which we still do not fully understand Scotland’s relations.\textsuperscript{21}

\textsuperscript{17} A. Drummond, \textit{The Kirk and the Continent} (Edinburgh, 1956) ix, 26; I. Grant, \textit{The Economic History of Scotland} (London, 1934) 80
\textsuperscript{19} This panel (\textit{Relations franco-écossaises}) focused on political issues. A panel entitled \textit{Parcours individuels} included mention only of an Englishman in the Guyenne region of France, and the religious conflict between the Huguenots and Puritans. Commerce was not discussed in respect to any of the British nations. A full programme can be found at \url{http://www.univ-paris13.fr/CRIDAF/conf17.htm}
\textsuperscript{20} C. Pfister, ‘Dunkerque et l’Irlande, 1690-1790’; G. Saupin, ‘Les Reseaux Commerciaux des Irlandais de Nantes sous le Regne de Louis XIV’; D. Hancock, ‘Combining Success and Failure: Scottish Networks in the Atlantic Wine Trade’, 16, 26, all in Dickson, Parmentier and Ohlmeyer, \textit{Irish and Scottish Mercantile Networks}
\textsuperscript{21} Such individuals have been examined extensively: D. Catterall, \textit{Community Without Borders: Scots Migrants and the Changing Face of Power in the Dutch Republic, c. 1600-1700} (Leiden, 2002); J. Davidson and A. Gray, \textit{The Scottish Staple at Veere: a Study in the Economic History of Scotland}
Such review of old ground is, in part, representative of the traditional view that Scotland’s trade with the Low Countries was her most important during this period. The Convention of Royal Burghs has been recognised as having pursued a highly organised trade with the Low Countries through the Scottish trading staple, whereas trade with France and elsewhere was arguably more opportunistic and less regulated. This has been taken as indicative that trade with the Netherlands was the most important of Scotland’s overseas connections. It has been said that ‘if further organisation had been required, the Convention would have undertaken it, but the scope of the trade with England, France etc. was probably too insignificant to necessitate further organisation’. The presence of the office of Conservator in the Low Countries adds to the view that trade through the Scottish staple was more organised, and implicitly more important, than trade elsewhere. Yet when James VI and Henri IV concluded a commercial treaty in 1606, James made a concerted effort to establish an office in France similar to that of the Conservator at Veere, referring to this office by the same name. The very use of the term ‘Conservator’ highlights the importance of Scotland’s continuing independent relationship with France into the seventeenth century; as late as

---

22 Guy, ‘Scottish Export Trade’, 67. The staple was usually at Veere, although there were several attempts to move the Staple to other towns such as Middleburg, which failed, though it did move briefly to Dordrecht (1668-1675). In theory the staple port was the only place that Scottish merchants could land staple commodities – defined in 1602 as any goods which paid customs in Scotland. For more on the business of the Staple see J. Davidson and A. Gray, The Scottish Staple at Veere: a Study in the Economic History of Scotland (London, 1905) 190 and passim; M. Rooseboom, The Scottish Staple in the Netherlands (The Hague, 1910). However, Scottish merchants continued to take staple goods to other ports, to the consternation of the Convention. CRB, passim.

23 Pagan, Convention, 151. Pagan contradicts herself, as on page 198 she states that the Scots ‘had a good deal of trade with France’.

24 Pagan, Convention, 151. The Conservator in Veere was the highest Scottish official in the Dutch Republic, and was primarily responsible for representing the economic interests of Scotland’s Royal Burghs, as well as those of Scotland as a whole.

25 Articles concluded at Paris the xxiiij of February 1605, stylo Angliae, by commissioners of the high and mightie kings, James by the grace of God King of Great Britaine, France, and Ireland, defender of the faith, &c. and Henrie the Fourth most Christian French king, and King of Navar, for the more commodious entercourse in traffique betweene their subjects (London, 1606). The fact that this treaty is entitled ‘Articles concluded betweene Great Britain and France’ has led to the assumption that Scotland was not a major part of it. B. Dietz, ‘England’s Overseas Trade in the Reign of James I’ in Smith (ed.), James VI and I, 107.
the 1670s this remained a specifically Scottish notion. Furthermore, the Convention did involve itself in French matters, continuing to push for the renewal of the privileges Scotland had historically enjoyed there, commissioning individuals such as Henry Nisbett, Thomas Fischer, Ninian Cockburn, Gilbert Logan and James Maxwell to travel to France to negotiate their renewal. This involvement has led to the assertion that the sole reason that Scottish privileges were renewed after 1560 was due to ‘constant embassies and agitation by the Convention of Royal Burghs’. While this statement in itself should be re-evaluated, the Convention did involve itself in matters concerning trade between France and Scotland, again testifying to their importance. Although trade with France may have not been organised in the same way as that with the Low Countries, this does not necessarily mean that it was less organised, less lucrative or any less beneficial to the Scottish nation.

II. SCOPE OF THIS STUDY

The approach that has been taken to this investigation has been partly governed by the need for brevity. While there is much more work to be done on the Scottish trading interest in commercial centres such as Lyon or the French colonies in ‘New France’, this thesis has been geographically confined to examinations of the major Atlantic coast ports. Primarily this has included Bordeaux, La Rochelle, Nantes and Rouen, but examples from Dieppe, Le Havre, St Malo and St Martins are also prevalent. Paris, though not strictly an Atlantic port, had access to the sea through the fluvial system and housed a number of Scottish merchants/bankers such as John Clerk of Penicuik and James Mowat who were directly connected to the networks discussed. Such individuals have been included in this study, although there is scope for a more focused examination of Scottish mercantile activity in this location. Henry Hamilton has suggested that as Scotland’s main trade was to the Netherlands, Germany and the Baltic, the eastern ports (he cites Kirkcaldy, East and West Anstruther, Burntisland, Crail and

27 CRB, I, 143, 272-3, 284, 287, 483, 494, 531-2, 557; II, 39
28 Grant, *Economic History*, 85
29 F. Bayard, ‘Naturalisation in Lyon during the Ancien Régime’ in *French History*, IV (1990) 277-316, focuses on the Irish presence in Lyon, mentioning the English in passing but neglecting the Scots entirely. Without further research, it is impossible to say whether this focus is justified.
Dysart) were the most important. This is corroborated by Isobel Guy who has attested that 80% of all customs revenue was generated by the major eastern burghs – Edinburgh, Aberdeen, Dundee and Perth. Leith has, in particular, been seen as Scotland’s primary port. In the 1520s it was arguably ‘the major player in Scotland’s limited overseas trade’, importing large quantities of wine and salt from France, and Sue Mowat makes a strong case for its significance. During the course of research for this thesis, it has become apparent that the east coast ports were essential for Franco-Scottish commerce – the major ports such as Aberdeen, Dundee and Leith but also the smaller east coast ports (Kirkcaldy, Anstruther, Burntisland, Dysart, Arbroath, Montrose and St Andrews). As Christopher Smout has suggested, there was also a significant amount of Franco-Scottish trade operating from the Glasgow ports, particularly in the later seventeenth century, and the west coast of Scotland has therefore also been included in this investigation, as have the Northern Isles.

Some previous assertions relating to Scotland’s geographic commercial interests in France are easy to challenge. Suggestions that ‘[Rouen] did very little trade with Scotland’ merely represent a lack of attention paid to sources held in this port, and the presence of prominent Scottish merchants and bankers in Rouen speaks for itself, as will become apparent. The Scots Andrew Russell and Robert Arbuthnot, both of whom were successful merchants with connections throughout Europe, had commercial interests in Rouen. Indeed, this is where Arbuthnot, who became a prominent Jacobite

30 Hamilton, Economic History of Scotland
31 Guy, ‘Scottish Export Trade’, 62
32 S. Wrightson, Earthly Necessities: Economic Lives in Early Modern Britain (New York/London, 2000) 97. Note the assumption that Scotland’s overseas trade was ‘limited’.
33 S. Mowat, The Port of Leith: its History and its People (Edinburgh, 1994)
34 T. C. Smout, ‘The Glasgow Merchant Community in the Seventeenth Century’ in Scottish Historical Review, XLVII (1968). Consideration of the role of the Northern Isles in Scotland’s overseas trade has been somewhat limited, and requires further research beyond the scope of this thesis. One useful contribution is Smith, Shetland Life and Trade. Brief mentions of the participation of the Northern Isles in Northern European trade (specifically Bergen and Hamburg) can be found in N. Pedersen, ‘Scottish Immigration to Bergen in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries’, 150, 152, 164; K. Zickermann, ‘Briseannia ist mein Patria’: Scotsmen and the ‘British’ Community in Hamburg’, 252, 271; both in Grosjean and Murdoch (eds.), Scottish Communities Abroad. For literature on the internal economic state and domestic trade of the Northern Isles see F. Shaw, The Northern and Western Islands of Scotland: Their Economy and Society in the Seventeenth Century (Edinburgh, 1980). Chapter 5 of this work includes a detailed examination of trade between the Isles and the Scottish mainland. In general terms, ascertaining the relative volumes of traffic entering each Scottish port in this period or its value to the country is extremely difficult. Documentation detailing the total amount of customs entering the Scottish ports between 1 August and November 1704 gives some indication of their relative importance, at least for this narrow period. See Appendix LI; NAS E73/128
35 H. Sée and A. Cormack, ‘Commercial Relations between France and Scotland in 1707’ in Scottish Historical Review, XXIII (1926) 277
financier, primarily operated. Furthermore, the Royal Burghs of Scotland had historically received trading privileges from the Parlement of Rouen which contained ‘exemptions and privileges in favour of Scottish merchants in the kingdom of France’, which they attempted to renew in 1690 (Chapter 6).

The chronological scope of this study is necessarily more limited than the time span might initially suggest. While concerned with the period from the Reformation and the Treaty of Edinburgh in 1560 to the end of the War of the Spanish Succession in 1713, this chronology has been broken down in order to pursue a specific intellectual rationale: that of the ways in which legislation and domestic and international conflict affected commercial activity. Previous examinations of Scotland’s participation in such conflicts have viewed it as both forced (as an English satellite state) and inherently damaging to Scotland’s commercial interests. War against France as part of the Nine Years’ War in 1688-1697, for example, has been seen as ‘damning to Scottish shipping and markets…war had undermined relations with France and wiped out the special privileges Scotland had enjoyed a hundred years before, under the Auld Alliance’.

This thesis will, by re-examining official records and utilising previously untapped archival material, question such assertions in the context of the wars in which Scotland and France participated in the late sixteenth, seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries, both domestically and internationally, and in light of commercial policy pursued by both countries.

III. SOURCES

As mentioned above, the economy and overseas relations of Scotland have traditionally been examined through quantitative and government sources. Such approaches have led to economics and finance of the early modern period being directly related to the Treasury and to commercial institutions. In Scotland’s case, consideration of both of these aspects has led to an assumption that she was economically backward, given the low returns to the Treasury from trade and the failure of the Company of Scotland; in

37 RPCS, 1690, 125
38 T. C. Smout, ‘The Road to Union’ in G. Holmes, Britain After the Glorious Revolution (Suffolk, 1969) 184, 187
this case, its virtual collapse and eventual sale to the East India Company through article XV of the 1707 Treaty of Union. Yet covert, or at least non-governmentally controlled commercial networks were often more effective than those ventures of Scots who tied themselves to companies or monopolies. When the success or failure of the individual, rather than national companies, is examined, Scotland’s alleged backwardness is far less prominent and, in places, simply inaccurate, refuting claims that Scotland in 1603 was ‘a country of underdeveloped economic resources, almost mediaeval in her organization of trade and industry’. Moreover, individual merchants contributed to their native society more than is usually assumed. The views of both contemporaries and modern scholars that merchants who traded for personal profit rather than specifically to improve their nation’s economy were economically damaging is also questioned here (Chapter 3).

Henriette de Bruyn Kops, Sheryllyne Haggerty, Xabier Lamikiz, Allan Macinnes and Steve Murdoch have recently recognised the need to examine private mercantile sources, and such investigations have had important results for, for example, our understanding of the trading relationships between Nantes and Rotterdam in the seventeenth century and between Liverpool and Philadelphia and within the Spanish Atlantic world in the eighteenth. ‘Official’ records can be misleading: if goods en route to France were shipped through the Scottish staple in the Netherlands and then either re-shipped or even carried overland by Scots to a Scottish community in Dieppe these figures would appear in official port records as trade between Scotland and the Netherlands, rather than between Scotland and France. Furthermore, many goods were

---

40 Murdoch, *Network North*, 423; D. Dickson, *Introduction to Dickson, Parmentier, and Ohlmeyer (eds.), Irish and Scottish Mercantile Networks*, 2-3
41 Keith, ‘Economic Causes’, 44; T. Keith, ‘Economic Condition of Scotland under the Commonwealth and Protectorate’ in *Scottish Historical Review*, V (1908) 276
43 Murdoch, *Network North*, 207; Lythe and Butt, *Economic History of Scotland*, 63; R. Nash, ‘The English and Scottish Tobacco Trades in the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries: Legal and Illegal Trade’ in *English Historical Review*, XXXV, 3 (1920) 355; G. Ramsay, *English Overseas Trade in the Centuries of Emergence* (1957) 172. Volumes of compiled statistics, such as that by M. Lynch and D.
sent through alternative channels, for example with individual messengers or through the postal system. Accurate conclusions regarding the state of a nation’s trade can only be drawn through a methodological approach that considers the actions of individual merchants alongside those of governments and larger trading companies. Through examination of this material it has been possible to reconstruct, at least partially, the networks within which these merchants operated, and to ascertain how individuals circumvented obstacles to their trade (for example, trade embargos and prohibitions in times of war). In so doing, the assumption that declarations of war, trade embargoes and prohibitive tariffs irreparably damaged trade has been questioned.

It is inevitable that throughout the course of a three-year project, not all available material could be consulted in depth; conversely much valuable research has had to be omitted in order to comply with the stipulated word limit and produce a coherent thesis. The nature of the sources used has also meant that material is often incomplete. For example, a lone bill of exchange might indicate the presence of a Scottish merchant in La Rochelle, but if no further information can be uncovered pertaining to them it is impossible to follow this strand of the network further. Furthermore, it is inevitable that much of the material that does survive pertains to the upper echelons of both the merchant class and of society itself – much of the evidence relating to John Clerk highlights commercial exchanges with figures such as the 3rd Earl of Lothian, Lady Pittenweem and Lady Newliston (Chapters 2, 3 and 4). The material that has been selected for inclusion, however, offers a valuable insight into this commercial relationship, and fundamentally alters the traditional view of Scotland’s economic position both in relation to France and within Europe.

IV. STRUCTURE

This thesis comprises two parts. Part I, ‘Peace and Prosperity’, is largely thematic. Chapter 1 provides an overview of legislation affecting commerce passed during this period, including declarations of war, trade embargoes, prohibitive rises in customs duties and domestic economic policy. This chapter also includes a discussion of legislation concerning the Auld Alliance. It seeks to establish the nature of the Scottish

Ditchburn in P. McNeill and H. MacQueen (eds.), Atlas of Scottish History to 1707 (Edinburgh, 1996) 240-283, are useful but cannot be taken, for the above reasons, as projecting the true nature and volume of trade during this period. Smuggled goods were also, obviously, not recorded in official records.
trading privileges in France, asking whether the alliance was ever formally abrogated or prolonged. Chapters 2 and 3 are concerned with the methods used by Scottish merchants to effect trade with France during times of conflict (providing the precursor to Part II). Chapter 2 readdresses the commodities that have traditionally been thought to comprise this trade. While salt, wine, fish and wool have, in particular, traditionally been seen as central to it (and their importance is certainly not denied here), in fact the commodities that made up this trade were far more wide-ranging. They demonstrate a larger trade in ‘luxury’ goods than has been previously considered, including furs and cloths, spectacles and furniture. The third and final chapter in Part I examines the commercial networks within which such commodities were exchanged, the ways in which these integrated into their host communities and the effect they had on their homeland as a result. Comparisons are drawn between the nature of Scottish settlement in France and the experience of Scots elsewhere in Europe in destinations where extensive research has thus far been undertaken, for example Sweden and the Dutch Republic.

Part II, ‘Conflict and Commerce’, considers the effect that the volatile political events of the long seventeenth century had on these continuing commercial links. Chapter 4 discusses the effect of internal war and domestic crisis, including examination of the Wars of Religion in France, but using the British Civil Wars and Interregnum (1639-1660) as the primary case studies.\textsuperscript{44} Chapters 5 and 6 consider the impact of international crises on Franco-Scottish commercial relations, focusing on periods of war. In these chapters interpretation of official documentation is questioned, private sources brought to light, and emphasis placed on the ways in which merchants used the methods outlined in Part I to pursue trade in the face of adversity.

While readdressing a specific gap in the consideration of Scotland’s position on the European commercial scene and, more specifically, her special relationship with France, this thesis will adopt revisionist methodologies, questioning those traditionally adopted by economic historians. Evidence of government initiatives and trading figures should no longer be seen as the key components of identifying the condition of a

\textsuperscript{44} The dates of these wars can be determined in a number of ways – in dating them until 1660, the period taken into account runs from the outbreak of the First Bishops’ War in 1639 to the Restoration of the Stuart Monarchy in 1660. While many have seen the regicide of 1649 as the ‘end’ of the Civil Wars, events such as the Royalist Uprising, led by John 1\textsuperscript{st} Earl of Middleton (1652-1654) and the Glencairn Uprising (1653-1654) were ongoing. For a succinct account of the ongoing argument surrounding the dating of this conflict/s, see Macinnes, \textit{British Revolution}, 3-4
nation’s trade. This should be based instead on the sum of all the commercial endeavors of the nation, be they governmental, corporate or individual.
CHAPTER ONE

‘In consideration of the ancient confederation’.\(^1\)

Legislation and Alliance, 1560-1713

The Treaty of Edinburgh, July 1560, and the Reformation Parliament the following month have often been seen to have led directly to the expiration of the Auld Alliance between Scotland and France. Upon closer examination, however, the Treaty of Edinburgh was wholly concerned with the expulsion of French soldiers from Scotland – and even this was not absolute, with a French garrison being permitted to remain in the Castle of Dunbar and on the Isle of Inchkeith ‘until the Estates should find means to maintain the said forts upon their own charges’.\(^2\) Commerce is not mentioned – and neither is the Auld Alliance formally dissolved. This piece of legislation is a prime example of one that has traditionally been fundamentally misrepresented, along with trade embargoes, declarations of war and increases in customs duties, which have been seen as necessarily indicative of a faltering in commercial relationships.

This chapter will establish what types of legislation were passed concerning Franco-Scottish (and -British) commerce during the long seventeenth century. It will question the motivations of governments in passing such legislation and, most pertinently, ask whether such legislation can be taken at face value. The question of perception – whether the people it affected understood what the rules were – will be examined, as will any consequences for breaking them. The role of institutions such as the Convention of Royal Burghs in this relationship will also be re-evaluated. While the claim that the Convention did not pursue strict organisation of trade with France due to its limited scope is inaccurate,\(^3\) so are claims that ‘it was only by constant embassies and agitation by the Convention of Royal Burghs that…exemptions [and privileges] were maintained’\(^4\).

Legislation concerning the Auld Alliance will also be addressed. While it has been widely accepted that the Scots continuously pushed for a reiteration of ‘the privileges’ they had previously enjoyed, similar actions on behalf of the French have

---

\(^1\) 21 March 1599, CSP, XVIII, i, 431
\(^2\) J. Spottiswoode, *The History of the Church of Scotland* (Yorkshire, 1972) 148
\(^3\) T. Pagan, *The Convention of the Royal Burghs of Scotland* (Glasgow, 1926) 151, see Introduction
\(^4\) I. Grant, *The Economic History of Scotland* (London, 1934) 85
seldom been considered. The motivations of both sides in pursuing this continuation will be discussed – particularly in questioning the widely held view that the Franco-Scottish relationship was of benefit to Scotland, but a hindrance to her ‘more powerful’ ally.\(^5\) Any formal reiteration or abrogation of the Franco-Scottish relationship will be explored, along with the question of what the ‘privileges’ enjoyed by the Scots in France actually were.

I. **ECONOMICALLY MOTIVATED LEGISLATION**

‘The manufacture of this kingdom will abundantly serve for all domestick uses’.\(^6\)

As Part II will discuss in detail, any declaration of war suggests the breakdown of a relationship and many such declarations involved commercial matters. To take one example, the Scottish declaration of war on France in August 1689 stated clearly that the Privy Council ‘discharge all the leidges of his Majesties antient kingdom of Scotland to trade, corospond or have any intercourse or medling with the said French King or any of his subjects’.\(^7\) However, this particular declaration did not end all trade and correspondence between Scotland and France, and declarations of war and their effect on commerce can easily be misconstrued due to the complexity of motives for them and the many different aspects of a relationship they affected. Legislation that directly modified a commercial relationship – such as acts concerning the import and export of goods, or the increase or lowering of taxes and customs duties – may seem less susceptible to false interpretation, but in reality have not been any more immune to it. In the late sixteenth century bans on the export of coal (1563) and wool (1581 and 1597) were implemented in Scotland, legislation apparently affecting her export trade, her economy and her overseas commercial relations.\(^8\) Yet, as one scholar has noted, this may not have had a detrimental effect on Scotland at all. In fact, the standard mercantilist device for the encouragement of manufacture was the banning of the export of vital raw materials,\(^9\) and the majority of prohibitions on the exportation of certain

\(^{5}\) It is older literature which has recognised that both countries gained from this trade: H. Sée and A. Cormack, ‘Commercial Relations between France and Scotland in 1707’ in *Scottish Historical Review*, XXIII (1926) 275

\(^{6}\) 1681, RPCS, iii, VII, 653

\(^{7}\) 6 August 1689, RPCS, iii, XIV, 17-18

\(^{8}\) A. MacDonald, *The Burghs and Parliament in Scotland, c.1550-1651* (Aldershot, 2007) 68; see: 1 November 1597, APS, IV, 135; 13 May 1597, Dundee, RPCS, V, 386; 27 February 1581, APS III, 221

\(^{9}\) S. Lythe, *The Economy of Scotland in its European Setting, 1550-1625* (Edinburgh/London, 1960) 106
commodities seem to have been influenced by domestic concerns regarding manufacture, consumption, and a desire to improve Scotland’s economy from within, rather than being used as political tools in times of conflict.

Wider global economic developments and the effect they had on policy must also be considered, and changes in the salt trade highlight this. Scotland traditionally imported large volumes of salt from France’s Biscay ports but, during the sixteenth century, the importance of this salt throughout Europe began to decline, causing prices to rise and French production to fall. Meanwhile, Scotland’s own salt production was expanding, and the quality of her salt improving. Although the decline of the Franco-Scottish salt trade coincided with a perceived cooling of political and diplomatic relations the causes were economic and, as Edgar Lythe has convincingly argued, whatever had happened to their crown or church Scotland would have bought less French salt.\(^{10}\) The improvement of Scotland’s export trade in this commodity should be similarly considered in light of a wider European context, as well as the increase in domestic production. The Baltic lands had historically imported salt from Holland or France but, between 1576 and 1578, French producers were struggling to provide and the Dutch skippers, who carried salt from France to the Baltic, were suffering from political upheaval.\(^{11}\) As this coincided with the improvement of Scottish salt production, it is not surprising that there was a peak in shipments of salt from Scotland to the North in this period.\(^{12}\) Policy concerning the exchange of salt must therefore be viewed within this context. An Act of Parliament passed on 30 April 1574 prohibited natives from exporting salt from Scotland ‘without oure soverane lordis licence’,\(^{13}\) a stipulation which was implemented not due to political motivations but in an attempt to encourage domestic production and consumption of this commodity.

Restrictions were also placed on the importation of foreign salt to Scotland, again to encourage the use of that produced domestically. This policy did present some problems for Scotland. Despite the drop in production, Biscay salt remained the optimum salt for curing Scottish fish, and this issue remained prevalent throughout the period. The Aberdeen Council continuously sent commissioners to the Convention of

---

\(^{10}\) Lythe, *Economy of Scotland*, 175-6

\(^{11}\) Ibid, 160


\(^{13}\) 30 April 1574, *APS*, III, 93
Royal Burghs with instructions ‘to obtane ane libertie for bringing home of salt…this toune is singular for the mater of salting of fish and speciallie salmond which cannot be saltit without French salt’. In 1671 foreign salt was permitted to be imported, although it was stipulated that this should be only for the curing of fish intended for export, thereby protecting domestic production of salt as far as possible while encouraging the export trade in fish. This was reiterated ten years later by the Privy Council, who ‘seing the salt manufacture of this kingdom will abundantly serve for all domestick uses, that no forrain salt be allowed to be imported from France except for curing of salmond and Spanish salt for curing of herrings’. Such concessions suggest that embargoes affecting the salt trade were not intended to be political; this would have undermined them. Rather, restriction of importation as opposed to complete prevention suggests economic rather than political motives. Consumption of domestic commodities was encouraged, but as legislation in 1579 clarified, although ‘our said soveranis lieges may be first servit’ with domestic fish, if ‘abundance occurit…they micht be sellit and transportit’.

Legislation regarding wine imports followed a similar pattern. In February 1650 the Council of Aberdeen, when speaking on an ‘act anent our wyn customes’, stated that ‘we will onlie get allowit to us ane hundredth tunes in all…for ane year’. Similarly an act drafted in 1701 regulated the amount of French wine that could be imported per annum rather than preventing its importation entirely, ceding that wine could be imported with ‘a speciall license from the Lords of his Majesties theasurer’. In 1649 ‘An Act for Relief of Feltmakers and Hat-band-makers against Aliens and Strangers importing such Wares to the hinderance [sic.] of their Manufacturers’ demonstrates similar protectionism and laws were also passed against the exportation of native

---

14 Additional Instructions to Baillie Cullen, 1652, ACL, III, 214; see also Instructions to John Jaffray and Gilbert Gray, 12 October 1657, ACL, III, 295; Instructions to Mr Robert Patrie, 3 August 1671, ACL, V, 84, 86; Commission from the provost and bailies to Andrew Skeine, 6 November 1671, ACL, V, 101; 6 December 1671, ACL, V, 106. Concerns over the shortage of salt continued to be voiced during the reign of Queen Anne. George Flint wrote to the Earl of Morton that ‘I hear the Fishery of this Country is like to be quite lost this year for want of Foreign Sald; & that they intend to apply to the Government for leave to import Foreign Salt from Irland’: n.d., NAS GD150/3508/38. It is not clear whether this shortage of salt was due to a lack of availability or embargoes implemented during the War of the Spanish Succession.
15 Robert Mylne to the Provost and Magistrates, 7 December 1671, Edinburgh, ACL, V, 108
16 1681, RPCS, iii, VII, 653
17 October 1579, APS, III, 146
18 Instructions from the Council of Aberdeen to Alexander Jaffray, provost to the next session of Parliament, 20 February 1650, Aberdeen, ACL, III, 164
19 Draft Act of Parliament, 1701, NAS PA/7/17/1/90iv
commodities, including wool and beer, in 1662. In fact, the Crown was sometimes so committed to promoting domestic consumption of certain commodities that it compromised revenue from other avenues. In July 1695 privileges granted to the Incorporation and Society of Linen Manufactory were ratified, ‘considering the great advantage that may arise to this Kingdom’ by its establishment. This act also ordained, however, that the societies and masters and servants of the manufactory were to be free from customs and excise on malt liquors both in the citadel of Leith and in any other places where the company worked, presumably in an attempt by the Crown to ensure their loyalty and to keep the manufactory within the kingdom.

Evidently commercial legislation did not necessarily concern itself with wider European concerns, but often had domestic issues as its focus. Regulation of prices of goods sold within the kingdom was not always intended to control markets or revenue, but instead to regulate internal disputes between merchants and consumers – in 1599, for example, the price of French wines was limited to 5s. per pint. In 1638 the Provost, Baillie and Council of Banff ordained that no merchant should ‘carrie away furth of the said burgh any merchandice of merchand wair to any landwart pairt to be sold be them except it be to public mercatis and fayres’, regulating the ways in which commodities could be traded, but not preventing their sale.

The French also often prioritized economic rather than political concerns. In 1668 the mayor of Bordeaux forbade foreigners to deal with anyone in France except French merchants. On close reading this declaration implies not that Bordeaux wished to prevent foreign merchants participating in trade, but that by this stipulation the government hoped to protect the domestic economy by ensuring that French merchants were involved in every transaction. In November 1687, a year before the Nine Years’ War broke out, an ‘ Arrest du Conseil d’Etat du Roy, Qui regle l’Entrée des Draperies étrangers dans le Royaume’ was passed. The importation of foreign cloth was regulated, but no political motives for doing so were cited, and the declaration stated that ‘les Etrangers pour préjudicier aux Manufactures du Royaume se sont efforcez de les contrefaire en fabriquant des Draps de memes qualities & measures’.

---

20 5 September 1649, AO, II, 239-40; Instructions to Andrew Cant, Alexander Cant, John Menzies and George Meldrum from the Privy Council, 18 November 1662, Edinburgh, ACL, IV, 191-2
21 11 July 1695, APS, IX, 430
22 7 December 1599, Edinburgh, RPCS, VI, 62
23 2 July 1638, AB, 88
24 1668, TNA SP117/288
25 8 November 1687, ADLA C656
II. SOCIALLY AND POLITICALLY MOTIVATED LEGISLATION
‘Poore labouring people and servants who eat only bread and drinke water’.

Despite concerns for domestic economy and manufacture underlying many pieces of legislation, some commercial policy was not related to economic concerns. An act passed in July 1593 against exporting animal skins was ostensibly due to ‘how necessary and profitable the schurling skynis ar for lyning cuschenis making of pokis lyning powchis [and] gluiffs’, suggesting that here, also, the encouragement of domestic consumption was the primary motive. This particular act also notes, however, that these commodities were used for ‘clothing of the puir’, suggesting social concerns. An act prohibiting the importation of French wines in 1626 was motivated in part by consideration over scarcity of money in Scotland, but also cited ‘the wraik of mony poore people, who, neglecting that trade and calling whairunto thay ar called for winneing of their leving, does unthriftilie spend the most pairt of their meanis in drinking of wyne’, stating that the prohibition was being implemented ‘for preventing of whilk abuse’. This example suggests some discrepancies between purported and ulterior motivations for legislation, as it is in fact more likely that this was an act of retaliation for the seizure earlier that year by the French Governor of Guyenne of a fleet of 200 English and Scottish vessels who were bringing over the annual supply of French wines from Bordeaux (Chapter 5).

In 1641 an act prohibiting the exportation of eggs did so as ‘it bringis not any considerable moneyes into the country…Considering the dyet of poore labouring people and servants who eat only bread and drinke water if egges were restrained might be bettered by getting eggis…at an easir rate’.

Throughout the early modern period, one prevalent social motivation for closing trade links was disease. In 1629 the Privy Council considered potential danger as Denmark, Sweden, Bordeaux and other places in France, Orkney and Shetland were ‘visited with the contagious sicknesse of the pest’. In 1664 Sir George Downing wrote to Henry Bennett from the Hague referring to Scotland’s decision to prohibit all trade

---

26 16 November 1641, APS, V, 421
27 21 July 1593, APS, IV, 29-30
28 Whitehall, 12 December 1626, RPCS, ii, 1, 478-9
29 RPCS, ii, 1, 479-80, note. See Chapter 5.
30 16 November 1641, APS, V, 421. Similar acts include that ‘anent the Exporting of Victual’: 12 June 1649, APS, VII, ii, 409
31 17 December 1629, RPCS, III, 386
with the United Provinces for fear of contracting the plague.\textsuperscript{32} The French were similarly aware of such dangers, in September 1712 passing an ‘Ordonnance du Roy, portant reglement, Sur les Précaurions qui doivent être observes dans les Ports de France pour prévenir la communication du Mal Contagieux qui regne dans le Nord’, citing problems in Denmark (Copenhagen in particular) and Sweden, but also following European precedent, as ‘l’Angleterre & la Hollande avoient par des Placards des 4 & 16 septembre 1711 pris des precautions pour empêcher que les vaisseaux, Equipages ou marchandises provenant des Pays du nord n’y répandissent la Contagion’.\textsuperscript{33}

An emphasis on economic and social considerations is not to suggest that political considerations played no part in the formation of economic policy, although where they did this was again often indicative of domestic rather than international issues. A new custom proposed by Charles I in 1625 upon coal exported in foreign vessels had little to do with politics or commerce – this was instead intended as an additional tax, which the Convention of Royal Burghs unsurprisingly refused as they were concerned that trade would fall as a result.\textsuperscript{34} Some legislation was directly aimed against political enemies, including the ordinance passed in France in 1691 ‘interdisant à ses sujets ou aux étrangers d’importer des marchandises provenant des pays ennemis’.\textsuperscript{35} Some economic prohibitions can be directly linked to conflict, but not in terms of preventing trade. In 1643 an ordinance was laid ‘for the speedy raising and levying of moneys by way of charge and new-impost, upon the severall commodities…for the maintenance of the Forces raised for the defence of the King, Parliament, and Kingdom, both by Sea and Land’ and another new excise was raised on both native and foreign commodities in January 1644 ‘for the maintenance of the Armies raised in defence of the King and Parliament…the Navy cannot be sufficiently maintained out of the Revenue of theCustomes’.\textsuperscript{36} The use of new excise taxes to raise money was fairly common – in fact, this was seen at the beginning of the Interregnum as ‘the most equal and indifferent levy that can be laid upon the people’.\textsuperscript{37} On occasion,

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{32} [Sir George] Downing to [Henry] Bennett [first Earl of Arlington], 4/14 August 1664, TNA SP84/171/107
\item \textsuperscript{33} 12 September 1712, AMN GG 774
\item \textsuperscript{34} W. Dickenson and G. Donaldson (eds.), \textit{A Source Book of Scottish History}, 3 volumes (Edinburgh, 1958) III, 294. This act was also vehemently opposed by the owners of the coalhouses on the Forth: 2 November 1625, APS, V, 186
\item \textsuperscript{35} 1691, ADCM B5608
\item \textsuperscript{36} 8 September 1643, AO, I, 274-283. The goods included were wine, strong waters and salt, among many others; An Ordinance Touching the Excise of Flesh-Victuals, and Salt, 9 January 1643/4, AO, I, 364-6
\item \textsuperscript{37} 14 August 1649, AO, II, 213ff
\end{itemize}
in order to avoid inflaming a volatile political situation by imposing complete embargoes, taxes were simply raised to a level prohibitive to trade. Such attempts to maintain ostensible neutrality while pursuing a specific agenda did not pass unnoticed. The Committee for Trade in the Scottish Parliament in 1698 commented that France of late have prohibited the import of Scots goods by Scots men either directly or virtually by impositions equivalent to ane prohibition & as a remedy it is proposed That the import of ffrench goods be discharged until the scots preveledges be restored & those incumbrances & havy impositions be taken off.

Indeed, retaliation was another motive for the implementation of commercial legislation. In 1701 Parliament passed an act stating that ‘tradeing with France may be discharged until they take off the prohibition of importing our herring and imposition upon Salmond and Scots ships there’. Contemporaries recognised the problems caused by retaliatory legislation, as the Deputies of the Council of Trade created by Louis XIV commented that to forbid imports from England simply because England forbade imports from France ‘would be like cutting off both our arms in order to deprive ourselves of the use of one hand’. 

Political considerations not only affected the movement of commodities, but also the freedom of movement of commercial agents. The motivations for the 1652 act ‘for calling home Seamen and Mariners and Inhibiting such to serve abroad without License’ are not specified, but its concurrence with the outbreak of the first Anglo-Dutch War cannot be coincidental. The French also ordered merchants home when they needed to furnish an army. In a letter from an anonymous writer to Sir Charles Hedges, English Secretary of State, in 1705 it was noted that the French restricted sailings of merchant vessels so that they could impress sailors they required for the navy during the

38 1698, NAS PA7/16/86/1; see also, in relation to trade with England, RPCS, iii, VII, 652; see also D. Defoe, The Trade with France, Italy, Spain and Portugal Considered (London, 1713) 22-3 [emphasis mine]
39 9 January 1701, APS, X, appendix 82; see also 31 January 1701, APS, X, 278
War of the Spanish Succession. \textsuperscript{42} The sustenance of such men was also essential, necessitating restrictions on the export of victual. In 1644 it was decreed that

\begin{quote}
all means be used for provydeing of victual for maintenance of the armes…[Parliament] doe thairfore…inhibite All his majesties subjectis of what ranke and qualitie soever That nane of them presoome nor tak upon hand after the date heirof To transport out of the Kingdome anie maner of victual wheat beare oatis meale or ry.\textsuperscript{43}
\end{quote}

Pieces of legislation that were governed by political concerns were often precipitated, inevitably, by the outbreak of war or rebellion, and during the 1690s this pattern was no different. In 1696 a proclamation for apprehending people who remained in France illegally after 1694 was passed, listing many suspected Jacobites. \textsuperscript{44} In 1698 an ‘Act anent Persons going to and returning from France’ specifically concerned several disaffected persons who did go into or remain in the Kingdom of France during the late war contrary to the late Act of Parliament…We hereby Command and Appoint all Masters of Ships who shall bring home any passengers from any forraigne Countreyes after the date hereof that they do detain them and take security of them.’\textsuperscript{45}

Control of the movement of people was often effected by ordering that licences were required in order to travel abroad. While this may be presumed to have been a problem for merchants, in reality it seems to have been little more than an inconvenience, as passes do not seem to have been too hard to come by. In May 1693, during the Nine Years’ War, Scots were permitted to correspond with and travel to France with ‘express leave’ of the Monarchs or Privy Council – a loophole that allowed merchants to continue their trade while simultaneously allowing the government to guard against insurgency. \textsuperscript{46} During the War of the Spanish Succession, Queen Anne often granted passes to Scottish merchants to trade with France and Spain, and the plethora of appeals to her to do so suggest that this precedent had been set long before (Chapter 6). \textsuperscript{47}

Much of the legislation thus far examined, while often having some impact on commercial activity, was not usually directed specifically against France. In fact, some
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\item[{46}] 23 May 1693, ‘Act anent Corresponding with France’, APS, IX, 265-6
\item[{47}] 14 September 1705, APS, XI, 247
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was governed by concerns to protect the Franco-Scottish alliance. In 1570 the Privy Council laid down a proclamation stating that no one may repair in the pairtis of France in their accustumat traid of merchandice without a testimonial frome the Queen…quhilk proclamationioun or edict is sinisterlie purchest be the malice of wickit persoune to steir up occasioun of trubill and unquyetnes betuix our Soverane Lord and his darrest brother, the maist Christian King of France, their realms, dominions, and subjectis, in hurt and prejudice of the ancient league and constant amitie that so lang hes continewit betuix the nationis.48

Twenty years later James VI prohibited ‘the carriage of wine to Newhaven [Le Havre], St. Valirie [Saint-Valery-sur-Somme], and other Catholic places disobedient to the present authority of the King of France’, 49 compromising Scotland’s own trade in order to offer political support to the French King – legislation here governed by political rather than economic motives, but being pro- rather than anti-alliance.

III. DOMESTIC COMMERCIAL POLICY

‘It is lack of freedom rather than a shortage of capable merchants which cripples overseas trade and navigation.’ 50

Changes in the European economy led to a change in commercial policy in both France and Scotland in this period – particularly fostering a rise in protectionist policies.51 Although in France the implementation of mercantilist policies has long been synonymous with Jean-Baptiste Colbert (see below), this approach had been previously advocated by politicians and some attempts had been made to apply it.52 Henri IV, for example, worked towards the development of the silk industry of Tours by prohibiting the importation of Italian silks.53 Although on this occasion the Lyon merchants

48 [n.d.] 1570, RPCS, I, XIV (addenda) 56
49 14 August 1590, CSP, II, 581; c.f. proclamation by James VI, 14 August 1590, CSP, X, 378
52 Many reforms later attributed to Colbert had already been identified in Antoine de Montchrestien’s Treatise of Political Economy (1614) and later in Richelieu’s Political Testament (1624); J. Félix (D. Bell trans.), ‘The Economy’ in W. Doyle, (ed.), Old Regime France, 1648-1788 (Oxford, 2001) 23; A. Usher, ‘Colbert and Governmental Control of Industry in Seventeenth Century France’ in Review of Economics and Statistics, XVI (1934) 237. It has often been Colbert in particular who has been seen as mercantilist in the French context: T. Keith, ‘The Economic Causes for the Scottish Union’ in English Historical Review, XXIV (1909) 44
53 J. Ball, Merchants and Merchandise: the expansion of trade in Europe, 1500-1630 (London, 1977) 46
resisted, forcing the relaxation of this policy,\textsuperscript{54} on other occasions merchants encouraged such activity. When Louis XIV acceded to the French throne in 1643, the textile sector was in the midst of a crisis marked by falling sales, profits and production levels. In order to minimise production costs and stimulate the industry, the Languedoc merchants transferred the majority of their cloth production into rural areas and out of the hands of urban artisans who were allegedly damaging the quality of cloth – a system of ‘putting out’ which not only improved manufacture of this commodity but promoted cheaper manufacturing in the countryside.\textsuperscript{55} Although the policies of Henri IV and his chief minister Sully (Maximilian de Béthune) were not always successful, they did initiate an economic policy of state-building that provided impetus for the mercantilist achievements of Richelieu and Colbert.\textsuperscript{56} In November 1626 Cardinal Richelieu presented an economic programme to the Assembly of Notables in which he praised the Dutch for their ability to pool resources, blaming the French merchants’ lack of success on their propensity to carry on overseas trade as individuals, concluding that ‘il faut…de grandes companies, obliger les marchands d’y entrer, leur donner de grands privileges comme ils [the Dutch] font’.\textsuperscript{57} His encouragement of trading companies, however, met with resistance and ultimately failed.\textsuperscript{58} Louis XIV’s first attempt to stimulate France’s domestic commercial activity – a crackdown on the payment of the taxe des estrangers (2.5% on the value of their goods) in 1643 – robbed foreign factors of their whole commission, removing their motivation for doing business in France in

\textsuperscript{54} Ibid. The merchants of Lyon, their prosperity and status as a commercial city already having been undermined during the Wars of Religion, described this prohibition as ‘premature’ and exploited their strategic location near the frontiers of Italy and Savoy to induce the state to relax the prohibition. This was not the only one of Henri IV’s policies to be overturned by popular pressure. In 1605 Isaac Bernard, one of his court officials, was granted a ten-year monopoly on the transport of exported brandies from Nantes. The following year, the municipal authorities sided with the local producers when they protested against this monopoly, and Henri was forced to renounce this privilege. AMN HH 194, 237; H. de Bruyn Kops, \textit{A Spirited Exchange: the wine and brandy trade between France and the Dutch Republic in its Atlantic Framework, 1600-1650} (Leiden, 2007) 124


the first place and thus eliminating competition to domestic factors (Chapter 2). Yet although this may have helped to stimulate the commercial activities of native factors in the short term, it also damaged France’s overseas trade.

Several projects of economic reorganisation were entertained in the first half of the seventeenth century, but there was little effective accomplishment before the rise of Colbert. Colbert deemed a standardisation of business practice one of the most essential elements for the improvement of commerce, and in March 1673 laid out a code savary (code of commerce), detailing rules for apprenticeships and the admission of masters, regulations for bankers and brokers and instructions for the formation of companies, partnerships and instruments of credit. He also limited rates of interest on loans, hoping to encourage investors to put their money directly into business or commercial enterprise rather than acting individually as bankers or brokers. To consolidate this approach, and in line with the policy of Sully that had been so unpopular under Henri IV, Colbert reduced duties on imports of raw materials and exports of manufactures, levying high duties instead on exports of raw materials and the importation of manufactured goods.

The level of Colbert’s success and any effect it had on French commerce has been hotly debated, with some arguing that under his regime France was able to ‘direct its economy towards the ideal of self-sufficiency’ and others maintaining that he ‘damaged French shipping interests and discouraged French efforts to take part in the highly competitive northern branch of shipping enterprise’. One French scholar has recognised that ‘l’histoire, la personnalité et l’œuvre de Colbert ont été déformées par l’historiographie’. Voltaire noted that ‘the enemy captured fewer French merchant
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59 de Bruyn Kops, *Spirited Exchange*, 34, 44; Cornette, *Chronique*, 226
61 Cole, *Colbert*, 360-1. Rates of interest were limited to 5% in 1665 and raised to 5 5/9% in 1672 at the outbreak of the Dutch war. At this point banks were still underdeveloped, with most banking continuing to be done through the hands of private individuals or small companies: W. Doyle, *The Old European Order, 1660-1800* (Oxford, 1992) 8, 37, 61-2
62 Cole, *Colbert*, 415
ships because there were fewer to be captured, Colbert’s death and the war having greatly reduced trade’, suggesting that during his life, Colbert had a positive effect on commerce. Undoubtedly, Colbert had attempted to tackle one of France’s biggest problems and, like Sully, precipitated massive economic recovery in some sectors, for example ending the crisis in the French textile industry. However, his reforms also caused problems for France’s overseas trade. Foreign ships had become accustomed to the advantages of trading with France on the numerous occasions when authorities, prioritising dynastic or political success, seemed willing to sacrifice the interests of their native merchants and shippers. Under Colbert, protective measures temporarily closed ports and a ‘hot and cold’ shipping policy damaged French shipping interests. In fact, although external war later in the century disrupted trade to some degree (Chapters 5 and 6), it has been argued that the nationalistic economic policies developed by Colbert had by this time already affected Franco-Scottish trade – for example, the abolition in 1663 of the exemption granted to Scots from the 50 sous per ton levy imposed on foreign imports. Moreover, by the time Colbert implemented his new tariff of 1667 the monarchy, government and financial position of the French crown had all improved – in part due to the conclusion of the Franco-British war of 1666-1667 (Chapter 5). These new tariffs, therefore, unlike those implemented three years previously, focused not on domestic improvement but on injuring the trade of rival countries, and almost all duties were increased (Appendix I.i). Although these increased tariffs were designed to act primarily against the Dutch who, despite being allied with France in the war few tolls and excises...local tradition thwarted his attempt to simplify France’s heterogeneous system of weights and measures’.

65 Voltaire, Age of Louis XIV, 161
66 In 1661, when he came to office, the royal income was approximately 32,000,000 livres p.a., while expenditure was 53,000,000. At Colbert’s death in 1683, income had risen to 94,000,000 and expenditure fallen to 40,000,000. G. Rowlands, The Dynastic State and the Army under Louis XIV: Royal Service and Private Interest, 1661-1701 (Cambridge, 2002) 111; Corvisier, Le France, 167; Cole, Colbert, 363; Félix, ‘The Economy’, 24-5
67 Bamford, ‘French shipping’, 208
68 Bamford, ‘French shipping’, 209; Cole, Colbert, 7. Several deputies of the French Council of Trade recognised that countries needed to import if they also exported, bringing us back to considerations over the balance of trade. Scoville, French Economy, 233
70 Cole, Colbert, 428-430; see also Levasseur, Histoire du Commerce, 356-360; Cornette, Chronique, 151; for the duties laid on 18 September 1664 see Anon., The Tariff settled by the French King and Council, September 18, 1664: Shewing the Duties agreed to be paid upon the several sorts of Merchandizes, Goods, Wares etc, being the Growth, Product and Manufactures of Great Britain, which should be imported from England unto France (London, 1713)
against the Stuart Kingdoms remained a fierce economic rival, in practice they were arguably more damaging to English and Scottish ship-owners and merchants. Despite further negotiations between England and France for a commercial treaty, from 1668 commercial relations became strained by Colbert’s tariff legislation.

Colbert was seen by some as ‘a sort of watchful father to the merchants of France’, or ‘the protector of merchants’, but many hated his interference and distrusted his motives. To many merchants the economic sanctions imposed, particularly protectionist measures, prevented them from buying in the cheapest markets. While the deputies of the 1700 Council of Trade maintained that Colbert had helped overseas trade by simplifying tariffs, subsidising shipping and shipbuilding and challenging the maritime supremacy of the Dutch and English, they believed that merchants should be granted more freedom and did not want to see a perpetuation of Colbert’s policy of regulation and control, as ‘commerce is presently too constrained both internally and externally…it is this lack of freedom rather than a shortage of capable merchants which cripples overseas trade and navigation’.

Scotland’s commercial policies must also be considered. Charles I’s policies have been seen as particularly damaging. His liberality with corporate monopolies, primarily in staple domestic commodities such as salt and malt, caused discord among independent commercial agents; this trend had begun under James VI, with 700 monopolies already granted by 1625. Furthermore, in Britain as well as in France the cost of shipbuilding rose as the cost of domestic timber, plank, hemp, flax, pitch and tar increased, encouraging shipbuilders to import cheaper materials from elsewhere, for example Scandinavia, hindering domestic production. In an attempt to bring Scottish
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71 J. Jones, Britain and the World: 1649-1815 (Sussex, 1980) 120. Certainly French records suggest that this tariff was directed against the English, rather than British commerce as a whole. In 1698, there is recorded a ‘Mémoire sure les droits levés à l’entrée en France sur les marchandises et denrées d’Angletère ou provenant du commerce anglais en vertu du tariff de 1667’. AN Marine B’ 499, 118
72 Cole, Colbert, 431. Although the commercial relationship became strained, the political relationship seemed to suffer less, with covert negotiations between Louis and Charles leading to the Treaty of Dover in 1670. See Sir Arthur Bryant, (ed.), The Letters of King Charles II (New York, 1968 edition) 274, speech of Charles II to both Houses, 7 January 1674; also 222, 243-245
73 Cole, Colbert, 362. For more on Colbert’s contribution to French commerce see Chapter 4.
74 Doyle, Old European Order, 66
75 BnF Fonds Français, ms 8038, f105, cited in Scoville, ‘French Economy’, 234
76 G. Howat, Stuart and Cromwellian Foreign Policy (London, 1974) 6; Smith, Creating a World Economy, 116-7
practice in line with England James VI, at his final Privy Council before he went to London in 1603, attempted to prevent merchants from freighting foreign bottoms. For James, this stemmed from a desire to bring Scotland and England under a common rule, but from the time of Cromwell’s invasion and under the aggressive mercantilism that followed Scotland ceased to be treated as an equal. The English protectionist lobby succeeded in having the Scottish Marine reassigned ‘alien’ status in a new series of acts including the 1660 Navigation Act, the 1662 Act of Frauds and the 1663 Act for the Encouragement of English Trade, excluding foreigners (but particularly Hollanders) from the import trade of England, except as carriers of their own commodities. These acts excluded Scottish traders from further participation in English colonial and domestic trades and imposed inflated duties on the movement of cattle, sheep, corn and salt from Scotland to England.

Scottish retaliation, in the form of the Scottish Navigation Act of 1661, included import embargoes and colonial and fishery schemes, but failed to produce a workable homespun version of mercantilism. Later in the century, attempts in Scotland to harden mercantilist policy included further bans on the co-ownership of vessels with foreigners. In 1681, in an attempt to resurrect the domestic
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78 The policy that only native ships should be used in shipping was proclaimed in 1615, as James VI attempted to utilise British shipping to its full capacity, having claimed that native ships were stagnant in port for want of employment. This was met with protest from Scottish skippers: 9 February 1619, Edinburgh, RPCS, II, 511. The burgh commissioners objected that other countries, especially France, might retaliate, but in response James argued that the French would still need to sell wine each year and so would not refuse to send it to Scotland on Scottish ships. RPCS, XI, xi; S. Mowat, The Port of Leith: its History and its People (Edinburgh, 1994) 153; Pagan, Convention, 156. The Privy Council supported this proclamation as they believed it would bolster the shipping industry: 27 July 1617, Glasgow, RPCS, II, 202-203. Despite the continued discouragement of the acquisition of foreign ships by the 1660 Navigation Act, a large number of Dutch ships continued to be purchased by both English and Scottish owners, although Scottish skippers acted to circumvent this legislation by having foreign-built ships registered as Scottish. V. Barbour, ‘Dutch and English Merchant Shipping in the Seventeenth Century’ in P. Emmer and F. Gaastra (eds.), The Organization of Interoceanic Trade in European Expansion, 1450-1800 (Aldershot, 1996), 109, 110, 130. In July 1626, several Scots who owned Flemish-built ships had them inspected by the Master and Brethren of Trinity House in England and certified as Scottish. 12 July 1626, CSPD, 1625-1626, 374. In 1629 Scottish ships were still being certified by Trinity House: 14 November 1629, CSPD, 157: the Seaventure of Kirkcaldy is noted as a 140 ton Yarmouth built vessel. S. Murdoch, The Terror of the Seas? Scottish Maritime Warfare, 1513-1713 (Leiden, 2010) 166 n.72. The Convention was worried that this would lead to higher freighting prices and damage Scottish trade, and they proposed a compromise in which freight to France and the south would be carried in Scottish or English vessels and that trade to the Baltic would remain the decision of individual merchants. The skippers, however, recognised the importance of the Baltic trade and refused this offer: 9 July 1619, Haddington, CRB, III, 87-88
79 RPCS, iii, 1, xxxv
80 E. Graham, A Maritime History of Scotland, 1650-1790 (East Linton, 2002) 330; Barbour, ‘Merchant Shipping’, 108; D. Woodward, ‘Anglo-Scottish Trade and English Commercial Policy during the 1660s’ in Scottish Historical Review, LVI (1977) 161. As Donald Woodward has demonstrated, Scottish cattle continued to be exported to England after the prohibitions implemented in 1663, and in 1664 the English Council of Trade recommended a relaxation of these restrictions, as they believed that their own market was being damaged: Woodward, ‘Anglo-Scottish Trade’, 153, 162-164
ship-building industry, the Privy Council compelled any Scottish owners of multi-
national ships to ‘sell their partes to forraigners or forraigners their partes to
Scotsmen’. In the same year, a Council of Trade was revived under James, Duke of
York (Lord High Admiral of Scotland), who intended to recover Scotland’s prosperity
by stimulating an export-orientated carrying trade while actively discouraging imports
with heavy customs tariffs, hoping to eliminate the trade deficit and bring Scotland in
line with the developed European mercantilist system.

