

EDINBURGH CASTLE RESEARCH

THE MEDIEVAL DOCUMENTS



HISTORIC
ENVIRONMENT
SCOTLAND

ÀRAINNEACHD
EACHDRAIDHEIL
ALBA



EDINBURGH CASTLE

THE MEDIEVAL DOCUMENTS

Arkady Hodge

CONTENTS

Introduction – The King’s House

Part 1: Calendar of References

Section A: 600-1124

Section B: 1124-1291

Section C: 1291-1341

Section D: 1341-1513

Section E: 1513-1603

Part 2: Index of Locations

Appendix 1: Anglo-Saxon Edinburgh?

Appendix 2: The Castle of Maidens

Appendix 3: The Inventories of 1282, 1291 and 1296

Appendix 4: The English Garrisons

Appendix 5: A 15th-Century Sauna

Appendix 6: A Medieval Parliament

Appendix 7: Life in Prison

Appendix 8: The King’s Daughter and the Moorish Lassies

Appendix 9: Royal Beasts – Lions and Other Exotic Animals at the
Scottish Court

Appendix 10: The Artillery

Addendum – The ‘Black Lady’ Tournaments in Primary Sources

Addendum – The Royal Tapestries

Bibliography

INTRODUCTION – THE KING’S HOUSE

Edinburgh Castle is a seat of power, its fortified walls placed in a strong and highly visible position atop a rocky crag at the centre of Scotland’s capital.

Although its physical appearance emphasises defensive strength, the castle fulfilled many diverse roles throughout the Middle Ages. It was a royal residence as well as a military fortress, and this combination of functions made it particularly important in Scotland’s history; in addition, it was a setting for parliaments and diplomacy, an administrative complex, a state prison and a military arsenal, not to mention a treasure house, an archive for documents and a major store for basic supplies such as salt beef and porridge oats.

Beyond the activities contained within its walls, the castle also stood at the centre of a larger territory, exerting varying forms of economic and organisational influence across the wider landscape encompassed by the view from the battlements, and especially over the town which shared its name, and stretched down the Royal Mile away from its main gate. Its role cannot be fully understood without reference to its setting. Moreover, the castle was also a distinct community in its own right, home to a group of people whose identities were defined by their association with it, ranging from princes to blacksmiths, and from prisoners to priests.

The publication of Ewart and Gallagher’s *Fortress of the Kingdom* has brought together everything that we know about the archaeology and structural history of the castle’s buildings.¹ Dr David Caldwell’s *Edinburgh Castle Under Siege* has chronicled the castle’s prominent place in the narrative of Scotland’s military history.² The aim of this project is to provide a wider context for these findings, by making a thorough survey of the references in early written sources, and thus chronicling the castle’s development as a physical structure and revealing the diversity of activities which took place within it. The bulk of the relevant material consists of items recorded in the expenses of the royal court and government, but the sources are very diverse, ranging from legal documents to literary fiction, and from eyewitness diaries to acts of parliament.

The period covered by this survey begins with the earliest allusions to Edinburgh around about the 7th century AD, when the feasting hall of a local king and his warriors seems to have stood on Castle Rock, but the relevant material become

much more detailed after the accession of King David I in 1124, when the castle emerges as one of Scotland's main royal centres; the project takes as its endpoint the Union of the Crowns in 1603, when King James VI departed to London to join together the monarchies of Scotland and England as James I of Great Britain.

This report consists of two main parts: first, a chronological calendar of all the textual references that have been located, followed by an alphabetical index of all the specific structures and functions which they identify within the castle. This is supplemented by a series of short appendices focused on topics that require more extensive discussion, ranging from the castle's early association with Arthurian mythology to its development during the Renaissance as the centre of production and display for Scotland's prestigious arsenal of royal artillery.

This introduction is designed to aid the reader's understanding of these findings by placing them in their proper context. First, it will provide a general outline of the organisation of royal power in medieval Scotland, and the ways in which that system shaped the castle's uses, followed by a brief summary of the main conclusions about the castle's history that have emerged in the course of the project.

Before any of that, it is perhaps useful to begin with a basic outline of the physical setting. The castle's layout is defined by the underlying geography of its rocky site, and can be divided into four component areas, which existed as part of the terrain before any permanent structures were built on the Castle Rock.

The outermost area of the castle consists of the final section of the lower ridge to the east on which the Royal Mile stands, known as the Castle Hill – the only place from which a straightforward approach to the higher crag of the Castle Rock is possible. The top of the ridge here was widened in the 18th century to create a level plaza named the Esplanade, an open space outside the defences which creates a clear sense of physical separation between the buildings of the town and the fortifications on the steeper cliffs of the Castle Rock. Until a major redesign of the defences in 1650, however, this area looked very different – the outer bulwarks of the castle projected boldly forward into the area of the esplanade, and in the third quarter of the 16th century there may have been as

many as four separate rampart-lines between the buildings of the town and the higher cliffs of the Castle Rock.

Moreover, the castle's original outer precinct covered a much larger area than the modern esplanade, stretching down the steep slopes on either side. On the south, a section of its outer wall still stands just behind the houses of the Grassmarket, and on the north (where the slope is called the Castle Bank), a ruined tower and outer rampart overlook the train tracks running through Princes Street Gardens – they originally stood on the shoreline of a wide stretch of water known as the **Nor'** Loch. Indeed, the castle's outer precincts did not end at these ramparts, but extended beyond them – the Nor' Loch itself was not a natural body of water, but a massive moat guarding the castle's northern flank, while a south-west gateway led out into an impressive expanse of Gardens and Orchards, sweeping round the southern and western flanks of the Castle Rock. The scale and sophistication of this outer area has been somewhat masked by the construction of the esplanade, which has the effect of isolating the castle visually as a more compact structure on the higher crags.

Inward from the esplanade, the Castle Rock rises up dramatically, but at its foot stands a compact entrance zone, providing access from the esplanade, and it is **this entrance zone which forms the castle's second area** – known conventionally today as the Outer Ward. This consists of a line of defences across the base of the cliffs, and a road leading inward round the northern flank of the crags, to an inner entrance. The defences at the base of the cliffs, consisting of a deep moat, drawbridge and gateway, were developed after 1650, and the neo-baronial gatehouse superstructure was only built in the 1880s, but this area represents the only practical route of access into the castle, and as visitors move inwards they quickly encounter surviving medieval structures – the Flanker building on the north side of the road which now contains the tourist shop, and the inner entrance, known as the Portcullis Gate, with its Renaissance facade marking the entrance into the interior of the castle.

The third area of the castle consists of the western part of the Castle Rock, stretching away beyond the Portcullis Gate, at a lower level than the highest central crag – the Middle Ward. From an early date, this area was encircled by a cliff-top rampart, incorporating a western postern gate providing access to a discreet footpath down the back of the crag, but there seem to be relatively few

clear indications of medieval structures within the rampart. The large buildings which now dominate this part of the Castle Rock date from the 18th and 19th centuries, and there are only two clearly identified areas of medieval activity here, a metalworking zone located in the area of the modern café, and an artillery rampart drawn across the interior of the zone in 1573. It seems likely that this general area was also the location of the 16th-century bronze foundry where cannons were produced for James IV and James V during the Renaissance, but precise evidence remains somewhat elusive.

The innermost sector of the castle is the Inner Ward, consisting of a raised platform of solid rock, fortified on all sides by ramparts. There are currently two entrances to this inner area, an outdoor stairway known as the Long Steps, and a ramped road leading up to an archway called **Foog's Gate** – these are located at the only two practical points for access to the inner ward, though the precise means of approach using a stairway and ramp may post-date 1603. Inside the ramparts, the inner ward area can be subdivided into two sectors – the northern part, through which the area is entered, was heavily reconstructed in the 17th century, and further modified by the removal of most of its buildings in the Victorian era; it now consists of a relatively flat plaza, with the isolated structure of **St Margaret's Chapel** standing above the two entrances at its north-western corner, and artillery positions extending along the enclosing ramparts to the north and east.

The southern part of the castle's central area, in contrast, is its most built-up sector, containing a substantial quadrangle of buildings around a courtyard known as Crown Square. Although the appearance of these buildings has been modified by later reconstruction, the basic layout dates back at least as far as the reign of James IV (1488–1513), with elements of the complex originating at an earlier date – some probably as early as the 13th century.

The castle's layout was shaped by far more than just the terrain, however. As a place of royal power in medieval Scotland, Edinburgh Castle formed part of a system of government with a very specific structure. To a large extent, this structure of government defined the physical layout within the castle, and dictated the organisation of the financial records, which form the main body of

written evidence relating to the castle in the medieval period. These three structures – castle, government and records – existed in parallel, and it is necessary to begin with an outline of the shape of the royal government, as an aid to understanding the spatial organisation of the castle itself, and the textual structure of the documentary evidence.

Scotland's medieval government was characterised by two important features: firstly, it was, at least in theory, overseen directly by the king; secondly, it was mobile. Edinburgh Castle was only one of many different residences available to the king, ranging from grand palaces, through castle keeps and manor houses, to portable tents and naval flagships – and the king might also ask accommodation from his subjects; the town of Musselburgh and the monastery of Arbroath were borrowed to hold major gatherings in the 13th and 14th centuries, a 15th-century folk-tale had King Duncan stopping at a miller's house at Forteviot after a hard day's hunting, James I was assassinated while residing in a Perth friary, and we find James IV breakfasting in a tenement in the Grassmarket, or spending a night on a kitchen table in Elgin. Normally, however, the king generally moved in a pre-planned itinerary between a selected group of major royal residences, accompanied by companions who served as both a private entourage and the public officials of the central government.

This mobile government was an organisation characterised by a remarkably strong level of structural continuity. It is first possible to document this structure in the reign of David I (1124–53), and historians have recognised that he had borrowed significant elements of contemporary 'best practice' from his brother-in-law Henry I of England; but David did not imitate the extensive bureaucratic reforms which Henry introduced in England in the 1120s, and subsequently there was only one significant moment of programmatic reform, implemented by James I at the start of his personal reign in 1424, based on his personal knowledge of Henry V's administration in England. This simply involved adding new departments, however: the basic arrangements put in place by David I remained entirely intact when James VI moved to London in 1603. The most striking indicator of this strong level of continuity is the fact that it is possible to present a largely static overview of the structure of the central government, with the same departmental structures and individual positions being as relevant in the reign of David I as they were in 1603. An overview of this sort also makes clear the

way in which the architectural spaces of Edinburgh Castle were used and conceptualised throughout in the period with which this report is concerned, so a detailed outline follows.

Historians generally use the term 'royal household' to describe this retinue, but in medieval Scotland the organisation was known simply as the **King's House**, conceiving its structure of departments and personnel as a virtual version of the royal residences which it inhabited. The central focus of the **King's House** was the **King's Chamber**, a term which denoted the abstract space where the sovereign conducted both his private life and personal business, and also identified the central group of personnel who attended in it. This was the space into which everything needed for the king's use was brought, and until the 1424 reforms this concept was not restricted to the things needed for his *personal* use: the chamber was also the royal government's central clearinghouse for the receipt and distribution of money and supplies.

The head of the chamber was the Chamberlain, one of the highest-ranking officials in the kingdom. From the early 12th century until 1424, the chamberlain was Scotland's finance minister – insofar as the chamber was the abstract space through which royal revenues were passed, he was automatically in charge of all government income and expenditure, and therefore in control of state finance and government logistics. Thus, his authority extended beyond the chamber to all the domains dependent on the **King's House**, involving management of the king's lands throughout Scotland, and a wide-ranging administrative and judicial oversight over the tax-paying towns. In the reforms ushered in by James I in 1424, the chamberlain's practical functions were removed, and the position soon became a ceremonial post for a leading nobleman. Nonetheless, this shift of functions meant that the position of chamberlain continued to be held by men with great influence in the **King's House** – they would have retained a right of undisputed physical access to the king, and at least in principal they retained control over the organisation and personnel of the chamber, a right which was strongly reasserted after 1581.

Attached to the chamber were several subordinate areas within the virtual architecture of the **King's House**. The oldest of these was the Wardrobe: as its name suggests, this was an abstraction of a walk-in cupboard, a storage space that was usually attached to a residential chamber in medieval buildings, which

served as a dressing-room and clothes-store – and contained the lavatory. The King's Wardrobe thus became the conceptual space which encapsulated the supply, administration and storage of the king's clothing, along with other property retained for his immediate use, and thus placed conceptually inside the chamber. For most of the Middle Ages, the wardrobe was the responsibility of a single official called the Clerk of the Wardrobe, whose title indicates that he was initially expected to be a churchman, and thus a literate man of sober, chaste and responsible character. This reflected the fact that, until the 1424 reforms, the wardrobe was also the location for the valuables which were assigned to the chamber for the king's use, principally a reserve of ready cash and a supply of costly and exotic perfumes and food-flavourings known as 'spices', but also valuable furnishings such as the Crown Jewels, gilded candlesticks and solid silver drinking-cups – in the 1290s, these valuables were kept in a dedicated treasury within Edinburgh Castle, though that continuity must have been interrupted when the castle ceased to be a royal residence between 1296 and 1341. James I removed these specialised responsibilities from the wardrobe, and transferred them to two separate conceptual spaces known as the Treasury and Spicehouse.

The treasury effectively became a new and independent area of the King's House and will be discussed in more detail below. In contrast, the organisation of the Spicehouse closely paralleled the wardrobe, as a small, specialised department directly attached to the chamber, overseen by a Clerk of the Spices. Initially, it seems to have been intended as a place to store not just spices, but also *species* – coinage forwarded from the treasury to the chamber to fund royal projects – but its responsibilities were quickly scaled back to pepper and perfume, just as the wardrobe had become a place for the literal storage of clothing for the king's personal use. This symmetry was emphasised a few decades later, when the two officials' titles were changed to Master of the Wardrobe and Master of the Spicehouse, a move which primarily represented the influence of French court terminology, though it also served as a concession that the two posts were now normally held by layman. In the 16th century, we find a few subordinates under them – each was usually supported by a single assistant, but the wardrobe also served as a conceptual space in which to group personnel such as the king's barber and laundrywoman, seamstress and tailor.

Even when it was still the central administrative space, the chamber had also represented the personal area where the king lived. In this sense, when business was not being done, it became a private family room. Unusually, it seems that it did not acquire the contingent of knights and squires who were brought into the analogous spaces in other princely households from about 1250 onwards – contemporary reports of James I's assassination in 1437 remarked on their absence. Equally unusual was the lack of formal gender barriers – the queen and her ladies-in-waiting seem to have shared the king's chamber, in contrast to the practice in France and England where they were organised into a separate entourage with their own quarters. When a separate establishment existed for the heir to the throne, it was set up in a different residence, and constituted as a distinct 'little household' duplicating the organisation of the King's House. With the residential qualities of the king's chamber thus focused distinctively on family life, the key subordinate in ensuring privacy was the Usher, responsible for controlling access, whose presence can be traced from around 1175 until the court departed for London in 1603. It was only around 1450 that a parallel **Queen's** Chamber emerged for the consort and ladies-in waiting, and a small entourage was finally introduced into the king's chamber itself, following the new fashion of the French court for an increased train of personal attendants – not bodyguards, but trusted companions of the king, who were capable of performing any tasks that he required.

Early historians believed that James III attempted to turn the chamber into the executive of an autocratic regime, appointing its personnel as proxies in high offices, to concentrate revenue and political power under his own control – but the accuracy of the accusation is now disputed, and if there was any truth to it, his overthrow in 1488 brought the practice to an abrupt and violent end. What is certain is that his chamber personnel performed remarkably diverse personal duties – one of them might be sent down the Royal Mile to buy a shirt, another off to Orkney to chaperone a wine ship back to Leith – and this pattern of varied employment continued in subsequent reigns. William Drummond, a particularly versatile chamber servant in the reign of James IV, is found pursuing an outlaw in the Borders, laying a new floor at Holyrood, selling the king a horse and hunting some partridges for the royal table, while his contemporary James Doig seems to have overseen the setting up of the furnishings when the King's House moved to a new location, and also played a significant role in the wardrobe – even though this

was in principle a separate sub-department with its own distinct corps of personnel.

The hierarchy of rank among these chamber servants always seems to have been relatively slight, even when it was belatedly formalised in the 1580s, but there was always an important formal subdivision into two groups, which has generally been overlooked by historians. The core group, often identified simply as 'the Chamber', but more formally distinguished as Cubiculars, were the men who saw to the king's private needs, and they often spent their entire career in the King's House. The second group consisted of boys being educated at the court, who also acted as a mounted escort for the monarch – they acquired their familiar and frenchified name of Pages in the later 16th century, but before that, like their counterparts at the English court, they were known as Henchmen. This name means literally 'horsemen', reflecting the emphasis on equestrianism in their role, and it had none of its modern connotations of latent violence and limited intelligence – those perceptions are entirely the result of the way that the loyal henchmen of Highland lairds were mischaracterised by Sir Walter Scott. Unfortunately, this change of meaning has tended to mislead scholars as to the true status of this group of chamber personnel, a problem that is intensified because the equivalent pages at other princely courts were partially excluded from the royal apartments, and officially affiliated to the schoolroom or the stable-block instead. It is important to realise that the henchmen of the King's House were a band of agile and well-dressed young courtiers, integral members of the chamber.³

The youth and dash of the henchmen helped to balance the greater experience and responsibility of the cubiculars, contributing to the informal and flexible group structure which historians have recognised as a key character of the post-1450 personal chamber, and explaining why it never acquired the strict hierarchy of formal social rank which characterised the inner circles of the Valois and Tudor courts. Similarly, although the associated space within the physical architecture of royal residences was gradually subdivided into a suite of rooms, the abstract chamber was never subjected to corresponding organisational subdivisions – another distinct contrast with other princely households in this period. The chamber thus retained its central place within the King's House until the court decamped to London in 1603.

As with the king's chamber, so, too, the **King's Chapel** – this was a conceptual space within the abstract King's House, and there was no clear distinction within it between the clerics who read the church services for the royal family and the clerks who wrote documents for the king's government. Their chief was the Chancellor, who controlled the great seal, the sculpted stamp which authenticated all important royal documents, and thus he supervised all major political, administrative and economic decisions. This gave him a natural oversight of all aspects of government and policy and meant that he was viewed as the head of the executive arm and the leader of the royal council. Until the 15th century, the chancellor was always a churchman, and usually a bishop or abbot, but the political prominence of the role meant that, from 1460 onwards, important lay noblemen were often appointed to the position.

Under the chancellor were two key members of the chapel, the Secretary and the Clerk of the Rolls. The secretary looked after the privy seal, a smaller stamp which authenticated the king's private correspondence, and thus came to administer that correspondence, drafting diplomatic letters and thereby supervising foreign policy, while also controlling the production of bureaucratic warrants issued in the king's name. The clerk of the rolls, also known as the clerk register, wrote the accounts of household income and expenditure, and also maintained the royal archive, containing old accounts and an indexed inventory of file copies of all major documents issued by the government. As early as the 13th century, this archive seems to have been kept in Edinburgh Castle, and, while it must have been moved elsewhere in 1296-1341, it had returned by the 15th century, and in the 1540s James V created a purpose-built building on Crown Square in the castle, known as the Register House – its stone vaults protected its contents through the sieges of 1573, 1650 and 1689, and it is the direct precursor of modern Scotland's national archives.

A miscellany of other clerks and chaplains assisted in the chapel. Some of them performed administrative duties, as we would expect, but they also included the priests, acolytes and choristers who performed the religious services for the royal household – and some evidently performed roles in both the 'virtual' chapel of the administration and the physical chapels attached to the royal apartments. As with the chamber personnel, the organisation of the group was clearly somewhat loose and ad hoc, as there never seems to have been any set rule about their numbers

or their internal organisation, and their funding was made up from an eclectic mix of sources: fees for writing legal documents, payments from the burgh mills in Perth, absentee benefices in other churches, offertory collections from church services and straightforward individual salaries. Nor is there much evidence of attempts to disentangle the chapel's two contradictory roles: its personnel are simply designated in the records by the straightforward title of 'clerk' or 'chaplain' in the King's House – the distinction being that a chaplain was a priest, while 'clerk' was a more generic term. Even when the office of chancellor passed to laymen, there is no evidence for an equivalent of the 'chief chaplain' who emerged to oversee the liturgical side of the corresponding body in England, later known there as the Dean of the Chapel Royal.

The religious duties of the 'virtual' King's Chapel were performed in real, physical chapels adjacent to the royal apartments. It is important to distinguish them from a distinct group of geographically fixed 'royal chapels' at places such as St Andrews, Stirling, Roxburgh, Chapel of Garioch and Rattray Head, which simply performed local religious functions, and were not directly affiliated to the King's House – they were 'royal' because the crown held some sort of jurisdiction over them, however that had originated. In particular, it needs to be emphasised that there was no special connection between the King's Chapel in the royal household and the grand church built inside Stirling Castle by James III, known as the 'College of St Mary and St Michael, *alias* the Royal Chapel of Stirling', or informally as the 'King's College'.

The confusion between the two institutions dates back to the late 16th century, when Pitscottie claimed that the choir in James III's royal household was officially affiliated to this 'Chapell Ryall' in Stirling Castle, and by 1619 the post-Reformation government clearly regarded the two 'chapels' as having been elements of the same body; but while the Stirling Chapel did enjoy a special status, symbolised by its clergy having an automatic right of access to the King's House, a close reading of the pre-Reformation sources makes the distinction between the *chaplains* and *clerks* of the King's House and the *canons* and *prebends* of the Stirling Castle foundation very clear. Even a connection between their choirs seems to be ruled out: Nicholas Abernethy, cantor or choirmaster of the King's Chapel under James IV, was a member of the royal household salaried directly by the Crown and ordinarily resident in Edinburgh (*ER* xii. 90); it is possible that prebendaries and

choirboys from Stirling were regularly seconded to the choir of the King's Chapel, just as clergy from the 'royal chapels' of St Andrews and Roxburgh had played prominent roles on the administrative side in much earlier reigns, but it seems clear that the King's College at Stirling was a distinct foundation with no direct affiliation to the King's House, somewhat analogous to St George's Chapel in Windsor Castle.

The only permanent benefice that can be directly linked to the royal household is the chaplaincy of Edinburgh Castle, founded by David II in the 1360s and given a formal endowment by Robert III in 1390. By the 1470s, when relevant records begin to be extant, we find that the chaplain of Edinburgh Castle was responsible for the ecclesiastical activities of the King's Chapel in all the royal residences. In the early years of the 16th century, however, the chapel was given a new base at the newly built Holyrood Palace, asserting a collegiate identity which embraced the traditional mix of liturgical and administrative functionaries, and provided a home for Scottish clergymen with unusual skills, including the painter Thomas Galbraith, and the landscape architect James Sharp.

The third component of the King's House was the Hall, which is mentioned less frequently in the sources, usually in incidental records which record payment for the roles of individual personnel serving there, or outlay for construction and maintenance work on physical structures within royal residences. The hall did not have the sort of conceptual importance which the chamber and the chapel represented. This was the public area of the King's House, the place of parliaments and banquets, the place where outsiders were admitted to interact with royal authority. A surprisingly high level of public access is revealed by a memorandum on dining rights at Holyrood from 1508, which forbade scruffy boys seeking a free lunch, but emphasised that any 'honest gentleman of reputation' was automatically entitled to admission. The organisation of the hall was structured in a way that was familiar throughout medieval Europe, with a barrier just inside the entrance called the Trance to control access, and a distinct area called the Dais at the inner end where the king's throne or table was located, directly accessible from the chamber.

The organisation of the hall was essentially military, and it was under the jurisdiction of the Constable – originally a high-ranking general, he became a hereditary officer whose duties extended beyond the King's House to the

supervision of parliaments and tournaments, spaces which were structured very much as analogies of the hall, with spatial divisions corresponding directly to the demarcation of the trance and dais. By the 15th century, the constable's authority in the King's House was usually exercised by a Constable Depute, but he remained very clearly a subordinate, deputised to perform his superior's functions. Under the constable or depute were a trio of Marshals of the Hall, a principal marshal and two deputies, responsible for the seating arrangements and serving of the meals – their role is first outlined in an important tract describing the 13th-century structure of the King's House, and it is still the same when we see them in action in the reign of James IV. The 13th-century text understandably assumed that they were deputies for the hereditary Marshal of Scotland, the commander of the feudal cavalry component in the army, and his regular presence in the King's House in the 14th century suggests that he performed duties in the hall in that period, if not before; a hint of this role can still be seen in 1607, when the hereditary marshal asserted a right to police the Outer Bar of Parliament, the equivalent of the trance of the King's Hall. Nonetheless, even in the period when the hereditary marshal was a regular court attendee, Marshals of the Hall appear with some regularity in the evidence, and as early as in the reign of David I we can see a clear distinction between the two roles, personified by the Celtic retainer Mael Aithgen, who appears among the court servants and was probably the Principal Marshal of the Hall, and the immigrant knight Hervey of Keith, who founded the hereditary line of Marshals of Scotland. For all practical purposes the two roles were separated by Robert III, when the office of Principal Marshal of the Hall was permanently bestowed on the Wauchope of Niddry family.

On all formal occasions, the constable and his subordinates in the hall were responsible for seating arrangements and good behaviour, in much the same way as the constable and the marshal of Scotland were expected to supervise the formation and discipline of the army. As an extension of his role in keeping order, the constable also had a legal jurisdiction over all crimes committed in and around the King's House, defined by a radius of roughly four miles around the monarch's current physical location. This sort of jurisdiction embodied the ancient idea that crimes committed near the sovereign infringed his honour as well as that of the injured party, a concept that was still understood in England and France in the 13th century – but the workings of the constable's court point to an origin in early Celtic law rather than a borrowing from the international legal milieu of the Middle

Ages. The procedure was instigated by the injured party rather than the Crown, the remit of the court was focused on crimes involving insult and bloodshed, and judgement involved the use of fines to symbolically compensate for the injury to honour, rather than the infliction of physical punishments.

Beyond these duties, the essentially military nature of the constable and his subordinates also hints at another aspect of the hall's role. As well as being a major public space, it also had a day-to-day role as the mess-hall and barracks for the military personnel attached to the King's House – the Guard.

Up until about 1350, the kings of France and England retained significant contingent of knights and men-at-arms at their royal courts, all of them dining and perhaps sleeping in the Great Hall; but their equivalents are hard to trace in the surviving Scottish sources. From the 1120s onwards, the documents show that a small number of knights were normally paid cash fees by the king, and we would expect them to form part of the household, but their presence is hard to confirm from the documents – the main body of expenses, concerned principally with the chamber and chapel, offers not the slightest hint of their actual presence at the court, and, very significantly, the description of the 13th-century King's House says nothing about the presence of a large body of knights, either – an impression borne out by the witness-lists to charters, which give the impression of perhaps no more than half-a-dozen knights in regular attendance in the King's House, most of them being men with official duties there.

In both France and England, the traditional corps of household knights dispersed around 1350, and for a century or so kings tried various expedients to maintain a large force of chivalry without keeping them resident at the royal court, but these were gradually abandoned after 1450, when resident battalions of men-at-arms reappeared as a major component of palace retinues. In Scotland, the first clear evidence for a parallel process is a list of the people with residence rights in 1508, during the reign of James IV – and this reveals a truly impressive retinue of ten earls, 24 belted knights, and 24 other men-at-arms; they had the right to dine in the hall and accommodation in the King's House – but, in contrast to their French and English counterparts, they were evidently expected to support themselves with their own means, receiving neither pay nor livery. Many are known to have had their own Edinburgh town houses, and they must have made use of the newly established palace at Holyrood much like a Victorian gentleman might dine at his

club. They probably formed much of the guest list when the new hall in the castle was inaugurated late in the reign. When the King's House moved to Linlithgow, Falkland or Stirling, there was probably more need for temporary accommodation, but it is not clear how many of the military men would travel there in the first place.

Nonetheless, the willingness of 50 knights and lairds to attend the court without pay seems somewhat puzzling to modern sensibilities, and it would have seemed equally unusual to their Valois and Tudor counterparts. A clue perhaps lies in Scottish legal and cultural perceptions that were articulated more explicitly in the following century – **these men's lands had been given to their ancestors by the monarchy in exchange for hereditary military service**, and they thus believed that their own high status was based on the military defence of the monarchy, and they accepted the principle that their lordly revenues were not simply private incomes to be used for personal aggrandisement, but were, in a very real sense, their pay as royal men-at-arms; even though their permanent presence in the King's House was not in any sense a formal obligation, it was a logical corollary of their status.

Clear evidence for an organised corps of paid men-at-arms in permanent residence dates only from September 1524, during the turbulent minority of the young James V. The Queen Mother took power in a coup, armed with English money to establish a new royal guard, and commissions were promptly granted to a captain, lieutenant and ten **Gentlemen in the King's House** – their courtly sounding title is actually a translation of *gentilhommes de la maison du roi*, the name of the glittering French cavalry unit formed from the king's courtiers, which had recently been reorganised to provide a platoon of sentinels with halberds in the Valois throne room.⁴ The corps evidently continued to exist in James V's reign, as further commissions continued to be granted until 1530, but a French visitor in the 1550s remarked on the lack of anything resembling a visible royal guard at the court of the Queen Regent, and Mary Queen of Scots and James VI appear to have employed a variety of ad hoc alternatives, such as Border reivers and chamber personnel.

Nonetheless, a body of soldiers is documented as a permanent force in the hall – a small bodyguard of infantry, known in the 13th century by the title of Durwards (door-guards), and consisting at that date of 24 men. They marched ahead of the

king when he was travelling, and for duty in the King's House, they divided into two 12-man platoons – one group provided a morning guard outside the hall until the king finished his meal in the early afternoon, the other half then guarded the chamber in the afternoon after he had retired there, and all 24 stood guard at night. They do not appear to have been derived from mainstream European practice – their presence is not paralleled in the English and French royal households of this period – but in their numbers and their role they closely resemble the *teulu* or warband of early Welsh royal courts, suggesting that they might be a survival from the Celtic past. This hypothesis coincides with the essentially Celtic nature of the law-enforcement jurisdiction exercised by the constable, who was also their commander.

This group's survival through the 14th and early 15th centuries can be inferred indirectly but fairly confidently from the imitative companies raised by foreign rulers. The 24 Scottish archers of the French *garde de la manche* are the most famous example, and were probably organised to protect the dauphin in 1419. The bodyguard of the Duke of Burgundy was also a corps of 24 archers: first securely documented in 1420, it can probably be traced back to the unit of Highland archers recruited by John the Fearless in 1411. The Duke of Orleans had also raised a bodyguard of Scottish archers in 1412, although they presumably ceased to exist as a unit at Agincourt in 1415. By 1478, even Edward IV of England had a bodyguard of 24 yeoman archers. A guard of 24 archers, something that had once been a uniquely Scottish royal practice, had become an essential part of great princely retinues.

Compared with these foreign imitations, the original guard is hard to trace in 15th-century Scotland. In the 1470s, a small group of references survive, mostly involving modest gifts of lands to individual personnel, but even in this period they are invisible in the day-to-day royal expenses.⁵ Nor can they be located clearly in the much more thorough records from the reign of James IV – although a royal bodyguard of Highlanders was observed during the 1497 campaign against England by the Spanish diplomat Pedro de Alaya. One possible explanation for the silence of the sources is that the guard remained the responsibility of the constable, paid for from his seigneurial resources and the administrative share of the damages awarded in his court. Successive constables certainly took their responsibilities seriously, successfully resisting persistent attempts by Edinburgh's

civil authorities to usurp the jurisdiction they held by virtue of the king's regular residence in the city, and in the 17th century they provided the guards for the Scottish Parliament at their own expense – 100 halbardiers for the 1661 session. It was certainly possible to raise a guard for one of the royal palaces without leaving much trace in the documents by devolving responsibility, even in the well-documented reign of James IV – when the queen and the infant heir to the throne (the future James V) moved to a separate household at Linlithgow in 1512, it seems that the keeper of the palace there provided a substantial guard from his own McCulloch kinsmen from Galloway, but we only hear of them because they were exempted from the jurisdiction of the local law-courts and militia organisation during their extended absence from their homes.

After a gap of some 200 years, detailed references to the guard reappear in the minority of James V: Allan Stewart, a veteran commander in the French army, was appointed as their captain, and in 1517 we have a chance reference to him and three of his archers sleeping on straw pallets in the hall to provide a guard while the young king slept – they appear in a passage that was edited out of a council resolution on the night-time security arrangements, as it was rewritten to accommodate a newly raised close-protection platoon of a dozen halbardiers. The new soldiers were apparently intended entirely for night-time duty, but they and their annual pay of £364 16s disappear from the accounts after little more than a year.⁶ The four-man night-time detail was evidently restored, as it recurs in a subsequent memorandum on the organisation of the King's House dating from 1522. This reveals that the guard had been reduced at some point to 22 men – though if there were still two day-time watches and the captain and lieutenant stood guard for both, that would raise the numbers to the traditional dozen. Their pay was a notional £850, but it was clear in advance that there was no immediate means to pay it, though provision was made for the issue of their red-and-yellow clothing.

At some subsequent point, the guard of archers was evidently disbanded, as it had to be revived for Mary Queen of Scots in 1562 – but continuity is indicated by the use of the title of Archers, the appointment of Captain Allan Stewart to command them (probably the grandson of his precursor), the fact that the numbers were kept at 22 men, and the payments for their straw pallises glimpsed in 1517. However, as with the contemporary French *gentilshommes pensionnaires*,

there were now four separate platoons, rotating on three-month assignments every year, and commanding a hefty wage bill of £9,000. The payment records ended with Mary's overthrow in 1567, and the traditions of the guard cannot be clearly traced in the reign of James VI, but a revived Royal Company of Archers was organised in the 1670s and remains in existence to this day.

The chamber, chapel and hall represented the public and personal spaces within the King's House, home to the private life of the monarchy, the administration of government, and the state's interaction with the people of the kingdom – but there was also a need to provide supplies for the court, and from the outset, the King's House also had a separate area in which this process took place – it was not clearly identified by a consistent name, but for convenience it can be called the Service Court, abstracting the term which architectural historians use to denote the relevant physical space within a palace or castle. This area was concerned principally with food and drink – the supply of daily rations, the production of complex feasts, the inventory of cutlery, tableware and linen, and, above all, the process of providing the king's own meals, extending from the procurement of the ingredients to placing them on the royal table.

Historians have generally assumed that the service court was a largely unseen area of the King's House, focused on more menial duties and less closely associated with the royal family – at the English royal court of the 15th and 16th centuries, the analogous 'House of Logistics' was designed as a purely administrative organisation to support the highly visible and ceremonial 'House of Magnificence'. However, this parallel cannot be taken for granted: points such as the flexible duties of personnel in the chamber, and the combination of bureaucracy and liturgy within the chapel, hint that the Scottish royal household may have been structured somewhat differently from its counterparts in other kingdoms.

The earliest relevant sources date from the 1120s and relate to a prominent official at King David I's court called Ailred – he was a scholarly young man to whom books were dedicated, perhaps already a cleric in holy orders, and he later became a monk and eventually the Abbot of Riveaulx in Yorkshire.

Contemporaries style him as *dispensator regis*, 'the king's dispenser', while his friend and biographer Walter Daniel describes his duties thus:

He was the manager of the royal household, and nothing was done without him, indoors or outside, satisfying everyone in all things, and never being found wanting; placed in the royal hall, he served in such a **manner that he seemed more like a monk than a layman ... Often he stood in the presence of the king at meal-times, distributing the dishes and dividing the portions of the meal among all the company as he saw fit ... namely as chief steward of the king's table ...**

As Professor Geoffrey Barrow recognised, these responsibilities are those of the Renner or 'divider' (*rannaire* in Gaelic), an ancient Celtic official responsible for assigning each member of the king's court his portion in the feasting hall. This old title remained in official use in the King's House until around 1175, and subsequently, sources speak of the Clerk of the Liverance, showing that Ailred's example had been followed and that the role had been formally transferred to a man in holy orders; nonetheless, the role remained the same – he was responsible for the *delivery* of food to the king's table, and the distribution of all other provisions, 'in the Hall and outwith'.

Behind the clerk of the liverance stood the Clerk of the Provend, whose name indicates that he was responsible for the *provision* of the food, supervising its procurement and storage; he also monitored the expenditure of the clerk of the liverance and other service court personnel, a role that naturally correlated with the need to keep a track of reserves. Insofar as the *rannaire* became the clerk of the liverance, it seems likely that the clerk of the provend corresponded to the *rechtaire* who occupies the role of household overseer and provisioner in the idealised Celtic royal courts of the 7th-century Ulster Cycle legends. The two roles, *rannaire* and *rechtaire*, are juxtaposed in archaising lists of Irish court personnel, but their actual survival as two distinct positions was remarkably conservative even in the 12th century – in Irish and Welsh royal courts, the roles of chief server and chief provisioner had merged in a single all-powerful post by 1050, imitating the authority of the Anglo-Saxon *disc-thegn* and the French *dapifer*.

While the posts of chief server and chief provisioner were of ancient Celtic origin, the appointment of clerics in minor orders to perform these roles was highly unusual, and may have been an innovation of the 12th century. This, too, was a distinctive feature of the King's House which set it apart from other royal

households, and one that was not entirely abolished until the Reformation. Another significant characteristic of these two positions is the fact that they were clearly not confined to the service court – the clerk of the liverance played a highly visible role in the formal ceremonies of the hall, and from the 1170s onwards we find the clerk of the provend acting as a frequent witness to the king's charters, indicating that he was a regular participant in the royal council. Just as the chamber servants could perform domestic tasks, the leading service court personnel were high-status courtiers. This reinforces the contrast with the English royal household, with its firm division between the public 'Magnificence' and hidden 'Logistics'.

In the 13th-century plan of the King's House, a nightly meeting in the hall is mentioned, in which the clerk of the liverance and clerk of the provend went over the day's expenditure, assisted by the marshals of the hall and the other department heads, and the clerk of the provend made a copy in the written accounts – notwithstanding the disruption of royal government between the 1280s and 1340s, later sources show that versions of this daily meeting continue in the 16th century.

As this suggests, the duties of these two key figures in the service court remained surprisingly stable – the main developments were further changes in their titles and social positions under the influence of international fashions, similar to the initial 12th-century transition from Celtic retainers into medieval clerics. The title of clerk of the provend disappears after 1290, and Robert the Bruce appointed laymen of knightly rank with the grander-sounding designation of Steward of the **King's House**. The role remained the same, however, with the steward controlling the supply of all the consumables in the King's House, from porridge oats to coal, and from jellied eels to dried rushes for the floors. The clerk of the liverance retained his title into the early 15th century, but this was superseded in 1406 by the lay title of Chamberlain Depute, renamed in James I's reforms of 1424 as the Master of the Household; this title was in turn replaced in 1498 by that of Master Carver, a designation which emphasised the traditional duties associated with the role, and simultaneously entrusted to a nobleman – the Master of Gray – whose superior social rank not only emphasised the grandeur of the monarchy, but also imbued his position with implicit authority over all the other resident personnel of the King's House.⁷

The continuity in the two roles is emphasised by the description of James V's household in 1522: the position of chief server had reverted to the now more conservative title of master of the household, its ceremonious nature being recognised by giving it to the pageant-producer and playwright David Lindsay, while the role of chief provisioner had been returned to a churchman, now designated as the Clerk of the Expense; but we still find him writing up the day's expenses every evening, in the presence of the master of the household and the officers of the guard, just as the clerk of the provend had done for the clerk of the liverance and the marshals of the hall some 250 years earlier.

In the mid-1520s, the titles switched back to carver and steward of the household, while the new designation of clerk of the expense was transferred to a subordinate of the latter who controlled the cash and the account books, perhaps a successor of the secretary mentioned as early as the 13th century. From the 1530s, a strong French influence introduced a new set of superficial changes – the carver reverted back again to being the master of the household, now with two incumbents of knightly rank rotating on six-month assignments as in the French royal household, while the steward, whose title had no convenient translation, adopted the approximately appropriate French designation of argentier, and reverted to being a layman. What is more surprising is that the appointment of clergymen to the role of chief provisioner had continued for so long in the first place, and they might have regained their place, if the Reformation had not reduced the clergy to a corps of parish preachers. The duties described in the 1580s remained recognisably the same as 450 years earlier, with the master of the household personally supervising the serving of the meal, while the steward of the household was responsible for the purchase and storage of all the provisions in the King's House, being required to know exactly where everything was kept and what was being taken out; in the nightly meeting, he acted as the arbiter who affirmed the expenses claims of the other personnel based on his detailed personal knowledge of the stocks, while the clerk of the expense set down the totals in the accounts.

The storage and preparation of the food brought into the King's House naturally required additional external spaces outside the hall and chamber, which can be grouped together conceptually as the buildings of the service court (although in literal architectural terms, it should be emphasised they could also be concealed

within the basements of a formal quadrangle dominated by the chamber, chapel and hall, a layout seen very clearly at Linlithgow). The most important of these was the **King's Kitchen**, presided over in the 12th and early 13th century by the Cook – there was a little dynasty of them, serving in the King's House over at least three generations from the 1140s to the 1220s, who also held the land of Balcaskie in Fife. In the later part of the 13th century, their authority passed to the Clerk of the Kitchen, who acted as both supervisor and accountant, and in the 14th century he is said to have handled an annual budget of £10, comparable to the income of a significant laird, which must have been for specialist ingredients and his subordinates' pay, and suggests an impressively large and perhaps sophisticated establishment.

The 15th century saw the gradual subdivision of the department between two kitchens, one to perform the fancier and more intimate cooking, the other to provide the basic victuals – the first evidence for this comes when the kitchen built in Edinburgh Castle in 1382 was joined by a separate 'King's Kitchen' in 1419, and these are presumably the two kitchens mentioned in 1434, assigned at that point to the four-year-old Duke of Rothesay and the Captain of the Castle, surrogates for the king in his chamber and the constable supervising the hall. A formal organisational division into a Court Kitchen and **King's Kitchen** is recorded in the reign of James IV; at that date, the head of each department retained the old-fashioned title of Usher of the Kitchen, changing to Master Cook in the reign of James V. As the 1434 reference reveals, the heir to the throne often had a separate **Prince's Kitchen** for his baby food and the rations of his nurses, and a third **Queen's Kitchen** was added for the French chefs of James V's queen and again for the Danish cooks of James VI's consort. Nonetheless, only Edinburgh Castle and James V's Holyrood offer clear evidence for the physical existence of multiple kitchens, and even then there were only two of them, and a close practical association between the departments is implied by the temporary lack of a separate master cook for the court sub-department in the 1590s. The divisions within the kitchen may have been more to do with a division of responsibilities between separate *cuisines* or entourages of cooks – James VI's pastry chef was in the king's kitchen, for example, and the French chefs under James V had been in the queen's – rather than the regular existence of genuinely separate physical spaces.

Three other major spaces existed within the service court, all of them concerned with storage: the Pantry (where bread was kept), the Buttery (where the 'butts' or barrels of wine and ale were housed), the Larder (the cellar where the meat was hung and barrelled); all three spaces appear in the idealised description of the 13th-century King's House, and as physical structures in the maintenance expenses for Robert the Bruce's residences; they recur as departments in 16th-century sources, and their presence should be borne in mind when interpreting the architectural plans of the royal palaces of that period. In practice, we would expect them to be a group of cool cellars.

While the geography of this area of the service court was dictated by the practicalities of storage, a more complex structure was required by the practicalities of service itself. Continuing the pattern of duties in which the personnel of the King's House moved easily between ceremonious duties and administrative responsibilities, the people who oversaw these storage spaces were also involved in the pageantry of the court – the titles of Panetar and Butler were granted as hereditary positions to great barons in the 12th or 13th century, as dignified posts which involved carrying the dish and cup to serve the king on formal occasions; but the text on the King's House indicates that they also had practical administration of the bread-store and wine cellar – presumably in the form of oversight of the relevant spaces, and control of the appointments of their personnel. Insofar as the panetar and butler were generally absentees, we can probably infer that there were subordinate ushers in the pantry and buttery who not only oversaw the management of the stores there, but also assisted the clerk of the liverance in serving the king's food and drink on a day-to-day basis, precursors of the Sewer and Cupbearer who appear in the same roles in the 15th century. We get a glimpse of the cupbearer's role in 1437, during the assassination of James I – he had just brought a late-night cup of wine from the buttery to serve the king in the chamber, and ran into the assassins when he was on the way out.

In the reign of James IV, we find a complex but tightly organised practical organisation which stepped across the notional departmental subdivisions: the Earl of Bothwell, having acquired the dignity of hereditary panetar along with his new peerage, appointed one of his nephews as sewer, with direct authority over the pantry, while another Hepburn kinsman combined oversight over the buttery, the larder and a small and probably relatively new department known as the

Cuphouse, where the silver and the pewter vessels were kept. Simultaneously, the butler, Sir Patrick Home, deputised his great-nephew to serve as the cupbearer – a young man who added further dignity to the office because he was the Master of Home, the heir to the family peerage, while a personal retainer of the butler's was in charge of the pewterware in the cuphouse – notionally subordinate to the Hepburn representative there, his role was evidently to facilitate supplies to the cupbearer. When the butlership was subsequently deputised to the lairds of Duntreath, they managed to place an Edmonstone kinsman in charge of the silverware, and when a fourth family, the lairds of Burleigh, gained authority in the buttery sub-department known as the Ale Cellar, they likewise added a kinsman as a third-tier subordinate in the cuphouse, a theoretical servant of the Home family retainer in the pewterware sub-department.

It is clear from this that the high-ranking noblemen and lairds performing prestigious roles in the King's House had direct and access to the practical service court departments which their duties required, mediated through the assistance of personal retainers whose relationships to them were somewhat obscured by the formal departmental structure. Throughout all this, the practical duty of purchasing and keeping the king's wine was kept separate, in the charge of a branch of the Douglas kindred – and, as one of them was seconded into the queen's household, it can be inferred that they, too, had a direct role in communicating with the private areas of the royal residence. These details reinforce the impression that personnel in the King's House were generally expected to perform both practical private duties and visible ceremonial roles, moving freely between the hall, the chamber and the service court, and indeed between the formal sub-departments to which they were assigned, in a way that contrasted sharply with the strict division of the English royal household. The structure was tight-knit and idiosyncratic, but ultimately practical, balancing an archaic geography of departments which remained relevant for storage purposes with the practical requirements of getting the necessary stores from there to the relevant people within the rather differently organised corps of servers in the hall and chamber.

The 13th-century text also mentions additional minor departments, which at that date were also passed down as a sort of inheritance in individual families; the text names the servants responsible for the linen, candles and water-jug – the Naperer,

Chandler and Ewer – but this was clearly not an exhaustive list. The linen or napery may have been responsibility of the Napier family, a prominent branch of which certainly held another of these little fiefdoms, the post of hereditary Poulterers to the royal household, combined with a small estate near the Dean Village on the outskirts of Edinburgh. By the 16th century, the other small departments seem to have lost their hereditary character, and to have been merged in practice, with a staff of just one or two personnel.

Two additional department heads – the Baker and the Brewer – had self-explanatory roles, but they stood at something of a distance from the rest of the service court within the virtual architecture of the King's House. Breadmaking was kept apart both organisationally and architecturally: the intense heat of its oven hearth and flue were considered a fire risk, and the loaves were not transferred directly for serving, but instead produced in large batches, and a morning delivery brought them to the pantry for further distribution from there. In the architecture of Scottish castles and mansions, it is generally assumed that the baking work was performed in an outbuilding located in the furthest area of the physical service court, but there is a surprisingly limited amount of evidence for a physical Bakehouse in the royal residences. The position of baker is much better documented, being first recorded in 1170, when Alilf the Baker was given lands at Inverleith near Edinburgh – but these were close to the royal flour-mills, suggesting that he may have been working on site there; his son Nicholas inherited both the post and the estate in 1213, and continued in office into the reign of Alexander III (1249–86). In the late 15th and early 16th century, the role seems to have been contracted out simultaneously to a number of commercial bakeries in the burghs, whose owners received large quantities of flour, and documents of the 1520s and early 1530s confirm that they were subordinated to the pantry department, part of a streamlined supply chain overseen by the steward, panetar and sewer – but, in 1535, one George Gibson was appointed Master Baker, apparently based in the King's House, and expected to regulate other suppliers by appointing them as his deputies.

Interpreting the exact role of the baker is complicated by two additional factors. Firstly, the basic rations of a Scottish household typically relied on porridge and perhaps oatcakes, which did not require the specialist facilities of a bakehouse – the extant procurement accounts from the 1520s and 1530s certainly indicate that

the 'bread' produced for the King's House at that time consisted of oatcakes, delivered weekly rather than daily. This would limit the specialist oven-baking duties to the production of high-end fare. Secondly, in the reign of James VI, the name of 'baker' is sometimes used for the pastry chef, who was in a separate department, the king's kitchen. The small ovens within unified food-preparation spaces, like the one which survives at Linlithgow, are simply too small for batch loaves, and must have been used for much more sophisticated recipes, like the venison-and-cabbage pastries mentioned in 1598. It may be no coincidence that the only evidence for the construction of physical bakehouses suitable for producing batch loaves within the royal residences dates from periods when the King's House accommodated important contingents of French personnel who would expect wheat bread – in Edinburgh Castle during the regency of the Duke of Albany in 1515, and at Falkland Palace after the arrival of Mary of Guise and her retinue in 1538.

One aspect of sustenance that was unquestionably important was the supply of beer, the main drink of Scotland in the Middle Ages and Renaissance. Castles and mansions usually had a brewhouse adjacent to the bakehouse, but, while facilities are found in the architecture of smaller royal centres,⁸ they are surprisingly absent in the major residences. A brewhouse is recorded at Linlithgow, but this was a modest wattle-and-daub building with a heather roof,⁹ so it must have stood well away from the palace proper, and it may be no coincidence that Linlithgow (somewhat uniquely) had the administrative complex for a substantial area of royal demesne located within its wider precincts. Another brewery was built in Edinburgh Castle in 1515, along with the new bakehouse,¹⁰ but this was perhaps to supply French-style beer to the Duke of Albany's men along with the wheat bread from the adjacent ovens, or else a security measure by a regime that was very conscious of the young James V's safety. We hear relatively consistently of **King's** Brewer, but it seems that even in the 13th century they were based outside the King's House, operating commercial breweries of some repute. The brewing of Scottish ale – unhopped and unfiltered – could in principle take place in any properly equipped kitchen, and this expedient may have been used when it is mentioned at Edinburgh Castle in the 1450s.¹¹

With the production thus outsourced, the main requirement for beer within the King's House was storage – by the end of the period this was regarded as an

important task, as the Scots had a high regard for local vintage ale, kept in barrel for up to a decade, and the King's House also drank a significant quantity of imported German beer. This responsibility naturally belonged to the buttery, and the evidence suggests that the brewer was in practice a subordinate of the butler – by the start of James IV's reign, the beer was apparently kept in a separate physical cellar, but was still administered by the butler; a separate Master of the Ale Cellar appears in the 1490s, in the person of the laird of Burleigh – this was not simply a sinecure, as he had relatives performing practical functions, but the positions they held show that, for practical purposes, the ale cellar continued to be integrated with the buttery. Only in the reign of James VI did the Ale Cellar finally become a separate department – it came into the hands of a family named Boag, who gained control of the offices of brewer and master of the ale cellar, provided all the personnel, and evidently supervised the entire process of production, procurement and storage of the royal ale, including a train of packhorses to bring it to the King's House.

One additional space which must have existed, but which is not clearly documented, is the large-scale dry storage required for the cereal and other staple ingredients, as well as other consumables such as firewood (giving way to coal from the 14th century), and straw for flooring and bedding – presumably, this came under the direct control of the chief provisioner, although it is hard to find much direct mention of it as a feature of major royal residences at any date. For convenience, it can be described as the Vault.

Thus, the enduring shape of the service court becomes clear – the chief server and chief provisioner worked in tandem to oversee the provisions of the King's House and the presentation of the food and drink in the hall, assisted in *both* roles by the subordinate personnel who were theoretically charged with the storage cellars; on-site preparation was performed by the staff of the large kitchen department, by the 16th century consisting of several specialist teams, not necessarily working in distinct physical spaces, while it is also important to consider the possibility that the production of bread and beer was entirely outsourced. This part of the King's House was much more directly located within the physical architecture of royal buildings than the very abstract chamber and chapel and even the hall, but at the same time it was organised in such a way that its personnel interacted easily across its official (and architectural) subdivisions, and moved with little

hindrance to perform roles in the public ceremonial of the court and the private lives of the royal family.

In addition, three further departments of the King's House need to be mentioned at this point – the treasury, which has already been mentioned above, and the Artillery, and the King's Stables. They lay within the broad precinct of its virtual space, but their duties were specialised and professional, and all of them were established during the one short period of systematic organisational reform under James I. Moreover, all of them were physically based in static headquarters within Edinburgh Castle. This means that they will be discussed in detail in Part 2 of this report, but an outline of their roles is useful at this point.

As mentioned above, James I's 1424 reforms of the King's House introduced the Treasury as a new finance department, based loosely on English royal practice. The Treasurer was either a layman of high social rank, or else a senior churchman with administrative experience – a prelate or the dean of a cathedral chapter. Under him were several subordinates, the most important of whom was the Comptroller – this title was borrowed from an English official who already had a counterpart in the person of the Clerk of the Rolls in the administrative section of the chapel, but in Scotland he came to act as the treasury's accountant within a streamlined and separate financial administration. Also associated with the treasury were the Masters of Works, project managers who were assigned individual tasks such as the repair of a particular royal residence, or the building of a ship, or minting a new issue of coinage. In an important administrative innovation, they each kept their own self-contained records of their expenditure on each project, which were audited individually and clearly distinguished from the rest of the royal accounts.

The treasury immediately asserted itself as a structurally important concept within the King's House. As well as being an abstract space, the department also acquired a physical base inside Edinburgh Castle, differentiated by the name of the Treasurer-House. This acted as the royal bank vault and the headquarters of the financial administration, but also served as the normal location where valuables used within the King's House were kept, such as the iron-bound cupboard containing the royal silverware, which only left the castle when it was specifically needed in another location, such as Holyrood or Falkland, and the Scottish Crown Jewels – earlier documents show that the same role was

performed by a physical 'treasury' within the castle as early as the 1290s, overseen at that date by the wardrobe department, and some form of continuity is possible. This suggested a specific physical association between the King's House and Edinburgh Castle, something which has already been mentioned in connection with the keeping of the bureaucratic records of the administrative chapel.

The Artillery is first recorded as a distinct department in 1436, when the first pay record for a Master of the Artillery survives; it can thus be associated with the reforms of James I, though its inspiration seems to have been Burgundian rather than English, and its emergence was probably related to the arrival of Scotland's first heavy siege gun six years earlier. From the outset, Edinburgh Castle was the centre where the king's cannons – including the famous Mons Meg – were stored and serviced, and in the reign of James IV this led to the castle becoming the kingdom's cannon foundry as well, the first production centre for heavy bronze artillery in the British Isles, using a team of alchemists led by a Master Melter. After Flodden, the duties of the artillery diversified to include the castle's defence: a permanent company of royal gunners was placed on duty, acting as independent officials of the King's House rather than subordinates of the military governor. These men were in fact the master melter and his assistants, under the titles of Master Gunner and Ordinary Gunners, so called because they were ordinarily resident in the castle, assisted by a number Extraordinary Gunners who were available to assist them if required. Although the castles at Stirling, Dumbarton and Dunbar also acquired their own artillery, and a naval storehouse was set up at Leith, Edinburgh was the home of almost all the heavy guns, and by far the largest corps of artillerymen – where they served as a reserve for the army and the fleet, a symbol of the strength of the monarchy, and also a practical part of the castle's defences. James V further expanded the military duties of the artillery, adding a Munition House, a building designed for storing and displaying armour and edged weapons as well as guns, which served into the 18th century as Scotland's main stockpile of infantry equipment. The corps also came to include a diverse body of skilled craftsmen – the carvers who created the Stirling Heads were officially salaried to design the increasingly ornate sculpted decoration on the bronze barrels of the king's cannons, and to build the gun-carriages which carried them, while the Edinburgh Castle smith worked simultaneously on metal fittings for gun-carriages and ornamental ironwork for Holyrood Palace. Another

decorative role which the artillery performed was the production of firework displays, which were introduced as early as the reign of James IV.

Another change which can probably be associated with James I's reforms was the emergence of the **King's Stable**. There were, of course, stables at all the royal residences, but in the 1450s a reference to an Avery (a hay-store for horses) marks the emergence of a distinct conceptual department, and its base from the outset seems to have been in the king's stables which were physically located at Edinburgh Castle, adjacent to the tournament-ground or 'Barras'. The early Clerk of the Avery was replaced by the Squire of the Stable, imitating the French title *ecuyer de l'ecuyerie*, under the influence of which both the squire and stable subsequently became known as the Equerry. The subordinate personnel are most consistently referred to as Yeomen of the Stable, but variously identified as marshals, valets, grooms or pages, and by a variety of individual titles such as sumpterman and stirrupman. As well as maintaining the horses and associated equipment, they functioned as messengers and attendants.

The physical king's stables lay out with the ramparts of the castle, but in theoretical terms the outermost location in the King's House was the Gate, where the Porter supervised access from his Lodge. This was the point at which the imaginary space interacted with the real world, and, whereas the rest of its virtual architecture was designed to fit into the internal layout of the royal residences, the gate was simultaneously represented by a series of specific entrances, located in a variety of different places. Reflecting this, there was a separate resident porter at each individual royal residence - the one at Edinburgh Castle is attested as early as the 1170s, and they are recorded widely in the 13th century. A Principal Master Porter only emerges under James IV, probably under the influence of the knight porter of the English royal household (in the reign of James VI, however, this position came into the hands of the Boags from the ale cellar, perhaps to facilitate the easy passage of their packhorse convoys laden with beer barrels). Beyond the gate were the Garden and Orchard, responsible for supplying vegetables and fruit - both their location and their role identifies these areas as real places outside the physical royal residences; at Edinburgh Castle, they were already well established in the reign of David I.

Another anomalous outpost of the King's House in the real world was the Mint, which produced the kingdom's coinage, but also functioned as a *bureau de*

change. This was normally run by a private contractor (such as the Edinburgh branch of an Italian merchant bank), and funded by the fees charged for its services, known as seigniorage. It thus shifted location regularly, and there was sometimes more than one mint working simultaneously in different towns, but, in principle, each Mintmaster was affiliated to the financial chamber until 1424, and subsequently became a master of works answering to the treasury, and the administration also tended to regard the buildings it used as part of the royal demesne and thus the abstract King's House. In the 16th century, the mint was temporarily brought inside Edinburgh Castle, and the mintmaster became more obviously a member of the administration.

The only central department of the medieval Scottish government which did not form an integral part of the King's House was the Exchequer, which was not involved directly in the administration, but had the more limited role of auditing the accounts of royal expenditure, a laborious task which was entrusted to a committee of noblemen known as the Lords Auditors – representatives of the kingdom's taxpayers. It is to the exchequer that we owe most of the extant documents relating to Edinburgh Castle and the other royal residences which embodied the abstract King's House.

One official who is surprisingly absent from the King's House is the Steward of Scotland, a senior hereditary official and powerful baron, whose family adopted the surname of Stewart – Robert Stewart, 7th Steward of Scotland, was a grandson of Robert the Bruce, and eventually inherited the throne as King Robert II in 1371, after which the title was always assigned to the king's eldest son. Since the 18th century, historians have taken it for granted the Steward of Scotland was originally a high-ranking member of the domestic personnel in the King's House, but this idea cannot be traced back beyond post-medieval antiquarian texts. Late-medieval writers saw the Steward of Scotland as a sort of viceroy, a grander equivalent to the royal stewards who acted as local governors in vacant earldoms annexed to the royal demesne, while the tract on the 13th-century King's House attributes him only a vague supervisory role with no specific duties. In short, there is no evidence to suggest that the Steward of Scotland ever had a practical role in the King's House – and when David I established the position, the obvious role-models were the Seneschal of France and his fictitious counterpart Sir Kay at the

imaginary Arthurian court, aristocratic military commanders whose household duties were restricted to occasional ceremonial appearances at the king's side.

In spite of the evolutions in the structure of the King's House, and the addition of extra administrative departments under James I, it is clear that the outline of Scottish royal authority remained essentially fixed, and firmly tied to the physical layout of the king's castles and palaces: the chamber acted as the personal residential and decision-making space, the chapel performed both administrative and religious duties, and the hall accommodated the military contingent and public interaction, all of them supported by the facilities of the service court – the kitchen, the storage departments and the high-profile personnel who oversaw them. The gatehouse and gardens provided a link to the real world. Even James I's additional administrative structures functioned as parts of the same virtual palace, not least through their physical location in Edinburgh Castle. This continuity is especially remarkable, as the origins of most of the key officials appear to lie in the distant Celtic past – the usher at the door of the chamber, the constable and his guards in the hall, and the server and provisioner coordinating the service court, can all be shown to have their origins a long time before the earliest clear documentation begins in the 1120s.

Under James VI, the King's House ceased to function as a unified body, as the sovereign travelled south to London to create the United Kingdom, leaving the chapel to become Scotland's civil service, and the hall personnel to perform guard duties for Parliament. The chamber and the service court disappeared from Scotland, and it seemed as though the ancient organisation had been broken up in a symbolic way as well as a physical one – but, in fact, the absent elements of the King's House merely took the high road to England and took up residence within the precincts of Whitehall Palace. The Tudor royal household had been reorganised so often to suit international fashions, royal whims, political moods or financial expedients that the palace coup passed almost without notice. In particular, the English privy chamber had been weakened by the Elizabeth I's female inner circle, and the king's chamber from Edinburgh moved deftly into the space in government where the ladies-in-waiting had been, consigning the parallel components of the English royal court to an irrelevant obsolescence and eventually abolition. The separate offices of Master of the Household and Lord Steward, and the inner core of Gentlemen of the Bedchamber and Pages of

Honour, all still in place today, arrived in England in 1603, while the Usher of the Chamber was intruded into the duties of his English counterpart Black Rod, and took over completely in 1620. It is thus the distinctive Scottish continuity of the King's House which is perpetuated in the present-day royal household of the United Kingdom.

For the purposes of this report, of course, the focus is the relationship of the King's House to one specific royal residence, Edinburgh Castle. To a large extent it is that relationship which continues to draw visitors to Scotland's most-popular tourist attraction – from Mons Meg and St Margaret's Chapel to the Great Hall and the Honours of Scotland, the castle's iconic sights are tangible and authentic expressions of the virtual palace in which the medieval Scottish monarchy set itself. Less obvious elements of the castle's architecture, such as Register House and the storage cellars, also embody the more practical aspects of the royal court.

Until the 1490s, however, the castle also served as a centre of local administration, the headquarters of an official known as the Sheriff, who administered a surrounding area of territory known as a Sheriffdom. This was the standard form of local government in medieval Scotland, but the sheriffdom was not administered as a single unified jurisdiction – it was formed from three separate administrative components: the castle, the town of Edinburgh and the surrounding countryside.

Any royal centre in Scotland was in principle a royal residence, a physical representation of the King's House in which the king could base himself if required. In the case of Edinburgh Castle, this role was very much a real one, but the mobile nature of the monarchy meant that no one residence was permanently under royal occupation – Edinburgh, like other important castles and palaces, had a hierarchy of local officials responsible for its defence and maintenance, whose organisation paralleled the structure of the King's House, just as they represented the royal authority.

As the head of this parallel hierarchy, the sheriff was known as the Keeper; he was assisted by a deputy known as the Constable of the Castle, whose local duties corresponded to those of the hereditary constable in the King's House, and he also had the resident staff of the King's House seconded to him – most obviously

the porter at the gate, and also the outdoor personnel in the garden and orchard. The formal garrison was very small, consisting only of a small number of salaried Watchmen (as few as two men in peacetime at Edinburgh Castle). In theory, these men were supposed to be reinforced in time of crisis by knights and lairds from the surrounding sheriffdom under a system called 'castle ward', but already in the 13th century this obligation had been reduced to a series of notional cash payments to the government. Instead, the keeper would normally create a retinue from his relatives and family retainers, in very much the same manner that has been discussed above with regard to the guard in the king's hall. In a 1514 report on the military readiness of Edinburgh Castle, the keeper barely needed to mention the issue of basic manpower, which was provided without any apparent hesitation by his 'kin and friends'.

The significance of Edinburgh Castle, both as a regular royal residence and as a major fortress, meant that the keeper and his men often had to work alongside the presence of royalty, and the actual personnel of the King's House. It is not always clear how this coexistence worked, but we can see that it took place. In the late 14th century, the castle was assigned to the heir to the throne, who appointed a subordinate keeper who also acted as the sheriff, while in the 1430s the castle accommodated both a resident keeper, and the separate 'little royal household' of the future James II, sharing the physical space in an unconventional way. In the early years of James IV's reign, the sheriff combined his authority as keeper with an important place in the King's House administration, acting as hereditary panetar, with kinsmen serving under him in subordinate roles. One source of the 16th century mentions a separate **Captain's Tower**, which may have provided a self-contained residence for the keeper from the start - 'captain' in a castle context being synonymous with keeper. A possible parallel is provided by the Elphinstone Tower at Stirling, whose name identifies it with the hereditary keepers of that castle - this was a self-contained tower-house, set spatially well apart from the royal residence.

Even when there was no resident royal retinue, however, the sheriff's authority was sometimes divided - the sheriff might act principally as military governor of the castle and appoint a subordinate to fulfil his administrative duties outside its walls, known as the Sheriff Depute. On other occasions, the castle itself was entrusted to a deputy, a more irregular situation which was described in the

records by various circumlocutions rather than a consistent title. Sometimes, it is possible that the roles of sheriff and keeper were completely separated, with two different men being appointed as direct subordinates of the king – in the 15th century, it is often hard to say whether the men styled keeper and sheriff at Edinburgh were a principal officeholder and his deputy, or two independent royal appointees, but the practice of separating the posts became standard after 1494.

Nonetheless, the conceptual association of the castle with the sheriff remained strong until the 1490s, and for long periods, there was certainly a real and direct link. Moreover, the sheriffdom also consistently provided the framework of political, social and economic organisation of the castle's immediate surroundings. In this context, it is important to understand the way that the sheriff provided local government for two other distinct territories, town and country.

The town of Edinburgh was a Royal Burgh, established by the king (in this case probably David I) and granted a near-monopoly on the import and sale of merchandise within the surrounding region, in exchange for paying a range of taxes on its trade. Edinburgh's importance was initially derived from the proximity of the royal court, which made it a natural centre for banking, the wine trade and the provision of luxury goods, but after the English capture of Berwick in the 1330s it also emerged as the hub of the lucrative wool-exporting business, whose profits and ties to Italian finance further strengthened the banking sector. Notwithstanding its importance, it was a very compact town, more or less restricted to the western stretches of the Royal Mile and Cowgate – suburbs outside these limits were not part of the town, though it had a detached enclave around the water-mills of Dean Village, and in the 14th century it also gained direct control over the port at Leith. The sheriff administered the burgh by presiding over the Burgh Court, which originally functioned as both a law-court and a political assembly, involving all the town's householders, known as the Burgesses. In the 14th century, however, the political functions and tax-collecting duties of the burgh court were absorbed by the more exclusive Merchant Guild, who began styling themselves the Burgh Council. Nonetheless, the sheriff and the burgh court retained the criminal jurisdiction (and possibly oversight of the town militia and parliamentary elections) until 1511, when the city became a separate urban sheriffdom governed by the head of the burgh council.¹² The early burgh court may have met in the castle, but, even in the 14th century, administration had

evidently moved to fortified administrative buildings within the town itself, with the council sitting in the Tolbooth and Bellhouse towers flanking the street next to St Giles' Church, while the sheriff used the Netherbow gatehouse at the entrance to the town. The law-enforcement situation was further complicated throughout the period by the ancient hereditary jurisdiction of the Constable of Scotland based in the King's House, which stripped both the sheriff and the burgh council of any authority over major crimes in and around Edinburgh, whenever the king was resident in the castle or at Holyrood.

The countryside of the province, described as Landward, was administered entirely separately by the Shire Court, a multi-purpose council headed by the sheriff, which could function as a law-court where he acted as chief judge, an administrative committee which he chaired as chief executive, an assembly of the king's subjects which he moderated as speaker, and a muster of able-bodied men which he commanded for military training and law-enforcement duty. In addition, he was chief collector and accountant of the taxes and other royal revenues. At least in the 12th and 13th centuries, and probably later still, the castle acted as a central storehouse which received a significant quantity of both cattle and cereal as royal tribute from the landward parts, not only providing victuals, but also useful by-products such as leather and candle-tallow.

The landward part of the sheriffdom was subdivided into a multiplicity of smaller components. Some parts were owned directly by the king and either leased or worked by labourers – this was called royal demesne, and an unusually large part of the castle's immediate hinterland was organised this way until the 14th century. The bulk of the territory was divided into hereditary lordships, broadly divided between small lairds, who normally had a compact estate with a private law-court which oversaw minor crimes, and major barons, important lairds, titled noblemen and major churchmen such as bishops and abbots – each baron was effectively a hereditary sheriff-depute in his own barony, which usually had its own castle and small town at its centre, and a number of subordinate small lairdships of its own. Lairds of all ranks were expected to attend the shire court in its role as a political assembly, or else to provide a substitute known as a Suitor.

The largest components of the sheriffdom were autonomous outlying districts known as Constabularies, each centred on another royal residence where the sheriff was effectively an absentee keeper, and the authority of a sheriff-depute

was delegated to a resident constable – Haddington and Linlithgow became constabularies subordinate to Edinburgh in the 13th century, each with its own constabulary court, royal burgh, and surrounding hinterland of baronies, lairdships and royal demesne. There were also a few traces of an older pattern of similar but smaller royal territories, known as Thanages – Haddington had once been the centre of a thanage, as had Callander near Linlithgow.

In contrast to the devolved authority in the town of Edinburgh, the baronies and the constabularies, there were also some territories which lay completely beyond the authority of the sheriff. The lands of important noblemen and great religious communities were fully independent of the system of sheriffdoms. These came to be known as Regalities – they could vary in scale from full-sized provinces to small lordships whose independence was largely honorific, but there were four significant regalities in the area around Edinburgh. Two of these were controlled by important abbeys, and had emerged more or less simultaneously with the sheriffdom itself in the reign of David I. The regality of Holyrood was the most significant as far as Edinburgh itself as concerned, since it included not only the abbey, but also the Canongate section of the Royal Mile, Arthur's Seat, Calton Hill and other territory directly overlooked from the castle's battlements. The regality of Inveresk was centred on the little castle of Pinkie and the thriving wool town of Musselburgh, an enclave of the larger monastic regality of Dunfermline, based beyond the Firth of Forth in Fife. The third regality was originally controlled by the Knights Templar, then annexed by the Hospitallers in 1309 – its centres at Temple and Torphichen were on the outskirts of the sheriffdom, but it's also included an urban enclave in the Grassmarket, directly adjacent to the castle's precincts. The fourth regality near Edinburgh was an hereditary secular lordship, created in the 1370s for the Douglas of Dalkeith family, uniting their scattered fiefs (and coal mines) into a private jurisdiction based at their castle.

In addition, the king sometimes chose to separate an individual castle or palace from the authority of the local sheriff, defining it as a sort of miniature sheriffdom in its own right – it did not have much in the way of territorial dependencies, but it had an independent keeper subordinate directly to the king, known as its Captain. This system began to affect the area around Edinburgh in the 15th century, when captains were appointed to the new royal mansion and naval storehouse in Leith known as the King's Wark, and to Blackness Castle, guarding the straits that led

into the upper Forth. In the 1480s, the growing importance of Linlithgow Palace saw its previously subordinate constable become an independent captain, with unusually wide geographical authority over all of West Lothian. In the final years of the 15th century, this system was extended to the capital, and Edinburgh Castle itself became an independent captaincy, separated from the sheriffdom and the burgh.

This transformation was a result of the 'byzantine' political in-fighting of the 1480s, and the context is not clearly understood by historians.¹³ In 1478, in a highly unusual move, the castle was detached from the sheriffdom and assigned to the queen as keeper, as a secure home for the upbringing of the future James IV – though in practice, it is evident that the incumbent keeper remained in place. In 1482, however, a bewilderingly rapid series of changes of keeper took place, and, amid this turmoil, the townsfolk of Edinburgh laid siege to the castle. They were rewarded by having the town promoted to become a separate urban sheriffdom with the provost as its sheriff – a move which was perhaps intended to give them control of the castle as well. In 1487, in equally unclear circumstances, a nobleman and former keeper, Lord Hailes, was anomalously elected as provost, and in 1488 he was appointed sheriff of the old territorial sheriffdom for a seven-year term – at this point, the castle was actually controlled by an opposing faction, which seems to have also set up a rival provost, but he installed himself as keeper after its surrender, and remained in post for the next five years. All these appointments were revoked in 1493, but the castle seems to have been promptly separated from the sheriffdom at this point, to become an independent fortress governed by a captain appointed directly by the king.

In the 16th century, the captain of Edinburgh Castle would be a purely military governor, and the castle's role was now to symbolise the strength and independent sovereignty of the monarchy, or to act as a state citadel in times of crisis.

The structure of the King's House and the organisation of the sheriffdom are both directly relevant for understanding the design and architectural development of Edinburgh Castle in the Middle Ages. These wider patterns of meaning also assist in understanding the castle in another way, however – they help to explain the

structure of the source material, and thus serve as a key to interpreting the evidence.

Any historical investigation is shaped by the nature of the evidence, and, in the case of Edinburgh Castle, the documentary sources are dominated by bureaucratic records of payment for the castle's expenses. These documents record centuries of royal expenditure on construction, maintenance, decoration, wages and the running of the varied state facilities which the fortress contained, and our understanding of the castle's history rests heavily on them; but the surviving records have a number of biases, which are important to understand in order to fully exploit the information they provide.

First and foremost, the surviving records are incomplete – there is, for example, a frustrating lack of evidence from the reign of James III in the late 15th century, a period when important construction projects were underway at the castle. Moreover, the story is made even more complex by the convoluted way in which the government funded its various requirements for expenditure on the fortress.

The medieval Scottish royal government retained a careful distinction between several different types of royal revenue, and, rather than automatically merging their incomes into a central treasury, the administration kept separate financial accounts of what each balance was spent on. Nor was expenditure on any project systematically assigned to one set of documents: when necessary, any and all of the governmental current accounts could be drawn on in a rather indiscriminate manner, depending on which of them contained a surplus of ready cash. The system was made even more complex by the ways in which it evolved over time, and, even when expenses *were* separated from the main accounts, this just multiplied the possible number of balance sheets where a particular cost could be debited.

These aspects of the royal accounts are not well understood, but they need to be clarified as much as possible in order to fully appreciate the meaning of the surviving evidence. It cannot be assumed that a single extant accounts document for a specific time period will contain all the relevant expenditure on the castle for those years – and aspects of the outlay that it *does* record may be disguised in various ways.

The Scottish royal government in the Middle Ages had two principal sets of financial records, known as the Exchequer Rolls and the **Treasurer's Accounts**, joined in the 16th century by a third set of accounts for the Master of Works.

The principal surviving body of the Exchequer Rolls are the accounts of the chamberlain. As explained above, this royal official oversaw the king's chamber, meaning the personnel and furnishings of the private royal apartments, a diverse group of men and objects, which happened to include the government's cash and bullion reserves. As such, the chamberlain was responsible for the principal body of royal incomes paid into the central government, and their outlay to meet the expenses of the court. The chamberlain thus assumed the role of chief financial officer. He gained substantial authority over the royal burghs, whose cash revenues formed an important element of the income which he received, and he also supervised the exchequer, the committee of auditors who scrutinised the accounts.

The chamberlain was not the only official to produce Exchequer Rolls, however: each branch of the royal administration maintained its own accounts, recording its own revenue and expenditure.

A few fragments of the exchequer accounts survive from the late 13th and early 14th centuries, followed by a reasonably complete series of chamberlain's accounts from the 1350s onwards, supplemented by a more fragmentary selection of other rolls, the most important of which are the records of export tariffs. All the extant medieval Exchequer Rolls were published in 23 volumes in 1878–1908. The initial 15 volumes down to the 1520s were overseen primarily by the then Lord Lyon, George Burnett, while the Scots literary scholar G. P. McNeill edited the rest of the material down to 1600 in eight more tomes.

In the 1420s, as mentioned above, James I implemented a major reform of the royal administration, modelled on English government practice, and based around the creation of a separate finance ministry, the treasury. The position of treasurer was created, and its incumbent was given responsibility for the oversight of royal finances, while the comptroller acted as his chief accountant and monitored royal revenues. The clerk of the spices was initially appointed to dispense cash payments, but this role soon passed directly to the treasurer. The new administration produced new forms of expense records, known as the Treasurer's

Accounts, introducing a new complexity into to the royal archives, though this complexity is intensified by the fact that the documents do not survive until the 1470s, and they diminished the importance of the extant Exchequer Rolls. The chamberlain's responsibilities were reduced to the oversight of the revenues from the burghs – a more technical task which often took him away from court.

Another aspect of James I's reform programme, and one which is often underestimated, but which has become apparent in the course of research for this project, was the appointment of officials known as Masters of Works, charged with the oversight of specific schemes of construction and maintenance in royal residences and fortresses. This new approach to project management introduced an important innovation – in contrast with the traditional Scottish practice of managing the royal accounts so that the expenditure was balanced against the various different revenues, the Master of Works kept individual accounts for their projects, and then submitted them to the treasurer for payment.

James III developed this system further. An efficient approach to the royal finances meant that the treasurer was handling larger revenues. At the same time, the Master of Works were given oversight of all royal building work, especially the king's ambitious schemes in and around Edinburgh. The king did not introduce the practice of Treasurer's Accounts and master of works' records, but the shift in the focus of royal financing suggests that his intention was to consolidate these expenses into a single, separate set of accounts, although this system broke down with James III's demise in 1488, and the treasurer's accounts subsequently became the principal clearinghouse for individual expenditure, with additional ad hoc account books being used where necessary for particular projects.

The treasurer's accounts survive in fragments from 1473 onwards, and in reasonably complete form from 1488, although some sections are missing. Publication of a printed edition began simultaneously with the exchequer records, with the first volume appearing under the editorship of Thomas Dickinson in 1877. The work was then taken over by Sir J. Balfour Paul, Burnett's successor as Lord Lyon, and by 1916 he had reached volume 11, and the overthrow of Mary Queen of Scots. After this work halted, until C. T. McInnes edited two more volumes in the 1970s, covering the years 1556–80.

The early Master of Works' accounts are missing – the extant records only commence in 1529, in the reign of James V, when the system was strengthened by appointing a permanent Principal Master of the King's Works. The documents are divided somewhat idiosyncratically into individual account books, some concerned to a greater or lesser degree with a specific building campaign on a particular royal residence, others recording general maintenance expenditure and the wages of workmen and artisans. The extant series of accounts appears to be relatively comprehensive, although there are certainly some gaps, and, of course, 'comprehensive' is a relative term for the paperwork of a royal administration which was still casually switching between different sets of accounts, depending on where revenue could be made available. The tighter integration of the Master of Works' system into the central administration had the effect of turning it into yet another juggling ball for the royal finances.

The works documents are available in print, in a more modern edition than the exchequer and treasury records, in two volumes covering the years 1529–1649: the first, down to 1615, was edited by H. M. Panton and appeared in 1957, and the second by J. Imrie and J. G. Dunbar in 1982.

One of the results of all these changes was that, as time went on, and the system grew more complex and entrenched, the diversity of possible documents in which expenditure on Edinburgh Castle might be recorded became wider. But, even where all three of the basic documentary types survive, they may not reveal the entire story of what was being done, as there were three forms of additional outlay which do not appear in the main documentary sources.

The most important of these consisted of the revenue received by the Sheriff of Edinburgh and his colleagues in the kingdom's other burghs. Somewhat counter-intuitively, the sheriffs' revenues did not include the substantial customs tariffs and trading-licence fees paid by the burghs in which they were based. Instead, they handled the administration of royal property in the shire, including rents as an urban landlord and revenues from royal lordships, and they also oversaw the collection of direct taxation in those years when it was levied. Records of their accounts were kept in written form among the Exchequer Rolls, but survive only in fragments, supported for Edinburgh in particular by some additional records from the English occupation regime between the 1290s and the 1330s. These contain enough evidence to show that the sheriffdom of Edinburgh provided a

substantial additional source of revenue in the 14th century, and, as office of sheriff was usually combined with the post of governor of Edinburgh Castle, these revenues were available as an immediate source for funding the castle's expenses.

The second form of lost expenditure takes the form of outlays that were handled by royal officials from within their own salaries – the wages paid to them were expected to cover not merely the cost of living, but also their professional requirements and other ordinary expenses. The basic wages of castle personnel such as garrison knights, master craftsmen and gunners would cover the upkeep of their equipment and the decoration and furnishing of their accommodation, but the larger sums to more important officials could be used to cover more important costs.

To take just one pertinent and prominent example, the sums of nearly £500 disbursed as wages to the governor of the castle during the years 1362–4 may have made a large contribution to the substantial rebuilding of the fortress which was ongoing at that time, in addition to the specific expenses itemised in the extant Exchequer Roll accounts, and any unrecorded outlay drawn from the sheriff's revenue.

Another very important source of expenditure, of which virtually no trace survives, consisted of revenues that were not paid in monetary form, commonly known to historians as 'renders'. An illustrative example of this can be glimpsed in the early Exchequer Rolls from the 1260s, where a payment is made for carrying eels from Forfar Loch to Forfar Castle, but no payment is entered for the eels themselves – we know from another source that the eels were owed as part of an annual render due to the king from the locality, but if the locals had not managed to secure compensation for transporting them they would not appear in the accounts at all. Many other renders were probably collected in this way, unseen by the extant accounts, and they would be paid out again in the form of rations, beer or non-monetary wages, or simply sold for cash which could then be expended in the usual way, all with an equal lack of record in the surviving sources.

The organisation of these non-monetary revenues was handled by a department of its own within the royal administration, which seems to have functioned much the same in the 12th century and the 16th. Its accounts are not now known to exist,

and their absence makes it impossible to gauge the extent of its revenues, except where they can be inferred in other forms of document.

For example, charters from the reign of David I refer to the bringing of cattle to the castle and other royal centres, and to the processing of these into products in the form of beef, hides, candles and soap. Nearly 400 years later, in the reign of James IV, we have records of large quantities of salt beef being brought out of the castle and placed aboard the warship *Great Michael* to serve as part of the crew's rations. It seems that both sets of records offer glimpses of an ongoing process, in which the castle vault served as a vast larder for beef products received as a non-monetary royal render, used to feed the royal household, supply other bodies of troops and to sustain the garrison in time of siege.

There were also obligations for unpaid labour, including a duty to perform construction and repair work on royal fortresses. These are not fully understood, but their existence at Edinburgh is implied in a charter issued to the municipal council by James II in 1450, giving them authority to build and maintain the city's fortifications. This document has puzzled historians, as the city's fortifications were already in existence by this date, but its meaning becomes clearer when we realise the likelihood that those fortifications had previously been built and maintained by the old system of unpaid labour services organised by royal officials. What James II was doing was relieving the burgh of these burdens and giving the council the authority and responsibility to maintain and extend the walls in future, funding and organising the labour and materials in whatever way they saw fit. Both before and after 1450, however, the implication is that conscript labour could be used to build the adjacent castle – quarrying, transporting and construction could all probably be carried on without appearing at all in the royal accounts.

The result of this complex system of organising the royal income and expenditure is that the sources for Edinburgh Castle must be handled in a careful and wide-ranging way, and the gaps in the record always need to be borne in mind.

A note for readers

This report synthesises a large quantity of primary source material, so, to conclude the introduction, it seems necessary to outline the editorial principles that have been adopted.

Due to the time constraints under which this report has been prepared, it is based largely on pre-existing published texts of the documents. It has proved impossible to consult original manuscript texts, except where necessary – the most notable examples of this are the documents from the 1330s discussed in Appendix 4: The English Garrisons, two of which had not been printed previously in full. Nonetheless, an effort has been made to consult all relevant documents in the original language rather than simply in translation, to ensure that the relevant phrasing and terminology is accurately reported. In two cases, under 27 November 1301 and June 1302, it has been necessary to cite an unpublished medieval text at second hand, based on a short remark in a secondary source, but this has been noted on both occasions.

In general, references to secondary works are given following the ‘Harvard’ system of author’s surname, date and page (e.g. Jackson (1969), pp 75–8), whereas primary sources are cited using short-title abbreviations without a date. The main Calendar and Index sections use in-line citations, but it has been found easier to adopt a footnote system for the appendices. Certain conventions have been employed where particular citation forms are familiar to scholars – for example, the *Scots Peerage* and *Complete Peerage* are cited simply as *SP* and *CP*, while the early printed source-collections of Thomas Rymer and Joseph Stevenson are ‘Rymer, *Foedera*’ and ‘Stevenson, *Documents*’. The *Calendar of Documents Relating to Scotland*, a very important source for the 13th and 14th centuries, is cited under the system used in its own index, in which citations are normally given by the reference number of the individual document, but page numbers are used instead when a source runs over several pages and has no convenient internal subdivisions that can be used to allow more precise referencing by document number (e.g. *CDS* iii. No. 1186 or *CDS* v. No. 492(xvi), but *CDS* ii. p 125).

Some idiosyncrasies have been adopted, largely to aid consultation of the sources – *The Bruce* is cited by the page number in Duncan’s edition rather than by line numbering, in order to harmonise references to its critical notes, while for the *Chronical of Lanercost* page references are given to both the Latin edition and the English translation, to ease consultation of both versions as required, and Bede’s *Ecclesiastical History* is cited by the authorial divisions of book and chapter rather

than the page numbering of any specific edition. These points are noted in full in the bibliography.

One important point concerns internal referencing. Where material which is entered in the main Calendar is cited within the Index and Appendix sections of this report, it is simply cross-referenced under the date at which it is calendared, presented in bold type, without a direct duplicate citation of the underlying source (eg 11 February 1306). Some references can only be by month or year, and, where it is impossible to fix a precise year-date, a date-range is defined from internal evidence, using two separate year-dates separated by an 'x' (e.g. 1242 x 1249). In contrast, when a word rather than a date is given in bold type, it is designed to direct the reader to the alphabetical Index section.

In a survey covering a period of roughly a millennium, drawing on sources in half-a-dozen different languages, issues involving the orthography of names and technical terms are necessarily complex, but simplicity and clarity of presentation have been aimed for as much as possible. Place names are given in their modern spelling, and technical terms are provided in modern English, with the original form from the source cited in brackets where appropriate. Where a word is translated without comment, or where an explanation is presented without a direct citation, reference should be made to the *Dictionary of the Older Scottish Tongue*, the *Anglo-Norman Dictionary* and the *Oxford English Dictionary*, depending on the source language.

Personal names and place names are often hard to render with simultaneous consistency and clarity, especially in the early period where many different languages were in use, but a number of principles have been adopted here. In general, I have opted to present names in a simple format which allows transparency for modern readers: both surnames and forenames are normally given in their conventional modern spelling, and place names and geographical surnames have been adapted to the standard modern orthography (thus 'Sinclair' rather than 'St Clair'; 'Gavin' not 'Gawain', except where the Arthurian character is being referred to; and 'Jedburgh' not 'Jedward'). In cases of uncertainty, the headword form in Black's *Surnames of Scotland* has been adopted (so 'Sir Geoffrey Lister' rather than 'Littyster') and in the case of obsolete names that are also Scots proper nouns, the standardised form from *DOST* is employed (thus, most notably, 'the Barras' rather than 'the Barres'). Where appropriate, late-

medieval priests are styled with the honorific 'Sir', although efforts have been made to make clear in the text that they are clerics and not knightly laymen.

For the Welsh, Irish and Anglo-Saxon names of the period before the 12th century, I have generally followed the scholarly convention of using standardised forms in the original language, rather than making any attempt to put them in modern English. In keeping with this convention, early Gaelic names are given in classic Old Irish orthography rather than modern Scots Gaelic spelling. Exceptions are made, however, when a modernised name is so familiar that it would be counterproductive to use a historically accurate form (so kings 'Alfred' and 'Athelstan' rather than *Ælfred* and *Æthelstan* and 'Malcolm III' rather than *Máel Coluim mac Cináeda* – but his brother is referred to as 'Domnall Bán' rather than 'Donald Bane'). Modernisation of spelling also seems sensible when dealing with names such as that of King Edgar, which were used in a multi-lingual environment. Sometimes, compromise seems necessary: in the case of the 9th-century ruler remembered as the first king of Scots, I have used the form 'Kenneth mac Ailpín', feeling that the modern form of his given name is still more recognisable than *Cinaed*, but favouring a correctly written patronymic over the misleadingly surname-like and orthographically unsound 'MacAlpin'.

I have tended to write medieval surnames in a straightforward fashion without a 'de' or 'of' (thus, 'Sir Herbert Morham', 'Sir John Kingston', 'Sir Ivo Aldborough'), unless the form seems to be primarily a geographical or professional by-name rather than a hereditary surname (such as the blacksmith 'John of Dalkeith'). In general, I have followed name forms used by the Ordnance Survey and the *Scots Peerage* (hence 'Hume Castle', but 'Home' rather than 'Hume' for both the surname and the title) and the 2004 *Dictionary of National Biography*, especially when these are widely used in modern historiography (with some hesitation, I thus refer at one point to 'Sir John de St John' rather than 'Sir John St John').

One particular problem comes where Scotsmen and Englishmen have surnames that are clearly of French origin, or else appear only in a Latin or French form that leaves its origins unclear: in these cases, a form with *de*, *le* or *fitz* is normally used, although the precise form adopted has to be decided on a case-by-case basis – consider the instance of a Scottish man-at-arms who served briefly in the English occupation garrison of the castle around 1300, and thus gains a mention in Appendix 4: *CDS* ii. p 580 indexes him as 'Thomas de Bosco', Barrow (2005) calls

him 'Thomas du Boys', while the *PoMS* database renders his surname 'del Bois', and Watson (1991) generally calls him simply 'Boys'; I have opted to call him 'Thomas du Bois', with his transparently French surname presented in its standard modern spelling. In general, I have found myself favouring French or quasi-French name forms, as is already conventional for men such as Ralph de Glanville and Alexander le Convers, but where it is impossible to make a firm decision, I tend to retain the Latin instead (so in 1392, I refer to 'Walter de Camera' rather than attempting to decide between 'Walter of the Chamber', 'Chalmers', 'Chambers' or '(de la) Chambre'). Under 1161 x 1162, I have avoided the issue completely, by referring to 'Walter fitz Alan' rather than trying to decide between 'Walter the Steward' and 'Walter (the) Stewart' as a literal translation of the form given in the text – 'Walter le Seneschal' or 'Walter Senescallus' would certainly be inappropriate in this case.

For foreigners from beyond the British Isles, I have used the form in which their names usually appear in recent academic work, favouring convention over consistency: hence 'Sir Eublo de Mountz' rather than the Latinised 'Sir Ebles de Montibus' found in older reference works, but 'Sir Piers Lubaud' rather than 'Pierre de Libaud'. German forenames are given in modern spelling, but surnames and by-names are generally put in modern English, as there is no clear indication of a German form – thus 'Dietrich the Gunner' and 'Hans Crichton'; with some hesitation, I refer at one point to 'Sir Dietrich of Germany' rather than 'Sir Dietrich of Almain' or 'Sir Dietrich von Alemannien', using the most comprehensible rendering rather than the most direct one.

In the reign of James V, the influx of French soldiers and craftsmen presents special problems. I have used the conventional form 'Andrew Mansioun' for the leading carver, notwithstanding the fact that the primary documentations recognisably treat his forename as an un-assimilated *André*. The surname of the soldier who is almost invariably named as 'Captain Bucket' in the sources is rendered as 'Bousquet' based on little more than the usage in the introduction of the relevant volume of Exchequer Rolls. In an exception from the general tendency towards modernised orthography, I have opted to use the archaic spelling *Jehan* for the French equivalent of 'John', not least to avoid confusion with the Scottish girl's name *Jean*.

The money of medieval Scotland was calculated in pounds, shillings and pence, with 12 pence to the shilling and 20 shillings to the pound. Figures are translated into modern numerals, and systematically converted into pounds – for example, a source might cite a sum as 40 shillings fivepence halfpenny, written ‘xl s. v d. ob.’, but it is rendered here as £2 0s 5½*d*. Attention should also be paid to the mark, an alternative accounting unit valued at 13s 4*d* – this seemingly irregular sum was in fact two-thirds of a pound or 160 pence, and many figures recorded in the royal accounts that at first sight appear unrounded are in fact straightforward multiples of marks – an attempt has been made to note these. Where appropriate and when possible, an effort has been made to give a sense of the purchasing power of any particular sum at the date in question, and to note exchange rates when foreign currencies such as the French *écu* and Flemish groat are used.

Weights, measures and distances are generally given in the format in which they are found – familiar terms such as the ton, pint and mile are generally employed, but the customary measures in use in Scotland often diverged from the English or ‘Imperial’ system, and also varied over time: exact figures in modern weight are not always easy to determine, though where possible a conversion is given. In the discussion in the Appendix, illustrative alternatives are sometimes used for clarity and simplicity: measurements are converted from the ell of 37 inches into feet, and large volumetric measures of dry goods, such as the Scots chalders and English quarter, are approximated in tons. Artillery calibres are generally given in inches and pounds, as these are the conventional metrics with which comparisons can most easily be made (not least because of a surprising level of consistency in calibre over time) – references to an ‘18-pounder cannon’ or a ‘4.5-inch bore’ seem more meaningful than ‘8kg’ and ‘115mm’.

Summary

Finally, and very briefly, it seems useful to present a note of the basic conclusions of the report in advance. It is hoped that this will aid in interpreting the material in its own terms, by highlighting the points that have emerged during the writing of the report.

Perhaps the most surprising and important conclusion is that Edinburgh Castle served as the home of the Scottish monarchy. Already in the reign of Alexander III (1249–86), it is clear that the castle functioned as the principal royal residence and

also the state archive and government treasury. These roles were interrupted during the Wars of Independence, but they were subsequently revived, and, even after the principal royal residence was relocated to Holyrood in 1503, the castle retained its administrative and symbolic functions, underlined by the addition of a new role as home of the kingdom's prestigious artillery arsenal.

A second point, related to the first, is that there was a very high level of continuity involved in the castle's role - a continuity embodied today by the continuing presence of the Scottish Crown Jewels and Mons Meg, and by the survival of structures such as St Margaret's Chapel and the Great Hall. Understanding those continuities, and their relationship to the abstract structure of the King's House, helps to interpret the castle's history in tangible and physical ways as well as through the abstract medium of documents and prose.

Thirdly, it has become apparent that there is a great deal more material available than has previously been realised. The royal accounts provide a remarkable quantity of information, and the ability to investigate the documents over a broad chronological timeframe has revealed even more than would have been possible with a more focused study - notably in bringing to light the continuity in the structure of the King's House organisation itself. The level of information that can be extrapolated is often remarkable, ranging from a taste of the rations eaten by the English occupation garrison in the 1290s, through the dresscode of the attendees at parliament and banquets in the reign of James IV, to a detailed image of the artillery and gunners at the time of the Long Siege in the 1570s.

Lastly, it has become apparent that the history of the castle divides into defined chronological periods: until the accession of David I in 1124, a continuous narrative is not really possible, but at that date the castle emerges abruptly in the sources as a major royal centre, a role that may have become increasingly important over time, until it was abruptly interrupted by the political crisis that led to the Wars of Independence - with regard to the castle, the transfer of control to an English governor in 1291, rather than the beginning of the crisis in 1286 or the start of the Wars of Independence in 1296, appears to be the key moment of transition, not least because of the sudden shift in the focus and intensity of the evidence as English sources become available.

The Wars of Independence form a distinct phase in the castle's history, as it temporarily ceased to function as a royal residence and served for long periods as an English occupation garrison, but this also forms a richly documented phase due to the depth and range of surviving material in the English archives, and the final recapture of the castle from the English in 1341 marks an appropriate endpoint. Subsequently, the castle resumes its role as the primary home of the Scottish royal family and the main seat of their government, its history documented largely in expense accounts, records of building work, furnishing, political activity and royal domestic life; but the accession of James V in 1513 marks another transition, as the emphasis in the castle's role shifted away from residence towards military defence and artillery, while the political climate was darkened by renewed hostilities with Tudor England, and detailed narrative sources appear to supplement the royal documents.

In many ways, the departure of James VI to England in 1603 did not significantly interrupt the day-to-day role which the castle had acquired, but it marked a watershed in the history of Scotland, and it marks an appropriate point at which to bring this survey to a close.

All of the above may give a rather imposing impression of the complexity with which the realities of the King's House and the royal government were organised, and of the textual density of the documentary sources which record the ways in which Edinburgh Castle was used during the Middle Ages.

It should be borne in mind, however, that this system was a lot less intimidating to people at the time. They understood its structures implicitly, and they provided a streamlined guide to understanding everything from the filing of documents to the physical implementation of royal policy, as well as an instinctive map of the spatial and architectural arrangements of royal residences such as the castle.

It is hoped that this introduction will provide something of an insight into this mindset for the reader, and thus aid in the interpretation of the source material that follows.

PART 1: CALENDAR OF REFERENCES

Section A: 600–1124

600 (approx.): The ancient Welsh poem *Y Gododdin* tells of a warband of 300 young men, gathered in the hall of a fortress named Eidyn, almost certainly located on the Castle Rock in Edinburgh. They spent a winter feasting, drinking honeyed mead and imported wine, then rode to a battle at a place called Catraeth ('the waterfall', perhaps Catterick in Yorkshire), where almost all of them were killed in a heroic clash against an opposing army.

Y Gododdin is one of the oldest and most important works in Welsh literature, and purports to have been composed by the warband's own bard, Aneirin. The fact that it is in Welsh might seem surprising to modern sensibilities, but an early form of Welsh was the local language in parts of southern Scotland and northern England until very roughly AD 1000, and the Gododdin tribal group can be confidently located in the area between Hadrian's Wall and the Firth of Forth.

The identification of Edinburgh as the Eidyn of the poem is now a matter of academic consensus, rejecting earlier attempts to associate the name with the Roman fort at Carriden near Linlithgow (Jackson (1969), pp 75–78; Koch (1997), p xiii and n. 4; Charles-Edwards (2013), p 4). Nonetheless, scholars express varying levels of confidence about how much we can recognise a genuine 7th-century poem within the surviving text (contrast the bold linguistic reconstruction of Koch (1997) and the more cautious source-critical methodology of Charles-Edwards (1978) and Charles-Edwards (2013), pp 364–78).

According to the traditional reading of the poem, Eidyn was ruled by a chieftain called 'Mynyddog the Generous', but the recurring phrase in the text, *mynyddawc mwynvawr*, literally means 'mountainous, luxurious', and it has been argued that this is actually a poetic name for the grassy crags of Castle Rock, and that the real leader was a man called Yrfai son of Wulfstan (Isaac (1990); Koch (1993), pp 86–7; Koch (1997), p xlvi). A case for the existence of Mynyddog as a chieftain can still be made, based on a close reading of the poem's social terminology (Charles-Edwards (2013), p 377, cf. p 317, n. 19), but whoever the leader was, the fact that Yrfai's father bore an Anglo-Saxon name rather than a Welsh one indicates a level of ethnic pluralism among the inhabitants, raising doubts about the traditional interpretation which places the poem in a context of Celtic resistance against the

encroaching ancestors of the English to their south. Recent scholarship has tended towards the opinion that linguistic divides did not dominate the network of alliances and rivalries that form the political background to *Y Gododdin*.

The poem perpetuates a detailed image of the fortress. It refers to *Din Eidyn* ('fort of Eidyn'), the name which became Edinburgh, and also to 'Eidyn's hill' (*Eidyn vre*), 'Eidyn's castle' (*Eidyn gaer*) and 'Eidyn's rampart' (*Eidyn ysgor*). All of these are presumably parenthetical references to the fortified Castle Rock, but they also reveal the poet's perception of the setting. In addition, the rampart, and its gate (*dor* or *tewddor*) and alder-wood palisade (*gwernor*), are all used as metaphorical identities for the warriors themselves, defending the territory in the same way that the capital is defended by its physical fortifications. Within the ramparts, the warband (*gosgordd*) are located in the shared space of the hall (*neuadd*) containing a dais (*cyntedd*) at its upper end, where the ruler and his close companions would be seated. The hall was lit by rush-light candles (*pabir*) and by a fire of sweet-smelling pinewood (*pin*), a reference which locates the poem emphatically in Scotland rather than Wales (Cessford (1992/3), p 4). It was primarily a feasting-space, where the lord provided the warriors with mead (*medd*) and wine (*gwin*), the latter imported from France, which were served by cupbearers (*menestri*) and drunk from goblets described as 'horns' (*gyrn*), though archaeology from other sites suggests these might actually be coloured glass 'claw beakers'.

The warriors rode horses (*merch*, pl. *meirch*), and each was armed with a spear (*paladr*), 'a white shaft with a four-edged point' (*gwyngalch a pedryollt bennawr*), as well as a shield (*sgwyd*), and at least some also had body-armour (*llurig*) and a sword (*cleddyf*). They are frequently described as 'circlet-wearing' (*kaeawc*), which is generally interpreted to refer to gilded brooches fastening their cloaks at the right shoulder, though the cloaks themselves, like their other clothing, are not mentioned directly.

The poem offers no unequivocal evidence for other buildings within the fortress – it seems credible that the warriors also bedded down in the hall (Jackson (1969), p 34, sees direct evidence, but the line is translated differently by Isaac (2002), p 83), and it is also possible that their steeds could have been left to graze outdoors, like the Border light horse of later centuries; however, neither of these

points is certain, and there is one allusion to a chapel or church, where a warrior made an offering of gold.

616 x 633: Edwin, the Anglo-Saxon king of York, is said to bring all the Welsh under his overlordship, implicitly extending his authority to the Firth of Forth (Bede, II.9, II.20). There is no reliable evidence linking him directly with Edinburgh, but in later centuries he was sometimes identified as the original founder of the castle, based on a theory that Edinburgh meant 'Edwin's borough'. In linguistic terms, this is simply nonsense (Watson (1926), pp 340-2; Gelling, *et al.* (1970), pp 88-9). For a discussion of the sources and the historical background, see Appendix 1: Anglo-Saxon Edinburgh?

638: A chronicler in Iona records a 'siege of Eatin' (*obsessio Eatin*, AU 638.1), a place that can be persuasively identified with the Eidyn of *Y Gododdin*, the fortress that became Edinburgh Castle. The siege is generally associated with the advance of the Anglo-Saxons from the south, at the expense of the Welsh-speaking rulers in the area (Smyth (1986), pp 31-2; Fraser (2009), p 171). For further discussion, see Appendix 1: Anglo-Saxon Edinburgh?

854: An English chronicle mentions Edinburgh in a list of the centres over which the Bishop of Lindisfarne exercised authority at this date (*Symeonis Opera* ii. 101). However, there are two problems with this reference: in its current form, the text only dates back to the 12th century, and Edinburgh may only be mentioned as a geographical guide, to help the reader understand the location of Abercorn. For more details, see Appendix 1: Anglo-Saxon Edinburgh?

934: King Athelstan of England leads a major campaign against the Scots. The Irish chronicle known as the *Annals of Clonmacnoise* records that he advanced as far as Edinburgh, while the English *Historia Regum* claims that he marched much further, to Dunottar (*Clonmacnoise*, p 148; *Symeonis Opera* ii. 94, 124). The latter statement has generally been accepted by recent scholarship (Woolf (2007), pp 161-4), but for more discussion, see Appendix 1: Anglo-Saxon Edinburgh?

954 x 962: A chronicle-fragment records the permanent abandonment of Edinburgh (*oppidum Eden*) 'to the Scots': the most straightforward reading is that an English garrison had pulled out, but this is little more than an educated guess (Hudson (1998), 151, 159; Woolf (2007), pp 194–5). See Appendix 1: Anglo-Saxon Edinburgh?

November 1093: according to a story whose earliest extant source is a 13th-century chronicle, St Margaret was in Edinburgh Castle when news reached her that her husband Malcolm III and their eldest son had both been killed in an ambush at Alnwick Castle in Northumberland. St Margaret herself passed away on 16 November 1093. This was promptly followed by the arrival of an army led by King Malcolm's brother Domnall Bán, who besieged the castle, forcing St Margaret's sons to slip away with her body through the postern gate in the western ramparts (*Fordun* i. 422). These events are first recorded in the *Gesta Annalia*, which is now thought to have been compiled by 1285, using earlier sources (Broun (1999), p 17). They do not appear in the eyewitness account provided by Turgot (*ESSH* ii. 82–4), which moves straight from St Margaret's death to her burial Dunfermline, but the application of Turgot's narrative to the castle places the events he describes in the locations later known as **St Margaret's Chapel** and **St Margaret's Chamber**, the latter first attested by name on 21 May 1278.

1107: King Edgar of Scotland, the son of Malcolm III and St Margaret, died 'in Edinburgh' (*in Dunedenn* or *in Dunedin*): the source may not be precisely contemporary, but probably belongs to the early or mid-12th century, perhaps as early as 1124 (Broun (1999a), p 157). The reference is presumably to the castle, as at this date there was no royal burgh and no Holyrood Abbey. For King Edgar's pet elephant or camel, see Appendix 9: Royal Beasts.

1114 x 1150: the *Life of St Monenna* by Conchubranus contains a reference to 'a church in honour of St Michael on the top of the hill which is today called

Edinburgh’, or ‘in Dunedin, which is called Edinburgh in English’ (*Conchubran*, pp 230, 234, cf. *Burton*, p 122). This is a complex text, which is based on the assertion that the early Irish abbess St Monenna of Killeavy was identical to St Modwenna of Burton-on-Trent in England and combines material from diverse traditions into a single narrative with marked chronological inconsistencies. The text appears to be of 11th-century origin, but the date-range under which it is entered here denotes the timeframe when Burton Abbey obtained the copy on which our knowledge of it is based, when we can be sure it reached its present form (*Burton*, pp xiv–xix). It is thus reliable evidence only for 12th-century perceptions of the past, but it provides important evidence for the early existence of **St Margaret’s Chapel**, and it is also relevant to the problems covered in Appendix 1: Anglo-Saxon Edinburgh? and Appendix 2: The Castle of Maidens.

Section B: 1124–1291

Between the accession of King David I in 1124 and the Bruce-Balliol succession dispute of 1291, Edinburgh Castle served as one of Scotland’s principal fortresses, although it may not have become the main royal residence in the city until the reign of Alexander II (1214–49). The main sources from this period consist of a mix of Scottish royal documents and contemporary English chronicles.

1124 x 1127: Royal charters from the early years of King David I’s reign produce the first strictly contemporaneous references to Edinburgh. The document with the earliest *date-range* records the king’s gift of a house (or at least the stance to build one) to the Benedictine monastery at Dunfermline (*David I*, No. 19). We would expect a burgh at this date to have a castle adjacent to it – in general, historians assume that Scottish castles of this period were fortified with wooden ramparts rather than with masonry walls (Oram (2011), p 382), though David I’s major fortresses at Roxburgh and Carlisle both had stone donjons, and there is no clear documentary or archaeological evidence from Edinburgh.

1128: Construction work began on the church of Holyrood (*Melrose*, p 68; *Holyrood*, p 29).

1124 x 1141: The *date-range* for the earliest extant examples of royal documents issued 'at Edinburgh', which confirm the presence of the king and his court here, rather than simply relating to property in the town. These do not necessarily mean that the king was resident in the castle, however, as he could also reside at Holyrood Abbey, or the early royal residence at the High School Yards (see below under 1242 x 1249).

1124 x 1139: David I gives **St Cuthbert's Church** a gift of lands adjacent to the castle. The geographical details are confusing, but a convincing reconstruction locates a large **King's Garden** to the south and west of the Castle Rock, while the gift to St Cuthbert's consisted of an area along the length of Princes Street to the north (Malcolm (1925), pp 101–3, 117–20).

1136: Geoffrey of Monmouth's *Historia Regum Britanniae* claims that a (thoroughly fictional) king called Ebraucus built 'the town of Mount Agned, which is now called the Castle of Maidens or the Dolorous Mount'. In itself, this has absolutely no historical value. For the origins of these names and the Arthurian associations of Edinburgh Castle in general, see Appendix 2: The Castle of Maidens.

1138 x 1141: The date-range for the first extant usage of the 'Castle of Maidens' terminology in local documents (*David I*, Nos. 70, 97). See Appendix 2: The Castle of Maidens.

1139 x 1151: Edinburgh Castle is the venue of a hearing to resolve a dispute between the Bishop of St Andrews and the Abbot of Dunfermline, mediated by a panel consisting of King David, his son Earl Henry, and their barons (*Sc. Ep. Act.* i. 140).

1141 x 1147: David I issues a major charter to the newly founded Augustinian monastery at Holyrood, making substantial grants out of royal property (*David I*, No. 147). These include a number of gifts relating to Edinburgh Castle, including firstly the 'church of the Castle' (presumably **St Margaret's Chapel**), and, separately, **St Cuthbert's Church** with its extensive parish rights, and the lands of Broughton. Perhaps the most striking reference, however, are gifts of by-products from meat-butchering associated with the castle, with gifts of 'half of the tallow, fat and hides of the slaughter of Edinburgh', and the 'pelts of all rams, ewes and lambs of the Castle and Linlithgow'. This was evidently part of a wider pattern of royal lordship, which produced not only meat but also wool, leather and materials to make candles and soap: parallel activities are also recorded at Dunfermline and perhaps other royal centres in Fife, at Stirling and at Roxburgh in Teviotdale (*David I*, Nos. 33, 42, 139, 240).

1156 x 1162: The office of sheriff of Edinburgh is explicitly recorded for the first time (*RRS* i. Nos. 185, 198). Until 1494, the sheriff was normally also the commander of the castle's garrison.

1157: The Norman chronicler Robert de Torigni reports that 'the Castle of Maidens' and 'county of Lothian' (*castrum puellarum ... et comitatum Lodonensem*) were among the 'English' territory restored by Malcolm IV to Henry II, along with Carlisle, Bamburgh and Newcastle (*Chronicles* iv. 192). This was evidently an error, corrected by an erasure adjusting the working copy to read 'the Castle ... Bamburgh', and it was omitted in subsequent manuscripts.

1161 x 1162 Malcolm IV grants Walter fitz Alan an area in Edinburgh known as the Newbigging (*RRS* i. Nos. 184, 309). Apparently comprising 20 acres in the Grassmarket or Lawnmarket, areas whose patterns of burgage plots are defined in part by the boundaries of the castle's Ward, this suggests that the castle's formal perimeter had been established by the 1160s.

1165 x 1173: Land within the South Gate of the burgh of Edinburgh is confirmed to Newbattle Abbey (*RRS* i. No. 61). This is presumably the later 'Overbow' or 'West Bow', whose location is marked by the gap in the Royal Mile street frontage overlooking Victoria Street. This shows that the street was already closed by a gateway here, albeit perhaps a customs barrier rather than a defensive fortification.

1173: The 'Castle of Maidens' is listed by an English source as one of the military strengths controlled by King William the Lion, along with Stirling, Jedburgh, Berwick, Roxburgh and Robert Bruce's castles of Lochmaben and Annan (*Gesta Regis* ii. 47-8, trans. *SAEC*, p 247).

1173 x 1178: Land in Inverleith, formerly held by Reginald, janitor of Edinburgh Castle, is granted to Ailif the king's baker (*RRS* ii. Nos. 174, 509). This came to be known as the Baxter Land, and was apparently centred on the stance now occupied by Canonmills petrol station - directly adjacent to the mill which had been in continuous operation since the 1130s, and thus useful for the king's baker in the 12th and 13th centuries.

1174: Intervening in an English civil war, King William the Lion is defeated and captured at the Battle of Alnwick. In the subsequent Treaty of Falaise, Henry II of England compelled him to recognise English overlordship, and to hand over several castles to English garrisons. The exact composition of the list varies, but Edinburgh is included in all versions, and the English occupation of Edinburgh lasted from 1174 to 1186. Scottish garrisons were to be placed in three southern English castles in exchange, a curious provision, perhaps allowing King William to retain control of Fotheringay and other castles in his earldom of Huntingdon (*ESSH* ii. 292, 295; *Gesta Regis* i. 94-9, trans *SAEC*, pp 261-2; Rymer, *Foedera* i. 30, *CDS* i. No. 139).

1175: Cardinal Vivian holds a council of Scottish churchmen 'at Edinburgh' (*apud castrum Puellarum*; *Melrose*, p 88). There is no evidence for the specific location,

but the English-garrisoned castle seems inherently unlikely: probably they used Holyrood Abbey or the royal residence in High School Yards (see 1141 x 1147).

1175: Alan son of Ruhald, Constable of Richmond Castle, is evidently acting as governor of Edinburgh Castle for Henry II; he has £26 13s 4d 'for the strengthening of Edinburgh' (*ad muniendum Castellum Puellarum*), from the Yorkshire revenues administered by the English royal official Robert de Stutteville (*CDS* i. No. 141; *Pipe R* 1175 (PRS 22), p 165). *CDS* and other translated sources cite the payment as being specifically for 'fortifying' the castle, but in medieval administrative Latin it can also have wider connotations of full readiness in a fortress, and often relates specifically to procuring a full store of provisions for the garrison.

1178 x 1186: Holyrood Abbey having lost 9 marks of annual revenue through the actions of the English garrison; King William the Lion bestows them an equivalent in compensation (*RRS* ii. No. 199).

1180: Alan the Constable is still acting as English commander in the castle; he has 50 marks for the keeping of Edinburgh (*Castellum Puellarum*) for half a year, paid by Robert de Stutteville out of royal revenues from Northumberland, on instruction from the high-ranking English bureaucrat Ranulf de Glanville (*CDS* i. No. 157).

1186: Henry II restores Edinburgh Castle to the Scots as a wedding present for William the Lion and his new queen, Ermengarde de Beaumont. In return, King William grants his queen a dower consisting of Edinburgh Castle, overlordship over 40 knights' fees, and an annual income of either £100 or 100 marks (£66 13s 4d) (*Gesta Regis* i. 350-1; Howden ii. 310; *SAEC*, p 294). Either way, the income is equivalent at this date to the revenues of a major nobleman, and the knights' fees would provide initial revenues known as *ward and relief*. The remaining provisions of the Treaty of Falaise are annulled in 1189, in return for Scotland paying 10,000

marks towards Richard the Lionheart's campaign during the Third Crusade (*RRS* ii. 8, 14–15).

1196: Harold Maddadson, Earl of Orkney, surrenders himself as a hostage after refusing to hand over his unruly sons, and is held in chains in Edinburgh Castle, until his son Thorfinn is handed over in his place (*SAEC*, p 317).

1210: Thomas de Colville is imprisoned in Edinburgh for treason but ransoms himself in November; the place of incarceration is generally assumed to have been in the castle, though the text does not make it explicit (*Melrose*, p 109; *ESSH* ii. 383).

1218: The Prior of Durham and the Archdeacon of the East Riding of Yorkshire are sent to release the Scots from the sentence of excommunication passed against the opponents of King John during the Barons' War. They absolve the king 'at Edinburgh' (*apud Edenburc*): the castle is a possible location for the ceremony, but this is far from certain (*Melrose*, p 133).

1235: Thomas of Galloway, illegitimate son of Alan of Galloway, is briefly imprisoned in Edinburgh Castle (*in castello Puelarum*) after the failure of his rebellion against his half-sisters; two of the commanders of his Irish mercenaries, are also subsequently brought to Edinburgh, 'to be torn apart by horses' (*Melrose*, pp 146–7; *ESSH* ii. 498); this appears to describe the punishment later known as 'drawing and quartering'.

1242, 16 March: 'The church of St Cuthbert's of Edinburgh, under the Castle' is re-consecrated by the Bishop of St Andrews, as part of a two-year programme to ensure that all Scotland's churches are properly consecrated, initiated at the Council of Edinburgh in 1239 (Ash (1974), pp 3–14; *ESSH* ii. 521).

1242 x 1249: Alexander II grants a royal 'manor' in suburban Edinburgh to the Dominican Order, to become the site of a friary (St Giles, No. 79; the date is from Cowan and Easson (1976), p 118). The location is the modern 'High School Yards' on the southern side of the medieval burgh. This would have previously served as an additional royal residence in Edinburgh and may have been favoured over the castle.

1254: Three men are detained in the king's prison at Edinburgh: John, Lord of Petcox in Haddingtonshire, his brother Patrick, and Nigel of Whittinghame their uncle; accused of robbing Reginald le Perron at Dunbar, the king is persuaded to release them by the intervention of the queen (from the context, presumably the 12-year-old consort Margaret of England and not the Dowager, Marie de Coucy), and the Bishop of Glasgow, William of Bondington: John and Nigel agreed to stand charges before an inquest, while Patrick went into exile to the Holy Land (*CDS* i. No. 2673). This is probably a fairly typical example of 12th-century law enforcement, preserved because a record of it ended up in an English archive.

1254, 27 December: Henry III asks Alexander III for support for his Gascon War and requests a parliament at Edinburgh on 16 February 1255 ('the quinzaine of Candelmas') (*CDS* i. No. 1947). It is possible that this parliament, if it was actually held, might have taken place in the castle.

1255, August: The teenage King Alexander III and his consort Queen Margaret, the daughter of Henry III of England, are living in Edinburgh Castle under the oversight of their guardians, when a dramatic power struggle occurs. The key events were the entrance into the castle of an English nobleman, the Earl of Gloucester, while Henry III himself led an army to the Border, leading to a partial Scottish military mobilisation, a peace conference and the subsequent appointment of a new set of guardians – but the Scottish and English sources provide very different perspectives on events. According to the Scottish sources, the underlying issue was a political power struggle between a regency government dominated by the Comyn family and a pro-English opposition led by Alan Durward; the *Chronicle of Melrose* says that an assembly was held at

Edinburgh to resolve the dispute, but during an adjournment, Earl Patrick of Dunbar, a key Durward ally, entered the castle with an armed force, expelled the royal household and garrisoned the defences – acting under the advice of the Earl of Gloucester, who had arrived from Henry III; the Comyn-led government mobilised the Scottish army to oppose them, but before they could be besieged the pro-English faction promptly took the king and queen south to the Border for a diplomatic conference with Henry III (*Melrose*, pp 180–1, trans. *ESSH* ii. 580–2; the Edinburgh incidents pass without any mention at all in the pro-Durward *Gesta Annalia*, *Fordun* i. 297); the English sources claim that the crisis was entirely precipitated by the personal whim of the queen (not quite 15), who wanted to start sleeping with her husband (not quite 14), and who wanted to move out of the castle, ‘a sad and solitary place, almost completely lacking in clear air and greenery, as it is too near the sea’ (*loco tristi et solitario, salubri aere et virore, ut juxta mare, penitus destituto*); these sources give the impression that Gloucester and the royal clerk John Mansel simply gained control of the castle by the bold stratagem of riding up to the gate and bluffing their way in, and make no mention of their Scottish allies (Matthew Paris, *CM* v. 501–6 says they tricked their way past the porter and the other warders; the annalist at Dunstable Priory, *AM* iii. 198, states simply that they gained entry ‘through the warders’ incompetence’ (*incaute custodiam*); the Burton Abbey chronicler, *AM* i. 337, ignores the Edinburgh incident but gives the most explicit account of the English version of the reason for the crisis (*non sustinuit eos carnalitur simul commiscere*); all are trans. in *SAEC*, pp 370–2); the most detailed English narrative, provided by the chronicler Matthew Paris, describes not simply a Scottish mobilisation, but an actual siege of the castle, which ended in a mutual agreement that King Alexander and Queen Margaret should move to the Border for a conference with Henry III. The contrast between the narratives makes it hard to analyse these events, but, whatever the exact details were, it is clear that the crisis involved dramatic actions in and around Edinburgh Castle.

1266: The royal accounts record a payment of 31s for carriage of 30 tuns of wine to the castle (*ER* i. 25); based on the estimated size of a 13th-century tun, the total volume seems to be at least 3,000 gallons, the equivalent of around 18,000 modern wine bottles (Gemmill and Mayhew (1995), pp 215–16).

1278, 21 May: A ceremony takes place in the castle, in the king's chamber which is called the 'Chamber of St Margaret the Queen' (*in camera nostra que dicitur camera beatae Margaritae regine*); John Strachan resigns his fief at Beath near Dunfermline into the hands of King Alexander III 'by rod and staff' (*per fustum et baculum*, physically placing these symbols in the king's hands), in the presence of the Sheriff of Edinburgh, the king's chamberlain, Sir Richard of Straiton, the clerks of the liverance, provend and wardrobe, the Constable of Edinburgh, 11 other named witnesses, and others unnamed in the document; the land was subsequently granted by the king to Dunfermline Abbey (*Dunfermline*, Nos. 86, 87; *RRS* iv. No. 115; cf. Taylor and Márkus (2006-12), i. 156-7, 161-2). Like the court case under 1254, this ceremony is a fairly typical example of the sort of 12th-century legal process that would have happened regularly in the castle; it has been preserved due to the thorough record-keeping of Dunfermline Abbey and is notable because it refers to **St Margaret's Chamber**.

1282: An inventory is made of documents in the royal treasury in Edinburgh Castle (*APS* i. 107; *CDS* i. Intro pp vi-viii). See Appendix 3: The Inventories of 1282, 1291 and 1296.

1284, 28 June: Thomas of Lamberton resigns Easter Craiglockhart in Gorgie to the king in Edinburgh, in the presence of Sir Patrick Graham, William of Kinghorn Constable of Edinburgh, and Ralph of the wardrobe; this is a prelude to the later transfer of the land in question to Newbattle Abbey (*RRS* iv. No. 152). Another legal ceremony like that of 21 May 1278, recorded rather less fulsomely in the document.

1286, 19 March: Alexander III falls from his horse near Kinghorn; according to an English source (which only reached its extant form several decades later, but appears to be based on a good contemporary account), he had held a council and a banquet 'in the high Castle of Maidens' (*in eminenti Castro Puellarum*) earlier

that day, before crossing the Forth to visit Queen Yolande in Fife (*Lanercost*, pp 116-17/39-42; *ESSH* ii. 690-1).

1290: William of Kinghorn, Constable of Edinburgh Castle, presents the annual accounts of the sheriffdom as the 'attorney' of William Sinclair, Sheriff of Edinburgh. These include a number of expenses relevant to the castle: the fee for the sheriff of £13 6s 8d (20 marks), wages for the porter of 16s, wages for two watchmen of 32s, additional wages of 48s for two extra watchmen 'placed in the Castle for fear of war, and for the greater and necessary guarding of the Castle', wages for the sheriff's own followers who he installed to garrison the castle (this total is unfortunately omitted from the surviving transcript), wages and expenses for the king's armourer totalling £3 11s 8d and also a fee of £10 to the architect or master-mason Richard Cementarius (*ER*. i. 41-3; for Richard Cementarius, see Slade (1985), pp 314-15). This seems to be the only set of systematic annual accounts for garrison expenses in the castle to survive, outside of the periods of English occupation: see Introduction.

1291, 13 June: Edward I writes to William Sinclair, commanding him to hand over Edinburgh Castle to an English 'keeper', Ralph Basset of Drayton (*Rotulae Scot.* i, 1a). This relates to a recently concluded agreement to accept Edward I as arbitrator of the disputed succession to the Scottish throne (Duncan (2002), pp 246-8; Stones and Simpson (1978), ii. 98-101, 105, 112-13). Although the castle would be returned to Scottish control in 1292-6, this event signals the abrupt shift in the role of the castle, and the nature of the documents relating to it, in the period which came to be known as the Wars of Independence.

Section C: 1291-1341

This period of Scottish history saw sustained English attempts to conquer the kingdom, with Edinburgh occupied by English troops for much of the period. The first English governor was installed in the

castle in 1291 as part of the agreement accepting the king of England as arbiter of the succession dispute (see above, 13 June 1291). The second and longest occupation lasted for almost 18 years from June 1296 until March 1314, and a third phase ran for eight years between 1333 and 1341. There had been a short return to normative Scottish control under John Balliol in 1292–6, and the English were also driven out for a more extended period under Robert the Bruce from 1314 to 1333, but the first of these phases was very brief and has left little trace in the sources, while in the Bruce period the castle was deliberately rendered defenceless and effectively abandoned, apart from St Margaret's Chapel. Thus, the source record for this period is dominated by English material, particularly reports produced by the English royal bureaucracy, whose pedantically detailed style is very different from most medieval Scottish records.

1291, 17 June: Ralph Basset of Drayton's salary as keeper of the castle is paid starting from this date (*CDS* ii. No. 547). The document shows that the payment of all the English governors of Scottish castles began simultaneously, regardless of how far they had to travel from Berwick with the warrants issued on 13 June 1291, which suggests that it may be a somewhat artificial date. Nonetheless, we can be sure that English control had been accepted by 29 June 1291.

1291, 29 June: King Edward I of England visits Edinburgh Castle, as part of his policy of taking the homage of Scottish dignitaries to show their acceptance of his authority in the succession dispute: here, he receives the Abbot of Newbattle, the master of Soutra and master of Ballencrieff, and the Prioress of Haddington, in **St Margaret's Chapel**, and then the heads of the Scottish commands of the two military orders, Alexander of Welles, Prior of the Hospitallers, and Bryan le Jay, Preceptor of the Templars, in the **King's Chamber** (*CDS* ii. p 125). Both the Hospitaller and Templar were Englishmen, subsequently slain while fighting for their king against the Scots in the Falkirk campaign of 1298 (Barrow (2003), p 135; Cowan, Macky and Macquarrie (1983), p 139).

1291, 13 August: Ralph Basset of Drayton, the English governor of the castle, receives 40 marks for 40 days' wages from the chamberlain of Scotland, and his 'associates' (Stevenson, *Documents* i. No. 152; *CDS* ii. No. 517). The 'associates' were English officials appointed as colleagues to the chamberlain, as part of the recent agreement accepting English arbitration in the succession dispute (Duncan (2002), p 247); the pay claimed by the English governor represents a vast increase compared with normal Scottish expenses: in 1290, the governor drew just 20 marks for a whole year's fee as both sheriff and keeper, meaning that, in objective terms, Basset's wage represented a 1,800 per cent pay rise; additional wages for the three separately salaried garrison personnel had totalled less than 3½ marks. For a discussion of the context for the increase, see Appendix 4: The English Garrisons.

1291, 23 August: The muniments in the 'Treasury of Edinburgh' are handed over to English to be deposited at Berwick, in keeping with the terms of the agreement in June that the royal archives would be moved out of the castle to a neutral place of storage, an instruction issued at Berwick on 12 August 1291 which shows that Edward I was specifically searching for documents to support the claim of his ally the Count of Holland; the English officials present are Sir John de Lythgreynes, Master William of Lincoln and Thomas of Fishburn, while the Scots are represented by the Abbots of Holyrood and Dunfermline and William of Dumfries, 'keeper of the rolls', the precursor of the modern Lord Clerk Register; the documents were deposited in Berwick on 3 September 1291 (*CDS* ii. Nos. 516, 526, 528; for the underlying agreement, see Barrow (2005), p 45).