IV. LEGISLATIVE VARIANCES

‘There are but Three Ports in France at which our
Manufactures are admitted to be imported’

As well as complex motivations for the implementation of legislation, its execution was
also convoluted. Rates on the same commodities hailing from different countries were
not consistent, for example. In 1644 rates of customs and excise on wine imported to
Scotland differed depending on the origin of the wine. While the import duty on a pint
of French wine was 1s. 4d., on the same amount of Spanish wine it was a comparatively
hefty 2s. 8d. Regulations were also somewhat inconsistent, depending on the purpose
for which the wine was purchased. In 1657 it was ordained that wine which was not
Spanish was liable for £6 of import duty per tun, to be paid by the buyer of the wine;
whereas Spanish wine was liable for £9, also payable by the buyer. However, if the
wine was being bought for the purpose of selling it on, the retailer was liable for the
duty, which was 30s. per tun. Trade in other commodities had similarly diverse rules.
An act of 1681 ‘anent the prices of French and Spanish salt’ stipulated, in order to
‘prevent the unnecessary importation of forreigne Commodities and the exorbitant
prices that may be exacted from the Leiges’, that ‘the Inland Salt of this Kingdom is
sufficient for all other uses except the cureing of Fishes and Beef exported…all
Importers of French Salt or Retailers thereof…shall not…exact more…then [sic.] Five
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81 22 February 1681, Edinburgh, RPCS, VII, 657; E. Graham, ‘The Scottish Marine during the Dutch
wars’ in Scottish Historical Review, LXI (1982) 71, 89
82 Graham, Maritime History, 51-2
83 25-27 June 1713, Mercator or Commerce Retrieved, issue 15, London
84 29 July 1644, APS, IV, i, 238
85 26 June 1657, AO, II, 1186-1223. It was unusual for Spanish wine to be measured in tuns rather than
butts – French wines were usually measured in tuns.
punds Scots for the Linlithgow boll of French Salt’, whereas ‘Importers and Retailers of Spanish salt shall not exceed six punds for the Linlithgow Boll thereof’. 86

While it is tempting to view nations as single entities, legislation often targeted specific ports or commodities rather than encompassing whole countries and rates of customs were often inconsistent. Rates from 1643 show a number of such discrepancies. 88

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Commodity</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Customs duty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Venetian, Florentine or Milan</td>
<td>12 ounces</td>
<td>3s. 4d.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gold and silver thread</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French and Paris gold and</td>
<td>11.5 ounces</td>
<td>2s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>silver thread</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridges silk</td>
<td>16 ounces</td>
<td>2s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paris silk</td>
<td>16 ounces</td>
<td>9d.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Callicoe quilt</td>
<td>1 item</td>
<td>2s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satin or silk quilt</td>
<td>1 item</td>
<td>6s. 8d.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French quilts</td>
<td>Dozen</td>
<td>4s. 8d.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1.1   Schedule of Commodities to be taxed, 22 July 1643

It should be noted that some French commodities seem to have had a substantially lower tax laid on them than the same commodities from elsewhere. 89 Control of the import and selling of wine from different ports of the same country also differed. The Scottish Parliament stipulated in 1573 the maximum prices that imported wine could be sold for. 90

86 17 September 1681, APS, VIII, 356
87 France did not have a single unified economy, rather a number of regional economies – which have traditionally been seen in economic terms as the Eastern Provinces, trading to Germany and the Rhineland, the North and West, trading to the Netherlands, and Central France, concentrating on Mediterranean trade: D. Parker, La Rochelle and the French Monarchy: Conflict and Order in Seventeenth Century France (London, 1980) 61
88 Schedule of Commodities to be taxed, 22 July 1643, AO, I, 208-214
89 This is examined in more detail in relation to wine imports in Chapter 2.
90 30 April 1573, APS, III, 82
Table 1.2 Maximum prices at which imported wine could be sold, 30 April 1573

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Origin</th>
<th>Maximum Price per tun</th>
<th>Maximum price per pint</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bordeaux</td>
<td>£24</td>
<td>12d.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Haultpoyis' (a town in the Bordeaux region)</td>
<td>£22</td>
<td>12d.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Cunyeak' (Cognac)</td>
<td>£20</td>
<td>10d.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Rochelle</td>
<td>£16</td>
<td>8d.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In July 1596 the Convention of Royal Burghs discussed ‘the lait impost at Deip’, which ‘is ceissit sen Maij last’, suggesting that this impost was both temporary and particular to this port. A commissioner sent by the Convention of Royal Burghs to France in 1601, charged with ‘doungetting of the customeis rayssit in France upoun the guide passand thearto further of this realm, contrair the preveldgeis grantit to this natioun and by the auld custome payit of befoir’, was instructed to consider goods being exported from Scotland to specific ports, namely Calais, Saint-Valery-sur-Somme, Le Tréport, Dieppe, Le Havre, Rouen and even Cayenne. Some ports, the ones with a significant Scottish presence, are notable for their absence – Bordeaux and La Rochelle in particular. This could have been either because the rates in these ports were satisfactory, or because it was perceived that there was little trade between Scotland and these ports (the latter is highly unlikely). Perhaps this was simply not intended to be an exhaustive list – either way, these discrepancies may have caused some confusion. In January 1612 the Convention of Royal Burghs suggested the placement of Scottish collectors at French ports, yet only considered ports in Normandy, naming Rouen, Dieppe, Le Havre and Caen. Often arrêts issued by the French Council of Commerce concerned only specific parts of France – for example, that issued against Scottish merchants trading in Normandy in 1635. Yet such stipulations and complications in trade were not new to
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91 Before her formal annexation to France after the Fronde in 1653, Bordeaux was often recognised as a separate entity; in July 1605 discussions between the English and Scottish Privy Councils concerning the appointment of two Scottish and two English agents to be sent into France to report on the relative privileges of the Scots and the English in France stipulated that this included ‘all trade with France distinct from the Bordeaux wine trade’. RPCS, VII, xxxv, 472-3; see also 1 July 1601, CRB, II, 104
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the post-Reformation period, nor were they confined to times of conflict, as the 1635 *arrêt* demonstrates. A proclamation of 8 January 1550 had ordained that French wine could not be purchased for dearer than £22 10s. per tun of Bordeaux wines, £18 per tun of Rochelle wines and £25 per tun of Cognac wines.\(^{96}\) In France in particular, the implementation of legislation differed between regions, depending on both local tradition and particular circumstances – for example, some regions were governed by statute law, while others were governed by common law.\(^{97}\)

Regulations on customs and excise in the British Isles were similarly inconsistent, and legislation also differed between different ports. In 1633, Charles I granted Edinburgh and Glasgow alone an exemption from wine duty.\(^{98}\) In England in January 1644 it was specified that the excise on domestic salt had to be paid by the maker, whereas in Scotland the first buyer of the salt was liable.\(^{99}\) The differences in the implementation of legislation across the Stuart kingdoms is perhaps unsurprising, but confirms that Scotland remained largely independent from England after the Union of Crowns – an issue which will be examined further in Part II. Differences in the amount of customs duties that were payable also depended on who physically brought the commodities into British ports. In 1647 a tun of wine brought into London by an Englishman was charged £4 10s, whereas the same amount of wine brought in by an alien was charged £6 – similarly, wine brought into any other port by a native was charged £3; by an alien, £4 10s.\(^{100}\) In terms of customs duties at least, it was cheaper for French vintners to use British merchants to carry their wine back to Britain, rather than importing it in their own ships. In 1649 the importation of wine, wool or silk from France was prohibited in England and Ireland, but not Scotland – perhaps indicative of the different political situations north and south of the border as Scotland, under Argyll, rejected the regicide and declared for Charles II.\(^{101}\)

\(^{96}\) 21 March 1550, R. Pitcairn, *Criminal Trials in Scotland, from AD 1488 to AD 1624*, I (1833) 349
\(^{98}\) Robert Patrie and Alexander Alexander to the Baillies, 31 August 1672, Edinburgh, *ACL*, V, 192. This highlights the care that needs to be taken in analysing trading patterns. It would not be surprising if both ports saw an increase in the importation of wines after 1633, yet this would be due primarily to this ordinance, rather than to the general political or economic climate.
\(^{99}\) 9 January 1644, *AO*, I, 365
\(^{100}\) 16 December 1647, *AO*, I, 1032-1042. See also 19 March 1661, *APS*, VII, 88
\(^{101}\) 28 August 1649, *AO*, II, 239-40. This act was repealed, 26 June 1657, *AO*, II, 1129
V. FORMATION AND IMPLEMENTATION OF LEGISLATION

‘The Custom house officers are so agog of seizing.’

By definition legislation was conceived and implemented by governmental bodies, rather than the wider population that was affected by it – in our case, merchants, manufacturers, retailers and consumers. It is not surprising that the populace made use of representative bodies such as the Convention of Royal Burghs or the Privy Council in pushing for reduction in taxes or the abolition of certain decrees. Yet despite claims that ‘even the most powerful merchant groups had no direct control over the state or policy’, instead merely trying to keep commercial objectives to the fore, throughout this period individuals at all levels were directly involved in the formation of commercial policy. Some acted as consultants; in 1681 merchants in Scotland were invited to participate in commercial proceedings of the Privy Council. Similarly the Councils of Commerce established in France by Colbert in 1664 and Louis XIV in 1700 involved members of the commercial classes; Louis XIV appointing thirteen men with ‘experience in commercial matters’ to act as deputies and advise the controller general and the secretary of the marine.

Petitioning was one typical way in which merchants and manufacturers attempted to influence policy. In 1672 the Masters of the Soap Works in Leith stated that despite the fact that soap works had been erected and the importation of foreign soap prohibited, ‘forraigne soape is brought in als great quantitie as ever…the manufactories of the country is therby absolutely discurraded and ruined’. Similarly in 1681 the saltmasters of Aberdeen submitted a petition ‘craving that all forraine salt may be discharged to be imported except for the curing of fish…and that they themselves may onlie import quhat is needful for fish’. These petitions are perhaps unsurprising – it stands to reason that those responsible for the domestic production of certain commodities would act if their businesses were affected by the importation of goods from abroad. In some cases, however, wider economic awareness was exhibited. In 1669 Robert Richardson, a sugar maker in Edinburgh, asked that ‘any goods which
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are needed to be imported for the setting up of manufactories, for the encouragement of domestic production, may be imported without charge of customs or excise’. While the encouragement of domestic production was probably mentioned more as rhetoric than as a pressing personal concern, this nevertheless demonstrates an appreciation of the wider economic situation. The 1681 petition of the weavers, spinners and rural domestic producers against exporting wool to France considered both social and economic implications, acting to protect their own ventures but also voicing apparent concern about the state of their nation’s society and economy. They maintained that by exporting wool to France and elsewhere Scotland had ‘exposed the inhabitants to all manner of means silliness vice and debaucherie throw idleness, so we have robbed the poor of their bread and given it to strangers’. The petition cited a ‘neglect to improve the product of our own nation’, and the danger that

the French will set up manufactories with our wool and by stealth import it unto England, And we our selves shall receive our own back with a heave…the French in time will fill all the places wherewith we and the English trade in woollen manufactorie.  

One issue broached in such petitions was the perception that domestic conventions did not always support legislation. In 1685 the Incorporation of Tailors of Edinburgh sent a petition to the Privy Council concerning the Act of Parliament forbidding merchants to import foreign cloth. They held that as there was ‘noe prohibition nor restraint as to the wearing of forraigne cloaths’, tailors who were unaware of the origin of the cloth they were supplied with suffered unduly. Furthermore, they stated that authorities ‘upon pretendit commissiones…cary away what they find at ther plea sure, soe that by this means your petitioners trade is absolutely ruined, for none will adventure to put any cloathes in their hands’. There is also some misunderstanding here, however, as there had been some acts passed which restricted the wearing of certain clothes, for example an act in 1672 ‘against all persones quha wearis silver or gold leafe silver buttons or
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louping, striped silks etc…non of the said commodities ar to be imported…The said act is to reatche womenis apparel als weill as menis’.  

The complex nature of commercial legislation unsurprisingly gave rise to confusion among both merchants and authorities. In 1614, in response to a proclamation prohibiting any goods being imported into England except in English ships, the French king issued an edict to the same effect. Although this was focused on England, it was also ‘to the great prejudice of the merchant estait of the Kingdome of Scotland’. When Scots factors appealed to the Parlement of Paris, however, they were assured that this edict ‘did no ways extend towards the subjects of the Kingdome of Scotland, their ancient friends and allayes’ – merchants themselves facilitating clarification of this legislation. Moreover, this highlights the ongoing distinction between Scotland and England after 1603, and that notions of the Auld Alliance persisted in terms of economic policy. In 1686 the Edinburgh merchant George Veitch and James Clerk, his correspondent, petitioned the Privy Council concerning the duty imposed in 1681 on the importation of bound volumes, to which the Council replied

it was not understood that the forsaid imposition imposed upon bound books imported was to be exacted off any lawfull books that are out of print or scarce to be had within the kingdome, and therefore the saids Lords does hereby allow the petitioners from time to time to import into this kingdome all lawfull books.

Despite periodically seeking clarification of their trading rights, it has been suggested that Scottish merchants were ‘apparently oblivious’ to embargoes implemented from London designed to inhibit imports to the British nations from France. Certainly it seems that they more often adhered to their perceptions of whether legislation should apply to them than to its actual stipulations, although this does not seem to have been due to obliviousness. In 1705 the French Board of Trade granted an extension to the passports of Dutch traders, who were at this time the direct enemies of France. Although the same favour was not granted to Scotsmen several
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Scottish shipmasters believed nonetheless that these decrees were applicable to them, and in 1712 appealed for the privilege of freely exporting their herring to France as ‘the Dutch had this privilege before the war and we were very unjustly refused it since that the Scots much more than a hundred years agoe were and are all naturalised in France beside the benefit they may demand of a free Commerce’.\textsuperscript{116}

It is unsurprising that not all merchants understood the complex legislation passed in this period, even when it related specifically to them, but authorities, too, often misunderstood legislation or seemed unwilling to implement it. In 1607 Thomas Inglis, merchant burgess of Edinburgh, complained to the Privy Council concerning the difference between the ‘bind of Burdeaulz and heich cuntrey wynis’. While importers of the latter had always received ‘every fyft tun in the payment of their imposi’t, the takkismen of the customes burdynnis the said compleenair with the hail imposi’t of certane canarie wynis brught hame be tham within theis kingdom, craving als mekle for the canarie as for wyne seck, albeit it be of treuth that the pype of canarie is sevin gallonis les not the pype of seck, and thairfoir the lyke consideratioun proportionallie aucht to be had in the imposi’t of thir wynis as is had in the imposi’t of the cuntrey and tun wyns of France.\textsuperscript{117}

Such complaints persisted throughout the period. In a similar case in 1676 it was reported to the Aberdeen Council that merchants were being charged ‘with generall letters of horneing when not guiltie’ and denounced ‘wherby they ware debarred from persutes and defence of their lawfull actions and were forceit to suspend and relax or to compone with the collectors’.\textsuperscript{118} Into the eighteenth century, George Flint complained of the ruination of the wine trade of Scotland, as ‘the Custom house officers [are] so agog of seizing, that no sooner a Wine ship approaches a porte; But the first that can get aboard seizes her right or wrong, for Importing French Wines’.\textsuperscript{119} There were complaints concerning lack of action, as well as mistaken action. In 1608 the Scottish Parliament talked of ‘the bipast negligence in not seiking the executioun’ of acts against the exportation of coals and ‘barkit ledder’, as a
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grite nowmeris of personis preferring their privt gayne to the obedience of the law ar not effrayed privatlie and publictlie to transports the saidis commodities To the grite hurte of the commounweele. Thairfore the estaities presentlie conveyed ordains new intimation and publicatioun to be maid of the saidis actis.\textsuperscript{120}

The extent to which legislation was implemented varied, despite some efforts of bodies such as the Admiralty Court to punish lawbreakers. As will be demonstrated throughout this thesis, commercial agents often displayed impressive cunning in finding numerous ways of circumventing laws but in many cases were allowed to do so with ease, calling into question not only the dedication and commitment of these bodies to enforcing legislation, but also whether the legislation itself was fundamentally enforceable. In some cases, merchants were merely afforded the benefit of the doubt. In 1595, following an Act of Parliament regulating the prices of imported wines, merchants and skippers who had brought wines home that year petitioned the Privy Council to be allowed to sell their wines at the old prices, claiming that they had embarked on their voyages with no knowledge of the change – this was permitted.\textsuperscript{121} In 1627, in contravention of an act prohibiting the importation of French wines, several merchants claimed to have brought home these wines ‘before…this restraint could be made known to them’, and the wines were permitted to be sold, provided the customs were paid.\textsuperscript{122} Such claims were relatively common and were generally accepted, particularly when dates of sailing corroborated the claim that merchants had been unaware of the legislation when they embarked on the voyage. Yet in other cases, authorities chose leniency when punishment might have been deemed a more appropriate course of action. In 1643 Robert Constable appealed to the Council of Aberdeen after he was caught trading illicit goods from Flanders under commission from Scotsmen. He claimed that, having been out of the country in the East Indies for 16 years, ‘quhat I have done hes bene out of ignorance not knowing the laws’. In 1645 he was admitted as a free burgess and fined – a relatively lenient punishment, given that contravention of some embargoes was punishable by death.\textsuperscript{123} Moreover, the level of punishment received by a transgressor might also depend on luck – for example, who apprehended you and what the miscreant’s political or religious persuasion was. The

\begin{footnotes}
\end{footnotes}
Marquis of Hamilton seized a Scottish ship laden with salt from La Rochelle in 1639 and asked Sir Henry Vane for advice regarding how the master of the ship should be dealt with, stressing that he found him to be ‘a verie honest man swears he neid subscryved the countries covenant and most willingly did sweare and signe that oath and the oath of supremacie’. On this occasion, the severity of the treatment received by the merchant would be decided by a question of political loyalty.

VI. THE AULD ALLIANCE

‘De faulfe de l'amitie et continuation de l'alliance avec c'est couronne’. 125

As we have already seen, the ‘ancient friendship’ between Scotland and France was often cited after 1603 to account for Scotland’s independent commercial position. There were attempts to re-implement the Scottish privileges in France, including the Auld Alliance in its pre-Reformation form. While it has been asserted that post-Reformation ‘as a first economic result, the trading privileges enjoyed by Scotsmen in France became less secure’, in fact both the existence and significance of the Franco-Scottish trading route continued to be documented. 126 Almost four decades after the Reformation James VI, perhaps motivated by the potential revenue, opened negotiations for observing the old liberties and privileges granted to Scottish merchants trading with France, and for obtaining discharge of customs and imposts raised on goods imported into that realm or transported furth thereof. Benefits redounding to the merchants of this country from the discharge of the said customs and exactions to be annexed to the crown. 127

To give just one more example, in January 1644 Charles I authorised the Privy Council of Scotland to appoint someone to go to the French court and ask that they ‘micht be restored to the former priviledges and enjoy the samene in tyme cuming without diminutione’. 128 Yet despite Pagan’s inference that these attempts came only from the
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Scottish side, the French also pushed for renewal of the old privileges. In 1561 a senator of Bordeaux, ‘Noalins’, came as ambassador to Scotland and ‘craved that the league betwixt Scotland and England might be brokin, the ancient league betweene Scotland and France might be renued’. While a decision was delayed until Parliament was due to convene the following May, this demonstrates not only that there was a desire to reiterate the alliance as soon as one year following its ‘demise’ but that this desire was on the French side as much as the Scottish. As David Chalmers of Ormond observed in 1579:

Premierement icelle alliance est digne de grande merveille à raison de l’ancienneté, y ayant tantoft 800, ans quelle fut commence, & tousiours observe sans avoir esté rompue depuis: chose admirable & nonpareille. Auparavant nulle histoire n’a fait mention, de quelque autre confederation que ce soit, laquelle ait duré si long temps de la troisieme partie.

If Scotland were the inferior partner in this alliance she would not have been in any position to negotiate, but in 1583 when offered a renewal of alliance terms by the French the Scots, rather than bending to their ally’s desire, saw this offer as an opportunity to obtain what they wanted from England.

On the 14th there arrived an embassy from Scotland...[Colonel Stuart] is to request this Queen [Elizabeth, of England] to give a firm assignment for 12,000lib to pay the pensions and the guard that holds the King, and to lend him a sum of money to repair the fortresses, some of which are in ruins. It is even said that if she will not agree to it they will be obliged to renew the alliance with France, and accept the subsidy and pensions from that country, which are again being offered by the French.

Five years later, a report from the Bishop of Glasgow suggested that the French had a specific need to preserve the Alliance, as he ‘d’informer le Roy son filz quelle perte il pourroict avoir si a leur default vous tumbiez en aultres mains au deffaulte de l’amytie et continuation delalliance avec ceste couronne’.

Scotland in France’, as part of ‘Ane Inventar of the whole Wreats belonging to the City of Edinburgh’. These included notes on the privileges granted in 1510, 1520 and 1554. CRB, II, 576-7. There are many examples throughout the CRB records of such embassies being sent.
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Eighty-four years after the Reformation, re-establishment of the Alliance was still being mooted. In 1644 French diplomats, concerned with the visit of Sir Thomas Dishington, reported that

the first thing to be done is to re-establish promptly and efficiently the privileges of his nation and its ancient alliance with France. That without this re-establishment nothing can be done in the present state of things...It is necessary that those of his country be satisfied with the treatment they receive here.  

While the French pressed for a formal reestablishment of the Auld Alliance, the Scots continued to play a political game. Throughout this correspondence the Scots were careful not to commit themselves to another formal alliance, instead obtaining all they could from France without offending England. The French had long been aware of this and in 1584 Henri III stated that he did not wish to affect Scotland’s relationship with England, merely to preserve his country’s league with Scotland. This is not to suggest, however, that France did not equally have her own motives for shows of loyalty towards Scotland. It was reported in 1570 that ‘the French ambassador continues his audiences with the object of frightening the queen of England into the idea that his master will not forsake the cause of the queen of Scotland, but little has come of it hitherto’. The French ambassadors in the 1640s consistently reported that maintenance of the relationship with Scotland would be a means of facilitating levies, and at several junctures France’s desire to prolong the Auld Alliance was not borne out of a sense of loyalty but political expediency. Charles I himself actively encouraged the continuation of the Auld Alliance – seemingly compromising his anglocentric policies
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because of domestic political developments. In French diplomatic correspondence we are told by Jean de Montereul that the Scots ‘had little care to perform what they promised’, but that Charles

found it necessary for me to not break with the Scots, as much because he judges it would induce them further to try, even more eagerly than they do at present, to come to terms, at his expense, with the English Parliament, if they thought that France wished to give them up.

He stated also that the Scottish Parliament would always try to retain the friendship of the English Parliament, ‘even when they may be assured of the assistance of France’. Negotiations to revive the Auld Alliance continued up to and including 1707, the year of Parliamentary Union, even if orchestrated by Jacobite politicians rather than those of Queen Anne. During an audience with Louis XIV in 1703 Simon Fraser, Lord Lovat, ‘enlarged upon the antient alliance between France and Scotland’, Louis responding that ‘himself and the whole French nation had their hearts unfeignedly Scottish; and that…he desired to be understood as from that moment renewing all antient alliances between the two nations’. A year later, Colonel Nathaniel Hooke was sent to Scotland in secrecy to report on the prospects for a resurrection of ‘l’ancienne alliance’. Louis XIV was afterwards thanked ‘for the hopes he had given us by Colonel Hooke, of haveing our privilege restored in France, and of seeing our king and this nation included in the future peace’. Certainly attempts to renew the Auld Alliance and enforce trading privileges came from both sides. Robert Arbuthnot, Scottish factor in Rouen, wrote to the Duke of Hamilton in 1700 that

your grace knows the ancient privilegedes the Scots have had in ffrance formerly, the which within these threttie years by past have been clipt to a great degree,
not by any publick authority, but rather by bringing them in desuetude, so that wee have as yet just title to pretend to them, and I have been assured here by such as pretend to know it that if a continuance of our priviledges was hansomly asked it would be granted provided our parliament renew’d the French priviledges in our country’. 145

A belief pervaded many quarters that the Scottish privileges had never been officially rescinded, and that their re-establishment was a formality.146 Yet throughout all of these exchanges, one thing is conspicuous for its absence – any explanation of what ‘the privileges’ were.

VII. THE ANCIENT PRIVILEGES

‘Our people have been too careless about preserving our muniments’.147

While ‘the privileges’ are often cited, illumination of the details of them repeatedly proves elusive.148 Thomas Moncrieff’s Memoirs Concerning the Ancient Alliance Between the French and the Scots states that ‘it is unquestionable, that, to begin from Philip the Fair [King of France, and John Baliol, King of Scotland, 23 October 1295], there runs an uninterrupted train of alliances between the Kings of France and Scotland, down to Henry IV and James VI’.149 It is widely accepted that Henri IV confirmed ‘the privileges’ in April 1599, declaring that

we desiring to treat well and favourably the subjects of the King of Scotland…in consideration of the ancient confederation and alliance so long kept and observed between the two crowns…the said privilege…we grant and confirm to them.150
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One year prior to this Henri had granted a patent of nobility to David Kinloch, a doctor of medicine and a native Scot who had studied and worked in France for more than 20 years, and his wife, Grisel Hay, granting them the same rights and privileges as the nobles of France ‘in consideration of the friendship and confederation we have long held with the Scots and which continues today…and whom [our Kings] have favoured as if they were the natural subjects of our Kingdom’. A year before this was granted, James VI opened ‘negotiations for observing the old liberties and privileges granted to Scottish merchants trading with France, and for obtaining discharge of customs and imposts raised on goods imported into that realm or transported furth thereof’. Louis XIV re-confirmed the naturalisation privileges of the Scots at Fontainebleau in September 1646 and in the same year issued a decree stating that ‘there has never been any difference in this Kingdom between his Majesty’s subjects and those of Scotland’. In 1648 the Committee of Estates of the Parliament of Scotland wrote to Mazarin regarding the privileges of the Gardes Écossaises, including a statement that ‘nous lui presentons de perpetuex l’ancienne amitié entre l’Écosse & la France & de nous obliger d’estre à jamais’. Moncrieff in his Memoirs talked of the ‘letters-patents containing the privileges of the Scottish merchants trading in France’ of May 1518, February 1554 and March 1599, yet the letters themselves, included as an appendage to this volume, do not state exactly what these privileges were. The letter of 1518 mentions an exemption from a ‘new impost of twelve French deniers per livre, raised in the city of Dieppe upon foreign merchandise’, the Scots only being obliged to pay four deniers per livre, which ‘hath been anciently collected’. The letter of 1554 granted an exemption that ‘the subjects of the said country of Scotland shall not be bound to pay for the commodities which they shall take and carry out of our country and duchy of Normandy, whatsoever they be, if designed for the said country of Scotland’. Henri IV’s 1599 ‘confirmation of the privileges’ spoke of ‘the same franchises, privileges and
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immunities for foreign customs and imposts, and after the same sort and manner that they enjoyed them in the days of the kings Francis and Henry’, remaining conspicuously vague concerning precisely what this ‘sort and manner’ was.\textsuperscript{157}

The French did continue to grant practical benefits to the Scots. In a discussion concerning the \textit{Gardes d’Écossaises} in 1575 it was reported that

the captain of the King’s guard in like manner to be given to a Scotsman…The yearly pension of money or munition \textit{contained in the old league} shall be yearly paid and sent into Scotland. All these offers shall be performed sua your grace with the rest of the nobility will observe and keep the old and ancient league betweixt the two realms.\textsuperscript{158}

In 1588 the Archbishop of Glasgow, the King’s ambassador in France, secured from Henri IV a customs reduction of one half for goods exported to Scotland,\textsuperscript{159} and in 1635 the merchant John Trotter succeeded in securing a reduction in import duties on Scottish wool and hides.\textsuperscript{160} When the Governor of Guyenne seized the fleet of English and Scottish vessels bringing in wine from Bordeaux in 1626, the Scottish vessels alone were released ‘in respecte of the ancient league’.\textsuperscript{161} Scots were initially exempted from Colbert’s 1659 duty of 50 \textit{sous} per ton on foreign vessels trading to France.\textsuperscript{162} In the wake of the 1697 Treaty of Ryswick, French diplomats considered Scottish antipathy to the English as potentially beneficial to Louis XIV. Although it has been stated that at this juncture they held out no meaningful prospect for a revival of the Auld Alliance, in 1701 the French accorded the Scots ‘favoured-nation status’ in the war of the Spanish Succession.\textsuperscript{163} As the Parliamentary Union between England and Scotland approached, the French became increasingly concerned with re-establishing the precise terms of the Alliance. A letter from Lewis Innes to Hooke in January 1707 stated that the Marquis de Torcy had ‘asked about the French league’.\textsuperscript{164} Hooke stated that Torcy was ‘very impatient to have the treaties’, to which Innes replied that

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{157} Ibid, 75
\item \textsuperscript{158} William Henyson to [the Regent Morton], 16 March 1574/5, CSP, V, 109 [my emphasis]
\item \textsuperscript{159} 3 July 1588, Edinburgh, CRB, I, 284-285
\item \textsuperscript{160} James Forret was sent to France to attempt this, 1 July 1601, Edinburgh, CRB, II, 104-105; ACA SRO25/3/2, General Convention of Burghs, Perth, July 1635, f493v. I would like to thank Dr Alan MacDonald (Dundee) for providing me with a transcription of this document.
\item \textsuperscript{161} RPCS ii I, Ixxxii, 479-80, n.
\item \textsuperscript{162} 30 September 1663, Edinburgh, RPCS, iii, I, 434; see also 13 September 1663, CRB, III, 567
\item \textsuperscript{163} A. Macinnes, \textit{Union and Empire: the making of the United Kingdom in 1707} (Cambridge, 2007) 238. This concession was terminated by Parliamentary Union in 1707.
\item \textsuperscript{164} Lewis Innes to Nathaniel Hooke, 23-29 January 1707, W. Macray (ed.), \textit{Correspondence of Colonel Hooke}, 2 volumes (1870-1) 109-11
\end{itemize}
I have sent him the treaties and privileges confirmed by Louis 12th, which are the most ample, and the confirmation of all by Henry the 4th and Louis the 13th, which are the latest... the said privileges [are] still in vigour.\textsuperscript{165} 

Later in 1707, a letter to the French King from the Earl of Errol talked of

renouvellement des anciennes et heureuses alliances que votre Majesté et les Roys ses predecesseurs ont eu avec la nation Ecossoise, comme aussi pour la conservation des libertez et de l’indépendance de ce royaume.\textsuperscript{166} 

Some exemptions were granted on request, rather than following specific precedent or established privilege. In 1647 Montereul wrote to Mazarin from Edinburgh that he informed the members of the Town Council there ‘you had kindly granted their request on their first application, to prevent the Scots who are in France from being obliged to pay their tax’.\textsuperscript{167} 

Even to those who have recognised the continuation of certain privileges into the seventeenth century, 1663 has been seen as a turning point.\textsuperscript{168} At the same time as the ‘practical exclusion’ of Scottish commodities from England, which arguably disposed Scottish merchants to attach greater importance to their trading privileges with France, Colbert’s mercantilist policies caused a shift in French attitudes towards Scottish traders. The French impost of 50 sous per tun of cargo exported in foreign bottoms was extended to include Scots, who claimed they were ‘in hazard to be reduced to the common condition of strangers and losse the benefite of these antient priviledges which for many ages they have enjoyed’.\textsuperscript{169} Yet the following year, despite the apparent apathy of the state, French merchants continued to desire a renewal of Alliance.\textsuperscript{170} In respect of this, coupled with Charles II’s desire to regain Scots privileges in France, the Privy Council forbade the farmers of the customs
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\item\textsuperscript{170} 19 January 1664, Edinburgh, \textit{RPCS}, iii, I, xxxvi-xxxvii
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to exact any more customes or other deuty for goods imported and exported in French bottomes then is payed be the natives of this kingdome, and that in regard of the priviledges and immunities that the natives of this kingdome doe enjoy in the kingdom of France for their vessells and goods.\textsuperscript{171}

The Scots believed that they retained a special relationship with France despite Colbert’s policies, and they too continued to push for an official renewal of the Alliance. In 1684 the Privy Council stated that ‘the subjects of this his Majesties antient kingdome haveing right to the priviledges of succeeding in France as natives, and of being free from all impositions due by strangers’.\textsuperscript{172} Later that year the Provost and Magistrates of Edinburgh appealed to the King (through the Lord High Commissioner) that he might instruct his ambassador at the Court of France to interpose with the French King, ‘that the Scotts merchants and all other his Majesties subjects in this kingdom may be restored to ther ancient priviledges in France, and particularly that the Scotts merchants may be free of the fifty souse upon the tunn’.\textsuperscript{173}

Perhaps the confusion over the correct terms of the privileges is not surprising when it is considered that those in government did not seem to have access to details of them. As demonstrated above, there are several instances of either French or Scottish ambassadors asking the other side for documents outlining the extent of the privileges, something which is prevalent from as early as 1562 when the French ambassador ‘sent for all the treaties in force between France and England and Scotland in order to provide against any injury being done to his masters’ interests’.\textsuperscript{174} While on occasion some documents were produced, on others this proved impossible. In a proclamation made by James VI in 1597 he noted that

we find no letters patent of this privilege earlier than the time of the said King Francis, whether because there was no occasion to demand them, or whether because our people have been too careless about preserving our muniments, yet it is to be presumed that the nation enjoyed this privilege before that date.\textsuperscript{175}

\textsuperscript{171} Ibid, xxxvi-xxxvii, 488
\textsuperscript{172} Council to the King, June 1684, RPCS, iii, IX, 43
\textsuperscript{173} Supplication by the lord provost and magistrates of Edinburgh, 19 August 1684, Edinburgh, RPCS, iii, IX, 115-6. The Convention was still attempting to get this imposition lifted in March 1698: 1 March 1698, CRB, IV, 260
\textsuperscript{174} Bishop Quadra to the Duchess of Parma, 4 July 1562, CLPS, XIV, 250
\textsuperscript{175} 1597, WP, II, 350
When reporting on Dishington’s visit in 1644 French diplomats noted that ‘he does not like to speak of the originals about which so much has been written’, suggesting either that he was not aware of what was written in the originals, or that he did not want to admit that the originals had been lost. Mid-negotiation with Louis XIV in 1684, ostensibly in respect of the 50 sous impost but perhaps with the underlying hope of a renewal of the Auld Alliance, the Privy Council reported the existence of several ancient papers and records that were in the town’s charter house which are absolutely necessary to have for clearing the Scots privileges in France... but these papers are all now abstracted and withdrawn, and, albeit the Lord Provost and magistrates have made all the diligent search that could be for getting of them, yet they cannot be found; and, seeing Sir James Rochhead certainly had these papers when the inventory was made... they crave that Sir James Rochhead may be ordered to exhibit and deliver to the Lord Provost these records and papers concerning the Scots privileges in France, so that the principals or authentic copies may be sent to France now when the matter is being considered by the French King.

While it was stated six years later that the Convention had ‘not only obtained extracts [of the privileges] but lykways... had procured up the principall charters and privileges granted by the kings of France to this nation to be keeped for the use of the royall burrowes’, no record has yet been found of what these documents detailed. The fact that contemporaries themselves often did not know the full terms of the Auld Alliance, and indeed seem not to have had any one document outlining them, speaks volumes for its nature, that perception was often more important than reality. Indeed, the general perception in France appears to be demonstrated by the publication of a pamphlet in Paris in 1579 outlining the history of the Auld Alliance and suggesting that it be continued. As the following chapters will demonstrate, merchants continued to pursue old trade links, despite not being in possession of clear facts relating to their privileges. For the commercial agents involved in this trade the actual terms seem not to have been as important as their belief in an enduring Alliance.

176 M. du Bosc to Cardinal Mazarin, Fontainebleau, 21 October 1644, DC, I, 564-5
177 Supplication by the lord provost and magistrates of Edinburgh, 19 August 1684, Edinburgh, RPCS, iii, IX, 115-6; see also 10 July 1685, CRB, IV, 57. 15 July 1690, 121
178 15 July 1690, CRB, IV, 121
VIII. A CHANGING ALLIANCE?

‘The amity of France with Scotland will be so much more sure when it shall also be constantly maintained between France and England’.180

It would be folly, however, to suggest that the Auld Alliance was in the same condition in 1713 as it had been prior to 1560, as changing political, financial and social contexts inevitably dictated change. While assumptions regarding Scotland’s move away from France and towards England immediately following the Reformation may be somewhat inaccurate, the English made some attempts to change the nature of Scotland’s relationship with France. This was precipitated by a defensive alliance between Elizabeth I of England and Charles IX of France in April 1572 – an agreement that not only provided for the provision of soldiers for both sides, but also included an arrangement for the pacification of Scotland (then in the throes of Civil War).181 Furthermore, an entry in Francis Walsingham’s letter book from 1577 describes ‘the amitie and good intelligence that hath bin of longe time established’ between England and France.182 This was rhetoric, as no long-term relationship, at least not one comparable with the Auld Alliance, existed. Rhetoric it may have been, but the French were not wholly averse to this change, although they made it clear that they would remain loyal to Scotland. Monsieur de Mauvissier assured Walsingham in 1583 that

the King of France only asks union and good understanding between those two Princesses, peace and quiet in Scotland with liberty and surety for the young Prince, and that he render all honour to the Queen of England, provided that it be not to the prejudice of the amity of France with Scotland, which will be so much more sure when it shall also be constantly maintained between France and England.183

This is supported further by an answer of the English merchants to a complaint of the French merchants in 1590, showing that they had the same privileges in England as the English merchants had in France.184 While both France and Scotland pushed for renewals of the Auld Alliance throughout the seventeenth century the traditional basis – an alliance against the ‘auld enemy’ of England – changed after 1560.

180 Monsieur de Mauvissier to Walsingham, 6 April 1583, CSP, VI, 370
181 19 April 1572, TNA E30/1152
182 1577, TNA SP104/163
183 Monsieur de Mauvissier to Walsingham, 6 April 1583, CSP, VI, 370
184 ?1590, CSPD, II, 711
It is perhaps unsurprising that the English pushed for inclusion in the Alliance, and their continued fear over its existence demonstrates that contemporaries did not see the Auld Alliance as having ended in 1560. In 1599 a consideration delivered to the English Parliament suggested that

the Statute 40 Edward III. ch. 8 be revived, ordaining that no Englishman fetch or buy any wines in Gascony or France, but have them brought into the realm by Gascons for the profit of the realm...and so make the French King 'afeard' to break friendship with us.185

A letter to the Lord Chancellor of England in 1605 on the difference in payment between English and Scottish merchants in France highlighted that English merchants actively pushed for the same trading privileges the Scots enjoyed – suggesting not only a desire on the part of the English to foster a closer relationship with France, but also that Scottish privileges in France remained covetable.186 By this time, the English had succeeded to a degree. An embassy consisting of two Scotsmen and two Englishmen, sent to France in 1605 to establish their respective alliances, found that the English privileges in Bordeaux and Gascony almost balanced those of the Scots in Normandy.187

Yet even given the changing nature of the Alliance, there were plentiful occasions when the French maintained clear distinctions between their respective behaviour towards the Scots and the English, particularly during times of war (Chapters 5 and 6). At the beginning of the eighteenth century it was being reported in England that an alliance was being considered between Scotland and France (undoubtedly one symptom of perceptions of Scottish Jacobitism). The English perhaps feared exclusion, and desired to protect herself by being included in the Alliance that was once aimed directly against her.188

IX. CONCLUSION

Reliance on official sources creates some problems in determining the state of the Franco-Scottish relationship throughout the long seventeenth century. While trade

185 Considerations Delivered to Parliament, 1599, TED, I, 327
186 [1605], TNA SP78/52/433
188 [?] to [Henning], 5 May 1702, Paris, TNA SP78/153/72
embargoes, declarations of war and commercial prohibitions ostensibly affected commercial relationships, closer examination of them reveals several things. First, that the motivations behind the implementation of such legislation was often far more complex than has hitherto been appreciated, secondly that even when commercial legislation was passed, this was often for an independent purpose rather than being indicative of a failing relationship, and thirdly that implementation of legislation did not guarantee its enforcement. Coupled with this, as will be demonstrated in the following chapters, reliance on official sources of a different nature – on port books and customs records – has also fostered misunderstandings.

While the Auld Alliance inevitably evolved over time it endured, in fact if not in name, in the minds of contemporaries and the actions of individual merchants who consistently exhibited their belief in the continuation of their privileges in France. Not only did the alliance endure throughout the long seventeenth century, but assertions that the Franco-Scottish relationship was one-sided must be qualified. Whatever the motives, there were evidently occasions when France desired the renewal of the alliance just as much, if not more, than the Scots, countering the assumption that Scotland had always been the inferior partner in the Alliance. No evidence has been uncovered that suggests that many involved were aware of what the ‘privileges’ were during the seventeenth century. Paperwork was lost, diplomats were asked to provide copies, and members of the Privy Council appear to have been unsure of the situation. Often, references to the ‘privileges’, or the ‘Ancient Alliance’ were used as rhetoric – with neither side being sure what these were, but continuing to maintain their commitment to them. As the following chapters will demonstrate, the actions of individuals often tell historians far more about the reality of any commercial relationship in this period than we can hope to learn solely through an examination of official legislation.
CHAPTER TWO

‘My prettie cap and brave big gooseberries’.  
Commodities and Methods of Trading

Franco-Scottish trade has often been seen as synonymous with wine, salt and fish. Indeed, assertions that the export trade of Scotland was heavily dependent on fish and sheep (woollen goods accounting for 60% of all customs revenue) can be substantiated from some sources, with customs receipts from 1595-1599 confirming that the primary export commodities were wool, cloth, fells and salmon – ‘native commoditeis’, according to the Privy Council. In terms of imports, wine and salt continued to account for large volumes of Scotland’s trade with France, and into the first quarter of the eighteenth century Scottish merchants maintained an interest in the quality of French wine vintages. Contemporary commentators saw these commodities as being central to Franco-Scottish trade, although suggested some limited diversity. Fynes Moryson stated in 1598 that ‘the Easterne Scots carry to Bordeaux coarse cloathes, both linen and woolen…and the skinnes of goates…and divers kinds of fish smoked or salted; and they bring from thence wine, prunes, walnuts’.

However, while these goods appear to have been central to Franco-Scottish commerce, from the sixteenth century this trade comprised a much larger variety of commodities. In December 1564, the Neptune from Dieppe arrived in Burntisland, among her cargo ‘ane little knok with ane wakener’ – an alarm clock. A book outlining the rates of customs and valuation of merchandise produced in 1612 includes mention

1 Countess of Stair to Sir John Clerk of Penicuik, 3 September 1715, Edinburgh, NAS GD18/5271/4
2 T. Devine, ‘The Cromwellian Union and the Scottish burghs’ in J. Butt and J. Ward, Scottish Themes: essays in honour of Professor S. G. E. Lythe (Edinburgh, 1976) 10-11 (concerning Glasgow specifically). Many works which consider trade between Scotland and France take this as a given. Some examples include: J. Robison, Kirkcudbright (St Cuthbert’s Town): its mote, monastery and parish churches (Dumfries, 1926) 136; H. Sée and A. Cormack, ‘Commercial Relations between France and Scotland in 1707’ in Scottish Historical Review, XXIII (1926) 275
4 John Steuart to Robert Gordon, 7 April 1721, Inverness, W. Mackay (ed.), The Letter-Book of Bailie John Steuart of Inverness, 1715-1752 (Edinburgh, 1915) 146; Walter Pringle to Edward Burd, 22 November 1735, Bordeaux, NAS RH15/54/19/19; Walter Pringle to Matthew Sharp, Bordeaux, 3 November 1736, NLS Acc.6552
5 F. Moryson, An itinerary written by Fynes Moryson Gent (London, 1617); A. Drummond, The Kirk and the Continent (Edinburgh, 1956) ix; I. Grant, The Economic History of Scotland (London, 1934) 80
6 30 December 1564, RPCS, I, lxxv
of ‘beds of silk or walnut trie French making’, ‘Gloves, of Bridges or French making’, ‘Gould and silver thread…Frenche copper gold and silver’, ‘Hats: French feltis lined with velvott…French feltis lined with Taffatie’, ‘Frenche Knyves’, ‘Linning cloth: French canves and Line narrow broun or white’, ‘Quilts: of French making’, ‘Silk stockings: of Milan or France’, alongside more traditional commodities such as salt and wine. The Aberdeen Shore Work Accounts (1597-1670) seem to verify that goods traded between Scotland and France comprised only fish (predominantly salmon), wine and salt. Only a handful of entries cite any other commodities – for example, in 1611-12, Robert Guthrie’s ship from Dieppe is recorded as having brought in ‘potts and strayvald’; in 1621 George Stewart brought in ‘pottes’ from Dieppe after taking salmon there, and in 1670 James Hunter’s ship came from La Rochelle with barrel hoops, alongside salt. However, a Book of Rates from 1612 listed commodities being exported from Scotland including brass, gloves, honey and nuts, and a customs book of Aberdeen from 15 April to 31 May two years later demonstrates the importation of luxury goods into the north-east, including French and Italian silks, taffeta, programs, napkening, cambrics, tapestries, velvets and satins, among many others. The Compt Buik of David Wedderburne demonstrates a similarly wide variety of goods imported into Dundee from France, including wine, woad, vinegar and salt, but also violet powder from La Rochelle, comfits, sugar candy, syrup, aniseed oil and toffee.

7 C. Innes, Ledger of Andrew Halyburton, Conservator of the Privileges of the Scotch Nation in the Netherlands, 1492-1503: together with, the book of customs and valuation of merchandises in Scotland, 1612 (Edinburgh, 1867) 289-334. ‘Bridges’ could be the Flemish city of Bruges.
8 1611-12, ASWA, 68
9 September 1621, ASWA, 108
10 9 June 1670, ASWA, 591
11 RPCS, IX, lxix; ACL, I, xxii-xxxiii. It is stated that only the ‘most characteristic articles’ in the Book of Rates are listed, suggesting that the range of commodities exported from Scotland is even wider than shown by this source. The commodities listed here seem to be goods indigenous to Scotland. With regard to imports, as has been argued by Louise Taylor in the introduction to her transcription of the Aberdeen Council Letters, Aberdeen could not have provided a market for all these goods – some must have been redistributed, either domestically or internationally: ACL, I, xxii-xxxii. James Dow has also shown that Scottish exports to Scandinavia included large quantities of wine that was certainly re-exported: J. Dow, ‘Scottish Trade with Sweden, 1580-1622’ in Scottish Historical Review, XLVIII (1969) 78, 147f. The triangular connection between Scotland, France and Scandinavia is further highlighted by John Charteris, a merchant of Edinburgh connected closely with the port of Bordeaux, who was appointed as an intermediary in Scottish-Swedish commerce by the Privy Council after petition from Scottish merchants. S. Murdoch, ‘The French Connection: Bordeaux’s ‘Scottish’ networks in Context, c.1670-1720’ in G. Leydier, Scotland and Europe. Scotland in Europe (Cambridge, 2007) 33
12 CBDW, xxxiii, xlv and passim.
I. RANGE AND REPATRIATION OF COMMODITIES

‘A watch or two for gentlewomen, of small value but small & handsome’.13

By examining official records not in isolation but in conjunction with each other, our perception of the commodities that comprised this trade changes, and examination of private records of commercial agents demonstrates further just how wide a range of items were involved. Many luxury goods imported from France were in the form of cloth. In 1692, in the midst of the Nine Years’ War, the Countess of Caithness purchased from a French tailor a ‘black crep manto’, a ‘black crep peticot’, a ‘percien tefety petticoat’ and ribbons.14 Cloth was not only purchased for clothes. In 1664 the Laird of Pitfodels purchased through Michel Mel, a Scottish merchant based in Dieppe, ‘48 els of ritch scarlet couloured Avignon taffatie to line a bed and to be very large…11 els of fine Callico of sam coulour to line the courtpoint…2 once halfe of silk of the coulour to stitch it’ – the account also included ‘drinking moneys to the tapissiers man’.15 Of particular use in demonstrating the range of goods sent back to Scotland from the continent are the extensive records of John Clerk of Penicuik, a Scottish merchant based in Paris in the mid-seventeenth century. Items commissioned from him by William Kerr, the 3rd Earl of Lothian included books and even book bindings for books he sent to France to have bound and returned to him,16 ‘gold watches of the newest fashion’ and ‘a reasonable faire ibeny cabinet trimmed with silver’.17 Other goods included spectacles and botkins, romany and clothes such as gowns and petticoats.18 In 1655 James Mowat informed Clerk that ‘Mr Charteris tells me your atlas is ready, and shalbe sent be Lord Craighall his sonne’.19 There was also interest in diamonds, as Alexander Charteris wrote to John Clerk in 1654 – in the middle of the Interregnum – that ‘at present Diamonds are verry deare here but if you have occasion

---

13 John Johnstoun to John Clerk, NAS GD18/2387
14 16 July 1692, NAS GD112/35/14/25
15 29 July 1664, NAS GD237/11/95/6
16 Account between John Clerk and William, Earl of Lothian, for books 20 January 1645, Edinburgh, NAS GD18/2439; Michel Mel to John Clerk, 30 October 1655, Dieppe, NAS GD18/2542 ‘with ane acconomp off 18-15-6 for the charges off 2 tronks off my lord lothians conteining Books to be bound’.
17 William, Earl of Lothian to John Clerk, 30 March 1643, Paris, NAS GD18/2425; Account between Clerk and Lothian, 20 January 1645, Edinburgh, NAS GD18/2439; Michel Mel to John Clerk, 30 October 1655, Dieppe, NAS GD18/2542 – this instance begins to suggest the number of people involved in such a trade, an issue which will be examined in more detail in the following chapter; John, Lord Maitland, to John Clerk, 9 November 1643, NAS GD18/2426; see also Lothian to Clerk, 1643-44, NAS GD18/2440, asking Clerk to buy pictures and books for him.
18 Letter-book of John Clerk, 1644-5, NAS GD18/2455, for example ff13v-14r, 17r-17v, 24r; Account between Lothan and Clerk, 8 March 1650-5 June 1652, NAS GD18/2445
19 James Mowat to John Clerk, 6 July 1655, Paris, NAS GD18/2505/7
for any he will furnish you at the easiest rates’. Clerk’s son and namesake, who also traded on the continent, was thanked by the Countess of Stair in 1718 ‘for your prettie cap and your brave big gooseberries’, and a month later for his ‘good big pears’.

Perhaps one reason that scholars have often focused on a narrow range of ‘traditional’ commodities has been due not only to the sources consulted, but also to assumptions over what defined a ‘commodity’, as they are often presumed to comprise foodstuffs, drink or substances such as coal or salt. Yet in an economic sense a ‘commodity’ is anything that is bought and/or sold, comprising commercial exchanges and impacting on the economy. Ships themselves were sold or exchanged – Alexander and Andrew Watson sold their ship in Cadiz in 1668, purchasing another in its place. Between 1682 and 1696, the Amiraute of La Rochelle reported four English-built, but French-named and owned, ships being registered. Damaged ships were also sold, as one Adam Smith reported in 1698, ‘we sold the wreck and I came to Rojan and from that to burdeaux’ – presumably after a more seaworthy vessel had been purchased. Furthermore, as Steve Murdoch has recently noted, ships involved in trade often re-fitted and gained provisions from foreign ports at which they were docked, and the merchants and skippers needed to sleep, dine and, of course, sample the local beverages – contributing to the economy of these ports. In 1595 Mungo Mackall wrote to Robert Galbraith, a Scottish merchant in Bordeaux, asking that if ‘ony of your friends or acquaintance passis to saintmalloss I pray yow to send with thame sua mekill money as to by for me 20 boulittis of narrow canves the best can be gottin for topsails’. The accounts of the David from 1713 show provisions being bought in Leith and Kirkcaldy in Scotland, but also in Danzig, Bordeaux, Dublin and Waterford, including beef, peas, butter, vinegar, brandy and candles. These accounts show money being paid to a sail maker and a smith in Bordeaux. A list of provisions bought here in October, November and December totalled 976 livres, 7 sous (converted here to £551, 18s Scots;

20 Alexander Charteris to John Clerk, 8 April 1654, Paris, NAS GD18/2528/3. It is likely that Clerk was purchasing these jewels as a business investment.
21 Countess of Stair to Sir John Clerk of Penicuik, 3 September 1715, Edinburgh, NAS GD18/5271/4; same to same, 1 October 1715, Edinburgh, NAS GD18/5271/8
22 20 August 1668, London, SAUL Watson Papers, ms38527/3a/18/5. These letters have been transcribed by Colin and Paula Martin.
23 ADCM B235
24 Journal of Adam Smith (1679-1723), October 1698, GUSC ms Gen 1035/2
25 Murdoch, ‘French Connection’, 42
26 Mungo Mackall to Robert Galbraith, 10 February 1595, Bayonne, NAS JC62/1/31
27 1713, NAS RH15/59/5/7/A
28 20 December 1713, NAS RH15/59/5/7/A/4
£51 09s 10d sterling), and the amount of money paid to tradesmen in this location totalled 890 livres, 15 sous, 11 deniers (£569 0s 4½d Scots; £47 0s 9½d sterling).²⁹ It was not only merchants and skippers passing through these ports who contributed to their economy, but also those who settled on a more permanent basis, spending money on accommodation, food and clothing.³⁰ Some spent money on lavish personal goods – two account books of John Clerk, dating from 1646-1659, retrospectively list commodities he seems to have bought during his time in France. These include paintings, silver and musical instruments – many of them ‘for the usse of my wyffe and childring’.³¹ Scots on the continent who were not ostensibly involved in commerce also had an impact on the French economy. The personal and household accounts of the Yester Estates, owned by the 2nd Marquess of Tweeddale, illustrate travel expenses from France and Italy in the late 1670s. These lists include goods that were bought for personal use, or perhaps as gifts for those back in Scotland, such as a coat, a ring, books and stamps, waistcoats, fans, a picture, a hunting horn, a gun, jewels, a periwig and essences.³²

Professor Christopher Smout, one of the few scholars to recognise the wide range of goods Scotland imported, has suggested that their type and diversity provides ‘an illuminating example of Scotland’s economic backwardness’.³³ It has, however, more recently been suggested by Philipp Rössner that the range of goods was not necessarily indicative of this, but rather that the demand for such items in Scotland was not large enough to warrant the risk and capital expenditure of setting up domestic manufactories.³⁴ Perhaps, if anything, the range of goods Scotland imported, and the small amount she manufactured, is indicative of the understanding within Scotland of her realistic economic situation. Furthermore, although Scotland’s trade may have been proportionally small within Europe as a whole this did not mean that she did not participate effectively in overseas trade; while Scottish salt exports were only a tiny

²⁹ 1713, NAS RH15/59/7/3-4. These are the figures given in the account – although it seems that some mistake has been made in conversion.
³⁰ For example, John Clerk included in his accounts a bill for breakfast, between 1636 and 1641, NAS GD18/2377/4
³¹ Account books of John Clerk, 1646-1659, NAS GD18/2482
³² 25 June 1674 onwards, NLS ms.14646(i) fl
³⁴ P. Rössner, Scottish Trade in the Wake of Union (1700-1760) (Stuttgart, 2008) 139
fraction of European trade Scottish producers were quick to take advantage of market opportunities.\textsuperscript{35}

Misunderstanding over the range of commodities Scots traded in could also be due to the methods by which these goods were delivered back to Scotland. They often bypassed traditional channels of trade and have therefore not been recorded in official documentation; instead, such goods were sent back to Scotland in the care of trusted friends or family. John Clerk engaged William Paton as carrier on more than one occasion for goods sent to numerous individuals.\textsuperscript{36} The practice of commissioning goods from countrymen abroad was not uncommon. In 1638 John Johnstoun requested that Clerk send home ‘a watch or two for gentlewomen, of small value but small & handsome’, which were gifts for his wife and daughter.\textsuperscript{37} Such transactions were conducted through orders and accounts in the ‘traditional’ manner, though not recorded in the same statistical sources that have formed the basis of conventional economic histories.

While such transactions fostered commercial exchange, they also expedited cultural exchange – although evidence for this is scarce as these exchanges seem to have been more usually conducted outwith formal accounts. John Hutcheson wrote in 1669, while in France, of a game played there, stating that ‘this bilzard table is neither difficult neither dear to erect, the clybs may be mad by any wright, and the balls also, otherwise as yo[u]r w[il]sh desired I wold have sent of them home, & yet with this letter I could not for they are not posts cargo’.\textsuperscript{38} While on this occasion it was not a viable option, ‘post’s cargo’ suggests that individuals used general post to send goods home. Although the goods themselves were not sent as part of an official commercial transaction, they nevertheless contributed to Scotland’s social, economic and cultural development.

\textsuperscript{35} I. Whyte, \textit{Scotland’s Society and Economy in Transition, c. 1500-c. 1760} (Hampshire, 1997) 144, 152-5
\textsuperscript{36} John Clerk to Lady Pittenweem, 15 April 1645, Paris, NAS GD18/2455, f13v. For other examples of Paton acting as a carrier to both Lady Pittenweem and others in Scotland, including Margaret Gray, see 20 May 1645, f13r; 20 September 1645, f17r-17v; 3 November 1645f 17v. Clerk acted as banker for Paton: 26 July 1644, f2v; John Clerk to Robert Inglis, 20 October 1644, Edinburgh, f3v
\textsuperscript{37} John Johnstoun to John Clerk, 27 [blank] 1638, NAS GD18/2387
\textsuperscript{38} John Hutcheson [of Auchingray] to Sir George Maxwell, 14\textsuperscript{th} of Nether Pollok, to be delivered to ‘Bailiff Russell in Stirling’, 1 February 1669, GCA T-PM/113/795/1
II. ADAPTATION OF TRADING METHODS

‘To be sauld quhair he happenis to mak mercat to my profit’. 39

Scholars have recognised the importance of certain locations for Franco-Scottish trade. It has been contended that commerce occurred in two distinct regions – the Northern region (Dieppe, Rouen), which drew on a hinterland of rich agriculture and advanced industrial technology, and the Biscay ports of La Rochelle and Bordeaux, which have been described as ‘synonymous’ to Scotsmen with salt and wine.40 Assertions over patterns of imports are, to some extent, supported by contemporary sources. The Dundee shipping lists for 1580-1618 show these patterns emerging. Cargoes from Bordeaux commonly contain commodities such as wine, woad and prunes,41 whereas cargoes from Dieppe contained ‘cradilles of glas’ and cork, as well as wine.42 Cargoes from La Rochelle and St Martin de Rhé invariably contained salt. It was recognised that Rouen, in particular, was a port at which cloth was traded: ‘the great vent of suche Cottons is at Roane in ffraunce…they have in the Countrie it self a kinde of Course cloth’.43 While a much wider range of commodities were exported from France’s Atlantic ports than has been previously considered, different ports did specialise in different commodities.

That Scotland imported such a wide range of goods has led to her overseas trade being described as ‘not so much a policy as a complex ad hoc response by producers/traders to a changing market situation’, fuelling the assumption that trade with France was unregulated and opportunistic.44 Such assertions, however, have recently been qualified. In the seventeenth century international merchants thrived precisely because they did not specialise in a single commodity, as diversification minimised risk, and commodity-specific specialisation did not become the norm until

39 27 February 1591, CBDW, xxxv, 140 [my emphasis]
41 These shipping lists have been transcribed as an accompaniment to the *Compt Buik of David Wedderburne*. 28 March 1614, CBDW, 242. This is merely one example – a thorough examination of this source demonstrates that nearly all cargoes coming from Bordeaux carried the same commodities, and were almost exclusively intended for numerous individuals in Scotland; the lists of individuals invariably not containing mention of the trading merchant himself, suggesting that skippers often operated on commission, travelling on behalf of a merchant situated in Scotland. This is a practice examined in further detail in Chapter 3.
42 This particular example is from 4 February 1588, CBDW, 221
43 c. 1582, TED, I, 206-7
the eighteenth century. Indeed, it was this very ability to take advantage of diverse ranges of opportunities that led to success, particularly during periods of maritime conflict. In his *Essays Upon Projects* (1697), Daniel Defoe noted that

ships are sent from port to port, as markets and merchandises differ...[exchange of information] and travel makes a true-bred merchant the most intelligent man in the world, and consequently the most capable, when urg’d by necessity, to continue new ways to live.

It has been recognised in the context of the seventeenth-century brandy trade between Nantes and Rotterdam that ‘official bans on trade diminished neither supply nor demand for import/export commodities – but forced merchants involved in coastal trade to create new routes, new destinations and new commercial connections’. Where there were obstacles to trade, merchants developed methods for dealing with this, for example when trade in certain commodities was affected – perhaps because of bad harvests – they generally switched commodities rather than ceasing trade altogether.

Furthermore, it was not uncommon for merchants to use different ports when one was closed to them, or when they could not acquire what they desired. In 1716 it was reported to the Earl of Mar by George Hamilton that ‘I have sent you 93 bottles of champagne which I bought at Montreuil, not finding a drop of any good at Calais’. The ‘ad hoc response’ of Scottish merchants is evidenced in many account books from the period listing a diverse range of both commodities and destinations. Such willingness to adapt contributed to the extensive knowledge of Scottish merchants regarding a variety of markets and commodities, and merchants were willing to share this knowledge with those less experienced than themselves. In November 1717 James Ogilvy wrote from Angers to Alexander Irvine in Bordeaux, asking him to ‘let me know your opinion of the places you have passed through particularly La Rochelle, Bordeaux

---


47 de Bruyn Kops, *A Spirited Exchange*, 245

48 J. Dow, ‘Scottish Trade with Sweden, 1580–1622’ in *Scottish Historical Review*, XLVIII (1969) 144

49 George Hamilton to the Duke of Mar, 13 February 1716, Paris, SP, I, 504

and Montpellier & how you find the way of living there, because I intend to follow…when I go from this place'.

Most merchants were proficient at last-minute adaptation and it was common for their commissions to offer several alternate commodities or ports, or for decisions to be left entirely to the skipper of the ship. A commission from the Dundee merchant David Wedderburne to Peter Man in 1591 noted ‘1 last hering to be sauld quhair he happenis to mak mercat to my profit’. From Archibald Hamilton’s letter-book, we can see that this Edinburgh merchant used the same practices. In a commission granted in August 1663 he instructed a Burntisland skipper to go to either Ireland or Spain, allowing the skipper to assess himself which one would be the most lucrative, or to adjust his voyage should weather conditions necessitate it. This method demonstrates a high level of trust between the merchant at home and those he commissioned to travel abroad and trade on his behalf.

That Scottish merchants were used to such practices was undoubtedly an asset as they continued to pursue trade to areas that were ostensibly closed to them throughout the changing political and economic conditions of the seventeenth century. They were also assisted by other nations, who were adept at certain tactics themselves. Dutch captains adopted ‘a series of cunning contrivances to cover their trade’, including the acquisition of a number of different false passes, so that if capture seemed imminent they could throw those that incriminated them overboard. ‘Flags of convenience’ were used – sailing under different flags depending on where you were trading – or neutral domicile claimed. During the Wars of the Three Kingdoms the Dutch declared themselves neutral – and thereafter their ports became safe havens for British ships,

51 James Ogilvy to Alexander Irvine, 4 November 1717, Angers, NAS RH1/2/964. I would like to thank Professor Steve Murdoch (St Andrews) for providing me with a transcription of this document.
52 27 February 1591, CBDW, xxxv, 140 [my emphasis]; see also August 1693, when Wedderburne sent power with Peter Imbrie under the same instructions: ‘to be sauld quhair he makis mercat to my profit…and gif he waris other in Rwen or Bordeaux schip my geir and mark it with my awin mark and send it hame in the first gude schip of our toun’: August 1593, CBDW, 79. See also 1603, W. McNeill, ‘Papers of a Dundee Shipping Dispute, 1600-1604’ in Miscellany of the Scottish History Society, X (Edinburgh, 1965) 57-8
53 4 August 1663, NLS Adv.mss.31.3.2, f 31r. See also James Carstairs to Alexander and Andrew Watson, 15 August 1668, London, SAUL, Watson Papers, ms38527/1/1/2, stating that the journey he had been commissioned to undertake would ‘intend for france and from thence to Holland, zelland ore brittan’ [my emphasis].
providing them with new papers.⁵⁵ Scottish merchants both used and provided flags of convenience and it was suggested by the Privy Council in 1619 that the best ships of Scotland were continually employed in the service of Frenchmen. It has been argued that due to the ‘somewhat indeterminate diplomatic status of Scotland’, France and England both used Scottish ships to enter waters where their own nationals could not.⁵⁶ Furthermore, ‘the greater affability of the French towards the Scots’, has been seen to provide ‘an obvious explanation of the English willingness to employ them in Anglo-French trade’, revealing an interesting perspective on Anglo-Scottish relations post-1603.⁵⁷ The practice of using foreign ships was not new, and during conflict merchants were able to draw on their experience of this practice to their advantage. In the 1660s both the Edinburgh merchant Henry Wilkie and the London merchant Thomas Culter used a Swedish ship, the St John of Congolfe, to pursue trade between Scotland and France.⁵⁸ This ship seems to have been used as a carrying ship, commissioned for use on voyages presumably to ports in which the merchant who had hired her had prior experience and connections. The practice of hiring foreign ships was prevalent throughout Europe in the seventeenth century.⁵⁹ In 1676 the Frenchman Etienne Jousselin transported ‘vins, sucres et eaux de vie’ in the Signe de Foi, ‘navire anglais’ to St Valéry,⁶⁰ and in the same year Drick Boendermaker transported ‘l’eau de vie et des graine de lin’ in two ships, the Providence of Aberdeen and the Jacques of London, to Rotterdam.⁶¹

On occasion, attempts to deceive authorities were noted and the miscreants punished.⁶² Often, however, authorities did not identify contraband activity, or else chose to turn a blind eye to it. A paper submitted to the Treasury in 1702 concerned French wine being brought over from St Sebastian:

It was taken there from Bordeaux, a Spanish name given to it, and reshipped in Spanish casks. Sufficient number of hogskins were kept in every cellar, and mules were also kept that it might be supposed the wines were brought from Navarre on mules’ backs in hogskins. Mr Manly and Mr Cooke, who were sent over to inspect the trade were blinded with this device, for in the night the gates

⁵⁵ de Bruyn Kops, *Spirited Exchange*, 55
⁵⁶ A. Smith (ed.), *The Reign of James VI and I* (London/New York, 1973) 73
⁵⁸ n.d. (1660-1670), 10 April 1667, SRA Anglica VII, 542 (unfoliated)
⁵⁹ 2 May 1690, ADG 6 B 193
⁶⁰ 19 March 1676, ADCM B5675, 31
⁶¹ 14 March 1676, ADCM B5675, 24-5
⁶² 6 November 1586, Richmond, *APCE*, XIV, 248-9; see also Bernardino de Mendoza to Martin de Idiaquez, 8 May 1588, *CLPS*, XVII, 280; 1593, *TED*, II, 82-3
were opened, and what was brought unto the town by day was sent out in the night to be ready to come in again the next day, and this method was used whilst they stayed.63

In January 1703 it was recognised that there was a ‘clandestine trade carried on from Bourdeaux and other parts of France by way of St Sebastian and other ports of Spain, whereby great quantities of French wine were imported, paying only the Spanish duty’. This report noted that ‘this management seemed to be carried on in concert between the consuls in foreign parts and some officers in the Customs...who for private gratuities undertook for and passed such wines as were of the growth of Spain’.64 A House of Lords enquiry in 1704 reported 15 ships, mostly from the West Country, Scotland and Ireland, in Bordeaux loading brandies and wines – there was a suggestion that the government discouraged informers, and was inclined to hush the matter up rather than pursue the offenders.65

III. ALTERNATIVE SOURCES

*If the French Wines and the Port Wines were all at a Price.* 66

Given the experience of commercial agents in adapting their itineraries it stands to reason that if trade with France had been affected by political upheaval, Scottish merchants would have tried to access the commodities they imported from France from elsewhere.67 It was noted by the deputies of the French Council of Trade in 1700 that French ports were being by-passed and wines bought in Spain and Portugal, and Louis XIV was heavily criticised for taxing wine and brandy exports excessively, decreasing foreign sales.68 Debate concerning French and Portuguese goods was rife in Britain in the early eighteenth century.69 The London newspaper the *Mercator* claimed in 1713 that ‘to take these People then at their own Words...They had rather drink Port Wine, if

63 Robert Leslie to John Taylor, Esq., [?1702], CTP, III, 90. This practice continued: see 17 April 1706, ADG C 4260
64 23 January 1702/3, CTP, III, 105-6
66 18-20 February 1713, Mercator, issue 117
68 Ibid, 233, 238
69 For example, see 30 January 1713-2 February 1713, Mercator, issue 109; 9-11 March 1713, Mercator, issue 125
the French Wines and the Port Wines were all at a Price’. In typically satirical vein, the editors of the *Tatler* had reported much the same fashion three years earlier: ‘He went on, Do you love French Wine? I believe you may; I did once myself: But let me tell you, that White Port is not only the cheapest, but the best Wine now about Town’. Such examples may speak more to taste than practicality (or outward antagonism towards all things French), but they certainly emphasise that alternative avenues of trade were available.

Throughout the seventeenth century Scottish merchants traded in both French and Spanish wine, and it has been suggested that in 1620s Scotland Spanish wines were equal in popularity with French. The activities of several members of the merchant Marjoribanks family trading in Edinburgh and Leith later in the century – John, Edward, James and Joseph – corroborate this. John is particularly prolific in the port entry books, and purchased quantities of both French and Spanish wine from Bordeaux and Cadiz, from various merchants, between 1680 and 1690; in two consecutive days in April 1681 he purchased wine from three different merchants’ cargoes. He had perhaps given prior commissions to several merchants; certainly it was not uncommon for merchants to commission or freight two or more different ships to different destinations if the size of their enterprise would allow it. Two receipts were drawn up by Henry Shelle, merchant in Leith and owner of the *Mary* of Leith and the *Alexander* of Borrowstoness, both dated 4 March 1654, to Henry Hope and Walter Younge, merchants in Edinburgh, for the freight of these two barks for voyages to Norway and Rouen and back respectively. In adopting this policy merchants spread their interests, insuring themselves against loss. This practice of ‘risk distribution’ as a means of insurance was a common one before official insurance came to the fore, and one

---

70 18-20 February 1713, *Mercator*, issue 117
71 10-13 March 1710, *The Tatler*, issue 301
72 Francis, *Wine Trade*, 47
73 Accounts of collectors of H.M. Customs and Foreign Excise, November 1690-November 1691, NAS E73/109/11/9/4; Leith: Entry books (wine), 1 November 1680-1 August 1681, NAS E72/15/22; 1 November 1682-1 November 1683, NAS E72/15/27. Other merchants exhibited the same behaviour, for example George Galbraith in December 1682, NAS E72/15/27 and Alexander Taitt in January 1685, NAS E72/15/33. Numerous other examples can be found within these records.
74 Henry Shelle to Henry Hope and Walter Younge, 4 March 1653/4, NAS RH9/17/32
adopted by Daniel Masson, a Scottish merchant based in St Martins and La Rochelle towards the end of the seventeenth century.\textsuperscript{76}

Despite the fact that Scots did import Spanish wine in some quantity, French wine seemed to have remained the more popular in the later seventeenth century. As demonstrated by Figure 2.1, in the twelve months from November 1669 re-exports of French wines to England vastly outnumbered those of Spanish, suggesting that the total amount of French wine imported into Scotland was also superior.\textsuperscript{77}

\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{wines_graph.png}
\caption{Re-exports of wine, Scotland to England, November 1669-November 1670}
\end{figure}

Indeed, the customs records for wine imports into Leith demonstrate the continuing popularity of French as opposed to Spanish wines:\textsuperscript{78}

\textsuperscript{76} 24 November 1689, ADCM B5678, 124-5; 25 November 1690, ADCM B5686, 91; 5 January, 28 March, 20 June, 7 June-4 July 1691, ADCM, B5687, 4, 33-34, 56, 68-69; 23 January, 19 March, 28 May, 19 June, 2 July 1692, ADCM B5688, 10-11, 36, 83, 106, 113-114. This list is not exhaustive, and subsequent years throw up more examples. See ADCM B5691 (1695) and B5695 (1699). The same documents indicate other individuals who clearly owned multiple ships, for example Robert Mackeral and Charles Cahell. Masson’s commercial interests stretched across Europe, including Scotland, England, Ireland, Bayonne, Saint Martin, La Rochelle, Brest, Spain, Danzig and the New World.

\textsuperscript{77} Data taken from ‘Accompt of Wines Exported overland to England’, November 1669-November 1670, NAS E73/23. For conversion rates used see Appendix II.i.

\textsuperscript{78} Data compiled from the second series of customs books (wine) for Leith, NAS E72/15. The gaps (1673-1680 and 1686-1688) are years for which the records are not extant. Spanish wine is measured in butts; French in tuns. Conversion rate: 1 tun = 2 butts (see Appendix 2.i).
While some merchants seem to have taken advantage of alternative routes – particularly following the outbreak of the Nine Years’ War in 1688 – French wine, on the whole, remained favoured. One undated but certainly contemporary epigram suggests that this was also the case with Portuguese wine:

Firm and erect the Caledonian stood,  
Prime was his mutton and his claret good, 
Let him drink Port! the wily Saxon cried, 
He drank the poison, and his spirit died.\(^{79}\)

In the case of some commodities, the reasons for continuing to pursue trade with a particular port are apparent – as examined in detail in Chapter 1, particular types of French salt were needed for the curing of certain fish. In the case of French and Spanish wine, taste was undoubtedly one factor that persuaded merchants to favour one destination over another. However, there were also financial motivations – as the same entry books for wine for Leith in the 1680s show, the customs on imports of French wine were lower than that of Spanish. Data is available for the years 1680-81, 1683-84 and 1684-85 and in these years (once the conversion from Spanish to French measurements has been made – see Appendix II.i) excise on French wine was £36 per

\(^{79}\) n.d., A. Maxwell, The History of Old Dundee: narrated out of the Town Council Register, with additions from contemporary annals (Edinburgh/Dundee, 1884) 448
tun, and on Spanish was £54 per tun. As we will see in more detail in Part II, while Franco-Scottish trade demonstrably continued throughout the seventeenth century aspects of it were affected by political events, trade embargoes and diplomatic actions. As evidence regarding wine imports begins to demonstrate, however, this did not seem to deter merchants from pursuing their preferred trading routes or the ones that would bring them the most profit, despite alternatives being available to them.

IV. ROLES OF COMMERCIAL AGENTS

‘A diversity of interests and talent’. Merchant classes in the seventeenth century have been seen as embracing ‘a diversity of interests and talent’, and this talent is evidenced in both the methods of trading described above and in the determination of merchants to continue their trade in the face of adversity. However, there were many ways in which one could be said to be ‘involved’ in international trade. There were those who acted as merchants, bankers or factors, those who traded alone and those who traded as part of a company, those who manufactured or retailed, those who settled in one place and those who were transient, being reliant on opportunity rather than knowledge or precedent. Several prominent Scots abroad acted as bankers and several of these became Jacobite financiers at the turn of the eighteenth century, including Robert Gordon, William Gordon and Robert Arbuthnot. Many individuals acted in multiple roles; some Bordeaux wine merchants also acted as agents for merchants who sold regional wines in foreign markets. These individuals were commissionaires – brokers who bought wine at the request of a distant correspondent. While they occasionally bought wine as investments for themselves,

80 Entry books of wine, Leith, NAS E72/15/22; E72/15/29; E72/15/33. The only year for which separate figures are included for the custom as well as the excise – 1683-84 – this is equal, being 60lb per tun French or 30lb per butt/60lb per tun Spanish. These years run from November – November.
81 G. Howat, Stuart and Cromwellian Foreign Policy (London, 1974) 5-6
82 Ibid.
84 T. Brennan, Burgundy to Champagne: the wine trade in early modern France (Baltimore/London, 1997) 43
85 For a near contemporary explanation of the role of commissionaires see J. Savary, Le Parfait Négociant, 2 volumes (Paris, 1777) II, 213, 312-315
and were identified equally as merchants and négociants, most of their commercial activity was by commission.  

It has been argued that by the late seventeenth century Scottish merchants preferred to trade with the aid of a Scottish factor overseas who would have been an expert on business, languages and foreign markets and who, of course, charged a commission for his services (usually 2.5%). It has also been argued, however, that the use of factors actually restricted the horizons of overseas trade, as merchants would have been wary of trading to ports where there were no Scottish factors present. Furthermore, factors throughout Europe often abused their position and there were several attempts made by Scottish institutions to regulate their income and behaviour. Despite specific attempts by the Convention of Royal Burghs to address this problem in 1599, complaints regarding the conduct of factors were made into the 1620s. By 1634 the Council of Aberdeen had stipulated that

as for the factors in France ye sall condescend that nane sall be employit be any merchand quhatsumever, bot as salbe authorized be the burrowes And ye sall nominat Mr Gilbert Paip to be a factor wha will set sufficient cautioun to obey the injunctiounes.

The many different guises in which commercial agents became involved in business dealings facilitated contact and dissemination of information – letters to and from the continent were often sent in merchant ships via, for example, ‘the ordinary merchant-post which starts from Rouen’. Individuals with no direct interest in commerce made use of merchants to transfer goods. In 1699 Sir James Dick used Alexander Stevensone, a banker in Paris, and Alexander Campbell, a merchant in Edinburgh, to expedite the passage of goods. Stevensone sent ‘3 bills of loading wi one for Sr James Dick be ing his sons books cloathes &…passing att the custome heer with port to Rouen and shipping abroad there coast 2 new crowns abt £7 Scots’

---

86 Brennan, Burgundy to Champagne, 43
87 Smout, Scottish Trade, 96-7; de Bruyn Kops, Spirited Exchange, 44, 60
88 Smout, Scottish Trade, 97-8
89 5 July 1599, CRB, II, 50
90 Instructions to Alexander Jaffray, Baillie of Aberdeen, July 1624, ACL, I, 232 regards complaints made against the factors in Campeir; a missive letter for the Convention of Royal Burghs from the Council of Aberdeen was ‘to send overtured for preventing factors’ abuses in France’, 7 July 1629, ACL, I, 299
91 Instructions to Alexander Jaffray, Baillie, commissioner of Aberdeen, July 1634, ACL, II, 16. Gilbert Pape was a prominent Scottish merchant in France during this period (Chapter 3).
92 Bernardino de Mendoza to the King, 9 June 1586, CLPS, XVI, 583; same to same, 10 September 1586, 623; [Henry Gilbert to Robert Balfour], 4 November 1592, CSP, XI, 8
Governments also did not hesitate to exploit the connections of merchants and bankers abroad. In 1713 John Gordon, a factor in Rotterdam, was ordered to send for the use of the town [Banff] as much weights as will weight two bolls of meal weighing 16 stone weight, Amsterdame weight, which doth agree with our old Scots weight, to consist of two four-stone weights, four two-stone weights, one stone weight and two half-stone weights.

John stated on 19 December that the weights had been sent, and billed the burgh court of Banff for £5 19 9 sterling. Merchants were also commissioned to provide or carry arms, munitions or victual, or to serve in the Navy during conflict. Charles Chalmot, a French merchant in La Rochelle, received payment of 1,318 livres tournois, 37 sous from Henry Balfour, colonel of the Scots Regiment in the service of the Prince of Orange for firearms, mines and other equipment. While acting as couriers for the government may be assumed to have been an inconvenience, the merchants involved were usually compensated. In 1593 John Gibson submitted an account ‘for the charge for purchase and transport of 20 horses to Brittany, and for impressing, victualling, and transporting 22 men: total £247 15s’. Merchants were able to take advantage of being under commissions for the government as ‘shippes or boats serving the Countrey, or the Prince, have great prerogatives. For first they go free from all Imposts, Customs, and Arrestments, not only in forth-going but also in their return’. Merchants who acted as couriers for the government had the opportunity to carry cargo on their return journeys custom-free, perhaps avoiding the expense of travelling one-way in ballast, or collecting a cargo which they might not otherwise have pursued.

Merchant ships also facilitated the movement of people. The accounts of the David, examined above, included wages paid to men working on the ship. This in itself is not unusual, but it seems that many of these men travelled only one way, as this account lists wages for ‘Jo Morton Gunner for coming from Dublin to Kircaldy, Jo

93 Alexander Stevensone to Alexander Campbell, Paris, 28 January 1699, NAS RH15/14/76
94 3 October 1713, AB, I, 184
95 ‘An Ordinance to enable to Lord high Admiral to press Mariners, Saylers, and others for the service of the Navy’, 21 February 1644/5, AO, 646-7
96 Discharge by Sieur Charles Chalmot to Sieur Henry Balfour [Balfour], La Rochelle, 15 November 1576; NAS GD63/42; the commissions were dated 15 November, 22 December and 29 December 1570 and 30 January 1571
97 February 1593, CSPD, III, 323
98 W. Welwood, An Abridgement of all sea-lawes (London, 1613) 48-9
99 For an example of this practice see John Dougall to John Clerk, 14 May 1642, Dieppe, NAS GD18/2416, which is discussed in Chapter 4.
Merchant ships, as well as facilitating the exchange of commodities, munitions, victual and providing a postal and courier service, seem also to have acted as transport for those willing to work on the ship to pay for their voyage. Furthermore, some individuals who could afford to pay their way, rather than work, used merchant ships as transport. In 1674 William and Madame Lockhart planned to travel together to Dieppe on a merchant ship, presumably paying a fee to the skipper.

In their capacities as bankers and financiers, merchants contributed to the war effort in other ways, doing business with those who were on the continent in military capacities. In May 1627, John Seaton of the King of France’s guard acknowledged receipt of money from Andrew Bethune, a merchant in Paris. In 1643 William Douglas, a captain in James Douglas’s regiment, borrowed 670 francs from Robert Murray, also a merchant in Paris. During the Interregnum the French ambassadors used merchant bankers – in 1647 Montereul reported to Cardinal Mazarin that ‘j’ay offert au Chevr Moray de luy toucher presentement quatre mille ecus, que le Sr du Talmond, marchand, m’a tenir prêts’. All of these examples suggest that individuals who operated in different spheres should not be viewed as entirely separate from one another.

1713, NAS RH15/59/5/7/A/7

William Lockhart to Madame Lockhart, 25 July 1674, NAS GD406/1/11395

5 May 1627, NAS GD7/2/33; see also Discharge, Patrick Seaton (Scots Guard in France) to James Lord Ogilvy of 100 crowns, owed to Mr Julian Quantine (merchant in Paris), 4 June 1588, NAS GD16/42/29. It is not known if these two individuals were related.

1 April 1643, re-payment of debt acknowledged by James Murray, 22 March 1644, NAS GD29/1309. There is scope for a wider study on the contacts between expatriate Scots in different spheres. It has recently been recognised that there was interaction between Scottish merchants and their countrymen in military service, education and churches – although the ‘nature of the interaction remains unclear’. D. Dickson, ‘Introduction’ to D. Dickson, J. Parmentier and J. Ohlmeyer (eds.), Irish and Scottish Mercantile Networks in Europe and Overseas in the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries (Gent, 2007) 3

Montereul to Cardinal Mazarin, 23 March/2 April 1647, Edinburgh, DC, II, 66-70

This is a conclusion also reached by Kathrin Zickermann in her recent work on Scottish communities in northwest Germany: K. Zickermann, ‘Across the German Sea: Scottish Commodity Exchange, Network Building and Communities in the Wider Elbe-Weser Region in the Early Modern Period’ (unpublished Ph.D thesis, University of St Andrews, 2009) 177, 181-2
V. CONCLUSION

In utilising only official records such as port books, scholars have continued to assume that ‘traditional’ commodities – wine, salt and fish – fully constituted Franco-Scottish trade. In fact, deeper examination of official records such as books of rates and an examination of private records reveals a much wider range of commodities involved in this commercial exchange than has often been recognised. While the diversity of goods imported and the number of destinations utilised by these merchants has historically been seen as negative, in fact such willingness and ability to adapt served two purposes – first, it highlights the amount of trust placed in merchants and/or skippers, in allowing them to trade with destinations and in commodities that they believed would make a profit, rather than having them follow strict itineraries. Secondly, we now begin to see why Franco-Scottish trading links did not break down during times of political crisis, as will be demonstrated at length in Part II. Moreover, the roles played by commercial agents in France in this period add to our understanding of their flexibility. Merchants often acted as bankers or factors – sometimes progressing to these roles over time. Their contribution to society, for example in effecting an international postal service and serving during periods of war, perhaps goes some way to explaining why authorities did not clamp down as hard as they might have done on illegal trade – it often suited the authorities to keep trade links open to facilitate the transfer of information, men, arms and munitions, and to protect the domestic economy.

Previous research has begun to counter the argument that all who lived or worked in France in this period must have held religious or political beliefs – including those tied to political institutions such as the Stuart exile court. Instead, many looked to improve their own position, regardless of the political issues that surrounded them. Merchants were no different, often not adhering to the religious or political policies of the area in which they worked or the people they worked with, and not taking heed of political obstacles or governmental decrees which interrupted their trade. In order to effect their personal aggrandisement, merchants, while often working for themselves, did not work in isolation. Indeed, it has been argued that the ports that were popular with foreign merchants were not so due to the commodities which could be sourced

106 Talbott, ‘Jacobites, Anti-Jacobites and the Ambivalent’, 73-88
there, but due to a high concentration of brokers.¹⁰⁷ Merchants often operated as part of commercial networks and communities, relying on others as much as on themselves. In order to understand these trading links fully, it is essential to understand these networks; to examine the people with whom these merchants did business, both home and abroad, and the ways in which they assimilated into their host communities in France. These issues, along with consideration of the effect that merchants’ behaviour had on the economy of their native country, particularly when it is considered that their primary motives were largely personal, are examined in the following chapter.

¹⁰⁷ Brennan, Burgundy to Champagne, 101
CHAPTER THREE

‘His individual interest and that of the nation are opposed’.1

Merchants and Commercial Networks

The way in which trade links have traditionally been examined has greatly affected conclusions drawn regarding them, with the changing nature of commercial relationships in the long seventeenth century not always being taken into account. It has been argued that as the domestic economy of France engaged increasingly in long-distance trade in the seventeenth century (as opposed to the domestic and short-distance European trade that characterised earlier periods), two contrasting market systems emerged – a public one and a private one, each obeying different rules, with the ‘asymmetrics of knowledge and power’ in long-distance trade ‘violat[ing] popular assumptions about the way that markets were supposed to work’.2 These developments meant that the intermediaries – factors, bankers, and merchants themselves – began to play a crucial role in making the market economy function.3 Yet despite this realisation being made at the beginning of the twentieth century, historiographically it is only recently that the role of these individuals has been seen as crucial to such studies. This chapter will support the argument that

once one leaves behind the antiseptic realm of theoretical economic models, and enters into an historical world of flesh and blood, merchants appear not as faceless facilitators, but as a social reality, an interest group, or even a class. Merchants thus do not appear as abstract individuals but as concrete collectives, indeed as merchant communities.4

Considering these merchants as ‘flesh and blood’, rather than as part of economic models, is essential to understanding the motives governing their actions and the methods they employed, and therefore to understanding Franco-Scottish trade (or, indeed, any commercial links) in this period.

1 Meek (ed. and trans.): Quesney, l’analyse, 164-5, cited in T. Brennan, Burgundy to Champagne: the wine trade in early modern France (Baltimore/London, 1997) xv
2 Brennan, Burgundy to Champagne, xiv
3 R. Westerfield, ‘Middlemen in English Business: particularly between 1660-1760’ in Transactions of the Connecticut Academy of Arts and Sciences, XIX (New Haven, 1915) particularly Chapter VII, 329-428
As examined in the previous chapter, commercial agents adapted their trading methods to allow them to pursue commerce during times of adversity. In understanding the networks within which these agents operated, we can further illuminate the methods used by them to trade, and examine the effect that such activity might have had on both their native and host countries. Any examination of such individuals is necessarily dependent on surviving evidence pertaining to them, and we are especially fortunate that the letter-books, account books and vast correspondence relating to one of the most successful Scottish merchants in France in this period – John Clerk of Penicuik – survive, allowing us to piece together in some detail the networks this entrepreneur fostered.\(^5\) Although the methods and networking undertaken by Clerk cannot be seen as indicative of the behaviour of all Scottish merchants in France in this period, he does provide us with a viable case study from which to begin our analysis. Contrast between his network and the networks of other, equally active Scottish merchants in France (and the links between them) allow us to form a more comprehensive picture regarding the nature of Franco-Scottish trade in this period, illuminating how commerce was fundamentally effected.

I. THE COMMERCIAL NETWORKS OF JOHN CLERK OF PENICUIK

‘A merchant sitting at home in his counting-house at once converses with all parts of the known world’.\(^6\)

John Clerk first appeared in Paris as the apprentice of John Smith, a merchant burgess of Edinburgh, in 1634 and remained in France until 1646, at which time he returned to Scotland and to his newly purchased barony of Penicuik, just south of Edinburgh.\(^7\) Although his residency in Paris was temporary his continental commercial networks were extensive, continuing long after he returned home and spreading not only back to

---

5 NAS collection GD18; NLS Adv.ms.35.1.10; NLS Adv.mss.23.3.26
7 Contract, John Smith and John Clerk, 16 August 1634, Edinburgh, NAS GD18/2359. The date on which Clerk left France to return to Scotland permanently has not yet been conclusively determined. However, it seems that it was during the autumn of 1646: in August he is still styling himself ‘John Clerk, marchant [sic] in Paris’, whereas in September this changes to ‘merchant in Edinburgh’. John Clerk to William Gray of Pittendrum, 16 August 1646, NAS GD18/2381/7; Account, same to same, September 1646, NAS GD18/2381/5
Scotland but also throughout France and across Europe. Reliable correspondents were vital to the success of commercial networks that spanned large geographical areas, and all involved were dependent to some extent on others to inform them of business opportunities and facilitate contacts. Indeed, Daniel Defoe noted in 1697 ‘the help of strange and universal intelligence; wherein some are so exquisite, so swift, and so exact, that a merchant sitting at home in his counting-house, at once converses with all parts of the known world’. James Mowat, a Scottish tailor and merchant in Paris, had a close business relationship with Clerk, dealing with him on many occasions. After Clerk had returned to Scotland, Mowat informed him that he was sending papers home with a Mr Thomson, who was ‘shortly for Scotland’. Throughout the 1640s Clerk dealt directly with Thomas Thomson, while Thomson was residing in Rouen, and Thomson helped Clerk to facilitate other lucrative contacts, for example in acting as a banker for Clerk in his transactions with the Earl of Lothian. Michel Mel, another prominent contact of Clerk’s based in Dieppe, was also part of Clerk’s business dealings with Lothian and on several occasions he was entrusted with facilitating the movement of goods. Included in an account between Mel and Clerk from 1652 is ‘a memore off 2 tronks off my lord lothians and 1 off my own which ar in Michel Mels hand marchand in Dieppe’ and in October 1655 Clerk received ‘1 letter fra Michel Mel in Dieppe…with ane accompt of 18:15:6d off charges he layd out for 2 tronks off my lord lothians containing Books’. Mel participated in other commercial transactions, and in the same 1652 account Clerk notes ‘inclosit is ane order fra Michel mel adrest to John Moyant marchant in Rouen to delyver up to me the above wreatten Thrie coffers’.

Like communities elsewhere, the Scottish merchant community in France operated through networks that fostered kith and kin relations and within which connections were passed down through generations of families. It was the longevity of

---

8 Clerk maintained contacts in Italy, London, Rotterdam, Veere, Middleburgh, throughout France and Scotland, as will be seen further throughout this chapter. John Clerk to Robert Inglis, London, 8 February 1645; John Clerk to John Dougall Younger, 9 March 1645, Dieppe; John Clerk to Lady Pittendrum, 20 September 1645; John Clerk to Lady Pittendrum, 3 November 1645; John Clerk to Janet Gray, 3 November 1645, NAS GD18/2414-2415, f7v, 11v, 17r-v;
9 Roseveare, ‘Merchant Organization’, 263
11 James Mowat to John Clerk, 22 January 1650, Paris, NAS GD18/2505/6
12 Accounts, John Clerk and Thomas Thomson, 1641-1645, NAS GD18/2414
13 Accounts, Thomas Thomson (Rouen), John Clerk (Paris) and the Earl of Lothian (Edinburgh), 1643-1644, NAS GD18/2439
14 Account, Michel Mel and John Clerk, 1 September 1652, NAS GD18/2371; Michel Mel to John Clerk, 30 October 1655, Dieppe, NAS GD18/2542
15 Account, Michel Mel and John Clerk, 1 September 1652, NAS GD18/2371
these contacts that propagated commercial links throughout the turmoil of the long seventeenth century, as is demonstrated in Part II. Robert Galbraith, an Edinburgh merchant in Bordeaux, had contact with Edward and James Macmath in the 1590s. The Macmath family continued to be prevalent throughout the seventeenth century. In 1612 Alexander ‘McMath’, merchant burgess of Edinburgh, complained to the Privy Council that James Dundas owed him ‘the sowme of twenty sex schillingis aucht pennyis money of this realme for everie liver of the sowme of four hundredth liveris Frensche money current in Burdeaux’. The Macmaths later dealt with John Clerk, and there survive from between 1635 and 1637 25 letters written by Hector Macmath from Dieppe, Rouen and ‘St Jermaines’ to Clerk in Paris. During this period, Hector Macmath also had connections with Thomas Thomson, bringing a case against him before the Admiralty of Rouen in 1635. David Macmath acted as a witness for the closing of an account between Clerk and Michel Mel in September 1652. John Clerk introduced his sons to his trade and they, the eldest John and the youngest James, were active on the continent after Clerk’s death in 1674, having benefited from the advice and assistance of their father. In 1676, the two Clerk brothers can be found corresponding regarding the purchase of household furniture. James, located in France, wrote to his brother in London that ‘ther is a place the Rag mercatt in Rotterdam or Amsterdam wher you will buy all sort of houshold furnitur very cheap’, demonstrating the range of commodities involved but also the wide range of knowledge of European markets and the geographical spread of these networks. James was also involved in the importation of bound books, acting as the correspondent of George Veitch when this Edinburgh merchant appealed to the Council for permission to import this commodity in 1686 (Chapter 1). As previously discussed in the context of freighting ships, many merchants chose to spread their commercial interests across many different

---

16 For more on this phenomenon in general see S. Murdoch, *Network North: Scottish kin, commercial and covert association in Northern Europe, 1603-1746* (Leiden, 2006) particularly Chapter 1, 13–48
17 Discharge, Edward and James MacMath to Robert Galbraith, 21 July 1596, NAS JC62/1 (unnumbered); James MacMath and David Ritchesone to Robert Galbraith, Bloye, 24 March 1596, NAS JC62/1/79
18 23 July 1612, Edinburgh, *RPCS*, IV, 417
19 1635, ADSM 204 BP 4
20 1 September 1652, NAS GD18/2371
21 James Clerk to John Clerk younger, 6 July 1676, France, NAS GD18/5177/2
22 2 December 1686, *RPCS*, iii, XIII, 7–8. A John Clerk appears in 1676 in the letter book of John Swinton, mentioned above, and although it cannot be ascertained whether this is the same John Clerk who is the son of our protagonist Clerk, it is possible that this demonstrates further threads of this network interlinking and continuing through generations. John Swinton to Walter Benthall, London, 21 September 1676, stating ‘my last was per John Clairk’, NAS CS96/3264
commodities and locations, rather than confining themselves to a single market. The Jolly family operated primarily in northwest Germany, but maintained commercial interests in Scandinavia, Spain and France. In 1682, Alexander Jolly was chartered by the Hamburg merchant Otto Danke to freight goods to Cadiz, Alicante or Marseilles, and the following year Jolly again sailed to Marseilles, although he was shipwrecked en route. The Jolly family maintained commercial interests in La Rochelle during the Nine Years’ War, as is noted in Chapter 6. Furthermore, Robert and John Jolly appear in the records of the Bordeaux Parlement in 1620, providing evidence in defence of a case brought against the Edinburgh merchant John Ur, demonstrating that this family was present on the continent throughout the century.

Links between merchant families, passed down by relatives, was a comparatively common phenomenon – and perhaps this is not surprising when it is considered that networks were often based on trust, recommendations and personal relationships. What remains impressive is the longevity of these contacts, further countering the notion that Scotland’s trade with France – and, in particular, the methods used to precipitate it – represented a disorganised and opportunistic trade.

II. NETWORK HIERARCHY

‘My merchant wold not weill acept me nor answer me’. Commercial networks comprised individuals in many different capacities, but they nevertheless remained largely non-hierarchical with every individual involved in them important if the network was to be successful. Limitations of surviving evidence leads us to certain assumptions, particularly regarding the relative importance of individuals within these networks and who was at the ‘centre’ of them. The vast amount of

---

24 Alexander Seaton, Chancellor of Scotland, to the Court of the Parlement of Bordeaux, 1620, NAS RH9/5/6
25 For more on this see Murdoch, Network North, Chapters 1 (13-48) and 2 (49-83); D. Horsbroch, ‘Wish you were here? Scottish Reactions to ‘Postcards’ home from the ‘Germane Warres’’ in S. Murdoch (ed.), Scotland and the Thirty Years’ War (Leiden, 2001) 247-8, 252-3
26 As argued in T. Pagan, The Convention of the Royal Burghs of Scotland (Glasgow, 1926) 151
27 Thomas [Dinmuir] to Andrew Russell, 7 May 1677, Nantes, NAS RH15/106/268/11
28 For recent arguments regarding the non-hierarchical nature of Scottish trading networks, see D. Dickson, ‘Introduction’, 2; D. Hancock, ‘Combining Success and Failure: Scottish Networks in the Atlantic Wine Trade’ both in D. Dickson, J. Parmentier and J. Ohlmeyer (eds.), Irish and Scottish Mercantile Networks in Europe and Overseas in the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries (Gent, 2007) 14, 20
evidence surviving that relates to John Clerk, for example, suggests that he was at the centre of this particular network; and certainly leads us to assume that he founded it and cultivated the ties within it. Yet Scottish networks within France were present long before Clerk began his continental career, and the network that became ‘Clerk’s’ was not established or entirely cultivated by Clerk himself. As Kathrin Zickermann has recently stated, every individual formed the centre of their very own network, but participated in multiple networks of those connected to them.  

At the end of the sixteenth century Robert Galbraith was already trading with Henry Hope, James Hope and Jean Mel, this older generation of Hopes and Mels engaged in commercial activity with each other before Clerk pursued his own links with either of these families.  

Throughout the seventeenth century the Mels operated as a merchant family, and an act of the Parlement of Rouen in 1617 shows Jacques Mel, ‘bourgeois marchand demourant à Dieppe,’ interacting with ‘Jehan le Tourneur, bourgeois marchand demourant à Rouen’. Much later in the century the Mels continued to pursue commercial links independent of any network of Clerk’s, for example in pursuing contacts with individuals in Scotland. Even though Clerk was at this time present in Penicuik, the Mels do not appear to have used Clerk to facilitate commerce – although of course it must be considered that evidence for this may simply have not survived. In January 1652 Michel Mel appears in the Aberdeen Propinquity Books as part of a dispute over a bill of exchange. The individuals involved in the dispute – John Donaldson elder (burgess of Aberdeen) and Mr John Irving – were Aberdeen-based individuals who appeared to have had Mel as their sole French contact; no evidence has been unearthed suggesting that they had any further links with France or the individuals based there.  

Later, in 1666, Jean Mel is recorded as ‘capitaine du Lion sur son voyage d’Ecosse à La Rochelle avec une cargaison de harengs, saumon, beurre et suif’ – on this occasion

29 Zickermann, ‘Across the German Sea’, 3  
30 Henry Hope to Robert Galbraith, n.d. (?)1596, NAS JC62/1/30; James Hope to Robert Galbraith, 10 January 1596, Newhaven, NAS JC62/1/52; Jehan Mel to Robert Galbraith, n.d., 1596, NAS JC62/1/76. Galbraith appears to have only settled in France temporarily, as he is present in the records of the Privy Council in 1619 as a ‘merchant burgess of Edinburgh’, 25 August 1619, Holyrood, RPCS, XII, 75  
31 Once Clerk had established himself in Paris, his contacts with the Mels, especially Michel in Dieppe, were extensive. For example, see accounts and copies of letters held at NAS GD18/2371, containing several documents dating from between 1635 and 1652; Michel Mel to John Clerk, 30 October 1655, Dieppe, NAS GD18/2542; and Clerk’s dealings with Hope were fairly long-lived, with correspondence between the two surviving from 1649: Henry Hope to John Clerk, 20/30 November 1649, Paris, NAS GD18/2413  
32 7 June 1617, NLS Adv.mss.33.1.1 VI  
33 ACA, Propinquity Books, I, 13 January 1652, f42v
trading in more ‘conventional’ commodities, rather than the luxury goods which appeared to have often been the most prevalent in Clerk’s networks.34

As has been noted, these networks comprised numerous individuals, in various locations and in varying capacities (Chapter 2). While it has been suggested that the nature of foreign exchange and the dangers of trading overseas (for example, piracy and privateering) meant that ‘it isn’t surprising that the merchants carried out every stage of their trading operation personally’, examination of networks of merchants in France suggests a different pattern.35 These networks were ‘private’ in the sense that individual merchants/factors/bankers were involved at every stage, but the very nature of these networks, and the ways in which business was conducted across large geographical areas, meant that carrying out every stage personally was impossible. One only has to examine the behaviour of the Dundee merchant David Wedderburne to see that while he may have overseen matters personally, he certainly was not involved at every stage himself. There is no evidence to suggest that he ever ventured to any of the European countries he traded with, or that he met any of the factors who facilitated his business. Instead, he often used the same merchants on several occasions, establishing business relationships with those whom he trusted.36

Furthermore, the most prominent of Clerk’s business partners did business with each other independently. James Mowat and Michel Mel began to correspond in 1656.37 Mel also dealt independently with Henry Hope, and Hope at times facilitated business between Mel and Clerk, placing himself at the centre of this partnership.38 Michel Mel maintained his own independent high-end contacts, buying goods including ‘ritch gold and selver dentel of the newest fas’hion’ for the Laird of Pitfodels in 1664.39 Mel had begun fostering this relationship several years previously, and during the 1650s correspondence with Pitfodels concentrated on less luxurious items, namely salmon

34 18 February 1666, ADCM B5667. This could perhaps be the same Jean Mel recorded as ‘ingénieur et géographe du Roi; créancier de Jacques Duchesne’ in Rouen in 1683, although this is merely conjecture: 1683, ADSM G 9402
35 H. Smith, Shetland Life and Trade, 1550-1914 (Edinburgh, 1984) 38; for more on the dangers of trading overseas, particularly with reference to pirates and privateers, see S. Murdoch, The Terror of the Seas? Scottish Maritime Warfare, 1513-1713 (Leiden, 2010) passim, and Chapter 7 for a French context.
36 This was a method of trading used throughout Europe – for example, wine buyers and distributers in Rotterdam also depended on international merchants to bring merchandise to the Republic, rather than venturing abroad themselves: H. de Bruyn Kops, A Spirited Exchange: the wine and brandy trade between France and the Dutch Republic in its Atlantic Framework, 1600-1650 (Leiden, 2007) 81
37 James Mowat to John Clerk, 8 March 1656, Paris, NAS GD18/2505/8, ‘I have written to Michel Mel at Dieppe to let me know of any vessell goeing for Scotland.’
38 Correspondence and accounts between John Clerk and Henry Hope, 30 December 1643, 19 January 1644, Dieppe, NAS GD18/2437
39 Account, Pitfodels and Clerk, 29 July 1664, Dieppe, NAS GD237/11/95/6
being shipped from Aberdeen to France – Mel perhaps needing to gain Pitfodels’s trust before he was commissioned to send luxury goods.\textsuperscript{40} James Mowat facilitated the meeting of two more of Clerk’s key business connections, writing that he had not yet ‘found convenient tyme to speak to Mr Poncet but shall once this day and speak [to] mr thomsone and cause maik them meitte’, here Mowat acting as the protagonist in establishing these new threads.\textsuperscript{41}

Clerk’s network cannot be seen as ‘standard’ in this period, although the plethora of surviving evidence makes it tempting to see it as such. Comparison between Clerk and Wedderburne demonstrates differences between the ways in which merchants chose to operate – Clerk settling in Paris and overseeing his network from a central, French location; Wedderburne remaining in Dundee and operating from there.\textsuperscript{42} Other Scottish merchants with extensive ties to France chose to operate from home and have their contacts facilitate trade – for example the Edinburgh based merchant Archibald Hamilton.\textsuperscript{43} Although Clerk lived in France, he still relied on factors in other locations. Jacques du Cornet acted as Clerk’s banker in Bordeaux, facilitating links between Clerk in Paris and other Scots on the west coast of France: Robert Brown in La Rochelle, Adam Mitchelson in Rouen and William Monteith in Bordeaux.\textsuperscript{44} Such practice was not uncommon. As Steve Murdoch has recently demonstrated in relation to the network of Andrew Russell, many Scottish merchants trading with Bordeaux in this period did not travel to Bordeaux themselves, nor did they ever meet the factors – usually Robert Stewart and William Popple – whom Russell put them in contact with. Instead, the merchants considered by Murdoch relied on Russell – an individual based in Rotterdam – to guarantee and oversee their business.\textsuperscript{45} It did not seem to concern merchants that Russell was not geographically based within a Scottish community in France. Through the large amount of Russell’s correspondence which survives, we can see the extent of

\begin{itemize}
\item Michel Mel to Sir Gilbert Menzies of Pitfodels, 1652-1658, Dieppe, NAS GD237/11/200
\item James Mowat to John Clerk, 8 March 1656, Paris, NAS GD18/2505/8. Clerk had, by this time, returned to live in Scotland, and so Mowat perhaps took over from Clerk as one of the protagonists of this network.
\item CBDW, passim.
\item Account Book of Archibald Hamilton, 1657-1679, Edinburgh, NLS Adv.mss.31.3.2
\item Jacques du Cornet to John Clerk, 9 August 1638, NAS GD18/2375E; same to same, 19 September 1636, and on reverse, Adam Michelsonne to John Clerk, ‘with order to remit James de Cornet 1000lib and John de Cornet 800lib’, 28 August 1636, Rouen, NAS GD18/2375F. See also other documents A-I in this bundle. I would like to thank Professor Steve Murdoch (St Andrews) for providing me with copies of these documents and Dr Alexia Grosjean (St Andrews) for providing me with translations of them. A relation of du Cornet’s, Nicholas, was also involved in this network. Nicholas du Cornet to John Clerk, 13 October 1639, NAS GD18/2390/15
\end{itemize}
his connections with Scots who were very much part of the French network – from Robert Stewart and William Popple in Bordeaux\textsuperscript{46} to James Gordon (who evidently stayed with Russell, correspondence being addressed to ‘Mr James Gordon, to be found at the hous of Mr Andrew Rousell Marchant in Rotterdam, Holland\textsuperscript{47}) and Henry Lavie.\textsuperscript{48} Similarly Henry Hope was not only active in France, but more often in the Netherlands – the usefulness of his connections recognised by the Convention of Royal Burghs in 1671, as he was sent to act as a factor at the Scottish trading staple, which was at Dordrecht at this time.\textsuperscript{49} These connections suggest that despite not being physically present in France, both Hope and Russell maintained a presence within this network; being settled in France was clearly not a prerequisite to participation in the commercial networks within it. Furthermore, many individuals opted to change location, with the William Popple present in Bordeaux in the 1670s probably being the same as that present in Hamburg as part of the Company of Merchant Adventurers in the 1650s and 1660s.\textsuperscript{50}

Several individuals and networks utilised factors such as Popple and Stewart in Bordeaux. The Aberdeen merchant Robert Gerard corresponded with them in 1681, stating that ‘som frinds & I intends to send a small vessel for wyns brandy vinager’.\textsuperscript{51} He asked them to send him the rates and also asked for the price of stockings and tallow, presumably contemplating a return cargo. Similarly, Hamilton used Robert Stewart (among other contacts) to facilitate the sending home of goods such as wine, brandy and vinegar.\textsuperscript{52} There were many Scottish factors present in Bordeaux in this period, despite Christopher Smout’s assertion that ‘it is astonishing to find how few they were in number…John and Richard Gordon, for example, seem to have managed

\textsuperscript{46} May 1675, NAS RH15/106/174/6; 9 March 1675, NAS RH15/106/199; 20/30 November 1675, NAS RH15/106/199/9-11; n.d. [1681], 4 August 1681, 1 September 1681, Bordeaux, NAS RH15/106/424/23-26; 12 December 1683 (bill of loading), NAS RH15/106/163/5; 8 February 1676, Bordeaux, NAS RH15/106/231/30, 32
\textsuperscript{47} John Caldrom to James Gordon, 20/30 November 1675, NAS RH15/106/199/11; 15 August 1676, Popple and Stewart wrote to Andrew Russell and James Gordon collectively, suggesting that Gordon was not only staying with Russell but that he also had an inherent interest in Russell’s business, 15 August 1676, Bordeaux, NAS RH15/106/231/33
\textsuperscript{48} Henry Lavie to Andrew Russell, 5 August 1680, Bordeaux, NAS RH15/106/387/31; same to same 30 November 1680, Bordeaux, NAS RH15/106/387/32 (this letter written by Walter Rankin ‘for Mr Henry Lavie’); same to same, 22 June 1680, Bordeaux, NAS RH15/106/387/33
\textsuperscript{49} 12 August 1671, Edinburgh, Convention, III, 630; Instructions to Mr Robert Patrie or Andrew Skeine as commissioners, August 1671, ACL, V, 85
\textsuperscript{50} Zickermann, ‘Across the German Sea’, 80, 186
\textsuperscript{51} Robert Gerard to Robert Stewart and William Popple, 25 June 1681, Aberdeen, AUSC ms3175/Z/156
\textsuperscript{52} Account book of Archibald Hamilton, 1657-1679, NLS Adv.mss.31.3.2. Dealings with Robert Stewart occurred primarily between August 1671 and February 1674 (f51r-f87r). On 12 February 1674 (f87r), the partnership of ‘Robert Stewart and William Popple’ is explicitly mentioned.
almost all the trade to Bordeaux’. As well as Stewart and Popple, other factors included Henry Lavie who, as we have already seen, was in contact with Andrew Russell. Lavie appears in the 1670s dealing with John Swinton, a Scottish merchant based in London – in this correspondence a ‘J Lavy’ is also mentioned, perhaps another member of the Lavie family. Lavie acted as factor not only for individuals, but also for unofficial companies, including the cartel of Glasgow merchants in 1674 who formed a bond of co-partnery to control the import of the Bordeaux vintage of that year. Lavie was probably trusted in this capacity as he had previously acted on behalf of John Cauldwell, who headed the cartel, again highlighting the importance of experience, contacts and reputation.

That all members of the network were vital to its smooth running is emphasised on the occasions that someone did not perform their role adequately, causing problems further down the line. Henry Lavie was compelled to write to Annabella, Lady Lothian in 1651 that

I am now sorry to tell your lady how I am disappointed of the confidence I had in the Mr boullay of Nantes who I thought would not refuse mee the favour I desire of him (in messers Broune & Inglis name) towards payinge your lady the £500, he hath been pleased to answer mee that he cannot doe it at all, in soe much that I am now forced to tell your lady plainly that I know noe way...to satisfie your lady’s desire.

In 1675 Thomas Smith wrote to Andrew Russell that ‘I have bein heir [Bordeaux] neow a meownth and ther is not eney apereinc of my lodeing for my merchen heir seyed that he kneos noe of on town of guwdes yeit to peit a bord of us bowt seir I heve down all

54 Letter-book of John Swinton, Merchant (London), 1673-1677, NAS CS96/3264. This particular letter is from Swinton to Lavy, 6 November 1673, stating ‘ordered him buy ten tunn Brandy & ship in...for account of J Lavy & my selfe’.
55 See, for example, Henry Lavie to John Anderson, Petter Gemmull, John Walkinshaw, John Caldwell, Hugh Nisbet, & Alexander Knox, 26 October 1674, Bourdeaux, NLS Acc.8100/143; Murdoch, ‘French Connection’, 30
56 B. Kay and C. Maclean, *Knee Deep in Claret: a Celebration of Wine and Scotland* (Isle of Skye, 1994) 190. By the beginning of the eighteenth century, we begin to see more ‘official’ companies trading. William Russell and Company, based in Wigtown, traded with Holland, Rouen, Nantes, Norway, England, Ireland and various Scottish ports in the first years of the eighteenth century, and Leith Rope and Saileduck Co.’s business account book includes invoices for Bordeaux wine shipped in 1725. 1701-4, NAS CS96/1145; 16 March, 10 April and 8 May 1725, NAS RH15/159. Working within a group of merchants was, however, not a new concept. It was usual practice, for example, for a ship to be owned by several merchants, either having equal shares (a quarter, eighth or sixteenth) or some merchants owning a bigger share than others.
57 Henry Lavie to Lady Lothian, 27 September 1651, Bordeaux, GD40/2/5/13/23
that I can do heir’.\(^{58}\) In a similar case two years later Thomas Dinmuir wrote to Russell from Nantes that ‘I am lying heir on the river of nantis & hes bein heir neir four weiks, & ame not readie yet for at first my merchant wold not weill acept me nor answer me’.\(^{59}\)

As well as the commercial agents involved at all stages of transactions, participants at either end of trading routes were also essential – for example French vintners and Scottish consumers, whose roles have often been neglected in favour of those who ‘carried out’ the trading. That merchants were vital in linking vintners or manufacturers with consumers is undeniable, but their importance at the expense of other members of the networks has at times been overstated.\(^{60}\) The adoption of a ‘Rubik’s Cube Model’ of economic history, a phrase coined by Henriette de Bruyn Kops, entails the acceptance that all commodities, all sectors and all regional economies were interconnected.\(^{61}\) This model could be extended to encompass people at all stages of economic exchanges. Inevitably, we are often thwarted in our investigation of this due to the sources that survive, but we are fortunate that for one year, 1672-1673, the final destinations of imported wines can be determined in more detail than is typically possible. In the entry books of wine for Leith, there is information not only regarding who imported the wine and who bought it in Scotland, but a separate list of who these people then sold their wine to, allowing the two sources to be cross-referenced. On the 22 January 1673, John Harmonson Lepman imported wines from Bordeaux in the Rowland of Hambrough on commission from several different merchants, and these merchants then sold their goods to a variety of people in Leith (Appendix III.i).\(^{62}\) This data demonstrates first, that commercial networks spread far wider than just the merchants, skippers and factors directly involved in them, with the consumer being vital,\(^{63}\) and secondly, that consumers often bought wine from different merchants, despite the wine being part of the same cargo. This suggests that wine was not
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\(^{58}\) Thomas Smith to Andrew Russell, 4/14 [damaged] 1675, Bordeaux, NAS RH15/106/199/12

\(^{59}\) Thomas [Dinmuir] to Andrew Russell, 7 May 1677, Nantes, NAS RH15/106/268/11

\(^{60}\) P. O’Brien, ‘Merchants and Bankers as patriots or speculators? Foreign commerce and monetary policy in wartime, 1793-1815’, in J. McCusker and K. Morgan (eds.), The Early Modern Atlantic Economy (Cambridge, 2000) 251

\(^{61}\) de Bruyn Kops, Spirited Exchange, 14, 242-3; Brennan, Burgundy to Champagne, xvii. The individuals who facilitated the movement of commodities once they were on British soil must also be considered. T. C. Smout, “The Glasgow Merchant Community in the Seventeenth Century” in Scottish Historical Review, XLVII (1968) 63-70

\(^{62}\) Entry books of Leith, November 1672-November 1673, NAS E74/15/13; E74/15/15. This is just one example; there are many other entries in the books for this year that demonstrate this.

\(^{63}\) Sources which may be used in a similar way exist in the French archives, for example the Account Book of the Bordeaux merchant Broissy, 1700-1705, which details people he sold goods to. Unfortunately on this occasion, no evidence has been found to connect this merchant to Scottish trade.
necessarily purchased from the same merchant each time, raising the question of whether trust and fidelity were as important at this extreme of the network. This could also be a way of safeguarding investment, as noted in Chapter 2 – if one merchant were to default on their agreement, not all would be lost, but the fact that this wine arrived as part of the same cargo suggests that this was unlikely. It was common for a wide range of people to have a stake in imported cargos during this period. Often, the very nature of business meant that it was not possible always to purchase goods from the same merchant, particularly in the same season, as the voyages themselves took several months. Many merchants who had stakes in the cargo of wine imported by Lepman had stakes in several different cargos throughout the year, imported by various merchants. Similarly, many individuals contributed to cargos that were exported from Scotland. A list of money owed by the Wigtown company William Russell and Co. includes a lengthy list of individuals from whom they acquired skins to be shipped to Nantes in December 1700, likewise the same account book demonstrates that many individuals owed money to the company for goods from the return cargo. Finally, several merchants purchased wine from Lepman for themselves. In the case of John Trotter, he purchased some wine on 23 January, and then after a week’s delay purchased some more. This behaviour is difficult to explain conclusively but could suggest that Trotter, rather than already having consumers in place, bought the wine on spec, selling it on an ad hoc basis rather than through previously agreed commissions. While there was often a prior commission for imported goods, other retailers relied on ad hoc sales, as evidenced by advertisements in British newspapers for sales of such goods. Adopting a ‘non-hierarchical’ model of trading networks correctly grants these individuals as much importance in the survival and success of the networks as the people at the ‘centre’ of it.