1291, 1 December: Ralph Basset of Drayton receives £80 for wages for keeping Edinburgh Castle from 6 September 1291 to 5 January 1292, from the chamberlain, and his 'associate' Robert Heron (Stevenson, *Documents* i. No. 183; *CDS* ii. No. 152).

1292, 13 February: William of Kinghorn, 'former Constable of Edinburgh Castle' hands over to Ralph Basset of Drayton, 40 marks wages for 40 days (Stevenson, *Documents* i. No. 203; *CDS* ii. No. 568).

1292, 10 October: Ralph Basset, as 'castellan' of Edinburgh, issues the chamberlain a receipt for £13 6s 6d in part wages from Trinity Sunday to Edward the Confessor's Day, i.e. 1 June 1292 to 13 October 1292 (*CDS* ii. No. 638).

1292, 15 November: Edward I concluded his arbitration in favour of John Balliol, who is enthroned as king at Scone on 30 November 1292. Edward I had pledged to hand the Scottish castles back to the successful claimant within two months of announcing his decision (Barrow (2005), p 45), so Edinburgh Castle should have returned to full Scottish control by January 1293. Subsequently, Edinburgh Castle evidently resumed its role as the site of the Scottish royal archives, and also emerges on record as a repository for the royal treasures (see below, September 1296, and Appendix 2: The Inventories of 1282, 1291 and 1296).

1295, October: Edward I, embarking on war with France, demands control of the castles of Berwick, Roxburgh, Edinburgh and Stirling for the duration of the conflict (*Scalacronica*, p 122). The Scots refuse, and instead ratify a secret treaty with the French.

1296, June: Edinburgh Castle is besieged by the English (Caldwell (2016), pp 46–9). Scotland and England went to war in March 1296, but English victories at Berwick (30 March), and Dunbar (27–9 April) were followed by the prompt defection of the Scottish commander at Roxburgh (13 May), while John Balliol and the remains of his army retreated northwards. Edinburgh Castle thus offered Scotland's only meaningful resistance. King Edward arrived in person on 6 June, when he installed himself and his travelling bureaucracy in Holyrood Abbey; a battery of three stone-throwing siege engines were set up and began firing day and night (Gough (1900), pp 142, 280; cf. Tyson (2001)). As it normally required days or weeks to prepare Edward's artillery in advance of a bombardment (two months seems to recur as a typical construction timeframe, and even dismantling machines could take weeks: Prestwich (2015), pp 284–6, 290–1), it seems likely that the siege had actually been underway for some time already, probably under

Sir John Despenser (*Dispensator*), an otherwise obscure knight who *Lanercost* identifies as the commander of the assault lines: according to *Lanercost's* highly detailed account, the siege engines discharged a total of 158 stones between 7 June and the morning of 10 June, and at this point King Edward dispatched a Welsh serjeant-at-arms named Lewyn as a dispatch rider for England, but the Welshman got drunk in an Edinburgh tavern, lost the money he had been given for the journey and the next morning he instead opted to defect – claiming that he wanted to stage a comedy attack on the castle before riding south, he set off with his crossbow and shield-carrier, reached the gates (*ante fores*, perhaps the Portcullis Gate), where he called out that he wanted to defect and hand over the English dispatches, and was brought up with a rope by the guards on the walls (*custodes murorum*). However, the Scottish commander was so outraged by this dishonourable behaviour that he handed the Welshman back to the English, mollifying King Edward, who renounced a previous pledge to massacre the garrison and simply executed the Welshman instead; the Scots were allowed to send a messenger to ask John Balliol's permission to surrender (*Lanercost*, pp 177–9/142–4). The start of negotiations with the garrison on 11 June is confirmed by the official campaign narrative (Gough (1900), p 280), but *Lanercost* omits to mention that the siege engines were still bombarding the castle on 13 June, when Edward departed towards Stirling (where the Scottish garrison had fled, leaving just the porter to surrender the keys; Gough (1900), p 280). In Edinburgh, terms of surrender were only agreed around 22 June 1296 (*Lanercost*, p 179/144), under instruction from Balliol – who by this time was already negotiating his own abdication. Although both *Lanercost* and the official campaign narrative are naturally partisan towards the English, it is clear that Edinburgh Castle put up an effective resistance (*Lanercost's* depiction of Lewyn's decision to defect, and of the Scottish commander calmly enjoying his morning walk inside the defences on 11 June (*vacabat gentationi*, 'he was idly stretching his legs'), suggest that neither of them was particularly troubled by the thought of the English taking the castle by assault), and its defence was the most creditable aspect of an otherwise disastrous campaign for the Scots. No source appears to identify the Scottish commander by name, and *Lanercost* calls him simply 'the Constable' (*constabularius*, *Lanercost*, p 178/143), a term which in English usage could often mean a garrison commander, not specifically the second-in-command as it did in Scotland.

1296, September: The Scottish royal treasury and archive is removed from the castle by the English, and taken initially to Berwick-upon-Tweed, where it arrives on 16 September. Very detailed inventories are taken at this point, before the whole cache is shipped south (*CDS* ii. Nos. 335, 840). See Appendix 3: The Inventories of 1282, 1291 and 1296.

1296, 6 October: Sir Walter Huntercombe is appointed as English military governor of the castle and Lothian (*CDS* ii. p 225; Rymer, *Foedera*, i. 848).

1296, 19 November: An inventory is made of the valuables in the English royal wardrobe, including significant remnants of the Scottish royal treasury seized when the castle surrendered in June 1296 (Stevenson, *Documents* ii. 142–4). One of these is ‘a great Stone on which the kings of Scotland used to be crowned’ (*Una petra Magna super quam reges Scocie solebant coronari*), i.e. the Stone of Scone. Its presence among the valuables held in the castle by the Scots is supported in a later inventory of 19 November 1303. The document also records how the English disposed of many of the remaining treasures in 1297. See Appendix 3: The Inventories of 1282, 1291 and 1296.

1296 x 1302: An English official makes a calculation of victuals required for the English garrison in Edinburgh Castle, which assumes a muster of 3 knights, 30 men-at-arms, 36 ‘boys’ to keep their horses, 20 crossbowmen, and 17 support personnel (*CDS* v. No. 210; Prestwich (1967), p 543). Prestwich dates this document at some point subsequent to the calculation of 1 January 1300, while the editors of *CDS* v. subsequently assigned it to ‘1297 x 1299’. The calculation cannot belong to the period from 29 October 1299 to 26 November 1300, when the strength of the garrison is known to have been very different (see also 1 January 1300 and 28 February 1300), and it cannot post-date the reorganisation of 12 February 1302. The document may belong to the period just before the muster of 27 November 1301, when there were 34 ‘archers’ in the garrison,

perhaps a way of mustering attendant 'boys' separately as soldiers. See Appendix 4: The English Garrisons.

1298, 24 July: Sir Walter Huntercombe, as English military governor of the castle, received at Leith 100 quarters of wheat, 10 casks of wine and 10 casks of salt; then 45 quarters wheat from Berwick, 21 quarters wheat, 30 quarters oats and 20 quarters malt from English merchants, and 40 oxen from the clerk of the kitchen; on 19 August 1298 he received a large dish and an alms pitcher (*CDS* ii. No. 997). The dish and pitcher may have been beaten replacements for the collection plate and alms boat which Edward I had melted down into English coinage. See Appendix 3: The Inventories of 1282, 1291 and 1296.

1298, November: Sir Walter Huntercombe and Sir Simon Fraser are instructed to store a large quantity of supplies in Edinburgh Castle, before forwarding them to a secret destination (*Stevenson, Documents* ii. No. 522; *CDS* ii. Nos. 1014-15). See Appendix 4: The English Garrisons. This evidently relates to the relief of the English occupation garrison in Stirling Castle, which was under siege by the Scots, and was probably issued while Huntercombe was still commanding in Edinburgh, before his transfer on 25 November 1298. Fraser was the pro-English Sheriff of Roxburgh.

1298, 24 November: In advance of his appointment as sheriff of of Edinburgh, Sir John of Kingston is empowered to accept the submission to England of all men in his province, except those whose land is worth more than £1 annually (*CDS* ii. No. 1031).

1298, 25 November: Sir John of Kingston is appointed as keeper of the castle and sheriff of the 'county' of Edinburgh in place of Huntercombe; he is also to command the projected foray to Stirling, and Sir Simon Fraser is commanded to aid him in this (*Stevenson, Documents* ii. Nos. 545-6; *CDS* ii. Nos. 1033-4).

1298, 1 December: Huntercombe and Fraser are instructed to scout and gather intelligence and then report back to Sir John Kingston; the expedition is to consist of at least 170 heavy cavalry, and if possible at least 200. Huntercombe has evidently been resigned as 'chieftain' (*cheventeyne*) of a cavalry force from Northumberland. (Stevenson, *Documents* ii. No. 547; *CDS* ii. No. 1036). See Appendix 4: The English Garrisons.

1298, 2–6 December: Two administrative officials are assigned to the English garrison; Alexander Convers is appointed as clerk to oversee the foray to Stirling, and William of Routh is assigned as a clerk to be based at Berwick under Kingston's orders, to ensure supplies to Edinburgh, either from stores at Berwick, or else by contacting the English government to procure them from elsewhere; this is followed by four memos on stores for the garrison which are waiting at Berwick (Stevenson, *Documents* ii. Nos. 548–52; *CDS* ii. Nos. 1037–41). It seems likely that these efforts were effective, as the English garrison in Stirling Castle held out for another year, and they occupied Edinburgh Castle itself until 14 March 1314 (Barrow (2005), p 144, n. 4). See Appendix 4: The English Garrisons.

1299, May: Sir John of Kingston, the English garrison commander at Edinburgh Castle, asks for letters of protection for John Folville, a member of his garrison (*CDS* v. No. 196; *Cal. Pat. Rolls. 1292–1301*, p 421). This implies that Folville had been threatened with prosecution at home in England; he was presumably one of the turbulent Folvilles of Ashby Folville in Leicestershire, for whom see generally Stones (1957), and for a serious charge of theft against a John Folville in 1293, Oggins (2004), pp 84–5.

1299, 16 July: Sir John of Kingston, the English garrison commander in the castle, is personally summoned south by Edward I to attend a conference on the military situation with Bishop Bek, the Earl of Lincoln, the pro-English earls of Dunbar and Angus, Sir Simon Fraser, Sheriff of Roxburgh, and a number of northern English barons (Stevenson, *Documents* ii. No. 572). It seems clear that Kingston was unable to attend, due to a Scottish military offensive.

1299, 9 August: Sir John of Kingston, the English governor Edinburgh Castle, reports military activities; among other information, he mentions that in response to Scottish military advances he has brought much of the livestock of the area into the castle (Stevenson, *Documents* ii. No. 527; redated by *CDS* v. No. 201). See Appendix 4: The English Garrisons.

1299, 28 December: English military supplies, freighted by at Berwick on the *Godale* of Beverley and originally intended for Stirling (which had now been recaptured by the Scots), are redirected to Edinburgh Castle (*CDS* iv. No. 1774).

1300, 1 January: The English bureaucrat John of Droxford draws up an estimate of the victuals required for the English garrisons in Edinburgh Castle, Berwick and Dirleton, from this date to 24 June 1300; these indicate a garrison in the castle of 64 men-at-arms, four hobelars, 120 'boys' attending them, 100 infantry, of whom 40 are crossbowmen, and 29 clerks and 'valets of office' assigned to remain within the fortress, producing a (rounded) total of 325 people (*CDS* v. No. 213; Prestwich (1967), pp 541-2). See Appendix 4: The English Garrisons.

1300, 28 February: The English garrison in Edinburgh Castle musters an impressive total of 67 men-at-arms, 78 crossbowmen and archers, and well over 100 grooms, plus a siege engineer, his assistant and several dozen domestic personnel (*CDS* ii. No. 1132). See Appendix 4: The English Garrisons.

1300, 10 May: Sir John Kingston, the English governor of the castle, writes a letter to his superiors; this contains no direct information on the castle, but shows its usefulness as an intelligence post (Sayles (1927), p 246; *CDS* v. No. 220).

1300, 7 August: The English garrison in Edinburgh acknowledges receipt a cargo of oats (*avenarum*) at Leith (Stevenson, *Documents* ii. No. 599). The total quantity seems to have been very roughly 30 tons by weight. See Appendix 4: The

English Garrisons.

1300, 23 October: £40 is paid by the English government to William of Routh, provisioner of Edinburgh Castle and Dirleton (Stevenson, *Documents* ii. No. 605).

1300, 26 November: A year's accounts for the English garrison under Sir John of Kingston, since 29 October 1299, totalling £648 7s 3½d in expenses: detailed pay and wage accounts record the permanent presence in garrison of the governor, seven knights, 61 other men-at-arms, plus 18 crossbowmen, two clerks, and an engineer, bowyer, smith and their three assistants; a significantly reinforced muster had been present in early 1300, ranging from the siege engineer Thomas of Houghton and two Carmelite friars to an indiscriminate group of infantry archers – the peak period was perhaps in February, when there were around 100 additional infantry in the castle, although significant numbers remained until July (*CDS* v. No. 235; *Lanercost*, pp 510–14 in the Stevenson edition). The document also shows that coal rather than wood was being used for the kitchen hearth and hall fire – a very unusual choice at this date.

1300 x 1301: Sir John Kingston has £20 to pay for supplies (*CDS* v. No. 273).

1301, 26 July: Robert of Clothale, a clerk of the Sheriff of Nottingham and Derby, departs to Edinburgh with victuals; his 5s expenses are not met until November 1306 (*CDS* v. No. 472(h)).

1301, 19 July: The English bureaucrats in Berwick-upon-Tweed complete the payment of arrears for victualling Edinburgh and other Scottish garrisons from 16 November 1299, and forward payments to 2 March 1302, totalling £710 5s 6d (*CDS* v. No. 272).

1301, August: 2,000 marks in cash are brought overland from Berwick to

Edinburgh, and thence to Peebles; £16 0s 2*d* is paid for two great ropes from William Trenefoill for the siege engine being made at Edinburgh for the siege of Bothwell Castle (*CDS* v. No. 266). The date can be inferred by the English army's encampment at Peebles from 27 July to 14 August 1301 (Gough (1900), ii. 203–4), and by the departure of the siege equipment to Bothwell on 29 August 1300.

1301, 29 August: Robert of Farnham departs Edinburgh with siege engines for the attack on Bothwell Castle, arriving there on 5–6 September 1301; his outlay of £5 0s 2*d* is not paid until November 1306 (*CDS* v. No. 472(h)).

1301, 1 October: Thomas of Houghton, King Edward I's siege engineer, is at Edinburgh Castle (*CDS* v. No. 259). This is connected with the intended siege of Stirling Castle, though Houghton, for whom see Taylor (1950), had been previously based in Edinburgh as early as 28 February 1300. See Appendix 4: The English Garrisons.

1301, 4 October: Sir John Kingston, the English military governor in the castle, writes to King Edward, reporting that simultaneously with Master Thomas's departure (thus after 1 October 1301) he shipped the siege engine 'Mountafui' and two springalds (large crossbow-style weapons); in the same ship he has also sent three hand-held crossbows, one large one with a stirrup that the user has to put both feet in to hold it down while pulling back the string, and two small ones with one-foot stirrups, along with 600 bolts for large crossbows (also suitable for similarly sized crossbows whose powerful string needs to be wound back by a winch) and 2,000 for small ones; he cannot comment on the readiness of the large siege engine, but it is sent nonetheless, and everything else is in good condition except that one of the springalds lacks shielding (*peil*), for which he is scouring the area; as an afterthought, he reports that he will also send the *peil* of the springald which remains in the castle (*CDS* ii. No. 1230). This letter provides an insight into the range of siege machinery and ammunition stored at Edinburgh (even after the departure of some engines for the siege of Bothwell on 29 August 1301), but it unclear what is meant by contrasting references to a 'small engine' and 'large engine' – was the 'Montafui' a relatively 'small' engine compared with

most trebuchets, which was then called 'large' to differentiate it from the springalds and crossbows, or were there two siege engines in the castle, with the smaller 'Mountafui' sent first before the larger one followed later? The latter option may be indicated by the reference of 15 August 1303 which differentiates the 'large' engine and the 'next-best' one. An earlier document of 30 September 1230 mentions a ship heading up the Forth with additional equipment - it had sailed from Berwick with two engines plus a squad of engineers and additional construction materials and was stopping at Dunbar to pick up another there (*CDS* ii. No. 1237). The definition of the 'one-foot' and 'two-foot' crossbows and the *arbalète à tour* is based on Caldwell (1982), pp 12-13.

1301, 27 November: A contract is agreed for the pay of the English garrison, at a strength of 30 men-at-arms, 4 hobelars, 20 crossbows and 34 archers, plus support personnel (Prince (1933), p 286 n. 4, citing Exch. Accts. 68/1 m.12; this document does not appear to have been included in *CDS* v). The pay agreement was renewed on 12 February 1302.

1302, 12 February: A contract is agreed for the pay of the English garrison until 10 June 1302 (Pentecost), at a strength of 30 men-at-arms, 12 of them in the governor's own retinue, at a pay of £40, plus 20 crossbowmen, 20 archers and a bowyer, carpenter, smith and watchmen (*CDS* ii. No. 1286). This is evidently related to a review of the garrison organisation drawn up at Roxburgh between 9 February 1302 and 18 February 1302, which assigned Edinburgh 30 men-at-arms 'beside officers' (*CDS* ii. No. 1337, for the date, see Gough (1900), ii. 210; for discussion of another English planning document issued at Roxburgh on 12 February 1302, see Watson, (1991), pp 306-7).

1302, 14 February: A memo notes that Sir John Kingston, the English Constable of the castle, is owed £151 14s 3½d from 16 November 1300 to this date (*CDS* v. No. 277).

1302, 15 August: The English commanders in Scotland meet at Lochmaben, where

a reorganisation of the garrison system is formalised: Sir John of Kingston will continue to serve as sheriff and governor of Edinburgh, but with a [probably significantly reduced] garrison of 41 men-at-arms and 40 infantry, and a salary of £60 for the period until 25 December 1302 (*CDS* ii. No. 1321(5)).

1302, June: A contemporary English chronicler at Hailes Abbey in Gloucestershire claims that the Scots broke the truce, stormed Edinburgh Castle and slaughtered the entire garrison (Watson (1991), pp 200-1, citing a still-unpublished manuscript source, London, BL MS Cotton Cleopatra Diii, f. 52v). No other source appears to repeat this story, and it is probably a false rumour.

1302, 14 September: A garrison of 41 men-at-arms and 41 foot (*CDS* ii. No. 1324(8)). See Appendix 4: The English Garrisons.

1303, 15 August: Sir Ebles de Mountz, constable of the English garrison in Edinburgh Castle, is ordered by King Edward to dispatch his second-best siege engine, along with the engine called 'Esplente' which has been brought up from Jedburgh, plus stones for throwing and timber, by sea to Montrose for the siege of Brechin (*CDS* ii. No. 1386). Sir John Kingston, the titular commander, was presumably with the king and the campaign army. The document also mentions a 'great engine' in the castle, which was not sent north.

1303, 20 August: Aymer de Valence, one of the senior English military commanders, is at Edinburgh (*CDS* v. No. 333).

1303, November 19: An inventory records the valuables being kept in the English royal wardrobe at this date, still including two items taken out of the Scottish treasure seized at Edinburgh Castle in September 1296. The Stone of Scone is again listed as one of them, as previously on 19 November 1296 (*CDS* iv. p 487). This corroborates the earlier reference, and also reveals that the Stone was temporarily brought back to Scotland during the English invasion of 1303-4.

When this inventory was made, King Edward and his court and wardrobe were in winter quarters at Dunfermline Abbey (Gough (1900), ii. 231). See Appendix 3: The Inventories of 1282, 1291 and 1296.

1304, March: From stores in Edinburgh Castle, 14 quarters and a bushel of oats 'by Scots heaped measure' and 31 quarters of beans by English 'level' measure are delivered by Richard of Wardington for the use of the king and queen of England's horses en route to St Andrews (*CDS* ii. Nos. 1443, 1446). The earlier delivery of a barrel of wine in Edinburgh to King Edward's falconers on 31 January 1304, and the release of hay from the sheriff for horses on 1 February 1304, may also relate to stores in the castle, but this is not explicit in the sources (*CDS* ii. Nos. 1443, 1446).

1304, 20 March: Edward orders Sir John Kingston as English constable of the castle to ensure that Master Thomas can take all the wood he requires from Newbattle to repair siege engines at Edinburgh (*CDS* ii. No. 1475).

1304, 30 March: Edward I orders the constable to send him all the 'great targes' for the siege of Stirling (*CDS* v. No. 356).

1304, 6 May: The garrison consists of Sir John Kingston, Sir Ebulo de Mountz, five esquires, 10 other men-at-arms, and 20 crossbowmen (*CDS* v. No. 373).

1304: A soldier in the Edinburgh garrison gets £6 18s 4*d* to pay his debts, among miscellaneous English accounts (*CDS* ii. No. 1646, p 442).

1304, 24 April: Sir John Kingston is owed £56 11s 3*d* or arrears due to himself, one other knight, and eight more men-at-arms, since 2 February 1304 (*CDS* v. No. 384).

1304, 20 August: Sir John Kingston is owed £103 18s for wages and compensation for losses in horses since 25 April 1304 (*CDS* v. 385). This follows on from the period in the memo of 24 April 1304.

1305, 12 April: Thomas du Bois of Easter Duddingston, a former man-at-arms in the garrison, is now in prison in Edinburgh, and is sent south to the Tower of London (*CDS* ii. No. 1660).

1305, 1 August: Sir John Kingston has £50 for his pay since 13 January 1305, and an additional £50 for the additional men-at-arms who had been present in the garrison until 7 March 1305 (Stevenson, *Documents* ii. No. 652).

1305, 15 September: Sir Ivo Aldborough is appointed as Sheriff of Lothian; Sir John Kingston remains military governor of Edinburgh Castle (*CDS* ii. No. 1691(3), (5)). This marks the first separation of the castle from the sheriffdom: it is partially explained by the commission of 26 October 1305.

1305, 26 October: Sir John Kingston, English governor of the castle, is appointed to a four-man regency commission with the senior English bureaucrat in Scotland and two Scottish representatives. Simultaneously, he is granted a salary of £50 as constable, and £50 to retain (additional?) men-at-arms until 20 February 1306 (*CDS* ii. No. 1707).

1306, 11 February: Sir John de Kingston, English governor of Edinburgh Castle, learns that Robert Bruce had already taken up arms against the English, after the slaying of John Comyn in Dumfries on 10 February 1306; he immediately mobilises his garrison, and leaves behind an improvised force of ten men-at-arms, four light cavalry and four crossbowmen, using his £80 salary to pay them until 15 September 1306; on 18 February 1306, a siege engineer and some workmen were taken into pay (*CDS* v. No. 492(xii)).

1306, 16 February: A letter is dispatched from London to the Constable of Edinburgh and his colleagues the co-regents of Scotland, renewing their commission of 26 October 1305 until 17 April 1306. As the entry under 11 February 1306 shows, the order had already been overtaken by events.

1306, 4 March: A messenger brings a letter to Edward I from Sir John Kingston, constable of the English garrison in Edinburgh Castle and co-regent of Scotland; perhaps somewhat optimistically, Edward sends a letter back addressed to all four co-regents on 9 March 1306 (*CDS* v. 472(w),(x)). At least one of the two Scottish representatives had joined Robert Bruce openly by the time of his inauguration as king on 25 March 1306.

1309, 19 June: The Battle of Methven, a defeat for Robert Bruce by the English. Sir John Kingston and elements of the English garrison from Edinburgh participate in the battle against the Scots, and the governor and two members of his immediate retinue all have their horses killed under them (*CDS* v. No. 492(xiii)).

1306, 22 July: Two tuns of wine are issued from the castle's stores by Walter Kingston, lieutenant of its English governor (and evidently his relative as well), for delivery to Edward, Prince of Wales; simultaneously, stores 'from Edinburgh' are issued to John of Brittany, Earl of Richmond and (titular) English governor-general of Scotland (*CDS* v. Nos. 475, 492(xvi)). A payment to the English governor, Sir John Kingston, also appears within the same set of accounts as the second reference, but he may already have been on campaign with the army.

1306, August: Robert le Mareschal and John de Darlham have their arrears of pay in the English garrison in Edinburgh for 20 November 1304–19 November 1305 (*CDS* v. No. 466). The approximate date of payment is inferred from the context in the calendar entry, although it does not seem precisely secure.

1306, 16 September: Pay for just four men-at-arms is recorded from this point to

9 November 1306 (*CDS* v. No. 492(xii)). The record relates principally to the £80 assigned for wages on 11 February 1306, although the actual sum disbursed was £181. Either way, it is possible that this very modest force was a section of a larger garrison paid using the remnant of an earlier cash sum, rather than representing the total garrison under pay in this period.

1306, November: Robert of Clothale and Robert of Farnham belatedly get cash for their expenses from 26 July 1301 and 29 August 1301 (*CDS* v. No. 472(h)).

1307, 17 July: Another inventory of treasures from Edinburgh Castle (*CDS* v. No. 494).

1307 x 1310: A letter from pro-English merchants describing themselves as the 'local community' (*communitas*) in the Berwick, Roxburgh and Edinburgh sheriffdoms, complaining that the truce is being violated by the English castle garrisons, who do not pay for their purchases (at least a quarter in Edinburgh), and steal from anti-English locals when they come to trade during the truce (*CDS* iii. No. 186). See Appendix 4: The English Garrisons.

1310, 14 August: Piers Lubaud, English Sheriff of Edinburgh, has taken victuals from Amerigo Friscobaldi to supply the Linlithgow garrison; in exchange, Friscobaldi has £14 13s 4d (22 marks) out of the tithes of Linlithgow parish church (*CDS* iii. No. 159). This appears to be the earliest dated record of Lubaud as Sheriff of Edinburgh, and also the first mention of the Friscobaldi banking family in Scotland.

1311, 7 July: Pay and victual for Edinburgh and nine other English garrisons totals £1,834 14s 7d since 1 October 1310 (*CDS* iii. No. 221).

1312: A full pay list of the English garrison: Sir Piers Lubaud commands Edinburgh Castle with a royal serjeant-at-arms, 81 men-at-arms and 28 hobelars, plus 25 crossbowsmen and 39 archers, and a support force of an engineer, smith, two bowyers, a mason and a carpenter. Lubaud's command also includes a substantial garrison at Linlithgow, which at its maximum had a knight, three serjeants-at-arms, 82 men-at-arms, 30 hobelars and 45 crossbows, and an engineer, bowyer, mason and smith and five watchmen, plus a smaller outpost at Livingston, with 10 men-at-arms, and 20 archers as infantry (*CDS* iii. App. VII, pp 408-12, 421-4).

1312, 14 March: Sir Piers Lubaud, Sheriff and Constable, is owed £1,416 13s 1d for the garrisons of Edinburgh and Linlithgow; assigned the customs of wool and hides from Boston, Lincolnshire, until paid (*CDS* iii. No. 254). This was one of the largest single sources of central government revenue in England, worth around £3,000 annually: see Appendix 4: The English Garrisons.

1312, 7 July: Sir Piers Lubaud, as English Sheriff of Edinburgh, presents accounts in which he renders a total of £169 4s 3d in the sheriffdom of Edinburgh: £115 9s ½d from royal demesne, escheats and county court, £34 13s 4d from the Edinburgh burgh fermes, Dean mills, tolls and other customs, and £19 2s 10½d from the Knights Templars' (confiscated) lands of Temple and Kirkliston (*Blantrodok et Templiston*). An additional £102 19s 6d from Haddington and East Lothian and £40 19s 4d from Linlithgow and West Lothian, plus separate accounts for the customs of Leith (£25 13s 5d) and Blackness (£12 0s 13½d) raise the total revenue in the Lothians to £351 3s 7½d (*CDS* iii. No. 432).

1312: English stores are being sent up for the garrisons (*CDS* iii. No. 259).

1312, 5 April: English garrison pay two merchants of Ravenser [Hull] for 'wheat, malt, barley, meal, canvas sacks, &c.' £39 18s 8d (*CDS* iii. No. 303).

1313, 16 May: Edward II commands the warden of Berwick and 'William le Getour' to let ships with provisions go past to Edinburgh and Linlithgow, so long as they feel confident they are not actually trading with the Scots (*CDS* iii. No. 317).

1313, 20 August: Edward II orders Ralph de Benton, receiver of stores at Berwick, to deliver to Piers Lubaud the necessary munitions for Edinburgh and Linlithgow (*CDS* iii. No. 330).

1314, 22 February: Edward II issues an order appointing Ebles de Mountz as governor of the castle in place of Piers Lubaud. According to *The Bruce*, the castle was already under siege by early February, and Lubaud had been thrown into prison by the garrison, after entering into communication with the Scots; *Vita Edwardi* accuses him directly of betraying the garrison – he certainly defected after the recapture of the castle on 14 March 1314, but in 1316 he was executed by the Scots on suspicion of being an English double agent (*Fine Rolls 1307–19*, p 189; *Bruce*, p 377–9; *Vita*, p 84; *Scalacronica*, p 140; cf. Cornell (2006), pp 97, 100–2).

1314, 14 March: The castle is recaptured by a Scottish surprise attack led by Sir Thomas Randolph, Robert the Bruce's nephew and newly promoted Earl of Moray: the sources agree that the Scots first besieged the castle, then broke in by scaling the Castle Rock, and subsequently demolished the fortifications in order to prevent reoccupation by the English (*Fordun* i. 346; *Lanercost*, p 223/202; *Scalacronica*, p 140; *Bruce*, pp 377–9, 397–401). The different sources offer varied details: *Lanercost* states that the attack came on the north side, aided by a feint against a South Gate; *Bruce* describes the siege as a more extended blockade which had prevented access through the main gate (*the yet*) since early February, and adds details that the Scots paused on a rocky ledge half-way up the ascent, and scaled a 12-foot wall at the top of the cliff; *Scalacronica* says that Randolph gained access 'by the highest part of the rock' (*a le plus haut du roche*). Modern interpretations have tended to follow *Lanercost* in placing the assault on the north side, finding an explanation for his problematic South Gate (Stair-Kerr (1913); Caldwell (2016), pp 57–8) and, if so, it is possible that they used the route from the Wellhouse Tower via the ledge on which **Wallace's Cradle** is built (for this

precipitous path, see Skene (1822), p 472); but it is also possible that the gate targeted by the blocking force was the Portcullis Gate on the north side (regarded as the main point of access in all accounts of the April 1341 assault), and that the ascent came up the sheer southern cliffs, the only place where there is a direct ascent to the inner ramparts. As Caldwell has pointed out, the assault party must have been outnumbered many times over by the garrison of around 200 English troops.

1322, 23 August: Edward II's invasion army reaches Leith. They subsequently sack Holyrood, and may have gained brief access to the castle, but lack of supplies forces them to retreat in disarray (*CDS* iii. Nos. 765-6; Powicke (1960), p 561).

1328: The Sheriff of Edinburgh is paid £40 as castleward (*ER* i. 112), corresponding to the amount that was paid in the 1290s, but now evidently not used for support of the garrison.

1329: The Sheriff of Edinburgh is paid £34 13s 4*d* as ward (*ER* i. 205).

1329: The Sheriff of Edinburgh is paid £6 13s 4*d* (10 marks) 'for making a park next to Edinburgh, where knights can fight, in which the English knight was vanquished' (*ER* i. 238). This seems to be the beginnings of the Barras and indicates that a joust or trial-by-battle had already taken place during that year.

1329: Sir John Jordan, a royal chaplain, receives part-payment for work involving 'the structure of the King's chapel within the Castle' (*ad fabricam Capelle Regie infra castris*, *ER* i. 239). This has been interpreted in modern sources as a reference to work on **St Margaret's Chapel** in Edinburgh Castle (Moir Bryce (1912), p 40; Driscoll and Yeoman (1989), p 233), but the church in question was really St John's in Roxburgh Castle, as is made clear by a previous part-payment for the same work, given to Sir John Jordan as 'rector of the chapel of Roxburgh Castle ...

for building work on the said chapel' (*rector capelle castri de Roxburgh ... ad constructionem dicte capelle*) (ER i. 210).

1334, 12 June: Edward Balliol, the son of John Balliol, is attempting to oust King David II and take the Scottish throne. To secure English support, he surrenders his claim to Lothian, Berwickshire, Roxburghshire and Peeblesshire to Edward III (*CDS* iii. No. 1127). The castle was at this point still ruined, but this agreement led to its subsequent reoccupation by the English.

1335, 30 July: The ruins of Edinburgh Castle form the setting for the climax of an unlikely battle, in which the Scots defeat the Count of Namur, ruler of a small principality in modern-day Belgium. As an ally of the English, Guy of Namur had agreed to join Edward III's 1335 campaign in Scotland, but arrived late at Berwick, and marched north with his private army and a number of English troops, trying to join up with the main English force on its line of march from Glasgow to Perth. They are intercepted near Edinburgh by John Randolph, Earl of Moray (son of the Scottish commander who had recaptured the castle in 1314) and Sir William Douglas, the 'Knight of Liddisdale'. *Scalacronica* and the later Scottish sources provide the same basic narrative, with a successful Scottish attack, a retreat by the Count of Namur to the abandoned ruins of the castle, and his surrender the next morning. The Scottish sources confuse Namur with his cousin the Count of Guelders, who was commanding another division of the invasion army, but their narrative (which seems to be largely based on a single lost source) adds a great deal of circumstantial detail, placing the battle at Boroughmuir to the south of Edinburgh, and describing how the count and his men held off Moray's initial attack until Douglas hurried down from the Pentland Hills with unexpected reinforcements; this forced the count to retreat into Edinburgh either up Friar Wynd or Mary Wynd (the modern Blackfriars' Street and St Mary's Street), and, once inside the ruins of the castle, they slaughtered their war-horses to form an improvised bulwark, but surrendered after an uncomfortable night without supplies or shelter. *Lanercost* gives a somewhat different narrative, in which Namur holds off an initial ambush and repeated subsequent attacks, as if the battle consisted of harrasing sorties against a column on a predetermined line of

march 'towards Edinburgh' (*versus Edenburgh*), and gives no mention of the events in the ruined castle, except to corroborates the lack of provisions as a reason for the surrender. *Lanercost* is probably right to suggest that Edinburgh was always Namur's intended destination, but *Scalacronica* supports the Scottish claim that his movements turned into a precipitous retreat from the Scots' attack. All sources agree that Moray chivalrously opted to release Namur and escort him back to the Border – but he was captured in turn, when he boldly detoured to attack the marauding English garrison recently placed in Roxburgh (*Fordun* i. 359; *Lanercost*, pp 282–3/292–3; *Scalacronica*, pp 165–6; *Scotichronicon* vii. 111–15; *Wyntoun* ii. 419–20; *Pluscarden* i. 278–9).

1335, 10–18 September: Edward III halts for a week at Edinburgh on return from the campaign (*CDS* iii. Nos. 1176–7). It is evidently at this point that practical steps towards refortifying the castle as the base of an English garrison and local occupation regime begin.

1335, 13 September: Sir Thomas Roslin takes office as keeper and sheriff, with a garrison of 60 men-at-arms and 60 archers, and sets to work repairing and refortifying the castle (*CDS* iii. No. 1186). See Appendix 4: The English Garrisons.

1335, 10 October: Sir John Stirling's indenture with Edward III; he is appointed Sheriff and Keeper of Edinburgh for life and is to have lands worth 300 marks in Lothian, or lands worth 200 marks in England if the English cannot hold the area (*Calendar* v. No. 742).

1335, 2 November: Sir Thomas Roslin delivers command of the castle and garrison to Sir John Stirling. Detailed records of building work since 13 September 1335 provide an important structural overview of the buildings abandoned since 1314 (*CDS* iii. No. 1186; the date is given as 1 November 1335 by *CDS* iii. No. 1215). The relevant text, previously only summarised in *CDS*, is translated in full in Appendix 4: The English Garrisons.

1336, 29 June: The Edinburgh garrison's pay is 18 weeks in arrears (*CDS* iii. No. 1207). Edward III sends a note from Perth to his Lord Chancellor urging that it needs to be hurried forward, and also pressing him to expedite confirmation of Sir John Stirling's remuneration (for which, see under 10 October 1336).

1336, 29 September: The annual sheriffdom accounts are presented; the landward revenue stood at almost £500, while information on the burgh revenues is restricted to the customs, with 17 voyages, nine of them made by just three ships, and a resulting cash revenue of £25 supplemented by shares of cargo (*CDS* iii. No. 1214, printed in full in App. III, pp 327–47). See Appendix 4: The English Garrisons.

1336, 31 October: Sir John Stirling draws up his construction accounts; a garrison muster is also presented, noting some 90 men-at-arms and 71 archers (*CDS* iii. No. 1215, App. IV, pp 347–59, and pp 360–2). The document indicates a surprising level of 'Scotticisation' in the garrison. See Appendix 4: The English Garrisons.

1337, 18 May: A muster of the English garrison taken by Sir John Swanland enumerates 84 men-at-arms and 64 archers (*CDS* iii. No. 1215, App. IV, pp 362–3). See Appendix 4: The English Garrisons.

1337, 29 September: The annual sheriffdom and burgh accounts are presented; the landward revenue topped £300, but with just ten ships calling at Leith in the year the customs were comparatively small, roughly £25 from the town of Edinburgh, a suspiciously rounded 20 marks from Haddington, and nil from Linlithgow, which is said to be completely deserted (*CDS* iii. Nos. 1246, 1247; the landward account is printed separately, App. VI, pp 376–83, 391–3). See Appendix 4: The English Garrisons.

1337, October: The start of a sustained period of Scottish military pressure against the English garrison in the castle (Caldwell (2016), pp 52–5). The basic narrative focuses on a Scottish siege, which was abandoned due to the approach of Edward Balliol and his English allies, but this was evidently a complex campaign, with a multiplicity of sources providing different details and perspectives (*Fordun* i. 362; *Lanercost*, p 293/308; *Sclacronica*, p 167; *Scotichronicon* vii. 131; Wyntoun ii. 438; *Pluscarden* i. 286). The siege itself is not described in detail, but we know that the Scots no longer relied on the simple tactics of blockade and infiltration – this army, led by the regent Sir Andrew Moray, was equipped with siege-engines, and experienced in using them after ousting most of the other English garrisons in Scotland. Their arrival seems to have been largely welcomed by the local community (*communitas*), with Laurence Preston being appointed as sheriff to establish regular local government; by implication, there was a high expectation of success in the siege (*Fordun* i. 362). The details of its ending are recorded in *Scalacronica*, which explains that the Scots broke off the siege to threaten the approaching English and Balliol men, positioning themselves to the south at Clerkington near Temple; their opponents encamped at Crichton and a bloody clash developed in what the source calls ‘Crichton Den’, evidently the wooded valley of the river Tyne in front of Crichton (cf. *Scotichronicon* vii. 138; *Extracta*, p 174); the English had the worst of the encounter, but the Scots then moved south, hoping to outmarch their opponents and raid unopposed into the north of England, forcing the English to hurry back to take up a blocking position and prevent them crossing the Tweed (*Scalacronica*, p 145; Wyntoun ii. 447–8 describes Crichton Den as a cavalry engagement in which the English men-at-arms were routed by a Scottish squadron led by Sir William Douglas, the ‘knight of Liddisdale’, but the Scots drew off rather than confronting the English infantry). The earliest Scottish source, in contrast, regards the ending of the siege as a failure, and seems to place the blame for it partially on treason by local Balliol sympathisers; the local result, the source observes, was a bitter war between the English garrison and Scottish forces remaining in the castle’s hinterland, with both sides committing depredations (*Fordun* i. 362). Bower’s *Scotichronicon* adds a story which begins with a successful raid by the castle garrison on the Scots’ herds on Calder Muir, masterminded by a pro-Balliol Scotsman in the garrison named Robert Prendergast; at the subsequent feast, Thomas Knayton, the English ‘marshal’ of

the garrison, used his authority over seating arrangements in the hall to insult Prendergast by placing him with the servants, and when Prendergast objected Knayton exploited his power to maintain discipline by beating him up with his baton; the next day, as Knayton and his comrades swaggered down the Royal Mile, Prendergast ambushed them, assassinating the marshal and wounding three of his men 'lethally' (*letaliter*); Prendergast escaped to the sanctuary of Holyrood Abbey, where patriotic monks kept him safe for 12 days, until he could be sneaked out disguised as a monk to a meeting in the hunting ground near Arthur's Seat with Sir William Douglas (who had been on a successful raiding offensive in north-west England and now assumed effective command of the campaign from Moray); learning that many of the garrison spent their nights in brothels in the town (*in domibus lenocinantibus*) rather than within the castle, the Scots returned in force, raided Edinburgh, and slew over 80 soldiers (*Scotichronicon* vii. 133-5). Bower's depiction of English garrison's fatal enthusiasm for prostitutes may be anticipated by his vivid description of Knayton's daily walk down the middle of the Royal Mile: 'he removed himself to the town for entertainment ... swollen with contemptuous pride' (*ad villam solaciandi causa secesserat ... fastu superbie turgentem*); his implication that the monks of Holyrood were in regular contact with the Scottish forces is rather more discreet. *Pluscarden* i. 286 simply says that Prendergast was belittled by the English, slew 'one of the noble governors of the Castle' (*unum de nobilibus castri gubernatoribus*), and then found Douglas, who returned and slew English troops 'billited in great numbers' in the town (*hospitati... in magna copia*). Separately, an English source records that, towards the start of 1338, Douglas ambushed and overwhelmed a powerful cavalry squadron led by Sir John Stirling, the English garrison commander, who was attempting 'to catch some prey' (*pro praeda qudam capienda*; the phrase presumably refers to livestock raiding or even deer hunting); he then brought them up in front of the walls of the castle, and threatened to execute them in an attempt to persuade the garrison to surrender; when his bluff was called, he imprisoned them in Dumbarton Castle (*Lanercost*, pp 295-6/312). The threat to execute the prisoners 'on gallows in front of the gate' (*ante portam ... in furcis*) may be an early reference to the place of execution on Castle Hill. This raid is also mentioned out of context by Scottish sources, which locate the clash at the unidentified 'Craggis by Cragyne' (*Scotichronicon* vii. 138; *Wyntoun* ii. 447-8; *Extracta*, p 174). It is not clear whether these separate narratives of raids against

the Edinburgh garrison by Douglas really record distinct incidents, or if they are two very different reports of the same events, a serious defeat inflicted by Douglas on garrison elements based outside the castle, which illustrated the vulnerability of the English anywhere outside the gates (it may be significant that the list of the Knight of Liddisdale's exploits in *Scotichronicon* vii. 138; Wyntoun ii. 447-9; and *Extracta*, p 174 has nothing else which might correspond to the raid on the Edinburgh brothels).

1338, 28 April: Edward III informs the warden of Edinburgh that Richard, Earl of Arundel is leading an expedition, to organise the garrisons and conscript men (*CDS* iii. No. 1267). The governor is unnamed, and perhaps the king, in London, did not yet know who had replaced Sir John Stirling after his capture.

1339, 27 June: Licence to Robert Rottenherring of Ravenser and William de Melton of Barton, to ship provisions in the *Radegund* of Ravenser, to the Perth, Edinburgh and Stirling garrisons (*CDS* iii. No. 1314).

1340, 26 January: Sir Thomas Rokeby, warden of both Edinburgh and Stirling, accounts for the pay of his two garrisons, and the expenses of construction work on the fortifications (*CDS* iii. No. 1323). The expenses for Edinburgh over the period from 16 July 1339 to 26 January 1340 are £1,017 in pay and £75 19s 2d on the fortifications, centred on rebuilding the Portcullis Gate and improving the roadway leading up to it. The section on the additions to the fortifications, previously only summarised in *CDS*, is fully translated in Appendix 4: The English Garrisons.

1340, 1 June: Henry Percy asks a letter of protection for his valet Alan of Heton, serving in the Edinburgh garrison with Sir Thomas Rokeby, who needs immunity from prosecution at home in England (*CDS* v. No. 801). The printed text misdates this to '[1346]', due to the fact that in both year the date fell on the same day of the week. An attached observation about an Earl of Angus evidently relates to Sir

Gilbert de Umfraville, the pro-Balliol claimant to the title, whose heirs continued to use the title into the 15th century.

1339 x 1340, 27 August: Badly damaged letter from Sir Thomas Rokeby, at Edinburgh (*Calendar* v. No. 795), The printed text misdates this to '[1341?]', when Rokeby had been a prisoner for four months. The date can be refined by the reference to the long Scottish blockade of Stirling.

1341, April 16–17: The castle is recaptured from the English in a dramatic Scottish raid (*Scotichronicon* vii. 239–40; *Pluscarden* i. 289–90; *Wyntoun* ii. 457–60; *Le Bel* i. 253–4; Froissart i. 113–14). The trio of Scottish sources represent a single closely related narrative tradition, but they are corroborated in outline by the independent report in the French chronicles of Jean le Bel and Froissart: a group of around 15 Scots disguised as merchants arrived by sea and gained admittance to the castle's main gate with pack-horses carrying supplies, killed the guards and jammed the entrance open with the goods they had brought, then used a hunting horn to call a larger Scottish force of around 200 men concealed nearby, who stormed in and overwhelmed the entire English garrison. The Scottish sources describe a prearranged plan devised by the fighting priest and former Balliol partisan Walter Bullock, in which the force was conveyed secretly from Dundee in a merchant ship, and identify key participants as the Border leader Sir William Douglas, the northern knights Joachim of Kinbuck and Walter Fraser, and the merchant Walter of Currie (whose role, along with two other merchants named William Bartholomew and Walter Fairley, is corroborated by generous reward payments: *ER* i. 490, 494). The French sources name the defending garrison commander as a certain Walter of Limousin, the brother of a notable English captain, while among the Scots they report the presence of the Earl of Dunbar, Simon Fraser and Alexander Ramsay, the last-named of whom was certainly closely associated with Douglas at this date, and say that the main attack force consisted of 'wild Scots', i.e. Highlanders; they state in addition that the Scottish troops rested overnight in Holyrood Abbey (where the monks seem to have assisted a previous Douglas raid following the abortive siege of October 1337). There are some discrepancies, however – the French sources have Douglas lead

the initial attack, stating that he and the infiltrators were initially only allowed through an outer gate, and that they had to overpower the guards to unlock the main inner gateway, spilling some of their supplies to prevent each gate being closed in turn, then holding off the garrison until their reinforcements arrived; in contrast, the Scottish narrative places Douglas in reserve commanding the main force, and gives the leadership of the infiltrators to the merchant Walter of Currie, describing how he used a plank to prop open a portcullis and then threw some of the supplies across the doorway of a tower to block English reinforcements; there is also an apparent inconsistency between the two Scottish accounts, with Wyntoun using the name of 'the Turnipke' for the tower, while Bower's modern translators interpret it as the name of an outer location where the Scottish reinforcements waited. (Caldwell (2016), pp 57-8 believes that the infiltrators were allowed through an outer gate at the head of the Royal Mile where their reinforcements lay in wait and that the advance party forced open a single inner gate, but see Part 2: Index of Locations - Portcullis Gate, Turnpike, where it is suggested that the apparent inconsistency in Bower is a translation error, and an alternative interpretation is discussed, with a sequence of two or three entrances close together in the area of the Portcullis Gate). Whatever the exact details, the castle was now back in Scottish hands, with the survivors of the English garrison placed in their own prison, and the town of Edinburgh jubilant: after an interval of 45 years, it was decided to restore the castle to its historic role as a royal fortress, in advance of King David II's return from exile. The titular English governor Sir Thomas Rokeby had surrendered himself to the Scots with the Stirling garrison due to lack of supplies some weeks earlier, but nonetheless submitted his pay accounts to the English government for the Edinburgh Castle garrison to the date of surrender: 49 men-at-arms, six watchmen, 60 mounted archers (*CDS* iii. No. 1383). One further uncertainty concerns the exact date of the attack - Scottish sources claim 17 April, but Rokeby's pay claim is dated to a day earlier - perhaps he opted to exclude the morning of the capture itself. See Appendix 4: The English Garrisons.

Section D: 1341-1513

This section covers the long period after the Wars of Independence, in which the castle served once again as a major royal fortress and residence – arguably the apogee of its reign as a palace and political hub. The sources for this period are primarily government documents, the majority of which are printed in the Exchequer Rolls and Treasurer’s Accounts volumes. This documentation does not match the consistently high level of detail in the bureaucratic material from the preceding English occupation phase, but it forms a sustained long-term record which compensates for the relative slightness of the narrative evidence, particularly for the period 1437–88.

1342: In the aftermath of the recapture of the castle, the royal accounts show William Douglas receiving a salary of £66 13s 4d (100 marks) as keeper, plus an additional £13 6s 8d (20 marks) during Edward III’s incursion in the winter of 1341–2 (*ER* i. 507–8). The accounts also record two separate payments for hemp for making cables for the siege engines in the castle (*ER* i. 487, 499), 40s for keeping the king’s victuals in the castle (*ER* i. 511–12) and part-payments towards the rewards of men involved in recapturing the castle (*ER* i. 490, 494).

1343: Further payments to the men who had helped recapture the castle (*ER* i. 522, 534).

1343 x 1360: There is a gap in the surviving Scottish government documents during the 1340s and 1350s.

1360: To John Lyle, Keeper of the Castle of Edinburgh, in part-payment of what he is owed for the keeping of the same castle, £20 (*ER* ii. 50).

1361: To James Wlp [*sic*], for cords, iron and other things, bought for Edinburgh Castle, £14 13s 4d; to John Lyle, as keeper, in part-payment of his fee, £20 9s 4d;

£18 9s 10d to Roger Hog for 'the fortifying and repair of the well and other defects of Edinburgh Castle, according to two separate letters of the King'; to Thomas Leche, burgess of Linlithgow, for two pipes of wine bought for the king's use, and carriage to Edinburgh, £10 (*ER* ii. 78–9). The well referred to here is the Wellhouse Tower.

1361, 20 June: To Sir John Preston for building the well and other works on castle, £20; to Roger Hog, burgess of Edinburgh, for the same, £40; the total paid thus far on the well and other repairs of the castle is stated to be £120 (*ER* ii. 83). It is not clear whether the discrepancy of £60 represents expenditure concealed under less specified headings, or if it was still owing.

1362: To Sir Archibald Douglas, Keeper of Edinburgh Castle, receiving each year £133 6s 8d (*ER* ii. 92). The sum is equivalent to 200 marks, a considerable increase on the previous fees; the next year, the fee rises to 300 marks. Perhaps this is connected with the ongoing building works.

1362: To Sir Walter Moygne, knight, for distribution among the king's household (*familiares regis*), £20; to the same Sir Walter Moygne, for 10 chalders of salt for the fortifying of the castle of Edinburgh, £13 6s 8d (*ad municionem*, in this case probably to be understood in terms of provisioning); to the same Sir Walter, for the expenses of the king's household (*domus domini nostri regis*) £9 16s 9d, and to the same Sir Walter, for his fee, for the year 1361, £20 (*ER* ii. 112–13). It is not clear whether any of this run of entries relates to the castle beyond the salt purchase, but it shows how castle-related activities can be buried in the general expenses – for comparison, the year before, Moygne had simply received a single sum of £66 13s 4d 'for the expenses of the King's household' (*domus domini nostri regis*, *ER* ii. 82), and the year before that, £25 14s ½d for seven separate but unspecified invoices for 'various expenses of the household' (*pro diuersis expensis domus*, *ER* ii. 49). It seems credible that running expenses for the castle were included, and it is even conceivable that these payments and others like them could be applied to the architectural structure of the literal 'king's house'.

1362, 14 August: To Roger Hog, burgess of Edinburgh, for construction of the tower of the well of Edinburgh Castle, viz. in part-payment of the same £80 (*ER* ii. 113-14). See 20 June 1361 for earlier payments for this work: the £80 here may in part have covered the £60 discrepancy there.

1362: Paid to Simon Reed, Constable of Edinburgh Castle, £10 (*ER* ii. 116). This is evidently his annual fee.

1364: Simon Reed, Constable of Edinburgh Castle, for his fee for 1362, £10. And to the same Simon, for buying a horse for the king's use, £10 (*ER* ii. 132).

1364: For diverse expenditures, at the time when the king was 'with strength' (i.e. with an army) at Edinburgh, £618 9s 8d (*ER* ii. 164). This evidently describes the royal response to the short-lived revolt against David II in 1363 by the Steward of Scotland (the future Robert II), the Earl of Douglas and the Earl of March.

1364: To Simon Reed, Constable of the Castle of Edinburgh, for repairs of the same castle, £42 9s 5d (*ER* ii. 165).

1364: To Sir Archibald Douglas, for sustaining the Castle of Edinburgh, in Pentecost term 1363, and Pentecost and Martinmas terms 1364, £200 (300 marks) (*ER* ii. 131).

1364: To Sir Archibald Douglas, Keeper of the Castle of Edinburgh, for keeping of the said castle, from Candlemas term 1362, £66 13s 4d (100 marks) (*ER* ii. 166).

1364: To Sir Archibald Douglas, for his fee, 66 13s 4d, viz. for keeping of the Castle of Edinburgh; and to the same, £80. And to Simon Reed, Constable of the Castle

of Edinburgh, for repairs of the same, £83 18s 7d (*ER* ii. 176).

1364: To Simon Reed, Keeper of the Castle of Edinburgh, for diverse repairs made within the Castle of Edinburgh, £44 14s 4d (*ER* ii. 178).

1365: Payments from the castlewards of the sheriffdom of Edinburgh, totalling £30 6s 8d, are paid to the Minorites of Haddington and Dundee (*ER* ii. 221). These revenues have thus ceased to have any real connection to the upkeep of the castle.

1366: A £10 payment from the burgh fermes of Edinburgh is paid to the chaplain celebrating in the chapel of St Mary within the castle newly built (*capella beate Marie infra castrum de nouo constructa*); the chaplain is named as William de Calebra (*ER* ii. 246). This is the first reference to the Great Chapel since its conversion into a granary in the 1330s.

1366: To Simon Reed, Keeper of the Castle of Edinburgh, for the wages of watchmen of the castle, for his wages and expenses £26 13s 8d (*ER* ii. 259).

1367: William de Calabre, chaplain in the New Chapel, £10 (*ER* ii. 282).

1367: To Simon Reed, 'castlekeeper of Edinburgh' (*custodicastri de Edynburgh*) for the expense of watchmen of the castle, £20 6s 8d (*ER* ii. 289).

1368: To John of Kirkcaldy, receiver of victuals at Leith, for victuals, coals and other necessaries for the Castle of Edinburgh, £78 16s 6d. And Thomas Sprowl, receiver of victuals within the Castle of Edinburgh, for wine, grain and other purchases, and for repairs within the said castle (two separate receipts), £89 12s 8d. For construction work, £5 7s 4d; for 10 marts, bought to the Castle of

Edinburgh, £40, and for 100 muttuns, bought for the same castle £6, for which marts and muttuns Thomas Sprowl is responsible; and for various carriages made to the Castle of Edinburgh, and in other diverse and minute expenses, examined on account, incurred at Leith and Edinburgh and Stirling, £12 10s 5*d*; and to Simon Reed and the watchmen of the Castle of Edinburgh, £47 13s 4*d* (*ER* ii. 306-7).

1368: To William Guppyld [*sic*], for construction of the new tower of Edinburgh, and for buying boards to the same, £85 10s (*ER* ii. 308).

1369: Chaplain in the New Chapel, £10 for his fee (*ER* ii. 322).

1369: To John Crab, burgess of Aberdeen, payment for a certain purchase in Flanders for military supplies for Edinburgh Castle; to Simon Reed, Constable of the Castle of Edinburgh, for himself and watchmen of the same castle, £53 13s 4*d* (*ER* ii. 347).

1371: To Sir Thomas Erskine, Keeper of the Castle of Edinburgh, for keeping of the said castle, £133 6s 8*d*, and to the same Sir Thomas, for the making of the new tower of Edinburgh, £20; and to Sir Thomas Erskine, Sheriff of Edinburgh, for his fee, £20 (*ER* ii. 364).

1372: For six tuns of wine remaining in Edinburgh Castle (*ER* ii. 368).

1372: To the chaplain in the new chapel, £10 (*ER* ii. 387).

1372: To Sir John, firstborn son of the king, Earl of Carrick, Steward of Scotland, in completion of £333 6s 8*d* owed to him for keeping the Castle of Edinburgh, discounting £40 already given him by the king, £293 6s 8*d*. To William Cairns, Constable of the Edinburgh Castle, for construction of the new tower of the same,

£40, and to the same constable, for the scything of Liberton meadow, £5, and to Thomas Sproult, receiver within the Castle of Edinburgh, for six chalders of grain, three sacks of flour, 15 chalders of gross salt, 1,500 boards and 48 chalders of coal, with carriage, £61 3s 1d (*ER* ii. 393).

1373: The chaplain in the new chapel, £10 (*ER* ii. 411).

1373: £448 19s 2d for six tuns of wine remaining in the Castle of Edinburgh, with costs (*ER* ii. 447).

1374: To Malcolm Fleming, Sheriff of Edinburgh, for repairing of the said castle, 700 boards, £6 16s (*ER* ii. 462).

1375: For 1,000 boards for roofing the hall of Edinburgh, attested by the chamberlain and the receipt of the Earl of Carrick, £10 (*ER* ii. 472).

1375: Payment made to the Earl of Carrick to make payment for the fabric of the tower built at the gate of Edinburgh Castle, £39 6s 8d (*ER* ii 473).

1375: Paid to the Earl of Carrick, in part-payment of the sum assigned to him for the keeping of Edinburgh Castle for Pentecost term 1375, £147 6s 8d (*ER* ii. 473-4).

1375: To the lord Earl of Carrick for the sum assigned to him for keeping the Castle of Edinburgh, for Martinmas term last, £146 13s 4d; for buying certain vases of Rhenish wine drunk at Christmas, £14 1s 2d; for the buying of 200 chalders of wheat to the Castle of Edinburgh, and supplies used by the Earl of Carrick, as appears by the said Earl's letters of receipt and obligation, £163 14s 8d, and for the same from the lord king in part-payment of the said sum assigned and 49s 9d;

and in payment for the making of the tower of the Castle of Edinburgh, as for the timber and fee of the master of work, so for that work, £227 13s 4d (*ER* ii. 475).

1375: For the chaplain in the new chapel, £10 (*ER* ii. 488).

1376: To the Earl of Carrick, for the sum assigned to him for keeping the Castle of Edinburgh, for Pentecost term in the year of this account, £146 13s 4d (*ER* ii. 488).

1376: Delivered to John Cairns, esquire of the lord Earl of Carrick, for work on the gate tower of Edinburgh Castle, £66 13s 4d (*ER* ii. 520).

1376: Paid for buying two tuns of honey, one tun of 'taynt', two pipes of wine and ten chalders of salt, delivered for the defence (*ad municionem*) of Edinburgh Castle, £80; delivered to William Cairns, constable of the same castle, for the fabric of the same castle, £22 (*ER* ii. 526).

1376: For the chaplain in the new chapel, £10 (*ER* ii. 536).

1377: Delivered to John Cairns, minister of the lord Earl of Carrick, for the building of the new tower of Edinburgh Castle, £13 6s 8d (*ER* ii. 551).

1377: Wages of the smith and carpenter, for their services, of the Castle of Edinburgh, £10; for iron, for making the iron gate, £10 (*ER* ii. 554).

1377: John Cairns, for the making of the new gate tower of Edinburgh, £40 (*ER* ii. 555).

1377: Distributed to John Cairns, for the making of the new tower of Edinburgh

Castle, £13 6s 8d (*ER* ii. 557).

1377: Chaplain in the new chapel, £10 (*ER* ii. 570).

1379: Chaplain in the new chapel, £10 (*ER* ii. 592).

1379: To the carpenter and smith of the Castle of Edinburgh, for their fees, in the terms of Pentecost and Martinmas in this account, £20. Payment made to the Earl of Carrick, for the sum assigned to him by the king, for Pentecost and Martinmas terms, £333 6s 8d; to the same count, for the castle, in one tun and one pipe of wine bought, £12, and to John Cairns, receiving on behalf of the said count, for the building of the tower of Edinburgh beside the gate, £40; and to the same John, receiving on behalf of the earl, as above, for the same construction, £26 13s 4d; the same, for boards, spars and other wood, bought for the same tower, and for the carriage of iron, £38 16s 5d; to the same, for the complete making and construction of the work of the same tower, £13 6s 8d (*ER* ii. 608).

1379: For iron for the gate of Edinburgh Castle, £10 (*ER* ii. 621).

1379: To the Earl of Carrick, receiving yearly from the customs of Edinburgh, for his fee, 500 marks, £333 6s 8d; and to certain masons of Edinburgh Castle, for the completion of the dog-kennels, £2 3s 4d; and the carpenter, for his fee, £10 (*ER* iii. 2).

1379: For timber bought for the use of Edinburgh Castle, £3 16s 8d (*ER* iii. 3).

1379: The chaplain in the new chapel, £10 (*ER* iii. 15–16).

1380: To Patrick Porter, for scything hay in the king's meadow (*le Kyngismedow*) beside Edinburgh, £4 13s 4d; the friar celebrating in the chapel of St Mary within the castle, £10; Duncan the carpenter, £10 (*ER* iii. 53).

1380: To Sir John Lyon, Keeper of Edinburgh Castle and sheriff of the same, established under the Earl of Carrick, yearly for life, beyond the sum assigned to him by the Earl, 100 marks annual from the burgh customs of Edinburgh (or else Dundee or Aberdeen) for the keeping of the said castle, to be paid at Pentecost and Martinmas terms, in equal portions: £66 13s 4d (*ER* iii. 54).

1380: A sum of £707 8s 4d is delivered by John Gray and John Rollo for keeping in custody within Edinburgh Castle, in the place above St Margaret's Chapel, deputised to them for this by the chamberlain, by letters of the king under the signet (*ER* iii. 656).

1380: For grain, malt, wheat, wheatflour (*frumento, brasio, silligine, farina*), coals, salmons salted in barrels, honey, marts and other victuals with their carriage, bought for the provisioning of Edinburgh Castle (*ad municionem*), and sent for storage in the keeping of the constable, for the provisions (*ad stuffam*) of the said castle, as appears in an itemised roll, £207 15s 6d [the itemised role lists these as purchases by the chamberlain for the provisioning (*ad municionem*) of Edinburgh Castle in the year 1380, sent to for keeping in the castle with the constable, William Wauchope, for the provision of the same (*ad stoffam*), as contained in full in the chamberlain account of 1382: ten chalders of grain (*frumentum*), £30, 20 chalders malt (*brasei*), £53 6s 8d; ten chalders wheat (*silligiis*), £17 8s; carriage, 20s; 60 sacks of wheat flour (*farine silliginis*), £22; 51 chalders of coal, £13 0s 6d, for carriage, £3 8s, ten barrels of salmon, £11; total, £153 2s 2d; two tuns of honey, sent to the provision of the said castle (*ad stoffam*), as above, £36 13s 3d; bought and sent for keeping to provision (*ad stoffam*), as above, 60 marts, £20; 100 muttons, £8; diverse silk bought for the castle, 20s; total £55 13s 4d; bought and sent for keeping in the supplies (*ad stoffam*) of the same castle, as above, 12 hauberks (*lorice*), £24; 12 bascinets with aventails and others (*et aliis*), £18; 12 pairs of armoured gauntlets (*paria cirothecarum*), 48s; six pairs of greaves (*paria*

armaturarum tibialium), £8; 12 targes (*targetes*), £6; caps of steel called kettle-hats (*capelli de calibe dicti ketilhattis*), £8; total, £56 8s; grand total, £275 3s 6d, written by John Gray, clerk of the rolls and register] and for various armours bought for the munition (*ad municionem*) of the same castle, particularly shown on the account and written in the said roll, sent for keeping with the constable as above, £66 8s. And spent for boards, spars, iron, lead and other small purchases and expenses and in short expended and used in necessities pertaining to the said castle, as appears in the said roll by single particulars as above, £54 3s 8d; in diverse expenses for an iron gate and a wall beside the gate, with costs made for the mason and other workmen, as appears in particular in the said roll, £104 9s 1d (*ER* iii. 653–4).

1380: To the carpenter of Edinburgh Castle, for his fee, £10. To William Pyot, serjeant in Edinburgh Castle, in the office which Adam Page had, for his service in the year of this account, £5 (*ER* iii. 655).

1381: To the Earl of Carrick, for the pension assigned for his fee, £333 6s 8d, and by the gift of the king, £100; Sir John Lyon, as keeper under him, £55 13s 4d (*ER* iii. 65). The account of Sir John's fee apparently replicates the 1380 one and is not given in full in the printed text.

1381: Chaplain in the chapel of St Mary, £10 salary (*salario*); allocated for the scything of hay in the king's meadow beside Edinburgh, £6. Allocated for boards and other various things received for the use of the Castle of Edinburgh, in the time of Malcolm Fleming, sheriff and keeper of the same, £10. Allocated for grain and malt (*frumento et brasio*) bought for the Earl of Carrick's use, £10 (*ER* iii. 66).

1381: In the Linlithgow burgh accounts, paid to the bearer of a certain letter sent to Edinburgh Castle, 18d (*ER* iii. 72).

1381: In payment made for various workers labouring for a long time finding the location of the well within Edinburgh Castle, which was destroyed and forgotten, and for cleaning of that well, and completely cleaning and perfecting it, £31 16s 6d; and for two pipes of 'wine of Respyne' (*vini de Respyne* – Retsina?) for the provisions (*stuffam*) of Edinburgh Castle, £13 6s 8d; for a tun of Spanish wine for the same provisions, £12; for ten chalders of salt for the same provisions, £20; for 24 chalders of coal for the smithy, £9 12s; for 2,000 boards, £22; for 200 'knorhaldis', £6; for stones, chalk, sand, with the carriage of them, for iron, lead, cords and stones drawn out of the well, and in salaries to the masons and other workers, and for other diverse works done in the Castle of Edinburgh, £64 3s 8d. To a certain artificer, making bows, crossbows and other instruments of artillery in the castle, for his fee, £20; to a certain carpenter called Theoderic, for his fee, £20; and to Duncan Wright, for his fee, £10, and the smith, for his fee, £10 (*ER* iii. 81–2).

1382: To John Lyon, chamberlain, £340; to the same, as Keeper of the Castle of Edinburgh, for keeping of the same, £61 (*ER* iii. 86–7).

1382: Chaplain in St Mary's Chapel, £10. Certain small expenses made for Edinburgh Castle, £9 4s 5d; for carriage of stones and sand for a new house, viz., the kitchen and other necessary houses, built beside the great tower in the castle, 'made in the form of a vault' (*ad modum voute factis*), £15 13s 8d; to the mason, for his skill on this work, £22, and the carpenter of the castle, for his fee, £10, and for the scything and drying of hay from the king's meadow of Liberton (*prati regii de Libertoun*), £6; and to William Wauchope, Constable of the Castle, for certain works ordered by him for a smithy and a moat (*una fabrina et una fossato*) beside the castle, £5 13s 4d (*ER* iii. 89). It is unclear whether the reference to a 'moat' should be taken literally and associated with the Drawbridge that was simultaneously under construction, or if it perhaps relates to the quenching trench discovered by archaeologists at the Smithy.

1382: Theoderic the carpenter, for his fee, £15 6s 8d (*ER* iii. 98).

1382: To merchants of Prussia, for timber bought for siege engines and for tools (*instrumentis*) for the castles, £194 6s 8d; to Sir Archibald Douglas, by the king's command, £78 15s 6d (*ER* iii. 659). It is not directly clear if this applies to the castle, but the following makes it likely.

1382: To Adam Forester, keeping by the king's command the Castle of Edinburgh, £10; for the carriage of timber for machines built within the castle, £22 13s 4d; for the fee of the smith of Edinburgh Castle, £10; to the artillerist (*artilario*) of Edinburgh Castle, for his fee, £7 10s; to Dietrich (*Teodericus*), carpenter building siege-engines in Edinburgh Castle, for his fee at Martinmas 1381, £10; for coal for the smithy and the hearths, £16; for some small expenses made in the smithy, and other small expenses made within the castle, £5; and for 200 stones of iron to the castles of Edinburgh and Stirling, £15 8s (*ER* iii. 660).

1383: Payment made by Adam Forester, at the chamberlain's command, for the making of pavement for the gate of Edinburgh Castle and for making the bridge of the same gate, and for certain works made for the fountain or for the well of the castle (*pro fone sive pro puteo castrī*), £33 9s; to Deitrich (*Dedricus*) the carpenter, for his work and skill improving his great engine to the agreed performance, by the agreement made by the said carpenter with the said Adam, £20; and for iron bought for the making of the great machine and the said bridge for the gate, £10; to the smith of the castle, for his fee for the year ending at Pentecost 1384, £10; to the chaplain celebrating in St Mary's chapel in Edinburgh Castle, for his salary for the year ending at Pentecost 1384, £10; to John of Scone, stonecutter or mason, brought to the work of the said castle by the lord Earl of Carrick, for his fee for a year ending at the feast of St Peter ad Vincula next after this account, £10; for Duncan Carpenter, for part of his fee, ending at Pentecost 1384, £5 (*ER* iii. 665).

1384: To John of Scone, stonecutter or mason (*lathomus seu cemenario*), brought to the work of Edinburgh Castle by the chamberlain, for his fee, £10; to Dedircus the carpenter of the siege-engine of Edinburgh Castle (*Dedirco carpentario machine castrī de Edynburgh*), for his service, £18 (*ER* iii. 117).

1384: To Deitrich the carpenter of Edinburgh Castle, in part-payment of his fee for 1384–5, beginning at Candlemas, £12; and for iron, brought for repairing the siege-engine of Edinburgh, 40s; and for the cutting (*tonsione*) of the great meadow of the king beside Edinburgh, £5 (*ER* iii. 118).

1386: To Deitrich the carpenter, for his work and skill within Edinburgh Castle, by the agreement made for him and another workman with him, £24; and to the chaplain in St Mary's Chapel, in part salary, £10 (*ER* iii. 133).

1388: For the king's expenses at Edinburgh in May 1379, £41 13s 9d (*ER* iii. 169).

1388: Deitrich the carpenter, for his fee until Candlemas 1387, £24; for iron and boards and diverse works done for the castle within Edinburgh Castle (*pro castro infra castrum de Edynburgh*), £25 1s 6d (*ER* iii. 170).

1388: To Deitrich (*Dedric*) the carpenter, for his fee to Candlemas 1388, in part, £18 (*ER* iii. 187).

1388: King Robert II's expenses in the castle (*ER* iii. 689).

1388: To Sir Geoffrey [Lister], chaplain celebrating in the chapel of St Mary newly built in Edinburgh Castle (*in capella Sancte Marie de novo constructa in castro de Edynburgh*), by will and grant of the king at present, for his salary for year 1388, £10 (*ER* iii. 693).

1389: To William Napier, one of the costumars of Edinurgh, £39 14s 9d for arrears of the last account, rendered viz. at Stirling in February 1388, for expenses made in work on Edinburgh Castle (*ER* iii. 204).

1389, 2 April: Sir Malcolm Drummond, summoned to appear before Parliament regarding his attempt to claim the forest of Selkirk and the sheriffship of Roxburgh, refuses, saying he fears harm, and asks a guarantee of safety from the Earl of Fife; in his answer, Fife says that this should be no problem, and that he has previously sent letters for him to Edinburgh Castle, through the constable of the same (*mittendo sibi ad castrum de Edynburgh' per constabularium ipsius castr*), offering safe conduct (*RPS 1389/3/11*).

1390: To Sir Geoffrey, chaplain currently celebrating in St Mary's Chapel in Edinburgh Castle newly built, in part-payment of £8 annual pension to him and his successors, chaplains celebration in the same chapel of St Mary, by charter of King Robert III, to be paid from the great customs of the burgh of Edinburgh, at Pentecost and Martinmas in equal parts, £3, and no more, as he had received the rest by the hand of the chamberlain-depute, Patrick de Lumley (*ER iii. 221-2*).

1390: To Sir Geoffrey, chaplain in St Mary's Chapel, £5 in completion of his £8 (*ER iii. 239*).

1390: To William Napier, Constable of Edinburgh Castle, for the fee of his office, £13 6s 8d (*ER iii. 240*). After much disorganisation, William Napier, custumar of Edinburgh, has secured the constabulary at 20 marks.

1391: To William Napier, Constable of Edinburgh Castle, for his fee of his constabulary owed at Pentecost 1391, £6 13s 4d; to the same William, for keeping Edinburgh Castle, by agreement made with him at the same Pentecost, to Pentecost 1382, £66 13s 4d (*ER iii. 279*). The keeper's fee is 100 marks again.

1392: To Patrick, porter of Edinburgh Castle, for his fee, by royal command, witnessed by Reignald Crawford, secretary, who made delivery to Willelmo Napier, constable of the castle, receiving on behalf of the said Patrick,

notwithstanding that no letter of appointment was shown on this occasion, £10; to Walter de Camera for various small expenses to the king's use at Edinburgh Castle, witnessed by the said Reginald the secretary; in payment for three tuns of wine, delivered for the king's use, and money delivered in his chamber, to his own uses, £48 10s; for payment in money in the king's chamber, for his own use, as shown by letters directed to the auditors sealed under the signet, £12 2s 4d; and delivered by Richard de Barde, clerk of the liverance, for expenses of the same house made at Edinburgh in January 1391, £33 (*ER* iii. 285–6).

1392: 'for various repairs made for various necessities for Edinburgh Castle' (*pro diversis reparacionibus factis pro diversis necessariis*), 13s (*ER* iii. 287).

1392: For Sir Geoffrey chaplain in St Mary's chapel, £8 (*ER* iii. 288). Text not given in full in printed edition.

1392: William Napier, Constable of Edinburgh Castle, receiving for keeping of the same castle, by the king's will, 100 marks, £66 13s 4d (*ER* iii. 311). Napier now receives only the keeper's fee, and not his original constable's fee in addition.

1393: Paid to the chaplain celebrating in Edinburgh Castle, in St Margaret's Chapel, £8 (*ER* iii. 321).

1393: In various expenses made for work on Edinburgh Castle, by a letter under the signet, £30 10s 9½d (*ER* iii. 322).

1395: For the chaplain of St Margaret's Chapel (*ER* iii. 352). Not printed in full in edition.

1395: In small repairs of the Castle of Edinburgh, 20s 8d (*ER* iii. 353).

1396: Paid to chaplain of St Margaret's Chapel (*ER* iii. 380). Not printed in full in the printed edition.

1397: To Sir Geoffrey, the king's chaplain, celebrating in St Mary's chapel in Edinburgh Castle, £8 (*ER* iii. 410).

1398: To Sir Geoffrey, in the chapel of St Mary, £8; to Sir Walter Stewart, Lord of Brechin, for his special retainer with the king in peace and war, £33 6s 8*d*, and as Keeper of Edinburgh Castle, for keeping the said castle, for the year ending at Pentecost, witnessed by Adam Forster and William Napier, £66 13s 4*d* (*ER* iii. 437).

1389: For a stone of candle-wax to light the altar of the Chapel of St Mary in Edinburgh Castle, 8s; for the expenses made by two accused prisoners in the castle, and for iron, keys (*pro ferro, clavis*), and other small expenses for the use of the said castle, £3 (*ER* iii. 438-9).

1399: To Sir Geoffrey, in chapel of St Mary in Edinburgh Castle, £8; and for (candle) wax bought for the lighting of the aforesaid chapel in the said castle (*ER* iii. 470). First part not printed in full in the printed edition.

1399: For chains made and bought for the securing of prisoners (*pro seris factis et emptis pro clausura hostoium*) in Edinburgh Castle (*ER* iii. 472).

1399, 4 May: Robert III 'at Edinburgh Castle', appointing commissioners for peace negotiations (*CDS* iv. No. 519).

1400: To Sir Geoffrey, in the chapel of St Mary, £8 (*ER* iii. 488). Not printed in full.

1401: To Sir Archibald Douglas, knight, Earl of Douglas and Lord of Galloway, for keeping of the Castle of Edinburgh, an annuity of 200 marks usual money of the kingdom from the burgh customs of Edinburgh, at Pentecost and Martinmas; dated 4 June 1400; £133 6s 8d. Sir Geoffrey in the chapel of St Mary, £8. For the king's expenses within Edinburgh Castle and Holyrood Abbey, at the time of the exchequer held at Edinburgh, £12 15s 8d. For diverse locks and irons for restraints (*serreis et ferreis clausuris*) made in Edinburgh Castle, 30s 2d (*ER* iii. 515–16).
Chaplain not printed in full.

1402, February: An evening banquet is being held in the castle, presided over by the Duke of Albany, the effective ruler of Scotland due to the incapacity of his elder brother King Robert III; the attendees are drawn outside by the appearance of a brilliant comet in the northern sky. Albany notes that he has heard from astrologers that comets often herald the rise and fall of princes, and his words soon appear to be proved correct; according to the chronicler Walter Bower, the comet finally disappears on the day that the Duke of Rothesay, King Robert's unruly eldest son, is arrested, and order is thus restored to the kingdom – though a comparison with other sources suggests that this is a misreporting and downplaying of a more dramatic truth (*Scotichronicon* viii. 40). The Great Comet of 1402 was one of the most spectacular ever recorded, possibly the brightest in history. Careful observations by the German Renaissance astronomer Jacobus Angelus or Engelhart show that the comet appeared in early February, and disappeared into the dawn sky to the south on the morning of 27 March 1402 (D. A. J. Sergeant, *The Greatest Comets in History* (New York, 2009), pp 99–100) – at the very time when the Duke of Rothesay was found dead in his prison in the castle at Falkland.

1402: Sir Geoffrey, in the chapel of St Mary, for 1401, £8 (*ER* iii. 544).

1402: To Archibald, Earl of Douglas and Lord of Galloway, as keeper, receiving 200 marks, as part-payment for 1401: £66 42s 4d (presumably a mistake for £66

13s 4d). For the repairing of the gate of Edinburgh Castle, and for expenses made around the bridge of the same castle, by William Napier, constable of the said castle, by his oath, £11 0s 6d; to the same William, constable of the said castle, for his fee and stipend, 20 marks of the great customs of the said burgh, at Pentecost and Martinmas, 1401, £13 6s 8d (*ER* iii. 545, 546).

1402: For royal expenses made at Edinburgh and Bute, in the wardrobe and elsewhere, by a letter under the signet, £36 16s 8d (*ER* iii. 548).

1403: To Sir Geoffrey Lister (*Littyster*), chaplain of the king, celebrating in the chapel of St Mary in Edinburgh Castle, receiving for his salary an annuity from the customs of the said burgh, £8, at Pentecost and Martinmas, for 1402; and Sir Archibald, Earl of Douglas, receiving 200 marks for keeping Edinburgh Castle, for 1402, £133 6s 8d (*ER* iii. 565).

1404: Sir Geoffrey Lister (*Lettister*), £8. Sir Archibald, Earl of Douglas, for keeping Edinburgh Castle, 200 marks from the burgh customs, at two terms, in 1403 Sir William Crawford, captain of the said castle, making receipt on his behalf, £133 6s 8d (*ER* iii. 591). Chaplain not printed in full.

1405: To Sir Geoffrey, chaplain, celebrating in Edinburgh Castle, £8 salary at four terms in 1404 and 1405, £16 (*ER* iii. 618).

1406: Sir Geoffrey, chaplain in Edinburgh Castle, for his salary, £8 from the burgh customs at two terms (*ER* iv. 18).

1406: Paid to Sir Archibald, Earl of Douglas, for 200 marks for keeping the castle, by letters of Sir William Crawford, keeper of the castle, £133 6s 8d (*ER* iv. 19).

1406: For repairs made in the Edinburgh Castle, by the command of the late King [Robert III], as appears by letters under the signet, and letters of Sir William Crawford, keeper of the same castle, £60 (*ER* iv. 20).

1407: To Sir Geoffrey, chaplain in the castle, £8 (*ER* iv. 41). Not printed in full.

1407: To Sir Archibald, Earl of Douglas, for keeping of the castle, 200 marks, as shown by letters of Sir William Crawford, knight, in full payment, £133 6s 8d (*ER* iv. 42).

1407: Memorandum relating that, among other irregular outlays from the customs revenue of Edinburgh which the government is loath to accept, Sir William Crawford, knight, seized 40 marks, asserting a grant of the said sum from the Earl of Douglas, owed for keeping the Castle of Edinburgh in 1402 (when the earl was captured by the English), and 20 marks seized by Robert Crawford, who asserts the same sum owed for him for the office of Constable of Edinburgh Castle (*ER* iv. 44-5, note).

1409: To Sir Geoffrey, chaplain celebrating for the king's soul in the chapel of Edinburgh Castle, for his salary, £8 from the burgh customs, as is shown by the letter of the said chaplain (*ER* iv. 79).

1409: Allocated for wood and boards (*pro lignis et tabulis*) bought by Sir William Crawford for the repair of certain houses in Edinburgh Castle, and paid by the accountants, £10 13s 4d; to the Earl of Douglas, receiving 200 marks for keeping the Castle of Edinburgh, from the customs of the said burgh, by the receipt of Sir William Crawford, as appears by an indenture made by the said Sir William and the customars of Edinburgh under his seal, £133 6s 8d; again rehearses the other outlay which the customs officials object to in 1407, including 40 marks likewise taken by the said Sir William Crawford, for himself because he said that the Earl of Douglas was owed the said sum for the keeping of the Castle of Edinburgh in 1402; 20 marks likewise against their will taken by the said Robert Crawford, who

said that sum was owed to him for the office of Constable of Edinburgh Castle (*ER* iv. 80). It seems that either the money or the customs officials themselves have been placed in the castle.

1410: Sir Geoffrey, chaplain, for 1410, £8. To Sir Archibald, Earl of Douglas, for keeping Edinburgh Castle in full payment (*ER* iv. 114). Chaplain's pay record not printed in full.

1410: For payment made by the lord Earl of Douglas for diverse repairs made in Edinburgh Castle, as it appears by letters of the lord governor of the precept, and of the said earl the receipt, £70. For building the king's kitchen in Edinburgh Castle newly made, by letters of the lord governor of the precept, £64 17s 6d (*ER* iv. 116).

1410: To Robert Crawford, £6 13s 4d [presumably his ten marks as Constable of the Castle]. To Robert of Hawick, working around the demolition of Jedburgh Castle and the building of the king's kitchen in Edinburgh Castle, £20. As there was a small surplus on the account, Robert Hawick was given £4 for finishing the kitchen of Edinburgh Castle (*ER* iv. 117, 118).

1412: To Sir Geoffrey, chaplain, as before, for two years, £16 (*ER* iv. 141-2).

1412: Sir Archibald, Earl of Douglas, for keeping Edinburgh Castle, 200 marks per annum, £266 13s 4d (*ER* iv. 142). Again, for two years.

1412: For repair of the bridge and gate of Edinburgh Castle, £4; in additional expenses made on the building of the new kitchen of Edinburgh Castle, £2 19s 3d; and for beams to make stairs (*pro tignis ad scalas factas*) in Edinburgh Castle, 16s (*ER* iv. 143).

1412: James Douglas, brother of the earl, and William Borthwick, involved in another Edinburgh customs dispute; this may again involve the castle (*ER* iv. 144).

1413: Sir Geoffrey, chaplain £8, at risk of accountant. To Sir Archibald, Earl of Douglas, by receipt of Sir William Crawford, £133 6s 8d (*ER* iv. 176). Neither text is printed in full.

1414: To the chaplain celebrating for the soul of the late king in the chapel of Edinburgh Castle, £8 from the customs of the burgh, as appears by the chaplain's writ. To Sir Archibald, Earl of Douglas, as keeper, £133 6s 8d, at the risk of the accountant (*ER* iv. 200). Earl's fee not printed in full.

1415: To the chaplain in the castle, £8; paid to Sir Archibald, Earl of Douglas, 200 marks from the burgh customs for keeping Edinburgh Castle, as appears by a cedula under the earl's signet, £133 6s 8d (*ER* iv. 222-3). Chaplain text not printed in full.

1416: To the chaplain in the castle, £8; paid to Sir Archibald, Earl of Douglas, 200 marks for keeping Edinburgh Castle, by letters of Sir William Crawford, knight, constable of the said castle, £133 6s 8d (*ER* iv. 252).

1417: To the chaplain celebrating in Edinburgh Castle for the souls of the kings, receiving yearly £8 salary from the burgh customs, as appears by the chaplain's writ; to Sir Archibald, Earl of Douglas, £133 6s 8d, at risk of accountants (*ER* iv. 276). Earl's fee not printed in full.

1418: To chaplain in castle, £8, to Sir Archibald, Earl of Douglas, £133; both at risk of accountants (*ER* iv. 299). Neither printed in full.

1420: To chaplain in the castle, for 1418, £8; to Sir Archibald, Earl of Douglas, for 1418–19, £266 13s 4d, at risk of accountants (*ER* iv. 322). Neither printed in full.

1421: To Earl of Douglas, by receipt of Sir John Forster, £133 6s 8d; to chaplain in the castle, £8, at risk of accountant (*ER* iv. 341). Neither printed in full.

1425: To William Giffard, king's squire, by command of the same (king), as appears by his letter under his privy seal, £20 from the burgh customs; delivered by the same William Giffard for the fees of the janitor and watchmen of Edinburgh Castle, by the lord king's command under his signet, £6; and to the chaplain celebrating in St Margaret's Chapel within Edinburgh Castle, receiving £8 annually from the burgh customs, by the king's alms, for his salary, at risk of the accountants, £8 (*ER* iv. 381). The fees for porter and watchmen were evidently met previously out of the keeper's salary.

1426: To Walter Mason, burgess of Edinburgh, Master of Work (*magistro fabricae*) of Edinburgh Castle, as appears by letters of our lord king under his signet, £100; and Sir Robert Lauder, knight, for keeping of Edinburgh Castle, as appears by the king's writ, £100. To William Giffard, king's servant, £20 and £10. To Walter Spot, then Master of Work (*tunc magistro fabricae*) of Edinburgh Castle, as appears by the king's writ, £16 (*ER* iv. 410–11).

1426: For 200 boards (*tabulis*) delivered by Simon Logan, 5s 6d; for boards delivered by Patrick Ogilvy, at the king's command by his writ, £5 10s; for 10 boards delivered to the king's use for the structure (*ad fabricam*) of Stirling Castle, 55s; for 60 boards sent to St Andrews for the king's use, 27s 6d; for 260 boards bought delivered to Martin Wright, for the king's work at Edinburgh, £6 17s 5d; for carriage of boards from Leith to Edinburgh, £4 18s 9d (*ER* iv. 413). Clearly, part of this probably relates to the castle, but it is a good example of how expenses can be lost in non-specific accounts.

1428: To Sir Robert Lauder as keeper, £100 (*ER* iv. 436). Not printed in full.

1429: To Sir Robert Lauder as keeper, £100 (*ER* iv. 471). Not printed in full.

1429: To Sir Robert Lauder as keeper, £100 (*ER* iv. 506). Not printed in full.

1431: Paid to Maurice Tailor for carriage of the king's pavilions and tents from Edinburgh to Perth, £4 (*ER* iv. 529).

1431: To Sir Robert Lauder as keeper, £100 (*ER* iv. 541).

1434: Paid to Sir William Crichton of that ilk, knight, Captain of Edinburgh Castle, for the keeping of the same in the year of account, as appears by the king's writ of precept, £100 (*ER* iv. 573).

1434: for a great lead [roof] (*uno plumbo magno*) within the Castle of Edinburgh, attested by Sir William Crichton, captain of the said castle, nil; for the chaplain celebrating in St Margaret's Chapel within the said castle, receiving yearly £8 for his fee, £8 (*ER* iv. 576).

1434: Account of Robert Gray, master of works, moneys and workmen (*magister fabrice, monete et fabricarum*) of Edinburgh Castle and Leith, rendered at Linlithgow on 4 June 1434, of all his receipts and expenses around the said works (*fabricas*) made and exposed, 16 May 1433 to 4 June 1434: £28 0s 12*d* profits from the mint from 306oz of gold used; £45 15s 9*d* profits from the mint out of 114lb 7½oz troy in silver, total £73 16s 9*d*; for the fee of the keeper of the mint, 15s 2½*d*; and the sculptor of the irons, receiving as above from the total ounces of gold and silver aforesaid, 15s 2½*d*. Sum of expenses 30s 5*d*; thus remaining, £72 6s 4*d*; to the same Robert Gray, as master of work (*magister fabricarum*) of Edinburgh Castle and the work of the barge and palace of Leith, the £72 6s 4*d* profit remaning from the mint account above; and £86 received from the king in diverse coins, and delivered to the accountant by Robert Nory in the time of the account,

and £26 13s 4d received from the provost of Edinburgh from the exits of the chamberlain eyre of the same burgh, by the king's command, of the year of the account, and £40 received by him from the master of the household (*a magistro hospicii*) in the same time; and £38 received from the keeper of the privy seal in the same time; and £140 received from the king various ways in the same time; and £81 by receipt of nine tuns of the king's wine, the price of the tun, £9; and £13 6s 8d received from John Tours of Inverleith in the same time; and £20 received from Thomas of Berwick, of the great customs of the burgh of Edinburgh in the same time; and £18 received from Thomas Crancom, in a loan delivered by William Purrock of Edinburgh, in 24 nobles of England, the price of the noble, 15s; and £10 received from Thomas Pulti [*sic*], master of the king's barge; and £16 received by the accounter from the comptroller in the same time and £40 received from the Prior of Coldingham in the same time; and £10 13s 4d by selling two chalders of the lord king's barley brought from northern parts to Leith, and sold by the accounter in the same time; and £30 received from Thomas Cranston aforesaid in the same time; sum of these burdens, £642 7s 8d; expense of the same; first, allowed to the accounter by overexpenses of his last account, £98 5s 1d; and allowed to the same for expenses made around the work (*fabricam*) of Edinburgh Castle, of the walls, and timber, and making the great chamber of the same work, and the king's barge made at Leith, and other expenses made by the accounter, and particularly examined on account by the auditors of the exchequer, as appears in three books and three booklets (*cedulis*) of the said accounter examined as above, £735 13s 9d; sum of expenses, £833 19s; and thus is owed £141 11s 4d (*ER* iv. 577). Essentially a thorough summary of a set of the otherwise lost **Master of Works'** accounts for this period, a detailed insight into the rather idiosyncratic way that revenue and expenditure were organised. The construction of the new royal apartment was combined with the building of a boat, the outlay and proceeds of the royal mint, and various regular and improvised forms of revenue.

1434: £2 3s 4d of the fermes of Muirhouse, which are of the king's property, from which was delivered a chalder of lime in Edinburgh Castle for 1s 6d (*ER* iv. 599; see also *ER* vi. lxii-lxiii). Of the once vast royal demesne around Edinburgh, Muirhouse and Merchiston alone remained at this date: Merchiston was already in

the hands of Alexander Napier and was perhaps as good as gone, and in 1450 Muirhouse was permanently granted to one Stephen Scot (*RMS* iv. 28).

1434: Delivered to John Spens, steward of the little household (*senescallo domicilli*) of the lord Duke of Rothesay, to his expenses made in Edinburgh Castle, in coals, £13 4s; and for payment made by the same steward in milk and coals, £6 4s 4d, and also for endives and rushes (*pro incibo et cirpis*) for the chamber of the said lord duke, £6 4s 4d; paid for repair of the kitchen of the lord Duke of Rothesay, and for the rebuilding of the kitchen of the Captain of Edinburgh Castle within the castle, and the rebuilding of the porter of the castle's little house, i.e. the lodge (*parve domus, id est, le luge janitoris castrī*), £7 11s 5½d (*ER* iv. 603).

1435: Payment made to Nicholas Plumber, by the king's command, as appears by his writ of precept showing on account, 45s; and allowed by the accounter, for diverse cash delivered for the king's use, as appears by the king's writ of receipt under the signet, showing on account, £1 7s 4d; and delivered to Nicholas Plumber for diverse carriages for making lead in Edinburgh Castle, by the king's command, witnessed by the keeper of the privy seal by his letter under signet, 6s (*ER* iv. 605). This is otherwise in a Stirling account – that town's 'plumbers', workers in lead and bronze, were well known in the late medieval kingdom.

1435: Paid to Sir William Crichton, knight, Captain of Edinburgh Castle, for keeping of the same, in the year of account, at risk of the accountants, £100 (*ER* iv. 621).

1435: Paid to Nicholas Plumber and the late Walter Mason, for completion of the king's herb gardens (*herbarii regis*) within Edinburgh Castle, as appears by letter of Sir William Crichton, captain of the said castle, £8; and to Sir John Hog, chaplain of Edinburgh Castle, for his salary, in the year of account, £8. And for repair of the house beside the Kirkstile (*le Kyrkstīle*) in Edinburgh, 21s (*ER* iv. 623). The latter place is the Royal Mint building located near St Giles on the site of the Signet Library.

1435: And John Dutchman, as assert the accounters, at the king's command by his writ of precept, and a writ of receipt of the same John, delivered to the Bishop of Glasgow, then chancellor, 318¾ nobles, of which inquiry is made among the quittances (*quitancias*) remaining in Edinburgh Castle (*ER* iv. 652).

1435, 21 December: And to our lord king, in his own hands, in his wardrobe (*in garda roba sua*) in Edinburgh Castle; 60 nobles (*ER* iv. 663).

1436: For the work of the Castle of Edinburgh made by the accounter [Robert Gray, Master of Works of the Castle of Edinburgh, of Leith, of the king's ships, and moneyer], as appears in the book of the same, specially (*particulariter*) examined on account, £86 6s 7d (*ER* iv. 626). No work on the castle is specified explicitly, with various works on the Royal Mint near St Giles, several ships and other expenses.

1436: For a delivery made by the wife of the accounter [John Turing] of two pipes and a roundall (*duas pipas et una rundella*) full of harnesses of armour, and containing ten complete pairs of armours (*plenis harnesiis armorum, et continentibus decem paria armorum integra*), to Thomas Cranston, Constable of Edinburgh Castle, receiving on the king's behalf, and placed in the armoury (*locatis in armaria*) of the said castle by the same, with the uncosts (additional expenses) of the same, at risk of the accounter, carried in the ship of Peter Dunkar, 25 Flemish groats (*ER* iv. 680). The 'pairs' of armour are perhaps breastplate-and-backplate body armour.

1436: For diverse uncosts (*oncostis*) and carriages of the aforesaid goods, proceeding from the ship to Leith, and from Leith to Holyrood and Edinburgh Castle (*ad monasterium [et] ad castrum de Edinburgh*), by diverse routes (*diversibus vicis*), £10 5s 2d (*ER* iv. 683–4).

1438: Delivered to Sir William Crichton, knight, Keeper of Edinburgh Castle, by a writ of receipt under his seal, £134 3s 4d for the expenses of our lord the new king [James II] at his coronation, and to the same William, by a letter of receipt, another £81 11s 3d (*ER* v. 24).

1438: For a feather mattress with a pillow (*una culcitra plumali cum cervicali*) for our lord king, delivered to Edinburgh Castle, £6 5s. Paid to Sir William Crichton, Keeper of Edinburgh Castle, as shows by his writ of receipt £48 (*ER* v. 26).

1438: To Sir William Crichton, knight, Keeper of Edinburgh Castle, as appears by his letters of receipt, £28 (*ER* v. 29).

1438: To Thomas Cranstoun, Constable of Edinburgh Castle, by the king's command, for the expenses of the new lord king, then Duke of Rothesay, £30 (*ER* v. 31).

1438: To Sir William Crichton, knight, Keeper of Edinburgh Castle, in full payment of his pension assigned by the king for the keeping of the same castle in 1436, £100; to the chaplain celebrating in the chapel of St Margaret the Queen within the said castle, for his salary in the year of account, £8 (*ER* v. 33).

1438: Thomas Cranstoun, Constable of Edinburgh Castle, stands witness to a chaplain called Paul, then steward (*seneschallo*) in Edinburgh Castle, for the provision of the coronation of the king [James II], the queen [Dowager, Joan Beaufort] then present in the same castle with the household (*cum familia*), for which Lord Crichton answers, £100; the same Lord Crichton, for ten chalders of grain (*frumenti*) bought and delivered to the same Sir William in Edinburgh Castle, at the time of the provision of the said coronation, the said Sir William making receipt on account, £72; for three lasts of Hamburg beer, bought by the accounter and delivered to the said Sir William Crichton, the price of the last £7, £21; for the same Sir William, for three butts of Greek wine, £30; the same Sir William, for six

pipes of red wine, £30; the same, for 14 measures of iron (*vangis dictis waris*), 7 stone, 11lb of Spanish iron for the iron gates and other necessities of the said castle, £20 10s; the same Sir William, for the custom of 30 sacks of his own wool, which he asserted that the late king remitted to him without customs charges, £48; Master James, craftsman of siege engines (*artifici machinarum*), by the said Lord Crichton's command, £40 there at time of coronation; payment to Crichton for works; Spanish iron for gate (*ER* v. 35-6).

1438: Sir William Crichton, knight, Keeper of Edinburgh Castle, as appears by his writ of receipt under his signet, £3 (*ER* v. 49).

1438: Five Hamburg barrels of salted salmon delivered to Sir William Crichton, Keeper of Edinburgh Castle, for the use of the new king, £9 (*ER* v. 52). This is James II, who had recently come to the throne.

1438: Delivered to Sir William Crichton, Sheriff and Keeper of Edinburgh Castle, as appears by his letter under the signet, £85, which he asserts £50 received for the expenses of the coronation of our new lord king (*ER* v. 53). Followed by other unspecified expenses of Crichton and the king totalling £322 6s 8d.

1438: For 19 sheathes of arrows made at Dundee and delivered in Edinburgh Castle to the captain of the same, 31s 8d (*ER* v. 64).

1438: For the freight of a certain ship, and the expenses of eight shiploads of the king's lead from Berwick to the Port of Leith, for the roof of the great chamber in Edinburgh Castle, £11 16s (*ER* v. 66).

1438, 19 July: Memorandum that Thomas Cranstoun, Constable of the Edinburgh Castle, and Keeper of the Royal Mint, appeared in the presence of the auditors of the exchequer, John [Winchester] Bishop of Moray, Sir Walter [Halliburton] Lord

Dirleton, treasurer, Sir William Crichton of that Ilk, Keeper of Edinburgh Castle, and Mr John Scheves, clerk of the rolls and register, regarding the quality of a large quantity of coin (*ER* v. 67).

1440, 20 February, 4pm: During a General Council being held in Edinburgh Castle (*in castro de Edynburgh*); the master of Gordon, appearing through his procurator Alexander Hepburn, secures a revocation of contract made by his mother and grandfather to his disadvantage; this is protested by Lord Keith, appearing through the master of Keith and Sir Alexander Ogilvy of Inchmartin; the named attendees are David Lindsay, 3 Earl of Crawford, Sir William Crichton, lord of that Ilk, Chancellor of Scotland, Sir Alexander, Lord Montgomery, Sir John Lindsay, Lord of the Byres, Sir Alexander Livingston, Lord of Calendar, Sir Robert Livingston, Lord of Drumry, Sir John Borthwick (*de Bothvane*), lord of that Ilk, Andrew Gray, Lord of Fowlis, and many others (*RPS* 1440/2/1). The notarial instrument taken on behalf of Lord Keith is the only record of this council. The attendees are largely representative of the 15th-century attempts to create a narrow English-style peerage, though those whose titles are given here in the form 'lord of' without capitalisation do not appear to have formally been appointed Lords of Parliament by this date. The dispute between the Gordons and the Keiths concerned lands around Aboyne on Deeside, and Panbride in Angus (*SP* iv. 521–2).

1440, 24 November: The 'Black Bull Dinner' – the assassination of the Earl of Douglas in the castle.

1441: A sum is delivered to the lord chancellor [Crichton] for the fabric of Edinburgh Castle, received by Stephen Scott. (*ER* v. 98). The sum appears to be a £10 19s 8d balance left in an account, but the preceding calculation is not printed in full.

1441: Delivered to Sir William [Crichton] the chancellor, for the work of Edinburgh Castle, received by Stephen Scot, 13s 9d (*ER* v. 104). The sum is again part of a balance remaining in an account.

1443: Of four tuns of wine bought at Dumbarton, David Galbraith delivered one tun to Dumbarton for the king's use, and two to Stirling Castle, and sent the fourth tun to Edinburgh Castle, for which William Cranston then Comptroller, answered (*ER* v. 130).

1443: John of Fife, receiver of the rents and fermes of Aberdeen and Banff, is allowed in full payment of money owed to him for four lasts of salmon delivered to Sir William Crichton, chancellor, in Edinburgh Castle, for the king's use and expense, as appears in the accounts of the customars of the burgh of Aberdeen, rendered on 17 July 1342 (*ER* v. 136).

1445: To the chaplain ministering in the chapel of St Margaret in Edinburgh Castle, in part-payment for his fee in the year preceding this account, £5; for payment made to William, Lord Crichton, knight, in part-payment of £700 owed to him for keeping Edinburgh Castle, granting him in this year £233 6s 8d; paid to the same Lord Crichton for roofing the king's great chamber in Edinburgh Castle, £50; paid to Sir Ninian Spot, chaplain, for his fee, by the king's command, as appears by his letters of precept, £5; paid to Alexander Lindsay, firstborn of the lord Earl of Crawford, knight, for his expenses at the time of the siege of Edinburgh Castle, James Livingston, Captain of Stirling Castle, attesting, £20; John Bower of Edinburgh, for bows (*pro arcubus*) bought from him, at the captain's command, £3; and to the same, for lances (*lanceis*, perhaps spears) bought from him for the lord king's use at the captain's command, 54s, and for delivery made to Henry Elphinston, at the captain's command, £4 16s 8d; and for David Hervy, going out of Edinburgh Castle and coming to the king, by the king's command, 20s; and a certain man called Thorntown, for arrows (*sagittis*), 21s; to John Moncur, for armour (*pro armaturis*) for James Dundas, in part of his fee, £3 10s; allowed to William Livingston custom at the tron of Edinburgh, by the captain's command, £3; and Alexander Davidson, of the custom of his goods, by the gracious gift of

the king, in relief of debts owed to him by the Lord Crichton, £15 3s 4d; allowed by the counters of customs for the goods of Francis Prest, by the king's gift made to James Auchinleck of that ilk, knight, £15 14s 6d; John Logan of Restalrig, knight, in part-payment of his fee for the year before, as appears by writ of precept under the signet, and of the said John of receipt, £13 6s 8d; Martin Fraser, by the captain's command, 13s 4d; and a certain called Crawford, by the captain's command, for military equipment (*pro cellis et harnesiis*) bought from him for the king's use, £7 8s 8d (*ER* v. 180). These entries seem mostly related to the recent siege of the castle.

1445: For payment or allowance to the husbandmen (*husbandiis*) of the Isle of Bute, for 33 'mailmartis' (cattle owed as rent) taken to the king's use in 1445, allowing for each mart 5s, £8 5s, and for the movement of the said marts from Arnele to Edinburgh, in all costs, 24s (*ER* v. 210). See below for the bringing of marts into the castle. The marts in 1444 went from Bute to Stirling.

1446: To Sir Ninian Spot, chaplain ministering in the chapel of St Margaret in Edinburgh Castle, in payment of his fee in the year of account, £5; and allowed for payment made to William Lord Crichton, knight, in part-payment of the pension owed to him for keeping Edinburgh Castle, of the sum of £123 6s 8d, for the year of account and the year preceding this account, £800 (*ER* v. 221).

1446: In part-payment of 51 groats owed for hangings of gilded silk (*pro pannis sericis deauratis*) bought (evidently on credit) under a privy seal writ dated 7 September in the king's seventh year; beyond the expenses abovementioned, allowed for the fee of the chaplain ministering in St Margaret's Chapel in Edinburgh Castle, for his fee for three terms before Martinmas 1445, because the said chaplain was not satisfied, £15 (*ER* v. 222). Chaplain paid at end out of balance left in Edinburgh accounts. The hangings may have been used in the castle and give an idea of the sort of furnishings the royal apartments would contain.

1447: Paid to Patrick Cockburn, Constable of Edinburgh Castle, in full payment of the pension assigned to him for keeping the said castle of Edinburgh by the king, £40 (*ER* v. 259).

1447: Paid to Sir Ninian Spot, chaplain ministering in St Margaret's Chapel in Edinburgh Castle, in full payment of his fee for the year of account, £10; allowed by the accountants [Thomas Cranston and William Bully, customars of Edinburgh] for expenses made by them around the building and repaired of the lord king's kitchen in Edinburgh Castle, as appears by the king's writ of precept signed with his signet, and by the book of diet of the said repairs (*et per librum dietarum dicte reparacionis*) shown by the said accountants, £45 6s 5d (*ER* v. 274).

1447: To William Lord Crichton, knight, Captain of Edinburgh Castle (*capitaneo castris de Edinburgh*), in full payment of the pension assigned to him for keeping the said castle in the year of account, as appears by letters of receipt of the said Lord Crichton, £266 13s 4d (*ER* v. 275). Same account as previous.

1447: For endive (*pro intubo*) bought for the king's chamber by the accountant [Robert Gray] and sent to the castles of Edinburgh and Stirling, £4 6s (*ER* v. 277).

1448: Paid to Patrick Cockburn, Constable of Edinburgh Castle, for keeping the said castle in Martinmas [1447] and Pentecost [1448] terms, £40; paid to the same Patrick Cockburn for his labours and expenses made around the siege of Dunbar Castle, £40 (*ER* v. 305).

1448: For the expenses of Thomas Mcculloch (*Machowloch*), mowing and bringing king's hay from the meadow to Edinburgh Castle, 38s 2d (*ER* v. 309).

1448: Paid to William Lord Crichton, Chancellor of Scotland, Captain of Edinburgh Castle, in full payment of the pension assigned to him for the keeping of the said castle in the year of account £266 13s 4d (*ER* v. 310).

1448: For four great beams bought for the repair of David's Tower in Edinburgh Castle (*turris David castri de Edenburgh*) from James Bunkle (*Bonkil*). And to Sir Ninian Spot, chaplain ministering in St Margaret's Chapel in Edinburgh Castle, of the pension assigned to him in the year of this account, £6 13s 4d; to the same, by the king's command, as appears by his writ of precept, £3 6s 8d (*ER* v. 311–12). The payments to the chaplain are 10 marks and 5 marks.

1448: Paid for endive for the king's chambers in the castles of Edinburgh and Stirling, in the time of the account, 55s 8d (*ER* v. 316).

1448: Delivered to Robert Gray of Leith, in part-payment for 44 barrels of salmon for the king's use, to Edinburgh Castle (*ER* v. 326). 'Sum of the expenses, £389 4s 10d and 38 barrels of salmon and there remain £10 15s 2d and six barrels of salmon'; the government passed the remaining salmon to some merchants, who could turn a profit by shipping it abroad for sale at market prices, and replacing it with freshly cured salmon from the suppliers in northern Scotland, for consumption by the royal household later in the year.

1449: To Sir Ninian Spot, chaplain in St Margaret's Chapel, £6 13s 4d (*ER* v. 344). The entry is not printed in full; the total is 10 marks.

1449: For Sir Robert Lany, chaplain, for keeping the king's chambers and houses (*camerarum et domorum regis*) in the castle, and all the king's goods remaining in keeping in the said castle (*bonorum regis in dicto castro custodiendorum relictorum*), and his other works in the king's business, and his diligence, in the year of account, £10 (*ER* v. 345). It is not completely clear if the castle in question is Edinburgh.

1449: Allowed for fourteen bolls of grain (*frumenti*) bought by the accounters and delivered to Edinburgh Castle for the provend (*providenciam*) of the said castle at the time of the siege of the rock of Fidra (*rupis de Futheray*, an island in the Forth), when James, master of Douglas wished to fortify (*edificasse*) it, £5 12s (*ER* v. 347). Nothing else seems to be known of this siege, though a castle on Fidra was attached to the barony of Dirleton.

1450: Paid to William Lord Crichton, knight, Captain of Edinburgh Castle, in full payment of the pension assigned to him by the king for keeping of the said castle, in the year of account, £366 3s 4d (*ER* v. 380).

1450: Paid to Sir Ninian Spot, chaplain, in part-payment of the pension of 20 marks assigned to him by the king, until he is provided to a better benefice, £6 13s 4d. And paid to Sir Henry Crichton, chaplain ministering in the chapel of St Margaret in Edinburgh Castle, for his fee in the year, £10, Sir Patrick Blair attesting receipt on account (*ER* v. 382).

1450: Allowed for the carriage and in-bringing of the hay of the meadow of Edinburgh, placed in the king's great stable under the castle, 38s (*ER* v. 396–7).

1450: Paid to three men for the movement of 80 marts from Carrick to Edinburgh Castle, within the year of account, £15 (*ER* v. 417).

1451: To Sir Henry Crichton, 'chaplain of St Margaret in the Castle, as p 380, £10' (*ER* v. 434). Not printed in full; seems in fact to be a reference to *ER* v. 384.

1451: Paid to William Lord Crichton, Captain of Edinburgh Castle, in part-payment of the pension owed to him for keeping the said castle of Edinburgh, in the year of account, £106 13s 4d (*ER* v. 438).

1451: For the allowance made to the husbandmen (*husbandis*) of Bute and Arran, for 34 mailmarts (*mailmartis*) received from them in 1451, allowing 5s per mart, £8 10s; and for moving the said 34 marts from Bute and Arran to the burgh of Edinburgh, 20s; and allowed for payment made to the same husbandmen for 16 mailmarts received from them in 1450, £4, and for the moving of the said 16 marts, 12s 4d (*ER v. 452*).

1452: For payment paid to William Lord Crichton, Captain of Edinburgh Castle, for the pension assigned to him for keeping of the said castle, £50. To Sir Henry Crichton, chaplain, at Martinmas 1451 and Whitsun 1452, £10; and for payment made to Sir Ninian Spot, chaplain, of his pension of 20 marks at Martinmas 1451 and Pentecost 1452, £10 (*ER v. 497*). Crichton's entry not printed in full.

1453: Allowed for the allowance made to the husbandmen (*husbandis*) of Bute, for 63 marts received from the same and delivered to the lord Bishop of Glasgow, allowing 5s per mart, £15 15s; and for moving 10 marts from Bute to Edinburgh, 10s, and for moving the said marts of the Bishop of Glasgow in the said two years, 40s (*ER v. 574*).

1453: For 300 shafts intended for making bows (*hastis ordinatis pro factura arcuum*), bought by the counter from an obscure German (*a nonnullis Theotonicus*) and delivered in Edinburgh Castle to the king's wardrobe, £18 (*ER v. 607*).

1454: To the chaplain celebrating in Edinburgh Castle, viz. Sir John Burnet (*Burnate*), as appears by his writ of receipt subscribed by his hand, £10; although he ought not to have received more than £8 (*ER v. 609-10*).

1454: And allowed to Sir John Burnet, chaplain of Edinburgh Castle, at Martinmas 1452 and Pentecost 1453, £10 (*ER v. 614*).

1454: 1 chalder 4 bolls of malt to Stirling; and by delivery made to the lord king's brewers, for brewing in Edinburgh Castle and Holyrood (*in castro et monasterio Edynburgh*), 2 chalders 9 bolls; and to Sir John Andrew, seneschal of the lord prince, for the expenses of the same in the same time, 14 bolls of malt; total 4 chalders 9 bolls (*ER* v. 619).

1454: And allowed for expenses in felling and squaring (*in dolacione et quadracione*) of 80 pieces of timber in Irneside (*Irnside*; Irneside or Earnside near Lindores) for the fabric of the stove house (*domus de le stowe*) of Edinburgh Castle (*ER* v. 687). This 'stove' was a sauna: See Appendix 5: A 15th-Century Sauna.

1455: To Sir John Anderson, Chaplain of Edinburgh Castle, receiving annually from the customs of the said burgh, £8; to William Peebles of Edinburgh, for a pipe of Gascon wine received from the same by Alexander Nairn, then comptroller and expended in the king's household (*in domicilio domini regis*); allowed for 200 poles (*asseribus*) from Prussia, bought for the fabric of Edinburgh Castle, and delivered to Thomas Oliphant, constable thereof, £20. Allowed to Adam Cant, for expenses made around the fabric of Edinburgh Castle, in repair and roofing of the great tower, as appears in a book of account remaining with the king in the hands of Sir Ninian Spot (*ER* vi. 4–5). The payment scheme was predictably complex.

1455: Allowed for linen cloth, wool and silk (*pro panno lineo, laneo et bissino*; the printed text treats 'linen' and 'cloth' as two separate entries), carriage, shipping and diverse other equipment (*instrumentis*), and great cables bought new for £20, delivered to Brother Andrew 'Lisouris' in Edinburgh Castle, and remaining there, and moreover £20 7s owed for the debts of the late (Hugh Douglas) Earl of Ormond (previously a prisoner before execution), as appears in a certain book of account, signed with the sign manual of the lord king (*signato signo manuali*; a written signature rather than a seal), resting with William Bonar, comptroller, £160

0s 6d (*ER vi. 8*). The 'equipment' may have been siege engines – the incongruity of silk and catapults on the same bill would be unsurprising.

1455: Allowed for 34 marts delivered to the expenses of the lord king; for the movement of the said marts from Bute to Edinburgh, 20s (*ER vi. 46*).

1455: By allowance to Thomas Oliphant, Constable of Edinburgh Castle, by the king's command, as appears by his writ of precept under the signet, in full payment of his fee, £13 6s 8d (*ER vi. 51*).

1456: Allowed for timber for 60 sheaves for arrows (*sexaginta garbarum pro sagittis*), delivered by Nicholas Henryson in Edinburgh Castle to Thomas Oliphant, constable of the same, 40s (*ER vi. 155*).

1456: In payment made to the lord Bishop of St Andrews (James Kennedy), from the fermes of the lands of Strathbrock, with the demesne lands easter and wester of the same, with the Wra [*sic*], assigned by the lord king to the said lord bishop for keeping of Edinburgh Castle, £55 13s 4d (*ER vi. 235*).

1457: To the chaplain of Edinburgh Castle, for his fee, by the writ of the king under the privy seal £10, allowing that the said chaplaincy was endowed at £8 (*ER vi. 296*).

1458: To the chaplain of Edinburgh Castle, for his fee, by the lord king's writ under the privy seal, £10 (*ER vi. 383*).

1458: Paid to Andrew Crawford for repair of the hall of Edinburgh Castle, in iron, linen panes for the windows (*panno lineo pro fenistris*) and other furnishings made there towards the parliament (*ibidem factis erga parliamentum*), £17 16s 6d; allowed to Adam Cant, for overexpenses made in the work (*fabrica*) of Edinburgh

Castle, 41s 6d; and to Thomas Oliphant and the aforesaid Adam Cant as masters of work (*magistris fabricis*) of the said castle, for their fee and works to the present, by consideration of the auditors, £6 13s 4d (*ER* vi. 385). References to 'fabric panes' are normally taken to mean fabric windowpanes but may describe some other form of curtains; see Appendix 6: A Medieval Parliament.

1458: For expenses made in Edinburgh Castle on the wardrobe and aumbries of the same (*super garderoba et ammoriolis ejusdem*), as also appears by the same book [of Andrew Crawford, customar of Edinburgh], £19 18s 6d (*ER* vi. 387). The book also included expenses on ironwork for Dunbar Castle, robes for the king, and bombards and horses sent by the Duke of Burgundy.

1459: Chaplain of Edinburgh Castle, £10 (*ER* vi. 495). Not printed in full.

1459: For the mending of the great bombard (*magni bumbardi*) in front of Edinburgh Castle, by the king's command, and for expenses made around the same, mending in brass, copper and iron (*in ere, cupro et ferro*), and other small expenses, £16 (*ER* vi. 497). This is either the Lion or Mons Meg.

1459: For the expenses of certain makers of arrows and lances (*factoris sagittarum et lancearum*) in Edinburgh Castle, and also for various things needed for the making of said arrows, receiving each week 3s for their expenses, £10 3s 8d (*ER* vi. 498-9). The 'makers of arrows and lances' probably followed the recognised profession of bower, whose name suggests a specialisation in archery equipment but who documents mainly record in connection with spears.

1459: Paid by David Pringle, Ranger of Tweed (*cursorem de Tueda*) to Thomas Oliphant, Keeper of Edinburgh Castle, in part-payment of his fee for the year of account, by the king's command, £40 (*ER* vi. 545). It looks as though by now the keeper's fee was being paid directly from the Border wool business. See below under 1495.

1459: Carriage of two bombards from Linlithgow to Edinburgh, 11s 11d (*ER* vi. 563).

1460: To the chaplain of Edinburgh Castle, £10. For the carriage of the lord king's artillery from Perth to the port of Leith, and from the said port to Edinburgh Castle, as appears by the lord king's writ under the signet and signature, and the cedula of the aforesaid brother Andrew, £8 2s. Allowed for payment to Thomas Oliphant, Constable of Edinburgh Castle for the king's work in Leith (*ad fabricam domini regis in Lethe*), by command of the same, £106 4s 10d. Paid to a certain maker of arrows and lances (*cuidam factori sagittarum et lancearum*) in Edinburgh Castle for his expenses for two weeks after the previous exchequer, receiving 3s weekly, 6s (*ER* vi. 580-2). Chaplain entry not printed in full. The entry to 'the king's work in Leith' is very possibly to the complex of buildings still known as the King's Wark.

1460: Paid to Robert Liddle for the carriage of two game carcasses (*duarum ferarum*) from the forest to Edinburgh and Stirling (*ER* vii. 25).

1460: The chaplain of Edinburgh Castle for his fee, receiving annually £10 from the customs, for Pentecost Term 1460, £5 (*ER* vii. 32).

1460: Payment made to Sir John Cockburn, Constable of Edinburgh Castle, for keeping of the same, by the king's command, from 1 August 1459 to 20 March 1460, as appears by two letters under the signet, the said John making receipt by other letters £33 6s 8d (*ER* vii. 33).

1460: George Leech, Thomas Weir and Thomas Heton, burgesses of Lanark, became debtors of the lord king to pay the £8 balance of their account, or else enter into the king's ward in Edinburgh Castle, and remain there in until full satisfaction (*ER* vii. 44).

1461: 6 chalders 6 bolls oats from Fife delivered to 'Hakynnet', servitor of the lord King, and sent to Edinburgh; and [also] sent to Edinburgh and delivered to a servitor of James Liddle for the expenses of the king's horses, and not entered into the book of diet, 2 chalders (*ER* vii. 84).

1462: Paid to Andrew Ker, Keeper of Edinburgh Castle, in part-payment of his fee of 200 marks for keeping the said castle for the year, £10 10s (*ER* vii. 136).

1462: To the chaplain in Edinburgh Castle, £15 for three terms (*ER* vii. 144). Not printed in full.

1463: To the chaplain of Edinburgh Castle, £10 (*ER* vii. 211). Not printed in full.

1464: To the chaplain celebrating in St Margaret's Chapel in Edinburgh Castle, receiving annually £10 from the great customs of the said burgh from the foundation of a former king, as appears in former rolls, to Sir John Rhynd (*Rinde*) chaplain of the same chapel, £10 (*ER* vii. 283).

1464: To Alexander Boyd of Drumcoll, knight, captain, and Thomas Oliphant, Constable of Edinburgh Castle, for keeping the same, receiving annually 200 marks, as appears by letters of the lord king under the privy seal, during the time of keeping the same, for Pentecost term 1464, £66 13s 4*d*. To Patrick [Hepburn], Lord Hailes, for his pension or debt for keeping Edinburgh Castle, £30; to the same, for expenses made over John Douglas [of Balvenie] in Edinburgh Castle for 12 days, six people guarding him, for every day 6s, by the king's command, £3 12s. To Adam Cant, paid by the treasurer, for iron, boards, linen cloth (*in ferro, tabulis, panno lineo*) delivered by the accounters for the repair of the castles of Edinburgh and Berwick, £23 15s 3*d* (*ER* vii. 284-5).

1464: Expenses involving the furnace in Edinburgh Castle (*ER* vii. 288).

1464: For 24 timbers called joists and two roods of wood called planks (*xxiiij lignis dictis gestis et duabus rudis lignorum dictorum plankis*) bought by the king's command, and delivered to Brother Andrew the carpenter, for the repair of the bombards of the said lord king and other works (*fabricas*) of the same in Edinburgh Castle, as appears by two writs of precept of the said lord king under the signet, with 40s delivered to John Wright for repair of the crowbars of the bombards (*de le wyndspakis bumbardi*), by the same command, £10 18s 10d (*ER* vii. 294-5).

1464, 12 January: Parliament rules that David Cumming of Couttie (a local laird in Perthshire) must enter into ward in Edinburgh Castle within six days, for the crime of destroying boundary markers between Couttie, Blair and [?Wester] Banchory, established after a perambulation (*RPS* 1464/1/1).

1465: To the chaplain of St Margaret's Chapel in the castle, by receipt of Sir John Rhynd, £10. Paid to Sir Alexander Boyd of Drumcoll, knight, for keeping Edinburgh Castle, receiving annually 200 marks, as appears by the lord king's writ of precept under the privy seal, Thomas Oliphant, constable of the same castle making receipt, £133 6s 8d (*ER* vii. 362). Chaplain not printed in full.

1466: To the chaplain of St Margaret's Chapel in the castle, £10. To Sir Alexander Boyd as Keeper, £133 6s 8d. And for the expenses of Dietrich Gunner, working on the cleaning (*purgatione*) and keeping of the lord king's bombards and artillery in Edinburgh Castle, and also linseed oil, red lead, canvas, pitch and resin (*oleo ligneti plumbo rubeo, canubio, pice, et roseto*), stipends of the painters and other labourers around them for 20 days, as appears by the lord king's writ and the book of account on the said expenses particularly examined on account, £8 6s 9d (*ER* vii. 422).

1466: For certain expenses made in Edinburgh Castle, in the treasury house (*in domo thesaurarie*), in locks, irons, keys (*in seris, ferris, clavibus*) and other expenses made there, Sir Alexander Boyd attesting the command of the lords of the council and the expenses, £3 3s (*ER* vii. 424). This evidently refers to the Treasury House.

1466: For certain slates (*tegulis*) delivered to Thomas Oliphant for the work (*fabrice*) of the castle and stable of Edinburgh, the treasurer's command, £4 (*ER* vii. 427). It is possible that wooden tiles or shuttering may be meant.

1467: To the Chaplain of St Margaret's Chapel in the castle, by receipt of John Rhynd, £10. For payment made to Robert Lord Boyd, for keeping of Edinburgh Castle, receiving annually 200 marks for keeping of the same, as appears by the king's writ of precept under signet and signature (*sub signeto et subscriptione*), for Pentecost term 1467, because Sir Alexander Boyd of Drumcoll, knight, had custody of the said castle until Martinmas Term 1466, £66 13s 3d; and by payment made to the foresaid Alexander Boyd for keeping of Edinburgh Castle in Martinmas term, £66 13s 3d. Delivered for repairs to the castles of Edinburgh, Stirling and the tower of Newark (*castrorum de Edinburgh, Strivelin, et turris de Newwerk*), by the same command as several previous entries [the king's], £19 3s, accounted with the masters of work (*magistris fabricarum*) of the said places; and for a chalice and vestment delivered to the lord king's chaplain in Edinburgh Castle, £3 10s 8d (*ER* vii. 500-2).

1468: Two local royal officials, William Park and John Thomson, have been placed in prison in Edinburgh Castle by another official, Simon Salmond, for failure to pay fines imposed on them by a law court (*ER* vii. 565).

1468: To the chaplain of St Margaret the Queen celebrating in the chapel of the same in Edinburgh Castle of the foundation of the lord King Robert II, who ought to receive by the terms of the endowment £8, allowed £10 annually afterwards by

the king's generosity (*ex gracia regis*), [paid] £10 by the king's generosity (*ER* vii. 589).

1468: For two cords delivered to Kirkwood the butcher, 4 stones of lead, 1½ stone of iron, 3 ells of canvas, delivered to Thomas for mending the cauldron (*lebetam*) in Edinburgh Castle, 31s 2d. Paid to Robert, Lord Boyd, Keeper of Edinburgh Castle, receiving annually 200 marks for keeping of the same, as appears by the writ of our lord king, for the two terms, £133 6s 8d; and to the same, for 4½ ells of green cloth, table, stools, keys and leather (*quatuor ulnis cum dimidia panni viridis, tabula, tripodibus, clavis et correo*) for the exchequer table 48s (*ER* vii. 591). The phrasing of this entry seems almost a parody, as it suggests that in the absence of written receipts, the Lords Auditors closely inspected the kitchen cauldron and then their own new table.

1469: To the chaplain of St Margaret the Queen celebrating in the chapel of the same in Edinburgh Castle, from the foundation of the late lord King Robert II, receiving annually £10 from the alms of the said lord king, £10. To Robert, Lord Boyd, for keeping Edinburgh Castle, £133 6s 8d (*ER* vii. 663). Lord Boyd's entry not printed in full.

1471: William Hamilton was fined £10 by the law courts, and due to his lack of goods wherewith to pay the sheriff delivered his person to Thomas Oliphant, Constable of Edinburgh Castle for imprisonment; the constable transferred him out of the sheriff's jurisdiction, and (it is implied) released him under caution (*ER* ix. 28).

1471: For the shipping of marts from the port of Findhorn (*Fyndarne*) to Edinburgh, £3 (*ER* ix. 83).

1471: To the chaplain celebrating in St Margaret the Queen's Chapel, receiving annually £10, as it appears in old rolls, in the year of account, £10. Paid to Colin

[Campbell], Earl of Argyll, for keeping of Edinburgh Castle, receiving annually 200 marks, £133 6s 8d (*ER ix.* 119–20).

1473: Paid for the carriage of six small bombards called serpentines, with powder (*parvorum bumbardorum dictorum serpentynis cum pulveris*) in two carriages (*curribus*) with four horses, from Threave Castle to Edinburgh, by the king's command written under signet and signature (*sub signeto et subscripcione*), £8; for expenses incurred with respect to 55 marts received from the Abbot of Dundrennan for a certain sum owed by the same abbot to the lord king, which marts were brought to Edinburgh to the lord king's larder (*lardinariam*) by William Niven (*Nevin*) and Alexander Leggat (*Legaite*), £5 (*ER ix.* 163).

1473: To the chaplain celebrating in Edinburgh Castle, receiving annually £10, though he ought strictly to receive no more than £8, from the foundation of the same, to Sir John Rhynd, chaplain of the same, having for Martinmas term 1472, £5. To Colin, Earl of Argyll, for keeping the castle for Martinmas term 1473, £66 13s 4d (*ER ix.* 189). Keeper's entry not printed in full.

1473: To the chaplain celebrating in Edinburgh Castle, receiving annually £10, though he ought to have £8, to Sir John Rhynd, chaplain of the same, for Pentecost term 1473, £5. To the Earl of Argyll, master of the king's household (*magistro hospicii regis*) for keeping of Edinburgh Castle, in the same term, £66 13s 4d (*ER ix.* 191).