64 See, for example, the shipping lists of Dundee from 1580-1618, transcribed as part of CBDW, 193-302
65 NAS E72/15/15. These individuals included Robert Learmonth, Andrew Stevenson, John Hall, James Law, Andrew Johnston, John Hall, John Trotter, Thomas Wilson and John Govan.
66 1700, NAS CS96/1145
67 Some of these instances are selling wine ‘condemn’d as prize’, for example 29 April 1708, London Gazette, issue 4432. Others, however, appear to be independent sales of wine by merchants, for example 16 July 1702, Post-Man and the Historical Account, issue 992
III. FAMILIAL CONNECTIONS

‘Truly I cannot cleanse myself of ingratitude’. 68

Commercial relationships in the seventeenth century have been seen to function as a foundation of trust and personal acquaintance that developed over generations, and in the case of many merchant families this was indeed the case. 69 As well as the longevity of families such as the Galbraiths, Hopes and Mels, many merchants relied on family members to undertake business for them. Peter Imrie, whose service was commissioned by David Wedderburne in August 1593, was Wedderburne’s uncle by marriage. Wedderburne sent his nephew Alexander to Europe in May 1614 with a ‘woffin [woven] bed’ to be sold. 70 Interestingly, these cargos were carried by members of the same family – Alexander and Walter Rankine. The benefit of a reputable family name is further demonstrated by the inclusion of different members of the same family in commercial transactions. In 1654, Mowat enclosed with a letter to John Clerk

a letter for...your brother which I pray you be cairfull to cause delyver to him in hand, for it conteines a bargaine I hav maid with his father for some salmond he is to send him. I pray you wreitt me two lynes of your resaite theroff. 71

Family members relied on each other to gain initial access to networks and James Mel used his brother, Michel, in this way. 72 It was perhaps this association which led James to act later in the period as a factor for the Edinburgh merchant James Graham – although the evidence we have for this suggests that his foray into factoring was not successful. Graham petitioned the Privy Council in 1686 complaining that Mel ‘having stayed a long time without giving the petitioner any satisfaction or security...is shortly to goe from this place [Rouen] without securing the petitioner as to what is duly resting him’. 73 While endorsements from one’s family might be used to pursue a career, links to such a successful network did not make all members of it necessarily successful in their own right, James Mel here clearly failing to make the successful transition from junior

68 John Dougall younger to John Clerk, 6 November 1642, Paris, NAS GD18/2416
70 CBDW, xxxv-xxxvi, 79, 83-4
71 James Mowat to John Clerk, 8 October 1654, Paris, NAS GD18/2528/4
72 Account between John Clerk and James Murray younger (Edinburgh), 1636, NAS GD18/2377/77; John Clerk to John Dougall younger (Le Havre). 9 March 1645, Dieppe, NAS GD18/2455, f11v
73 17 December 1686, Edinburgh, RPCS, iii, XIII, 93
merchant to factor. The use of family ties to facilitate business dealings was not uncommon. A letter from Charles Erskine of Cambuskenneth to his wife, Mary Hope, in 1645 asked her to

tell Harie Hope that the monie doeth concerne my selfe and otheres will doe it to me for 19s the franke and if he will doe that some he shall have it before anie bodie he most pay thrie thousand poundes Scots to you and I shall pay it to anie he plesies at paries.74

It has been suggested that the personal nature of trading networks in this period was a disadvantage, as it reduced the clarity of the business at hand, clouded or delayed rational decision-making, and provided ‘no contractual coordination’ as there would have been between strangers.75 Indeed, instances can be demonstrated where interest was not charged on loans made to family, and where debts were not chased up as vociferously as they might have been, for example in the case of Jean-Louis de Rodolp, a French country gentleman in Castres in the early eighteenth century.76 Often, it has been argued, social and political obligations lay behind the granting of credit (for example to family members or patrons), at the expense of the consideration of economic imperatives and further, that family members were granted special terms, for example no-interest credit.77 Yet conversely, many merchants appear to have adopted a level of professionalism, even when working with family members. In 1590 a list of ‘debtis awin me’ made by Wedderburne included a sum of 5 pounds, 27 and a half merks owed by ‘Lady our mother’ (Lady Westhall, Wedderburne’s mother-in-law), and another list from the 1590s includes, ‘Robert my brother’ for 3 pounds and ‘James my brother’ for 5 pounds.78 The Edinburgh merchant John Charteris included in his memorandum book money owed to him by his mother and Pierre Petit, a Bordeaux merchant, listed in 1688 ‘tous les achats que le seront entre ma mere et moy’.79

Yet merchants did not always view these connections in a positive way – and at times they were inconvenient. In 1642 John Dougall wrote to John Clerk from Paris that ‘sore against my will I am forcet to goe doun to Newheaven for ther ar arryvet tuo of

74 Charles Erskine to Mary Hope, 25 February 1645, London, NLS ms.5089 f97
75 Hancock, ‘Combining Success and Failure’, 17
78 CBDW, 25-27
79 1671-1688, NAS CS96/3937; 18 August 1688, ADG 7 B 2581
my fathers barks, truly I cannot cleanse myself of ingratitude’. 

The family elders did not always know best, and earlier in the year Dougall had written that ‘ther is no calling for salmond in this toun [Dieppe] and I am affrayed to be long heir, my father wreats to cause sell them all and let non ly over year but treuly they cannot be sold without merchands’. Furthermore, despite claims that ‘all merchants were dependent on the good or bad fortune of the members of their family’, permanent settlement of a family on the continent, and their prolonged success, was not necessarily indicative of success for all parties involved. The Hope family appears to have been present on the continent from at least 1548, as in that year we have a letter written by an Alexander Hope in Dieppe to his father, John Hope, a Burgess of Edinburgh, detailing a consignment shipped from Dieppe back to Edinburgh. Over two centuries later, between 1787 and 1789, correspondence survives between a James Hope in Amsterdam and his sister, Anne Hope, in Edinburgh. These letters focus primarily on his work, which he did not enjoy – relaying his long hours in the counting house, the intense cold and the unwelcoming atmosphere created by his fellow lodgers. One of the letters also speaks of his worry at having upset a ‘Mr Henry Hope’ – and he writes to his sister that he does not know what he could have done to deserve the treatment he received from him. James was likely on the continent due to family precedent, yet seems to have lost (or been excluded from) the mercantile links that had made his predecessors so successful.

IV. NON-FAMILIAL CONNECTIONS

‘I never saw such an discreet and oblidging marchand as that Mr Thomson is.’

Fortunately, familial connections were not the only way for merchants to gain access to commercial networks, and even those merchants who did use them did not do so exclusively. An examination of Wedderburne’s Compt Buik demonstrates that while he may have used family on occasion he also entrusted many voyages to independent
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80 John Dougall younger to John Clerk, 6 November 1642, Paris, NAS GD18/2416
81 John Dougall younger to John Clerk, 10 January 1642, Dieppe, NAS GD18/2416; Dougall expressed his desire to go home and his frustration that his father ‘wreats nothing of my home going’ in April of the same year, again in a letter to Clerk: 27 April 1642, Dieppe, NAS GD18/2416
82 Fontaine, ‘Antonio and Shylock’, 48
83 Alexander Hope to John Hope, 20 January 1548, Dieppe, NAS RH9/2/126; Letters from James Hope to Anne Hope, 1787-1789, Amsterdam, NAS GD253/183/10, particularly 1, 2, 12, 21
84 Earl of Lothian to Lady Lothian, 27 January 1680, Montpellier, NAS GD40/2/8/25
individuals. Clerk trusted recommendations from his close contacts, often concerning individuals we have no evidence he previously knew or had any experience of working with. Through this practice, we can begin to see the ways in which such networks expanded. In the space of just three months from January 1644 Clerk, now acting as a banker, lent more than 720 *livres* to Sebastien Jauffray, 422 *livres* to Monsieur Belm and 145 *livres* to Jean Perouet, all on recommendations from Henry Hope, to whom he also provided finance. 85 No evidence has been found that Clerk personally knew these individuals – and they were certainly not family – instead it seems he implicitly trusted Hope’s recommendations.

While they did not have to be familial, recommendations of some description were essential for merchants at all stages of their career, and credit and reputation have been described as ‘elusive but the fundamental key to success in early modern commerce’. 86 There are many examples of Clerk furnishing fellow Scots with contacts in France. James Mowat wrote in 1654:

I hav found…that M[onsieur] Dourny was a good friend butt not fite for my business, for this six months bygone I have not one lyne from him…If you know of any merchand that would tak peines for me in my bussines, I would pay what he desyreth. You will infinitely oblige me to give me advise. 87

Evidently such recommendations encompassed native Frenchmen as well as expatriate Scots. In the same year, Alexander Charteris thanked Clerk

most hartily for your good advise in reference to my livin and tradeing in this place [Paris]…and for your sake shall recommend such of my acquaintance as hav neede of draperi to Mons[jieu]r Poncet who is my neare neighbor for I am now lodged *a la pomme d’or* the next shop. 88

---

85 Account between John Clerk and Henry Hope, 15 January, 6 March, 15 March, 26 July 1644, NAS GD18/2437
87 James Mowat to John Clerk, 8 October 1654, Paris, NAS GD18/2528/4
88 Alexander Charteris to John Clerk 8 April 1654, Paris, NAS GD18/2528/3. Another Monsieur Poncet, perhaps a descendant of this contact of Clerk’s, also had ties in Bordeaux, as he appears in the journal and account book of Pierre Lahaye, 1696-1723. ADG 7 B 2688, 2690
Monsieur Poncet appears to have been recommended by Clerk to multiple individuals, and Clerk acted as an intermediary for business between Poncet and Henry Hope. Moreover, positive experiences such as that of Charteris guaranteed Poncet more recommendations among Charteris’s, as well as Clerk’s, contacts. Reputation was of paramount importance, among clients as well as fellow merchants. In 1680 Robert Kerr, 4th Earl of Lothian, wrote to his wife that

I just now receaved 200 crowns from Mr [Thomas] Thomson in Burdeaux, upon whom the Bill was drawn from Mr Ellision in Newcastle, althow I had neither Bill nor letter of credit which should have come from Rosline, cam somewhat slow, I writ to Mr Thomson who immediately returned me all I desird, so Intreat that so soone as my Bills for that sume coms, yow cause Androw Ainster pay it immediately, conform to the Bills to Mr Ellison, before any other, for I never saw such an discreet and oblidging marchand as that Mr Thomson is.

This was a successful transaction for Thomson not only because he was paid promptly, but also because Lothian would presumably have recommended Thomson as reliable – and a recommendation from such a high profile member of Scottish society must have been invaluable. Of course, some individuals did not receive such positive reports, and this inevitably affected their business standing and their profits. In 1668 James Carstairs reported to his business partner, Alexander Watson in Kirkcaldy, that

there hath been one with us anent the fraughting of the ship for Copperwich in Noravey and to Load great timber to Bring for this port of Rotterdam and hath proffered us ane and twentieth hundred guldens Butt we are doubfull of him because he hath abade report which hath caused us to desist from Imbracing his proffers.

Inevitably, not all recommendations fostered lucrative relationships. From 1643, after a recommendation from Henry Hope, Charles Erskine began dealing with Clerk. When Erskine asked that Clerk also assist his brother, William, while he was on the continent, Clerk obliged – William benefitting from the reputation of his family but unfortunately for Clerk not living up to the name. In 1644 William wrote to Clerk thanking him

89 Monsieur Poncet to Clerk, inclosing a letter and account for Mr Hope, 22 February 1655, Paris, NAS GD18/2542
90 Robert, Earl of Lothian to Lady Lothian, 27 January 1680, Montpellier, NAS GD40/2/8/25
91 James Carstairs to Alexander Watson, Rotterdam, 16 May 1668, SAUL, Watson Papers, ms38527/1/1/1
92 Henry Hope to John Clerk (Paris), 10 June 1643, Edinburgh; Henry Hope to John Clerk (Paris), 27 June 1643, Edinburgh; Henry Hope to John Clerk (Paris), Rouen, 11 January 1644; Account between John Clerk and Henry Hope, 26 July 1644, NAS GD18/2437
‘hartile for the paynes ye have taken to furnish my coffer I doue not dout of your carr of it…as for my monies I am confident my brother will put that in order schortlie’. However, this particular venture proved ill advised, and money lent to William in the 1640s had still not been repaid by 1669. Clerk stated in one of his account books in this year that ‘I keep thir letters – that if I ever see his face; to see iff he will repair any off my great losse of the 4444 livres Bot I fear the worst’. This occurrence supports the assertion that information, while vital to commercial success, was only as good as the provider.

For experienced merchants such recommendations were beneficial, but for younger merchants hoping to start a successful career they were essential. This social credit, obtained through association with older, more experienced and well-trusted individuals, was often the precursor to financial credit. In October 1644, Clerk wrote from Edinburgh to Michel Mel to introduce

Robert Fletcher sonne eldest to Sir Andrew Fletcher…on off the lords off the session: the gentleman with him is Mr Piter wederburne whom ye knoue weill in my name I bessich yow offer to doe them any pleaser you can: I have wreatten to Jhone dougall younger to give them sum money for my Accompt.

Clerk himself had benefited from the patronage of more experienced merchants at the beginning of his career, which started with an apprenticeship to an Edinburgh merchant. Despite the opinions of some, many merchants recognised how vital recommendations were. In 1678 John Snodgrass wrote to Andrew Russell seeking his advice on whether to go to France, talking of the ‘vain conceit’ held in Scotland that ‘it is almost sufficient to obtain employment and credit…that he have lived in France were it but for two days’. Snodgrass, however, recognised that Scottish or not, recommendations were essential, and asked for Russell’s ‘counsell in this matter, (for in this place, you are to me as ane other father,) for I am altogethuer undetermined of my self’. As well as recommendations helping merchants to kick-start their careers, they
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93 William Erskine to John Clerk, April 1644, Angers, NAS GD18/2457/5; Selection of letters from William Erskine to John Clerk, regarding money loaned to him whilst on the continent, 1644-52, NAS GD18/2457
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95 Zahedieh, ‘Credit, Risk and Reputation’, 66
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97 John Clerk to Michel Mel, 4 October 1644, Edinburgh, NAS GD18/2455, f3v
98 16 August 1634, Edinburgh, NAS GD18/2359
99 John Snodgrass to Andrew Russell, 10 March 1678, Leiden, RH15/106/285/5
could also be instrumental in protecting them. Laurence Fontaine has argued that the credit system was designed to foster leniency; that merchants were encouraged to display disinterestedness. Indeed, Savary in *Le Parfait Négociant* emphasised that it was essential to adopt a gentle approach with debtors: ‘one should not make too much of debtors who are unable to pay their debts because their business has failed; this is a time when one should treat them gently, so as not to force them into bankruptcy’. As a consequence of such attitudes, it often happened that the first to be hit by bankruptcy were the most recently established merchants, those who were least well-integrated, even if they were not the deepest in debt, whereas those who had high levels of support could escape bankruptcy even if their level of debt was high.

That so many relationships were forged on trust and understanding explains why many merchants opted to trade with or through the same individuals, particularly those who did not travel abroad themselves. Merchants would have welcomed commissions to the same ports multiple times, especially if they had family or acquaintances there, as it allowed both captains and crew to build up experience of sailing specific routes. This might lead to a repeat commission if they could demonstrate superior competence to other crews. The Scottish skipper Alexander Gillespie kept a record of his voyages between 1663 and 1682, demonstrating knowledge of multiple destinations and of the seas surrounding them. At the rear of the volume he included instructions for other sailors, describing how to navigate certain areas of sea safely. This source demonstrates the importance of experience – Gillespie left his knowledge as a legacy for future skippers and, as Thomas Riis has pointed out, such experience helped significantly to reduce sailing times, making these voyages more efficient.
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101 Fontaine, ‘Antonio and Shylock’, 55
102 de Bruyn Kops, *Spiritied Exchange*, 167. Even before the use of factors became commonplace, merchants preferred to trade to ports where they or their family had prior contacts, and where they could utilise recommendations (Chapter 3).
103 Alexander Gillespie’s Log-book, 1663-1682, SAUL ms38352. This source has been transcribed by Colin and Paula Martin. T. Riis, ‘Long Distance Trade or Tramping: Scottish Ships in the Baltic in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries’ in T. C. Smout (ed.), *Scotland and the Sea* (Edinburgh, 1992) 67
V. TEMPORARY OR PERMANENT SETTLEMENT?

‘Being well known in trade, and being desirous to settle in this Kingdom.’

The longevity of many of the networks and individual contacts mentioned above is impressive, but the question of whether merchants settled permanently or temporarily remains. There has been some debate over this, particularly in the context of northern Europe. Concerning France, a number of assertions have previously been made. It has been suggested that Scotsmen were so at home in Dieppe that they ‘semblent avoir été absorbés par la population indigène’, whereas it has been contradictorily asserted more recently that the status of all foreigners in France was precarious. In some locations, municipal records of births, marriages and deaths indicate that some families settled on a permanent basis, and Henry Lavie was part of a merchant family of which several generations were active in Bordeaux. The death of ‘Samuel Lavie, filz naturel et [legistime] de Sieur Henry Lavie bourg[eois] et marchand de bourdeaux’ was recorded in June 1676. Less than two years later another son, Henry Lavie junior, was born. This settlement continued – Pierre Lavie is recorded in the records of ‘receptions de capitaines de vaisseaux’ for this city at the beginning of the eighteenth century, and it is probable (though not proven) that he was a relation of Henry. Well into the eighteenth century branches of this family remained in Bordeaux; François Lavy married a Frenchwoman, Marie Judith François, in Bordeaux in 1758 and 25 years later a Jeanne Elisabeth Lavie is included on the death registers. Marriage into an ‘alien’ society has been seen as having ‘special business significance’, and may suggest a desire for permanent settlement. In 1642 a ‘Madame Mell’ is present in Dieppe, and can be assumed to have been the wife of either Michel or James, both of whom were in
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Dieppe at this time. While it is not known whether she was French or Scottish, both of these scenarios suggest that at least one of the Mel brothers wished to settle in Bordeaux. Either they married a Frenchwoman, and opted to settle in her country, or Madame Mel was Scottish and travelled to France to be with her husband, this also suggesting that the merchant Mel intended for his stay to be prolonged. Marrying into the indigenous population did not, however, necessarily lead to permanent settlement. In 1619 John Hamilton married a Frenchwoman in Bordeaux, but then persuaded her to move with him to Scotland – when they stopped at Ireland en route, ‘within few dayis efter their arryvell their he did foirsaiik hir uterlie, and mariet him self privilie to ane Scottis woman’.

There are also cases in which permanent settlement for the merchant did not result in permanent settlement for his family. In 1561 the widow of Gilbert Logan, Marie Ross, was living in Dieppe, presumably having travelled there with her merchant husband. In this year, one year after her husband’s death, she requested safe passage back to Scotland, along with ‘her subjects, and James Logane, with the rest of their bairns, families, &c. 12 persons in all’. Although Gilbert’s wife, children, subjects and other relatives had made a life for themselves in France, after his death they returned to Scotland. The death of Logan does not, of course, conclusively prove that there was ever an intention to remain in France permanently as it is not known, as in many cases, whether the family had always planned to return to Scotland. Similarly, while the notable Jacobite financier Robert Arbuthnot is recorded dying in Paris in 1723 after a long and successful career abroad it is not known whether he had ever planned to return home.

Although the notion of kith and kin within merchant networks was indeed important, this has sometimes been over-emphasised, and even within merchant families who ostensibly opted to settle permanently some members chose instead to return to Scotland. Despite the settlement of the Lavie family in Bordeaux, one son of
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112 John Dougall younger to John Clerk, 16 May 1642, Dieppe, NAS GD18/2416. This letter concerns the acquisition of a trebuchet for Madame Mell.
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Henry Lavie appears in legal papers in Edinburgh at the turn of the century, having returned to Scotland despite being born in Bordeaux and the rest of his family being settled there. Hugh Galbraith can be found acting as a merchant in Glasgow in 1683, choosing not to continue the French links forged by his kinsman Robert a century earlier, despite pursuing the same career. Not all members of the Macmath family involved themselves in commercial networks in France – William Macmath, despite carrying on the family trade as a merchant, remained in Edinburgh and no evidence has yet been uncovered that he ever exploited his family connections to pursue business with France.

Despite some evidence for the permanent settlement of Scots in France, the majority of merchant Scots appear to have always intended to return home. William Gordon, a Scottish factor in Paris, was part of a family whose members were particularly prolific in Scottish commercial networks throughout Europe. Yet by 1705 a contract relating to the sale of fir wood between Gordon and David Ross, a merchant in Elgin, describes him as ‘late factor at Paris now merchant in Edinburgh’. This is in contrast to Robert Gordon, who was still loading cargoes in France for Scotland in the 1720s. Even merchants who remained in one location for a prolonged period often sought a return to their homeland. John Clerk, for example, resided on the same street
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119 1627-29, NAS RH15/29/148
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121 Robert Gordon applied for a pass to come home in 1703, yet remained in France until at least 1727: 13 August 1703, CSPD 1703-4, 339: pass for ‘the Robert of Leith to come from Bordeaux to Scotland between now and the end of November. Is bringing home the goods of Robert Gordon, factor at Bordeaux, who has petitioned for this pass. He has, at his own charge, released a sufficient number of English [or Scotch] subjects, prisoners of war at Bordeaux, to sail the vessel home, and has hired her to bring home his belongings, wishing to withdraw from France’; Murdoch, ‘French Connection’, 36. However, Gordon demonstrably remained in France long past this date, calling into question the legitimacy of his application for a pass. For example, Robert Gordon wrote to John Innes from Bordeaux 2 July 1716 regarding business transactions: NAS RH15/147. He appears also in a bill of loading from Bordeaux shipping the Catrin of Leith with Robert Beatson, master, with 2 tons of wine for Arthur Clephame: 27 February 1723, NAS RH15/32/21. He also writes from Bordeaux to William ?Syne at ?Banff, 16 May 1724, with an invoice for wine from Bordeaux, destined for Banff: NAS GD248/568/1/2/5. Gordon appears in cases brought before the Admiralty Court from the mid to late 1720s, still being termed a ‘merchant of Bordeaux’. 1724: AC8/297; 1725: AC8/319; 1726: NAS AC8/336; 1727: AC8/349; 1728: AC8/376 It seems that Gordon may have spent some time in Inverness, as he appears in a case from 1724 as a ‘merchant of Inverness’: NAS AC8/297
throughout his twelve-year stay in Paris. Despite this stability and his range of business associations in France, many of Clerk’s actions suggest that he always intended to settle ultimately in Scotland. Frequent visits back to, and correspondence with, Edinburgh suggest that he did not uproot himself entirely – he continued to visit his homeland, preparing for life after his career in France, and his pursuit of Mary Gray, a Scotswoman, for his wife adds weight to this speculation. Clerk became acquainted with Mary through his business dealings with her father, William Gray of Pittendrum. He wrote to William Rires in 1645 that ‘I dare not promisse so much hapynes to my selff that shoe sould be to me what ye name hir, housoever pray hir to pardon me who honors & respects hir in the highiest measur I can (thogh not suiuteable to hir decerneing)’. Certainly, the lengths that Clerk went to in order to acquire the goods she desired went beyond the call of duty for an ordinary merchant:

Efter I had run over all the shops in Paris I resolved and tooke this Flourd tабein with the grein conteining 4 ell and a quarter: the stuff is excellent and verie chapi. Efter I had boght it I began to repent persuading my selff that cullor wold not pleas your Lady whair for I made a new recerche and happened on ane uther flourd tабein in which is sum gridilyne, which in my opinion I thoght a little graver as the uther and to the end your Lady might resave the better contentment.
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Again these transactions were conducted by formal accounts. Moreover, several purchases made by Clerk demonstrate a continuing interest in his homeland (as well as suggesting the level of education such a successful merchant would have had). Accounts from 1648 include learned books such as ‘histoire d’angleterre, Escosse & Ireland par du Chesne’, New Testaments in French and Latin, works of Calvin, and ‘regiam maiestatem the old laws and constitutions of Scotland’.

While Clerk seems to have always intended to return to Scotland, once there he continued to maintain correspondence with his associates in France. In 1655 he communicated with Michel Mel concerning books that the 3rd Earl of Lothian had commissioned him to have bound in Paris, and in 1663 sold ‘431 onces 14 drape of paris silver plait’ to Lothian. His contacts in France kept him informed of events, both professional and personal, that affected the network. In July 1655 James Mowat informed him that ‘Mr charteris is latly marryed with a verry veryy pretty madamoisle, of Picardye…Nicholas Macmath a month befor mr charteris married’ – these events perhaps suggesting that Charteris and Macmath had chosen to settle in France.

In December 1688 one Charles Charteris wrote to John, his cousin, concerning 6 tuns of wine imported from La Rochelle – this presumably being a later generation of the Charteris family. Mowat also kept Clerk informed of ongoing commercial activity, involving the same individuals with whom Clerk had previously operated – Michel Mel, Mr Thomson and Mr Poncet – again demonstrating the length of time these individuals remained part of the network. Clerk remained important to his contacts abroad, and he continued to provide recommendations. Although James Mowat had long been established in his profession in Paris by 1655 he continued to benefit from these, being

127 The accounts are mentioned in a letter from John Clerk to Lady Pittenweem, 20 May 1645, Paris, NAS GD18/2455, f14r
128 1648, NAS GD18/2482
129 Account between John Clerk and William, Earl of Lothian, 20 January 1645, Edinburgh, NAS GD18/2439; Michel Mel to John Clerk, 30 October 1655, Dieppe, NAS GD18/2542; 7 July 1663, NAS GD18/2445. It is not clear whether Clerk brought home these goods himself or whether he used his prior connections in France to have goods sent home to him, although his continuing links to the French network he was once part of suggests that the latter is possible.
130 James Mowat to John Clerk, 6 July 1655, Paris, NAS GD18/2505/7. This example perhaps indicates permanent settlement by Charteris.
131 25 December 1688, Falkirk, NAS RH15/59/5/7
132 James Mowat to John Clerk, 8 March 1656, Paris, NAS GD18/2505/8
extremely glad to know be yours that Mr andersone would be pleased to taik pains for me, in my bussinesse, I can not mett with a moore honest man. I have heir written againe to him to desire the same courtesye of him.\footnote{James Mowat to John Clerk, 6 July 1655, Paris, NAS GD18/2505/7. It is not known how long Mowat remained in France, but he was still present in Paris in October 1667: 24 October 1667, NAS GD172/1919}

As well as maintaining French connections after his return to Scotland, Clerk also continued to deal with individuals he had known before his departure. William Paton, who often acted as a courier for Clerk (Chapter 2), also acted as a financial contact for Clerk in Scotland – as is illustrated by a bond made between John Lermond and Clerk in 1643. Clerk loaned money to Lermond to be paid ‘to the said John Clerk…or in his name and of his usse to William Paton’.\footnote{1643, NAS RH15/45/31. For further examples of the relationship between Clerk and Paton, see this correspondence and accounts 1643-1644, NAS GD18/2438 – this correspondence also mentioning Michel Mel, James Mowat and John Dougall.}

The contract between Clerk and John Smith on his first foray to France in 1634 was witnessed by two people – one of these was James Nasmyth, whom Clerk was ‘for the present servitor’ to, and the other was a fellow servitor, William Paton.\footnote{Contract, John Smith and John Clerk, 16 August 1634, Edinburgh, NAS GD18/2359} Participation in Scottish commercial networks in France did not begin on arrival and end on departure, but fostered contacts that were maintained and networks that endured across large geographical areas and over long periods of time, affording a wide range of opportunities to merchants and factors.

While this transiency had some benefits, the decision over whether to settle permanently or temporarilly was perhaps made, in part, according to laws governing merchants’ rights while abroad. As part of the ‘Scottish Privileges’ in France it was understood that the monarchies of France and Scotland automatically granted naturalisation to each other’s subjects (Chapter 1),\footnote{For the grants by Louis XII in 1513 and Mary Queen of Scots in 1558 see H. Fenwick, \textit{The Auld Alliance} (Kineton, 1971) preface; \textit{WP}, II, 351. For further information on the laws governing the naturalization of foreigners in France in this period, see P. Sahlins, \textit{Unnaturally French: Foreign Citizens in the old regime and after} (Ithaca/London, 2004) and C. Wells, \textit{Law and Citizenship in Early Modern France} (Baltimore, 1995), particularly Chapter 5, ‘The Transformation of Citizenship in the Seventeenth Century’, 94-120} and it has been said that

Scots noblemen at the French court…had always been treated courteously and like fellow-countrymen…Some Scots even went so far as to assert that the difference between their relationship with France and England was the difference between…brotherly love and rabid hostility.\footnote{D. Duncan (ed.), \textit{History of the Union of Scotland and England, by Sir John Clerk of Penicuik} (Edinburgh, 1993) 61. This can be compared to propagandist attitudes which prevail in works such as D. Defoe, \textit{A Dialogue between Whig and Tory, alias Williamite and Jacobite} (London, 1693)
Certainly naturalisations were granted to Scots, for example to Thomas Pringle in Nantes between January and May 1620. Naturalisation of other Britons in France was evident, the Irishman Nathaniel Hooke obtaining letters of naturalisation in 1706 and having them confirmed in January 1720. ‘Lettres de naturalité’ were also granted to citizens of other European nations; at the beginning of the seventeenth century to Henrique Mendez de Quarios and Jérôme Mendez ‘de Portugal, domiciliés à Rouen’, and their wives and children. The skills for which some of these individuals were naturalised suggest the high level of Scottish activity, as Laurent Vauchek, who lived in Quillebeuf, was an ‘interprète des langues flamande et ecossaisé’, and probably made himself useful to the French as a translator. The French in Scotland also continued to enjoy these privileges. In March 1707 it was declared that a Frenchman, John Hugueton,

being well known in trade, and being desirous to settle in this Kingdom and to bring all his effects here in order to carry on trade…the said John Henry Huguetan and the Children of his Body…be to all intents and purposes whatsoever holden and repute, taken and esteemed a naturall born subject of the Kingdome.

In 1715, a Calais merchant approached the Earl of Stair, British Ambassador in France, taking ‘la liberté d’Ecrire à votre Excellence pour la supplier très Humblement de m’accorder un passeport par aller en angleterre…avec mon fils’. Data compiled by Françoise Bayard concerning naturalisation in Lyon between 1594-1764 suggests that a greater number of merchants, when compared to professions such as priests, artists, craftsmen, students, doctors and soldiers, were naturalised during

138 January-May 1620, ADLA B 205
139 DNB, volume XXVII, 949-50
140 1604-5, ADSM C1263
141 1604-5, ADSM C1263
142 25 March 1707, APS, XI, 484
143 30 October 1715, NAS GD135/141/4/145; Marquis of Wharton to the Duke of Mar, 2 December 1716, SP, III, 279. The settlement of the French in Scotland was not always peaceful. In 1559 it was reported that ‘since I came to Scotland, the French in Leith and Edinburgh, use such cruelties, that all Scots absent themselves: and they are like to drive their friends away.…’: R. Melvyn to Croft, 15 December 1559, CSP, I, 275. Some French individuals who sought to settle in Scotland included: Francis Shammo, a feltmaker who in 1686 petitioned the Privy Council that he ‘haveing been bred all my lifetime in France att my employment of making all sorts of hats, and being now forc’t to retire from my owne native countrey, and being informed there wes now manufacturie of hatts in this kingdom, I presume to make application to your Lordships, haveing the great encouragement of that excellent act of Parliament made by his sacred Majestie in favours of strangers quherby its expressly provided and declared that strangers setting up manufacturies within this kingdome shall enjoy the whole priviledges of a native, as also be frie of any imposition, and that it shall be lawfull to them to sett up their manufacturies…’ – and he was in due course naturalized as a Scot: 14 September 1686, RPCS, iii, XII, 450-1. In this case, it seems likely that Shammo was a Huguenot who had been driven out of France by persecution following the revocation of the Edict of Nantes in 1685.
this period (Figure 3.1). While her calculations include only the Irish of the British nations, and focus only on Lyon, the higher total figures for merchants indicates that naturalisation among Scottish merchants was likely to be higher than those among the military, intellectual or religious classes.\textsuperscript{144}

![Naturalisations by Profession: Lyon, 1594-1764](image)

**Figure 3.1** Naturalisations by Profession: Lyon, 1594-1764

Yet being naturalised did not necessarily benefit merchants’ business. In 1705 Staipaert, a Dutch merchant in Nantes, wrote to Michel Chamillart, the Controller-General of Finances, that ‘I am always included with the foreign merchants, even though I have been naturalised for 36 years and established here since 1660’, and the Intendant of Brittany confirmed in April that Staipaert, who was originally of Bruges, had been established at Nantes for 30 years and had a large commerce in wines and brandies

\textsuperscript{144} Bayard, ‘Naturalization in Lyon’, 296-7. Origins of individuals included in these figures are: Savoy, Florence, Milan, Piedmont, Lucca, Venice, Genoa, Papal States, France-Comté, Brese, Germany, Spanish/Austrian Netherlands, Lorraine, Switzerland, Ireland and the United Provinces. It is possible that Scotland is not included in these figures as no data exists, as Scots were automatically classed as naturalized foreigners in France.
there. Such an example, while of a Dutchman rather than a Scot, suggests that even when naturalisation was obtained this did not always place the individual on an equal footing with the indigenous population.

The level to which Scottish merchants became integrated into the indigenous population is well demonstrated by the actions of French merchants in Britain, who often chose to deal with Scottish merchants in France rather than their own countrymen. In December 1688 François Roux, ‘natif de Saint Malo, de present resident à Limérik, en Irlande, faisant profession de la religion catholique, apostolique et romaine’, bought l’Explication of Limerick from Jean Butler, a Scottish native settled in La Rochelle. It has been argued in the context of the trading relationship between Nantes and Rotterdam that partnerships between a Dutchman and a Frenchman were rare – that usually merchants operated within their own national communities. However, this did not seem to be the case within Franco-Scottish trading networks. A contract was drawn up in 1603 between George Christie of St Andrews, master of a ship called the St Michael, and the merchant brothers Jean and Jean Dorath from Bordeaux, for a joint return venture from Bordeaux to London. Although there is no mention of the nature of the cargo, the Dorath brothers financed 586 livres 11 sols – presumably Christie’s contribution was the use of his ship. Scotsmen continued to embark on transnational ventures despite government attempts to dissuade them; in 1665 Michel Mel made a successful supplication to the Privy Council to be allowed to embark on a voyage to France in the Margret of Diep with salmon and herring, ‘of which vessel the master skipper and whole company (except three Scotsmen [Walter Anderson, George Gorthy and James Fisher]) are Frenchmen’.

---

145 Sr. Staipaert to Michel Chamillart, 12 April 1705, AN G7 1507; Brennan, Burgundy to Champagne, 305 n. 63
146 30 December 1688, ADCM B222. Of course, this may simply have been a case of Butler being in the right place with desired merchandise.
147 de Bruyn Kops, Spirited Exchange, 56.
148 30 May 1603, Bordeaux, NAS RH9/5/5.
149 19 January 1665, Edinburgh, RPCS, iii, II, 5. In 1661 it had been ordained that ‘all ships belonging to Scots that have not the Master of most part of the companie natives or inhabitants within the kingdome salbe reputit as forrengers’. ACL, IV, 155
VI. INSTITUTIONAL SUPPORT

*I am much pressed by your advysse of my friends to taik a great lodging to lodge out countrymen*.150

The nature of the Scottish community in France bears some resemblance to Scottish expatriate communities elsewhere – for example, in operating through kith and kin networks and in becoming well integrated into the indigenous population. The depth of integration suggests that these expatriate Scots would have had a level of institutional support available to them – as Scottish communities in Stockholm, Gothenburg and the Netherlands did in this period. The Scottish Staple in the Netherlands has been described as a ‘centre for market advice and commercial intelligence’ and ‘invaluable to merchants abroad’ because of the social support network it offered in providing accommodation, advice and financial assistance to both visiting and settled merchants.151 Andrew Russell, James Gordon and other merchants in the Netherlands were bolstered by the strong presence of the Scottish Kirks in Rotterdam and Veere,152 and there was obvious institutional support for the Scottish merchant community based at the Staple in the form of a resident chaplain – whose stipend was ‘payed by a contribution to be imposed upon the merchands goods that cummes to Camphear and no utherwayes’.153 When the Convention of Royal Burghs ratified the re-establishment of the trading staple at Dordrecht in 1669, provision was made for a Reformed church and an apothecary, as well as a well-maintained harbour and a night watch.154 Steve Murdoch has convincingly argued that many locations that hosted foreign communities had some form of institutional structure, which both lured Scots to that location initially

150 James Mowat to John Clerk, 6 July 1655, Paris, NAS GD18/2505/7
151 A. Cummings, ‘Scotland’s links with Europe, 1600-1800’ in History Today, XXXV (1985) 47
153 Instructions to Alexander Jaffray, Baillie, January 1630, ACL, I, 313; see also Instructions to Sit Thomas Mengzes Cultis kniht provest of Aberdeen and George Nicolsoun Commissionaris, July 1619, ACL, I, 171; Missive letter for Convention of Royal Burghs to be held at Montrose, 3 July 1632, ACL, I, 347-8; Cummings, Scotland’s links, 47. For the decline of this institution see ‘A short information of the abuses practised in the Stepell’, 1670s, ACL, III, 175
154 7 July 1669, CRB, III, 675-688. I would like to thank Claire McLoughlin (St Andrews) for alerting me to this entry.
and supported and protected them once they were there. In Stockholm, for example, Scottish entrepreneurs oversaw ore-mining and iron production, and became embedded in institutions such as the nobility, councils and parliament.\textsuperscript{155} In Gothenburg two seats were reserved on the city council for Scots and Thomas Cunningham, Scottish Conservator at Veere, became part of that city’s upper class and married into the local oligarchy.\textsuperscript{156} 

In some ways, Scottish mercantile activity in France reflected commercial structures elsewhere in Europe – for example, in the use of factors.\textsuperscript{157} Previous research into the Scottish community in Bordeaux has revealed some level of institutional support for Jacobite refugees – the Irish College, an institution sympathetic to Jacobites, was established in 1603. Murdoch has suggested that it is probable that any Scottish Jacobites would have retained links with members of this institution, although this has yet to be proven.\textsuperscript{158} In France, independent institutional support appears to have been more readily available. In July 1655 James Mowat wrote to John Clerk that ‘I am much pressed by your advysse of my freinds to taik a great lodging to lodge out countrymen, and others when they come’.\textsuperscript{159} Yet Murdoch convincingly argues that clear comparisons of the Scottish communities in France and in the Dutch Republic are impossible – primarily as Bordeaux, unlike the Dutch Republic, did not appear to host a sizeable enough static Scottish community within which to absorb Jacobite refugees.\textsuperscript{160} 

In places such as the Netherlands and Sweden, a distinct expatriate Scottish community mirrored the community back home, offering individuals who were part of it a secure and distinctly Scottish environment in which to operate,\textsuperscript{161} although some traders within such communities also travelled around in order to facilitate the best deals, rather than remaining entirely static.\textsuperscript{162} By comparison the Scottish community in France operated more often through transient networks, rather than within geographically close-knit communities, with less institutional support and more onus being on the actions of the

\textsuperscript{156} Grosjean and Murdoch, ‘Scottish Community’, 191; Enthoven, ‘Thomas Cunningham’, 45  
\textsuperscript{157} Murdoch, \textit{Network North}, 148-161, esp. 152  
\textsuperscript{158} Murdoch, ‘French Connection’, 39  
\textsuperscript{159} James Mowat to John Clerk, 6 July 1655, Paris, NAS GD18/2505/7. Note that the timing of this occurrence is in the middle of the Interregnum, following the 1654 Union (Chapter 4.)  
\textsuperscript{160} Murdoch, ‘French Connection’, 43; see also Dickson ‘Introduction’, 3  
\textsuperscript{161} Nina Pedersen on Bergen, Douglas Catterall on Rotterdam, Alexia Grosjean and Steve Murdoch on Gothenburg, Rimantas Žirgulis on Kėdainiai and Kathrin Zickermann on Hamburg in Grosjean and Murdoch (eds.), \textit{Scottish Communities Abroad}, 135-168, 169-190, 191-224, 225-248, 249-276  
\textsuperscript{162} de Bruyn Kops, \textit{Spirited Exchange}, 115; Zickermann, ‘Across the German Sea’, 8
individual. Zickermann’s investigation into Scottish communities in the Elbe-Weser region of northwest Germany reveals that in this location too, there was an absence of a centrally organized group of permanently settled Scottish merchants.

However, some Scots did become involved in local government in France. In 1670 Thomas Kirkpatrick, Secretary to the King of France, applied for a Scottish birthbrieve; as did James Pringle in 1672, giving his occupation as Councillor in Rennes in Brittany. James Pringle stated that he was the son of ‘the deceast Thomas Pringle Esquyre’ – likely the same Thomas Pringle naturalised in Nantes in 1620. In Bordeaux Scots testified on behalf of countrymen applying for passports to travel back to Scotland. Robert Gordon testified to the Admiralty of Bordeaux on behalf of William Ramsay in October 1717, stating that ‘Je certifie a Messieurs les officiers de l’amirauté et tout ceux a qu’il aparter que le nomme Guillaum Ramsay est Escossé de natione et qu’il desire se retuner cheq luy a Bordeaux’. In other testimonies, Gordon explicitly stated that the individual wished to return home, certifying in 1718 that ‘Jaques Strachen est Escossois de nation et qu’il souhaite se retirer dans son payé’. Gordon testified on behalf of his kinsman George in May 1718, as had J. Albertson in April 1717.

---

163 Murdoch, ‘The French Connection’, 38-9, 41-2. Sir William Gray of Pittendrum is an example of such a merchant. He was the father of Mary Gray, future wife of John Clerk of Penicuik, and one of the most important merchants of Edinburgh. He traded with several foreign countries, acquired much landed property as a result and was knighted before 1642. J. Balfour Paul (ed.), The Scots Peerage: founded on Wood’s edition of Sir Robert Douglas’s Peerage of Scotland: containing an historical and genealogical account of the nobility of that Kingdom, 9 volumes (Edinburgh, 1904-14) IV, 288. Andrew Russell and James Wauchope were also individuals with extensive networks: Andrew Russell Papers, NAS RH15/106, particularly RH15/106/213; Letter-book of James Wauchope, GD377/399

164 Zickermann, ‘Across the German Sea’, 48


166 27 October 1717, ADG 6 B 59

167 19 [July] 1718, ADG 6 B 59

168 4 May 1718, ADG 6 B 59. In addition, Gordon testified on behalf of William Henderson in May 1717, George Farquhar in November 1717 and Laurence Charters in December 1717, among others. While it is not explicitly stated that Albertson was a Scot, precedent in this documentation shows that fellow natives were usually called upon to testify. Individuals from Ireland, England and Guernsey acted in the same capacities, including Jean Lynch, Patrick Roche, P. Mitchell (Ireland), H. Sampson, G. Ainslie, (London), George Smith, H. Sampson, G. Sandilands (England), Giles Spicer (Guernsey) and Ralph Sampson (‘Britain’): All 1717, ADG 6 B 59
VII. THE EFFECT ON THE HOMELAND

‘The grit hurt the natioun does suffer through occasioun of the factoures abroad.’

Scots used such established associations to retain strong connections with their home country, on many occasions functioning as ambassadors and acting in Scottish interests. In the Dutch Republic Scottish exiles formed a temporary community between 1660 and 1680, based largely around Rotterdam but with salient and transient members elsewhere. From the early 1680s, the influx into this community of individuals with the specific intent of influencing events at home arguably led to the Earls of Argyll’s and Monmouth’s invasions in Scotland and England in 1685. The Netherlands served as a convenient base from which the Swedes could send Covenanting supplies to Scotland in the 1630s and 1640s and Thomas Cunningham, factor at Veere, used his position to ship a sizable military supply to the Covenanters in 1639 – an action noted by the Royalist Conservator, Patrick Drummond. Many Scots in Poland-Lithuania in this period contributed to the subsidy raised for Charles II in 1651, even if for some this was under duress.

In contrast, there is little evidence to suggest that Scottish merchants in France actively intended or even desired to influence their homeland. Even among politically minded and religious Scots in France there seems to have been no real predilection to influence events at home, although there was some transnational influence in the religious sphere. In 1622 Robert Fleming, one of the bailies of Glasgow, delivered to Benjamin Basnage, of the general assembly of the Reformed Churches in France, £3565 6s 8d collected in Glasgow for transmission to La Rochelle. The discharge is signed by

---

169 8 July 1630, CRB, III, 316
170 For the Swedish perspective, see A. Grosjean, An Unofficial Alliance: Scotland and Sweden, 1569-1654 (Leiden, 2003) particularly Chapters 6 (165-190) and 7 (191-213)
171 Zickermann, ‘Across the German Sea’, 8
173 Grosjean, Unofficial Alliance, 189; Enthoven, ‘Thomas Cunningham’, 57. Cunningham replaced Drummond as Conservator, 10 July 1641: 45
175 This is true even of individuals who were only present in exile for political or religious sedition: S. Talbott, ‘“My Heart is a Scotch Heart”: Scottish Calvinist Exiles in France in their Continental Context, 1605-1638’ in Worthington (ed.), Emigrants and Exiles, 197-214
Basnagne, but also by John ‘Makmach’, William Dick and James Speir. 176 We have no evidence that Dick or Speir were tied to the merchant network, but can speculate that John Macmath was linked to the merchant family of the same name. Some Protestant Scots in France acted in support of the Restoration, Rev. Robert Douglas receiving a letter from Mr Sharp in France in 1660 stating that ‘the letters which are come from France, we intend to publish them, they will be of good use for the vindication of the King, whose restitution is most passionately desired by the protestant ministers there upon account of the protestant interest’, yet this does not include any evidence of merchant involvement. 177 There are other occasional suggestions of merchants attempting to influence political issues, but these usually concerned English or Irish, rather than Scottish, individuals. For example, in 1570 Spanish intelligence reported ‘it is understood that some of the English traders in Calais had formed a plot with certain soldiers to deliver the town [back] to the English, but it was discovered’. 178 Certainly these occurrences seem to have been few and far between among merchant Scots settled in France.

The two Roberts, Gordon and Arbuthnot, acted as Jacobite financiers, and their participation in these roles stemmed from careers as successful merchants and bankers – in Rouen and Bordeaux respectively – positions which were established long before the outbreak of the Jacobite movement. 179 In 1716, Robert Gordon was sent a list of thirty-three people from Charles Stewart with an order to pay them a month’s subscription of 585 livres, and to these were later added a further twenty names. Arbuthnot noted that these additional men, the crew of Captain David George’s ship the Bonaccord, had been lying in Bordeaux since February, ‘eating her provisions and being paid their full pay, and have done very little for it’. 180 In 1716 Charles Carnegy wrote to Lord Panmure numerous times, stating that there ‘att present is a grat many more of our country of nott knowing how to subsist…I beg your lordships advice and assisting…I have not received...

176 20 June 1622, GCA D/TC3/9/2; 10 June 1622, NAS GD76/208. It is not stated whether these individuals used their influence in order to procure this assistance for their host community, or whether the initiative was started in Scotland, but it is possible.
177 Mr Sharp to Rev. Douglas, 7 April 1660, London, GUSC ms Gen 210, 74-6
178 Antonio de Guaras to Zayas, 3 September 1570, CLPS, XV, 284
179 Arbuthnot can be seen asking for permission to enter a cargo of Herring into France in 1698, demonstrating that he began what became an illustrious career as a banker by utilising the pre-existing trade links between Scotland and France. n.d. [1698], AN B7 499 f124. For more on the careers of these two individuals see DNB, II, 325-9; Arbuthnot to Mar, 19 March 1716, SP, II, 30; Nordmann, ‘Les Jacobites Ecossais’, 83; Gordon to Mar, 31 December 1716, SP, III, 376; same to same, 4 January 1717, same to same, 14 January 1717, 445-6, SP, III, 397-8; Murdoch, ‘French Connection’, 21-3
any of my subsistence from Mr [Robert] Gordon’. Gordon later complained to the Earl of Mar that

I am sadly harrassed for want of money...I have got nothing for last month nor this from the Court. I do not grudge my pains and would as little grudge my money for the king’s service, but I shall not be able to serve if not supplied.

While Gordon may have sympathised with the Jacobite cause and, on occasion, donated significant amounts of money to it, he was not always prepared to assist out of his own pocket.

Instead, the priorities of these merchants appear to have been largely personal. It has previously been suggested that all Scots present in France during the Jacobite period were necessarily affiliated to the Stuart exile court, and that their presence in France was political, yet it is now understood that this was not the case. While some Scots involved in migrations to France in this period did attach themselves to the Stuart court, there were also notable numbers of ‘economic Jacobites’, who yearned for personal aggrandisement away from the political scene and led their lives separately from the exiled court. For example, the Irish family the Whites, based in Nantes, ran one of France’s largest tea-firms and managed a bustling contraband trade with Ireland. While part of the Jacobite emigré community there is no evidence of their being involved in any kind of sedition. Many simply wished to carry on their business undisturbed.

181 28 October 1716, NAS GD45/14/219/5/1; 14 February 1719, NAS, GD45/14/219/18/1
182 Gordon to Mar, 16 November 1717, SP, V, 211; see also Campbell to Mar, 28 December 1717, SP, V, 340
184 McLynn, Jacobites, 136-141
186 Monod, ‘Dangerous Merchandise’, 170
James Axton…a loyal subject to [King James], and a good Catholic…he only asks permission to continue to work at his trade of weaver at Paris, where he has already worked for several years, without giving cause of complaint to anybody. 187

One Moses Corbett in 1691 ‘declared he would trade to France in spite of anybody’, 188 demonstrating that commercial priority often outweighed dynastic or religious conviction, and the Letter-Book of James Wauchope from 1717 contains much commercial correspondence with Robert Gordon, but makes little mention of politics. 189 Individuals such as Andrew Russell evidently preferred to concentrate on their commercial interests, rather than turning their efforts towards politics. 190 Although there were many connections between Scotland and France in this period which were Jacobite, they were not exclusively so, 191 and despite assertions that ‘political affiliations were significant for the trading classes’ many individuals do not seem to have considered politics as they strived to make their living. 192 Many who arrived on the continent chose to invest ‘dans des affaires commerciales, et pour beaucoup d’entre eux la première préoccupation fut de gagner de l’argent, de reconstituer leur fortune’. 193 It is clear from examining correspondence between those in exile on the continent and their wives and families at home that, for many, political issues were not the most pressing matters. Even individuals such as the Countess of Stair and John Clerk junior corresponded primarily regarding personal concerns, despite having vested interests in the outcome of political upheaval. 194 In 1715 the Countess of Stair thanked Clerk for ‘your prettie cap and your brave big gooseberries’ and a month later for ‘your good bigg pears’. 195 Many individuals in France demonstrate concern for personal well-being; an anonymous letter from 1720, from a husband home to his wife, says ‘there is one

187 Caryll, 14 June 1700, SP, I, 149
188 CSPD, 1690-1, 479
189 July 1717-August 1719, NAS GD377/399. The Letter-Book of Bailie John Steuart of Inverness similarly contains many references to trade with France but few references to politics. 24 September 1715, 23 March 1716, 12 May 1716, Letter-Book of John Steuart, 12, 14, 18. See also 17 December 1707, NAS CS96/3074
190 NAS RH15/106; Murdoch, Network North, 145
193 Nordmann, ‘Les Jacobites Ecossais’, 82
195 Countess of Stair to Sir John Clerk of Penicuik, 3 September 1715, Edinburgh, NAS GD18/5271/4; same to same, 1 October 1715, Edinburgh, NAS GD18/5271/8
excellent occasion for your coming to Paris, as Charlie tells me he advis’d you too… I am told 40 per cent can still be made’. 196

It is arguably such attitudes that have led to the merchant being distrusted; the physiocrat François Quesnay in his *l’Analyse* accused the merchant of trying to ‘buy out at the lowest possible price and to sell at the highest possible price, so as to make his gain as high as possible at the expense of the nation: his individual interest and that of the nation are opposed’. 197 The Convention of Royal Burghs complained in 1630 of

the grit hurt the nation does suffer through occasion of the factoures abroad who having their means and education from the merchant of this country yet proves so unthankfull that they become altogether negligent of all duty other to their native country or merchant, that he employed them, and by marrying with strangers becomes altogether aliens and strangers. 198

In Rouen at the turn of the century similar concerns were raised that

since the sole purpose of merchants is to make profits and become wealthy without regard to the welfare of the state, their actions may prove prejudicial to the nation as a whole. The Council [of Trade] therefore, should endeavour to ascertain [and then to encourage] whatever lines of trade are likely to prove most beneficial to the state. 199

In 1713 the *Flying-Post* reported that ‘the private Interest of a few Men’ corrupted British trade with France,

for there ever was, and will be some in the World, that always value nothing but private or particular Gain, although such may be a ruin to the fair Merchant or Trader, and bring a general Calamity upon Trade in all its Parts. 200

However, merchants had a positive effect on their native economy even when they did not intend to do so. Perhaps this was why Adam Smith, looking back on commercial history from his eighteenth-century vantage point, was such a supporter of the private entrepreneur:

By directing that industry in such a manner as its produce may be of greatest value, he intends only his own gain, and he is in this, as in many other cases, led

---

196 Anon., 9 January 1720, NAS GD44/43/2
198 8 July 1630, *Convention*, III, 316
200 4-6 June 1713, *The Flying-Post; or, The Post-Master*, issue 3384, 2
by an invisible hand to promote an end which was no part of his intention. Nor is it always the worse for the society that it was no part of it. By pursuing his own interests he frequently promotes that of the society more effectively than when he really intends to promote it.  

One way in which merchants inadvertently assisted the Scottish economy was by the repatriation of capital back to Scotland, as touched upon above and in the previous chapter in the context of gifts being sent to family and friends. John Black and the Temperance of Anstruther spent 1602-1603 sailing between Boston in Lincolnshire and Bordeaux, and in February 1603 Black shipped 200 quarters of malt and beans from Boston to Leith. His earnings from months of Anglo-French voyages were therefore repatriated to Scotland in kind. If we assume that he was not the only individual to embark on such ventures and eventually return with his earnings to Scotland, Scotland’s trading account must have been substantially enlarged as a result. Clerk’s purchase of the barony of Penicuik came as a direct result of money he made in France, from beginning as an apprentice in 1634 to returning home a wealthy man over a decade later. In 1701 the Aberdeen merchant Robert Gerard wrote to an ‘RA’ in Bordeaux, highlighting the importance of Bordeaux to the cloth manufactory in Aberdeen and asking his correspondent to ‘advise me if thow please what may be most vendible with yow at this tyme’, in this case the types of cloth being manufactured in Aberdeen being directly influenced by foreign trade. Internationally the merchant community (not just Scots) impacted upon the way in which individuals, communities and governments operated. For example, the bill of exchange ‘started life as a way of paying for traded goods but had long since been transformed into a means by which governments could move money within their own borders and abroad’. Indeed, it has been recognised that expatriates often fundamentally altered local business practices.

---

201 A. Smith, An Inquiry into the Nature and Causes of the Wealth of Nations (Edinburgh, 1863) IV, 2, 9; Murdoch, Network North, 127
202 Lythe, Economy of Scotland, 230; for this argument generally see Murdoch, Network North, 228, 242-3
203 Robert Gerard to ‘RA’, 20 January 1701, Aberdeen, AUSC ms3175/Z/156. I would like to thank Professor Allan Macinnes (Strathclyde) and Professor Steve Murdoch (St Andrews) for bringing this document to my attention.
Examination of merchant networks of Scots in France reveals that their situation was quite unique when compared to other European locations where research has thus far been undertaken, although in some ways mirroring that in northern Germany. Scottish communities in France seem to have been less static, more transient and less interested in using their position abroad to influence matters at home, and any economic benefits were largely inadvertent. Networks of merchant Scots in France were both organised and lucrative, suggestive of the state of Franco-Scottish trade in general in this period. What has been perceived as ‘disorganisation’ in fact meant that, rather than being confined to a geographically static community, the Scottish merchant community in France was wide-ranging, perhaps more flexible, and as a result encompassed a wide range of commercial opportunities. Moreover, the claim – made by contemporary polemicists and reinforced by modern scholarly commentators – that the activities of commercial agents had no economic benefits for either France or Scotland and that they harmed the native economy must now be questioned. Furthermore, assumptions regarding network hierarchy need to be adjusted. While commercial agents such as John Clerk were instrumental in facilitating business connections, all individuals involved in trading routes should be granted consideration – one unreliable person could result in problems throughout the network. Moreover, without vintners or consumers at either end of the spectrum, the actions of merchants themselves would be made somewhat void. The importance of family connections also requires further evaluation. While family connections remained important, many individuals acted outwith these links, building relationships both with other Scots and throughout the indigenous population. Indeed, we have examined instances where merchants chose not to take advantage of familial connections, or where they felt they were disadvantaged by them, in the case of John Dougall.

This and the preceding chapter have examined the methods used by Scottish merchants in France to conduct trade in this period, and the ways in which they used commercial networks to their advantage. In Part II, we turn to specific ‘crises’ of the long seventeenth century, focusing on those which have traditionally been seen as the most detrimental to Scotland’s overseas trade, particularly with France, in this period. The following chapters will ask how successfully Scottish merchants in France were able to use their skills at adapting their trading methods, routes, commodities and
personnel in order to circumvent embargoes caused by war and diplomacy, and question whether the prosperity achievable during peacetime was also attainable during times of conflict.
PART II: CONFLICT AND COMMERCE

‘If commerce had to accommodate itself to war, it is equally true that in certain circumstances war had to accommodate itself to commerce’.¹

It has been argued that in seventeenth-century Britain, unlike in the sixteenth and eighteenth centuries, there was no purpose or coherence to foreign policy and no consistent or widely accepted foreign enemy. Further, it has been said that none of the Stuart Kings, nor Cromwell, had any real expertise in trade and commerce.² Undoubtedly, the seventeenth century was a period of conflict.³ Internationally and domestically, wars and changes in policy meant that the parameters within which merchants conducted trade changed regularly. This, as discussed in Part I, at times gave rise to confusion regarding legislation governing trade, often exacerbated by the perception of merchants of whether legislation was applicable to them. Legislation and restrictions on trade aside, the very fact that the nation was at war created problems for all those who participated in overseas commerce, as the crown needed extra revenue – often raised through increased taxes and customs duties – to furnish ships and recruit men for service.

In Part I, the legislation affecting merchants, the commodities they traded and the methods and networks used by them as they pursued commerce between Scotland and France during the long seventeenth century were examined. Part II considers how these methods were implemented during specific ‘periods of crisis’ that characterised the seventeenth century. Chapter 4 examines the effect of domestic crises on overseas trade, considering for example the prolonged Wars of Religion in France. Its focus, however, is the domestic situation in Scotland throughout the British Civil Wars (1638-1660), incorporating the Interregnum (1649/1651-1660). Chapters 5 and 6 then focus on the effect of international conflict. The Franco-Stuart conflicts, including the Scottish declaration of war in 1627, the failed British expeditions to La Rochelle and events up to the peace agreed at Susa on 24 April 1629, and the 1666-67 conflict which took place

¹ J. Ball, Merchants and Merchandise: the expansion of trade in Europe, 1500-1630 (London, 1977) 45
² G. Howat, Stuart and Cromwellian Foreign Policy (London, 1974) 1, 5
³ There has been ongoing debate among historians regarding a general ‘crisis’ of the seventeenth century. There is not room to go into these historiographical arguments here, but see E. Hobsbawn, ‘The Crisis of the Seventeenth Century’ in Past and Present, V-VI (1954); H. Trevor-Roper, ‘The General Crisis of the Seventeenth Century’ in Past and Present, XVI (1959); G. Parker and L. Smith (eds.), The General Crisis of the Seventeenth Century (London, 1978)
as part of the second Anglo-Dutch War, are discussed in Chapter 5. Here, the apparent antipathy of the authorities responsible for upholding restrictions on trade implemented during these conflicts, such as the Privy Council and the High Court of Admiralty, is considered. Questions are also asked regarding the attitude of the authorities and of Scots more generally during the Franco-Stuart wars – in particular whether Scotland became involved in ‘England’s’ war or fought on her own terms. Chapter 6 considers the external conflicts fought after the final capitulation of the Stuart monarchy in 1688, including William of Orange’s usurpation of the British throne in the Glorious Revolution, 1688-1689, his anti-French policies and wars on France as part of the Nine Years’ War (1688-1697) and the War of the Spanish Succession under Queen Anne (1702-1713). The changing political situations in both Scotland and France will inevitably feature in both of these chapters, although certain elements – for example the effect of the British Unions, or the Jacobite movement, do not form a key part of the discussion here. Of course, their ramifications are inevitably considered where applicable to the question of ‘Conflict and Commerce’ – for example, the fact that it was the unions that have led scholars to believe that Scotland did not act independently during the ‘British’ wars, or that affiliation (or otherwise) to Jacobitism affected individuals’ commercial activity.

By placing legislation and restrictions on trade in their proper context, and by examining how merchants pursed commerce in the face of adversity, a fuller understanding of both the specific Franco-Scottish relationship and the wider European economic situation can be gleaned. As stated by Adam Smith, the actions undertaken and the profits made by individual merchants often had an effect on the economic situation of the nation, even if the merchants themselves did not envisage it, and as one merchant stated during the height of the Nine Years’ War: ‘I will trade to France, in spite of anybody’.

5 Moses Corbett, 1691, CSPD, 1690-1, 479
CHAPTER FOUR

‘Civill War ruines Trade faster than any other’.¹
Domestic Conflict and Continuation of Commerce, 1560-c.1660

Now there is no greater enemy to Trade than War, be it in what Countrey it will...Yet forraigne war is not so great a disturber of Trade, nor halfe so destructive, as intestine; For as the fire that’s kindled within doores, and in the bed-straw, as it were, rageth more violently: so civill War ruines Trade faster than any other.²

Figure 4.1    Voyages between Aberdeen and France, 1597-1670

The above data, detailing ships both entering and departing the port of Aberdeen on voyages from or to France in the first part of the seventeenth century, suggests that this particular route of Franco-Scottish trade was affected by domestic upheaval.³ There is a
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¹ J. Battie, The Merchants Remonstrance (London, 1648) HL 434906, 2
² Ibid.
³ Data compiled from ASWA, passim. It should be noted that the pattern of French trade with the port of Aberdeen, when both entries and departures are considered, follows that of overseas trade from Aberdeen generally, indicating that Franco-Scottish trade was not affected in a particularly distinct way to trade between Aberdeen and other overseas destinations. ASWA, passim; T. Devine, ‘The Cromwellian Union
significant lull at the time of the Union of Crowns and a distinct fall during the British Civil Wars, with figures improving significantly after the Restoration. While it has been stated that in the seventeenth century ‘stumbling foreign policies had repercussions on domestic affairs’, whereas in the sixteenth and eighteenth centuries domestic events dictated the course of foreign policy, the long seventeenth century too saw domestic events in both Scotland and France affect not only foreign policy but also the ways in which commerce between these countries was conducted.

The assumption that France was necessarily the dominant participant in the Auld Alliance has already been questioned (Chapter 1), and claims that the seventeenth century was economically a ‘golden age’ for France require similar re-evaluation. Despite being geographically blessed with a long coastline, harbours, forests and a large sea-faring population, it has been argued that France remained ‘tragically underdeveloped’ at the beginning of the seventeenth century, with a ‘tiny and ineffective’ merchant and war fleet and disparate regional and local economies. Internal government was preoccupied with continental issues and France lacked established mercantile dynasties, due to negative attitudes surrounding participation in trade fostered by both the nobility and those merchants successful enough to gain social elevation on the back of their trading activities. While the noblesse were never officially excluded from commerce, entrenched attitudes discouraged their participation until 1664, when an edict was passed that permitted nobles to enter the East and West India companies and the customary laws of Brittany and the privileges of Lyon and the Scottish Burghs’ in J. Butt and J. Ward, Scottish Themes: essays in honour of Professor S. G. E. Lythe (Edinburgh, 1976) 5

4 G. Howat, Stuart and Cromwellian Foreign Policy (London, 1974) 2
6 P. Hoffman, ‘Rural, Urban and Global Economies’ in M. Holt (ed.), Renaissance and Reformation France, 1500-1648 (Oxford, 2002) 74, 85-6; R. Knecht, Richelieu (Essex, 1991) 150; D. Parker, La Rochelle and the French Monarchy: Conflict and Order in Seventeenth Century France (London, 1980) 61; T. Munck, Seventeenth Century Europe, 1598-1700 (Basingstoke, 1990) 31. It has been argued that comparatively, Scotland was disadvantaged in that she lacked the resources to match her desire to trade – for example, she was richly endowed with fisheries, yet did not have the resources to exploit this effectively: I. Whyte, Scotland’s Society and Economy in Transition, c. 1500-c. 1760 (Hampshire, 1997) 144
recognised that nobility and business were compatible. Despite progress under Colbert, however, and a reiteration of these policies in 1669, such attitudes prevailed in France until the turn of the eighteenth century, at which time one of the deputies of the Council of Trade noted that ‘one has only to become a merchant to be held in contempt’. By contrast, noted the deputies, the English (and the Scots) had a much healthier attitude to trade, with nobles often apprenticing their younger sons to merchants – it was not uncommon for these sons to become wealthier than the eldest, who had inherited the family estate.

Before the seventeenth century France’s infrastructure was not conducive to successful mercantile activity. Historically, the French crown manipulated the coinage, spent little on roads and canals and distrusted the middlemen who would have allowed trade to extend into the countryside. They also condoned the behaviour of the guilds, which although encouraging trade to a degree taxed heavily and limited competition among manufacturers, ensuring that prices of French goods remained high and therefore unattractive to potential foreign buyers. The willingness of the French to allow their strongest economic competitors – the Dutch – a monopoly over the carrying trade in the first half of the seventeenth century was arguably an effect of France’s inherent economic weaknesses. In the regions in which France did have some success in commerce and manufacturing, this was limited and often temporary. Lyon, for example, was the focal point for European finance and Italian trade in the sixteenth century, but her status declined following the Wars of Religion and the development of
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9 Scoville, ‘French Economy’, 246-7
10 Ibid; Knecht, Richelieu, 150. Nonetheless, French merchants did operate within family networks. The personal correspondence of the Bordeaux merchants Anthoine and Pierre Filheau, 1663-1728, shows that they did business with nephews, sons and brothers, as well as operating in partnership with each other: ADG 7 B 2548
13 P. Bamford, ‘French Shipping in Northern European Trade, 1660-1789’ in Journal of Modern History, XXXVI (1954) 207-208. Under Louis XIV, the French finally began to counter this monopoly, and by 1690, with the exception of Baltic traffic, most French commerce was being carried in French, not Dutch ships – including colonial trade. W. Doyle, The Old European Order, 1660-1800 (Oxford, 1992) 2
more accessible financial markets elsewhere – for example in Antwerp. Trading centres such as Rouen, Nantes, Bordeaux and La Rochelle could arguably not compete with those in Antwerp, Lisbon, Seville and Amsterdam, and none of the merchants in France generated enough business to have a significant impact on regional or national economy.

I. DOMESTIC CONFLICT IN FRANCE

‘Be ressoun of the civile trouble and Insurrectioun quilk hes Interveniit within the cuntrey of france.’

When considering the effects of both domestic and international conflict, care must be taken to account for natural developments in policy. As one scholar succinctly put it when considering the consequences of the French Wars of Religion, ‘the principal difficulty in assessing the economic impact of half a century of civil wars is distinguishing between what was the result of civil wars and what was simply the result of half a century’. However, direct effects of civil war on commerce can be discerned in both France and Scotland during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. Many scholars have examined the French Wars of Religion from both domestic and international viewpoints. Civil war in France arguably ‘killed the only major centre of international commerce and finance’ and ‘paralyzed French economic initiative in the critical latter half of the sixteenth century’. During the wars, particularly following the Massacre of St Bartholomew’s Day in August 1572 and later the Revocation of the Edict of Nantes in 1685, many Huguenots fled the country and sought work elsewhere,
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14 Hoffman, ‘Rural, Urban and Global Economies’, 67, 95, 96; Mackenney, Tradesmen, 177
15 Hoffman, ‘Rural, Urban and Global Economies’, 68
16 4 March 1596, APS, IV, 112-3
19 J. Ball, Merchants and Merchandise: the expansion of trade in Europe, 1500-1630 (London, 1977) 191; J. Condliffe, The Commerce of Nations (London, 1951) 59. The Wars of Religion coincided with the end of a period of extended economic growth precipitated by the arrival of large sums of money from the New World. Climate change also led to harsh winters and poor harvests in 1565, 1570, 1573, 1585, 1586 and 1588, and by the 1590s plague was widespread. The presence of soldiers in France exacerbated these problems as they spoiled land and stole crops to feed to their horses. Holt, Wars, 194, 198-9; Knecht, Wars, 90-93. Efforts to alleviate the shortage of grain by importing Baltic rye were hampered by English privateering: the English were feeling the effects of the bad weather and specifically targeted grain ships to combat their own shortage.
depriving France of skilled individuals and contributing to economic hardship which exacerbated Catholic hostility towards Protestantism.  

It has been argued that the division of France into regions of Catholic and Protestant influence in some ways played into the hands of the Scots as many of their traditional haunts (for example La Rochelle and Dieppe) became strongholds of Protestantism. The impact of political occurrences has been shown to have had a marked impact on the religious make-up of certain areas. For example, after the siege of La Rochelle, 1627-1628, this location and particularly its trading links to New France slowly became Catholicised. While it has been claimed that the business arrangements in which Catholics and Huguenots collaborated were due to ‘the pressure of economic circumstance’ – out of necessity rather than choice – both Protestants and Catholics continued to trade in this location. As well as seeking refuge in sympathetic locations some merchants adapted their religious affiliation. In 1665 Alexander Strachan saw religious conversion as the key to commercial success: ‘for Mr Alexander its [sic.] some 17 years since he came to France: he had nothing imaginable. Seing he could make no fortune unless he turned his coat, he turned Papist’. Despite such precedent however, and the fact that the importance of religious fellowship has been (over-) emphasised, most Scottish merchants did not choose locations based on religion and such considerations have recently been demonstrated to have been a much weaker motivation for most Scots than previously assumed. 

20 Condliffe, Commerce, 59. William Scoville’s study on the effect of Huguenot persecution on France’s economy and trading relationships provides detailed discussions of this and related issues: W. Scoville, Persecution of Huguenots and French economic development 1680-1720 (California, 2006) passim. Scoville concludes that while Huguenots did flee persecution particularly following the Revocation of the Edict of Nantes, no more than 10% of the Huguenot population fled, and that those that remained worked to strengthen their economic position: 445. His discussion of the relative effects of Huguenot persecution in different French ports is also enlightening: 253-260
21 S. Lythe, The Economy of Scotland in its European Setting, 1550-1625 (Edinburgh/London, 1960) 171
23 Bosher, ‘Gaigneur Clan’, 36
24 S. Murdoch, Network North: Scottish kin, commercial and covert association in Northern Europe, 1603-1746 (Leiden, 2006) 88-93
26 Changing confessional affiliation in order to circumvent commercial or political restrictions was neither new nor confined to merchants. S. Talbott, ‘‘My Heart is a Scotch Heart’: Scottish Calvinist Exiles in France in their Continental Context, 1605-1638’ in D. Worthington (ed.), Emigrants and Exiles from the Three Kingdoms in Europe, 1603-1668 (Leiden, 2010) 197-214, considers the extent to which religious affiliation affected Scots in France in this period in varying capacities, including military, intellectual and commercial. H. de Bruyn Kops, A Spirited Exchange: the wine and brandy trade between France and the Dutch Republic in its Atlantic Framework, 1600-1650 (Leiden, 2007) 70, 105 demonstrates that in spite of official rules, Dutchmen in Nantes were not refused naturalisation based on
Many merchants continued to trade regardless of France’s internal conflict, and David Wedderburne’s continuing activity during this period has already been examined (Chapter 2). Moreover, this was carried out with the knowledge of the French monarch, who in 1584 wrote to the diplomat Monsieur de Castelnau that ‘my intention was, that the Scottish merchants might exercise their trade in my kingdom, in all freedom and surety, with no harassment or extortion’. Later in the century, despite the Fronde being said to have gone hand in hand with a severe economic crisis, Michel Mel wrote from Dieppe and Le Havre to Sir Gilbert Menzies of Pitfoddels, one of his regular customers, regarding shipments of salmon from Aberdeen to France in the midst of this conflict. On one occasion Mel wrote of the political situation in France:

heir we have the civill wars the prince of condi with a strong army cum near al saith but has retired & we houp sal not harne uss any more…at see [sic] the dangers ar much great for we have nothing bot taking of schips…the marchands have nead of a more setled tyme god graunt it.

Despite these concerns, however, other letters in this collection of correspondence from Mel to Pitfodels, which dates from 1652-1659, make no mention of interruption to commerce, and these merchants were not deterred from trading.

The effect of civil war in France on Franco-Scottish trade inevitably had an impact on attitudes towards the Auld Alliance. In March 1596 the Scottish Parliament outlined its concerns:

Quhill now of lait that sindrie Impoistis and Exactionis hes bene rased of the guidis of the saidis maircheantis of this realme, be ressoun of the civile trouble and Insurrectioun quilk hes Intervenit within the cuntrey of france thir divers yeiris bigane, be the qlk forme of doing his majestie finding the said auld league tobe sumquhat infringeit and alterit and the saidis maircheantis of this Realme thairby gritlie prejugeit.

religious affiliation. In order to become naturalised in Scotland however, Frenchman were bound to adhere to the Protestant religion. Both Abrahame Turrin, a hatmaker from Rouen, and the feltmaker Francis Shammo had to testify to the Privy Council that there were ‘of the Protestant reformed religion’ before naturalisation, although of course this may have been lip-service: 14 September, October 1686, Edinburgh, RPCS, iii, XII, 450-1, 478

27 Henri III to Monsieur de Castelnau, 9 May 1584, A. Teulet, Relations Politiques de la France et de l’Espagne avec l’Écosse au XVIe Siècle (1515 - 1561), 5 volumes (Paris, 1862) II, 647
28 de Bruyn Kops, Spirited Exchange, 49
29 Michel Mel to Pitfodels, 16 September 1653, Dieppe, NAS GD237/11/200/8
30 Michel Mel to Pitfodels, Dieppe and Le Havre, NAS GD237/11/200
31 4 March 1596, APS, IV, 112-3
Parliament acted on these concerns, instructing John Lindsay of Balcarres, the king’s secretary, to go to France ‘to procur at his said darrest brutheris handis a speciall discharge of the saidis impostis and exactionis and to have the auld liberties and previlegeis of the saidis mercheantis of this realme observit’. Despite the effect on his commercial interests James VI offered support to the French King during these conflicts. In 1590, as Henri IV was engaged in trying to win back Paris from the hands of the Catholic League, James wrote to the Viscount of Turenne that

since the present danger of France…your master may count upon the whole of our forces, means or credit for the advancement of this most just and holy war, which manifestly also touches us closely, by reason of the ancient alliance between our crowns and the holy and firm bond of our religion.

James wrote to the German Princes in an attempt to expedite the sending of succour to Henri IV, and promised to send 3000 Scots to serve in France if it became necessary.

Though evidence for the period is somewhat sparse, it is clear that trade continued between the two nations while civil war ravaged France and that the two monarchies continued to maintain a close relationship. Their alliance was sealed by treaty in 1606, once Henri gained total control of his kingdoms. From a Franco-Scottish perspective, the British Civil Wars were perhaps more complicated, having more of an impact on the relationship between the auld allies.

32 Ibid.
33 James VI to the Viscount of Turenne, Holyrood, [26] December 1590, WP, II, 147-8 [my emphasis]
34 Robert Bowes to Lord Burghley, 26 December 1590, Edinburgh, CSP, X, 441; WP, II, 147-8. The German Princes concluded that James ‘intended no further treaty for peace, but rather wished succours to be sent to the French king for defence of the common cause endangered, but without looking for other answers to the articles proposed by his ambassadours’. See ODNB entry for Colville, James, first Lord Colville of Culross (c.1551–1629); S. Murdoch, ‘The April 1640 Committee: The Projection and Reflection of the Covenanting Revolution’ in M. Landi (ed.), L’Écosse et ses Doubles; Ancien Monde, Nouveau Monde (Rives, forthcoming) 2. I am grateful to Steve Murdoch (St Andrews) for sharing this research with me prior to its publication.
35 Articles concluded at Paris the xxiiij of February 1605, stylo Angliae, by commissioners of the high and mightie kings, James by the grace of God King of Great Britaine, France, and Ireland, defender of the faith, &c. and Henrie the Fourth most Christian French king, and King of Navar, for the more commodious entercourse in traffique betweene their subjects (London, 1606)
II. CASE STUDY I: THE BRITISH CIVIL WARS, 1639-1649

'The great prejudice of trade, not only to the Staple, but also to France and other places'.

The British Civil Wars (1639-1660) were an intricate web of political, economic and social upheaval, which many scholars have attempted to unravel. This series of conflicts pitched Charles I against a variety of opponents within his own dominions, including the Scottish and English Parliamentarians and the Irish Confederates. The wars also saw the two British parliaments come together as allies under the Solemn League and Covenant (1643-1647) and fight against each other (1648, 1649-1651). While this conflict was a domestic one, involvement of overseas nations was perhaps inevitable. From the very beginning of the conflict the Irish Confederates worked alongside the notorious Dunkirk privateers, and Ireland’s privateering armada was almost exclusively composed of Dunkirk frigates. In November 1639 a ship of Gilbert Aikman was ‘taken by the Irish frigatis and dunkirkeries’ and in 1648 the Dunkirkers sank a ship belonging to Gilbert Andersone that was en route to Bordeaux. Some individuals lost cargos to this partnership on more than one occasion, Andersone having 20 tuns of wine ‘caste away in Bichebay’ in 1648, and George Aikman losing a cargo worth 3000 merks plus 16,000 merks worth of salmon to Dunkirkers in 1639 and having ‘ane schip of Aberdein…with 15 last Salmon’ taken in 1648. A ‘schip belonging to the Forth’, of which Andrew Burnet was merchant, was taken to Dunkirk with 45 lasts of salmon and the merchandise was ransomed for 26,000 (currency not

36 E. Courthope, The Journal of Thomas Cuningham of Campvere, 1640-1654: with his Thrussels-banner and explication thereof (Edinburgh, 1928) 242
38 J. Ohlmeyer, ‘Irish Privateers during the Civil War, 1642-50’ in The Mariner’s Mirror, LXXVI (1990) 123. For a detailed discussion of Irish Privateering during the Civil Wars see Ibid., 119-133; for a detailed examination of activities at sea on all sides from an Irish perspective see E. Murphy, “No Affair before us of Greater Importance’: The War at Sea in Ireland, 1641-1649” (Unpublished PhD thesis, Trinity College Dublin, 2007), especially Chapters 5, 6 and 7, 174-279
39 Report for the commission for trying the losses of Aberdeen, 6 December 1648, ACL, III, 115
40 Report for the commission for trying the losses of Aberdeen, 6 December 1648, ACL, III, 121; S. Murdoch, The Terror of the Seas? Scottish Maritime Warfare, 1513-1713 (Leiden, 2010) Appendix V:2, 384. At this point Dunkirk was temporarily under French control, having been captured from the Spanish Habsburgs in 1646.
41 Report for the commission for trying the losses of Aberdeen, 6 December 1648, ACL, III, 122
42 Ibid, 115, 123; Murdoch, Terror, 197 n.32
Several merchants were assisted by foreign powers. Throughout these conflicts the Dutch were instrumental in providing British ships with false papers that allowed them to continue trading (Chapter 2). As the Wars of the Three Kingdoms began to be fought at sea the States General declared the United Provinces neutral, facilitating the acquisition of false papers and allowing foreign ships refuge in Dutch ports. The Dutch benefited from their neutral ‘participation’ in this conflict, selling arms and ammunition to all sides and seeing a rise in the number of English ships paying anchor money at Veere after 1641, as rebellion in Ireland broke out in Ulster in October and the first civil war in England erupted in January 1642.

Such a lengthy, widespread conflict inevitably impinged on British commercial activity. In 1640 a report to the Aberdeen Council spoke of

the imminent danger we now stand in, we thought gude first to let yow know that the Englishe (whether freebutterers or the kingis ships we know not) have takine sindrie of our Scotishmen comming from Holland and France and have confiscate ther gudis and schippis stript ther men naked and used them with all kynd of hostilitie.

In 1645 Thomas Cunningham observed that ‘our Staple ships, being affrighted from comming to Sea, because of the many Irish and other men of warre, and for want of convoyes from Scotland to the great prejudice of trade, not only to the Staple, but also to France and other places’. When Cunningham visited Scotland in 1648 he observed ‘a very great quantity of all sort of native commodities lying upon merchants hands ready to spoile in Scotland, for not daring to venture them in regard of the many Irish, and Dunkirk pirates’. Alongside negative consequences for individuals the Civil Wars allegedly ‘retarded national industrial development’, affecting the nation as much as the natives. French views of the Civil Wars saw them as similarly destructive; Voltaire
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43 Report for the commission for trying the losses of Aberdeen, 6 December 1648, _ACL_, III, 122; Murdoch, _Terror_, Appendix V:2, 384
46 E. Courthope, _The Journal of Thomas Cunningham of Campverie, 1640-1654: with his Thrissels-banner and explication thereof_ (Edinburgh, 1928) 242
47 Ibid, 242-3
48 I. Grant, _The Economic History of Scotland_ (London, 1934) 185
stated that ‘this civil war…prevented England for a time from interesting herself in the concerns of her neighbours, she lost alike her prosperity and her reputation; her trade was suspended’. The local effect of the wars made itself evident, as the Council of Aberdeen petitioned central government that as a result of the debt created by war ‘this place is become so miserable that almost ther is non in it that can subsist or have any liveing’. Financial repercussions of ‘the late troubles’ were still prevalent in August 1675, when 32 noblemen and heritors of Aberdeenshire consented to a tax on ale, beer, wine, brandy and strong waters ‘for relief of the pubblick debts’ that had resulted from the conflict. Official records suggest that trade stagnated during the 1640s. The Scandinavian Sound Toll Registers show that while 98 Scottish ships on average per annum sailed through the Sound between 1625-1630 (eastwards and westwards), this figure dropped to 56 between 1644 and 1649. Trade through the commercial centre of Aberdeen fell during the civil war years with an average of 83 entries and departures per year (from/to all destinations) for the period 1643-1649, compared to an average of 126 per year between 1620 and 1625. We saw at the beginning of this chapter that this fall manifested itself in voyages specifically to and from France.

Problems were also experienced in the exchange of information. John Clerk of Penicuik wrote to Janet Gray in November 1645 that he had

\[\text{resavet a letter fra Mr William Rires date at Newliston, 6 September last, in which he wreat that long ago he had wreatten to me & then sent a letter ye wes pleasd to honor me with. I have never sein it, sorie it is unhapily miscairied, since I beleve it wes the first. At this tyme I have wreattein to Mr William to}\]

---

50 Information from the provost and bailies of Aberdeen, 19 April 1654, *ACL*, III, 228
51 Tax agreement, 18 August 1675, Aberdeen, AUSC, ms 934. This repository’s catalogue states that this passage relates to the ‘English’ Civil Wars, although it is also possible that it refers to the second and/or third Anglo-Dutch wars (1666-1667, 1672-1674). The terminology used – ‘the Troubles’ – is suggestive that this refers to the Civil Wars when certain publications are taken into account: J. Stuart (ed.), *J. Spalding, Memorialls of the Trubles in Scotland and England, AD 1624-AD 1645*, 2 volumes (Aberdeen, 1850-1851)
52 N. Bund (ed.), *Tabellr Overskibsfort Og Varetranspot Gennem Øresund, 1497-1660* (Copenhagen, 1906). I would like to thank Claire McLoughlin (St Andrews) for sharing her tabulations of this data with me. Despite this, records for entries into the Swedish ports of Gothenburg, Lubeck, Antwerp and Augsburg show that nine Scottish ships made their way into these ports. Six of these arrived after the declaration of war with the Dutch Republic and four of those ships deemed it safe enough to attempt a return journey. C. Dalhede, *Handelsfamiljer på Stormaktsidens Europamarknad* (Stockholm, 2001), data collected from CD database.
53 *ASWA*, passim.
informe me hou and what way and with whom he sent his letters, to the end I my wse means to discouer them.\textsuperscript{54}

The threat at sea from contesting parties interrupted trade as well as the flow of information. In April 1644 the Edinburgh merchants John Slowane and Adam Mitchelson presented a supplication to the Convention of Estates that having loaded James Redie’s ship in Burntisland for a voyage to Bordeaux for wine the ship, wines, skipper and whole company were taken at St Martins by John Tisone of Dartmouth, ‘who is imployed and direct out be his majestie’. The petition stated that ‘the said ship companie and wynes is takin by his majesties warrant be reason of the common cause now in hand, covenant and reformation’. The estates declared that the crown should repay the value of the goods lost to the supplicant, but by this time the merchants involved had already been affected.\textsuperscript{55} Retaliation compounded the effects of the conflict. In July 1649 John Gillespie was given a commission by the Parliament ‘for pursuing the Irish frigotts and uther enemys of this kingdome by sea’, due to

the great losses sustaneed by diverse merchandis of his kingdome through the taking of thair schipps by irish frigotts Pirrats haunting upon the coast of this kingdome and elswhair to the obstructing of the trade merchandize and utter ruine of many merchands.

His commission stated that

Captain Johne Gillaspie, Captane of the schip callit the Elizabeth of kirkcaldie
To protect secuir and defend all the merchand schips of the kingdome in the exercesing of thair laufull trade from the violence and wrongs of the Irish frigotts and pirrats and all other pirrats and sea robbers whatsoever.\textsuperscript{56}

The need for both men and ships to participate in these wars hampered commerce as merchant ships were pressed into service by the Covenanted Parliament, usually as troop transports, victualling ships and sometimes as convoy escorts. On 27 April 1640 William Keith, sixth Earl Marischal of Scotland, ordered ships to be stripped of their sails in order to keep them in Aberdeen and as reported by John Spalding: ‘wnder feir the tounes covenanteris wold flie...Many tounes men, heiring of

\textsuperscript{54} Mistresse Janet Gray, Paris, 3 November 1645, ‘under covert off hir mother the Lady Pittendrum’, NAS GD18/2455 f17v
\textsuperscript{55} 16 April 1644, APS, VI, 89
\textsuperscript{56} 23 July 1649, APS, VII, ii, 494
Marischallis cuming to the toune, takis the flight.\textsuperscript{57} This policy was one which continued throughout the conflict, particularly after the signing of the Solemn League and Covenant (1643) when the executive body of this confederation, the Committee of Both Kingdoms, officially took on responsibility for all matters military, naval and concerning foreign policy after February 1644.\textsuperscript{58} Only a month prior to this, an ordinance had been issued in the English Parliament setting a new rate of excise on several commodities, both native and foreign, ‘for the maintenance of the Armies raised in defence of the King and Parliament’.\textsuperscript{59} This included new rates on foreign salt, much of which can be presumed to have come from France. In 1645, Parliament decreed that due to the need to prevent the transportation of men abroad in order to suppress the rebellion ‘no person whatsoever [may] transport themselves forth of this kingdome to Ireland, or any other place, without a sufficient passe granted by the Committee of Estates’.\textsuperscript{60} Furthermore, the actions of soldiers damaged the state of trade at home, as ‘under the pretence of the libertie that soldiers claims to trad in any part of the thrie dominions all sort of unfrie people have usurpit the libertie and priviledgs and tradt at ther pleasur and bear no part of the common burdens’.\textsuperscript{61} Not only was commerce affected during periods of conflict, the periods of peace immediately following them, as well as periods of ‘ceasefire’, were fraught with danger, as many ships that had been prevented from sailing suddenly took to the seas. In October 1640 it was reported that there was ‘ane cessation fra Warres both be sea and land for tua moneths and libertie to pass and repass during the said space’.\textsuperscript{62} In the same year, and apparently after this cessation was granted, it was reported that ‘mony schippis tane the seas being very full’,\textsuperscript{63} suggesting that merchants had to contend with increased danger during periods of ostensible peace.


\textsuperscript{58} Ordinances appointing the First and Second Committee of Both Kingdoms, 16 February, 22 May 1644: S. Gardiner (ed.), \textit{(ed.)}, \textit{The Constitutional Documents of the Puritan Revolution, 1625-1660} (Oxford, 1899) 271-272

\textsuperscript{59} 9 January 1643/4, AO, I, 364-5

\textsuperscript{60} 10 July 1645, \textit{The Acts Done and Past in the second, third, fourth and fifth sessions of the first triennial parliament of our soveraigne lord Charles} (Edinburgh, 1646) 43

\textsuperscript{61} Instructions from the Burgh of Aberdeen to Colonel Stein Winthrop, commissioner to the Westminster Parliament, to be held 17 September 1656, \textit{ACL}, III, 272

\textsuperscript{62} Robert Petrie, 24 October 1640, Edinburgh, \textit{ACL}, II, 243-4

\textsuperscript{63} Alexander Jaffray to Patrick Leslie, Provost [n.d], 1640, \textit{ACL}, II, 271
Despite these conflicts – or perhaps because of them – belief in the Auld Alliance was perpetuated as some Scots sought refuge in France. In 1646 it was reported in the Aberdeen Council that

many of our neighboures quha haid best estates and greatest traffique have removiet thenselffis, and ar setlit in forrein countries as in France, Mr Alexander and Robert Irwingis, David Inglis, Thomas & Alexander Mengzeis, Mr Alexander Burnet, Mr Gilbert & George Paines, William Robertsone…and many others have quytt thair burgess richts and gone, sum to the south otheris to the north to dwell.\(^{64}\)

The Inglis, Burnet, Pape and Robertson families all played a significant part in Franco-Scottish trade in this period.\(^ {65}\) Rather than ceasing overseas activities during this domestic conflict, they chose instead to relocate to France where they may have been better placed to facilitate commercial links. For those entrenched in politics, as well as for merchants, France was seen as an ally and was approached for assistance by both the Covenanter and the Royalists, the latter through Charles’s queen, Henrietta-Maria. In 1639 a principal adviser of the Covenanter, John, second Lord Balmerino, voted in Parliament for the necessity of a defensive war and subsequently wrote to Louis XIII to implore, in consideration of the ancient alliance between France and Scotland, assistance against the ‘tyrannical proceedings’ of Charles I.\(^ {66}\) The Royalists, buying into the nationalistic rhetoric of the Covenanter, were wary of the continuation of this relationship. Secretary Coke wrote to Secretary Windebank in May 1639 that ‘you will understand what heavy burden the French begin to lay upon our merchants, and how they favour the Scots after the old manner.’\(^ {67}\) In September, the Covenanted Scots remained hopeful of external assistance, Robert Baillie writing that ‘we were hopefull

\(^{64}\) Instructions for George Morisone to the conventione of burrowes to be holden at Brunt Iland, 7 April 1646, ACL, III, 44

\(^{65}\) For examples of these individuals/families trading in France see: Letters and accounts, John Clerk and Robert Inglis, 1636-1676, NAS GD18/2379/1-8; Bill of exchange drawn on Alexander Burnet, 29 December 1677, GD237/11/157/4-5; Gilbert Pape, procurator for William Gray vs. M. Mel, 1647-8, GD18/2486; Correspondence, Gilbert Pape and William Robertson to John Clerk, 1645, GD18/2466; Gilbert Pape appears in the records of the Juridiction Consulaire, Dieppe, January and March 1654, January 1655, January 1656, ADSM 200 BP 35 (unpaginated). These examples are by no means exhaustive.

\(^{66}\) J. Balfour Paul (ed.), *The Scots Peerage: founded on Wood’s edition of Sir Robert Douglas’s ‘Peerage of Scotland: containing an historical and genealogical account of the nobility of that Kingdom*, 9 volumes (Edinburgh, 1904-14) I, 565-6. Balmerino had been a principal instigator of the St. Giles’s Cathedral riots in 1637, following the attempt to introduce the Book of Common Prayer (Laud’s Liturgy).

\(^{67}\) CSPD, XIII, 143. Secretary Coke to Secretary Windebank, 9 May 1639. For a more detailed discussion of this matter, see Murdoch, ‘April 1640 Committee’.
of powerful assistance from abroad if we should have required it. France would not
failed to have embraced our protection. Holland and we were bot one in our cause’.68

However, despite Coke’s opinion that France favoured Scottish merchants,
France provided support for all sides during this conflict. In 1642 a supplication by
James, Duke of Lennox, Great Admiral, and Alexander, Earl of Linlithgow, Vice-
Admiral, reported a great number of Irish rebels with merchant goods on the Clyde
‘intending to France’, although these rebel ships were captured by the Laird of
Greenock and the merchants held prisoner.69 While being pursued by the Cavaliers in
1644 the English Parliamentarian Thomas Ellis was ‘forced for safety, being sought
after by the Cavaliers to be apprehended…to fly towards France, carrying such
commodities as he could procure’.70 While Ellis did not, in the event, make it to France,
it was his destination of choice as a place of safety. The plethora of British citizens in
France at this time also provided a location for the Royalist army to dispose of
prisoners. The English Royalist Sir Thomas Allin RN worked under Prince Rupert of
the Rhine after completing his service to the king during the English Civil War. He was
instructed by Rupert in 1644:

> when you have taken any prize from any of the rebels against the King of
> England…keep all your prisoners safe aboard your own ships; suffer none of
> them to remain in the prizes, till you may conveniently send them on shore in
> England or France after that the goods are sold and the whole fleet put out to
> sea, to prevent noise and discovery.71

Charles himself, by early 1647, sought the protection of the French ambassadors, as he
‘did not see a single place within the three kingdoms where he could remain in safety’.72
He proposed to Jean de Montereul that the French ambassador ‘publish loudly here that
he [Charles] was right in not sanctioning the Covenant, and in not establishing
Presbyterianism, and not doing the other things that were demanded by the Scots’.73
Despite their earlier support the French started to voice their frustration with the

---

68 Robert Baillie to William Spang, 28 September 1639, in D. Laing (ed.) The Letters and Journals of
Robert Baillie, principal of the University of Glasgow MDCXXXVII-MDCLXII, 3 volumes (Edinburgh,
1841) I, 191; Murdoch, ‘April 1640 Committee’
69 1642, CSPD, ii, VII, 342. Later, a warrant was sought from the Lords to interchange
the prisoners with
Scottish prisoners held in Ireland.
70 24 August 1644, CSPD, XXX, 448
71 Rupert to Allin, further instructions, 8 January 1649, R. Anderson (ed.), The Journal of Sir Thomas
Allin, 1660-1678, 2 volumes (London, 1890) II, 212-3
72 Montereul to Mazarin, 10/20 January 1647, Newcastle, DC, II, 401
73 Ibid, 404
conduct of the Scottish Covenanters, and in 1647 Montereul informed the British king of ‘the unwillingness of the Scots and the little trust he ought to place in their statements’ and wrote to Cardinal Jules Mazarin that

the treatment that he [Charles] was at present receiving from the Scots gave him no reason to wish to do anything towards releasing them from their promises...The King of Great Britain manifested his approval of what I said, and stated that he would act accordingly.\(^\text{74}\)

Despite a continuing desire, whether pragmatic or cynical, to rekindle the Auld Alliance (Chapter 1), France wished to maintain profitable relations with all of the contesting parties of the British nations, although a willingness to assist was often equal to downright interference in British affairs. Mazarin succeeded Richelieu as the principal agent of French government and diplomacy in 1642, and pursued policies that enwrapped the French government with British affairs.\(^\text{75}\) It was at Mazarin’s behest that Montereul spent the majority of 1646-1648 in England and Scotland meeting the King, Scottish Covenanters and English Parliamentarians, under a remit to persuade the Scottish Covenanters to stand by Charles, urge the King to consider acceptance of the National Covenant and suggest the official revival of the Auld Alliance. One goal was to protect the institution of Monarchy, but the French also thought that there was less for France to fear from an England under Charles than from a Republican England that might threaten France’s declining naval strength.\(^\text{76}\) France’s vacillating allegiance did not go unnoticed by the Scots, some of whom voiced concerns regarding France’s motives and the dangers of trusting her. The Scottish Dove, a populist news-book produced throughout the mid-1640s, stated in August 1646 that

the desires of France were granted before they could be asked!...The French Ambassador and Montrill [Montereul] are conceived to doe hutt [hurt] not good…and it is believed our Brethren of Scotland will…not be stirred either by large promises nor greatest threats.\(^\text{77}\)

The Scottish Covenanters were right to exercise caution in dealing with France, the actions of the French testifying to the largely selfish nature of their motives. The French

\(^\text{74}\) idid, 404-5
\(^\text{75}\) For more on Mazarin, see A. Corvisier, La France de Louis XIV, 1643-1715 (Paris, 1957) 140-145, 156-164
\(^\text{76}\) Howat, Foreign Policy, 48-9
\(^\text{77}\) The Scottish Dove, 5-12 August 1646, cited in DC, II, Appendix P, 588, 593-4
ambassadors constantly pursued the levying of British troops for French service. In June 1646 Montereul wrote to Mazarin that ‘I believe it will be possible to send from here four or five hundred men, who have formerly served the King of Great Britain, but I fear there may be some difficulty in obtaining passports for them’. In March of the following year the French ambassador Pompone de Bellièvre confirmed that he had ‘the verbal assurance of the leaders of Parliament and of this Committee…that the ships in the service of Parliament on the coast of Ireland [would] allow the ships sent there from France to convey the soldiers to pass and repass’. Not only were French ships allowed to collect soldiers, these ships brought over arms and ammunition for Ireland, ‘the letters from France by last mail increase still more the suspicions that exist here. Those of Augier affirm that the ships for which we are asking passports are laden with arms and gunpowder for Ireland’.80

French involvement in British affairs, rather than truly assisting any nation, had actually heightened the effect of the civil wars on commerce by the spring of 1647.

The shelter given in the French harbours to the ships that keep the sea with commissions from the Prince of Wales make them [the Parliamentarians] look for an opportunity of avenging themselves on the French, which they propose to do on the first opportunity, by giving letters of marque to their traders, who say they have not been able to obtain justice in France for the wrongs that have been done there…the principal members of Parliament are in favour of granting reprisals.81

That spring, the ‘St Malo incident’ further fuelled mistrust of the French. A ship sent by the English Parliament to Ireland laden with cloth for soldiers’ uniforms was captured by a French frigate and taken to St Malo. Bellièvre felt that ‘although those who are acquainted with such affairs know well that this cannot have taken place as it is related, such rumours produce the worst possible effect on the public mind’, and he asked for more information, to prevent ‘what may impair the good understanding that ought to

---

78 Montereul to Mazarin, 28 May/7 June 1646, Newcastle, DC, I, 208; see also Mazarin to Bellièvre, 12 January 1647, Paris, Mazarin, II, 356-7 concerning Scottish levies for French service. French attempts to levy Scottish troops are documented well before these occurrences. See Richelieu to Bellièvre, 6 October 1638, Paris; 13 November 1638, Richelieu, VI, 211-213; 238-240
79 Bellièvre to Brienne, 14 March 1647, London, DC, II, 43
80 Ibid., 74. The intention to recruit soldiers from Ireland is evident from the other side of this correspondence from 1 January 1644, Mazarin writing to the Comte de Harcourt that ‘je jouis ce mot à la depesche que vous a fait M. de Brienne, pour vous prier de vous employer auprès du roy de la Grande-Bretagne pour faciliter une levee de deux ou trios mille Irlandois, que nous avons resolu de faire’: Mazarin, I, 354
81 Bellièvre to Brienne, 4 April 1647, London, DC, II, 86-7. For a detailed explanation of the role of letters of marque and letters of reprisal see Murdoch, Terror, particularly Introduction and Chapter 2.
exist between these two kingdoms [crowns]’. Ultimately, though reluctantly, Bellièvre wrote that

Parliament has ordered today that...this ship laden with uniforms, which they say has been taken to St Malo, [be] restored to them...it will obviate great complaints...I cannot engage to prevent the letters of reprisals that have been spoken of for some time from at last being granted.83

The distraction of the Civil Wars was continually exploited by the French ambassadors not only for material gain, but to permit them to influence the course of events in Britain, sometimes resulting in their actions being contradictory. In September/October 1645, the French assured the Covenanted Scots that despite the fact that they were no longer ‘the masters of the settlement of affairs in Great Britain’, France would willingly maintain ‘the union that has always existed between the two kingdoms’,84 yet by 1646 the French had intervened in an attempt to bring the British Civil Wars to a close in favour of the King.

Our negotiations will place the king at the head of more than four thousand Scottish cavalry, and assure him of one of the best fortresses on this island, which will render it necessary evidently for the Scottish Government to interpose in order to make peace on some tolerable terms.85

Even correspondence which cited ostensible support for Scotland included observations that ‘the king’s party being reinstated, France will have full time to consider how she can interpose to assure the peace of these kingdoms86 and the intention of Bellièvre to ‘continue to influence matters here as much as I can.’87 Moreover, when Montereul reported in 1644 that France had an interest in preventing Charles I from coming to terms with the Independent party because this would mean the ruin of the Scots, whom France should ‘maintain as a power she will one day be able to oppose to England’, he also stated that France should effect the agreement before the Spanish could benefit

82 Bellièvre to Brienne, 11 April 1647, London, see also Bellièvre to Brienne, 15 April 1647, London DC, II, 98-9, 106, 109-11
83 Bellièvre to Brienne, 18 April 1647, London, DC, I, 109
84 Montereul to Mazarin, 28 September/7 October 1645, DC, I, 8
85 Bellièvre to Brienne, 14/24 September, London, DC, I, 269
86 Montereul to Mazarin, 28 September/7 October 1645, DC, I, 8
87 Bellièvre to Brienne, 14/24 June 1647, London, DC, II, 165
from facilitating it themselves, suggesting that France was always governed primarily by her political position within Europe.\textsuperscript{88}

Yet despite the volatile diplomatic and political relationships within the British Isles and the problems this precipitated between Scotland and France, re-examination of official data can go some way to demonstrating that commercial relations were not affected as severely as might be expected. For example, there was little change in the amount of trade passing through Dumbarton during the civil war years compared to the 1620s, and in fact there was a slight increase in activity, with 8 ships on average per year being recorded between 1643 and 1648, compared with 7 on average from 1620 to 1625.\textsuperscript{89} Furthermore, although examining the Aberdeen figures for both entries and departures shows trade falling during the civil war years (to France specifically as well as more generally) data for ships’ entries alone yields an alternate view. While the French import trade into Aberdeen was not the largest, it seems to have been more consistent than from other European destinations during this period, a consistency maintained even as entries from Norway and the Baltic declined over the first half of the decade: \textsuperscript{90}

[Chart on following page.]

\textsuperscript{88} ‘...deux puissants intérêts que le roy de la Grande Bretagne ne s’accommode point, par le moyen des Indépendants – l’un parceque ce serait la ruine entière des Ecossais, que la France doit maintenir comme une puissance qu’elle pourra un jour oppose à l’Angleterre; l’autre pour ce qu’il vaut mieux que l’accomodement se fasse par l’entremise de la France, que par celle des Espagnols, par les offices desquels il se rouvera, que les Indépendants se seront accommodés’. Montereul to Cardinal Mazarin, 18/28 September 1645, London, DC, I, 11-17

\textsuperscript{89} F. Roberts and I. MacPhail, \textit{Dumbarton Common Good Accounts, 1614-1660} (Dumbarton, 1972) appendix B. I am grateful to Claire McLoughlin (St Andrews) for sharing her tabulations of this data.

\textsuperscript{90} Data taken from Devine, ‘Cromwellian Union’, 6
The discrepancy in the patterns of trade exhibited by examining the entries alone as opposed to the entries and departures in conjunction with each other suggests that overseas relations were not adversely affected by civil war, but that domestic demands on seafaring equipment and men meant that overseas voyages were somewhat curtailed. What does become clear from Figure 4.2 is that one cannot assume that the civil war period produced constant statistics, or that domestic crises did not have any effect on overseas trade. For example, the Scottish Covenanters triumphed over Charles I in the Bishops’ Wars (1639-1640) only because of aid arriving by sea from their Dutch and Swedish allies, somewhat skewing the shipping figures. Moreover, there were periods of relative peace for Scotland, particularly after the Covenanter occupation of Newcastle in 1640 and up until the re-entry of the Covenanters into the war on the side of the English Parliament, in 1643. Figure 4.2 reveals a slight rise in ‘French’ voyages at this juncture and a massive rise in Dutch ones. Similarly we can see periods of apparent collapse. 1644-1645 witnessed the spectacular Montrosian campaigns against the Covenanters, also including the sacking of Aberdeen. The year 1647 began with the

---

91 Murdoch, Terror, 197-9
Argyll party still in control of Parliament, but the Duke of Hamilton and his pro-
Royalist Engagers ousted them from power. This led to a failed invasion of England in
1648 and the return of Argyll through his military coup d’etat – the Whiggamore raid.
His return to power and the good terms he brokered with the English Parliament helped
to secure the seas for Scottish shipping, and the recovery of trading voyages is apparent.
Once Argyll proclaimed Charles II as King of Great Britain in 1649 after the execution
of the Charles I, Cromwell invaded Scotland and the impact on overseas voyages can
also be seen from this data.

The Aberdeen data appears to reflect the political machinations of the civil war
period rather well, as well as highlighting the relative stability of the French trade when
compared to other European nations. There are also other ways of interpreting the
period. For example, when considering merchant activity in general within the town of
Glasgow, the civil wars do not seem to have had such an adverse effect. In order to
receive full commercial privileges (including the right to import goods from Europe),
merchants were required to be registered as guild brethren. In Glasgow, the number of
merchants registering themselves remained healthy during the civil war years. Between
1610 and 1615, 101 merchants registered, between 1645 and 1650 this was slightly
higher at 104, from 1675 to 1680 the figure was 99 and between 1700 and 1705 it was
98.92 Thus the number of merchants operating in Glasgow during the civil war period
appears to have remained fairly constant, suggesting that the civil wars did not impact
equally on all Scottish cities.

Examination of private sources suggests still further that merchants were not
deterred from their pursuit of Franco-Scottish commerce. For many merchants, the
biggest concerns they faced were not commercial. A month after the First Bishops War
broke out at the beginning of 1639, William S. Chilthomas wrote to Lewis Dick at
Bordeaux concerning daily military discipline, stating that he hoped ‘he will be home
shortly in these dangerous times’.93 Alongside this concern for his family and assets at
home, however, he also discussed his continuing participation in the wine trade. Sir
Charles Erskine of Cambuskenneth wrote multiple letters to his wife Mary Hope from
France in 1643 giving no indication that his travels were unduly affected by the Civil
Wars. In August, he concerned himself with matters that, to him, were more important

92 J. Anderson, The Burgesses and Guild Brethren of Glasgow, 1573-1750, Scottish Record Society
(Edinburgh, 1925). Data compiled from this source by T. C. Smout, ‘The Glasgow Merchant Community
in the Seventeenth Century’ in Scottish Historical Review, XLVII (1968) 59-60
93 William S. Chilthomas to Lewis Dick, 26 February 1638/9, Edinburgh, CSPD, XXIV, 507
than the outcome of international politics and diplomacy, though which perhaps testify to where his loyalty lay during this conflict, as otherwise his reluctance to name his son after himself seems surprising:

I am so over joyed since the receat of your last letter shooing of your hapie deliyverie of a young Charles for so your father called him bot we knowe that it was not my desyer for I deseyred if a sone Thomas if a doctor [daughter] Elisabeth and tell him so from me.\textsuperscript{94}

Many merchants remained in France and continued to pursue commerce with Scotland, their continued interest in their native country leading to news from Scotland being reported in France. John Clerk wrote to John Murray from Paris in 1640 that ‘sum agreement is past Betuixt the noble men of England. And the Scotts commissioners at Rippon in England sum 4 myles fra Boroubrigs. First, A Cessation of Armes. By Both Armies. Second, A trade to be made open for both kingdoms’. He added a postscript that

in respect that nou the passage is open to Scotland. Letters will cum more frequently as Before: in case any fall in my hand for Mr Metland or you: ye wold not doe amisse to Advyse hou they sould Be sent you – If I had knowen all this tyme whair ze had Bein I wold have wreatte more frequently: off the passages of our Countrie.\textsuperscript{95}

The Treaty of Rippon paved the way for an end to the Bishops’ Wars, and commercial opportunities increased, as Clerk described. The Scots also paid off their debt to France for remaining neutral in the conflict by providing soldiers for French service.\textsuperscript{96} This in turn facilitated a trading opportunity in that Scots transporting these soldiers could return with goods from France custom free (Chapter 2). In 1642 John Dougall wrote to John Clerk that

yesterday Mr Mell resaved [a letter from Dougall’s father] wherin he wreats that he hes freight the ship that is heir cum over with the souldiers to goe to the Rochell for salt and also one uther ship that is coming from Scotland heir to goe to St Mallos or any uther pairt aux environs to load with cornes if they are cheap.\textsuperscript{97}

\textsuperscript{94} Sir Charles Erskine to Mary Hope, 2 August 1643, Châtillon, NLS ms.5089 f12
\textsuperscript{95} John Clerk to John Murray, 11 November 1640, Paris, NLS Adv.mss.23.3.26 f106
\textsuperscript{96} Murdoch, ‘April Committee’, 7
\textsuperscript{97} John Dougall to John Clerk, 14 May 1642, Dieppe, NAS GD18/2416
John Dougall was one of several itinerant Scots who embarked on commercial missions despite the outbreak of renewed hostilities in the British Isles between Charles I and the English Parliament. He was certainly not averse to changing location in order to achieve the best profit. Correspondence from him to Clerk in 1636 sees him at Rouen, but in 1643 he is in Dieppe, and correspondence from later in that year places him at Le Havre. Similarly William Erskine appears in Orleans, Angers, Geneva, Marseilles and Lyon in the space of 18 months between February 1644 and October 1645.

Charter parties and commissions continued to be drawn up regarding imports of commodities from France. In the brief period of peace between the Pacification of Berwick (1639) and the outbreak of the Second Bishops’ War (1640) Alexander Dick, collector of customs at Burntisland, acknowledged the payment of customs on salt from La Rochelle by skipper burgess Robert Angus. Although this cargo arrived during a time of ostensible peace, an agreement for this shipment is likely to have been drawn up several months before it landed and in any case, relations between the King and the Covenanter remained tense even during this period of peace. Similar examples can be found throughout the period. An account from August 1643 detailed furnishings including satin, taffetas, a black trellis and a ‘toile de rouan blanche fine’ provided for Lord Ross from a merchant in Toulouse. In 1647 an agreement was drawn up between David Dunbar in Garmouth and the partnership of Aberdeen merchant Alexander Farquhar and James Browne in Findhorn, skipper of the Aberdeen ship the George, for Bordeaux wine, with no mention of any particular difficulties or special considerations to be made due to the ongoing civil war. Thomas Cunningham, while reporting on the effect conflict in Britain had on the trade through the staple, acted to circumvent this problem by obtaining

from the Admiralty of Zeland a ship of warre, not only to carry me over…but to stay there upon my returne and to follow my orders, so as thereby I gave warning to all the merchants who presently laded their commodities, and they were safely convoyed, to the number of 12 shipps full of Staple goods.

---

98 John Dougall to John Clerk, 21 January and 10 April 1636, Rouen, NAS GD18/2380/1/1-2; John Dougall to John Clerk, 7 November and 2 December 1643, Le Havre, NAS GD18/2380/4/42, 48
99 William Erskine to John Clerk, various correspondence, February 1644-October 1645, NAS GD18/2457
100 Discharge, Alexander Dick to Robert Angus, 1 November 1639, NAS GD172/1765
101 Account, Lord Ross and Monsieur [Daldeguie], 23 August 1643, NAS GD3/13/2/1/9
102 1 September 1647, NLS Culloden Papers, Ch.1657
103 Courthope, Journal of Thomas Cuningham, 242-3
We know from a variety of sources that there was little variation in consumer goods sought in France during the civil wars – although the transportation of arms and ammunition inevitably increased. The numerous letters and accounts between Henry Hope and Clerk consistently mention luxuries; in January 1644 Clerk recorded that Hope owed him 17 livres ‘payit to a goldsmith for setting your ring & for gold’. Clerk wrote to Lady Pittenweem from Paris in 1645 to inform her that sixteen gowns and petticoats were being sent to her with William Paton. For the rest of the year, at a time when the Montrosian civil war raged in Scotland and the wider British war continued, Clerk consistently sent such commodities home, including a packet to Lady Pittenweem ‘conteining divers callors off worsit [worsted]’ and a ring, ‘tyed with A Bit off bleu ribbon to on off the little pacquet’. In the same letter Clerk enquires as to ‘what hight ye wold have the pearling for your oune goun’, stating also that he had ‘bein vereie desireous to have found out sum prettie stuff to be A waskyne [vasken] for your Lady’. On another occasion he sent ‘1 grein etuise [a French case] with sheirs botkin and knyffe’. Lady Pittenweem was not the only recipient of goods from Clerk; in the same letter-book there are copies of letters to Lady Newliston and to Janet, Margaret and Mary Gray, Clerk’s future wife, to whom Clerk sent similar merchandise. Goods exchanged by Clerk and James Mowat in 1647 included ‘ane sute of blak clothe for Robert Gray & the compt off A gray drap de Berrie [French design] casak for my self’. Sir Charles Erskine consistently sent home gifts with his letters, including a watch and clothes for his wife Mary’s brother, Sir Alexander, a pair of ‘Romon’ gloves from Paris for Lord Hadington and a ‘sticke of blac stufe’ and ‘tuoe glasses’ for his wife. Although he mentioned the conflict in October, he wrote not of

104 Closed account between John Clerk and Henry Hope, 26 July 1644, NAS GD18/2437
105 John Clerk to Lady Pittenweem, 15 April 1645, Paris, NAS GD18/2455, f13v. For other examples of Paton acting as a carrier to both Lady Pittenweem and others in Scotland, including Margaret Gray, see 20 May 1645, f13r; 20 September 1645, f17r-17v; 3 November 1645 f17v. Clerk acted as banker for Paton: 26 July 1644, f2v; John Clerk to Robert Inglis, 20 October 1644, Edinburgh, f3v.
106 John Clerk to Lady Pittenweem, 20 May 1645, Paris, NAS GD18/2455, f14r
107 John Clerk to Lady Pfittenweem, 20 September 1645, Paris, NAS GD18/2455, f17r. This is an item usually associated with dressmaking.
108 John Clerk to Lady Pittenweem, 20 September 1645, 3 November 1645, Paris, NAS GD18/2455, f17r-17v. Mary Gray was the daughter of Sir William Gray, with whom Clerk did business. It can be assumed that he met his future wife through this connection (Chapter 3). John Clerk to Michel Mel, 3 February 1645, London; John Clerk to John Dougall elder, 6 February 1645; John Clerk to James Cutler, 1 March 1645, NAS GD18/2455, f7r, 7v, 13v
109 James Mowat to John Clerk, 1647, Paris, NAS GD18/2484
110 Sir Charles Erskine to Mary Hope, 2 August 1643, Châtillon, NLS ms.5089 f12
111 Sir Charles Erskine to Mary Hope, 2 August 1643, Paris, NLS ms.5089 f11
112 Sir Charles Erskine to Mary Hope, 12 September 1643, Bourges, NLS ms.5089 f15
the effect on international affairs or commerce but only of dangers to his own person, demonstrating again the understandable preoccupation of merchants with their personal position as opposed to the state of their home nation; ‘my dear heart, I resolvelled not to let you knoe of our leat voyages wich he have head to the franche armie for I knoue ye wold have been feared although ther was no danger wee are nou returned and going to Chatillion’. 

Existing networks of merchant Scots in France were used to facilitate this continuation of trade. Michel Mel, in Dieppe, settled an account with Andrew Bethune, a Scot who had once been in Paris but had returned to Edinburgh, in June 1643. This occurrence not only demonstrates the continuation of this link after Bethune had returned to Scotland, but also during the height of the British Civil Wars.

III. CASE STUDY II: INTERREGNUM, 1649/1651-1660

‘I am not able to do anything with this new state.’

By April 1654, the domestic situation in Scotland had changed radically. The Covenanters under Argyll had been defeated by Cromwell at Dunbar in 1650, while the Royalist Army of the Patriotic Accommodation that entered England found itself seriously under-supported by English and Irish Royalists, and met its fate against Cromwell at Worcester in 1651 – leading to the Cromwellian conquest of Scotland. Scotland was then incorporated first into the English Commonwealth and then the Cromwellian Protectorate, drawing Scotland into war against the Dutch during the first Anglo-Dutch War (1652-1654). The relationship between the British states was of course fundamentally altered following the civil wars, and further by Cromwellian usurpation, with the Earl of Loudoun stating that Scotland was ‘under the power and force of the armie of the Parlament of the pretended Commonwealth of England’.

While some scholars have adopted this view, others have questioned it, with varying

113 Sir Charles Erskine to Mary Hope, 12 October 1643, Marne, NLS ms.5089 f23
114 Discharge, Andrew Beaton and Michel Mel, Dieppe, 18 June 1643, NAS GD7/2/38
115 Andrew Hay to Archibald Hay, 10 April 1649, Holyrood, NAS GD504/9/88
It is now clear that Cromwell was not indifferent to his northern kingdom, and certainly not to the ships hailing from it. In May 1657 Cromwell wrote to Frederick III of Denmark-Norway concerning two Scottish ships captured between Dunkirk and Whyting in Norway – the Greyhound, captained by William Adamson and the Comfort, captained by John Robertson. Upon receiving letters from the captains concerning the incident, Cromwell asked Frederick III to punish the behaviour of those responsible, asking that an example be made of them.