1473, 19 June: A St Margaret's Day service in the castle is attended by James III and Margaret of Denmark: vestments and altar furniture (*chapell graith*) are brought from Holyrood to the castle and back again at a cost of 18d, and the royal couple offer a French *écu à la couronne* and half an English rose noble (*a Franche croune and half a ross noble*), valued at £1 7s 6d; a payment of 16s 6d to the castle chaplain, Sir John Rhynd, for a shelved chest to contain vestments and altar furniture (*a pres kist to the chapell to keep the graith*) may also be connected (*TA i.* 64).

1474: For the carirage of certain things of artillery (*rerum artilarie*) from Threave to Edinburgh, by the king's written command, £4. Allowed for 2 stone 2lb of brass (*eris*) delivered to David Wright for the king's artillery, together with carriage of the same from Wigtown to Edinburgh, 40s (*ER ix. 216*).

1474: To the chaplain in Edinburgh Castle, Sir John Rhynd, £10. Paid to David Crichton for keeping of Edinburgh Castle, receiving annually 200 marks from the customs of the said burgh, as appears by the lord king's writ of precept and the said David's of receipt, £133 6s 8d (*ER ix. 253*). Chaplain entry not printed in full.

1475: Wooden (?) equipment is made by John Murray and sent to Edinburgh Castle for the king's artillery from Ettrick Forest, £4 (*ER ix. 268*).

1475: Delivered to the expenses of the lord prince (the future James IV) in Edinburgh Castle from 6 August 1474 to 6 August 1475, as appears in the book of the said expenses, 3 chalders of grain (*frumenti*) (*ER ix. 293-4*).

1475: To the chaplain celebrating in St Mary's Chapel within Edinburgh Castle, receiving annually £10, though he ought not to receive £10 from the endowment, to John Rhynd, chaplain of the same, £10, foundation. To David Crichton, for keeping Edinburgh Castle, £133 6s 8d (*ER ix. 312*). Keeper's entry not printed in full.

1476: For certain carriages of pigs, geese and poultry (*porcorum, auucarum, et pultris*) from Linlithgow to Edinburgh and Stirling, and not entered in the book of diet, £1 2s 6d (*ER ix. 334*).

1476: To the chaplain celebrating in St Margaret's Chapel within Edinburgh Castle, receiving by the king's grace, £10, allowing that the foundation contains only £8,

as appears in preceding rolls, £10. To David Crichton, for keeping of Edinburgh Castle, £133 6s 8d (*ER ix.* 390). Keeper's entry not printed in full.

1477: Paid to the chaplain celebrating in the chapel of Edinburgh Castle, from the king's old foundation, receiving annually £10, to Sir John Rhynd, chaplain of the same, £10. To David Crichton, for keeping Edinburgh Castle, £133 6s 8d (*ER ix.* 466). Keeper's entry not printed in full.

1478: Delivered to the expenses of the lord prince in Edinburgh Castle, as contained in household books also particularly examined, 7 chalders of malt (*brasi*) (*ER ix.* 500).

1478: To the chaplain in Edinburgh Castle, John Rhynd, £10. To David Crichton, for the keeping of the said castle of Edinburgh, receiving yearly 200 marks, £133 6s 8d (*ER ix.* 546). Chaplain's entry not printed in full.

1479: Paid to the chaplain celebrating in Edinburgh Castle from the old foundation of the king, receiving annually £10, [thus paid] £10. To David Crichton, for the keeping of Edinburgh Castle, receiving in the year 200 marks of the said customs, £133 6s 8d (*ER ix.* 629–30).

1480: By payment made to the chaplain celebrating in Edinburgh Castle by old foundation of the king, receiving annually £10 of the said customs, £10. And to David Crichton, for keeping of Edinburgh Castle, receiving annually 200 marks of the said customs, £133 6s 8d (*ER ix.* 78–9).

1481: To the chaplain in Edinburgh Castle, £10 (*ER ix.* 153). Account not printed in full.

1482: To the chaplain in Edinburgh Castle, £10 (*ER ix. 202*). Account not printed in full.

1482, 22 July: During a political crisis, James III is taken captive by a group of noblemen at Lauder, and subsequently incarcerated in Edinburgh Castle. This is a confusing crisis involving shifting alliances between multiple factions, made even more complicated by evidence that the keeper of the castle, Lord Darnley, secretly remains loyal to the king, however (see 19 October 1482).

1482, 24 July: Accounts of the Earldom of March, delivery made to the lord king as appears by his writ in which he commanded the accountant [Simon Salmond, receiver of fermes and rents in the earldom] to deliver to Andrew Lesly and James Schaw all the cereal (*grana*), viz. wheat, bere, oats and barley (*frumentum, brasium, farrinum, et ordeum*), for the sustenance of Edinburgh Castle at that time (*ER ix. 436*). This may represent preparations by James III to place siege supplies in the castle in the face the twin threats of revolt by a faction of the nobility and an expedition from England, or it may in fact have been organised by his aristocratic opponents, who had taken him captive at Lauder two days earlier (see 22 July 1482).

1482, 18 August: Payment made to the queen [Margaret of Denmark] for keeping Edinburgh Castle from this date to 22 October 1482, in part-payment of 200 marks assigned to her by the king, assigned in turn by her to John Lord Darnley £95 16s 11½d (*ER ix. 213*). This relates to a complex factional dispute, which is not fully understood. Darnley was in fact purporting to be allied with the king's captors, although he is said to have been secretly loyal to the king. See under 22 July 1482, 29 September 1482, 7 October 1482 and 19 August 1482.

1482, 29 September: With James III still imprisoned in the castle, his brother the Duke of Albany besieges the castle, ostensibly to release the king from his captors – although he had previously attempted to usurp the throne as 'King Alexander

IV', the siege ends when King James joins Albany and his captors in forming a unity government, apparently through the mediation of Queen Margaret.

1482, 7 October: James III writes to John Stewart, Lord Darnley, instructing him to hand over the castle to the Earl of Atholl or his representative; the letter is authenticated by the king's signet and signature (Fraser (1874), ii. 121). This relates to the complex ongoing political crisis and the associated military situation. See above, 22 July 1482, and below, 19 October 1482.

1482, 19 October: James III commands that letters of pardon should be issued to Lord Darnley under the great seal, attesting that when the king was brought captive from Lauder (after 22 July 1482) and imprisoned in the castle, he believed that 'certain lords and persons' planned to slay him, but Lord Darnley was able to avoid being ejected from the keepership by feigning allegiance to the rebel lords, and thus ensured that the king was protected by himself and his 'servitors'; when the Duke of Albany besieged the castle in an attempt to take the king prisoner (on 29 September 1482), Darnley by the king's advice defended it, but it was immediately handed over at the king's command when he decided to join his brother (*it was geven oure at his command incontinent eftir that he schew it was his will to haue bene furth at his saide bruther*; this passage is obscure, but it apparently means that, when James III decided to conclude a rapprochement with Albany, Darnley handed the castle to Atholl – see 7 October 1482); in short, the king declares that Darnley did not hold him prisoner but on the contrary remained with him by royal command. The pardon is accordingly issued to Darnley and 66 named 'servitors and familiars' (Fraser (1874), ii. 121–3). As well as an important source for the confusing events of 1482, this is unquestionably the best-known record of a medieval garrison in the castle. Among the named group, Rothesay Herald, named last, is the most obviously identifiable; three are apparently clergymen – Mr John Maxwell (third-named in the list, probably the son of Lord Maxwell who was commemorated alongside James III in a chaplainry founded at Caerlaverock church in 1493; *RMS* ii. No. 2131, cf. *SP* i. 220, vi. 477), Mr Walter Drummond (probably the brother of Lord Drummond, later rector of St Andrews

University, Dean of Dunblane and Lord Clerk Register) and Sir James Vaus. Given the emphasis placed on bonds of kinship in raising military followings in late medieval Scotland, it is perhaps surprising that only half a dozen of the garrison share Lord Darnley's surname of Stewart, but they include three of the five first-mentioned; there are also four Maxwells, including three of the first six named, three Cochranes and three Mures.

1483: To the chaplain celebrating in St Margaret's Chapel within Edinburgh Castle, receiving annually £10 of the said customs, at peril, £10 (*ER ix. 217*).

1483: Delivered to John [Stewart] Earl of Atholl, of £100 for keeping of Edinburgh Castle, by the king's command written directly / in writ directed to the accountant (*literatorio comptanti directo*) under the signet, the lord chancellor making receipt on the part of the said earl, £100 (*ER ix. 219*). It seems clear from the entries for 18 August 1482, 7 October 1482 and 19 October 1482 that the Earl of Atholl did not in fact serve as captain in the first part of the term, and only assumed office in October 1482 when a unity government emerged from a complex factional crisis.

1483, 3 July: Robert, Lord Lyle, appears before the Lords Auditors to accuse James Stewart, Earl of Buchan, for theft (*RPS 1483/6/28*). See Appendix 7: Life in Prison.

1484: To the chaplain celebrating in St Margaret's Chapel within Edinburgh Castle, receiving annually £10 by the king's tolerance (*ex tolerancia domini regis*), allowed although the benefice as founded contained only £8 (*licet fundacio continet solum octo libras*), as appears in old/former rolls, to Sir John Rhynd, chaplain of the same, making receipt on account for the year of account, £10 (*ER ix. 285*).

1485: To the chaplain celebrating in St Margaret's Chapel within Edinburgh

Castle, receiving annually £10 by the king's tolerance (*ex tolerancia domini regis*), allowed although the benefice as founded contained only £8 (*licet fundacio continet solum octo libras*), as appears in old/former rolls, paid to Sir John Rhynd, chaplain of the same, for the year of account, at the accountant's peril £10 (*ER ix. 344*).

1486, 5–11 July: accounts of the ward of Tweed in Etrick Forest, at the command of Thomas Simpson, then comptroller, for certain expenses made at the lord king's command, viz. stakes and flax (*sudis et liniculis*) for the work involving the bombards (*ad opus bumbardorum*) in Edinburgh Castle, and carriage of the same from the forest, as appears by the king's writ, £12 5s (*ER ix. 416*).

1486: To the chaplain in St Margaret's Chapel, paid to Sir John Rhynd, at peril £10 (*ER ix. 450*). Account not printed in full.

1487: To the chaplain celebrating in St Margaret's Chapel within Edinburgh Castle, receiving annually £10 by the king's tolerance (*ex tolerancia domini regis*), allowed although the benefice as founded contained only £8 (*licet fundacio continet solum octo libras*), as appears in old/former rolls, of the year of account and at the accountant's peril £10 (*ER ix. 547*).

1487: Perth burgh customs, £40 19s 0½d balance, which sum Robert Mercer [custumar of Perth] paid to George Robertson, comptroller, making receipt on account for payment to the laird of Lundy (*domino de Lundy*), Captain of Edinburgh Castle, and for which he answered (*ER ix. 541*).

1486: To Sir John Lundy of that ilk, knight, Captain of Edinburgh Castle, receiving annually 300 marks for keeping of the same, for the terms (*pro terminis*) of three years and more during (*trium annorum et ultra durante*) the king's will, entering to the payment of the said sum at Martinmas next (*proxime*

sequens), as appears by two letters of the lord king under privy seal and subscription of the date of 26 August 1486 shown on account, the said John making receipt on account for the year of account, £200 (*ER ix. 548*).

1488, 16 June: Five days after the overthrow and mysterious murder of James III at the Battle of Sauchieburn, and his replacement on the throne by his teenage son James IV, Edinburgh Castle is visited by six leaders of the successful rebellion – the Earls of Angus and Argyll, Bishop Blackadder of Glasgow, Lord Hailes, Lord Home and Sir Henry Knollys, head of the Knights of Rhodes in Scotland and newly reappointed lord treasurer (*the knyght of Torfichane, Thesaurare*); their purpose is to make an inventory of the royal valuables (*to see the jowalls, silver money and uthir stuff*): coin and jewels in James III's treasure chest (*the blak kist*); royal tableware in an iron-bound chest resembling a meat-safe or *garde-viandes* (*a bandit kist like a gardeviant*), probably the same upright press referred to subsequently as 'the cupboard'; and miscellaneous treasures in a small inner room in the royal apartments in David's Tower (*the cloissat of Davidis Toure*) (*TA i. 81–8*). In later Scottish historiography, the 'black kist' would remain the iconically notorious symbol of James III's oppressive rule, though this is the solitary contemporary record to confirm its existence; six days later, Lord Hailes is appointed as captain of the castle.

1488, 19 August: To the chaplain celebrating in the chapel of Edinburgh Castle, receiving yearly £10 from the said customs, as appears in previous rolls, for Whitsun term 1488, £5. Delivered to Patrick [Hepburn], Lord Hailes, Captain of Edinburgh Castle, for keeping the same from 22 June 1488, for the period in his writ under the Great Seal containing seven years, as it is asserted, receiving yearly £200 from the said customs, in part-payment of the same, as appears by his letters under signature, £50; delivered to the said Lord Hailes for the expenses of the lord Duke of Ross [younger brother of James IV] by receipt of Thomas Young, steward of the household of the same, in part-payment of the same according to the tenor of the above indenture made on this topic (*desuper confecte*), as appears by the writ of the said Thomas signed by the hand of the said Lord Hailes,

£50 (*ER* x. 57–8). The date under which these entries are calendared is the end of the period covered by the relevant set of accounts, beginning on 3 May 1488.

1488, 9 October: John [Ramsay], Lord Bothwell, is indicted for treason: among other charges relating to the Sauchieburn campaign are these: for a treasonable mission with James Stewart, Earl of Buchan, into England, to bring English military aid, for conspiring [which, the indictment of Ross of Montgreenan suggests, took place in Edinburgh Castle] with the Bishop of Moray, the Earl of Buchan and Lord Forbes in drawing up a commission for himself and certain documents taken with it into England by himself and Henry Wyatt, an English messenger (*delatorem*, perhaps a herald), leading to the outbreak of civil war, these documents involving the treasonable subjection of Scotland to England; for sending a commission to the Earl of Northumberland and Sir William Tyler, Englishman, knight (*domino Willelm[o] Tyldare, Anglicano militi*), authorising them to give remission to all Scots allying with the English against the king [James IV?] and his lieges; and for advising the king [James III] to leave Edinburgh Castle to attack the rebels at Stirling (*RPS* 1418/19/14). The indictment relates to the period immediately before the Battle of Sauchieburn, when rival factions recognised both James III and James IV as king; as a result, Ramsay is accused of two simultaneous but completely contradictory crimes, complicity in James III's royal tyranny against a wholly justified rebellion by his subjects and high treason against the absolute sovereign prerogative of James IV.

1488, 14 October: John Ross, laird of Montgreenan, is indicted for treason; among other charges relating to the Sauchieburn campaign, are these: when James III came to Edinburgh Castle [in June 1488?], he advised and assisted Andrew Stewart, Bishop of Moray, in sending John Ramsay, Lord Bothwell, to England to request military aid in exchange for feudal submission, and that he subsequently advised and assisted in advising the king [James III] to attack the rebels at Stirling (*RPS* 1488/10/27).

1488, 17 October: Parliament appoints Patrick [Hepburn] Lord Hailes, master of the household, who has the keeping of Edinburgh Castle, as governor of the Duke

of Ross and the artillery and supplies (*artilyery and stuff*) within the castle (*RPS* 1488/10/53). The Duke of Ross was the younger brother of King James IV.

1488: Delivered for the expenses of the lord Duke of Ross [brother of James IV] and of others staying (*et aliorum existencium*) in Edinburgh Castle, 20 marts, 20 salt pigs and barley (*ordeo*) to the value of 40 marks by Alexander Lesk from the fermes of the Isle of Sanday on the part of Henry Sinclair, as was proved in the presence of the auditors, £26 13s 4d (*ER* x. 41).

1488, 13 November: To the chaplain celebrating in St Margaret's Chapel in Edinburgh Castle, receiving yearly £10 from the said customs by the ancient concession of the king, as appears in previous rolls, for Martinmas term, £5 (*ER* x. 61). The account covers the period from 8 August 1487 to 11 March 1488, and this may be a back-payment for the period of the civil war before Sauchieburn.

1489: Aid to the expenses of the lord Duke of Ross in Edinburgh Castle, Mr Alexander Inglis making payment on account, £100 (*ER* x. 120).

1489, 3 May: Taken personally by the king from the treasury (*furth of the Theasurare Houss*), 80 demis (*foure score of demyss*), £56 (*TA* i. 110).

1489, 5 May: To Sir John Rhynd, to carry the chapel gear (*graytht*), 20s (*TA* i. 110). Given the evidence that the chaplain of the castle assumed wide responsibilities for religious services in the royal residences in James IV's reign, it is not entirely certain that the castle was actually involved in this move.

1489, 16 June: Taken that afternoon by the king from the treasury (*furth of the Theasurare Houss*), 30 rose nobles, £50 (*TA* i. 114).

1489: To the chaplain in Edinburgh Castle, £10. Paid to Lord Patrick [Hepburn], Earl of Bothwell, Captain of Edinburgh Castle, for the keeping of the same, receiving yearly 300 marks of the said customs, as appears by writ of the lord king under the great seal, dated 22 June 1488 to the same day in 1489, of which pension has been paid £50, £150 (*ER* x. 139). The entry for the chaplain is not printed in full, while the keeper's entry is scored out, which may mean the payment was cancelled.

1489, 10 July: To English pipers (*Inglis pyparis*) who came to the castle gate (*Castell zet*) and played to the king, 12 demis (*xij demyss*), £8 8s; drinksilver for the gunners when they 'carted' Mons Meg (*cartit Monss*), by the king's command, 18s (*TA* i. 115). These entries relate to the departure of Mons Meg for siege of Dumbarton. It is unclear whether the reference to the 'carting' of the bombard means that it was being placed in a cart specifically for transport, or simply moved on a gun-carriage.

1490: To the chaplain in Edinburgh Castle, £10 (*ER* x. 228). Not printed in full.

1491, 2 February: 3 unicorns, valued at £2 14s, to the Duke of Ross when he moved from Holyrood to the castle (*TA* i. 118). A unicorn was a Scottish gold coin.

1491: To the chaplain in Edinburgh Castle, £10 (*ER* x. 296). Not printed in full.

1492: To the chaplain of St Margaret in Edinburgh Castle [for half a year], £5. Paid to Patrick [Hepburn], Earl of Bothwell, in part-payment of the keeping of Edinburgh Castle, received by the laird of Waughton, Adam Hepburn, brother of the said earl, attesting the said payment for the year of account, £50. To the chaplain in Edinburgh Castle, for Whitsun term [1492] £5 (*ER* x. 356-7). The entries for the chaplain are not printed in full.

1492: For expenses made in wine and expenditure in the said [royal] household, except the residue (*preter restancias*) of two pipes of wine located in Edinburgh Castle, as appears in the said books, £362 8s (*ER* x. 375).

1493, 8 June: The Lords Auditors decree that James Rutherford of that ilk, having failed to secure the release of James Lawrie (*Lowry*), a servant of Patrick [Hepburn], Earl of Bothwell, who is incarcerated in Norham Castle as pledge for one-quarter of the compensation owed (*a quarter of a bill*) for the sack of Wark, is ordered to place himself in custody in Edinburgh Castle immediately (*enter his per(s)one in warde within the castell of Edinburgh incontinent*), remaining there at his own costs (*apoune his aune expensis*) until he frees Lawrie by settling; the captain of the castle (*the capitane*) is ordered to receive him, and letters from the king are to be written to that effect (*RPS* 1493/5/36).

1493: To the chaplain in Edinburgh Castle, £10. To Laurence, Lord Oliphant, for keeping of Edinburgh Castle, receiving yearly 300 marks from the said customs, as appears by the lord king's writ, from 12 August 1492 to 14 August 1493, the said Laurence making receipt for the first term [Martinmas 1492] by his writ, and at the accounter's risk for the second term [Whitsun 1493], £200 (*ER* x. 387-8). The chaplain's entry is not printed in full.

1494, January: After New Year at St Andrews, the arras work is moved to Edinburgh, and hung in the King's Chamber (*Kingis Chalmer*) in order to receive the Danish ambassador (*TA* i. 240). It is not directly clear whether this refers to the castle or Holyrood, but a later reference on 20 March 1497 indicates that new furnishings or wall-hangings had been put out in the castle during a visit by the Danish envoy, and removed after his departure; at the very least, this shows that the high-status chambers in the castle were decorated for receiving the Danish ambassador, and it is possible that, after departing England in 1493, his visit to Scotland did indeed continue for three years (cf. Rymer, *Foedera* xii. 516; *ER* x. 529, xi. 16).

1494, March: For the carriage of the tapestries (*herras work*) from Edinburgh to Stirling ahead of Easter (*agane pasch*) with 5 horses, 25s; for the carrying of the cupboard and silverware (*copburd and siluer veschale*), 2 horses, 15s; for the chapel gear 20s (*TA* i. 241).

1494, April: To Mr Alexander Schaw, expenses going to Edinburgh to put the cupboard in the treasury (*Tressourhous*) and remaining there six days upon the making of the king's costume (*abilzement*) for the Isles, 30s (*TA* i. 241).

1494: To the chaplain of St Margaret in the castle, £10. To Laurence, Lord Oliphant, for keeping of Edinburgh Castle, receiving £200, for Martinmas term 1493, as appears by the lord king's writ of receipt, £100 (*ER* x. 460-1). The chaplain's entry not printed in full.

1495: In Yarrow, the fermes of the two places of Easter and Wester Mountberger (*Montbergeris Estier et Westir*) are 'set' (i.e. hired out) to Patrick Crichton of Cranston Riddell (Captain of Edinburgh Castle) for £100 annually to be paid at St John's Day (25 June), allowing that it has customarily been set for 200 marks (£133 6s 8d), as appears in previous accounts, allowing that it should pay £100 by the king's writ, for which the same Patrick shall answer. Memorandum that £100 remaining with Patrick Crichton above in the present account was allocated to him in part-payment of his fee for keeping of Edinburgh Castle, which is agreed upon with him (*super quo comptandum est cum eodem*), because Laurence, Lord Oliphant, then captain of the said castle, is fully paid up to Martinmas term 1493, and the said Patrick entered after him in the first week of Lent (*ER* x. 503-5). Following on from an isolated hint in 1459, this shows that the captain of the castle's salary was being paid from the profits of sheep flocks in Border shielings; the new captain was initially running the shielings in question as a commercial venture, and the king first reduced the royal profits, then simply demitted them back to him as his pay.

1495: To the chaplain of St Margaret in Edinburgh Castle, £10 (*ER* x. 534). Not printed in full.

1496: To the chaplain in Edinburgh Castle, £10 (*ER* x. 613). Not printed in full.

1496, January: For carrying the cupboard from Linlithgow to Edinburgh, 10s; to the porters (*pynouris*) to put it away (*turs it*) in the treasury (*Thesaurary hous*), 2s; then with the arras to Stirling for Easter (*Pasch*) (*TA* i. 268).

1496, 22 June: To John Mavor and Dandy Atchinson, in part-payment for roofing (*theking*) the chapel of Edinburgh Castle with wooden shingles (*spule*), £4 0s 12d (*TA* i. 279).

1496, 1 July: To carters for carrying 48 Eastland boards and 30 spars (*four dosane of estland burdis and xxx sparris*) from Leith to the castle to make enclosed carts (*clos cartis*) for the artillery, 9s (*TA* i. 280).

1496, 2 July: Dandy Atchinson goes to Melrose to make wheels for the artillery, £10 (*TA* i. 281).

1496, 3 July: One week's wages to 10 wrights, John Mavor, sr at 12s 4d, John Maitland and eight whose names are not transcribed at 9s 4d; to John of Park and John 'Rabane', carpenters (*sawaris*), for sawing boards and spars for the carts, 18s 9d, to two other carpenters (*sawaris*) working with them, 17s 8d. 200 spiked nails for the carts (*for ijc spykyn nalis to the cartis*), 32d, 300 smaller nails (*ijc nalis smalare*), 2s; to Tom Barker for ironworking, £5, drinksilver for the wrights on the first day they worked, 16d, that same day, to Will Walker of Leith, for 24 short trees to be ribbing (*schethis*) for the carts, 24s, to carry them to the castle, 18d; carrying 180 (*ix xx*) rafters to the castle, 9s (*TA* i. 281). The entry in *DOST* suggests that 'scheithis' formed the flatbed framework

above the cart's axles.

1496, 5 July: 1s 9d for carrying three dozen rafters from the castle to Holyrood (TA i. 281).

1496, 7 July: 4s for 32 great spars brought to the castle; 8s for 96 Eastland boards (*vijj dosane of estland*) also brought to the castle (TA i. 281). Other associated references are likely to be related to work in the castle, such as the payment to Herman, the Dutch timber merchant (*Hermyn, tymmyr man, Duchman*), of £17 17s for 512 rafters at £3 10s per 100, and 8s 9d for 110 hoop-poles (*girthstingis*, *DOST* states that a 'girthsting' was a pole suitable for making hoops, rather than a finished item).

1496, 8 July: 3s 8d paid for two locks, one for the hall door and the other for the chamber door in the castle, to secure the supplies (*for tua lokkis, ane for the hall dur, ane for the chamir dure in the Castel, to kepe the geir*) (TA i. 282).

1496, 20 July: For bringing 900 small wooden panels (*knapholtis*) from Leith to the castle, 3s 4d (TA i. 285).

1496, 23 July: The wrights are still being paid at £7 10s (TA i. 285–6).

1496, 25 July: For carrying 1,500 boards (*burdis*) from Leith to the castle, £4 10s (TA i. 286).

1496, 3 August: To the chaplain celebrating in Edinburgh Castle, receiving annually £10 of the said customs by the old foundation of the king, as appears in previous rolls, for Martinmas term, £5 (*ER* xi. 53). The date is the start of the period to which the relevant set of accounts apply; they continue to 8

February 1497 and were only audited on 21 June 1498.

1496, 5 August: For 800 nails for the doors of the workhouse (*werkhous*) in Edinburgh Castle, 5s 4d; for taking a load of spikes (*laid of spakis*) from the castle to Holyrood to make tent pegs (*pailzoune pynniss*), 2d (TA i. 289).

1496, 9 August: For a cart to carry cart shafts (*cart lymouris*) from the Castle of Edinburgh to Leith, 18d (TA i. 289). A 'limber' in this context was probably simply the harness-pole of an ordinary cart, but it could be a specialised (and usually wheeled) pulling section for attaching to a gun-carriage.

1496, 17 August: For two carts to carry the tent poles (*pailzoun treis*) from Holyrood to the castle to put on their metal reinforcements (*bandis and platis*), 30d (TA i. 290). There does not seem to be any recorded payment for the actual fitting of the metalwork; perhaps the cost was covered within the smith's salary?

1496, 20 August: For carrying four spars from Leith to be props (*proppis*) for the hall in Edinburgh Castle (*the hal of the Castel of Edinburgh*), 17d (TA i. 290). This presumably refers to a 'prop' in the sense of an upright used in building work, but it is one of the earliest recorded occurrences of the word in this context: the majority of early citations relate to free-standing poles set up as markers or targets.

1496, 25 August: To 'Hobbe Forno', the smith of of the Water of Leith, in part-payment for nails for the wooden roofing (*spule theking*) in Edinburgh Castle, 8s (TA i. 291). The smith's forename is a typical Scottish nickname form of 'Robert', but the unusual surname may be the Italian word for furnace or oven; the 'Water of Leith' in this context probably means the suburb now known as the Dean Village.

1496, 3 September: 9st. 11lb of tow-ropes (*towis*) to be traces (*trassis*) to pull the artillery, 3s 9d the st., 34s 3d; 15st. of tow-ropes, 4s 8d, £3 10s; for carrying of these tow-ropes (*thir towis*) to the castle, 8d. Then on 5 September 1496, for bearing a burden of tows (*byrding of towis*) to the castle from the booth (*buth*) where they were bought, 3d (TA i. 292). Presumably the 'booth' was a shop in the burgh.

1496, 11 September: For carts to carry the wheels from the castle to the carts and guns at Leith, 3s 4d; to the porters that bore them (from the carts) to the gun-carriages (*to the stok*) at John Lamb's house, 8d; to the men that lifted the guns that day in Leith, 2s (TA i. 296). These references are part of a very long run of entries relating to the artillery preparation.

1496, 3 October: to John Mavor, jr, in payment for the workhouse (*werkhous*) in the Caste, £2 14s (TA i. 301).

1496, 7 October: to Dandy Atchinson, in advance payment (*in onwart*) for the roofing of the chapel in Edinburgh Castle, 15s 6d (TA i. 301). The printed text dates this entry to 7 October 1496, but it stands chronologically between entries for 1 October 1496 and 3 October 1496 and may perhaps belong correctly on 2 October 1496.

1496, 14 October: to John Mavor, sr and Dandy Atchinson, in payment for the chapel roofing (*theking*) in the castle, £3 2s; to John Mavor, jr, for roofing (*theking*) an 18ft 6in section of wooden tiles (*a rude of spule thak*) on the workhouse (*werkhous*) in the castle, £3; to John Mavor, sr, and Dandy Atchinson, for coupling 15 couples (*xv coupill*) for the chapel roof in the Edinburgh Castle, 46s (TA i. 302). A 'couple' was a pair of structural rafters, presumably with their additional connecting timbers.

1496, 15 October: For clearing out (*redding*) the workhouse (*werkhous*) in the

castle to house the artillery, 12*d*; to to John Williamson of Edinburgh, for 72 spars (*sparris*) for the chapel roof in the castle, £12 (*TA* i. 302–3).

1496, 15 October: For an alb (*ane alb*) for the king's chapel (*kingis Chapel*) in Edinburgh, 15*s* 6*d* (*TA* i. 302–3). The alb was a white tunic worn by the clergy during church services; the 'chapel' in this context could be a building or the personnel organisation.

1496, 3 December: To John Lamb of Leith, in part-payment for nails for the wooden roof-tiles (*spule thak*) of the workhouse (*werkhous*) and chapel in Edinburgh Castle, £3 12*s* (*TA* i. 307).

1497, 17 January: To John Lamb, in part-payment for 5,000 nails, 1,000 small 'bowsprits' (*singil bowspleit*) and 4,000 'wraklings' (*wraklene*), £4; John Mavor, jr, in part-payment for roofing (*theking*) the workhouse (*werk hous*) in the castle, £5; to the carpenters (*sawaris*) for sawing wooden tiles (*swap thak sawing*) for the same house, 30*s* (*TA* i. 310). The 'bowsprit' was a clenched nail, i.e. one whose point protruded through the plank and was hammered to bend it back against the surface; the 'wrakling' was a large straight nail around 6–12in long. The names are apparently derived from continental shipbuilding terminology.

1497, 1 February: To John Mavor, jr, for part-payment for the roofing (*theking*) of the 'great house' (*gret hous*) in Edinburgh Castle, £4 (*TA* i. 319). This is followed by other entries that may refer to the castle: on 5 February 1497, 3½ ells of canvas (*cammas*) were got to cover 'the kingis gret bed in the gret chamir'; on 6 February 1497, artillery work was carried out 'in Edinburgh'.

1497, 19 February: Given to eight porters (*pynouris*) to carry the king's new cupboard to Edinburgh Castle from Holyrood, 3*s* 2*d* (*TA* i. 320).

1497, 19 March: For the hire of four horses from Edinburgh to Stirling with the king's tapestries (*arras claiths*) and coffers ahead of Easter (*agane Pasche*), 20s (*TA* i. 325).

1497, 20 March: To the watchmen of the Edinburgh Castle, to put away the new furnishings and bring out the old ones in their place (*hous the new paralingis, and to bring furth the old to set thaim vp*), 2s (*TA* i. 325). The term 'parallings' could denote furnishings in general such as chairs and cushions, or specifically wall-hangings of less grandeur than the large-scale Arras tapestries, such as plain blue worsted or the foliage tapestry design known as verdure; the change of furnishing presumably relates to the Danish envoy's departure to Denmark along with the Lord Lyon (see January 1494); but cf. also the 'gun paraling' for whose construction payments were made on 22 February 1497 and 3 March 1497 (*TA* i. 321-2).

1497, 29 May: For carrying 100 Eastland boards from Edinburgh Castle to Leith, to transport to Dunbar, 7s 6d; for carrying the hinges (*crukis*) of the iron gate (*irne zet*) of Dunbar [Castle] from Edinburgh Castle to Leith', 4d (*TA* i. 338).

1497, 31 May: In the castle 'at the casting of Mons', by the king's command to the gunners, 18d (*TA* i. 338). The reference is probably to digging out around the bombard to move her, and the payment is likely to be drinksilver.

1497, 19 July: 32 fathoms of great tow-ropes, to be bracing (*hed towis*) for the king's Great Hall, 10s 8d (*TA* i. 346). The entry is included among artillery expenses in Edinburgh; the term used is normally used for the 'standing rigging' of a ship, the fixed ropes which brace the masts, or for the tent-ropes of pavilions.

1497, 20 July: Drinksilver to the workmen in the castle, when the king was

there before he rode (to Melrose), by his command, 13s 4*d*; to the porters (*pyonuris*) to go to the castle to assist moving Mons Meg (*Mons*) down [to Holyrood], 10s; for the king's offering on St Margaret's Day in the castle, 13s (*TA* i. 348). These entries are evidently post-dated by a day, as the previous day was St Margaret's Day, and Mons Meg had been brought to Holyrood on that day (*TA* i. 347).

1497, 5 August: 16s to the lead-caster (*lede man*), making lead bullets (*ledin pellokkis*) in the castle, for six days' wages for himself and two servants, 2s 8*d* per day for the three of them (*TA* i. 350). This relates to preparations for the siege of Norham: lead would be used in Scotland to make cannonballs of all sizes, as it was cheaper than iron and more readily available, and it may have had ballistic advantages over iron for high-powder-charge bronze guns like the 'falcons' used in this siege; cf. the entries mentioning the arrival of newly made 'gun stones' from Edinburgh on 4 August 1497 and 6 August 1497.

1497, 12 August: To porters (*pynouris*), to bring the new cupboard from the castle to Holyrood, when the Spaniards (*Spanzartis*) were at Holyrood, 3s 6*d* (*TA* i. 351). These are presumably the Spanish envoys led by Don Pedro de Alaya. Unlike the Danish envoys, they do not seem to have been received in the castle.

1497, 16 September: To the chaplain in Edinburgh Castle, at risk, £5 (*ER* xi. 55). Account not printed in full. The date given here is the end date of the long period covered by the relevant set of accounts; it began on 13 February 1496 and was only audited on 21 June 1498; however, it overlaps with the account period for the entry calendared under 3 August 1496.

1497, 25 November: The king's offering in the castle on St Margaret's Day, 14s (*TA* i. 368). This presumably relates to the Nativity of St Margaret on 16 November, rather than the main celebration which in the Middle Ages fell on 19 June, the anniversary of the translation of the relics in 1250.

1498, 17 April: For bearing the silverware (*siluer weschale*) from Holyrood to the castle after Easter (*after Pasch*), 8s (*TA* i. 387).

1498, August: For carrying the silverware (*siluer vesscheall*) east from Linlithgow to Edinburgh, 15s; for carrying the tapestry (*arress*) there at the same time, 15s. To Sir John Rhynd, to carry the chapel gear (*chapell graytht*) from Linlithgow to Edinburgh following the departure of the Spanish envoys (*after the Spanzeartis*) 24s (*TA* i. 393).

1498, 6 November: To the chaplain in Edinburgh Castle, etc., received by Sir John Rhynd, £15 (*ER* xi. 231). Account not printed in full. The date under which this entry is calendared is the start of the period to which the relevant account applies, continuing to 5 March 1499. A large payment, appropriate for a year and a half's salary.

1499, 25 June: Account of Patrick Crichton of Cranston (Captain of Edinburgh Castle), for the two places of Mountberger (*Montbergeris*) Easter and Wester, Catslack (*Catslak*) and Blackgrain (*Blakgrane*), extending to 40 marks, for St John's Day term 1499, as appears in the accounts of Ettrick Forest, burdens himself with £266 13s 8d, of which the accountant is allocated for the keeping of Edinburgh Castle for Whitsun and Martinmas terms in the abovementioned year, receiving annually 200 marks, £133 6s 8d, £100 to Patrick Home, comptroller (*ER* xi. 208). The system introduced in 1495 to pay the captain's salary has been refined, with additional Border shielings added, which had previously been administered on a similar basis by Lord Home; the £100 payment to Home out of these represents the royal profit previously demitted back to Lord Home for his own salary as March Warden, retained by his family although the underlying relationship has ceased (cf. *ER* x. 504).

1499, 5 March: To the chaplain in Edinburgh Castle; to Sir John Rhynd,

chaplain, by his letters making payment on account for the two terms of this account, by William Adamson, £10 (*ER* xi. 274). The date under which the entry is calendared is the start of the period with which the relevant accounts are concerned, which continues to 17 December 1500; the first part of the entry is not printed in full.

1501, 15 April: Paid to the porters of Edinburgh for bearing the cupboard from the castle to the abbey before Easter (*Pasch*) and up again afterwards, 16*d* (*TA* ii. 103).

1501, 19 April: For 54 ells of Breton canvas (*Bertane cammes*) to be cloths to dry the gunpowder on in the castle, and to be two bags (*pokis*) to bear it forth, 7*d* the ell, 54*s* (*TA* ii. 24). This is probably an early reference to the production of the superior mix of gunpowder called 'culverin powder', created by soaking the chemicals in whisky: see Appendix 10: The Artillery.

1501, 30 April: For bearing the chest containing the Exchequer Rolls (*kist with the Rollis*) from the castle to Robert Colville's chamber, for an inquiry into matters concerning the lands of Burnturk in Fife (*for the seing of Bernturk matter*), 16*d* (*TA* ii. 105). Colville was a royal administrator, and Burnturk was the subject of a legal dispute.

1501, 6 May: For bearing two coffers (*tua coffrez*) from Holyrood to the castle, to put jewels (*the jowales*) in them to send to Stirling, 8*d*; for wadding (*caddas*) to stuff the little coffers with jewels (*the litil coffrez with jowales*), packing thread to bind the same, to prevent damage (*for breking of the jowales*), 3*s* 1*d*; for bearing the jewels forth of the castle to the town, and the treasurer's great chest (*the gret kist of the Thesaurar*), and for the carting of the same, 3*s* 8*d* (*TA* ii. 106–7).

1501, 14 May: By the king's command, 49 rafters (*iiij dosan i rachter*) to be a

house for Mons, Messenger and Tabard guns (*ane hous to Mons, Messengeir and Talbart gunnis*), 24s 8d; sawing of said rafters, 2s 9d; for eight spars to the said houses, 18d each, 12s; for six willow spars (*wykir sparris*) at 5d each, 2s 6d; for sawing of five of the said spars, 10d; for carrying the said rafters and spars from Leith to the castle, 2s 4d; 'for casting of the erd fra Mons and to turne hir and lay the twch hole vp', 3s 2d; to porters (*pynouris*) for lifting of Messenger and Tabard up from the ground and placing them on trestles (*of the erd and laying of thaim on treis*), 2s; to the wright that made the said houses on Messenger and Tabard, 4 days' wages, 5s 4d; to Robin Ker remaining in Edinburgh 'at the houses making', to him and his man, 18s (*TA* ii. 24).

1501, 15 May: For 20lb red lead to paint (*lay*) Mons, Messenger and Tabard, 40s; 'for iiij pointis of oyle lingeat to the samyn', 12s; to 'Hans gunnar and Robin Herword' for 'laying of thaim' with red lead and for their expenses to build the 'hous', 18s (*TA* ii. 24).

1501, 14 June: For bearing the Exchequer Rolls (*the Rollis*) forth of the castle to Blackfriars, where the exchequer audit was being held (*to the Blak Freirs for the Chekker*), 2s 2d (*TA* ii. 111). The index also indicates a similar entry at *TA* ii. 118, but I cannot locate it in the text.

1501, 17 June: The Sheriff of Edinburgh's account for the middle ward of Midlothian, including the following castlewards: £1 from the barony of Roslin, £1 10s from Pentland, £1 10s from the barony of Cousland, £1 8s from Borthwick and Middleton, £1 8s from Gorton, £2 from the barony of Melville, £1 from Straiton, £1 from Over Liberton, 10s from Glencorse, 10s from Gilmerton; [and] for the castlewards of the upper parts of the serjeantry of Edinburgh (*de castris superioris partis sergandrie de Edinburgh*), 13s 4d from Gogar, 6s 8d from Mountlothian, £2 from barony of Redhall, £1 10s from the barony of Braid, 10s from Bavelaw, 16s from Balerno, 16s from Newton, 4s from Malcomstone, 4s from Whitelaw, 6s from Curry, 2s from 'Schawisland of Holl', 15s castleward of Crichton [which had its own castle]. The account is not burdened with the castleward of Castlelaw in the king's hand (*ER* xi. 301*). The

asterisk in the page number denotes a section of the text which was discovered after printing had begun, requiring duplicated page numbers to insert it in the correct place. In the original text, all the sums are entered in shillings rather than pounds, but they are normalised here for clarity.

1501: To the chaplain in Edinburgh Castle, etc.; to Sir John Rhynd, chaplain, by his letters making payment on account by Alexander Lauder, £5 (*ER xi. 375*). The first half of the entry is not printed in full.

1501: Payments from Yarrow; Mountberger, and the two steads at Catslack and Blakgrain are occupied by the king's property (*occupati cum proprios regis*) in the form of 700 sheep, for which Patrick Crichton, knight (Captain of Edinburgh Castle), answers (*respondebit*), paying annually in money £133 6s 8d; two further steads occupied by the king's property (*occupati cum proprios regis*) in the form of another 700 sheep, for which Alexander, Lord Home answers (*respondebit*), paying annually in money £133 6s 8d now assigned to the said Patrick Crichton by the king's special command. Whithope, with £6, a cow from the stock rented out by the tenant, and two beefs (*Quhithop £6 bowkow ij fog marte*), is assigned to Alexander, Lord Home, Great Chamberlain, for his office. Memorandum that from the four places abovewritten feud (*assedatis*) to Patrick Crichton, the same Patrick receives 200 marks for keeping of Edinburgh Castle (*ER xi. 400*). The year date of this entry is not entirely certain.

1501, 28 June: Delivered for the expenses of the lord king's household in Edinburgh and Stirling, between this date and 14 October 1501, by Richard Brewster and Andrew Brewster, eight chalders one boll of malt out of the arrears of account (*brasii de arreragiis comptantis*); from 24 December 1501 to 14 July 1502, 33 chalders 11 bolls of malt by Richard Brewster, eight chalders by Andrew Brewster, and three bolls by George Kinkaid (*ER xii. 13*). Not clearly in the castle, but indicative.

1501, 31 July: To two porters working five days in the castle at the drying of the powder, 10s (*TA* ii. 115).

1501, 16 August: For a chest for the treasury (*kist to Theasaur Hous*) to store fabric and goods (*claith and graith*) when the cypress chest (*cepir kist*) was in Stirling, 10s; for bearing it to the castle, and the scarlet and silk, when 'we durst not' leave it in the town, 12*d* (*TA* ii. 116).

1502: Memorandum that the fermes of Galloway below the water of Cree (*Galwedie subtus aquam de Cree*) with victuals and dues resting upon Adam Mure, then chamberlain, and received by Patrick [Hepburn] Earl of Bothwell and his factors, assigned by the same earl in full payment of the expenses of the lord Duke of Ross, of whose lordship he is custodian (*feodi sui gardianatus*), and the keeping of Edinburgh Castle, as is more fully contained in the account of the Sheriff of Edinburgh, in the roll of the present year (*ER* xii. 18).

1502, 9 January: To Sir Patrick Crichton, knight, for keeping of Edinburgh Castle in the year of the account, £133 6*s* 8*d*; and to the same Patrick, for the expenses of Ferquhard Mackintosh, Kenneth Beg, Malcolm Mackintosh and Hugh Alanson (*Ferquhardi Makintoische, Kenyeoth Beg, Malcolmi Makintoische, Hugonis Alanesone*), staying in ward in the said castle for the whole year before 9 January 1502, and for the expenses of Thomas 'Erlintoun', Englishman, incarcerated in the same castle from 10 February 1500 to the said 9 January [1502], also for the expenses of two Millburn brothers (*duorum fratrum de Mylnburnys*) from 18 June 1501 to the said 9 January [1502], also English, from agreement with the said Patrick by the said comptroller for the said expenses by the king's command, and then the said Patrick was exonerated for the expenses of the persons abovementioned, £66 13*s* 4*d* (*ER* xii. 35). The payments are 200 marks and 100 marks, the latter presumably rounded; merk totals are no longer mentioned. Ferquhard Mackintosh was the chief of his clan, an important figure; it is not clear whether the English 'Millburn brothers' were siblings or friars.

1502, 12 January: For bearing of the king's silverware (*silver weschale*) from Holyrood to the castle, 12*d* (*TA* ii. 133).

1502, 26 January: For bearing the coining irons (*cunzee irnis*) from Holyrood to the castle, 6*d* (*TA* ii. 134).

1502, 5 March: For carrying the silverware (*silver weschale*) from Stirling to Edinburgh, 4*s*; for bearing the cupboard and the larger tableware (*gret weschale*) from the castle to the abbey, 12*d* (*TA* ii. 138).

1502, 5 May: To Partrick Kildow to pass to Stirling to get the royal verdure tapestry (*the Kingis hinging of verdour*) for Edinburgh Castle, 4*s* (*TA* ii. 146).

1502, 19 June: St Margaret's Day, for the king's offering in Edinburgh Castle, 14*s* (*TA* ii. 79).

1502, 16 August: Guns and powder that had been in Denmark are carried from Leith to the castle in four carts at 8*s*; carrying a barrel of powder that was beyond what could be carried in (*by*) the carts, 6*d*; taking the guns and powder from the houses in Leith, 16*d*; housing them in Edinburgh, 16*d* (*TA* ii. 157). These ships had been sent by James IV to assist his uncle King Hans in an unsuccessful attempt to suppress a revolt by the Swedes.

1502, 24 October: For bearing the cupboard from the castle to the abbey, in anticipation of (*agane*) the coming of Lord Dacre to Melrose (*TA* ii. 345).

Thomas, Lord Dacre, was one of the leading English officials on the Border, charged with defence, diplomacy and local peacekeeping.

1502, 20 December: James Douglas is reimbursed for paying for the carriage of two pairs of coffers from the castle to Holyrood and then to Stirling, 13s (TA ii. 351).

1502: To the chaplain celebrating in the chapel of Edinburgh Castle, receiving annually £10 from the great customs of the said burgh by the old concession of the king, as appears in previous rolls, Sir John Rhynd, chaplain, payment being made on account by Alexander Lauder, £10 (ER xii. 89).

1503: Paid to [Sir] Patrick Crichton of Cranston, knight, for keeping of Edinburgh Castle, by the king's command in writ, for the year of account, £133 6s 8d (ER xii. 113).

1503: Paid to [Sir] Patrick Crichton, knight [and Keeper of Edinburgh Castle], for his [separate] fee in the lord King's pantry (*in panetria*) for Martinmas term [1502] and Whitsun term [1503], £13 6s 8d (20 marks); to the same, for the expenses of certain Englishmen and other persons staying in ward in Edinburgh Castle, allowed to the said Patrick Crichton, from his previous allowance to 4 September 1503, £25 4s 8d (ER xii. 114). Part of same account as previous.

1503: [Katherine Turing], the Captain of Edinburgh Castle's wife makes a shirt (*gret sark*) for the king; 6¾ ells of closely woven Dutch linen (*small Holland claith*), 10s the ell, £3 7s 6d; 1oz silk thread (*sewing silk*), 3s 6d (TA ii. 212). From an account book of personal expenses for James IV and Queen Margaret (*pro rege e regina*).

1503: To the chaplain in Edinburgh Castle, £10 (ER xii. 162). Entry not printed in full.

1503, 17 July: Seven horses' carriage from Stirling to Edinburgh with the

treasure-house gear (*Thesaur hous gere*) and the scarlet hangings, 28s (*TA* ii. 381).

1503, 25 August: James Douglas is reimbursed for a horse from Stirling to Edinburgh 'with the copburd of glasses', 5s; for bearing the cupboard from the castle to the abbey 'at the mariage', 4s (*TA* ii. 390).

1503, 1 September: To James Dog to [pay] carters and porters for carrying beds, clothes and hangings from the castle to Holyrood and other places, 36s. For carrying the tents (*pailzonis*) to the castle, 8s (*TA* ii. 392). These are among the expenses for the royal wedding of James IV and Margaret Tudor; the tents had been previously freighted from Coldingham to Leith.

1503, 13 December: 11 ells of canvas to cover king's great bed in great chamber, 9s, 15 ells of canvas for the windows (*finisteres*) of the queen's gallery in Edinburgh, 22s 6d (*TA* ii. 410). These entries presumably relate to Holyrood Abbey.

1503 23 December: For bearing the cupboard from the castle to Holyrood ahead of Christmas (*agane Zule*), 4s (*TA* ii. 411).

1504, 17 January: For bearing the cupboard after Christmas (*eftir Zule*) to the castle, 4s (*TA* ii. 416).

1503, 11 June: To Fergie Graeme, Rook, Halliday and John Wallace, for the silverware (*silver weschale*), to hire (*fee*) them horses to Linlithgow, 8s 4d (*TA* ii. 438). Edinburgh is not explicitly specified as the starting location, but the chapel gear left the city on 10 June 1503.

1504, 16 July: 'grass' (*girs*, presumably dried rushes) is got for the floor of the king's chamber (*TA* ii. 447). This entry may well refer to Holyrood.

1504: For the carriage of the Exchequer Rolls from Edinburgh to Linlithgow, and afterwards from Linlithgow to Stirling, in great carts (*in magnis curribus*) (*ER* xii. 201).

1505, 9 February: For shoes, slippers (*schone, pantonis, and caffunzeis*) to Lady Margaret, the king's daughter, in Edinburgh Castle, 5s (*TA* ii. 478). This is in a long run of debts settled at the end of an account but coincides with the next entry on 11 April 1505.

1505, 11 April: 7 ells of damask to be a gown to Lady Margaret, the king's daughter [by Margaret Drummond], in Edinburgh Castle, at £1 6s 8d the ell, total £9 6s 8d; 2 ells velvet to border it, £4; buckram to it, 2s; making, 6s 8d; 3½ ells black grey to line, 3s 8d; 7 quarters Lille black for kirtle, £2 6s 8d, cutting 10½d, making, 2s, 2 ells black grey for kirtle, 2s 8d; linnen or lining and lacing eyelets (*lynyn clath and maizeis*) for both, 2s 2d; 1½ quarters velvet towards a collar, 15s, making, 1s; ½ ell of damask, blue and red, to be two pairs of sleeves, 1s; 8 ells Holland cloth for 4 sarks, £1 12s; 6 ells of silk crêpe (*singill kyrsp*), 18s; 2 ells of double-layered silk crêpe (*double kirsp*) towards collars, 8s; 1oz ribbons, 5s; 1 oz white sewing silk, 3s 6d, a tippet (*tepat*, a boy's hat), 8s, two belts of 'braid' ribbon (broad or braided?), black and yellow, 5s 4d; 17 ells ribbons, 8s 6d; Marjory Lindsay [her attendant]: 2¼ ells French tan for a gown £1 11s 6d; 4½ ells black grey to line that and kirtle below, 6s; linnen/lining (*lynyn clath*) to both, 1s 6d; 7 quarters Scots black for a kirtle, £1 1s; 1½ quarters velvet to be her collar, 15s; ½ ell Holland cloth to be her collars, 2s. The two Moors [her African ladies-in-waiting], 10½ ells green kersey to be their two gowns, £2 8s 4d; 6 ells red kersey to be their two kirtles, £1 7s; 4 ells Holland cloth to be their collars and hose (*howis*), 12s; two pairs of double-soled shoes for them, 4s (*TA* iii. 93). See Appendix 8: **The King's Daughter and the Moorish Lassies**.

1505, 25 May: To Hans, gunner, for his expenses; to the porters (*pynouris*) who brought the falcons (*falcoun gunnis*, light artillery) forth from the castle to pass to Leith; to the porters that took forth the bombard and went (*zeid*) 'with her' to Leith, 3s 4d; for five white plates of iron to be ramrods (*chargeouris*), 5s; for bearing of the iron to the castle which was made into dice for shrapnel (*quihilk wes the dis*), and for bearing the same dice to Leith when made, 1s 6d (TA iii. 141-2). This relates to the fitting-out of the royal flagship, the *Margaret*: additional charges concerning the bearing of the artillery, powder and other supplies, notably the material of 'coyis', i.e. wooden box-beds.

1505, 19 June: 14s offered by the king in St Margaret's Chapel (TA iii. 75). This is St Margaret's Day – and it is also, therefore, the name day of the king's daughter, Lady Margaret, resident in the castle with her own household at this time. It seems likely that Queen Margaret would have also marked the day, though it seems likely that her own patron saint was Margaret of Antioch, in whose church in Westminster, rebuilt by her father, she was baptised.

1505, 19 August: 5 ells of black Lille fabric for a gown, kirtle and hose for Lady Margaret, the king's daughter, in Edinburgh Castle, £1 6s 8d the ell, £6 13s 4d; 2 ells of lining or linen, and eyelets for lacing (*lynyn clath and malzeis*) to the gown and kirtle, 2s 3d; 2¼ ells velvet to the gown, kirtle and collars, £4 10s; making of gown, kirtle, 2 pairs hose, 1 velvet collar, 1 velvet stomacher (*stomo*, a bodice or a panel for the front of the gown), 7s 8d; 12 ells ribbon, 6s (TA iii. 99).

1505: paid by John Stirling, then comptroller, in £53 6s 8d, for [Sir] Patrick Crichton, knight, of which sum £30 is for sheep bought by the said Patrick; and also 200 marks [£133 6s 8d] for the said Patrick in sheep and cash (*in mutonibus et pecunia*), the said John being present and making payment on account of £120 [the other £13 6s 8d was evidently paid in sheep (!) and is not itemised in the accounts]; by the said John Stirling, for the same Patrick, 10 marks of the fee of the said Patrick for Martinmas term 1504, £6 13s 4d; paid by the said John Stirling, then comptroller, £1,269 2s 6d, of which are £50 for 60 sheep bought by the accountant and entered into the household books, £1,260 2s 6d (ER xii. 316).

1505: For the movement of 135 marts from Kintyre towards Stirling, Edinburgh and Dumbarton in various years before the said account, £2 8s (*ER* xii. 365).

1505: To the chaplain in Edinburgh Castle, £10 (*ER* xii. 372). Entry not printed in full.

1505: To James Homyll for the expenses of a 'Portuguese' (*unius portigalie*) carrying four Ethiopians (*personas Ethiopum*), two horses and other animals for the lord king, remaining at Edinburgh for 40 days in the house (*in domicilio*) of the said James by the lord king's command, £18 4s (*ER* xii. 375). The simplest reading would be that the 'Portuguese' was simply to 'a man from Portugal', and Homyll had previously hosted a Spaniard in his 'lodging' (*ER* xii. 364); but it is not entirely clear why a man would be described as 'carrying' people and animals; the index to the printed volume (*Er* xii. 784, 804, 856) seems to regard a 'portingal' or 'portingalo' as some form of vehicle being kept at his house, but I cannot find any corroborating citations. It is also possible that the reference is to a Portuguese ship, though why the accommodation costs would be described as expenses *for* it is unclear.

1505, 8 December: To Sir Patrick Crichton, Captain of Edinburgh Castle, for the bairn's expenses (i.e. the king's daughter Lady Margaret), and with her, Marjory Lindsay and the Moorish lassies (*the Moris*) and servants, for a year, £100 (*TA* iii. 175).

1506, 3 January: For 22 gold beads to the king's daughter [Lady Margaret] in Edinburgh Castle, 22 unicorns, thus £19 16s (*TA* iii. 178). A unicorn was a Scottish gold coin, with one evidently being used to make each bead here.

1506, 1 April: For carrying of the tent (*pailzoun*) to Newhaven from Edinburgh Castle, 3s (*TA* iii. 188).

1506, 3 April: For bearing down the cupboard (*the copburd*) from Edinburgh Castle to Holyrood, 2s (*TA* iii. 189).

1506, 19 June: St Margaret's Day: James IV attends a church service in the castle and makes a gift of 14s (*TA* iv. 42).

1506, 24 June: To Hans, gunner, for his expenses to the porters who took out two guns from the castle to be sent to the Isles (*TA* iii. 200). This relates to an expedition commanded by the Earl of Huntly, which bombarded Stornoway Castle on the Isle of Lewis to capture the rebel leader Domnhall Dubh. See also 19 July 1506 and 14 October 1506.

1506, 3 July: 4½ ells satin to be a kirtle for Lady Margaret [King James's daughter] in Edinburgh Castle, £1 3s the ell, £5 4s 6d; a decorative piece (*ane waut*) of Lille brown to it, 3; linnen or lining and eyelets for lacing (*lynyn claith and malzeis*) to the kirtle and gown, 12d; three quarters taffety to line gown-sleeves of velvet, 9s; 3½ ells buckram to line the same gown, 7s; for lining and reversing it (*lyning of it and translating*), 2s; 3 ells Holland cloth for headwear (*hede clathes*), 15s; 9 ells Holland cloths to sarks, £1 16s; ½oz white silk to clothes, 1s 8d; hat and tippet, 17s; 1oz ribbons for headbands (*to hir hede lases*), 5s, 2 ells silk crêpe (*kirsp*), 7s (*TA* iii. 114).

1506, 19 July: To Hans, gunner, for the expenses for bringing artillery forth of the castle to the king's ship, eight porters who brought four falcons and a cannon (*four falcons and ane cannon*) forth of the castle, 9s 4d; to a wright two days, 2s 8d; for carrying of those five guns to the ship, 20s; for carrying down to the ship two barrels powder, 16d; to a man who went (*zeid*) down with the carts, 8d; for two powder bags, two iron plates for chargers, 4s; to the workmen in the castle in drinksilver (*drinksilvir*), 8d (*TA* iii. 203). The ship in question is the *Margaret*, previously armed from the castle arsenal on 25 May 1505, but this time, instead of

a traditional wrought-iron bombard, the main armament is a heavy bronze cannon, firing an iron roundshot of around 36lb. The ship and the big gun were probably being deployed for the naval campaign along with the guns on 19 June 1506. Other expenses for the ship follow, but these do not directly relate to the castle.

1506, 7 August: To the porters who bore the silver vessels and cupboard (*the silvir weschale and copburd*) from Holyrood to the castle, 4s (TA iii. 330).

1506, 13 August: To Hans, gunner, for his expenses in drying the gunpowder in Edinburgh Castle and mending the powder cloths (*powdir clathis*), 20d (TA iii. 332).

1506, 11 October: For bearing of the cupboard (*the copburd*) from the castle to the abbey when Montjoy dined in the abbey, and [back] again, 8d (TA iii. 349). Montjoy was the senior French royal herald and was on an embassy to Scotland and Denmark.

1506, 14 October: To Hans, gunner, for what he paid for landing the guns which were in the Isle of Lewis (*the Lewis*), carrying them to the castle, and repairing their carriages (*mending of thair cartis*), 26s 8d (TA iii. 350). The return of the guns mentioned under 24 June 1506 and 19 July 1506.

1506: Paid to [Sir] Patrick Crichton, knight, in 200 marks for keeping Edinburgh Castle, by the lord king's command in writ, £133 6s 8d, and paid by James Redheugh, comptroller, for the aforesaid Patrick, in 200 marks of the said fermes, i.e. £133 6s 8d, and 10 marks being paid to the said Patrick for his fee of the household in Martinmas term [1505] (ER xii. 391). The 200 marks or £133 6s 8d is the captain of the castle's fee. The fee of £13 6s 8d (i.e. 20 marks) is for his other post as master of the pantry in the royal household.

1506: To James Redheugh, comptroller, by receipt of Peter Colquhoun, of £7 6s for the carriage of the assize herrings (*allecum assise*) from Glasgow to Edinburgh, by the command of the said comptroller and for three barrels of herring (*barilibus allecum*) bought by the said Peter for the use of the lord king's household, £7 6s (*ER* xii. 462). Assize herrings were barrels of fish paid as tax.

1506: To the chaplain of Edinburgh Castle, John Rhynd for the first term, John Lamb for the second, £10 (*ER* xii. 464). Not printed in full.

1506, 3 December: 7 ells damask to be a gown to Lady Margaret the king's daughter in Edinburgh Castle, £1 4s the ell, sum £8 8s; 5 ells damask for a kirtle, £6; 4 ells black grey to line the gown at 5s 4d, 3 ells white to line her kirtle, at 4s, and 1 ell buckram to her gown, at 20d, 11s; 3 quarters 1 nail velvet to her gown, £1 15s 9d; making of gown and kirtle, 8s; 3 ells Lille black to be a gown to her, £4; for cutting, 18d, 3½ ells black grey to line it, 4s 8d, 1 nail velvet to 'band' it, 9d, and for making, 2s, total 10s 11d; 7 quarters brown for a kirtle, £1 15s; cutting, 10½d, 3 ells white to line, 4s, and making, 17d, total 6s 4½d; 3 ells of linnen or lining (*lynnyn*), 3s to those two gowns and kirtles; 2 ells of silk crêpe (*kirsp*) 6s, for lacing eyelets (*mailzeis*), fasteners (*claspes*) and 'bands' (*bandis*) to her gowns and kirtles, 2s, 2 pairs of hose, 5s 4d, total 13s 4d; 1½ quarters of velvet, 'and making of it', 18s 6d; 8 ells Holland cloth for shirts, £2; 1oz ribbons, 5s. Marjory Lindsay [her attendant]: 3 ells French tan for gown, £1 19s; cutting, 18d, 3½ ells black grey to line it, 4s 1d, and making, 2s, total 7s 7d; 7 quarters red kersey to her kirtle, 8s 9d, 2½ ells white to line the same, 3s 4d, and 5 quarters linnen to her gown and kirtle, 15d, clasps and mailzeis to them and making of her kirtle, 2s 4d, total 15s 8d; ½ ell velvet to her gown and collar, £1 1s 6d; making of her collar, 12d; 2 ells Breton cloth to be her shirts, 4s, ½ ell Holland cloth to her collars, 2s 6d, and 1 pair hose to her, 16d, total 7s 10d. The two Moors [her African ladies-in-waiting]: 7 ells russet to be two gowns, £2 9s; cutting, 13d, 9½ ells black grey to line them, 12s 8d, making, 4s, total 17s 10d; 1 quarter velvet to band their gowns, 5s 6d; 6 ells red kersey to be their kirtles, £1 10s; 7 ells white to line them at 9s 4d, making, 3s, 3 ells linen cloth to their gowns and kirtles, 3s, bands to their kirtles, clasps and lacing eyelets

(*mailzeis*), 2s, total 18s 4*d*.; 5 ells Breton cloth to their shirts, 10s, 1 ell Holland cloth for their collars, 3s 6*d*, and 2 pairs of hose, 4s, total 18s 6*d* (TA iii. 309).

1507, 5 January: To the Captain of Edinburgh Castle's wife (*the capitane of Edinburgis wif*, Janet Turing) for Lady Margaret's 'board' for a year (*burd ane zeir*), and with her Marjory Lindsay and the two Moors (*tua Moris*), £100 (TA iii. 361).

1507, 10 January: For bearing the cupboard (*the copburd*) from Holyrood to the abbey after the Christmas season (*after Zule*) (TA iii. 362).

1507, 19 June: St Margaret's Chapel, 28s (TA iii. 291). This is again St Margaret's Day.

1507, 19 June: In Edinburgh Castle, to the tentmakers (*to the pailzoun makaris*) in drinksilver (TA iii. 392).

1507, 25 June: To Hans, for taking the artillery forth of the castle and equipping it (*grathing of it*), thread for fireballs (*threid for fire ballis*), quicksilver and other small stuff, 19s 2*d* (TA iii. 395).

1507, 27 July: To the Chaplain of Edinburgh Castle, received by Sir John Lamb, chaplain, £10 (ER xii. 593). Not printed in full, but in a set of accounts covering the period from 3 July 1506 to the date at which it is calendared here. The payment is immediately followed by a £13 6s 8*d* salary to Sir John Sharp, chaplain of the king's college within the palace of the monastery of Edinburgh (*capellano collegii regii infra palatium monasterii de Edinburgh*), i.e. the Holyrood Chapel Royal (cf. ER xii. 466).

1507, 31 July: In the Ettrick accounts, the sum of 200 marks is conceded to Patrick Crichton of Cranston, knight, for keeping of Edinburgh Castle as appears by letters of the lord king under signet and subscription, to allowance in year of account, £133 6s 8d (*ER* xiii. 34). This sequence of entries is for a set of accounts covering the period from the date at which it is calendared to 3 July 1508.

1507, 7 August: To the porters and carters that brought the guns forth of the castle and had them to Leith, [and] for barrels and bags for powder, 46s 4d (*TA* iii. 408). Another expedition to the Isle of Lewis.

1507: For payment made to [Sir] Patrick Crichton, knight, in 200 marks for keeping of Edinburgh Castle, by the king's command in writ under signature and signet (*sub subscriptione et signeto*), £133 6s 8d; paid by James Redheugh for the said Patrick in £144 10s of the said fees and in £300 6s 8d in the fee of the household of the said Patrick, as appears by two quittances of the said comptroller, £157 16s 8d (*ER* xii. 536).

1507, 12 December: 5oz sewing silk, bought for 15s, is delivered to [Janet Turing,] the captain of the castle's wife (*TA* iv. 17).

1508, 7 May: 17 'hanks' of gold, bought for £4 5s, are delivered to [Janet Turing,] the captain of the castle's wife to make purses for the king (*TA* iv. 22). This is among the entries relating to the Black Lady Tournament (see Addendum).

1508, 6 June: To Sir James Ellem, chaplain celebrating in the chapel newly built under the walls of Edinburgh Castle (*noviter constructa sub muro castris de Edinburgh*), receiving annually 20 marks by letters of the lord king under the privy seal of the date of 6 June 1508, for Whitsun term last, the said Sir James payment being made upon account of the said term, £6 13s 4d (*ER* xiii. 96). This relates to the new Chapel at the Barras; the date used for calendaring it is that of the royal writ, but the relevant set of accounts extends forward to 27 July 1508.

1508, 3 July: In the Ettrick accounts, the sum of 200 marks is conceded to Patrick Crichton of Cranston, knight, for keeping of Edinburgh Castle as appears by letters of the lord king under signet and subscription, to allowance in year of account, £133 6s 8d (*ER* xiii. 177). The date under which this entry is calendared is the start of the period for which the relevant account is concerned, which extends to 28 June 1509.

1508, 7 July: From the Edinburgh customs revenue, to the chaplain celebrating in the chapel of Edinburgh Castle, receiving annually £10 from the said customs, to Sir John Lamb, chaplain of the said chapel, by his letters making payment upon account, receiving annually, £10. (*ER* xiii. 95). The sequence of entries is for a set of accounts covering the period from 27 July 1508 to the date at which it is calendared.

1508, 27 July: From the Edinburgh customs revenue, to the chaplain in the castle, at risk, £10, to Sir James Ellem, £13 6s 8d (*ER* xiii. 229). Account not printed in full. The date under which this entry is calendared is the start of the period for which the relevant account is concerned, which extends to 27 June 1509.

1509, 27 June: From the Edinburgh customs revenue, to the chaplain in the castle £5, to Sir James Ellem, £6 13s 4d (*ER* xiii. 364). Account not printed in full. The date under which this entry is calendared is the start of the period for which the relevant account is concerned, which extends to 1 February 1510, and was audited on 11 September 1510.

1509, 28 June: In the Ettrick accounts, the sum of 200 marks is conceded to Patrick Crichton of Cranston, knight, for keeping of Edinburgh Castle as appears by letters of the lord king under signet and subscription, to allowance in year of account, £133 6s 8d (*ER* xiii. 351). The date under which this entry is calendared is

the start of the period for which the relevant account is concerned, which extends to 31 July 1510.

1510, 2 February: From the Edinburgh customs revenue, to the chaplain in the castle, £5. To Sir James Ellem, £6 13s 4d (*ER* xiii. 366–7). Account not printed in full. The date under which this entry is calendared is the start of the period for which the relevant account is concerned, which extends to 12 August 1510 and was audited on 12 September 1510.

1510, 12 August: From the Edinburgh customs revenue, to the chaplain in the castle, £10. To the chaplain in the chapel under the castle wall, £13 6s 8d (*ER* xiii. 391). Account not printed in full. The date under which this entry is calendared is the start of the period for which the relevant account is concerned, which extends to 21 August 1511.

1510, 1 October: The accounts for Edinburgh Castle record the start of a period of payment to the culverin-maker George Keppin, at a rate of £7 14s monthly, being 7 French crowns for him and 4 French crowns for his servitor Kasper Lepus; from this point until 31 August 1511, their pay makes £84 14s (*TA* iv. 276). The culverins in question were probably bronze handguns (a type often used for sport) rather than the larger artillery pieces of the same name.

1510, 13 October: The culvern-maker George Kepin is paid a gift (*propin*) of 2 French crowns, i.e. £1 8s in addition to his wages beginning on 1 October 1510 (*TA* iv. 276).

1511, 13 January: Gervaise the gunner (*Gerwez, gunnar*) and his associates 'departed their own house' (*departit of thare awne house*) and enter service under Thomas Kincaid, constable of the castle, at a rate of £34 5s per four weeks: Gervaise himself and his servants the bronzefounders (*meltaris*) Jehan Garnier, Stephane d'Avesnes and Jacquet (*Johne Garnere, Stewin Davenneis and Jacat*)

take £9 12s 'for their expenses in meat and drink only', Jehan and Stephane take a wage of £3 12s each, Jacat takes £3 3s, another Jaquet from Tours (*Jacat of Towris*) takes £4 10s for expenses, wages and fees, a wright named Yvon (*Evon*) takes 8 francs or £4, as does a smith named Antoine (*Anthone*), while the smith's servitor takes 2 crowns or £1 16s (*TA* iv. 277). At this point, this team of French gunfounders was evidently still on the Continent: see 1 April 1511 and 21 July 1511. Jean Garnier was perhaps the progenitor of the Gardiner family of gunners, who remained in royal service until at least the 1670s.

1511, 2 March: £7 is paid to George Patterson for the shipping of 144 cannonballs (*gune stanis*), 11 pieces of narrow rope (*small cordalis*), 9 bolts of great canvas, 2½ barrels of spices (*spicery*), 3 heavy ropes (*gret cordalis*), 1,700 ratlines (*wiflyne*), brought from Flanders to Leith (*TA* iv. 288). It seems likely that cannonballs would be kept in the castle, but their inclusion here with cooking ingredients and naval supplies (ratlines are the rope 'steps' in the rigging of a mast) is an indication of how hard it is to disentangle entries that specifically relate to the castle.

1511, 1 April: Gervaise the gunner and his associates, employed since 13 January 1511, are paid a total of £65 6s 3d for the intervening period, by the constable of the castle, Thomas Kincaid (*TA* iv. 277). The next payment to them is on 21 July 1511. The accounts also record a payment of 70 francs and 6 deniers, or £35 0s 3d for expenses while they had been waiting at Dieppe, aboard ship and in lodgings on a street there (*bidand one the schip and wynd in Deip*), paid in the constable's name by Guillaume Cristall to Gervaise to pay to 'Monsieur John of Murray': Murray was a Scottish merchant or financier based in Dieppe (cf. *TA* iv. 173, 294) who had evidently supplied the expenses, but Cristall was Murray's representative, so the idea that he was reimbursing Gervaise his costs, so that Gervaise could then forward the same sum back to Murray, was probably little more than an accounting fiction.

1511, 1 May: The start of a four-month period of employment for the gunners Jacob and Master Hans, plus a colleague of the latter (*his marrow*), all hired (*condukkit*) by the Dean of Glasgow: Jacob has 8 marks monthly, thus £21 6s 8d

for the period, while Master Hans has 6 marks monthly and thus £16 for the period (TA iv. 277-8). It is not quite clear why the Dean of Glasgow was hiring royal gunners, but the context shows that they were working in the castle.

1511, 21 July: Gervaise the gunner and his associates, employed since 13 January 1511, are paid a total £156 16s for the period since 1 April 1511, plus £16 10s to Gervaise for his own 'necessaries', by the constable of the castle, Thomas Kincaid (TA iv. 277).

1511, 21 July: A gunpowder mill (*ane powdir myll*) is imported for the king from Flanders to Dundee, by James Wedderburn, burgess of that town, at a cost of £3 12s; at Dundee it is delivered to Frederic Sandersone, and then moved from Dundee to Edinburgh at a cost of £14s (TA iv. 292). The powder mill was imported along with unspecified 'cart gear' and some wicker baskets (*mandis*), possibly the type known to scholars as gabions, which were designed specifically to serve as the basis of temporary artillery fortifications during the 16th century.

1511, 30 July: In the Etrick accounts, the sum of 200 marks is conceded to Patrick Crichton, knight, for keeping of Edinburgh Castle in year of account, £133 6s 8d (ER xiii. 411). Account not printed in full. The date under which this entry is calendared is the start of the period for which the relevant account is concerned, which extends to 17 July 1512.

1511, 7 August: 100 roof spars are sent to Edinburgh Castle, out of a consignment of 400 spars at £7 per hundred, and 100 baulks (*bawkis*) at £3 per hundred, imported by John Barton at a total price of £31 10s, the rest of which is divided between Linlithgow and Stirling (TA iv. 293). The total price is £31, and the remaining 10s is presumably additional expense.

1511, 13 August: The end of the period of pay for the culverin-maker George Keppin which began on 1 October 1510 (TA iv. 276).

1511, 21 August: From the Edinburgh customs revenue, to the chaplain in the castle, £5. To the chaplain in the chapel under the castle wall, £6 13s 4d (*ER* xiii. 483). Account not printed in full. The date under which this entry is calendared is the start of the period for which the relevant account is concerned, which extends to 3 January 1512, and was audited on 23 July 1512.

1511, 14 October: The workmen at the gunpowder mill in the castle are paid 14s in drinksilver (*TA* iv. 313).

1511, 26 November: Thomas Kinkaid, Constable of Edinburgh Castle, is granted 6 ells of grey-brown fabric (*broun greise*) for his livery gown ahead of Christmas (*agane Zule*), £5 8s (*TA* iv. 257).

1511, 27 November: A wheelwright from Melrose (*the qweile wricht of Melros*), who is making gun-wheels in the castle, is given 5 ells of tan fabric from Rouen, valued at £3 6s 8d, to make his livery gown (*TA* iv. 259). This is evidently for Yule, though it is unclear whether it is a gift or an indication that the wright attended the royal festivities.

1511, 24 December: the Cupboard is carried from the castle to Holyrood before Christmas (*agane Zule*) by seven porters (*TA* iv. 323).

1512, 3 January: From the Edinburgh customs revenue, to the chaplain in the castle, £15. To the chaplain in the chapel under the castle wall, £6 13s 4d (*ER* xiii. 486). Account not printed in full. The date under which this entry is calendared is the start of the period for which the relevant account is concerned, which extends to 24 July 1512. A large payment of 18 months' salary.

1512, 31 January: Robert Borthwick, gunner in Edinburgh Castle, is paid 3 French crowns, valued at £2 2s, in drinksilver, and 6 French crowns, valued at £4 4s, is also gifted (*propinit*) in drinksilver to the Dutch (*Duche*) smiths, Scottish smiths, masons, wrights, gunners, powdermen and other workmen of the castle (*TA* iv. 329).

1512, 14 July: Accounts of the chamberlain of the lordship of Fife, for bringing of wood for the roof of the Great Hall of Falkland to the palace of the same, and for bringing of wood for the roof of the new chapel of Edinburgh Castle to the gate of Falkland park, £14 6s 8d. For cutting (*scisione*) of woods (*lignorum*) and 'mundatione' of the same for the roofing of the Great Hall of Falkland and the chapel of Edinburgh in £21 and delivered to John Drummond, in complete payment of the cutting of the said roofs, £21 (*ER* xiii. 504-5). The date under which this entry is calendared is the start of the period for which the relevant account is concerned, which extends to 27 June 1513.

1512, 18 April: Thomas Kincaid, constable of the castle, begins a series of purchases of metal for the king's guns, in addition to the metal imported directly from France and Flanders, which conclude on 22 July 1512, and total, according to his account book and the petty account books, £139 11s 6d (*TA* iv. 278). This set of purchases is simply summarised in the main set of royal accounts – the detailed accounts are lost.

1512, 29 April: Sent to Leith by Master James Simpson of Flanders with William Brownhill of Campvere six 'bemys culverings' from Campvere, each piece priced 11s 9d in groats, making £3 10s 6d in groats, or £10 11s 6d Scots; sent with George Patterson, 318 cannonballs (*pellokis*) weighing 6,300lb, for £100 6s 10d groats, or £64 11s 6d Scots; that same month Simpson also sends in Skipper Lamb's ship from Campvere to Leith 5,058lb of copper and 608lb of Cornish tin, originally acquired in Antwerp, at a total cost of nearly £300 (*TA* iv. 301). This series of accounts also includes the import of naval supplies, much of it probably intended for the *Great Michael*, including large quantities of sailcloth, rigging and ten ships' compasses, but the metal, evidently for gunfounding, must have been delivered to

the castle, and the culverins and cannonballs are included here as they are also arsenal material. The 'bemys culverings' were presumably handguns, as the price quoted seems too low for an artillery piece – the adjective is not in *DOST*, but probably describes some aspect of their manufacture or origin (cf. the 'bemys knyffis' imported to Perth in 1550 by a Dutch ship, *Perth Guildry*, p 207). If the cannonballs were all of the same calibre, they would have weighed around 20lb, but the description of them as 'pellocks' rather than 'gunstones' might mean that they were heavy lead bullets, in which case they would be for a gun whose normal iron cannonball weighed around 12lb. For further consignments, see also 23 May 1512, then 25 June 1512 and 6 July 1512.

1512, 23 May: 5,500lb of copper for gunmaking, priced £207 4s including transport, warehousing, customs and other costs, and a large consignment of cannonballs (*gune stanis of yrne*), including 423 'of the gretest sort' weighing 33½lb, and 263 'of the lest sort' weighing 15lb, at a total cost of £163 0s 6d, all procured by Master James Simpson in Flanders, are imported from there to Leith in William Brownhill's ship (*TA* iv. 301). This follows on from previous deliveries calendared under 29 April 1512 and was followed by more on 25 June 1512 and 6 July 1512. The cargo also included two lasts of tar and a half-last of pitch, probably for caulking the hull of the *Great Michael*.

1512, 12 June: Gervaise and his companion gunners (*marrowis gunnares*) are given 2 French crowns as drinksilver, valued at £1 8s, and the 'poor bodies who helped to melt' get 14s (*TA* iv. 348).

1512, 14 June: The king's Cupboard is carried from Holyrood to the castle (*TA* iv. 349).

1512, 20 June: Carters from Leith are sent with ten furnished carts (*furneist cartis*) to fetch two great guns (*twa gret gunnis*) from Threave, a trip which is expected to take ten days at a cost of £45, at 9s per cart per day; John Drummond, wright,

accompanies the carts with men and necessities for transporting the guns, and expenses of £12 6s (*TA* iv. 350).

1512, 25 June: A consignment of cannonballs (*irne pellokis*), including 436 'of the gretest sort for the cannonis', weighing 36lb each, and 203 'for the grose culveryngis' weighing 16lb, at a total cost of £169 5s is delivered by Master James Simpson to John Balzard's barque at Campvere and subsequently unloaded from the said barque at Leith (*TA* iv. 303). See also 3 May 1512 and 6 July 1512, the variation in weight compared with the previous consignment corresponds approximately to the difference between the English pound weight and the French *livre*: see Appendix 10: The Artillery.

1512, 6 July: William Brownhill is paid for 316st. 8lb of metal for gunfounding, priced at £253 4s, delivered to him by Sir William Ramsay and recorded in a previous account book, and also paid for the shipping of the cargo calendered under 23 May 1512 (*TA* iv. 305). The two payments also include costs for additional shipbuilding materials.

1512, 16 July: Ettrick accounts, payment made to Patrick Crichton, knight, of 200 marks for keeping of Edinburgh Castle in year of account, £133 6s 8d (*ER* xiii. 524). The date under which this entry is calendered is the start of the period for which the relevant account is concerned, which extends to 30 July 1512.

1512, 23 July: The completion of a series of purchases of iron, made by Thomas Kincaid the constable and the smiths, totalling £190 12s 3½*d* as recorded in the petty account books (*TA* iv. 278). The details of the purchases do not survive, as the petty account books are lost, but the summary payment is included in the extant accounts; a more complete summary of the next series of purchases is made on 6 August 1512.

1512, 24 July: From the Edinburgh customs revenue, to the chaplain in the castle £10. To the chaplain in the chapel under the castle wall, £13 6s 8d (*ER* xiii. 574). Account not printed in full. The date under which this entry is calendared is the start of the period for which the relevant account is concerned, which extends to 8 August 1513.

1512, 31 July: Thomas Kincaid, the constable, as master of work in the castle, is paid a total of £1,264 4s 4d for the wages, expenses and fees of masons, wrights, smiths, quarriers, carters and other workmen and diverse other necessities for the furnishing of the said works, since 20 September 1511, as recorded in his account book and the petty account books (*TA* iv. 278).

1512, 5 August: 5s is paid to a poor prisoner (*ane pure presonere*) in the castle (*TA* iv. 357). This seems to begin a list of miscellaneous payments at the end of a set of accounts.

1512, 6 August: A great cannon called 'the Nekar' is cast in the castle; Thomas Kincaid the constable is paid £86 6s for 1,819½lb of brass used in its casting, as recorded in his account book relating to this; the same day, he also gets £45 5s 2d to cover the purchase of 21 waws, 6st. 10lb of iron at £2 2s the waw since 23 July 1512, £7 16s to cover purchases of charcoal, smithy coal and glass (*glassinwerk*), as recorded in his account book (*TA* iv. 278). The order of entries in the accounts suggests that the additional series of purchases of metal for gunmaking which began on 18 April 1512 was also paid simultaneously, but that is not made explicit in the text.

1512, 7 August: Three great guns (*iii greit gunnys*) are brought down from the castle to the ships at Leith, each requiring six carts, at a cost of 2s per cart, totalling £1 16s (*TA* iv. 451).

1512, August: Miscellaneous purchases: 11lb of sulphur (*bruntstane*) for gunpowder totalling £4 8s; 50 rafters for scaffolding at a cost of £1 15s and 4s for carrying them, making £1 19s; and £11 2s to Kelso the slater for the roofing of the Great Hall (*the gret hall*), as agreed in his contract with Robert Callendar, Constable of Stirling, recorded in previous account books (*TA* iv. 279). These entries follow the gunfounding expense of 6 August 1512 and are probably miscellaneous expenses paid off with the remnants of the cash assembled for that purpose. Thus, although these entries occur in a series of accounts entitled 'Work on Edinburgh Castle' (*Fabrica Castris Edinburg*), it is uncertain whether the the roofing work was actually being carried out on the Great Hall at Edinburgh, though relevant work is documented at Edinburgh, along with Stirling and Linlithgow, at around this time (*TA* iv. 280, 293, 372).

1512, 1 October: The castle, along with Holyrood, the royal mint (*cunzehous*), and the shipyards, is one of the places among which a consignment of timber valued at £370 19s 8d was divided (*TA* iv. 306).

1512, 25 October: George Kippinghame, smith in the castle, is given pay for himself and his servant until July 1513, at £7 13s per month, and Wolf of Nürnberg the gunpowdermaker (*Wolf Urnebrig, that makis the gun powder*) has £4 4s monthly for the same period (*TA* iv. 439). These two entries are closely preceded by two payments of overdue wages totalling £62 16s for Gervaise the French gunner and his servants, made on 23 October 1512.

1512, 29 October: In part-payment of the contribution of the Prioress of North Berwick, received by Thomas Kincaid, constable of the castle, £98 4s (*TA* iv. 361). This entry is calendared under the date on which the account was audited but was probably collected slightly earlier.

1512, 12 November: The cupboard and the coffer with the jewels are carried from the castle to Holyrood, at a cost of 4s 4d (*TA* iv. 397). Presumably the coffer was

the one with the queen's jewels, returned to the castle from Holyrood on 10 December 1512.

1512, 26 November: Paid to Thomas Kincaid, constable of the castle, to buy copper for the king's guns, £30 (*TA* iv. 399).

1512, 5 December: The cupboard is carried by eight porters (*pynouris*) from the castle to Holyrood and back again on two separate days, at a cost of 8s (*TA* iv. 399).

1512, 5 December: To John the quarrier, for stone cannonballs (*gwn stanes*) for the bombards named Tabard and the Gun of Threave (*to the Talbert, and gwne of the Treif*), £2 5s (*TA* iv. 460).

1512, 19 December: To 14 workmen for the shipping of two guns in haste (*in hannis, in haist*), 4s 6d, and to Thomas Branwood, carter, for eight loads of guns, gunstones and powder from the castle to Newhaven, totalling 16s (*TA* iv. 460).

1512, 10 December: The coffer with the queen's jewels is carried back to the castle from Holyrood at a cost of 4s (*TA* iv. 400). Presumably the return journey of the same coffer mentioned on 12 November 1512.

1512, 13 December: Thomas Cameron, servitor to the Master of the Artillery, Lord Sinclair, is paid £4 6s 9d for expenses made carrying guns and gear (*gunnis, and geir*) from Edinburgh Castle to Newhaven, and from Leith back to the castle (*TA* iv. 310). Presumably the guns were carried to a ship at Newhaven which then sailed (on sea trials?) along to Leith where they were unloaded. The next day, the accounts record a payment of £1 15s lost by the king in competitive archery against Lord Sinclair, Sandy McCulloch and others, 'at the buttis' – conceivably the Butts in the castle.

1513: £10 to Thomas Kincaid, constable of the castle, to buy metal for casting of equipment for the great ship's mast (*TA* iv. 530). The fragmentary nature of the document means that it is unclear what was being manufactured, but bronze pulley-blocks are a possibility: a hundred of these had been imported from Gdansk in April 1512 (*gret blokis brase of Danskyne*, *TA* iv. 301, 305), and more were manufactured in the castle foundry in the next reign (see 5 July 1539 and 2 August 1539).

1513, 21 January: To Thomas Kincaid, constable of the castle, to buy iron for the works (*for the werks*), delivered to his son Mr John Kincaid, £40 (*TA* iv. 445). It is unclear from the text if the cash or the iron itself was delivered to John Kincaid, but as he was a priest and lawyer it seems more likely that he was handling the money rather than the smithy supplies.

1513, 11 March: To Thomas Kincaid, constable of the castle, to pay for iron, £40 (*TA* iv. 446).

1513, 19 March: To 10 workmen with Robin Borthwick at the guns, two with Rob Scot, smith, one with George the Dutch smith (*Georgie Duche, smith*), each 8*d* daily for six days, totalling £2 12*s*; to them for working at the furnace in the night at the melting of the metal for the guns, 6*s* 8*d* drinksilver; to Rob Scot, smith, and his two servants, £1 11*s* 6*d*; to James Fotheringham, mason, 8*s*; to Robert Herwod, gunner, 9*s*; to John Quarrier and his two servants, 19*s*; to John Drummond and his seven servants, 14*s* for his pay and 9*s* for each servant, £3 17*s*; 9*s* to Robert Johnson, wright and 12*s* to Pat Noltman, wright (*TA* iv. 508). The start of an extant account book entitled 'The Wark of the Castell of Edinburg'; similar weekly payments recur throughout. On the basis of the reference calendared under 31 January 1512, it seems clear that the man whose name is interpreted by the editors of the printed text as 'George Duche, smith' was actually 'George, Dutch smith'.

1513, 19 March: To Thomas Branwood, carter, for bringing to the castle 12 loads of metal from Newhaven, 13 loads of timber from Newhaven and four loads of timber from Leith, totalling £3 14s 8d; for two dozen fir spars to Robin Borthwick to stir the metal with, 13s 8d, and to him thereafter, 6 great spars at 7s 6d and a dozen oak (*akin*) spars to make handspikes (*windes spakis*), 18s; for a cart to bring these to the castle, 2s; for 100lb of tin for the casting (*metlyn*) of three guns, at 1s 6d per pound, bought by the constable for £7 10s (*TA* iv. 508).

1513, 25 March: To 13 workmen in the castle, each 8d daily for six days, total £2 12s; for three dozen oak spars for the limbers of close carts (*the lymmaris of clos cartis*, i.e. the shafts of carts to carry ammunition and weaponry); to Rob Barker, smith, for his workmanship of 4 waws of iron, with other work and small fittings (*graith*), £3; for 6st. 6½lb of tin for the melting of three guns, at 18d the pound, and for three hanks of wire at 8s each, and two loads of charcoal at £1 4s and three loads of coal at 2s 10d, total £10 4s 7d (*TA* iv. 508).

1513, 2 April: To 16 workmen for three days, each 8d daily, total £1 12s; to four English prisoners for the three previous weeks' wages, each man 8d per day, and to an Englishman for the same period at 12d daily, and to three Scotsmen who dug up a buried treasure in Dunkeld (*at fand the hurd in Dunkeld*), each man 8d daily for the said period, in total £5 19s; for four loads of gunstones from Leith to the castle, 8s, for three loads of coals to Wolf the gunner to make a device (*to mak the wys*), 2s 8d, and also to him 2lb wax for 4s 6d, 2lb resin (*rosat*) for 6d, and 2lb tallow for 4d; for two 'wisps' (*wosp*) of steel to Rob Scot, smith, 5s 8d; to Barker (*Bercar*) the smith, for 800 door nails and 400 plancher nails, taken by John Drummond for the close carts, 16s; to Robin Borthwick for 10st. of metal at 13s 4d the st., four loads of charcoal at 16s each, and for wax and resin, 4s, and four bands of wire (*bwnd of wyir*) at 8s each, four loads of coal at 3s, and 5lb of candle at 20d, total £11 18s (*TA* iv. 508-9). It is unclear if Master Wolf's 'device' was a metal sculpture or a piece of equipment such as a screw mechanism for a crossbow.

1513, 9 April: To 13 workmen working with Robin Borthwick, Rob Scot and Wolf, in the powder mill, each man 4s weekly, £2 12s; for a lock to the Hall door in the castle, 5s; to Thomas Branwood, carter, for 12 loads of timber from Newhaven to the castle, totalling £1 12s, to Alexander Auchencrow for 5 waws of iron to George the Dutch smith and Rob Scot, totalling £11 10s (*TA* iv. 509).

1513, 16 April: To 13 workmen working in the castle, each man 4s weekly, £2 12s; to Thomas Branwood for 20 loads of timber and firewood (*burne wod*) from Newhaven to the castle, total £2 13s 4*d*, and for six loads of copper from Newhaven to the castle, total 16s; for eight loads of coals to Wolf, total 9s 4*d*; for red lead and linseed oil for colouring the three great iron guns that were put into the great ship, and two small falcons given to Rob Harwar and John Drummond, £2 8s 8*d*; to Robin Barker, smith, for the working of 6 waws of iron into wheel work and for gun stocks, total £4 10s, and to him for 100 great nails, 6s, and to him for 300 window nails to John Drummond, 2s 6*d*, and to him for 100 plancher nails, 2s to John Hartside, pavilion man, working at the pavilions for three weeks with four servants, taking 1s 4*d* daily and 1s for each servant, totalling £5 12s (*TA* iv. 509).

1513, 23 April: To ten workmen paid by Robin Borthwick, each man 4s, total £2, two workmen with Rob Scot, two with George the Dutch smith, two with Wolf, one with John Drummond, each taking 4s weekly, total £1 8s; to Rob Barker, paid by John Drummond for working 4 waws of iron, £2 16s, and to him for 200 double nails, and for 700 door nails for close carts, totalling 11s 8*d* (*TA* iv. 509-10).

1513, 30 April: To Thom Branwood, carter, for four loads of timber from Newhaven to the castle, each 2s 8*d*, total 10s 8*d* (*TA* iv. 510).

1513, 7 May: To 10 workmen with Robin Borthwick, four with the smiths, four in the powder mill, each man working six days, 8*d* daily, total £3 8s; to Robin Borthwick for 20st. of metal, 12s 2*d* per lb, total £18 13s 4*d*; for half a chalder of coals to

George, the Dutch smith in the castle, at 1s 2d per boll, total 9s 4d; for the carriage of the coal to the castle, 2s 8d (TA iv. 510).

1513, 14 May: To Robin Borthwick, for 14½st. of brass bought by him at 13s 4d per st., total £9 13s 4d; for 44 loads of wood, at 1s 4d each, total £2 17s 8d; for six loads of charcoal, £1 14s; 60lb of tin, price 1s 10d the lb, tot. £5 10s; to the lathe-worker (*turnour*) for 26 rammers for medium culverins (*chargeouris to the culvering moyaine*), 4s 4d; for 14st. 3lb of brass, priced 13s 4d per st., total £9 9s 2d; for two dozen spars to stir the metal with, 10d per dozen, 1s 8d; for a cart to carry them to the castle, 2s (TA iv. 510).

1513, 21 May: To 20 workmen with Robin Borthwick polishing and cleaning the guns (*dichtand the gunnys and cleyneand thame*), four with the smiths, three in the powder mill, each man at 8d daily for six days, £5 8s; to Alexander Lyle for 20 cartfuls of old wood (*ald wod*) to cast (*melt*) the guns, 5s per cartful, total £5; for 20 carts to bring that wood to the castle, £2; for 6 waws of iron delivered to George the Dutch smith (*Duche, smythe*), for iron fittings on the guns' wooden carriages (*for werk to the gun stokkis*), at £2 10s per waw, total £15; delivered to Robin Barker, 6 waws of iron for large wheels and gun-carriages (*for the greit quhelis and gun stokkis*), at £2 10s per waw, total £15; to him for working the iron at 14s for each waw, £4 4s; to Rob Scot, 4 waws of iron to make an iron gun, at £2 10s per waw, total £10; for 20 bolls of smithy coal for the castle at 18s per chalder, total £1 2s 6d; paid to Rob Scot, smith, for a year's fee, at the king's command, £10 (TA iv. 510).

1513, 28 May: To 10 workmen with Robin Borthwick, four with the smiths, three in the powder mill, each man at 8d daily for six days, £3 8s; to the two sawers sawing great timber for the gun-carriages (*the gwn stokkis*), 13s; to two French wrights to go to the woods for timber for axles (*to pas to the wod for extreis*), in drinksilver, at the king's command, 14s; to the little Englishman, prisoner in the castle, at the king's command, 2 French crowns, valued at £1 8s; to Robin Borthwick for 15st. of brass bought by him at 13s 4d per st., total £10; to

Cunningham the carter, for six loads of old timber from Newhaven to the castle, at 2s 8d each, total 16s; for 200lb of tin at 1s 8d per lb, total £10 (TA iv. 511).

1513, 4 June: To 14 workmen with Robin Borthwick at the guns, four with the smiths, three in the powder mill, each man at 4s weekly, £4 4s; to Thom Branwood for 16 cartfuls of old timber from Newhaven to the castle for gunfounding (*for the melting of the gunnys*), each cartfull 2s 8d, total 13s 8d; for packaging thread (*pak threid*) and oil (*oily*) to the arquebuses (*hacknuschis*), to George the Dutch smith, 6d; for six loads of coal, 4s 2d; for two loads of sea coal, 2s 6d; for the freight of 17 bolls of coal sent by the Abbot of Culross, 5s 4d; for carriage of the same to Edinburgh Castle, 4s 8d; for Wolf in the powder mill, 12 ells of linen cloth for the sieving (*fynyng*) of the powder at 10s, earthenware pots (*piggs of layme*) at 2s, two loads of coal at 1s 8d, thread and oil at 1s, a quart of vinegar (*venaker*) at 1s 4d, a new tub at 1s, 100 stubby nails (*ane hunder stobbis*) at 3s 4d, a load of large wooden canes (*ane draught of greti wattellis*) at 2s 6d, verdegris and alum (*vergrys and alme*) at 4s, and 1st. of Orkney butter at 6s; to Robin Borthwick, seven hanks of wire at 8s each, totalling £2 18s, 3lb of wax at 7s 6d, 3lb of resin at 9d, 2st. of coarse flax (*hardis*) at 10s, 2st. of tallow at 7s, six loads of dry wood at 1s 4d each, total 8s, six 'wisps' of steel at 4s each, total £1 4s, 1,000 small nails (*takkettis*) at 6s 8d, and 200 door nails at 2s 6d (TA iv. 511).

1513, 11 June: For a boat that brought six gun-carriages (*gwn stokkis*) from Stirling to Leith, £1 10s; to eight men who unloaded them at Leith, 4s; for three carts to bring them from Leith to Edinburgh, 6s; to two sawers sawing boards and timber for the close carts, 13s (TA iv. 511-12).

1513, 24 June: To 20 workmen with Robin Borthwick polishing and cleaning the guns (*at the dichting and clengeing of the gunnys*), four with the smiths, three in the powder mill, each man at 4s weekly, total £5 8s; to two sawers in the castle, 14s; to Robin Borthwick, at the king's command, four French crowns in drinksilver, £2 16s; to George the Dutch smith, and Rob Scot, in drinksilver, at the king's command, 2 French crowns, £1 8s; to the constable of the castle from 12 March 1513 to 25 June 1513 for 15 weeks' wages at 13s weekly, £10 10s; for 4½ waws of

iron given to Rob Barker, smith, priced at £2 8s the waw, total £10 16s; to the said Barker, smith, for the working of the said iron, 14s per waw, total £3 3s; delivered to the said Barker, smith, by Alexander Auchencrow, 16 waws of iron priced at £2 6s the waw, total £36 16s (*TA* iv. 512).

1513, 2 July: To 12 workmen with Robin Borthwick, four with the smiths, three in the powder mill, each man at 4s weekly, £3 16s; two sawers sawing wooden axles and timber in the castle, 13s; to Robin Borthwick, 2lb of wax at 3s 8d, 2lb of resin at 6d, a band of wire at 8s (*TA* iv. 512). Some payments are omitted in this entry in the printed text.

1513, 9 July: For 10st. of brass, at 13s 4d per st., total £6 4s 4d; for eight loads of wood, each at 1s 4d, total 10s 8d; for two loads of charcoal, 17s; for two 'wisps' of steel, 8s, for two quires of Lombard paper (*ij quair Lumbart paper*) to Master Hans, 3s (*TA* iv. 512).

1513, 16 July: To 14 men with Robin Borthwick, four with the smiths, three in the powder mill, each man at 4s weekly, £4 4s; 350 rafters bought from Sir David Wilson and sent to the castle to make the close carts, at 9 crowns the hundred, total £15 15s; four dozen great spars to be limbers to them, £1 16s per dozen, total £7 4s; for 18 carts to bring the said rafter and spars to the castle, at 2s each, total £1 18s (*TA* iv. 512-13).

1513, 23 July: To 32 workmen with Robin Borthwick at the guns, polishing and cleaning them and moving them within the castle (*for the dichting and clengeing of them and the bering of the said gunnys in the castell*), four with the smiths, three in the powder mill, each man at 4s weekly, total £8; to Stewart with John Drummond, 4s; to Thom Duncan (*Thome Dunkane*), wright, and his four servants, taking 16s himself in the week, and 10s for each servant, total £2 16s; to James Carver and his servant, £1 1s; to Andrew Carver and his two servants, £1 12s; to William Aikenhead and his servant, 16s, to John Henderson and his two servants, £1 12s; to William Young and his servant, £1 2s; to Robin Landells and his two

servants, £1 12s; to William Mayne and his five servants, taking 14s himself in the week, and 9s for each servant, total £2 19s; to Thomas Gourlay and his sons, £1; to James Gourlay, 10s; to Robin Scougall, 8s; to Rob Scot, smith, and his servants, £1 11s 6d; to Monypenny, smith with him, 5s; to William Ramsay, smith with him, 5s; to Barker, smith, for putting metal tyres on 20 pairs of large wheels (*for the schoyng of xx pair of greit quhelis*), at 10s per pair, total £10; to him for working 10 waws of iron at 14s each, total £7; for half a chalder of smithy coal 8s; in cost and carriage of the coal from Leith to the castle, 2s 8d; for 4,000 double nails to the close carts, at 3s 4d per hundred, 6,000 single nails at 1s 8d the hundred, 5,000 door nails at 10d per hundred, 4,000 window nails at 8d the hundred, 2,000 plancher nails at 1s 10d the hundred, total £15 16s 8d; for 20st. of tow-rope to be hauling-traces (*towis to be soumes*) for the guns, at 8s per st., total, £8; for a cart to carry them to the castle, 2s; to four men who made the hauling-traces at 6s each, total £1 4s; for a barrel of tar for the said tow-ropes, £1; in transporting it from Leith to the castle, 4d; to the constable of the castle for his month's wages, 14s weekly, total £2 16s (TA iv. 513).

1513, 28 July: 12 cart loads of armour (*harnes*) brought from Denmark are carried from Newhaven to the castle, at a cost of 13s and an additional 1s 4d to porters (*pynouris*); 200 items of armour (*iic pece hanres*) are promptly taken down to the ships, at a cost of 6s for transport and 1s to porters for carting it, and 200 items of armour (*x score pece harnes*) are taken from the castle to the armourer for polishing (*to the dichtin*) at a cost of 3s (TA iv. 417-18). It is possible that all three entries refer to the same consignment of armour, but, if so, the polishing and carrying to the ships are recorded in reverse order, and it is unlikely that all these movements occurred on one day; nor is it clear whether the references to 'pieces of harness' represent individual components or full sets of armour.

1513, 30 July: To 32 workmen with Robin Borthwick and the wrights, four with the smiths, three in the powder mill, each man at 4s weekly, total £8; to Walter Halliburton, for two weeks' wages, £1; to the constable of the castle his wage, 14s; to Barker the smith, for working 6 waws of iron into gun fittings (*in gwn wirk*), at 14s the waw, total £4 4s; for carrying a tar trough and tar kettle (*ane tar trouch*

and ane tar kettill) from Leith to the castle, 1s 4*d*; for 24st. of tow-ropes to be harness-traces, hauling-traces and back-straps (*thetis, soumes and rigwideis*), at 8s per st., total £9 12s; for a cart to bring them to the castle, 2s; to four men who made the said hauling-traces and gear in the week, £1 4s; for a barrel of tar to them £1; for carrying it to the castle, 6*d*; for 20 pairs of cart wheels for the close carts, at 18s the pair, £18; for carrying each pair of wheels from the market to the castle, 4*d*, total 6s 8*d*; for 200 horse-collar stiffeners (*horse hamys*) at 2*d* the pair, total £1; to the man who brought them from the wood to the castle, 5s; for 12 wooden axles bought in the market for the close carts at 2s each, total £1 4s; for 20 dozen oxbows (*oxin bowis*) at 2s each, total £2; for six dozen yokes, at 6*d* each, total £1 16s; for six dozen cart-saddles fully equipped (*cair sadillis gratht*) at 1s each, total £3 12s; for 36st. copper bought from Hendrik Bardner, Dutchman, which copper is still in the castle, at 16s the stone, £22 7s; for 3,000 double nails at 3s 4*d* the hundred, 5,000 single nails at 1s 8*d* the hundred, 11,000 door nails at 10*d* the hundred, 5,000 window nails at 8*d* the hundred, 4,000 plancher nails at 1s 10*d* the hundred, total £19 1s 8*d*; for a chalder and a half of smithy coals, £1 4s; for the carriage of one chalder of coal to the castle, 4s 4*d*; to carry the half-chalder to the King's Wark at Leith (to the *kingis werk*), 1s 4*d*; for the working of 2 waws of iron in Newhaven, to make tyre-like metal fittings (*doule straikis*) for cart wheels, £1 8s; to a man who brought that ironwork to the castle, 6*d*; to Barker the smith, for working 7 waws of iron into picks, mattocks and crowbars (*pikkes, mattokis, and cavillokis*), at 13s the waw, total £4 18s; for 20 'wisps' of steel to them, at 4s each, total £4; and to Barker for 20 pairs of iron bands for the close carts, at 1s 8*d* each, total £1 3s 4*d* (TA iv. 513–14). *DOST* regards the 'doule straikis' as having something to do with the wooden dowels used to hold together the wooden sections of the tyre's circumference, but the citations offered do not contain demonstrative evidence for this; in the terminology of traditional cartwrights, 'strakes' are a series of iron strips fitted around the wheel, an alternative to a complete circular metal tyre.

1513, 3 August: From the Edinburgh customs revenues, for a great cord for dragging cannons and bombards (*machinas et bumbardos*) from Edinburgh Castle towards the battlefield (*versus campum*), and for the buying of certain pots and pans (*certarum ollarum et patellarum*), delivered to the king's ships at the

time when they sailed towards France, as appears by a certain receipt in the hand of Thomas Schaw, principal cook, extending [together] to £20 5s 8d (*ER* xiv. 55-6). The tow-rope was almost certainly bought in connection with the movement of the guns towards Flodden Field (similar procurements are calendared under 6 August 1513, 13 August 1513, 18 August 1513 and 20 August 1513). There is no evidence that the pots and pans came anywhere near the castle, but their juxtaposition with the tow-rope shows the often idiosyncratic ways in which payments were combined in the account, and the reference to the departure of the fleet (which sailed from the Forth on 25 July 1513 and later called in on the Clyde in August 1513) corroborates the approximate date for the purchase of the rope: hence this entry is calendared at the start of the period for which the relevant set of accounts is concerned, although other entries from the same series are recorded at its end-point on 2 July 1514 (note, however, that sum is said to have been paid out by Janet Paterson, widow of the Lord Provost Alexander Lauder of Blyth, so the debt was probably only settled after the Battle of Flodden on 19 September 1513, when she and Margaret Crichton, the widow of his colleague George Halkerston, took up their husbands' roles as the town's customs officials).

1513, 6 August: To the constable of the castle, 14s; for 80 spades, at 6d each; 20 spade irons at 8d each, 300 shovels (*schulis*) at 4d each, and 300 shovel irons at 6d each; total £19 4s 4d; for ten pairs of iron bands to the close carts, at 1s 8d the pair, and for 30 locks to them, at 3s each, total £5 6s 8d; for 20 plates of white iron to be chains for the close carts and pavillions, at 1s 6d each, total £1 10s; four carts that passed to the wood with Sir John Ramsay for trees to make axles (*extreis*), each hired at 9s for the day, total £1 16s; two carts that passed to Edmonstone for axletrees and two carts that passed to Sheriffhall for axletrees, for one day, £1; to the wrights who cut the trees for the axles (*fellit the extreis*), in drinksilver, 5s; for a great tow-rope to be hauling-traces for the guns, weighing 14st., price of the st., 8s, total £5 12s; four men who made the hauling-traces, each paid 6s in the week, total £1 4s; to Barker the smith, for working 5 waws of iron in bolts and plates for the gun-carriages (*in boltis and plaitis to the gwn stokkis*), 14s per waw, total £3 10s; for ten yokes, 5s; for 11 dozen oxbows, £1 2s; for six pairs of cart wheels, *varie precie* ('at various prices', a Latin phrase), total £5 11s; to the

smith at Newhaven for 10st. weight of tyre-like metal fittings (*doule straikis*) for these wheels, at 5s 8d per st., total £12 18s 6d (TA iv. 514–15). For the nature of ‘*doule straikis*’ see above under 30 July 1513. Sir John Ramsay, is the former Lord Bothwell, indicted for treason 25 years earlier on 9 October 1488, partially rehabilitated by James IV, but at this point supervising tree-cutting in East Lothian rather than participating in international conspiracies.

1513, 13 August: To the constable of the castle, 14s; for half a barrel of tallow to grease the wooden axles at the ‘carting’ of the guns and a half-barrel of free grease (*fre creis*) at £1 4s each, total £2 8s; to two porters (*pynouris*) who brought them from the Netherbow to the castle, 4d; for 2st. of Orkney butter to Robin Borthwick, 1s; for 10st. of small tow-rope to be pulling-ropes for the harness (*smale towis to be eirlederis for the hernys*), 11s per st., total £5 11s; for 143 oxen bought in Dunblane by the master of work and master butcher (*b the maister of werk ad maister fleschar*), at various prices, £208 (TA iv. 515).

1513, 17 August: This day five cannons were fitted out and put on the road (*thar was furneist and ut on gait fyve canonis*), drawn with men to the Netherbow in St Mary’s Wynd, who got drinksilver totalling £14; to five men who waxed (*wolk*) them all night, and looked after the associated equipment (*and kept thaim one thair geir*) 12s (TA iv. 515). It is not entirely clear whether the ‘gear’ pertained to the guns or the waxing process. See Appendix 10: The Artillery.

1513, 18 August: The five cannons depart: the first cannon, pulled by the captain of the castle’s oxen, with eight drivers; the second cannon, drawn by 36 of the king’s oxen and the laird of Dun’s, with nine drivers, the third cannon drawn by 36 belonging to the Prior of Whithorn and two lairds in the south-west of Scotland (*ij lardis in the Westland*), with nine drivers; the fourth cannon pulled by 36 of the king’s oxen, and the fifth cannon by 36 of the king’s and the Provost of Coldstream’s; each cannon is also accompanied by 20 workmen with ten shovels, five pikes and five spades, and has two hauling tows to stabilise it when moving up and down slopes (*tua drawyn towis to keip hir at upwith and dounewith*), those of the first four being furnished directly from among the king’s tow-ropes in the

castle, while the fifth, weighing 10st., was bought at £4, and the men who brought the Provost of Coldingham's oxen had 14s in drinksilver (*TA* iv. 515–16). The campaign wages of approximately 140 drivers and workmen are also given, totalling over £175, but are omitted here as not directly relevant for the castle.

1513, 19 August: Two great culverins and four culverins *più che mezzana* (*twa gros culveringis and four culvering pikmoyance*) are dispatched from the castle and hauled by men to the lower gate of St Mary's Wynd (*the nethir port of Sanct Mary Wynd*), the men being paid £1 10s in drinksilver. Ten men spent the night at the Netherbow where they waxed the guns and guarded their equipment (*wolk thir gunnys and kept thair geir*), being paid 5s (*TA* iv. 516–17). In the text, the payment for the overnight waxing is itemised under the travel costs of the first gun, calendared below under 20 August 1513. The unusual *piu che mezzana* terminology is otherwise known to me only from the artillery schematics in Leonardo da Vinci's *Codex Atlanticus*. See Appendix 10: The Artillery.

1513, 20 August: The rest of the guns begin to move off: the first great culverin has 36 oxen of the king's and nine drivers, while the second has the laird of Dalhousie's oxen, number unspecified, and eight drivers; each is accompanied by 20 workmen with pick-axes, shovels and spades, and has two tow-ropes weighing 8½st., bought for £3 6s; 13s drinksilver is paid to the men who brought the laird of Dalhousie's oxen.

Each culverin *più che mezzana* has four drivers and ten workmen, but there is an odd discrepancy in their team organisation, with the first, third and fourth each being assigned a team of 16 oxen and one horse, procured (*cost*) for £4, and a single tow-rope weighing 4st. and bought for £1 12s, but the second gun is assigned 15 oxen and a horse bought (*bocht*) for 4 French crowns, amounting to £4 4s and two tow-ropes weighing 3½st., bought for £1 8s. The oxen provided for the first and third were all the king's, but part of the team pulling the third gun belonged to the laird of Loch Leven, while the Prioress of Haddington provided the complete team of oxen for the fourth; drinksilver of 7s is paid to the men who brought the oxen from Loch Leven and 14s to the prioress's servants for bringing hers.

These are followed in the accounts by six moyanes, each of which have a team of eight oxen and a horse, two drivers and a man to attend to the horse, and six workmen with shovels, spades and pickaxes, though only the first has a tow-rope, valued at 16s; the first of these (*the first culverinng moyiane*) has oxen supplied by the laird of Restalrig (*Lestalrig*), those of the second are from Andrew Aytoun and Rob Arnot, the oxen for the third are the laird of Kellie's from Fife and Angus, the fourth has the laird of Balgonie's (*Bawgonyis*), those of the fifth are from the Prior of Sweetheart (*New Abbay*), and those pulling the sixth are the king's, while all the horses are newly bought on the royal account for varying sums totalling £21 8s.

These are accompanied by a crane (*ane cran*) drawn by a team similar to those of a culverin moyane, which also carries eight dozen newly bought 'forebows' (*forebowis*), 28 pack-horses carrying creels full of cannonballs (*hors with creillis ... to cary gun stanis*); four carts carrying between them 16 barrels of powder and a number of arquebuses (*xvi barrelis powder and haukbuschis*), four more powder-carts, one more with cannonballs, and one that was originally intended to carry gunpowder but eventually carried bread; two close carts each drawn by two horses; 26 men accompanying Robin Borthwick carrying the rammers (*chargeouris*), two carts of spades, shovels, pickaxes and mattocks provided by the water-carriers (*burneledaris*) of Edinburgh; and Barker the smith with two servants, a hired smith and six hired horses carrying his iron and coals and his smithing equipment (*werklumys*).

The account continues with a weekly wage payment dated 20 August 1513 for 40 workmen involved in dispatching the guns, close carts, powder, cannonballs and other ordnance, at 4s weekly, totalling £8. This is followed by a combination of back pay and campaign pay for castle craftsmen: the master wright John Drummond and his servants are paid a month's advance of £19 8s 'to pass in England', while many artisans who had been working to prepare the artillery get their week's pay and also a fortnight's advance to join the invasion: Thom Duncan and his servants on £2 16s; Andrew Carver, John Henderson, Robin Landells, each with two servants, on £1 12s; William Young and his servant on £1 2s, William Mayne and his five servants on £2 19s, Walter Haliburton and James Gourlay on 10s. Rob Scot the smith and his two servants on £1 10s weekly, were given a month's wage to accompany the army, and his brother was also recruited for £2. Some craftsmen seem to have remained in the castle, however: no campaign pay

is given to Thom Cameron in the powder mill paid at £2, or his man Stewart, separately paid at £1 4s, nor to William Aikenhead and his servant, who get 16s, or Thom Gourlay and his sons, on £1; the smiths Monypenny and Ramsay are given 10s specifically 'to work at home in the Castle' to provide additional equipment for the army. James Carver, on £1 1s weekly along with his man, was given a fortnight's advance go to Stirling rather than accompany the army.

Last but not least, a horse carrying four arquebuses (*haukbuschis*) to join the army is paid £2 8s for a week's wages, presumably for its attendant and fodder.

The siege train also included a number of master masons, their servants and quarriers totalling at least 34 men.

Then come the tents – John Hartside and his four servants had been working on them for three weeks, with a total pay of £5 0s 4d, while Hunter the smith was given £2 17s 8d for ironwork, and two shoemakers (*soutaris*) were paid 8s for two days' work dressing the tanned hides which were added to the king's pavilion; additional tents were made for the heralds and for Robin Borthwick; John Forman [probably the knight who an English source describes as the Scottish 'sergeant porter', i.e. the commander of a palace guard detail, rather than his nephew the Abbot of Kilwinning] led 40 men for putting up and taking down the tents, on a wage of £36, while they were transported by the carters Thom Branwood (with two carts), Will Logan and John Cunningham; Will Logan also brought two further carts with the king's coffers.

The last set of entries before the army's departure are for flags – St Andrew's and St Margaret's banners, requiring 4 ells of blue taffeta between them, the king's banner, made from 4 ells of red taffeta, and the king's standard, made from 3 ells of taffeta of unspecified colours; the 'banners and standards' (*baneris and standartis*) were fringed with 14oz of sewing silk costing £3 10s, with a further £2 being paid to the woman who made the fringes of the 'banner and standards' (*baner and standartis*); four tanned sheepskins (*basand skinnis*) were bought to make their cases for 14s, and a man was paid 10s to wait while they were being finished and hurry after the army with them. Simultaneously, ten hanks of gold were bought for £2 10s and given to the captain of the castle's wife [Katherine Turing] for work on the king's heraldic surcoat (*the kingis coit armour*, as the account then notes, the king had bought himself a new suit of armour for from Sir

David Guthrie on 19 April 1513, with the implication that it required some modification or remaking). Lastly, the [unidentified] author of the accounts himself was paid £16 by the constable to furnish all his needs (*till furneis us all necessaris*) (TA iv. 517–20).

For the types of guns here, see Appendix 10: The Artillery. The total number of guns is corroborated by English sources – seemingly, none of the small-calibre carriage-guns called falcons accompanied the army, though a number of swivel-mounted arquebuses did, some carried on gunpowder carts, others on a pack-horse; but the amount of work and material put towards ‘close carts’ would suggest that a total of more than two had been built to join the campaign; the failure to mention them may reflect the fact that they did not require hired horses. Caldwell (1982), p 157 says that the crane was for moving the guns on and off their carriages if required; *DOST* is unable to explain what the ‘forebows’ it carried were. Notwithstanding the possibility of such omissions, this represents the most detailed source for a Scottish artillery train on campaign, and it is notable that it was very much a mobilisation of the castle workforce, including not only the foundry workers and the smiths and carpenters, but also the hired personnel, such as the carters who brought material from Leith and elsewhere; it is somewhat frustrating that there seems to be no evidence to identify the author of the accounts.

A note can be added about the flags whose hasty construction concludes the entry. A ‘banner’ meant a normal rectangular flag: ‘St Andrew’s Banner’ would presumably be the Scottish saltire, while the king’s red banner was probably the lion rampant; the third banner, also blue, was probably gold cross surrounded by birds which denoted the Anglo-Saxon royal dynasty, and proclaimed James’s status as direct heir of England’s early kings. A ‘standard’, in contrast, was a long narrow flag of more complex design, with the national arms, heraldic animals and symbols, and a motto emblazoned on diagonal stripes – the one aboard the *Great Michael* had the saltire on a blue section beside the flagpole, then the lion and unicorn (TA iv. 477); it might also have had thistles (green and purple thread were provided), and the royal motto *In My Defens*. Once again, Katherine Turing, the captain of the castle’s wife, was called on to provide needlework, this time for the king’s surcoat.

1513, 29 August: The [unidentified] keeper of the artillery accounts is sent back to the castle to get cannon wheels, cannonballs and oxen; he pays for six horses to carry cannonballs at £4 4s; 20 men, each with a horse, to carry 20 dozen spears to Coldstream at £6; brings 22 oxen of John Forman's from Falkland, with three drovers, costing £3 for movement to the Border, 6s 8d for the ferry on the Tweed, and £1 to the three men in England; and brings 12st. of tow-cable bought by Master Finlay Ramsay for a total of £6 12s, plus 14s to a man and horse to carry them to the army (TA iv. 517-20).

1513, 9 September: The Battle of Flodden is fought in northern England. King James IV is missing in action and presumed dead, while the entire Scottish artillery train is captured by English forces the next morning. The throne passes to the infant James V, and a turbulent regency ensues. Nonetheless, Robert Borthwick, John Drummond and their personnel return to the castle and set about rebuilding the arsenal.

Section E: 1513-1603

This section covers the period of 90 years after the Battle of Flodden, comprising the reigns of James V, Mary Queen of Scots and James VI. This was an extended period of political instability in which an increasing emphasis was placed on Edinburgh Castle's military role as a fortress, arsenal and weapons factory. In parallel, changing fashions and social expectations led to a decline in the castle's importance as a royal residence. These changes reached a climax in 1603 when King James VI rode south to London to peacefully inherit the English throne - an event which marked the effective end of the castle's regular use as a royal residence and also greatly diminished its military importance. In this complex period, the sources become more varied and fragmented, with detailed narrative records, precise expense accounts and varied governmental records, but due to the quantity of material it has not been possible to consult and calendar every reference for this period in the exhaustive way that has been

attempted for the years down to 1513. For this reason, although the coverage of this section notionally continues down to 1603, the final entry in the calendar is to 1585.

1514, 20 February: Patrick Crichton of Cranston Riddell, knight, Captain of Edinburgh Castle, presents a report to the queen dowager and the lords of the council; this states that they know that the castle is lacking in 'artillery and other things necessary for its defence', and that the Sieur de la Bastie and Robert Borthwick have at their instruction designed a system of 'bulwarks and trenches' to be manned by defending soldiers and artillery, but that this plan means nothing if it is not completed (*the castel quhil is ane of the principale strenthis of the realme is now desolat of artalery and uther thingis necessar for defens and keping therof, and now latly Monsr. Delebawty and Robert Borthuik hes of your causing visit the said castell ad hes devisit bulwerkis and trinchis to be made before the place and siclike within the castell to be stuffit with men and artalzery for defens therof in tyme of the assalt gif ony beis maid be or anymis, the quhilk devise without it be put to executioun and fulfilit in deid is vane*); therefore, he asks them to immediately deploy workmen to complete the planned fortifications, under the direction of Borthwick or other appropriate supervisors, with a view to completing them before the next military campaigning season begins, and asks them to arrange for sufficient soldiers, rations, weaponry, fuel and other provisions for the garrison (*caus werkmen be put incontinent to fulfil the said devise as salbe schewin to thame be Robert Borthuik and uther wis men sic as ye ples to assigne thereto and that without delay, sen that is gret werk to be maid baith within the castell and utouth and the tyme is schort, for the symmer sesoun approchis fast, and als that ye wll provide in tyme for furnissing of the said castell with men, vittalis, artalzery, fewel and sic uther thingis as is necessar for keping therof in tyme of weir*); he also asks for payment of his pension, as the shielings allocated for it have been ravaged and the sheep there have been rustled (*the forest stedis that war assignit to the pament therof ar layt waste, and my gudis that war theron restand stollin*), and due to the unsettled situation he must now command a larger garrison of guards on the ramparts, towers, gates and elsewhere (*wachmen, garatouris, portaris and utheris servandis*); he states that he stands ready, along with his family and associates (*kyn and frendis*), to do everything in his power to

defend the castle; he also asks for confirmation that he has presented this report, and a brief note is added on the back of the sheet by the clerk register (Hannay (1916), pp 3–4). It is not entirely clear if the attack on Yarrow was caused by English military action, or simply the result on an upsurge of unrest among the Borderer clans; Crichton's pay was provided by 14 July 1514, out of those Border wool revenues that had been successfully gathered by the government. Antoine d'Arces, Sieur de la Bastie, was a French gentleman who had previously visited Scotland as a tournament fighter (see Addendum) and was now acting in a military capacity.

1514, 14 July: From the revenues of Ettrick Forest, allowed by the accountant in payment made to Patrick Crichton, knight, for 200 marks for keeping Edinburgh Castle in the year of account, £133 6s 8d (*ER* xiv. 17). The captain's salary continues to be met from the same source, though now the accounts no longer link to specific shielings contracted to him (on 20 February 1514, he noted that these had been attacked, either by the English or unruly Borderers); instead, the accounts total up all the revenues of Ettrick to £2,781 12s 9d, and use the consolidated sum to meet various expenses, among which his pay is the first item listed (and the second largest, after Lord Home's salary of £300 as March Warden). The date under which the entry is calendared is the end-point for the relevant set of accounts, covering a period beginning on 30 July 1513. Beginning with the next set of accounts, calendared under 25 September 1515, the system of paying Crichton directly from the Border flocks is abandoned, and customs revenues on wool exported through Edinburgh are used instead.

1514, 2 July: from the Edinburgh customs revenues, to the chaplain celebrating in the chapel newly built under the wall of Edinburgh Castle (i.e. the Chapel at the Barras), receiving annually 20 marks, in the time of this account and at the risk of the accountant, £13 6s 8d. In payment made to the chaplain celebrating in the chapel inside Edinburgh Castle, taking annually £20 from the said customs, for the said year of account, £10 (*ER* xiv. 54). The date at which these entries are calendared is the end-point for the relevant set of accounts, beginning on 3 August 1513.

1515, 25 July: £12 12s to Old Julian the Italian (*Auld Juliane, Italiane*) for 6,000 tiles made by him and received by Robin Borthwick's servitors, to make a new furnace for gun-founding in Edinburgh Castle; £3 10s to a certain Will Custe (*ane Wille Custe*) for carrying seven dozen loads (*sex dusane ane laid*) of the foresaid tiles from Tranent to Edinburgh Castle (*TA* v. 18-19). 'Old Julian' is presumably Julian Drummond, the Italian trombone player who led the royal brass band, alongside his son of the same name.

1515, 1 August: £20 is delivered to Robin Borthwick, master founder and gunner (*master foundar gunnar*) to provide wooden fittings (*stokkis*), iron, charcoal and other necessities for casting certain guns in the castle; he is to give account thereof to the French soldier Captain Jehan Bousquet (*Johne Bukat, francheman*) by the receipt of Pierre (*Peris*) his servant (*TA* v. 19). Bousquet was a representative of the Duke of Albany, appointed as 'Commissioner of the Artillery' (*TA* v. 71), while 'Peris' is almost certainly the man known in Scottish documents as Paris Rowane, who later succeeded Borthwick as master gunner and master of the foundry. In later usage, a reference to wooden gun-stocks would suggest handguns, but in 16th-century Scottish usage the term could also apply to the wheeled gun-carriages of heavy artillery; see below 19 September 1515 and, for further gunfounding, 16 February 1516.

1515, 1 August: To Duncan Carter (*Dokan, cartar*), for 11 carts which laboured a whole day carrying guns, cannonballs, powder, coffer and other artillery out of Edinburgh Castle and Holyrood to Leith; at 9s per cart, a total of £4 19s (*TA* v. 28). Also noted at around this time are a payment to Duncan Carter of £2 3s for 24 horses or six cart-teams (*makand vj cartill*) for carrying two of the artillery pieces called moyens, with cannonballs, powder and certain arquebuses 'out of Edinburgh' to Linton and back again; part-payment of wages to ten gunners totalling £16 16s, part wages in French crowns to gunners named 'Adriane Frened' and 'Thomas Waiche' (presumably Frenchmen called Adrien Frenet and Thomas Vache) totalling £3 10s, and payment of £2 2s to John Quarrier to travel (*pass*) with the guns and gunners (*TA* v. 28-9).

1515, 18 August: £2 16s is delivered to Robert Borthwick to hire servitors to go with him with the artillery towards Hume Castle (*TA* v. 19).

1515, 3 September: £2 16s is delivered to Robert Borthwick to hire workmen for the guns in the castle (*TA* v. 19).

1515, 10 September: To three metalworkers (*hammyrmen*) for 12 days' work in the castle at 8*d* per day, total £1 4s (*TA* v. 37).

1515, 12 September: To Duncan Carter, £3 18s 8*d* for his cart, working in carrying artillery armour, halberds, pikes and spears for six days between Holyrood and Edinburgh Castle, as contained in Captain Bousquet's account; and 18s to him for two days' labour bringing clay tiles (*tyld*) from Tranent to the castle (*TA* v. 37). See also 25 July 1515 for the tiles, which were for rebuilding the gunfoundry.

1515, 13 September: £4 is delivered to Robert Borthwick, by the receipt of his servitor Pierre (*Peris*) in part-payment of his wages (*TA* v. 19).

1515, 19 September: 13s to Robert Borthwick, in full payment for men working prior to this date on gun-carriage and wheels in the castle (*gun stokkis and quhelis*) (*TA* v. 19).

1515, 25 September: From the Edinburgh customs revenues, £13 6s 9*d* to the chaplain of the Chapel the Barras, 'at risk', and £10 to the chaplain in the chapel of Edinburgh Castle (*ER* xiv. 102). Neither entry is printed in full. The date at which these entries are calendared is the date at which the accounts were audited, covering the period from 28 July 1514 to 20 September 1515.