Although Cromwell eventually demonstrated his concern for Scottish commerce the upheavals caused by changes in government impacted upon commerce in similar ways to open conflict. Three months after Charles I’s execution in January 1649 Andrew Hay wrote to his kinsman Archibald discussing at length the political situation in Scotland, stating that ‘I am not able to do anything with this new state…it is not possible yet for a little tyme to procure yow a passe to goe to France, becaus they doe so much search into mens actions’. Such obstacles, however, while inconvenient, provided incentives for commercial expansion. After relaying these troubles, Andrew wrote that ‘I have enquyred for shippes going to Barbados, ther is on going within ane moneth from the west countrey to barbados, and ther is on going from Leeth presently to Virginia’. Some merchants had already been pushed towards other trading destinations following the turmoil of the 1640s. In February 1642 Benjamin Fletcher, a Scottish merchant in Rouen, sent an account to Alexander Hayes in London concerning
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117 It is perhaps overstating the case that ‘Ireland and Scotland, after being conquered, were forcibly incorporated in a military state totally dominated by England’: Jones, Anglo-Dutch Wars, 84. Other scholars have also adopted this view, see G. Donalson, Scotland, James V–James VII (Edinburgh, 1965) 344-346. For two articles refuting this, see Pinckney, ‘Scottish Representation’; Casada, ‘Scottish Representation’. The former argues that Scotland ‘had a semblance of valid representation in the 1656 parliament, and some of the English representation were capable of working for Scottish interest’ (113); the latter that ‘although it is not true that Scottish representation was wholly English…from a Scottish perspective the union was a dismal constitutional failure’ (146-147). R. Hutton, The British Republic, 1649-1660 (Basingstoke, 1990) rightly acknowledges that ‘it is in a British, not an English, context that the true importance of the Interregnum should be appreciated’ (135), however he focuses almost wholly on England, especially in regard to overseas relations (for example, 54-7, 107-113). For another view on the wider British aspect of the Commonwealth see P. Little, ‘An Irish Governor of Scotland: Lord Broghill, 1655-56’ in A. Mackillop and S. Murdoch, Military Governors and Imperial Frontiers (Leiden, 2003) 79-98. For a comprehensive overview of the union see C. Terry, The Cromwellian Union (Edinburgh, 1902) xv-xcvii; see also Firth, Scotland and the Commonwealth; C. Firth, Scotland and the Protectorate: Letters and Papers Relating to the Military Government of Scotland from January 1654 to June 1659 (Edinburgh, 1899); F. Dow, Cromwellian Scotland (Edinburgh, 1979); R. Hutton, The British Republic 1649-1660 (Basingstoke, 1990); Macinnes, British Revolution, Chapter 8; S. Murdoch, Britain, Denmark-Norway and the House of Stuart, 1603-1660 (East Linton, 2003) Chapter 7


119 Andrew Hay to Archibald Hay, 10 April 1649, Holyrood, NAS GD504/9/88
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a shipment of cotton wool from Barbados.\textsuperscript{121} At times when Franco-Scottish trade was interrupted, merchants tended to turn to alternative destinations and different commodities rather than ceasing commercial activity, and Benjamin Fletcher’s continued presence within Scottish trading networks in France throughout this period suggests that although he sought alternative locations for trade this was in addition to, not at the expense of, commercial links with France.\textsuperscript{122} Of course, it is feasible that these merchants merely spotted new opportunities and took them, although the timing of these ventures suggests that they were pushed towards these new destinations.

Continued optimism among the merchant classes immediately following Charles’s execution is again epitomised by the Clerk network and the desire to source and send home luxury goods remained evident. In January 1650 Mowat assured Clerk that ‘Madam Selon hath maid and delivered your six hats to Mr Houp [Henry Hope]’, and that ‘Monsieur Peronet hath maid you 8 hatbands…according to your order he gave them to Monsieur Houp’.\textsuperscript{123} Indeed, twice in 1650 Mowat wrote to Clerk regarding continuing opportunities in France, in the first instance stating that

any merchand ther in Paris, with whom you hav haid to doe with before would send you [goods] upon your simple leter, for says often to me that they mutch mor wish you send your commisones for waires, and that you should not pay one pennye moor as give you were in persone yourself.\textsuperscript{124}

Perhaps most poignantly, he wrote five days later that

if you weree hier you could gaine what you please, for theris many english and severall Scots that you might deal with, and now a firme peace betwixt bretaigne and France and oppen commerce. good Mr Clerk taik once moor a triall of it, and you shall be most heartly welcome…if you find your own securitye you may deal with gentlemen at home, and remite your moneys hier and fournish them, and maik good profite you know the way before.\textsuperscript{125}

\textsuperscript{121} Benjamin Fletcher to Alexander Hayes, February 1642, Rouen, NAS GD34/843/1/20. This account includes an item for ‘portage from newhaven to Rouen’, suggesting that overland transport was utilised after the goods had docked in a French port – further highlighting the need to look beyond port records to see the true destinations of commodities.

\textsuperscript{122} Benjamin Fletcher was connected to the commercial network of John Clerk of Penicuik (Chapter 3), as evidenced by a letter written to him by an A Hay, concerning sending cloths to several individuals, including William Blackburn in Rouen: [1650], NAS GD34/843/2/15. Sir Andrew Fletcher, Lord Innerpeffer wrote to John Clerk in 1646 regarding the provision of money for his son, and asking Clerk to keep him updated with news of his son. NAS GD18/2475. There is also evidence of a George Fletcher entering the port of Havre, 17 December 1653, ADSM, 200 BP 35 (unpaginated).

\textsuperscript{123} James Mowat to John Clerk, 17 January 1650, Paris NAS GD18/2593/3; see also same to same, 19 January 1650, Paris, NAS GD18/2595/4

\textsuperscript{124} James Mowat to John Clerk, 17 January 1650, Paris, NAS GD18/2505/4

\textsuperscript{125} James Mowat to John Clerk, 22 January 1650, Paris, NAS GD18/2505/6
The fact that James Mowat, even at this juncture, thought nothing of mentioning trade with Englishmen, Scots and Frenchmen is indicative that for the merchant classes, commercial concerns were more important than political divisions.

The Cromwellian Union of 1654 has, perhaps understandably, not been examined as thoroughly as the unions of 1603 and 1707. Under Cromwellian government Scotland was arguably ‘ill-prepared for the importation of aggressive mercantilism’ and foreign trade, it has been argued, was unable to prosper. Christopher Smout has suggested that Scotland was too ‘enfeebled [by] years of anarchy’ to take advantage of the opportunities offered by the Cromwellian Union in 1654, and Theodora Keith has stated that on the whole it does not seem that the country benefited materially during the Interregnum. Poverty was great, manufactures could not be set up. Trade, both inland and foreign, had decayed, and showed little sign of recovery, and the bankruptcy of the country continued towards the bankruptcy of the whole government, and the downfall of the Protectorate.

If we look again at the Sound Toll Registers, we see that Scottish trade through the Sound deteriorated throughout the 1650s as well as the 1640s, with just 26 Scottish ships on average per year sailing through the Sound between 1653 and 1658 (compared to 98, 1625-1630 and 56, 1644-1649). This is perhaps better attributed, however, to the outbreak of the first Anglo-Dutch War in 1652 and the embargo placed on all Scottish ships through the Sound in 1653 rather than to a general decline in trade – and accordingly in 1653 no Scottish or English ships are recorded passing through the Sound in either direction. Although no ships were recorded entering the Glasgow ports in 1651, the year following the Scottish defeat at Dunbar and the Cromwellian

---

129 Keith, ‘Economic Condition’, 284
130 Bund (ed.), *Tabellr Overskibsfart*. Despite this, records for entries into the Swedish ports of Gothenburg, Lubeck, Antwerp and Augsburg show that nine Scottish ships made their way into these ports. Six of these arrived after the declaration of war with the Dutch Republic and four of those ships deemed it safe enough to attempt a return journey. Dalhede, *Handelsfamiljer*, data collected from CD database.
131 Macinnes, *British Revolution*, 208. Denmark-Norway were obliged to assist the Dutch republic during this conflict under the terms of their alliance of 1649, see Murdoch, *Britain, Denmark-Norway*, 173-180. This occurrence would benefit from more careful scrutiny – for example, asking whether British merchants adapted their trading methods in order to circumvent such embargoes, in the same way in which they did when pursuing trade with France.
Tom Devine argues that the Cromwellian Union was not disastrous for either Aberdeen or Glasgow as under the regime both towns quickly re-established the level of commercial operations that had prevailed before the civil wars. Dumbarton and Aberdeen displayed a marked improvement in traffic under the Cromwellian regime. In Dumbarton, 16 ships on average are recorded for the period 1654-1659 (both entries and departures), a 116% increase from 1643-1649, and in Aberdeen 119 ships on average are recorded between 1654 and 1659, a 43% increase on the previous period. As during the civil war period, entries into Aberdeen from France appear to have remained more consistent than from their European counterparts:

![Graph showing ships entering Aberdeen from Europe, 1650-1660](image)

**Figure 4.3** Ships entering Aberdeen from Europe, 1650-1660

In this case, the impact of the outbreak and conclusion of the second Anglo-Dutch War is evident, and figures for the Baltic perhaps suggest the effect of the abdication of Queen Christina of Sweden in 1654.
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132 Roberts and MacPhail, *Dumbarton Common Good Accounts*, 264
133 Devine, ‘Cromwellian Union’, 6, 12. Devine maintains that this was not necessarily typical of other burghs, as Dundee continued a decline in trade which had begun before 1652.
134 *ASWA*, passim; Roberts and MacPhail, *Dumbarton Common Good Accounts*, appendix B
135 *ASWA*, passim.
Both French and Scottish records corroborate the fact that voyages between Scotland and France continued regularly throughout the Interregnum. The records of the *Juridiction Consulaire* of Dieppe and the *Amirauté* of Le Havre attest to continuing British trade in these ports through the second half of the Interregnum and into the Restoration period, although these records frustratingly stop in 1656 and 1664 respectively.136 Most notably the Scot Gilbert Pape appears in the Dieppe records several times: in January 1654, twice in March of the same year, in January 1655 and again one year later.137 In March 1662 the records of the Admiralty of La Rochelle record a case of ‘Guillaume Robertson, marchand écossais à Bordeaux, contre Daniell Smythe, marchand écossais à La Rochelle, reclamacion d’une somme de huit cent huit livres à saisir entre les mains dudit, appurtenant à Antoine Hal, marchand anglais en Irlande’.138 While this particular case demonstrates the negative side of business relationships, it also indicates that merchants from all British nations continued to operate in France.

Mention of politics does not tend to feature heavily in surviving mercantile correspondence from the Interregnum and Restoration periods. William Robertson enjoyed a prolonged period of business in various ports in France under the Cromwellian regime, his disagreement with Smythe coming in 1662 but he having been active in Franco-Scottish trade from at least as early as 1651. Robertson, an Aberdonian who acted as both a merchant in La Rochelle and a factor in Le Havre appears in business documentation from this year along with the partnership of John Forbes, provost of Inverness, Edinburgh merchant Patrick Leslie and Alexander Keith. This documentation details exchange of money but gives no hint that ubiquitous domestic crises and changes in government in Britain affected his business transactions.139 In the same year Annabella, Countess of Lothian, wrote from La Rochelle to her daughter Lady Lothian that the best way to send her letters was by John Inglis, her merchant. She wrote to her daughter’s husband in March that Inglis had gone to Scotland but would return shortly, suggesting that political upheaval in Britain was not preventing this

136 The records of the *Juridiction Consulaire* of Dieppe cover the period October 1653-April 1656, and entries for British ships include: 19 November 1653; Jean Duval, 13 December 1653; George Fletcher, 17 December 1653; Thomas Richardson, [?] February 1654; Jean Anderson, 27 February 1654; B[enjamin] Duval, 14 April 1654 and 23 April 1655; Thomas Gray, February 1655: *ADSM*, 200 BP 35 (unpaginated); the records for the Admiralty of Havre date from 10 February 1655 to 17 March 1664: *ADSM*, 216 BP 122
137 January and March 1654, January 1655, January 1656, *ADSM*, 200 BP 35 (unpaginated)
138 4 March 1662, *ADCM*, B309
139 24 February-27 March 1651, NLS Culloden Papers, Ch.1673-5
merchant from either travelling between Scotland and France or from continuing to act as her merchant.\textsuperscript{140} Inglis was another Scot who continued to pursue commercial links with France throughout the 1650s and who had contacts in more than one location, writing to George Maine eight years later of his ‘correspondent in deip [Dieppe] mester biger’.\textsuperscript{141} Similar occurrences can be seen in the first volume of the Aberdeen Propinquity books. John Donaldson, burgess of Aberdeen, allegedly drew a bill of exchange on Michel Mel in Dieppe in November 1650 to be paid to John Irving, but Donaldson submitted a complaint that Irving had forged this bill. Although this, again, represents a negative side of doing business, no indication that domestic issues caused difficulties for such a transaction are highlighted here. Incidentally, Donaldson used his good reputation here to his advantage, as Thomas Melville, former Dean of Guild, Alexander Alexander, burgess of Aberdeen, Alexander Davidson, advocate and former bailies George Morrison and Alexander Lumsden testified that Donaldson was ‘a man of good credit and honest and of good estimation within the said burgh’.\textsuperscript{142} A discharge in 1662 by Edinburgh merchant Thomas Crawford and Francis Kinloch in Paris to Sir Thomas Hay of Park detailed money loaned for Park’s ‘travels in France and England preceding the month of December 1656’.\textsuperscript{143} Being under the Commonwealth did not prevent individuals from continuing to utilise merchants in order to finance their travels, and political troubles did not preclude travel through France. Alexander Charteris wrote to John Clerk in 1654 that he ‘made a journey to Bordeaux, Rochelle and other places in these quarters where I stayed three months much longer then I intended’, the unexpected length of stay being due to previously unforeseen mercantile opportunities – testifying not only to the continuation of commerce, but to its health.\textsuperscript{144} Indeed, at home standard commercial concerns continued to dominate local burgh records, with the Council of Aberdeen, for example, continuing their efforts to gain permission to import French salt for the curing of fish, with apparently no expectation that this might be prevented by the current government (Chapter 1).\textsuperscript{145} Non-essential items continued to be sent home from the continent, and in 1652 John Clerk sent to the Earl of Lothian ‘a knyffe for cutting the corns on the feet’, noted in an account that also contained

\textsuperscript{140} Annabella Lothian to William, Earl of Lothian, 4 March 1651, La Rochelle, NAS GD40/2/5/13/1
\textsuperscript{141} John Inglis to George Maine, 8 April 1659, London, NAS RH9/2/133
\textsuperscript{142} 13 January 1652, Aberdeen, ACA Propinquity Book I, f42v
\textsuperscript{143} 30 January 1662, NAS GD72/139
\textsuperscript{144} Alexander Charteris to John Clerk, 8 April 1654, Paris, NAS GD18/2528/3
\textsuperscript{145} Additional instructions to Baillie Cullen, September 1652, Aberdeen, ACL, III, 214
IV. CONCLUSION

The involvement of the French in Scottish/British affairs, particularly during the civil wars, again calls into question assumptions regarding the perceived discontinuation of the Auld Alliance. Evidently both sides continued to desire a renewal of the alliance and trading privileges between their countries. Care must be taken, however, to recognise the ulterior motives of both parties. Moreover, for the diplomats involved in these discussions, commerce does not appear to have been a primary concern. Once again, merchants took matters into their own hands, influencing policy where possible and otherwise taking advantage of opportunities to increase their profit, altering their trading patterns where necessary. There is some evidence that individuals acted on behalf of a certain political cause; in April 1651 James Bruce wrote to the Earl of Lothian from La Rochelle that ‘he had procured a cargo of materials for his majesty’s army, which would be sent upon the engagement that it should be paid in Scotland, with the freight of the ship’ – but while Bruce was willing to assist the Royalist cause, he was not willing to finance this assistance himself. Such exceptions aside, assistance for the Royalist, Parliamentary or Covenanting causes from the merchant sphere in France appears to have been limited – although, of course, it may be that evidence for this assistance simply does not survive. However, what this chapter has demonstrated is that individual merchants were adept at discerning opportunities for continued trade. It is now beyond doubt that there was continued commodity exchange not only in the traditional trades in wine, salt and fish but also in luxury goods – most noticeably in the network surrounding John Clerk of Penicuik, but also undertaken by similar organisations for which surviving evidence affords us only a glimpse of activities. It is true that Clerk returned to Scotland during the civil war period, but no evidence found suggests that his return was motivated by the conflict, and as seen in Chapter 3 he continued to be involved in this network after his return home. Once again the individual merchant

\[146\] Account between Lothian and Clerk, 8 March 1650-5 June 1652, NAS GD18/2445

\[147\] James Bruce to Lord Lothian, 5 April 1651, La Rochelle, NAS GD40/2/5/13/6. It should be noted that, unlike in the case of Cuningham and Petrie in Rotterdam, above, this was Royalist, rather than Covenant, support. An investigation into the differences between Scots in different locations and the sides they chose to support might yield interesting results, although that is outwith the scope of this thesis.
appears impressively resilient to political change, if somewhat selfish in his aims and methods. It is apparent that domestic conflict in either France or Scotland did not extinguish either practical Franco-Scottish commerce or notions of the Auld Alliance, regardless of the regime in power.
CHAPTER FIVE

‘The outbreak of war between the King’s majestie
and the Kingdome of France’:¹

International Conflict and Continuation of Commerce I, 1627-1667

Despite the impact domestic upheaval had on Franco-Scottish trade, merchants continued to pursue commerce through both open and covert channels. While John Battie claimed that ‘civill war ruines trade faster than any other’, international conflict, bringing with it trade embargoes, commercial legislation and increased dangers from privateers, perhaps provided an even tougher arena in which to compete.² Throughout the seventeenth century several international conflicts threatened the continuation of the Franco-Scottish commercial relationship, although these conflicts took place within different contexts, with the interests of the House of Stuart being prominent until 1688. However, the 1627-1629 and 1666-1667 Franco-Stuart wars arose out of different circumstances and thus affected commerce in different ways. While the 1627-1629 conflict was concerned with relations directly between the Houses of Stuart and Bourbon, the conflict that broke out in 1666 was part of the wider second Anglo-Dutch War.³

The marriage of Charles I to Henrietta-Maria, Louis XIII’s sister, in June 1625 provided Britain with a strong ally against Spain, with whom hostilities officially broke out after the English and the Dutch agreed the Treaty of Southampton in September.

¹ 10 December 1629, Edinburgh, NAS AC7/2, 219
² J. Battie, The Merchants Remonstrance (London, 1648) HL 434906, 2
However, the disastrous efforts at La Rochelle, Buckingham’s deplorable conduct and the refusal of Charles I to alter his religious policies at Louis’s request caused this relationship to fracture and by April 1627 the Stuart navy was preparing to sail to La Rochelle to assist the Huguenots against their monarch. In the later conflict, Britain and France became enemies by default as a direct result of wider European issues, and Louis XIV’s motives for involving himself in a war against Charles II have attracted some debate. He was bound to assist the Dutch by a treaty of 1662 and they enlisted his support, which Louis reluctantly offered. Louis’s involvement in the 1666-1667 war epitomised his long-term political aims, rather than a sense of loyalty or empathy for Dutch interests, and he certainly appeared apathetic to pursuing war actively against Stuart Britain. He allowed his Court to express freely their reluctance to enter the conflict and permitted his sister-in-law, Charles I’s daughter, to continue her correspondence with her brother, retaining the channel of communication that would be used after 1667 to reconcile the two kings and initiate the negotiations that ended in the Secret Treaty of Dover in 1670. That France was sympathetic to Charles II had previously been suspected by the Dutch, a report in the English parliament in 1664 stating that they ‘begin to be somewhat suspicious & jealous as if his Majestie & the French King did too well understand one another’, although perhaps these fears had abated by the time France involved herself in the war. Louis’s antipathy towards pursuing a policy of enmity towards Britain continued after he had declared war in January 1666, allowing three months for English merchants to move their belongings and families out of France. This undoubtedly caused some level of upheaval for the merchant class, but suggests that his commitment to the war was not emphatic. Moreover, British merchants remained in France regardless of the conflict, as will be

4 ODNB. For Buckingham’s role in this conflict see Cogswell, ‘Foreign Policy’, 247-265; RPCS, ii, 1, lxi-lxii; S. Murdoch, The Terror of the Seas? Scottish Maritime Warfare, 1513-1713 (Leiden, 2010) 157, 163-4, 170-1
5 Rommelse, Second Anglo-Dutch War, 14; Jones, Anglo-Dutch Wars, 166; Voltaire, (M. Pollock, trans.), The Age of Louis XIV (London, 1958) 75. Louis, arguably, did not feel any particular loyalty to England or the Stuart Crown; one of his primary motivations was the death of Philip IV of Spain in September, which brought the issue of the Spanish inheritance to the fore in Europe. Louis hoped that if he declared war on England Johan de Witt (councillor pensionary – raadpensionaris – of the States of Holland) would assist him in his plan to annex portions of the Spanish Netherlands. De Witt, however, with Dutch trade being endangered by England and Dutch security being endangered by France, needed to secure the Spanish Netherlands as a ‘buffer state’ for protection from France. Jones, Anglo-Dutch Wars, 166-7
6 Jones, Anglo-Dutch Wars, 167-8; Sir Arthur Bryant, (ed.), The Letters of King Charles II (New York, 1968) 274, speech of Charles II to both Houses, 7 January 1674; also 222, 243-245; Howat, Stuart and Cromwellian Foreign Policy, Appendix 3, 166-171
7 Downing to Bennett, 2/12 December 1664, The Hague, TNA SP84/173/65
8 Rommelse, Second Anglo-Dutch War, 151
demonstrated below. Descriptions of the Franco-Stuart wars as ‘unnecessary’ (1627-1629) and ‘reluctant and half-hearted’ (1666-1667) epitomise the lack of dogged determination on either side.\(^9\)

While Scotland was inevitably drawn into the Stuart conflicts, her dedication to the causes has been called into question. It has been suggested that the value of Scotland’s contribution to Charles’s wars was limited,\(^10\) and a report in the English Parliament from the end of 1664 stated that ‘Scotland is very much against the war with this country & that his Majestie must expect nothing from that kingdome nor Ireland towards the maintainance thereof’.\(^11\) Certainly on occasion some Scots did not seem wholly committed to their monarch’s participation in the later Stuart wars. Scots as well as English were targeted by legislation ordering seamen to return from abroad in order to participate in the conflict, but William Coventry reported to Secretary Bennett in November 1664 that he ‘believes the Scotchmen at Yarmouth may be found on merchantmen, where they have run for great wages’.\(^12\) However, Andrew Little has recently provided an alternate view, demonstrating high levels of participation by Scots in ‘England’s’ wars throughout the Stuart period.\(^13\) Moreover, while the English may have discerned little support from north of the border, it was reported from Edinburgh in August 1666 that ‘people want peace with Holland and war with France. The King might have 20,000 volunteers from Scotland’.\(^14\) Whether reluctantly or not, Scotland participated in the Franco-Stuart wars of this century.

However, although Scotland participated, she also maintained her independence. While participation particularly between 1666 and 1667 formed part of the wider Anglo-Dutch Wars, Scotland entered into the war as an independent nation and under different rules of engagement and separate legal jurisdiction, despite sharing a crown with England, a fact that was appreciated throughout Europe.\(^15\) As stated by Thomas Cunningham, Conservator of the Scottish nation in the Dutch Republic, ‘the States of

\(^9\) J. Jones, *Britain and Europe in the Seventeenth Century* (London, 1966) 68
\(^10\) *RPCS*, ii, i, lxxii
\(^11\) Downing to Bennett, 2/12 December 1664, The Hague, TNA SP84/173/65
\(^13\) Little, ‘Comparative Survey’, 333-374
\(^14\) Robt. Meine to Williamson, 7 August 1666, *CSPD* 1666-1667, 15
\(^15\) Murdoch, *Terror*, 238; see also Little, ‘Comparative Survey’, passim. For the now outdated view that these were ‘English’ conflicts, see T. C. Smout, *Scottish Trade on the Eve of Union, 1660-1707* (Edinburgh/London, 1963) 18, 185
Zeland were very willing to contribute towards the protecting and exempting of our Staple shipps, so as our Staple trade might still be continued notwithstanding of the warre with England.\textsuperscript{16} The realities of trading links that existed during this period suggest that England and Scotland followed separate legislation regarding commerce with France. In an occurrence which can speculatively be dated to 1667 the Edinburgh merchant Henry Wilkie freighted a Swedish ship, the \textit{St John} of Congelfe, from Scotland to Bilbao, from there to Bordeaux and then back to Scotland, with 140 tuns of French wine and 11 bales of paper. He claimed that the ship was forced into the Thames for ‘shelter from the Enimie’ and therefore could not complete her intended voyage from Bordeaux to Scotland. Wilkie asked for permission, as some of the cargo was perishable, for a licence to enter and sell the goods in London.\textsuperscript{17} As well as demonstrating the use of a neutral Swedish ship, this occurrence suggests that embargoes on French goods (or at least their implementation) differed between London and Scotland. One implication could be that the claim of needing to ‘shelter from the Enimie’ was fabricated in an attempt to circumvent the English embargo on French goods during the 1666-1667 war. In April of the same year Thomas Cutler, a London merchant, freighted the same ship to go from London, to Leith, to Gothenburg, to Bordeaux and back to London. On the final part of the voyage the ship ‘came to a disaster being cast ashoare neare the coast of ffrance’, and he was forced to unload all the goods and repair his ship, which took almost three months, meaning that the ‘ship could not arrive here within the time of his Majesties proclamation’. He therefore asked for permission to unload his goods after the embargo had been implemented.\textsuperscript{18} It is not stated which particular proclamation is being referred to, but as the ship was coming to Britain from Bordeaux, it may be surmised that it was the embargo on trading with France implemented as a result of the war which began in 1666. His troubles, of course, may have been genuine but he perhaps bent the truth in order to pursue illegal commerce.

These examples also demonstrate the benefits afforded to neutral Swedish ships by the conflict – this ship being hired multiple times to facilitate Franco-Scottish trade. As France and Denmark joined the second Anglo-Dutch War in 1666 proclama-
against foreign shipping, in addition to those already present, and the hampering of the extensive Dutch carrying trade practically prevented trading in all but neutral Swedish ships.\textsuperscript{19} In the context of circumventing embargoes and avoiding seizures by privateers, neutral shipping was a valuable commodity for all nations. If legitimate neutral shipping could not be acquired, merchants carried false or duplicate passes and/or sailed under ‘flags of convenience’ (Chapter 2).\textsuperscript{20} The complexity of international trade and the methods merchants used to effect it caused problems for officials whose job it was to implement legislation. For example if, before the French formally entered the war, French merchants used Dutch ships to transport goods to the Netherlands and the ship was (legitimately) seized by the English, the French could still claim neutrality and demand their goods back.\textsuperscript{21} During the Anglo-Dutch Wars, the Duke of Albemarle told the French ambassador De Cominges, while discussing the capture of French ships, that he found it remarkable that French maritime trade seemed to have doubled in quantity in one year, suggesting that when France was not involved in these wars herself her ships were used to facilitate trade between the warring nations.\textsuperscript{22}

I. COMMERCIAL CONSTRAINTS?

‘In pursuit of His Majesty’s enemies.’\textsuperscript{23}

Scottish independence in the wars was not commensurate with a disinclination to participate, despite some views revealed above. Numerous Scottish seamen became actively involved in the Stuart conflicts, often volunteering themselves and/or their ships for service.\textsuperscript{24} A notebook of Vice-Admiral Sir John Pennington, found among Scottish papers including correspondence between Louis XIII of France, Monsieur Courcelles (French ambassador to Scotland) and Nicolas Bruart, the French chancellor, concerns the assembling of the fleet at Portsmouth for La Rochelle, and the inclusion of this in Scottish papers is suggestive of Scottish involvement in this conflict.\textsuperscript{25} There are specific cases of Scotland actively pursuing the French, not only in Europe but also

\textsuperscript{19} Rommelse, ‘English Privateering’, 21
\textsuperscript{20} Murdoch, Terror, 264
\textsuperscript{21} Rommelse, ‘English Privateering’, 25
\textsuperscript{22} Ibid, 23-4
\textsuperscript{23} 31 December 1628, Edinburgh, NAS AC7/2, 117
\textsuperscript{24} For the granting of letters of marque against Spain, for example, see 20 April 1626, Holyrood; 2 June 1626, Edinburgh, RPCS; ii, I, 283-4, 295, lxi-lxii. For the most recent analysis of this practice see Murdoch, Terror, passim.
\textsuperscript{25}1628-1631, NLS Newbattle Collection, ms.5741
further afield, and not simply in terms of privateers’ captures of ships or cargo. Scots under the authority of Sir William Alexander of Menstrie (later Earl of Stirling), Admiral of Nova Scotia, captured Quebec in 1629, a prize not returned to the French until 1632 despite the Peace of Susa in April 1629.26

Participation in privateering certainly afforded opportunities to individuals to take advantage of the wars, and it may be assumed that a desire to make personal profit, rather than acting in the interests of the nation, was commonly prevalent. However, to obtain a privateer’s commission individuals had first to pay a surety of £2000 sterling – even if they never took any prize, which was not uncommon, suggesting that financial reward was not always the primary motivation for undertaking such a commission.27

Steve Murdoch has estimated that the total amount held in escrow by the state in just one of the conflicts of the 1660s was between £160,000 and £240,000 sterling.28 For some individuals, this did prove to be a profit-making exercise. Recent research has demonstrated that Scottish privateers had some success in the various conflicts of 1626-1630 against the Imperial cities, France and Spain,29 and certainly instances of Scottish privateers acting against the French are documented. In September 1628 a fleet of five ships, two of the Royal Navy (the Unicorn, captained by David Murray and the Thistle, captained by William Duff) and three privateers (the Grace of God of Dysart, captained by David Robertson, the Alexander Bucephalus, captain David Alexander and the Gift of God of St Monans, captain James Binning) captured the Jonas of Dunkirk, which had a Calais skipper, Albert Jansonne, as its master.30 David Alexander appears again in the Gift of God in November 1629 alongside two other Scottish men of war off the coast of Shetland, having captured the Green Drake, a Dutch ship from Alkmure captained by Cornelius Peterson, as it sailed illegally from Gothenburg to Bayonne in France carrying masts, tar, deals and copper.31 The skipper argued that they had sailed for

---

27 Murdoch, Terror, 28, 262. Patrick Crowhurst has argued that except for a few spectacular successes, most privateers do not seem to have made any profit. P. Crowhurst, The Defence of British Trade, 1689-1815 (Kent, 1977) 16
28 Murdoch, Terror, 279, 328. For an idea of the numbers of Scottish privateers who paid the sum of £2000 between 1665 and 1667 see Appendix VI:1, 386-395. For the earlier periods see IV:2, IV:3 and V:1
29 Murdoch, Terror, 174
30 2 September, Leith, 2 September 1628, NAS AC7/1, 190
31 3 February 1629, Edinburgh, NAS AC7/1, 246. This appears to be the same case as the Green Dragon, reported in the Privy Council 5 March 1629, RPCS, ii, III, 86. Both names have been cited: Murdoch, Terror, 175, 395, 397
Bayonne before Charles I had issued his proclamation against trading with France; the case appears not to have gone before the Admiralty Court, suggesting that it was dismissed and the ship released.\textsuperscript{32} The personal benefit that was gleaned by some from forays into privateering is evidenced by the case of Richard Binning, a mariner of Yarmouth, who in May 1627 was hired by William Ramsay, captain of the \textit{Alexander}, for a passenger voyage to Nova Scotia. The ship sailed in September 1628 but Ramsay changed his plans, putting his passengers ashore at Loch Ryan and going to sea ‘in pursuit of His Majesty’s enemies’ on 24 September\textsuperscript{33} – believing that acting as a privateer would prove more lucrative than his current employment. He seems to have been proven right; on 28 September, just four days after being granted his letter of marque, he captured a Lubeck ship laden with salt. He later captured two French barks carrying fish. However, French trade was not exclusively targeted. David Alexander appears in a different ship, the \textit{James} of Anstruther, having captured the \textit{Houpe} of Calais, master Jacob Hanson, bound from Norway to Malaga with deals and tar in May 1629.\textsuperscript{34}

Patrick Logan, captain of the \textit{James} of Leith, was granted a letter of marque in February 1667 ‘against the ships and goods belonging to the French King, the King of Denmark and the State of the United Provinces and to their subjects or inhabitants’.\textsuperscript{35} Privateering activity remained a real concern during the later Franco-Stuart wars, and individual Scots with commissions exploited their geographical position to take advantage of certain opportunities. As war continued, most of the Atlantic trade of northern Europe began to round Scotland rather than sail through the Channel, avoiding a route which had hitherto presented a higher capture risk.\textsuperscript{36} Already by the end of 1664, before the second Anglo-Dutch War had broken out, the Dutch were officially ordered to avoid using the Channel and sail around Scotland instead.\textsuperscript{37} This practice became so common that the authorities discussed the possibility of having forts built in Shetland to prevent it,\textsuperscript{38} perhaps as a way of forcing the Dutch back through the Channel and

\textsuperscript{32} 5 March 1629, RPCS, ii, III, 86; Murdoch, \textit{Terror}, 175
\textsuperscript{33} 31 December 1628, Edinburgh, NAS AC7/2, 117
\textsuperscript{34} 30 January 1630, 23 February 1630, 18 March 1630, Edinburgh, NAS AC7/1, 259, 269, 272. While it is not conclusive that this is the same person, the fact that he captained ships from St Monans and Anstruther respectively suggests that it probably is.
\textsuperscript{35} 1 February 1667, London, NAS RH9/17/32/11
\textsuperscript{36} E. Graham, ‘The Scottish Marine during the Dutch wars’ in \textit{Scottish Historical Review}, LXI (1982) 69
\textsuperscript{37} Downing to Bennett, 6/16 December 1664, The Hague, TNA SP84/173/69
\textsuperscript{38} De Bacquoy to Bennett, 2/14 February 1665, Leeuwarden, TNA SP84/174/84; Alvise Saguedo, Venetian Ambassador in France to the Doge and Senate, 9 January 1665, CSPV, XXXIV, 74-5
making them easier prey. The fort was not completed during this conflict, however, and the Scots continued to prey on Dutch shipping.\(^{39}\) As one report in the *London Gazette* in June 1667 noted in relation to Dutch prizes:

> a great store of prizes lately brought in daily by Scottish vessels and of late scarcely a day hath passed in which there had not been two or three prizes sent in, so much that the harbour [Burntisland] is so thronged that they are forced to send several of them to other places.\(^{40}\)

Although such actions inevitably had an impact on commerce, the numbers of French prizes taken were in fact remarkably small.\(^{41}\)

> Despite some successes of their own, the Scots suffered losses to privateers during these wars. In 1666 a commission was given to the Duke of Beaufort to arm a frigate, *l’Ermine*, against ‘aux Anglais et autres ennemis de l’Etat’.\(^{42}\) The taking of so many Dutch merchantmen by the British nations affected French trade, as many of the vessels that were captured were French ships sailing under flags of convenience or were Dutch ships transporting French goods. As a result, many French products remained in warehouses in French ports – hurting the interests of both the merchants and the national government and economy.\(^{43}\) Scotland did, however, benefit as a result of the damage done to the Dutch carrying trade by privateers. As the Dutch began to disappear from Scottish waters more merchants were encouraged seriously to consider owning their own ships.\(^{44}\) In this sense, the wars provided some impetus for Scotland’s merchants, encouraging them to expand their personal investment in overseas trade and, as a by-product, helped to promote Scotland’s commercial significance in Europe.

> While most profit that was made through privateering was legitimate, privateers also attempted to use underhand methods (some more intelligent than others) to achieve financial gain. In September 1665 a French captain was arrested in France for using an English letter of marque against the Dutch, the French and even the English themselves.\(^{45}\) Furthermore, not all prizes were judged legitimate. In 1629 John Anderson and John Daw captured two Calais vessels, the *St Michael* and the *St Peter*,

---

\(^{39}\) Murdoch, *Terror*, 257  
\(^{40}\) Sunderland Report, 1 July 1667, *London Gazette*, issue 170  
\(^{41}\) Murdoch, *Terror*, 174-5  
\(^{42}\) ADCM B5607  
\(^{43}\) Rommelse, *Second Anglo-Dutch War*, 132-3  
\(^{44}\) F. Roberts and I. MacPhail, *Dumbarton Common Good Accounts, 1614-1660* (Dumbarton, 1972) 264  
\(^{45}\) Rommelse, ‘English Privateering’, 21
while they were at anchor off Molde, Norway. The captured skippers and crews brought cases against the Scots for cruelty – two of the Scottish crew were found guilty and John Haddon, captain of one of the privateers, was sentenced to death (although Charles I later commuted the sentence to banishment from Scotland) and the French vessels were freed. Three French ships taken by the Royal Navy in 1627 also had to be given back as they had been taken while under the convoy of a Dutch-man-of-war. The Scots sustained fewer losses at the hands of the French than may have been expected, and both parties sustained a relatively small number of losses at each other’s hands: the greater distance to Scottish waters and the far smaller merchant marine certainly contributed to this.

More pertinently, it is plausible that the importance of Franco-Scottish trade was an inhibiting factor on the desire of the French and Scottish privateers to take each other’s vessels, and the Privy Council received numerous petitions from merchants wishing to continue to trade with France during wartime. While privateering posed a very real threat to shipping and trade (as did piracy during peacetime), concern over privateers or pirates as a specific, isolated danger did not always manifest itself in the records kept by individual merchants or mariners. The Elie skipper Alexander Gillespie sailed to France during the 1666-1667 war, yet when privateers were encountered he dealt with them civilly and his logbook does not mention any concerns or problems arising.

46 29 December 1629, Edinburgh, NAS AC7/2, 231, 241
47 8 January 1630, 22 March 1630, 12 June 1630, Edinburgh, NAS AC7/2, 251, 260, 291; 2 April, 6 June 1630, RPCS, ii, III, 521-3, 589; 17 February 1631, RPCS, ii, IV, 148; Murdoch, Terror, 20, 178. Harry Thomson and Alexander Gedd were acquitted of the charge of cruelty. John Anderson and John Daw were acquitted of charges of taking the ships wrongfully, as they had been acting under a commission from William, Earl Marischal, and the prizes had been declared lawful in Leith. This perhaps demonstrates the shortcomings of the jurisdiction over such matters in Scotland, and the confusion that could arise. John Daw was held prisoner in Bordeaux for taking Leveane Rickleman’s ship The Sanct Peter, and Rickleman was prevented from returning to Bordeaux until Daw was freed. Rickleman eventually appealed to the Admiralty Court for permission to return to Bordeaux before his ship was wrecked, and was allowed to do so on the condition that he secured Daw’s release, a bargain that was upheld.
48 7 December 1627, APCE, 1627-1628, 167, cited in Murdoch, Terror, 171
50 Murdoch, Terror, 175
51 See, for example, Hew Ross to Lady Ross, La Rochelle, 8 April 1611, NAS GD3/13/4/2
52 SAUL, ms38352, 20, 24, 52
II. INDIRECT RESTRICTIONS ON COMMERCE

‘Your Majesteis subjectis ar haiely distrest, thair voyage maid unprofitable, and thay thameselffis compellit to serve’.\(^{53}\)

As noted in Chapter 2, merchant ships were often pressed into government service, in varying capacities, during times of war. In September 1626 the Privy Council noted that ‘for defence of his awne dominionis and persute of the enemie [Charles] is to outreik his navyiis and armies be sea and land, and to send royll supplies to his confederattis, in all whiche cais es shippis ar necessarie above all things’, permitting no ship to go abroad without a licence.\(^ {54}\) The impressment of these ships was more explicitly stated in the Privy Council two months later.

For the better praeventing and resisting of the Spanishe praeparationis whairwith this Iland is threatnit, causit stay and arreist all the s hippis within his Majesties dominionis, to the intent thay might be in reddines to be armed and send to sea as the necessities and occasioun of thair imployment and service sould require.\(^ {55}\)

All ships already on voyages were recalled. On 27 September Thomas Haddington, the Earl of Melrose and first Earl of Haddington, wrote to the Scottish burghs informing them that the King had ordered the Privy Council

to make stay of all shippes bound for France, and commands to all such as are gone, to prevent the danger that some of them may happin to incurre by goinge to France, in regaird…of some lait differences between him and the Frenche King; and at this same tyme all the serviceable shipps within the kingdome wer arrested for his Majestie, and at his command.\(^ {56}\)

While the Privy Council register explicitly mentions Spain rather than France, the antiquary James Balfour’s supposition that this legislation was also motivated by conflict with France is logical.\(^ {57}\) Even before the impressment of merchant ships was publicly announced, the Privy Council had begun making preparations for war. In July 1626 they wrote to the Council of Aberdeen asking how many ships could be assembled for the King’s wars, what their burden was and the number of men they could hold. They were also asked how many seafaring men were within the town as men, as well as

\(^{53}\) 21 July 1625, Edinburgh, \textit{RPCS}, ii, 1, 88
\(^{54}\) 28 September 1626, Edinburgh, \textit{RPCS}, ii, 1, 431
\(^{55}\) 21 November 1626, \textit{RPCS}, ii, 1, 445
\(^{56}\) Balfour, \textit{Annales}, II, 146-147 cited in \textit{RPCS}, ii, 1, 430, 432n., lxvi
\(^{57}\) \textit{RPCS}, ii, 1, 432n. For more information on both Haddington and Balfour, see \textit{ODNB}.
their ships, were pressed into service. 58 Two days later Gilbert Cullen was sent to Aberdeen as Commissioner to the Privy Council and a week later they produced ‘a nott of the schippis belonging to the toune of Aberdeen and of their burdenis’. 59 These included the Bonacord, master Gilbert Anderson, which was reported to be 50 tuns in burden, and ‘presently absent at hir voyage in France, whair shee hes almost being this year bypass’. 60 Such recruitment was not always successful, however:

none of these shippis caries any ordinance, except onlie the Bonacord, quhilk caries bot two talioune; and they have not amongis thame all abone fyftie marineris to sail tham, quhairof their is bot fourtie belongis heir. The remanent ar hyred elsquhair. 61

In August 1626 the Aberdeen Council were informed ‘of the grit preparatiouns of a powerfull and forayne cuntrey to invade…That a competent number of shippis providit with all weirlyke furnitour may be sett onto and maintained be the burrowes during the tyme of this common danger’. 62 In October 1626 these ships were lying in the harbour, being six in number, an embargo laid on, by order of the Council, in pursuance of a missive from the secretary of state…I [the Earl of Melrose] am comandet by his majestie to command yow in his name to take order preceislie that nain of your shippes sail any whair out of the dominionnes whill we have warr. 63

The enlisting of merchant vessels for war was inevitably unpopular, and this remained so during recruitment for Scottish participation in the second Anglo-Dutch War. The Scottish burghs could theoretically be fined 500 merks for each man they failed to provide for the Royal Navy, and when in 1665 Aberdeen had difficulty raising the 14 men she was obliged to (as the seamen had absented themselves during the call for service) the withdrawal of brewing privileges from the wives of these men was threatened as an incentive. 64 However, while the enlisting of merchant vessels for war may have been unpopular with merchants individually, the recalling of ships was not a direct attempt to stifle trade specifically between Britain and her ‘enemy’ countries; this

58 Little, ‘Comparative Survey’, 336; for the later Stuart wars see 339-345
59 17 July 1626, ACA, Aberdeen Council Minutes, LI, 275, 276
60 25 July 1626, RPCS, ii, I, 669. This demonstrates the continuation of trade with France up until the outbreak of war.
61 25 July 1626, RPCS, ii, I, 669
62 10 August 1626, Edinburgh, ACL, I, 249-250
63 October 1626, ACA, Aberdeen Council Minutes, LI, 299
64 Smout, Scottish Trade, 64; 15 March 1665, J. Stuart (ed.), Extracts from the Council Register of the Burgh of Aberdeen, 215; Little, ‘Comparative Survey’, 340, n.26
was simply a side-effect of recruitment for the war effort, as during the British Civil Wars (Chapter 4).

Merchants appear to have benefited and been inconvenienced in almost equal measure by being commandeered to transport men or goods for the Crown during the Franco-Stuart conflicts. In September 1626 Andrew Brown, master of the Tyme of Leith, transported soldiers from Aberdeen to Glückstadt in Denmark. He intended (as ordered by the owners of the ship) to go on to Bordeaux and try for a freight back to Scotland, taking advantage of being able to take a return cargo custom-free (Chapter 2). However, he was prevented from doing so ‘by the outbreak of war between the King’s majestic and the Kingdome of France’.65 In April 1628 Archibald Douglas, captain of the Lyon, was ordered to take the Earl of Morton to the Isle of Rhé for the La Rochelle expedition. He was compensated for this voyage, being given two barrels of peas and a barrel of herring for provisions on returning to the Isle of Wight.66 In October 1667, a contract was made between Lord George Douglas, Colonel to the Scots Regiment, and James Mowat, the Paris merchant, for transportation of 300 men from Leith or Burntisland to Dieppe.67 Mowat commissioned John Brown, the son of a merchant burgess of the same name in Edinburgh, to act on his behalf in Scotland and prepare two ships for this purpose. While this commission may have been inconvenient (for example, it may have prevented him from transporting a cargo back to France from Scotland, although alternatively it may have saved him from travelling in ballast), the contract stated that Mowat ‘should be free of all…dampnadge interest & expenses’.68 Presumably, Mowat could also take advantage of the concession relieving him from paying customs duties on any return cargo to Scotland. While these cases demonstrate the benefits merchants could in theory gain from such commissions, this did not always come to fruition. Brown had to bring the Tyme home in ballast, being unable to obtain a return freight, gaining nothing for himself or the owners of the ship from the voyage.

65 10 December 1629, Edinburgh, NAS AC7/2, 219; W. Welwood, An Abridgement of all sea-lawes (London, 1613) 48-9
66 29 April 1628, AC7/2, 77
67 24 October 1667, NAS GD172/1919. The transportation of Scottish men suggests that Scotland was involved in organised campaigns in her own right in this war, and also that the Treaty of Breda, agreed on 21 July 1667, did not signal the end of all aggression between Britain and France. For the activities of those Scots who embarked for Louis XIV’s service from Rye in September and October see Little, ‘Comparative Survey’, 344-5
68 This instrument was endorsed in November, confirming that James Mowat had fulfilled his part of the contract to provide the ships. 30 November 1633, NAS GD172/2400
Perhaps, then, the sympathy apparently held by the Privy Council for merchants affected by these wars is understandable. In the summer of 1625 Alexander Gray of Dundee, master of the *Falcoun*, William Black in Anstruther, master of the *Blew Due*, John Dow in Crail and ‘some others’ petitioned the Privy Council when, upon being in France pursuing trade, they were

stayed at the Rotchell be commandement from Monsieur de Subyis and the governour and magistattis of the Rotchell, and commandit to attend thair directionis and service; quhairthrow your Majesteis saidis subjectis ar haiely distrest, thair voyage maid unprofitable, and thay thameselffis compellit to serve.\textsuperscript{69}

The Privy Council ‘could not in so just a manner refuse thame’, and recommended to the King that ‘a coarse’ should be taken for their ‘comfort and relief’.\textsuperscript{70} The Privy Council chose to act in their merchants’ interests on more than one occasion. In December 1625 a Dunkirker took a ship of the Scotsman Gilbert Weddell, the Mary, which had been freighted to Calais with wheat. The ship and goods were ‘made lawfull pryze’. Yet Weddell, on the grounds that his ship after being sold to a Frenchman in Dieppe was taken by English ships and brought into Plymouth, asked that the ship be returned to him. Despite the ship having been initially classed as lawful prize, the Privy Council acquiesced to his demand in July 1627.\textsuperscript{71} Furthermore, many such successful appeals to the Council resulted in victories for French ships. Shortly before war officially broke out in May 1627, but after relations had become tense, Scottish merchants trading in France complained regarding an arrest made in Scotland of some French ships, a bark of Calais and a hoy of Rouen, who were detained under suspicion that they were Dunkirkers, ‘his Majesteis profest and declaired enemies’, but were released after they were ‘cleared to belong to Frenschemen’.\textsuperscript{72}

\textsuperscript{69} 21 July 1625, Edinburgh, *RPCS*, ii, i, 88
\textsuperscript{70} Ibid, 89
\textsuperscript{71} 19 July 1627, Holyrood, *RPCS*, ii, II, 20-1
\textsuperscript{72} 28 May 1627, Holyrood, *RPCS*, ii, I 613
III. MERCHANT METHODS

‘Recouped by the purchase and import of wine’.\(^73\)

Whether as a direct result of embargoes or not, trade between Scotland/Britain and France was affected during the Franco-Stuart wars. The records of the Admiralty of Le Havre record no ships going to or coming from any of the British nations between 9 July 1627 and 11 April 1629.\(^74\) Similarly an entry book for Kirkcaldy from November 1666 to November 1667 records no voyages between this port and France.\(^75\) However, it is not unlikely that as this trade was officially contraband, the port officials chose to turn a blind eye to it, and did not record it as diligently as they may have done in peacetime. Furthermore, restrictions on trade must be considered in their true context. In 1668 the mayor of Bordeaux issued a declaration preventing foreign merchants from concluding any association in France, except with French merchants.\(^76\) Although ostensibly this may seem to have been an attempt to stifle international trade in a time of war, the stipulation that foreign merchants could continue to trade with French merchants suggests, instead, that this was an attempt simply to protect or enhance France’s domestic economy. This explanation seems all the more likely when it is considered that this stipulation was made during the French intendant Jean-Baptiste Colbert’s financial reforms in France (Chapter 1). Furthermore statistical analyses, as already discussed, are not always conclusive. Analysis of the percentage of ships entering or departing the port of Leith from or to France suggests that the wars of 1627 to 1629 did have an adverse affect on Franco-Scottish trade. As a percentage of ships going from Leith to European destinations, those going to France fell dramatically from 41.2% in 1611-1612 to just 5% in 1626-1628. This, however, is not necessarily indicative of a fall in trade to France. It must also be noted that the percentage of ships going to the Netherlands rose between these periods, from 22.3% to 37.8%. This suggests that merchants continued to trade to the continent, but chose to trade through other European destinations; furthermore, upon reaching Europe goods were likely to have been transported overland, allowing merchants to facilitate trade with French locations but avoid using French ports which were ostensibly closed to them.

\(^{73}\) 26 April 1628, NAS AC7/1, 153; 28 April 1628, NAS AC7/1, 154

\(^{74}\) ‘Enregistrement des exportations du Havre pour d’autres ports (de France ou de l’étranger) du 9 juillet 1627 au 11 avril 1629’, ADSM 216 BP 145, f 15r-f 59r

\(^{75}\) 1666-1667, NAS E72/9/3

\(^{76}\) 3 November 1668, TNA SP117/288
This data, being presented in percentages rather than numbers of ships, does not allow us to gauge the amount of trade in real terms that continued during this period. For the later Franco-Stuart conflict, however, Eric Graham has compiled data showing numbers of ships entering the port of Leith from European destinations, giving a better indication of the volume of trade that continued during this conflict:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country of Origin</th>
<th>1638</th>
<th>1660</th>
<th>1661</th>
<th>1662</th>
<th>1663</th>
<th>1667</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NORWAY</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BALTIC</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GERMANY</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOW COUNTRIES*</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENGLAND</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FRANCE</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPAIN</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AMERICAN COLONIES</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>139</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.1    Ships entering Leith from Europe, 1638-1667

*Graham does not specify whether this represents the Dutch Republic or the Spanish Netherlands, or a combination of both.

The gaps in this data make it difficult to draw firm conclusions from it, but it indicates that imports to Leith from France fluctuated throughout the seventeenth century, falling during the 1666-1667 war – although not ceasing altogether. However, there is a marked rise in entries from the Low Countries during 1667, suggesting again that merchants did not cease trading to France but instead found ways to avoid trading to ports that were prohibited or areas in which there was a real danger from privateering by

77 McNeill and MacQueen, *Atlas of Scotland*, 270. The origin of this data is not stated, neither is any distinction made between the Dutch Republic (or the United Provinces/States General/Northern Netherlands) and the Spanish Netherlands (Southern Netherlands).
transporting goods overland and transporting them home from the Low Countries. Perhaps more interestingly, the numbers of ships entering Leith from England also rose considerably in 1667. While it is unlikely that this represents importation of French goods from England (as English merchants were operating under the same prohibitions) it suggests that rather than deprive themselves of business, Scottish merchants adapted their activities and imported goods from alternative destinations. In fact, when the total number of ships arriving in Leith is considered, overseas trade appears considerably higher in 1667 than it had been for the rest of the decade, for the years for which there is available data.\(^79\)

The 1627-1629 war against France has been cited as causing the first break in economic ties with France,\(^80\) with Edgar Lythe specifically stating that the £400,000 raised in Scotland in 1625 for war against the French represented ‘active participation’ on behalf of Scotland and was the ‘last straw on the back of the Auld Alliance’.\(^81\) He maintains that the 3000 troops sent to La Rochelle under the Earl of Morton in 1627 signified the moment that the old economic alliance ended.\(^82\) Yet while these wars inevitably had an impact on Franco-Scottish trade, to couch it in this way is to overstate the case. On 19 December 1626, the importation of French wine into Scotland was forbidden, although the reasons formally cited for this were scarcity of money and the behaviour of poor people who ‘spend the most pairt of thair meanis in drinking of wyne’.\(^83\) However, as noted in Chapter 1, this act in fact seems to have been made in retaliation for a violent incident sanctioned by the Duke of Epernon, the French Governor of Guyenne, in which a fleet of 200 English and Scottish vessels sailing from Bordeaux was seized, this occurring before any formal declaration of war between the two countries – the Scottish ships were released ‘in respect of the ancient league’, but

\(^79\) Graham, *Maritime History*, 144 has suggested that peace with the Dutch after the end of the second Anglo-Dutch war revived Scotland’s trade to the Low Countries, and states that there was a ‘drift in Scotland’s foreign-going trade away from France and towards England and her colonies’. However, although the records for 1667 may suggest this, the data has been compiled from 1667 as a whole, yet the second Anglo-Dutch war persisted until the Dutch victory at the Raid on the Medway in June. Without comparable data from 1665 and particularly 1666, it is difficult to draw firm conclusions. This data requires further evaluation as it suggests that trade to the Low Countries rose during the Anglo-Dutch war, clearly anathema to the political situation.

\(^80\) G. Donaldson, *Scotland, James V-James VII* (Edinburgh, 1965) 387

\(^81\) Lythe, *Economy of Scotland*, 211. Whyte agrees with this assessment: Whyte, *Scotland before the Industrial Revolution*, 272


\(^83\) 19 December 1626, Edinburgh, *RPCS*, ii, I, 478-479
the English ships remained captive.84 Under the decree preventing the importation of French wine two French barks, the *Hoip* of Rouen, master Jacques Ilkus, and the *St Johnne* of Calais, master Paul Lupine, were sequestrated in Leith in January 1627 but were freed upon petition from their masters, the reason given for this being that the French authorities had liberated the Scottish portion of the British fleet that had been arrested by the Governor of Guyenne, further consolidating the speculation that the embargo was implemented in retaliation for this earlier misdemeanour.85 Embargoes were not implemented as strongly as the tenor of them might suggest – on this occasion the Privy Council (and to a certain extent Charles himself) demonstrating some level of apathy towards this prohibition – possibly due to Scotland’s commitments elsewhere in this period, not least to the King’s uncle in Denmark.86 Furthermore, when several merchants complained in January 1627 that their shipments of wine had been confiscated, Charles allowed the cargo to be restored, accepting that the merchants had been unaware of the embargo when they had first undertaken the voyage.87 Two days later another Scottish merchant, who had imported French wine in a Flemish ship, was permitted to sell his cargo despite the embargo.88

Franco-Scottish trade did not grind to a halt in either of the Franco-Stuart conflicts of the seventeenth century, and merchants utilised the methods investigated in Part I in order to continue trading, including trading through different ports and transporting their goods in neutral (usually Swedish) ships, and once again merchants acted directly to influence commercial policy. When in 1627 Charles tried to prevent the sale of French wine already present in Scotland the merchants protested so fiercely that the monarch relented, allowing the sale of this wine to continue.89 In February 1628 an embargo was placed on the importation of any French goods in any ships, with the ban on French wines which had been in place since December 1626 being specifically reiterated, removing the loophole which allowed French goods to be imported in neutral shipping.90 Scottish merchants informed the Privy Council that ‘upoun the occasioun of the troubles fallin out betuix the Kings Majestie and the Frenshe King, we out of our

---

84 RPCS, ii, I, 479-480n.
85 9 January 1627, Holyrood, RPCS, ii I, 486-7, lxxiii
87 30 January 1627, Holyrood, RPCS, ii, I 506-507
88 1 February 1627, Holyrood, RPCS, ii, I, 527-528
89 Lee, *Road to Revolution*, 82; 6 January 1627, RPCS, ii, I, 488-9
90 5 February 1628, Holyrood, RPCS, ii, II, 567-8
most humble respect to his Majesties interesse have dewtifulie forborne all trading in France’, but asked that:

for the better securing of our estaitis there frome the danger of arrestment we gave ordour to our factouris to lift and imploy our stockes upon Frenshe commoditeis and to imbarque the same in Flemish bottomes the better to assure the transport thairof hither without challenge or impediment.

These merchants also raised concerns for the wider implications of the wars; embargoes on French markets compelled merchants to pursue trade in Flanders, a market that was not as well known and therefore less certain. While merchants did adapt their trading methods and traded to alternative destinations when necessary, this was not always welcomed. If merchants in these locations denied their business it would place their trade in jeopardy; moreover, in return for the goods they sold merchants had to accept ‘suche commoditeis as they please give us’ in return, as the transportation of money to or from the Low Countries was forbidden. Continuous protestations from merchants to the Privy Council, and Council to King, eventually culminated in a letter from Whitehall on 26 March 1628 conceding that all French goods already purchased by merchants may be brought into the country until 1 July. This news reached Holyrood on 7 April:

the King has granted permission to all merchants who had stocks of wine in France at the time of his proclamation forbidding the import of the same, to import it before 1 July 1628. And that the wynes to be brocht home be them at the returne of thers gudes within France. By the end of April they must inform the Admiral of what wine they have in France, and the quantities they have, and thereafter may import only existing stock.

While the prohibition in 1628 may have only been relaxed temporarily, merchants also played a part in its later abrogation and, even before this had been achieved, flouted it as they perceived that it should not apply to them. In January 1629 the Earl of Linlithgow, the acting Lord High Admiral, rightfully arrested a consignment of French wines brought into Leith. However, the Scottish merchants asserted that they were

91 26 February 1628, Holyrood, RPCS, ii, II, 243
92 Ibid.
93 Ibid. 243, xxxii, see also 11 March 1628, 265-6; 25 March 1628, 284-5
94 7 April 1628 (26 March 1628), RPCS, ii, II, xxxiii-xxxiv, 305-307
95 7 April 1628, Holyrood, NAS AC7/1, 152. The time limit on the relaxation of the embargo seems to have been implemented; in January and February 1629 wine that had been imported contrary to this decree was arrested. 27 January 1629-February 1629, NAS AC7/1, 232-239
encouraged to this kynde of imployment of their stockes by the exemple of the English who (as they affirme) wer daylie buying and sending over to England great quantitie of Frenshe wynes which had a free and uncontrolled vent there, without challenge or arrestment.  

Perhaps as a result of the Scottish merchants mentioning that ‘their factours had sent home these wynes for furnishing of the countrie at the tyme of your Majesteis muche expected heerecomming’, the embargo on French wines was lifted on 12 February 1629 – ten weeks before the formal declaration of peace at Susa on 24 April.

While these relaxations allowed merchants to continue legitimately trading with France via some means, it is not inconceivable that once the embargo was relaxed speculative merchants found ways of taking advantage of it. While in this case relaxation allowed only for the importation of wine already in their possession, merchants might, for example, declare more than they had, allowing them to purchase the difference later. Following the granting of the concession, there was a sudden spate of merchants making appeals to the Admiralty Court, declaring money abroad that ‘could only be recouped by the purchase and import of wine’. The Glasgow merchants John Hamilton and William Hill declared that factors in France held money of theirs – naming James Ligorie, a merchant of Le Croisic, who owed 2000 francs for Scottish cloth, plaiding and hides, Tobias Pedro, also in Le Croisic, owing 2800 francs for coal sent in August 1626 and Roger Lorentine, factor at Bordeaux, who owed them 1200 francs for herring and salmon sent in September 1626. Hamilton and Hill specified that they needed to buy wine if they were to recoup this money.

Two days later the Edinburgh merchant John Slowane declared that François Burse, his factor in France, held 5000 francs as the proceeds of skins sent by him in 1626 and 1627, again stating that this money could only be recouped ‘by the purchase and import of wine’. It is surprising that merchants who were savvy enough to understand the implications of this legislation had previously been so lax in recouping debts, only now acting to acquire money owed to them for goods taken to France over eighteen months before, rather

---

96 29 January 1629, Holyrood, RPCS, ii, III, 24-5
97 29 January, 12 February 1629, Holyrood, RPCS, ii, III, xxii-xxxiii, 24-5, 44. Lee, considering only political and diplomatic matters, rather than the pressure exerted by the merchants, suggests that this was prompted by the fall of La Rochelle in 1628; asserting that Charles ‘cut his losses’ and made peace, "promptly" re-opening the wine trade: Lee, Road to Revolution, 82-3
98 26 and 28 April 1628, NAS AC7/1, 153-4
99 26 April 1628, NAS AC7/1, 153
100 28 April 1628, NAS AC7/1, 154. It is probable that this was a Scottish factor by the name of Francis Bursie. He may have had links to John and Peter Bursie, the Scottish factors in Sweden in the 1640s and 1650s mentioned by Murdoch, Network North, 221
than recouping the debt the previous season. Perhaps these claims may have been exaggerated, or perhaps their factors in France were prepared to support such claims; not least as without trade, the factors themselves made no profit (Chapter 2).

While certain embargoes were relaxed, others were simply not effectively implemented. In June 1628 James Smallat, merchant burgess of Dumbarton and master and owner of the *Providence*, made a complaint about having the goods aboard his ship unlawfully seized and driven to the Kyle of Alloway on Mull. What interests us more than the details of the claim, however, is the planned voyage of the ship. Smallat had loaded herring in the Clyde before proceeding to Ireland and loading the rest of the ship’s cargo, including cloth, butter and cheese. They then set sail to France. Despite trade with France from England and Scotland – and their dominions, which included Ireland and Nova Scotia – having been under prohibition since February, this voyage seems to have been permitted, and the Council highlighted no such embargo in relation to this voyage.\(^{101}\) When a case was brought before the Admiralty Court in April 1628 by Andrew Watson, captain of the *Blessing of Burntisland* against George Scott, the former master of the ship, the case was settled, including £38 10s. to be paid to Scott by Wilson for 1 last of Rochelle salt, despite the prohibition on French commodities – although in this case this may have been permitted because the salt was purchased and loaded before the implementation of the prohibition.\(^{102}\) In September however Patrick Baxter freighted the *Angel* for transporting goods from Leith to Dysart, and from there to his home port of Dundee.\(^{103}\) The cargo was French salt, suggesting not only that this salt was imported during the war with France, but also that French goods continued to be traded domestically despite the war.

While some merchants demonstrably adopted specific tactics to allow them to continue to trade with France or to take advantage of relaxed legislation, others seem to have continued trading openly. Inevitably, there are many gaps in the evidence of particular merchants, but an examination of correspondence and bills of exchange enacted during both of these wars does not suggest that merchants’ business was adversely affected. A month after war broke out in May 1627 Andrew Bethune [Beaton], a Scot active in Paris throughout this period, furnished 11,000 francs to John

---

102 16 April 1628, NAS AC7/2, 63. This may be the father of the Watson brothers noted below trading from Kirkcaldy in the 1660s.
103 28 January 1629, Edinburgh, NAS AC7/2, 132
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Seaton, according to a bill of exchange by William Dick (Chapter 2). In June and August 1666, following the declaration of war in February, the customs records for Kirkcaldy show imports of French wine from St Martins by Patrick Angus, and 48 dozen French Coudeberks hats by James Broune, an Edinburgh hatmaker. In February 1666 Jean Mel is recorded in the records of the Admiralty of La Rochelle as the captain of the *Lion*, on a voyage from Scotland to La Rochelle with a loading of herring, salmon, butter and tallow, with no suggestion that this was in contravention of any specific legislation and without mention of the current political climate.

The Edinburgh merchant Alexander Hamilton also continued to deal in French goods, primarily wine. His trade continued seemingly unaffected up to and after the declaration of war in 1666 and was pursued through established mercantile networks. Links with George Jardine, Robert Johnston, James Lundy and John Penston in the early 1660s continued throughout 1666. Penston appears in numerous transactions with Hamilton concerning the purchase of wine and in April Andrew Johnston, probably a relative of Robert Johnston, dealt with Hamilton for French wine, hoops and chairs. Jardine and Robert Johnston bought French wine from Hamilton in May. These associations continued throughout the height of the war with France; in October and December 1666, Penston again appears in transactions with Hamilton concerning French wine.

Moreover, this ledger demonstrates the breadth of Scottish commercial networks in France, as Hamilton records a business transaction involving Michel Mel in February 1665 comprising a ‘voyage to deip in a French skipper, mr [scarlet] per convoyance of James Grame merchant debett 237.12 to stockings 237:12 for 9 dozen at 44s per dozen to be sold per mittchell mell for my acompt’.

Similarly, correspondence recorded in the Watson Papers relating to the commercial ventures of the Kirkcaldy merchant brothers Alexander and Andrew

---

104 5 May 1627, Paris, NAS GD7/2/33. Beaton continued to act on Dick’s behalf throughout the war: Bond, Earl of Montrose to Andrew Bethune [Beaton], Paris, in the name of William Dick, 11 September 1634, Edinburgh, NAS GD220/6/638. Beaton dealt with the Earls of Mar and Erskine, 22 September 1637, 2 November 1638, GD124/2/54. We have no record of the intervening years (which is not uncommon) but the implication is that he continued to live in and pursue trade with France throughout this period, and he certainly did business with James Mel: J Smyth to Andrew Beaton, 14 March 1634, Edinburgh, NAS GD7/2/34. He also had business with James Meill [Mel]. Mel is cited here as James Mel ‘elder’, suggesting the presence of a James Mel ‘younger’, presumably his son; it is not clear which generation of this family the James Mel trading with John Clerk was (Chapter 3).

105 20 June 1666, 28 August 1666, NAS E72/9/1

106 18 February 1666, ADCM, B5667. Although this occurrence took place after France’s declaration of war on Britain, it appears that Mel had already set sail before the Scottish declaration of war on France.

107 16 September 1664-8 December 1666, f 38r-f46v, NLS Adv.mss.31.3.2

108 1 February 1665, NLS Adv.MS.31.3.2, f 40v
Watson demonstrates continuing trade with France (and elsewhere) throughout the 1660s. The wars with France appear to have inconvenienced their trade enough for James Carstairs, one of their business associates, to note in April 1668 that ‘we her that ther is peace with England & france concluded’, yet the nature of the transactions suggests that they had continued to pursue their business despite this inconvenience. In May Carstairs wrote that ‘John Jack shewes me that the time appointed for the payment of the bills from nantez is not expired and as soon as the bills are payed he and I shall account and I shall shewe him what the difference is betwixt yowe and he’. Further evidence comes from an account from 5 March of Mr Legatt to Alexander and John Watson, which includes goods such as sea instruments, books, hats and the cost of posting letters from France, although we are not given a precise date for these itemised expenditures. It is unlikely that this merchant network would have been able to pursue such wide-ranging trade so soon after the end of the war if the war had affected trading routes.

The methods used by this particular merchant network require some further examination. Their correspondence demonstrates the undertaking of one particular voyage with multiple destinations including Bordeaux, Rotterdam, Norway and London, and the ways in which the Watson brothers conducted their trade illuminates the methods that continued to be used in this period, consolidating the fact that merchant ventures cannot often be viewed as bilateral voyages between two ports. Some of the Watsons’ cargoes were loaded at Dunbar, rather than at Kirkcaldy, demonstrating the use of multiple ports but also raising questions concerning the true origin of these goods. Furthermore, the Watsons traded within a family network, including cousins in Stirling, Edinburgh and Fife who were also involved in maritime trade.

109 Destinations in France included Nantes: SAUL ms38527/1/1/1, 16 May 1668, ms38527/3a/20/2, 23 September 1668; La Rochelle: ms38527/3a/19/10, 23 July 1668; Bordeaux: ms38527/3b/2/7, 15 August 1668, ms38527/1/1/6, 21 August 1668, ms38527/1/2/4, 28 August 1668, ms38527/1/1/4, 25 September 1668. On other occasions the exact destination is not stated. It is not clear exactly when the prohibition on French wines was lifted, and it is not until April 1669 that a new eruption of merchants bringing French wine into Scotland prevails: 7 April 1669, Edinburgh, NAS E73/25/1. The Watsons traded in French wine and brandy: account of Mr George Lesley, 23 September 1668, ms38527/3a/20/2; James Carstairs to Alexander and Andrew Watson, 25, 30 September, 2 October 1668, Bordeaux, ms38527/1/1/4, ms38527/1/2/5, ms38527/3b/6/4; Alexander Watson to James Carstairs in Bordeaux, 22 October 1668, Kirkcaldy, ms38527/1/2/2; Alexander Watson to Ebenezer Watson, 30 December 1668, Leith, ms38527/1/1/8; Andrew Glasfurd to Andrew Watson, n.d., Cupar, ms38527/3a/9/10.

110 James Carstairs to Alexander and Andrew Watson, Rotterdam, 21 April 1668, SAUL ms38527/1/1/10.

111 James Carstairs to Alexander Watson, Rotterdam, 16 May 1668, SAUL ms38527/1/1/1.

112 5 March 1668, SAUL ms38527/3b/2/7.


114 Ibid, 2-3. Another cousin in Inverness asked advice on how his son might train as a merchant.
family networks can tentatively be traced further back. In an account of March 1668, there is a transaction between a Mr Legatt and ‘John Watson in Burntisland’, who was possibly a relation of Alexander and Andrew.\textsuperscript{115} The Andrew Watson who brought a case against George Scott before the Admiralty Court in 1628 was captain of the \textit{Blessing} of Burntisland and, while Watson is a common name, it may be speculated that these individuals were related. The Watson brothers also imported both French and Spanish wines apparently indiscriminately, testifying to the health of the market for wines from both destinations (Chapter 2).\textsuperscript{116}

Trade pursued with France during the 1666-1667 war was effected with varying degrees of success. In May 1667 the \textit{St Jacob} was captured and the case brought before the Admiralty Court, whereupon the skipper and steerman of the ship stated that there was a load of salt on board belonging to a French factor. The Admiralty Court intimated that only the salt, and not the ship itself, would therefore be judged prize, in accordance with the prohibition. But before the decision could be ratified, a Hamburger offered to prove that both the ship and goods belonged to the British king’s allies – this backfiring as the Court decreed after his testimony that both the goods \textit{and} the ship were lawful prize, stating that his testimony had rendered that of the skipper ‘extra prediciall & elicit’. It seems that the Hamburger, possibly in cahoots with the skipper, attempted to facilitate the release of the goods as well as the ships, but through his testimony actually damning the \textit{St Jacob} as not only carrying French commodities, but being, if not French, of a country of which ships were lawful prize, contrary to the skipper’s original testimony.\textsuperscript{117} Four months later the \textit{Flower de Luce} of Stockholm, master Joachim Burmaster, appears on a list of Swedish owned ships taken by Scottish privateers. The goods onboard the ship belonged to Dutch citizens and the steerman, timmerman and cook were all Dutch. The ship went to France despite the pass stating a different destination (we are not told where). Furthermore, the pass cited salt but the ship was also found to be carrying wine, vinegar and pepper, and never having ‘broke ground’ in

\textsuperscript{115} 5 March 1668, SAUL ms38527/3b/2/7
\textsuperscript{116} Alexander Watson to Ebenezer Watson, Leith, 30 December 1668, SAUL ms38527/1/1/8; two bonds, Alexander Watson for excise on 12 butts and three butts of sec, 1 July 1669, SAUL ms38527/1/2/9. During the 1670s, Alexander appears to have retired, using Andrew as his business agent for his remaining mercantile interests which included shares in ships. C. and P. Martin, ‘Introduction’, SAUL, ms38527, 3
\textsuperscript{117} 22 May 1667, NLS Adv.mss.6.2.1 f 78r
any Swedish harbour.\textsuperscript{118} Although the master of this ship was ultimately not cunning enough to pull off the deception and the ship was caught, both the practices of using neutral shipping and false documentation are demonstrated by this example.

IV. CONCLUSION

The Franco-Stuart wars of 1627-1629 and 1666-1667 were, despite both being fought under Stuart monarchies, markedly different. Yet in many ways the effect they had on Franco-Scottish commerce was similar. In both conflicts Scotland involved herself in many guises; as a nation under duress, as an independent nation pursuing her own agenda, but also through the actions of individuals who saw opportunities to pursue personal profit despite the obstacles ostensibly presented by the wars, whether through commerce or privateering. Many merchants found ways of circumventing embargoes, legislation and dangers at sea. While such methods were utilised, however, there were also merchants who continued to trade in their usual way, with the usual people, despite the ongoing war effort – such activity raising questions about whether the wars can be said to have had any serious effect on these trading links at all. The dedication of Charles I, Charles II, Louis XIII and Louis XIV to the Franco-Stuart wars can and should be questioned, along with their motives. There is little evidence suggesting that either side was determined to pursue a war against the other, particularly during the 1666-1667 conflict, but rather chose to pursue courses of action which they believed would have long-term gain for them – not unlike the merchants we have examined throughout the course of this thesis. Under the Stuart kings, war with France indeed seems to have been half-hearted, and perhaps it is unsurprising that restrictions on trade were overturned by pressure exerted by merchants, or that merchants continued to trade without any demonstrable fear of retribution.

\textsuperscript{118} 26 September 1667, SRA Anglica VII, DXLII, 1660-1670 (unfoliated). Although the Treaty of Breda was signed on 21 July 1667, the restrictions on trade were not lifted until February 1668. Murdoch, \textit{Terror}, 396
CHAPTER SIX

‘I will trade to France, in spite of anybody.’¹

International Conflict and Continuation of Commerce II, 1688-1713

The Stuart monarchy involved itself in multiple European wars during the seventeenth century – throughout all of which Franco-Scottish trade continued to be carried on by merchants, factors and mariners. As the seventeenth century progressed, however, there rose a growing fear of French political and economic hegemony that for many was confirmed by the Treaty of Nijmegen, which ended hostilities between the French and the Dutch in 1678.² This fear was exacerbated by British involvement in the third Anglo-Dutch War (1672-1674) – Charles II, in allying himself with Louis XIV, increased fears across Europe that a papist and arbitrary government would be imposed on Britain with the help of the French King.³ Furthermore, involvement in the Dutch War of 1672-1678 established William of Orange as the chief opponent of France’s ambitions in Europe prior to his acquisition of the British monarchy in the ‘Glorious Revolution’ of 1688-1689.⁴ While the Glorious Revolution was in some ways an internal conflict, as John Brewer has contended, ‘in a wide historical perspective it is arbitrary to make any separation of the Revolution of 1688-1689 from the war which followed’.⁵ Indeed, William immediately became involved in international conflict against France – one of his primary motives in seeking the British thrones. The Glorious Revolution was arguably ‘the untimely upset that wrecked the fine balance of Anglo-Scottish rivalries that had been held in check by their common allegiance to the Stuart monarchy’.⁶ William’s declarations of war on France have been seen not only as detrimental to Scottish trade, but indicative that Scotland’s interests, which had been

¹ Moses Corbett, 1691, CSPD, 1690-1, 479
² G. Howat, Stuart and Cromwellian Foreign Policy (London, 1974) 5
accommodated within ‘the existing framework of independent nations ruled by the
divinely appointed James VII, a sovereign informed in Scottish maritime affairs and
benevolent towards his northern subjects’, were now subsumed into the wider interests
of Britain, dominated by England. Scottish concerns were arguably of secondary
importance for the house of Orange, as the domination of the English Parliament
‘guaranteed the supremacy of the English mercantilist interest in British maritime
affairs’. While once again, historians have been too quick to draw such conclusions,
the shift in dynamic within the British monarchy and the splits it fostered between
Jacobites and Williamites inevitably means that the Nine Years’ War differed in nature
from the earlier, Franco-Stuart wars.

I. THE NINE YEARS’ WAR, 1688-1697
‘All our treasure is stock-jobb’d/While we groan under slav’ry’.9

William’s pursuit of war against France in some ways damaged both Scottish and wider
British commercial interests as war closed British markets to French imports; it being
asserted that direct trade to France was virtually ruined as a result.10 William was
particularly careful to ensure that his commercial foreign policy included keeping
Scotland out of any French alliance – as well as declaring war in Scotland’s name,11 he
ensured that restrictions on commerce, communication and emigration were imposed,
‘discharging all the leidges of his Majesties antient kingdom of Scotland to trade,
corospond or have any intercourse or medling with the said French king or any of his
subjects’.12 The freedom of movement previously enjoyed between the two countries
was curtailed: ‘we have thought fitt to require…all persones during this tyme of warr
who intend to goe out of [Scotland] to apply themselves for passes’.13 Such
declarations, as well as being motivated by war with France, were also undoubtedly

7 Graham, ‘Scottish Maritime Interest’, 90
8 Ibid.
9 A. Lang, ‘Jacobite Songs’ in Scottish Historical Review, VIII (1911) 146
10 F. O’Gorman, The Long Eighteenth Century: British Political and Social History, 1688-1832 (London,
1997) 52-3; T. C. Smout, Scottish Trade on the Eve of Union, 1660-1707 (Edinburgh/London, 1963) 245
11 10 July 1689, RPCS, iii, XIII, 529. This was almost two months after England had declared war on
France on 17 May 1689: J. Cornette, Chronique de Règne de Louis XIV: de la fin de la Fronde à l’aube
des Lumières (Paris, 1997) 370
12 6 August 1689, Edinburgh, RPCS, iii, XIV, 18; This was later reiterated: 22 April 1693, APS, IX,
Appendix, 72; 23 May 1693, 82; 1 July 1695, 111; 2 July 1695, 118
13 4 May 1691, RPCS, iii, XVI, 274; SP, I, 67
precipitated by rebellion against the new monarchy within the British Isles. On 23 April 1689 an embargo [was] laid on all shipes and Barkes within this Kingdome till further order...no shipes or Barkes aforesaid be allowed to sail abroad till they first find cautione to the respective collectors that they shall not goe to France or Ireland.14

The commercial aspect of the Franco-Scottish relationship was specifically targeted, and in May Government officials were authorised to

stay and arrest all...ships and vessels...conveying any goods or merchandize in them belonging to the French King or to his subjects and inhabitants or belonging to any persone within...this kingdome [Scotland].15

The French Trade Bill, November 1690 and the Trade with France Prohibition Act, March 1693, consolidated such embargoes.16 Despite the lack of interest allegedly shown to Scotland by William III, she was nonetheless dragged into international conflict, and the Scottish Privy Council issued their declaration of war on France on 6 August 1689.17 Shortly after this the Council, as ‘William and Mary...have not as yet nominat and appoynted any persone to be Lord High Admirall of this kingdome nor have given orders for commissiones or letter of mart to privat men of warr’, took it upon themselves to issue a commission to Captaine William Burnsyde, to man The Dogarwyne of Edinburgh, and

to take and apprehend, and incaise of resistance to fyre, burne, sink and destroy the ships and goods of the French or Irishes in rebellione against their Majesties...and alse to stay and areist all other ships and vessells of whatsomever other kingdome, countrey, natione of people conveying any goods or merchandise in them belonging to the French king or to his subjects and inhabitants.18

14 22 April 1689, APS, IX, 58
15 RPCS, iii, XVI, 1691, 277; see also CSPD, 1689-1690, 310, 371
16 Historical Manuscripts Commission: Fourteenth Report, The Manuscripts of the House of Lords, 1692-1693 (London, 1894) 384f. Scotland had also to contend with legislation from England, as in 1695 the Navigation Acts were made more stringent, and the penalties for infringement more severe: T. Keith, ‘The Economic Causes for the Scottish Union’ in English Historical Review, XXIV (1909) 47, 54
18 30 May 1689, Edinburgh, RPCS, iii, XIII, 395-6. A commission granted to Captain William Burnsyde and the Dogarvine of Londonderry is recorded on 28 May: 387-8: S. Murdoch, The Terror of the Seas? Scottish Maritime Warfare, 1513-1713 (Ledien, 2010) 398. It is unclear if this is the same ship but it is likely.
This was consolidated in February 1690 by the Privy Council, which granted ‘letters of marque and generall reprizall’ to John Boswell ‘for apprehending ships or goods belonging to the French or Irish’. However, such actions again seem more concerned with countering any possibility of a domestic Jacobite rebellion, rather than embargoes being used as tools of international warfare.

The prohibitions issued during this period, whether as a direct result of international war or not, along with the higher taxation such conflicts inevitably fostered, can (and have) been used to allege that the Franco-Scottish relationship suffered irreparable damage following the Glorious Revolution. War against France has been seen as ‘damning to Scottish shipping and markets’ and Scotland’s continental trade as ‘declining or stagnant’ as war had undermined relations with France and wiped out the special privileges Scotland had enjoyed a hundred years before, under the Auld Alliance. Inevitably William’s French wars, especially when coupled with internal politics and economic difficulties, saw tensions emerge across the British Isles. One popular Jacobite song, while unsurprisingly hostile to William, attests to widespread feeling in Scotland at this time, including the salient lines: ‘And, all our treasure is stock-jobb’d/ While we groan under slav’ry’.

Scotland did in some ways suffer as a result of trading prohibitions. From 1689 Scottish herring and salmon were prohibited from entering France, ‘a great and heavy imposition laid on our native product by the French King’, with one petition from Ayr stating that fishing had been ‘the only subject of our trade’. The need to recruit men
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19 11 February 1690, RPCS, iii, XV, 74-5
21 T. C. Smout, ‘The Road to Union’ in Holmes (ed.), Glorious Revolution, 184, 187
23 Lang, ‘Jacobite Songs’, 146. ‘Our Darien can witness bear/ And so can our Glenco, Sir:/ The South Sea it can make appear/ What to our King we owe, Sir:/ We have been murder’d, starv’d, and rob’d/ By those your kings and knav’ry/ And, all our treasure is stock-jobb’d/ While we groan under slav’ry.’
for the war effort has been seen as particularly damaging as it led to unseasonable patterns of sailing. All trading ships were prevented from leaving port between February and May, and were required to have returned by February the following year. Furthermore, the extent of naval operations meant that there was little protection against privateering available for those merchant ships that did venture out. The Glasgow merchant George Lockhart claimed that he lost his share on 22 ships between 1690 and 1698, and on two more in 1699 and 1700. Several Scottish merchants were taken by French privateers – for example, David and John Williamson, father and son from Kirkcaldy, were captured by a French privateer while bound for Holland in May 1689 and taken to Amiens as prisoners, and the Grangepans skipper Thomas Smith and his seamen were on a voyage from Bo’ness to Rotterdam in May 1689 when they were captured by a Dunkirk privateer and taken to Rochefort.

II. SCOTTISH INDEPENDENCE

‘The Scots had a free trade with France, which I now confirm’. The real extent to which Scotland was ‘dragged’ into a war against her auld ally, however, must be questioned. William acknowledged the damage the war would cause to Scottish trade and in February 1693, while implementing a press for the navy, stated ‘for the security and encouragement of the free trade of Scotland we have ordered that no pressmen seize any seaman on board any ship belonging to Scotland’. The Privy Council had already acted to prevent Scottish merchantmen being pressed, in 1690 granting a protection to David Wood, a Montrose skipper, and his entire crew:

considering that his Majestie...hath recommended to the saids Lords to find out a way for raising a competent number of seamen for his service, being resolved that Scotsmen (if prisoners) shall be equally relieved with the English and that
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25 Jones, War and Economy, 17
26 Ibid.
27 APS ix 49; Smout, Scottish Trade, 69; Murdoch, Terror, 295; T. Keith, Commercial Relations of England and Scotland, 1603-1707 (Cambridge, 1910) 155
28 19 September 1689, RPCS, iii, XIV, 306-7; 11 October 1689: 405. For a detailed account of the actions of privateers during the Nine Years’ War see Murdoch, Terror, Chapter 7.
29 SPD VIII, home office, admiralty, IV, 101, cited in Keith, Commercial Relations, 151-2
30 28 February 1693, CSPD, 1693, 47; A. Little, ‘A Comparative Survey of Scottish Service in the English and Dutch Maritime Communities c. 1650-1707’ in A. Grosjean and S. Murdoch, Scottish Communities Abroad in the Early Modern Period (Leiden, 2005) 343
Scots trading ships shall have protectione on board for preventing their mens being pressed.\textsuperscript{31}

Furthermore, the initial privateering commissions granted to Scots to take French and Irish ships came before the official declaration of war in Scotland, suggesting that some Scots were willing participants in this conflict.\textsuperscript{32} Scotland acted independently during the Nine Years’ War, as she had in conflicts earlier in the century (Chapter 5). Theoretically, commercial activity between all of the British nations and France was prohibited, yet in 1691 the Captain of the \textit{Pembroke}, sent by the lords of the English Admiralty to examine boats suspected of trading with France, observed that

the Scots had a free trade with France, which I now confirm…I heard of one Francis Duncombe, master of the \textit{John}, pink, whom I followed to this place, intending to have examined him, but about twenty of his men presented their arms at me…and farther they told me that free trading was allowed in these parts with France.\textsuperscript{33}

The English were clearly aware of this continuing trade, as they deployed privateers and men-of-war to cruise around the Scottish coasts and arrest ships suspected of trading with France and the American Colonies.\textsuperscript{34}

As in other conflicts, Scots used various methods to continue pursuit of trade, such as using neutral ships, registering their ships as belonging to a neutral country, or carrying falsified documents and passes. The ship the \textit{Maria} registered as a Swedish ship in 1694, despite being owned by a Scot and skippered by Jasper Stewart, a Scottish burgess of Stockholm.\textsuperscript{35} This was specifically to avoid capture by French privateers – Swedish neutrality allowing the ship to sail from Aberdeen to La Rochelle and then on to Sweden.\textsuperscript{36} Not all merchants successfully employed such tactics, however, and it was reported in the \textit{London Gazette} in May 1695 that ‘a Flushing Privateer brought last Tuesday into Leith Road 4 Suedes and Danes laden with Wine, Salt, Brandy and Mollosses from France’.\textsuperscript{37} Yet some Scottish and English merchants, rather than

\begin{footnotes}
\item[31] 11 February 1690, Edinburgh, \textit{RPCS}, iii, XV, 77-78
\item[32] 6 August 1689, Edinburgh, \textit{RPCS}, iii, XIV, 17-18
\item[33] TNA SP32, Home Office, Admiralty, IV, 101, cited in Keith, \textit{Commercial Relations}, 151-3. There were also complaints from England that Scotland was providing victual for the enemy, although the Scots denied this claim.
\item[34] 22 May 1693, \textit{RPCS}, cited in Keith, \textit{Commercial Relations}, 153
\item[36] Murdoch, \textit{Terror}, 312
\item[37] \textit{London Gazette}, 13 May 1695, issue 3079
\end{footnotes}
continuing to adopt covert methods through which to trade, also blatantly disregarded prohibitive legislation. In 1689 the Commissaries of Customs told the Lords of the Treasury that they ‘daily received advice of ships, by art and violence, getting out of port and going to France, without giving security, according to the King’s late order not to go to France, and that there was a great number of English shipping then at Bourdeaux’.

In London in June and July 1695, it was reported that the Rupert brought in a vessel to London ‘laden with salt from France’, with no indication here that this was contrary to legislation.

Assertions that ‘Franco-Scottish trade…was decisively brought to an end in 1689 by the Glorious Revolution’ require qualification, particularly when the openness with which many individuals continued to pursue commerce – often with government knowledge and consent – is considered. In 1690 Sir John Hall of Dunglass, Lord Provost of Edinburgh, petitioned on behalf of the royal burghs of Scotland for the return of

several charters of the Great Council of France and decreets of the Parliament of Rouen, containing exemptions and privileges in favour of Scottish merchants in the kingdom of France and duchy of Normandy, which have been allwayes keepe in a particular shuttle of the chartor chist of the town of Edinburgh and were taken out to be advised in order to the borrowes sending one in their name to the king’s ambassador at Paris for continueing and renewing these privileidges.

The House of Lords returned these charters to the petitioner, knowing they would be used to facilitate French trade. In January 1692 six passes were issued by the Scottish Privy Council for five Glasgow ships and one Leith ship to travel from Scotland to Bordeaux to trade, although only for authorised goods. These passes were granted just three years after William and Mary consolidated their power in Britain, suggesting that despite William’s political and religious grievances with France, he recognised the importance of the continuation of trade. France treated Scotland as an independent nation during this conflict, not always subjecting her auld ally to the legislation that was put in place against her southern neighbour. The Admiralty of La Rochelle issued an ordinance in 1690 concerning the opening and closing of ports, reporting a ‘Lettre de

38 30 March 1689, CTP, I, 34
39 A Collection for Improvement of Husbandry and Trade, London, issue 153, 5 July 1695
40 Smout, Scottish Trade, 168
41 RPCS, iii, XV, 125; Murdoch, ‘French Connection’, 35
42 13 January 1692, SP, I, 67
Seignelay interdisant aux vaisseaux anglais, hollandaise et de la Flandre espagnols de sortir des ports de France sans avoir chargé des denrées ou marchandises de France’, but placing no similar stipulation on the Scots or Irish. In November 1691 a French merchant in La Rochelle, Abraham Duport, petitioned the Admiralty of that town for a passport for John Broune, commander of the Scottish ship the Jean of Pittenweem, to travel from La Rochelle to Scotland – the passport was granted on 22 November. Throughout the 1690s both Scottish and Irish ships were continually granted passes in the port of La Rochelle. In May 1692 the Scot Edmond Gould was granted a passport for the Poste, to pass through La Rochelle on his way to Norway. The owner of the Jacques (Charles Cahell) applied for a passport to go to Scotland in July, and in October and November three Scottish ships, the Concorde (Robert Mackarel), the Marguerite of Glasgow (also owned by Charles Cahell) and the Jacques of Leith once more registered passports for voyages from La Rochelle to Scotland. Robert Mackarel appears again in December, registering a passport for the Providence, bound for Scotland, and James Dallein, master of the Elizabeth of Glasgow, arrived from Scotland on 14 December 1692. Records from this port for 1695 demonstrate further that the French authorities continued to allow both Scottish and Irish trade, but seemingly no English; in this calendar year, 15 passports were granted to British ships, with 12 of those being Scottish and the remaining three Irish (Appendix VI.i). Certainly, the port of La Rochelle enjoyed the continuing presence of Scottish merchants throughout the period, with Michel and Jean Jolly appearing consistently between 1676 and 1698 in the records of the Cour du Gouvernement, Sénéchaussée et Présidial de la Rochelle. This corroborates some merchant trading patterns examined in Chapter 3, although there are also some anomalies. Several individuals owned more than one of the ships being
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43 1690, ADCM, B5630. In the same documentation, an ordonnance ‘permettant la sortie des bâtiments portant marchandises ou munitions en Irlande’ was issued, demonstrating the continuing support offered by France to the Irish Jacobites. Jean-Baptiste Colbert, Marquis du Seignelay, was the eldest son of Jean-Baptiste Colbert, French minister of finance (Chapter 4). He was named Navy Secretary on the death of his father in 1683, a post he held until his death in November 1690.
44 2 November 1691, ADCM, B5688/51
45 28 May 1682, ADCM, B5688/85
46 2 July; 27 October, 5 November, 5 November 1692, ADCM, B5688/113-114, 177, 179-180
47 9 December, 14 December 1692, ADCM, B5688/195, 207
48 15 January-3 December 1695, ADCM B5691/57-90
49 ADCM, 1676, B1382; 1688-1689, B1615; 1697-1698, B1393. Detailed research has recently been undertaken by Dr Kathrin Zickermann (St Andrews) into the European business networks of the Jolly family, particularly Robert and Alexander Jolly in North-West Germany and Northern Europe. K. Zickermann, ‘Across the German Sea: Scottish Commodity Exchange, Network Building and Communities in the Wider Elbe-Weser Region in the Early Modern Period’ (unpublished Ph.D thesis, University of St Andrews, 2009) Chapter 2, esp. 86
granted passports in this year – Daniel Masson, Jean Mackarel\(^{50}\) and Abraham Duport being particularly prolific, supporting the notion that those involved in commerce tended to spread their interest as insurance against loss. However, from this data it appears that the France-based Scots and Irish employed several different commanders, rather than using the same individuals they knew and trusted. It is of course possible that these individuals were employed on a regular basis, but evidence pertaining to these patterns has yet to be uncovered.

La Rochelle was not an anomaly; the records of other west coast French ports corroborate this evidence and the records for the Bordeaux region are particularly revealing. Throughout the 1690s numerous Scottish ships are recorded being granted permission by the Admiralty of Guyenne to pass through this port (Appendix VI.ii).\(^{51}\) In contrast to La Rochelle, however, English activity can also be detected. Between 1688 and 1697, many English ships were also accorded passports by the Admiralty of Guyenne (Appendix VI.iii).\(^{52}\) However, the times at which they were active differ markedly from the patterns of Scottish or Irish activity, as demonstrated by Figure 6.1. First, the majority of English cases fall during the year 1689, with no passports being recorded as being granted to English ships between July 1692 and April 1696. This suggests either that English merchants honoured the embargo, or that French authorities were effective in implementing it against them. The Scottish cases, however, occur between 1691 and 1696 – Scottish merchants perhaps recognising that the lack of English trade under the embargo left a vacuum for them to fill. Moreover, the French authorities condoned this trade, highlighting the independence afforded by the French to Scottish activity during this conflict.

\(^{50}\) Jean Mackarel is elsewhere recorded as Irish, although here he was explicitly freighting ships for Scotland, as was Robert Mackarel above, who we can speculate was a relation. AN Marine B\(^{7}\) 505/351, n.d., concerning the ships La Fortune of Dublin, ‘capitaine Jean White, armé par Jean Mackarel, marchand Irlandais établi à la Rochelle’. This ship was under investigation for transporting Protestants. White appears again under the same charges: AN Marine B\(^{7}\) 505/353, 4 August 1699.

\(^{51}\) ADG 6 B 75-7. The original sources have been checked for accuracy, but the majority of this data has been taken from the following database: http://bd.archivescanadafrance.org/sdx-222-acf-pleade-2/acf/home.shtm

\(^{52}\) ADG 6 B 73-7; http://bd.archivescanadafrance.org/sdx-222-acf-pleade-2/acf/home.shtm
The special treatment granted to Scots by the French can be gleaned from records of prizes taken during the course of the Nine Years’ War. Prizes brought into Le Havre between 1692-1697 register no Scottish or Irish ships being captured, but include English (Appendix VI.iv).\(^{53}\) Similarly, records for prizes taken into Nantes by *corsaires* between 1689 and 1691 include several English ships but no Scots or Irish.\(^{54}\) The Scottish port records corroborate the continuation of trade despite the embargo on shipping to France laid on 23 April 1689.\(^{55}\) This embargo, however, only prohibited shipping to France (or Ireland) – to prevent the transportation of Jacobite rebels – and merchants were still able to bring wines into Scotland. Edward Burd brought the *George* of Edinburgh into Leith in May 1689, and the collectors of Customs and Foreign Excise noted ships bringing in merchandise from France after the prohibition on shipping was implemented.\(^{56}\) However, a second embargo laid in 1691 was more

\(^{53}\) 1691-1697, ADSM, 216 BP 316
\(^{54}\) 1689-91, ADLA B 4887
\(^{55}\) 23 April 1689, *APS*, IX, 58. The transportation of people to France was forbidden: 31 October 1689, *CSPD*, 1689-1690, 310: ‘I hope the example of Joyce, who is sent for in custody, will be a warning to all others concerned to be more faithful and diligent in securing the passage and I should be glad to be informed by you what is the best course to be taken with those who pursue a trade in carrying persons to France, who have no allowance to go’; 28 December 1689, 371: ‘Warrant for the apprehension of [blank] Montuke and [blank] Glendenny, masters of a vessel, for sedition and treasonable practices against the Government in conveying away several dangerous and disaffected persons into France’.
\(^{56}\) NAS E72/15/42; NAS E73/66, folders 1 and 2. See also E73/88/6-7
emphatic, and in May Ninian Gibsone, Glasgow merchant and captain of the *Lamb*, was granted a commission to ‘arrest all other ships and vessels of whatsoever other kingdom, country, nation or people, conveying any goods or merchandize in them belonging to the French King or to his subjects’. This embargo was likely the reason that the Admiralty of Guyenne stopped granting passes to English ships in this year, although they had allowed English merchants to trade in the Guyenne ports during the first two years of the war. Scots, however, continued to trade after 1691. Two months after the embargo was laid, Robert Watson brought into Leith on the *Constantina* of Copenhagen, coming from Bilbao, 110 tuns and 2 hogsheads of French wine. William Wemyss, in the *Pearle* of London, brought in 26 tuns of French wine ‘conforme to the Lords of Thesirii ther order’, and in September several merchants are recorded bringing in French wine – one of these being George Clark in the *Golden Flight* of Stockholm, with 88 tuns. Scottish merchants continued to pursue trade with France despite official prohibitions, often with consent of authorities who granted them passes with which to do so, and this was a pattern repeated under Queen Anne.

III. THE WAR OF THE SPANISH SUCCESSION: 1702-1713

‘The Peace of Ryswick began the ruin of the flourishing trade established by Colbert, and the War of Succession completed it.’

Scotland once again became involved in war against France through British participation in the War of the Spanish Succession. Even before war had been officially declared both Scotland and France had begun to lay impositions on each other’s commerce. Following discussions throughout December, in January 1701 the Scottish Parliament issued an ‘Act Dischargeing Wine Brandie and all other Liquors of the growth of France’, declaring a prohibition on

the importation of all French wines, Brandie and other strong waters and vinegar made in France from any place whatsoever; the brandie strong waters and
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57 4 May 1691, *RPCS*, XVI, 276-8
58 Some English merchants were given passports after this date – some passes were granted in 1690, 1692, 1696 and 1697, but were far fewer in number than those granted to the Scots.
59 NAS E72/15/51, 1
60 Voltaire (M. Pollock, trans.), *The Age of Louis XIV* (London, 1958) 334
vinegar from and after the first day of May next and all other wine from and after the first day of October next to come.  

This proclamation was largely retaliatory, being as it was expressly to remain in force ‘while the same liberties and immunities be granted to herrings and all other goods exported from this Kingdom into France and the same freedom and immunities granted to Scots ships sailing thither that any other Nation enjoy in that Kingdom’. In September of the same year, the French issued an arrêt preventing the importation of alcohol, textiles, and metal from Great Britain and placed greater impositions on goods ‘du crû et fabrique d’angleterre, Écosse, Irlande et pays en dépendent’. News of this imposition and its perceived impact on trade travelled quickly throughout Scotland, and Charles Lord Yester wrote to his father John, second Marquess of Tweeddale, on the 23 September stating ‘as of the project you write off, about our trade with France, I believe it wil come to nothing; for, by the accounts we have in the last publick news, the King of France seems to have discharged all trade with Brittain’. On 11 April 1702, a month before war was officially declared, the French issued an arrêt preventing the entry of any manufactures from England, Scotland or Ireland. War was declared in May, Scotland’s declaration being made by the Privy Council just over one week after that of England. The following month Britain imposed an additional duty on French goods, which was reported in London in June 1702, and shortly afterwards all trade with France was prohibited. On 28 August 1703 the French Council of Commerce issued an arrêt prohibiting trade with all enemy powers – England, its dependencies, Holland and Germany. Moreover, even after the Treaty of Utrecht had been agreed in March/April 1713, British ships still encountered some problems in renewing their trade with France, as
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a great many of our Merchant Ships are arrived at Rochel, Bourdeaux, Natz, and other Harbours of France; but being ordered to keep at a certain Distance from the Harbour for 30 or 40 Days, the Chamber of Commerce have writ to the Intendants, representing the Prejudice which will thereby accrue to Trade.\(^\text{70}\)

In some respects, the impact of Anne’s French war was similar to that of William’s – particularly in the problems it created for merchants through unseasonal sailings, delays and insufficiency of protection for shipping.\(^\text{71}\) Yet Scotland again remained a distinctly separate player in this conflict, and neither Scottish nor French authorities fully implemented trade embargoes. French privateers have been seen as particularly injurious and there were instances in which Scottish ships were taken.\(^\text{72}\)

However, the impact of such activity on Scottish overseas commerce has recently been re-investigated, and Steve Murdoch has demonstrated that the ‘suffering’ of the Scots at the hands of the French was nothing like as catastrophic as has been previously suggested.\(^\text{73}\) Some staggering figures for British captures were reported in London. In 1704 Daniel Defoe’s the *Review of the Affairs of France* reported that ‘in general, our Trade has thriven upon the War, notwithstanding I compute above 30 Millions Sterling lost at Sea, by French Privateers’.\(^\text{74}\) It was the English, however, who appeared to suffer the greatest losses at the hands of the French, again suggesting that Scottish merchants received special consideration in comparison. A London pamphlet from 1701 declared:

> they know very little of Trade, who are ignorant that the greatest advantage the French gain of us in a War, is in their Privateers surprising so many of our Merchant Ships, which can never be avoided in a War, because of the great quantity of Shipping we employ in every corner of the Seas, and the Impossibility of assigning Convoys to every Part of the World. Some have affirm’d, how true I know not, that during the last War they took Three

\(^{70}\) *Flying Post or the Post Master*, London, 18 June 1713, issue 3390. A copy of the treaty suspending arms between France and England in 1713 can be found at ADLA C 690

\(^{71}\) Jones, *War and Economy*, 161

\(^{72}\) Petition to the Convention of Royal Burghs from James Cuming, Edinburgh, whose ship was left by its convoy and taken by French privateers. 12 July 1709, Edinburgh, IV, *CRB*, 489. That there was a convoy in place at all testifies that institutions in Scotland permitted this trade to continue. See also the case of the *Eagle Galley* of Aberdeen, taken on a return voyage from Liborne by a French privateer from St Malos: 4 September 1706, ACA, Propinquity Book II (unfoliated); or the case of the Anna of Pittenweem, taken off the coast of Aberdeen by a French privateer, *l’Amazon* of Calais in August 1705 and ransomed for 5094 livres (£310/£354 8s 4d sterling): ACA, Propinquity Book I, f 169, 170, 172 – for the latter case see also Murdoch, *Terror*, 301. Murdoch notes that the transaction that took place to pay the ransom was facilitated by Scottish factors in France. Trade with the Northern Isles was disrupted; Smith, *Shetland Life and Trade*, 37-8. See 29 July 1690, Edinburgh, *RPCS* iii XV 338-9.


\(^{74}\) *Review of the Affairs of France*, London, 19 December 1704, issue 83
Thousand Sail of our Ships, and the loss to the English has been Computed at Twenty Million.  

IV. RELAXATION OF LEGISLATION

‘All laws prohibiting the importation of any goods from France should be repealed’.  

Often, both merchants and authorities failed to adhere to the embargos implemented during this conflict, and on some occasions prohibitions were revoked from an early point in the war. Just a week before war was declared by Scotland, and just after war had been declared by England, a renewed Franco-Scottish alliance was being considered. On 5 May 1702, in a letter to Caspar Frederick Henning, one J.G. wrote from Paris that: ‘depuis Mecredy la Cour est à Marly où l’on delibere actuellement sur l’alliance entre la France et l’Ecosse, et sur les moyens d’engager les Escosais dans l’Interest de la France.’ This did not come to fruition, but actions on the part of both the Scottish and French throughout a time of ostensible conflict highlight a desire to prolong the commercial relationship. Despite the arrêt they had issued on 28 August 1703 the French Council of Commerce announced shortly afterwards that they were re-opening trade with Scotland and Ireland, and was soon flooded with requests for passports from Frenchmen and from Irish and Scottish merchants residing in French ports. The Scottish Wine Act of 1703 rescinded all previous legislation concerning the importation of French wine – in direct contravention of the economic blockade that was a key strategy in the Crown’s war effort against the French. This act benefited the

75 Anon., Reasons against a war with France or an argument shewing that the French King’s Owning the Prince of Wales as King of England, Scotland and Ireland; is no Sufficient Ground of a War (London, 1701), TNA SP9/248, 12-13. Complaints of Scottish merchants can be found directed at the behaviour of English ships, rather than French. During the War of the Spanish Succession some Edinburgh merchants petitioned Queen Anne complaining of Scottish vessels being stopped and seized by English ships under fabricated claims that they were bound for France – even though the Scots could prove that they had in fact been freighted for Lisbon. n.d., c. 1702-1707; NAS, PA7/21, f196; Murdoch, Terror, 322 n.199. Indeed, Isobel Grant has suggested that ‘as far as the Scots were concerned, the worst offenders in terms of piracy were the English’, and routes to France and the Netherlands were particularly liable to attack. Between 1569-87 £20,717 worth of goods were taken from the Scots, of which £15,974 remained un-restored. I. Grant, Social and Economic Development in Scotland Before 1603 (Edinburgh/London, 1930) 344; see also T. Pagan, The Convention of the Royal Burghs of Scotland (Glasgow, 1926) 159, who argues that the Convention fitted out planned expeditions against the English, using up their resources and Keith, ‘Economic Causes’, 51

76 Historical Manuscripts Commission, Report on the Manuscripts of Lord Polwarth, 3 volumes (London, 1911-1931) I, 9-10, George Baillie of Jerviswood to Marchmont, 16 May 1713

77 J.G. to Caspar Frederick Henning in London, 5 May 1702, Paris, TNA SP78/153/72. This could perhaps be James Gordon, although this is pure speculation.

78 Schaeper, Council of Commerce, 113

79 Whatley, Scots and the Union, 200; Murdoch, ‘French Connection’, 37; Graham, ‘Scottish Maritime Interest’, 103
Treasury through increased import duties, but also legalised practices merchants were already pursuing. In February 1706 Captain Archibald Cockburn of Edinburgh, Daniel Masson of St Martins and Alexander Young of St Martins brought a case to the Admiralty Court against George Gordon in Leith, formerly of Bordeaux, representing the Bordeaux merchant Samuel Martin and Peter Lawson, master of the *St Anne* of Bergen. They claimed £13,026 Scots for ‘tonnage for fourty tuns claret wyne from Bordeaux to Leith’. From the moment they declared war, Scotland asserted her independence from England, Parliament refusing to augment the tariffs on merchandises coming in from France despite urgent requests from Queen Anne to do so. The French Council continued to grant passports to Scottish vessels and by 1706 permitted direct trade with England, thus pursuing trade not only with her auld ally but also her erstwhile enemy. In 1708 and 1710, the Lord High Admiral of Great Britain ordered all ‘captains and commanders of her Majesty’s ships and vessels, as also all persons who now have, or shall have private commissions or letters of Marque, not to molest any of the fishing vessels belonging to the subjects of France’ – part of a reciprocal agreement with the French. On 15 March 1711, two years before the Treaty of Utrecht, the British Parliament formally allowed the importation of French wine in neutral vessels. Suggestions were being made in London by the end of the conflict in 1713 that ‘all laws made in Great Britain since the year 1664 prohibiting the importation of any goods from France [should] be repealed’.
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80 Whatley, *Scots and the Union*, 199. Some remained unconvinced that a move towards France would be of any assistance, claiming that exports of salmon, herring, butter and beef to France were not as beneficial as had previously been believed and that the cost of importing French wine would not be balanced. ‘Philopatris’ to the Duke of Hamilton, 1703, NAS GD406/1/5217; Whatley, *Scots and the Union*, 200.

81 15 February 1706, Edinburgh, NAS AC13/1, 40, 259. This Daniel Masson is almost certainly the same individual trading in La Rochelle and St Martins during the Nine Years’ War.

82 H. Sée and A. Cormack, ‘Commercial Relations between France and Scotland in 1707’ in *Scottish Historical Review*, XXIII (1926) 276. This split was recognised immediately in Britain. In November 1701, six months before war was officially declared, a report in a London newspaper advertised a new publication: *The dangers of Europe, From the Growing Power of France. With some Free Thoughts on Remedies. And particularly on the Cure of our Divisions at Home: In Order to a Successful War Abroad, against the French King and his Allies: Flying Post or the Post Master*, London, 29 November 1701, issue 1025 [my emphasis]

83 They also offered a similar favour to the Dutch. Sée and Cormack, ‘Commercial Relations’, 275

84 Schaeper, *French Council of Commerce*, 114

85 11 May 1708, TNA, HCA 26/13; Murdoch, *Terror*, 307; *London Gazette*, 10 May 1708, 7 September 1710, issue 4741. It has been argued that from 1710 the tenor of the war changed and conditions more favourable to peace began to emerge. Cornette, *Chronique*, 517

86 Schaeper, *The French Council of Commerce*, 131; Levasseur, *Histoire*, 406; George Baillie of Jerviswood to Marchmont, 16 May 1713, Historical Manuscripts Commission, *Polwarth*, I, 9-10. Schaeper includes an assessment that even though these wines were still subject to the high import duties implemented in the 1690s, many Englishmen were becoming tired of inferior and unfamiliar wines from
V. CONTINUATION OF COMMERCE

“They left in Bordeaux several sail of Scotch ships, which were taking in their lading.”87

This conflict again saw Scots receive special treatment from the French in comparison to their English and Irish counterparts. ‘Prizes and ransoms’ recorded by the Admiralty of Le Havre detailing during the 1700s denote a high percentage of English and several Irish cases, but no Scots:88

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Total Cases Recorded</th>
<th>English/%</th>
<th>Irish/%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1704</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5/36%</td>
<td>1/7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1705</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1706</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1/33%</td>
<td>1/33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1709-1710</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1/50%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6.1 Prises et rançons, Le Havre, 1704-1710

Similarly, prizes recorded by the Admiralty of Dieppe from 1702-1705 included many English ships, but only one Irish (in 1705) and no Scots.89 This seems to have been reciprocated, as in 1702 the French closed ports between Dunkirk and Bayonne because of ‘un grand nombre de frigates et autres vaisseaux des ports d’Angleterre et de Hollande, pour croiser sur les côtes de son royaume et enlever les vaisseaux marchands, barques et autres bâtiments qui y naviguent’, but not mentioning any similar Scottish activity.90 The Irish, despite losing some ships to the French, continued their trade, and the Repertoir des conges par l’éstranger for Nantes from 1707-1710 shows a high rate of Irish merchant activity within this port:91

Portugal, Spain and Italy and so were willing to pay higher prices for the French product. Schaeper, French Council of Commerce, 131; Chapter 2.

87 The Post-Man and the Historical Account, London, 20 January 1705, issue 1366
88 1704-1710, Archives Départementales de Seine-Maritime, Rouen [hereafter ADSM] 216 BP 317
89 1702-1705, ADSM 214 BP 12-15
90 1702, ADCM B62/118
91 ADLA B4725. It should be noted that of these ‘Scottish cases’, the first, from 7 November 1708, involves Thomas Harper, of l’aventure de Glasco, 70tx, for Glasgow; the second is again mastered by Thomas Harper, this time on the Jan de Glasco, 30tx, but bound for Dublin. J. S. Bromley notes that trade with Scotland and Ireland did not disappear during the war. He calculates that between 1707 and 1710 174 Irish ships entered Bordeaux, 164 La Rochelle, and 164 Nantes. J. Bromley, ‘Le Commerce de la France de l’ouest et la Guerre Maritime’ in Annales du Midi, LXV (1953) 64 n.68; Schaeper, French Council of Commerce, 142 n.35. In Table 6.2 ‘Other’ includes ships from various countries, predominantly the Scandinavian nations and Spain, but no ships are recorded as being from England.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Dutch</th>
<th>Irish</th>
<th>Scottish</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1707 (April-Dec)</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1708 (Jan-Dec)</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1709 (Jan-Dec)</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1710 (Jan-Feb)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6.2  
*Repertoir des conges par l’étranger, Nantes, 1707-1710*

The Scots that were taken by the French in this period appear to have been those engaging in trade not between Scotland and France, but elsewhere in Europe. For example the *Helen* of Dunbar, skippered by John Ferguson, was taken by a French privateer in 1704 while returning from Stavenger with timber.\(^{92}\) The *Henrietta* of Bo’ness, skippered by Duncan Finlayson, was captured by a French privateer in 1710 and taken to Calais while *en route* from Holland.\(^{93}\) Such occurrences perhaps suggest that it was trade with Scotland, rather than merchant Scots themselves, who enjoyed special treatment. It is interesting that despite the Baltic convoy apparently being targeted by the French, the Scots continued to employ methods such as using neutral shipping or disguising their own ships as neutral in order to circumvent trade embargoes.\(^{94}\) English merchants also used this tactic. In June 1707 *The Little Jacob*, ‘of and for Stockholm’, Jacob Gentleman master, laden with salt from La Rochelle, was reported arriving in Falmouth – Gentleman presumably using a Stockholm ship (or a ship he was claiming to be from Stockholm) in order to facilitate trade to London in Rochelle salt.\(^{95}\)

However, such caution was not always necessary for the Scots and Irish (and indeed, may well have backfired), for often the French authorities not only overlooked but authorised this continuing commerce. It has been calculated that between 1702 and 1712, 109 Scottish and 387 Irish ships entered Bordeaux with Council of Commerce passports,\(^{96}\) although the records of the Admiralty of Guyenne record only three

---

\(^{92}\) Murdoch, *Terror*, 404

\(^{93}\) Ibid, 406

\(^{94}\) Murdoch, *Terror*, 310-6; Smout, *Scottish Trade*, 65, 69

\(^{95}\) *The Daily Courant*, London, 5-6 June 1707, issue 1661. On 6 June, the report states that ‘she has been plunder’d by 4 French Privateers of 26, 18, 14 and 12 guns’.