1515, 25 September: From the customs revenues of Edinburgh, in payment made to Alan Cochrane, armourer, £11 4s owed for sustaining the expenses of six Frenchmen, viz. four gunners and two carpenters (*sex Gallorum, videlicet quator machinatorum et duorum carpentariorum*), for five weeks by the written command (*per preceptum*) of the lords of the council, [paid] at the risk of Margaret Crichton. And by the said Margaret, in payment made to Alan Cochrane, armourer, for the cleaning of arms and armour placed in Edinburgh Castle (*pro mundatione armorum locatorum in castro Edinburgi*), £10, the said Alan being present and taking payment on account. And by the same Margaret, in payment made to George Gunnar [and] Jasper Smyth, smiths of the lord king in Edinburgh Castle, of £38 10s for their fees, by the written command of the lords of council (*ER* xiv. 104–5, 107). These entries form part of the same set of accounts as the chaplains' fees calendared immediately above under the same date but seem sufficiently different in context to warrant a separate entry. It should be noted that while Alan Cochrane's £10 fee as armourer is explicitly said to be for equipment located in the castle, it can only be inferred that the gunners were also based there; similarly, the castle had not been mentioned when Cochrane's £10 fee was paid the previous year, nor when its arrears were settled for £15 in 1522 (*ER* xiv. 55, 466). George Gunnar and Jasper Smyth may be George the Dutch smith and his assistant, mentioned in the accounts from 19 March 1513 onwards. Margaret Crichton was a niece of King James III, the daughter of a relationship between the king's sister and Lord Crichton (there seems to be no conclusive evidence to show whether or not she was legitimated by a marriage between them); she was also the young widow of two prominent Edinburgh merchants, was soon to marry the Earl of Rothes as her third husband, and had inherited her second husband's role as one of the capital's tax officials after Flodden (see 3 August 1513).

25 September 1515: From the customs revenues of Edinburgh by Margaret Crichton, in payments made to Patrick Crichton of Cranston, knight, Captain of Edinburgh Castle, in 200 marks for certain expenses made by the same captain in repair of the said Castle, in walls near the tower of the well (*in muris prope turrim fontis*) and in the postern-head (*in capite de le postrom*), and for the construction of buildings (*in construction domorum*), viz. the brewhouse and bakehouse (*le*

browhous et baikhous), and for construction of the portcullis of the forward tower (*le portculis anterioris turris*), with iron chains and other necessaries by the command of the queen [Dowager Margaret Tudor] and the lord governor [the Duke of Albany] with their signature (*manibus forum subscriptis*), showing on account £133 6s 8d (*ER* xiv. 108). Part of the same series of accounts as the two preceding entries also calendared under 25 September 1515. For the identity of Margaret Crichton, see the second of these entries.

1515, 28 September: £1 8s to Robert Borthwick to hire workmen (*TA* v. 19).

1515, 2 October: 10s to a wright called Johnson, for mounting two light artillery pieces on gun-carriages (*the stoking of tua falcons*) in Edinburgh Castle, as attested by Robin Borthwick (*TA* v. 44).

1515, 13 October: To Robert Borthwick on his departure for Glasgow, for necessary outlay for bringing home part of the artillery and powder, and for his wages (*for the hamebringing of part of artalzery and powdir, and in his wagis*), £5 17s (*TA* v. 19). The royal warships *Margaret* and *James* had arrived at Dumbarton in June 1515, and fourteen guns from them, including two heavy cannons, had been taken by boat to Glasgow (*TA* v. 16–18, 38).

1515, 2 November: For parchment and paper for writing down the accounts of the exchequer, carrying the rolls from the castle towards the exchequer house, and the [re]placing of them [back in the castle], £3 6s 8d (*ER* xiv. 121). The date under which the entry is calendared is that on which the audit in question took place.

1515, 19 December: To Captain Bousquet (*Cabdene Bukket*) for the pointing and mending of stairs in the castle, £2 2s (*TA* v. 52). See further 24 December 1515.

1515, 24 December: To Captain Bousquet (*Cabdene Bukket*) in complete payment for mending the Lang Stair in the castle, a further £2 2s beyond the £2 2s paid on 19 December 1515 (*TA v. 52*).

1516, 11 January: To Nicholas Allardyce (*Allirdas*), mason, in part-payment of a greater sum owed him for 39 days' work with two servants in Edinburgh Castle, and for sand and lime bought by him, £2s (*TA v. 67*). See below 18 January 1516, where the debt is stated as £8 18s.

1516, 18 January: To Allardyce the mason, £2 in part-payment of the £8 18s owed to him for work done in Edinburgh Castle (*TA v. 69*). A second payment of £2, following 11 January 1516.

1516, 16 February: To Robert Borthwick, master gunner (*maister gunnar*), £10 to pay the wages of the workmen and necessaries of the guns being made this day in Edinburgh Castle (*TA v. 72*). This is preceded by several references to artillery construction that would have almost certainly taken place in the castle, although the location is not explicitly mentioned there: on 10 January 1516 Robin Borthwick, as master gunfounder (*maistar foundar of the gunnis*) was paid £24 out of £50 owed for his hiring workmen and buying necessities in connection with gunfounding (*for the founding of certane artalzery*), at the Regent Albany's command; on 12 January 1516, John Drummond was paid £20 to provide wrights and timber to make gun-carriages (*for gun cartis*), then on 14 January 1516 Borthwick was paid £10 10s for five waws of iron bought for making gun-moulds and other necessaries, and on 22 January 1516 he had £12 12s to pay off the remainder of the £50 owed. See also previously 1 August 1515.

1516, 23 March: £5 5s to John Kelso (*Kelsaucht*), slater of Stirling, to buy slate for the castle in Edinburgh (*to by skalze for the castel in Edinburgh*) (*TA v. 115*). It is not clear from the phrasing whether the slate was being bought for use in Edinburgh Castle by a roofer from Stirling or bought in Edinburgh for roofing Stirling Castle.

1516, 1 April: 5s 4d to Duncan Carter (*Docan, cartar*) for transporting four carts of baggage (*tursing of liij cartis with ger*) from the castle to Holyrood (*TA* v. 117).

1516, 15 April: £2 2s is given to the chancellor (*my lord chancellor*, Archbishop Beaton) to give to Lord Dacre's man (*TA* v. 77).

1516, 16 April: At the castle, the French minstrel named Bontemps (*Boynetampns*, 'Goodtimes') is paid £3 at the Regent Albany's command (*TA* v. 77). This is one of several references to this minstrel, who seems to have accompanied the regent's household, suggesting that Albany was at the castle for some sort of public event.

1516, 9 April: The Duke of Albany holds a meeting in the castle with Lord Home. They appear to get on well, and Home is restored to his position of chamberlain and to his property and positions, though a few months later, he is subsequently arrested and executed (*Diurnal*, pp 6-7).

1516, 28 April: A lock, key and iron bands are provided for the door of the king's stable in the castle (*TA* v. 112). Included among the personal expenses of the infant James V, this may relate to a secure stable inside the walls of the castle, rather than the associated **King's Stables** at the western end of the Grassmarket.

1516, 11 May: £2 2s 10d to Thomas Carver for the furnishing of the gunpowder store (*grathing of the powdir hous*) in the castle (*TA* v. 79).

1516, 15 September: From the Edinburgh customs revenue, to the chaplain in the chapel at the Barras, at risk, £13 6s 8d. To the chaplain in Edinburgh Castle, £20 (*ER* xiv. 199-200). Not printed in full. Part of a set of accounts covering the period from 25 September 1515 to the date at which it is here calendared.

1516, 15 September: From the Edinburgh customs revenues, by Margaret Crichton, in payment made to Sir Patrick Crichton of Cranston Riddell, Captain of Edinburgh Castle, £66 13s 4*d* in part-payment of his fee for Whitsun term 1516 for keeping Edinburgh Castle by command of the lord governor [the Duke of Albany], by a precept signed by him. And by John Hamilton, in payment made to Sir Patrick Crichton of Cranston Riddell, Captain of Edinburgh Castle, for keeping the said castle, 100 marks for Martinmas term 1516, the said Sir Patrick the captain presenting his receipt signed by himself, £66 13s 4*d* (*ER* xiv. 202). Part of the same set of accounts as the chaplains' fees calendared above under the same date. John Hamilton, an Edinburgh merchant, now joins Margaret Crichton (for whom see 3 August 1513 and 25 September 1515) as one of the officials managing the town's tax revenues. These entries mark a shift away from the use of Border shielings to pay the captain's fee, probably due to disruption caused by the ongoing war with England, although wool revenues still amount for the vast majority of the sum involved. The precept by Albany authorising the Whitsun payment was also used to pay £21 15s to four chamber 'servants' attending the infant James V, the first-named of whom was perhaps the grandson of the captain of the castle, still described as a 'bairn' a decade later, and presumably similar in age to the three-year-old king (December 1526).

1516, 26 September: For parchment and paper for writing the accounts of the exchequer, carrying the rolls from the castle towards the exchequer house, and the [re]placing of them [back in the castle], £3 6s 8*d* (*ER* xiv. 222). The date under which the entry is calendared is that on which the audit in question took place.

1517, 10 February: To John Kelso, slater, for work done on various buildings (*on sindry hous*) in the castle, four lightweight French crowns, equivalent to £2 16s (*TA* v. 153). It is not clear why the printed text indicates that this entry belongs in 1517 and not 1518, the date which would be suggested by previous entries in the series.

1517, 15 February: Among a large number of expenses in connection with two large-scale raiding campaigns on the Border in Berwickshire, £6 is paid to John the smith for eight days' labour in the castle on ironwork for guns with three servants, after which he accompanied the army for 16 days with one servant and his bellows and equipment (*belleis and werk lowmes*), and £6 13s 4d is paid to John Drummond, wright, also working in the castle with three servitors, equipping and repairing gun-carriages and gun-wheels (*in grathing and mending of cartis and gun quhels*), and then also accompanying the army (*TA* v. 156).

1517, 18 March: 4s 8d to the men who brought the guns out of the castle, and 13s for lead to make cannonballs (*TA* v. 157). This evidently relates to the campaigning in Berwickshire for which preparations are recorded under 15 February 1517, but the entries are somewhat out of order, with this entry occurring after references to the guns at Lauder and infantry at Soutra, and it is the date of those entries from which its calendar date is taken; it is not totally clear if preceding entries relating to iron and fittings bought for the guns 'at their departure for Edrington', keys and a lock for gun chests, and six large leather bags for powder, refer to activity in the castle, or later procurement on campaign at Lauder.

1517, 12 April: £4 16s for two dozen Eastland boards bought in Leith by John Drummond to be doors, windows and their frames (*durres, wyndois and casis*) for the castle; 18s for a dozen oak spars (*alikin sparris*), 4s for two carts with said stuff from Leith to the castle; 8s 9d for 26 loads of sawn Eastland board and nine loads of ash trees (*eschin treis*; perhaps worked trunks or beams); 6s for 600 door nails, 1s 6d for 100 window nails, 2s for 100 plancher nails; £1 8s 8d for 4st. 12lb of ironwork made into bands, hinges and for the castle work, bought from John the smith; and £2 10s to six wrights working for five days in the castle with John Drummond refurbishing (*reparaland*) the Great Hall with windows and shutters (*windois and breddis*), each man taking 1s 8d daily for food and pay (*TA* v. 118-19). Parts of this work are also covered in the sequence of entries on 23 April 1517.

1517, 23 April: 10s to Robert Balze (Bailie?) for flooring the lord's hall in **David's** Tower (*for fluring of the lordis hall in David tour*); £5 to Mr John Carpenter,

wright, for the materials and workmanship (*for fynding of all manner of trein werk and werkmanschip*) for seven single cases for the windows in the Great Hall (*single casis for the gret hall windois*), and two double window-cases for the **King's Chamber** (*double casis for the Kingis Chambir*); £1 19s for [26 ells] of French canvas called [veten] bought for filling and forming panes in the foresaid seven large window-cases (*for stenting and fenistring to the said vij gret casis*), as desired by the Regent Albany; 4s for two pairs of twin hinges (*ij par of double gemmay bandis*) for the king's chamber window(s); £4 2s for two great joists bought in Leith, each 42ft long and 1ft square; 4s for bringing the said joists to the castle; £3 14s 8d for 16 double dales bought in Leith for flooring the middle apartment of David's Tower (*the myd chamir in David Toure*); 8s to 12 workmen clearing and carrying the fallen rubble and earth at the falling down of the two great joists in David's Tower for a whole day, each man at 8d daily; to 21 porters (*pinoris*) on another day in the castle, drawing, hoisting and putting up the two great joists on the middle floor (*drawand, heand and upputtand the ij gret jeists in the myd chamir*); 8s 9½d for 448 plancher nails for flooring the said ceiling (*loft*) at 2s the hundred; for an iron grapnel (*crepar of irne*) made for taking up the rope that fell down (*the toll that fell*); £2 14s 4d to four wrights working in the castle with John Drummond in David's Tower, remaining there for eight days at 1s 8d per man daily; note that they wrought two tables, four pairs of table-leg trestles and four benches (*ij burdis, iij traistis, iijj formis*), one great hanging gate for the lead roof (*j gret hungin zet for the leddis*), one door and one window for the king's kitchen, 684½ square feet of floor (*ij rud of lofting*) in David's Tower, framing (*sintreis*) for the chimney in the new court kitchen and other small things in the Gunhouse; for candle for the masons when taking down three chimneys (*thre chymnays*) in David's Tower; 2d for a line of skein thread (*skanze threid*); £1 4s for 36 loads of lime bought for building the said kitchen chimney at 8d a load; 15s 4d for 91 loads of sand at 2d per load, and 19s for 54 loads of water to make mortar at 2s the dozen; £4 4s to six master masons hewing stones for a pointed arch or vault (*hewand owgerus*) for the said chimney, taking down the great chimney and making it again, each man taking 2s 4d daily for meat, fee, dinner and a light luncheon (*nownschankis*); 15s to John Kirk master mason and deacon, for his work at this time; £2 14s 4d to eight barrowmen for six days at 10d per man daily; 12s for two long iron bands each measuring 37in. (*ilk ane elne lang*) with two large hinges (*gret crukis*) for the barrier gate leading to the lead roof (*the barres zet of*

the leddis), two bands for the king's kitchen, and two bands for the window of the same, weighing 2st. when made, price per st. (*pretium pecie*) 6s; 10s to two sawers working two and a half days, each getting 2s daily; 3s for the 'key silver' of the said chimney (drinksilver paid when the keystone was placed and the project was complete?), before the framing was removed (*or the syntreis war strikin*); £1 5s paid at Calton Hill (*Cragingalt*) to 25 workmen bearing all the munitions, viz. pikes, halberds, bills, mattocks, spades, shovels and body armour with limb armour (*halcrikkis, with splenttis*), from the **Captain's Tower** to the Gunhouse, over a day and a half at 1s 6d per man daily; 10s 8d to Robert Borthwick for workmen whom he caused to carry all the stuff out of the Great Hall to the artillery house (*artalze hous*), wheels and gunstocks and other woodwork (*uthir treis*); 3s 8d to 14 porters (*pynoris*) who brought the artillery into the castle when the king arrived in Edinburgh (*TA v. 120-2*).

This set of entries seems to record a full-scale refit of the castle's primary accommodation and service spaces, with the payments apparently not entered in chronological order. In **David's Tower**, the king's apartment on the top floor received new windows with hinged panes (the glazing of these was perhaps among that paid for on 24 May 1517 and the bill for furnishing the rooms was probably settled on 28 August 1517), while a heavy 'barrier gate' was built to control access from an adjacent lead roof, presumably the one on top of the Palace range. The removal of three chimneys in the tower and an internal collapse of material including earth as well as rubble can probably be associated with the massive thickening added to the tower's eastern wall in the early 16th century to resist artillery, which has been discovered by archaeologists; the collapse evidently required the clearing out of rubble, the complete replacement of the timber floor and joists of the middle apartment or 'mid chalmer', and repairs to a flagstone floor of the Lord's Hall on the floor beneath; the two tables with their benches said to have been built for David's Tower correspond with the ones recorded in the hall and the outer room of the king's apartment on 26 March 1567, and indicate that its furniture was also replaced.

There are also continuing references to the refurbishment of the windows and doors in the Great Hall, which had begun with the outlays recorded on 12 April 1517, specifying seven windows with panes filled with a special French fabric recommended by the Duke of Albany; these windows probably did not open, as

there is no mention of hinges, but the previous outlay shows that they did have shutters. This is presumably the separate Great Hall on Crown Square, rather than additional refurbishment to the Lord's Hall in David's Tower; the refurbishment was presumably necessary because the hall had previously been used to store artillery and armaments, which were removed from here and from the **Captain's Tower** to the Gunhouse; in addition, work was performed in at least one kitchen – in the 'new court kitchen', a chimney was dismantled and rebuilt with a new pointed arch of carved stones, and in 'the King's kitchen', a new iron-bound door and window were put in place. Potentially, facilities would need to be upgraded both for the royal suite in David's Tower, as the flues from the tower's lower storeys had been dismantled, and in the Great Hall, which had presumably been put back into use.

1517, 24 May: £8 6s 8d to Thomas Peebles, glasswright, by the Regent's precept, for the work done in the castle (*TA* v. 124).

1517, June: The start of a period for which pay records appear for Robert Borthwick and six other gunners (*aliis machinatoribus*), remaining in Edinburgh Castle for the keeping (*pro custodia*) of the lord king, the said Robert taking monthly £10, and each of the other six taking monthly £4 2s; the first record covers their pay for three months, viz. June 1517, July 1517 and August 1517, extending to £103 16s particularly examined on account, and by the command of the lord governor [the Duke of Albany], signed by his hand and showing on account (*ER* xiv. 285). Paid out of the comptroller's accounts for the period from 12 October 1516 to 3 September 1517. See below 1 September 1517 and 25 August 1518 for continuing payments.

1517, 19 June: £8 to an Englishman who presented cloth-of-gold from England to the king in the castle (*TA* v. 126). This was evidently a present from the Dowager Queen Margaret to her son; she was returning from a period of exile in England and crossed the border on 15 June 1517.

1517, 16 July: £3 for building archery targets for the four-year-old James V (*the Kingis buttis*) in the castle (*TA* v. 112). These may have been at the Butts. Additional debts relating to them were met in a subsequent payment of £4 10s 8d on 25 July 1517, which also settled all the other outstanding expenses for James V and his brother since his accession.

1517, 28 August: £3 to Master Gavin Dunbar, the king's schoolmaster, for the outlay he made in repairing the chamber in the castle where the king now studies (*the chamir in the quhilk the King leris now in the castell*); £25 2s; to Lord Borthwick for beds and tables, etc. (*beddis and burdis etc.*) and other necessary things made by him in the castle and delivered to Lord Ruthven, by command of the lords; £1 for work done by the master cook similarly in the castle for keeping the king's property (*the Kingis stuff*) (*TA* v. 129). These entries are presumably associated with the work calendared primarily under 23 April 1517.

1517, 22 August: From the Edinburgh customs revenue, to Sir James Ellem, chaplain, for the fee of the exchequer house (*pro feodo domus saccarii*) in the year of this account and the preceding year, £13 6s 8d. For the chaplain in Edinburgh Castle, £10. And to Sir Patrick Crichton, Captain of Edinburgh Castle, for keeping of the same, at 200 marks for Whitsun and Martinmas terms [in the period] of this account, to him by his signed receipt, £133 6s 8d (*ER* xiv. 269). Part of a set of accounts covering the period from 21 October 1516 to the date on which it is here calendared, with the comptroller, Robert Barton, now acting as customar of the burgh. Sir James Ellem was the chaplain of the Chapel at the Barras, but the money given to him here appears to be the rent of a building in which to perform the audit of royal expenses – conceivably his chapel itself. The entry for the castle chaplain is not printed in full.

1517, 25 August: £1 2s paid to Patrick Donaldson, servant in the wardrobe (*in the wardropar*), for sundry necessaries bought and made by him in the castle in the Wardrobe House (*wardrophous*) (*TA* v. 130).

1517, 1 September: Allowed by the accountant for payment made to three lords, viz. Borthwick, Ruthven and Erskine, each of them taking £200 for the third part of a year, from 1 September 1517 to 1 September 1518, paid by the accountant at his own risk, £500; allowed by the accountant for payment made to Sir Patrick Crichton of Cranston Riddell, knight, receiving annually 400 marks for keeping the said castle of Edinburgh during the residence of the lord king in the same and until the arrival of the lord governor [the Duke of Albany], from 1 September 1517 to 1 September 1518, £256 13s 4d; allowed by the accountant for payment made to Robert Borthwick and six other gunners (*aliis machinatoribus*), remaining in Edinburgh Castle for guarding (*pro custodia*) of the lord King, the said Robert taking monthly £10 and each of the other six taking monthly £4 2s, viz. from 1 September 1517 to 1 September 1518, totalling £415 14s (*ER* xiv. 349). Lord Borthwick, Lord Ruthven and Lord Erskine were now acting as the king's personal 'keepers' in Edinburgh Castle. The pay for the gunners follows on from that calendared under June 1517. These entries occur together in the Comptroller's accounts for the period from 3 September 1517 to 25 September 1518 but are calendared under the start of the period which they cover; the next payments are calendared under 25 August 1518.

1517, 3 September: For parchment, paper for writing the accounts of the exchequer, carrying the rolls from the castle towards the exchequer house, and the [re]placing of them [back in the castle], £3 6s 8d (*ER* xiv. 289). This is part of the same series of accounts as the entry calendared under June 1517; the date under which the entry is calendared is that on which the audit in question took place.

1517, 6 October: To six porters (*pynouris*) who brought all the armour and spears (*hearnes and speris*) out of Holyrood and carted them into the outer courtyard (*the uter clois*), which are now in the castle (*TA* v. 150).

1517, 26 December: For William Fullarton, servitor to the Captain of Milan, for work made in the castle in his master's chamber, such as windows, doors, locks and a closet, £4 8s 6d (*TA* v. 152). It seems likely that this refers to work done at

Edinburgh, where Allan Stewart, former commander of the Castello Sforza in Milan, was now garrison commander, but it may in fact refer to Dumbarton Castle, where he was also titular commander, as the next entry is a £3 9s purchase payment for a copper kettle sent there.

1518, 10 August: £9 12s for work done in the castle by the captain (*TA* v. 148). The date is the last one cited previously in the text, but the very next entry belongs to 2 December 1518, and its exact timing is uncertain.

1518, 13 August: 11s to 35 porters (*pynouris*) who brought the guns into the castle at 4*d* each (*TA* v. 163). The printed text misprints the payment as 40s rather than 11s (reading *xl* for *xi*); the correct sum can be calculated from the individual wages.

1518, 21 August: From the Edinburgh customs revenues, to Sir James Ellem, chaplain of the Barras, taking annually 20 marks, for the year of this account, £13 6s 7*d*. To the chaplain in Edinburgh Castle, £10 (*ER* xiv. 334). The castle chaplain's entry is not printed in full. Part of a set of accounts for the period from 22 August 1517 to the date on which they are calendared.

1518, 25 August: The start of a long period of consolidated accounts for the lodging and protection of the infant King James V in the castle. The king's expenses from this date to 1 June 1522 total £6,978 4s 6½*d*, of which £625 10s 10½*d* is for spices and candles, and £217 4s 8*d* is for overheads (*uncostis*) (*ER* xiv. 456–7).

1518, 27 August: For parchment and paper for writing the accounts of the exchequer, carrying the rolls from the castle towards the exchequer house, and the [re]placing of them [back in the castle], £3 6s 8*d* (*ER* xiv. 357). The date under which the entry is calendared is that on which the audit in question took place, part of the same set of comptroller's accounts as the material calendared under 1 September 1517, and also the next entry below.

1518, 27 August: To Cuthbert Crichton and Duncan Crichton, for their labours in the castle, allowing that they were not entered in the book of the lord king's household [expenses] (*in libro domicilii domini regis*), at the consideration of the auditors, the said Cuthbert taking 6 marks and the said Duncan 4 marks, totalling £6 14s 4d for the year of this account (*ER* xiv. 358). It is unclear what duties these two men performed, but they were clearly kinsmen of the captain of the castle, and perhaps part of the garrison. This is part of the same set of comptroller's accounts as the previous entry and the material entered under 1 September 1517.

1518, 1 September: Allowed by the accountant for payment made to the three lords, guardians of the king (*dominibus custodibus domini regis*), viz. Borthwick, Ruthven and Erskine, each of them taking yearly £200, from 1 September 1518 to 1 May 1522, which are three years and eight months, particularly examined on account, £2,200; allowed by the accountant for payment made to umquhile Sir Patrick Crichton of Cranston Riddell and James Crichton his firstborn son, captains of Edinburgh Castle, receiving annually 400 marks for the keeping of the said castle, extending to £1,000, of which 1,100 marks was paid (*solute*) to the said umquhile Sir Patrick and 400 marks to the said James, from 1 September 1518 to 1 June 1522, which are three years and nine calendar months, £1,000; allowed by the accountant for payment made to Robert Borthwick and six other gunners (*machinatoribus*), remaining in Edinburgh Castle for the keeping of the king, the said Robert taking £10 monthly, and each of the other six taking £4 2s monthly, from 1 September 1518 to 1 March 1521, which are three years and six calendar months, particularly examined on account, £1,453 4s (*ER* xiv. 458-9). These entries are included in the comptroller's accounts covering the long period from 27 August 1518 to 1 September 1522, effectively a single set of expenses for the bulk of the period while the young King James V was residing in the castle; they follow on from the material calendared under 1 September 1517, overlap largely with the long period of royal household expenses calendared under 25 August 1518 (which immediately precedes them in the text) and are followed chronologically by the material calendared under 1 August 1522, which concludes the period of the king's residence in the castle .

1518, 2 December: £9 12s for 12 ells of Rouen russet at 16s per ell, to be gowns for the king's three gentlewomen in the castle, delivered to them at Yule, and £3 9s for six quarters of black velvet to trim their gowns, at £2 6s the ell (*TA* v. 148).

1518, 2 December: £16 16s for [Thomas] Schaw, the king's master cook, for an ovenhouse (*owynhous*) built in the castle (*TA* v. 148). This entry is calendared under the last date cited above it in the text, but the next date records outlay in both December 1518 and May 1519, and the entries then switch back to to September 1517, making the timing very unclear.

22 May 1522: from the Edinburgh customs revenues, to the chaplain celebrating in the chapel within Edinburgh Castle, receiving annually £10 per year, for the year and terms of this account and at the risk of the accountant, £35 (*ER* xiv. 444). Covering the period from 21 August 1518 to the date at which it is calendared. The comptroller is still serving as customar of the burgh.

1522: For the repair of Lady Gordon's chamber in Edinburgh Castle, for all expenses (*in singulis expensis*; an idiomatic phrase), £5 8s (*ER* xiv. 459). Part of the same set of accounts covering the period from 27 August 1518 to 31 May 1522 as the payments calendared above under 1 September 1518.

1522, 31 May: For parchment and paper for writing the accounts of the exchequer, carrying the rolls from the castle towards the exchequer house, and the [re]placing of them [back in the castle], £6 13s 4d (*ER* xiv. 467–8). This entry is calendared under the date which the audit in question took place, but the outlay is double the usual fee, evidently a reflection of the fact that this audit covered an unusually long period, from 27 August 1518 to the date at which it was calendared (as the comptroller's accounts from which the material calendared under 25 August 1518 and 1 September 1518, this covers much of the period in which James V was resident in the castle).

1522, 8 June: Two crates (*creddillis*) of glass are bought from John Adamson, sr, for £4 4s each, total £8 8s, and delivered to Thomas Peebles for repairing (*reformatione of*) the glass windows in Holyrood and the castle (*TA v. 199*).

1522, 1 August: King James V moves from Edinburgh Castle to Stirling. For remaining with the king in Edinburgh Castle, William Lord Borthwick was allowed £200 for every 4 months, and thus for the 3 months from 1 May 1522 to this date, he is paid £150. James Crichton, Captain of Castle of Edinburgh, takes 400 marks yearly for remaining in the said castle while the king was staying in the same; for 2 months from 1 June 1522, to this date, he thus has £44 8s 10d (*ER xv. 91*).

1522: accounts as comptroller for parchment paper (*pergamino papiro*) for writing the accounts of the exchequer, carriage of the rolls from the castle to the exchequer house (*domum saccarii*) and putting away (*impositione*) of the same during the said terms. £6 13s 4d (10 merks) (*ER xv. 97*).

1523, 18 June: The government messenger David Lowry is given a letter under the signet to summon Gilbert Keith and the laird of Ardendraught to enter ward in Edinburgh Castle within eight days of notification under pain of treason and given 3s additional expenses for this (*TA v. 201*).

1523, 7 March: From the Edinburgh customs revenue, to Sir James Ellem chaplain of the Barras (*de lie Barras*) taking annually 20 marks, in the year and period the period from 22 May 1522 to this date, £26 13s 4d. To the chaplain celebrating in Edinburgh Castle, receiving annually £10, in the year of account and at risk of accountant, £20 (*ER xv. 53*).

1523, 1 July: A letter under the royal signet and a letter of the lords assembled in Edinburgh, to the Archbishop of St Andrews, to have his advice regarding the furnishing (*in furnissing*) of Edinburgh Castle (*TA v. 215*). In the context,

'furnishing' could refer to either redecoration or to military provisioning, but the entry of 6 July 1523 suggests the topic was victuals for the garrison.

1523, 6 July: John Langlands is given a letter under the signet charging the comptroller to provide victuals for a garrison of 400 people to defend Edinburgh Castle from the English (*TA* v. 216).

1523, December: James Crichton, master of the pantry, is given £17 17s for two years' clothing allowance (*TA* v. 197–8). Crichton was also captain of the castle but held this household office alongside it.

1524, 7 April: £41 15s paid to James Crichton of Cranston Riddle, Captain of the Castle of Edinburgh, for expenses made by him on the sustenance of Donald of the Isles, Patrick Wilson, Camus the Frenchman (*Cammous, francheman*) and diverse others in ward in the castle in the time of this account, by the governor's handwritten instruction (*TA* v. 237).

1524, 22 August: James Beaton, Archbishop of St Andrews and Chancellor of Scotland, and Gavin Dunbar, Bishop of Aberdeen, are imprisoned in the castle for refusing to renounce their support for the Duke of Albany (*Diurnal*, p 9). A new pro-English regency government had taken office and was acting against pro-French politicians.

1524, December: James Crichton, i.e. the captain of the castle, is included with a dozen other 'officers and children of the King's chamber' (*officaris and childer of the Kingis chamir*) in getting livery clothes valued at £12 11s each for Yule (*TA* v. 260).

1525, 8 January: 17s to John Cunningham for mending artillery in the castle, by the governor's command (*TA v. 261*). This is followed immediately by a payment of £2 for a boat carrying artillery to Stirling.

1525, 25 February: The council and other subjects of the Crown travelling to Edinburgh are being threatened by gunfire from unpleasant people in the castle (*invadit persewit or troublit be evill avisit persounes being in the Castell of Edinburgh be schot of gun*), parliament mandates that the captain allow no damaging gunfire from the castle, nor the removal of any munitions except by authorisation of the guardians appointed to protect the king and by extension govern Edinburgh Castle (*the lordis chosin of the counsale*), on pain of treason; and no gunners go to the castle without their approval, on pain of death (*RPS 1525/2/18*). This document is part of a parliamentary attempt to effect a political reconciliation between the Queen Dowager, Margaret Tudor, and the political opposition led by her estranged husband, the Earl of Angus. Reflecting the complex situation, the queen was named as head guardian, but was also in charge of the garrison during the shooting.

1525, 7 August: From the Edinburgh customs revenue, to Sir James Ellem, chaplain of the Barras (*de lie Barres*) receiving annually 20 marks of the same customs, £20 in the period from 7 March 1523 to this date; to the chaplain celebrating in Edinburgh Castle, receiving annually £10, in the same period and at the accountant's risk, £15 (*ER xv. 184*).

1525, 17 August: In Robert Barton's accounts as comptroller, paid to James Crichton of Cranston Riddle, Captain of Edinburgh Castle, in £200 for keeping of the said castle in the period from 12 April 1523 to this date, £200 (*ER xv. 200*).

1525, 17 August: Robert Barton accounts as comptroller for parchment paper (*pergamino papiro*) for writing the accounts of the exchequer, carriage of the rolls from the castle to the exchequer house (*domum saccharii*) and putting away

(*impositione*) of the same during the period from 12 April 1523 to this date, £9 (*ER* xv. 206).

1525, 17 August: In Robert Barton's accounts as comptroller, the castlewards of Edinburgh, totalling £24, are remitted to the sheriff and deducted (*ER* xv. 211). The date is the end of the period for which this set of accounts are concerned, commencing on 12 April 1523.

1525, 1 November: On All Saints' Day, a terrible wind strikes Edinburgh, blowing down many houses, including David's Tower, and causing a fire in the queen's lodgings. Elsewhere, the Bishop of Whithorn, praying in his chamber, emerges miraculously unscathed when the house collapses around him (Lesley, p 414, tr. Dalrymple, ii. 200). The Scots translation suggests that David's Tower 'fell', while the queen's lodgings 'nearly fell', but the underlying Latin version has a different emphasis, stating that the storm 'damaged the battlements of the tower which is eminent above the rest in the castle, which is called David's, and started a fire in the queen's apartments, wherein the flames eventually spread so widely that it almost entirely collapsed in ruins'. It seems to be suggested by the phrasing that the damage to the tower had a knock-on effect on an adjacent **Queen's Lodging**, but it is not entirely certain, and it is possible that the apartment referred to was at Holyrood or in the burgh rather than in the castle; the event presaged the usurpation of power from the queen dowager by her estranged husband the Earl of Angus.

1526, 26 May: £20 to Robert Borthwick in part-payment for four small artillery pieces (*iiij smal pecis of artalzere*) being made in the castle; £10 likewise given to John Drummond for his servants' fees and wages in making the gun-carriages to the four little falcons (*the cartis to the iiij litil falconis*) (*TA* v. 266). Both entries evidently refer to the same guns, the wheels and fittings of which are mentioned under 27 May 1526 and 31 May 1526.

1526, 27 May: £1 4s 2d given to 68 porters (*pinouris*) who brought the great guns from Holyrood to the castle, and afterwards carried six spars for completing the wheels of the falcons (*ending of the falcoun quhelis*) (*TA v. 266*). The falcons are the same light-artillery guns whose other construction expenses are entered under 26 May 1526 and 31 May 1526.

1526, 31 May: £2 to the carters of Leith for six loads of green timber out of the orchard at Sheriffhall for fittings for (*graithing of*) the four little falcons, each load with four horses costing 6s 8d; £2 1s 10d for 8st. 6lb of iron delivered to be fittings (*graith*) for the said four falcons, price per st. (*pretium pecie*) 5s; 11s 4d to the smith for his workmanship on the iron (*TA v. 266*). Completing the construction outlay on these guns, following the entries of 26 May 1526 and 27 May 1526.

1526, 6 June: £20 to James Crichton for his clothes for Yule (*TA v. 267*). One of several payments of salaries and liveries that conclude a set of accounts which otherwise ends on the date noted above.

1526, 1 August: Colville as comptroller, paid to James Crichton of Cranston Riddle, Captain of Edinburgh Castle, in 200 marks for keeping of the said castle [for the period from 17 August 1525 to this date], said captain being present and receiving the payment on account and at risk of accountant, £133 6s 8d (*ER xv. 286*).

1526, 1 August: Colville as comptroller, for parchment and paper (*pergamino et papiro*) for writing the accounts of the exchequer, carriage of the rolls from the castle to the exchequer house (*domum saccharii*) and putting away (*impositione*) of the same in the said castle £6 6s 8d (*ER xv. 291*). The date under which this entry is calendared is the date on which the audit audited its own expenses; in theory, the accounts in question extend from 17 August 1525 to this date.

1526, 3 August: Edinburgh customs, to Sir James Ellem, chaplain of the Barras (*de lie Barres*) receiving annually 20 marks of the same customs, in the year of

account from 7 August 1525 to this date, £13 6s 8d; to the chaplain celebrating in Edinburgh Castle, receiving annually £10, in the year of account, £10 (*ER* xv. 271).

1526, December: £20 to [James Crichton], the captain of the castle in the payments for liveries at Yule, and, by the king's command for livery to the captain's son, David Crichton, 'the bairn', 6 ells of tawny camlet (*tanny chamelot*, 'camel coat' material) valued at £3 12s for his gown, 3 ells black velvet valued at £8 5s for his doublet and for trim on his gown, and two quarters and a nail of Flanders red cloth valued at 14s 4½d (*TA* v. 308). The note that the payment was made at the command of the teenage James V hints that the captain's young son may have been a childhood friend (see 15 September 1516). The captain of the castle is also issued a second livery payment valued at £12 11s in his other capacity as master of the pantry (*TA* v. 310).

1527, 15 June: £6 to John Drummond, for timber work for gun-carriages, wheels, limbers and wooden axles (*tymer wrocht in the stokkis of the gunnys, quhelis, lymaris, and extreis*); £1 5s for carrying the said timber from Leith to the castle; £12 to five wrights, at 16s weekly, for 52 weeks; £3 12s to the sawers for the same space of time; 10s five lock bands with all their fittings; 3s for nails to nail the coffers; 3s to 12 porters (*pynouris*) for taking off and putting on the wheels of the great gun (*the of taking and on putting of the grete gun hir quhelis*); 4s for Orkney butter to grease the wheels and wooden axles; £16 11s 4½d for iron for repairing the guns, at 3s per st., 11st. 2½lb of Spanish iron to Thomas Crawford, and 26st. 7lb of the same to Sir Alexander Jardine, and 4st. of French iron to John Drummond; £1 19s 4½d for 15lb of Spanish iron to make pickaxes, sent to the army with the smiths for the gunners; 6s for two 'wisps' of steel; £8 16s for the working of the said iron, and for the smiths' wages (*TA* v. 321-2).

1527, 12 August: From Edinburgh customs revenue, to the chaplain celebrating in Edinburgh Castle, receiving annually £10 of the said customs, in the year of account [from 3 August 1526, to this date], £10 to Sir James Ellem, chaplain 'de lie Barres' receiving annually 20 marks of the said customs, in the year of account, £13 6s 8d (*ER* xv. 363-4).

1527, 19 August: Colville as comptroller, paid to James Crichton of Cranston Riddle, Captain of Edinburgh Castle, in 200 marks for keeping of the said castle [in the period from 1 August 1526 to this date], said captain being present and taking payment on account, £133 6s 8d (*ER* xv. 379).

1527, 19 August: Colville as comptroller, for parchment and paper (*pergamino et papiro*) for writing the accounts of the exchequer, carriage of the rolls from the castle to the exchequer house (*domum saccarii*) and putting away (*impositione*) the same in the said castle, £3 6s 8d (*ER* xv. 386). The date at which this entry is calendared is again that on which the audit audited its own expenses; in theory, the account extends from 1 August 1526, to this date.

1528, 2 July: The teenage King James V, having recently overthrown the regency government of his stepfather the Earl of Angus, commands two of Angus's closest relatives and allies, George Douglas of Pittendreich and Archibald Douglas to enter ward in the castle; they refuse (*Diurnal*, p 11).

1528, 18 August: Colville as comptroller, paid to James Crichton of Cranston Riddle, Captain of Edinburgh Castle, in 200 marks for keeping of the said castle [for a period from 20 August 1527 to this date], said captain being present and taking payment on account and at risk of accountant, £133 6s 8d (*ER* xv. 458).

1529, 7 March: Colville as comptroller, paid to James Crichton of Cranston Riddle, Captain of Edinburgh Castle, in 100 marks for keeping of the said castle in Martinmas term of this account, and at risk of accountant, £66 13s 4d (*ER* xv. 543). The account covers the period from 20 August 1528.

1529, 16 May: A parliament in Edinburgh orders the Earl of Bothwell, Lord Maxwell, the laird of Buccleuch and Mark Kerr to be warded in the castle (*Diurnal*, pp 13-14). All four men were leaders of powerful Border clans, caught up in a

complex local system of blood-feuds and outlawry, but at least three of them were also key supporters of the teenage James V, who had recently taken personal control of the government with their assistance, and who presided in person in this parliament (see above 2 July 1528); it is thus unclear what the arrest order represented – perhaps it was a symbolic statement that the king was a genuine sovereign to whose authority even his most powerful friends had to submit, rather than the figurehead of an arbitrary coup by Border chiefs.

1529, 13 July: From the Edinburgh customs revenues, to the chaplain celebrating in Edinburgh Castle, receiving annually £10 of the said customs, in Martinmas term, £5; to Sir James Ellem, chaplain of the Barras (*de lie Barres*), receiving annually 20 marks of the said customs, in the term abovementioned, £6 13s 4d (*ER xv. 438*). The date under which the entry is calendared is the end-point of the period covered by the relevant account, extending from 12 August 1527.

1529, 14 August: From Edinburgh customs revenue, to the chaplain celebrating in Edinburgh Castle, receiving annually £10 of the said customs, for Martinmas term within this account and for Whitsun term preceding this account, £10; to Sir James Ellem, chaplain of the Barras (*de lie Barres*) receiving annually 20 marks of the said customs, Martinmas term within this account and for Whitsun term preceding this account, £13 6s 8d. To the chaplain celebrating in Edinburgh Castle, receiving annually £10 of the said customs, for Whitsun term within this account, £5; to Sir James Ellem, chaplain 'de lie Barres', receiving annually 20 marks of the said customs, for the aforesaid year [or rather, half-year term], £6 13s 4d (*ER xv. 516, 519*). A relatively short accounting period, running from 12 July 1529 to the date on which it is calendared, but back-payments are being made.

1529, 15 August: Robert Barton as comptroller, paid to James Crichton of Cranston Riddle, Captain of Edinburgh Castle, in 100 marks for keeping of the said castle in Whitsun term of this account, and at risk of accountant, £66 13s 4d (*ER xv. 532*). The account covers the period from 7 March 1529.

1529: The captain of the castle is given his Yule livery payment (*TA* v. 382). Entry not printed in full.

1530, 3 January: £10 to James Crichton for his basin silver (*TA* v. 386). This is probably a reference to the captain of the castle in his capacity as master of the pantry; basin silver was a gratuity paid to department heads in the King's House at seasons such as Yule, New Year or Pasch.

1531: A belated Yule livery is granted to James Crichton (*TA* v. 432); the index identifies this as the captain of the castle, but the entry is not printed in full, and the date is not specified.

1531: £2 4s for bringing out the artillery and other munitions from the ships and carrying it from Leith to the castle; £186 for 8½ barrels of powder, bought from Dutchmen; 13s 4d for carrying the powder from Leith to Edinburgh and putting it in the castle. £6 paid for carrying gunpowder and munitions brought home by Thomas Stewart of Galston (*the Iarde of Gaustoun*) from Leith to the castle (*TA* v. 461). The munitions had cost £140, with an additional £100 in associated expenses (*TA* v. 458).

1531, 18 September: The captain of the castle's son, David Crichton, is among the many household members issued liveries (*TA* vi. 37). Not printed in full. David Crichton appears to have been a younger son who joined the royal household, becoming master of the wardrobe in 1536.

1532, 21 July: Compensation of 40s to a poor woman (*puir womane*) whose husband was slain by a gun shot from the castle (*TA* vi. 41).

1532: For putting away (*tursyn*) a black chest (*the blak kist*), containing chapel furnishings and reliquaries (and recently brought from Stirling, where it was

given new lock and metal bands Stirling) in the castle, 3s; for bearing it forth from the castle to the cart to be taken to Stirling ahead of Easter (*agane pasch*), 8d (*TA* vi. 49). This is part of an account largely concerned with shuttling chapel gear, tapestry and coffers between Stirling and Edinburgh – it is unclear, however, if any of it was still regularly stored in the castle; the ‘black kist’ may be James III’s treasure chest of the same name.

1532: A man named John Scott is warded in Edinburgh Castle for defying a court order obtained by James Lawson of Highriggs; he goes on hunger-strike for 32 days, taking only a drink of water every day; his endurance is attributed to ‘the help of the Virgin Mary’, and afterwards he delivers a public sermon at the Market Cross on 6 October 1532 (*Diurnal*, p 14). Calderwood, writing in the 17th century, states that his place of imprisonment was **David’s Tower**. Subsequently, he went on pilgrimage to Rome and Jerusalem before returning to Scotland.

Highriggs is the area of high ground just outside the town walls to the south of the castle, where George Heriot’s now stands, suggesting that he was a local man. The source reports that he preached ‘naked’ (*naikit*), but the semantics of this word in medieval Scots could cover a state of undress involving underclothes such as his shirt, though some level of undress is certainly hinted at by the subsequent gift of a vestment to him from the Pope. Buchanan presents him as something of a ‘holy fool’, but a very different biography emerges if he is the John Scott who graduated from St Andrews in 1531, the multilingual Franciscan scholar who worked closely with the Catholic hierarchy in the 1540s and 1550s, or indeed the printer who produced the vernacular catechism and ‘Twapenny faith’.

1532, 12 September: For two locks to the artillery house (*artailzerie hous*) in the castle, one on the inner door and one on the outer, 4s. To two porters (*pynouris*) that brought down the [smiths’] equipment (*werkloumis*) from the castle to be carried by cart to the siege of Tantallon (*tursit in the cart to Temptalloune*), 4d (*TA* vi. 155).

1532, 12 September: To two pioneers who brought the guns to be stocked

(*tursit the gunnis to the stokkin*) in the castle. Carriage of the artillery forth of the castle to Leith for freight to Tantallon and carrying two gun stocks from Leith to the castle, three draughts with the cart at 2s 8d, 8s (*TA* vi. 156). Other references show that the timber for the stocks had come from Lochaber.

1532, 17 September: To John Drummond's children (*Johne Drummond's childer*) working on arquebus stocks (*the hagbute stokkis*) in the castle, in drinksilver, 20s (*TA* vi. 156). Drummond's children appear to have all been daughters; an arquebus could be either a musket-style handgun with a wooden stock and a pole-like firing rest, or a small cannon with a tripod and a tiller; the former type seems more likely here.

1532, 24 September: To the smith that was in Tantallon, to carry his equipment (*werklowmes*) from there to Edinburgh, 5s. To the six porters that brought the new wheel(s) ('new quheile') down from the castle, 4s (*TA* vi. 157).

1532, December: For nine carts to bring up to the castle the copper, gunpowder and saltpetre (*the coppir, pulder and saulpeter*) sent home from Flanders by the king's almoner (*Maister Elmosinar*), 4s the cart, 36s (*TA* vi. 158).

1533, 25 January: The Earl of Bothwell and Adam Dundas are imprisoned in the castle on an allegation of dealings with the English (*Diurnal*, p 15).

1533, 11 February: To a poor man called John More, who was taken bearing letters with Mr Gilbert McMath and was imprisoned for a long time (*lang halden*) in Edinburgh Castle, 20s (*TA* vi. 90). The arrests had occurred in early 1532 (*TA* vi. 103); McMath was a chaplain of Cardinal James Beaton, and the letters they were carrying were presumably connected to the accusations of treasonable correspondence for which Beaton was arrested in April 1533 (Herkless and Hannay (1907–15), iii. 223–32).

1533, 12 April: To the workmen working with the French gunner Paris (*quhilkis werkis with Peris*) in the castle at the founding of [bronze] artillery, 3 weeks' wage, £2 5s; 20 April 1533, to the same men, for 1 week, 15s (*TA* vi. 162).

1533, 16 June: To the wrights in the castle in drinksilver, £1, to the gunners in the castle in drinksilver, 10s (*TA* vi. 97).

1533, 15 September: To Paris [the French gunner] and the rest (*the laif*) of the workmen, putting the guns behind gates (*zettand the gunnis*) in the castle, 'in drink silver', £1 (*TA* vi. 104).

1533/4: To the Captain of Edinburgh Castle, £20 (*TA* vi. 206).

1534, 28 January: To Galloway, the captain of the castle's boy, who bought writings from the king, 5s (*TA* vi. 219). James V was then in Fife, and the messenger was returning to Edinburgh.

1534, 10 May: The laird of Buccleuch is convicted of treason at Jedburgh (*Diurnal*, p 17). Sir Walter Scott of Buccleuch was a friend and a key ally of King James V, and this trial, engineered by his local enemies as a pretext for assassination, led to a paradoxical solution: he accepted the conviction, and was 'imprisoned' in a comfortable apartment in the castle where he was safe from his enemies, but was released on parole when his services as a military commander were required. See September 1536 and Appendix 7: Life in Prison.

1534, 23 June: To 14 porters (*pynouris*) who lifted and bore the guns in the castle to be shot at the king's coming to the town, 14s (*TA* vi. 215).

1535, July: The slaters Robert and John Blair perform watertighting work (*beting werk*) and stonework pointing (*poyniting werk*) on the newly reconstructed Holyrood Palace, the mint on the Royal Mile and the king's stables (*the cunyeuous the Kingis stabelis*); they also perform some similar watertighting (*certain beting*) on Edinburgh Castle's Gunhouse and **Porter's Lodge** (*the gunhous of the castall and porter luge*); £7 18s 4d (*MWi*. 188). This probably involved lime render.

1536, September: Ironwork weighing 30st. 9lb (approximately 200kg) is provided to make window-grilles in a room in Edinburgh Castle known as 'the Laird of Buccleuch's chamber' (*the Lard of Bawcleuchis chalmer in the castall Edinburgh*), the cost of the iron is £12 5s 6d (*MWi*. 185). Sir Walter Scott of Buccleuch was, in theory, detained 'at his Majesty's pleasure' in Edinburgh Castle from 19 April 1535 until 15 March 1542, but custody seems to have been largely an artifice to protect him from his enemies, and in mid-1536 he was on parole serving as a military commander on the Border during a period of Anglo-Scottish sabre-rattling (Fraser (1878), i. 98–100, ii. 183–5). In keeping with the paradoxical nature of his custody, the window-grille is as likely to have been a fashionable decorative addition as a device to prevent escape (McKean (2001), p 57).

1536, October: 16s to John Balgro in Leith, for six loads of gun timber and spears from Leith to the castle (*TA* vii. 94). Included in an account otherwise concerned with moving tapestries and the new queen's luggage between royal residences.

1536, 2 November: By command of the regents [during James V's personal embassy in France], to 'Malcolm Toische' (*malcolmetoische*) held in ward in Edinburgh Castle to ensure law and order in the nation (*for gude reuill of the cuntre*), for his expenses, £10 (*TA* vi. 303).

1536: Andrew Purves, macer, to travel (*pass*) and summon a jury for the inquest on the killing of the Captain of Edinburgh Castle's servant (*capitane of the castillis servand*) in Cranston Riddell, 5s (*TA* vi. 407). The captain of the castle was also the laird of Cranston Riddell.

1537, 24 January: Sir Patrick Hepburn of Waughton is convicted after a dispute with the laird of Roslin's brother, and imprisoned in the castle (*Diurnal*, p 20). Ironically, he would later become captain of the castle (see 21 July 1543).

1537, 3 March: The start of a surviving account book, primarily concerned with the preparation of artillery for James V's 1536 voyage to France to court and marry the daughter of King Francis I, and particularly the provision of new naval gun-carriages (*se stokis*) for the heavy guns; but, as was still apparently typical of Scottish accounts, a number of other outlays found their way into the same account, ranging from the re-roofing of the Great Hall to the caulking of a cargo ship working between Leith and Beaulieu.

The first part of the account concerns ironworking in the castle – for the fittings on wooden gun-carriages, perhaps the construction of small anti-personnel guns, and also possibly the production of larger wrought-iron cannon of the sort that were coming back into vogue in England: 11 separate purchases of iron were procured, costing together £113 10s 8½*d* and totalling 445st. 7lb Scots tron weight (approximately 700st. by the Imperial system, or 4.5 metric tonnes); the carrying of this to the castle and the construction of furnace hearths, all carried out by the same porters for a total of 28s 5*d*; the procurement of furnace coal (*smedy colis*) at £4 8s, and the wages of three smiths and their 12 assistants totalled £57 6s 8*d* (William Hill for eight weeks, James Johnston for six weeks and Robert Monypenny for four weeks two days, each with four servants).

The woodworking construction for the gun-carriages was performed in the castle by 11 named 'land wrichtis' and six assistants, led by the master wright John Drummond, for a total of £90 11s, while one John Lang worked on drying (?) gunpowder and casting new roundshot (*dryand and castand bullettis*) at £2 10s, plus two workmen to assist the casting and the timberwork at £3; also partially within the castle were the £9 11s wages of three 'sawars' and their junior colleagues (*marrowis*), and a force of workmen moving and dismounting guns, for £14 5s 4*d*; the carters, based in Leith and Canongate, accounted for 46 draughts of timber brought to the castle for working, and 55 draughts of munitions carried down to Leith, plus one cart hired specially from Edmonstone, used to carry

timber from the tournament ground to Leith (*fra the listis to Leith*), and to bring a gun-carriage and unspecified artillery supplies (*small munitioun*) down from the castle.

Also relevant are miscellaneous expenses from a separate (lost) account book kept by Paris Rowan: white iron for rammer-heads, tampions (*hairgeouris tawponis*) and other small expenses; a number of gunpowder barrels, a lock for the vault (*the wolt*) for securing the small artillery supplies (*the small munitioun*); this introduces a more miscellaneous set of expenses – lime for watertighting the Gunhouse, wages and materials for the slater Robert Blair, renewing the roofs of the Gunhouse and Great Hall in the castle, and the chapel in the Barras, and a substantial hire of horses, not only carrying wet sand (*quik sand*) to the castle (presumably for making quicklime mortar) but also dry sand to resurface the tournament ground; more relevant to the project but less directly connected with the castle were the timber-procuring work in the wooded ‘parks’ at Newbattle and Cranstoun, and the varied expenses of the ‘hoy bark’, dispatched on two voyages to Beaulieu in Ross to collect extra timber.

After the fleet returned from France, much of the artillery was housed in the King’s Wark at Leith, but the carters’ wages for returning the artillery to the castle were assessed to the extent of 76 loads (a semi-abstract unit of account denoting one journey by four horses) for the gun-carriages, 46 loads for unspecified guns and munitions, five loads for the wheels of ‘double cannon’, and two draughts over two days, with considerable extra expenses, for the transport of [36-pounder] cannons, plus the assistance of 16 workmen and 12 porters; subsequently, Drummond, the smith William Hill, and their assistants, were employed for several further weeks dismounting the guns from their new naval carriages and returning them to their land-service carriages, at a cost of £17 16s, and an additional outlay for Hill and his assistants for £3 2s is added as an addendum; Paris also presented another miscellaneous account book for the purchase of saltpetre, sulphur (two of the three ingredients of gunpowder), oil, petroleum, turpentine, brandy or whisky (also used in improving gunpowder), mercury, hemp, twine and metal tyres for carriage wheels (*in sal peter bruntstane ule petrol tarpantyne aquawite quik silver hardis pak threid and quheill rymmis*) (MWi. 229–34).

1537, July: Lady Glamis, a young widow and the sister of the exiled Earl of Angus, is convicted of seeking to poison the king, is burnt at the stake in front of the castle; her co-accused – her son Lord Glamis, her second husband Archibald Campbell, a ‘barbour’ called John Lyon and a priest, are all imprisoned in the castle (*Diurnal*, p 22). See Appendix 7: Life in Prison.

1537, 13 July: The Master of Forbes, having been previously accused of treason, is warded in the castle, and is drawn, hung and beheaded (*Diurnal*, p 22). See Appendix 7: Life in Prison.

1538, 17 November: Start of a period of expenses on the munitions, including expenditure on John Drummond and many other wrights until 13 September 1539 (*TA* vii. 209–31). The wrights’ expenses are not printed in full; following on from the project-related for the royal expedition to France, calendared above under 3 March 1537, this marks the start of a series of monthly artillery accounts, from which most of the following entries down to 30 August 1539 are taken. From 12 April 1539, this series includes (and to an extent focuses on) the accounts for the construction of the Munition House. Comparable dedicated accounts do not survive from previous decades, except in the busy and historically important period before Flodden commencing on 19 March 1513. See Appendix 10: The Artillery.

1538, 17 November: Start of a period of pay for expenses to carters carrying timber from Leith to the castle for artillery work at 2s 6d per load; £1 to John Dickson, carter, for eight loads of gun timber; £2 17s 6d to William Bapty, John Gogar, Thomas Branwood, Walter White and John Little, carters, for 23 loads of gun timber; and £8 2s 6d to Thomas Millar, Robart Stewart and George Fergusson, for 39 loads of gun timber and 18 loads of cannon carriages (*cannoun stokkis*); also paid here is £2 10s to James Lawson, wright, with woodwrights and other workmen, for cutting and cleaning the gun timber in Ross in the summer of 1537 and for bringing meat to them in the woods, as recorded in a bill of account (*ane ticket*) signed by John Mackenzie (*TA* vii. 209–10). The 18 loads or ‘draughts’ of cannon carriages probably reflects the number of horses involved (four in a load,

so a total of 72), rather than the number of different journeys. From its position in the account series, it is possible that the journeys were completed by 7 December 1538, but it is not entirely clear.

1539, 16 January: £5 5s for 42 short trees (*schort treis*) bought from Thomas Davidson at £1 10s the dozen, to be spokes (*spakis*) for gun-wheels; 3s to Robert Stewart and John Little, carters, for carrying it to the castle in three loads at 1s per load; £16 5s 6d for 81st. 6lb of French iron, bought (*brocht*) from Robert Mar at 4s per st., and delivered to be William Hill, smith, to be tyres (*schone*), plates and other ironwork for the gun-wheels; 1s 4d to porters (*pynouris*) for bringing the same iron up to the castle (*TA* vii. 210–11).

1539, 18 January: £1 10s paid to Thomas Millar and Robert Stewart, carters, for 12 loads of gun timber brought from Leith to the castle since 21 December 1538. Meanwhile, two sawers enter into pay, sawing trees for gun-carriages and wheels, at 18s weekly, thus making £3 12s for the four weeks to 15 February 1539 (*TA* vii. 211). The sawers appear to have remained at work until 13 September August 1539, but the relevant entries are not printed in full.

1539, 20 January: William Hill and his four servants, smiths, enter into pay to work the ironwork of the gun-carriages and wheels mentioned on 18 January 1539, taking £4 2s weekly between them; for the period to 15 February 1539 they have £12 8s; £2 2s 8d is laid out on two chalders of coal bought in Leith for this, and 13s 4d for carrying the coal to the castle (*TA* vii. 211). The smiths remained at work until at least 31 August 1541, but the relevant entries are not printed in full.

1539, 30 January: £8 16s 3d for 44st. 1 lb of French iron at 4s the st., bought from Robert Mar to be tyres (*schone*) to the wheels mentioned above on 20 January 1539; £20 11s 6½d for 91st. 7lb of Spanish iron at 4s 6d the st., to be nails and other small gears for this artillery equipment (*the said munitionis*); 3s to porters (*pynouris*) for bringing the said iron to the castle (*TA* vii. 211–12).

1539, 31 January: £16 18s 11*d* for 75st. 5lb of Spanish iron at 4s 6*d* per st., bought from James Reid and delivered to William Hill, smith; £15 19s 1*d* for 68st. 9lb of Spanish iron bought from William Dick at the same time at 4s 6*d* per st., iron which was used for iron axles for little wheels at the rear of the cannon stocks (*extreis to lytill quhelis, quhilk quhelis ran upoun extreis of irne in the ferder end of the cannoun stok*); and £25 0s 9½*d* for 115st. 9lb of French pan iron to be tyres for cannon wheels (*schone to the grete cannoun quhelis*) at 4s 4*d* per st.; 4s 4*d* to porters (*pynouris*) for bringing all this iron to the castle (*TA* vii. 211–12). The gun-carriages with rear wheels are almost certainly ‘sea stocks’ for shipboard use.

1539, 12 February: £8 for four dozen short oak joists at £2 the dozen, bought from Thomas Fotheringham and delivered to John Drummond for the above artillery equipment (*the saidis munitionis*); £5 12s for eight dozen quarter-timbers (*quarter cliftis*, cleaved lengthwise from larger pieces) to be spokes for the gun-wheels at £14s the dozen; £1 12s 6*d* to Robert Stewart and Thomas Miller, carters, for bringing up the said timber from Leith to the castle, in 13 loads at 2s 6*d* per load (*TA* vii. 212).

1539, 10 April: 4s 4*d* for taking 52 barrels of powders out of the King’s Wark in Leith and for carrying it in sleds and carts (*slading and carting thairof*); 8s given to a barrel-cooper for fitting hoops and stoppers (*gyrding and plowking of*) the said barrels, which took three dozen hoops (*gyrdis*); 5s to Robert Stewart and Thomas Miller, carters, for two loads of barrels, each comprising four barrels, from Leith to the castle, at 2s 6*d* per load; £1 2s for 44 horse loads with sleds (*xliiij hors draughtis witht sladis*), each horse taking one barrel, at 6*d* each; 8s 4*d* to porters (*pynouris*) in the castle for taking the said barrels off the sleds and carts and putting them in storage (*houssing thairof*); £1 12s 6*d* for 45 horse loads with iron bases (*irne barsis*, a type of small gun) and bullets from Leith to the castle at 6*d* each; 13s 4*d* to porters (*pynouris*) for unloading eight great bells which came out of Flanders, and placing them on carts (*carting thairof*, in this instance probably related to loading rather than transport); £1 for eight cart loads (*vij draucht with cartis*) with the said bells from Leith to the castle, at 2s 6*d* each; 13s to porters

(*pynouris*) for taking the said bells, bullets and bases off the carts and sleds, and putting them in storage (*houssing thairof*) within the castle (*TA* vii. 213–14).

1539, April: £4 10s for a large mast to make templates (*ane grete mast to be patrouis*) to make the gun-moulds with; 5s for carriage of the same from Leith to the castle; £10 to Master Hans Cochrane, master gunner, for wire, clay, hair, oil, wax and other necessaries, bought by him for making the gun-moulds, and chambers thereto; £8 10s to a painter for polishing, painting and overpainting (*dichting, colouring, and ourelaying of*) 60 iron bases (*irne barsis*) and their 90 chambers, at the master of the artillery's command, at 2s 6d for covering each piece and its three chambers with red lead (*TA* vii. 217). In this context, 'patrouis' or patrons were evidently full-size wooden models of guns, around which wax moulds would be constructed for casting the bronze weapons (confusingly, the same word also denoted a design drawing, or a paper or fabric cartridge containing gunpowder), 'base' was an iron gun, and its 'chamber' was a removable breech section containing its gunpowder charge and shrapnel or shot – with three chambers, each gun could be quickly reloaded twice for a short period of rapid fire. These payments are calendared among the entries for the period from 12 April 1539 to 10 May 1539.

1539, 12 April: George Balglavy is recruited by the master wright John Drummond for attending, guarding and counting (*awayting and keiping and tailzeing*) all the timber, lime, sand and stone calendared below down to 5 May 1539, and the transport thereof to the castle, taking 6s weekly, so for the period to 10 May 1539 he has £1 4s (*TA* vii. 217). This entry, placed retrospectively in the text, concerns procurement for the large project converting the Great Chapel into the Munition House, records for which commence below on 18 April 1539.

1539, 14 April: James Johnston, smith, and his three servants, enter into pay working on the munitions, taking £2 10s weekly between them; for the period to 10 May 1539 they have £10; William Coupar, smith, and his servant likewise enter into pay working on the munitions, taking £1 5s weekly between them; for the period to 10 May 1539 they have £5 (*TA* vii. 214).

1539, 18 April: £1 to the quarriers for producing (*wynnyng*) 60 pieces of stone for the work on the chapel, 3s for bringing it out of the quarry and putting it on carts (*carting of the same*, with the same meaning as on 10 April 1539); £4 to Robert Stewart and John Little, carters, for carrying the same from Ravelston Craig quarry to the castle, requiring 24 loads at 3s 4d each; £1 4s 4d for 40 loads of quicklime, delivered into the castle for the same work, at 8s per dozen loads; 17s 6d for 96 loads of sand, delivered into the castle for the same work, at 2s 6d per dozen loads; 5s to a porter (*pynour*) who sieved (*riddlit*) the said lime and sand, working for five days at 1s daily; for a riddle (*ane riddill*, a type of sieve) and two shovels to work the same with; 8d for a water bucket (*TA* vii. 214–15). This material was for the conversion of the Great Chapel to become the Munition House; masons were hired on 21 April 1539. There were several quarries at Ravelston, but the earliest and most important lay behind Ravelston House (now the Mary Erskine School), and supplied squared ashlar blocks.

1539, 18 April: £10 for 100 oak spars to be spokes for cannon wheels, bought in Leith by John Drummond; 3s to porters (*pynouris*) for placing this on carts (*carting thairof*, evidently the same meaning as on 10 April 1539); £2 10s to Robert Stewart, carter, for transporting it up to the castle in 20 loads at 2s 6d per load (*TA* vii. 216).

1539, 21 April: William Caddislee (*Cadislie*), mason, and his servant, enter into pay to work on the chapel, to mend the walls, fill up the window and doors, and strike through large new doors therein, because it was being made into a Munition House for keeping the artillery and gun-carriages and wheels; they take £1 8s weekly between them; for the period to 5 May 1539, they have £2 16s (*TA* vii. 214). Also £28 8s for 142 trees each 37ft long (*xj dosane x treis at xij elnis of lenth ilk tre*), at 4s each, for the roof of the chapel within the castle; £8 8s 6d for 67 trees each about 25ft long (*ilk tre viij elnis of lenth*, precisely 24ft 6in), bought at 2s 6d each, for the same work (*to the samin office*); 14s for two long trees for the same work, each around 50ft long (*ilk contenand xvj elnis of lenth*, precisely 49ft 4in) (*TA* vii. 216). Like the procurement of materials on 18 April 1539, this refers to the

conversion of the Great Chapel to the Munition House. Note that the hiring of the masons and the purchase of the timber, although occurring on the same day and thus calendared here together, are entered separately in the accounts. Further timber was also procured on 27 April 1539, then 29 April 1539 and 5 May 1539. Further regular pay to the same mason, bringing his hire down to 13 September 1539, occur on 10 May 1539, 7 June 1539, 5 July 1539 and 2 August 1539 and 30 August 1539, though the last entry is not printed in full.

1539, 24 April: £9 17s 9d for 43st. 15lb of Spanish iron bought from Robert Mar and delivered to William Hill, smith, containing 25 'ends' (*endis*), at 4s 6d per st.; £12 16s 8d for 48st. 6lb of Spanish iron bought at 4s 6d per st. from Alexander Sandilands and delivered to the same; 1s 4d to porters (*pynouris*) for carrying it to the castle (*TA* vii. 215).

1539, 25 April: £1 2s 6d for 45 horses carrying cannons, bullets and gun-chambers from Leith to the castle, at 6d per horse; 3s to porters (*pynouris*) in Leith for bringing all this (*furthlaying thairof*) out from the King's Wark and leading the horses; 1s for an iron bullet bought in Leith; 8s 8d to eight porters (*pynouris*) in the castle, for taking the same off the horses and placing it in storage (*houssing thairof*) (*TA* vii. 215). The work extended over two days.

1539, 26 April: £2 2s 8d for two chalders of coal to work the iron procured on 24 April 1539, bought in Leith at £1 1s 4d per chalder; 13s 4d for carrying thereof from Leith to the castle at 6s 8d per chalder (*TA* vii. 215).

1539, 27 April: £6 4s for 30 (?) planks 'of a tree' (*twa dosane half dosane of ane tre*) of oak timber, at £1 8s the dozen (*TA* vii. 216). For the roof of the Munition House, see 21 April 1539.

1539, 29 April: £8 16s for 22 trees, each about 50ft long (*ilk tre xvj elnis of lenth*, precisely 49ft 4in), bought in Leith; £29 for 116 trees 37ft long (*ilk tre xii elnis of lenth*),

and £3 9s for 23 oak trees of about 25ft in length (*ilk tre aucht elnis of lenth*, precisely 24ft 7in); £17 17s 6d to Robert Stewart, John Little, Thomas Gibson, Gilbert Matheson and John Smith, carters, for carrying the said timber from Leith to the castle in 163 loads at 2s 6d per load; 9s 6d to porters (*pynouris*) for 'carting' the said timber (TA vii. 216). All this also for the roof of the Munition House. The transport cost probably also covers earlier procurements on 21 April 1539 and 27 April 1539, and as in previous entries beginning on 10 April 1539 the payment for 'carting' probably relates to loading the carts rather than moving them.

1539, 5 May: £68 2s 8d for a large quantity of dales (*dalis*, a type of plank), bought from a Dutchman as rafter-sheathing, ceiling and scaffolding (*to be sarking, lofing and scaffalding*) for the roof of the Munition House; £2 6s for 82 horse loads from Leith to the castle with the said dales, each horse carrying two dales at sixpence hire; £3 10s to the carters for carrying the remnant of the said dales from Leith to the castle, totalling 28 loads at 2s 6d each; 8s to the porters (*pynouris*) for unloading the dales and placing them on carts in Leith (*losing and carting of the said dalis in Leith*); 4s to porters (*pynouris*) in the castle, for counting and piling up (*telling and laying togidder of*) the said dales within the Munition House (TA vii. 217). The numbers given for quantity and price do not appear to add up. The total is listed as 'twenty-nine score and four dales, totalling 404 dales' (*xxix^{xx} iiij dalis, quhilk is iiif^v xx^{xx} iiij dalis*: we would expect *xxix^{xx} iiij* to be *iiif^v iv^{xx} iiij*, i.e. 584). Perhaps the purported 29 score proved to be 400 when the planks were counted and stacked in the castle, but that would not explain the stated price of £68 2s 8d: at the quoted rate of '£14 per hundred' (*price of the hundreth xiiij li.*) this implies 486²/₃ dales; for 584 dales, this total would imply a price per hundred of £11 13s 4d, or for 404 dales, an odd sum of just over £14 17s 3¹/₂d. Perhaps the figures disguise some haggling over price?

1539, 10 May: £2 2s 8d for two chalders of coal bought in Leith for work on the munitions at £1 1s 4d the chalder; 12s 4d for transporting thereof from Leith to the castle; £5 12s to William Caddislee (*Cadislie*), mason, and his servant, at £1 8s weekly; 6s for one week to a man with a wheelbarrow (*ane barrowmanne*) who provided him with stone and quicklime (*lyme*) and worked the quicklime; £1 16s to

two sawers working on the sawing of trees for the said work for two weeks at 18s weekly between them; 1s 4d for chalk to mark the trees (*for calk to strik the treis with*), delivered to John Drummond; 8d for a skein of thread to be a plumb-line (*ane lyne*) for the mason, and for mending a quicklime tub; £1 4s to four men working for one week in the Gunhouse on clay for making gun-moulds, at 6s weekly each; £3 1s 5d for 1,060 slates (*in lx of skailze*) bought in Peebles to mend the roof of the Great Hall, delivered to John Drummond within the castle; 5s 4d for eight fir spars to be 'beak ladders' (*aucht fyrrin sperris to be beik ledderis*) at 8d each, to mend the Great Hall (*the said hous*); £6 to a slater for mending the said hall with the said slate, and for mending the gunhouse (*TA* vii. 218). These entries occur without precise date within a monthly set of accounts spanning from 10 May 1539 to 7 June 1539; they probably extend across the period to 31 May 1539, as the subsequent entries from 1 June 1539 onwards *are* regularly dated. The 'beak ladder', also mentioned under 30 August 1539, is cited by *DOST* with no definition beyond '?', but from the context is evidently a roofer's ladder with a hooked end that goes across the roof-ridge.

1539, 1 June: £7 16s for 1950 slates bought from Sandy Miller (*Sanderis Myllar*) in Leith to roof the new Munition House; 2s to porters (*pynouris*) for taking them out of Sandy Miller's close and packing the same on the horse(s) to be taken to the castle; £1 for carrying the same to the castle, in 40 horse loads at 6d each (*TA* vii. 219).

1539, 2 June: £8 18s 6d for 21 long trees, each 28ft long, at 7s 6d each, for the work on the Munition House (*TA* vii. 218).

1539, 3 June: £12 12s for 84 oak trees for the work on the Munition House, each tree around 28ft long (*ix elnis of lenth*, precisely 27ft 9in), at £1 16s per dozen; £6 to carter for bringing the same timber up to the castle in 48 loads at 2s 6d per load; 2s to the porters (*pynouris*) for unloading the timber onto the shore and loading it on the carts (*for laying one the schore and carting thairof*) (*TA* vii. 218). It seems likely that the place of landing was the long quay known as the Shore which runs up the eastern side of the old Leith harbour, but wood could also be

brought directly into the adjacent area known as the Timberbush from the beach on the shore of the Forth to its north. The timber procured on 1 July 1539 was loaded at the junction of the quay and the beach, as the cart could not be brought up to the inner end of the quay.

1539, 7 June: £7 for 100 small planks (*small dalis*) for the Munition House work, bought in Leith from John Williamson and John Halder; 3s for transporting them up from Leith to the castle; 3s to the porters (*pynouris*) for unloading the dales onto the shore and loading it on the carts (*for laying on schore, and carting thairof*); £1 4s to George Balglavy for his month's wages at 6s weekly (*TA* vii. 218). As above on 3 June 1539, the 'shore' here is probably the Leith quay known as the Shore but might alternatively relate to the open beach at its northern end.

1539, 7 June: £2 2s 8d for two chalders of coal bought in Leith for work relating to the artillery at £1 1s 4d per chalder; 13s 4d for bringing them up from Leith to the castle at 6s 8d per chalder; £5 12s to William Caddislee and his servant, working on the said work for the period to 5 July 1539 at £1 8s weekly; £2 8s to two men with wheelbarrows (*twa barrowmenne*) who worked quicklime (*wrocht the lyme*) and assisted him during this period, at 12s weekly; £2 14s to two sawers working for three weeks at 18s weekly; 16s 8d to the quarriers for producing (*wynnyng*) 50 pieces of stone for the said work within this period, at 4d a piece; 2s 8d for porters' fees (*pynouris feis*) for bringing them out of the quarry and putting them on carts; £3 to Robert Stewart, carter, for carrying the same stones from the Ravelston Craig quarry to the castle, in 18 loads at 3s 4d per load; £1 19s 1d for 67 loads of quicklime delivered for the same work, delivered to the castle in the same period, at 7s per dozen loads; £1 5s for 120 loads of sand delivered into the castle in the same period at 2s 6d per dozen lods; £1 4s to George Balglavy for his month's wages at 6s per week; £4 16s to four men working in the gunhouse at Master Hans Cochrane's command, for the same period at 6s weekly each (*TA* vii. 220). These entries strictly speaking cover the entire month from 7 June 1539 to 5 July 1539, with Balglavy being paid twice within this period; but are all placed in an otherwise chronological series between entries for 9 June 1539 and 17 June 1539.

1539 9 June: £5 12s for four weeks' pay to John Wedderburn and John Vaux (*Vache*), wrights, entering into pay to work on the artillery or Munion House at £1 8s weekly, because Richard Stewart and Alexander Boyd were to go to Falkland (*TA* vii. 218).

1539, 17 June: £14 15s 0½*d* for 65st. 9lb of Spanish iron, containing 30 'ends' (*endis*) bought from Master Thomas Kean (*Kene*) at 4s 6*d* per st., and delivered to William Hill for work on artillery equipment; £14 5s 7½*d* for 81st. 4lb of Spanish iron, bought from John Brown at 4s 6*d* per st., from John Brown for the same work (*to the samin office*); £12 10s 4*d* for 55st. 10lb of Spanish iron, bought from the widow Margaret Mack at 4s 6*d*, for the same work; 3s to porters (*pynouris*) for bringing all this iron up to the castle; it was used on cannon wheels and carriages, and necessaries relating to them (*TA* vii. 221).

1539, 20 June: £9 for 36 trees bought from a Dutchman for the Munion House work at 5s each; £4 for 12 long trees, each around 50ft long (*xvj elnis of lenth*, precisely 49ft 4in), bought from him at 6s 8*d* per tree; 10s paid to him subsequently in addition to what was originally promised by John Drummond; 4s to porters (*pynouris*) for bringing this ashore and placing it in carts; £2 for bringing the same timber up to the castle in 16 loads at 2s per load (*TA* vii. 221).

1539, 23 June: To 11 porters (*pynouris*) for bringing out some iron bases (*bassis*, a type of gun), and other munitions and laying them out in order in front of the castle gate (*the castell zett*), when the king inspected (*vesyit*) them, and to ten porters for putting them away again (*houssing of the samin agane*) after the king left; £5 15s for polishing this artillery, painting and overpainting it with red lead (*dichting, colouring and ourlaying of the samin artailzery with reid leid*), to prevent it rusting; for overpainting (*ourlaying*) Mons Meg (*monce in the castell*) with red lead; for overpainting and painting (*ourlaying and colorying*) of four 'headstakes' (*heid steikis* a type of gun) lying in the castle, and for polishing (*dichting*) of them

and their chambers; £1 to a painter for overpainting (*ourlaying*) certain small iron guns in the castle with red lead, at the same time (*TA* vii. 222).

1539, 1 July: £16 to William Leith in Leith, for 14 masts to be scaffolding for putting up the roof of the Munition House, which were afterwards made into ceiling ribs therein (*ribbis to the lofting thairof*), six of them at £1 10s each and the other eight at £1 each, as shown in John Barton's bill; for bringing the said masts from the Bridge of Leith to the end of the pier (*fra the brig of leith to the bulwerk end*) in a boat, because the carts could not take them aboard where they originally lay; £1 15s to the carters of Leith for bringing the same up to the castle in 14 loads at £2 6s each; £78 10s for 23,000 slates to roof the Munition House, 8,000 at £3 5s per thousand, and the other 15,000 at £3 10s per thousand; 15s 4*d* to porters (*pynouris*) for unloading them and leading the horse(s) carrying them to the castle, at 8*d* per thousand; £11 10s for bringing them up from Leith to the castle in 460 horse loads at 6*d* per load (*TA* vii. 221-2). The entries on the timber and slate are separated in the text by the chronologically displaced artillery accounts for 23 June 1539. The bridge mentioned here lay further up the river than the current ones, at the end of Tolbooth Wynd; the end of the pier was a little way beyond the current road bridge (the waterfront was later extended northwards onto the tidal flats in the 17th century).

1539: £2 17s 4*d* to Paris the gunner (*Peirs, gunnare*) in Edinburgh Castle, for wooden stocks, hair, tallow, wire, quantities of hemp and other necessities (*stokkis, hair, talloun, wyre, pecis hemp, cordis and uthir necessaris*), furnished by him for making the pulleys for the rigging (*the pilleis*) of the king's new ships, as in his bill of account (*as ane ticket of compt gevin mow latilie be him thairupoun bers*) (*TA* vii. 207). A rare example of a payment for 1539 that is not entered in the dedicated Munition House accounts; this almost certainly relates to the casting of bronze pulley-blocks (probably the same ones mentioned on 5 July 1539 and 2 August 1539; for earlier examples in the reign of James IV, see 1513). It is not clear what 'stocks' were in this context – perhaps only the pulley-wheels were brass, and the outer housing (known as the block) was wooden.

1539, 5 July: £1 1s 4d for a chalder of coal to William Hill for work on artillery; 6s 8d for bringing it up from Leith to the castle; £5 12s to William Caddislee, mason, and his servant, for their pay to 2 August 1539 at £1 8s weekly; £2 8s to two men with wheelbarrows (*barrowmenne*) working on the same work in the same period, at 12s weekly; £1 4s to George Balglavy for his wage, at 6s weekly; £3 to four men working in the gunhouse on the gun-moulds, polishing them and fixing them together with long iron rods (*in slipping and bynding thair of witht lang gaddis of irne*), each of the six moulds taking eight rods, and working on the moulds of these guns' chambers, and drying and polishing over 15 days, each man having 6s weekly; and to one of them working on the moulds of brass pulleys for the king's new ships for the same time at the same rate; £2 spent by Paris the gunner for clay, hair, wire, flax, oil and other necessities for casting the same moulds for the pulleys; £1 to the quarriers of Ravelston Craig for producing (*wynnying*) 60 pieces of stone at 4d each, for the Muniton House (*the said werk*, though it has not in fact been mentioned previously in this section); 2s 8d to porters (*pynouris*) for bringing them out of the quarry and placing them on carts; £4 to John Little and Robert Stewart, carters, for carrying the same from the quarry to the castle, in 23 loads at 3s 4d per load; £1 16s 2d for 62 loads of quicklime (*lyme*) delivered to the castle at 8s per dozen loads; 12s 6d for 60 loads of sand to work the same quicklime at 2s 6d per dozen loads; 12s to William Hill and his colleagues for great iron mauls, iron wedges and pickaxes (*grete irne mellis, irne weggis, and pikkis*) for levelling an outcrop of rock within the Muniton House (*breking and ryving of ane crag within the said werk*), and for steel delivered to him to temper the same pikes and wedges with (*TA* vii. 223-4). All these entries cover the entire period from 5 July 1539 to 2 August 1539 without any precise dates being given.

1539, 16 July: 10s to Robert Stewart and John Little, carters, for four loads of iron bases (a type of gun) at 2s 6d per load, totalling 36 bases, with 72 chambers and 39 wedges, carried out of the castle to Leith to be put into the *Unicorn* when she set out on her sea trials accompanied by the *Mary Willoughby* (*at hir furthtpassing witht the Marywillybe, quhen scho previt salage*); 1s 6d for two horse loads with four guns and their chambers, and one horse load with half a barrel of powder to be put in her at the same time, at 2s 6d per load; 4d to 'one porters' (*ane pynouris*) for carrying 60 iron bullets from the castle to Leith for the said guns; 2s

to porters (*pynouris*) in the castle, for bringing all of these guns out of the Munition House and putting them on the carts; 4s for the hire of a boat for bringing the same to the ship in Leith Roads (TA vii. 224-5). The *Unicorn* was a large, newly built war-galley; the *Mary Willoughby* was an older ship originally captured from the English. Leith Roads is the outer anchorage in the Firth of Forth off the coast at Leith.

1539, 19 July: Four falcons with their shrapnel and bullets, 12 arquebuses with their bullets, and half a barrel of powder, brought out of the castle to be put into the *Mary Willoughby* at her departure with the *Unicorn*, and given to Robert Stewart and Thomas Miller, carters, to carry down to Leith for 10s; 4s for the hire of a boat to bring them aboard the ship; 2s to a porter (*ane pynour*) for putting them in the boat, and the other munitons mentioned on 16 July 1539 (TA vii. 225).

1539, 24 July: 6s for the hire of a boat for bringing back the artillery mentioned on 19 July 1539 to the Shore from the *Mary Willoughby*, lying in Leith Roads after her return with the *Unicorn*; 1s 4d to porters for unloading the same and placing it ashore; 8s to Leith carters for bringing it up to the castle (TA vii. 225).

1539, 30 July: Nine double falcons with their chambers, two dozen arquebuses, with a barrel of powder, are delivered out of the castle to be put aboard the *Unicorn* when she sailed to hunt down pirate ships that had pillaged Scottish ships (*quhen scho past to serche and seik the schippis that pyllijt the scottis schippis*); 13s 8d to porters (*pynouris*) for carrying this out of the Munition House and putting it on carts; 1s to a porter (*ane pynour*) for counting the bullets and carrying them out of the Munition House; £1 12s 6d to Robert Stewart, John Little and Thomas Miller and their colleagues, carters, for taking the same 'from Leith to the Castle' (*fra Leith to the castell*) with other small artillery equipment, and another double falcon to be put in James Coutt's ship, totalling 13 loads at 2s 6d per load (TA vii. 225). Contrary to what the text says, it seems almost certain that the carters were in fact paid for the opposite journey, from the castle to Leith. The cruise against the pirates was evidently successful, as on 14 August 1539 and 15 August 1539 munitions from both the *Unicorn* and the pirate ship(s) she had

captured were taken ashore and stored in the King's Wark in Leith (*TA* v. 228; as these entries do not directly relate to the castle, they are not calendared separately here, but see 19 August 1536).

1539, 1 August: 2s 8*d* to eight porters (*pynouris*) in the castle, for carrying certain other munitions out of the Munition House and placing it on carts; 5s to Thomas Miller and John Little for bringing the same down to Leith in two loads at 2s 6*d* per load; 2s for four horse loads with two falcons, each horse hired for 6*d*; 6s for the hire of a boat to take these munitions aboard the ships in Leith Road (*TA* vii. 225–6).

1539, 2 August: Paid for work on the munitions or the Munition House in the period to 30 August 1539; £5 12s to William Caddislee (*Cadislie*), mason, and his servant, at £1 8s weekly; £2 8s to two porters (*pynouris*) who brought him lime and stone in the same period, at 6s weekly each. Also £2 13s 4*d* for 2½ chalders of coal bought in Leith for the smith at £1 1s 4*d* per chalder; 16s 8*d* for bringing them up to the castle at 6s 8*d* per chalder; £1 6s 4*d* for 45 loads of lime delivered to the castle at 8s per dozen loads; 12s 6*d* for 60 loads of sand at 2s 6*d* per dozen loads; £1 4s to the quarriers for providing (*wynning*) 60 pieces of roof-ridge stone (*riging stane*); £4 to Robert Stewart and Thomas Miller, carters, for carrying the same from the quarry to the castle in 24 loads at 3s 4*d* per load. And £1 4s to a man working in the Gunhouse on the moulds of pulleys for the king's ships, and on the altering of them (*the chengeing of the pilleis*) at 6s weekly (*TA* vii. 226–8). These entries appear to relate to expenses in the whole period from 2 August 1539 to 30 August 1539, though only the fees to the mason and his co-workers are placed at the start of the relevant account, the rest being placed between dated entries that are not in chronological order; with the exception of the manufacture of the bronze pulleys, the text does not specify which 'work' each item is for but it is clear that the mason's pay and the architectural stone is for the Munition House, while the coal for smithing is probably for work relating to the artillery itself.

1539, 3 August: £4 16s for four men hired on this day at 6s weekly, to level the rock outcrop inside the Munition House (*to ryff the crag wthin the said munitioun*

hous), to help heave up the roof of the building for setting up the [couplings] (*the cupyll*), and providing the wrights with nails and other necessaries thereto; £1 12s for 24 loads of coal delivered to the castle, bought at 1s 4d per load, to burn the outcrop because it refused to remove without fire (*TA* vii. 226–7). The payment for the coal appears to cover both purchase and delivery.

1538, 7 August: £11 13s for 58st. 4lb of French iron in wide sections (*braid French irne*), totalling 31 ‘ends’ (*contenand xxxj endis*) and bought from Robert Mar at 4s per st., and delivered to William Hill to be tyres for the wheels of medium-calibre artillery of the type known as moyanes (*schone to colvoring moyane quhelis*); £29 5s for 130st. of Spanish iron, totalling 99 ‘ends’, bought from John Farlie at 4s 6d per st., to be reinforcements, nails and other fittings for gun-wheels and gun-carriages (*to be bandis, nalis and uthir necessaris to the munitioun quhelis and stokkis*); 3s to porters (*pynouris*) for bringing all this iron up to the castle (*TA* vii. 228).

1539, 10 August: £1 19s 4d to John Drummond for 4st. of hauling ropes (*takyll towis*) for heaving and putting up the roof of the Munition House, at 7s 4d per st.; 4d to bring the rope up from Leith to the castle (*TA* vii. 227).

1539, 15 August: £28 for 200 planks (*dalis*) bought from Martin Edward at £14 per hundred, for roof-sheathing and ceiling-planks in the Munition House (*to be sarking to the said werk and lofting*); £1 5s to Robert Stewart and Thomas Miller, carters, for bringing ten loads of these planks up from Leith to the castle at 2s 6d per load; £1 16s for 72 horse loads with the rest of these planks, each horse taking two planks at 6d a load; £10 0s 12d for 60 Eastland boards to be doors and windows (*dure and wyndoys*) for the Munition House; 12s 6d for bringing it up to the castle in five cart loads; £1 4s to George Balglavy for his month’s wage at 6s weekly (*TA* vii. 227). Balglavy was the overseer of timber procurement, hired on 12 April 1539. ‘Sarking’ was the actual timber layer of the roof between the frames and the slate; ‘lofting’ properly meant a ceiling but also therefore flooring.

1539, 15 August: £2 is given for four pairs of small wheels for falcons (*TA* vii. 228). Falcons were small artillery pieces; these may be additional rear wheels being added to gun-carriages for naval use, a relatively new innovation at this date (see 31 January 1539 for the addition of similar wheels to the gun-carriages of larger cannons).

1539, 19 August: 4s to 12 men in the castle for bringing out a *moyen*, two small falcons and two dozen arquebuses to be put aboard the *Little Unicorn* when she went to sea; 10s to Robert Stewart and Thomas Miller, carters, and their colleagues, for bringing down the same to Leith, totalling four loads at 2s 6d per load; 6s for hire of a boat to take these munitions aboard; 4s to eight men at 6d each for shipping them in the boat (*TA* vii. 229). The *Little Unicorn* was another new royal warship, and other references show her to have been designed as a fleet scout and royal yacht; she sailed to Dundee on what was probably her first cruise, accompanied by the larger *Unicorn*, which had returned successfully from the pirate-hunting crews of 30 July 1539; on her return, her guns were placed in the King's Wark at Leith rather than returned to the castle, while no reference at all is made to bringing ashore the guns aboard the larger *Unicorn*.

1539, 30 August: £9 18s 3d for 49st. 5lb of French iron bought from Robert Mar at 4s per st. and delivered to William Hill to be plancher nails and other necessities for the work in the castle; 8d to bring the same up to the castle (*TA* vii. 229).

1539, 30 August: Expenses on the munitions and Munion House to 13 September 1538, including £3 12s to six porters (*pynouris*) assisting the masons, taking down the scaffolding and levelling the rock outcrop; 12s to George Balglavy for his wage at 6s weekly; 12s to the man working in the gunhouse at 6s weekly; £1 1s 4d for a chalder of coals delivered to William Hill during this period; 6s 8d for bringing it up from Leith to the castle (*TA* vii. 229–30).

1539, 6 September: £3 0s 12d for four great joists for ceilings (*to the lofting*) in the Munion House, three bought at 17s, the other at 10s; 10s for bringing them

up to the castle, in four loads at 2s 6d per load; £12 12s for 36 small joists for the same purpose (*to the samyn office*) at 8s each; £1 10s to Robert Stewart and Thomas Miller, carters, for carrying them to the castle in 12 loads at 2s 6d per load; 15s 2d for 26 loads of lime delivered to the castle at 8s per dozen; £12s 6d for 60 loads of sand delivered to the castle at 2s 6d per dozen; 1s for chalk (*calk*) to mark (*stryk*) the trees with, delivered to John Drummond; £3 to a painter for gilding ten chain (*ourlaying of ten chanys ... witht gold*) to put on the roof-ridge and gable-ends of the Munition House (*the rigging of the said wirk and gavillis of the samyn*) and sealing (*ourelaying*) the ironwork of its windows with lead; £16 to the slaters in part-payment for roofing the Munition House at £2 per 342¼ square feet (*for the rude*); 6s for six spars to be roofers' ladders (*beik ledderis*, see 10 May 1539) for roofing the Munition House at 1s each; 6d from carrying them from Leith to the castle (*TA* vii. 229–30). This marks the conclusion of the detailed set of accounts begun on 17 November 1538, and the completion of the conversion of the Great Chapel into the Munition House. In contrast to the pay for the wrights and smiths, which is noted in a heavily summarised form throughout the printed text, this is the only section where the pay of the mason William Caddislee and his co-workers is not printed in full. The series closes with four miscellaneous fees; the hire of a house by John Drummond in connection with the work for £2 10s is directly relevant, if only because it shows that a space outside the castle was used for part of the project (*TA* viii. 120 suggests that this house may have been near the gatehouse of Holyrood Abbey), and £12 6s 8d for a year's outlay to Master David Balfour in connection with the artillery is also likely to be at least partially relevant, as he seems to have been the accountant for the munitions, but the salaries of the king's saddler and sword-sharpener are added on in the typical fashion of incongruous miscellaneous expenses, and are not clearly connected to the castle.

1539, 13 September: The start of a new set of accounts relating to the artillery, following directly on from the set begun on 17 November 1538 and carried down to this date; these continue to 31 August 1540. As with the previous set, the pay records are not printed in full, but this time those for the first month are itemised, and here, the total wage amounts to £14 4s weekly, and the personnel comprise the master wright John Drummond with three servants; the wrights John Crawford and William Marshal each with a servant, the wrights John Wedderburn,

Thomas Lindsay and William Lowry; the smith William Hill and his four servants; the mason William Caddislee and his servant; George Balglavy the timber-buyer; and five porters and barrowmen making quicklime, assisting the masons and 'levelling the rock outcrop to make a route for cannons into the Munition House' (*to mak ane passage for cannonis to the munitioun hous*).

The sum of 13s for a half-chalder of smithy coal delivered to William Hill during this period, with the cost of transport from Leith to the castle; 10s for steel delivered to him to temper the pickaxes and wedges for levelling the rock outcrop; £9 19s for 49st. 12lb of French iron, bought from Robert Mar at 4s per stone, delivered to William Hill; 8d for bringing it up to the castle; 12s 10d for 22 loads of quicklime from Cousland, delivered to George Balglavy in the castle at 8d per load; £3 6s for six trees to be flooring and supports (*lofting and pillaris*) in the Munition House at 11s each; £1 to Robert Stewart and William Miller, carters, for carrying the same trees from Leith to the castle in six loads, and for two loads of curved timber (*crukit tymmer*) obtained from John Barton out of the ship timber (*of the rest of the schip tymmer*), at 2s 6d per load; £22 to the slaters to complete the payment of £38 owed for roofing the Munition House, totalling 6,502³/₄ square feet at £2 per 342¹/₄ square feet (*exteding to xix rude, havand for the rude xl s*), less the £16 paid in the account of 30 August 1539 (*TA* vii. 341-2). The figures for the area of the roof are measured in roods 18 ft 6in square and are unlikely to be precisely accurate.

1539, 9 October: Ongoing expenses for the four weeks to to 7 November 1539; 9s for six loads of coals to burn on the rock outcrop to allow it to be removed (*to gar it rise*), at 1s 6d per load; £2 16s for 200 smithy coals, delivered to William Hill, at £1 8s per hundred including transport; 12s 4d to the quarriers of Ravelston Craig, for producing (*the wyning of*) 25 pieces of roof-ridge stone and corbles (*riggin stane and corbell*) for the said work; £1 13s 4d for transport therefor from the quarry to the castle, totalling ten loads at 3s 4d per load; £1 1s for 18 double loads of Cousland lime during this period, at 1s per load; 5s for two dozen [loads] of sand at 2s 6d per load; £12 8s to Hans Cochrane for expenditure on stocks, clay, hair, wire, wax, steel, coal, peat, small pieces of coal (*pannis*) and other necessities for the making of six gun-moulds, as his particular account bears; £2 to Andrew Masterton, carver, for making and carving templates (*patronis*) for six guns, with

wooden lion heads and fleur-de-lis (*with lyoune heidis and flour de lices of tre*); £6 4s for six workmen working in the gunhouse on the making of the same moulds and working of the clay during this period, each man having 6s weekly. £21 12s to Robert Stewart, Thomas Millar, and John Gogar, carters, for carrying 48 loads of firewood from Newbattle to the castle, delivered to Master Hans Cochrane in this period at 9s per load; £1 3s for cutting and sawing 46 trees of the same firewood, at 6d for each tree cut and sawed; 7s to William Miller for cutting, attending, 'carting' (probably in this context, loading onto carts) and bringing in (*inbringing*) the same over seven days at 1s daily (*TA* vii. 343-4).

1539, 30 October: 16s for 2st. of candles, delivered to John Drummond at 8s per st.; £11 17s 4d for 40 trees received from Florence Cornitoun at that time to be ribs on the upper-storey ceiling (*uvir loft*) in the Munition House, at £2 16s per dozen, and for six great trees to be joists and pillars for the same ceiling, at 10s each; 3s 6d to porters (*pynouris*) in Leith for putting the same on carts, and for bringing six great trees from the harbour (*the port*) where they lay beyond the bridge to the cart; £2 5s to John Gogar and his colleagues, carters, for the transport of the same timber from Leith to the castle, in 18 loads at 2s 6d per load (*TA* vii. 343).

1539, 6 November: 7s 6d to Robert Stewart, William Millar and John Gogar, carters, for three loads of copper metal from Leith to the castle at 2s 6d per load; to William Millar for one load of the small timber (*the small tymmer*) from Leith to the castle (*TA* vii. 343).

1539, 7 November: Ongoing expenses for four weeks to 6 December 1539: 12s 10d for 22 loads of lime at 8d per load; 8s 6d for four dozen [loads] of sand at 2s 6d per dozen (*TA* vii. 344-5).

1539, 5 December: 16s for 2st. of candles delivered to John Drummond (*TA* vii. 345). The printed text reads 'October', but from context, as with the entry on 6 October 1539, this seems likely to be a mistake.

1539, 6 December: Ongoing expenses for the period to 3 January 1540; 12s for 12 loads of lime and 24 of sand, delivered to George Balglavy in this period; £1 8s for 100 smithy coals, and for carrying them from Leith to the castle, delivered to William Hill during this period; 18s for 200 slates to complete the roof of the Munition House above the smithy, at 9s per hundred, delivered to the castle without charge (*laid fre in the castell*); £8 to the slaters for roofing of the same, extending to approximately 1,200 square feet (*ijj rude half rude*; precisely 1197.875 square feet, but this is unlikely to be an exact figure) at £3 per rood (in theory, 342¼ square feet); £5 18s to Hans Cochrane, for expenses outlaid by him on coal, peat, wire, wax, tallow, resin and other expenses outlaid by him on making two new moulds, and for the time he melted and poured in the metal for them (*the tyme he meltit and ran the samin*), as his particular account bears; £8 8s to him to pay the wages of eight men working in the Gunhouse at £2 2s weekly [in total between them] (*TA* vii. 345). The printed text reads 'October' for the start-date of this period, but from the context this is likely to be a mistake.

1539, 9 December: £14 9s 8d to John Fisher's wife for 64st. 6lb of Spanish iron delivered to William Hill at 3s 6d per st.; £60 14s for 48st. 8lb of French iron at 4s per st.; 1s 8d to two porters (*pynouris*) for bringing the same up to the castle (*TA* vii. 345).

1539, 22 December: The start of a period where Sir Peter Crichton, Captain of Edinburgh Castle, pays for expenses on two comyns and someone called 'Flitcomit' (*twa Cumyngis and ane persoun callit Flitcomit*), which ends on 12 March 1540; the auditors of the accounts eventually award him emended expenses of £10 for this (*TA* vii. 339). Presumably these three people were being held prisoner. It is just possible that 'Flitcomit' (whose name seems to mean something like 'come-lightly') was a parson rather than simply a person, as the spelling of the word 'persoun' could cover both possibilities.

1540, 3 January: Ongoing expenses for the period to 31 January 1540: £1 8s for a chalder of coals delivered to William Hill in this period, including transport from Leith to the castle; 8s for 1st. of candles delivered to John Drummond in this period; 14s for 22 loads of lime delivered to George Balglavy in this period; 7s 7d for two dozen [loads of] sand delivered to him, at 2s 6d per dozen (TA vii. 346).

1540, 28 January; £13 16s 9d to John Fisher's wife for 61½st. of Spanish iron delivered to William Hill at 4s 6d per st.; 11d for bringing it up to the castle (TA vii. 345).

1540, 31 January: Ongoing expenses for the period to 28 February 1540; £2 2s for 1½ chalders of smithy coal delivered to William Hill in this period, at £1 8s per chalder including transport from Leith to the castle; 13s 4d to the quarrier of 'Ravelsraig' for the production (*wyning*) of 40 pieces of stone to be door jambs, pediment, sill and arch (*durris, theik, soll and pend*) to a door struck through in the east end of the Muniton House, at 4d per piece; £3 3s 4d to Robert Stewart and William Miller carters, for carrying the stone from the quarry to the castle, in 19 loads at 3s 4d per load; 15s 2d for 26 loads of lime received by George Balglavy in this period at 8d per load; 8s 9d for 30 [loads] of sand at 2s 6d per dozen. £8 4s for ten hanks of wire and 2,600 short nails (*takketis*) to wire the window-frames of the Muniton House (*wyre the caiss of the munitiounis*) which remain unwired, and for workmanship for the same, as the bill of account given by Paris Rowan bears. £6 2s 10d to Hans Cochrane for expenses outlayed by him on the making of two pieces of artillery, in complete payment; £8 8s to him to pay seven workmen's wages, taking £2 2s weekly [between them] (TA vii. 346-8).

1540, 6 February: £2 2s 6d to John Gogar, carter, and his colleagues, for 17 loads of munitions from Leith to the castle ahead of the formal coronation of James V's queen consort Mary of Guise (*agane the Quenis coronatioun*) at 2s 6d per load; 8s 6d to the sled-men (*sledderis*) for 18 loads of gun chambers from Leith to the castle at 6d per load; to two porters (*pynouris*) for taking down 30 gun-chambers from the top of David's Tower (*the heid of Davidis towris*) and placing them on carts with other chambers and munitions, to be taken back to Leith; £1 to the

carters for taking the same back to Leith in eight loads at 2s 6d per load (*TA* vii. 347). The carters' pay is said to have extended over two days to 7 February 1540; the coronation itself occurred on 22 February 1540, and the removal of the material back to Leith must have occurred afterwards, but the material is calendared together for convenience. This is followed by entries from the period between 17 February 1540 and 20 February 1540 relating to the moving and refurbishing of guns and ammunition in Leith, but these entries are not calendared here as they do not relate to the castle.

1540, 9 February: 5s 4d for eight fir spars to John Drummond for the work, at 5s 4d for the lot; 6d for bringing them up for the castle (*TA* vii. 346).

1540, 28 February: Ongoing expenses to 27 March 1540: 13s for ½ chalders of smithy coal delivered to William Hill in this period, including transport; 10s 10d for ten loads of lime and two dozen [loads of] sand delivered to George Balglavy. £8 8s to seven workmen working in the Gunhouse in this period, having £2 2s weekly [between them]; £2 to certain woodwrights, for cutting, cleaning and loading (*carting*) of certain firwood in the woods of Newbatttle, Carrington and Dalhousie, to be brought to the castle to melt the metal with, remaining six days in the woods; 8s 8d for six fir spars to stir the metal in the furnace with, price including transport from Leith; £19 7s to Robert Stewart, William Miller, John Merlioun and other colleagues, carters, for the carriage of the same firewood from the woods to the castle, totalling 43 loads at 9s per load, £1 14s 5d to Thomas Peebles, glasswright, for the glass of three windows in the upper Munition House, in the gables, and for the little window in the passageway (*trance*) thereof, totalling 19½ [square] feet of glass at 1s 2d per foot; to Robert Binning, glasswright, for glassbands, nails and 'flaws' provided by him (*glas bandis, malis and flawis furnissing be him*; it is not clear what a 'flaw' was but the *DOST* citations show that it was an item used in making windows, perhaps a type of nail) at the captain of the castle's command, for the windows in **David's Tower** and the chapel, as shown in two receipts signed by the captain (*TA* vii. 348-9).

1540, 2 March: £9 4s 9d to Michael McQueen's wife for 39st. 10lb of 'broad' iron to be tyres (*schone*) to the cannon wheels, at 4s 8d per st.; 8d for bringing this up to the castle (*TA* vii. 348–9).

1540, 22 March: £2 10s for the shipping of 43 pieces of copper in the form of foot-long blocks and flat cakes (*in fodmellis and caikis*) from Perth to Leith; 8s 6d for bringing this up from Leith to the castle (*TA* vii. 349).

1540, 23 March: £3 3s 8d to Master Hans Cochrane for expenses outlaid by him on the melting of the metals and casting of two double culverin moyanes on this day, as his account shows; the same day, £24 5s 0½d for 103st. 15lb of Spanish iron, bought from Robert Mar at 3s 6d per st. and delivered to William Hill; 1s 8d to the porters (*pynouris*) for bringing this up to the castle (*TA* vii. 349).

1540, 27 March: Ongoing expenses to 24 April 1540; £6 16s to George Balglavy, John Cunningham, and three barrowmen, hired by the master of the artillery to attend the munitions for guarding and organising them (*in keping and ordouring thairof*), in Leith and the castle, taking between them £1 14s weekly; £2 16s for two chalders of coal delivered to William Hill during this period, price per chaldar inclusive of delivery from Leith to the castle, £1 7s; £5 8s for six lasts of small barrels bought by John Cunningham to put the powder in, to be put in the ships; £1 2s 8d for 32 loads of Gilmerton lime at 5d per load, and 16 loads of Cousland lime at 8d per load; 17s 11d for 72 [loads] of sand at 2s 6d per dozen; £6 to the slaters for pointing and mending the Great Hall throughout, agreed with them by John Drummond; 15s 1d to porters (*pynouris*) for taking down certain small munitions from the top of the tower at Holyrood (*out of the tour heid of the abbay*) and carrying them to the castle, and for removing (*changeing of*) certain other munitions out of the 'bridge-house' in the castle (*brighous in the castell*) to the great Muniton House; £7 4s to six men working in the Gunhouse on drilling out the barrels of the new guns (*upoun the boring of the new pecis*) at Hans Cochrane's command during this period, each man taking 6s weekly; £2 2s to two smiths working on the polishing and cleaning (*dichting and clengeing*) of the same guns for 14 days, at 3s daily; £8 16s to the said Master Hans for his spending

on hammers, files and other equipment (*hammeris, fylis and uther werklumys*) bought by him for cleaning, drilling out and polishing of the same guns. £9 to Paris Rowan, gunner, for expenses outlaid by him on the making of certain pulleys (*polis*) for the ship *Lion*, which were delivered to John Barton in this period (*TA* vii. 350–2). One last was a unit of cargo assessment approximating to around a dozen normal barrels. The concluding item, bronze pulleys for the rigging of the galleon *Lion*, is calendared under the expenses for the next period beginning 24 April 1540, but the accounts make clear that the work was done in this period.

1540, 24 April: Ongoing expenses to 22 May 1540; £1 8s for 100 smithy coals to William Hill, price including transport. £15 9s 6d to William Millar, Robert Stewart and their colleagues, carters, for 107 loads of cannons, battards and other heavy munitions from the castle to Leith with their carriages and wheels, at 2s 6d per load; and to 84 sled-men (*sledderis*) with the small falcons, base chambers, and other small munitions from the castle to Leith in this period, at 6d per load, as a set of accounts signed by the master of artillery shows (*TA* vii. 351–2).

1540, 30 April: £4 7s for 18st. 4lb of broad pan iron (*braid pan irne*), bought from William Dick's wife at 4s 10d per st., and delivered to William Hill to be tyres for cannon wheels (*shcone to the cannoun quhelis*); £6 3s 8d to James Ramsay for 16½st. of Spanish iron at 3s 8d per st., delivered to the same William (*TA* vii. 352).

1540, 7 May: Lord Methven, as master of the artillery, files a separate set of ongoing expenses that are kept from this date to 12 June 1540 when the ships sailed; £6 13s 4d for porters (*pynours*) working in the castle on 7 May 1540, 10 May 1540, 18 May 1540 and 19 May 1540, loading munitions on carts and moving it around (*carting, carrying, and bering thairof*) at Methven's command, 1s 8d each. 2s 8d to two porters in Leith who helped to take the artillery off the carts that came from the castle; £1 5s to William Millar and his colleagues, carters, for four loads of powder, four loads of wheels, iron fittings and gunrests (*quhelis, irne graith and trestis*) from Leith to the castle at 2s 6d per load. £12 5s for small expenses on porters' fees, the movement of gun-carriages, wheels, tow-ropes, powder, bullets, nails, boats, the opening of powder barrels, the bringing down of

incendiaries (*of the fir werk*) from the castle to Leith, and other small expenses during this period. £13 4s to Paris Rowan for his expenditure on powder bags, small nails, lombard paper, sheepskins and other things relating to the guns at the master of the artillery's command; £57 6s 1d at his command to Master Wolf and Christopher, Frenchmen, gunners, for their expenditure on quicksilver, brandy, sal ammoniac, canes, vermilion oil, petrol, olive oil, walnut oil, turpentine, sulphur, lint, hemp, tallow (*quik silver, aqua vite, salmoniakill, canis, vermeniou ule, petrolle, ule de olive, wannat ule, turpatyne, britstane, lynt, hemp, talloun*) and other expenses on 72 fire spears, 24 fire devices, 15 fire balls and eight fire pikes (*vj dosane fyr sparris, twa dosane fyr gannis, xv fyre ballis, and xvij fyre perkis*), with other incendiary ammunition (*fyre werk schot*) invented by the king. Some artillery was sent back from the ships as they departed, and £2 was paid to eight porters (*pynouris*) for bringing it back onto the land, putting it on carts and putting it away in the castle, along with a cannon that had not been put aboard the ships; £3 2s 7d to the carters for bringing back the said artillery from Leith to the castle, and for the transport of a cannon, totalling 15 loads, at 2s 6d per load; £22 1s for 126st. of lead, bought at Methven's command at 3s 6d per st. and delivered to the master wright John Drummond (*TA vii. 353-7*). This set of accounts also includes the shipping of the guns out to the fleet, the purchase of wheels for gun-carriages, the fitting of rollers under the guns when they were already aboard ships, the movement of equipment between Leith and places such as Stirling, Holyrood and the Newbattle woods, work in a dry dock at Burntisland, and a great deal of refitting of old-fashioned wrought-iron guns at Leith; among these works, 'the great bombard', perhaps Mons Meg, got a new wooden stock, at a total cost of £4 1s 8d, but given the fact that a new woodwright was hired, and evidence that other guns were mounted at the harbour, we cannot be sure that the work was done in the castle. Similarly, a comprehensive set of new equipment for loading the guns is omitted as it was presumably purchased at the last minute and cannot be confidently associated with the castle.

1540, 14 May: £10 14s 8d to Robert Denholm, for 42st. 15lb of Spanish iron, at 5s per st., delivered to [William Hill the smith] for making breech-wedges, straps, elevating-wedges, wheels (*slottis, bandis, waggis, schone*) and other necessaries for the munitions that were put into the ships; £3 12s 10d to John Arbuckle for

17st. 7lb of French iron at 5s 4d per st., delivered to [William Hill] for the same work; 2s for bringing up to the castle all this iron, totalling 9 waws less 4st. (*ix waw four stane les*) (TA vii. 351-2). Adding the iron calendared on this day and under 30 April 1540 gives a total of 95st. 2lb; it is not clear how this relates to the stated total.

1540, 22 May: Ongoing expenses to 19 June 1540. £2 14s to George Balglavy (*Balgavy*) during this period, and John Cunningham during three weeks until the departure of the ships [on 12 June 1540], at 16s weekly; 12s to two sawers for four days, taking 3s daily; £1 8s for 100 smithy coals delivered to William Hill in this period, with their carriage from Leith to the castle included (TA vii. 352).

1540, 5 June: £9 15s to Robert Mar for 29st. of Spanish iron at 5s per st., delivered to William Hill to be breech wedges, straps, rings (*slottis, bandis, ringis*), and other necessaries for the artillery which was put in the ships; £8 14s to him for 36st. French iron for the same purpose, at 4s 10d per st.; 1s for carrying the same to the castle (TA vii. 353).

1540, 13 June: 6s 6d for two cart loads and three sled loads of gunpowder from the castle to Leith this morning; 1s for bringing back two barrels of powder from Leith to the castle (TA vii. 357). This is included in the master of artillery's separate account begun on 7 May 1514, but is calendared separately as it is dated precisely, and falls outwith the period which that account notionally covers.

1540, 19 June: Ongoing expenses to 17 July 1540; £1 8s for 100 coals delivered to William Hill in this period (TA vii. 358). The account also includes £12 8s to John Drummond and his assistants, to cover previously unpaid work done aboard the ships.

1540, 22 June: £11 0s 2d to Robert Mar, for 45st. 9lb of French iron, at 4s 10d per st., delivered to William Hill; to Mr Thomas Kean (*Kene*) for 24st. 14lb of Spanish

iron at 5s per st., delivered to the said William; 1s for bringing the same up to the castle (*TA* vii. 358).

1540, 17 July: Ongoing expenses to 14 August; £1 8s for a chalder of smithy coal, and its transport from Leith to the castle; £5 17s 8*d* to the master of artillery for expenditure taking the artillery from the ships at Burntisland, shipping it to Leith, and for porters' fees (*pynour feis*) for unloading, landing and mounting it [on the gun-carriages?] and then dismounting it again in the castle (*for lossing, laying on land, monting thairof, and dismonting of the samin in the castell*); £29 2s 4*d* to the carters in Leith for bringing cannons, battards, moyans and other munitions from Leith to the castle between 3 August 1540 and 6 August 1540, totalling 25 cart loads and 260 horse loads, and for other expenses on the same as John Drummond's accounts show (*TA* vii. 358–9).

1540, 3 August: £14 to a Dutchman for 100 planks (*dalis*) to floor the [part of the] Munion House above the smithy in the castle; £12 for 24 oak timbers to repair the windows in the foundry (*in the melting hous*), at £6 per dozen; 5s to the porters (*pynouris*) for towing the said planks and timber and loading them on carts; £2 15s to William Millar, Robert Stewart and their colleagues, carters, for carriages of the said planks and timber from Leith to the castle in 22 loads at 2s 6*d* per load (*TA* vii. 359).

1540, 9 August: £10 to Michel Bay, the French pavement-maker (*Michell Ba, Franche calsay maker*), in part-payment for flooring the new Munion House in the castle with paving stones (*calsay stane*) (*TA* vii. 359).

1540, 14 August: Ongoing expenses to 31 August 1540; £11 10s 6*d* to John Fa'side for 49st. 6lb of French iron at 4s 8*d* per st., delivered to William Hill; £16 1s 4*d* to James Stevenson, for 72st. of Spanish iron at 4s 8*d* per st., delivered to the said William; 1s 10*d* for bringing it up to the castle; £8 13s to Paris Rowan, gunner, for his expenditure on clay, flax, wire, hair, tallow, wax, coals, peats, turfs (*clay, flokix, wyre, hair, talloun, walx, colis, petis, turvis*) and other necessaries for making a new

mould for a double culverin 16ft long, as his particular account shows; £6 8s to six men working in the foundry (*the melting hous*) with him on making said moulds, and working the clay for three weeks, each man taking 6s weekly; £13 6s 8d to Mr David Balfour for his fee for his labours in overseeing the work on the castle and keeping the accounts, and other works done by him (*TA* vii. 360).

1540, 16 August: £20 5s to William Miller, Robert Stewart, Thomas Braidwood and their colleagues, carters, for carrying 45 loads of birch (*byrk*) from the woods of Dalhousie to make (?) yokes (*zokkis*) and to be firewood to melt the metal with, between this date and 28 August 1540 (*TA* vii. 360).

1540, 31 August: The start of a third set of accounts relating to the artillery, following directly on from the set begun on 13 September 1539, and carried down to this date; these continue for a full calendar year to 31 August 1541. As with the previous sets, the pay records are not printed in full, but those for the first month are itemised and the total wage amounts to £13 16s weekly, for personnel comprising: the master wright John Drummond with three servants, two sawers, and the wrights John Crawford, with one servant (increased to two from 24 April 1541), and Thomas Lindsay; the smith William Hill and his four servants; six men working in the foundry with Paris Rowan (reduced to five from 9 October 1540, then two after 4 December 1540, and none from 1 January 1540); and George Balglavy the timber-buyer and factotum (who has wages only for the first four-week period ending on 9 October 1540, but reappears as a carter and apparently a scrap-metal dealer on 12 May 1541). Also in this period, John Laing and his servant were also recruited to work in the foundry for two weeks, at 14s weekly, receiving £2 8s for this period; 10s was paid for glue to glue small wooden pieces (*the spillis*) onto the template of a gun; £1 1s 4d for a chalder of coal delivered to William Hill, smith; 6s 8d for the transport of the same from Leith to the castle (*TA* vii. 486).

1540, 18 September: 3s 4d to the porters (*pynouris*) of Leith, for carrying and loading onto carts 400 boards, 100 oak trees and 12 fir spars, received from Florence Cornitoun and delivered to John Drummond to make close carts; £4 12s

6d to William Bapty, John Little and their colleagues, carters, for carrying the same timber from Leith to the castle in 38 loads at 2s 6d per load (TA vii. 487). The accounts also belatedly settle the fee for transporting timber to Holyrood for the coronation of Mary of Guise on 22 February 1540.

1540, 24 September: £12 0s 10½d to John Nortwall for 4 waws 2st. 11lb of Spanish iron delivered to William Hill to be an iron gate at the top of the tower in Holyrood Palace, at £2 17s per waw; 10d for bringing this iron up to the castle (TA vii. 487). Although ultimately intended for Holyrood, the ironwork was evidently done in the castle smithy.

1540, 9 October: Ongoing expenses to 6 November 1540; £2 to John Cunningham at 10s weekly; £2 16s for two chalders of smithy coal, including transport from Leith to the castle, delivered to William Hill; £4 for three large padlocks for the prison door in the castle, and one for the iron gate at the top of the tower (*thre grete hingand lokkis to the prisone hous dur in the castell, and ane to the heid of the tower upoun the irn zet*), at £1 each; 16s for 2st. of candle delivered to John Drummond (TA vii. 487–8). The gate at the top of the tower may be the one for Holyrood, which as being constructed in the castle smithy, cf. 24 September 1540.

1540, 12 October: £4 0s 12d to Paris Rowan for his expenses paid to 15 men who helped to stir the metal in the furnace and fed (*bett*) the fire of it on this day, and for wire, peat, coals, tallow and other necessaries furnished thereto (TA vii. 488). This was the casting of the double culverin mentioned under 14 August 1540.

1540, 6 November: Ongoing expenses to 4 December 1540, during which Paris and his five assistants work at cleaning and boring out the new gun; £2 16s to John Laing and his servant, working on the gun for four weeks, at 14s per week; £3 to Andrew Mansioun, carver, and his servant, working on the gun for two weeks, at £1 10s weekly; 14s for files to clean the gun with; 3s for a saw to cut the gun's mouth with (John Drummond's two sawers do the sawing); £34 13s 5d to Robert

Mar and Robert Cor for 11 waws 6st. 11lb Spanish iron, delivered to William Hill at £3 per waw; £7 4s 5d to Rober Mar for 29st. 14lb broad French iron at 4s 10d per st., delivered to the said William to be tyres for small wheels; £19 12s to William Dick's wife for 84st. of broad pan iron to be tyres for cannon wheels at 4s 8d per st.; 3s 8d for bringing the same iron up to the castle, totalling 21 waws 25lb (TA vii. 488-9).

1540, 4 December: Ongoing expenses to 1 January 1541; £4 to Andrew Mansioun, carver, and his servant, working in the foundry at £1 10s per week; £1 3s 6d to Paris Rowan for his expenditure on sharpening the files to clean the new gun, and for candle to work with during this period; 12s to a barrel-maker (*ane cowpar*) for 48 girdles to gird the saltpetre barrels with, at 3s per dozen; £33 17s 6d to Michel Bay (*Mychaell Bay*) French pavement-maker, in complete payment of £43 17s 6d for the pavement in the new Munition House, extending to approximately 3,000 square feet (*ix rude thre quarteris*, precisely 3336.9375 square feet at £4 10s per 342¼ square feet); £2 to eight men working for three days placing the munitions in the Munition House, after the floor was laid, each man on 1s 8d per day (TA vii. 489-90).

1540, 7 December: 8s for 1st. of candle delivered to John Drummond (TA vii. 489).

1541, 1 January: Ongoing expenses to 28 January 1540; £4 to Andrew Mansioun, carver, and his servant; £1 8s for a chalder of smithy coal delivered to William Hill, including the cost of transport from Leith to the castle; £1 12s for 4st. candle delivered to John Drummond at 8s per st. (TA vii. 490).

1541, 28 January: Ongoing expenses to 26 February 1540; 3s for steel delivered to William Hill to sharpen his chisels with; £1 8s for a chalder of smithy coal delivered to William Hill, including the cost of transport from Leith to the castle. £1 18s 4d for two great pans weighing 14lb delivered to Paris to make a set of scales (*ballandis*) to weigh the gunpowder with, priced at 2s 8d per lb; 1s 8d for four

fathoms of cord delivered to be strings for the same, at 5*d* per fathom; £1 6*s* 8*d* for 4st. of lead delivered to him to make weights for the scales, at 6*s* 8*d* per st. (*TA* vii. 490-2). The expenses for the gunpowder scales follow in the accounts after the recruitment of John Cunningham to work in the powder mill on 5 February 1541 and are to an extent probably connected.

1541, 5 February: John Cunningham and his servants entered pay in the powder mill at the command of Lord Methven, master of the artillery; £8 6*s* is given to them from this point to 12 March 1540, with Cunningham taking 10*s* weekly and each servant 6*s* weekly; 8*s* for 1,400 wands delivered to him to make charcoal at 6*d* per hundred; 3*s* for a sandglass to measure the hours with; 2*s* 8*d* for tubs to put the sulphur, coal, saltpetre and powder (*brintstane, cole, salpeter and pulder*) in; 13*s* for 26lb of sulphur delivered to him, at 6*d* per lb; £6 5*s* to John Ker for 10½st. of sulphur delivered to him during this time, at 10*s* per st. (*TA* vii. 491).

1541, 22 February: £13 16*s* 4*d* to James Graham's wife for 63st. 12lb of French iron at 4*s* 4*d* per st. delivered to William Hill; 10*d* for transporting it to the castle (*TA* vii. 491).

1541, 26 February: £8 to William Leach for a great mast delivered to John Drummond to be two templates for making gun-moulds; £1 4*s* for three great planks delivered to him at the same time, at 8*s* each; 2*s* to the porters (*pynouris*) for carrying the mast and planks to the carts and putting them in them; 7*s* 6*d* for carrying the same from Leith to the castle, in three loads at 2*s* 6*d* per load (*TA* vii. 491).

1541, 26 February: Ongoing expenses to 26 March 1541; 16*s* to two woodwrights who helped cut timber in Calderwood for a week during this period (*TA* vii. 492).

1541, 3 March: To Thomas Turbot for 42st. 2lb of Spanish iron, at 5s 4d per st., delivered to William Hill; 8d for bringing up the iron to the castle; 16s 8d for half a chalder of smithy coal delivered to him, including the delivery cost (TA vii. 492).

1541, 16 March: £21 13s 9d to Patrick Aitken, for 8 waws 2st. 12lb Spanish iron at £3 per waw, delivered to William Hill; 1s 3d for bringing it up to the castle (TA vii. 492).

1541, 22 March: £16 to John Ray and John Fairbairn, fletchers, for feathering and balancing (*feddering and ewynnyng*) 2,000 old crossbow bolts (*ganzeis for the croce bow*) and the balancing of 700 bolts with wooden fins (*fedderit with tre*), at 16s per hundred (TA vii. 492-3).

1540: £120 paid to John Merlioun (*Merlezeone*), mason, for supplying materials (*stuff*) to build the Register House in the castle (TA vii. 337).

1541, 23 March: £8 6s 8d given to John Lawson for 22 trees to be scaffolding in the Register House in the castle, at 6s 8d each; £3 6s to Thomas Morton for 72 rafters for the project at 11s per dozen; 18s 6d to Thomas Branwood, carter, for carrying the same trees and rafters from Leith to the castle, in seven loads at 2s 6d per load; 2s to the porters (*pynouris*) for carrying the timber to the carts and loading it on (TA vii. 493).

1541, 26 March: £13 6s 2d to John Fisher's wife and Mr Thomas Kean for 53st. 7lb of Spanish iron at 5s per st., delivered to William Hill to be an iron gate for the Register House (*ane irne zet thairto*); 10d for bringing it to the castle (TA vii. 493).

1541, 26 March: Ongoing expenses to 23 April 1541; £2 14s to two sawers working on the props (*centreis*) for the Register House for three weeks at 18s weekly; £1

8s for a chalder of smithy coal delivered to William Hill, including transport from Leith to the castle; £1 16s to John Cunningham, working in Calderwood making charcoal for the powder mill for two weeks at 10s weekly, and two men with him for eight days at 2s daily; 2s 4d for bringing the same [char]coal home to the castle (TA vii. 493–4).

1541, 23 April: Ongoing expenses to 21 May 1541; the wages are again printed in full for this month, with the two sawers now added to the personnel at 18s weekly for £3 12s; £2 16s for two chalders of smithy coal delivered to William Hill at £1 8s each, including transport from Leith to the castle (TA vii. 494).

1541, 25 April: 10s for shipping two guns [across the Forth] in a boat from Burntisland to Leith; 1s for putting them in the boat and taking them out again in Leith; 104 cut planks (*sawin dalis*), 51 oak trees, 60 corbles (*corbellis*) and 200 rafters are received from Florence Cornitoun, no price being specified; 8s to the pioneers, for carrying them to the carts and loading them on; £7 7s 6d to carters for carrying the said guns and timbers from Leith to the castle in 59 loads at 2s 6d per load (TA vii. 494–5). The carters' names are partially obscured by a gap in the text; they include John Merloun and apparently another named John (probably the John Smith who appears on 29 April 1539 and 13 August 1541).

1541, 24 April: £1 to 12 porters (*pynouris*) for bringing up the heavy guns to the battlements to fire a salute (*furthlaying of the grete artelzerie to the wall heid to be schot*) to mark the birth of a son to the king (*my lord Duke*), and for bringing the guns back and putting them away (*inlaying and housing of the samin*) on 26 April 1541 (TA vii. 495).

1541, 6 May: £2 4s to John Cunningham and two servants with him, working in the powder mill for two weeks until 21 May 1541, taking £1 2s 0d weekly between them (TA vii. 495).

1541, 12 May: 13s 4*d* to eight porters (*pynouris*) at 1s 8*d* per man, for carrying certain great oak trees cut in the Abbot's Yard at Holyrood to the west gate of the church (*to the west kirk stile*) and for putting them in carts there; 13s 8*d* to William Miller and George Balglavy, carters, for carrying the same trees together with three (?) large guns found at Holyrood (*thre grete peccis gottin in the abbay*) to the castle, in 11 loads at 1s 4*d* per load; 4s to George Balglavy for carrying a large copper kettle from Corstorphine to the castle, and 2s for taking it out of the furnace [at Corstorphine] and putting it on a cart (*TA* vii. 495).

1541, 21 May: Ongoing expenses to 18 June 1541; £6 2s to John Cunningham and his four servants for three weeks within this period at £1 14s weekly; 9s 4*d* for 700 dried cod bladders (*dry keling soundis*) to make glue, at 1s 4*d* per hundred (*TA* vii. 496).

1541, 29 May: £33 0s 4*d* to Robert Ker and Simon Marjorybanks' wife, for 10 waws 3st. 13lb Spanish iron at 5s 4*d* per st., delivered to William Hill; £6 17s to John Reid for 27st. 6lb French iron at 5s, also delivered to him (*TA* vii. 496).

1541, 10 June: £11 2s 10*d* to Cuthbert Davidson for 47st. 12lb French iron at 4s 8*d*, delivered to William Hill for work at Crawfordjohn in Lanarkshire; 2s 10*d* porters (*pynours*) for bringing it to the castle. £1 4s for three carriage horses with the wrights' equipment (*wirklumes*) and a double door of oak, sent from the castle to Crawfordjohn; £1 12s for four large locks for Crawfordjohn at 8s each. £2 8s for six horse loads with the locks, and window glass [not supplied from the castle], and chairs, stools, bands, nails and other ironwork made in the castle, at 8s per horse; 6s to a boy coming several times from John Drummond at Crawfordjohn to Leith and the castle for timber, iron bands, locks, nails and other ironwork sent to Crawfordjohn (*TA* vii. 496–7). These entries show the castle serving as a base for activity at Crawfordjohn in Lanarkshire, probably primarily concerned with the royal goldmine there; they are calendared together here for convenience, under the date assigned in the accounts for the first of them; additional entries for window glass from Thomas Peebles and timber from Leith are not summarised, as they do not directly concern the castle.

1541, 18 June: Ongoing expenses to 16 July 1541; £4 8s to John Cunningham and his four servants working in the powder mill for two weeks, and him working in the wood at Newbattle on the cutting and cleaning of wood to be charcoal for the other two weeks of the period, having weekly 10s for himself, and 6s for each servant; 8s to two men working with him on the cutting and cleaning of wood for four days at 2s per day; £1 14s 2d for carrying the same wood from Newbattle to the castle in 41 loads at 10s per dozen loads; £16 to Thomas Branwood, carter, and his colleagues, for carrying two double falcons and five smaller bronze guns (*two dowbil fawconis, and v smallar pece of found*) from Craignethan Castle (*Draffen*) and Hamilton, and a copper kettle from Crawfordjohn, all to Edinburgh Castle, totalling eight loads at £2 per load. £2 4s to Michael Gardiner for his expenses and hire of a horse to Kelso Abbey to collect a broken bell and three pots, and other associated journeys which proved necessary to collect the necessary paperwork; £1 1s for three horses to carry the old broken bell from Kelso to Edinburgh at 7s per horse (*TA* vii. 497–8). Michael Gardiner, perhaps the son of the Jehan Garnier recruited in 1511, was the progenitor of a long-serving dynasty of royal artillerymen.

1541, 30 June: To Jehan de Lyon (*Johne Delyoun*) for his expenses and the hire of a horse to Hamilton and Craignethan with a mandate to collect the falcons mentioned under 18 June 1541 and return with them to Edinburgh (*TA* vii. 498–9).

1541, 8 July: To Jehan de Lyon for his expenses passing to Kilwinning Abbey, twice before they would consent to hand it over; 10s to a wright for making scaffolding for taking it down from the steeple there; for eight horses to bring it from Kilwinning to Edinburgh Castle, at 8s per horse, as it weighed 94st. (*TA* vii. 499).

1541, 13 July: 8s 6d to carters for three drafts of [artillery] from the castle to Leith, to put in the *Unicorn* when the cardinal [Archbishop of St Andrews, James Beaton] departed for France, at 2s 6d per load (*TA* vii. 497). A gap in the text conceals what was carried, but it was evidently the artillery whose return from the

ship is recorded under 16 July 1541. The actual interlude between departure and return was probably slightly longer, but the travel time for a galley was very fast indeed.

1541, 15 July: 4s to the porters (*pynouris*) in Leith, for carrying and loading on to carts 448 pikes of Spanish oak and 107 pikes of white oak, each with their spearheads (*iiii^l xlvij pikkis of Spanze esche and i^l vij pikkis, quhite esche hedit*), a further 42 pikeshafts of white ash and 12 pikeshafts of beech (*xlij pikkis quite esche, and xij pikkis of beche, unhedit*), 130 lightweight handguns (*half haggis*), 64 hand-culverins (*culveringis*), 103 powder horns (*hornis*), 220 lints and two barrels of culverin powder, received from Charles Murray; £1 5s for carriage of the same to the castle in ten loads at 2s 6d per load; 1s 8d for skeins of thread to hang the powder horns on; £9 5s to William [Smeberd], armourer, for polishing and 'nailing' (*dichting and naling*) of the said 555 pikes with spearheads (*pikkis hedit*), at 4d for polishing each one (*TA vii. 497*). From context, the 'pikkis' and 'culverings' are clearly long spears and handguns rather than pickaxes and heavy artillery. The 'nailing' of the pikes may possibly have simply referred to fastening their spearheads on firmly, or even fixing them to the wall on display, but it may have involved the more complex process of attaching metal ribs down the top section of each shaft to prevent them being cut in battle.

1541, 16 July: £10 15s for two barrels of culverin powder; 6d for carrying the same to the castle, where it was received by John Drummond; 16s to a barrel-maker in Leith (*ane cowper of Leith*) for re-lidding and refitting (*heding and grathing*) two lasts of old powder barrels taken from the ships when they returned from the Hebrides; 2s to two porters (*twa pynouris*) for carrying the same from Leith to the castle (*TA vii. 497*). A last was a quantity of around a dozen barrels.

1541, 16 July: Ongoing expenses until 13 August 1541; £2 16s for two chalders of smithy coals delivered to William Hill, at £1 8s each including delivery from Leith to the castle; £3 4s to John Bickerton, smith and culverin-maker, entering into pay to work in the castle on the polishing and fitting of the lightweight handguns and hand-culverins (*half haggis and culveringis*), making screws, screw-shafts and

cleaners (*vices, vice nails and clengeris*) for some of them, at 16s weekly. 11s for shipping the munitions out of the *Unicorn* from Burntisland to Leith after her return from France; 8s for carrying the same to the castle, totalling three loads and one horse load; 1s 4d for porters (*pynouris*) who took them out of the boat and loaded them on the carts (*TA* vii. 499–500). The departure of the *Unicorn* for France is calendared only a few days earlier on 13 July 1541 – the real gap was probably a little longer, but galleys were certainly very fast.

1541, 30 July: John Drummond receives 199 (*ii, ane les*) Eastland boards for the ‘shrouding’ (*schrouding*) of the Register House from Florence Cornitoun; 4s to the porters (*pynouris*) for carrying them to the carts and loading them on; £2 8s 6d to the carters for carrying them to the castle in 19 loads at 2s 6d per load (*TA* vii. 499). *DOST* suggests that ‘schrouding’ was related to roofing, but the only other citations offered seem to relate to mill-wheel paddles. Perhaps it was timber panelling for walls?

1541, 1 August: 2s for a horse to carry the equipment (*werklumes*) of John Drummond and the wrights when they passed to Calderwood; £2 4s to four men with four horses gathering together the hundred great trees they cut in sundry parts of the wood for making wheels for close carts; £1 2s to the forester for his due, at 4d per tree (*TA* vii. 500).

1541, 9 August: £8 15s 6d to Robert Mar, for 39st. of French iron at 4s 6d per st., delivered to William Hill; for 10st. Spanish iron at 5s 4d per st., delivered to him at the same time (*TA* vii. 500).

1541, 13 August: Ongoing expenses to 31 August 1541; £2 to John Bickerton, culverin-maker and smith, at 16s weekly; £20 to the master of the artillery, for money he paid at the king’s command, for a ‘single’ falcon made by Master Wolf (*Maister Wolloff*), gunner in Dunbar, and delivered to Lord Maxwell; £12 4s for the costs of carrying the same from Dunbar to Edinburgh Castle, along with certain sulphur and charcoal to make gunpowder with, and for the carriage of metal from

Jedburgh, the readying of six arquebuses sent to Rothesay Castle (*grathing of vj hawkbuttis sent to the Kingis grace castell in Bute*), the fitting of metal straps and wooden stocks to (*girthing and stokking of*) eight hand-culverins, and other small expenses made by him. £5 8s to Robert Murray for casting 108st. of lead ballast for the ships in the Isles campaign, not paid previously; £13 6s 8d to Mr D[avid Balfour] for his fee for his labours in [overseeing] the work on the castle and keeping the accounts, and other works done by him (*TA* vii. 501–2). Murray may not have been working in the castle, and his inclusion is a typically miscellaneous payment added to the end of an account but is included here for completeness' sake. Balfour's own entry is fragmentary but can be reconstructed from the previous entry on 31 August 1540.

1541, 13 August: To Jehan de Lyon, for his expenses and the hire of a horse travelling to St Andrews to take a moyan out of the castle; 6s to the porters who brought the same from the tower to the boat; £2 for shipping it in the boat to Leith; 4s to the porters (*pynouris*) in Leith who took it out of the boat and loaded it on the cart; 6s 7d to John Smith for carrying the moyen with 'her' gun-carriage and wheels (*hir stok and quhelis*) to the castle, in three loads (*TA* vii. 501).

1541, 20 August: 2s for bringing back the wrights' equipment (*thair wurkumes*) from the woods; £14 14s to George Balglavy, Thomas Branwood and their colleagues, carters, for carrying the equipment and the timber calendared under 1 August 1541 to the castle in 21 loads at 14s per load (*TA* vii. 501).

1541, 23 August: £1 6s for three barrels of sulphur (*brintstane*) containing 65st. weight, delivered to John Drummond in Leith (*TA* vii. 501). It is not entirely clear if this was brought to the castle, as no delivery is noted.

1541, 29 August: 14s to George Balglavy for bringing a load [of wood] to make charcoal, from Calderwood to the castle (*TA* vii. 501).

1541, 31 August: £14 5s 9d to James Stevenson for 63st. 8lb of some sort of iron (*vernour irr*; the meaning of the word is unknown to *DOST*) at 4s 6d per st., delivered to a Dutchman to make certain iron guns at the master of the artillery's command; and £4 15s to the said James for 17st. 13lb of broad Spanish iron at 5s 4d per st., delivered for the same purpose; 1s 2d for carrying it up to the castle (*TA* vii. 501-2).

1541, 31 August: The start of a fourth set of accounts relating to the artillery, following directly on from the set begun on 31 August 1540, and carried down to this date; these continue for more or less a full calendar year, with the last entries being dated 5 August 1542. In contrast with the previous sets of artillery accounts, these no longer contain monthly sections with pay records followed by expenses, but are organised thematically, beginning first with accounts for general artillery expenses, then those for the Gunhouse from 19 September 1542 onwards, both sets probably originally intended to be brought down to 18 March 1542, but the latter evolving without a break into an ongoing set of general expenses after that date; these are followed by shorter sets of accounts for the powder mill (see Powder Vault), the purchase of ropes and the construction of the Register House, all of the relevant material being calendared individually by date below.

Pay for this period is summarised separately at the end of the accounts, and includes: £16 10s to John Drummond, master wright, working on the munitions and the Register House, at £1 weekly until to 31 December 1541, when he was given a privy seal grant of £6 monthly in 'ordinary wages' (*ordinar wageis*) not covered by these accounts; £39 4s 6d to John Crawford, wright, at 18s weekly until 30 June 1542, when he was taken on 'ordinary wages' of £4 monthly; £30 to Patrick, smith, to 30 June 1542 at 14s weekly; £38 13s 3d to Thomas Lindsay, wright, to 5 August 1542 at 16s weekly; £3 16s 8d to William Laurison (*Lowrysoune*) for the same period, at 14s weekly; £3 16s 8d to David Langmuir for the same period, at 14s weekly; £33 16s 8d to George Bishop until 25 March, and then to William Lister (*Litster*) in his place until 5 August, at 14s weekly; £24 3s 4d to Harry Anderson for the whole period at 10s weekly; £149 16s 8d to William Hill, smith, and his four servants, for the whole period at £3 2s weekly between them; £149 16s 8d to John Bickerton working upon cleaning, mending and polishing of the small handguns and muskets (*half haggis and culveringis*) and other small

ironwork, for the whole period at 16s weekly; £15 6s to Willem van Dyck the Dutchman (*Williame Fandik, Ducheman*), maker of iron guns, from his entry to work in the castle on 27 August 1541 to 21 December 1541, when he passed away (*decessit*), at 18s weekly; £36 9s to two sawyers for ten months and three days at 18s weekly [between them]. £13 6s 8d to Master David Balfour, for his work attending on the craftsmen, receiving their accounts, and writing them up, during this period (*TA* viii. 118, 133–5). The total outlay recorded is £1,289 14s 2d. Entries relating exclusively to non-castle topics, such as warships and the King's Wark arsenal at Leith, have been omitted from the calendar in this report.

1541: A set of accounts for expenditure on repairs to the Palace (*beting of the place*) and completion of the Register House; 6s to John Drummond for glue provided by him for the doors and window-mullions (*durris and mulleris*) of the Register House; 10s to Archibald Rule, painter, for overpainting (*ourlaying*) the window-mullions with black; £3 11s 4d to Thomas Peebles for 53½ square feet of glass for the windows at 1s 4d per square foot; 14s for two hanks of wire at 7s each, delivered to Paris [Rowan] to wire the cases of the window; 2s 6d for 500 small short nails (*small takettis*) at 6d per hundred, delivered to him for that purpose; 18s for 300 slates (*ij^{xx} skelze*) at 6s per hundred, to mend the roof of the Great Hall; £3 15s for 1,000 slates (*j^m sklait*) to repair the Munition House, the gate tower (*zett tower*, see Portcullis Gate) and the [adjacent] porter's lodge; 10s total for carriage of each hundred from Leith to the castle at 1s [per hundred]; £3 4s 2d for 55 loads of quicklime at 1s 2d per load, delivered into the castle for the plastering (*pergenyng*) of the Register House and levelling the surfaces (*fylling*) of the walls, and for the roofing of the gate tower and porter's lodge, and the repairing (*beting*) of the Great Hall and Munition House; £2 5s for 15 dozen [loads] of sand at 4s per dozen, delivered for the works on these buildings (*to thame*); £9 2s to John Kelly, plasterer (*perginar*), working on the plastering of the Register House and the levelling and smoothing of the surfaces of its walls (*filling and evynnyng of the wall thairof*), for 13 weeks at £14 weekly for him and his boy; £8 8s 10d to slaters for the roofing of the porter's lodge and part of the gate tower totalling around 1,500 square feet (*four rude viij elnis new wark*, a rood being 342¼ square feet, and a square ell being two square inches over 9½ square feet, so the total cited is 1,445 square feet and 16 square inches, though this is unlikely

to be precisely accurate) at £2 per rood; £3 4s to them for repairing and pointing (*beting and pointing*) of the rest of the tower, the [Great] Hall and the Munition House; 12s to George Balglavy for his expenses attending to (*awayting upoune*) the bringing in of the two sorts of slate, the quicklime and the sand (*the sklait, skelze, lyme and sand*); £1 4s to four men with wheelbarrows (*barrowmen*) for a week's work clearing out Crown Square and taking all the loose earth and stone away (*the redding of the clos, and baring of the lous erd and stane furtht of the samin*) (TA viii. 132-3). Placed separately at the end of the set of accounts begun on 31 August 1541, without useful dates attached; it is unclear how long this ongoing project took, but the work certainly ran longer than anticipated, and final payment to the French master mason in charge of the project was not made until 14 July 1542.

1541, 9 September: 6s 8d for 40 new ramrods (*rammes*), delivered to John Bickerton, for the old culverins which were found in the castle, rusted with their ramrods broken (*roustit, and the rammes broken*); 6s for three chopins of olive oil (*chopinnis ule de olyve*), delivered to the said John for cleaning them (TA viii. 118). These culverins were evidently iron handguns of musket type, and the rust was evidently mild enough to allow them to be reconditioned.

1541, 14 September: £7 12s to Robert Mar for 32st. 4lb Spanish iron at a price of 5s 4d per st., delivered to Willem van Dyck (*William Fandyk*), Dutchman, maker of iron guns; 6d to the porters (*pynouris*) for carrying it to the castle; £2 16s of smithy coal, delivered to William Hill to work the said iron and other [iron]work with, price of the chalder £1 8s with free delivery (*fre laid*) into the castle (TA viii. 118).

1541, 14 September: 2s 8d for carrying 30 sets of armour (*xxx pair of harnes*) to the castle, received by William 'Smythtberd' from James Henderson, in Francis Aikman's lodging; £4 8s to the said William for fitting up and polishing (*grathing and dighting*) of the same armour and of 14 sets of armour bought from a Dutchman, at 2s per set polished; 1s 8d to him for fitting up and polishing of 60 pikes received from James Henderson, at 4d per pike polished; 3s for the fitting

up and polishing of six halberds brought home by him, at 6*d* per each one polished; these armours, pikes and halberds, together with two small handguns and two short muskets (*twa half haggis, twa schort culveringis*), a small barrel of coarse gunpowder (*ane kingking of gross pulder*), a small barrel of saltpetre, 12lb of sulphur, and three (?) trial pieces of copper (*pece of sey copper*) was brought home by James Henderson for a (?) trial (*for ane sey*), paid by the treasurer at the king's command, and delivered to John Drummond; of the pikes, 34 were 20ft long, five were 15ft long, 12 were 12ft long, and eight were 8ft long (*TA* viii. 118–19). There are a number of obscurities in this set of records. A 'pair of harness' probably implies an iron cuirass with a breastplate and a back-plate, suitable for light cavalry or heavy infantry such as pikemen. There may be deliberate wordplay in the fact that the work on the pikes is calculated at the *price of the pyk* in place of the stock phrase *price of the pece*. The meaning of 'sey' is also unclear: *DOST*, s.v. *Say*, n. 2, interprets the *thre pece of sey copper* as bronze artillery brought home for testing, and the 'sey' mentioned subsequently as the test in question, a reading which seems somewhat strained as it seems more likely that the 'sey' related to *all* of the cargo; from the context, this may be an idiomatic phrase meaning it had been brought home 'speculatively' as a commercial cargo, or alternatively, following a Scots literary use of 'assay', it may have been brought home 'for a raid'; similarly, the 'sey copper' might in fact have been 'assaying' copper for use in testing other metal, or 'assayed' copper that had been tested for purity and was ready for use in bronzecasting, or alternatively 'sea copper' procured either from a coastal source or simply from overseas (cf. 'sea coal').

1541, 19 September: 18*s* for three limewood (*lyne*) boards delivered to John Drummond, for the gun-carriage of a culverin (*to stok ane grete culvering witht*) (*TA* viii. 119). Limewood was normally used for carving rather than for structural purposes, and it is plausible that these boards were procured to produce an ornate gun-carriage with decorative reliefs (perhaps with the limewood as a veneer on top of a more durable frame). The gun in question is likely to have been one of the two massive 'double culverins' cast in the foundry: one had been produced on 12 October 1540, while work on a second began on this day (see next entry); it was eventually cast around 25 February 1541, and had an elmwood gun-carriage for which payment was made on 8 April 1542, but if the limewood

was simply a veneer, this would not exclude both entries being for parts of the same structure (and the entry for 18 March 1542 further suggests that its carriage was complete by that date).

1541, 19 September: The start of a set of accounts for the Gunhouse, which for this period seems to have been focused exclusively on making of a [second] large bronze gun of the type known as a 'double culverin'. The following entries cover the period from this date down to 30 October 1541. 4s for glue to glue the wooden template (*patroune*) of the gun; 4s to Paris Rowan, which he spent for 12lb flax for making the gun-mould, 4s for 2st. of cowhair (*nolt hare*) for it, 8s for 1st. of tallow for it, 9s for a pan weighing 3lb to melt the tallow in, 2s 6d for 1lb of wax, 4s for 1lb of hemp, £1 15s for five hanks of wire at 7s each, 3s for 6lb of candle, 4s for six shovels (*schulis*), 6s 6d for 13 fathoms of small cord at 6d per fathom; 1s 2d for a riddle and a sieve (*ane riddill and ane seiff*), 10s 6d for 36 loads of clay and six loads of sand delivered to make the mould from; £1 10s for 22 loads of large coal (*grete cole*) at 1s 6d per load, delivered to Paris Rowan (*to him*); 9s for a load of charcoal at 7s and a for peat and turf at 2s, delivered to him; £9 8s to five men working with Paris at 1s week, on working the clay, making and drying the mould and spindle (*spindill*, a cylinder designed to create the shape of the gun's interior space), casting the sink, cleaning the furnace, setting the mould, and casting the bronze (*rynnynng of the mettall*), from 19 September 1541 to 30 October 1541, plus John Laing for a week at 8s per week; 8s 6d for 12 fir spars (*sparris of fyr*) to be coal rakes and to stir the metal with (*TA* viii. 124-5). A first double culverin had been cast in the foundry on 12 October 1540. After two unsuccessful attempts on 30 October 1541 and 31 December 1540, the second gun was eventually cast successfully around 25 February 1541.

1541, 3 October: John Drummond and his servants travelled to Dalhousie wood and cut 280 pieces of birch (*birk*) to be yokes (*zokkis*) and firewood, and ten elm trees to be wheel-hubs (*navillis to quhelis*); 10s paid for carrying their equipment (*warklumes*) to the wood, and bringing it back home; 10s to four wood wrights who helped them to cut and clean the wood; £2 4s for carrying the wood to the carts at the side of the road (*to the gate syde to the kartis*), from various parts of

the wood; £1 to the forester for his due and forest fee; for transport to the castle, totalling 50 loads at 9s per load, plus 5s to four men who helped to put the wood on the carts, total £23; £2 15s to Jehan de Lyon for his expenses going to Fowlis for a bronze mortar (*ane mortar gun of found*), and for transporting it from Fowlis to the castle; £3 2s for 7st. 12lb of ready-to-use candles (*maid candill*) at 8s per st., delivered to John Drummond to provide light for the craftsmen over the winter (*to geve lycht to the craftismen in the tyme of winter*); 5s for 250 cod bladders (*keling soundis*) at 5s per hundred, delivered to him to make glue (*TA* viii. 119–20). The text mentions the payment for loading the carts ahead of the transport to the castle, the two items being swapped here to make clear that they are added towards the same total. It is unclear whether the mortar (a short-barrelled, large-calibre gun) was found at Fowlis Easter in Strathearn, or Fowlis Wester near Dundee.

1541, 30 October: An attempt is made in the Gunhouse to cast the double culverin on which work was begun on the 19 September 1541, but the molten metal flows out through a hole where the mould meets (?) the outflow from the furnace (*ane vent in the cuppling of the mulde witht the tayll*), causing it to fail, and requiring the bronze to be broken up for a second attempt; £3 10s is paid for 42 loads of coal which was necessary to heat the metal with before it would break up (*or sche wald brek*); work begins on a new mould, and evidently continues to 31 December 1541, requiring 10s for 5st. of cowhair (*nolt hare*), 8s for 1½st. of flax (*flokkis*), 8s for 1st. of tallow, 10s for 24 fathoms of small cord, 2s for 2lb of hemp, 2s 6d for 1lb of wax, 8s for a hank of wire, 1s for 200 small, short nails (*small takkettis*), 7s for a load of charcoal, 1s 4d for two shovels (*schulis*), 1s 6d for a load of turf, 3s for mending the bellows, 4d for a wicker coal-basket (*ane colle mand*), 1s for a load of quicklime for mending the channel (*fowsye*), 9s 6d for 19lb of candle at 6d per lb; £22 12s to eight men working with Paris at 6s weekly, breaking the metal, cleaning the furnace, mending the faults thereof, and on the drying and positioning (*drying and setting*) of the mould and spindle (*spindill*, a cylinder used to create the gun's interior space), cleaning the pit in which the mould was placed (*the sink*) and casting the bronze (*rynnynng of the metal*), from 30 October 1541 to 31 December 1541, plus John Laing for eight weeks at 8s per week (*TA* viii. 125–6). *DOST* offers no explanation for 'tail' in a bronze-casting

context, but I suspect it describes the channel for the molten metal leading from the bronze-melting furnace into the mould, named for analogy with the 'tail-race' or outflow from a mill or dam, and it is the same (stone or brick) channel for which quicklime mortar was bought to perform repairs. The resulting attempt to complete the gun on 31 December 1541 was again unsuccessful, and the weapon was eventually produced around 25 February 1542.

1541, 7 November: John Drummond receives 413 small handguns (*half haggis*), 412 sets of bullet-moulds (*calmes*), 62 powder-horns, 413 powder-flasks (*flassis*) and 407 slow-matches (*luntis*), plus eight muskets (*culveringis*) with their bullet-moulds, and three barrels of powder weighing, as Charles Murray's account states, 800lb; £1 paid for transporting all this to the castle in eight loads at 2s 6d; £2 13s 4d to eight porters (*pinouris*) working four days on unloading and storing the said munitions, and taking them out of (?) Charles Murray's house (*the hous*) when they were handed over (*deliverit*) (TA viii. 120). The porters' fees may also cover the storage of 3,500 pikes and 500 halberds delivered by Murray, which had been stored in a house near Holyrood Abbey on 2 November 1541, and which were later moved to the castle on 1 March 1542.

1541, 8 November: £13 6s to Adrian Johnstone for 8st. 5lb of culverin powder at 2s per lb, delivered to John Drummond; 4d for transporting it to the castle (TA viii. 120).

1541, 8 November: £11 7s 6d to William Clapperton for a tow cable (*ane cabill tow*) weighing 22st. 12lb at 10s per st., delivered to John Drummond to make into hauling-traces (*to mak somes of*) (TA viii. 130-1). The first in a dedicated set of accounts for 'cords to be harnessing-traces and hauling-traces' (*cordis to be thetis and soumes*), evidently for gun-carriages or for close-carts, continued on 16 March 1542, 4 April 1542 and 29 April 1542, and eventually including most or all of the material and manufacturing costs for the relevant pulling equipment.

1541, 16 November: £19 18s to Robert Mar, for 88st. 7lb of French iron at 4s 6d per st., delivered to William Hill; £4 6s 8d for two chalders of smithy coal, bought in Leith and delivered to him, at £1 13s 4d per chalder, with free delivery to (*fre laid in*) the castle; 200 Russian boards (*reis burdis*) and 80 wooden corbels (*corbellis*) are received from Florence Cornitoun; £2 8s 6d for carrying them out of William Leith's yard and up to the castle in 19 loads at 2s 6d per load; 5s to the porters (*pynouris*) for bearing the same timber out of the King's Wark and loading it in the carts; £35 5s to William Lawon for 11 waws 3lb of Spanish iron at 5s 4d per lb, delivered to William Hill; 3s 4d for bearing this iron, and the iron written above, to the castle (*TA* viii. 120-1).

1541, 12 December: John Drummond, working in the castle (*within the castell*), has made an organ loft for the chapel of Holyrood Abbey; 1s 4d to a carter for carrying it from the castle to Holyrood (*TA* viii. 121). Further expenses follow for fitting the organ-loft in the chapel, the project being completed on 19 December 1541.

1541, 29 December: John Drummond and his servants went (*passit*) to Dalhousie wood, and cut 260 birches (*birkis*); 10s to five men who helped to carry them to the cart; £1 2s to the forester for his forester fee; £10 16s for carriage of the same to the castle in 24 cart loads at 9s per load; 10s for carrying the wrights' equipment (*warklumis*) to the wood, and bringing the same back (*TA* viii. 121-2).

1541, 31 December: A second attempt is made to cast the bronze 'double culverin' begun on 19 September 1541 and resumed after an unsuccessful first attempt on 30 October 1541; the casting-process for the gun again fails, due to the cylindrical template designed to create the barrel's interior space bobbing upwards in the mould (*because of the rysing of the spindill efter the mettell was all run*); expenses towards a third attempt begin with £2 14s 8d for three dozen loads of coal at 16s each, to heat the metal so it could be broken up again, and 5s 4d for 1st. flax for making another mould; the subsequent entries down to 18 March 1542 are not printed in full, but they conclude with 2s for fitting iron hoops onto wooden tubs (*girthing of the tubbis*) and 4s 4d for six spars to stir the metal with, to be coal

rakes, and for their transport from Leith; and £16 10s to Jehan de Lyon and four men with him, all working at 6s weekly in the Gunhouse on the gun and things necessary (*necessaris*) for casting it, and on boring out its barrel and cleaning it (*the boring and clengeing of the samin*), from 31 December 1541 to 18 March 1542; and to John Laing for the same period at 8s weekly (*TA* viii. 126–7). It is evident that the third attempt to cast the gun was successful – the old-fashioned use of a cylindrical template to cast the gun hollow seems to have been abandoned in favour of an at least partial reversion to the technique of casting the gun solid and drilling out its barrel, an innovative and precise but highly laborious process, already used by Hans Cochrane on the earlier successful double culverin and the two double moyens which preceded it (see 27 March 1540 and 6 November 1540). This successful third attempt seems to have been performed around 25 February 1542, though work continued to 18 March 1542.

1542, 7 January: £7 9s 4d to Christopher, for 4st. of culverin powder at 2s 4d per lb, delivered to John Drummond; £3 6s 8d for two chalders of smithy coal at £1 14s 4d per chalder, delivered free to (*laid fre in*) the castle, for William Hill (*TA* viii. 122).

1542, 18 February: Michael Gardiner is taken on for work in the Gunhouse, having 18s for the period until 18 March 1542 at 6s weekly, evidently working on the completing of the second double culverin that was successfully made around this date; three more men are hired to bore-out the barrel and clean the gun (*to bore and clenge the pece*) for a period of two weeks ending no later than 18 March 1542, taking £1 16s between them at a collective rate of 18s weekly; £1 for 5 ‘wisps’ of steel with which to sharpen (*temper*) the files, hammers and chisels ‘of the spindle’ (*fylis, hammeris, and chesellis of the spindill*), at 4s per ‘wisp’, and 8s for performing a process on the files (*hawing of the fylis*) (*TA* viii. 127). This is evidently related to the final stages of the casting of the large bronze artillery piece known as a ‘double culverin’, which had begun on 19 September 1541, after two previous attempts on 30 October 1541 and 31 December 1541. The bringing in of the Stirling-based artilleryman Michael Gardiner to join the team, and the hiring of additional personnel for two weeks work boring out the barrel and

cleaning the gun prior to 18 March 1542, suggest that the actual date of casting the gun must have been at around this point. *DOST* cannot explain what is meant by 'hawing' (though it notes that the phrase recurs at *TA* vii. 488); I am also hesitant to accept *DOST's* interpretation of the 'spindle' referred to in the context of sharpening the tools as a cylindrical template used in casting the interior space of the gun; I rather suspect that a 'chisel of the spindle' was a drill used for boring out the barrel.

1542, 18 February: £49 0s 8*d* to Francis Aikman for 15 waws 3st. 14lb of Spanish iron at £3 4s per waw, delivered to William Hill in the castle; 3s 9*d* to the porters (*pynouris*) for carrying it to the castle; £1 13s 4*d* for a chalder of smithy coal, delivered to him at the same time, price including delivery (*TA* viii. 122).

1542, 1 March: 3,500 pikes and 486 halberds, stored in a rented house near Holyrood, are handed over to William 'Smythberd' and John Drummond; £3 4s 4*d* is paid for carrying them up to the castle in 59 loads at 1s 3*d* per load; 12s to six men for their work taking them out of the house and placing them to the carts. The movement of the weapons up the Royal Mile into the castle is completed on 2 March 1542, but it takes from 3 May 1542 until 7 March 1542 to sort and organise them and tie them into bundles (*band the samin*), then move them into the Munition House; six men work at this on 3 March 1542 and the day after, reduced to four for the further three days, all at 1s per man per day, totalling £1 4s, plus 1s 3*d* for 5 fathoms of cord for tying them (*to be bindingis thairto*) (*TA* viii. 122–3). These weapons had arrived on 2 November 1541, and earlier references show that 3,000 of the pikes had shafts of white ashwood while the rest were of Spanish ashwood; there were originally 500 halberds, and the reason for their reduction in number is not explained (see 7 November 1541). Other surrounding entries record their refurbishment before they were moved up the Royal Mile.

1542, 9 March: John Drummond receives artillery from Hans Anderson, which he brought out of Flanders in the ship *Mary Willoughby* (*the Marewilibe*); a double cannon with a gun-carriage but no wheels (*stokkit, but quhellis*), two large moyans without carriages or wheels (*twa grete culvering moyanis, butt stokkis*

and quhelis), and some cannonballs for them (*certane bullettis thairfor*); and 11 barrels of Duch gunpowder plus one broken barrel; £4 2s 6d is paid for carrying them to the castle in 33 loads at 2s 6d per load, along with the crane which was used to (?) place the guns on carriages (*the crane quharwitht the samin wes montit*); 17s 4d to the porters (*the pynouris*) for their work in unloading, landing ashore and mounting these, and pulling the double cannon in through the castle gate, where the horse refused (*lossing, laing une schore, and monting of the samin, and drawing of the double cannoun at the castell zett quhare the hors refusit*); at the same time, William Smythberd also received from Anderson two large quantities of cargo (*twa grete drywaris*) containing 50 sets of armour with chain-mail collars (*pare of harnes, all witht pissants of malze*); paying 5s for their transport to the castle (*TA viii. 123*). It is not quite clear whether the 'mounting' of the guns involved placing them on gun-carriages in the castle or on carts on the quay at Leith, or perhaps both.

1542, 11 March: 300 breastplates and 21 sets of armour with breastplates and backplates (*xv^{xx} foregaris and xxj halkriggis bak and fore gair*) which were originally brought out of Dunbar Castle, 29 Jedburgh staffs (*xxix Jedburgt staffis*, a sort of cavalry weapon with a very long blade, which may have combined elements of the sabre and spear), 21 javelins (*jefellingis*) and 77 halberds are received by William 'Smythberd' at Holyrood; 7s 7d for carrying them to the castle in six loads at 1s 3d per load; £10 to him for fitting up (*grathing of*) the said 300 breastplates, at 8d each; £1 1s for fitting up the said 21 sets of armour at 1s 8d each; £2 3s 4d for fitting up the said 610 staffs, javelins and halberds, at 4d each; £2 4s to him for the scrubbing and polishing (*scouring and dighting*) of 30 sets of armour (*pair of harnes*) brought home by James Henderson and 14 sets of armour got from the Dutchman at 1s each; £1 14s for three quarts of olive oil provided by him, and for wax and sheep tallow to mix the same with, to put on the armour (*lay upon the harnes*) to stop it rusting; 4s 10d for 500 nails and six hanks of packing thread to hang the armour [up] with (*TA viii. 123*). The total of 610 polearms must include the 483 halberds brought to the castle on 1 March 1542, while the armour mentioned at the end of the list arrived on 14 September 1541.

1542, 16 March: £8 1s to David Leiper (*Leper*) for a small cable weighing 20st. 2lb at 8s per st., delivered to John Drummond (*to him*) to make into hauling-traces (*somes*); £20 4s 6d to him for 50st. 9lb of rope tackle (*takle*) at 8s per st., delivered to him to be harnessing-traces (*thetis*) (*TA* viii. 131). Part of a series of rope-related purchases begun on 8 November 1541 and continuing on 4 April 1542.

1542, 17 March: £10 3s to Christopher, for 5st. 7lb of culverin powder at 2s 4d per lb, delivered to John Drummond (*TA* viii. 123).

1542, 18 March: 5s is given to certain porters (*certane pynouris*) for mounting the gun on its gun-carriage and pulling it to the top of the rock outcrop (*monting and drawing of the samin to the Cragheid*) to be approved and test-fired (*seyit and schot*), and for pulling the earlier double culverin out for the same purpose (*the pece cassin befor the last chakar to be schote witht hir*); 3s for taking them both into the Munition House after they were fired and approved; £13 6s 8d to Andrew Mansioun (*Andres Mensioun*) for engraving the king's coat of arms with unicorns, thistles and fleur-de-lis (*the Kingis grace armes witht unicornis, thrissillis and flour-de-lyes*) on the same gun and engraving the year-date (*dait of the zere*, i.e. 1542) on the muzzle, and for engraving coats of arms, thistles and fleurs-de-lis on various other pieces, assigned to him as a project (*set in task*) by John Drummond (*TA* viii. 127). This marks the final completion of the double culverin begun on 19 September 1541 and the earlier gun of the same design cast on 12 October 1540. The test-firing of a gun typically used a far larger quantity of gunpowder than usual – and for a double culverin this would be very large indeed. With regard to the decoration, it seems likely that the unicorns were the 'supporters' flanking the shield on the most ornate form of the royal coat of arms, while the thistles and fleur-de-lis would be displayed in a repeating geometric pattern around the part of the gun forward of the trunions, like the cast-relief fleur-de-lis on some contemporary French guns; two smaller 16th-century Scottish guns decorated in this manner were later documented as part of the artillery in Dumbarton Castle.

1542, 27 March: The start of a set of expenses relating to the castle's gunpowder mill (*the pulder myln*, see Powder Vault), evidently covering the period continuing to 5 August 1542; 1s 8d for two tubs delivered to John Cunningham to put saltpetre and charcoal in; £2 8s for two [iron] pans weighing [a total of] 16lb at 3s per lb, to boil (*seith*) the saltpetre in; 4s for two sieves (*rangeis*) delivered to Cunningham (*to him*); for a lock to the door of the place (*the hous dur*) where the saltpetre is purified; 5s for five loads of coal at 1s each delivered to Cunningham (*to him*); £1 13s 4d for carriage of 40 [horse] loads of wood out of Dalhousie to Edinburgh to make charcoal, at 10d per horse; 19s for 1½ lasts of barrels to put the powder in; 14s for six large powder bags (*grete puldir baggis*); £16 10s to William Hume for a barrel of saltpetre weighing 220lb at 1s 6d per lb, delivered to John Drummond; £26 4s to four men who worked with John Cunningham in the powder mill from 28 March 1542 to 5 August 1542, at 7s weekly each; delivered by John Cunningham to John Drummond in this period, 18 large barrels of dry gunpowder (*xviiij berrell dry pulder*), each containing 15st. of gunpowder (*ilk berrell xv stane wecht*) (TA viii. 130). A last was a total of around a dozen barrels, and the 1½ lasts purchased here would correspond to the 18 barrels full of powder presented to the master wright at the end of the set of accounts. The boiling of saltpetre and the production of charcoal from wood represent the first two stages of making gunpowder; the next stage involved combining these products with saltpetre to produce the basic mixture, often followed by a process of steeping in whisky or brandy to enhance its performance; neither stage is directly mentioned, nor is the procurement of the ingredients. In modern works, the reference to the finished product as 'dry powder' would indicate a version that had *not* been mixed with alcohol, as opposed to a version that had been steeped and dried, but it is not certain whether that holds true here.

1542, 4 April: £14 to a Dutchman called 'Sconcost', for a Flemish cable measuring 100 fathoms (*ane Flandris cablll contenand v^{xx} fawdome*), delivered to John Drummond to be windlass, ropes and hauling-traces (*windes, cordis and somes*); £23 4s to Robert Dawson beyond the bridge at Leith (*the brig of Leitht*), for two cables weighing 57st. at 8s per st., delivered to him to be hauling-traces; £5 7s for 9st. of the sort of binding-cord called marline (*merling cord*) at 12s per st., delivered to George Haliburton to wrap and make and the loops of the traces (*to*

wap and mak the lowpes somes and thetis); £9 12s for nine barrels of tar delivered to him to tar the same with, at £1 2s per the first two barrels £1 8s for the third and £1 for the remaining six; £1 12s for 4st. of small cord at 8s per st. to be attaching-ropes (*ereleddirs*); £1 for carrying of the aforesaid tow-ropes and tar from Leith to the castle, in eight loads at 2s 6d per load; 6d for carrying a trough and a pot to boil (*sethe*) the tar in (*TA* viii. 131). These entries form part of a set of accounts relating to the manufacture of rope tackle for gun-carriages or close-carts, following on from entries calendared on 8 November 1541 and 16 March 1542, and evidently cover purchases continuing down to at least 29 April 1542. A windlass is a simple machine for winding or unwinding rope, with a horizontal wooden axle turned by levers and secured by a ratchet, designed for lifting heavy loads; this is the only suitable definition offered by *DOST* for the word *windes*. It is possible that the word could be extended to describe the associated rope, but I suspect that the correct reading may be '*windes cordis and somes*', i.e. 'windlass-ropes and hauling-traces'.

1542, 7 April: 14s to George Balglavy for two loads of elm trees cut at the bridge at Hailes (*the brig of Halis*), carried to Edinburgh Castle to make a gun-carriage for the new gun (*ane stok to the new pece*), at 7s per load; 1s for cod bladders (*kelling soundis*) to make glue for it; 5s to John Bickerton for oil provided by him for the small handguns and muskets (*half haggis and culveringis*) (*TA* viii. 127). The reference to mounting the gun on 18 March 1542 suggests that the gun-carriage was complete before that date; see also 19 September 1541.

1542, 28 April: £19 2s 6d to William Hog and John Watherstone (*Walderstoun*) for 76st. 8lb of French iron at 5s per st., delivered to William Hill; £33 15s 8d for 10 waws 6st. 11lb of Spanish iron, delivered to him at the same time and bought from James Bannatyne at 5s 6d per st; 4s for carriage of the same, totalling 16 waws 9st. 8lb, to the castle; £3 6s 8d for two chalders of smithy coal at £1 13s 4d per chalder, delivered to William Hill (*TA* viii. 128).

1542, 29 April: To George Haliburton and his boy, working on the making of the traces (*the soumes and thetis*), tarring and coupling 240 pairs of harnessing-

traces (*thetis*) and 130 new hauling-traces (*somes*), and mending and tarring 70 old hauling-traces, from this date to 5 August 1542 at 19s weekly; 3s 6d for six spade shafts delivered to John Drummond; 12s the price of 200 goads (*gad wands*) delivered to him, 2s for carrying these from the castle to Leith; 15s for two tanned horsehides (*barkit hors hidis*) delivered to make into hauling-collars (*brechonis*); 4s for making these supple and fitting them up (*sowpelling and grathing thairof*) (*TA* viii. 131–3). Concluding the series of rope-related purchases begun on 8 November 1541 and continued through 16 March 1542 and 4 April 1542. Much of this consists of somewhat miscellaneous outlay met at the end of the series, though only the spade-shafts are not obviously connected to the project of constructing harness for gun-carriages or close-carts.

1542, 13 May: £23 14s 7d to Alexander Sandilands for 94st. 15lb of Spanish iron at 5s per st., delivered to William Hill; 1s 6d to the pioneers for bringing it to the castle (*TA* viii. 128).

1542, 23 May: John Drummond receives three barrels of culverin powder, 16 small handguns (*half haggis*) and nine muskets (*culveringis*) from John Drummond, and 2s 6d is given to George Balglavy for carrying them to the castle (*TA* viii. 128). The value of the transport suggests a cart trip from the quay at Leith harbour.

1542, 24 May: 6s for the transport of a coffer containing a suit of armour from Edinburgh to St Andrews, which the cardinal sent to the king (*TA* viii. 128). Presumably the cardinal in question is the Archbishop of St Andrews. James V was at Falkland Palace in Fife on this date. It is not completely clear if this armour was kept in the castle before being dispatched thither.

1542, 3 June: £9 to Neil Aird (*Neill Ard*) for 100 wooden corbels (*corbellis*) at 1s 6d each, delivered to John Drummond (*TA* viii. 128). For their delivery, see 12 June 1542.

1542, 12 June: £9 13s 8*d* to Gilbert Mar for 83 quarter-timbers (*quarter-cliftis*, cleaved lengthwise from larger pieces); for carrying them to the castle along with the wooden corbels obtained on 3 June 1542 in 27 loads at 2s 6*d* per load (*TA* viii. 128). Again, the price per load suggests Leith as the place where the timber deliveries were brought from.

1542, 15 June: £1 13s 4*d* for a chalder of smithy coal delivered to William Hill, with transport from Leith included. 2s for glue delivered to John Drummond; £6 to Richard Seton for 400 'chargers' for small handguns (*chargeouris for half haggis*), at £1 10s per hundred, made by him at the master of artillery's command (*TA* viii. 129). A 'charger' could be either a ramrod, or else a simple device for measuring the quantity of powder required for one shot (in this case perhaps small powder-flasks, which soldiers equipped with firearms were beginning to wear in bandoliers of around a dozen each).

1542, 30 June: £60 to David Crichton, Captain of Edinburgh Castle for a year's expenses for Mathew Hamilton, Ewen McIlvanney (*Ewyne McNeyllvane*), Thomas Gray and Andrew Hamilton (*TA* viii. 86). Presumably these were either prisoners or else perhaps garrison personnel.

1542, 9 July: John Drummond and his servants went to Kirkettle wood and cut 100 trees; £2 4s to the forester for his service and forester fee; £2 4s to four men with four horses working on carrying the trees from the wood to the carts over six days; 16s to two wood wrights who helped to cut and clean the same; 8s for the carriage of the wrights' equipment (*warklumes*) to the wood and bringing them back; £27 18s to the carts for carrying the same [timber] from the wood to the castle in 62 loads at 9s each; 3s 6*d* for carrying 42 iron arquebuses (*irne hawkbuttis*) received in Leith to the castle; 2s 6*d* for carrying two puncheons of tallow received by John Drummond from the King's Wark; £1 13s 4*d* for a chalder of smithy coal delivered to William Hill and its transport from Leith; 4s to John Bickerton for a pint of olive oil provided for the small handguns and muskets (*half haggis and culveringis*) (*TA* viii. 129). The arquebuses are evidently the ones whose subsequent readying is recorded under 2 August 1542.

1542, 14 July: £21 to John Merlioun (*Johnne Merlzounne*), in complete payment for building the Register House in Edinburgh Castle, because the work took longer than expected (*because the wark wes ekit*) (TA viii. 93).

1542, 2 August: £2 5s to Archibald Rule, for polishing, painting and overpainting (*dichting, colloring and ourlaying*) 42 iron arquebuses (*irne hagbusches*) with their [breach-loading] chambers, using red lead and oil (*witht reid leid and ule*); for 200 wedges for the chambers (*waggis for the chalmeris*), and two 'powder hacks' (*twa pulder haggis*). 5s to Archie Rule (*Arche Roule*), for painting (*colouring*) a close cart for the munitions (TA viii. 118, 133–5). These payments are included at the end of the pay accounts for the period from 31 August 1541 to 5 August 1542, presumably being met out of the available cash. An arquebus was a musket-type weapon, sometimes a very heavy variant mounted on a firing-pole or tripod, but the reference here to separate powder-chambers with wedges for securing them in place shows that these examples were breach-loading weapons designed for rapid firing, an unusual feature at this date: they may have been the relatively primitive and bulky wrought-iron swivel-guns which were normally called 'bases', or else an ambitious attempt to produce rapid-firing muskets based on the sophisticated sporting weapons produced in Germany (though the reference to 'wedges' suggests that they used straightforward bolts to secure the chamber in the barrel, rather than the complex locking mechanisms of the German guns). It is even more unclear what the *twa poulder haggis* were – *DOST* offers no suggestion, and the term resembles a diverse variety of Scots words describing handguns, chopping blades, wooden boards, hooks and crevasses; it is not completely impossible that it simply describes a haggis-shaped bag of gunpowder (or even a spelling mistake for the simple 'powder bags' or *puldir baggis* of 27 March 1542).

1542, 14 December: After the military defeat at Solway Moss, James V dies at Falkland; his infant daughter Mary Queen of Scots becomes queen at the age of just one week old. A subsequent parliament appoints the Earl of Arran as regent –

he is chief of the powerful Hamilton family, a cousin to the infant queen, and in his own eyes, heir-presumptive to her throne.

1543, 21 July: Arran, having allied himself with the exiled Earl of Angus and Henry VIII of England, attempts to allow an English invasion army to reach Edinburgh; they are prevented by a Scottish army acting independently of the regency, but although Arran is supposed to hand the castle over to these patriots, he manages to 'betray' Hepburn of Waughton, the captain of the castle, replacing him with one of his own Hamilton kinsmen, the laird of Stenhouse (*Diurnal*, p 28).

1543, 31 October: Lord Maxwell is captured acting as a courier for the English; he is subsequently imprisoned in Edinburgh Castle (*Diurnal*, p 29). Maxwell had been taken prisoner at the Battle of Solway Moss, and was an 'Englishman' only under duress – another example of the convoluted politics of the time.

1543, 8 November: Master David Balfour takes an inventory of the gold and silver in the castle, witnessed by a group of royal officials and clergymen, led by George Durie, Commendator of Dunfermline Abbey, and including James Hamilton of Stanehouse, captain of the castle. The account opens with a solid gold basin and ewer decorated with thistles and lilies, and four solid gold cups decorated with heraldic devices. A large array of silver-gilt objects then follows, including basins, ewers, flagons, barrels, 'ships', stoups, a water-bowl, more cups, including one called 'King Robert the Bruce's cup', chandeliers, platters, salt-cellars and 'assay pieces' whose exact nature is unclear. There are two sets of chapel furnishing, one in silver gilt and the other in plain silver: each includes a cross and two candlesticks for an altar, a holy-water stoup to stand near the door, and two 'cruets' for the communion wine and the water that it is mixed with. However, several items are *not* duplicated between the sets: a silver-gilt chalice and patten (cup and dish for the altar, the most important objects), a silver-gilt alms-dish in the shape of a clam-shell, a plain silver handbell and communion-bread case. Plain silver secular objects conclude the list: four tall candlesticks, a little silver barrel, two salt cellars, a bowl lid, a 'schowfer' (?) and a plate for heating meat (*Inventories*, pp 109–13).

1544, 1 January: 15 four-horse cart loads of artillery are brought from Edinburgh Castle to the pier of Leith, for transport by water to Stirling, at a cost of £1 19s (*TA* viii. 248). This stands at the head of a set of accounts for military preparations against the English-backed rebel army of the earls of Lennox, Cassilis and Glencairn; although ten named gunners from the castle accompany the guns, the rest of the expenditure appears to relate to additional personnel and equipment required for the campaign, and is not itemised here (with the exception of the payments calendared on 11 January 1544).

1544, January: The English-sponsored rebel army surrenders at Leith: Sir George Douglas of Pittendreich, the Earl of Cassilis, and his son Lord Kilmaurs, are imprisoned in the castle (*Diurnal*, p 30).

1544, 11 January: For four cannonballs (*bullatis*) shot from the castle to Leith, and brought up again by poor men who found them, 4*d*; on the same day, payments are made for pioneers and horses, relating to bringing 'certain great and small artillery' out of the castle; the pioneers are given 10s in drinksilver for helping to take the guns as far as Lord Bothwell's house on the Royal Mile (*my lord Boithwellis logeings upon the hie gait*), and 12 of them are hired to accompany the artillery and guard it at night, at £3 per month, with a total payment of £18; four horses are hired for eight days at 3s each, total £4 17s, and nine more horses are hired for three days to take the guns to Leith, again at 3s each, total £4 0s 12*d* (*TA* viii. 248). The inconsistency between the sums for the pioneers' wages suggests that they were paid two weeks' wages rather than a month's. This stands within the same accounts as the entry for 1 January 1544.

1544, 4 May: An English army lands at Leith and attacks Edinburgh. This involves an unsuccessful siege of the castle, which is largely glossed over in English sources, but the *Diurnal* says the castle garrison slew many of the attackers (*Diurnal*, p 31), and it is clear that the English forces lost a cannon (a heavy bronze siege gun comparable to a Scottish 36-pounder). Although the official English

account claims that the cannon had to be abandoned when a shot from the castle broke its gun-carriage, and that they sabotaged it beyond repair before departing, the accounts for 6 January 1544 show that the Scots recovered not only this gun, but also several other smaller siege guns abandoned by the English, which gives more credence to the claims in Scottish sources that the besieging force was driven off in some disarray.

1544, 6 May: To John Drummond, for three dozen gunpowder bags, bought and delivered to him in Edinburgh Castle, at 12*d* each, total £1 16*s*; for a copper cauldron to melt down and make rammers for cannons, £1 16*s*. For 38 fathoms of cord to bind the governor's coffers which were taken out of Edinburgh Castle to Cadzow, 9*s*; to John Brown to buy 'drugs' (*droggis*) for curing the injured men in Edinburgh Castle during its siege, £2 9*s*; John Hamilton of Bothwell, who remained in the castle during the siege, is paid £1 2*s*; to Master Gavin Hamilton, for the pay for gunners of Leith 'and others' who remained in the castle during the siege, and for furnishing other necessaries for the castle, £110; pioneers (*pynouris*) are paid £1 2*s* for bringing at least one cannon and several smaller guns (*the cannoun and other small artalze*) up to the castle from where it stood on the Royal Mile (*upoun the hie gait*); on 8 May 1544, a Leith carter named Peter Ferguson is also paid £1 2*s* for his help in moving the artillery (*TA* viii. 289-90). Gavin Hamilton would later be the last pre-Reformation Catholic archbishop of St Andrews; the gunners from Leith were presumably seamen, a supposition supported by the fact that they were organised in 'quarters' under quartermasters, i.e. as a ship's crew under petty officers (see 16 May 1545); the artillery were English guns, abandoned during the unsuccessful attack on 4 May 1545, and brought into the castle by the Scots on 6 May 1545 when the English troops returned and burned part of the Old Town (*at the cuming of the Inglishemen furth of Leith the tyme of the birnyng of the toun*). The repeated use of £1 2*s* and multiples thereof here and in subsequent entries for 8 May 1545, 9 May 1545, 16 May 1545 and 24 May 1545 indicate that much of the outlay was made in high-value coin of this denomination, specifically French gold *écus*.

1544, 8 May: For four extraordinary gunners who had come from Kinfauns (*quhilk*

com furth of Kilfaunis) and were received into Edinburgh Castle, in drinksilver, £1 2s (*TA* viii. 289). It is surprising to find that Kinfauns Castle, a laird's residence, could provide four gunners.

1544, 9 May: To Gavin Hamilton, to remain in Edinburgh Castle, £11; to certain poor men who brought the governor's coffers from Holyrood to the castle, and thence to Cadzow, £11; to William Semple, 10 *écus* (*x crounnis of the sonn*), i.e. £11; to Andrew Mylne, barber, to buy 'drugs' for curing the injured men in the castle, £11 (*TA* vi. 290). It is not quite clear that the payment to William Semple was related to the castle, but it is quoted as it confirms that the payments in multiples of £1 2s were being made in a specific coin of that value, and that this coin was the French gold *écu*.

1544, 16 May: To William Forestar, one of the quartermasters in the castle (*quarter masterris within the castell*), to be distributed among certain men of Leith, gunners in his quarter, 13 French *écus*, i.e. £14 6s; to three wrights, servants to John Drummond (of Milnab), who remain in the castle, in drinksilver, £33; to two Edinburgh barbers, who remained in the castle during the siege, two angel nobles, i.e. £3 8s; to John Drummond's priest, Nicholas Reid, and Henry White, who helped to bring victuals from the burgh to the castle, £4 8s; to Mark Drummond, trumpeter, in drinksilver and for expenses made in the castle during the siege, £1 14s; to Blair the gunner, who was burned by gunpowder in the castle, 'for curing of him agane', £1 2s; to Todd the minstrel, who stayed in the castle and played his drum (*his swesche*) during the siege, two angel nobles, i.e. £3 8s; to Mr Peter Semple, appointed acting constable (*constable for the time devisit within the castell*), four angel nobles (i.e. £6 16s); to Mr John Bruce, one of the quartermasters within the castle, £44; to Malcolm Gourlay, who stayed in the castle to look after the tapestry, some of the Earl of Arran's coffers, and some of his other goods there, £43; to a servant of the same Malcolm (Gourlay), who stayed with him, 5s (*TA* viii. 290). The angel noble was an English gold coin, and was evidently used for the payments valued at £1 14s or multiples thereof; Mark Drummond was probably a trombonist of Italian ancestry, one of the family of Julian Drummond; a *swesche* was a small, tambourine-like drum of Swiss origin

(*DOST*, s.v. *swesche*, n.1); in one literary reference, the word is used to translate a Latin word for a military horn being played during a siege, but the translator was probably thinking of the instruments which 16th-century Scotsmen would recognise in that context.

1544, 24 May: To David Lumley and Gilbert Balnaves, ordinary gunners, in drinksilver and for their expenses in the castle during the siege, £4 8s. A keg (*kinking*) of gunpowder is bought for £6 12s and stored in Edinburgh Castle (*TA* viii. 292, 294).

1544, 3 July: Three barrels of gunpowder are shipped from Dunbar Castle to Leith for 14s, and then brought up to Edinburgh Castle for 3s; two foreign gunners from the Dunbar garrison are paid drinksilver for work on gabions on the Fore Wall of Edinburgh Castle (*TA* viii. 304). Gabions were wicker baskets filled with earth, used as gun-parapets in the 16th century.

1544, 10 November: A consignment of artillery is sent from Leith to Stirling to attend the parliament there, drawn by levied oxen and 46 hired horses; on 21 November 1544, it is brought back up again to the castle, with 36 horses being hired (*TA* viii. 327, 329). This parliament was held by the queen dowager in opposition to the Earl of Arran's government, and the artillery was presumably designed for a siege of Stirling Castle, but in the event Cardinal Beaton brokered a lasting rapprochement between the rival leaders (*Diurnal*, p 36). The oxen are only documented because a payment is recorded to the man who collected them up and oversaw their passage with the artillery, providing important evidence that Scottish guns remained ox-drawn, and as a result the documented payments for horses pulling guns do not necessarily indicate the total size of any given artillery train; the number of horses alone would indicate that this artillery train consisted of more than a few small guns, however (see Appendix 10: The Artillery); as the various payments relating to hired gunners, transport and small items of equipment do not directly relate to the castle or its personnel and inventory, they are not itemised here.

1544, 28 November: Four three-horse carts with 'cutthroats' and two with 'single falcons' are brought out of Edinburgh towards Coldingham, accompanied by two four-horse carts with gunpowder, cannonballs, mattocks, shovels and hackbuts of crock (*hagbuttis of croichartis*); although the carts are apparently part of the castle inventory, the horses are hired at 3s each per day for eight days, total £31 4s (*TA* viii. 329). A 'cutthroat' was a small iron gun firing shrapnel, while a falcon was a lightweight bronze gun, sometimes breech-loaded and/or swivel-mounted; hackbuts of crock were heavy bronze handguns (see Appendix 10: The Artillery). The reference to 'single' falcons probably refers to their size rather than the number of guns, as it seems likely from the phrasing that there were multiple guns on each cart, though the source does not exclude the possible that they were otherwise relatively conventional two-wheeled gun-carriages.

1545, 23 February: Five carts of artillery, three of them carrying cutthroats and two carrying 'single' falcons, are brought out from Edinburgh Castle, accompanied by a cart with powder, cannonballs, spare axles and other equipment, plus the gunner John Crawford and a dozen pioneers to ensure the road is passable for the artillery (*to mak gait before the samyn*). These guns served in the Scottish victory at the battle of Ancrum Moor on 27 February 1545 (*the feild strikkin at Lyliarttis Cros*); they seem to have been at Kelso by the end of February 1545 and were then brought back to the castle around 3 March 1545, when various additional payments were made, including £5 in drinksilver for the carters (*TA* viii. 348, 358). For the nature of these guns, see above 28 November 1544 and Appendix 10: The Artillery.

1545, 9 March: A dozen sheep-skins are bought to be rammers (*moppettis*) for the artillery, and 36 (*thre dousan of girth stingis*) to be shafts for these (*the saidis chargeouris*), along with 600 small nails (*takkattis*).

1545, 23 March: Two pairs of gun-limbers (*lymmaris*) are brought from the castle to Leith Sands for two carts of cutthroats, whose original limbers had broken on

the road (*TA* viii. 360).

1545, 18 July: Two *moyens* (*tua moyanis*) brought into Scotland by the French general Monsieur de Lorges are brought to Edinburgh Castle (*TA* viii. 389). These were bronze guns firing shot around 3lb weight (see Appendix 10: The Artillery), and were perhaps the same guns brought out from the castle on 2 November 1545; the account notes that they were carried for free by 'shire horses' (*the hors of the schyre*), evidently belonging in some sense to the local authorities, accompanied by ten hired pioneers. Around 26 July 1545, the same account records that additional artillery is concentrated at the castle for a siege of Wark Castle on the Border.

1545, 28 July: In preparation for the siege of Wark Castle on the Border, artillery is concentrated in Edinburgh Castle – two *battards* (*battardis*) are brought across from Greenock by road, arriving around this date; gunpowder is brought from Glasgow via Kinneil and Leith, and a large consignment of ammunition and other artillery supplies, earlier brought to the Clyde by Monsieur de Lorges, is brought round aboard the Scottish warship *Lyon* and then landed at Leith, including 866 cannonballs, a dozen barrels of smaller shot for *battards* and *moyens*, equipment for carthorses (*breichamys with thair sadillis, certane brydillis*), and other smaller, plus payments to smiths and wrights working on preparations; mention is also made of a *moyen* being ferried by boat, evidently to Linlithgow rather than Leith, and brought from there by hired horses (*TA* vii. 391-2). The cannonballs were specifically for heavy 36-pounder guns, the *battard* was a bronze gun firing cannonballs of around 8-12lb weight, and the *moyen* was a 3-pounder (see Appendix 10: The Artillery); the *moyen* recorded here was presumably different from the pair brought on 18 July 1545.

1545, 12 September: As the Earl of Arran leads forces to the Border in response to an English attack on Kelso, five carts carrying some sort of artillery are brought out of the castle, along with a hired close cart carrying powder, bullets, spare axles and other necessities; the gunner John Crawford and 12 pioneers accompany (*TA* viii. 406). A lacuna in the text means that the exact nature of the

guns is unclear; five carts recorded carrying bronze guns called falcons and small iron guns called 'cutthroats' on 23 February 1545, and it is likely that these were the same, though they were also used to carry the bronze handguns known as hackbuts of crock (see Appendix 10: The Artillery); the same account shows that they were accompanied by packhorses carrying the **governor's tents, campaign furniture** (*oisting burdis*) and bedding, which may have also come from the castle, and a tailor and six assistants to maintain and erect it all.

1545, 2 November: Two moyens (*tua culvering moyanes*) are moved out of the castle to besiege the English garrison in Caerlaverock Castle, with 30 horses hired to pull them; additional teams of horses carried gunpowder, tools, cannonballs and the gunners' victuals, and a dozen pioneers were recruited to 'make' (i.e. improve) the road as they travelled (*TA* viii. 415). The moyen was a gun firing a cannonball of around 3lb; these may have been the two guns brought from France which had previously arrived on 18 July 1545. The gunners themselves are not mentioned and were presumably 'ordinary gunners' from the castle garrison; Caerlaverock surrendered without a fight, and the guns joined a siege train sent from Cadzow in laying siege to Lochmaben.

1546, 16 January: The Duke of Châtellerauld and Cardinal Beaton lead a force of 500 men who capture two pro-English Protestant gentlemen, the laird of Ormiston and the young laird of Calder; they are imprisoned in the castle (*Diurnal*, pp 41-2). Châtellerauld is the Scottish regent James Hamilton (see 14 December 1542), formerly titled Earl of Arran but now promoted by the gift of a duchy from the King of France.

1546, March: The start of a series of payments for building work on the **Governor's Lodging** for the Earl of Arran. This complex set of entries is most conveniently presented in summary form. Masons working on the project included John Merlioun (an important craftsman who had led major Renaissance projects at Falkland, Stirling and Holyrood, as well as the Register House), his relative Thomas Merlioun and John Bryson, an employee of Thomas; they were provided with candles when they worked in the vaults (*quhen thay wroucht in the voltis*);

also involved was the painter Archibald Rule, who is recorded in April 1546 working on the doors of at least one chamber and hall; John Peebles the glasswright made 196 [square] feet of window glass, and there are also references to the construction of shutters (*vinda breddis, wyndak breddis*); there were smiths, wrights, sawyers, pioneers, plasterers (*pergonaris*) and barrowmen, some of them involved in tidying up after the workmen (*redding and clenging*), others assisting the masons, others carrying stone from a quarry; and quarriers themselves, presumably working off-site.

Also in April 1546, two additional masons were hired for work on the Fore Wall (*enterit to the forewall of the castell*); the list of masons and barrowmen retained in May 1546 suggests that they were primarily working on the fortifications, and in the set of payments for June 1546 (which unusually extends into mid-July 1546), they are said to be working more generally 'within Edinburgh Castle', but 60 pieces of stone are specially quarried for the Gun Hole (*lx pecis of stanis to the goun holl*); a separate concluding entry for July 1546 records that they had moved on to repairing, and perhaps specifically harling (*beting and mending*) the castle walls.

In April 1546, a reference to straw for use in making non-masonry walling (*mudewall*) is followed in May 1546 by references to this material being used to construct the Kitchen chimney (*the keeching chymnay*), and by payments for clay for flooring the kitchen and making a new furnace (*to the flurring of the keiching and making of ane new furnes*).

Other materials procured included coal, Spanish iron, additional iron and steel obtained in April 1546 for quarrying tools, glue, some of which was used on shutters, clay, used at least in part for laying floors, but also perhaps for walling, and large quantities of lime, some for plaster, but when combined with sand presumably for mortar. Further miscellaneous expenses include cleaning out an old gutter outlet (*ane ald gutter how*), payments in both March 1546 and May 1546 for mending a mortar tub used by masons and putting metal hoops on (*girthing*) a bucket in May 1546 (*TA* viii. 445-8, 452-4, 459-60, 462-3, 468). Previous work on the same residence may be concealed in very general entries in the royal accounts, for example, the wages of the Earl of Arran's 'house-painter and servants' from 15 August 1543 to 7 May 1544 totalled a massive £3,785 13s 4d, with no itemisation provided (*TA* viii. 389).

August 1547: The parapet of the castle's Fore Wall is lined with gabions, wicker baskets filled with earth, a type of fortification normally used as an artillery breastwork (*TA* ix. 100).

1547, 2 September: The laird of Ormiston reports to his English masters that the Netherbow gate has been fortified with a turf rampart, and that on the Castle Hill a fosse has been cut and gabions and artillery set up behind it (*CSP* i. 18). A fosse and gabions are technical terms for a wide ditch and a parapet of wicker baskets filled with earth, standard 16th-century defences for an artillery emplacement.

1547, 13 July: An English intelligence report claims that the French expeditionary force is pressing for Edinburgh Castle to be handed over as a stronghold for their pay chest and artillery, but that this is being resisted by the Earl of Arran (*CSP* i. 147).

1551, 10 November: Six cart loads of gun chambers are brought from Leith to the castle to fire a salute to celebrate the queen dowager's arrival from France (*TA* x. 32). As at Mary of Guise's coronation on 6 February 1540, detached gun-chambers, probably borrowed from relatively small wrought-iron weapons, were brought to the castle to fire a large salute from the battlements.

1552, 21 July: to William Peebles, plumber, for mending holes in the lead-roofed range (*the hous thekit with leid*) in Edinburgh Castle, £2 10s (*TA* x. 97). See **Captain's Hall, King's Chamber**, Palace.

1552, 30 October: Four 'single' falcons are moved out of the castle towards Jedburgh with the Duke of Châtelleraut's forces; they require 12 horses between them, accompanied by two horses carrying gunpowder and ammunition, and eight pioneers led by one Will Anderson; as on 23 February 1545 and 12 September 1545 John Crawford is evidently the gunner in command (*TA* x. 117–

18).

1552, 19 November: To Isabel Crichton, for wine taken from her by the captain and keeper of the castle during the siege by the English, £50 (*TA* x. 126); the reference is presumably to 4 May 1546.

1552, November: To James Dalzell, Master of Works in Edinburgh Castle, and his counterparts at Linlithgow Palace, Hamilton, and Brodick Castle on Arran, for their expenses on building work in these residences, £5,268 11s 9d (*TA* x. 130). This was a vast expenditure, which is not itemised at all in the documents. It is unclear whether the work at Hamilton was on Cadzow Castle or the smaller tower-house known as the Orchard which was later enlarged into Hamilton Palace.

1554: The Earl of Huntly, Chancellor of Scotland, is imprisoned in the castle, having been accused by the Earl of Cassilis, Treasurer of Scotland, of manslaughter; he is only released after surrendering his grant of Moray, Ross, Orkney and Ardmnoch (*Diurnal*, p 267). This vast appanage comprised most of northern Scotland, and Ross and Ardmnoch in particular were normally reserved for royal princes; giving them to Huntly was no doubt controversial and arguably illegal, and also a serious diminution of royal revenues and resources; nonetheless, Cassilis' action was a remarkably high-handed piece of fiscal policy, and the fact that the gift was made in the first place might be seen as a tacit acknowledgement of Huntly's close genealogical relationship to the royal house: see Appendix 8: **The King's Daughter and the Moorish Lassies**.

1556, July: The Earl of Caithness is brought prisoner to Edinburgh, accused of various heinous crimes but not prosecuted due to the impossibility of assembling an unbiased jury; he is subsequently released after paying a great fine (*Diurnal*, p 267).

1557, February: The start of a year-long construction project involving substantial structural work on the Fore Wall and **David's Tower**, later extended to other work at Holyrood (*the biging of the foirewale of the castell of Edinburgh, David tourheid, and certane uthir bissines done in the palice of Halierudehous*), at a cost of £1,136 19s 10d (TA x. 409). At some point between August 1547 and 27 January 1573, the artillery position on the Fore Wall was transformed from a breastwork of earth-and-wicker gabions to a high stone wall with porthole-like gunloops, and this may be the work recorded here.

1558: A French intelligence memorandum on the state of Scotland states that the castle is the only fortress in the hands of the Scottish Crown (as opposed to Dunbar, Inchkeith, Broughty Castle, Blackness and Eyemouth garrisoned by the French, and the Bass Rock, held by the laird of Lauder); it has just 18 men in garrison, and the burgh has still not recovered from the sack of 6 May 1546 (CSP i. 206). The document is calendared at 1558 in CSP, presumably on the basis of the reference to a new fort at Eyemouth held by the French; but internal evidence hints that it may have originated a decade earlier – the list of forts corresponds to those which the Scots invited the French to garrison in 1550 (in which case the ‘new fort’ at Eyemouth is the earlier one vacated by the English in that year), and the lack of references to the key French stronghold at Leith or to the Earl of Huntly being among the noblemen who had been granted the Order of St Michael would suggest an underlying version drafted in 1548.

1558, 3 July: Mons Meg is taken out ‘from her lair’ (*furtht of hir lair*) to be shot, and afterwards her ‘bullet’ is found and carried back from Wardie Muir (*fra Weirdie mure*); ‘certain pioneers’ are paid 10s 8d for their labour in both activities (TA x. 367). The open ground of Wardie Muir corresponds to the Stewarts Melville and Fettes school rugby pitches on Ferry Road.

1558, 11 July: £4 is paid for a year’s rent of a cellar (*ane sellar male*) on Castle Hill (TA x. 367). This presumably lay outside the castle but is likely to have been procured for activities associated with it.

1558, 2 November: For ropes (*towis*) made in the castle and associated horse-collars (*hemmis thairto*), to serve as traces for the queen's carriage, £1 16s. For 1½ 'wisps' of steel for fitting (*grathing*) certain culverins in Edinburgh Castle, and for olive oil, £1 10s (*TA* x. 400). The culverins might be handguns or artillery pieces. Olive oil was used for a number of purposes, notably for applying a patina to bronze guns.

1558, April: 156st. of iron, and a consignment of newly manufactured tools comprising 108 picks and mattocks, 100 shovels and a dozen lanterns (*bowattis*) are stored in Edinburgh Castle before being sent to Eyemouth for construction work on the new French fort there (*TA* x. 422).

1558, April: 12st. of iron, a barrel of tar, 1st. of sulphur (*brintstane*), 3st. of saltpetre, canvas to make small bags for the sulphur, intended for Hume Castle, are carried up from the Tron to the castle by cart, and subsequently dispatched to Hume, along with 16 dales, gun-carriages for a battard and a moyen complete with their wheels and axles, and 30 cannonballs for battards (*TA* x. 436-7). The way the relevant payments are broken down does not make it entirely clear which elements of the consignment of supplies were actually stored in Edinburgh Castle, but the way that these supplies are combined for dispatch to Hume with artillery equipment which must have already been in the castle suggests that it was all brought within the gates.

1558, April-May: Expenses are recorded for the casting of artillery in the castle, notably a gross culverin (*gros culvering*). In April 1558, procurement includes 40 loads of clay from Pilrig, 4st. 7lb 8 oz. of tow-ropes to fit the 'patron' to the mould (*fulfill and just the patrone to the muld*) of the gun, 370 great oak ship-timbers carried up from Leith for heating the furnace for casting (*melting*), six hanks of wire, 58 loads of coal for breaking-up the metal, 50 loads of peat for drying the moulds and spindles of the gross culverin and two double falcons, and the master gunfounder David Rowan is paid for outlay on hair, tallow, line, cords, tow-ropes,

shovels, wooden casks (*puncheonis*), nails, lead, canvas, leather (*skynnis*), hemp, candles, wax and other small expenses; in addition, brass is bought to make rammers (*chargearis*) for a saker (*sacrat*), two moyens and a double falcon, and Lombard paper to make the 'patrons' (*draw the patronis*) of a double culverin, battard, moyen and other necessities relating to them. In May, payments are recorded for 9st. 1lb of tin to alloy the copper (*tyn to dulce the mettell*) for the gross culverin, payment to the engraver James Cooke for putting the queen's arms on a double falcon, 4lb of steel to edge the engraving tools and back payment to various labourers from 30 January 1558, working mainly on gun-moulds (*TA* x. 437-8). The gross culverin was a heavy gun firing a cannonball around 18lb; falcons were small guns firing cannonballs weighing around 1lb, but 'double falcons' seem to have had comparatively thick bronze barrels allowing them to take a heavy powder charge to improve their range and hitting power; a saker was a captured English gun firing perhaps a 6lb cannonball, moyens were 3lb guns, battards somewhere in the 8lb-12lb range, and a double culverin was an 18-pounder with a thick barrel to allow a greater powder charge. Although the two double falcons were probably cast successfully, and appear to be recorded in a 1575 inventory, the reference to using coal to break up spilled bronze and the subsequent rebuilding of the entire foundry suggest that the attempt to cast the gross culverin was not successful; interpreting the exact meaning of the passage is made more complicated by the multiple meanings which the word 'patron' could have in the context of 16th-century artillery: it could apparently mean a full-size wooden mock-up for a making a clay gun-mould, a design plan for a cannon or a powder-cartridge, and, adding further to the confusion, both the plans and cartridges could be made of 'Lombard paper'.

1558, June: A dozen short oak beams (*garronis*), a great corble (*corbale*), 19 dales, 11 small joists, two gun-carriages for battards (*battart stokis*) and four wheels (evidently for the gun-carriages) are sent out from the castle to Tantallon via boat from Leith (*TA* x. 435). The 'corble' was probably a long wooden beam to be cut up and made into a whole set of timber corbles (*DOST*, s.v. *corbell* n. 2). Subsequent supplies sent 'from Edinburgh' to Tantallon in September 1558 may also be from the castle, but this is not explicit.

1558, 3 September: Army equipment intended for a muster at Fala Muir is reported as still stored in Edinburgh Castle, totalling 58 picks and mattocks, 44 'shod' shovels and 32 'unshod' ones, a great tow-rope weighing 2st. 4lb to serve traces to 'double' and 'single' falcons, 1st. of line to tie (*merling to knet*) the said traces, horse-collars (*hemmis*) bought from John Crawford; the same account records the cleaning (*dichting*) of two vaults in the castle and the flooring (*soling*) of one of them, at a cost of 10s, perhaps to act as a storage space (*TA* x. 434-5).

1559, 7 October: After a defeat the previous day, the pro-English 'Lords of the Congregation' have abandoned Edinburgh overnight, leaving their artillery unattended in the streets; the castle garrison, led by Lord Erskine, sortie out to capture it (*Diurnal*, pp 54-5).

1559, 20 December: The Earl of Arran writes to the English secretary of state Sir William Cecil with details of his preparations for a pro-English coup: among other things, he believes that they can secure Edinburgh Castle, as the captain, Lord Erskine, is the uncle of Arran's co-conspirator the Prior of St Andrews (*CSP* i. 277). James Hamilton, Earl of Arran, was the Duke of Châtellerauld's son, recently returned to Scotland; the 'Prior of St Andrews' was James V's illegitimate son by Lord Erskine's sister, later the Regent Moray; Sir William Cecil is better known to history as Lord Burghley, though he was not raised to that title until 1571.

1560, 1 April: Faced with another English invasion, the Queen Regent Mary of Guise moves from Holyrood to the castle; the Archbishop of St Andrews, and the bishops of Dunkeld and Dunblane; the Archbishop of Glasgow, the Bishop of Amiens, Lord Seton and the French commanders join the French garrison in Leith (*Diurnal*, pp 56-7, 274). It is clear that Robert Stewart, Commendator of Holyrood, was also involved, but the ambiguous grammar of the first version gives the sense he went to the castle, while the other places him in Leith.

1560, 6 April: Mary of Guise has a parley with the commanders of the English expedition at the Blockhouse (*Knox*. ii. 65-6; *Lesley*, p 283).

1560, 29 April: Mary of Guise writes from the castle to the French commanders at Leith, reporting that she is constructing a flanker guarding the gate in the Spur (*de lesperon*), and that 15 English soldiers were slain in the siege lines the previous night (*CSP* i. 389). The editors of *CSP* hesitates unnecessarily about the location of the gate – the reference is evidently to a defending gun-battery designed to fire along the south side of the Spur, either located around the southern end of the current Victorian gatehouse or perhaps in the area at the south-east angle of the Palace later known as ‘the Battery’.

1560, 30 April: The English military commander Lord Grey expresses confidence that Edinburgh Castle would be easily captured and claims that he would have done so long ago had he not been directed to besiege Leith instead; however, he cannot at present spare the troops until the siege of Leith is over (*CSP* i. 391).

1560, 7 May: Mary of Guise sits on the Fore Wall of the castle to watch the French garrison of Leith repulse an English assault (*Knox* ii. 67–8).

1560, 10 June: Mary of Guise dies around midnight, having held a meeting with the rebel leaders, the Duke of Châtellerauld, chief of the Hamilton family, and James Stewart, the Commendator of St Andrews and future Earl of Moray, in which they promised to be faithful to her daughter Mary Queen of Scots (*Diurnal*, pp 59, 276–7).

1561, 1 March: Mary of Guise’s coffin is removed from the castle and put on a ship at Leith for burial in France (*Diurnal*, p 61).

1561, 21 June: The burgh council decide to execute an apprentice leatherworker (*ane cordinare seruant*) simply for staging the town’s traditional Robin Hood play; they stage a show-trial with a packed jury, and both they and their ally John Knox rebuff attempts by the craft guild to have the sentence postponed pending an

appeal to the Duke of Châtellerauld, titular regent of Scotland; the apprentices, led by the rest of the actors from the play, who have been hiding from arrest, arm themselves, break down the gibbet, break open the Tolbooth and chase the town council into a nearby lawyer's office (*writing buith*); being unable to leave through the locked Netherbow Gate, they make their way up towards the castle, but the burgh council shoot at them from inside the Tolbooth as they pass, injuring one; a firefight develops, lasting from 3pm to 8pm; the master-craftsmen are unable to persuade the apprentices to stand down, and it takes the personal intervention of the constable of the castle, who comes down from the castle and persuades the council to issue a full pardon to the apprentices for all past crimes, in exchange for which the apprentices agree to end the siege (*Diurnal*, pp 65–6, 283–5). The second version of the narrative speaks of the 'masters of the Castle' rather than the master-craftsmen (*maisteris of the craftismen*) being approached before the constable; presumably, this is simply a transcription error.

1561, 2 September: Mary Queen of Scots makes her formal entry into Edinburgh. Riding from Holyrood by a road on the north side of the town, presumably the precursor of Market Street (*the lang gait on the north syid of the said burgh*), she enters into the castle through a gate made specially for her, where she meets the earls and lords of parliament and their sons, from where they ride up the Castle Bank to the castle, and dine inside; at noon, she rides out again, with a massive salute of artillery, and is met on the Castle Hill by 16 town worthies who carry a massive gold-fringed purple velvet canopy over her while she rides on horseback, 50 young men guising as Moors and a cart containing some boys with the Cupboard and appropriate 'gifts' (*propyne*) to the queen. From there, they proceeded down the Royal Mile, where a series of small masques were presented (*Diurnal*, p 67).

1562, 30 August: The Earl of Bothwell, having previously been imprisoned in the castle due to allegations of a coup plot, escapes during the night, and makes his way to Hermitage in Liddisdale (*Diurnal*, p 73).

1562, 27 November: Lord Gordon, having been brought a prisoner to Edinburgh (after a brief civil war), is taken from the Duke of Châtellerauld's lodgings (on the site now occupied by the Old Quad of the University), and escorted by men-at-arms to the castle where he is imprisoned, awaiting the trial which takes place on 8 February 1563 (*Diurnal*, pp 74-5).

1563, 8 February: Lord Gordon, imprisoned in the castle since 27 November 1562, is put on trial, convicted of treason and returned to prison in the castle for two days until 11 February 1563 (*Diurnal*, p 75).

1563, 11 February: Following his conviction on 8 February 1563, Lord Gordon is transferred from the castle to Dunbar (*Diurnal*, p 75).

1563, 20 May: At 8am, the Archbishop of St Andrews enters the castle; the previous day, the Protestant faction in parliament had attempted to prosecute him under the illegal sectarian legislation of the so-called 'Reformation Parliament', which imposed a death sentence on all practising Catholics; although his entry into the castle notionally meant that he was being detained at Her Majesty's Pleasure (*in the queen's will*), this was largely a device to protect him from his opponents (*Diurnal*, p 75).

1565, 12 February: Lord Erskine as captain of the castle hosts a banquet in the castle for Mary Queen of Scots, her husband Lord Darnley and the French ambassadors who were then in Edinburgh; it begins at noon and ends with the departure of the guests to Holyrood at evening (*Diurnal*, p 87). Following on from several days of entertainment at Holyrood, this appears to have been the last formal event of the ambassadors' visit. Note that Darnley is styled 'King' in the *Diurnal*.

1565, 26 August: Mary Queen of Scots and her husband Lord Darnley lead an expedition against the Earl of Moray, taking six artillery pieces (*Diurnal*, p 82). The guns probably came from the castle.

1565, 31 August: At around 5pm, a force of around 600 rebel cavalry led by the Earl of Moray and the Hamiltons arrive and occupy the town of Edinburgh; the guns of the castle fire three or four shots at them as they arrive (*Diurnal*, p 82). The clash continued the next day, 1 September 1565.

1565, 1 September: At 10pm, the captain of the castle, Alexander Erskine, sends a messenger to Moray, ordering his forces to leave Edinburgh by midnight and threatening to open fire if they do not; at first, the rebels seem to be in no hurry to leave, but three shots from the castle into the buildings of the town hasten their departure, and they pull out around midnight (*Diurnal*, p 82).

1565, 29 September: Six leading citizens of Edinburgh are imprisoned in Edinburgh for 'certain crimes', apparently largely a pretext for their refusal to make a loan to the government; they rapidly come to an accommodation which is formalised 6 October 1565 (*Diurnal*, p 85). They had previously been held for two days in 'the old tower wherein my lord of Murray lodged', but the context indicates that this was the Bishop of Murray's lodging in the Canongate – cf. *CSPS* ii. 297 – not the Earl of Moray's lodging in the castle (mentioned in 1522).

1566, 20 March: The Laird of Drumlanrig is warded in the castle as one of a number of individuals arrested in connection with the murder of Rizzio (*Diurnal*, p 97).

1566, 20 April: The earls of Argyll, Moray and Glencairn, Lord Boyd and Lord Ochiltree have a meeting in the castle with Mary and Darnley; a truce is declared to last for the length of the royal couple's residence in the castle (*Diurnal*, p 99).

1566, 26 April: The Earl of Arran, imprisoned in the castle since 1562, is transferred to house arrest at Hamilton under £20,000 bail put up by the earls of Argyll and Moray and others (*Diurnal*, p 99).

1566, 19 June: Prince James, the future King James VI, is born in the castle. Salutes are fired by the castle's artillery to mark the occasion (*Diurnal*, p 100). The *Diurnal* also mentions the lighting of many bonfires – presumably this refers to celebrations throughout the kingdom as the news spread, a typical 16th-century practice, but at least one bonfire within the castle may have accompanied the artillery display.

1566, 7 October: The queen departs Edinburgh (*Diurnal*, p 100).

1567, 9 March: The Earl of Mar having ended his custody of Edinburgh Castle, Mary Queen of Scots and her privy council grant him, and his father Lord Erskine his predecessor, and their heirs and subordinates, exoneration for all their handling of (*intromissioun with*) the castle, the munitions and other things it contains, and for any charge of negligence in office; this is duly ratified by parliament on 16 April 1567 (*RPS* 1567/4/4).

1567, 20 March: Sir James Balfour make an inventory of the artillery and equipment of the castle. The gun positions include the Fore Wall, the 'towerhead' (of **David's Tower**), the hill at the rear of the Munition House, the end of the Chapel, the Postern, the earliest unequivocal mention of the Butts and the gable-end of the Gunhouse; as well as the contents of the Munition House and Gunhouse, structures mentioned include the Smithy, Workhouse, Powder Vault, and the Kitchen Tower, Bakehouse, and Brewhouse, the Great Hall and the adjacent chamber (presumably the ground-floor space of the Register House), **David's Tower** and the To-falls (*Inventories*, pp 165–77). This entry is normally dated a year early due to the traditional Scottish tendency to change the year-date around Easter. It relates to the handover from one captain to another,

recorded in the documents of 9 March 1567 and 21 March 1567. See also Appendix 10: The Artillery.

1567, 21 March: The Earl of Mar hands over the castle to the queen, who appoints Sir James Cockburn of Scarling as captain (*Diurnal*, p 107). The *Diurnal* notes that the move was opposed by the 'inhabitants' of the capital, who appreciated Mar's personal decency, and his refusal to suppress public dissent.

1567, 17 April: In her speech at the opening of parliament in the Tolbooth (i.e. the nave of St Giles), the queen thanks the Earl of Mar for his loyalty in keeping the castle, and the session opens with a special act absolving him of any penalty for his actions as keeper (*Diurnal*, p 108).

1567, 24 April: Mary, returning to Edinburgh from Stirling, is intercepted [at Cramond Bridge] by Bothwell with a large force of cavalry; as the report of the queen's abduction spreads, the people of Edinburgh rush to arms, and the castle's guns are fired to signal the alert (*Diurnal*, pp 109–10). The exact nature of this event is still controversial.

1567, 6 May: Mary returns to Edinburgh, escorted by Bothwell and his horsemen; they are saluted by the castle's artillery as they ride in by the West Port and West Bow, but Bothwell, leading the queen's horse by the bridle, still seems to be her captor (*Diurnal*, pp 110–11). Whatever the exact nature of the rendezvous on 24 April 1567, the queen was by now married to Bothwell.

1567, 8 May: The marriage of Mary and Bothwell is proclaimed; Mr James Balfour, the clerk register, is appointed captain, and Cockburn of Skirling hands over the keys (*Diurnal*, p 111).

1567, 11 May: Mary and Bothwell move from the castle to Holyrood (*Diurnal*, p 111).

1567, 10 June: The Earl of Morton, the Earl of Mar and a large force of noblemen and armed men ride to Edinburgh; although the people of the town anticipate that their column will be targeted by the castle's artillery fire, they force their way in by the gate at the junction of the Cowgate and St Mary's Street, and are not hindered as they break open all the town gates, and gather at the Market Cross, where they proclaim themselves to be a posse in pursuit of the murderers of Darnley. Several rival proclamations are subsequently made at the Cross, and a group of the queen's supporters enter the castle, including the Earl of Huntly, his uncle the Archbishop of Athens, the Archbishop of St Andrews, the Bishop of Ross, Lord Claud Hamilton, the Commendator of Kilwinning, the Dean of Glasgow and David Chalmers, Provost of Crichton. They hope that the queen and Bothwell will move to support them, but in fact they have retreated from Borthwick to Dunbar (*Diurnal*, pp 112-13).

1567, 23 June: Mary Queen of Scots has been captured and effectively overthrown by the Earl of Moray and his allies; James Balfour, captain of the castle, gives the new regime 'the piece of artillery to defend the town' (*Diurnal*, p 116). It is unclear if this relates to a specific gun that was assigned for defence of the burgh, or a weapon from the castle arsenal.

1567, 1 September: James Balfour, captain of the castle, betrays it to the Earl of Moray, in exchange for £5,000 in cash, the commendatorship of Pittenweem Priory and an annual pension of 30 chalders victual to his son (*Diurnal*, pp 120-1).

1567, 11 September: John Hay, an associate of Bothwell who had been arrested in Fife, is imprisoned in the castle on suspicion of participation in Darnley's murder; he is questioned in the castle by the 'lords' two days later (*Diurnal*, p 122). Trial and conviction followed on 3 January 1568.

1567, 24 September: Moray appoints Sir William Kirkcaldy of Grange as captain of the castle and hands over the keys to him (*Diurnal*, p 124).

1567, 26 September: Moray dispatches a siege train from the castle to attack Dunbar, consisting of four cannons, two gross culverins and a battard. A convoy of powder and shot follows them out (*Diurnal*, p 124). The guns in question are four 36-pounders, two high-velocity 16-pounders, and an 8-pounder – with the exception of the 8-pounder, they correspond to the guns deployed in the main battery on the Fore Wall. Three other guns, probably smaller ones, had already been dispatched from Edinburgh to the siege of Dunbar on 21 September 1567 (*Diurnal*, p 123), but there is no direct evidence showing they were from the castle (See Appendix 10: The Artillery).

1568, 3 January: John Hay of Tallo, imprisoned in the castle since 11 September 1567, and several other associates of Bothwell subsequently captured and imprisoned there with him, are tried, convicted and executed for Darnley's murder (*Diurnal*, pp 127-8).

1568, 13 May: Mary Queen of Scots having escaped from imprisonment, she raises an army, but at the Battle of Langside her supporters are defeated by the forces of the Earl of Moray, acting in the name of the infant James VI. Mary flees into exile in England, and many of her followers become prisoners-of-war, who Moray brings to the castle on 18 May 1568.

1568, 18 May: After the Battle of Langside, the high-ranking prisoners from the queen's army are imprisoned in the castle, including Lord Seton, Matthew Campbell of Loudon, Sheriff of Ayr, Sir James Hamilton of Crawfordjohn, Sir William Scott of Balweary and a large number of other lairds, many of them members of the Hamilton family; the Hamilton contingent and a few others are brought from the castle to a token trial on 21 May 1568, but returned that same day (*Diurnal*, pp 130-1). Some are transferred to Blackness Castle on 22 June

1568; Lord Seton is released from Edinburgh on bail on 2 November 1568 others on 21–3 March 1569; the rest were all released on 19 April 1570.

1568, 26 May: A convoy of 13 carts is escorted in the castle, carrying coffers seized from the Duke of Châtellerauld's castles at Hamilton, Draffen [i.e. Craignethan] and Kinniel (*Diurnal*, p 132).

1568, 22 June: Some of the prisoners incarcerated in the castle since 18 May 1568 are transferred to Blackness Castle (*Diurnal*, p 133). Others are subsequently released on 2 November 1568 and 19 April 1570.

1568, 2 November: Lord Seton, one of the prisoners held in the castle since 18 May 1568, is released on bail (*Diurnal*, p 189); another source says he was released around 21–3 March 1569; he is presumably liberated from his bail conditions in the general release of the remaining prisoners on 19 April 1570.

1569, 21–3 March: Lord Seton, the Sheriff of Ayr, Sir James Hamilton and other prisoners are released from the castle on bail (*Diurnal*, p 143). It is unclear what relationship this has to Lord Seton's release on bail as reported on 2 November 1568.

1569, 16 April: Lord Herries, having attended a parliament held in Edinburgh, but refusing to acknowledge the government set up by Moray in the name of James VI, is arrested and sent to the castle around 8pm. The Duke of Châtellerauld, who had made a similar show of defiance, is initially held by Moray at Holyrood, but sent to join Herries in the castle two days later on 18 April 1569 (*Diurnal*, p 144). Herries is eventually released on 31 March 1570.

1569, 18 April: The Duke of Châtellerauld, arrested alongside Lord Herries on 16 April 1569, is sent to join him in the castle around 9am (*Diurnal*, p 144). Châtellerauld is subsequently released on 19 April 1570.

1569, 1 August: William Stewart, former Lord Lyon, and Paris [Lord Bothwell's valet], accused respectively of conspiracy to assassinate Moray and involvement in Darnley's murder, are taken from the castle to St Andrews, convicted and executed (*Diurnal*, p 146).

1569, 9 September: William Maitland of Lethington, the queen's secretary of state, is brought captive to Edinburgh by the Earl of Moray, but placed under house arrest in the town rather than imprisoned in the castle in the customary manner, as he is known to be a close friend of Kirkcaldy of Grange, the captain of the castle, and Moray suspects that, if the normal procedure was followed, Kirkcaldy would refuse to hand Lethington back over for his planned show-trial and execution; Kirkcaldy promptly transfers Lethington to ward in the castle anyway, to protect him from Moray (*Diurnal*, p 150). Lethington is subsequently released on 14 February 1570.

1570, 14 February: The Earl of Moray, having been assassinated, is buried in St Giles - Sir William Kirkcaldy of Grange, captain of the castle, leads his funeral procession; Sir William Maitland of Lethington, a prisoner in the castle since 9 September 1569, is brought before the privy council in the Tolbooth (i.e. the secularised nave of St Giles); he gives a brilliant speech in his own defence, and is found not guilty and reappointed to the council (*Diurnal*, p 158).

1570, 3 March: The Duke of Châtellerauld, imprisoned in the castle since 18 April 1569, writes to his Hamilton kinsmen and their allies, who have mustered under arms at Linlithgow, to withdraw in order to prevent conflict, and allow a political convention in Edinburgh to go ahead (*Diurnal*, pp 161-2).

1570, 8 March: Rival councils are held in Edinburgh by the supporters of the queen and the regency, that of the queen's men apparently taking place in the ground floor of the Register House; Kirkcaldy, the captain of the castle, attempts to broker a rapprochement and a meeting, but is unable to secure agreement (*Diurnal*, p 163).

1570, 31 March: Lord Herries, imprisoned since 16 April 1569 is released from the castle, following a conference held the previous day by the queen's supporters at Niddry Castle (*Diurnal*, p 167).

1570, 19 April: The Duke of Châtellerauld and the other prisoners in the castle are all released by command of parliament (*Diurnal*, pp 170-1).

1570, 4 May: An English army crosses the border at Berwick; Kirkcaldy of Grange receives intelligence that they plan to besiege the castle, and begins strengthening the defences (*Diurnal*, p 174). The supporters of the regency are nonetheless able to make a proclamation at the Market Cross a few days later before making a rendezvous with the English army; they bivouac together in the town from 13 May 1570 to 16 May 1570, before marching west, though some supporters of the regency, led by Lord Lindsay and Lord Ruthven, appear to have remained in or around Edinburgh until 30 May 1570.

1570, 28 May: Secretary Lethington leaves the castle for a meeting of the queen's supporters at Dunkeld (*Diurnal*, p 178).

1570, 7 May: The Earl of Morton and an army supporting the regency encamp at Brechin, garrisoned by the queen's supporters; a contemporary diary makes the perhaps ironic remark that Kirkcaldy of Grange, now aligned to the queen's party, 'had refused to lend them artillery' from Edinburgh Castle for the siege (*Diurnal*, p 183).

1570, August: There are rumours of a renewed English invasion, and speculation that Scotland might also be the target of a Spanish fleet reported to be at sea under the Duke of Alba, and of a new army being mobilised by the King of France: amid these alarms, Kirkcaldy of Grange, as Captain of Edinburgh Castle, is said to have 'made furnishing and preparation in the said castle for the defence thereof, in such manner that the like in our days was not heard nor seen' (*Diurnal*, p 184).

1570, 7 September: Robert Hepburn, younger son of the laird of Waughton, a supporter of the queen, is ambushed at Bathgate by followers of the Earl of Morton, the main supporter of the regency; he flees on horseback, and just outpaces them into the castle; Morton is reportedly annoyed at Kirkcaldy for allowing him entry; two days later, however, Kirkcaldy hands him over to Morton, on the condition that he should not be prosecuted except for the murders of Darnley and Moray; a contemporary diarist, presumably in irony, remarks that Hepburn was 'heartily content' with the decision (*Diurnal*, pp 186-7).

1570, 21 December: A party of half a dozen of Kirkcaldy's personal retainers assassinate a servant of the laird of Durie as part of a private feud; as they return from the crime scene in Leith to the castle, one of them is caught, and Kirkcaldy sends out part of the garrison to rendezvous with the rest at the Castle Bank; later that day, between 6pm and 7pm, Kirkcaldy sends a party of soldiers and retainers to break the captured man out of the Tolbooth, which encounters no resistance either from the Regent Lennox, then resident in the town, or from the burgh council; it is reported that this was due to a large number of local men being implicated in some way (*Diurnal*, p 197).

1571, 3 January: Kirkcaldy holds a meeting of his associates in the town, to discuss an offer of blood money to be paid for the assassination on 21 December 1570. Although the magistrates warn the citizens to be ready to be called to arms, the meeting is not hindered (*Diurnal*, p 198). This may have also been a show of force to deter the assembly planned by supporters of the regency for 12 January 1571.

1571, 28 January: Kirkcaldy is bold enough to attend the Sunday service in St Giles (*Diurnal*, p 199).

1571, 4 February: Kirkcaldy seizes Patrick Eggar's house at the top of the Royal Mile (*Patrik Eggaris land at the castlehill*) and establishes it as an outpost in front of the castle, garrisoned with a company of 100 men (*Diurnal*, p 199).

1571, 8 March: Elizabeth of England writes to Kirkcaldy as captain of the castle, and to the Regent Lennox, asking them to continue their truce until 1 April 1571; Kirkcaldy is using the opportunity to strengthen the castle's defences (*Diurnal*, p 201). It is evident from the sequel on 19 March 1571 that he was also recruiting soldiers, principally for the new outpost at the head of the Royal Mile, rather than for the castle itself.

1571, 19 March: The regent issues a proclamation at the Market Cross commanding the new recruits for the garrison to stand down again within three days; in response, around 4pm Kirkcaldy sends a drummer down the Royal Mile to publicly recruit more men, and to muster for pay at the head of the Royal Mile the next morning, 20 March 1571; thus strengthened, he sends a force to seize and occupy Holyrood Palace (*Diurnal*, p 202).

1571, 28 March: Kirkcaldy of Grange, the captain of the castle, also occupies and garrisons the steeple of St Giles (*Diurnal*, p 202).

1571, 5 April: The Earl of Huntly and an escort of half a dozen men enter the castle, avoiding ambush parties set for their capture (*Diurnal*, p 203).

1571, 8 April: Alexander McCulloch, a herald (*pursevant*), attempts to read a proclamation by the regency against the castle garrison commanded by Kirkcaldy

of Grange; in response he sends soldiers to seize the script, prevent the proclamation and take McCulloch prisoner to the castle (*Diurnal*, p 205).

1571, 11 April: Secretary Lethington, having arrived at Leith the previous day in a ship from Aberdeen, with reinforcements sent south by the Earl of Huntly, is brought up to the castle in a sedan chair (*cheir*), escorted by troops of the queen's faction (*Diurnal*, p 206). It is unclear whether 'the captain's soldiers' who provided the escort are the reinforcements led by Captain Cullen, or Kirkcaldy of Grange's garrison troops.

1571, 13 April: Sir William Kirkcaldy of Grange, captain of the castle, issues a proclamation at the Market Cross of Edinburgh, rejecting the authority of the Regent Lennox's government on patriotic grounds and thus implicitly anti-English, but tacitly Protestant in its reference to the 'true religion established in this realm', and making no mention of whether Mary Queen of Scots or James VI was the rightful monarch (*Diurnal*, pp 206–8).

1571, 14 April: Lord Maxwell, Lord Herries and Gordon of Lochinvar enter the castle for a meeting of the queen's supporters; Gavin Hamilton, Archbishop of St Andrews, also arrives in Edinburgh, has a meeting with the captain of the castle, Sir William Kirkcaldy of Grange (*Diurnal*, pp 208–9). The arrival of prominent Catholic supporters of the queen somewhat undercuts the preceding proclamation of the previous day, 13 April 1571 (it is unclear whether the archbishop arrived with the others or separately, as the author of the *Diurnal* evidently did not hear news of his presence until a few days later, and notes it out of sequence; to add further confusion, he refers to the newly promoted prelate under his former title of Commendator of Kilwinning). Maxwell, Herries and Lochinvar leave Edinburgh on 18 April 1571, to meet Alexander Gordon, Archbishop of Athens, who had been in England for negotiations with the English government, but the Archbishop of St Andrews was evidently still in Edinburgh on 29 April 1571.

1571, 21 April: Patrick Ogilvy is arrested and imprisoned in the castle for plotting the assassination of its captain, Kirkcaldy of Grange, and the betrayal of its garrison (*Diurnal*, p 209).

1571, 27 April: Kirkcaldy of Grange, captain of the castle, seizes the guns and pikes of the town militia, and moves them into the castle (*Diurnal*, p 209).

1571, 29 April: At 2am, officers of the castle garrison arrest eight supporters of the regency in a house in the town, and take them into imprisonment in the castle; around 11am, a company of around 40 of the Regent's cavalry ride up to the Netherbow from Leith Wynd, make an 'affray' at the Netherbow but fail to gain entry, retire to Leith and make a proclamation calling for recruits to muster at Dalkeith (the base of the Earl of Morton), then ride back to the Netherbow and fire indiscriminately through the gate for around half an hour, injuring and terrorising the civilians, before riding off down St Mary's Wynd to Dalkeith; the garrison sortie in pursuit with a force of cavalry and some 200 infantry, led by the Kirkcaldy of Grange as captain of the castle, the Earl of Huntly, Lord Home, John Maitland Commendator of Coldingham, and Gavin Hamilton Archbishop of St Andrews; they clash at Boroughmuir, but the regent's troops force the castle garrison to retreat, and pursue them back towards the town (*Diurnal*, pp 209-10).

1571, 30 April: Kirkcaldy of Grange, captain of the castle, proclaims that all inhabitants who will not openly accept his authority should leave the town within six hours, but is persuaded against enforcing it (*Diurnal*, p 211).

1571, 1 May: Lord Boyd comes to the castle as an envoy from the Earl of Morton, staying overnight for discussions with the captain, Kirkcaldy of Grange (*Diurnal*, p 211).

1571, 2 May: Kirkcaldy of Grange, captain of the castle, erects a fortification (*ane bastalzie*) at the Overbow (*Diurnal*, p 211). This refers to the original route down to

the Grassmarket, now represented by the gap in the buildings on the south side of the Royal Mile at the end of Johnston Terrace.

1571, 3 May: The Duke of Châtellerauld, chief of the Hamiltons, comes to Edinburgh with 300 cavalry and 100 hagbutters, in advance of the parliament called by the queen's supporters (*Diurnal*, p 211). Although the source says the Hamiltons came 'to Edinburgh to the Captain thereof', they may not have actually entered the castle.

1571, 8 May: The captain of the castle's brother, Mr James Kirkcaldy, arrives at Leith in a ship from France, with 10,000 *écus*, a supply of firearms, body armour and morion helmets, and some wine (*10m crownis of the sone, with ane greit number of hagbittis, corslattis and mirriounis*); the entire assembled force of the queen's supporters (or as the source says, 'the Captain's faction') is mustered out of the castle and the town to escort these supplies up and into the castle (*Diurnal*, p 212).

1571, 9 May: Around 10pm, an additional force of around 40 cavalry arrives to support the Queen's Men, led by the Earl of Argyll, Lord Boyd, and the duke's second son (who is the Hamilton heir-presumptive due to the incapacity of his brother). Preparations are being made to garrison the Flodden Walls as well as the castle (*Diurnal*, p 212).

1571, 13 May: Kerr of Fernieherst arrives with 80 more horsemen to reinforce the Queen's Men; that night, the Regent Lennox's troops establish an artillery position on the south-west corner of Calton Hill (*the dow craig*), and others stage an attack on the Netherbow, causing casualties both among the Queen's Men and ordinary inhabitants (*Diurnal*, pp 212-13).

1571, 14 May: Kirkcaldy of Grange, captain of the castle, has the Netherbow port blocked with stone and earth; the Regent Lennox comes into the Canongate and

holds a token parliament in a house in the small section at the south-west corner of that street which is officially located in the burgh of Edinburgh rather than the regality of Holyrood, in order to satisfy the conditions of a previous proclamation announcing a parliament to be held 'in Edinburgh' that day; Kirkcaldy's men fire down the Canongate in response, causing casualties among the inhabitants in return; they inflict more significant retribution the next day, 15 May 1571 (*Diurnal*, p 214).

1571, 15 May: In retaliation for the Regent Lennox's token parliament of the previous day, 14 May 1571, the Queen's Men bring a double cannon down from the castle to High School Yards, to bombard the house where the parliament had been held ('ane double cannone to the Blak Freir zaird', *Diurnal*, p 214; 'the grit cannone was brocht downe out of the castell', *Memorials*, p 123). The gun in question must either be the one procured at Veere in 1541, or one of the two brought by Albany in 1523, the three most imposing artillery pieces in Scotland with the exception of Mons Meg (see Appendix 10: The Artillery); a contemporary diarist's reference to much shooting of 'cannone feir' in this week suggests the gun employed was the cannon from Veere (*Memorials* p 133). Notwithstanding this, the regent and his men return the next day, 16 May 1571.

1571, 16 May: The Regent and his supporters return to the cannon-damaged house in the Canongate where they convened their parliament (see 14 May 1571 and 15 May 1571), and resume their parliament under sustained artillery fire from the castle; they pronounce forfeiture on several of the leading Queen's Men, and adjourn to Stirling on 3 August 1571; Lord Maxwell and Lord Herries arrive with 240 more cavalry to support the Queen's Men (*Diurnal*, pp 214-15). Further manoeuvres and skirmishing take place around Edinburgh over the subsequent days, but nothing directly pertaining to the castle is noted. The decision to garrison troops in the town and man the Flodden Wall (*Diurnal*, p 212) had probably shifted the military focus outwards to the town defences.

1571, 27 May: The English general Sir William Drury, known as the Marshal of Berwick, comes to Edinburgh as an envoy from Queen Elizabeth, and has a

meeting with Sir William Kirkcaldy, the captain of the castle, in a vain attempt to bring him onto the English side; the negotiation evidently takes place outside the castle, but Drury is subsequently allowed into the castle for a time between supper and 10pm (*Diurnal*, pp 217–18).

1571, 12 June: The leaders of the Queen's Men process from the castle to the Tolbooth (i.e. the nave of St Giles) and hold their parliament there (*Diurnal*, p 220)

The named attendees are the Duke of Châtellerauld and the Earl of Huntly (named first as co-regents under a commission of 28 February 1569), the Archbishop of St Andrews, the Archbishop of Athens, the Bishop of Dunkeld, commissioners for the bishops of Aberdeen and Moray, the Abbot of Sweetheart (*the commendatre of the Newabbay*), the Commendators of Paisley and Coldingham, the Prior of Pittenweem, a commissioner for the Commendator of Arbroath, a commissioner in the name of Holyrood Abbey, Lords Home, Maxwell and Somerville and members for the burghs of Jedburgh, Dumfries, Aberdeen, Elgin, Forres and Inverness; it seems that a number of lairds also attended, but Lord Herries 'feigned himself sick' and remained away.

Their first act was to pass a statute affirming the nullity of Mary's enforced abdication, and either then or the next day, 13 June 1571, they also passed a statute according some form of recognition or tolerance to Protestantism (the nature of the source makes it hard to know exactly what was asserted); they proceeded back to the castle, with the duke carrying the crown, Huntly bearing the sceptre and Lord Home the sword of state; at some point during the day, they also received Sir William Drury as ambassador from Queen Elizabeth of England.

1571, 13 June: The Queen's Men had the acts of their parliament proclaimed at the Market Cross, and the guns of the castle fired in salute.

That evening, learning that a set of reinforcements for the regent's forces were attempting to cross the Forth, part of the garrison was sent out in a ship and four small boats to intercept them, setting sail about 8pm; they intercepted them the next day, 14 June 1571.

1571, 14 June: Having set out by ship the previous day, 13 June 1571, a section of the castle garrison captured one of the two small ships (*crayaris*) in which the regent's reinforcements were attempting to make the crossing of the Forth; prevented from landing near Leith by the pro-regency forces of the Earl of Morton, they sailed back to Burntisland, got some food there and landed near Cramond at midnight, making their way to Edinburgh the next day, 15 June 1571 (*Diurnal*, pp 222–3).

1571, 15 June: After landing at Cramond near midnight the previous day, 14 June 1571, a section of the castle garrison returning with prisoners from an amphibious sortie march back via Corstorphine to Edinburgh and are saluted by four guns from the castle (*Diurnal*, p 224).

1571, 16 June: The Queen's Men, commanded by the Earl of Huntly, and the regent's soldiers, led by the Earl of Morton, draw up for battle near Holyrood; Sir William Drury, the English ambassador, rides out from the regent's army and negotiates a truce, but as soon as the Queen's Men believe that the battle has been averted and lower their guard, the regent's cavalry charge them, killing around 25 including the Archbishop of St Andrews and capturing around 70 including Lord Home (*Diurnal*, pp 224–5). The clash is not explicitly linked to the castle but is likely to have involved elements of the garrison.

1571, 3 July: A supply cargo sent from France to the captain of the castle is intercepted by the regent's forces, is partially recovered and much of the rest destroyed (*Diurnal*, pp 229–30). As the whole set of events took place on the coast of the Forth, and the only force of the Queen's Men directly involved was a troop of 20 horsemen, it is unclear whether this directly involved the castle, though the helmets and firearms they recovered may have subsequently served the castle garrison.

1571, 20 July: Sir Archibald Napier of Merchiston, a supporter of the regent, is imprisoned in the castle, having been captured by a force of the Queen's Men led by the laird of Minto (*Diurnal*, p 233).

1571, 25 July: A cannon and a gross culverin are brought out of the castle and set up at High School Yards; that afternoon, they shoot at Holyrood, controlled by the regent's forces, though they do little damage; the same day, an English envoy, Mr Cary (*Cace*) comes to the castle, with letters from Queen Elizabeth regarding her desire for a truce (*Diurnal*, pp 234-5).

1572, 23 June: The laird of Drumlanrig is captured by the Queen's Men, and imprisoned in Edinburgh Castle (*Diurnal*, pp 227-8).

1571, 27 August: The Queen's Men build a new, smaller gateway at the Netherbow (blocked since 14 May 1571); they use ashlar stone previously plundered from Restalrig church for a civilian building project (*Diurnal*, p 241). As with much of the military activity in Edinburgh this period, the castle's garrison were probably involved, but there is no clear indication of any direct reference to them beyond the reference to Kirkaldy of Grange's commission as captain of the castle.

1571, 29 August: The Queen's Men, led by Châtellerauld, Huntly and Home, hold a parliament in the Tolbooth [i.e. the nave of St Giles], and pronounce a sentence of forfeiture for treason against the Regent Lennox, the Earl of Morton and a very thorough list of supporters of the regency who had attended a rival parliament the previous day in Stirling; proceeding thence to the Market Cross with the sword, sceptre and crown they have the sentence proclaimed in public (*Diurnal*, pp 242-5). Presumably as on 12 June 1571, they processed to and from the castle; certainly, the regalia were being kept there, a point observed by the *Diurnal* in its reference to the preceding regency parliament at Stirling and would have been returned afterwards.

1571, 17 November: The Earl of Morton, as ambassador for the Regent Lennox's regime, travels to Berwick for a conference with Lord Hunsden the English commander there; although the regency spreads a false rumour that they are trying to open peace negotiations with the Queen's Men, their real purpose is to request an English invasion force with artillery to besiege Edinburgh Castle (*Diurnal*, p 255).

1572, 2 January: English envoys, led by Sir Henry Cary, son to Lord Hunsden, and Sir William Drury, his second-in-command at Berwick, come to the castle for peace negotiations; Hunsden stays the night in the castle and returns the next day to Leith (*Diurnal*, pp 256, 287). One of them is mentioned in each section of the source.

1572, 19 February: At 2pm Lord Seton arrives at Edinburgh Castle accompanied by a single servant, a borderer called Ecky (*ane bordourar nameit Eickie*), having passed through England in disguise as a shipwrecked merchant; simultaneously, the English general Sir William Drury and the diplomat Mr Thomas Randolph arrive at Leith, ostensibly for a conference with Sir William Kirkcaldy, the captain of the castle; a rumour in the town claims that they have no real commission from Queen Elizabeth but have been sent by Lord Hunsden, the commander at Berwick to aid the Regent Lennox's regime against the Queen's Men in the castle (*Diurnal*, pp 259, 288-9); this rumour appears to link their arrival with the request for military aid made to Lord Hunsden on 17 November 1571.

1572, 21 February: The English envoys Sir William Drury and Thomas Randolph come to the castle for a conference; they are met on Leith Walk by Lord Seton and a force of cavalry, who escort them into Edinburgh along with the lawyer and diplomat Mr Archibald Douglas; when they pass through the gate, they are greeted with a salute of artillery, although the rumour claims that this was done to honour Lord Seton and not the Englishmen (*Diurnal*, pp 259, 288-9). Strictly speaking, the grammar of the entry, stating they came 'to Edinburgh Castle' and entered 'the west port thereof', implies that they entered via a western gate of the castle itself; this cannot be the western postern at **St Katherine's Gate**, where a

force of cavalry could not enter up the steep footpath, but it is possible that they rode into the castle's Ward through its west-facing postern (where Johnston Terrace now passes beneath the south side of the Half-Moon Battery) and then up the slope, rather than through the West Port of the burgh at the entrance to the Grassmarket and then up and round to the head of the Royal Mile.

The event is dated a day later in the second of the two narratives incorporated in the *Diurnal*. Further conferences were held on 25 February 1572 (this one is not explicitly recorded as being in the castle) and on 27 February 1572.

1572, 27 February: The English ambassadors, Sir William Drury and Thomas Randolph, dine in the castle, and after noon, they ask the captain, Sir William Kirkcaldy, in whose name he held the castle; he replies by asking them to see their own commission, which they also refuse; that evening, they travel to Leith, the visit having been to no effect (*Diurnal*, pp 259, 289). Kirkcaldy had been appointed by the Regent Moray on 24 September 1567, who had in turn purchased the captaincy from the Earl of Bothwell's deputy on 1 September 1567, Bothwell being appointed by Mary under a revival of the hereditary grant of the captaincy calendared under 16 June 1488; the question of who sent the ambassadors relates to a rumour they had been sent by Lord Hunsden, the commander at Berwick, rather than by Queen Elizabeth, as noted under 21 February 1572.

1572, 3 March: A force of the Queen's Men, commanded by Captain James Halkerston, leave Edinburgh in the morning to collect provisions for the troops in the town; a force of the regent's cavalry ride out in attempt to intercept and capture them, led by Lord Ruthven and Lord Methven; after skirmishing on the Boroughmuir, they ride round the west of Edinburgh and are returning past Broughton when a long-range cannon shot from the castle kills Lord Methven, cutting him in two and beheading his horse (*Diurnal*, pp 259-60, 289-90; the second of these accounts does not seem to be informed of the reason for the excursion, but adds an infantry contingent from the regent's army, and that seven other cavalry and two infantry were also killed).

The two young noblemen were particularly closely related by marriage – they had been raised together as stepbrothers after the remarriage of their widowed parents, the old Lord Ruthven and the dowager Lady Methven, and they had subsequently married each other’s sister – having already grown up with them as step-siblings (*SP* iv. 261–3, vi. 167–9).

1572, 4 March: Alexander Stewart, Captain of Blackness Castle, defects to the Queen’s Men; his son is sent to Edinburgh Castle as surety for his loyalty (*Diurnal*, p 290).

1572, March–April: The Queen’s Men establish a mint (*cunziehous*) within the castle, and begin reissuing the queen’s old coinage, notably the 30s pieces but also 20s and 10s pieces and Mary of Guise’s small-change ‘placks’ (*Diurnal*, pp 261, 291). Additional fighting continues to be recorded in this period, but the castle is not mentioned directly.

1572, April: At the request of Mary Queen of Scots, the royal tapestry collection is sent out of Edinburgh Castle, to be brought to her while she is under house-arrest in England (*Diurnal*, p 291).

1572, 15 April: £5,000 in gold has been smuggled into the country in a crate of figs, and brought into the castle by Mr Archibald Douglas; Douglas and his servant Thomas Binning are also accused of an attempt to shoot the Earl of Morton, which failed simply due to Binning’s pistol misfiring; they and the Frenchman who brought the money from overseas are all caught; Douglas is imprisoned in Loch Leven Castle, his servant is handed over to the English and the Frenchman’s fate is unrecorded (*Diurnal*, p 292). This may be related to the issue of coin recorded under March–April 1572. The *Diurnal* identifies the source of the money as the Duke of Alba, the Spanish commander in Flanders, but the coin and the courier are both identified as French. Douglas was a notorious conspirator who acquired a reputation for untrustworthy opportunism, but it is surprising to find him in the service of either Spain or France.

1572, 12 April: Mr Cary, an English ambassador, is escorted into the castle by Lord Herries, to bid farewell, having been summoned to England (*Diurnal*, p 293). Presumably the same ambassador who had visited on 25 July 1571; he returned on 5 May 1572.

1572, 5 May: Ambassador Cary returns from England, having previously departed on 12 April 1572, holds discussions in the castle and lodges at Leith (*Diurnal*, pp 295-6).

1572, 21 May: The French Ambassador, who is attempting to broker a peace deal between the Queen's Men and the regent, travels to the castle, he is accompanied by the English envoy Sir William Drury; they are escorted in by Lord Seton, and saluted by the guns as they enter the West Port; the soldiers form an honour guard all the way from there to the Overbow, where the town militia is gathered on the Royal Mile, entering the castle at the Nether Gate (*nethir zeit*); that night, the Ambassador returns to his lodgings in Leith, perhaps returning again on 27 May 1572 (*Diurnal*, pp 263, 297).

1572, 27 May: After the talks of 21 May 1572, there are more talks in the castle, with contradictory sources: one source reports briefly that the French ambassador returns, but to no effect; another says in more detail that the English envoy Sir William Drury attended, and reports a rumour that the French ambassador was imprisoned by the Regent Lennox's supporters in Leith (*Diurnal*, pp 263, 298).

1572, May: The Regent Lennox's supporters begin to produce a debased silver coinage; it is alleged that counterfeit issues are also produced in the castle, as the good money minted previously was being bought for a little above its face value in the debased coin, and shipped out of the country (*Diurnal*, p 298).

1572, 10 June: The Earl of Huntly with the whole of the queen's army and a cannon, marches out of Edinburgh to besiege a small garrison of the Regent Lennox's men in Merchiston Castle; the gun breaks gaps in the walls, and the garrison is on the point of surrender, but the soldier sent to the battlements to negotiate sees the regent's army marching up from Leith, and rallies his comrades; Huntly turns away to fight the regent, but his own horse is shot from under him during the battle, and the Edinburgh town militia break formation and flee. However, the cannon is brought safely back to Edinburgh (*Diurnal*, p 263). The cannon (i.e. a 36-pounder) must have come from the castle, although its return is only mentioned as far as the West Port of the town.

1572, 4 July: Fifteen French prisoners-of-war, compelled to serve in the regent's forces, desert and come to Edinburgh; as they are heading up the Royal Mile to the castle, they fire a celebratory volley with their firearms outside St Giles, one of which, though charged with only powder and no bullet, fragments the paving and injures the passing Lord Fleming in the legs (*Diurnal*, p 304). This was particularly ironic as Lord Fleming was, loosely speaking, a stepbrother to the King of France – they shared a biological half-brother, the result of an affair between the Dowager Lady Fleming and King Henri II.

1572, 12 July: Sir Henry Cary, English ambassador, comes to the castle and returns to Leith (*Diurnal*, p 305).

1572, 22 July: The English and French ambassadors visit the castle to confirm a two-month truce they have negotiated between the Queen's Men and the regent's forces (*Diurnal*, p 306).

1572, 27 July: As a result of the truce agreement of 22 July 1572, the Queen's Men remove their artillery from various positions in the town, on the Flodden Wall, the steeple of St Giles and at Kirk o' Field, and take it all into the castle; simultaneously, the regent's forces in Leith remove their artillery to the King's Wark (*Diurnal*, p 308).

1572, 30 July: As part of the truce agreement, the castle garrison is reduced to its strength as of 27 January 1570 (*Diurnal*, p 310).

1572, 1 August: Amid clear signs that the regent's forces are disregarding the spirit of the truce and occupying the town of Edinburgh with a view to taking power, the ambassadors hold a meeting in the castle; the Duke of Châtellerauld, the Earl of Huntly and Lord Seton nonetheless return home with their troops (*Diurnal*, p 311).

1572. 18 August: The regent's government declares at the Market Cross that the high-value bullion coinage struck in the queen's name in the castle during the civil war is worthless and illegal, and orders its confiscation by the Crown (*Diurnal*, p 312).

1572, 1 September: Lord Fleming, previously resident in the castle, leaves for Biggar, where he dies on 6 September 1572, amid rumours of poisoning (*Diurnal*, p 312).

1572, 21 September: After the return of envoys from France and England, they hold a meeting in the castle with Sir William Kirkcaldy, its captain, and those leaders of the Queen's Men who remain there (*Diurnal*, p 314).

1572, 25 September: Sir William Kirkcaldy of Grange, captain of the castle, asks the English ambassador to make the regent's soldiers leave the town of Edinburgh in order to permit a restoration of civilian self-government (a basic condition of the truce of 27 July 1572); the ambassador refuses to do anything; the Queen's Men and the regent's party likewise refuse to give undertakings of support to the English and French governments respectively.

1572, 27 September: John Gordon, Bishop of Galloway, and Mr James Balfour, Commendator of Pittenweem, deputies acting for the Earl of Huntly and the Duke of Hamilton, who are in turn co-regents on behalf of Mary Queen of Scots, along with William Eicling of Petaldry, constable of the castle and deputy to Sir William Kirkcaldy of Grange, its captain, come down from the castle and meet in the Tolbooth (i.e. the secularised nave of St Giles) with the regent and his supporters holding a parliament there; they ask for a general pardon, while Kirkcaldy of Grange asks for 20,000 marks to settle his debts and restoration of his inheritance, while they propose the Earl of Rothes to take over as captain of the castle; in spite of discussion continuing from 9am to noon and 2pm to 6pm, no agreement can be reached; the Earl of Huntly is sent for, and parliament adjourned for a week (*Diurnal*, pp 314-15).

1572, 28 November: The English ambassador visits Huntly and the Queen's Men to discuss a new truce; they agree, but the Earl of Morton, now regent on behalf of James VI, refuses any truce without the castle being handed over to him (*Diurnal*, p 322).

1572, 25 December: The town authorities begin to erect a fortification of divots and dung across the Royal Mile just west of St Giles, to blockade the castle (*Diurnal*, p 322). Although the *Diurnal* attributes the action to 'the town of Edinburgh', the regent's forces are intensifying their military pressure against the castle.

1572, 29 December: The regent's forces in Edinburgh redeploy from St Giles to the head of the Royal Mile and the West Port, to blockade the castle; the garrison is rumoured to be short of water (*Diurnal*, pp 322-3).

1573, 1 January: At 6am, a gun is fired from the castle, to signal the end of the truce (*Diurnal*, p 323).

1573, 2 January: A fish market is held in the Royal Mile; the castle fires six cannon shots down the street – as well as causing casualties, the powerful shockwaves throw the fish across the street and strip slates off the roofs (*Diurnal*, p 323). The reference to the guns as ‘cannon’ suggests 36-pounders. See Appendix 10: The Artillery.

1573, 10 January: The English ambassador returns with £10,000 of English money to recruit an army to attack the castle; Mr James Balfour, Commendator of Pittenweem, and some other allies of his, have evidently come to terms with the regent – they are pardoned and allowed to pass to Fife (*Diurnal*, p 323).

1573, 12 January: The castle warns all loyal subjects of Mary Queen of Scots to leave the town, commands all rebels to depart by 15 January 1572, and summons the Earl of Morton, along with Mr James Balfour and Gilbert Balfour (who defected on 10 January 1572) to appear in the castle on a treason charge that day, on pain of outlawry (*Diurnal*, pp 323–4). It is unlikely that the garrison expected to be taken seriously – it is primarily a warning that the parliament which the regent intended to hold would be subject to attack.

1573, 17 January: The Regent Morton holds a parliament under gunfire from the castle. The traditional processions to and from the assembly takes place inside St Giles’ Kirk, using a fake set of brass regalia rather than even the silver-gilt set made for James VI, and rather than meeting in the main Tolbooth in the secularised nave of St Giles, the session is held in the vaulted basement of the town council house, abutting to the south-west (*the laigh counsell hous of the toun on the west syid of the tolbuyth*) (*Diurnal*, p 323). The performance is repeated in a subsequent session on 26 January 1573.

1573, 26 January: A second session of parliament is held by the Regent Morton with the threat of the castle’s artillery forcing a repeat of the precautions of 17 January 1573; the same day, a pay chest for the Edinburgh Castle garrison is landed at Blackness Castle from France – it consists of Mary Queen of Scots’

French dowry, claimed to be 50,000 double ducats; the immense value of the cash prompts a bizarre series of events, in which the commander of Blackness Castle betrays the courier to the regent on 3 May 1573; the imprisoned courier manages to gain control on 8 January 1573 and installs a well-provisioned garrison of the Queen's Men, but is betrayed again by his own wife on 11 January 1572. (*Diurnal*, pp 324–5).

1573, January: Serious damage is done to the buildings adjacent to the castle (i.e. the head of the Royal Mile and the north side of the Grassmarket), far more than was ever done during the previous hostilities (*Diurnal*, p 325).

1573, 27 January: An English report by siege engineers gives a detailed description of the castle, including the Spur, the Curtain, **David's Tower** and the **Constable's Tower**.

1573, 7 February: The castle garrison sortie and burn the 'main barn' (*mane barne*) and St Giles' Kirk and lay down gunfire to prevent the fire being extinguished (*Diurnal*, p 325). It is unclear if the gunfire came from the soldiers of the sortie, or from the castle itself. The barn was perhaps at Castle Barns near Lothian Road, in the opposite direction from the Royal Mile.

1573, 12 February: The castle garrison sortie and torch some tenements near the castle (*vnder the wall*); the wind spreads the fire down the south side of the Royal Mile as far as St Giles' Kirk; the regent's soldiers make no attempt to help extinguish the blaze, but content themselves with plundering in the chaos; the fire eventually burns out around 2am (*Diurnal*, p 326). The phrase 'under the wall' could refer generally to houses on the upper part of the Royal Mile or else in the Grassmarket – as the fire spreads down the south side of the Royal Mile, the head of the street on this side is the most likely position.

1573, 13 February: The castle garrison sortie again, finding the regent's trenches unmanned, and reach a position in the Royal Mile near the junction of Johnson Terrace; they attempt to set fire to both sides of the street, but are prevented, and driven back to their defences; in response, the regent's men order all houses to be unroofed (*tirrit*), all stacks of heather (*heddir stakis*) taken down to the bottom of the garden (*transportit at their awin bounds*) and burnt, and the placing of water in all chimneys (*lumes*) at night (*Diurnal*, pp 326–7).

1573, 16 February: Sir William Kirkcaldy of Grange, Captain of Edinburgh Castle, is declared outlaw at the Market Cross (*Diurnal*, p 327).

1573, 28 February: The English ambassador visits the castle and asks the garrison to accept an agreement reached between the respective regency regimes for James VI and Mary Queen of Scots; they refuse to do so without personal approval from Mary Queen of Scots, or authorisation from the King of France (*Diurnal*, p 238).