\(^{96}\) Schaeper, *French Council of Commerce*, 142 n 35
Scottish ships being granted passports to trade through Bordeaux between 1702 and 1713.\textsuperscript{97}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document Ref (ADG)</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Master of Ship</th>
<th>Name of Ship</th>
<th>Tonnage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6B 79 187-187v</td>
<td>1702</td>
<td>Daniel Feur</td>
<td>la Marguerite</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6B 79 188-188v</td>
<td>1702</td>
<td>Daniel George</td>
<td>le Diligent</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6B 82 223v-225</td>
<td>1706</td>
<td>Robert Kay (Écossais habitant Bordeaux)</td>
<td>Vigilent de Bordeaux</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6.3 \textit{Passeports et soumissions, Amirauté de Guyenne, 1702-1706}

In 1705 information circulated in London that the Prince of Flushing, who had come into Falmouth with a Dutch ship as prize, laden with wine and brandy from Bordeaux, had ‘left in that Port several sail of Dutch, Irish and Scotch ships, which were taking in their lading’.\textsuperscript{98} Far from attempting to stem this trade, Queen Anne earned herself a reputation amongst Scottish authorities for granting passes that allowed merchants to continue. In August 1705, James Ogilvy, the Earl of Seafield, wrote that

other is a letter from the Council too her Majestie sent to Sir David Nairn, advising the granting of passes to Scots ships for ther securitie in ther tread with France and Spain, this being agreeable too the treatie with the States of Holand. Without wee had done this, the merchants wer to have applyed to the Parlament, so wee thought it better to send this letter, which, wee hope, will be granted.\textsuperscript{99}

Precedent for passes being granted perhaps encouraged a group of Edinburgh merchants to petition the Queen in September:

during the time of war for carrying on their said trade…request that passes be granted by her Majestie to the subjects of this Kingdome trading to France and Spain and that her Majesty may be pleased to give such orders as shall protect them in their said trade as well against her Majesties ships of war and privateers as those of her allies.\textsuperscript{100}

\textsuperscript{97} ADG 6 B 79, 82. While large samples of the original sources have been checked for accuracy, the majority of this data has been taken from the following database: http://bd.archivescanadafrance.org/sdx-222-acf-pleade-2/acf/home.shtm
\textsuperscript{98} The Post-Man and the Historical Account, London, 20 January 1705, issue 1366
\textsuperscript{99} Letter from James Ogilvy, first earl of Seafield, 26 August 1705, Edinburgh, Seafield, 77
\textsuperscript{100} 14 September 1705, APS, XI, 247
In October, reports continued to circulate in London that ‘the Franchises of the Fair of Bordeaux have been extended to the last day of Novemb., a month more than they used to be, in favour of the Dutch and Scotch Ships that shall come there to lade Goods of the Growth or Manufacture of this Kingdom’.\(^{101}\)

Despite official prohibitions the French, Scots and even the English recognised the benefits of allowing participation in this trade to continue. In January 1709 a petition was brought to the Lord High Treasurer by merchants trading to Portugal, Spain and Italy, complaining of a proposal brought by merchants in Virginia and Maryland asking for liberty to export tobacco, plantation goods and British manufactures to France in neutral ships and in return to import wine from France. The petition had initially gone to the Commissaries of Customs, who

were of opinion that though the trade of Portugal, Spain and the Straits was very beneficial to Great Britain, and ought by all means to be encouraged, yet that the enlarging the vent of the plantation goods and British manufactures, would be a further advantage to the nation; even on the supposition that some French wines might be imported in return for such goods.\(^{102}\)

The Treasury concluded that they were not qualified to determine ‘whether this advantage were of importance enough to open any trade with France at this time’, which ‘was a subject for much higher consideration than for this Board’.\(^{103}\) However, they were clearly of the opinion that allowing French wines to enter Great Britain was a reasonable price to pay for the expansion of the Plantation Trade.

Given the willingness on both sides of the Channel to relax and even ignore trading embargoes, it is perhaps unsurprising that Franco-Scottish commerce continued regardless of initial legislation. Certainly, suggestions that the leading Scottish factors left Bordeaux eighteen months after the War of the Spanish Succession broke out in 1702 because they no longer had any business in France are misleading.\(^{104}\) Despite the threatened punishments that would be administered to any Scot found trading with France – including the death penalty – trade with Bordeaux and other French ports continued. In February 1706 Robert Arbuthnot wrote to Henri François d’Aguesseau, the procurator fiscal in France, concerning the continuation of Franco-Scottish

\(^{101}\) Post Man and the Historical Account, London, 26 October 1705, issue 1548, Paris
\(^{102}\) 20 January 1708/9, CTP, IV, 90-1
\(^{103}\) Ibid.
\(^{104}\) Smout, Scottish Trade, 66; this has now been refuted by Murdoch, ‘French Connection’, passim; Murdoch, Terror, 310-6. See 17 December 1707, NAS CS96/3074; 27 February 1723, NAS RH15/32/21; SP, III, 305
commerce – and one month later his kinsman Thomas is registered entering the port of Dieppe.\textsuperscript{105} From 15 March 1711, as mentioned above, the British Parliament formally allowed the importation of French wine, although other commodities were also permitted to pass, including stockings, herring and various cloth as an account book of an anonymous Edinburgh merchant testifies.\textsuperscript{106} In 1712 a transaction for the sale of salmon and grilse from James Menzies of Pitfoddels, merchant in Aberdeen, was carried out in Dieppe through James Arbuthnot (possibly a relative of Thomas), despite peace not being declared until the following year.\textsuperscript{107} By the beginning of 1713 (before the Treaty of Utrecht came into force) reports were coming from England of ships from France entering British ports, these occurrences being reported strikingly matter-of-factly.\textsuperscript{108} On 16 May 1713 Robert Arbuthnot wrote to James Menzies of the ‘miserable market’ for salmon in Rouen, but attributed this to ‘the bad condition your salmond came to france in’ rather than the ongoing conflict.\textsuperscript{109} The account books of William Russell and Company, merchants in Wigtown, denote trading with various destinations in Holland, Norway, England and Scotland but also with Nantes and Rouen, throughout the 1700s.\textsuperscript{110}

Concern for trade and the improvement of the nation did not seem to have featured at the forefront of merchants’ considerations throughout these periods of conflict. Instead, their concern was often with their families. A letter from John Barclay in Peterhead to his wife at Buthlaw talks of the return of a C. Gordon with a Scots wine-ship under his convoy, and a ‘little French privateer’ with six guns that he had taken. The tenor in which this is reported suggests that this forms only a small part of his interest and concern, the letter beginning by reporting that ‘Megie being so very ill, as I found her; though I hope is it only a feaver of cold’ and ending by stressing ‘I extremely long for your return, tho I cannot premise to goe for you…And the morrow being

\textsuperscript{105} 5 February 1706, AN B' 504/213; 1 March 1706, ADSM, 214 BP 4, 160v
\textsuperscript{106} 1711, NAS RH9/1/200 passim (unpaginated)
\textsuperscript{107} 1712, Rouen, NAS GD237/11/108/29
\textsuperscript{109} Robert Arbuthnot to [James Menzies of Pitfoddells], 16 May 1713, Rouen, NAS GD237/11/108/29
\textsuperscript{110} 1701-1704, NAS CS96/1145-1150/3. The Letter-Book of John Stuart of Inverness also demonstrates the continuation of trade beyond the end of the War of the Spanish Succession. His correspondence shows continuing commercial links between Scotland and France until 1729, but also shows the continuing presence of Scottish merchant families in France – in this instance, the Gordons in Bordeaux. W. Mackay (ed.), The Letter-Book of Bailie John Steuart of Inverness, 1715-1752 (Edinburgh, 1915) esp. 8-9, 12-15, 18-19, 146-7, 190, 243-4, 294-5, 343-4
Satunnday, you cannot readily expect me, thos I incessantly expect you’.\textsuperscript{111} In this case, Barclay is demonstrably more concerned with the health of his family and seeing his wife than with the wine trade or with privateering. In fact, the way in which he describes the privateer brought in by two earls, who ‘were nobly intertain’d, for above ane hour’s time’, speaking of ‘21 great shot’ and ‘noise of great guns’, suggests that these occurrences were viewed as everyday rather than extraordinary, as part of the normal course of business.

Furthermore, political affiliations do not appear to have interfered with commercial exchange between France and the British nations, despite claims that ‘political affiliations were significant for the trading classes’.\textsuperscript{112} While ports such as Bordeaux and La Rochelle have often been thought of as Jacobite, Hanoverians were also present, and it is now clear that those of both Whig and Tory persuasion settled in France during the Jacobite period.\textsuperscript{113} The Old Pretender himself declared in 1718 ‘God forgive our Whigs on this side of the sea’.\textsuperscript{114} Business dealings of several Jacobite commercial agents suggest how little some involved in Franco-Scottish trade cared about political affiliations. The Earl of Mar – ‘Bobbing John’ – dealt with both Robert Arbuthnot and Robert Gordon after beginning to act for the Stuart cause. However, while Mar was still working for the British government – and before he offered his allegiance to George I – he had already been trading with Arbuthnot. In March 1716 Mar wrote to Arbuthnot from Paris that

\begin{quote}
I wish I had been to drink the wine you were sending me on the other side… the thin wines here do not agree with my stomach for constant drinking, so I want some good old claret very much, which is not to be got here, and I wish you could find me a way of sending me some soon.\textsuperscript{115}
\end{quote}

Thomas and James Arbuthnot were not alone among Robert’s brothers to continue trading with France during the War of the Spanish succession. Their half-brother George, baptised in 1688, was a career officer in Queen Anne’s army. After Anne’s death, however, he remained in France and worked as a wine merchant, before later returning to Hanoverian Britain and trading on London East India Company ships to

\textsuperscript{111} John Barclay to Mrs. Barclay, 15 June 1705, Peterhead, AUSC ms 1160/4/2
\textsuperscript{113} Campbell to Mar, 12 November 1717, SP, V, 194; Mr Brady to James III, 14 August 1716, SP, II, 346
\textsuperscript{114} James III to Dillon, 7 January 1718, SP, V, 373
\textsuperscript{115} Duke of Mar to Robert Arbuthnot, 15 March 1716, Paris, SP, II, 16-17
China. Ultimately, neither merchants nor authorities appear to have discriminated based on political affiliation. Rather, it seems that more importance was placed on nationality.

VI. CONCLUSION

Scottish merchants continued to pursue trade with France throughout the international conflicts of the seventeenth century, whether under a Stuart, Orange or Hanoverian regime. Moreover, while some clandestine tactics were adopted many merchants traded openly with their ‘enemy’ and this often with governmental or monarchical support. Schaeper has argued that France only reopened any trade with Britain because she had come to rely on Scotland and Ireland for various foodstuffs, suggesting that trade was re-opened only out of necessity. The French government undoubtedly had their own agenda in continuing to pursue a commercial relationship with Scotland – and it should not be surprising that they considered their wider European position, as they had throughout the period. Arguably, it was only once the French Council of Commerce realised that total commercial warfare was damaging to their interests they relaxed their arrêt to allow the importation of goods from Scotland, and to foment divisions within Queen Anne’s kingdoms. The attitude of contemporaries would appear to corroborate this. When Robert Arbuthnot wrote to d’Aguesseau in February 1706, he claimed that there was a political aim in France granting these favours to Scotland – fomenting disunion between England and Scotland. In January 1713 a letter was written to the editor of a London newspaper suggesting that ‘Your Lordship is under such strange Perplexities when you begin to form your Apprehensiens of the French King’s Designs, that I hope no Mortal will believe, you or your old Friends were ever in his Interests, or let into his Secrets’. The leniency shown to the Scots, moreover, was not consistent. In October 1705, the French Board of Trade granted an extension of time to the passports of Dutch traders, who were technically the direct enemies of France, but not to Scots. Once again, perception becomes an important element as Scotsmen,

---

116 ODNB
117 Schaeper, French Council of Commerce, 110-11, 113; Murdoch, ‘French Connection’, 36-7
118 Ibid.
119 Sée and Cormack, ‘Commercial Relations’, 275; Murdoch, ‘French Connection’, 36-7
120 The Examiner, January 1712/3, London, issue 28
121 Sée and Cormack, ‘Commercial Relations’, 276-7
believing that these decrees were applicable to themselves, set sail for Le Havre in December and were captured by pirates from Ostend.122

Yet while the concessions granted by the French may not have been consistent, the extent to which Scotland was offered favoured-nation status during these conflicts is striking, and Louis XIV’s assertion in 1703 that ‘the whole French nation had their hearts unfeignedly Scottish’ suggests that there remained some vestige of the perception of the Auld Alliance into the early eighteenth century.123 For any French privateer with a commission against British ships it would have been relatively simple to stake out the entry to the Gironde River, blocking the entrance to Bordeaux and capturing any ships attempting to enter that port – a method successfully employed against the English. Yet as the records of the Admiralty of Guyenne testify, Scots continued to be allowed to enter this port – perhaps as the French were all too aware of the damage they would do to their own economy and international commerce by depriving themselves of Scottish trade. The monarchy and government of both France and Britain seem to have been complicit in what were essentially contraband trading ventures during the later wars of the seventeenth century. These were not cases of rogue Scottish merchants disobeying orders and choosing to pursue trade that they knew to be illegal – they continued to ask permission of both French and British authorities, ensuring that they obtained the correct paperwork. Once again, commercial and economic development was given greater priority than political expediency.

122 Ibid.
CONCLUSION

‘The said privileges [are] still in vigour.’¹

Sanjay Subrahmanyam has recently concluded that ‘once one leaves behind the antiseptic realm of theoretical economic models, and enters into an historical world of flesh and blood, merchants appear not as faceless facilitators, but as a social reality’.² Throughout this thesis, we have seen that it is only by adopting such an approach that commercial connections can be fully scrutinised and understood. Reliance on ‘official’ sources – on port books, customs records, government embargoes and legislation – has fostered various misunderstandings, including assumptions that the Scottish Reformation and the Treaty of Edinburgh ended the Auld Alliance and that trade embargoes had a detrimental effect on commerce. It has also encouraged lack of consideration of the variety of commodities that comprised this trade and the ways in which they were traded. Yet it has certainly not been the intention of this thesis to discount such sources entirely, and a thorough re-examination of the official sources themselves goes some way to addressing some of these inaccurate assumptions. Comprehensive re-examinations of port records, of prizes taken and the provision of passports have shed new light on this often-misunderstood relationship. For example, while the Aberdeen port records for 1597 to 1670 at first glance show a decline in trade between this port and France, in fact closer examination points to trade being affected in only one direction (Chapter 4). A closer examination of the prizes taken by the French during the Nine Years’ War points to a continuation of the Auld Alliance (Chapter 6; Appendix VI.iv), and while the Admiralty of Guyenne provided passports for both Scottish and English ships during this conflict, the years in which these respective passes were granted speaks volumes for the attitude of the French authorities towards these nations (Chapter 6; Appendices VI.i, VI.ii, VI.iii). Furthermore, such attitudes continue to demonstrate, as has been shown throughout this thesis, that Scotland did not become an English satellite state but maintained her own commercial links even when this actively countered the actions of the British monarchy (Chapters 5 and 6). This, particularly when coupled with Scottish dealings with French diplomats in the 1640s,

¹ W. Macray (ed.), Correspondence of Colonel Hooke, 2 volumes (1870-1) 109-111, 23-29 January 1707
suggests that the British dynamic should be re-evaluated (Chapters 1 and 4). While England has traditionally been seen as the most powerful partner within the British alliance, the ways in which Scotland maintained her independence and exploited both the French and English for her own ends suggests that she was in no way subsumed under English control.

Official sources, however, while remaining important for any economic study, should no longer necessarily be seen as central to them. In some ways they remain fundamentally misleading, for example in causing many scholars to assume that wine, salt, fish and woollen goods comprised the whole of Scotland’s trade with France (Chapter 2). Even when this has been recognised not to have been the case, the type and diversity of goods Scotland imported has caused some somewhat inaccurate assessments of her economic strength, leading Christopher Smout to claim that such a range of imports provides ‘an illuminating example of Scotland’s economic backwardness’. Such an assessment of Scotland’s manufacturing abilities, while not wholly inaccurate (it is indisputable that Scotland’s manufacturing capabilities were far below those of many other European states, including England), fails to take into account the reasons for this. Scotland’s merchants, factors, manufacturers and government were far more aware of the wider economic impact of their activities than they have hitherto been given credit for, and would have no doubt known that it was not economically viable for Scotland to attempt to manufacture a wide range of goods herself. While the petitions of the Edinburgh sugar maker Robert Richardson in 1669, the Masters of the Soap Works in Leith in 1672 and the salt masters in Aberdeen in 1681 inevitably had personal concerns at their heart, they also demonstrate the extent to which these individuals and groups understood the consequences their actions had for Scotland’s economy and manufactures (Chapter 1).

Examinations of records of private transactions support the hypothesis that commercial agents had a high level of economic understanding. Many private exchanges took place through commissions and accounts, but outwith the jurisdiction of port officials and their records (Chapter 2). They also demonstrate a far wider range of commodities being traded between Scotland and France than has been previously fully considered, and while the importance of staple commodities such as wine, salt, fish and wool is undeniable, many other goods were also exchanged including luxury cloth.

---

jewellery and furniture. Furthermore, it is now clear that scholars of economic history should not concern themselves only with the buying and selling of ‘traditional’ commodities but with all types of commercial exchange. In living and trading in French ports Scots contributed to France’s local and regional economies, a factor which has until recently been overlooked.\(^4\) Consideration of this element of commercial exchange is particularly essential if the balance of trade between any two nations is to be understood, and its omission has contributed to the accepted view that Scotland’s balance of trade with France was unfavourable – another assumption regarding this relationship that must now be reassessed. There are other ways in which a preoccupation with port records has contributed to misunderstandings. In examining such sources, scholars have assumed that the origins and destinations of goods matched the ports through which they were transported – that goods travelling between the ports of Rotterdam and Aberdeen, for example, originated in the Netherlands and ended up in Scotland. In fact, the amount of goods sent home with friends, relatives or business partners alters our perception of both the volume and worth of goods traded, and passage of goods highlights that commodities were often re-shipped or transported overland either before or after overseas transfer (Introduction; Chapter 3).

Consideration of every aspect of commerce, rather than solely of that moved through official trading channels, highlights the importance of considering the individuals involved at every level of these transactions. Interestingly, the nature of the activity of commercial agents in France lies in contrast to many areas of Europe in which research has thus far been undertaken, as demonstrated in Chapter 3. More so than in other areas, commercial agents in France appeared more willing and able to adapt their itineraries based on opportunity, rather than following a foreordained agenda. This ability to think on their feet undoubtedly contributed to the amount of commercial activity which persisted during times when this trading link appeared to be under duress, and while all networks were fundamentally based on trust and recommendations, within these relationships this appears to have been particularly important. This is demonstrated no more effectively than by the number of commissions which did not contain specific instructions; for example when Alexander Indrew was instructed by John Steuart in 1715 to sell salt beef ‘either for mony or Barter of some

\(^4\) This aspect of commercial exchange has recently been recognised by Steve Murdoch: ‘The French Connection: Bordeaux's 'Scottish' networks in Context, c.1670-1720’ in G. Leydier, Scotland and Europe, Scotland in Europe (Cambridge, 2007) 42
Vendible goods’ (Chapter 2). Far from ‘merchants carrying out every stage of their trading operation personally’, a high level of trust was placed in individuals at all levels of transactions. The settlement of merchant families such as the Galbraiths, the Lavies, the Macmaths, the Gordons, the Popples and the Clerks in France undoubtedly contributed to the success of this trading network. Yet even within these families settlement was not necessarily permanent and, indeed, not all descendants followed the family precedent (Henry Lavie, William Macmath, Hugh Galbraith). Success was also not guaranteed for those who did attempt to follow in their ancestors’ footsteps (James Hope, James Mel, William Erskine). Family connections, moreover, while important for younger merchants attempting to gain access to the network, were not always viewed in a positive light, as in the case of John Dougall younger (Chapter 3). While family connections were utilised, trust between individuals and their ability to continue to trade seems to have been the most important element within these commercial networks. The experience and commercial understanding of the merchants who successfully pursued Franco-Scottish trade during periods of conflict is astounding, and emphasises again the importance of considering merchants ‘not as faceless facilitators, but as a social reality’. Trade and commerce were not entirely unaffected by such upheaval, and as we have seen merchants were sometimes forced to adapt their trading methods in order to circumvent embargoes. Many merchants looked to alternative commodities or destinations, as ‘official bans on trade diminished neither supply nor demand for import/export commodities – but forced merchants involved in coastal trade to create new routes, new destinations and new commercial connections’ (Chapter 2).

International conflicts, bringing with them trade embargoes, prohibitive customs rates and active privateering, have perhaps understandably been assumed to have had a negative effect on commerce and shipping. ‘The last straw on the back of the Auld Alliance’ (1627-1629 war), ‘damning to Scottish shipping and markets’, ‘declining or stagnant…war had undermined relations with France and wiped out the special

---

5 John Steuart to Alexander Indrew, 8 August 1715, Inverness, W. Mackay (ed.), The Letter-Book of Bailie John Steuart of Inverness, 1715-1752 (Edinburgh, 1915) 8-9; see also James Carstairs to Alexander and Andrew Watson, 15 August 1668, London, SAUL, Watson Papers, ms38527/1/1/2, stating that the journey he had been commissioned to undertake would ‘intend for france and from thence to Holland, zelland ore brittan’ [my emphasis].
6 H. Smith, Shetland Life and Trade, 1550-1914 (Edinburgh, 1984) 38
7 Subrahmanyam, ‘Introduction’ to Subrahmanyam, Merchant Networks, iii-xiv
8 Ibid, 245
privileges Scotland had enjoyed a hundred years before, under the Auld Alliance\textsuperscript{10} (Nine Years’ War) are just some of the opinions of scholars of how war affected both Franco-Scottish commerce and the Auld Alliance in this period. Yet such opinions can now be proven to be largely unfounded. More than the ability of merchants and skippers to circumvent such obstacles, the complicity of authorities in allowing them to do so speaks to the true nature of these prohibitions, and also to the importance of these trading links to both France and Scotland. Many embargoes and prohibitions, even those laid in times of war, did not have political motivations at their heart (for example the bans on the export of coal in 1563 and wool in 1581 and 1597; Chapter 1).\textsuperscript{11} Even when trading embargoes and prohibitions were used as direct weapons of war, they were not diligently upheld or were altered at the behest of merchants, for example the wine which was permitted to be exported under the December 1626 prohibition, or the lenient treatment showed to Robert Constable in 1643 (Chapters 5 and 1). It is no longer possible to link politics and commerce inextricably, to assume that all economic sanctions were politically motivated or that all political actions necessarily had an economic effect. Alongside an acceptance of this, scholars must also now recognise links that have previously been ignored. As discussed in the Introduction, as advocated by Henriette de Bruyn Kops and as demonstrated throughout this thesis, a separation of ‘Economic History’ and ‘Social History’ as genres now seems somewhat futile.\textsuperscript{12} A wholly economic approach demonstrably leaves us with gaps in our understanding, leads us to make inaccurate assumptions, and most of all has caused scholars to repeat without question accepted views surrounding not only Scotland’s specific relationship with France but also her economic position within Europe more generally. In order to understand the state of a nation’s trade or economy fully, the actions of those individuals involved in it at all stages must be more fully considered (Chapter 3).

While commerce continued and the ‘special relationship’ between Scotland and France endured, the nature of the Auld Alliance inevitably changed between 1560 and 1713, although claims that ‘the onset of the Protestant Reformation [in Scotland]

\textsuperscript{10} T. C. Smout, ‘The Road to Union’ in G. Holmes, \textit{Britain After the Glorious Revolution} (Suffolk, 1969) 184, 187

\textsuperscript{11} A. MacDonald, \textit{The Burghs and Parliament in Scotland, c.1550-1651} (Aldershot, 2007) 68; 1 November 1597, \textit{APS} IV, 135; 13 May 1597, Dundee, \textit{RPCS}, V, 386; 27 February 1581, \textit{APS} III, 221

\textsuperscript{12} H. de Bruyn Kops, \textit{A Spirited Exchange: the wine and brandy trade between France and the Dutch Republic in its Atlantic Framework, 1600-1650} (Leiden, 2007) 1
shattered Scotland’s close relationship with France (enshrined in the ‘Auld Alliance’)13 must now be re-evaluated. International and domestic shifts in policy and government, and both domestic and international conflict did affect the ways in which the Alliance was viewed. Yet this was not necessarily commensurate, as has usually been assumed, with its collapse. Assertions that Scotland became subsumed under English control and that any meaningful commercial relationship between Scotland and France died in 1560 now fail to stand up to scrutiny. Throughout the period under consideration, both sides made approaches to the other, making very real attempts to prolong their relationship. The desire on the French, as well as the Scottish, side to maintain the Alliance further suggests that the Alliance was not as one-sided as has always been assumed, and the French as well as the Scots recognised the benefits of its preservation.

There is one issue, concerning both practical commerce and notions of alliance, which has come across perhaps more strongly than any other throughout the course of this thesis – that of perception. Often, belief in the perpetuation of the alliance and of trading privileges was more important than any official continuation, as demonstrated by the Scottish shipmasters in 1712 who believed that they were entitled to the same, or better, privileges than the Dutch, despite no formal exemption having been granted (Chapter 1).14 While no document has been unearthed thus far that allows us to pinpoint the exact terms of the privileges that continued to be enjoyed by the Scots trading with France, it is clear that Scots received different treatment to natives of the other British nations throughout this period, particularly throughout the Nine Years’ War and the War of the Spanish Succession, during which the provision of passports by the French and the prizes taken by their Admiralties demonstrates a concern to protect their commerce with Scotland and the continuation of a notion of a ‘special relationship’ (Chapter 6).

While this study has readdressed fundamental misunderstandings concerning Franco-Scottish relations, Scotland’s economic position within Europe and approaches to Economic History more generally, there are inevitably areas stemming from this study that require further attention. First, activity within other areas of mainland France, such as the financial centre of Lyon, should be examined if we are fully to understand

13 J. Ohlmeyer, ‘Seventeenth Century Ireland and Scotland and their wider worlds’ in T. O’Connor and M. Lyons (eds.), Irish Communities in Early Modern Europe (Dublin, 2006) 459
14 Lord Advocate Stewart to [?], 9 August 1712, Edinburgh, TNA SP54/4/78; H. Sée and A. Cormack, ‘Commercial Relations between France and Scotland in 1707’ in Scottish Historical Review, XXIII (1926) 276-7
Scotland’s economic relationship with France. Secondly, activity within the French colonies should also be considered. In 1601, the Convention of Royal Burghs instructed a commissioner to get customs rates in France reduced, being asked to focus on specific ports, including Calais, Dieppe, Le Havre and Rouen, but also Cayenne.\(^{15}\) Activity in ‘New France’, and conflict with Nova Scotia, also deserve further attention, but fall out of the remit of this thesis. Furthermore, this research has been necessarily limited to the specific Franco-Scottish experience, thus leaving a great deal unsaid about several issues. While some comparison with Scotland’s other European relationships has been drawn (Chapter 3), this needs to be far more detailed if we are to contextualise how ‘special’ Scotland’s relationship with her auld ally was. As highlighted in Chapter 5, the fact that Scotland continued to trade with the Low Countries during the second Anglo-Dutch War requires further attention. This thesis has also left a great deal unsaid about the wider British agenda. La Rochelle, for example, hosted a multinational British merchant community, within which merchants from different British nations interacted and cooperated in order to facilitate trade, as shown to some degree (Chapters 2 and 6; Appendix VI.i) by the examples of Henry Shelle, Daniel Masson, Abraham Duport, Charles Cahell and Jean and Robert Mackarel.\(^{16}\)

Yet what this thesis has convincingly shown is that there are many fundamental misunderstandings that have perpetuated through generations of literature, and which scholars must now begin to address; misunderstandings which concern not only the specific Franco-Scottish relationship, but which have implications for how we approach questions of commercial globalisation. If the methodologies adopted here are applied to commercial links that have so far escaped detailed attention, our picture of the development of the global economy in this period, and the relative positions of countries within it, will be enhanced. But in the meantime it has been demonstrated that for the period and scope of this particular research, Lewis Innes was apparently correct when he informed Nathaniel Hooke in 1707 that ‘the said privileges’ the Scots enjoyed in France were ‘still in vigour’.\(^{17}\)

\(^{15}\) 14 February 1601, Edinburgh, \textit{CRB}, II, 97-8
\(^{16}\) This is the topic of an Economic History Society postdoctoral fellowship held at the Institute of Historical Research (University of London) by the author during the academic year 2010-11. This project is entitled “‘Every man lives by exchanging”: the British Commercial Dynamic on the French Atlantic Coast, c.1603-1707”.
\(^{17}\) Lewis Innes to Nathaniel Hooke, 23-29 January 1707, W. Macray (ed.), \textit{Correspondence of Colonel Hooke} (1870-1) 109-11
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Appendix I.i

Total customs paid at Scottish ports, 1 August-November 1704

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Port</th>
<th>Total Customs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Leith</td>
<td>No total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portglascow</td>
<td>17642 14 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glasgow</td>
<td>2351 6 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bo’ness</td>
<td>6255 5 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prestonpans</td>
<td>3035 5 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auton</td>
<td>321 17 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dumfries</td>
<td>1365 8 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kirkcaldy</td>
<td>2739 15 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dundee</td>
<td>2541 0 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montrose</td>
<td>302 2 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aberdeen</td>
<td>2788 8 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inverness</td>
<td>892 17 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jedburgh</td>
<td>409 4 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Castletown</td>
<td>990 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irvine</td>
<td>658 6 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portpatrick</td>
<td>1666 13 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portpatrick (Dunragit)</td>
<td>1244 5 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alisonbank</td>
<td>No total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perth</td>
<td>No total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ayr</td>
<td>No total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kelso</td>
<td>No total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edinburgh</td>
<td>652 5 10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 NAS E73/128
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Customs rates, France, 1664 and 1667

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goods</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>1664 rate (livers, sous)</th>
<th>1667 rate (livers, sous)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Woollen Stockings</td>
<td>Dozen Pairs</td>
<td>3 10</td>
<td>8 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silk Stockings</td>
<td>Pair</td>
<td>0 15</td>
<td>2 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cotton Stockings</td>
<td>Dozen Paris</td>
<td>2 0</td>
<td>4 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English bays</td>
<td>Piece of 25 ells</td>
<td>5 0</td>
<td>10 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Double bays</td>
<td>Piece of 50 ells</td>
<td>15 0</td>
<td>30 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burails (single)</td>
<td>Piece of 25 ells</td>
<td>4 0</td>
<td>8 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish woollens (fine)</td>
<td>Piece of 30 ells</td>
<td>70 0</td>
<td>100 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English and Dutch woollens (fine)</td>
<td>Piece of 215 ells</td>
<td>40 0</td>
<td>80 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English cloth called douzaines</td>
<td>Piece of 9-10 ells</td>
<td>4 10</td>
<td>10 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woollen hats</td>
<td>cwt</td>
<td>8 0</td>
<td>20 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gilt leather</td>
<td>cwt</td>
<td>15 0</td>
<td>30 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tanned ox leather</td>
<td>Dozen hides</td>
<td>12 0</td>
<td>14 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coal</td>
<td>Barrel</td>
<td>0 8</td>
<td>1 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chamois style leather</td>
<td>Dozen hides</td>
<td>1 10</td>
<td>3 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lace and embroidery of Linen</td>
<td>Pound</td>
<td>25 0</td>
<td>50 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tin plate</td>
<td>Barrel</td>
<td>15 0</td>
<td>30 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frizes (Spanish and Flemish)</td>
<td>Piece of 20 ells</td>
<td>8 0</td>
<td>16 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frizes (English)</td>
<td>Piece of 18 ells</td>
<td>3 0</td>
<td>7 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Molletons</td>
<td>Piece of 26 ells</td>
<td>6 0</td>
<td>12 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soap</td>
<td>cwt</td>
<td>3 10</td>
<td>7 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serges de seigneur et d’Ascot, and so forth</td>
<td>Piece of 20 ells</td>
<td>6 0</td>
<td>12 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milled serges</td>
<td>Piece of 15 ells</td>
<td>10 0</td>
<td>15 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scotch serges</td>
<td>Piece of 25 ells</td>
<td>2 0</td>
<td>4 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tapestries (old, or new, Flemish, but not from Brussels or Antwerp)</td>
<td>cwt</td>
<td>60 0</td>
<td>100 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tapestries (old or new from Brussels or Antwerp)</td>
<td>cwt</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Appendix II.i

Conversion rates, measurements of wine

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gallon</th>
<th>Rundlet</th>
<th>Barrel</th>
<th>Tierce</th>
<th>Hogshead</th>
<th>Firkin, puncheon, tertian</th>
<th>Pipe, butt</th>
<th>Tun</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 1.5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Tune</td>
<td>1 1.3 2 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Tierce</td>
<td>1 1.5 2 3 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Rundlet</td>
<td>1 1.75 2.5 3.5 4.7 7 14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Wine gallon</td>
<td>3.79 68.14 119.24 158.99 238.48 317.97 476.96 953.92</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Litres (pre-1824)</td>
<td>1 15 26 .25 35 52 ½ 70 105 210</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Gallon (imperial)</td>
<td>4.55 68.19 119.3 159.1 238.7 318.2 477.3 954.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3 These conversion rates are by no means standard. For example, Henriette de Bruyn Kops has slightly different figures: de Bruyn Kops, *Spirited Exchange*, 345
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Consumers of wine imported in the *Rowland* of Hambrough
by John Harmonson Lepman, 22 January 1673

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Merchant</th>
<th>Consumers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>John Hall (5 tuns)</td>
<td>John Bowes, Widow Livingston, Alexander Brusson, James Allison,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Widow Garvine, William Cunningham, George Braithwitt, William Davidson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Learmonth (16 tuns)</td>
<td>Isabella Rae, James Cleghorn, James Angus, James Tompson, Mrs Campbell,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Widow Caddell, James Alson, Alexander Abercromby, Adam Darling, Richard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wilkie, John Browne, James Geines, John Bining, William Ewing, Henry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gourlay, John Murray, James Hamilton, Herr Gourlay, Captain Cockburne,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>George Blyth, William Davidson, Widow Livingston, Widow Caldwell, James</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hary, Sam Cranston, Duke Hamilton, James Geines, Thomas Speirs, Stephen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Douglas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrew Stevinson (11 tuns)</td>
<td>Alexander Bryson, Andrew Wardlaw's relict, James Menteith, James</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Steith, William Cunningham, Alexander Pearson, Thomas Fisher, John</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Anderson, James Penterer, William Cunningham, Andrew Smart, William</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Seaton, Patrick Young, Widow Herrick, James Monteith, Widow Murray,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>William Cunningham, Alexander Pearson, John Anderson, Widow Pollock</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Hay (11 tuns 2 hhds)</td>
<td>David Seaton, Hugh Blair, Robert Stark, Patrick Sheill, George Hutson,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>George Hutson, Widow Caldwell, James Cleghorne, Widow Garvin, Thomas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Speirs, John Braice, William Davidson, Widow Watt, Robert Montgomery, Mary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pears, Adam Cunningham, Robert Meine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Govan (4 tuns 3 hhds)</td>
<td>William Sinclair, Widow Greer, Widow Gillis, Mary Pears, John Penston,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Widow Greer, Andrew Young, Widow Murray</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Wilson (4 tuns 3 hhds)</td>
<td>Alexander Fliskin, William Aickman, Robert Wilson, Francis Tompson,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>James Ker, Alexander Crumbie, James Clarke, William Aickman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henry Bourne (4 tuns 3 hhds)</td>
<td>William Nicoll, Thomas Fisher, William Aickman, Patrick Steel, James Deane,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>William Nicoll</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Calderwood (4 tuns)</td>
<td>James Campbell, James Robertson, Henry Cunningham, Widow Tompson,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Alexander Brysson, Widow Caddell, Walter Baird, William Muirhead, Robert</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Semple</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patrick Ffyf (8 tuns)</td>
<td>John Anderson, Alexander Pearson, Hay, George Farquhar, Robert Meince,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Adam Cunningham, Alexander Pearson, John Anderson, Widow Hamilton,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Alexander Brysson, Widow Wardlaw, Alexander Hay, Hellen Elphingston,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Alexander Montgomery, Alexander Hay, Widow Wardlaw, Patrick Steill, Hugh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Blair, Widow Fulton, John Bruce, Alexander Pearson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patrick Andrew (10 tuns)</td>
<td>Andrew Callice, Widow Tompson, Widow Cowan, Adam Cunningham, Widow Gib,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>John Rotherford, Widow Gibb, Andrew Steir, Peter Coinster, Widow Tompson,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>James Deane, Widow Masterton, James Cleghorne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alexander Sympson (5 tuns)</td>
<td>George Hutson, Widow Livingston, Robert Strachan, Widow Steir, Janet Gray,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Adam Cunningham, George Strachan, David Livingston, Patrick Steill,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>William Aickman</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

4 Data compiled from the entry books of Leith, November 1672-November 1673, NAS E74/15/13; E74/15/15. This is one example of several in these sources.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>George Reid</td>
<td>12 tuns</td>
<td>Mary Peirs, Andrew Cassie, Widow Sickeson, Widow Wardlaw, Widow Caddell, Henry Cunningham, David Govan, Mary Pears, James Halliburton, William Ewing, John Rotherford, John Farquson, Patrick Steill, Widow Dickson, James Geines, James Halliburton, Widow Caddell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Murehead</td>
<td>3 tuns</td>
<td>For himself</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sir Alexander Hope</td>
<td>20 tuns</td>
<td>Thomas Tait, Hugh Blair, John Galloway, Widow Garvan, James Deane, Laird Ava</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Law</td>
<td>1 hhd</td>
<td>For himself</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrew Johnston</td>
<td>2 hhds</td>
<td>For himself</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Trotter</td>
<td>2 hhds</td>
<td>For himself</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix VI.i

Passports granted to British ships in La Rochelle, 1695

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Entry No.</th>
<th>Ship Name</th>
<th>Of Destination</th>
<th>Owner</th>
<th>Master</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>58-9</td>
<td>Hélène</td>
<td>Glasgow</td>
<td>Daniel Masson</td>
<td>Archibald Murchye</td>
<td>15 January</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60-1</td>
<td>Daniel</td>
<td>Dublin</td>
<td>Daniel Masson</td>
<td>Edward Taylor</td>
<td>15 January</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>Succèz</td>
<td>Cork (registered as a Scottish ship)</td>
<td>Joseph Comershard</td>
<td></td>
<td>17 January</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>Fortune</td>
<td>Glasgow</td>
<td>Daniel Masson for Galbraith</td>
<td></td>
<td>5 February</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67-8</td>
<td>Chester</td>
<td>Irish</td>
<td>Jean Mackerel</td>
<td></td>
<td>16 April</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72-73bis</td>
<td>Jean et Jacques</td>
<td>Leith</td>
<td>Abraham Duport</td>
<td>Edward Burd</td>
<td>9 May</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74-75</td>
<td>Elisabeth</td>
<td>Scottish</td>
<td>Alexander Lait</td>
<td></td>
<td>19 May</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td>Elisabeth</td>
<td>Glasgow</td>
<td>Jean Mackarel</td>
<td>Robert Buckle</td>
<td>12 August</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>Catherine</td>
<td>Leith</td>
<td>Abraham Duport</td>
<td>Jean Lait</td>
<td>3 September</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td>Jacques</td>
<td>Leith</td>
<td>Abraham Duport</td>
<td>George Hil</td>
<td>15 September</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
<td>Christine</td>
<td>Glasgow</td>
<td>Jean Mackarel</td>
<td>Hugh Campbell</td>
<td>24 September</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84-5</td>
<td>Hélène</td>
<td>Glasgow</td>
<td>Daniel Masson</td>
<td>Jacques Sinclair</td>
<td>5 October</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87</td>
<td>Guillaume et Georges</td>
<td>Scottish</td>
<td>Abraham Duport</td>
<td>Robert Kew</td>
<td>22 October</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88-89</td>
<td>Jean</td>
<td>Dublin</td>
<td>Daniel Masson</td>
<td>Jacques Moor</td>
<td>5 November</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>Jean et Samuel</td>
<td>Aberdeen</td>
<td>Abraham Duport</td>
<td>David Houisson</td>
<td>3 December</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

5 ADMC B5691/57-90
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Scottish ships granted permission by the Admiralty of Guyenne to pass through the port of Bordeaux, 1691-1697

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document Ref (ADG)</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Master of Ship</th>
<th>Name of Ship</th>
<th>Tonnage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6B 75 25v-26</td>
<td>1691</td>
<td>John Bartown</td>
<td>le Holy Island</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6B 75 53-53v</td>
<td>1691</td>
<td>Thomas Ridle</td>
<td>le Hopeful</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6B 75 67-67v</td>
<td>1691</td>
<td>François Duncan</td>
<td>la Marguerite</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6B 75 81-81v</td>
<td>1691</td>
<td>Thomas Ridell</td>
<td>le Hopeful Marquet</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6B 75 124v-125</td>
<td>1692</td>
<td>Alexandre Eroudey</td>
<td>The Hope and Confidence</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6B 75 129v-130</td>
<td>1692</td>
<td>Danis Fargisson</td>
<td>l'Ami de Glasgow</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6B 75 130v-131</td>
<td>1692</td>
<td>Jean Miller</td>
<td>le Guillaume</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6B 75 160v-161</td>
<td>1692</td>
<td>Robert Holmes</td>
<td>l'Anne de Belfast (entered as Scottish)</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6B 75 161-161v</td>
<td>1692</td>
<td>John Watson</td>
<td>la Jeanette</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6B 75 141v-142v</td>
<td>1693</td>
<td>Hughé Dyat</td>
<td>Jean et Anne</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6B 76 2v-3</td>
<td>1694</td>
<td>John Barr</td>
<td>The George of Leith</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6B 76 3v-4</td>
<td>1694</td>
<td>George Still</td>
<td>The James of Leith</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6B 76 5-5v</td>
<td>1694</td>
<td>Leonard Robertson</td>
<td>le Jacques</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6B 76 39v-40</td>
<td>1694</td>
<td>Robert Arthur</td>
<td>l'Elisabeth</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6B 76 40-40v</td>
<td>1694</td>
<td>Jacques Raé</td>
<td>la Marguerite</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6B 76 147-147v</td>
<td>1695</td>
<td>Jean Marchand</td>
<td>le Grissel</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6B 76 154-154v</td>
<td>1695</td>
<td>Jean-Jacques Fervier</td>
<td>le George</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6B 76 154v-155v</td>
<td>1695</td>
<td>Jean Jasson</td>
<td>le Dragon</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6B 76 159v-160v</td>
<td>1695</td>
<td>Jacques Cook</td>
<td>le George</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6B 76 160v-161v</td>
<td>1695</td>
<td>Jean Kewe</td>
<td>le Thomas</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6B 76 161v-162v</td>
<td>1695</td>
<td>Jean Dauling</td>
<td>l'Elisabeth</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6B 76 162v-163v</td>
<td>1695</td>
<td>Robert Arthur</td>
<td>l'Elisabeth</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6B 76 163v-164v</td>
<td>1695</td>
<td>Alexandre Stuart</td>
<td>l'Aventure</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6B 76 164v-165v</td>
<td>1695</td>
<td>Jacques Rail</td>
<td>écosais la Marguerite</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6B 76 165v-166v</td>
<td>1695</td>
<td>Edouard Burd</td>
<td>le Jean et Jacques</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6B 76 167v-168v</td>
<td>1695</td>
<td>Jean Tist</td>
<td>la Catherine</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6B 76 169-169v</td>
<td>1695</td>
<td>Robert Alizon</td>
<td>le Henry</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6B 76 169v-170v</td>
<td>1695</td>
<td>George Hil</td>
<td>le Jacques</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6B 76 173-174</td>
<td>1695</td>
<td>Charles Ramsri</td>
<td>l'Ange de Glasgow</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6B 76 174-175</td>
<td>1695</td>
<td>Patrick Higgens</td>
<td>la Madelaine</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6B 76 175-176</td>
<td>1695</td>
<td>Thomas Gourlay</td>
<td>la Marguerite</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6B 76 176-177</td>
<td>1695</td>
<td>Adam Tod</td>
<td>la Concordia</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6B 77 6v-7v</td>
<td>1695</td>
<td>George Beevorick</td>
<td>l'Ami de Kirkaldy</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6B 77 59v-60</td>
<td>1695</td>
<td>Eric Kruskenk</td>
<td>The Speedwell</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6B 77 71-71v</td>
<td>1695</td>
<td>Guillaume Ponton</td>
<td>le Lion Rouge</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6B 77 105v-106v</td>
<td>1695</td>
<td>Jean Jounge</td>
<td>Jacques</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6B 77 121v-122v</td>
<td>1696</td>
<td>Jacques Simson</td>
<td>la Catherine</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6B 77 133v-134v</td>
<td>1696</td>
<td>George Hill</td>
<td>Jean et Jacques de Leith</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6B 77 138-139</td>
<td>1696</td>
<td>Georges Weir</td>
<td>le Christian</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6B 77 139-140</td>
<td>1696</td>
<td>Edward Hill</td>
<td>le Jacques</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page Range</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Author 1</td>
<td>Title 1</td>
<td>Author 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6B 77 172v-173v</td>
<td>1696</td>
<td>David Houissan</td>
<td>le Jean et Samuel</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6B 77 173v-174v</td>
<td>1696</td>
<td>Jean Houisson</td>
<td>l'Elisabeth</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6B 77 174v-175v</td>
<td>1696</td>
<td>Charles Ramsey</td>
<td>James</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6B 77 190v-191v</td>
<td>1696</td>
<td>George Lay</td>
<td>le Faucon</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6B 77 211-212</td>
<td>1696</td>
<td>Jacques Gabraith</td>
<td>l'aiguron</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6B 77 217-217v</td>
<td>1696</td>
<td>William Ponton</td>
<td>le Lion Rouge</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6B 77 228-229</td>
<td>1697</td>
<td>Charles Ramsey</td>
<td>l'Amitié de Glasgow</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6B 77 265-266</td>
<td>1697</td>
<td>Jean Honison</td>
<td>le Robert</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6B 77 285-286v</td>
<td>1697</td>
<td>William Ponthon</td>
<td>le Lion Rouge</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6B 77 291-292</td>
<td>1697</td>
<td>Alexandre Young</td>
<td>l'Anne</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6B 77 292 bis-293</td>
<td>1697</td>
<td>Charles Ramezay</td>
<td>l'Unité</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6B 77 293-294</td>
<td>1697</td>
<td>John Noir</td>
<td>le Jacques</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6B 77 294-295</td>
<td>1697</td>
<td>Edouard Hic</td>
<td>le Jacques</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6B 77 295-296</td>
<td>1697</td>
<td>Jacques Wilson</td>
<td>le Bewer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6B 77 301v-302v</td>
<td>1697</td>
<td>John Young</td>
<td>la Providence</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix VI.iii

English ships granted permission by the Admiralty of Guyenne to pass through the port of Bordeaux, 1691-1697

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document Ref (ADG)</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Master of Ship</th>
<th>Name of Ship</th>
<th>Tonnage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6B 73 149-149v</td>
<td>13 janvier 1689</td>
<td>Robert Thurkettol</td>
<td>la Marie</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6B 73 156-156v</td>
<td>13 janvier 1689</td>
<td>William Holman</td>
<td>l'Amitié</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6B 73 74-74v</td>
<td>13 janvier 1689</td>
<td>Guillaume Gattas</td>
<td>la Bonne Aventure</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6B 73 146v-147</td>
<td>16 janvier 1689</td>
<td>Manasses Paine</td>
<td>le Dauphin</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6B 73 148v</td>
<td>16 janvier 1689</td>
<td>John Errington</td>
<td>la Bonne-Vivante</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6B 73 91-91v</td>
<td>16 janvier 1689</td>
<td>Eduard Smith</td>
<td>le Facteur de Bordeaux</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6B 73 96v-97</td>
<td>16 janvier 1689</td>
<td>James Modden</td>
<td>le Lucas</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6B 73 89v-90v</td>
<td>22 janvier 1689</td>
<td>Daniel Wisilaw</td>
<td>le Thomas</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6B 73 79v-80</td>
<td>23 janvier 1689</td>
<td>Nicolas Flagg</td>
<td>les Deux Frères</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6B 73 86-87</td>
<td>23 janvier 1689</td>
<td>Robert Michal</td>
<td>la Tourterelle</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6B 73 102-102v</td>
<td>24 janvier 1689</td>
<td>Thomas Knowles</td>
<td>la Dextroite</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6B 73 104-104v</td>
<td>24 janvier 1689</td>
<td>William England</td>
<td>le Marigold</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6B 73 105-105v</td>
<td>24 janvier 1689</td>
<td>Thomas Wood</td>
<td>le Gladre</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6B 73 109-109v</td>
<td>24 janvier 1689</td>
<td>Joseph Brandell</td>
<td>la Bonne Volonté</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6B 73 126</td>
<td>24 janvier 1689</td>
<td>John Hirris</td>
<td>le Scedive</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6B 73 90v-91</td>
<td>24 janvier 1689</td>
<td>Robert Bristoll</td>
<td>le Félix</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6B 73 105v-106</td>
<td>27 janvier 1689</td>
<td>Jean Godrling</td>
<td>le Marie</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6B 73 145v</td>
<td>27 janvier 1689</td>
<td>William Henderson</td>
<td>la Recontre</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6B 73 75v-76</td>
<td>27 janvier 1689</td>
<td>Roger Grassingham</td>
<td>le Thomas et Elisabeth</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6B 73 82-82v</td>
<td>27 janvier 1689</td>
<td>Jean Pilton</td>
<td>la Prospérité</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6B 73 88v-89</td>
<td>27 janvier 1689</td>
<td>John Dyx</td>
<td>le Hopewell</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6B 73 94</td>
<td>27 janvier 1689</td>
<td>Samuel Castent</td>
<td>la Sacrade</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6B 73 83</td>
<td>30 janvier 1689</td>
<td>Henry Moon</td>
<td>le Désiré</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6B 73 102v-103</td>
<td>31 janvier 1689</td>
<td>Richard Miles</td>
<td>le Bon Plaisir</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6B 73 104v-105</td>
<td>31 janvier 1689</td>
<td>Richard Dany</td>
<td>l'Amitié</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6B 73 121-121v</td>
<td>31 janvier 1689</td>
<td>Jean Fuller</td>
<td>le Lys</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6B 73 124-124v</td>
<td>31 janvier 1689</td>
<td>Jean Miquitsil</td>
<td>le Bachelier</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6B 73 140v-141</td>
<td>31 janvier 1689</td>
<td>John Roch</td>
<td>le Saint-Patrice</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6B 73 59-59v</td>
<td>31 janvier 1689</td>
<td>Guillaume Alington</td>
<td>le Guillaume et Jeanne Alington</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6B 73 92-92v</td>
<td>31 janvier 1689</td>
<td>William Godleg</td>
<td>l'Estoille</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6B 73 99-99v</td>
<td>31 janvier 1689</td>
<td>Thomas Hercher</td>
<td>la Catherine</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6B 73 91v-92</td>
<td>06 février 1689</td>
<td>Nicolas Willy</td>
<td>le Heron</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6B 73 151v</td>
<td>08 février 1689</td>
<td>Allan Scott</td>
<td>l'Aventurier</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6B 73 100v-101</td>
<td>16 février 1689</td>
<td>Ambroise Lorrain</td>
<td>le Loyal Jacques</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6B 73 101v-102</td>
<td>16 février 1689</td>
<td>Jean Beale</td>
<td>le Marchand de Golchester</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6B 73 112v</td>
<td>16 février 1689</td>
<td>William LeRoy</td>
<td>l'Edouard</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6B 73 147v-148</td>
<td>16 février 1689</td>
<td>Thomas Weir</td>
<td>l'Hélène</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6B 73 155-155v</td>
<td>16 février 1689</td>
<td>François Pety</td>
<td>la Prospérité</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6B 73 58-58v</td>
<td>16 février 1689</td>
<td>Thimothé Tourson</td>
<td>le Bourgeois</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Numéro</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Nom du Personne</td>
<td>Prénom du Personne</td>
<td>Vaisseau</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6B 73 74v-75v</td>
<td>16 février 1689</td>
<td>Michel Williams</td>
<td>l'Anne et Marie</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6B 73 92v-93</td>
<td>16 février 1689</td>
<td>Conry Cobb</td>
<td>le Robert</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6B 73 76v-77v</td>
<td>16 février 1689</td>
<td>Thomas Bealle</td>
<td>la Rebecca</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6B 73 107v</td>
<td>20 février 1689</td>
<td>William Lanes</td>
<td>le Vilain</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6B 73 126v-127vv</td>
<td>16 février 1689</td>
<td>William Chipman</td>
<td>le Marchand</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6B 73 165-165v</td>
<td>16 février 1689</td>
<td>Joseph Goodrrin</td>
<td>la Rébecca</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6B 73 60-60v</td>
<td>20 février 1689</td>
<td>William Shower</td>
<td>l'Amour</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6B 73 85v-86</td>
<td>20 février 1689</td>
<td>Henry Pay</td>
<td>l'Amour</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6B 73 89v</td>
<td>20 février 1689</td>
<td>Leonard Mocher</td>
<td>l'Amour</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6B 73 70v-70v</td>
<td>20 février 1689</td>
<td>Henry Olding</td>
<td>l'Amour</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6B 73 89v</td>
<td>20 février 1689</td>
<td>William Lanes</td>
<td>l'Amour</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6B 73 70v-70v</td>
<td>20 février 1689</td>
<td>Joseph Goodrrin</td>
<td>la Rébecca</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6B 73 99v-100v</td>
<td>20 février 1689</td>
<td>Abraham Downton</td>
<td>le Devoir</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6B 73 103-103v</td>
<td>21 février 1689</td>
<td>Edouard Tibfort</td>
<td>le Scort</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6B 73 107v</td>
<td>19 mars 1689</td>
<td>Richard Robin</td>
<td>la Contraintude</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6B 73 130-130v</td>
<td>21 mars 1689</td>
<td>Thomas Jackson</td>
<td>la Marie et Sarra de Hull</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6B 73 126v</td>
<td>23 mars 1689</td>
<td>Georges Hephens</td>
<td>l'Industrie</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6B 73 97v-97v</td>
<td>23 mars 1689</td>
<td>Joseph Chappront</td>
<td>le Joseph</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6B 73 150-150v</td>
<td>30 mars 1689</td>
<td>Thomas Burton</td>
<td>le Jean</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6B 73 106-106v</td>
<td>31 mars 1689</td>
<td>Daniel Clark</td>
<td>la Bretagne</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6B 73 107v</td>
<td>31 mars 1689</td>
<td>John Ross</td>
<td>le Henri</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6B 73 109v-110</td>
<td>31 mars 1689</td>
<td>William Receng</td>
<td>le Retour</td>
<td>175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6B 73 130v-131</td>
<td>31 mars 1689</td>
<td>Peter Thomson</td>
<td>la Marie et Anne</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6B 73 131v</td>
<td>31 mars 1689</td>
<td>Thomas Grimston</td>
<td>la Providence</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6B 73 149v-150</td>
<td>31 mars 1689</td>
<td>Joseph Ould</td>
<td>La Bonne Volonté</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6B 73 152-152v</td>
<td>31 mars 1689</td>
<td>Philips Smith</td>
<td>le Succès</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6B 73 150v-151</td>
<td>31 mars 1689</td>
<td>Thomas Allan</td>
<td>l'Amour</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6B 73 155v-156</td>
<td>07 avril 1689</td>
<td>William Tromnd</td>
<td>le St-Mathieu</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6B 73 122v-123v</td>
<td>12 avril 1689</td>
<td>Joseph Fray</td>
<td>le Spirituel</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6B 73 123v-124</td>
<td>29 avril 1689</td>
<td>Daniel Janneran</td>
<td>la Judith</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6B 73 127v-128</td>
<td>29 avril 1689</td>
<td>Jacob Maczten</td>
<td>le Saint-Pierre</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6B 73 154-154v</td>
<td>31 avril 1689</td>
<td>Thomas Petit Jean</td>
<td>la Marie</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6B 73 165v-166</td>
<td>07 mai 1689</td>
<td>Thomas Sutton</td>
<td>John Canton</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6B 73 166-166v</td>
<td>30 juin 1689</td>
<td>John Canton</td>
<td>le Thomas et Anne</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6B 74 55-55v</td>
<td>12 juillet 1690</td>
<td>William Wilson</td>
<td>le Blessing</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6B 75 83-84</td>
<td>12 janvier 1692</td>
<td>Jean Cain</td>
<td>le Thomas de Londres</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6B 75 84-84v</td>
<td>11 février 1692</td>
<td>Jacob Seale</td>
<td>le Guillaume et Pierre de Londres</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6B 75 128-128v</td>
<td>30 juillet 1692</td>
<td>Henry Bichet</td>
<td>le Lion</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6B 77 101-102v</td>
<td>05 avril 1696</td>
<td>Jean Baroe</td>
<td>La Princesse de Lancaster</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6B 77 103-104</td>
<td>06 mai 1696</td>
<td>Jean Wellon</td>
<td>la Fortune</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Person</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Amount</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 juillet 1696</td>
<td>Patrick Willson</td>
<td>le Henri</td>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 juillet 1696</td>
<td>Robert Ballandin</td>
<td>la Catherine</td>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 février 1697</td>
<td>Jean Baron</td>
<td>la Princesse de Lancaster</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 février 1697</td>
<td>Jean Young</td>
<td>la Providence</td>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 juillet 1697</td>
<td>Johan Swift</td>
<td>La Ville de Bristol</td>
<td>45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03 août 1697</td>
<td>Wil Kinson</td>
<td>la Loyalité</td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix VI.iv

Prizes brought into Le Havre, 1692-1697\(^6\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Ship Taken</th>
<th>Nationality</th>
<th>Ship Taken By</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1692</td>
<td>Le Thomas et Marie</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>La Marguerite and Le Granadan of St Malo and La Paix of Granville</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1692</td>
<td>La Roue de Fortune</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>Francois le Fer, captain of Le Marquis (avec traduction d’instructions anglaises pour la guerre de course)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 December 1692</td>
<td>Le Dauphin</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>Failly and Carrion (King’s ship)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1693</td>
<td>Le Saint Sacrament</td>
<td>Portuguese</td>
<td>‘La Favourite’ (King’s ship)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1693</td>
<td>L’Ange Tutélaire</td>
<td>Dutch</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1694</td>
<td>Le Renard</td>
<td>Dutch</td>
<td>La Palme Couronnée, Louis Bommelard de Dunkerque</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1695</td>
<td>Le Diligent</td>
<td>English</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1697</td>
<td>Le Saint-André</td>
<td>Danish</td>
<td>Le Marie, Gabriel de Jonnaute</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^6\) ADSM 216 BP 316
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