1573, 1 April: English siege engineers arrive in Leith, and start construction of gabions (wicker baskets full of turf) to serve as breastworks for English artillery being brought to besiege the castle (*Diurnal*, p 328).

1573, 4 April: A short truce is agreed between the castle and the Regent Morton for peace negotiations, with the Earl of Rothes visiting the castle to consult with Sir William Kirkcaldy, its captain (*Diurnal*, p 328). Discussions continue the next day, 5 April 1573.

1573, 5 April: After the opening of negotiations the previous day 4 April 1573, the Earl of Rothes and Lord Boyd go to the castle further negotiations with the garrison. Simultaneously, 100 English pioneers arrive, and the guns from Stirling Castle are brought to Leith to join the siege; Lord Seton and others are

imprisoned by the regent for communication with the castle, though Seton is released on £1,000 bail on 15 April 1573 (*Diurnal*, pp 328–9).

1573, 11 April: The English pioneers who arrived on 5 April 1573 begin constructing siege works around the castle (*Diurnal*, p 328).

1573, 15 April: The English pioneers having erected a wide turf wall (*ane braid fail*) to conceal their work from the castle, the garrison make a sortie, burn it and inflict casualties among them before withdrawing (*Diurnal*, p 328). Presumably the turf was either very dry, or else the 'fail' included other elements such as gambisons with wicker baskets.

1573, 20 April: Sir William Drury, the English commander, arrives at Leith with an English brigade estimated at 500 arquebusiers and 140 pikemen in three companies (*Diurnal*, pp 329–30).

1573, 25 April: The Englishmen position themselves in the siege trenches, though the castle garrison inflict casualties on them; Sir William Drury their commander, along with Colonel Sir James Haliburton of Pitcur commanding the Scottish troops involved in the siege, go to the castle and ask the captain, Sir William Kirkcaldy, to hand the fortress over to James VI; he asks time until 30 June 1573, which is rejected (*Diurnal*, p 330).

1573, 26 April: Three English supply ships (*houlkis*) arrive at Leith with artillery: a cannon royal, four single cannons, nine gross culverins, four pot pieces and one of the Scottish 'Seven Sisters' captured at Flodden, plus five smaller bronze guns (*Diurnal*, p 330).

1573, 27 April: The Scottish coat of arms (*handsengie of Scotland, and bag thairof*) is displayed above the castle (*Diurnal*, p 330). It is unclear if this 'enseign and badge' refers to a flag or some form of heraldic carving on the battlements.

1573, 29 April: The English artillery which arrived at Leith on 26 April 1573 is unloaded and mounted on its gun-carriages (*Diurnal*, p 331).

1573, 12 May: On this and the next two nights, the English artillery is positioned to bombard the castle. The garrison do not open fire on them in reply (*Diurnal*, pp 331-2). See Appendix 10: The Artillery.

1573, 16 May: A proclamation is read at the Market Cross of Edinburgh on behalf of the Regent Morton, imposing exile on all those who took pay as the queen's soldiers during the 'unrest' (*cummeris*), and also on the family members of the castle's garrison (*Diurnal*, p 332). An absurdly self-serving interpretation of the agreement of 27 July 1572. The same policy is continued in August 1573.

1573, 17 May: The bombardment of the castle begins at two in the afternoon and continues until eight in the evening. The garrison return fire with hackbuts, inflicting 'many' casualties (*Diurnal*, p 332).

1573, 22 May: On the sixth day of bombardment, the first significant damage is inflicted on the castle, with the collapse of the south 'quarter' (side or corner) of **David's Tower**, along with sections of the Fore Wall and Head Wall (*Diurnal*, p 332).

1573, 24 May: Further damage is inflicted on the castle by the English guns, with the collapse of the east 'quarter' of **David's Tower**, and the northern section (*north quarteris*) of the Portcullis Gate, along with the Wellhouse Tower, and more of the Fore Wall. The castle's garrison respond with small arms and perhaps

some smaller cannons (*small artailzerie*), but their heavy guns are unable to respond due to being subject to suppressing fire (*commandit*) from the English (*Diurnal*, p 332).

1573, 26 May: At 7am, two simultaneous attacks are made by the English infantry and the Regent Morton's Scottish troops. An assault against **St Katherine's Gate** on the west side of the castle is repulsed, but an attack against the Spur with ladders is successful, due to the very small defending force inside it (*Diurnal*, pp 332–3). The *Diurnal* states that there were just two men inside the Spur, while other sources claim 20. Nonetheless, Scottish small-arms positions would be able to fire on the men inside the fortification. The English commander, Sir William Drury, offers a parlay with the garrison, without consulting Morton.

1573, 27 May: Kirkcaldy stands on the Fore Wall to parlay with the English commander inside the Spur. Kirkcaldy boldly demands that Elizabeth of England should honour the agreement of 27 July 1572 (*the first articles*), but the Regent Morton refuses to accept this (*Diurnal*, p 333).

1573, 29 May: The castle is surrendered, with the leading defenders appealing for mercy to Elizabeth of England (which she repays by promptly ordering the captain's execution), while the rest of the garrison are allowed to march out with 'bag and baggage' – an honourable surrender. It is the Regent Morton's forces, not the English, who take control of the fortress. A great deal plundering of the artillery equipment and stores takes place, including stuff previously placed in the castle by Edinburgh townspeople for protection, but the royal treasures are not harmed. George Douglas, brother-in-law of the Regent Morton, is appointed captain of the castle (*Diurnal*, pp 333–4).

1573, 18 June: Lord Home is placed in prison in the castle (*Diurnal*, p 335); he is released on 2 June 1575.

1573, 22 June: Workmen and masons start rebuilding the castle in the area of **David's Tower** and the blockhouse (*quhair the tour wes and blokhous*) (*Diurnal*, p 335).

1573, August: The Regent Morton imposes substantial monetary fines on everyone in Edinburgh who had stayed in the town during the time of the 'unrest' (*cummaris*); half of this was promised to repair war damage in the town, but instead, the regent places all the cash in the castle and refuses to release it (*Diurnal*, p 336). Strictly speaking, the 'cummaris' is the Morton regime's euphemism for the period before the agreement of 27 July 1572 (see 16 May 1573); the regent, having completely ignored his own obligations under the agreement, nonetheless alludes to it as a justification for oppressing his opponents.

1573, 20–1 August: A large number of Border reivers having surrendered to the Regent Morton, some of them are imprisoned in the castle (*Diurnal*, p 337).

1573, 24 November: John Ormiston of that ilk, the 'black laird of Ormiston', having been captured by the Regent Morton, is imprisoned in the castle (*Diurnal*, p 338); his questioning about the murder of Darnley begins on 12 December 1573.

1573, 12 December: The start of a three-day questioning of the laird of Ormiston, held in the castle, in which he makes a confession, following by his execution on 14 December 1573 (*Diurnal*, pp 338–9).

1575, 2 June: Lord Home, imprisoned since 18 June 1573, is released from the castle to house arrest (*Diurnal*, p 348).

1579, 26 March: A thorough inventory of the contents of the castle is carried out when the Earl of Morton stands down from the regency. This includes: throne-

room hangings, bed-hangings, tapestries, cushions of gilded leather, silk, velvet and other materials; chairs, stools, toilet seats, tablecloths and sideboard cloths; folding beds, mattresses, bedsheets, embroideries, a vast quantity of clothing and luggage; miscellanea such as costumes for masques, maps of Malta, violins, chess sets, portraits, a wooden statue of the Samaritan woman at the well (from John's Gospel, Chapter 4, vv. 4-24), and the fabric parts of a campaign tent without its wooden frame or guy-ropes; a large library of books; a large number of bronze cannons, and a somewhat reduced and disorganised inventory of armaments and military equipment in the Munition House and associated buildings; the regalia (crown, sceptre and sword), plus diamonds, gems and gold jewellery, among them the large diamond brooch known as the Great Harry (*Inventories*, pp 201-73).

1579, 19 March: The Master of Mar, as Captain of Edinburgh Castle, along with the treasurer and the clerk register, conduct an inventory of the Crown Jewels in their coffer in the castle – producing a very similar list to that of 26 March 1579, with the crown and the other regalia, plus diamonds, gems and gold jewellery, including the large diamond brooch known as the Great Harry (*Inventories*, pp 287-96).

1576, 26 May: The start date of the only extant account book for the reconstruction work at Edinburgh Castle under the Regent Morton. The book covers the expenses of 'workmen' for a period of seven weeks to 14 June 1576 (though there is no entry for week 6 of the period). Nine workmen are paid a wage every week (except week 6), with the first name every week being that of Jacques Guillaume (*Jax Gilzeame*) – evidently a Frenchman, he was perhaps the leader of the group; the others are John Crawford, Matthew Johnston, William Fallow, Robin Neir (or *de Neir*, another Frenchman), James Hanno, John Lachlans (*Lauchlanis*), Thomas Bird and Sandy Aitken (*Sanderis Aitkin*); additional wages are paid in some weeks to another nine workmen: John Panton (weeks 1, 2, 3, and 5), John Smellie (weeks 2-5), Robin Johnston, John Walker and John 'Finey' (week 4), John Somerville (weeks 5 and 7), and James Saunders, William 'Elcheonar' and William Bell (week 5). No details of the building work are given,

but the accounts mention the repair of mattocks, and the ironwork and lubricant for a wooden crane. The total expense is £53 9s 4d (MWi. 299–301).

1583, 7 May: A proposal is presented for a thorough programme of repair and new building at all the Scottish royal residences: at Edinburgh Castle, the project was to involve four separate projects: (1) a dedicated residence for the governor (*ane speciall hous quhair the capitaine of the Castell may mak his dwelling place*), to be created by heightening the Portcullis Gate into a tower-house, with a new two-storey superstructure and stone-flagged wall-walks, corner turrets and battlements (*with allering, gailyeownis and battaling*), costed at £3,000; to this is appended a note that the new Portcullis Gate lacks its iron yett and portcullis, and that the empty hinges for the yett are rusting due to the lack of a proper superstructure above the empty portcullis slot (*quhair the crwikis thair of consumis with rane and wetter in defalt of an hows abone the same*); (2) the repair of roughly 400ft (*twentie scoir of fwttis*) of wall adjacent to the Portcullis Gate, to a height of 8 ells (24ft 8in) and a thickness of 8ft, costed at £1,000, a sum said to be partly due to the difficulty of transporting material (*in respect of the far cariage*), plus the repair of 80ft of wall 'beside the smithy' on the west side of the castle, costed at £500, again due to the difficulty of transporting the material (*In respect of the far cariage of materialls*); (3) refurbishing the roofs of the dilapidated Great Hall, which was then serving as a workshop (*the greit hall callit the workhows*), costed at 200 marks, and that of the Smithy, of which half was to be roofed in slate, and the other half, along with the chapel, cheaply in wooden boards (*spoune*) – the mention of a smithy and chapel under the same roof suggests that this was the Munition House; (4) as the **Captain's Hall** (*the capitenis hall*) had a flat lead roof above a planked ceiling (*sarkit abone with deillis*), it was proposed to remove the lead and apply it to other uses (*keipit to the kingis grace use*); in its place, it was suggested that the wallhead should be raised 6ft, with stone gables, and a pitched slate roof (MWi. 311–12). The total cost estimate was thus £4,740, not counting item (4), for which no sum is mentioned: presumably the lead was to be sold, but the author of the proposal did not wish to spell this out explicitly and was thus unable to cost this part of the project.

Contrary to what many secondary sources report, especially with respect to the Portcullis Gate, this proposal does *not* appear to have been carried out in

full, if at all. Only in 1612 was a new proposal made for a substantial repair programme at Edinburgh Castle, involving the refurbishment of the Register House, the improvement of the Palace with case windows, a modified roof, and the refurbishment of the Lang Stairs, and a set of repairs to the Fore Wall gun-battery, the outer gate in the Spur and the adjacent guardhouse, costed at £1,061; a substantial construction programme followed to 1615 (*MWi*. 325–7, 341–74).

1584, 8 August: Alexander Erskine of Gogar, Captain of Edinburgh Castle, hands over the castle and the military and household valuables therein to James [Stewart] Earl of Arran, as authorised by Arran's commission, notwithstanding that the keeping of these valuables and the accounting for them was assigned to other named officials, and that Erskine's commission was restricted to the castle and the receptacles in which the valuables were kept (*onlie the castell house and veschellis quhairin the same war ordanit to be keptit and preservit*); Arran exonerates Erskine for any responsibility and obliges himself to procure a parliamentary exoneration; on 10 August 1584, Erskine receives an exoneration by the king and privy council for himself, his subordinates and their heirs, for any crime of negligence he may have committed in respect to his office in the castle, and on 22 August 1584 this is ratified by parliament (*RPS* 1584/5/106).

1584, 22 August: A system of pay and victual for the garrisons in Edinburgh, Dumbarton, Stirling and Inverness, established c. 1579, is continued; Edinburgh receives 1,200 marks cash in monthly instalments from the Tron customs and the surplus of the 'thirds of benefices', and in victual from the third of benefices, thus: in wheat (*quhyit*) everything from St Andrews, namely 7 chalders, 2 bolls, 3 firloths, 1 peck; the unassigned remainder (*the rest*) of the 'third of benefice' of Scone, which is 3 bolls, the whole from the Perth Charterhouse (*the priorie of Charteris*), which is 2 chalders, 5 bolls, 3 part bolls, the whole from Lindores (3 chalders, 4 bolls, 3 firloths, 3 pecks), the whole from Monifieth (1 chalder, 3 bolls, one-third boll (*third part boll*)); in barley (*the beir*), 8 chalders, 5 bolls, 3 part pecks from of St Andrews; 1 chalder, 2 bolls, 1 firloth, 2 part pecks (*part pectis*) from Scone, 3 chalders, 3 bolls, 1 peck, 3 part pecks from the Charterhouse, 6 chalders, 9 bolls, 1 firloth from Lindores, 1 chalder, 9 bolls, 3 firloth, 2 part pecks (*part pectis*) from

Arbroath, and 94 chalders, 13 bolls, 3 part bolls from the bishopric of Dunkeld; in meal (*meill*), the whole third from St Andrews, namely 4 bolls, from Scone, 11 bolls, 1 firloft, everything from the Charterhouse, namely 2 part bolls (*part boll*), and from Lindores, 4 chalders, 11 bolls, 3 firlots, 2 pecks; from Dunkeld, 4 chalders; in peas and beans (*peis and benis*), the whole from St Andrews, namely 1 boll, 3 part bolls (*RPS 1584/5/83*). Apart from some surplus cash to Dumbarton, the rest of the castles' needs are met by local Crown resources. This is revised on 27 May 1617, with the St Andrews' render being returned to the archbishop and alternates substituted (*RPS 1617/5/42*). These were local rents owed to the Church, part of the 'third of benefices' claimed by the royal government after the Reformation; the fact that large cargoes of raw materials were being shipped directly across the kingdom to pay the captain and provide the garrison's rations is a sign of the collapse of the cash economy in this period.

1585, 15 November: Sir James Home, laird of Cowdenknowes, is appointed Captain and Keeper of Edinburgh Castle, the artillery and ammunition therein, and the sceptre, sword and crown, with the pay and victual assigned in 1584, and power to make constables and officers, the ordinary (i.e. resident) gunners to obey him, revoking all previous grants of the pay and victuals; this is ratified by Parliament on 10 December 1585 (*RPS 1585/12/55*).

Part 2: Index of Locations

Artillery House: See Gunhouse

Back Draw Well: A water well referred to in post-medieval sources, located in the west part of the castle near **St Katherine's Gate**. It is first documented in 1628, when the lower rock-cut section of its shaft was dug out to its current depth and width, and it was heightened with masonry to its present form when the ground level was raised this part of the castle in 1708–9 (Ewart and Gallagher (2014), p 143). It was probably simply created from scratch in 1628, but it is also possible that the work at this date involved the widening and deepening a small existing cistern: see Wells for more discussion.

At least one earlier reference to a 'back well' exists, but this clearly denotes a different water supply, **St Margaret's Well** outside the castle ramparts, which was blocked in 1573.

Bakehouse: A new bakehouse for the castle was built by 25 September 1517, along with a Brewhouse. Given the hints at a major reorganisation of the Crown Square complex in this period, it is not clear that either of them had a predecessor. The inventory of 20 March 1567 records that the 'new bakehouse' contained a baking board, a wooden grain-store (*girnell*) and a dough-trough (*troche*). It would also have had an oven and chimney, either of masonry or of clay, or just possibly of Italian-style brick.

It is tempting to think that the bakehouse lay near the Kitchen Tower and may thus perhaps be related to the two ovens in the Vaults (though a date of c.1700 is proposed for these by Ewart and Gallagher (2014), pp 87–8). From the late 17th century, the castle's brewhouse and bakehouse were located in a range behind the south ramparts of the Middle Ward, between **Dury's Battery** and the Butts, but these were probably built in the 1670s, as they are not shown on earlier depictions of the castle, including Slezer's first plan.

Barras: The tournament-ground beside the castle, extending from the **King's Stables** to **St Margaret's Well** – an area alongside King's Stables Road, now approximating to parts of the multi-storey car park and the Argyle House tower block.

It seems to trace its origins to 1329, when the sheriff was paid £6 13s 4d 'for making a park next to Edinburgh, where knights can fight, in which the English knight was vanquished' (*pro factura parci iuxta Edenburgh, ubi milites pugnabant, et in quo miles Anglie fuit devictus, ER. i. 238*).

There is a possible reference to the Barras during the English occupation in the 1330s, when some work was done on 'the wall of the barras' (*murum del barres*), though this may refer to the *barrieres* of the Ward. Subsequent documentation is slight, but it was used extensively in the reign of James IV, and around 1508 the king built a chapel at the corner of the tiltyard and endowed a chaplain to serve it (see Chapel at the Barras). Part of his duty was apparently to absolve participants before combat.

Tournaments seem to have ceased in the early 16th century, but in 1571 the Barras was still regarded as the regular arena for trial-by-combat. As a duelling ground, it continued in use into the 17th century.

Brewhouse: A new brewhouse for the castle was built by 25 September 1517, along with the Bakehouse. As with the bakehouse, there is no direct evidence that it had any specialised predecessor – the Kitchen may have been used instead. The inventory of 20 March 1567 shows that it contained the standard equipment of a medieval Scottish brewery – a mashing vat (*maskin fatt*) for the steeping of the malt, a kettle (*kettell*) for boiling the resulting wort, two gyle vats (*gyle fattis*) for fermentation, and a kimmén (*cumming*), a trough for collecting the yeast which 'worked over' from the fermenting liquid.

As with the bakehouse, it is conceivable that the brewhouse lay near the Kitchen Tower, and thus in the area of the Vaults – in support of this, it can be added that the brewhouse kettle is the only suitable vessel for boiling food and drink recorded in the 1567 inventory, and that there is little clear evidence for hearths in late-medieval Scottish palace brewhouses (perhaps unsurprisingly, as the mash and wort needed to cool in the other stages of the brewing process), a

combination of details which suggests that all the boiling in the castle was possibly done in the brewhouse kettle on the kitchen hearth. In a later period, the castle's brewhouse and bakehouse were in the Middle Ward, but as noted above, under the entry for the bakehouse, these were probably only built in the 1670s.

Bulwarks: After Flodden in 1513, the government authorised the start of work on a scheme of 'trenches and bulwarks' to protect the castle 'to be stuffed with men and artillery for defence thereof in time of assault'. If work progressed on it, this may have been the beginnings of the Flanker or the Spur.

Butts: An area behind the south-western ramparts of the castle, to the south of the **St Katherine's Gate** postern.

The name has generally been explained as a reference to 'butts' in the sense of archery targets, and there was certainly a set of these within the castle, as construction or repair work on 'the King's butts' is recorded on 16 July 1516; by 20 March 1567, the main artillery position defending the western ramparts was located 'betwixt the butts'.

Probably, these references relate to the presence of both archery targets and a gun battery in this area of the castle, but in Scots the term *buttis* could also refer to a piece of ground separated physically from its surroundings, a good description of the way this area is enclosed between the ramparts and the higher crag behind (*DOST*, But, Bute, n. 1). It is possible that the archery targets, and perhaps even the guns, were positioned elsewhere.

Plans and views of the castle in the late 17th century do not depict any formal gun positions here, and it was apparently necessary for the Jacobite garrison to 'place the cannon in battery' to suppress Williamite siege positions to the west during the siege of 1689 (*Siege*, p 46). In the early 18th century, the ground at the Butts was levelled upwards to create a parade ground, and the area's role as an artillery position was formalised by the construction of a purpose-built gun platform known as Butt's Battery (Ewart and Gallagher (2014), p 31).

Captain's Hall: Discussed in the document of 7 May 1583, when it was proposed to strip its lead roof and re-use it elsewhere. This may be the former Great Chamber, the only lead-roofed building discussed previously.

Captain's Tower: Referred to explicitly in a single reference amid the extensive works paid for on 24 April 1517. The reference shows that it had contained a vast panoply of armour – pikes, halberds, billhooks, mattocks, spades, shovels and iron cuirasses (*halcricckis*) with splinted limb guards – all of which had just been transferred to the Gunhouse by a team of 25 workmen.

The name of the Captain's Tower indicates that it was the residence of the commander of the castle. It was probably a distinct structure from the **Constable's Tower**, as Scottish usage generally distinguished the captain from the constable. By a process of elimination, it is likely to have been the tower whose fragments have been identified at the south-west corner of Crown Square, adjacent to the Great Hall. The movement of the armour out of the tower occurred along with a similar transfer of munitions from the Great Hall, but may have been associated with the simultaneous construction of a new Court Kitchen, which it has been suggested lay close to the west end of the Great Hall and thus by implication beneath this tower or adjacent to it; if so, it is presumably the same structure subsequently recorded as the Kitchen Tower, and contained a small hall, chamber and loft.

Alternatively, it is notable that the captain's residence in the 1680s was in the building now known as Cannonball House at the head of the Royal Mile: a plan of 1674, discussed in the index entry for the Ward, suggests that this may have originated as a tower at the outer entrance of the castle.

Castle Barns: An area on the outer edge of the castle's precincts (located near the modern line of Lothian Road), which evidently acted as a store for cereal, hay and other dry supplies. Malcolm (1925) suggests it was in existence as early as 1373, and it may have been the primary storage area for supplies for the court, rather than using cellarage within the castle buildings.

Chamber of St Margaret: See **St Margaret's Chamber**.

Chamber within the Hall: The ground-floor room within the Register House tower, accessed by a discreet corridor from the adjacent Great Hall. Its position implies that it functioned as the 'chamber of dais', a sort of drawing room for the guests from the king's table in the hall (see Dunbar (1999), p 116), but structurally it was part of a free-standing tower which pre-dated the construction of the hall in 1512, and was perhaps originally part of a suite of royal apartments. The conversion of the tower into a state archive in 1540 may have led to a stone-vaulted roof being inserted, but the corridor from the Great Hall remained in use.

In the inventory of 20 March 1567, its only furnishing was a small table (*ane litil buird*), but by 1571 it had become the personal quarters of William Maitland of Lethington, one of the leaders of the embattled regime ruling in the name of the exiled Mary Queen of Scots. It served as his bedroom, but also where he conducted personal meetings. It was probably, therefore, the location of the council held by the supporters of Mary Queen of Scots on 8 March 1570.

Chapel at the Barras: Founded by James IV in 1508 as an adjunct of the Barras or tournament ground associated with the castle. The chapel was situated directly below the Castle Rock, at the junction of King's Stables Road and Lady Wind. An 18th-century sketch shows square-headed windows of contrasting sizes, similar to contemporaneous private chapels at Castle Sempill and Innerpefferay, hinting at a similar design with a small porch-like nave at the west end, and a large and well-lit sanctuary for the performance of the liturgy. It was given a blue-and-red striped baldacchino for its altar in 1508, and had a slate roof, which was renewed in 1537.

Chapel under the castle wall: See Chapel at the Barras.

Church of the castle: See St **Margaret's Chapel**.

Church of St Cuthbert by the castle: The parish church of the area of landward around Edinburgh. It stands on low ground just to the west of the Castle Rock, and in medieval references its name almost always includes some form of the phrase 'beside the castle' (*sub castro* or *iuxta castrum*), but it seems to have had no formal connection to the castle, except that its grounds lay adjacent to the **King's Garden**.

Constable's Tower: This structure figures very prominently in the secondary literature, but it is in fact mentioned very sparsely in the primary documents. Unspecified repairs here were part of a major refurbishment of the castle completed on 2 February 1569, but the bulk of the available information is provided by the English military report of 27 January 1573: this locates it at the far end of the upper ramparts on the northern side of **David's Tower**, estimates its height as approximately 50ft, and states that it had a flight of 40 steps 'in the bottom' providing the main entrance to the castle.

The 1573 report indicates that the tower stood in the vicinity of the extant Portcullis Gate and Long Steps, and the reference to a stairway echoes the earlier reference to a tower here called the Turnpike, the name of which suggests a spiral stair. It may also be the structure referred to as **St Margaret's Tower**. The name suggests that it contained the accommodation of the castle's constable, a title which in Scotland properly identified the second-in-command of the garrison, subordinate to a commander known variously as the captain or keeper.

The Constable's Tower is generally assumed to have been destroyed during the artillery bombardment of 1573. However, a tall tower is still shown on the battlements above the rebuilt Portcullis Gate in the woodcut in Binning's *Light to the Art of Gunnery*, published in 1675 but referring back to the siege of 1650 – the Constable's Tower may in fact have survived to be demolished by the Cromwellian garrison in the 1650s.

Court Kitchen: Constructed in 1517, probably near the south end of the Great Hall, and designed to cater for the population of the royal court rather than serve the royal family. See Kitchen.

Cromwell's Tower: The conventional modern name for a small tower incorporated in the Half-Moon Battery where it adjoins the Head Wall. It seems not to be mentioned in any medieval source, and its identity as a separate structure is now disguised by the fact that only its cottage-like caphouse rises above the modern rampart-line, but it seems clear that it was a distinct and free-standing tower until around 1670, when the adjacent walls were heightened up level with its battlements, and the ground level behind it was dramatically raised to match. From within the ramparts, it would have towered above the Forewell, whose shaft had to be built up directly against its face for a height of about 24ft (Oldrieve (1914), p 256). Its function is unclear, and it is not certain if it is simply a turret of more or less solid masonry, or if there are internal chambers concealed within its structure. It may be the 'tower of the well' mentioned in 25 September 1515 in the context of repairs on nearby walls, though this may also refer to the Wellhouse Tower.

Crown Square: The conventional modern name for the quadrangle enclosed on its four sides by the Palace, the Great Hall, the Great Chapel (subsequently the Munition House) and the Vaults on which the post-medieval Queen Anne Building is built.

Its emergence as a formal courtyard with a level surface is usually associated with James IV's construction of the Great Hall, but the ranges to the north and east may both have their origins early as the 13th century (see under Great Chapel and Palace), and the vaulted substructures to the west are now thought to be 14th-century, and there are indications that they were always accessed from the area where Crown Square now stands (Ewart and Gallagher (2014), pp 79, 82). It is possible that the ground level of an older courtyard was simply raised during the reign of James IV, or perhaps even later.

What seems to be the first explicit reference to the space dates to 1541 in the reign of James V, at the completion of the Register House and a programme of general repairs on the buildings of the castle, when a squad of men with wheelbarrows spent a week removing loose earth and stone from 'the close'. It is

unclear whether this relates to the levelling of the courtyard, or simply to the removal of building rubble.

Once the current ground level was established, evidence suggest that the courtyard was enclosed by a cloister-like arcade – the corbels and sill for its roof are clearly depicted on a 1754 plan of the Great Hall’s facade, while a matching arrangement of corbels and sill is also visible along the ground floor of the Munition House on Slezer’s highly detailed view of the castle in the late 17th century. Excavation has also uncovered footings for the outer wall of the arcade in front of the Great Hall and also on the west side of the square (Ewart and Gallagher (2014), p 82). This feature may have been a neoclassical borrowing from the French court architecture of the mid-16th century, but it also has a prototype under James IV in the adaption of Holyrood Abbey’s cloister as a garden for Holyrood Palace in 1503.

The modern name of Crown Square is not recorded in any early source: Binning, describing events in 1650, may refer to it as the ‘Parado’, where the garrison were mustered and addressed by the captain of the castle (Binning, p 118). The diary of the 1689 siege calls it the ‘Great Court’ (*Siege*, p 81) and again describes it being used to muster the soldiers in front of the castle’s commander for a speech and instructions.

Curtain: In military architecture, the term ‘curtain’ can denote any length of defensive wall, but the name is used in an English report of 27 January 1573 to specifically identify an important element of the castle’s defences at that date: ‘from [David’s Tower], a Curtain with 6 canons or such-like pieces in loops of stone looking in the streetward, and behind the same stands another tier of ordnance, like 16 foot climb above the other, and at the north end stands the Constable’s Tower’; a few lines later, the Spur is said to stand ‘before the foot of the rock that the said Curtain stands upon’.

Several other documents corroborate the existence of this rampart, armed with six heavy guns, and located between the spur and the higher ramparts on the cliff-top, which they describe as the Fore Wall rather than the curtain: the inventory of 20 March 1567 describes it as the location of six heavy guns (four 36-pounder cannons and two similarly massive gross culverins) comprising the

most powerful single artillery position in the castle, while on 27 May 1573 the *Diurnal* speaks of it as the location from which the castle's commander negotiated with English soldiers who had established themselves inside the spur, and in describing the artillery bombardment of 1573, also distinguishes it from the higher Head Wall leading to **St Margaret's Tower**. In 1626, there is an important reference to multiple 'vaults underneath the forewall' (*MW* ii. 186). Although the Scottish sources consistently use the term 'Fore Wall', that name has come to be applied to the higher rampart line known in the 16th century as the Head Wall, and the term 'Curtain' is favoured here to prevent confusion.

It is clear that this curtain formed a prominent element of the castle's main defences in the area between **David's Tower** and the Portcullis Gate, and it evidently carried a very powerful battery of artillery – in fact, it was probably the single most heavily armed gun emplacement in the British Isles at the time (see Appendix 10: The Artillery). Its origins cannot be traced clearly in earlier documents, but it may be the same fortification as the Bulwarks of 1513. The earliest explicit reference to a 'Fore Wall' occurs in August 1547, when its parapet was being lined with gabions – turf-filled baskets used as a temporary breastwork to strengthen artillery positions, indicating that it was already in use as a gun emplacement at that date. It is also identified as the main focus of a significant year-long building project which began in February 1557, but, considering the earlier reference, this project may have involved only the construction of the enclosed gunloops and tall parapet whose existence is explicitly asserted in 1573, but whose absence in 1547 is implied by the use of gabions to protect the guns at that date. It is also said to be the place from which the queen regent watched a battle at Leith on 7 May 1560.

Another problem is the lack of clear documentary evidence for the exact location of the curtain. Archaeologists have hypothesised a zig-zag line of artillery emplacements linking the two gunloop positions known to exist in this area, the Gun Hole whose deep embrasure is visible in the Half-Moon Battery, and the Flanker at the bottom of the rocky slope to its north (Driscoll and Yeoman (1997), p 85): however, the area between these positions seems to be an unlikely site for additional artillery positions, as it is occupied by the steep slope of the Castle Rock, the loose infill of a medieval Quarry and the main road into the castle.

Another hypothetical possibility is a line of emplacements stretching back from the gun hole along the top of the Castle Rock, with the head wall parapet rising at their rear, but the 20 March 1567 inventory mentions a separate two-tier artillery emplacement in this area, with two guns 'on the hill' immediately to the north of the Munition House, and two more 'below the hill' on a lower level; this probably does not leave enough room here for the curtain on the clifftops, and the gun hole itself may be the position for one of the two cannons 'below the hill', perhaps with a second gunloop immediately adjacent to it on the north.

The most likely location for the curtain is thus probably in the area across the foot of the crags behind the spur, in the approximate position of the post-1650 outer guard and the entrance forecourt behind the modern gatehouse. It is even conceivable that part of the basic structure of the curtain has survived in the core of these later works – their oldest feature is a tall vertical curtain wall rising high above the natural ground level; post-medieval military architects used this as the central element of an increasingly complex entrance structure, while simultaneously attempting to shield it from the threat of attacking artillery with a long series of projects designed to raise the surface in front of it, culminating in the deceptively gentle approach from the modern esplanade. The earliest extant plan of the castle, produced in 1674 by John Slezer (RHP 6520/1) shows a rampart around 15ft high and 5ft thick, while its structural successor now serves as the rear wall of the basement beneath the Victorian gatehouse.

Behind the curtain, the sources clearly indicate the location of an artillery position. This may have originally been carried on a wooden deck, but a vaulted substructure of some sort is implied by a reference to 'tidying-out (*redding*) of one of the vaults underneath the forewall' in 1626 (*MW* ii. 186): vaulting would be the most desirable platform for heavy guns and may have been part of the design from the outset. However, Slezer's plan shows an open, unvaulted area behind the rampart, and the two long vaults which now spring backwards from its wall-line to support a raised forecourt in this area have been dated to the 18th century – a date which must certainly be correct for the northernmost part, which was removed during reconstruction in the 1980s, and overlay a drawbridge pit of the 1640–90s (MacIvor (1993), p 89; Driscoll and Yeoman (1997), pp 102–6; Ewart and Gallagher (2014), p 1117); thus, although these 'casemates' broadly reflect the concept of the older vaulted artillery platform, it is highly uncertain if there is any

structural continuity in this part of the structure – the original vaulting may have been removed between the 1620s and 1670s, or else it is possible that the guns behind the curtain were sited relatively low, nearer to ground level than parapet level, and that the whole entrance structure is in fact built above a second, lower level of vaulting, set even deeper beneath the modern surface level.

The curtain is also an alternative candidate for the bulwark depicted on the Petworth plan of 1560, which is normally identified as part of spur.

David's Tower: The main keep of the late-medieval castle, first referred to in 1382. Its construction is normally attributed to King David II (d. 1371), and this is almost certainly correct, given what is known about its architecture, the evolution of the castle and the development of élite architecture in Scotland and Europe generally, but there is little direct evidence to confirm it in the documents. The name 'David's Tower' is not recorded until the 1440s, and there is no evidence to corroborate that it refers to David II – the name may reflect perceived associations with the 12th-century King David I or with the 'Tower of David' citadel in Jerusalem.

Similarly, although the tower's construction is usually linked with references to the construction of a 'new tower' in the late 14th century, this is not explicitly supported in the documents. The only references in this period which *might* refer to the construction of David's Tower come in 1368, 1371 and 1372, but they are too generic to inspire confidence, and are promptly followed by a sequence of similar references in 1375 and 1379 which clearly relate to a gate tower, probably a precursor of the Portcullis Gate. David's Tower may have been built in the 1340s or 1350s when no detailed documents survive, or it may potentially have been an earlier structure – though the destruction of the defences after 14 March 1314 and the lack of any references to it in the 1330s make it hard to avoid the conclusion that, if it *did* have older origins, David II must have rebuilt it from a ruin.

Its recorded history is relatively sparse: it begins in 1382 when a Kitchen was built nearby. Four large wooden beams were bought in connection with repairs in 1448, and this may relate to the same repairs on the roof paid for in 1455. Subsequent inventories and documents reveal something of its internal structure, and there are several extant 16th-century sketches of its appearance.

The starting point of any reconstruction of the tower is its surviving basement. The extant section consists of a rectangular basement, originally vaulted, with a corridor across its western side, leading from a spiral staircase at the northern corner to a projecting jamb at its southern end; a doorway in the eastern wall of this jamb originally led out towards the Castle Hill through a small barbican; at a later date, this was later replaced by a tall, thick-walled chamber that may have been designed as a prison, while all the eastern walls were strengthened with massive additions of masonry on their internal faces, designed to reinforce David's Tower against artillery.

Evidence for the tower's internal layout above the surviving basement levels must be extrapolated from a number of documents. The earliest is an inventory on 17 June 1488 when a 'closet' is mentioned – a term which at that date denoted a room opening off a chamber, which might be a study or a private oratory. On 22 April 1517, a series of payments occur relating to work on the tower – there are references to the dismantling of three chimneys (perhaps in this context meaning fireplaces), and to an accidental collapse of 'rubble (*grunmale*) and earth' – suggests that work may have been connected with the archaeologically documented strengthening of the eastern wall to resist artillery; simultaneously, a 'new court kitchen' was being constructed, a curious juxtaposition which might indicate that its precursor was in David's Tower and was being rendered non-functional by the wall-thickening.

More conclusively, we learn details of the interior arrangements – the collapse had brought down two huge joists supporting a floor described as the 'mid chalmer', necessitating their replacement along with the floorboards they supported, while the flooring of the 'lord's hall' also required refurbishment, probably due to the collapsed timbers crashing down into the floor below. Subsequent memoranda from 1522 discuss the 'inner under chalmer', or 'inner chalmer' where the Master of the Household lodged, and the 'fore hall of the tower' or 'fore hous' where the bodyguards slept, as well as the 'king's chalmer' itself. An inventory of 20 March 1567 lists the 'hall', dining table and two benches plus a chest, a 'house', containing two pairs of beds which might suggest two rooms, and 'second house', containing a dining table with two benches, a bed, and a large chest or cupboard, which again would most naturally be interpreted as the furnishings of two rooms, this time organised into a single suite.

It seems that we can reconstruct three levels of apartments in David's Tower – in 1517, there was a 'lord's hall' beneath a 'mid chamber' and an inferred upper apartment above it, most likely functioning as the private room and bedroom of a vertically arranged suite which began in the formal space of the hall below. The hall is not mentioned in 1522, but its continued existence can be inferred from the reference to it in 1567; however, the 'inner under chamber' and the 'fore hall' of 1522 imply a subdivision of the upper apartments, probably implemented in the works of 1517: the 'inner under chamber' is presumably one of the pair of bedrooms implied by the furnishings on the mid-level in 1567 – 'inner', as it was accessed through the other room from the stairs – while the 'fore hall' is the small hall implied by the furnishings of the top floor, paired with an inner bedroom to form a compact suite which was used in 1522 as the royal apartment.

It is not clear whether there was a kitchen floor between the basement and the hall, and it is also uncertain how high up the tower the abutting jamb at its south-west corner rose – it may have been essentially restricted to the surviving structure at basement level, and in support of this the 16th-century depictions all suggest a square tower rather than an L-plan one: however, the evidence is not conclusive, and a higher jamb is a possible location for a room previously used by the Earl of Moray which is mentioned in 1522, and for the closet of 1588 – though, alternatively, these could also have been small apartments in the thickness of the walls.

There also seems to have been access from David's Tower to an area known as 'the leads': the sequence of payments on 22 April 1517 refers to carpenters working on 'a great hanging gate for the leads', and 'the leads' were again included in the memorandum of 1522, as an area outside David's Tower which nonetheless might require to be under the authority of its keeper for security purposes; these references probably relate to the flat lead roof of the **King's Chamber**, which abutted the tower's south-west corner. This might be the location of the 'little yett', outside which a sentinel was appointed to stand guard in 1522.

The great storm of 1 November 1525 damaged David's Tower, though the original Latin version of the source suggests that the damage may have been limited to the collapse of the battlements. On 6 February 1540 its parapet was lined with 30 wrought-iron gun-chambers borrowed from naval guns at Leith, to serve as

stubby, lightweight saluting guns to mark the coronation of Mary of Guise. On 12 February 1548, it was reported that the project which led to the construction of the Fort on the Castle Hill called for a reduction in the tower's height, presumably to use it as an artillery platform: it is unclear if this was implemented immediately, but in 1562–3 a *moyen* (a bronze gun firing shot around 3lb weight) was hauled up 'to the toure heid', and what is evidently the same gun remained mounted 'upon the toure heid' in the inventory of 20 March 1567.

The external appearance of the tower is preserved in sketch views from 1544, 1560 and a print from 1573: these all show a square tower, though the 1573 depiction suggests that the tower was visibly stepped inwards at each floor level: these steps must be exaggerated, as the 42ft length of the joists of the second-highest floor cannot have spanned a significantly narrower area than the 36½ft-wide basement, but their presence as a feature of the tower's architecture is supported by the distinct step surviving around the basement level, and this is a feature which is also found on the Wellhouse Tower of c.1360 and on other square keeps of the 14th century, such as Clackmannan Tower and the donjon of Karnan Castle in Helsingborg (originally a Danish–Norwegian royal residence, now located in southern Sweden).

David's Tower is assumed to have been the main royal residence in the castle, and as originally designed it certainly contained the suite of rooms appropriate for a lordly apartment, but there is little clear evidence of this: it was certainly possible to accommodate royalty within the building, but other alternative apartments such as the Great Chamber and Register House also appear to have been used, and by the time that James V occupied the tower it appears to have been subdivided into multiple separate apartments, with the middle floor providing two bedrooms, and the king installed in a small two-room suite on the uppermost floor. David's Tower was undoubtedly the visual centrepiece of the castle, and it was evidently regarded as the most secure location in the fortress, but, beyond the records of maintenance and reconstruction work, the only significant events of its recorded history are its brief use as a residence for James V during his childhood, and its destruction by artillery during the siege in 1573.

Drawbridge: Payments for a bridge and road surface associated with a gate were made in 1383, and there is a possible reference to the digging of a moat in 1382: these references suggest that the castle was then being provided with a drawbridge. This was probably associated with the new gate tower that had been constructed just previously – probably a precursor of the Portcullis Gate, though just possibly an outer gate in the Ward, or a precursor of **Foog's Gate**.

If this drawbridge was associated with a precursor of the Portcullis Gate, its moat must have interrupted the approach road directly in front of it, documented from 26 January 1340. The drawbridge was rebuilt in 1402 and 1412 and disappears from the records afterwards. Much later, a new drawbridge was constructed further forward, almost in line with the end of the Flanker, but its origins belong to the 17th century, outwith the period of this survey (Driscoll and Yeoman (1997), pp 100–2, cf. *Somerville* ii. 247–8, which refines the date to the 1640s).

Dury's Battery: A gun position located to the south-west of Crown Square, outside the Vaults. It was built around 1700 under the supervision of the French-born military engineer Théodore du Ry, from whom it takes its name (full discussion and archaeological report in Ewart and Gallagher (2014), pp 127–33). Although constructed well after the period with which this survey is concerned, it is included in this gazetteer for purposes of completeness.

Flanker: The conventional modern name for a section of fortification in front of the Portcullis Gate, which encloses the entrance roadway into the castle, and now contains the tourist shop.

The roadway enclosed within the Flanker provides the only easy route of access to the castle's interior and is likely to have always been the main approach. The earliest fully explicit reference to this road dates from 26 January 1340, during a short-lived English occupation, when a precursor of the Portcullis Gate was strengthened, and a road 'outside the Castle' was simultaneously widened to facilitate the passage of groups of cavalry – as completed, this road is described as being 80ft long and 24ft wide, supported on its outer side by a wall and situated under the Quarry – this is a tolerably good description of the route as it survives today.

However, it is likely that the original road sloped down much more steeply towards the east – at its current height the roadway actually leads onto a raised platform behind the castle’s post-medieval gatehouse (a successor to the artillery platform on the 16th-century Curtain), and the ground in front was artificially raised to the same height only in the 18th century. The early cobbled surfaces and flanking wall uncovered deep below the current road level at the eastern end of the approach road (Driscoll and Yeoman (1997), p 100), may in fact relate to these entrance arrangements.

The description of this road as lying ‘outside the Castle’ suggests that, at that date, there were no fortifications blocking the approach from the Ward. The first explicit reference to fortifications in this area consists of an authorisation to build an artillery forework called the Bulwarks after the Battle of Flodden in 1513. It is unclear if this project was completed, but it may indicate the origins of the Curtain referred to from at least August 1547 – a rampart housing the castle’s heaviest guns, located at the base of the Castle Rock. The flanker may also be structurally related to these fortifications. It has been argued that an early form of the flanker is depicted in a sketch of 1544 and a print of 1573 (Driscoll and Yeoman (1997), pp 78–9, 84, 90), though it also seems possible that these two illustrations depict the Portcullis Gate behind it.

The first clear reference to the flanker occurs in an English military report of 27 January 1573, which describes the adjacent Spur as ‘flanked out on both sides’: this shows that the flanker was already being used for the purpose which gave it its later name – although the name itself does not seem to be directly attested until sometime after 1603. The flanker’s name refers to a Renaissance artillery tactic known as ‘flanking’, in which a relatively narrow artillery bastion (in this case, the flanker’s eastern face) projects at approximately right angles from a longer rampart-line (here, the northern frontage of the spur): artillery firing from the flanker would be used to sweep the ground in front of the spur, sending shrapnel and shot through the flank of attacking troops with devastating effect.

On 22 May 1573 and 26 May 1573, the English artillery besieging the castle brought down sections of the artillery curtain behind the spur, and the flanker may have been affected. Subsequently, the damage inflicted on the castle was rebuilt, but the relevant documents do not appear to explicitly identify the wall in question.

Archaeological excavation has shown that the flanker was extensively rebuilt after the period with which this survey is concerned, and its current masonry is an aggregate of centuries of rebuilding, repair and repurposing. Nonetheless, its basic layout has not changed significantly (Driscoll and Yeoman (1997), pp 87–93). Behind the east-facing wall which once flanked the spur, two parallel walls stretch back to the west, enclosing an open rectangular area between them: the southern wall serves to buttress the road that leads to the Portcullis Gate, while the northern one is an outer rampart overlooking Princes Street Gardens. The southern wall alongside the entrance road and the short east-facing rampart both remain on their original footings, and incorporate some original masonry, although a comparison of the recorded archaeology with the documentary sources raises several questions.

As noted above, there has in fact been a wall supporting the road alongside the flanker since the first half of the 14th century, but, while the figures for its original dimensions correspond tolerably well with the known dimensions of the modern road, they do not fit the 16th-century dating assigned to the wall which buttresses it (Driscoll and Yeoman (1997), pp 86, 92). It is possible that the visible wall is built up against the concealed face of the older retaining wall beneath the road, to enable it to carry the tall and wide wall screening the road, without having to narrow the road by several feet.

Secondly, the archaeological evidence shows that an entrance route passed through the flanker in the earliest phase of its existence (Driscoll and Yeoman, pp 87–90), detouring from the straight route represented by the modern road, which is securely documented from the 1330s and has probably served as the natural entrance route into the castle throughout history. Although the excavators believed that this entrance route would have led into the interior of the outer fortification known as the spur, that seems on balance unlikely to the author of the present report: it is possible that this route was a response to the construction of the preceding fortifications across the end of the road into the castle in the earlier 16th century, which may have temporarily blocked the conventional access route. Alternately, it may have only ever been a secondary postern, with the main route always continuing along the line of the road and downwards from the artillery defences in the vicinity of the modern drawbridge.

The archaeologists inferred that the outer wall of the flanker overlooking Princes Street Gardens originally stood several feet outwards, lower down the slope, and that it was entirely reconstructed at a date certainly after 1573, and perhaps after 1603: this conclusion was reached was on the basis of the excavation which discovered the buried remains of a continuation of the flanker's eastern wall-line extending for at least 7m in Princes Street Gardens (Driscoll and Yeoman (1997), pp 88, 93). However, the extended eastern wall is depicted on one of the earliest extant plans of the castle from the late 17th century, where it simply defines the edge of a northward continuation of the castle's post-medieval dry moat (PRO MPF 1/245, printed in Driscoll and Yeoman (1997), p 25). It may therefore be a 17th-century addition, and it is notable that it corresponds to the relevant section of the expanded outer defences which Captain John Slezer proposed in 1675, the first in a series of uncompleted projects proposed for the outworks of the castle (BL K. Top. XLIX.69, printed in Anderson (1913), p 19). If this interpretation is correct, then the northern wall-line of the flanker probably remains on its original footings.

Foog's Gate: One of two modern routes through the inner defences into the highest part of the castle (the other is the Long Steps). It consists of an archway in the western rampart of the inner ward, approached from below by a steep ramp. This entrance's existence is not explicitly documented in any source before the 1670s, but it provides the only means of direct access to the interior for heavy traffic such as carts, cannons, horses, treasure chests and barrels. When a precursor to the extant gate was not in place, a crane must have been used.

Archaeologists have suggested that a 14th-century roadway in the vicinity of the smithy may have led towards Foog's Gate, and it is just possible that it was the gate where a Drawbridge was built in 1382 (though the wider context of building work on a tower tends to suggest the Portcullis Gate). It is also possible that it was built around 1460, when the castle saw extensive building work and became the permanent home of the artillery arsenal. Its existence can probably be inferred in 1540-1, when there are references to the creation of a level route to allow artillery to be wheeled into to the new Munition House on Crown Square (*TA* vii. 226 229, 341-2, viii. 127), as it would be extremely cumbersome to haul every gun in and out with a crane: a gate corresponding to Foog's Gate is also depicted in

the somewhat stylised woodcut views of the castle included in Holinshed and Braun, both perhaps derived from an English military plan drawn in early 1573, although the only access route explicitly mentioned in the associated written report of 27 January 1573 is a staircase in the area of the Long Steps.

As it stands, the evidence tends to suggest that Foog's Gate is late-medieval in origin, with 1460 and particularly 1540 providing plausible contexts (the possibility should also be borne in mind that it might have originally been approached by a drawbridge rather than a ramp, which would have added to the security of the Inner Ward): the flanking walls are equipped with musket-loops which can be attributed with some confidence to the late 17th century, but a recent archaeological survey of the masonry indicates that these are part of a rebuilt upper section standing on top of an older core including the gate itself.

However, Foog's Gate first appears for certain on plans of the castle drawn in the 1670s, and, given the lack of conclusive references to it in earlier sources, it may in theory be entirely post-medieval – even though the circumstantial evidence for a gate into the Inner Ward is strong, it might not have been in this position. Moreover, the earliest plans show the gate without the musket-loops, while carefully indicating similar defences elsewhere in the castle (TNA MPF 1/245, BL K. Top. XLIX.69, printed in Driscoll and Yeoman (1997), p 25, and Anderson (1913), p 19), showing that the loops represent a relatively late phase of the castle's 17th-century strengthening.

The etymology of the 'Foog's Gate' name has proved puzzling – it is first recorded as 'Foggy Gate' in a plan of the castle in 1735, and then as 'Fogg's Gate' in subsequent schematics. 'Foog' is perhaps a misspelling, as it is first recorded on the 1893 Ordnance Survey plan (compare the gentrification of the Butts Battery as 'Bute's Battery' on the 1853 OS plan). A clue to the name's origin is provided by the earliest printed source to refer to it by name, a piece of 19th-century American travel journalism in the *Brooklyn Daily Eagle* for 23 August 1870. This mentions 'Old Fogg's Gate – from which is derived the name of "old fogies"'. The reference is presumably to the 'Castle Foggies', the force of superannuated soldiers who had performed the basic guard duties at the castle until about 1820. If so, the name was probably relatively new at the time of the first reference in 1735, when the ageing soldiers of the garrison company were coming to be perceived as a unit of superannuated 'fogies' rather than regular infantry.

Fore Wall: In modern usage, the 'Forewall Battery' is the rampart between the Half-Moon Battery and Portcullis Gate, but the *Diurnal* under 1573 contrasts a lower, outer 'foir wall' and an inner, upper 'heid wall' (see Head Wall). It seems likely, therefore, that the Fore Wall designation originally applied to an outer rampart between the Portcullis Gate and the Spur: see Curtain for full discussion of the evidence for this fortification, which appears to have been a powerful artillery bastion in the area of the modern gatehouse and entrance forecourt, and Flanker for the ramparts at the same level on the north.

Forewell: The main well of the castle. Its original rock-cut shaft is around 85ft deep, with an estimated capacity approaching 30,000 gallons (roughly 125,000 litres), and is one of the oldest structures in the castle - it was evidently blocked and concealed by fallen masonry during the demolition process after the castle's recapture from the English on 14 March 1314, as the well's rediscovery and refurbishment is recorded between 1381 and 1383, prior to which the Wellhouse Tower had been used as a replacement. After the construction of the Half-Moon Battery, the ground level around the well was raised some 24ft, necessitating the construction of a new upper shaft (Oldrieve (1914), pp 256-7). Although the original excavator believed that this heightening happened in the 1570s simultaneously with the initial construction of the Half-Moon, it seems unlikely that it can have occurred until around 1670, after Slezer's earliest prospect of the castle.

The name 'Forewell' is recorded as early as 1573. At that date, the 'Back well' was an alternative name for **St Margaret's Well**, but latterly a cistern just inside the western postern came to be known as the Back Draw Well.

Fort of the Castle Hill: Built in 1548 by the Italian siege engineer Ubaldino and described in contemporaneous English intelligence reports.

The first stage of the project consisted of the cutting of a defensive trench across the Castle Hill, the digging of which is documented in February 1547 and April 1547. Rumours reported that this was to be the first stage in the construction of a

significant new defensive outwork, but, although some guns had been positioned behind the ditch by September 1547, they were only protected at that date by a temporary breastwork of earth-filled baskets.

On 12 February 1548, a letter from the English commander at Carlisle notified the English government of a Scottish plan to build a 'great fort' at Edinburgh, involving a 'platform with two bulwarks', and a reduction in the height of **David's Tower**. On 16 March 1548, intelligence from the Scottish defector Ninian Cockburn reported that construction material was being assembled, including the stones from the tower-house of his friend and fellow-defector Alexander Crichton, and described the intended structure as a 'black house' – evoking the image of a long, low Highland building with a drystone wall and sloping turf roof, a striking metaphor for the revetment and parapet of a Renaissance artillery rampart. A subsequent report of 12 October 1548 from a former prisoner-of-war described the completed fortification as consisting of a low rampart with a pointed bastion in the centre; an appended sketch plan adds two more triangular demi-bastions at the ends. The structure was evidently a conventional Renaissance fortification of the *trace italienne* type, designed to resist artillery, and would have been very similar to the contemporaneous fort which survives at Eyemouth.

The fort of the Castle Hill is conventionally identified as the fortification later known as the Spur, as both structures shared a same symmetrical design with a central pointed section (see that heading for fuller discussion, including the alternative possibility that the spur was a completely separate layer of defence).

Garrison Chapel: Emerging into the records when it was roofed by James IV in 1512, this abutted immediately to the east of **St Margaret's Chapel**, and subsequently became the main chapel of the castle's garrison. It was probably the chapel where the body of Mary of Guise lay in state in 1560.

The chapel's basic form is documented in post-1603 material, including old views of the castle and architectural plans of 1719 and 1845: it was a rectangular building approximating a double-square in its proportions, approximately 14ft by 28ft internally. The original entrance evidently stood at the north-west corner, while the south wall contained a large, rectangular central window, flanked by narrower single-splayed lights. The woodcut of the castle in Binning's *Art of Gunnery*, which

is somewhat schematised but does not appear to invent any details elsewhere, gives it an east window with intersecting tracery and a small spire on the north flank, which find parallels in the architecture of this period in the friaries at Aberdeen and Elgin – the spire probably implies a rood screen with a gallery on top. On the southern flank, the rectangular, double-splayed design of the larger central window is similar to the surviving fenestration in the contemporaneous churches at Castle Semple and Innerpefferay and the chapel in Falkland Palace, and the same style was probably also used in the castle's own Chapel at the Barras, but the narrow, single-splayed windows flanking it are unusual for this period. Also notable is the way in which the building interacted with the east wall of the adjacent St Margaret's Chapel, which doubled as the west wall of the new chapel: the section of the wall which extended north to accommodate the new chapel's greater width not only kept to the same precise alignment but also maintained the same thickness, making it look like it was part of the same original build. These features raise the possibility that this chapel was adapted in 1512 from a pre-existing building, possibly **St Margaret's Chamber**.

The building was progressively modified to suit the needs of the soldiers and their chaplains, acquiring Protestant pews and a Presbyterian loft, a Georgian porch and eventually a large neo-baronial apse to the north. It was demolished in the Victorian period to remove accretions around the adjacent St Margaret's Chapel, by restorers who seem to have been largely unaware that it was a 16th-century building.

Gates: There were a number of gateways within the medieval castle: for the main gate, see Portcullis Gate and Drawbridge, and for others, see Turnpike, Spur, Ward, **St Margaret's Gate** and **Foog's Gate**. There was also a postern in **David's Tower**, and one at the west recorded as **St Katherine's Gate**.

Governor's Lodging: When James Hamilton, Earl of Arran and later 1st Duke of Châtellerauld, became Regent of Scotland in 1542, the fractious political situation meant that the castle resumed its former prominence as a secure seat of power in Scotland's capital, a prominence which was emphasised by the damage inflicted on at least the outer precincts of the Holyrood palace complex in the English

attack of 6 May 1544. In this context, it is no surprise that, in March 1545, we learn of a major project to construct a lodging inside the castle for 'his grace the Governor'.

We know that the resulting governor's lodging contained at least one hall and chamber, with painted doors and plastered walls, and windows with glass and shutters. Important craftsmen were involved – the masons John and Thomas Merlioun, the glazier John Peebles, and the painter Archibald Rule – suggesting a building of high quality.

The project also involved work on the Fore Wall and Gun Hole, which might indicate that this was a refit of the Palace itself, and in that context the reference to masons working in a vaulted basement may hint that it was this project which was responsible for the row of two-storey oriel windows which formed the main architectural feature of the palace until 1573, whose heavy supports remain bonded into the walls of the basement vaults. However, the project also involved a thorough refit of a Kitchen, which may conversely indicate the Kitchen Tower, which certainly contained a small hall and chamber on its upper storeys, and appears to have been the former **Captain's Tower**, and thus an appropriate location for a viceroy to reside. With the large kitchen hearth probably located in its basement, it would also be comfortably warm – a traditional design feature of Scottish tower-houses which had probably been lost in **David's Tower** in the 1510s.

Great Chamber: A new royal apartment constructed by James I. Most of the construction work appears to have been carried out around 1434, but the lead for the roof is not mentioned until 1438, and payment for it was delayed until 1445. It is the only lead-roofed structure recorded in the castle and may thus be the same as the lead-roofed **Captain's Hall** of 1573. It was proposed to recycle the lead for another building at that date, and it is possible that this lead roof was subsequently recycled into the similarly unique lead roof placed on the Palace in the 17th century. (See that entry for a hypothesis that it forms the structural basis of the royal suite on the middle floor of Crown Square's east range.)

Great Chapel: A large chapel – significantly bigger than **St Margaret's Chapel** or the Garrison Chapel – located on the north side of what is now Crown Square. It is first documented in 1335 when an English occupation garrison was beginning to

repair the castle (see Appendix 4: The English Garrisons) – their first recorded action was to insert a kitchen ‘below’ it, which suggests that it stood above a weatherproof basement – the only place of shelter amid the roofless castle buildings. Roofing the chapel itself followed quickly, and this project simultaneously served to roof a strongroom named as the Countinghouse, described as ‘a pentice above’ the chapel. The implication of these remarks is that the chapel had a vaulted basement, and a strongroom structure built against it. In the event, it was converted by the English into a granary, but it is nonetheless likely to have been the same Chapel of St Mary which emerges into documentary records in 1366. Eighteenth-century plans show this to have been a rectangular building, long and very wide, built against a fall in the rock whose height would comfortably allow a vaulted basement beneath its main space, and with a two-storey pentice-roofed adjunct built against its northern flank – presumably the countinghouse of the 1350s.

In the 1360s, and for many years subsequently, this chapel was described as ‘newly built’ (*de novo constructa*), indicating that, after the Scottish recapture of the castle on 16 April 1341, a full-scale rebuilding was needed in order to render it suitable for renewed religious use. For unknown reasons, however, the castle’s chaplains migrated to **St Margaret’s Chapel**, a move that became permanent in the early 15th century. A further rebuilding seems to have followed in the late 15th century, indicated by tracery fragments from which a window has been reconstructed (Ewart and Gallagher (2014), p 95): this rebuilding may have been begun by James III as a partner to the ambitious new royal chapels at Stirling and Restalrig, but it was probably this chapel which was given a re-roofing by James IV in 1496: advance payment was made on 2 October 1496, followed by additional expenditure on 14 October 1496, 15 October 1492 and 3 December 1496, which show that it required 15 roof-couples, 72 spars and a covering of wooden tiles. There is no direct evidence that the refitted chapel was ever used, however – the roofing project stands in isolation in the documents, and the choice of wooden tiles rather than a more prestigious material such as slate, lead or stone suggests that it may have been merely designed to make an empty and unfinished building weathertight and to create an external illusion of completeness. The abandonment of the Great Chapel is also implied by the construction of a new castle chapel in 1512, located immediately adjacent to St Margaret’s Chapel (see Garrison Chapel).

James V rebuilt the Great Chapel into the Munition House, a three-floored arsenal building (see the separate entry for notes on its subsequent use). In this modified form, the chapel is depicted in the Petworth plan of 1560, three 17th-century images – the map by Rothiemay, a view by Slezer and a woodcut in Binning's *Art of Gunnery* – and two detailed sets of 18th-century plans. The Petworth plan and the Binning woodcut concur in showing a circular rose window in the east gable, while Rothiemay shows a south facade with three rectangular windows set inside tall arches, possibly the partially blocked openings of earlier ecclesiastical fenestration, above a ground floor which appears to have a corbel-table and sill to support a colonnaded arcade like that which ran along the flank of the Great Hall opposite; the 18th-century plans confirm that there would have originally been a fourth window bay towards the west of the south facade, and indicates that the west wall contained a straight stair up to first-floor level.

The Great Chapel is inherently unlikely to have been built at any date after 1286, and everything that we can reconstruct of its design, with a vaulted basement, at least one rose window in the gable ends, a building for the storage of valuables and documents on the north flank, and perhaps a raised tribunal on the west front, closely resembles that of the Sainte-Chapelle in Paris and St Stephen's in the Palace of Westminster – the principal palace chapels of the French and English monarchies. While it may not have had the same impressive verticality and intensity of glazing found in Paris and London, its interior had one of the largest uninterrupted floor spaces in medieval Scotland, and parallels for its main liturgical space may be found in other contemporaneous buildings with a similar floorplan, such as Merton College Chapel and the east limbs of the cathedrals at Dunblane and Dunkeld.

Great Hall: The main formal space of the palace, used for public assemblies and parliaments, though the name denotes at least two separate structures at different periods: the earliest reference to a hall in Edinburgh Castle is in the records for the English occupation garrison for the period from October 1299 to 27 November 1300. All we know of it at this date is that it had a coal fire – a very unusual and modern feature at that time – and that it was probably being used as a mess hall and barracks by the English troops. It is unlikely to have been built after the death of Alexander III on 19 March 1286, however, and is thus the likely

setting of the grand Scottish political assembly and banquet that seem to have been held in the castle on that day, prior to his accidental death.

There is no clear allusion to the hall in the extant reconstruction records of the English garrison in the 1330s, but it was probably completed by the time of the unsuccessful siege of October 1337, as the garrison are depicted dining in a formally organised hall in Bower's narrative of the subsequent incident involving Robert Prendergast. The next reference occurs in 1375, when the 'hall of Edinburgh' was re-roofed with wooden tiles (an economical form of roofing which required regular renewal every few years). In the reign of James II, 'the hall in Edinburgh Castle' recurs as the setting of the parliament which opened on 6 March 1458.

The exact location of this early hall is not certain, and it is possible that the references record successive buildings on separate sites, although the fact that the hall of 1375 had its own roof shows that it was a free-standing building at that date, not part of **David's Tower**. Given the lack of references to the major building campaign required for a new hall, and the relatively constricted nature of the Castle Rock as a site, it is possible that the hall of 1286 was rebuilt in the 1330s and continued in use throughout – if so, it is almost certainly the main formal room within the Palace, known today as the Laigh Hall. A new Great Hall was built by James IV on the south side of Crown Square, completed in 1512 – and certainly still survives today.

The new structure was given a hammerbeam roof, covered externally by slates – the latter were refurbished in 1537, and refurbishment was again proposed in 1583. By this date, however, the hall is identified as the '*the greit hall callit the workhows*', suggesting that it had ceased to be a formal, high-status location and repurposed as a Workhouse. It is possible that it had been damaged during the intensive bombardment of the castle's southern flank by the Regent Mar's forces which began on 15 October 1571 – at some point in the 16th or 17th centuries, one of the southern windows appears to have been removed and patched up rather than replaced, affecting the formal interior layout.

The Great Hall of 1512 may have been refurbished as the 'Great Hall' of the castle which was used briefly in the Scottish coronation ceremony of Charles I in 1633, where the king was formally invited to assume the Crown by the Three Estates

before the procession to the main ceremony in Holyrood Abbey (Balfour iv. 385–8), but, considering the evidence that this building had lost its high status by 1583, this is perhaps more likely to have been the smaller Great Hall in the Palace. The conversion of the Great Hall into a barracks is usually attributed to Cromwell's occupation (though providing sleeping quarters for the royal guards was always part of the role of the hall in the King's House); by 1719, mezzanine floors had been installed and a lavatory had been jettied out over the battlements, and the 1512 Great Hall remained confined to the military role until its Victorian restoration gave it the form it now retains.

Gun Hole: A 'goun holl' in the castle was under construction or repair in 1546, and this has been identified as a reference to the vaulted 16th-century artillery position on the north side of **David's Tower**, around which the northern half of the Half-Moon Battery was subsequently constructed after 1573 (Caldwell (1982), p 478; MacIvor (1991), pp 145, 152; Gallagher and Ewart (2014), p 45). The identification is tentative, but it is supported by a reference showing that some of the masons involved had been hired in April 1546 specifically for work on the Fore Wall, and the name is a convenient one to describe this structure with its cramped casemate and deep gunloop. It is probably referred to as a Bulwark in 1573, but that name is too generic to use to identify it.

Gunhouse: The foundry where bronze artillery was produced, and originally also the storehouse for the royal guns. It is first mentioned explicitly on 23 April 1517, when a store of arms and armour was moved from the Great Hall and **Captain's Tower** (the text suggests it was then also known as the Artillery House). Subsequently, there are references to minor repairs on 12 September 1532, July 1535 and again during the long set of documents beginning 3 March 1537. Much more impressive are references to its use as a gun foundry from 10 May 1539 onwards, first producing six breech-loading guns with elegantly decorated barrels, followed by two 'double moyens' on 23 March 1540, and several bronze pulleys for the rigging of ships, among them the powerful new royal galleon, the *Lion*.

With the conversion of the Great Chapel into the Munition House, references to the gunhouse temporarily cease, but there are continuing references to a foundry

or 'Melting House', for which no significant expenditure is recorded, though the renewal of oak window-frames on 3 August 1540 suggests that it was not a new building. This is evidently the same structure – the removal of the munitions allowed the use of the older building to be focused entirely on gunfounding, which continued with the casting of two 'double culverins', large, impressive guns, longer in the barrel and more technologically advanced in their production techniques than anything known from Tudor England. The first gun was produced on 12 October 1540. The old name of the gunhouse reasserts itself in the accounts relating to the second gun, begun on 31 August 1541; after accidents during two casting attempts on 30 October 1540 and 31 December 1540, it was successfully produced around 25 February 1542.

The gunhouse is again referred to under its old name in the inventory of 20 March 1567, where it contains a small bronze gun and miscellaneous artillery equipment – plus a pair of bellows, presumably those of the foundry.

There is some reason to believe that the gunhouse was located on the western part of the Castle Rock, with easy access to the Portcullis Gate. The earliest plan of the castle (RHP 6520/1), dating from around 1670, shows only one building in this area, the structure later known as the Magazine (Ewart and Gallagher (2014), pp 135–40). If this was indeed the gunhouse, it seems possible that the Powder Vault may have been part of the same structure.

Half-Moon Battery: Constructed in the 1570s around the remains of **David's Tower**. **Slezer's earliest prospect of the castle** shows that until a date around 1670 it had a somewhat lower parapet, with open embrasures rather than gunloops, and its guns positioned *around* the exposed remains of David's Tower rather than on top of it. It thus did not mask the windows of the Laigh Hall in the Palace as it now does, and this also has important implications for the chronology of the Forewell.

Head Wall: Referred to in 1573, this appears to have been the old name for the length of rampart between the Portcullis Gate and **Cromwell's Tower**. Confusingly, this rampart is now conventionally called the 'Forewall', when in 1573 the name Fore Wall was originally given to the precursor of the Flanker below it.

The area behind this wall now appears as a large and approximately level open space, on the same height as the gun emplacements along at the wallhead, but this layout only dates from the 1670s when the Half-Moon Battery was heightened, and significant levelling-up took place behind it. There must have originally been a steep descent in this area, leading down from **St Margaret's Gate** to the level of the **David's Tower** entrance and the basement of the Palace. The head wall itself also seems likely to have been somewhat lower than it is now. By 1572, however, this wall already carried a tier of artillery, indicating that there was a structure on its rear capable of supporting the weight of guns – perhaps the vaulted Kitchen of 1382 ran along its rear? If so, it may survive beneath the level of the modern paving, as its counterpart at Stirling Castle was found to have done after being similarly concealed in 1689.

King's Garden: A large area of garden – perhaps primarily a vegetable garden – which stretched around the west of the Castle Rock from **St Margaret's Well** to the Grassmarket. It was already in existence by 1124 x 1139, but most of it appears to have been given over to the Barras and **King's Stables** in the 14th and 15th centuries, though the adjacent Orchard may have survived for longer.

Subsequently, a new set of gardens inside the castle are mentioned from 1435 onwards, when payments to a mason and a plumber suggest the construction of walling and perhaps water features – Malcolm (1925) connected this garden very plausibly with the level terrace located within the surviving southern stretch of the Ward's ramparts, which is still a garden today. On the analogy of other late-medieval and Renaissance gardens in Scotland, there may have been additional terraces or slopes higher up towards the esplanade – and the Stove House sauna constructed in 1454 may have been located nearby (see Appendix 5: A 15th-Century Sauna).

King's Meadow: An area or areas near Edinburgh which was kept under grass to provide grazing and supply hay for the castle and the **King's Stables**. The porter of the castle was often employed to scythe it. References in 1372 and 1382 locate a royal meadow at Liberton, to the south of the Old Town, but there has also been speculation that the principal meadow was located at Dalry, which lay

immediately to the west beyond the castle's sizeable Orchard – the name may be simply Gaelic *dail righ*, 'king's meadow' (Dixon (1947), p 65; Malcolm (1925)).

King's Stables: Located beneath the southern ramparts of the castle, adjacent to the tournament ground (see Barras). Apparently, the central base of the royal equerry, the stables are recorded from 1450, and continued in use until some point in the 16th or 17th century.

Kitchen: The castle had several kitchens, some of them working simultaneously. The need to construct a new one when **David's Tower** was strengthened to resist artillery in 1517 suggests that there may have been one in the lower part of the keep, but the earliest recorded one was built in 1382, 'in the form of a vault' near David's Tower. It may have lain directly along the back of the Head Wall. Another kitchen was built between 1410 and 1412, initially described as the 'King's Kitchen' (although with James I a prisoner, not yet enthroned, and the Duke of Albany governing as regent, there was technically no king at that date), while in 1434 we hear of a 'Duke of Rothesay's Kitchen', serving the suite of the future James II.

Both references may relate to the same kitchen, and perhaps to the hearth whose remains are in the basement levels below Register House – originally a tower containing royal suite which, by process of elimination, may have been the one assigned to the heirs to the throne.

A new Court Kitchen was built in 1517, probably to serve the new Great Hall of 1512, and may have given its name to the Kitchen Tower. The work on the **Governor's Lodging** begun in March 1545 involved fitting a kitchen with a clay chimney, clay floor and a new clay 'furnace', presumably an oven – a unique indication that such important structures were made of material which would not necessarily leave archaeological traces. Notwithstanding the multiplicity of possible locations implied in earlier evidence, an inventory of 1567 lists the contents of a single kitchen in the castle: a griddle, two cooking racks and two spits, all of iron, and two tables for preparing food. The apparent abandonment of the Great Hall as a dining space by the 1580s must have rendered the associated facilities somewhat inconvenient for the Palace, and at some point a kitchen was improvised out of what had previously been a very grand chamber at its north-

west corner; this may date to the 17th century, however, and it is conceivable that the basement of the demolished David's Tower was initially used, enclosed within the Half-Moon Battery but not yet buried beneath its gun platform, and interconnecting directly with the Laigh Hall.

Kitchen Tower: Named in the inventory of 20 March 1567, when it contained a 'little hall', and a chamber accessed from within the hall, as well as a loft above the chamber. The 'little hall' contained three tables and their benches, and an iron chimney-grate, while the chamber contained a bed, cupboard and counter, a bench containing a folding bed and a fire-grate for its chimney. The loft had contained a chest, but this had now been moved to the 'first over chamber of the To-falls'. A Kitchen itself is mentioned next in this inventory, and was evidently located nearby, but it is unclear whether it was within the tower.

The number of separate kitchens recorded within the castle makes it hard to identify the precise location of this tower, and there are at least three possibilities: the Register House seems the least likely, as by this date the hearth below it appears to have been defunct; another option is the tower now known as **Cromwell's Tower**, which stands close to the presumed location of the 14th-century kitchens, though it is unclear whether this is a habitable tower with internal rooms, or a solid masonry turret. Perhaps the most obvious location would be the tower whose fragmented remains stand at the west end of the Great Hall, in the area where the kitchen serving that structure would most logically be located (Ewart and Gallagher (2014), p 84). If so, it may have been the earlier **Captain's Tower**.

Long Stair: The name conventionally used for the straight main staircase within the Palace (e.g. Ewart and Gallagher (2014), pp 67-8, 76).

A stairway of this name is referred to on 24 December 1515, when repair work on it was paid for, overseen by the French artillery commander Jean Bousquet. This has been equated with the palace stairs, but it might also refer to the long, straight staircases within the Vaults on the western side of Crown Square (Ewart and Gallagher (2014), pp 79, 82), or else the Long Steps, if they were in existence at this date.

A reference in 1612 to the 'long stairs which are the only way up to all the to-fall chambers' has been taken to relate to the palace stairs (*MWi*. 356; McKean (1997), p 102, n. 19; Ewart and Gallagher (2014), p 57), but it might alternatively denote the ones in the Vaults (see To-falls).

Long Steps: A modern name for the main route up into the inner defences of the castle, an outdoor stone stairway climbing the cliff just behind the Portcullis Gate (this term is favoured here for clarity over the alternative 'Long Stair(s)', which is used inconsistently in print to refer to this flight of steps *and* the main staircase in the Palace, and which occurs in a 16th-century source with reference to a stairway which cannot be confidently located: see Long Stair).

It is normally claimed that there was an outdoor stairway here by 27 January 1573, but this is not clear on a close reading of the source, and the reference may be to a spiral stair inside the **Constable's Tower**, the Turnpike of the 14th and 15th centuries. The Long Steps are clearly depicted on Rothiemay's plan of Edinburgh from 1649, and again on Slezer's surveys from the later 17th century.

Melting House: See Gunhouse.

Munition House: Towards the end of the reign of James V, the Great Chapel was secularised, and began to be converted into a military arsenal – a project first explicitly mentioned on 21 April 1539, fully completed soon after 4 December 1540. The documents indicate that the work involved the refitting of an older structure for a new purpose, leaving the pre-existing walls largely intact. Although repeated post-medieval rebuildings have obscured its fabric, very detailed documentation means that the Munition House is one of the most clearly understood of the major buildings in the pre-1603 era of the castle, second only to the relatively simple and well-preserved space of the Great Hall facing it across Crown Square.

In building plans of 1719 and 1750 the Munition House is depicted as a three-floored building, with an annexe along its north wall containing a smith's forge and an upstairs chamber. All these rooms can be easily identified in inventories of

20 March 1567 and 26 March 1579, and most of them can also be identified in the building records, which describe the completion of the building's external structure, then the insertion of first one internal floor level and then another upper one, each with their own supporting pillars (13 September 1539 and 30 October 1539), and the upper floor above the smithy in the annexe (3 August 1540), once the stone pavement of the ground floor was laid. We can thus be confident that the building did not change significantly in layout throughout its history.

Nor, it seems, was there ever a significant revision of the way the equipment in the arsenal was arranged. The ground floor, described as the 'laich' or 'nether' Munition House, was designed to accommodate the royal artillery – in 1567, it contained the equipment for hauling the guns, wheels for their carriages and other miscellaneous artillery equipment. The first floor or 'midhouse' contained more artillery stores, including some supply carts, incongruously juxtaposed with plate armour for men-at-arms and cavalry horses, while the top floor or 'over house' had hundreds of pikes, and dozens of handguns, plus more gunpowder for them. The smithy had metalworking equipment and the ironwork being worked on, while the room above it had a miscellaneous collection of equipment, including five naval gun-carriages. In 1579, the quantities of equipment were much reduced, and a great deal of the first-floor equipment is said to be in the smithy, which seems unlikely in literal terms.

The 1708 report reveals that the same basic layout had remained the same – the artillery was on the ground floor, the armour on the first floor and the pikes on the top floor, though the layout had been somewhat rationalised; the supply carts were now downstairs with the artillery, and the muskets had been brought down to the middle floor, though their accoutrements all remained upstairs alongside the pikes.

The 1708 report noted that the middle floor was damp, and by the time of the 1750 plan the north facade was sagging dangerously – the wall had never been designed to support the inserted floor, and to make matters worse the original load-bearing buttresses had been removed and the weight was being borne instead on infilled window openings. The Munition House was converted into a Georgian barracks, with structural considerations and the need for access to Crown Square requiring the dismantling of more of the standing fabric than was originally intended; later Victorian rebuilding progressively dismantled most of the

original walling that remained – apart from re-used stone, probably only the foundations of the east and west frontages retain medieval fabric. Nonetheless, a level of structural continuity has been maintained through the centuries: it is now the National War Memorial.

Nor' Loch: A large body of water which stood to the north of the castle and the High Street in the area of the modern Princes Street Gardens. Although always referred to as a 'loch' or lake, it was in fact an artificial moat associated with the castle, created by the construction of a 500ft-long dam across the valley between the Royal Mile and the New Town.

The dating of the Nor' Loch has posed a problem for historians, as the earliest documented references, in the work of the 15th-century historian Walter Bower, appear to contradict each other: first, in reference to Robert Prendergast's actions after the unsuccessful siege of October 1337, he describes the protagonist hurrying down a close from the High Street to its shore, and mounting his horse to ride to Holyrood, but then Bower goes on to state that a tournament in 1396 was held 'where the lake now is'. These contradictions can perhaps be resolved by the fact that the loch could be drained by adjusting the outflow from the sluice in its dam, although it is worth noting that the jousting pistes of the great castles at Kenilworth and Caerphilly were positioned on top of moat dams very similar to the one in Edinburgh: Bower's remark may therefore be a misinterpretation of an older source describing jousting on the dam.

The lake-like moats of Kenilworth and Caerphilly, wide bodies of water on one side of each castle, created by the construction of massive 500ft dams, provide the closest parallels to the design of the Nor' Loch, and hint at a 13th-century date for the Nor' Loch; certainly, if it was in existence by 1337, the course of events suggests it is unlikely to have been built much after 1286. However, large lake-moats at Leeds Castle in Kent and Morton Castle in Nithsdale probably belongs to a later period, and the broad moat created around 1370 to front the new eastern defences of the city of Paris also present possible parallels. Regardless of its exact date, the construction of the Nor' Loch emphasises the original scale and complexity of the castle's medieval outer precincts, extending well beyond the

modern dry moat at the head of the esplanade, and to some extent directly integrated with the defences of the town.

It is possible that the height of the loch was determined with reference to the fresh-water spring which came to be enclosed in the Wellhouse Tower in the early 1360s – it needed to be low enough to prevent flooding the well, but it was brought high enough to provide direct access between the loch and the Ward, through a water gate which still survives in the adjacent rampart. Bower's references suggest that, if the Nor' Loch did post-date 1396, it had been in existence for long enough by the 1440s that its existence could be projected back to 1337, and it occurs unequivocally in a document of 1437.

In sources from the late 18th century, the Nor' Loch is described as an insalubrious stretch of stagnant water, and this concept has influenced later perceptions, but the earlier evidence reveals a very different attitude. Quite apart from its defensive effectiveness, the water was considered readily drinkable, the surface was ornamented with swans, and the outflow stream was still considered an attractive feature of the Physic Garden and the courtyard of the civic old folks' home in the early 18th century. The sluice controlling the outflow was always maintained in good order and continued to be adjusted regularly for both military and civic reasons. Only a short section of the loch's southern bank was directly overlooked with built-up tenements stretching back from the High Street, and even this need not have led to the accumulation of refuse in its waters – the buildings of the Old Town originally had a system of toilet drains (presumably flushed by rainwater) feeding into sewers beneath the streets, which was deliberately destroyed by the burgh council in the 16th century, in order to collect and sell household refuse as part of a for-profit recycling scheme. It was only as this refuse scheme began to break down that the Old Town's residents took to dumping refuse in the waters of the Nor' Loch – a phenomenon first recorded (with some reluctance) in the 1580s.

In the pre-1603 period (and even in the early 18th century) the Nor' Loch was perceived in very different terms from the way in which it is now remembered: it was a moat which played a meaningful role in the castle's defences, and a glistening expanse of fresh water with positive aesthetic connotations for the castle's setting.

Orchard: First recorded in the English occupation accounts of the 1330s, but evidently in existence from an earlier date. Later documents suggest that it covered a very large area between Lothian Road and the Grassmarket. It would have supplied fresh fruit to the castle and may have also been used commercially.

Palace: The range of royal apartments on the east side of Crown Square. It was rebuilt into its current form shortly after the end of the period surveyed in this report, but it preserves the basic structure of older royal apartments.

The palace consists of two parallel ranges sharing a central spine wall. The east section overlooking the Old Town contains two levels of pre-1603 royal apartments above a basement, and the lower of the two high-status floors was used by Mary Queen of Scots in the 1560s. Its main room, now known as the Laigh Hall, marks the start of a conventional linear sequence of hall, presence chamber, privy chamber and closet; the aumbries preserved in the walls of the first two rooms have been taken to suggest that this sequence may date back in part to the reign of James IV, and this is also supported by the position and date of the fireplace in the Laigh Hall. The first-floor suite was originally parallel in layout, and the two floors were united by dramatic oriel windows on their west front.

At an earlier date, however, the Laigh Hall and presence chamber may have formed a single larger space, and they certainly did not have any substantial upper floor above them, while the rooms later used as the privy chamber on each floor formed the vertical floors of a structurally separate tower at the southern end. The larger space now represented by Laigh Hall and presence chamber has conventionally been interpreted as the Great Chamber of the 1430s, apparently due to the belief that the principal formal spaces in the castle were previously restricted to **David's Tower**, but this rationale is incorrect, as there is clear evidence for a free-standing Great Hall, possibly dating back to the reign of Alexander III.

It is possible to see the Laigh Hall, interacting with David's Tower through the door near its west end, as being this Great Hall, the scene of parliaments and even the last banquet of Alexander III, with the Great Chamber of the 1430s subsequently set above it in the manner of the 15th-century residential range at

Crichton Castle (which may have been built by the man who oversaw the Great Chamber project). The conversion of the original hall level into a parallel suite for the queen on the floor below follows 16th-century fashions and would have been facilitated by the construction of the current Great Hall in 1512. This outline of the palace's development removes the need to posit a substantial but undocumented heightening of the building in the 16th century, although a substantial refurbishment would have been required if it contained the **Queen's Lodging** badly damaged by a conflagration on 1 November 1525, and major repairs could be concealed in very opaque entries in the accounts, such as the payment of £3,785 13s 4d to the regent's 'house-painter and servants' between 15 August 1543 and 7 May 1544 (*TA* viii. 389), and the £5,268 11s 9d paid for work on Edinburgh and other residences in November 1552.

The lead-roofed **Captain's Hall** of the 1580s may be another term for this level (Bothwell, as Mary's husband, would have briefly occupied these apartments when he was captain of the castle), but, if so, its rebuilding into the king's apartments in the 17th century would have restored its original functions as the main royal suite. The buildings of the palace's western range fronting Crown Square are less easy to interpret, but a careful reading of the documents indicates the Treasurer-House of the 15th century is incorporated here. The documents suggest that the level of architectural continuity in the palace, and the age and historical resonance of its extant spaces, may be greater than has previously been realised.

Details of the 17th-century rebuilding indicate that the palace's eastern oriel windows were removed at some point before 1617 – there is no explicit documentation recording their destruction, but this is generally attributed to gunfire damage during the Long Siege of 1571–3, and the most likely context identified in the documents is the intensive two-day bombardment by the Regent Mar's forces, which began on 17 October 1571, in which around 280 cannon shot are said to have been fired at the 'south wall' and the adjacent Spur, breaking gaps and holes through the structures in this part of the castle. No further damage here is recorded in the detailed records of the week-long bombardment by English guns which began on 17 May 1573.

There is no clear evidence for significant repairs between the Long Siege and 1603. The palace as it now stands is largely the result of a thorough reworking in

the 1610s, which gave the building smart Jacobean facades and a complex internal layout: the old ground-floor apartment has been retained as a ceremonial space, but the king's lodging directly above it is oriented in the opposite direction, and an L-shaped third-floor apartment was added for Queen Anne of Denmark (though its actual occupant during the stay of the court in 1617 was the Duke of Buckingham). Careful attention has been paid to the floor levels, which are not equal across each storey of the building – the way that the three apartments wrap around each other thus allows the sequence of rooms in each of them to begin in a tall outer chamber, leading through progressively more private spaces with progressively lower ceilings, while the north-west corner of the palace, containing the kitchens and smaller chambers for courtiers, is a separate block subdivided into four floors rather than just three.

Portcullis Gate: The main gateway to the castle, located at the only convenient point of access to the Castle Rock – a narrow natural passage leading inwards from the Ward around the north side of the natural citadel of the inner defences towards the relatively open western area of the Castle Rock.

The layout of the Castle Rock itself thus suggests that this has been the main entrance since the earliest fortifications were erected – it may be, therefore, the site of the gateway mentioned in *Y Gododdin*. The existence of the outer Ward complicates our understanding of the early defences, but this is a plausible location for the gate referred to in 1255 and 1296, and the gate mentioned in accounts of the recapture of the castle on 14 March 1314.

Important evidence for the entrance arrangements is provided by English documents recording the rebuilding of the defences by an occupation garrison in the 1330s, after the castle had lain ruined for 20 years (see Appendix 4: The English Garrisons for a wider discussion, and a translation of the key documents). The earliest repairs, completed by 2 November 1335, involved the refitting of a 'great gate' with a pair of wooden 'crooks' to act as its frame (implying that it had an arched shape) as well as iron crook-and-band hinges for its doors. A second gate 'under the hoardings' (*subtus le hurdys*), received not one but two pairs of wooden crooks, as well as iron bands for its hinges. The reference to 'hoardings' indicates that this gateway was directly beneath part of the wooden defensive

structure on the castle's battlements, and by implication this suggests that the hoardings did *not* extend to the 'great gate'. There was also a chamber near the gates, presumably a porter's lodge.

A later document of 26 January 1340 reveals that one of the gates was being rebuilt with stone arches, while the road approaching it was being reconstructed to allow easier access for large groups of mounted men – described as 80ft long and 24ft wide, and located beneath the castle's Quarry, this was evidently a precursor to the extant approach to the Portcullis Gate, though it was probably originally somewhat steeper than it is at present.

These entrance arrangements also appear in narrative history in sources recording the dramatic events when the gates were stormed by the Scots on 16 April 1341. The French chronicler Jean le Bel (whose narrative is also followed by Froissart) describes two gateways, the outer *porte des barrières* and the inner *grand'port* – the names used are the same ones as used in the 1335 document, and unquestionably relate to the same structures. The Scottish narrative shared by Walter Bower and Andrew Wyntoun describes the events in slightly different terms, with an outer gate containing a portcullis, behind which stood a tower called the Turnpike, which also had an entrance of its own.

Combining these references, it is possible to get a very clear sense of the entrance arrangements as they stood in this period: there was an outer gate with wooden defensive hoardings directly above its entrance, equipped with a portcullis (this explains why it received *two* arched wooden frames in 1335, to provide a slot for the portcullis to travel up and down between them), and also an inner 'great gate', which formed part of a tower called the Turnpike – the name of the tower suggests that this inner structure also contained a spiral stair, perhaps leading up into the inner ward of the castle. The fact that the road leading up to the modern Portcullis Gate lay 'outside the Castle' in 1340 enables us to locate both gates in the vicinity of the surviving Portcullis Gate.

Perhaps even more surprising is the existence of a detailed description of this entrance arrangement as early as the 1170s, applied in Chrétien de Troyes' Arthurian romance *Yvain* to the palace of the Lady of Lothian – a location which would most naturally be identified as a fictionalised Edinburgh Castle: first comes 'such a narrow approach that two knights on horseback could not possibly enter

together without confusion or great unease' (*si estroite entree / que .ii. chevaliers a cheval / sans encombrer et sans grant mal / n'i porroient ensamble entrer*), corresponding to narrow road that must have existed before it was widened to facilitate cavalry in 1339. At the head of this stands a double gateway: first came an outer gate equipped with 'an iron portcullis, sharp and piercing' (*une port a coulant / de fer esmoule et trenchant*), but then 'it had another gate behind, just like the one which was in front' (*une autel porte avoit derriere / comme chele devant estoit.*), although there is no indication that this one had a portcullis. The space between them is described as a 'narrow room' (*sele enclos*) or an 'alley' (*alés*). The layout corresponds so exactly to the distinctive entrance arrangement which was rebuilt from ruins at Edinburgh in 1335 that it strongly suggests that the entire design was in place by the 1170s. We can probably discount as fiction the idea that the portcullis was dropped by spring-loaded systems comparable to both a crossbow and a trebuchet, but it is perhaps permissible to use Chrétien's statement that the passage contained 'a narrow wicket-gate' (*.i. huisset estroit*) leading to 'a small chamber' (*une chambrette*) to infer the location of the porter's lodge, the chamber near the great gate which was fitted with a new doorway in 1335 – placing the porter's lodge between the gates would also make best sense of the statement that the gatekeeper in 1341 was able to open the outer gate to admit visitors without unlocking the inner one.

These are also likely to be the gates where a 'new tower' was built between 1375 and 1379, perhaps widening or heightening the existing turnpike structure, and subsequently strengthened with a Drawbridge. A reference to the procurement of chains for 'the portcullis of the forward tower' on 25 September 1515 may relate to a refit of the structure, and in 1541 part of the slate roof of the 'gate tower' was replaced, along with a new roof for a porter's lodge that was presumably adjacent and perhaps part of the same structure (this had previously been given running repairs in July 1535). Later sources identify a **Constable's Tower** or **St Margaret's Tower** in the vicinity, and a source of 27 January 1573 mentions that the main entrance into the castle was by stairs in the base of the Constable's Tower – probably the same spiral flight implied by the much older name of the turnpike.

The survival of the early arrangement of two defensive gates can perhaps be seen in visual sources from the 16th century: a sketch of 1544 depicts two battlemented

walls controlling the entrance to the castle, and the print included in Holinshed's chronicles portrays a square enclosure with a gate on its east side; the corresponding triangular enclosure with two gates in the slightly later Braun and Hogenberg print may be intended to represent the same structures (note, however, that these are interpreted as depictions of the Flanker by Driscoll and Yeoman (1997), pp 78-9, 84, 90).

It is clear that the gate structures were damaged by English artillery in the Long Siege of 1573, with the northern part of the portcullis being ruined. The extant Renaissance entrance facade was built in the later 1570s by the Regent Morton, though the report of 7 May 1583 shows that it was not properly completed or roofed. Contrary to what is often said in secondary sources, a proposal to heighten this gate into a tower-house for the garrison commander was not carried through at this point, and at some date, perhaps subsequent to 1603, it was roughly completed with a battlemented gun platform and a vaulted pend beneath. The Victorian upper section, known as the Argyle Tower, is a fair approximation of what was originally proposed three centuries earlier, but its lower section still incorporates elements of the original double-gateway design, and some parts of the structure may even belong to the 12th century.

Porter's Lodge: See Portcullis Gate.

Postern: See **St Katherine's Gate**. Powder Vault or Powder House: The place(s) where gunpowder was made or stored. Possibly part of the Gunhouse.

Quarry: A quarry outside the castle's gates is mentioned in 1339, when a wide roadway buttressed by a wall was built beneath it. Much later, a late-17th-century survey of the castle by John Slezer identified an old 'frie stone quarrie' concealed by backfill in the crags on the northern side of the Half-Moon Battery (PRO MPF 245; cf. Driscoll and Yeoman (1997), pp 1, 25). This suggests that the roadway of 1339 was a precursor of the main access route which still runs inside the Flanker, leading to the Portcullis Gate.

Queen Anne Building: An 18th-century range on the west side of Crown Square: it is largely beyond the remit of this report, and fully discussed in Ewart and Gallagher ((2014), pp 79–95), but it is built over a massive basement of medieval Vaults (q.v. for discussion of the previous structures here; cf. also Kitchen, **Captain's Tower** and To-falls).

Queen's Lodging: The great storm of 1 November 1525 is said to have caused a fire in the apartment of the Queen Dowager Margaret Tudor which almost totally ruined that structure; the phrasing seems to imply that the direct cause was the blowing down of the parapet from **David's Tower**, and thus that the queen's lodging was directly adjacent, presumably in the Palace, but the passage is not completely unambiguous, and it is possible that the queen's apartment was actually a separate location outside the castle, in the Old Town or at Holyrood.

Register House: Located on the south side of Crown Square immediately to the east of the Great Hall, constructed in its present form as a purpose-built state archive by James V around 1540, it represented a modification of what was originally a tall, free-standing tower: it is the likely location of the south-facing window from which James IV and Queen Margaret watched tournaments in the Barras, and may have contained a suite of royal apartments, perhaps originally those assigned to the heir-apparent.

When the Great Hall was built in 1512, the west wall of the tower was modified to double as the gable behind the royal dais. A discrete passage was also inserted, connecting the hall with the ground-floor chamber in the tower, suggesting that it now functioned as a sort of drawing room, later known as the Chamber within the Hall.

The conversion of the tower into an archive building hints that the simultaneous construction of the Munition House had rendered the previous storage facilities unusable. The construction work was covered by a single payment, so no details are documented, but it is probably at this date that the tower was enlarged to the north to bring its facade level with the Great Hall, and acquired a stone-flagged roof that remains visible in architectural drawings of 1754 (corroborated to some extent by the *lack* of separate payments for slate roofing).

The most detail records relate to the fittings – the interior walls were lime-plastered, and the windows contained 54½ square feet of new glass, contained in wire frames and wooden cases with black-painted mouldings.

Sauna: See Stove House.

St Katharine's Gate: Apparently the postern of the castle, 'sanct Katherin's 3et on the west syid' in one narrative of the 1573 siege (*Diurnal*, p 332). This implies that, contrary to some interpretations, **St Margaret's Gate** was elsewhere in the castle. St Katherine's Gate should probably thus be identified as the precursor of the extant but blocked postern visible on the western ramparts of the castle, and as the gate where repairs were done on 'the head of the postern' on 25 September 1515.

St Margaret's Chamber: Recorded in 1278, when it was serving as the King's Chamber within the castle. The source shows that it was a large space, capable of accommodating at least 20 people. The name used in 1278 suggests that it was identified as the royal chamber where St Margaret died in November 1093, though this does not guarantee the survival of any 11th-century fabric even at that date.

Nonetheless, the narrative of 1093 implies that it ought to have been located very near **St Margaret's Chapel**. It may have been located immediately adjacent towards the east – old plans suggest that the Garrison Chapel which is documented here from 1512 (demolished in the 19th century) may have had lancet windows of a significantly earlier date than the 16th century, and wall-lines which directly continued the east and south walls of the chapel.

St Margaret's Chapel: The oldest surviving building in the castle, and indeed the oldest intact building in Scotland, its association with St Margaret is well documented from the 14th century, though the earliest reference suggests that it was already regarded as ancient even in the 12th century.

The *Life of Monenna*, which dates in its current form from the first half of the 12th century, refers to a church of St Michael 'on the top of the hill which is today called Edinburgh' (see 1114 x 1150). The story told of its foundation by a group of Irish or Anglo-Saxon nuns is too contradictory to be trusted, but this reference reveals the chapel's original dedication, and suggests that it was already regarded as old in the reign of David I. This is supported by a poorly recorded excavation carried out in 1917, which was claimed to have uncovered evidence of a structural phase significantly pre-dating the 12th century. This interpretation may have been quite erroneous, but it is also possible that the chapel is centuries older than the Romanesque elements of its fabric would lead us to suspect, making it of even greater historical significance than is usually realised.

This was presumably the Church of the Castle, granted to the monastery at Holyrood by David I (see 1141 x 1147). By c.1250 it was identified as the chapel recorded in Turgot's narrative of the events of November 1093, with St **Margaret's Chamber** (mentioned in 1278) evidently being interpreted as the adjacent royal chamber. Sixteenth-century sources add **St Margaret's Tower** and **St Margaret's Gate**.

Barbour's account of the Scottish recapture of the castle in 1314 describes the discovery of a narrative wall-painting supposed to have been illustrated by St Margaret herself or under her direction. A reference to repairs on 'the king's chapel within the castle' in 1328 actually relates to St John's at Roxburgh, but St Margaret's Chapel was refitted in 1336, during a renewed period of English occupation.

In the later 14th century, the castle's royal chaplain was principally associated with the much larger **St Mary's Chapel**, and it is possible that St Margaret's Chapel was still under the patronage of Holyrood, but services appear to have temporarily relocated there between 1393 and 1396, and a permanent move was effected at a date between 1403 and 1425. During the reigns of James III and James IV, the king seems to have regularly attended the service here on St Margaret's Day.

Around 1512, a second chapel was constructed, directly abutting the original structure to the east, later known as the Garrison Chapel, perhaps re-using parts of the fabric of St Margaret's Chamber. In practical terms, the two adjacent

chapels would have functioned as a single ecclesiastical unit, but the old chapel disappears from the sources in the later 16th century.

St Margaret's Gate: In 1573 the besieging artillery brought down the south flank of **David's Tower**, along with parts of the Fore Wall and the Head Wall 'besyd Sanct Margretis Zet'. The context suggests a position at Portcullis Gate, and this can probably be identified with the entrance at the head of the Long Steps, near St Margaret's **Chapel** and probably **St Margaret's Chamber**. This was the principal route into the castle until the subsequent construction of **Foog's Gate**. Some secondary sources have suggested that St Margaret's Tower was the west postern above **St Margaret's Well**, but this is named in the same source as St **Katherine's Gate**, and there was no equivalent of the head wall here.

St Margaret's Tower: 'an irne yet for Sanct Margrettis tour' is referred to as being in the Smithy in the inventory of 20 March 1566. This is presumably the tower at **St Margaret's Gate**. It may thus be the same as the **Constable's Tower**.

St Margaret's Well: A well located beneath the Castle Rock on the west side, first mentioned in 1124 x 1139, but not referred to by name until 1573. It stood at the corner of the **King's Garden**, but lying close to the **St Catherine's Gate** postern, its location evidently made it useful for the garrison to send out forays to take water, but it was apparently blocked or tainted by the English during the Long Siege. The name was subsequently transferred to the Wellhouse Tower.

Smithy: Excavated archaeology and dated to the 14th century (Driscoll and Yeoman (1997), pp 49-59); it can thus be equated with the smithy which appears in documentary records starting with the English reoccupation of the castle in 1335, operated by a smith called John of Dalkeith and his assistant. Documents of 1382 may record the construction of the quenching trough discovered by the archaeologists.

By 3 August 1540, however, the castle's main smithy had evidently moved to a new location in the northern annexe of the Munition House, where it remained until the 18th century.

Spur: A large, triangular fortification which occupied the Esplanade area, constructed at an uncertain date in the 16th century. In addition to the uncertainty over its origin, the first detailed description of the spur, dating from 27 January 1573, has been misinterpreted – when this text describes it as ‘vamyred with turfe and baskete’, it is not referring to the use of earth and wickerwork in the main structure of the spur itself (as interpreted in Ewart and Gallagher (2014), p 101), but to a vauntmure, a separate outer earthwork used in Renaissance military architecture: this was erected some way in front of the main rampart, to protect it from artillery fire, and to create a wide, steep-sided gap which functioned as a dry moat. This vauntmure can be tentatively identified with the ruined outer fortifications beyond the spur, shown on Rothiemay's map of 1649.

There is no evidence that the main V-shaped fortification of the spur itself was ever anything other than a masonry rampart – and a notably high one, too. It was recorded as being 20ft high on 27 January 1573. It had a platform for guns at its apex, which appears to have been protected by a semi-circular rampart set back above the triangular point – it seems to be shown thus in a sketch of 1560 and is certainly depicted that way on a detailed plan of the 1640s (PRO SP 52/25/2, reproduced in Driscoll and Yeoman (1997), p 81), and is referred to at least once as a ‘half-moon’ echoing the semi-circular shape of the Half-Moon Battery above it (*Somerville* ii, 224). The description of the whole fortification as a ‘Spur’ probably refers to the resemblance of its pointed apex and semi-circular battery to the ram prow of a Renaissance galley, which was sometimes known by the same name (*OED*, s.v. spur, n.1 ll.6a): the resemblance was obvious enough for Pitscottie to describe it as the ‘galley snout of the Castle’.

An entrance was located near the centre of the spur's southern side – described in the 1550s as a gateway of some architectural sophistication. The Flanker provided covering fire to sweep along the northern rampart, in keeping with contemporary Renaissance ideas of artillery defence, and a corresponding southern flanker was constructed in 1560.

Internally, the spur initially contained little more than a timber platform for the guns, but in 1572–3 it was substantially strengthened with earth backing, and the gun platform gained masonry reinforcement. It also contained a freshwater well, whose capture was instrumental in provoking the surrender of the garrison in 1573.

The spur was essentially identical in plan to the fore spur at Stirling Castle, which is documented in detail by several views and plans from the years around 1700, and still partially incorporated in the 18th-century outer defences: this was a massive triangular fortification with thick stone ramparts about 25ft high, protected by flankers, a dry moat and *vamure*, with an entrance on its southern side and an artillery battery at its apex, featuring a semicircular sweep of cannon embrasures set above a diamond-shaped prow. Its intact northern rampart gives the clearest indication of the strength and scale of the demolished spur in Edinburgh.

The spur is conventionally equated with the Fort of the Castle Hill built in 1548, but this typical *trace italienne* fortification bears little resemblance to the spur as it is detailed in later sources – it was a low earthwork, not a tall rampart, and it was essentially quadrangular in plan, with three triangular bastions on a linear outer rampart, whereas the spur was a single large triangular fortification projecting directly from the castle. The fort of 1548 would seem more credible as the precursor of the earthwork *vamure* mentioned in 1573. However, at this point a puzzling question arises: was the spur built after 1548 inside the existing *trace italienne* fort, or was the *trace italienne* fort built around a spur that was already in place in the mid-1540s?

The spur was certainly in existence during the regency of Mary of Guise in the 1550s, but it may simply have been strengthened and modernised at this date. Its true origins may even lie in the artillery Bulwarks whose construction was ordered in 1513, although the resemblance to a galley might suggest the influence of the squadron of oared Renaissance warships acquired by James V in 1537–42.

The spur was damaged in an intense two-day bombardment by the Regent Mar's artillery in 17 October 1571 but was subsequently repaired and strengthened by 1573. No damage to the spur is recorded in the *Diurnal of Occurrents'* detailed day-by-day notes on the week-long bombardment by English artillery which

began on 17 May 1573, although the destruction elsewhere in the castle is carefully itemised. Instead, the spur was eventually captured in a frontal assault by massed infantry on 26 May 1573, leading directly to the castle's surrender the next day.

Recent scholarship has posited a major reconstruction of the spur after the siege (Gallagher and Ewart (2014), p 103), based on the belief that passages in the *Diurnal of Occurrents* and *Historie of James the Saxt* describe two phases of reconstruction on the castle after 1573, but, in reality, the two sources are textually related to each other, and the relevant passages record a single event, the start of construction on the Half-Moon Battery: there is no evidence that the spur required or received any significant reconstruction at this date. Contrary to the usual usage, the 'Blockhouse' mentioned by the *Diurnal* is probably the Gun Hole adjacent to David's Tower.

In keeping with the visual impact and architectural sophistication of the spur, it seems likely that it contained some of the castle's most powerful artillery, although direct evidence is lacking: the artillery inventory of 20 March 1566 makes no mention of the spur at all, and the report of 27 January 1573 merely attests that it was 'furnished with ordnance'; moreover, both reports indicate that the largest-calibre cannons were positioned in the Fore Wall or Curtain behind it. However, documents from Stirling show that the fore spur there could support the weight of at least three of the ultra-heavy high-velocity guns known as *gross culverins*, and the spur in Edinburgh would be a credible location for the castle's share of these sophisticated and powerful weapons (see Appendix 10: The Artillery). By 1640 it carried a battery of six guns, and a reference to them as 'cannons' might indicate even large guns of 24-pounder or 36-pounder calibre (*Somerville* ii. 246).

The spur was seriously damaged by explosives during a siege in 1640 (*Somerville* ii. 246–7), and eventually dismantled around 1650 (its destruction was mandated on 19 June 1649 (*RPS*1649/5/238), and *Somerville* ii. 229 indicates that it was demolished before Cromwell began his siege in December 1650: Douglas (1898), pp 200–3 favoured a Cromwellian propaganda report in the main London newspaper which claimed it was still intact, but this may represent the reputation of the spur than the reality). It is illustrated in its 17th-century form both in Rothiemay's map of 1649, and in a military plan of similar date (PRO SP 52/25/2,

reproduced in Driscoll and Yeoman (1997), p 81). Note that this plan, tentatively dated to c.1620–50 in previous scholarship (Dunbar (1969), p 12), can be firmly dated to the 1640s, as it depicts two modifications after the 1640 siege – an awkwardly indented wall-line at the south-eastern corner, repairing the gap where the original structure had been blown clean away by explosives, and an internal moat and drawbridge added at the entrance to the Flanker, which did not exist during the siege (*Somerville* ii. 247–8).

It is said that the section of the spur blown up by the mine in 1640 was thrown right across the Castle Hill and landed ‘near by the Nor Loch’ (*Somerville* ii. 247), and a part of it may still be visible in the relevant part Princes Street Gardens – a sizeable chunk of coursed masonry is embedded on its side in the ground, facing the footbridge which leads across the railway lines from the north.

Stove House: A medieval sauna built in the castle in 1454. Little is recorded directly about it beyond the provision of 80 squared timbers from northern Fife for its construction, but a contemporaneous Scottish writer has left a detailed description of how to build and use a sauna of this sort. See Appendix 5: A 15th-Century Sauna. A location close to the second **King’s Garden**, on the south slopes below the esplanade, can be tentatively suggested.

To-falls: A slope-roofed building set against an existing wall – in Scotland, the term could denote anything from the side aisle of a cathedral to a lean-to outhouse. The existence of such a structure in the castle is first documented on 20 March 1567 when the ‘first over chamber of the To-falls’ is identified as containing a chest, recently moved from the loft of the Kitchen Tower. In 1612, there is a reference to the ‘long stairs which are the only way up to all the to-fall chambers’ (*MW* i. 356).

The to-falls of 1612 have been identified as the lofts beneath the pitch-roofed southern section of the Palace, at the top of the Long Stair, which certainly seem to have been covered by a lean-to roof propped against taller adjacent walls (McKean (1997), p 102, n. 19; Ewart and Gallagher (2014), pp 60–1), but this identification seems less likely for the place referred to in 1567. Alternatively, the combined descriptive evidence for both the 1567 and 1612 references would fit the

lean-to structure shown facing outwards from the west side of Crown Square in Rothiemay and Slezer's 17th-century views of the castle, which must have once been accessible from the flights of stairs in the basements below (Ewart and Gallagher (2014), pp 80, 82-3). This structure, which has previously been dated to the 17th century, is perpetuated to some extent by the eastern half of the extant Queen Anne Building above the Vaults (Ewart and Gallagher (2014), pp 88-91).

However, if the 1612 to-fall was indeed in the palace roof as has been thought, the 1567 to-fall might be elsewhere – perhaps a dormer storey above the vaulted Kitchen range of 1382 near **David's Tower**, or a loft in the lean-to roof of the cloister-like arcades which formerly encircled the quadrangle of Crown Square itself.

Tower: See **Captain's Tower**, **Constable's Tower**, **Cromwell's Tower**, **David's Tower**, Kitchen Tower, Portcullis Gate, Register House, **St Margaret's Tower**, **Wallace's Cradle**, Wellhouse Tower.

Treasurer-House: Mentioned as undergoing construction or repair work in 1466, and subsequently referred to regularly from 5 May 1489 onwards, it evidently contained a wide range of the royal valuables, ranging from the cash reserves to the iron-bound Cupboard full of silver tableware. It was presumably under the authority of the treasurer and may have also served as the headquarters of the administrative treasury. A close inspection of the Master of Works accounts for the 1617 reconstruction of the Palace appears to confirm that its physical successor is the tower-like unit containing the Crown Room, incorporated into the east frontage of Crown Square.

Turnpike: A location mentioned in the accounts of the recapture of the castle on 16 April 1341 by both Walter Bower and Andrew Wyntoun (Wyntoun ii. 457-60; *Scotichronicon* vii. 146).

At first sight, their descriptions appear contradictory: Wyntoun describes the turnpike as a tower located just inside the castle's portcullis, and in this context its name implies that it contained a spiral stair, whereas the editors of Bower's text

evidently understood him to mean that the turnpike was a location outside the castle where attackers could conceal themselves, and phrased their English translation accordingly: this has led Caldwell ((2016), p 57) to identify it as a turnstile barrier controlling access to the Ward.

It is clear, however, that the two chronicles are both following a shared source, and it is possible that the apparent inconsistency is caused by an error in the translation of Bower: the key is the interpretation of the phrase *e vicino*, which the translators interpreted very literally as 'from the vicinity', but which can also idiomatically mean 'near' or 'approaching' in medieval Latin (cf. its usage in one of the passages in the standard medieval Latin teaching textbook, Sidwell (1995), pp 195–6, *dies anniversarius ... e vicino immenens*, 'with the anniversary nearly upon him').

Both sources describe how the attackers were admitted through the main gateway in disguise as merchants with a convoy of packhorses laden with supplies, and how a man named Walter of Currie propped open the portcullis with a sturdy plank of wood. Next, Wyntoun says, 'so withall, he let the coals and baskets fall on the turnpike' (*Syne the colis and crelis wyth-all / Apon the turnepyk lete he fall*). Reading *e vicino* as meaning 'approaching', Bower's text would have an exactly parallel meaning: 'thus also, throwing the baskets and coals into the entrance of the tower, then approaching, which is called the Turnpike' (*ac etiam projectis cophinis et cadiferreis ad introitum turris, tunc e vicino, qui dicitur le turnipyk*). This is evidently the sense in which the passage is parsed in the citation in *DOST*, s.v. turnpik, *n*.

The translation in the standard edition of Bower, in contrast, reads the section beginning *tunc e vicino* as meaning something like 'then from the vicinity which is caled the Turnpike ...', and therefore regards it as the start of the next clause of the sentence, which goes on to describe the arrival of reinforcements.

The first translation has the advantage of producing a meaning exactly in agreement with Wyntoun and resolving the apparent contradiction. If this is correct, the turnpike was a tower located just inside the Portcullis Gate, with a doorway at ground level. Its name indicates that it housed a spiral staircase, which was presumably the primary means of access to the inner ward of the castle, a precursor to the open-air Long Steps leading up to **St Margaret's Gate** on the

higher ramparts. Bower's description of the turnpike as 'then' (*tunc*) close by during the attack on the gate may indicate that the arrangements had been modified by the time he wrote (a larger tower is known to have been built at the Portcullis Gate around 1375), but *e vicinio* seems to convey a sense of 'approaching' rather than statically 'nearby', so *tunc* may indicate primarily the proximity of the Scottish attackers to it at that moment in time, and the probability is that the turnpike remained a part of the castle's structure when Bower and Wyntoun wrote in the 15th century. An internal staircase is probably also the most natural interpretation of the reference of 27 January 1573 to a flight of 40 steps leading into the interior of the castle, located 'in the bottom of' the **Constable's Tower**.

Vaults: The name for the basements beneath Crown Square, and especially the complex on its west side beneath the post-medieval Queen Anne Building. Their archaeology is discussed in detail by Ewart and Gallagher (2014), pp 79–94.

Documentary references to 'vaults' in the castle appear from an early date (e.g. *TA* viii. 448, x. 435). Some references relate to other structures such as **David's Tower** and the Curtain, but the usage to describe the basements under Crown Square apparently dates to the 17th century (*Siege*, pp 54, 59, 63).

The main core of the complex is located on the west flank of Crown Square. As originally constructed, the principal space within the vaults was a substantial room on the western side with two west-facing windows. There was a timber-floored upper level above and a vaulted basement beneath, each illuminated by a pair of windows in its southern wall. To the east was a second parallel range, consisting of a taller main floor with a window high up on its south wall, and a basement with a similar window beneath. The eastern wall of the complex contained two straight flights of stairs leading upwards towards the open space which later became Crown Square. Access between the different areas was provided by a wide corridor or trance across the northern end of the complex, while wall thicknesses and masonry fragments suggest a tower rising higher at the southern end, perhaps the **Captain's Tower**.

At a later date, the principal space within the vaults was heightened by removing the timber floor of the upper level, allowing a high stone-vaulted roof to be

inserted. In parallel, additional vaults were extended west to link up with the Register House and Palace – primarily consisting of a prison complex, these acted as the platform for the new Great Hall constructed in 1512, and the new Court Kitchen of 1517 probably stood somewhere within the west range of the modified complex. It is also possible that the subdivision of the principle space within the vaults and the insertion of two ovens here is connected to this phase of work, which also saw the construction of a new brewhouse and bakehouse within the castle (though these changes are dated rather well after 1603 by Ewart and Gallagher (2014), pp 87-8). The insertion of new cooking facilities to serve the Great Hall would suggest that the tower at the southern end of the range was the one referred to in 1567 as the Kitchen Tower.

Archaeology has shown that this tower was demolished and replaced by an open artillery platform, over which a narrow range abutting the west side of Crown Square was later extended southwards. The transformation had been completed by 1649, when the results are visible on Rothiemay's plan of the castle. Subsequently, in the early 18th century, the narrow range was widened across the entire breadth of the vaults to create the extant Queen Anne Building.

If the tower here was indeed the Kitchen Tower, it was still extant on 20 March 1567, and its demolition must have been subsequent to that date. However, it is possible that the narrow range is also referred to at the same date, under the name of the To-fall. If so, then it is possible that the process of structural development was more complex than has been realised, with the narrow range initially abutting the tower, which was subsequently demolished and replaced by an open gun platform, across which a southward extension of the range itself was later built in a third phase completed by 1649.

Wallace's Cradle: The name recorded in the 19th century for a squat tower located outwith the main defences on the north of the Castle Rock. It is not explicitly mentioned in any medieval source, but it certainly did not play a role in the castle's much-more-thoroughly documented post-medieval defences, and secondary sources have observed that a crane hereabouts would be necessary to haul up water from the Wellhouse Tower below. An early archaeological investigation uncovered the existence of a precipitous route up the cliff between

the two structures, by means of rock-cut stairs and a cleft that was probably scaled by a ladder, and noted that the siting of the tower thus also has defensive purposes, to control a precipitous but passable route up the cliff (Skene (1882), pp 470–2).

The associated conjecture that the name of Wallace's Cradle is a corruption of 'Wellhouse Cradle' (Wilson (1848), i. 132) gains some strength from references to the Wellhouse Tower as 'Wallace tour' on 24 May 1573 and again in 1689 (cf. DOST cradill n. 2, and MW ii. 8, 14, 19, 21, 49, using the term 'cradle' to describe a platform used for harling the castle walls, evidently similar to a bosun's chair or a modern window-cleaning scaffold; a similar 'wellhouse cradle' may have been part of the crane apparatus needed to move water barrels up and down here).

Ward: The English accounts for 1335–6 mention 'the motte of the castle of Edinburgh with a certain place called Ward of the same' (*quadam placea vocata Warda ibidem*) (CDS iii. App. III, p 327). This has been persuasively identified as the area of modern esplanade and the slopes leading down to the Grassmarket and Princes Street Gardens on either side. A reference from 1161 x 1162 indicates that the town's tenement plots had been laid out up to its perimeter by that date, showing that its roughly rectangular boundary line had already been established. Especially when compared with the Castle Rock itself, it was a very large enclosure.

Significant lengths of the ward's north and south ramparts still survive, though little archaeological work has been done on them. The northern rampart runs from the Wellhouse Tower at the base of the Castle Rock and would have once stood directly on the shores of the **Nor' Loch**, with a small water gate still visible. The southern rampart stands directly behind the Grassmarket and encloses a level terrace which may be part of the second **King's Garden**. Old illustrations and documents suggest that it turned north at the west end of the Grassmarket, and continued north to connect with David's Tower, with a small postern gate located here around the level of the modern Johnston Terrace. The date of these stone walls is very unclear – they could originate at any point from the 12th century to the 16th, although their relationship with the 14th-century Wellhouse Tower and

perhaps the gardens of the mid-15th century suggests a comparatively early origin.

There is much less evidence for the outer rampart of the ward at the head of the Royal Mile – this is one possible location for the second gate ‘under the hoardings’ mentioned in 1335, and for the new gatehouse and Drawbridge constructed between 1375 and 1383, though this may have been the Portcullis Gate. One definitive piece of evidence is provided by John Slezer’s earliest, unpublished plan of the castle (RHP 6520/1), from 1674, which shows that the outer wall was aligned with the *western* walls of the two large houses at the top of the Royal Mile, enclosing them within its bounds. This suggests that these tenements may have originated as towers flanking the castle’s main entrance. In this context, it is notable that the building on the south side of the street, known as ‘Patrick Edgar’s Land’, had a long association with the castle, serving as an outer bastion during the Long Siege, and as the captain’s residence in the 1680s; this building still survives in a much-reconstructed form as Cannonball House.

The ward is never clearly identified in the primary sources as a military defensive perimeter, and it was superseded by the Fort of the Castle Hill and the Spur in the 16th century. It may have served primarily as an area to accommodate the castle’s auxiliary structures, such as stables, gardens and facilities for the assembly and butchering of oxen and sheep. It certainly incorporated a well, later enclosed in the spur. Nonetheless, the possibility exists that it contained significant elements of the castle’s military defences and high-status structures, especially in the 12th and 13th centuries, and it represents an obvious focus for archaeological inquiry.

Wellhouse Tower: A ruined tower built to guard a freshwater spring at the foot of the Castle Rock, its construction is recorded in 1361 and 1362. Getting water from here to the castle would have required it to be hoisted up by a crane in **Wallace’s Cradle** on the crags above, and then hoisted up again into the castle. The Forewell was restored in 1381 to provide a more straightforward supply.

Nonetheless, the tower continued to serve as a part of the castle’s fortifications: it was probably the ‘tower of the well’ near where walls were repaired in 25 September 1515, and damage by English artillery is chronicled on 24 May 1573 –

by which date it had come to be known as 'Wallace tower' – and as 'Wallace Tower' it continued to act as a guard post for the garrison in the siege of 1689 (*Siege*, p 65).

As well as protecting the well, the tower served as part of a more complex defensive scheme: it guarded a steep route up the Castle Rock via Wallace's Cradle, presumably the means of access in 1689, and it stood at the north-west corner of the ramparts of the massive outer bailey known as the Ward: a significant stretch of the adjacent curtain wall stretching away to the east is still visible, having been excavated and exposed in the 1820s (Skene (1822), pp 470–2). Immediately outside these ramparts stood the castle's immense northern moat, misleadingly known as the **Nor' Loch**, accessed from the castle by a water gate beside the tower.

Although in its modern setting the water gate appears to be simply a partially buried doorway leading through the wall onto what was once the shore of the loch, the modern ground level inside the wall conceals 'a chasm in the rock about twenty feet in width', which acted as a broad moat in front of the Wellhouse Tower (Skene (1822), p 471). Moreover, the fact that the water gate opened *into* this chasm implies that it was a water-filled culvert which flooded the moat with the waters of the loch, thus further strengthening the security of the castle's water supply, while also providing a secure berth for boats inside the ramparts. This option also has important implications for the medieval water level of the loch, as it would have stood half-way up the water gate, rather than somewhere below its sill level.

In 1689, it was presumably by the use of a boat that the Jacobite garrison of the besieged castle established secure lines of communication from the Wellhouse Tower 'over the north loch' (*Siege*, pp 50, 61).

Wells: There were several wells in and around the castle – the rock-cut Forewell was in use from an early date until 1314, then reopened around 1381. It is located within the castle's inner circuit of ramparts, but references suggest that it is really a rainwater reservoir rather than a consistent supply. The Wellhouse Tower was constructed around 1361 to protect a natural spring at the foot of the Castle Rock, from where barrels of fresh water could be hoisted up inside by crane. There are

also reports of a fresh-water well in the Spur, and another at **St Margaret's Well** located in the Castle Garden, which could be accessed relatively easily from the postern at **St Katherine's Gate**. The Back Draw Well, a second rainwater cistern located inside the western ramparts, is first documented in 1628, and may be entirely post-medieval in date. A plan of 1746 also indicates a well in the Portcullis Gate.

One puzzle is the lack of any documented wells within the castle's main defensive perimeter in the period 1335–60. It is possible that the Portcullis Gate well provided a regular water supply (though, if so, it is puzzling that it is not mentioned before the mid-18th century), or that the work recorded on the Back Draw Well in 1628 represented the enlargement of a smaller cistern – even a small pool could supply the garrison with several weeks' siege rations. Alternatively, it is possible that the garrison was expected to rely primarily on their stores of beer and wine, supplemented when necessary by making sallies to the springs outside the walls.

Workhouse: A name that may have been used consecutively for at least two separate buildings.

In 1496, the castle workhouse was refurbished to house artillery, being given new doors studded with iron nails, and a new roof of wooden tiles (5 August 1496, 3 October 1496, 14 October 1496, 15 October 1496, 3 December 1496 and 17 January 1497). References to 'props for the hall' on 20 August 1496 and to roofing work in 'the great house' 1 February 1497 may also relate to the same building.

References to the workhouse recur in the 16th century, including the inventory of 20 March 1567, but when a 'Great Hall called the workhouse' is identified in 1583, it seems that the role had shifted to the main Great Hall.

APPENDIX 1: ANGLO-SAXON EDINBURGH?

Among source-based historians, there is a broad consensus that Edinburgh Castle once formed a northern outpost of the Anglo-Saxon world.

According to the agreed narrative, this phase in the history of the castle began in the decades before AD 650. At this time the ancestors of the English were emerging as the main force in the area that had once been Roman Britain, rapidly expanding their rule at the expense of neighbouring Welsh chieftains – and pushing north over the modern Border as far as the Firth of Forth. Anglo-Saxon control of Edinburgh, it is asserted, lasted for more than 300 years, until the fortress, and the surrounding lands of Lothian, eventually came into the hands of Scottish kings in the second half of the 10th century (Smyth (1986), pp 31–2, 232; Fraser (2009), p 171; Woolf (2007), pp 194, 234).

Implicitly, at least, this Anglo-Saxon phase in Edinburgh Castle's prehistory helps to define a basic pattern in the wider history of Scotland: the arrival of the Anglo-Saxons represents the establishment of the language which would become Scotland's own vernacular, along with associated social hierarchies, settlement-patterns and religious infrastructure – while the much later annexation of Edinburgh by the Scots marks the emergence of a unified kingdom that is recognisably Scotland, with its kings in control of the future national capital, and commanding a land frontier approximating the modern Border.

Archaeologists have perhaps been more cautious. In the major monograph which resulted from the 1988–91 excavations in the castle, the authors accepted the broad outline of the historiographical consensus, but noted that, in archaeological terms, it is an 'extremely dark period', in which '[a]lmost nothing can be said of the fate of the castle' (Driscoll and Yeoman (1997), p 229).

In fact, the written sources offer surprisingly scant support for the standard narrative, and a close examination of the texts raises doubts about their reliability. What follows is a survey of the evidence for Edinburgh Castle's history in the Anglo-Saxon period, which aims to lay out the source material and summarise the conventional interpretation of it, while also drawing attention to questions of interpretation, and it takes as its starting point a tale which appears to be complete fiction – a story that Edinburgh Castle originated as an Anglo-Saxon fort, built by King Edwin of Northumbria in the 7th century.

This story finds its fullest expression in a 14th-century history of England known as the *Chronicle of Lanercost*, named after a monastery near Carlisle where it seems to have been edited into its present form. This source explicitly identifies King Edwin as the founder of Edinburgh Castle, and adds the picturesque detail that he used the fortress as a place of safety for his seven daughters – a story designed to explain the alternative name of the 'Castle of Maidens' (*Lanercost*, p 179/145; see Appendix 2: The Castle of Maidens). This is notable as the earliest surviving attempt to provide a historical explanation for the 'Maiden Castle' name, but this does not add any credibility to the story.

Edwin was an important historical figure, a powerful king who is said to have acquired overlordship over all of modern England and Wales before his defeat by a revolt in AD 633, whose conversion to Christianity revitalised the nascent missionary church among the Anglo-Saxons and whose reign was remembered

nostalgically a century later as a time of peace and justice. However, his purported association with the castle appears to be based entirely on the mistaken idea that Edinburgh was literally 'Edwin's borough'. The possibility of any genuine linguistic connection between Edwin and Edinburgh has been rejected by every major study of Scotland's place names, and can thus be safely ignored – the castle's name is simply a partial translation of the Celtic place name recorded in Welsh as *Din(as) Eidyn* and in Gaelic as *Dun Edin*, a name that already seems to have been well known in Edwin's lifetime (Watson (1926), pp 340–2; Gelling, *et al.* (1970), pp 88–9; Jackson (1969), p 76; the exact etymology of *Eidyn* is uncertain, but it has nothing to do with Edwin; in the early modern period, antiquaries linked it to *edyn*, a variant form of *adain*, 'wing', and thus identified with the place given the Greek name *Pteroton Stratopedon*, 'Winged Fortress', in Ptolemy's geographical survey of Roman Britain; alternatively, it may be related to Gaelic *éit*, 'herd of cattle', and Welsh *eidion*, 'ox, bullock'). Once the fanciful nature of the story is recognised, all that needs to be explained is when and why the story arose in the first place.

At least two earlier sources prior to *Lanercost* allude to the theory that Edinburgh was 'Edwin's borough', both dating from around the 1120s. In this period, we find that the fanciful etymology of the name was briefly in vogue in Edinburgh itself, as the form was used in at least one royal charter granting endowments to the newly founded Augustinian monastery at Holyrood (*David I*, No. 147), but even then, however, the preponderance of records used philologically correct forms such as *Edenburch*, which is enough to show that the 'Edwin's borough' version was an artificial name form utilised by a limited minority of scribes.

The other early source, perhaps dating to a few years before, is the *Historia Regum*, or 'History of the Kings', a compilation of chronicle material assembled in its current form in northern England around 1120. This uses the form *Edwinesburch* in a reference to events in the year 854, which will be discussed in more detail below (*Symeonis Opera* ii. 101).

One other, later source also shows knowledge of the purported connection between Edinburgh and Edwin – the White Book of Rhydderch, a famous and important manuscript of Welsh literature written around 1350 at Strata Florida Abbey near Aberystwyth. In copying a note on the ancestry of St Kentigern from an older text, one of the scribes altered the Welsh name of Edinburgh from *Dinas Eidyn* to *Dinas Etwin*, 'Edwin's fortress' (Bartrum (1966), p 56).

The whole idea of a connection between Edwin and Edinburgh seems to depend on the false etymological connection, which is first alluded to some 500 years after King Edwin's reign, and unanimously rejected by modern scholarship. Moreover, out of the four texts which show knowledge of the theory, the three earliest can all be associated with Durham, suggesting that the story may have originally had a relatively restricted circulation in scholarly circles there.

The *Historia Regum* is unquestionably a Durham text, and seems to have reached its present form under the editorship of Symeon, a learned monk who served as the official historian of Durham Cathedral in the early 12th century – its exact textual development will be discussed in more detail below. The Holyrood charter has likewise been assigned to a Durham-educated scribe on the basis of its distinctive style of penmanship (*David I*, pp 24, 27). The material in *Lanercost* falls within the timeframe of an underlying text attributed the Franciscan friar Richard of Durham (Grandsden (1996), pp 495–6) – a man of learning who helped to found

Balliol College in Oxford, he, too, seems likely to have been educated at the cathedral school.

In short, the idea that King Edwin had founded Edinburgh was a natural extension of the way that later English historians came to perceive him – falsely – as overlord over Scotland, and it served to imbue the castle with a prestigious English past, perhaps motivated by a belief that it *should* have been that way. This did not necessarily equate in practice with support for contemporary English political overlordship, however – after the Norman Conquest of England in 1066, Malcolm III of Scotland became the protector and patron of the Anglo-Saxon elite, providing them with military support, but also with refuge in exile. In the 1120s, an educated Yorkshireman could still gravitate to the Scottish royal court, and as late as 1180 the Borders could be thought of as ‘England in the Scottish kingdom’ (*PL*, vol. 198, col. 723), suggesting that people could square an English cultural identity with a Scottish political allegiance. It seems credible that the idea of an ancient English past for Edinburgh and Lothian would have helped to encourage the integration and settlement of English immigrants from further south, and this may have been a major factor in giving the idea of ‘Edwin’s borough’ its brief popularity in this period. Moreover, the intellectual traditions of Durham owed a great deal to Turgot, prior of the cathedral in the years around 1100, who had formerly been an exile in Scotland under Malcolm III, and who was certainly motivated in part by a belief in the ancient English identity of the Borders. Indeed, some parts of *Historia Regum* may be his own work, as they are identified as such in a 13th-century Scottish chronicle which makes use of them.

Nonetheless, the idea that Edwin had exerted overlordship in Scotland also naturally appealed to English thinking south of the Border. The Venerable Bede, whose 8th-century *Ecclesiastical History* is the most important primary source for the early Anglo-Saxon period, attributes to Edwin a form of overlordship over all of modern England and Wales, but even grander claims were made for the extent of his authority in later centuries – Alcuin, writing around 60 years after Bede, claimed that he had subjugated the Scots and Picts north of the Forth–Clyde line; this enhanced depiction of Edwin’s dominions contradicts a key point of the only reliable account of his reign, that provided by Bede, but it naturally appealed to Englishmen, and was regularly repeated by later writers such as William of Malmesbury, sometimes being used as blatant political propaganda.

In this context, the interests of Durham Cathedral have already been alluded to, a point which will be discussed in more detail below. The revival of the idea in the 1290s may also reflect English interests. In 1292, Edward I of England had commanded the monastic libraries of his kingdom to provide him with all the evidence they could find for historic English political overlordship in Scotland, and the knowledge of the ‘Edwin’s borough’ theory displayed by *Lanercost* was perhaps among the results of these events. This revival of interest probably also accounts for the allusion to the theory in the *White Book of Rhydderch*; this reflects the willingness of Welsh Cistercian monks to use English historiography to increase their knowledge of the world, and thus attests to the revived currency of the idea in the English intellectual milieu of the 14th century. The same knowledge may have informed the 1336 agreement in which a pretender to the Scottish throne secured English military support by agreeing to cede Edinburgh and all of south-west Scotland to England – English scholars probably believed that they were getting the area ‘back’.

Overall, however, the theory that Edwin founded Edinburgh had a relatively restricted circulation: to sum up, it appeared in the early 12th century, primarily in Durham, and enjoyed a renewed if somewhat restricted vogue in English intellectual circles during the late 13th and 14th centuries. It can be associated with the wider historical perception that Edwin was a powerful king who exercised overlordship in the north. The idea that a king's daughters were kept safe in the 'Castle of Maidens' recurs in the 16th-century *Scottorum Historia* of Hector Boece, though here the king in question is supposed to have been Pictish. The etymological story of 'Edwin's borough' also reappears in post-medieval antiquarian writing and was popularised by Sir Walter Scott – a theory that was certainly encouraged by a knowledge of some of the relevant medieval manuscripts. The theory has been expunged from academic history since the Victorian period, though it still recurs today in tourist guides.

The idea that Edwin founded Edinburgh Castle thus played a significant role in shaping the idea that Edinburgh's history had a formative Anglo-Saxon phase, defining the attitudes of medieval English scholars and British intellectuals of the 19th century; but, if we set it aside the story, it becomes apparent that there is surprisingly little real evidence for an Anglo-Saxon presence. There is certainly some place-name evidence and archaeology affirming Anglo-Saxon settlement in Lothian, but specific evidence for the castle and the capital is limited to four widely spaced chronicle references which can be said to provide a bare framework of history for Anglo-Saxon Edinburgh – though none of them mention any Anglo-Saxons in Edinburgh Castle at all.

The primary sources that refer to Edinburgh in the Anglo-Saxon period can be summarised very briefly before embarking on any detailed discussion of what they mean. As noted above, Bede asserts that King Edwin was overlord over 'all the Welsh', with his authority extending as far north as the Forth, a statement which might imply that he was overlord of Edinburgh in some sense.

Edwin was overthrown in 633 by a revolt of his Welsh and pagan vassals, but the ultimate victor of the ensuing civil war was another Christian Anglo-Saxon from Northumbria – Oswald, the head of a rival royal dynasty who had been in exile among the Picts and Scots during Edwin's reign; a few years into his reign, a siege of Edinburgh is mentioned – conventionally dated to 638, and conventionally explained as marking some sort of territorial annexation by Oswald. After 650, sources make clear that the Northumbrians were establishing monasteries and royal manors in Tweeddale and Lothian, and by the 670s an Anglo-Saxon bishopric had been established at Abercorn, a clear indicator that the area around Edinburgh was under Northumbrian control.

The Battle of Nechtansmere in 685 and the rapid decline of Northumbrian authority that followed brought the bishopric to an end, but Anglo-Saxon control in the area around Edinburgh is thought to have continued, based in part on place-name evidence, but primarily on the basis of a document which purports to be an overview of the diocese of Lindisfarne in to 854. This period of apparent stability was followed by the onslaught of the Vikings, piratical pagan invaders from Scandinavia, who waged campaigns of conquest and plunder against Northumbria, climaxing around 875 with the establishment of a new Viking kingdom based at York.

This narrative is heavily dependent on the 12th-century Durham source known as the *Historia Regnum*, referred to above as one of the earliest witnesses to the

'Edwin's borough' theory; although it evidently drew on evidence that is now lost to us, it also clearly reflects the attitudes of a period much later than the events it is describing, and much of its content is unsupported by contemporary evidence from the period in which these events took place.

The next mention of Edinburgh in an Anglo-Saxon context is notable for *not* being in this Durham source. In 934, King Athelstan, who had made himself king of all England and overlord of Wales, led an army against the Scots; the conventional interpretation of the campaign, based again on *Historia Regum*, has them marching as far as the Highlands, and sending a fleet to the very north of Scotland, but, in contrast with these claims, an Irish source states that they only reached Edinburgh, and achieved nothing of worth.

Finally, a Scottish source records the passing of Edinburgh under Scottish overlordship around AD 960, an event which is interpreted as marking the transition from the Anglo-Saxon period. This slim summary embodies the total narrative of Anglo-Saxon Edinburgh provided by the sources; but on close inspection even this sketchy outline becomes very indistinct indeed.

The most important observation that needs to be made about the nature of Edinburgh in this period is this: recent studies have tended to emphasise the multi-ethnic nature of military hegemony in the early medieval period. Allied territories often remained under their native rulers, and the contingents of troops they supplied were vital to maintaining the authority of the overlord; such relationships were generally advantageous to the allied territories, as they provided a strong peace-keeping deterrent against raiders or rebels, gave their leaders wider political influence as colleagues of the overlord, and provided their warriors with the opportunity for plunder. In the period when the area was unquestionably still 'Welsh', we have an allusion to an Anglo-Saxon nobleman named Wulfstan whose son fought in the local warband under Celtic hegemony, providing a hint at a complex ethnic situation. Thus, Edwin's overlordship in Lothian need not have meant anything more than a mutually beneficial alliance with local Welsh chiefs, and, given the fact that the Picts immediately to the north retained full independence, it is not at all clear whether Edwin's overlordship extended over Edinburgh itself. Uncertainty thus surrounds the issue of Edwin's authority at Edinburgh, and there is no reason to imagine that this was a period of direct Anglo-Saxon overlordship.

The earliest explicit reference that may relate to an Anglo-Saxon phase at Edinburgh relates to a siege in Oswald's reign. This is recorded in a group of medieval Irish histories known as the *Chronicle of Ireland* texts, which all derive from a lost sequence of contemporary annals made on Iona during the 7th and 8th centuries. This material mentions a 'siege of Eitin' in 638 or thereabout – dislocation between the different texts means that it is impossible to be entirely sure about the intended year, but there are reasons to feel confident that Edinburgh is the place being referred to. Firstly, Edinburgh, the *Eidyn* of the Gododdin, is the only obvious candidate location anywhere in the British Isles to which this place name might refer. Secondly, the reference to the siege forms the part of a small block of text within the chronicle, paired with a report of a battle in which a defeat was inflicted on the forces of Domnall Brecc, the ruler of the Gaelic-speaking kingdom of Dál Riata in the West Highlands: the textual linkage suggests a shared geographical and political context in northern Britain. In addition, sieges were not a regular feature of warfare in early medieval Ireland, and, when attacks on fortresses are recorded in the Iona chronicle, they tend to

be in Scotland and the north of England. We can thus be fairly confident that the fort on Castle Hill was besieged around 640, and that it was a significant enough event to attract the attention of the contemporary chronicler in Iona.

However, that is really all we know about this event. This siege of 638 has normally been interpreted as a marker for the transition between the early period of Welsh rule in Lothian, and a subsequent era of sustained Anglo-Saxon control, but in itself the chronicle tells us virtually nothing. Nor is it easy to infer the context. The besiegers are conventionally seen as the Anglo-Saxons of Northumbria, under their powerful new king Oswald, but the remarks above about the multi-ethnic nature of early medieval hegemony are equally applicable for Oswald, a Hebridean-educated Anglo-Saxon whose key advisor was an Irish bishop, and whose nephew became king of the Picts. Even if one side in the siege was allied to Oswald, it does not follow that they were necessarily Anglo-Saxons themselves. We know nothing certain about who was defending the fortress, or who was besieging them, or even who won (*ES* i. 164). The preceding reference to a defeat inflicted on Domnall Brecc of Dál Riata might suggest that this was also an attack on Dál Riata's allies, but it is unclear whether they were aligned with Oswald or opposed to him, and the connection may simply be that both battles happened in Scotland in the same year.

In short, this reference indicates that a precursor of Edinburgh Castle was an important fortress within the military geography of northern Britain in the mid-7th century, and that a siege there disturbed the relative peace of the later 630s, but it tells us nothing certain beyond that. Recent interpretations emphasising the multi-ethnic and federal nature of 7th-century military and political hegemony would suggest that, even if the battle *was* related to the stabilisation of Oswald's overlordship, it might still have been a battle in which a local Welsh chieftain defended or recaptured the castle.

Nonetheless, Bede's narrative does indicate Northumbrian political expansion in the Borders in the third quarter of the 7th century. Whatever the exact situation had been in Oswald's reign, his brother and successor, King Oswiu, gradually adopted a more hard-line political attitude towards his northern neighbours, and this attitude assumed militant force in the reign of Oswiu's son King Ecgrith. There is also clear evidence for Anglo-Saxon settlement in the Borders: around 650, a monastery was founded beside the Roman fort at Newstead, and in 655, Oswiu gave lands straddling the modern Anglo-Scottish Border to the Church (Barrow, (2003), pp 22, 120). By 672, there was another monastery at St Abb's Head, and by 680, an Anglo-Saxon royal official presided at Dunbar; by now, the imperial ambitions of Northumbria had assumed the character of military conquest under Ecgrith, and by 681, an Anglo-Saxon bishop was installed in another monastery at Abercorn to the west of Edinburgh, claiming diocesan authority over the Picts to the north.

We can thus infer that Anglo-Saxon control of the area around Edinburgh was regarded as tolerably secure by c.680, and late sources suggest that a nunnery may have even been founded on the Castle Rock itself, centred on a church which was later rebuilt into the extant **St Margaret's Chapel**. This claim is very hard to evaluate, as it is only preserved in 12th-century material that conflates evidence from multiple different sources, but it provides another possible explanation for the 'Castle of Maidens' name, and it might suggest that Anglo-Saxon control was strong enough for the fortress to be de-militarised and converted into a religious foundation. At the very least, the story suggests that St Margaret's Chapel was

already regarded as a very old building in the reign of David I, requiring a reconsideration of its conventional dating.

This pattern of local churches may have also played a role in the spread of Anglo-Saxon language and culture, by encouraging a pattern of social interaction and education in which these traits came to be regarded as useful and desirable, without directly associating acculturation with political subordination.

However, the military ascendancy which facilitated this expansion was very short-lived; Anglo-Saxon control in the area around Edinburgh may not have been secure until about 680 and was abruptly ended by a military defeat at the hands of the Picts in 685. The limits of Northumbrian power contracted sharply, and the bishop promptly abandoned Abercorn for Yorkshire, suggesting that English authority was no longer tenable in the immediate hinterland of Edinburgh. The **monastery at St Abb's Head, burnt down in 682, was certainly not rebuilt before the 730s, if at all, a further indicator of a reduced Anglo-Saxon presence.**

Direct evidence for Anglo-Saxon authority in the area after 685 is tenuous. A later chronicle mentions a battle between the Northumbrians and the Picts near Falkirk in 711, but this tells us nothing specific about where the frontier lay, as Anglo-Saxon armies were certainly capable of campaigning well beyond their own frontiers, raiding Anglesey and Ireland.

Some level of continued Anglo-Saxon presence appears to be indicated by a chronicle reference which records the obituary of a hermit named Balthere in 756, who is equated with St Baldred of the Bass, the local holy man of the area of East Lothian between North Berwick and Dunbar where the most intense concentration of Anglo-Saxon archaeological evidence and place names is located. However, Balthere and Baldred are two different names, and, though it is possible that one has been superseded with another, it is also possible that two distinct individuals have become muddled up: all we know for certain about Balthere is that he originated in York and left to seek a place for prayerful solitude.

If this did indeed lead him to East Lothian, it does not necessarily follow that there was any significant Anglo-Saxon settlement or political control there at this date. Moreover, the earliest reference to offer any hint at the location of Balthere's hermitage associates him with Billfrith, the hermit who produced the jewelled metal covers which originally enclosed the Lindisfarne Gospels, and who is generally thought to have been based at Lindisfarne Cathedral's own hermitage in the Farne Islands. While it would be unwise to rule out the accuracy of the traditional narrative, it is quite unclear what it would mean in terms of political control and settlement-patterns, and there are reasons, to be discussed more fully below, to be somewhat suspicious of the 12th-century assertion that Balthere was the East Lothian saint who is better known today as Baldred.

The documented history of Northumbrian settlement near Edinburgh after 685 thus consists of a single hermit, at best. After this, the sources fall silent until the 9th century.

Place names and archaeology provide an alternative body of evidence for Anglo-Saxon settlement in Lothian. Bede gives the Anglo-Saxon name of *Penneltun* for a settlement a few miles west of Edinburgh, while Anglo-Saxon sculpture of this period survives at Abercorn, as well as Aberlady and Tynningham, and a small Anglo-Saxon weaving-shed has been excavated on a settlement site at Ratho,

also to the west of the city (Smith (1995), pp 101–11, 115–17). In East Lothian, a series of highly informative place names combine with substantial material evidence to indicate an important concentration of early settlement: the area is centred on Aldhame, the ‘old settlement’, surrounded by secondary settlements at Tynningham, Whittingehame and Coldingham, and the lost *Pefferham and *Liningham (near Aberlady and East Linton), followed by outlying settlements at North Berwick, Hedderwick and Innerwick.

In part, the archaeological evidence can be tied to Anglo-Saxon expansion – the sculptures at Abercorn are certainly connected with the short-lived bishopric of the early 680s; but the legacy of this brief period of Northumbrian expansionism is not necessarily evidence of a longer-term Anglo-Saxon presence; at Ratho, the evidence for settlement is complicated by dating indicators which suggest that it took place at a very early date, when we would expect the area to be under Romano-Celtic overlordship: however, the allusion to Wulfstan in *Y Gododdin* certainly shows that it was possible for an Anglo-Saxon component to be accommodated in the population under Welsh rule, and this minority may have included weavers as well as warriors.

The East Lothian place-name evidence is also more complex than it appears. For one thing, East Lothian is not Edinburgh, and this orthodox pattern of Anglo-Saxon place names is distinctive precisely because of its lack of parallels elsewhere in the area. Moreover, while the name-form pattern in *-ham*, *-ingham* and *-wic* is entirely conventional, some doubts have been raised about the conventional assumption that the *-ingham* names belong as early as the 7th century, and it is also noteworthy that the names of *Pefferham, Tynningham and perhaps *Liningham take as their root the Welsh names of local geographical features – the Peffer Burn, the East Lothian Tyne and the falls and pool of the Linton Linn; Coldingham, too, seems to derive from the name of its river, now the Court Burn but historically the Cole, while Bede’s form *Urbs Coludi* shows that this is not Anglo-Saxon *ceald*, ‘cold’ or *col*, ‘coal’; it may be the Welsh *caled*, ‘hard’. Even more strikingly, Innerwick appears to contain the Gaelic *inbhir*, ‘river-mouth’, ‘confluence’ – a name-element which itself was probably introduced under Scottish hegemony no earlier than c. AD 850, and thus indicates that this ‘early’ English name was generated at a comparably late date, probably in the 10th or 11th century. The most important secular centre in the area, Dunbar, has never lost its Welsh name.

Around Edinburgh Castle itself, there is certainly a matrix of reasonably early English place names: Broughton, the Kirkton of St Cuthbert’s, the valley of the Dean and at least one outlier at Liberton – but this group of names may have been caused by the influx of exiled Anglo-Saxon noblemen after 1066, followed by the recruitment of Anglo-Norman knights and merchants in the 12th century, and the central name of the group, that of Edinburgh itself, is certainly only a partial translation of an older Celtic one. Liberton, ‘subordinate settlement on the slope’, may likewise be a doublet of a nearby settlement with the most common of all Pictish place names, Pittendreich.

Many other places now in Edinburgh’s suburbs, such as Gorgie, Dalry, Inverleith and Craigmillar, retain toponyms of unambiguously Celtic etymology. Others have lost their original Celtic names at relatively late dates. Duddingston had a Welsh name until after 1150, while Calton Hill did not lose its old Celtic name of Cragingalt until the 16th century – and even the modern name, superficially a *-tun* form, appears to be a post-medieval reinterpretation of a purely Celtic word. The

names of Crichton, Gilmerton and Liston show the *-ton* suffix being applied in a landscape where the names of both people and places remained Celtic. Where names are purely English, such as Canonmills, Grange or Boroughmuir, they appear to have originated after 1100 (and, strictly speaking, Grange is not English but French). Perhaps most significantly of all, there are no obvious examples of Celticising names based on English forms, comparable to Bonjedward and *Inverwedale in the Borders, which we would expect to find if the Welsh and Gaelic settlements of the 10th and 11th centuries had superimposed themselves on a solid foundation of Anglo-Saxon toponymy. A detailed survey would be necessary to resolve these questions, but a cursory evaluation suggests that, at the least, the toponym around Edinburgh cannot be used to *prove* early Anglo-Saxon settlement in the area.

The *Historia Regum* or 'History of the Kings' has been mentioned above as one of the early sources for the 'Edwin's borough' etymological fallacy. The passage in question is part of the chronicle's entry for the year 854, and if it is genuine, it is by far the earliest reference to Edinburgh under its modern name. However, evaluating the actual historical value of this passage is not easy. The *Historia Regum* is a complex text: its opening section down to AD 731 is based largely on Bede's *Ecclesiastical History*, completed in that year, followed by a unique Northumbrian chronicle from 732 to 804 presumably derived from contemporary records added to an early manuscript of Bede's work. Next follows a section spanning the years 804 to 957, which is very largely derived from Asser's *Life of King Alfred* and the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*, although it incorporates a little Northumbrian material. This is followed by a section described as the 'Recapitulation', which overlaps with the previous section from 848 to 957 and has very little original content at all; finally, there is a chronicle from 957 onwards known as the 'Continuation', attributed to Turgot by one Scottish source, but probably continued by Symeon of Durham, to whom the overall compilation in its current form has been attributed since the 12th century.

The reference to Edinburgh stands near the beginning of the 'Recapitulation'. After recording the consecration of Eardulf as Bishop of Lindisfarne, the text proceeds to list what its author asserts were the lands of the diocese at that date - these include Lindisfarne and Norham, a core diocese between the Tweed and Tyne, a vast western tract including Carlisle and everything else beyond the Pennines, apparently claimed as a vast territorial lordship rather than simply a pastoral jurisdiction, and a long list of places in between the River Tweed and the Firth of Forth. After enumerating half a dozen sites such as Melrose and Jedburgh in the Borders, the text moves to a series of locations along the Forth from west to east - the passage with which we are particularly concerned here - before moving back again to add territory in northern England.

The first problem with this passage concerns the way that Edinburgh is mentioned. The manuscript punctuates the text as if it should read 'Abercorn on the west side, [then] Edinburgh, and Pefferham', and so on (*Eoriercorn ad occidentalem partem, Edwinesburch, et Pefferham*: Rollason (1998a), pp 148-9), but the more natural interpretation of the Latin would simply be 'Abercorn on the west of Edinburgh', followed by Pefferham and the rest (Woolf (2007), pp 67, 82, respects the punctuation, while it is ignored by *SAEC*, p 60, n. 4; Aird (1998), p 15). This uncertainty obviously affects the interpretation of the passage: should it be regarded as laying direct claim to Edinburgh as a one-time dependency of

Lindisfarne, or is the reference is simply being used to explain the location of Abercorn, and perhaps implicitly to claim that Edinburgh lay within the historic frontiers of Anglo-Saxon Northumbria?

The second problem concerns the value of the passage as genuine evidence for the mid-9th century. It has long been recognised that this text is connected to attempts by the 12th-century clergy of Durham Cathedral to assert their authority over lands that they believed were rightfully theirs, but its full implication as a piece of narrative has not been fully appreciated. The survey of 854 is not simply a helpful outline of the territory of the diocese at a random date, provided by a disinterested contemporary historian and preserved by a 12th-century copyist who found it useful – it serves as a textual introduction to a chronicle with a very deliberate structure: the next entry jumps forward a dozen years and records the start of a Viking onslaught in the 860s, and it climaxes in 875 when ‘they destroyed all the monasteries’, leading to the exiling of the monks of Lindisfarne, and eventually, as the author and his intended audience knew, to their permanent settlement at Durham in AD 995. This is combined with an orthodox political narrative recording how Alfred the Great, the ruler of the kingdom of Wessex in southern England, defeated the Vikings, and how his heirs expanded their territory by conquest to become the kings of all the English, and waged wars to assert themselves as overlords of the Welsh, the Vikings and the Scots as well.

There is virtually no other original material in the ‘Recapitulation’ – its basic framework is adapted from William of Malmesbury’s chronicle, written around 1120, and it also borrows material from other 12th-century sources, as well as from the preceding part of the *Historia Regum* itself, which is in turn based very largely on known sources. The text in its current form is clearly late and composite in nature, and the use of the fanciful but politically significant ‘Edwin’s borough’ name form raises further questions about its accuracy. While it might be based to some extent on genuine material, in its present form it represents the perception of the past held by the monks of Durham Cathedral around the 1120s, and in that context the reference to Edinburgh could be simply a geographical marker placed there for the benefit of a 12th-century audience, to explain where Abercorn was located, and to remind them of the idea that King Edwin had extended Anglo-Saxon rule as far as Edinburgh.

This analysis has two important implications for our understanding of the Anglo-Saxon phase at Edinburgh – not only does it remove any confidence about the reference to Edinburgh as an Anglo-Saxon settlement in 854, it also removes the wider framework of narrative that has been inferred to indicate an Anglo-Saxon continuity in Lothian until that date.

The only reliable reference to events in south-east Scotland in the 9th century relates to the activities of Kenneth mac Ailpín, a king based north of the Forth who was later remembered as the founder of Scotland’s enduring royal dynasty: he is said to have conducted six campaigns against the Anglo-Saxons around the year 850, capturing Melrose and burning Dunbar: this reference would be entirely compatible with a political frontier located south of the Lammermuirs, and **certainly suggests that Northumbria’s northern frontier was subject to punishing military pressure from the north before the Viking raids of the late 860s.**

In the 10th century, Anglo-Saxon authority in northern England was represented by a dynasty based at Bamburgh on the coast of Northumberland, who do not seem to have ruled as independent kings, and who may have acknowledged

Scottish royal overlordship. They were isolated from the other Anglo-Saxon territories by the powerful Viking kingdom established at York – initially they were isolated by a swathe of Viking territory extending as far south as Leicester and London; but over the course of the 9th century the royal dynasty of Wessex, the heirs of Alfred the Great, waged campaigns to establish themselves kings of all England

In this context, we find another reference to Edinburgh in an Anglo-Saxon context.

In 934, King Athelstan of England led a campaign against the Scots. This campaign is recorded in a variety of sources that differ considerably from one another in what they say, and it is relevant here as one of these sources mentions Edinburgh – an Irish chronicle known as *The Annals of Clonmacnoise*, which now survives only in the form of a 17th-century English translation. This records that Athelstan ‘preyed & spoyled the kingdom of Scotland to Edenburrogh, & yett the Scottishmen compelled him to return without any great victory’ (*Clonmacnoise*, p 149).

The *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* notes that that the English king ‘went to Scotland with a land army and a naval fleet, and he raided across much territory’, without recording any more specific results. A contemporary document shows that the Scottish king Constantine briefly came south with Athelstan, and attended a political assembly at Glastonbury, where he seems to have outranked all of the English king’s Anglo-Saxon and Welsh vassals.

Two other sources which add extra information on the campaign are both from Durham, and both appear to contradict the Irish source’s reference to Edinburgh. The *Historia Regum* claims that Athelstan ‘subjugated the enemy: with the land army, he laid Scotland waste as far as Dunottar and the Highlands, while everywhere as far as Caithness was depopulated by the fleet’. Symeon’s *Libellus de Exordio* is even grander, although less specific about geography: ‘putting to flight king Owen of the Cumbrians and king Constantine of the Scots, with armies by land and sea, he conquered Scotland, making it subject to him’.

Historians have tended to regard the *Historia Regum* as accurate. If they mention the contrasting evidence of *Clonmacnoise*, they tend to assume that the name of Dunottar has simply been mistranslated, based on the assumption that an army which reached the Highlands while coordinating with a fleet ought to have arrived there. However, this is pure speculation, and several strands of evidence raise doubts about the accuracy of the accepted version.

The reference in the *Historia Regum* appears both in the ‘Recapitulation’ and in the preceding chronicle-section – in both texts, it is one of the very few entries with original material, and is also evidently a modification of the passage in the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*. This in itself indicates that the additional information has been added to the base text and raises questions about its origin.

The *Libellus* can be shown to be inaccurate by the contemporary charter record – Constantine did not flee but came south to negotiate and was accorded precedence over all of Athelstan’s subordinates. Even the existence of King Owen can be questioned – he was named by William of Malmesbury, but this may be a confusion with the ruler of Gwent; independent evidence for the existence of an important Welsh king named Owen is provided by two records of political

assemblies held by Athelstan, in which a ruler named Eugenius (the Latin equivalent of Owen) outranks the Welsh king Hywel Dda, who was generally Athelstan's most important ally; but, while this does suggest that Eugenius was someone important, it does not directly show that he was ruler of Strathclyde. We know that the Welsh of Strathclyde were ruled by a king named Dwyfnal in the 920s and 940s, and Owen's supposed reign has required a somewhat convoluted interpretation of the regnal list; it would perhaps be easier if he was discarded, along with the rest of the source that asserts his presence as ruler of Strathclyde. The Eugenius of the charters might be an Irish or Breton ruler, and, even if he was a northern prince, the charters show that the historical Eugenius did not flee from Athelstan, but was accorded high precedence, a point which emphasises the unreliability of the hostile narrative.

The *Clonmacnoise* entry is hardly the most reliable source either, given the late date of the extant text and the fact that it is a translation out of the original language. Nonetheless, it does seem to be an independent source, and there is no sign of the sort of systematic editing which characterises the Durham material. The question is whether the reference to Edinburgh can be accepted – the locale fits with the theory voiced by some modern historians that the campaign of 934 concerned the dynastic succession in Northumbria. In this context, Edinburgh would make a logical endpoint for the campaign – though it is surprising that an army advancing 'on Scotland' would only get as far as Edinburgh, suggesting that Lothian may have *already* been perceived as under Scottish control by this date.

There is one last possible reference to an Anglo-Saxon presence at Edinburgh. Around AD 960, according to a text known as the *Poppleton Chronicle*, 'Edinburgh was abandoned, and has been left to the Scots until today'. The source is another 12th-century compilation assembled from several older histories that are no longer extant, and although its outlook is broadly Scottish, both in terms of the origins of its sources and the allegiances of the compiler, the phrasing of this particular remark suggests that it was taken from a non-Scottish source (Woolf (2007), pp 193–5).

As noted above, most historians have inclined towards the view that the forces who withdrew from Edinburgh at this point were English, and, notwithstanding the hesitations expressed above, some form of Anglian continuity is certainly credible. On the other hand, the wider context shows that the northern ambitions of the new English monarchy suffered a reverse around 960 – Athelstan's successors had established a man called Osulf as a viceroy over all of northern England, but he disappears from the records at this point, and his vast province promptly split back into its two components, separate Anglian and Viking lordships based at Bamburgh and York. If the disappearance of an English garrison from Edinburgh around 960 should be associated with the collapse of Osulf's authority, then the existence of that garrison in the first place was primarily an expression of contemporary West Saxon empire-building; and, if that was the case, it need not have been there for more than a few years – perhaps they had been installed by Athelstan in 934, but the Scottish frontier can hardly have been a military priority for the English until the Viking army in Yorkshire was defeated in 954.

Alternatively, it is equally possible that the defenders who left Edinburgh around 960 were not English at all, but Welsh (Woolf (2007), pp 194–5). Throughout the period, local Welsh rulers had retained control of a kingdom on the Clyde, and they are likely to have remained aware that Edinburgh was the *Eidyn* of Y

Gododdin. Moreover, there is convincing evidence to show that at some point around the 9th or 10th century they had been able to significantly expand their territorial control at the expense of the English, advancing south to reconquer Carlisle and the Lake District, and eastwards to the shores of the North Sea, even into the area of heavy Anglo-Saxon settlement in East Lothian, where a significant new stratum of Welsh place names was established. With this in mind, Welsh control of Edinburgh in the 950s seems as credible as English occupation, and there is one further piece of evidence suggesting a dispute for control of the area in which the English were playing no part: in 971, around a decade after the Scots gained Edinburgh, a Welsh prince killed the Scottish king Cuilén 'in Lothian'. In addition, within the context of the *Poppleton Chronicle*, the unusual non-Scottish perspective from which this note is written would perhaps be more likely to be Welsh than English.

A date around 960 seems to mark the point at which Edinburgh came under permanent Scottish control – but we cannot be sure whether this represented the end of local Anglian political continuity stretching back to pre-Viking Northumbria, the ousting of an isolated frontier garrison established a few years earlier by the new English monarchy, or simply a local conflict with the Welsh inhabitants of the region. What we can say for sure is that this period saw a strong Welsh resurgence in Lothian, and this raises questions about the credibility of long-term English political control at Edinburgh during the 10th century.

When Edinburgh emerges into documented history again, in the years around 1100, it is a long way north of the Border, and firmly under Scottish political control.

Considering the general lack of reliable evidence, it is still possible that a precursor of Edinburgh Castle was an Anglo-Saxon frontier fortress for over 300 years, from the 630s until the late 10th century, and that this period laid the foundations for the enduring patterns of language and society in the area by introducing Old English and the settlement pattern embodied by the East Lothian place names; but it is also possible that Anglo-Saxon control was limited to a brief occupation in the 670s and 680s. The area of Anglo-Saxon settlement around Tynningham and Coldingham is more significant but does not directly indicate anything about the situation 20 or 30 miles to the west.

At Edinburgh itself, what appears far more clearly in our sources is evidence for a *belief* in an appropriately English past among Anglo-Saxon immigrants in the decades after 1066. That evidence also contains a number of anachronistic details which make it clear that the belief in question was not entirely justified. At least to some extent, it was an act of purest wishful thinking.

APPENDIX 2: THE CASTLE OF MAIDENS

In many medieval sources, Edinburgh appears under the alternative name ‘Castle of Maidens’. This name was in use from the reign of David I onwards, first appearing in Scottish royal documents around 1140 (*David I*, No. 70). It came to be widely adopted in Latin, and as *Chastel as Pucelles* it seems to have become Edinburgh’s usual name in medieval French.

This name seems to embody an enigmatic allusion to a story about the castle, but it is hard to know exactly what it originally meant, as the various hints and statements in the sources are rather contradictory. This appendix will survey the evidence relating to the ‘Castle of Maidens’ name and the various tales associated with it – and, in doing so, it will survey another closely related topic, Edinburgh Castle’s association with the Arthurian legends.

The only source to offer an entirely explicit explanation for the ‘Castle of Maidens’ name is the *Chronicle of Lanercost*, written in northern England around 1300, which claims that King Edwin of Northumbria had built the castle in the 7th century AD, and placed his daughters there to keep them safe – this cannot be trusted as a historical claim, as it is closely associated with the spurious idea that Edinburgh was ‘Edwin’s borough’ (see Appendix 1: Anglo-Saxon Edinburgh?), but it may in some way have reflected a popular tradition – by the 16th century, the story was being told with reference to the daughters of the Pictish kings.

Another very different explanation is hinted at in the *Life of St Monenna*, which claims that St Margaret’s Chapel had originally been the church of a 7th-century nunnery on the Castle Rock. This is a comparatively early source, dating no later than 1114 x 1150, and it thus provides an insight into how the castle’s past was viewed in the reign of David I. But, although it was heavily based on older sources, it seems to combine material from various different traditions, working from the central premise that the Irish abbess St Monenna of Killeavy was identical to St Modwenna of Burton-on-Trent, and introducing marked chronological inconsistencies: the origin of the Scottish material it contains is particularly hard to analyse (see Appendix 1: Anglo-Saxon Edinburgh?).

A third possibility is a simple misunderstanding: medieval Welsh lore mentioned a place called *Pen Rhionnydd*, which was regarded as King Arthur’s northern capital, and the seat of an archbishopric. The name is intelligible as the Welsh equivalent of *Cenn Rigmonaid*, the Gaelic name for St Andrews in Fife, but it came to be interpreted as *Pen Rhionedd*, ‘headland of maidens’, and it is possible that the name was relocated to identify Edinburgh after its original meaning and location had been forgotten.

Outside of local documents, the earliest explicit use of the ‘Castle of Maidens’ name occurs in a passing reference in the *Historia Regum Britanniae*, a seminal telling of the Arthurian legend by the early Oxford scholar Geoffrey of Monmouth. This is a work of Tolkienesque fantasy dressed up as history, and in one of the various passages used to create an illusion of verisimilitude Geoffrey claims that one of his fictional characters, King Ebraucus, built ‘the town of Mount Agned, which is now called the Castle of Maidens and the Dolorous Mount’. The name of ‘Mount Agned’ is taken from the older text known as the *Historia Brittonum*, and Geoffrey could probably do no more than guess at its location; but the ‘Castle of

Maidens' and 'Dolorous Mount' are more relevant. These are evidently names which Geoffrey did expect his readers to recognise, which he used to identify the location to which he was applying the fanciful name of 'Mount Agned' – but it is not clear at first sight if Edinburgh was the place he meant.

Scholars have disagreed about whether this literary reference pre-dates the local equation of Edinburgh with the 'Castle of Maidens'. The great Arthurian scholar Sheridan Loomis suggested that the identification of Edinburgh as the 'Castle of Maidens' was originally invented by Breton troubadours earlier in the 12th century, and that it gained widespread popularity due to Geoffrey of Monmouth's work (Loomis (1955), pp 8-9), but the Scottish historian A. A. M. Duncan has been rather more cautious, being prepared to accept the identification of Edinburgh as the Castle of Maidens post-dated Geoffrey of Monmouth, and was simply an attempt to glamorise the city by cashing in on the popularity of Arthurian fiction.

The second name used by Geoffrey, 'Dolorous Mount', provides important evidence to resolve the uncertainty. A single source corroborates the local use of this name at Edinburgh: in the early 1170s, William, Abbot of Holyrood, appears in his monastery's chronicle as *Willelmus abbas de Monte Doloroso* (ESSH ii. 275; the subsequent misidentification of the prelate in question as William, Abbot of Melrose is corrected by Anderson (1953), p 71). The association of the name with Holyrood rather than with the burgh or the castle seems to point towards the identification of the 'Dolorous Mount' with Arthur's Seat. I would suggest the 'Dolorous Mount' is a mistranslation of the name of Salisbury Crags, interpreting it rather fancifully as 'Sorrow's hill' (which would be *sorhes beoruh* in 12th-century Middle English) rather than the correct 'Willow brae' (Middle English *seales bra*).¹⁴ The renewed local connection provided by the Holyrood reference, and the possibility that the name has a specific etymological source in Salisbury Crags, significantly strengthens the probability that Geoffrey of Monmouth was referring to Edinburgh.

The combination of the two names, 'Castle of Maidens' and 'Dolorous Mount', are also found in a shared context within other Arthurian legends not used by Geoffrey of Monmouth. Both names are specifically associated with a widespread tale in which the heroine is rescued from a castle, where she is either being imprisoned or besieged by a hostile king. Probably the earliest depiction of this tale is in a sculpture above the north doorway at Modena Cathedral in Italy, where King Arthur is shown leading his knights to rescue a maiden who is probably Queen Guinevere from a castle where she is besieged or imprisoned by a villain and his henchmen.

Scholars have reconstructed an influential 12th-century version of the story; the hero was Sir Yder, saving the Castle of Maidens from a villainous King Caradoc (they appear on the Modena carving as 'Isdernus' and the villainous 'Carado', and are evidently based on Welsh prototypes named Edern and Caradog). In the earliest version of this story, the besieged heroine was evidently Queen Guinevere herself, and Yder was her lover, occupying a role similar to that later filled by Lancelot – the relationship is alluded to in the early poem known as the 'Berne *Folie Tristan*', and even on the Modena sculpture, where the fact that Yder rides into battle without armour reflects the fact that he had been on a romantic walk with the queen when she was kidnapped (the point is later made more explicit in the tale of *Durmart le Gallois*). The surviving 13th-century version of the Yder story known as the *Roman d'Yder* replaces Guinevere with a princess called Guenloie in the key section relating to the siege, but nonetheless leaves the rest of the

framework intact. The 'Castle of Maidens' name is used in the *Roman d'Yder*, but when the story is alluded to in the tale of *Erec et Enide* the hero is called 'Sir Yder of the Dolorous Mount', tying the two names together once again.

Another written version focuses not on Sir Yder, but on the better-known Sir Gawain, who appears in the posse on the Modena sculpture as 'Gavaginus'. In the Latin tale *De Ortu Waluuanii*, probably written in the late 12th century, a villainous pagan king successfully besieges and destroys the Castle of Ladies and captures the lady who owns it, but as the villain marches away he is defeated in a climactic battle in the shadow of the Antonine Wall. Here again, the geography suggests that the author had Edinburgh in mind.

Another version of the story, clearly defined from the rest, makes no explicit mention of Edinburgh or the 'Castle of Maidens' at all, but is highly relevant nonetheless, since it tells of how Sir Yvain defeats the Black Knight and marries his widow, the Lady of Lothian – this version represents an authentic Celtic tradition located geographically in the Lothians, and its hero and heroine are Owein Rheged and St Enoch, the parents of St Kentigern. In the definitive version by Chretien de Troyes, the 'palace' of the Lady of Lothian, with its portcullis gate at the head of a narrow approach suitable only for one or two riders at a time, is an apt description of the entrance to Edinburgh before the approach road was widened in 1339 to allow the passage of large bodies of horsemen.

In the Breton *lai* of *Doon*, the Castle of Ladies is explicitly identified as *Danebroc*, i.e. Edinburgh, although this story has a looser resemblance to the original versions, as the heroine in the castle is a feminist serial killer who does not seem to be threatened by anyone. In *Fergus*, written in Scotland in the 1190s, the *Castiel as Puceles* is again Edinburgh, but it merely provides a night's lodging on the journey from Lothian to Queensferry: the besieged heroine is located at Roxburgh, and *Mont Dolerous* is the Roman fort at Newstead near Melrose (Loomis (1953), p 11).

Even in the early material, duplicate tales complicate the matter – after marrying the Lady of Lothian, Sir Yvain liberates another castle where the maidens are forced to work in a sweatshop weaving factory, while Durmart le Gallois, having assisted Yder in the rescue of Guinevere from the Castle of Maidens, goes on to rescue the Queen of Ireland and her ladies-in-waiting from a besieged castle in Limerick. In later Arthurian material, the connections tend to break down even further. The 'Dolorous Mount' and 'Castle of Maidens' appear in various versions of the Grail Legend, though they seem to have lost any connection to any specific geographical location – in the German *Parzival*, 'Clarissa of Edinburgh' is one of the maidens of the castle, but her name seems no more obviously relevant than that of her companion, 'Garschiloye of Greenland'.

It is nonetheless possible to reconstruct something of the context in which the 'Castle of Maidens' name was understood in the 12th century, in which Guinevere was kidnapped by a villainous king based at Edinburgh, and rescued by Arthur and his knights, including her lover Sir Yder. If the 'Dolorous Mount' was a misinterpretation of the name of Salisbury Crags, the story seems to have partially been shaped by the local geography, and, by a similar fancy, Edinburgh itself could be regarded as 'Yder's borough'. Neither of these suggestions is etymologically realistic, but they do suggest a clear localisation of the tale at Edinburgh – and, if Salisbury Crags correspond to the 'Dolorous Mount', it seems plausible that Arthur's Seat was the ancient 'Castle of Ladies', and Yder was

perhaps imagined founding Edinburgh after destroying it and rescuing the heroine. The name of 'Arthur's Seat' may even reflect an early stratum of the legend in which Arthur was the oppressive king from whom Guinevere required rescuing.

The version of the tale involving Yder was not the only one, however: on the one hand, the concept of the Castle of Maidens became generic to accommodate Sir Gawain or Sir Fergus, while conversely, the geographically well-defined story of Sir Yvain and the Lady of Lothian also implicitly revolved around Edinburgh. It is this version involving Yvain which provides the clearest evidence that the story of the Castle of Maidens embodied older local legends, derived from the Welsh-speaking tradition of poetry and legend which once flourished in southern Scotland – Sir Yder's most likely archetype, Edern ap Nudd, also seems to be placed by Welsh genealogists in this area. At the very least, the way the names of both the 'Dolorous Mount' and 'Castle of Maidens' are used in the *Historia Regum Britanniae* suggests that the localisation of the story in Edinburgh had already taken place by the 1130s, and the castle shown on the Modena sculpture could even be argued to be the earliest extant depiction of Edinburgh.

Nonetheless, although the concept of the 'Castle of Maidens' came into focus in the 12th century, in the form of an Arthurian tale which imagined the rescue of Queen Guinevere taking place within the real geography of Edinburgh, this clarity of narrative was fleeting: the story seems to have been drawn together from a variety of different sources, and the 'Castle of Maidens' name may even have been associated in some way with an Anglo-Saxon nunnery that had no Arthurian connotations at all. Even in the 13th century, the integrity of the story was breaking down, with elements of its plot and setting being freely borrowed and adapted into new geographical and narrative structures. While Edinburgh, as the 'Castle of Maidens', has some claim to be the prototype of the Grail Castle, there is no evidence that the developed concept of the Grail Castle was ever equated with Edinburgh.

The clearest legacy of the story was the perpetuation of an alternative name for Edinburgh, which soon acquired alternative explanations – but this name may have been assimilated to the legend from a source which originally had nothing to do with the Arthurian legends, and, given the fluidity of the narratives involved, it may have originally had nothing to do with Edinburgh Castle, either.

APPENDIX 3: THE INVENTORIES OF 1282, 1291 AND 1296

One insight that has emerged in the course of the research for this project is the realisation that Edinburgh Castle enjoyed immense symbolic significance in the late 13th century. Perhaps the strongest indicators of this status are provided by the inventories of the royal treasures and state archives kept there. These reveal that the castle served as the king's treasure house, storing valuable objects, both secular and sacred, and also as a central repository of administrative documents.

The precious objects and priceless relics, displayed in the public ceremonies of the chamber, hall and the chapel, embodied the grandeur of the monarchy; while the cache of parchments naturally had a practical role in recording Scotland's treaty relations with foreign governments and documenting the structure of property, revenue and law within the kingdom, but precisely because they served as a body of legal proof and practical reference material to facilitate the exercise of royal authority, the documents too were elevated into a symbolic statement of the king's power.

To the historian, these inventories have great value – they present an impression of both the splendour of the 13th-century Scottish court, and a glimpse of the administrative role which the castle performed at this time. Nor is their importance entirely limited to this specific chronological period – no other inventories of comparable importance survive before 1488, and, when taken as a group, they provide the single most comprehensive overview of the contents of the King's House at any point in the Middle Ages.

It is thus surprising that the inventories have been relatively neglected – it seems that none of them has ever been fully translated into English, and, although historians are aware of their existence, there appears to have been little detailed consultation of the texts since the 19th century. The tendency has been to consult them to answer questions prompted by other material, rather than to present them on their own terms as a guide to the wider context.¹⁵

The first inventory consists simply of a list of archived documents. It was made on 29 September 1282 by a trio of royal bureaucrats, apparently just because it was thought useful to have an up-to-date list. The original Latin text is published in the first volume of the *Acts of the Parliament of Scotland* and is translated here on the basis of that text.

A new pair of inventories was made on 23 August 1291, enumerating both valuables and documents. This was a product of the agreement which allowed the King of England to arbitrate the disputed succession to the Scottish throne and preceded the removal of the treasury from the castle to be placed in a secure and neutral place of storage at Berwick-upon-Tweed. The whole consignment evidently returned to the castle around the start of 1293 and may have been joined there by additional treasures as war with England loomed.

A third group of inventories was made when the Scottish garrison surrendered to the English in September 1296, after the complete military collapse of John Balliol's regime. Once again, separate inventories were made of documents and valuables – essentially cargo manifests, drawn up at Berwick in advance of shipping them south to England; but it is clear that some of the most important objects had been brought directly to Edward I, including the massive solid gold

sceptre of the Scottish kings, and these are only recorded in a separate inventory made on 16 November 1296, along with a selection of objects which had by now been transferred from the Berwick inventory. In subsequent inventories, the English bureaucracy charted the fate of the precious objects from the treasury – two glimpses in inventories of 16 November 1303 and 17 July 1307, which show the objects that King Edward kept about his person are translated here.

At the time of the peace treaty of 1328, it seems the English were required to return a number of the most valuable and symbolic items. These will be discussed individually below. The fate of the documents is less clear. Although Joseph Bain attempted to argue that they were left in Berwick,¹⁶ his own research disproved this, as he calendared a document recording the prompt dispatch of ‘a great coffer and two small coffers’ of documents south with the jewels in September 1296. Some of the documents did either remain in Scotland or return there, as some 13th-century royal accounts were transcribed in the 16th century (these were presumably destroyed in the fire which damaged the archives at Parliament House in 1818). The more administratively useful files may have simply been left at Berwick for the convenience of the occupation regime and thus recovered by the Scots in 1297 or 1318, but some may have been subsequently handed back from England, either in 1328 or after the Union of the Crowns in 1603.

There is a poignant irony in the fact that these inventories are almost the only known survivors of the cache of documents and objects they record. Before presenting the translated texts of the documents, however, it is useful to summarise the highlights of their contents – starting with one object from the collection that has certainly survived.

Perhaps the most surprising item in the inventories is the Stone of Scone. Its appearance in these official records strongly suggests that it was indeed being kept in Edinburgh Castle for security in 1296, and was not captured at Scone, as some English chronicles claim – the inventories carefully distinguish the Edinburgh cache from valuables seized further north at places like Coupar Angus and Restenneth. Indeed, the castle may always have been the usual home of the Stone, with the move to the traditional enthronement site at Scone only taking place for coronations. The inventory of 19 November 1303 reveals a further surprising detail – it shows that the Stone was temporarily brought back to Scotland by King Edward during the English campaign of 1303–4. According to a contemporary chronicler, it should have been returned permanently to Scotland under the terms of the 1328 peace treaty, but its dispatch was physically blocked by disgruntled Londoners – by now, it seems to have been bolted to the floor of Westminster Abbey and, in the event, its return home had to wait 700 years.¹⁷

With this evidence in mind, however, it seems thoroughly appropriate that the Stone was returned to the castle in 1996: it now resides within the same fortress from which it was originally removed over 700 years ago, and, indeed, within the same context – there is probably some level of direct continuity from other royal treasures returned in 1328 to the modern collection of Scottish Crown Jewels to which the Stone was joined, but it is unclear whether any other physical trace of the early treasures has survived its long evolution into the modern collection: the Stone thus represents the continuous history of the Honours of Scotland, and the castle’s role as their enduring home, in a way that is both highly symbolic and tangibly physical.

Probably next in renown after the Stone of Scone was the crucifix known as the Black Rood. This was described as a significant fragment of the True Cross, enclosed in a solid gold crucifix with an ivory figure of Christ, about 4in or 8in in length, and further enshrined in a larger silver-gilt outer case.¹⁸ It may have originally been part of the cache of Carolingian relics obtained by King Athelstan of England in the 10th century, and its well-documented history in the late 11th and 12th centuries shows that it had been inherited from St Margaret by her sons (if the events of November 1093 really took place in Edinburgh, it was already in the castle at that date), but its subsequent history after 1296 is complex; it was retained among the personal relics of Edward I and Edward II, and the well-informed contemporary report in *Lanercost* describes how it was returned to the Scots in 1328, but it seems to have been back in English hands by early 1346, as it was removed from storage by Edward III before his departure for the Crécy campaign, undermining the claims of 16th-century sources that it was captured at Neville's Cross later that year and raising questions about its identity with a crucifix later displayed at Durham.¹⁹

In addition, the castle was the home of the king's personal regalia – his crown, his sceptre and his orb, and the Golden Rose, presented to King William by the Pope in 1182. The fact that this particular item was over a century old in the 1290s suggests that the other elements of the regalia may also have been of comparable antiquity. The sceptre was unquestionably impressive, made of solid gold and weighing nearly 2lb – for comparison, its Renaissance successor is silver gilt, intrinsically much less valuable, and around 25 per cent lighter. After the surrender of the castle, the sceptre was brought post-haste to Edward I, and he subsequently presented all the Scottish regalia to Westminster Abbey a year later – placing them on the altar in St Edmund's Chapel in an imitation of the final act of the English coronation ceremony, to proclaim that he had taken possession of another kingdom; however, in contrast to the Stone of Scone, there seem to be no records of the Scottish regalia in Westminster in later centuries,²⁰ making it possible that they were returned to Scotland with the Black Rood in 1328. An unexpected possibility thus exists that the gold, diamonds and pearls of the crown, refashioned into their extant form by James V,²¹ might be those of the original circlet, dating back to the 13th century and beyond. More research by specialists would be necessary to evaluate whether this idea has any real merit – but, at the very least, the simple weight of the sceptre attests to the impressive nature of the early Scottish regalia, and the reappearance of the Scottish Crown Jewels in safe-keeping in the castle in the later medieval period represents the symbolic revival of the older practice documented in the 1290s.

There was also a substantial quantity of chapel gear in the castle – the largest objects were a massive solid silver alms dish weighing nearly 30lb, and a second alms vessel of the type known as a 'ship' or *nef* of nearly 10lb weight, both of which were melted down into English coinage as soon as possible. A silver incense burner was donated to Canterbury Cathedral. An object described as 'a *pallium* to hang in church' has been interpreted as a royal enthronement mantle placed on display;²² but it is noteworthy that the September 1296 inventory mentions 'two panes of arras' (*panni de arista*), mentioned again in 1303 as 'two palliums to hang in church, which came from Scotland', apparently of verdure tapestry (*de viridi baud*).²³ Do all three descriptions refer to a single pair of hangings?

Whatever its exact design, this object was of sufficient splendour for King Edward to set it up in his dynastic mausoleum in Westminster Abbey, located at the central focus of the royal chapel between its altar and Edward the Confessor's

shrine – where it was also probably visible above the retable of the high altar at the focal point of the entire architecture of the abbey.²⁴ It may have been a tapestry baldacchino designed purely to act as an altar retable, but, if it was some sort of mantle intended for veneration, it does not seem to appear in later lists of relics in Westminster:²⁵ this, too, may have returned to Scotland in 1328.

Alongside the regalia and the chapel furnishings, we also get a glimpse of the valuables used in the chamber or the hall. There was a group of around dozen solid silver cups – some of them with covers, most of them gilded. These were gradually dispersed by King Edward: by 19 November 1296, several of them had already gone, and notes in the inventory of that date record that three of them were subsequently given as a present to his daughter, while one was sold to a Belgian abbess – but the largest, weighing over 2lb, was still being kept personally by the king in 1303.

There was also a variety of exotic drinking cups – some of glass or perhaps carved crystal, others of maple and tamarisk wood, some apparently hollowed out from nuts, one from an exotic egg, all of them finished in various ways with silver and gilding. Evidently fragile, several of them were damaged by the time the treasure reached Berwick from the castle in 1296; unlike the silverware, they were not transferred to the royal household, and it is unclear what happened to them. The collection was completed by several pitchers for water and wine, and two matching pairs of basins – one set, decorated with images of bishops, was given as a present to the mayor of Cologne.

There also seem to have been three candlesticks – two of silver gilt with a single branch but at least two spikes for candles, one of plain silver with a three-branched design, and two candles flanking a central ornament of glass or rock crystal. These seem to have been initially claimed for the king's use, as they were not in the inventory when the bulk of the goods were consigned south, and their design seems domestic rather than liturgical – but two of them were given away to churches in Chichester and Canterbury in 1297.

It is easy to read a level of cynicism into Edward I's use of the Scottish royal treasure – relatively small prizes were presented to some of England's major pilgrimage shrines to symbolically publicise the conquest of Scotland, while the massive alms dish was promptly desecrated to make money, and the silver cups were rapidly disposed of; nonetheless, the fact that they *did* serve as prestige gifts emphasises the value of the Scottish royal treasure – and it is notable that **the king of England felt that the castle's *pallium* was a fit adornment for the focal point of Westminster Abbey, and he seems to have kept the most intrinsically valuable drinking cup for himself.**

The principal home for all these valuables seems to have been a treasury building attached to the Great Chapel, described in a document of the 1350s as the Countinghouse – corresponding to the similar role of the sacristy of the Saint-Chapelle in Paris. By 1388, there was also a storage space in the loft above St Margaret's Chapel where substantial sums of money might be stored. It is surprising to find this practical adjunct in the older and smaller chapel, since it had been thought of primarily as a shrine since the mid-13th century, and the countinghouse in the Great Chapel provided an obvious alternative location: it is possible that the loft might have been fitted out simply to make an additional space, but it seems more likely that its use as a treasury began before 1250, when

the little old church was still primarily regarded as a working building for the royal clerks, performing both liturgical and administrative duties in the King's House.

The Exchequer Rolls were certainly stored somewhere in the castle by the 1520s, and the countinghouse may have continued in use into the 16th century. Documents in the reign of James III and James V speak regularly of a Treasurer House, which is perhaps the same building under a new name, and which now contained valuables ranging from cash reserves to the iron-bound cupboard with the royal silverware. The documentary archive was given a new home by James V, with the remodelling of an older tower incorporated into Crown Square adjacent to the Great Hall, which became the new Register House. This occurred simultaneously with the conversion of the Great Chapel into the new arsenal building, suggesting that the documents had remained in the countinghouse until that date. Just as the Stone of Destiny and the broader continuity of the Crown Jewels' preservation in the castle symbolically links the 13th century to the present day, the archive of Alexander III is thus the direct precursor of today's National Archives of Scotland, based in the current Register House locations in Edinburgh.

Found in Edinburgh Castle

1. In the coffer with a cross are these written below:

First, a handsome coffer, in which are:

A shrine of heraldry (*unam pulvinarium de armis*), broken

A gilded fastener

A cross of tin

A shrine with griffons

Two pieces of tapestry

An alb with the heraldry of the King of England

A stole and maniple

Also, a shrine with the Scottish royal arms, covered with a red shroud

A gilded crook which belonged to the bishop of Ross

A 'nut' (*nux*) fitted with with a foot and a cover of silver gilt

A cup of crystal with a gilded foot

A cup all crystal fitted with silver

Three horns of ivory adorned with silk and silver

A horn of buffalo (*de bugle*)

Two small wine-cups of tamarisk wood (*de tammari*) furnished with silver

A 'nut' with a silver-gilt foot, broken

A cup of crystal with a silver-gilt foot, broken

2. In the coffer with 'L'

First, two wine-cups of crystal bound with silver.

A mazer furnished with a foot and cover of silver, [all] gilt

A cup of griffon egg completely broken, furnished with silver

A cup of crystal with a foot of silver gilt

A cup with a cover of maple (*de mugetto*) and a foot of silver gilt

A pitcher of maple furnished with silver gilt

A mazer without a foot, of small value

A silver 'ship' weighing 9lb

A pair of silver basins weighing 6lb

A pair of silver basins weighing 5.875lb (117s 6d)

3. In the coffer of 'H'

Large silver-gilt cup with a foot and cover weighing 6 marks 2s 6d

Cup of silver gilt with a foot and cover weighing 58s 9d

Cup of silver gilt with a foot and cover weighing 46s 8d

Cup of silver gilt with a foot and cover weighing 50s minus 3d

Cup of silver gilt with a foot and cover weighing 38s 6d

Cup of silver with a foot and cover weighing 52s 9d

Cup of silver gilt with a foot and without a cover, weighing 35s 3d

Cup of silver gilt with a foot and cover, 51s 5d

Cup of silver with a foot and cover weighing 1 mark 16d

Cup of silver with a foot, without a cover, weighing 38s 4d

Cup of silver, white [enamel?], with a foot, without a cover, weighing 22s 5d

Cup of silver gilt with a foot, without a cover, weighing 23s

Cup of silver plate weighing 23s 6d

Pitcher of silver with a cover weighing 41s 4d

Pitcher for water, white, weighing 41s 4d

A laver for water, of silver, white, weighing 22s

Pitcher of silver for water, white, weighing 22s 8d

Memorandum that on 17th September Year 24 all the jewels above written were sent from Berwick to London by John Chandler in three coffers with signs as above. And a big coffer and two small coffers with various writings and memoranda found in Edinburgh Castle, and a coffer with relics found there - and nineteen horns of buffalo (*de Bucle*), and one griffon horn, which were delivered into the Wardrobe by Sir Robert Giffard and Sir Hugh de Roburo, which were found in a certain Priory near Forfar, and a package with various things which belonged to the Bishop of St Andrews, delivered into the Wardrobe by Sir John Swinburne knight, keeper of the same bishopric, at the start of September, and a large silver dish for alms.

And all these were delivered by the said Sir John to John of Droxford, which the same Sir John deposited in the Wardrobe of Westminster.

* * *

Jewels remaining at the end of Year 24 of the Jewels which belonged to the former King of Scotland found in Edinburgh Castle in the same year.

A gold sceptre, which belonged to John Balliol, former king of Scotland, found in Edinburgh Castle and delivered to the master of the Wardrobe at St Johnstone of Perth, 24 June, by Master John of Droxford, weight 46s 8d.

[offered by the king at the shrine of St Edward in the abbey church of Westminster, 18 June of this year]

Cup (*ciphus*) of silver, to be valued (*pretii*)

weighing 54s 3d

Cup of silver to be valued

weighing 38s 6d

Cup of silver to be valued

weighing 51s 5d

delivered by the king's command to the lady Elizabeth his daughter, Countess of Holland, together with other jewels by the king's gift, against her passage to her own parts, at Westminster, 2 August

Cup of silver, priced

which was without a cover (*sine cooperculo*) and weighed 36s 3d

Now it has a cover newly made, and weighs 48s

Cup of silver

which formerly was without a cover and weighed 1mk 16d

Now it has a new cover, and weighs 24s 2d

delivered by the king's command to the lady Elizabeth his daughter, Countess of Holland, together with other jewels by the king's gift, against her passage to her own parts, at Westminster, 2 August

Cup of silver, weighing 28s 4d. It weighs however by true weight 30s 8d
priced

This was taken (*invaditur*) by Ugelino da Vicio, by the king's command, together with other jewels of the king, to the abbess of St Hubert at Antwerp for £300, as shows in the receipts of account

Cup of silver

which formerly was without a cover and weighed 20s 5d

Now it has a cover, [one] of those four covers from old stores which appeared in the list of jewels of year 24, and weighs in total 2 mk 1d

Cup of silver

which formerly was without a cover and 23s

Now it has a cover newly made, and weighs 31s 8d

delivered by the king's command to the lady Elizabeth his daughter, Countess of Holland, together with other jewels by the king's gift, against her passage to her own parts, at Westminster, 2 Aug

1 pair of silver basins with images of bishops, weight £4 3s 4d

priced

Given by the king to Sir Henry of Verneburghe, provost of Cologne, at Ghent (*Gandavum*), 8 September, by the hand of the Bishop of Durham and Steward

An old clasp (*nouschua*) of gold with a cameo (*camahuto*)

offered by the king to the image of St Mary in her chapel of Walsingham, 2nd February

Chasuble, tunic and dalmatic with the arms of the Earl of Cornwall

offered by the same king at the altar in the same chapel, the same day

Candlestick (*ramus*) of silver gilt, with 'serpent tongues' (*cum linguis serpentinis*; presumably sharp spikes for holding candles)

A chasuble, striped (*una casula radiata*)

offered by the king at the shrine of St Alban, at St Albans, 17 February

Crown of gold with a silver gilt 'apple' (*cum pomo*) and a golden rose, which belonged to the king of Scotland

offered by the king at the shrine of St Edward at Westminster, 18 June

A mantle (*pallium*) to hang in church

offered by the king at the altar of St Edward within Westminster Abbey, to hang beyond that altar, 18 June

A great stone, on which the kings of Scotland used to be crowned

An embroidered choir cope with a silver clasp (*morso*)

A silver incense burner (*incensarium*)

Offered by the king at the shrine of St Thomas Martyr in Christ Church
Canterbury, 3rd June in the present year]

3 candlesticks of silver with two 'serpent tongues' and one crystal in the middle,
with a flat foot of silvert gilt

offered by the king at the shrine of St Augustine in the abbey church of St
Augustine of Canterbury, 6 June

A candlestick of silver gilt with 'serpent tongues'

offered by the king at the shrine of St Richard, in the cathedral church of
Chichester, 26 May

A 'ship' of silver for alms.

weight, £9

priced

A great dish of silver for alms

weight £27 6s

These were sent by command of the king to the tower of London to the
royal mint (*ad cambium regis*) there, and coined there 2 Aug, together with
other of the king's jewels, as shows in receipts of money of the present year

* * *

Jewels remaining in the end of Year 31 of the jewel which belonged to
the former King of Scotland found in Edinburgh Castle in the 25th Year,
viz.:

Cup of silver, weighing 51s 5d, value [blank]

a great stone on which the kings of Scotland used to be crowned

APPENDIX 4: THE ENGLISH GARRISONS

For 50 years between 1291 and 1341, the history of Edinburgh Castle was defined by England's attempts to subjugate Scotland; for half of those 50 years, the castle was under the direct control of English governors, serving as a fortified base for an occupying regime, and during the principal interlude of Scottish control within this period the castle lay ruined and abandoned, its defences shattered by the Scots themselves to prevent the English from installing a new garrison there. Only during a brief three and a half years in the 1290s was Edinburgh able to fulfil its normal functions as a stronghold of the Scottish royal government.

The English occupation period produces a remarkable quantity of documentation - in part, this is due to the tranquil history of the London archives where these documents have been stored for seven centuries, but it also reflects the underlying fact that the medieval English government had a much stronger bureaucratic ethos than its Scottish counterpart, and produced and preserved far more paperwork in the first place. These documents can be divided into three chronological groups.

The first series date from the first phase of English control in 1291 and 1292, and consist principally of the governor's pay records, texts which raise questions about the nature of that occupation - questions which need to be articulated but are hard to answer conclusively. During the initial years of the second and longest period of English occupation, from 1296 to 1307 and particularly between 1298 and 1302, there is a dense miscellany of detailed records such as letters and receipts, recording the day-to-day activities of the garrison. This tells us something about the soldiers' personalities, a great deal about their unit organisation and even more about the cash and victuals needed to pay and feed them. It also reveals the castle's role as a logistical base from which campaigns could be mounted and sieges supported, and the attempts of the governor to be more than just the commanding officer of a foreign garrison. This is the single most intensively documented period in the castle's medieval history. Then, from about 1307 until the end of this phase of occupation in 1314, and again during the third occupation in the years 1335-41, the record becomes less frequent, but more consistent and regular, consisting primarily of semi-annual muster rolls and administrative accounts. In the final phase from 1335 to 1341, these records chronicle the efforts of the garrison in rebuilding the defences and their attempts to administer the sheriffdom, and they present an unrivalled source for the medieval architecture of the castle itself and the organisation of its administrative hinterland.

This section of the report is intended as both an introduction to this material and also a preliminary analysis of it, providing a discussion of the nature of the sources, while also using them to tell a detailed narrative of the castle's history in this timeframe, and to explain its role within the wider narrative of the Wars of Independence. It concludes with an analysis and translation of two key documents from the 1335-41 period, which present the earliest systematic overview of the castle's architectural structures.

On 13 June 1291, Edward I of England sent a formal letter to the Sheriff of Edinburgh, Sir William Sinclair, commanding him to cede control of the castle to an English soldier, Ralph Basset of Drayton.

This demand was a result of a political crisis in Scotland, caused by the lack of an undisputed heir to the throne after the demise of King Alexander III in 1286. This was a complex dispute involving four conflicting agendas, but it is necessary to outline these briefly in order to understand the events of the 50 years which followed (see Barrow (2005), and the more detailed study in Duncan (2002)). There was broad political support in Scotland for a regency council known as the Guardians, initially established to protect the rights of King Alexander's granddaughter, the 'Maid of Norway', but she too died in 1290, without ever setting foot in Scotland. The main challenge to the Guardians came from the Lord of Annandale, a distant cousin of the king who had aggressively claimed the throne since 1286. A third issue was the rival claim of John Balliol, another distant cousin, whose main interests lay in Yorkshire and Picardy rather than Scotland, but who emerged as the natural alternative to Annandale in 1290. The fourth factor, and the most dangerous of all, was the ambition of the English king, Edward I, who had sought to meddle in the crisis from the outset, in a bid to gain political control of Scotland - he was broadly opposed by the Guardians, but both Annandale and Balliol were willing to make major political concessions to him in the hope of securing his support.

Eventually, an agreement was reached which allowed Edward I to arbitrate the Scottish succession dispute. It was this agreement which led to the King of England's letter commanding the installation of an English governor in Edinburgh Castle in June 1291, and similar commands issued simultaneously to a dozen other royal fortresses across the Scottish kingdom. The exact implications of this handover are hard to gauge, however - there are blatant inconsistencies in the English archival documents recording it, which appear to have been redrafted and edited in some form of medieval government cover-up, and the clearest detail that emerges from the documents is that the new English officials were awarded a generous new level of pay, funded out of Scotland's royal revenues (Stones and Simpson (1978), ii. 112-13; *CDS* ii. No. 547; Duncan (2002), pp 247-8).

The best evidence for what was really going on comes from Edward I's interaction with the powerful Comyn family, whose compliance the English king undoubtedly gained with generous financial incentives, while also using legal and financial threats to the revenues of their English estates to encourage them to acquiesce in his usurpation of power within Scotland (Young (1999), pp 213-15). It is possible that the intrusion of the English governors and the award of their salaries was partially a cover for a complex bribery scheme, and partially an illegal coup facilitated by such a scheme. However, the topic is sufficiently complex that it lies outside the range of this report, and all that can be done here is to briefly note the existence of evidence for some form of double-dealing.

Ralph Basset, the new English governor of Edinburgh Castle, was certainly no Scotsman - he was a young man-at-arms in his mid-20s, serving in the retinue of the English king's brother, the Earl of Lancaster, who himself was given control of Roxburgh Castle. The records show that he was paid relatively promptly at first, though by 10 October 1292 his salary was four months in arrears, and he could only be given a modest percentage of what he was owed. Curiously, the payment

to him on 13 February 1292 was made by the castle's 'former' (*jadis*) Scottish constable or deputy-governor, William of Kinghorn, who was presumably still acting on behalf of the Sheriff, Sir William Sinclair. The sum he handed over at this date is the only part of Basset's salary that we can be sure was met from local revenues – the bulk of it was certainly paid directly by the central government, a hint that local Scottish officials may not have been cooperating fully with the new pay scheme.

There is little record of the castle under Basset's governorship beyond the fact of his salary. One notable event occurred near the start of his tenure, on 29 July 1291, when Edward I visited the castle in person as part of his policy of receiving homage to acknowledge his position as arbitrator; he took the homage of a handful of local clergy in St Margaret's Chapel, before moving to the King's Chamber to receive the leaders of the Scottish sections of the Templar and Hospitaller military orders – they are unlikely to have had any qualms about personal submission, as both were Englishmen by birth and allegiance, and would be killed by the Scots while fighting as officers in an English invasion army in 1298.

Administrative detail is very hard to come by. On 29 June 1291, King Edward had sent a formal demand to the Lord of Douglas, commanding him to hand over a prisoner to the Sheriff of Edinburgh for incarceration in a government prison, but this was still perhaps during the handover period, and it is not entirely clear whether it implies anything at all about the workings of the castle in this first phase of English control (*Rot. Scot.* i. No. 2). The only thing we really know for sure about Edinburgh under Basset's governorship is that, as a part of the arbitration agreement, the royal archives and treasures were moved out to a neutral location where full Scottish oversight was possible – the move took place on 23 August 1291, and the neutral location proved to be Berwick-upon-Tweed, where the archives were also conveniently available to the contenders in the arbitration.

King Edward now decided to have the archives searched, to see if he could find support for an eccentric claim to the Scottish throne put forward by his ally, the Count of Holland. This gave him a pretext to adjourn his arbitration for nine months (Duncan (2002), pp 204–5, 265–6). Naturally, the English officers remained in control of Edinburgh and the other Scottish castles through this period, drawing their inflated salaries. It was November 1292 when the King of England finally made his decision and ruled in favour of the rights of John Balliol.

Nonetheless, Edward had pledged to return the Scottish castles to Scottish control within two months of delivering his verdict as arbiter of the Great Cause – if he failed to do so, he pledged to donate the staggering sum £100,000 to fund a new Crusade. Balliol was enthroned as King of Scots on 30 November 1292, and the castle should thus have been back under Scottish control by 15 January 1293, though no records survive to record the actual handover, and little documentation exists to show the activities of the Scottish keeper and garrison in the castle over the next 3½ years.

We do not even know who the castle's governor was in this period – it seems credible that Sir William Sinclair initially resumed control as sheriff, but there seems to be no clear evidence that he retained the role, and he is hard to trace at all after mid-1294.²⁶ One possible hint about who commanded the castle during this period is provided by a later Scottish tradition, which recalled a 'kepar of yone hous' surnamed Francis (*Bruce*, p 389); there is no other convenient gap in which

to place his tenure, especially as his son William, old enough to be sneaking out of the castle to spend nights with his girlfriend during his father's term of office, was still physically active enough to lead a commando raid up the Castle Rock in 1314.²⁷

We can be certain of one thing, however: the consignment of government documents and royal treasures was brought back from Berwick (where they were handed over on 20 December 1292 to the chamberlain, now freed from his 'associates'), and returned to safe-keeping in the castle.

1296–1302

King Edward regained control of Edinburgh Castle in June 1296. English attempts to subjugate Scotland politically had only led to war, but English military success prompted John Balliol's rapid abdication. The castle's garrison put up a creditable resistance, but their capitulation seemed to represent the end of organised military opposition. However, although Edward I believed that Scotland had been conquered, Scottish resistance continued, culminating in the victory at Stirling Bridge in September 1297, which rapidly reduced the English hold to only a few isolated castles – Berwick, Roxburgh, Stirling and Edinburgh (Barrow (2005), p 127).

It is unclear how the English had initially intended to use the castles – in England and Wales in this period, castles seem to have generally become places of passive strength, designed to intimidate the population and resist sieges, and there is little sign that they acted as bases for mobile troops or aggressive campaigning. In Edinburgh, the first English sheriff was not a soldier but a lawyer and administrator, Hugh de Lowther – perhaps always intended as a temporary appointee during the complex but rapid process of issuing pardons after Balliol's surrender; however, he was promptly replaced on 5 October 1298 by Sir Walter de Huntercombe, a baron who had led the English force that occupied the Isle of Man in 1290, and who seems to have been appointed as 'warden' of Lothian rather than a conventional sheriff – perhaps an early acknowledgement that the war had not been won. By 1298 he was also serving simultaneously as the leader of a military contingent from Northumberland, serving as a mobile occupation force in Scotland (*CDS* ii. No. 852, p 225; Barrow (2005), p 38). A set of receipts beginning on 24 July 1298 provides a glimpse of a series of supply consignments: the main component was wheat, brought by sea for the soldiers' bread, but other deliveries varied from wine to an alms dish. Little is really known of activities in the castle during Huntercombe's tenure, however, and in November 1298 it was decided to restrict his role to command of the mobile troops from Northumberland, while the castle was entrusted to Sir John Kingston.

The new governor was an English knight with manors in Berkshire and Wiltshire, who had arrived in Scotland as a soldier in the king's household cavalry (McFarlane (1981), pp 49–52); insofar as knightly service and seigneurial lordship were international concepts, he probably had much in common with his Scottish peers, but he is also described in some documents as a 'knight of the bishop of Chester', a title which emphasises a distinctively English aspect to his background. As part of a system whose origins pre-dated the Norman Conquest, each bishop or abbot in England was required to provide a squadron of knights to serve in the king's army – instead of pay, each of them was normally given a small hereditary

manor on the diocesan estates. Moreover, in a letter to his bishop in 1299, Kingston speaks of Edinburgh as 'our castle' (*nostra chastel*, Stevenson, *Documents* ii. No. 527), as if the bishop, too, had some sort of authority over Edinburgh – hinting that it was the bishop who held the primary official responsibility – perhaps as 'warden of Lothian', like Huntercombe before him – with Sir John technically acting as his deputy while fulfilling the bishopric's military obligations.

Sir John Kingston was thus a knight of a distinctively English type. Unsurprisingly, the English administrative documents from his tenure use a distinctively English terminology; as governor of the castle, Kingston is often described as 'constable', a term which in Scotland only denoted the deputy-governor, and, as sheriff, they speak of his authority in the 'county' – a term that was generally used in Scottish documents only to denote aristocratic earldoms rather than royal sheriffdoms. Perhaps this was inevitable, and perhaps it was entirely a reflection of English bureaucratic ignorance about the details of Scottish local government, but it also reflects an important truth – English bureaucrats of the 1290s understood only one way to govern a castle and its surrounding territory, and that was to integrate its administration fully into England.

In addition, Kingston was assigned two clerks, designed to solve the challenges of military logistic through an increased intensity of administration, and it is probably the appointment of these two efficient bureaucrats which explains the significant quantity of very detailed documentation surviving from this period. William of Routh was assigned to Berwick-upon-Tweed, acting as a detached officer of the garrison under Kingston's command, with authority to forward supplies from the military stores there as required, and an explicit mandate to call directly on the English central government whenever additional equipment or provisions needed to be procured elsewhere. Meanwhile, Alexander le Convers was based in Edinburgh itself to oversee the supplies destined for the English garrison in Stirling Castle, the first of a series of military logistics positions he would hold in Scotland for the English government.

Alexander le Convers commands additional attention because of his unusual background: he was a member of a small community of military families closely associated with the Tower of London, highly skilled experts in siege warfare and military logistics, descended from elite Jewish crossbowmen in the royal guards of Henry II and King John. The surname *le Convers* recorded the fact that several of these men had converted to Christianity (at least nominally) in the 13th century, thus allowing their descendants to survive Edward I's expulsion of the Jews in 1290.

The documents from this period reveal that the castle was regarded as a vital hub in the military occupation. King Edward had gained a hard-won victory over William Wallace at Falkirk in July 1298, and laid out a vast expenditure on that campaign, but, although modern sources often describe the years that followed as a 'guerrilla war' between an occupying army and a resistance force, the reality seems to be that Falkirk had not enabled the English to regain the military initiative at all. Stirling Castle, the only English garrison beyond Edinburgh, was under blockade, and dangerously short of provisions. To break through to resupply the garrison, Kingston was effectively placed in command of the entire English army fighting the Scots – he was to command of a 'foray' of some 200 heavy cavalry, assembled from all the local commands and garrisons in Scotland and the north of England, within which the largest single contingent was the

mobile element of his own garrison in the castle, consisting of at least 30 men-at-arms, all riding 'barded' horses protected by armoured trappings. Whatever the initial intention had been in 1296, cavalry was now the most important element in the English occupation forces.

In addition to its garrison role, Edinburgh was serving as a logistics hub, receiving a large consignment of supplies designed for forwarding to another base – its destination, coyly left unstated in the instructions issued in November 1298, was clearly Stirling Castle, still under Scottish blockade and short of supplies. The vital consignment ranged from around 20 tons of malt for making oatmeal stout to two barrels of communion wine, and waffle irons to make communion wafers. Nor was this the end of the campaign. By the end of December, Conyers was marching north again as chaperone of a powerful column of 600 men-at-arms, who were to base themselves in Edinburgh for the campaign; such a large division required a massive pay chest, and this was to be placed in Edinburgh Castle, as King Edward judged it to be the best place in Scotland for storing such a valuable consignment (Watson (1991), p 85, citing TNA E101/7/9).

The 'foray' was evidently successful, and the English garrison in Stirling was able to hold out for a further year. Yet the evidence from 1299 shows that the relief of Stirling, like the victory at Falkirk before it, had not allowed the English to regain the military initiative; in fact, they retained exactly the same precarious position they had held since 1297, based on their occupation of the four major castles between the Border and the Forth. A meeting was scheduled for 1 August 1299 to discuss 'the garrisons and the marches', a topic which tacitly conceded that the English-held castles were now regarded primarily as forward positions in front of the Border, designed to defend England itself from Scottish attack. In the event, a Scottish offensive prevented Kingston from attending the conference at all, and the letter which he dispatched to the bishop of Chester on 9 August 1299 provides a detailed glimpse of Edinburgh garrison's situation.

The governor begins by noting that two of his knights and their retinues of men-at-arms needed new liveries – the expensive robes which served as both uniforms and symbols of elite status; a force of crossbowmen, who had been moved directly to Edinburgh from garrison duty at Bourg-sur-Mer and Blaye in Gascony, required both uniforms and shoes. A Scottish force had appeared at Edinburgh, capturing one of his knights, and moved south into Etrick Forest – the large area of royal forest in the Borders, corresponding approximately to Selkirkshire, not entirely wooded but sparsely populated and administered outside the system of sheriffdoms. Sir Simon Fraser, the Scottish keeper of the forest, who had made his peace with the English back in 1296, had promptly abandoned his post, pleading that his forces were not nearly strong enough to confront this incursion; with the vanguard encamped in the forest, the main Scottish army had now marched to Glasgow, and they were planning to march south to join up with the vanguard and threaten the Border directly.

Kingston felt that Fraser's complaint of insufficient troops was an excuse, claiming that he could have mustered a strong enough force by following a pre-arranged plan to mobilise the garrisons at Edinburgh and elsewhere – again, an emphasis on the central role of cavalry in English thinking. The English governor of Edinburgh believed that Fraser was – perhaps unsurprisingly – working with his fellow Scots, and expressed the opinion that he had twice tried to lure him into an ambush – first by trying to coax him out of the castle just before the Scottish vanguard

showed up at Edinburgh, and then secondly by requesting a meeting which would have led him into their line of march as they moved into the forest.

It was also clear that there was no sympathy for English rule – the inhabitants of the forest had openly declared their Scottish allegiance en-masse, while a meeting of local rebels had been held relatively openly in the manor house at Penicuik (which, perhaps disingenuously, Kingston claimed lay 20 or 30 miles from Edinburgh). When he mentioned the ‘poor folk, who say they are in our peace’ (*poures gentz ... qui dient quil sont a nostre pees*), he implicitly acknowledged that he did not really believe what they said – it was a token gesture which allowed them to escape English retribution but conveyed no sense of genuine loyalty.

In response to the Scottish offensive, he had brought all the livestock (*bestes*) from the area into Edinburgh Castle – an unexpected echo of its much older role as a centre for the processing of royal tribute in cattle and sheep (see 1141 x 1147). A hint of logistical difficulties is revealed in a question about whether it was acceptable to confiscate some of the livestock ‘for’ money (*que nous preignoms de eux pur le deners le roy*) – it seems unclear whether he envisaged a forced purchase of much-needed supplies, or a sale of impounded animals to generate cash revenue, or simply a distribution of meat in place of pay, but, whatever the exact meaning of the request, it attests to a shortage of either supplies or pay, or perhaps both. At the end of the letter, the governor noted that Stirling once again required supplies. This time, there was no relief convoy – the English garrison there would surrender around 12 weeks later. Edinburgh was now the northernmost outpost of English power, though at least they had the benefit of the provisions which had been belatedly assembled for Stirling (28 December 1299).

A muster of the garrison on 28 February 1300 shows that their numbers had been dramatically increased – Sir John Kingston was now accompanied by seven other knights with their esmall personal retinues, a number of royal serjeants-at-arms led by the Gascon Piers Lubaud, plus a miscellany of other men-at-arms, bringing the heavy cavalry force to 67 soldiers. Although they only had 60 decent war-horses, this nevertheless represents a doubling of the size of the garrison in around a year, and their numbers were further emphasised by the vast panoply of well over 100 ‘grooms’ attending them, many of them mounted on light horses, so perhaps serving as light cavalry – ‘hobelars’ are mentioned in an administrative document from the castle in this period, but do not seem to appear formally in the muster (Watson (1991), p 158; only a quartet briefly appear in the official muster of 27 November 1301 and are gone by 12 February 1302). Eighteen crossbowmen and 60 archers provided an infantry contingent to man the walls, with various units in the process of being rotated on deployment through the garrison. The leading English siege engineer Master Thomas of Houghton was also present (see Taylor (1950), p 30), and the document also reveals a vast train of non-combatant personnel – among them two friars, two secretaries, the cook and baker and two brewers, a swineherd, barrel-maker and harper, carpenters and smiths, a coal-carrier, and a bowyer and farrier and their assistants, mustering a total garrison of 347 people. The full year’s accounts, submitted on 26 November 1300, reveal that the powerful squadron of men-at-arms with all their grooms was permanently resident in the garrison through this period, but that the force of infantry and auxiliaries was perhaps unusually high in February when the detailed muster was taken – between October 1299 and the start of the year, and again from July 1300 to October, the dedicated infantry component seems to have been as low as just 18 crossbowmen, with a modest echelon of eight support personnel.

An insight into the sort of men in the garrison is provided by an act of 5 June 1299, when, in response to an appeal by Kingston, one of them was granted a royal immunity from impending prosecution – he seems to have been a member of a notorious family of literal ‘robber barons’ from Leicestershire, and in a previous incident he had been bold enough to steal a highly valuable hunting hawk from the Duke of Brabant, who, as well as being one of Europe’s leading noblemen, was also King Edward’s son-in-law.

There were also a few Scots among the English soldiers. The principal contingent in the 28 February 1300 muster was led by Sir Thomas Morham and his son Sir Herbert, the latter reputed the tallest and most handsome man-at-arms in Scotland, with a combined retinue containing an additional four men-at-arms, eight mounted ‘grooms’ and four others without horses. They had both been taken prisoner in 1296, and subsequently agreed to fight for the English, but Herbert had since changed sides again twice more, serving for a time as the commander of the Scottish siege of Stirling before rejoining his father in the English garrison in Edinburgh;²⁸ Thomas du Bois of Easter Duddingston, whose lands lay uncomfortably close to the castle, was serving apparently independently as a man-at-arms with one mounted groom and one dismounted (*CDS* ii. No. 1132; Watson (1991), pp 339–43, 358–9), but English sources suggest that he was also affiliated with the Morhams, apparently changing sides with Sir Herbert around the start of 1301, and eventually being executed alongside him in 1306 (Watson (1991), p 343; Barrow (2005), p 462 n. 62).

A further insight into the garrison is provided by an estimate of the victuals required for Edinburgh and other English garrisons in Scotland, produced by King Edward’s central administration on 1 January 1300, evidently in response to the fall of Stirling a few weeks earlier. This envisaged a repetitive diet: salt beef or cured herring, depending on the day, accompanied by wheat bread and a pottage of peas, beans and oatflour, all washed down by several pints of oatmeal stout. A modern estimate has calculated that these rations provided nearly 6,000 calories, a high-energy diet suitable for men engaged in very strenuous physical activity, but it was unhealthily high in carbohydrates and low in vitamins (Prestwich (1967), pp 538–9). In addition, each man-at-arms’ war-horse required around of 25lb of oats a week, and each other horse was assigned half that quantity.

Actually getting the supplies to Edinburgh proved problematic, even though the garrison still had its dedicated logistics officer, William of Routh, forwarding priority supplies from Berwick (see 23 October 1300). At the time of the inventory, the garrison was completely out of peas and fish, and even King Edward expressed concern that Edinburgh might be blockaded into surrender, as Stirling had been; a modern analysis of subsequent documents suggest that sufficient quantities of provisions were shipped, and even a significant consignment of mutton was added for good measure, but, nonetheless, the garrison appeared to be eating supplies faster than they could be provisioned, and had dug deep into their original reserves (Prestwich (1967), p 541). On 7 August 1300, we have a detailed receipt for one of the supply cargoes, which reveals some of the underlying problems. The consignment consisted entirely of oats, which the English presumably used to feed their horses, but it is notable because it shows the sort of logistical complexity that the occupation forces encountered. One part of the cargo seems to have consisted of 100 quarters of oats in their conventional ‘level’ or ‘struck’ measure, but, although the quantity in which the other consignment was packed was also *called* the ‘quarter’, it proved to be only three-fifths or two-thirds of the standard English measure of that name

(the receipt estimated two of these irregular measures to one 'heaped' quarter, which in turn meant roughly 125 per cent standard measure). Thus, although the consignment claimed to contain over 200 quarters of oats, the actual quantity was somewhere around 160 quarters, a shortfall of as much as 20 per cent. While this was still a significant supply of provisions – it totalled roughly 30 tons of cereal – the discrepancy hints at the problems of logistics: even when the proper quantities of supplies were thought to have been dispatched to the garrisons, they might not contain the total actually required; the sheer weight of cereal also gives a sense of the large and cumbersome scale of the grain convoys which had to make their way up Leith Walk and the Royal Mile to the castle.

In response to the supply shortage, the garrison seem to have made their own arrangements. A hint of this is provided by the appearance in the inventory of a large quantity of bacon, which is not identified among the supplies shipped north from England (Prestwich (1967), p 541, notes its presence without discussing the discrepancy). A document which cannot be securely dated more closely than 1296 x 1302, but which probably belongs to 1301, reveals the real situation in the Edinburgh garrison in more detail. The quantities of bread and pottage had been reduced, while the meat had been entirely switched from beef and lamb to bacon, and dried cod was being used alongside cured herring – perhaps primarily to allow procurement from more diverse sources, rather than introduce variety in the diet; more intriguingly, the beer ration had been partially replaced with a daily pint of wine, and the diet was being leavened with onions, garlic, butter, cheese and, when possible, honey. There seems to be a lack of fruit (Prestwich (1967), p 537), but the castle's large orchards may have provided this. In addition, the light horses must have been switched to the traditional Scottish system of grass-grazing, as a supply of oats was now needed only for the men-at-arms' chargers. The impression is that the garrison had adapted to life in Edinburgh – eating bacon and grass-grazing their ponies – partially to ease their logistical problems, but also to achieve a more diverse and interesting diet.

One very striking detail recorded in the estimate is the requirement for a vast quantity of coal, over 100 tons of it; the document of 26 November 1300 confirms that this was used 'both for ironworking and for the kitchen and the hall' – and, while coal fires were standard in medieval metalworking forges, their use for heating and cooking was decidedly unusual. The household use of coal rather than firewood seems to have emerged in the 14th century as a peculiarity of the coal-mining regions in Scotland, the north of England and the German Rhineland, and this document, pushing back their use in the castle into 1299, may in fact be the very earliest surviving reference to domestic coal fires in medieval Europe.

As well as requiring its own supplies, Edinburgh Castle also continued to serve as a logistics hub for the English campaigns. In 1301, King Edward returned to Scotland in person, marching into Clydesdale while his son Edward of Carnarvon (the future Edward II) led a second column into Galloway. Although the main armies bypassed Edinburgh, the castle was used to store a pay chest, which was brought north from Berwick then escorted south to Peebles in August 1301, and it also provided siege-engines for use against Bothwell Castle (see 29 August 1301). The capture of Bothwell could hardly be called a great victory, however: a single tower and its small garrison defied an English army of several thousand men for several weeks, while the Scottish army in the Borders forced the Prince of Wales to retreat, preventing him making his planned rendezvous with his father, and threatened the main army's lines of communications.

King Edward abandoned his plan to march to the Clyde, and instead spent some weeks frowning ineffectively at Stirling – a letter of 4 October 1301 shows that even more siege equipment was being sent from Edinburgh for a planned assault there, but in late October King Edward moved instead to Linlithgow, where he opted to establish his winter camp (Watson (1991), p 180; Gough (1900) ii. 206 shows that the royal household and administration moved from Dunipace, the base for the abortive siege of Stirling, over a protracted period between 23 and 30 October). This decision inevitably caused a shift of local emphasis away from Edinburgh, in advance of wider changes that were soon to follow. The garrison may have already been scaled back late in 1300 or in 1301 in response to the logistics challenges, as the supply estimate calendared under 1296 x 1302 envisages a very compact muster of 30 men-at-arms and just 36 attendant ‘boys’ (and thus a very reduced echelon of light horses, even if they all remained mounted), along with 20 crossbowmen. By 27 November 1301, the mounted garrison in the castle had certainly been reduced back to its earlier strength of 30 men-at-arms, though they were now supported by a considerable infantry contingent of 20 crossbowmen and 34 archers, plus four ‘hobelars’, light cavalry serving independently of the men-at-arms’ retinues – these were not yet a standard part of the English military structure at this date, and their presence was probably connected to the improvised use of light cavalry hinted at in previous sources. A comparison of the two documents also raises the possibility that the ‘boys’ evolved into the force of archers and four hobelars, now formally enrolled for soldiers’ pay.

As well as serving as a garrison stronghold, the castle was also supposed to be the seat of English government in the ‘county of Edinburgh’, administering Lothian in the name of King Edward. The first overt hint of the king’s policy in this regard is found in orders issued to Sir John Kingston on 24 November 1298, empowering him to receive the population of his sheriffdom ‘into the king’s peace’ – that is to say, allowing them to make a formal submission to Edward I’s royal authority, and live obediently under English rule. However, only those worth less than £1 annually were allowed to submit – the policy, it seems, was to bring the peasants, and the manorial revenues they might generate, directly under English authority.

The question of whether 13th-century Lothian actually had the sort of English-style manorial economy that would make this policy work is well beyond the scope of this report, but a hint of the result is seen in the letter of 9 August 1299 referred to above – the ‘poor folk’ had come to peace, at least nominally, though the English governor doubted whether they were doing more than accepting the opportunity to get on with their lives without oppression. Kingston evidently did not press the issue, and, when he brought the livestock into the castle in response to the Scottish military offensive, he had carefully separated out the animals of the *poures gentz*, and returned them in acknowledgement of their token submission and their need for a livelihood.

A glimpse of the situation among those excluded from the English peace is revealed by his reference to Margaret of Penicuik, apparently widowed at the Battle of Dunbar in 1296; she was in the king’s peace (Stevenson, *Documents* ii. No. 385), but her son Hugh was active with the rebels, and was evidently basing himself fairly openly at home. The lack of any hint of punitive action against Margaret of Penicuik – glossed by a generous overestimate of the distance from Edinburgh to her manor house – combines with his willingness to allow the *pourez gentz* their livestock even though he doubted their loyalty to suggest that Sir

John Kingston felt tolerance, rather than punishment, was the key to the security of his garrison.

By 1301, we have a clearer sense of the administrative responsibilities which Kingston was exercising (Watson (1991), pp 157–8, 189–90, citing unpublished accounts in TNA E101/9/2 and E101/9/3; it seems from the different dates cited for the two reports that Kingston was operating a highly improvised administrative year, and then recalculated his totals a few months later at the end of the English tax year). The total conventional revenue generated in Lothian, both from the towns and landward, was less than £50, and even when this was supplemented by cash raised from impounded property, and fines levied on men coming to peace, the total was still less than £100. It is clear that the English governor was resorting to unconventional measures – he was using some of his soldiers as armed herdsmen to look after impounded livestock (a use for the hobelar that goes largely unrecorded in the sources), but he was also buying supplies from local suppliers and employing local smiths to shoe his men-at-arms' horses; and yet he still generated nearly £500 in unspecified additional revenue. It has been suggested that this was achieved by the sale of locally bought produce to his men in exchange for cash from their pay (Watson (1991), p 158), though it is also possible that it was generated by the trade in wool and hides, either through customs dues or direct participation in commercial activity. Even with all his creativity, however, Sir John was still over £70 in deficit simply on his administrative budget – and this modest and highly improvised set of accounts provides the only extant evidence for any form of real English civil administration in Scotland this period (Watson (1991), pp 158, 402).

The impression which the sources give is that Sir John Kingston was basically a good man – he was a loyal English knight, certainly, but he also showed a level of tolerance and compassion in his handling of the local community around Edinburgh, and a great deal of creativity in improvising something resembling a civilian administration. Implicit in his pragmatic flexibility, however, is a quiet truth: the inflexible bureaucratic expectations of the official English occupation strategy did not work – and there is no evidence that any other English official in this period thought to imitate his approach.

It seems likely that King Edward did understand that Kingston's approach was working – early in 1301, he opted to extend his offer of peace to the 'midle sort' in Scotland, a vaguely defined group above the £1 limit he had imposed 2½ years earlier;²⁹ but it is doubtful whether really the King of England understood *why* the occupation in Lothian had not degenerated into violence – to Edward I, giving his peace to the Scots meant magnanimously redeeming them from a state of outlawry which allowed any Englishman to kill them without fear of retribution. What Sir John Kingston had achieved around Edinburgh looks a lot more like a tactful cooperation with a local population which he knew had no loyalty to England, allowing them to live their own lives in order to ensure a state of relative peace.

The series of detailed documents recording garrison activities halts in 1302, and it is perhaps no coincidence that the secretary William of Routh appears to have been reassigned to other duties at this point – we find him administering the revenues of the Bishop of Glasgow, building a fortress at Selkirk and acting as paymaster for the English campaign army. The later evolution of the garrison is principally recorded by a sequence of muster lists, with several in rapid succession from around 1302, followed by additional reports in 1304, 1307 and 1312. The shift

in the pattern of documentary evidence also coincided with two other events: a year-long truce, and a major review and reorganisation of the entire English occupation strategy.

1302–6

The background to the truce lay in Edward I of England's continental war against Philip II of France. The French king had sprung John Balliol from house arrest to political asylum in his ancestral French chateau, and now he threatened to send a military expedition to Scotland to place the exiled king back on his throne. It was mainly a bluff, in order to force the English to come to the negotiating table, but the French insisted that the resulting truce and peace negotiations needed to be extended to cover the Scots as well.

The truce took effect on 26 January 1302, to last until the start of November, and the English used the pause in hostilities to reorganise their military deployments (*CDS* ii. No. 1337). The new plan envisaged a shift in the main deployment of troops to castles further west in Galloway and Clydesdale, to hold strongpoints taken in the previous year's campaign and combat Scottish forces active in their hinterland; the shift of emphasis was signalled by the promotion of Sir John de St John, the commander in Galloway, to the position of commander-in-chief of all forces in Scotland. At Edinburgh, the reduced garrison of 30 men-at-arms was retained, a decision formalised on 12 February 1302, now supported by a reduced and rationalised infantry contingent of 20 crossbowmen and 20 archers. They were surrounded by an increased number of even smaller local garrisons in Lothian and the Borders, based on a new administrative structure of smaller counties, with new sheriffs at Linlithgow, Jedburgh and Selkirk. Sir John Kingston was to remain in command in Edinburgh, but with a reduced territorial responsibility that no longer included the frontier zone in West Lothian.

The English probably never seriously intended the truce as anything more than an opportunity to prepare for a renewed war. As early as 12 February, Sir John Kingston was assigned to oversee the construction of a 'fortress' (*forcelette*) at Linlithgow (Watson (1991), pp 306–7, citing unpublished documents in E101/68/1, m.23). By June, construction was well underway (*CDS* v. No. 282). The defeat of the French cavalry by Flemish rebels at Courtrai in July 1302 meant that the threat of an expedition to return John Balliol to his kingdom could be dismissed, and a revised garrison scheme, formally agreed on 15 August 1302 and in place by 14 September 1302, was designed as a basis for renewed offensive preparations, ahead of a massive invasion which was already scheduled for May 1303. This new plan called for a slight increase in the castle's garrison compared with the truce period, although it was not restored to anything like the size it had been in 1300 – it now consisted of Kingston and his lieutenant, 40 other men-at-arms and 40 infantry. More significant changes are revealed by the details which this document provides about the organisation of the cavalry force; gone are the knights and their retinues, and, instead, the garrison consists of lower-ranking men-at-arms, divided roughly equally between an enlarged personal retinue for Kingston, a platoon of soldiers serving individually for pay and men performing unpaid knight-service owed by local lordships (several of which King Edward had evidently declared forfeit and given to English barons). Half the infantry were crossbowmen, the rest presumably archers, following the model established at the

start of the truce. The bowyer, carpenter and the smith and his assistant made up a modest support element.

Although the garrison's numbers had been raised again, its relative importance was simultaneously reduced by assigning proportionally stronger reinforcements to several other strongpoints: it was now just one of a group of local bases, with identical garrisons installed in Roxburgh and the Bishop of Glasgow's castle at Carstairs. The shift of status was most clearly emphasised, however, by the very strong contrast with the new garrison at Linlithgow, where a force of almost 100 heavy cavalry were now stationed, including nearly a dozen knights and 16 royal serjeants-at-arms, supported by a battalion of 100 infantry working on the construction of a new fortress to accommodate them. Linlithgow had evidently superseded Edinburgh as the base of the main English combat force in central Scotland.

The decision suggests that Edinburgh Castle may not have been particularly well adapted for the form of warfare which the English were attempting to wage in Scotland, in which castles were thought of as fortified bases for heavy cavalry squadrons, with their attendant requirements in support personnel and horse-fodder. Evidence from the 1330s suggests that the road into the castle was awkwardly narrow for formations of war-horses, while the large outer bailey in the area of the modern esplanade may not have been particularly secure. The new fortress taking shape at Linlithgow, described as a peel rather than a castle, consisted of a broad moat backed by rugged wooden ramparts, enclosing a parish church whose steeple and nave were converted into a keep and granary (Watson (1991), pp 305–8), and – surely the primary consideration – a large tract of lush lakeside meadow, ideal accommodation for a powerful force of war-horses. Another significant factor in this shift of focus was the emergence of a local Scottish baron as an important regional figure on the English side: Sir Alexander Livingston, who had been appointed as Sheriff of West Lothian with a retinue of ten men-at-arms, now working in conjunction with the Linlithgow garrison.

The move may have actually strengthened Edinburgh Castle's role in some respects – a smaller garrison required a reduced quantity of victuals, thus making them less vulnerable to the sort of replenishment problems which had led to Stirling's surrender in 1299, and potentially this also allowed Edinburgh to give over a larger proportion of its storage spaces to serve as a logistics hub for other bases; but there is little sign that Edinburgh played a significant role in the English campaigns of the next few years.

People in southern England were told that the renewed war was merely a response to a sudden uprising by a rag-tag mob of peasant rebels under an outlaw named William Wallace, but events in the first stage of the campaign revealed that the reorganisation had not significantly strengthened the English position. In February, the Scots routed the first significant English foray at Roslin, less than 10 miles from Edinburgh Castle, and destroyed the brand-new English peel at Selkirk, but on 16 May 1303 Edward I led the main army into Scotland in person. The king paused for only one night at Edinburgh on 4 June (Gough (1900), ii. 226, 286), then marched north, besieging Brechin Castle on the way, and advanced as far as Kinloss before turning south. English chroniclers report with pride on the brutal war they were told had been waged against the civilian population. Simultaneously, a division of reinforcements from Ireland were shipped to the Clyde and directed against castles in Argyll. The King of England

encamped for the winter at Dunfermline Abbey, symbolically located north of the Forth but also readily supplied directly by sea, while his men prepared for the siege of the Scottish garrison in Stirling Castle (Barrow (2005), p 165; Haskell (1999), pp 224–32).

Edward won no great victories in this campaign, and it cost England a great deal of money, but early in 1304 a deal was struck with the majority of the Scottish leaders, led by the Comyns: in exchange for political autonomy and a general **amnesty, they accepted Edward's overlordship**, and agreed to pay relatively modest financial compensation (Barrow (2005), pp 169–70). A minority refused to accept. The regent Sir John de Soules, abroad for peace talks in Paris, chose to remain in exile, though a fighting force remained in arms under William Wallace – the former Edinburgh soldier Thomas de Bois may have been among them – and the Scottish garrison of Stirling Castle held out until 25 July 1304. Their surrender was a barren success for Edward I: English chronicles show a shift in his **subjects' attitudes since the previous year – they were impressed by the Scots' heroic defence, and felt troubled by their king's blatantly vindictive attitude towards them.**

Amidst this sustained activity, Edinburgh Castle is notable in this period mainly by its absence from the records, with only intermittent glimpses of its old role as a logistics hub. On 15 July 1303, the garrison was ordered to send the castle's second-best siege engine north by sea for the siege of Brechin, along with another one that had been brought up to Edinburgh from its normal location at Jedburgh. There are some references to deliveries of supplies in and around Edinburgh in early 1304 that might have drawn on stores in the castle (*CDS* ii. Nos. 1443, 1446), but the documents only clearly identify a brief flurry of renewed activity in March 1304, when oats and peas from the castle stores were provided as fodder for English horses, and the siege engineer Master Thomas of Houghton was evidently sent to inspect a supply of siege equipment still remaining in Edinburgh, in advance of the assault on Stirling.

On 20 March 1304, Sir John Kingston was ordered to ensure that Master Thomas could strip Newbattle Abbey's woods as much as he needed to repair the siege engines at Edinburgh, and it seems likely that Master Thomas's advice lay behind a letter from King Edward to Kingston on 30 March 1304 – someone had noticed a set of large shields kept in the castle, and it was thought that they would be useful in the attack on Stirling. It is telling that two *former* officers of the Edinburgh garrison played significant roles at Stirling – Thomas of Houghton had been in Edinburgh in 1300 and 1301, while Alexander le Convers, the logistics clerk from 1298, seems to have been involved in building the massive new trebuchet, *Loup de Guerre* or 'Warwolf'. Their skills were now employed elsewhere. Even Sir John Kingston seems to have been absent for protracted periods (Watson (1991), p 310).

The peace agreement brought about a further reduction in Edinburgh Castle's importance to the English occupation regime. Even before the surrender of Stirling, the muster of 6 May 1304 shows that the English garrison in Edinburgh had declined to just two knights, 15 other men-at-arms and 20 crossbowmen. It seems that Edward I did not pass through during his return to England in August (Gough (1900), ii. 240).

The garrison seems to have been temporarily strengthened a few months later, only to be reduced again on 7 March 1305. Perhaps this had something to do with

the capture of Thomas du Bois, who was ordered south to the Tower of London on 12 April 1305. In the next year, the garrison was certainly scaled down even further, and Kingston's salary declined from £100 to just £80. In this period, we find him involved in repairing the peel at Linlithgow (*CDS* v. No. 409), affirming local knights and barons who had been at war with England for a decade in peaceful possession of their lordships, and negotiating the competing claims that had arisen due to English grants of 'forfeited' lands (*CDS* v. Nos. 355, 365). In August 1305, the capture of William Wallace gave Edward the opportunity to use his graphic public execution to celebrate the peace and the start of discussions over a new constitutional settlement, rubber-stamped by a brief parliament on 15 September 1305: in its Anglicisation of the executive and its lack of security for any Scotsmen in positions of power, it must have seemed similar to what he had done in 1291 (Barrow (2005), pp 175–6). A young English knight, Sir Ivo Aldeburgh, was appointed as Sheriff of Lothian, marking a further reduction in Sir John Kingston's local responsibilities, which were now purely restricted to the military garrison.

A new role was being prepared for the constable of Edinburgh, however. On 26 October 1305, Sir John Kingston was one of two English representatives appointed to a four-man regency commission, along with John Sandal, an English financial administrator tactfully given the Scottish title of chamberlain, and two senior Scottish leaders Sir Robert Keith and the Bishop of St Andrews. The decision to appoint Kingston seems to indicate that, notwithstanding the reduced size of his garrison, he had been restored to his original position as the *de facto* commander of the military aspect of the English occupation. The decision also suggests that he was someone the Scots were prepared to work with, supporting the inferences drawn from his well-documented actions in 1299–1301. The system presumably seemed to work, as Edward I ordered the commission temporarily renewed on 16 February 1306.

On 10 February 1306, however, Robert Bruce and John Comyn had held a secret meeting in the Franciscan church at Dumfries, to discuss how to revitalise the Scottish resistance. Heirs of two of the compliant magnates of 1291, and heirs also of the Balliol and Annandale claims to the throne, they had not inherited their forebears pro-English inclinations, and had both been leading Scottish military commanders against the English, but they had a history of personal hostility, which had prompted Bruce to come to peace with the English during the truce of 1302, while Comyn led the main Scottish surrender in 1304. Now, during the Dumfries conference, a squabble ensued: Comyn was slain, and Bruce put himself at the head of a renewed Scottish mobilisation. The Bishop of Glasgow absolved him for his rival's death and presented him with the war banner that had been flown at Stirling Bridge and Falkirk. On 25 March, Robert Bruce was enthroned at Scone as King of Scots.

The news of events in Dumfries seems to have reached Edinburgh Castle the next day, 11 March 1306: Sir John Kingston hurriedly mobilised his men, and placed an improvised new garrison in the castle – just ten men-at-arms, four light cavalry and four crossbowmen, being paid using Kingston's £80 salary; his lieutenant, a kinsman from his retinue, was left in command (see 22 July 1306), and a siege engineer and some workmen were found a few days later. This was the smallest force that the English had ever used to hold Edinburgh, but its slender numbers surely reflect a simple lack of available troops and funds. On 22 July 1306, they had the privilege of issuing supplies to the Prince of Wales and the English governor-general of Scotland, hurrying north in pursuit of Bruce's men, but they

did not receive any reinforcements. Most of the time they may have been shut up behind their fortifications, glad that their small numbers eased their need for new supplies.

Sir John seems to have rendezvoused initially with the Chamberlain John Sandal, and they attempted to act as co-regents and coordinate the English response – but they appear to have been abandoned by their Scottish colleagues and were finding it hard to enforce their authority – the English Sheriff of Cumberland was simply ignoring them (*CDS* v. No. 414). Kingston took his leave from left the remnants of the regency regime (probably before 4 March 1306), and joined the campaign army mobilised by Aymer de Valence, participating in the victory over Bruce's men at Methven on 19 June 1306; it was a hard-fought battle, where Sir John, one of his men-at-arms and one of his hobelars were all among the English cavalry who lost their horses to the Scottish spears, but it did not end the war: they were still 'riding continuously' with the army in November 1306.

By now, Sir John Kingston had been on continuous campaign in Scotland for nine years, and officials in London were starting to forget that he was an Englishman – in December 1307 he was accidentally included in a draft list of Scotsmen loyal to England (*CDS* v. No. 499). At this point, however, he simply disappears from the records, and, while he might have been uncomfortable to be mistaken for a Scot, this unintended compliment by an English bureaucrat is perhaps an appropriate place to lose sight of him – all the efforts he had made to find a practical means of coexistence between his English garrison and the people around the Scottish fortress that they occupied had not gone unobserved.

1306–14

The English position was initially strong – Comyn's slaying and the acclamation of King Robert had divided the Scottish community, with most of the Comyn and Balliol supporters thrust into the English camp, and the defeat at Methven and the fall of Scottish-held castles like Kildrummy weakened the resistance, and many of Bruce's men-at-arms were captured, or simply surrendered; but King Edward I of England threw away every military advantage in a display of bloodshed and cruelty that appalled even his loyal friends (Barrow (2005), pp 198, 209–10). One detail out of the many was particularly relevant to the story of Edinburgh Castle. When King Edward captured and beheaded Sir Simon Fraser, he remembered that handsome Sir Herbert Morham had once used the turn of phrase 'I bet my head they'll never catch him' – so he declared that he had won the bet and thus Sir Herbert's head, beheading Thomas du Bois alongside him for good measure.

The only effect of all this madness, as even the most loyal English chroniclers conceded, was to galvanise the Scottish people behind Bruce. Edward marched north with an army and began to realise the catastrophic effect his policy had had; then he was thrown into a new rage by the Scottish victory at Loudon Hill in May 1307, in which Bruce defeated Valence's cavalry and avenged Methven (Barrow (2005), pp 222–4; *Bruce*, p 304, n. 271). When he dropped dead in July 1307, still raging, he was succeeded by his son, King Edward II. Perhaps the English were initially thankful for a king who preferred building drystone walls to watching public executions. Now, however, something else happened which changed the nature of the war: English-held castles began to fall, not to protracted blockades of the sort that had won Stirling in 1299, nor to the intensive sort of military

engineering the English themselves employed, but to commando-like raiders storming over their high walls with minimal equipment – first Inverlochy, Urquhart and Inverness in 1307, and by 1309 castles were falling to simultaneous Scottish campaigns all across the kingdom, and the English government was authorising – perhaps even ordering – the few remaining strongpoints north of the Forth to accept any truce that they could negotiate in order to prevent complete collapse (Barrow (2005), pp 250–1).

Although these events provide important background context, Edinburgh Castle plays no real role in the narrative of this period. It seems the extant sources do not even identify the governor between 1308 and 1310. The few surviving documents suggest the same irregular pattern of intermittent victuals and delayed pay, and the one detailed insight into the life of the garrison in this period cannot be securely dated any more precisely than 1307 x 1310. This is a letter sent in the name of everyone between the Forth and the Border who had come to peace with the English after a decade of occupation, styling themselves the ‘local community’ (*communitas*). They complain that the soldiers in Edinburgh Castle and the other English garrisons had acquired the habit of simply stealing what they wanted from the town markets, a habit that was particularly strong in Edinburgh. To make matters worse, during truce periods when the Scots who were not at peace with the English came into the towns to trade, the garrison soldiers plundered them as well. None of this, the authors point out, was benefiting anyone. Two conclusions can be drawn: firstly, the English garrisons still did not have the military strength to confront the Scots even in Lothian and the eastern Borders – indeed, they actually depended on their local enemies to some extent for provisions and revenues, in a curious symbiosis which also implies that the Scots were buying supplies and equipment from the ostensibly English-controlled towns; to make matters worse, the increasing rapacity of some troops – itself a sign of fraying discipline – was alienating those Scots in close proximity to Edinburgh and the other castles, who had accepted the ‘king’s peace’ because it allowed them to get on with their lives. This fits with a wider pattern of evidence which shows that English control in Lothian, probably never based on anything more than the garrison’s basic need to live in relative peace with their neighbours, was starting to openly unravel (Barrow (2005), pp 246–9).

Around 1310, a new military governor emerges into view in the documents: Piers Lubaud, a serjeant-at-arms – a sort of mounted commando – from Gascony who had been in Lothian for around a decade, serving mainly in Linlithgow but occasionally in Edinburgh. One well-informed source asserts that he was a relative (*cognatus*) of Piers Gaveston, Edward II’s influential favourite, and insinuates that he had been promoted to command due to this connection (*Vita*, p 184). A degree of personal closeness with the royal household is certainly suggested by a courtly exchange of gifts between Lubaud’s wife and the king (*CDS* iii. No. 298). By August 1310, Lubaud’s authority had been extended from his original command at Linlithgow to make him sheriff of all Lothian, and military governor of Edinburgh Castle. This may have been in anticipation of the arrival of Edward II and Gaveston with a campaign army – though, in the end, the army never advanced beyond the Borders. The gift to Lubaud of royal demesne lands at Bathgate and Ratho is not significant in itself, and even the award of knighthood was probably not excessive – many men-at-arms with less prominent positions received similar promotions; but it is notable that the gift of lands was taken back at the end of 1311, just after a faction of barons had forced their way into government and driven Gaveston into exile (*CDS* iii. No. 230). Nonetheless, Lubaud retained his position as commander

of the garrison and Sheriff of Lothian. Perhaps no one else wanted the responsibility.

The pay list in 1312 represents the fullest outline of the English garrison at any date in its existence. This document shows the garrison was also at its highest ever strength - it had unequivocally regained the importance which it seemed to be losing a decade earlier. The Edinburgh garrison now had over 80 men-at-arms, plus a similar number of other troops. The men-at-arms were divided into three distinct companies - the largest, mustering around 50 men-at-arms, was led in person by Lubaud, supported by two smaller retinues of 25 and five, led respectively by George Saunford, a royal serjeant-at-arms from London, and a Yorkshire man-at-arms, John of Yokefleet. An even more significant change is the **significant concentration of Scottish names among Lubaud's men-at-arms**: around 20 of the 50 can be confidently regarded as Scots, with many clearly drawn from Lothian - Duddingston, Crichton, Hawthornden, Seton, Winton; others are Frenchmen, and yet more have names which do not clearly reveal their origins, so this company may have had a Scottish majority, outnumbering the Englishmen.

Outside this, however, **there are only four probable Scots in Saunford's retinue**, as well as two who might be French, and the overall pattern is complicated by hints of transfers between the units - William Mowat, a Scottish-man-at-arms serving in Lubaud's contingent, has a son in Saunford's company, and Lubaud and Yokefleet each have another Saunford in theirs, while the bulk of the English names appear to be associated with Yorkshire. The impression is of a force of men-at-arms divided roughly equally between Scots and English - perhaps specifically Scots and Yorkshiremen - with a small balance of Frenchmen in addition. Among the 84 other troops - hobelars, archers and crossbowmen - exactly one-quarter are identifiably Scots, while later evidence suggests that the mason and perhaps the smith were also local men. The English had now controlled Edinburgh for 16 years, and perhaps this level of local participation in the garrison is understandable - though evidence to be discussed below suggests that the situation was more complex.

In addition, **there were two further garrisons under Lubaud's command in West Lothian**. These each had its own distinct character, but they were united by the role of the local baron Sir Archibald Livingston, who had now been serving as the head of the occupation administration here for at least a decade, although the document in question does not grace him with a formal title. A detailed discussion of West Lothian is something of a digression, but it will be seen below that it is necessary for a full understanding of the castle's role in this period.

The troop concentration at the Peel of Linlithgow was only slightly smaller than that at Edinburgh - but it was smaller, nonetheless, attesting to a shift of emphasis back to the traditional powerbase of the castle. The Linlithgow garrison mustered around 70 men-at-arms, 30 light cavalry and 45 crossbowmen, but it had a much more complex organisation: as the head of the local administration and as the only resident knight, Sir Archibald Livingston was de facto commander, but his personal retinue of four Scottish men-at-arms, **plus two more serving as Lubaud's esquires**, formed only a small minority in a predominantly foreign garrison, whose leaders were the Gascon serjeants Raymond Caillou and Arnaud de Saint-Martin (possibly a pirate serving temporarily on land; see Heebøl-Holm (2003), p 158 n. 97) and the Cornish man-at-arms Thomas Hewysch. As these men's backgrounds suggest, this garrison was a medley of soldiers with very disparate origins - mostly from England, but with no obvious local or regional focus among its

recruits, plus several men from Ireland and a few French, and at least one, Bernard 'de Campania', who may have been from southern Italy; the inclusion of a smattering of Scots among them, such as the men-at-arms Alexander Stirling, William Murray and John and William Lithgow, the hobelar Alan of Bothwell, and the crossbowman Alan of Windyshiels, simply represents the diverse nature of this garrison. It is notable that the rank-and-file, the light cavalry and crossbowmen, did not contain the significant Scottish minority seen in Edinburgh – and it is also notable that there are no archers at all; the use of only crossbowmen, by definition professional soldiers employed as static garrison troops, suggests a more militarily vulnerable position.

Outside of Sir Alexander Livingston's personal retinue, the most concentrated group of Scots at Linlithgow in 1312 was among the six watchmen at the bottom of the pay scale, of whom at least half were certainly Scots – Nicholas of Forth, Stephen of Torphichen and William of Edinburgh. They, too, were probably Livingston's own men, but their presence only serves to highlight the contrast between the small Scottish contingent here, and the little army of mercenaries which the English government had placed in garrison with them – an uneasy juxtaposition intensified by the fact that Livingston's authority in the garrison is only implicit in the muster, based on his knightly status and his local standing, and his position at the head of the list. In practice, Caillou and Saint-Martin might have answered directly to their fellow Gascon.

A sharp and surprising contrast is presented by the smaller garrison based at Livingston, consisting of ten mounted men-at-arms and 20 archers serving as infantry – this was Sir Archibald's own moated manor house, and the men here were all probably Scots: six men-at-arms and 17 archers take their names from Scottish places, and none are obviously English.

The whole scenario seems like an uncomfortable compromise between an occupation force of fundamentally foreign character, and the military retinue of a local baron who was too powerful to ignore, but at the same time, too obviously independent of the English apparatus to allow his men to hold the area alone. This impression is intensified when we glance back at the Edinburgh muster – Andrew Livingston, man-at-arms, Archibald Livingston and John and William Strathbrock, hobelars, and Jon Lithgow and Hugh of Blackness, archers, all represent the same local powerbase in West Lothian. Others, with less immediately obvious West Lothian connections, may also be Sir Archibald Livingston's men: he had taken control of Duddingston, in the castle's immediate hinterland, a decade earlier, and held onto it in defiance of repeated English attempts to take it off him (Watson (1991) p 358), so it is no surprise to find a Thomas of Duddingston as a hobelar in the Edinburgh garrison now. The wide range of Livingston's recruitment base is further emphasised by the presence of soldiers from the wider Lothian area in the effectively private garrison of Livingston – men from Currie, Petcox and Haddington, and a Thomas Morham, man-at-arms, who might be Sir Herbert's younger brother. The overall impression is of a single local baron who had used an accommodation with the English not simply to protect his interests, but to make himself indispensable to theirs – his status embodied first and foremost by what was effectively a small private army garrisoning in his own manor house, and further expressed by his authority at Linlithgow, and a meaningful contribution to the garrison in Edinburgh. With this in mind, it is necessary to modify our interpretation of the local contribution to the Edinburgh garrison at this date – rather than representing a broad-based community of Scots working directly with

the English, many of the Scottish soldiers were instead the followers of one local baron who had taken that responsibility on himself.

Notwithstanding the war, the occupation regime was able to secure some revenues from the sheriffdom – indeed, for the first time, we can see the general socio-economic outline of the English occupation regime in Scotland as a whole. In the year ending in July 1312, Lubaud rendered a total revenue from the Lothians of just over £350, of which Midlothian provided approximately half, equal to the combined totals from Haddington and Linlithgow. Within Midlothian itself, a little over two-thirds of the royal profits came from the landward, with the remainder being divided between the burgh taxes and the revenues of the Templars' forfeited lordship – the English government had not yet begun the process of transferring Templar property to the Hospitallers (Perkins (1910), p 259). The relatively modest total of less than £20 from the Templars' lands, however, makes clear that these numbers were mere fractions of what would be obtained in normal circumstances.

The total being administered by Lubaud represented just under a quarter of the occupation regime's revenues in Scotland, making the control of Edinburgh a significant asset to the English government, though it came in a modest second place behind the customs generated by wool export from Berwick, which accounted for almost half the total. Equally significantly, this revenue was heavily outweighed by the expenses of the garrisons – the annual pay for his men topped £4,000, roughly half of that being for Edinburgh and the rest divided between Linlithgow and Livingston, with rations adding not one but two further layers of expense: firstly, they needed to be paid for, and it is also clear that they still needed to be imported from England. To make matters worse, a document of 16 May 1313 suggests that merchants were using the cover of supply runs to the garrisons to simply sell military supplies to the Scots. Given what we can infer about the way that the local truce was observed, the concern was perhaps not unfounded (and with the supplies already paid for in England, the Scots probably got a much better price for them as well).

With arrears of pay approaching five years' revenue from his sheriffdom, on 14 March 1312 Lubaud was granted indefinite control of the taxes from Boston in Lincolnshire – then the second-largest single item of English government income after London's trade (*CDS* iii. No. 254; the table in Lloyd (1977), p 123 indicates that Boston in 1312 produced an annual revenue of over £3,000). This grant of revenue may partially reflect Lubaud's kinship to Gaveston, who had recently been restored to favour by Edward II, but it is also a sharp indication of the financial burdens under which the garrison were struggling; even assuming that the Boston grant survived Gaveston's overthrow and execution, money in Lincolnshire could not be used to directly solve the physical difficulties of paying and provisioning Edinburgh Castle in Scotland, especially with the English military position now starting to unravel completely – the capture of Perth in January 1313 removed the last English base north of the Forth, while the fall of Dumfries a month later signalled the collapse of the hard-won English position in the south-west. The Scots were also taking the offensive into northern England, highlighting the impotence of the remaining garrisons. All England's gains since 1297 had been wiped out. Lubaud was now isolated politically by his cousin's execution, and militarily by the shattering of the illusion of an occupation zone, and it is probably no surprise that by 20 August 1313 the Edinburgh garrison was short of supplies again. By the start of 1314, it seems that his garrison was in a state of mutiny.

On 22 February 1314, Edward II issued an order appointing Sir Ebles de Mountz as governor in place of Lubaud. The Scots had shifted to the offensive, and captured Roxburgh on the night of 19–20 February – according to *The Bruce*, Edinburgh Castle was already under siege by this point, surrounded by a large Scottish force which lacked sophisticated siege engines, but were more than capable of blockading the main gateway; Lubaud may even have been negotiating his surrender. In response the garrison had ousted him from command, replacing him with an English commander chosen from their ranks.

The deposition of Lubaud showed that the garrison were determined to hold out, and that determination was echoed by the English government's decision to appoint the veteran Sir Ebles de Mountz as his permanent replacement. It did them no good, and the garrison's end came dramatically. On the night of 14 March 1314, a small force of Scottish assailants scaled the Castle Rock and louped over the battlements on a rope ladder. The version in the *Bruce* says they were guided up by a man named William Francis, who had used the route to slip in and out to see his girlfriend when his father had been keeper of the castle – as noted above, he is likely to have been the son of the commander who surrendered the fortress to the English in 1296. The Scots must have been outnumbered several times over by the garrison, but the English sources do not attempt to use the taint of Lubaud's personal treason to excuse the defeat that the Scots inflicted on his men.

For the first time in nearly 20 years, the Scots controlled Edinburgh Castle, but its capture was swiftly followed by its demolition – Barbour says that King Robert ordered it done when he arrived a few days later. Only St Margaret's Chapel appears to have been left intact.

1314–35

For the next 20 years, virtually nothing is recorded of the castle. The English did threaten Edinburgh once more, around 23 August 1322, but Edward II's army was already disintegrating through lack of supplies, in what seems to have been a horrific logistical catastrophe (Powicke (1960)). With Scottish military offensives generally keeping the English armies tied down to the south of the Border, Edinburgh recovered; the burgh tax revenues were generously capped at £34 13s 8d (50 marks plus £1) to stimulate trade, but by 1328, admittedly a particularly good year, the wool trade generated an additional customs receipt of over £600, and the landward returned revenues of nearly £400 (*ER* i. 112, 175). Small contributions from Haddington and Linlithgow helped the Sheriffdom's revenues above £1,000, around three times what the English had taken in 1312, and there was no garrison to support, either – it was all reinvested in the community, or helped support King Robert's government. The royal court also resided regularly in the town – but they must have stayed at Holyrood or Blackfriars rather than the castle. A reference to repairs on a castle chapel in 1329 has been thought to refer to St Margaret's Chapel, but it evidently relates to work at Roxburgh. Parts of the Castle Hill in Edinburgh were leased as grazing ground for sheep.

Edinburgh had already enjoyed a decade or two of peace when war formally came to an end on 3 May 1328. The terms of the peace treaty granted the Scots full recognition of their independence, and an English princess as a bride for David II, in exchange for providing a £20,000 bribe to the English government – a clever

move, which paid for the return of some of the treasures plundered in 1296, gave the English government a financial incentive to support the Scottish wool trade rather than encourage piracy against it, and also provided Queen Isabella with a private revenue to support her regency.

The impetus for renewed war in the 1330s came from an unexpected quarter – King Robert died soon after the peace, with all his hopes achieved, but the regency for the young David II was unstable and apparently unpopular, and in 1332 a group of exiled heirs of the Comyn faction rallied around John Balliol's son Edward, and staged a bold invasion of Scotland, initially achieving dramatic success and enthroning Edward Balliol at Scone; but they proved unable to retain their grip on power in the face of the military support commanded by David II's Randolph, Moray and Stewart kinsmen and their Douglas allies. Edward III extracted a high price in exchange for military support for Edward Balliol: on 12 June 1334, the Balliol claimant formally ceded the lands between the Forth and the Border to the King of England.

In the first two years of this new war, Edinburgh Castle appears to have lain deserted. The first we hear of it is on 30 July 1335, when the Count of Namur, beaten at the Boroughmuir, fled into Edinburgh tried to fortify the ruins – but he surrendered after a single night. The height of the Castle Rock was a naturally strong position, but a castle needed victuals and quarters for its garrison. The English had opted to avoid Lothian during their invasion, advancing instead through Roxburgh, Stirling and Perth, returning only when they had garrisoned those three strongpoints. The second English occupation of Edinburgh Castle formally began on 13 September 1335, and the new garrison embarked on a thorough project to refortify the castle.

1335–41

The documents produced by the English garrison during this period are less numerous in quantity than those from 1298–1302, but they include unquestionably the most important individual items of medieval paperwork relating to Edinburgh Castle. To an extent, the second English occupation reads like a predictable repeat of the intractable problems encountered the first-time round – by 26 June 1336, pay was already 18 weeks in arrears, and the surviving documents illustrate the same background pattern of intermittent supply ships, armies passing north on ineffectual campaigns and letters of protection for soldiers accused of crimes at home. There is also a distinct difference which emerges on a close reading of the evidence: there was also a distinct shift towards the employment of Scotsmen, or at least the sons of Scottish exiles. The main significance of these documents, however, is the painfully detailed record of the English governors' attempt to rebuild the castle and its attendant sheriffdom.

In sharp contrast even with the unsettled days of Piers Lubaud, the new regime found only a ruined heap of rubble, surrounded by an abandoned hinterland in which a great deal of the landscape seems to have been returning to the wild. Nonetheless, the documentation, in its detailed enumeration of each uncollected item of revenue, retains a memory of what *should* have been there – it reveals the vast and prosperous seigneurie of royal demesne which had stood around the castle in the peace of the 1320s and even in the 13th century, and the rebuilding of

the ruined castle allows us to gain the strongest glimpse of all of the architecture of the medieval buildings themselves.

The early English accounts record an unrivalled survey of medieval Lothian. While some areas of the landward generated worthwhile revenues, and we can glimpse **flickers of life in manor houses and monasteries**, the castle's immediate hinterland seems to have been almost totally deserted and was perhaps returning to a wilderness. The burgh revenues had dropped to barely £15, and the customs toll was even lower. This shows that the area was seriously disrupted even before the tempo of military activities around Edinburgh increased in October 1337, an event which the Scottish chroniclers describe as causing serious socio-economic damage in Lothian. Equally significantly, the documents record what *should* have been there – a **prosperous land of little castles and lairds'** houses, with a scattering of modest religious foundations established by pious but evidently prosperous men of knightly rank, and small fishing ports and market towns, giving way around Edinburgh itself to a quite different landscape: tracts of woodland and moorland, much of which would be used for royal hunting, interspersed with the vast open fields of an immense concentration of royal demesne (for comparison, most of Inverleith Park seems to have been a single field of grain), all lightly populated but in principle immensely prosperous – probably the largest concentration of royal demesne in Scotland. **Beneath the castle's walls and cliffs, the landscape** developed into gardens and orchards, but in normal times the view of field and forest from the castle's battlements would have been a vista of royal wealth and pleasure, with drama added to the landscape by cliffs and gorges such as Arthur's Seat, Calton Hill and the Dean. It is here that we stand closest to the castle's setting in the medieval landscape, when the town was still restricted to the Royal Mile and the Grassmarket – and, even here, the townscape would be defined predominantly by church towers and long gardens rather than by clustered tenements.

The accounts of the revenue that was *not* being brought in by the English occupation regime records only an after-image of the Edinburgh of Robert Bruce and Alexander III, but the castle itself was being repaired, and a report filed on 2 November 1335, after about six weeks of repair work, show that progress was being made (the relevant section is translated in full at the end of this appendix). A group of masons were at work, and a smith, John of Dalkeith, along with his assistant; the lack of any expense accounts for his smithy suggests that it had perhaps already been built – it can be identified with the forge located archaeologically on Mill's Mount, dated precisely to this period.

The first priority was apparently making a kitchen, its location described as 'under' (*subtus*) the Great Chapel, followed by a great deal of work on roofing and doorways, suggesting that the castle contained stone buildings which were put back into a rough sort of repair; the fact that the space 'under' the chapel did not need re-roofing hints that it had a vaulted undercroft, which was already weatherproof.

A major effort was expended to put a roof on the chapel and an adjacent aisle-like strongroom called 'the Countinghouse', and this was nearly completed by November; they also got a lock for the countinghouse, and an iron-bound chest from Flanders to put documents and coin in, while the chapel also gained an arched timber frame of two crucks (*crokes*) for its door, and perhaps a ceiling, with 141 'Eastland boards' (oak, fir or spruce planks from Prussia) being bought in addition to the initial roofing material – though, in the end, it was decided to use it

as a granary. A new stable for the soldiers' horses was also built and began to be roofed, while a 'great chamber' is mentioned as requiring similar refurbishment. Fittings were also procured for a prison, with three pairs of fetters, and metal hasps and staples for the stocks.

There was a great gate, iron-bound and set in a frame of iron-bound wood rather than a stone archway – perhaps the original arch had been brought down, but the adjacent guard chamber only required a new door. There was also an outer gate 'under the hoardings' (*subtus le hurdys*), which received two iron bands (*bandes*) and four crucks – the same two gates are recognisable under the same names in the narrative of the 1341 attack on the castle provided by Jean le Bel and Froissart.

Supplies of lime were obtained – mostly to be shipped north for the fortifications of Perth, but some evidently for the mortar and harling of the castle's repaired walls and building; axes and other stoneworking tools were procured, some from William of Dunfermline, who subsequently appears as one of the masons working on the site. An associated list of the workmen tells its own story – John of Kilburn, master of works, and the master-carpenter William of Swaledale, are both English, but at least six of the 11 masons are evidently local Scots, and, among the eight carpenters, a Donald, a David and a Duncan betray their origins, while others appear to be the sons of men who had been working in the castle under Sir John Kingston; all of them may have been local men, as, too, was the smith, John of Dalkeith. Although the project was overseen by Englishmen, and paid for in English cash, it seems that Edinburgh Castle was largely rebuilt by Scottish hands.

Additionally, there were four waggons, one of them iron-bound, and 24 oxen, presumably supply carts for victuals from Leith – we learn that they needed replacement parts, and hay for the oxen, got by mowing of six acres of meadow somewhere; they were looked after by Duncan Scot the wagon-master, with two ox-herds, a cooper for the wheels, and two men drying the oxen's hay – once again, local men.

There is a gap in the documents in the later 1330s, but an account filed on 26 January 1340 (translated in full at the end of this appendix) shows that, over the previous seven months or so, a team of four masons had been making a new gate with stone arches, presumably replacing the timber crucks set up in 1335, and a wall 'outside the castle under the quarry ... to raise the ground for a road for horses'; this wall buttressed a road 24ft wide and 80ft in length, which can be identified with the precursor of the modern route to the Portcullis Gate – an old quarry is identified in the cliff above it in some of Slezer's 17th-century sketches. There was also a carpenter making doors and timber battlements, perhaps for the new gateway, and a roofer (*coopertarius*), probably renewing the wooden roof-tiles that were now nearly five years old – and a quarrier, winning stone for the walls, plus eight men carrying the stones and six more making mortar, and six 'scavengers' whose main role was perhaps carrying out horse dung from the castle, but who performed various other duties as required. The image is of a castle community finding its footing, but the continued emphasis on the defences provides a distinct contrast with Stirling, where the emphasis on building and thatching their new grange feels almost bucolic.

The garrison itself was the centre of the new occupation regime – the body of men who the revenues of the sheriffdom and the fortification of the castle itself were supposed to sustain. The English record dates its official establishment from 13 September 1335 (*CDS* iii. No. 1186). It consisted of 120 men, divided equally

into 60 archers and 60 men-at-arms, eight of whom were knights. The archers were all from Yorkshire, but ten of the men-at-arms have names which identify them as Scots, including a knight called Sir Alexander Craigie – plus the commander, Sir Thomas Roslin. They may have formed a single unit; they certainly formed the basis of an enduring Scottish contingent which stayed in English pay until the garrison was overthrown. There was a significant body of auxiliaries, already discussed above, and concerned principally with the reconstruction of the fortifications and the castle's buildings.

At the start of November 1335, Sir Thomas Roslin handed over the castle to Sir John Stirling, a knight who a contemporary chronicler describes as 'a Scotsman by birth', although he had probably spent over 20 years in England. Perhaps the most telling indicator of his Scottishness was that he agreed to a salary of just £20 per annum – displaying a thoroughly Scottish sense of what a military governor's pay should be, and one which has somewhat puzzled historians used to the generous level of remuneration expected by medieval English captains; his main reward was to be an estate in Lothian worth 300 marks, or one valued at 200 marks in England if the English lost the war. This has been interpreted as a sign that Sir John Stirling was sceptical of the chances of the war's success – but it also signalled that he was loyal to Edward III, and that he would choose exile rather than defection.

The muster of 31 October 1336 shows a significant increase in the garrison's size to at least 90 men-at-arms and 71 hobelars and archers. This seems to be the largest medieval garrison ever recorded in the castle – a clear sign of its importance to the English campaign. Even more significantly, the garrison had acquired a predominantly Scottish character – although the hobelars and archers were all English troops, the English component among the higher-ranking personnel had declined to just 30 men-at-arms and one knight, Edmund of Berkley, who seems something like an afterthought in the list, and has no esquires attending him.

The Scottish component dominated the garrison's upper echelons; in addition to the commander, the number of Scottish knights had increased to five, each with two additional men-at-arms serving as their squires, and at least 25 additional men-at-arms serving individually, three of whom have the words 'not against oath' (*non contra fidem*) noted against their name – i.e. a concession that they are not obliged to fight in circumstances which go against the terms of a previous oath, an indication of accommodation to local sensibilities – they were probably men who had a 'bond' of personal alliance or allegiance with local leaders active on the opposing side. In another expression of the strangely Scottish character of the garrison, the traditional offices of a gatekeeper and two watchmen had been restored, though all three of them were in fact English. The international character of the command was emphasised by a contingent of nine German knights – a captain named as Sir Dietrich of Germany, with his two personal squires and five other men-at-arms. The strong Scottish element among the fighting men reinforces the impression that the accompanying contingent of masons and carpenters were also principally local men. In effect, Edinburgh Castle in this period was not truly an English outpost in the same way that it had been under Kingston and Lubaud: it was something else, with Scottish officers in charge, run in the manner of a 13th-century Scottish castle rather than a Plantagenet occupation garrison, and supported by a predominantly Scottish force of men-at-arms. The English contribution consisted principally of the low-ranking manpower taking orders from them.

The muster for 18 May 1337 shows an even more emphatic Scottish bias among the men-at-arms, and the start of local recruitment for the footsoldiers as well. This was the garrison which faced the siege of October 1337 and the subsequent period of sustained unrest, but it is unclear how we should understand those events – and the identity of the 80 ‘English’ casualties slain in a devastating Scottish night attack on their quarters outside the castle. Were they all, as Bower’s *Scotichronicon* suggests, swaggering English nationalists making use of the local brothels, who treated the pro-Balliol Scotsmen in the garrison as second-class human beings and perhaps took a similar attitude to the women they used for sex? The less assertive narrative of *Pluscarden* appears to deliberately eschew these implications and even introduce a note of moral ambiguity about the Scottish partisans’ actions, and underlines that other interpretations are also possible – were they actually innocent and well-liked local men, living with their guard down? Or were they unwanted reinforcements from the south, conscript archers far from home, perhaps billeted in the town by their commanders when the abortive siege revealed how little control they really had over the local population? It is hard to be entirely sure, but English pride and patriotism might well have been inflamed by the garrison’s reliance on local Scottish troops, and by the uncomfortable discovery that Sir John Stirling and his men had not achieved the pacification of Edinburgh, but merely – like their precursors 30 years before – peaceful coexistence with a local population who felt no love or loyalty for King Edward.

Muster rolls for 1338 and 1339 are missing, and it is unclear what the garrison was doing in these years beyond sitting tight; Sir John Stirling was captured in early 1338, and at some subsequent point Edinburgh Castle was united administratively with Stirling, with both fortresses being placed under the Stirling governor, Sir Thomas Rokeby – a Yorkshire neighbour of Edward Balliol. The next evidence confirms a decline in the Scottish component. On 26 January 1340, the garrison stood at 67 men-at-arms, including the governor and three other knights, 71 mounted archers and six watchmen – there are barely 20 Scots, although the core of local men under Sir Alexander Craigie remains in place.

The Scots’ recapture of Perth in 1339 had reduced the English invaders once again to little more than the quartet of castles held in 1297. A badly damaged letter from Rokeby reveals little but uncertainty (1339 x 1340) – and a long blockade of Stirling which further emphasised that England had neither achieved nor learnt anything useful since the 1290s. Early in 1341, the English position in Scotland collapsed abruptly and almost completely. On 10 April, Rokeby surrendered himself along with the entire garrison of Stirling, and a few days later Edinburgh Castle was stormed by the Scots. It was a dramatic and emphatic victory by a small raiding party armed mainly with imagination and courage, worthy of the heroes of 1314.

Rokeby, already a Scottish prisoner-of-war, nonetheless proceeded to submit his annual pay claim to his superiors in London, dated 16 April 1341. The slightly reduced muster of 49 men-at-arms, 60 mounted archers and six watchmen has been taken to reflect a reduction in the manning of the castle, but, given the context, the discrepancy may in fact represent casualties sustained during the capture of the castle.

The filing of this set of accounts, produced by an English commander who was already a Scottish captive, brings to a fitting end the documentary record of the

English occupation – a story of largely impotent garrisons doomed to eventual capitulation, and copious bureaucratic paperwork.

Another story is told by another document from 1342, which shows the new keeper claiming a fee of 100 marks (£66 13s 8d) for all the expenses of his garrison – five times what Sir William Sinclair had drawn 50 years earlier, it is true, but still a mere fraction of what the English commander had required at any point during the occupation.

Things had gone back to the way that they were supposed to be.

* * *

The two following documents, translated here for the first time, provide by far the earliest detailed overview of the buildings within the chapel, including relatively detailed references to the Great Chapel and a precursor of the Portcullis Gate.

* * *

Document 1: Drawn up on 2 November 1335, recording repair works on the castle **after 30 years' abandonment (TNA E101/19/21**, previously summarised in CDS iii. No. 1186, but translated here in full for the first time).

And for the making of a certain kitchen under the great chapel, in full payment, and for a chimney for the same (*cuiusdam coquinam subtus magnam capellam in grossa et pro foramine ad eiusdem*), 18s.

And for scything 6 acres of meadow and hay got there for the king's oxen, 5s.
And for making the same, 3s 3d.

And for carriage of the same hay from the meadow to Edinburgh, 3s. For a cart bound with iron and all other instruments pertaining to the same, total £2 3s 3d. For other new carts, £1. For 24 oxen bought, the price of each one 13s 4d, total £16. To Richard Clerk of Leith for 12 chalders of lime, price of the chalder 1s 2d, and in total 12s. And for carriage of the same lime beyond the sea called Forth, by agreement, 6s 8d.

To Gilbert Dyntard for 19 chalders of lime, price as above, total £1 2s 2d. And for carriage of the same lime beyond the aforesaid sea, 9s 6d. David Limeburner (*Lymebruner*) for 2 chalders and 6 bolls lime, 2s 3d.

For 1,306 great spikings, price of the hundred 8d, total 6s 10½d for the great chapel and the chamber called the countinghouse (*pro magna capella et camera*

vocata le contynghous). Falcons and barons: for 500 boards (*broddes*), price of the hundred 4*d*, total 1*s* 8*d*. For 1,000 spikings, price as above, total 6*s* 8*d*, for the great stable (*pro magno stabello*). And for 2,250 boards for the same stable and a certain great chamber (*quandam magnam cameram*), price as above, total 8*s* 6*d*.

For 3 pairs of fetters (*paribus de fettres*), total 3*s*. For hasps and staples for the stocks, total 3*d*. For 18 stones of iron brought on account for the great gate for crooks and bands (*pro magno portu pro crokes et bandes*), price of the stone 14*d*, total 21*s*. And for the sharpening (*le sharpynge*) of 100 axes, punches and chisels (*axes, punchuns et chisels*), total 10*d*. For 2 stone of iron bought for wedges (*pro wegges*), 2*s* 4*d*. For 5 sheaves of steel (*garbis calabis*), total 4*s* 2*d*. To William of Dunfermline for 6 masons' axes (*axes cementaris*) and 6 chisels, total 3*s*. For 2 bands for the gate beneath the hoardings (*bandes pro portu subtus le hurdys*), total 1*s*. For one lock for the chamber called the countinghouse (*i. Lok' pro camer avocata le contynghous*), total 10*d*.

For 8 yokes, 12 bows and 4 axletrees, total 10*d*. For 6 crooks (*crokes*) viz. 4 for the gate beneath the hoardings, and 2 crooks for a certain chamber beside the great gate (*pro quadam camera iuxta magnam portam*), 1*s*. And for 2 strakes for placing between the body of a certain cart and the wheels with nails, total 3*d*. For 2 crooks for the doorway of the chapel (*pro hostio capelle*), total 4*d*.

An ell of canvas for sacks made for carrying lime, price of the ell 4*d*, total 7*s* 8*d*. For a certain woman for sewing of the sacks, total 6*d*. For 4 crowbars (*gavelokkes*) and 2 iron mauls (*mell' ferris*), 11*s*. And for 4 eastland planks (*tablis de Estland*) for 'hottes' and falcons, total 6*d*. For 1 great chest from Flanders well bound with iron for placing money and documents inside, total 6*s*. For 141 Eastland Boards (*bordis de Estland*) bought from John Bolgy for the roofing (*pro coopertura*) of the great chapel, total 12*s*. For 4 bolls [i.e. of lime] bought for the masons, total 4*d*. For parchment, 1*s*. For 8 new sacks, 2*s* 6*d*.³⁰

* * *

Document 2: Drawn up on 26 January 1340, recording recent building work in the castle by the English garrison (TNA E101/22/20, summarised somewhat incompletely in CDS iii. No. 1323; sections enclosed in square brackets are partially illegible, though not directly **relevant to the primary subject of this report; references to the '13th Year' and '14th Year' refer to the years of King Edward III's reign, the start of the 14th Year, on 25 January 1340, being the reason for the production of the accounts**).

Works on Edinburgh Castle

The same [governor] accounted for the wages of 1 quarrier, 1 roofer of houses and 1 carpenter, each at *6d*, 2 porters each at *4d*, and one bowyer's boy (*garconis attilat*) at *2d*, per day, continuing to dwell in the aforesaid castle of Edinburgh, viz. for the said quarriers breaking quarry for making walls and stones throwable by hand for the defence of the castle. And the said roofer for roofing the buildings of the castle. And the said carpenter for making gates and brattices. And then to the porters for carrying stones and keeping supplies, and [... to the aforesaid boy deputising] for the bowyer his master, from 16th July in the 13th year to 26th January next following, for 193 days.

And in wages to 4 masons making new (*de novo*) a certain port with arches of stone (*quandam portam cum archiis lapidem*) and a certain wall outside the castle under the quarry (*quandam murum extra castrum sub quarreram*) extending in length 80 feet and in width 24 feet (*in longitudine lxx pedes et in latitudine xxiiii pedes*) by which [the ground] is raised for exiting with horses, there making 8 men carrying stones for the use of the said masons, 6 men making cement also for the use of the said masons, each of the said masons taking daily *6d*. And each of the said men taking daily *3d* ... - £38 15s 2d.

And in wages to 6 men staying in the said castle of Edinburgh for carrying dung out of the said castle, making paths (*viis*) for men keeping watch by night and making turf walling (*modewall' facientes*) in various places within the castle and repairing the partitions of buildings, from 7 July in the 13th year to 26th January in the 14th year, for 194 days, each taking daily *4d* - £14 9s.

Sum total of the works on Edinburgh castle - £75 19s 2d.

APPENDIX 5: A 15TH-CENTURY SAUNA

In 1454, a substantial shipment of timber from Fife was brought to Edinburgh Castle for the construction there of a *domus de le stowe* or 'stove house'. At this date, the word 'stove' always denoted what is now called a sauna or Turkish bath (*OED* shows that the word first acquired a wider meaning in Tudor travel literature, when it was used to describe sauna-like heated rooms in Eastern European architecture, and its earliest citation attesting to the importation of domestic stoves for generic heating purposes dates from 1604). This seems to be the first sauna recorded in Scotland, and perhaps the first one in the British Isles.

Beyond asserting to the existence of the 'stove house', the source tells us little except that its construction involved a quantity of timber. However, we also have a detailed contemporary description showing what the Scots of the mid-15th century thought a sauna should be like. In 1450, Sir Gilbert Hay, scholar, soldier, courtier and priest, returned to Scotland from his long sojourn in France. Settling at Roslin, he was commissioned by the Earl of Orkney to translate several handbooks on courtly and chivalrous lifestyle – including one called the *Governance of Princes*, which advised young kings to build a sauna.

Although it is thought that Hay did not produce his finished translation until 1456, his knowledge of the French original would have been readily available to the Scottish court, due to his close connection with the Earl of Orkney, who was then the chancellor to the young James II. It is also possible that he had already produced an earlier draft of the text – a stand-alone copy of 'The government of princes writtin in perchment' is recorded in the inventory of the Edinburgh Castle library on 26 March 1579; it was an anomaly among the printed-paper books of the 16th-century royal library, and could conceivably have been there since the 1450s.

A translation of Hay's text into modern language thus follows. The vocabulary has been modernised, but the phrasing has been followed relatively literally and I have retained the technical terms 'stove' and 'bath', which are used to refer to the entire suite of rooms within the sauna-house. It is presented as one of a series of letters of advice from the ancient Greek philosopher Aristotle to his pupil Alexander the Great, although modern scholars believe that it was originally written in Arabic around the 9th or 10th century:

'Of baths and stoves and their procedure and uses. Here the noble author explains the custom of baths and of stoves'

Alexander, my dear boy, you should know well that stoving and bathing work like a miracle for sustaining mankind in this world. If someone does this properly, it should be made and organised after the four seasons of the year, for coldness is compared to the winter and warmth and moistness to the early period that is called spring and heat to the summer and dryness to the harvest, and therefore there must be good planning to make a bath or a stove properly, for men should organise four chambers, each one beside another by order of which the first should be cold, the second luke-warm, the third hot, and the fourth dry.

And when a man wants to stove himself, he should first enter the first chamber, that is cold, and then the next, that is warm, and then to the hot and wet, and then to the warm and dry, and remain a while in each in order, so he is not suddenly overcome by unfamiliar hot or cold that would cause him a dangerous indisposition. And he should not suddenly leave, but go through in order, for when a man passes suddenly from great heat to great cold, he will not fail to fall into trouble.

And you should know that such thing should be made in a hot place where there is good air, and that it has a great furnace giving the heat inwards, but the mouth of it should face away from the place of the stove, to send the flames away from the stove. And it should be low set near a pool of fresh water, and there should be fair herb-gardens with herbs of diverse natures, fair and virtuous, gathered for the baths according to the season of each bathing and stoving session.

And after the stoving and bathing, men should sit on fair benches in these herb-gardens, each sprinkling his face and hands and forehead with rose water, and stimulating and rubbing his feet and hands and other parts of his body according to his desire and taste, with a fair linen towel, standing on a fair sheet underfoot, white and clean.

And then he should go into the water, and wash himself again of all excesses, and so pass in order from chamber to chamber until he is well cooled of his great heat, and afterwards, at the end after all his stoving and washing, he should have his hair combed and his body anointed with sweet balms or other ointment, precious and appropriate, gathered according to the season, and then when he is well cooled at his ease, he should occupy himself with such delicious and cooling spices until he is cool and comfortable. And if he is at all too cold, he should use a warming syrup and a medicinal wine. And then afterwards, you should take a little light meal of easily digested meat, and drink a good, light, pleasant wine diluted with water, and then go to a fair bed, well furnished with sweet cloths and clean ones, and sleep a good full sleep, a good long while. For such behaviour restores again that which you have lost in sweating. And then after that, all the rest of the day you should turn to joy and **comfort and happiness and rest ...**

Based on Hay's description and the documented provision of 80 beams of 'cut and squared timber' for the building, it is possible to make a conjectural reconstruction of the 'stove house' built in Edinburgh Castle in 1454. It would have been a long, low, wooden-framed building of four rooms, with a large coal-fired furnace built up against one side of the hot room, fed from the outside through an opening which also acted as the outlet for the flames and smoke. If it also had an outdoor pool and a nearby herb garden, as the text proposes, then two possible locations can be identified.

Probably the more likely location is on the south side of the modern esplanade, near the fresh-water well which was later enclosed in the Spur, and above the terraced **King's Garden**, where a plumber had installed lead fixtures (most likely for water features) in 1435. Alternatively, the sauna could have been located in the inner ward, near the Forewell, where a small garden is also documented to

the north of Crown Square in the 18th century – if so, it might have adapted the vaulted 14th-century Kitchen building, which is not clearly referred to again after this date.

APPENDIX 6: A MEDIEVAL PARLIAMENT

The fact that Edinburgh Castle served as a venue for meetings of Parliament in medieval Scotland does not seem to be widely known. The castle is barely mentioned in extant literature on the topic of the pre-1707 Parliament, and the Parliament is not normally discussed at all in studies of the castle.

Parliamentary meetings could be held anywhere that was convenient. The legislature assembled in monasteries such as the abbeys of Arbroath or Dunfermline, or in urban settings in towns like Musselburgh and Perth and Aberdeen, and, while there are repeated references to Parliaments being held simply 'in Edinburgh', this might relate to Holyrood Abbey, to the old royal mansion in High School Yards or to another location such as the civic building known as the Tolbooth, located next to St Giles' Kirk on the Royal Mile.³¹

By the 16th century, this Tolbooth building had become the preferred location for meetings of Scotland's parliament; it was also the meeting place of the burgh council, and from the 1530s the permanent home of Scotland's central law-courts. This connection was reinforced in 1563, when the whole panoply of parliament chamber, courtrooms and civic administration was moved into a new home in the secularised nave of the adjacent St Giles' Church.³² In 1639, they moved again to the purpose-built Old Parliament House which henceforth acted as the regular venue for Scotland's parliament until 1707 – the Parliament Hall itself still survives today as the central space of the nation's High Court complex.

By the late 16th century, it seems clear that Edinburgh Castle was *not* regarded as a favourable venue for the parliament. In 1571, when the castle was the seat of government for an embattled regime acting in the name of the imprisoned Mary Queen of Scots, the assembled members nonetheless processed solemnly down the Royal Mile to St Giles for the sessions of parliament which opened on 12 June 1571 and 29 August 1571. An important recent study has argued that the castle and other royal residences were regarded as distinctly *unattractive* sites for Scottish parliamentary assemblies: as expressions of monarchic power, they could not serve as neutral meeting-places.³³

On the other hand, the later emphasis on the Tolbooth complex on the Royal Mile has had a distorting effect on our perceptions of the medieval Scottish parliament, and perhaps particularly on its previous relationship with the castle. This emphasis is partially a result of scholarly interpretation in the 19th century – the 1563–1639 parliament chamber in the nave of St Giles' Kirk had evidently been forgotten, and antiquaries encountering references to Parliament sitting 'in the Tolbooth' misidentified the building in question with the ramshackle Jacobean prison next to it, built out of the half-demolished remains of the Old Tolbooth.³⁴ They then proceeded to posit that building's use as a permanent legislative chamber from the 1380s to 1640s. In fact, the Edinburgh Tolbooth is first explicitly identified as a parliamentary venue only in 1438 and is hardly mentioned half a dozen times before the 1530s. Historiographical assumptions about the location of Parliament need to be treated cautiously.

Our ability to gauge the significance of the castle as a parliamentary venue is further disguised by the ambiguity of references to parliament sitting 'in Edinburgh': any of these references – perhaps even the majority of them – might

in fact relate to the castle, and on some occasions the castle *is* explicitly specified as a meeting-place for parliament, including two particularly significant sessions which took place in the castle's Great Hall in 1286 and 1458. What follows is a brief reconsideration of Edinburgh Castle's place in the history of Scotland's parliament, followed by a more detailed reconstruction of the particularly well-documented session which opened in the castle on 6 March 1458.

The parliamentary system in Scotland had its origins in the King's House and was thus intrinsically associated with the royal residences: a medieval royal court also functioned as a law-court where legal transactions could be performed and legal cases could be heard, and well-documented examples of this practice occurred in the castle on 21 May 1278 and 28 June 1284. As early as the 12th century, special hearings or *parlements* were organised in advance to discuss specific topics, such as major legal cases, national policy decisions or the levying of national taxation – the rationale being that advance notice would allow a larger attendance and a broader national dialogue and political consensus. A plenary assembly of this sort was held in the castle as early as 1139 x 1151.

It is thus clear that meetings of the sort which would later be called parliaments took place in Edinburgh Castle from the reign of David I onwards, though modern scholarship is reluctant to accord these early assemblies the status of proper parliamentary meetings. Nonetheless, historians *are* more willing to accord parliamentary status to an assembly which took place in the castle on 19 March 1286. The well-informed *Chronicle of Lanercost* records that Alexander III had held a council of his barons to approve policy documents in advance of a diplomatic conference with England, followed by a banquet with a main course of eels, at which a lot of wine was drunk. Late in the evening, the king opted to ride out from the castle to cross the Forth and spend the night with his young wife in Kinghorn – but he fell fatally from his horse somewhere on the Fife coast, triggering a political crisis and eventually leading to a long war against England. This parliament is not recorded in any formal document, but it is important because it proved to be one of the most significant days in Scottish history, and also because the *Lanercost* narrative gives a clear sense of the wider context of a medieval Scottish parliament, an event involving far more than just the political and legal decisions which form the official record.

English military occupation and the temporary abandonment of the castle inhibited its use as a place for parliamentary meetings from 1296 to 1341, and when it became available again Scotland's parliament had assumed more or less the form it would retain until 1707. A distinction had emerged between full parliamentary sessions of the Three Estates, which had tax-raising powers, and consultative meetings of varying levels of formality known as Conventions, which might assume a parliamentary role as law-courts and legislatures: sometimes, the distinction between them could be blurred, and both are encompassed by the generic term 'parliament'.

The name of the Three Estates was a reference to a conventional medieval social model which divided the community into priests, warriors and workers, but this did not have a significant influence on the actual organisation of the parliament. Nor was there a division into a House of Lords and House of Commons on the English model – or even a system of elections and constituencies. On the same principle that all the king's subjects, irrespective of rank, could seek justice in the King's House, all of them were entitled to attend the parliament. As in England, it did become customary to announce a parliament by sending out letters to each

shire court and burgh court, but these were very much *open* letters: an early surviving summons for 1331 invited all those 'who hold an interest' in the proceedings, a phrase which effectively opened attendance to every interested inhabitant of the kingdom. By the end of the 14th century, the invitation was limited to prelates, earls, a committee of up to six representatives from each burgh, and all the 'tenants in chief' – the vast array of barons, knights, minor lairds and gentlemen who held their lands directly from the king; the principle was that they in turn represented everyone else, but they sometimes brought their followers along in person anyway.

James I attempted to introduce an English-style system, by creating an enlarged parliamentary peerage, and restricting the rest of the attendance to elected constituency members – one from each burgh and two from every sheriffdom. These reforms promoted several dozen prominent barons to the peerage as lords of parliament, but had little in the way of practical effect. Only in 1587 was a system of elected representatives analogous to the English MPs successfully introduced, as part of a new trend towards more restricted and controlled political representation.

The best indication of the composition of a late medieval Scottish parliament is the list of attendees which survives for the sessions convened on 21 November 1469 and 18 February 1472.³⁵ In 1469, the 18-year-old King James III presided over an assembly with 102 named attendees 'and many others' present in addition. The clergy were led by seven bishops, 11 abbots, two priors and eight other prominent churchmen. The king's brothers, the 15-year-old Duke of Albany and the 12-year-old Earl of Mar, headed a nobility mustering ten earls, 20 lords of parliament and 20 barons, plus unnamed representatives for 22 burghs. Three years later, a full list of attendees survives, revealing that the 20-year-old James III chaired a smaller council with 78 attendees. The Duke of Albany, still a teenager, is listed next in seniority ahead of the Estates. The Church was represented by four bishops, six abbots and four priors – two of them representing the chapter of St Andrews Cathedral. The peerage mustered seven earls and 14 lords of parliament. A total of 31 lairds attended 'for the barons', and listed along with them is the Earl of Errol, attending *ex officio* as constable and placing himself in his traditional position alongside the door, separate from the other peers. The burghs sent ten commissioners – two each from Edinburgh, Linlithgow and Dundee, and one apiece from four other towns ranging from Dumfries to Aberdeen.

Even at this date, it seems that some members were accompanied by significant coterie of followers – in 1461, John of Islay, Earl of Ross and Lord of the Isles, attended with his full retinue of Hebridean chieftains and Inverness-shire lairds. Perhaps retinues of this sort accounted for the large number of unnamed attendees in 1469. At this date, the key difference was perhaps that they did not have literal *seats* in parliament, though they were probably increasingly excluded from the chamber after 1500. Throughout the 16th century, any Scot, man or woman, could still in theory *speak* before the parliament, though normally they were bringing legal cases rather than arguing political causes, and often hired a lawyer to do most of the talking on their behalf; others were summoned to answer legal charges brought by the government. Nonetheless, a tradition of direct political participation was still alive in 1707, when 20,000 people – approaching 10 per cent of the adult male population – 'appeared' by proxy to oppose the Act of Union.

The 1469 session of parliament took place in the Edinburgh Tolbooth, but the 1472 session may in fact have been held in Edinburgh Castle. As noted above, the sessions which are explicitly identified as meeting in the Tolbooth are few and far between, and two important pieces of evidence show that sessions which are officially recorded simply as taking place 'in Edinburgh' could actually take place in the castle. The first of these consists of records of a convention held in late March and early April 1441, explicitly in the castle, which was subsequently relocated to the Tolbooth for a follow-up session that June. Secondly, there is a record of expense recording the preparation of the Great Hall for the full session of the Three Estates which opened on 6 March 1458. The parliamentary minutes themselves offer no hint that the castle was the setting for this session of parliament, and, with this in mind, it is possible that the handful of 15th-century sessions specifically recorded as sitting in the Tolbooth may in fact have been the anomalous ones.

The session of parliament which convened in the castle in 1458 was a particularly busy one with respect to legislation and is regarded as particularly important in terms of defining the character and remit of the Scottish legislature. Moreover, the visual look and layout of this session of parliament can be reconstructed with more confidence than any other meeting of the Scottish parliament before the 1560s, if not 1639, because the previous full session in 1455 had formalised the physical layout of the parliament hall and voted to introduce a new style of robes: the 1458 parliament voted to continue with their use, requesting that the royal government produce fully standardised exemplars in order to eliminate variation.

In contrast with the Westminster parliament in England, there was no division into separate houses of lords and commons: the entire body met as a single council in the same hall. The 1458 session convened in the hall of the castle, which probably meant the room in the Palace now known as the Laigh Hall: this is now the only pre-1563 meeting-place of the Scottish parliament to survive, and indeed it is the oldest extant parliament chamber in the British Isles. The hall received a refurbishment in advance of the session, at a cost of £17 16s 6d, with 'linen cloth for the windows' being specifically noted; this probably means that the windows were only partially glazed, with their lower parts normally closed up with wooden shutters, and were fitted with panes of waxed fabric for the occasion to let as much light as possible into the space. Additionally, a coal fire would have been lit in the hearth, a feature recorded in other medieval Scottish parliamentary sessions. In origin, the hall may have incorporated what is now an adjacent chamber to its south, and would have been similar in size to the 13th-century Painted Chamber which acted as the meeting-place of England's parliament in Westminster, but by 1458 it may have already been reduced to something like its current form, a more compact and symmetrical room, with two square-headed windows in its eastern wall, and a central fireplace on the west.

Conventionally, the king sat on a throne at the upper end of the hall, with the peers of the realm and the prelates of the Church positioned to either side of him. The throne was probably raised at the top of a flight of steps, with a fabric 'cloth of estate' hanging on the wall behind and a matching canopy above (these are shown as red damask hangings on the Trinity Altarpiece of the 1480s, discussed in more detail below); it would certainly be positioned in the centre of a bench along the rear wall. Seating on the bench was more or less guaranteed for the bishops (to the king's right) and the earls (to the left); other prelates (abbots and priors) and members of the nobility (the lords of parliament and the earls' sons) would sit with them if there was enough room, but some might be seated on the steps of

the throne (a place subsequently associated with the earls' sons), or else standing along the sides of the room. At the low end of the hall, the 1455 session of parliament had mandated the provision of a three-tier grandstand 'for the commissioners', and this may have been implemented in 1458 – the £17 16s 6d in expenses could have been largely for these benches. Strictly speaking, the 'commissioners' would only denote the elected representatives from the burghs, and with at least 20 burgh commissioners in 1469, it is possible that they could have filled it, but the ten burgh commissioners in 1472 would hardly justify a three-tier stand, so it is possible that the barons also sat here – a total of 40 or 50 people. Additional barons who could find no place on the benches would have presumably stood along the sides of the room.

There was probably a table in the centre of the room where the clerk wrote the minutes of the meeting. People bringing matters before the parliament, usually accompanied by their lawyer, would stand to one side of the table, and if the matter was a legal case with a defendant the defence team would assemble on the other side of the hall.

What enables us to visualise this particular parliament so clearly is the detailed record of the clothing worn by the attendees. The starting point here is the portrait of James III from the altarpiece of the Trinity Kirk, painted in the 1480s: this shows him in the crown and a silk surplice (presumably the same one recorded in the castle in 1488), and a long cloak of a somewhat brownish purple colour, opening vertically at the front, with an edging of ermine fur, much wider on the inside than the outside, and a shoulder cape covered completely in ermine; what appears to be a decorative hood is worn folded around the shoulder cape on the left side.

This cloak is almost identical in design to the parliamentary mantle mandated for earls in 1455 and reaffirmed in 1458. Their colour was specified as 'brown crimson' (*brown granyt*, from *granum* or *graine*, the medieval name for the kermes insect from which crimson dye was derived),³⁶ and the edging of white fur extended as a lining on the inside of the opening at the front, at least a hand's breadth wide, as far as was required (*lynit befor outwith ane hand braide to the best stede with the same furyn*); the same depicted on the king's portrait.

The hoods were to be worn on the earls' shoulders (*wysit on thir schuldiris*), and the king's portrait shows one way to do this, though the exact style might vary according to fashion and personal choice; in the *Parlement de Paris*, and in the English House of Lords, the hood was simply pulled down around the neck, and quickly evolved into a circular fur collar; another style, known as a chaperon, had a very long tail known as a tippet, and normally no visible fur – it would be worn draped around the back of the neck, and still survives in a very stylised form on the shoulder of the mantle of Knights of the Garter.

The main difference between the king's robe and the earls' mantles seems to have been in the furring. For the earls, this was probably pure white miniver rather than spotted ermine, which at this time was restricted to royal robes, and the fur on the shoulder-cape was probably restricted to the lower edge, leaving the rest as plain fabric.

The lords of parliament were assigned mantles of the same design as the earls, except that their mantles were red rather than crimson, and their fur trim was grey rather than white (three different varieties being authorised). They were also

allowed to substitute a silk lining for the wide fur trim on the inside of the garment.

The burgh commissioners were dressed in blue cloaks, fastened at the right shoulder and falling almost to the floor, trimmed in fur 'as appropriate' (*as efferis*), and once again adorned with matching hoods. No explicit mention is made of robes for baronial attendees, but in the 17th century the ceremonial robe of a feudal baron was a long red cloak in the same long-obsolete shoulder-fastened style mandated for the burgh commissioners in 1455, and, given the apparent relationship between the two designs, this was probably already worn in the 1450s.

The appearance of the prelates' robes was also not specified by the legislation, but was well established by custom – they wore red gowns trimmed with pale fur, similar in appearance to the peers' mantles, though often with sleeves or a more generous fur trim. This style of robe was evidently worn widely by churchmen, and not restricted to the prelates entitled to sit in parliament – a topic that the 1458 parliament itself legislated on.

An additional display of colour was provided by lawyers acting as 'forespeakers' for people appearing in legal cases before the parliament; they were clad in 'habitis of grene, of the fassone of ane tunycaill, and the slevis to be opyn as a tabart' – that is to say, in green surcoats, styled like a priest's dalmatic (i.e. about thigh-length, with a rectangular front panel) with sleeves like those on a herald's tabard (rather loose flaps wrapped around the shoulder with no fastening beneath the armpit, a style fashionable for dalmatics at the time).

The business of the 1458 parliament consisted of a comprehensive body of social legislation concerned with the ordering of the kingdom. There were a series of acts concerned with the administration of royal justice, with detailed regulations for the relatively new court of session, attempts to reform other law-courts to suppress powers which seemed arbitrary and pointless, carefully thought-out regulations for the punishment of corrupt or incompetent officials, and a concession that freeholders with revenues under £20 did not have to attend parliament in person.

Much of the legislation was in a sense concerned with the *appearance* of the kingdom, with regulations designed to ensure the planting of woodlands and hedges, and to encourage the planting of wheat, peas and beans – laws which seem to have taken at least partial effect. There was also legislation protecting wildfowl, rabbits, hares and salmon by restricting the seasons when they could be caught, but encouraging the hunting of wolves and taking steps to reduce the numbers of raptors and scavenger birds, by destroying their nests in trees on private ground. All of this had a coherent agenda, as it allied the image of an ordered and flourishing countryside in which neither men nor predators were allowed to plunder, with the healthy management of resources, which provided a varied diet and useful raw materials for the people of the kingdom while simultaneously restricting the need to import timber and wheatflour, and increasing the quantities of salmon and fur available for export. Woodland and hedges, for example, provided timber while removing the need to supply large quantities of cut wood for boundary-fences, but also had a recognised aesthetic value, provided fruit and habitats for songbirds and small game, and acted as windbreaks to protect the countryside.

On a more human level, the same vision of a well-organised kingdom was apparent. The legislation on parliamentary apparel was accompanied by a wide-ranging 'sumptuary laws' on clothing. Ordinary burgesses and gentlemen were forbidden from wearing silk, scarlet or marten fur, and their wives and daughters were compelled to keep opulently furred gowns only for Sunday best, while labourers and their families were to wear work clothes of undyed cloth and only light blue, green or plain red for Sundays. It was implicitly conceded that forbidding the lower clergy from wearing fur-trimmed red robes was impossible, but the more sumptuous sorts of dye and fur were forbidden to rank-and-file priests. A cynic might note that everyone voting on the measure in parliament was implicitly exempted from these rules, but the idea of regulating dresscode on social grounds was very conventional in the 14th century, and what is more significant here is the level of thought involved: on one level, an implicit belief is being expressed that social interactions are easier and more honest when everyone can be easily recognised – fashionable mufflers which allowed women of all ranks to hide their identities while shopping or attending church were also banned; and, again, the sumptuary statute embodies the concept that a well-ordered kingdom also gains the benefits of restricting imports and enhancing exports and the domestic economy: these were laws designed to ensure that more fur was available for profitable export and that capital was spent on better things than overpriced imported fabrics.

A similar agenda can be seen in much of the rest of the legislation: beggars were required to obtain a licence from the sheriff court, and the activities we now call squatting and busking were banned, while every crewman on merchant ships needed to be a professional seaman, and had to ship at least three bales of goods on every voyage – this act was designed to boost the economy both by stimulating trade, and by increasing the number of labourers looking for employment at home. On a more practical level, a standard system of weights and measures was enacted, and a parliamentary committee was set up to investigate the currency and regulate the jewellery trade, regulations that were designed to prevent fraud and restrict the quantity of bullion being brought out of the country – a major concern of 15th-century governments in Scotland and beyond.

Last but not least, this was also the parliament which passed the famous act banning golf and football in order to encourage archery practice – with free beer being offered as a further bribe.

We can thus envisage the 1458 parliament in detail – the space of the Laigh Hall, with the king enthroned in his ermine-shouldered crimson beneath his red damask cloth of estate, flanked the prelates and peers in their white-furred gowns, and faced by the tiered benches of the burgh commissioners in blue and the barons in red, with the light shining in through the windows and the coal fire in the hearth; at the same time, we can see that this parliament saw itself as a representation of the wider kingdom in ways that were not merely constitutional, as an expression of the ideals of a society which was well ordered both in terms of its social structure, and the physical setting it occupied; moreover, the parliament declared, an orderly and handsome kingdom was also a prosperous and honest one.

We might not always share these ideals today, but they display an integrity and confidence, and represent a wide-ranging, consistent and positive vision of what Scotland should be.

APPENDIX 7: LIFE IN PRISON

Edinburgh Castle is Scotland's oldest surviving prison. Its use as a jail spans the period from the 12th century until the First World War, and, although incarceration has never been the primary function of the castle, it is nonetheless a sustained role which the fortress has performed through its long history.

Extant documents from before 1603 are generally sparse in detail, merely reporting the identities of the prisoners held in the castle, and something of the charges levelled against them. Insights into the workings of the jail facilities are rare. There is a single detailed record from the 1480s, however, which provides a clear insight into the lifestyle of a high-ranking prisoner incarcerated in the castle.

Lord Lyle was a noted diplomat in 15th-century Scotland, a key negotiator in peace talks with England from the 1470s onwards, and a leading member of a diplomatic mission to Spain in the 1490s. In the middle of this distinguished career, it seems that he was caught up in the complex and rapidly shifting political crisis of the early 1480s, arrested on a charge of treasonable correspondence with the exiled Earl of Douglas and incarcerated in Edinburgh Castle, before being brought to trial in front of parliament on 22 March 1482. Perhaps to the surprise of the authorities, he was acquitted, but when he attempted to reclaim his personal property from his cell in the castle he was evidently rebuffed by the Earl of Buchan, who was serving as commander of the fortress and its garrison.

On 3 July 1483, Lord Lyle therefore appeared in parliament again, bringing a case against Buchan for theft. The charge sheet is a key source for understanding Edinburgh Castle's medieval dungeons, as it provides us with a unique insight into the lifestyle of a high-ranking prisoner in the medieval castle.

It is clear that Lord Lyle had been residing in surprising comfort in the castle. His room evidently came furnished, though he had brought his own linen: the bed was made up with two sheets, three pillows, a large blanket adorned with ornamental stitching, an English worsted bedcover and an **outer covering of 'verdure'** – a style of tapestry depicting leaves, trees and woodland scenery. There is no reference to the hangings which would accompany a grand four-poster bed, and this may have been the type later known as a 'dess', a medieval sofa-bed which folded up into a carved bench for daytime use.

The table was laid with two settings – two linen place-mats, two napkins and two silver goblets were among the goods listed as stolen, implying that the prisoner was entertaining guests in his chamber. Even more surprisingly, he had two liveried servants attending him, Andrew Congiltoun and Malcolm Fleming – their long green gowns were among the items the earl was accused of stealing, along with one of Drew Congiltoun's shirts.

To pass the time, Lord Lyle had three books – specifically described as 'English books', a description which may reflect more than the language they were written in. One is described as *The Philosophouris Sawis* and has been credibly identified with Caxton's *Dictes and Sayings of the Philosophers*, an early printed work containing a selection of translated quotes and excerpts attributed to famous thinkers of the Greek and Roman past. The subjects of the other two books are as identified as *gentris* and *medecyn*, and both can also be tentatively identified as printed books by Caxton: the *gentris* seems like a play on the ambiguity of the

word 'gentile' in Middle English, which could refer to both dynasticism and paganism, thus evoking the title of Boccaccio's *Genealogies of the gods of the gentiles*, the Trojan part of which was adapted in English by Caxton as the *Recuyell of the Historyes of Troye*: this offered a comprehensive summary of ancient mythology, and would have made a natural companion-piece to complement the philosophical primer of the *Dictes*; on 26 March 1579, a copy of 'Bocas' *Of the geneologie of the goddis* was still listed in the castle library (there was also a hand-written manuscript of Gilbert Hay's *Governance of Princes* which may have been there since the 1450s – see Appendix 5: A 15th-Century Sauna). Inasmuch as two of the three 'English books' appear to be early printed works by Caxton, the third can perhaps be identified as his *Gouuernal of Health*, a medieval healthy-living guide which came complete with a diet plan. The trio of early printed books represent appropriate reading for a diplomat, a man of international horizons who needed to interact easily with cultured foreigners: they reveal a desire to access the Greek and Roman learning which the Renaissance had made fashionable, and the willingness to use vernacular translations is also a Renaissance trait, while the concern with lifestyle and diet is surprisingly modern. Moreover, the printed book itself was a very new technology in the 1480s, with a cachet perhaps akin to the smartphone or tablet today; Guttenburg's earliest experiments with movable type had taken place within Lord Lyle's lifetime, and printing in English was an even newer innovation, which had begun less than a decade previously with Caxton's production of the *Recuyell*. These 'English books' would have identified their owner as a thoroughly modern man.

In short, Lord Lyle saw his prison cell as a place to entertain his friends to dinner, where he could sleep in a comfortable bed and catch up on the latest in fashionable literature, all the while being waited on by servants. With this in mind, it is not surprising that this gentleman-prisoner was well dressed. In fact, he seems to have brought in his tailor to have some new clothes made while he was in the castle. The highlight of his wardrobe was a black ensemble, consisting of a floor-length gown, an unlined over-gown and a tippet hat trimmed in grey fur, set off with a ruby pendant round his neck on a fashionably short gold chain, and a gold-chased belt. The choice of colour was as much of a style statement in the 15th century as it is today, while the long cut of the clothing not only presented a dignified appearance appropriate for a diplomat but combined it with a certain discreet ostentation due to the sheer quantity of expensive fabric involved. This ensemble was valued at around £30 in total, divided roughly equally between the cost of the clothing and the jewellery – at that time something in the region of a whole year's income for an ordinary laird. Moreover, the ensemble had apparently been run up while Lord Lyle was in prison, as a bolt of left-over fabric worth £1 10s was among the items listed as stolen. Further evidence that he had had the tailors in is provided by a fine new doublet valued at £5, plus £7 10s in left-over fabric, and a set of red robes valued at a comparatively modest £1 10s, which sound like old parliamentary robes, stripped of their white miniver fur trim during the making of a new set, which he must have worn for his trial (see Appendix 6: A Medieval Parliament). The inventory of clothing was completed by a second suit consisting of a grey gown with a tawny over-gown and tippet hat, a weighty gold chain worth £28, and a variety of hats and pairs of hose, three shirts and three 'kerchiefs', probably underpants of typical 15th-century style, consisting of a rectangular piece of fabric and waist strings which tied off at either hip.

A more subtle indicator of the nature of the prison cell is provided by the quantity of clothes in question – Lord Lyle's chamber must have had a 'wardrobe' or

'closet', a walk-in cupboard which could be used as a place to keep his belongings, as well as perhaps a dressing room, a toilet and even a private study. This suggests a chamber of some architectural sophistication, not just a bleak dungeon vault – in addition, it seems almost certain that he would have had a coal fire in the main room, with an imposing stone lintel and an iron grate.

To complete his comforts, Lord Lyle had a treasure chest, containing a substantial quantity of cash – a mix of English, French and Scottish gold coins worth the best part of £100, and a large sum of English and Scottish silver groats with a total value of around £30, plus a number of pearls, and some important documents relating to his business affairs – he had made a substantial cash loan of 700 marks (£466 13s 4d) to the Master of Kilmaurs, a remarkable sum in ready money for a private individual, but he accused the Earl of Buchan of purloining both the receipt for the loan itself and a long-term rental agreement giving him theoretical control of a substantial part of his creditors' estate, which must have been given as security for the loan (cf. *SP* v. 554, and nn. 4, 5, which shows that he had similar arrangements with other creditors as well). The cash may in part have been to pay his expenses – he was probably expected to meet his own living costs while in detention, and in addition he had evidently been on something of a shopping spree in preparation for his trial; but the inventory is topped off by a separate £20 rent payment which he had received from his barony of Lundy, which certainly gives the impression that Lord Lyle was actively managing his business affairs from his cell within the castle.

The impression is that Lord Lyle was allowed a comfortable and dignified lifestyle within the confines of his prison chamber. Perhaps this represented a level of confidence in his acquittal, or a 'charm offensive' against people who might influence the sentence, or perhaps he was simply determined to live like a gentleman to the last; whatever the exact reason, his acquittal denied the Earl of Buchan the jailer's traditional perquisite of the condemned man's goods, and the theft of Lord Lyle's belongings may hint that he felt cheated out of his reward. Whatever the exact reasons, this is the first documented incident in a long-running personal dispute between the two noblemen, which would see both men switch sides repeatedly, alternating between rebellion and royal favour, as each attempted to outmanoeuvre the other – adding a further layer of complexity to the bewilderingly fluid factional politics of the 1480s. The young James IV finally managed to bring them to a sort of agreement around 1490, but Lord Lyle's subsequent dispatch on a prestigious and long-running diplomatic mission to Spain was probably a way to neutralise their personal hostility by physically separating them by as wide a distance as possible.

In the absence of evidence to the contrary, it seems likely that the comfortable lifestyle which Lord Lyle enjoyed in prison was fairly typical of what could be expected when high-ranking were men locked up in Edinburgh Castle in the Middle Ages. Moreover, his high social rank itself was also something that made him typical of the castle's medieval prisoners; the preponderance of the medieval prisoners held in the castle seem to have been aristocrats and gentlemen, and almost all of them were accused of what we would today call crimes against the state – acts of conspiracy or rebellion which directly threatened royal power. Edinburgh Castle seems to have assumed this role rather abruptly just before 1200, replacing the great keep of Roxburgh Castle as the appropriate place of detention for men accused of treason against the king. Henceforth, Edinburgh Castle seems to have performed much the same role in Scotland that the Tower of London played in England.

Perhaps the first prisoner to be incarcerated in Edinburgh was Earl Harald, the ruler of Orkney and Caithness, who was detained in 1197 for a failure to control his warlike sons; he seems to have been initially held in Roxburgh, but then transferred to Edinburgh, marking the moment at which the castle assumed its enduring role as Scotland's premier prison – a role reaffirmed when the earl's eldest son was finally brought into custody and replaced him in the castle. In 1210, he was followed by Thomas de Colville, a baron accused of plotting treason, who bought his freedom with a generous payment to the king, while the rebel leader Thomas of Galloway was also briefly incarcerated in 1235, before being generously released by the king. Scant though these references are, they suggest a consistency in the sort of prisoners being held in the castle, and a policy of relative clemency by the royal government.

By 1254, the castle was being used to imprison men of slightly lower social rank, charged with simply committing a crime, rather than conspiring against the king: three East Lothian men-at-arms accused of robbery. They seem to have provoked the pity of the 12-year-old queen, who had two of them released for trial and probable acquittal, while the third went into exile in the Holy Land.

In none of these four cases is there any reference to a trial before incarceration – and in the case of the robber barons of the 1250s the context strongly indicates that there had not been one. It seems that the royal government was asserting a right to imprison men who had engaged in open rebellion, effectively regarding them as prisoners-of-war rather than ordinary criminals; the change from state prisoners to gentlemen-bandits after 1250 may suggest an adaptation of this precedent to cope with an unusual incident of lawbreaking, in what seems to have been a relatively peaceful period of Scotland's history.

There is surprisingly little record of the castle being used as a prison in the period of English occupation, and there is a surprising bias in what *is* recorded – every hint of detention in the castle in this period relates to restive elements of the English garrison itself. In 1299 Sir Herbert Morham, a Scottish knight who had been compelled to serve in the English garrison, was accused of kidnapping the Countess Joan, a member of the English royal family and widow of the murdered Earl of Fife; he was brought from the castle for his trial, and then returned to the fortress afterwards, but there is much that is unclear about this case – we know that Sir Herbert changed sides twice over the course of 1299, but we do not know which side he was on when he was arrested, nor is it clear whether or not the Countess Joan was a willing participant; as a result, we do not know if he was actually imprisoned at the time of his trial, or if he was simply serving as a man-at-arms in the castle's garrison (see Appendix 4: The English Garrisons); his friend and comrade Thomas du Bois certainly switched roles from garrison soldier to prisoner – recaptured after they both defected (again!) to the Scots, he was held in the castle until 12 April 1305 when he was sent south to join Sir Herbert in the Tower of London. In 1314, the soldiers were reported to have imprisoned their own commander, fearing that he would betray the castle to the Scots – it did them no good, as the Scots stormed the defences on 14 March 1314. The castle was subsequently abandoned until 13 September 1335, when the English officially began to reoccupy and refortify the castle, and a prison was promptly fitted out, with three pairs of fetters and a set of iron-bound stocks. Once again, the only people known to have been incarcerated in the refitted prison are members of the garrison, who ended up imprisoned in their own dungeon, when the Scots again recaptured the castle on 16 February 1341.

References from the late 14th and early 15th centuries are very sparse – little more than a mention of two anonymous prisoners in 1389, and a purchase of chains in 1399. It is only in the second half of the 15th century that the castle's role as a prison re-emerges clearly into view – largely due to the long shadow of the events of 1455, when the four Douglas brothers led an uprising against King James II. After the Battle of Arkinholm, Hugh Douglas, Earl of Ormond, was taken prisoner and lodged in the castle until his execution for treason: he was allowed expenses of £20 7s paid for by the king, perhaps a sign that he was very heavily guarded, or perhaps a generous acknowledgement of his status as a war hero.

A decade later in 1464, the youngest Douglas brother, John of Balvenie, was caught in the Borders and brought to the castle, but the only costs met by the government were the £3 12s charges of a guard of six soldiers for the 12 days it took to arrange his execution. Their elder brother James, the 9th Earl of Douglas, remained at large in English exile, and it is significant that the next documented case of imprisonment for treason in the castle, nearly 30 years after Arkinholm, was still prompted by a charge of treasonable correspondence with 'the traitor James Douglas' – this was incarceration and unsuccessful prosecution of Lord Lyle in 1482, discussed in some detail above.

There were also some prisoners of less exalted rank, accused of crimes that were less politicised. On 12 January 1464, a Perthshire laird, David Cumming of Couttie, was incarcerated for attempting to encroach on his neighbours by destroying boundary markers between their lands (regarded as a very serious offence, as it was effectively a theft of a noticeable percentage of your neighbour's property); in 1468, it was the turn of two local royal officials from Dunbar, William Park and John Thomson, who had been convicted of corruption by the courts, but refused to pay the resulting fine; after three years of defiance, they were arrested and imprisoned by their colleague Simon Salmond to compel them to pay up. On 8 June 1493, the Border chief James Rutherford of that ilk was incarcerated in Edinburgh Castle: he had agreed to pay compensation for a cross-Border attack, and had sent another man into English custody as a hostage for his good behaviour, but he had simply allowed his surrogate John Lawrie to languish there in jail, and his own incarceration in Edinburgh was designed to compel him to pay up, so that his proxy could be released. A more generous attitude was taken in 1471, following the imprisonment of a man called William Hamilton, who did not have the wherewithal to pay a £10 fine – he seems to have been released by the constable, who must have trusted that he would work off his debt, and taken the risk of him going on the run.

All four cases reveal a clear and rational pattern: imprisonment in the castle was being used as a coercive measure after these men had failed to perform the act of recompense mandated by the courts – typically involving the payment of a fine. Although not members of the highest nobility, it seems that these prisoners were usually lairds or men-at-arms, and the incarceration of a man of lower socio-economic rank seems to have been viewed with disapproval by the garrison commander, who took it upon himself to release him so that he could work off his debt. The fact that this man was in prison in the first place suggests either corruption or ineptitude on the part of the prosecuting authorities, a pattern which is also indicated by the garrison commander's theft of Lord Lyle's prison-cell furnishings and wardrobe in 1482 and in a different way by the arrests of the Border officials in 1468; but the constable's problem-solving response to the counter-productive imprisonment of a man who was struggling to pay a fine can be taken together with the fact of Lord Lyle's acquittal, and the general use of the

castle's prison for coercive and preventative rather than punitive ends: these details suggests that, in general, people in 15th-century Scotland had a surprisingly pragmatic and enlightened attitude to the process of obtaining justice.

In 1481, Edinburgh acquired a second prison, when the burgh council converted one of the small shops beneath the Tolbooth, the civic building adjacent to St Giles' Kirk (*Burgh Records 1403-1528*, p 39); in secondary literature, this has been interpreted as an act of royal planning by James III, designed to clear out low-ranking prisoners and petty criminals from the castle so that fortress's dungeons could be reserved for men of high social rank being held on serious charges; in effect, it is argued, the king was seeing prisoners as a sort of architectural feature, and they needed to be selected in keeping with the castle's symbolic importance as an expression of the grandeur and power of the monarchy. Recent scholarship has even linked this perceived desire to reinforce the castle's role as a state prison with the subsequent construction of a new prison facility. None of this has any real support in the primary sources – all we know is that the burgh council fitted up a small shop as a cell. Nonetheless, it does seem likely that James III was responsible for initiating the construction of the surviving medieval prison complex in the castle – a structure behind the southern battlements which subsequently came to serve as the supporting basement beneath the new Great Hall: this facility was built on two levels, with two cellar-like vaults on the lower level, and two more generously appointed chambers above them, each with a large fireplace, a big south-facing window and an en-suite toilet.

In practice, however, there is surprisingly little evidence for the castle being used as a prison of any sort in the reign of James IV. The new king had even persuaded the Earl of Buchan and Lord Lyle to set aside their differences. However, documents of 1502 and 1503 record the presence of four Highlanders and three Englishmen in the castle's dungeons: the leader of the group is Ferchard Mackintosh, chief of one of the most powerful Highland clans, and nephew of John of Islay, the deposed Lord of the Isles; his presence provides partial corroboration for the later clan traditions which report that he had been incarcerated after trying to incite a pro-English revolt in 1497, but it seems that he had the freedom to manage his estates, write a history of his family and father several children; he and his associates had probably been transferred from Dunbar in 1499 or 1500, and he was probably released in 1503, in connection with a successful mobilisation of his clan to fight for James IV against a Hebridean uprising. As had been the case in the 13th century, it seems that imprisonment was being used to reconcile rebels to the king.

It is only after the Battle of Flodden in 1513 that the sources indicate a real shift away from the coercive use of the prison to persuade men-at-arms to pay punitive fines, towards the exclusive use of the castle for the detention of very high-ranking prisoners; there were also more of them, and they often seem to have been treated more harshly. This process seems to have had its origins in the intense political division which emerged in the childhood of James V, in which rival political factions backed by France and England competed to rule in the king's name. In fact, the boy king viewed *himself* as a prisoner, resenting the tight security arrangements which defined much of his youth – he was guarded in various ways, in various different castles and palaces, but he seems to have always felt a particular distaste for the period in which he was forced to reside in Edinburgh Castle, apparently confined within a small suite on the top floor of **David's Tower**, and with very limited access to outsiders.

The documents relating to the king's captivity suggest that his guardians were genuinely concerned with protecting him, but his imprisonment also foreshadows the harshness of subsequent decades. On 22 August 1524, soon after the pro-English faction gained control of the government, they imprisoned the Archbishop of St Andrews and the Bishop of Aberdeen, two strong supporters of France who had refused to assent to a new pro-English foreign policy. This was a genuinely unprecedented action, because it represented a blatant move by the secular government against clergymen who were supposedly exempt from its jurisdiction - when James III had deposed the Archbishop of St Andrews, for example, he had carefully legitimised his actions with the support of sympathetic churchmen.

As a statement of the regime's willingness to overthrow the accepted social order in pursuit of social control, the arrest of the bishops marks the start of a period in which the tool of imprisonment in Edinburgh Castle was used in various creative and ruthless ways by whoever was in control of the government, simply to sustain or enhance their hold on power. Although he was arguably one of the first victims of the new policy, James V showed no inclination to repudiate the aggressive policy when he seized power from his guardians at the age of 16. It also seems that the prison was being used more frequently - there are too many examples of imprisonment in the castle in this period for convenient summary, but a few significant examples illustrate the point.

Perhaps the clearest example of naked self-interest by the king or his officials concerns the 3rd Earl of Bothwell, who was imprisoned at the age of 17 on 16 May 1529, as a ploy by the royal government to keep hold of the revenues of his earldom and the attached political and military powers in the Borders, all of which royal agents had administered during his childhood; he was released a few months later, but excluded from claiming his inheritance, and this prompted him into treasonable dealings with England, providing an excellent pretext to have him detained again on 25 January 1533; he was moved to Inverness in 1535 and subsequently exiled in 1539, and he was not restored to his rights until after James V's death - a clear indicator of the more inclusive policy adopted under his widow, the Queen Regent Mary of Guise; she is said to have even considered marrying him.

A sharp contrast can be found in the motives behind the jailing of another major Border figure, Sir Walter Scott of Buccleuch: he seems to have been personally liked by the king, and was certainly his most trusted deputy on the Border, but he was first imprisoned in the castle alongside Bothwell on 16 May 1529, perhaps due to a refusal to take on Bothwell's administrative responsibilities (Emond (1989), p 333, notes his reluctance in 1522). Although he was soon released, he proved too effective for his local enemies to tolerate - and in May 1534 they accused him of collusion with English raids, though this was apparently part of an assassination plot: faced with the possibility of conviction and execution in a rigged court, they expected him to refuse to answer the charges, allowing him to be outlawed and thus hunted down and killed. Instead, Buccleuch turned to James V, and on 19 April 1535 he pleaded guilty to the trumped-up charges, and was sentenced to be detained in the castle 'at his majesty's pleasure': the sentence was evidently designed primarily to protect him from his enemies by keeping him safe inside the castle - he was even paroled in 1536 to assume a military command on the Borders, and the addition of an iron window grille to his chamber in September 1536 seems deliberately ambiguous. A grille was both a security measure appropriate for a jail, and a fashionable decorative detail for a nobleman's apartment, and the fact that the builders were able to get to work suggests that

the 'prisoner' was still away commanding the army. In short, the whole thing has very much the look of a joke by the king, an act of generosity and parody but also perhaps a subtle reminder of the strength of royal power; Buccleuch was promptly pardoned by Mary of Guise on 15 March 1542, and rapidly reappointed to a Border military command.

The contrasting examples of the Earl of Bothwell and the laird of Buccleuch show that James V was using the castle's prison in creative and versatile ways to serve contrasting personal agendas; it is thus no surprise that the prison was also used to support the most prominent and consistent policy agenda of his reign – his hostility to his exiled stepfather, the Earl of Angus, and his 'Red Douglas' followers – cousins of the 'Black Douglas' faction who had been the main targets of royal hostility in the 15th century, they had profited from their cousins' fall, but now found themselves in the same situation. The most dramatic display of the new policy came in the summer of 1537, when Angus's nephew by marriage, the Master of Forbes, was accused of involvement in an abortive plot to assassinate the king. This prompted a massive sweep of arrests against everyone vaguely connected to the Red Douglas family, and the grim atmosphere was intensified by the sudden death of Queen Madeleine on 7 July. The Master of Forbes was brought south and placed in prison in the castle on 13 July 1537, where he found himself facing unexpected extra charges relating to direct collusion with the English, and he was tried and convicted on all counts the next day; his sentence was reduced from the protracted agony of hanging, drawing and quartering to the relatively brief shock of beheading, after which his body was dismembered and placed on the city gates.

The next day, his teenage brother-in-law Lord Glamis, nephew of the Earl of Angus, was also arrested and imprisoned in the castle, on suspicion of further conspiracy. It seems that the investigators used a classic English interrogation tactic, showing him a series of torture devices, and forcing him to watch his loyal servants being 'questioned' with them, and he promptly began to babble uncontrollably; out of whatever he said, the interrogators extracted a confession which accused his mother Lady Glamis, Angus's sister, of scheming to poison the king. This was probably what they wanted to hear, as she had been unsuccessfully prosecuted on several previous occasions on charges of conspiring with her exiled brother. On 17 July 1537, Lady Glamis, was arrested, tried and convicted – some sources say that she conducted her defence in person, and the jury of peers recommended clemency, but the request was ignored and she was immediately taken out onto the open ground where the Esplanade now stands, tied to a stake atop a pyre and burned alive.

The man accused of supplying the poison to Lady Glamis had his ears cut off, while the informant who had initially brought the charge of conspiracy against the Master of Forbes was probably grateful to be sent back home to Aberdeenshire and forbidden from travelling south. There remained several prisoners in the castle, against whom no trial could be brought due to lack of evidence. Lady Glamis's second husband, Sir Archibald Campbell, promptly fell to his death from the castle battlements in what was said to be a botched escape attempt – a convenient outcome for his nephew the Earl of Argyll, who was thus able to inherit a large tranche of the Campbell inheritance which had been bestowed on his uncle, and which would have been confiscated by the state if he was tried and convicted. The Master of Forbes's father and brother were simply kept prisoner in the castle, allowing royal officials to administer their lordship. Lord Glamis was spared, but he was disinherited – the king rebuilt his castle as a royal hunting

lodge to suit his own architectural tastes, and wrung £6,000 from the confiscated lordship over the next few years, even after disposing of various parts of it as gifts to his friends – though this, too, was rescinded in the raft of pardons issued by Mary of Guise; Lord Glamis reclaimed and reunited his dismembered lordship, and the old ancestral tower at Glamis has long outlasted James V's adjacent palace structures.

Mary of Guise also achieved what her husband never had and brought the 'Red Douglas' faction to heel: she outmanoeuvred the English-backed rebel army, and forced them to surrender in January 1544. Their leaders, Sir George Douglas and the Earl of Cassilis, were both incarcerated in Edinburgh Castle, a move which was designed not to punish them but to coerce them into rediscovering their patriotism. Sir George was very quick to change sides – when the English invaded three months later, he was released from the castle to enter the English camp as a double agent on behalf of Mary of Guise. Cassilis, too, was firmly on the government side by 1554, when he was appointed as finance minister – perhaps in part an illustration of the political instability of the kingdom, but also an illustration of the effectiveness of imprisonment: Cassilis had renounced his militant Protestantism and his enthusiasm for English bribes, and had clearly become convinced of the benefits of the castle's dungeons as a tool of coercive policy; he was using the prison to detain other noblemen and extort vast sums of money in exchange for their release, first imprisoning the Earl of Huntly, followed by the Earl of Caithness in July 1556.

In the reign of Mary Queen of Scots, the use of the castle as a prison is very closely associated with the agenda of her influential half-brother the Earl of Moray: on 20 May 1562, the queen was forced to arrest the Archbishop of St Andrews and impose indefinite detention, in order to *prevent* his prosecution and execution by her brother's faction. The Earl of Arran, a close ally of Moray's who had abruptly gone 'off-message', was also imprisoned in 1562 – he was declared insane, and some historians have accepted that he was, but by the time he was released in 1566 his mental state had certainly been broken, and he remained under house arrest for over 40 years. On 27 November 1562, Lord Gordon, Moray's rival for local power in the north of Scotland, was brought to the castle, where he remained until his trial on 8 February 1563; at this point, he was sentenced to relatively lenient custody at Dunbar – not what Moray desired, as he promptly attempted to murder him with a forged death warrant, which helped to secure Gordon's rehabilitation and Moray's disgrace.

The pattern of arrests immediately stopped, only to resume in earnest after Moray seized power from his sister in a coup in 1567: the pretext for the coup was an allegation that the queen and all their other political enemies had been involved in the unexplained murder of her husband Darnley, and the resumption of an aggressive incarceration policy was marked by the arrest of several low-ranking men accused of participation in the conspiracy, followed by a show trial and execution on 3 January 1568; over the next two years, everyone from ordinary soldiers to the premier peer of the realm would be thrown into the castle dungeon for opposing Moray's rule. But, eventually, the regent overreached himself – when he arrested Mary's former Secretary of State, William Maitland of Lethington, on 9 September 1569, he ordered that he should *not* be imprisoned in the castle. The fortress's governor, Sir William Kirkcaldy of Grange, was a personal friend of Lethington's, and Moray knew that Kirkcaldy would stand in the way of his plans to kill the diplomat – but Kirkcaldy promptly plucked him from house arrest on the Royal Mile and brought him into the castle anyway – still notionally under arrest

on treason charges, but in effect in protective custody. Moray's assassination in January 1570 brought his policy to an end; his allies quickly set up a new government in Stirling, but Edinburgh Castle became the headquarters of a rival regime loyal to the exiled Mary Queen of Scots, led by former prisoners such as Huntly and Lethington.

As in the period when the queen had been in full personal control of her government in 1563–7, the policy of political incarceration was temporarily ended – though the civil war that followed did see several imprisonments for local security reasons. On 8 April 1571, a herald sent by the Stirling regime to make a proclamation at the Market Cross in Edinburgh was arrested and incarcerated, followed on 21 April 1571 by an officer planning to betray the garrison. On 29 April 1571 some supporters of the regent in the town were seized by a pre-dawn raid and carried up the Royal Mile to the castle. It is unclear if the fortress was used to hold the larger group of prisoners-of-war captured on 15 June 1571. Given the comparatively restricted arrest policy used by the 'Marian' regimes, the Laird of Drumlanrig was thus particularly unfortunate to be imprisoned twice, entering the castle on 20 March 1566, and again after his capture on 23 June 1572.

After the capitulation of the queen's garrison on 29 May 1573, the castle came under the control of the Regent Morton, and as a former ally of Moray he revived his policy of punitive imprisonment and execution. As early as 18 June 1573, Lord Home, one of the high-ranking defenders captured after the castle's surrender, was returned to the fortress as a prisoner, where he remained for another two years. Another conviction for Darnley's murder served as a clear statement that the new government would follow in Moray's footsteps – Sir James Ormiston, known from his brooding looks as the Black Laird, had been accused in the initial show trial in 1567, but was still at large in the Borders six years later; he was promptly caught and incarcerated in the castle on 24 November 1573, where he remained until his execution on 14 December 1573. The queen's supporters were forced to tolerate the Morton regime, as their allies in France could not spare the military or diplomatic resources to assist them. But Morton eventually overreached himself, as Moray had done before him, and the teenage James VI seized power, echoing the actions of his grandfather James V in 1528. Morton was imprisoned in the castle and tried for treason. On the castle's new Portcullis Gate, he had placed a subtle display of his own heraldic insignia on the pediment, higher up than the royal lion rampart, and this was enough to secure his conviction and execution.

James VI, like his grandfather and uncle, would henceforth use the imprisonment of high-ranking men in Edinburgh Castle as a means to achieve the aims of government – although, in general, he seems to have favoured long-term incarceration over execution, and he had a somewhat more idealistic agenda. The king desired a kingdom with a unified national church, a common language and culture, and a centralised system of royal justice; as a result, Catholics, Gaelic-speakers and the fractious families of the Borders were particular targets for arrest and incarceration – and it was no coincidence that all three groups were also regarded as subversive enemies by the English government, whose favour James VI was anxious to cultivate in order to make good his hereditary claim to the Tudor throne (it should be emphasised that Presbyterians, democrats and noblemen with autonomous law-enforcement rights were also subjected to royal pressure, although with varying degrees of English support, they do not seem to have been incarcerated with the same regularity). The departure of the king to London in 1603 did not really bring about any shift in policy, and the best

insight into the prison in this period comes from slightly later, on 4 December 1607, when a dramatic and well-documented prison break was staged.

Lord Maxwell was a Border nobleman, while Sir James MacDonald of Dunyvaig was a Hebridean chief; both men were powerful Catholic clan leaders whose territorial claims were in conflict with those of local Protestant rivals, leading to cycles of violent retaliation – and, whatever the right and wrong of the matter, both men had found themselves in the Edinburgh Castle dungeon while their rivals walked free. It is unclear exactly where Maxwell was lodged, but **MacDonald's cell can be located by combining references to a south-facing window which looked out directly over the cliffs, and a spiral staircase providing access from above: it must have been one of the two rooms in the basement of the corner block between the Palace and the Register House, suggesting that the prisons had expanded from their original location beneath the Great Hall to the west, presumably to increase their capacity.** Although conventional historiography still portrays MacDonald as a warlike Highlander, it should be emphasised that he had built up a considerable private library while in prison, including Gaelic poetry, Jesuit theology and Scottish history – revealing him as a multi-lingual Renaissance man as well as a bold clan chief.

The escape attempt, admittedly, somewhat lowers the tone. It began with a drinking competition involving the prisoners and the guards, something that most of the witnesses were unwilling to admit explicitly. In contrast with modern sensibilities, they were rather more comfortable admitting that the wine-bloated participants had relieved themselves by urinating out the windows, which was where Maxwell alerted MacDonald to the impending escape attempt. The fuddled guards handed over their swords as part of a drinking game, and the prisoners raced out, fighting their way through the Portcullis Gate and then leaping down from the southern battlements beneath the Half-Moon Battery.

The fates of the two escapees were very different. Maxwell escaped, and arranged a meeting with his key rival Sir James Johnstone in an attempt to mend the feud between the two clans – but the meeting degenerated into a scuffle which ended with Johnstone dead; Maxwell was eventually recaptured in 1612, returned to the castle and was executed in 1613. MacDonald landed badly, breaking his leg, allowing him to be promptly recaptured; but he would eventually escape successfully from the castle in 1615 (somehow taking his entire private library with him), in order to place himself at the head of a popular uprising to fend off Campbell encroachments in Kintyre and the Hebrides; the uprising failed, but he was subsequently pardoned and restored to favour at the court of Charles I.

In hindsight, there is something rather uninspiring in the way the castle was used as a prison in the period after 1450, and particularly after 1520. Although the authorities no doubt believed that they were projecting strength and power, their actions tend to betray irrational preoccupations, overreactions and sometimes, perhaps, self-deception and sheer greed – counterproductive tendencies which destabilised the kingdom rather than controlling it. Nonetheless, the stories are dramatic and colourful, adding detail to the history of the castle, and they provide a thought-provoking contrast with the relatively merciful and successful attitude taken by earlier monarchs, which could still be reprised with notable success, especially by James IV and Mary of Guise.

APPENDIX 8: THE KING'S DAUGHTER AND THE MOORISH LASSIES

This appendix focuses on a trio of young women who were prominent residents of Edinburgh Castle in the reign of James IV. The king's teenage daughter, known as 'the Lady Margaret', has been a comparatively overlooked figure in recent scholarship, whereas the presence at the Scottish court of two 'Moorish lassies' from Africa has rightly drawn substantial academic attention. Yet a close reading of the primary sources reveals that their stories need to be told together – the African girls acted as the Lady Margaret's ladies-in-waiting, and together they formed an important and unexpected adjunct to her father's court.

Like the 'Moorish lassies', the Lady Margaret was a young woman with an unusual status – she was one of at least half a dozen children born to James IV from relationships before his marriage in 1503, but she was given much more attention and acknowledgement than the others, giving some credence to stories of a secret betrothal between the king and her mother Margaret Drummond (who had been murdered with her sisters in a shocking and mysterious triple poisoning in 1502).

When the king's daughter was brought to visit her father at Falkland on her name day that year, she is identified simply as 'Margaret Drummond' in the royal expenses, but subsequently she is consistently styled 'the Lady Margaret', a title which implicitly identifies her as a royal princess. This status was reinforced by the fact that she was set up as the head of her own personal household, and by her presence at the court from childhood until marriage. All these things distinguish her from all the other children born to King James outside of his 1503 marriage: the king's illegitimate sons were kept away in the care of tutors, and the only one of her half-sisters who was eventually brought to the court was known by the non-royal title of 'Mistress Margaret Stewart'.

In June 1503, the king's daughter and her nurse were brought to Stirling. Two months later, her father and his new queen made Holyrood Palace their primary home, thus freeing up accommodation in Edinburgh Castle for the king's daughter – the documents show that she was there between 1504 and 1507, and perhaps from around the time of her father's marriage until her own marriage in 1510.

The 'Moorish lassies' seem to have arrived in Scotland in 1504. In November that year, they rode from Edinburgh to join the royal court in Fife, and the next month both they and the Lady Margaret accompanied the king on a royal round trip through the Borders – an unseasonal journey for December, on which three events occurred in rapid succession: first, one of the 'lassies' was baptised, five days later, the Lady Margaret's nurse was paid off with a generous £14, and four days after that, as the royal party returned to Edinburgh, we have our first explicit confirmation that the king's daughter had lodgings in the castle. Within two months, clothing records confirm that she was now the head of her own household, and the African girls had become her ladies-in-waiting. They were all probably about ten years old.

In the royal palaces of Spain and Portugal and the ducal courts of Italy, it was highly fashionable for women of princely rank to have African girls as attendants, and adopting this custom was another subtle way for King James to emphasise

the status of his daughter. It also identified the Stewart court as a bold northern outpost of Renaissance aesthetics – the extensive modern scholarship on the topic offers no hint the practice had yet reached England, or even France.

Thus, the prominent presence of the two African girls gave the household of the Lady Margaret an exotic flair that was certainly unique in the British Isles, and perhaps in all of northern Europe – but the high-profile presence of black immigrants was not unparalleled in Scotland: James IV had had an African manservant for several years, and a Moorish drummer, perhaps a relative of the ‘lassies’, also arrived in 1504, and soon married and had a child. A group of ‘Blackamoor friars’ visited the court in 1508 (discussions of their possible origin have focused on Ethiopia and Egypt, but there were also important communities of indigenous Christians in Tunisia, Sudan, India and newly converted Angola, while the Ethiopians also had a monastery in Rome, and an expatriate community in Cyprus), and ‘Egyptians’ (i.e. Roma) had arrived in Scotland by 1505, while the Scottish knight Sir Cuthbert Hume was winning honour – and developing diplomatic links – as a general in the Egyptian army. A further context for cultural acceptance was provided by a popular belief that one of Scotland’s national heroines had herself been ‘black skinned’ – Countess Agnes, who defeated the English army at the siege of Dunbar in 1338 (the idea is not taken seriously by modern historians, but it was evidently accepted at the time).

Alongside the African girls, another key member of the household, also recorded in the clothing records, was an attendant named Marjory Lindsay – perhaps she was a cousin (Margaret Drummond’s mother seems to have been a Lindsay); perhaps she was a young heiress who had become a ward of the Crown (at least two contemporary Lindsay lairds were succeeded by daughters named Marjory); or perhaps she was the nurse who had brought the king’s daughter up after her mother’s murder, rapidly re-employed after her 1504 departure (a hesitant case can be made that the Lady Margaret had been in the care of a ‘Marioun Lindsay’ as early as 1495). Whoever she was, Marjory Lindsay and the two African girls corresponded to the three unmarried ladies-in-waiting who acted as the queen’s inner household. The captain of the castle, Sir Patrick Crichton, and his wife Dame Janet Turing handled their finances, a dignified older couple approximating the roles of the chamberlain and his wife in the queen’s establishment. Other household servants might have been paid out of their expenses, or the roles might have been carried out by castle personnel – for example, the castle chaplain (John Rhynd and then John Lamb) is the most likely person to have fulfilled the role of ‘clerk of the closet’, or household priest.

The annual expenses of the Lady Margaret and her household totalled a generous £100, equivalent to the annual salary of a senior courtier. Among additional expenses, the accounts record dancing lessons from Guillaume, the French drummer, and a hint that the Lady Margaret was being taught to sew by Janet Turing, a skilled seamstress who made the king’s underwear and surcoats. We can also infer that the girls learned to ride – by her late teens, we know that the king’s daughter was capable of a long ride on a bad road in winter (probably accompanied by one of the African girls, too – they had certainly been on horseback as early as 1504). The Lady Margaret could also read and write, and a much later reference reveals that she played the guitar.

We also know that the king always attended the annual St Margaret’s Day service in St Margaret’s Chapel, and it seemed inevitable that he would have been

accompanied on these occasions by his daughter and her household – it was also the name day of the Lady Margaret, and one of the ‘Moorish Lassies’ too.

The main records of their lifestyle, however, are in the lavish records for their clothing. The king’s daughter certainly wore costumes fit for a princess – the earliest, given to her in 1504, had the ermine trim that was reserved for royalty, and fashionable black velvet was the usual material for her dresses, offset by 22 gold beads worn in a necklace or a border round the bodice, while the two ‘Moorish lassies’ wore gowns of russet-coloured cloth over bolder red kirtles, and Marjory Lindsay had a tan-coloured gown with a red kirtle.

In addition, they each had several pairs of shoes every year (few details about them are recorded, but references to Lady Margaret’s ‘pantounis’ and ‘caffunzeis’ suggest they included platform-soled velvet-covered sandals and Italian-style dancing shoes; the ‘double-soled shoes’ of the African girls were equally fashionable, albeit rather more practical). There are no explicit references to the cowls or hoods worn by the young women at other royal courts, only to ribbons for head bands or snoods, as was customary for unmarried young women in Scotland, although, in a striking glimpse of character, we learn that the Lady Margaret wore boys’ headgear, owning both a tippet hat and a bonnet.

As I have mentioned elsewhere, it is even possible that the Lady Margaret and the Moorish lassies played the roles of the Black Lady and her ladies-in-waiting in the tournaments of 1507 and 1508 (the Lady Margaret is normally said to have been 12 and 13 in these years, though she could have been a few years older).

One thing that is not clear is the exact location of their lodgings within the castle, but there are at least two possibilities: the formal King’s Chamber built by James I, which seems to have been located above the space now known as the Laigh Hall, and the tower on the south flank of the castle now known as Register House, from which the king and queen watched tournaments.

A gap in the relevant records in 1508–11 means that we largely lose sight of the Lady Margaret and her attendants in these years, though the sources record the ‘Moorish lassies’ and Marjory Lindsay receiving new clothes at the start of 1508, and shoes through much of the year, showing that they remained together as a group – the likelihood is that the household continued in much the same way as it had before.

In or before April 1510, the Lady Margaret was married to Lord Gordon, son and heir of the Earl of Huntly – he was arguably the most eligible bachelor in Scotland, and her marriage-portion was the vast Highland lordship of Badenoch and Fortingall with its castles at Ruthven and Garth. Even after her marriage, however, the king’s daughter remained a regular visitor to the court. She visited Edinburgh with her husband for Christmas 1511, when her present from her father and stepmother was a gown that cost a staggering £100, made of patterned tawny velvet and edged with pure white fur, it complemented a similarly styled and equally expensive costume recently made for the queen, thus using the festivities to make a visual statement of the dual relationship of wife and daughter with the king. ‘My Lady Gordon’ was also continuing to buy a large supply of shoes in Edinburgh. An otherwise unrecorded visit in November 1512 is marked by records showing that she rode home by a mountain road, while a record of minor repairs at Holyrood in 1513 reveals that Lady Gordon and her husband had a room of their own in the palace, a clear indicator of their status as part of the family. She was at court again in May 1513 for the memorial service for her great-uncle, the King of

Denmark, where her public presence alongside her father and stepmother emphasises once again her position in the royal dynasty.

One of the African girls, Ellen, transferred to the royal household, and remained there until at least 1513. Due to her persistence in the records, she is presumably the 'black maiden' mentioned as an attendant on the queen in 1512. The other one, Margaret, almost disappears from the records – but around Christmas 1513 she seems to have been back at court, as 'the two black ladies' received a joint New Year's present of ten gold coins, and as 'black Margaret' she received fine russet fabric for a new gown on St Margaret's Day 1513 – it is tempting to think that she was the 'Margaret Prestoun' who had ridden north with the Lady Margaret in November 1512, and who had received an identical gift at that time. If so, the surname suggests that she had married to a Scotsman. After 1513, I have found nothing in the records. Marjory Lindsay also disappears from the records after 1508 – perhaps she had retired or joined the Gordon household in the north as well.

The Lady Margaret subsequently had an adventurous life. She was widowed in 1517, and there are reports of a secret betrothal to her cousin, the Abbot of Scone, who was attempting to escape a career in the Church and secure English support for his claims to the dukedom of Albany and the position of heir-presumptive and regent for the infant James V. She subsequently married again, to a cousin on her mother's side, Sir John Drummond of Innerpeffray, but she continued to act as matriarch of her first husband's family and a great Highland landowner in her own right, and in the 1550s she occupied a prominent place at the court of her sister-in-law, the queen regent, Mary of Guise.

The Lady Margaret had two sons by Lord Gordon and five daughters by Sir John Drummond (and, it seems, at least one child by the Abbot of Scone); through them she became an ancestress of many prominent figures in later Scottish history, including the dukes of Gordon and the earls of Eglinton and the various branches of the Drummond family; through exiled Royalist and Jacobite lineages, her descendants also include the last King of Poland and the princely Czartoryski and Poniatowski families in that country, as well as generals in the Russian and French armies.

APPENDIX 9: ROYAL BEASTS – LIONS AND OTHER EXOTIC ANIMALS AT THE SCOTTISH COURT

The keeping of a menagerie or private zoo was a recognised statement of royal power in the Middle Ages. Exotic animals could only be acquired by those with a princely level of economic resources and international contacts, and thus served as a symbolic way to affirm the authority of a monarchy. The concept dates to at least AD 802, when an elephant arrived at the court of the Emperor Charlemagne. In England, a royal menagerie was established at Woodstock by Henry I (1100–35) and moved to the Tower of London by King John (1199–1216). It remained there until the 1830s, when it was amalgamated with the Zoological Society to form the modern London Zoo.

In Scotland, the earliest record of an exotic royal animal dates from 1105, when King Edgar owned an ‘animal of great size’ called a *camall* (perhaps another elephant rather than a dromedary), which he gave as a gift to the Irish high-king Muirchertach Ua Briain. Insofar as King Edgar is said to have resided at Edinburgh Castle, it is possible that this exotic African creature was part of a royal menagerie located there.

Further evidence for the existence of a royal menagerie in the 12th and 13th centuries is lacking, however. The keeping of exotic animals only re-emerges clearly in the 14th century, when Robert the Bruce acquired a pet lion.

The lion was a particularly significant animal in Scotland, because it was the heraldic symbol of the Scottish kings, but in the medieval imagination it was imbued with attributes which made it an especially appropriate companion for royalty in general. The ‘king of beasts’ was also the ‘beast of kings’, and a popular saying claimed that a lion would not harm a rightful sovereign. This was a particularly resonant point for the Bruce dynasty, due to their long struggle against their Balliol rivals and the imperialist claims of the Plantagenet kings of England. In addition, the Arthurian tale of Sir Yvain, the ‘knight with the lion’ who married the Lady of Lothian, might have further added to its local symbolism.

Lions also formed a key part of the English royal menagerie, the natural point of reference for any exotic animals at the Scottish court. The lions were named in first place in a contemporary list of the animals in Henry I’s original collection, they were present at the Tower of London by 1204, and by the 1330s they had moved to special accommodation in the new Lion Tower, the barbican at the entrance to the castle, where every visitor would have to pass by their enclosure. Recent archaeological work has confirmed long-held suspicions that the animals in question were Barbary lions from North Africa, a distinctive breed which is now thought to be extinct – they were even larger than today’s surviving sub-Saharan subspecies, and differentiated by their long snouts and bigger, darker manes. Scotland’s medieval lions were probably of the same type.

The earliest surviving records of the Bruce lion begin a few weeks after King Robert’s death, when the court of his son David II moved to Perth, but it seems unlikely that the lion’s arrival coincided with the shift of location (*ER* i. 277, 288, 307, 372; cf. Penman (2008), p 47, n. 94). It had presumably lived before this in the king’s elegant new manor house at Cardross on the Clyde, although, contrary to the claims made in some secondary sources, there seems to be no explicit

documentary support for this (Lang (1900), i. 235). It subsequently remained in Perth until at least 1331. The existence of a lion at the royal court during this period may also explain the lively and lifelike appearance of the silver-gilt lion on the royal banqueting cup known as the Bute Mazer, a symbolic metaphor for King Robert himself (Stevenson (1931), pp 220, 231, 238).

The Bruce lion was kept in a rented 'house' – perhaps literally that, a house in the burgh of Perth. The cost was evidently 6*d* per week: 16*s* 8*d* between August 1329 and March 1330, and £1 6*s* for the whole administrative year 1330–1, but it required the more substantial outlay of £6 13*s* 4*d* (i.e. 10 marks) for its yearly food (*ER* i. 277, 288, 307). At some point in the second half of 1331, John the lion-keeper died, but the government settled his £1 3*s* in unpaid wages, provided a cage also costing £1 3*s*, paid £3 6*s* 8*d* for half a year's food, and 6*s* 8*d* for the house, implying that the annual rent had fallen to 13*s* 4*d* (1 merk), perhaps because the cage reduced the risk involved (*ER* i. 372).

The outbreak of a civil war between the Bruce dynasty and the exiled Balliols in August 1332 disrupted the royal administration and also led to Perth passing rapidly back and forth between the rival governments. Perhaps unsurprisingly, the lion disappears from the documents. For over a century, no surviving sources give any further indication of whether the kings of Scotland owned any lions or other exotic animals, though it is entirely possible that they did exist – they may simply have been paid for by officials whose accounts do not survive, and both David II and James I would have seen the menagerie in the Tower of London during their periods of captivity in England.

A lion is next explicitly recorded in Scotland in 1452–3, when records show that James II was keeping a lioness in Edinburgh (*ER* v. 590, 615). The accounts record a payment totalling £7 8*s* 4*d* for a quarter of a year from 6 October 1452 to 3 January 1453, inclusive of the rent of the 'lioness house', the expenses of the lioness herself, and those of her keeper, named Tullybelton, and also a rent payment of 16*s* for Whitsun term 1453. Taken together, these two figures suggest that the annual outlay was now £30 5*s*, divided into £1 12*s* in rent, and £28 13*s* for the lioness's feeding and her keeper's fee, but they are clearly only fragments of the total outlay for the period they cover, appearing irregularly in two separate sets of accounts, and they suggest that the expenses of the lioness were normally met by payment from another source – perhaps out of the revenues of the sheriffdom, or else out of the substantial fee paid for the keepership of Edinburgh Castle, which appears to have been left vacant in 1452–5. James III imported another lion from Campvere in the Netherlands in 1474 (*TA* i. 69), but the lack of any other references beyond the gift of £10 to the man who oversaw the beast's transport imply that the day-to-day costs were still being met in a way that is not recorded in the surviving documents. The incomplete documentation from this period thus hints at a more sustained policy of lion-keeping by the Scottish kings of the 15th century.

The location of the 'lioness house' is not entirely clear. The payment of a rent might suggest it was located in the town of Edinburgh, but there would be little obvious advantage to keeping a prestigious royal symbol in a private yard, and there was substantial precedent for rented land existing within the precincts of the castle itself. Cash rents had been charged for the castle's outer ward, orchard, gardens and woodworking shop in the 14th century, creating a pattern of tenancies from which buildings might have to be rented back (*CDS* iii. App. III, p 327). In 1453, the king's stables, located at the foot of the Castle Rock, also seem

to have been rented back from someone, requiring an annual outlay of £1 by the government (*ER* v. 590). After the English raid of 1385, free building plots within the castle precinct had been offered to Holyrood Abbey and the burgesses of the town, and if these offers had been taken up, even in part, they would have further extended the amount of privately held land within the castle precincts.

The concept of a 'royal lion' was also revived in a different form in this period: in 1430, James I had a bronze siege cannon made in Flanders, with a message inscribed on its barrel in Latin verse: 'For the famous James, the Scots' noble ruler, magnificent king; when I roar, castles fall; I was made to serve him – thus, I am called the Lion' (*Scotichronicon* vii. 263–5). As a gleaming metaphor for royal strength with a snarling muzzle and a dark mane of gunsmoke, the cannon was an appropriate surrogate for a real lion. The black metal of Mons Meg and the other wrought-iron bombards which were subsequently added to the royal arsenal might seem more resistant to this symbolism, but contemporary sources show that they were painted bright red, evoking the heraldic beast on the Scottish royal coat of arms.

In 1461, the deposed Henry VI of England was given political asylum in Edinburgh, and a contemporary Scottish commentator extended the lion metaphor to the royal magnanimity shown by the Scots to their dethroned enemy: 'it is the lion's noblest attribute to spare the fallen'. The cannon called the Lion was subsequently lent by the Scots for Henry's invasion of the north of England (*Pluscarden* i. 68, 380).

As noted above, the symbolism and heraldic significance of lions made them peculiarly appropriate companions for Scotland's kings. In contrast with the English royal menagerie, where unusual animals like polar bears and porcupines were often singled out for attention, the royal lions appear to have occupied a rather unique position in Scotland. The other well-documented animals attached to the royal household in Scotland are the horses in the king's stables, and the royal falcons – species which might be sourced from exotic places such as Greenland or Arabia, but which were also owned and used by many of the king's subjects, and which had functional roles for transport and hunting that were understood throughout the kingdom. In Scotland in the 14th and 15th centuries, it seems to have been specifically the royal lions which displayed the unique prestige of the monarchy.

Under James IV (1488–1513), however, a significant royal menagerie was created. A lion was, of course, acquired, arriving from overseas in 1506 (*TA* iii. 200), but the development of the collection had begun several years earlier. A peacock was given to the king in 1502, perhaps the same rare white one that is recorded two years later (*TA* ii. 96, 135, 445). In 1504, documents show that a ship had arrived at Leith with several more exotic animals aboard (*TA* ii. 468, iii. 148). There was a dramatically coloured Portuguese horse, with a white coat and a red tail. There was a 'must cat' and there was a 'jennet', probably a civet and genet, two relatives of the mongoose, with handsome spotted fur and pleasant-smelling musk. Also included in the list were 'the Moors' – an African drummer and two 'Moorish lassies'.

The inclusion of human beings in a cargo of exotic pets strikes a very unsettling note, and some Renaissance rulers certainly regarded African slaves as status symbols to be bought and sold or given as gifts, but it is possible that these 'Moors' were in fact being liberated from slavery after the capture of a Portuguese

ship, as part of the privateering quasi-war which ran from the 1470s to the 1560s (Murdoch (2010), pp 80–5). It is certainly important to emphasise that the Moors were rapidly accepted as members of the royal entourage, and there is absolutely no indication that they were slaves – the African drummer joined the royal household's Italian brass band, and quickly settled down with a local girl, while the 'Moorish lassies' became ladies-in-waiting to the king's daughter, Lady Margaret.

Over time, other animals from distant lands joined the menagerie – late in 1507, a friar from Ferrara in Italy brought another 'must', being paid the impressive sum of £70 in reward (*TA* iv. 81). In 1508, the accounts refer to a 'mermuset of Calzecut', a small monkey brought from India, dressed in a little green satin coat (*TA* iv. 117). The menagerie also included animals caught in the wild in Scotland – a captive wolf was presented to the king on Speyside in 1505, and he was given a young otter near Stirling in 1507 (*TA* iii. 170, 382). Nonetheless, the lion remained the premier animal: in 1511, the king embarked on the construction of a 'lion house', overseen by Sir John Sharp, the royal chaplain, project manager and landscape architect who was in charge of Holyrood Palace and its grounds (*TA* iv. 275, 372, 377). The building was almost certainly at Holyrood, although its exact location cannot now be identified, and the phrasing of the references is just ambiguous enough to allow the possibility that it was located elsewhere, for example at the castle or the king's stables.

The creation of the menagerie seems to have formed part of a wider project of royal image-making, reaffirmed in the iconography of two contemporary royal portraits, preserved in 17th-century copies by Mytens. The portrait of James IV with a hawk on his wrist is derived from the imagery of the Burgundian court and emphasises his ability to control and command wild creatures, and thus to rule the landscape which they inhabit. The painting of his queen, Margaret Tudor, shows her holding a monkey with spectacular tufts of fur in its ears, perhaps a Latin American marmoset, a species that can only have been discovered by European explorers a few years earlier. Moreover, the king and queen are both wearing clothing trimmed in leopard-fur – an outlandish replacement for ermine which turned the wild and the exotic into a fashion statement, and one that is well documented in the royal accounts (*TA* ii. 208, iii. 249, 250, 253, iv. 18, 25).

The symbolism of the menagerie was intensified and extended in the 'Wild Knight' tournaments of 1507 and 1508, with their pageantry involving 'beasts' – the dragons, with their wooden wings and papier-mâché heads, were evidently automatons, but a real hart was killed during the 1508 tournament (*TA* iii. 394, 397, 400, iv. 128–9, 140), and it is possible that the lion and the other exotic animals of the royal menagerie were displayed as part of the pageant, or even used for combat – a revival of the ancient Roman gladiatorial sports might have appealed to a Renaissance court, and the hunting of 'hart and hind, doe and roe, bear and boar, wolf and lion' was also identified as an appropriate knightly adjunct to tournament fighting in a thoroughly orthodox late-medieval Scottish source, Gilbert Hay's *Book of the Order of Knighthood* from the mid-15th century.

A few days after the 1506 'Black Lady' tournament, we can be confident that the king and his companions did indeed hold a fight against a savage animal – special spearheads were made to slay a 'bull at Cumbernauld', one of the fierce wild white cattle which inhabited the woods there, mentioned by the chronicle Hector Boece (*TA* iii. 400). However, purported reference to bears obtained in 1506 and 1512 may in fact relate to domesticated *boars* bought as food for the royal table (*TA* iii. 191, iv. 339).

These diverse sources emphasise that exotic pets and wild beasts assumed an unprecedented importance in the reign of James IV. The varied animals employed in the menagerie and other forms of royal display served as symbolic statements of the king's authority, representing both his power to tame and command the wilds of his native kingdom, and also his ability to assert Scottish prestige in the wider world of the Renaissance and the Age of Discovery; the message was not merely about asserting dominance, however, but also about a celebration of the beauty and diversity of the natural world. Nonetheless, the outlay on the 'lion house' emphasises that the traditional 'king of beasts' retained a predominant position, and that the new pageantry was a development of the traditional ways of expressing royal power.

The menagerie disappears from the records during the long political crisis which followed Flodden (1513–28), but the personal reign of James V (1528–42) provided an opportunity to revive a collection of exotic beasts. An ape was obtained in 1535, a parrot followed in 1538 (*TA* vii. 22) and a herd of wild boars were imported from France in 1541 and sent to the royal hunting preserve at Falkland (*TA* vii. 461; *ER* xvii. 513). The king also sought to obtain some ornamental turkeys, but it is unclear if they arrived.

Most secondary sources state that the young king acquired a lion, some specifically identifying it as a gift from his uncle Henry VIII, but the evidence does not strongly support these claims. In 1537, Tudor representatives in Flanders bought a cub which their Scottish counterparts had been attempting to purchase, and an informant in Edinburgh suggested to the English government that it might be an effective diplomatic ploy to pass it on to the Scottish king. In 1539, England used the information to make a vague offer of a lion as a diplomatic incentive, but there is no evidence that the offer was ever acted on (*SP Henry VIII*, vol. xii. No. 1158, vol. xiv pt 1, No. 406).

Little evidence is known for the menagerie in the long regency of the Queen Dowager Mary of Guise (1542–60), and the personal rule of her daughter, Mary Queen of Scots (1561–7), but wild boars are supposed to have been introduced to the grounds of Holyrood in the 1560s, and other beasts may have also been imported at this time.

The menagerie re-emerges from obscurity under James VI, who acquired a substantial collection of 'pets and beasts'. In November 1584 a lynx and a lioness are mentioned. In 1586, a chain was procured for the king's bear (*TA* MS.52b), and by 1587, when regular pay records commence, the menagerie included not only a lynx and a lion (perhaps now a male one), but also a tiger and a number of fighting cocks (*ER* xxi. 379; some secondary sources wrongly identify these 'game cocks' as partridges). In 1589, a camel was imported from England, and at least one additional lynx was added (*TA* MS. 170b; *ER* xxii. 70–1).

As they had been in the days of James IV, the royal animals were kept in the gardens at Holyrood, but the upkeep of the big cats proved to be a considerable expense. At first, the lynx was kept in its cage and the lion was put on a rope leash, but within weeks £70 had been expended on 'making of ane house' for them, in which the lioness was leashed securely to a metal bolt in the wall, while the young lion-keeper, John McTapyn, was costumed in a doublet and breeches of stout buff leather, which presumably served practical protective purposes, but which were also trimmed with fringes and buttons of green silk, offset with a black

hat, grey socks and a grey cloak with a velvet collar and silk fringe – an ensemble which cost over £50 in total.

In 1587, when the care of the menagerie was transferred to the gardener, Thomas Fenton, he was paid with a chalder of bere – a substantial quantity of grain, part of which would be sold to cover his wages and expenses, while some was evidently expected to feed the fighting cocks (*ER* xxi. 379; cf. *ER* xxii, 45, 131–2, 207, 265, 352), but the expenses spiralled upwards considerably the next year, so from 1589 the payment-in-kind was supplemented by a substantial annual payment of £244 in cash, specifically allocated to feed the big cats (*ER* xxi. 413, xxii. 70–1, 152, 231).

The nature of the evidence, focused on these two payments, means that other animals in the menagerie, such as the bear and camel, are barely glimpsed in the records – their feed and upkeep presumably required less outlay. At its apogee around 1590, the collection was evidently an impressive one, with at least four big cats, a bear, a camel and the fighting cocks. However, as the 1590s progressed, changing payment patterns suggest that the size of the menagerie was being scaled back again: the number of lynxes fell back to one, and the tiger ceased to be mentioned; explicit payments for the two remaining big cats are last recorded in 1595, and by 1599 the accounts record only the original payment of the chalder of bere (*ER* xxii. 299, 388, xxiii. 46, 252–3).

The decline of the menagerie may have been accelerated by its involvement in a notable public relations failure in August 1594. James VI had decided to use the lion at the climax of the festivities surrounding the baptism of his son, Prince Henry – the beast was supposed to enter the Great Hall of Stirling Castle, pulling a massive chariot with the dessert buffet for the banquet, and six actresses playing the roles of symbolic virtues to act as serving-girls; but, although the chariot was used, the idea of employing the lion was abruptly abandoned. The official line was that the beast was simply too dangerous, though other commentators suggested that it was old and tame and tired, and simply did not look impressive enough.

In 1603, King James travelled south to claim the English Crown, and subsequently revitalised the royal menagerie in London, but now that there was no longer a resident royal court in Edinburgh all trace of its Scottish counterpart disappears from the records.

The former presence of the royal animals was not entirely forgotten, however – though curiously, it was the lions of the medieval kings that were remembered, and not the 16th-century royal zoo at Holyrood. When the army drew up detailed official plans of Stirling Castle in 1709, they identified the courtyard of the palace as ‘The Lyon’s Den’, and in 1754 their plans of Edinburgh Castle identified the medieval basements immured inside the Half-Moon Battery as ‘formerly a Lyon’s Den’. These are sober and serious sources, and they show that the former existence of lion pens in both castles was regarded as a straightforward matter of fact.

Subsequent sources reaffirmed the idea of lion enclosures in the royal palaces, although the credibility of these later claims is undermined by the fact that the purported dens seem unlikely to have ever served that purpose. In the 1820s, the Edinburgh antiquary Robert Chambers recorded that a ruined structure on the northern slopes of Castle Hill beneath the esplanade was ‘popularly called the Lion’s Den, and supposed to have been the place of confinement of some lion kept for the amusement of the Scottish monarchs’ (Chambers (1825), p 63), but it

seems very likely that the structure in question was in fact the 'Grand Secret', an abandoned military fortification of the early 18th century (Ewart and Gallagher (2014), pp 112-14).

At Linlithgow Palace, Victorian sources claimed that the 'Lion's Den' was located in a subterranean chamber beside the east entrance, but they are inconsistent about exactly where it was. Was it one of the vaults in the basement of the east range, or in the demolished tower at the northern end of the castellated forework? Neither location seems practical, and, although Linlithgow certainly boasted a 'lion chamber' with stained-glass windows, this was probably part of the royal apartments.

What these stories do attest to is an enduring awareness that Scotland's medieval kings had kept lions as distinctive symbols of royal power, living expressions of their coat of arms. The memory of them has endured for centuries and remains far more vivid in the popular imagination - and in the scholarly literature - than the more sophisticated and diverse menageries of the 16th century.

APPENDIX 10: THE ARTILLERY

It is hard to say when artillery first arrived in Edinburgh Castle, not least because the early history of firearms in western Europe is a topic surrounded by uncertainty. True, there are scientific references to gunpowder from the 1250s, and it was certainly in military use by the 1280s, but this does not mean that it was being used in guns – the most detailed early descriptions refer to incendiary projectiles flung by heavy crossbows and throwing-arm trebuchets. Clear references to primitive firearms – metal tubes out of which a projectile was propelled by a gunpowder explosion – only emerge after 1325, but it is uncertain when the use of guns became genuinely widespread. The sources do not clearly indicate when (or where) they evolved from isolated and eccentric military experiments into reliable and familiar weapons with a well-understood combat role. Making matters more confusing, the old-fashioned throwing weapons continued to be used alongside firearms throughout the 14th century, and contemporary sources often fail to clearly distinguish between the two types of weaponry, using ambiguous terminology like ‘artillery’, ‘engines’ and ‘machines’.

These problems of interpretation pose challenges for any attempt to reconstruct the earliest phase of the history of firearms in Scotland, but at the same time they illustrate an important point – the Scots, like their contemporaries in other countries, seem to have originally regarded firearms as simply an addition to the existing range of siege weaponry.

The first extant references to siege engines at the castle occur in June 1296, when the English laid siege and set up a battery of three stone-throwing trebuchets – English chroniclers were impressed by them, but they apparently had little real effect, as it was the political collapse of John Balliol’s regime that caused the surrender of the garrison. During the subsequent English occupation of 1296–1314, there is significant evidence for an arsenal of siege engines and equipment within the castle itself (see Appendix 4: The English Garrisons), but it is unclear if any items in the inventory were inherited from the earlier Scottish garrison, and, whatever the origins of this stockpile, it must have been removed or destroyed when the Scots retook the castle in 1314, as they promptly demolished the fortifications to prevent the English using it as a base. The English did eventually reoccupy and rebuild the castle in 1335–41, but there is no real evidence that they found time to create a new arsenal of siege machinery during this period.

By the mid-1330s, the Scots were using siege weaponry with some skill – they employed some sort of artillery against English forces at Dundarg, Stirling, St Andrews and Bothwell, and it would be strange if they did not bring it with them when they advanced south in October 1337 to launch an unsuccessful siege of the English garrison in Edinburgh Castle. Some medieval chronicles claim that the Scots even used early firearms during these sieges, but the leading expert on medieval Scottish weaponry, Dr David Caldwell, has shown that these statements are probably erroneous, caused by 15th-century writers misunderstanding the pre-gunpowder terminology of earlier sources. Nonetheless, it is clear that the Scottish army that assailed the English garrison in Edinburgh Castle in 1337 had acquired effective siege artillery of some sort, and it remains possible that they did have early firearms.

In the end, the successful Scottish recapture of the castle on 16 April 1341 involved commando tactics rather than a formal siege, but the new Scottish garrison rapidly acquired an artillery component: payment accounts for 1342 record the procurement of ropes for use in siege machines – perhaps hauling ropes for a simple trebuchet, or torsion springs for a more complex machine. The state of the arsenal over the next few decades is unclear: there is a scarcity of sources, and the records that do exist record little more than the commander's salary: it seems that the commander was paying for the castle's regular expenditure without any detailed outlay being itemised. Specific evidence for the arsenal only re-emerges in the 1380s, when Scotland came back into open conflict with England, and documents provide evidence for a sustained effort to equip Edinburgh Castle with new artillery. The main emphasis still seems to have been on throwing machines. The expenses for 1381 include the wages of an 'artillerist' making crossbows, and a siege engineer named 'Dietrich the Carpenter', both earning twice as much as the castle's resident carpenter and blacksmith. In 1382, the 'artillerist' was still on the payroll, albeit with a more modest payment which suggests he left royal employment during that year, but Dietrich was hard at work constructing a 'great machine' of timber and wrought iron. In 1383, we find him working to improve its performance so that it could throw 'three ways' (*per tres vices*); it is hard to know what was meant by this phrase. Was it a weapon incorporating three separate launching systems (torsion bar, counterweight and crossbow), or a reference to the use of three cranking screws to draw its firing limb back for launch (*OED* s.v. *vice*, *n.2.2.a*), or perhaps both? Whatever the case, Dietrich remained in royal employment until 1388.

Notwithstanding the emphasis on Dietrich's machine, this period also saw the first securely documented appearance of firearms at Edinburgh Castle: a gun was purchased for the castle in 1384, along with sulphur and saltpetre to make gunpowder.³⁷ The fact that the gunpowder was being mixed in the castle shows that at least some of the underlying technological processes for artillery had already been localised in Scotland, but the means by which the technology arrived is not entirely clear; the name of Dietrich the Carpenter suggests that foreign specialists could be recruited from the Dutch- and German-speaking lands – and the names Dietrich and Hans would recur among Scottish gunners in later centuries; but the military alliance with France, established in 1296 and strongly developed after 1350, may have also played a role in introducing artillery. This was a period of close military collaboration, with élite Scottish units fighting in France, and in 1385, when a French expedition arrived in Edinburgh to open a 'second front' against England, they definitely brought a number of guns with them.

Part I: the age of the bombard, 1384–1488

The French artillery, procured at Sluis in the Netherlands, consisted of seven 'portable cannons' priced at two *livres tournois* each, along with 38 stone cannonballs for them, and 100 'irons to throw fire' priced at half a *livre* each – presumably primitive muskets, as 300lb of lead was bought to make little round bullets for them, a type of ammunition that was probably very new at this date; 457lb of gunpowder completed the purchase, which had a total cost of just less than 100 *livres*.³⁸ In contrast with these figures, the gun acquired for Edinburgh Castle in 1384 was an individual weapon, relatively expensive at £4 (around 20 *livres tournois*, ten times the price of one of the French guns, and 40 times the

value of a handgun), which suggests that it was not simply a hand-held weapon, or even a small 'portable cannon'; in contemporary England, a similar price would have bought a bronze cannon weighing around 250lb, relatively large by the standards of the time. However, the diversity of early artillery design means that it is hard to say much for certain about the gun in Edinburgh.

Two distinct types of firearms existed in the 14th century: the cylindrical wrought-iron 'barrel', literally resembling a hooped beer barrel, with the difference that its structural staves as well as its reinforcing rings were forged from metal; and the bronze 'vase', a decanter-shaped weapon whose curved outline concealed a cylindrical interior tube – the rounded swell at the base of the 'vase' reinforced the section at the bottom of the tube where the gunpowder explosion took place. There were also two types of ammunition, both of which had been inherited from the old throwing engines – stubby metal arrows of the type used in crossbows, known as 'quarrels', and 'gunstones' descended from the heavy projectiles flung by throwing-arm weapons; these were still usually hand-carved stone balls, but by the 1380s small handguns had replaced them with soft, heavy lead bullets. By the 1380s, firearms were being used both in siege warfare and in battle, and sources occasionally distinguish between primitive handguns and larger cannons transported on carts, as well as singling out the production of unusually large and idiosyncratic experimental weapons. The Duke of Burgundy had made an unsuccessful attempt to create a huge bronze gun firing large stones in 1377, while his rebellious subjects in the town of Ghent built an incredibly long wrought-iron 'serpentine' to besiege the nearby loyalist town of Oudenarde in 1384 – it only shot quarrels, and the task of launching stones was left to a huge trebuchet built alongside it, but, even if its reported length of 50ft was perhaps an exaggeration, it must have been a dramatically large weapon. It is thus hard to know exactly what sort of 'gun' the castle acquired in 1384 – it was probably neither a mere handgun nor a massive weapon, but we do not know if it was bronze or iron, or if it fired stones or quarrels or both, and we cannot say if it was designed for the castle's defence, or simply stored there for siege work or battlefield use.

Two important innovations seem to have occurred around 1400. The first of these was an acceptance that the best type of projectile was a smooth, spherical cannonball or 'gunstone'. The second change was a modification to the structure of the typical gun, when it was realised that the breech section containing the powder charge did not need to have the same proportions as the main barrel in which the gunstone was placed – it could be made with a much narrower internal diameter, and thus with much thicker and stronger metal walls, allowing it to contain the blast of a proportionally heavier charge of powder, and also focusing that explosion forward onto the centre of the gunstone, so that the cannonball would be fired with far greater force.

In the early 15th century, these innovations allowed the emergence of very large siege guns known as bombard, which replaced heavy throwing machines as the main form of siege artillery. Bombard quickly became symbols of power, differentiating princes from mere noblemen: they were costly and complex weapons, as well as dangerous and destructive ones, and the ability to acquire and use them was an implicit assertion of statehood – membership of a small international elite armed with a superior level of economic resources, technical knowledge and personnel organisation; furthermore, leaders who were able and willing to wreak destruction with artillery thereby laid claim to the self-proclaimed moral authority of a sovereign power – asserting the right to punish internal dissent and confront international enemies however they saw fit; it was a might-

makes-right sort of international law, but it was nonetheless effective. For centuries, it was proverbial that the voice of artillery was *ultima ratio regum*, a form of argument by sovereign powers which overrode all possible opposition, and simultaneously an expression of rulers' fundamental right to do as they pleased. In the 15th century, the dukes of Burgundy were the premier examples of this phenomenon – in principle, they were one of several junior branches of the French royal family, but they created a de facto state in the frontier zone between France and Germany whose political independence was very largely based on having the best arsenal of gunpowder artillery in western Europe, supported by the technological capabilities of the forges and foundries in their territories in the Low Countries.

These were developments that Scotland could not ignore – in contrast to Burgundy, where princely independence was largely won through the acquisition of an artillery arsenal, Scotland risked *losing* her sovereignty if she did not acquire effective artillery to counter a hostile and well-armed England; but, thankfully, the Scots had good relations with Burgundy. Scotland exported mercenaries for Burgundy's armies, and wool for its weaving factories, and the Burgundians showed their enthusiasm for the alliance by adopting the Scottish saltire flag and the black-and-grey livery of their Douglas boydguards; a marriage alliance between James II and the Duke's niece followed in the 1450s, but by then the Scottish monarchy had been using the Burgundian connection to procure weaponry for several decades.

The new heavy artillery seems to have arrived in Edinburgh Castle in 1430, when one of the Burgundian artillery factories made James I a bronze bombard called the Lion, named after the heraldic beast on the Scottish royal banner, and inscribed with a Latin stanza proclaiming that it had been purpose-made on behalf of the Scottish king. This weapon was the first clearly documented artillery piece to make its home in Edinburgh Castle, and it proclaimed the Scottish monarchy's ability to acquire and use the powerful new artillery of early 15th century. Payment accounts show that the Lion was part of a larger consignment of 'bombards, engines, and other instruments and apparatus of war', and that, although it was made in a Burgundian factory, its manufacture was overseen by a Scotsman, Nicholas Plumber, a versatile master craftsman and metalworker who also worked at Edinburgh Castle installing a lead roof on the Great Chamber and water features in the **King's Garden**. By 1436, documents show that James I had appointed a master of the artillery, a title which seems to have derived from Burgundian practice, and which implies the formal emergence of a professional gunnery organisation – though much of the artillery was promptly lost in the abortive siege of English-occupied Roxburgh later that year. It seems that that the Lion was hauled away into woodland near Galashiels, where it was effectively abandoned and not brought back to Edinburgh until the early 1440s.

What little is known of the Lion's design parallels what we know of other early bombards. Bronze was the preferred material for very large guns, exploiting the pre-existing expertise involved in producing massive church bells, and offered the opportunity to give the resulting weapons a gleaming bright finish with sculpted decorative details. The Duke of Burgundy, in whose foundry the Lion bombard was made, had just produced two bronze 'lions' of his own. These were guns which were literally forged 'in the shape of lions' with highly sculpted muzzles, and it seems very likely that they were the direct inspiration for the larger Scottish bombard – although the Scottish *Lion*, consistently described as a large bombard, was probably a bigger weapon than the Burgundian 'lions', which were siege guns

of a somewhat smaller type described as *canons* or *veuglaires*. The Lion also bears comparison with the best-documented of the early bronze bombards themselves, a gun known as *Faule Mette*, produced for the Duke of Brunswick in 1411, which was emblazoned behind her muzzle with a two-line inscription and the lion shield of the duke who commissioned her.

Destroyed in 1787, but extensively illustrated and measured before that date, *Faule Mette* provides our best insight into the form of early bronze bombards such as the Lion. This gun had a very wide muzzle with a diameter of around 30in, but a proportionally short barrel 6ft long, and the interior bore tapered inwards so that the actual calibre of her gunstone was around 25in. At the rear was a bulky breech designed to contain the gunpowder chagre, measuring 4ft long externally, but evidently very thick-walled, with a narrow internal bore, as 18th-century sources attribute this bombard a comparatively modest powder charge of around 50lb, rather less than 10 per cent the weight of its gunstones. The same typology, with short barrel, massive calibre and bulky breech, also characterises the only 'European' (as opposed to Islamic) bronze bombard to survive intact, the 23in *Bombard d'Aubusson* forged in c.1475–1500 for the knights of Rhodes – this has an even shorter barrel, around 3ft long, but a comparatively bulky breech whose external length is even greater than the barrel's; it probably also has a modest internal powder-chamber contained inside a very thick bronze structure, though precise measurements are not available. Also closely comparable in design but not material is the *Grosse Pumhart* now in Vienna, which is a slightly shorter version of the *Faule Mette* design forged from wrought iron; this seems to be a 16th-century Ottoman gun, captured by the Austrians at the siege of Vienna in 1529, and it is probably no coincidence that the Turkish word for 'bombard', *balyemez*, seems to be derived from that of *Faule Mette* herself. The Lion is likely to have been similar in her proportions, short and broad-barrelled, and, while she may not have matched their immense size and calibre of these guns, their consistency of scale means that such a vast size is not out of the question. We do know a little about the gun's supporting infrastructure, however. On campaign in the 1450s, the Lion travelled in a convoy of three carriages, with one for the bombard, one for gunstones and another for the army's supply of spare arrows and other such weapons – oddly, there is no mention in the procurement documents of the wooden flatbed platform from which a bombard was usually fired, or of the crane used to move the gun into position, but a strong rope had been acquired for use with the Lion in 1450, presumably either to lift her or lash her down, or perhaps for both purposes.

Surprisingly little is known about the bronze bombards of the dukes of Burgundy themselves – the princes in whose foundry the Lion was made, and the primary exponents of siege artillery in the 15th century. There are references to breech-chambers alone weighing around 10 tons, suggesting weapons of a very large scale indeed, and a bronze Burgundian bombard named Dijon was captured by the English in 1436, and dominated England's artillery arsenal for many decades. In general, however, the Burgundians favoured bombards of a very different design from the German-Mediterranean type: wrought-iron guns, longer and bulkier but of somewhat smaller calibre. At least three of these guns survive intact, and one of them is of course the castle's own Mons Meg: she will be discussed below in her Scottish context, but before introducing her it is necessary to outline her context. Another survivor is the even larger Dulle Griet. This gun is traditionally said to have been used by the rebellious townpeople of Ghent when they rose in another rebellion against the Duke of Burgundy in 1452 and was possibly built for the duke

as early as 1411, but it is not securely documented until it was carried off from Oudenarde to Ghent during a later rebellion in 1578. A third bombard exists in Basel, probably captured by the Swiss in 1476. In addition, there are other bombards of broadly 'Burgundian' type whose pre-modern history is unclear – one, found at Chapelle-aux-Naux in Touraine in 1894, is in the Musée de l'Armée in Paris; two more are at Mont-St-Michel, traditionally said to have been abandoned by the Burgundians' English allies after their siege of the fortress there in 1424; another, the Eridge Mortar, is first recorded in the 1780s on an old Tudor firing-range in the iron-working district of the Sussex Weald, and seems likely to be of English manufacture. With the exception of the 24in Dulle Griet, these weapons have a slightly more modest calibre than Faule Mette and Pumphart von Steyr, usually around 18in in calibre, but they are much longer guns, from 10ft to 17ft, with proportionally larger breech chambers and thus larger charges of gunpowder, with the result that their shots had proportionally more power, and greater range. At the siege of Ham in 1411, the first shot from a Burgundian bombard flew right across the town and landed on the far side of the river Somme; the second shot, though it fell a little short of its target, caused a shockwave which led to a partial collapse of one of the castle's four massive towers and parts of the adjacent walls. The third shot punched straight through the town walls. The castle and town surrendered while the fourth was being loaded.

In the 1450s, Scotland fought a civil war which illustrates both the ideological and practical significance of bombard artillery. The rival leaders were King James II and his most powerful subject, the 9th Earl of Douglas. King James, like most 15th-century sovereigns, was a strong believer in royal authority, but Douglas controlled a vast lordship which extended from the Rhins of Galloway to the Black Isle, and his family was powerful enough to maintain semi-independent diplomatic relations with foreign governments, including the dukes of Burgundy; moreover, like the Duke of Burgundy, the Earl of Douglas also acquired artillery – his seat of power at Threave Castle in Galloway was modified to support an impressive arsenal of defensive guns, with a large siege bombard and a battery of perhaps a dozen smaller 'serpentes', overseen by an artillery expert named John Dunbar. The guns of the earls of Douglas represented a statement – perhaps an unintentional one – that they, like the dukes of Burgundy, could stand their ground against crowned sovereigns. The 6th Earl had been brutally murdered in Edinburgh Castle in 1440 at what seems to have been the king's tenth birthday party, and, while the adult James II at first showed no intent to continue the policy of his youthful advisors, his attitude changed abruptly in 1452, when he invited the 8th Earl to dinner at Stirling Castle, and had him taken out and executed. The power of the earls of Douglas – and to a large extent that meant their artillery – was something that the king could not tolerate.

Artillery was itself the key to King James II's subsequent military victory over the 9th Earl, in the form of a gun named the Great Bombard, which was evidently superior to anything in the Douglas arsenal – it was used against the great keep of Hatton in 1452, then in 1454 it demolished Abercorn Castle on the Forth – the French gunner was praised for the fact that every shot hit the walls within 6ft of its target, a stark illustration of the improvements in technique since the shot which missed the entire town of Ham in 1411. Next, the gun was hauled across the Southern Uplands to besiege Threave Castle in Galloway, the base of the Douglas artillery arsenal. The appearance of the royal gun at Threave passed into oral tradition, and since at least the 18th century she has been identified with Mons

Meg, but documents discussed below make it clear that Mons had not yet arrived in Scotland at this date: the Great Bombard must, in fact, have been the bronze Lion; she is referred to again under the same name in 1436, when compensation was paid for damage she caused in transit from Bruges, and in 1442 when she was recovered from Galashiels, in 1450 when a heavy rope was bought for her (probably to lash the gun down during transport or firing), in 1452 with reference to the siege of the rebel stronghold at Hatton Castle, and once more in 1459, when she was repaired with brass and copper.

It should be noted that the Lion was relocated from Edinburgh to Linlithgow Palace in the years 1455-8 – but this move was originally made during the civil war against the Douglases, and it has the look of a temporary tactical deployment which was then extended when the Lion crashed into the palace gate, and required subsequent repairs *in situ*.³⁹

During the 1455 campaign against Threave, the royal arsenal acquired additional bombards: a small calibre one designed for rapid reloading was bought in early 1455, perhaps imported from Burgundian territory – it had a set of three breech-chambers, evidently of the interchangeable type which acted as primitive cartridge casings packed with powder and shot, designed to be bolted in place with a metal wedge, and removed and replaced in quick succession.⁴⁰ A subsequent reference to *fabricia circa bombardos* in Edinburgh may even refer to ‘the making of bombards’ rather than just ‘work relating to bombards’.⁴¹ A second large bombard seems to have been added to the convoy on the return journey from Threave, and had presumably been part of the Earl of Douglas’s private artillery arsenal there.⁴²

The largest addition to the arsenal came subsequently. A surviving Burgundian export licence shows that a massive wrought-iron bombard firing 18in gunstones arrived in Scotland in 1457, as a gift from the Duke of Burgundy to James II, perhaps a delayed wedding present after his marriage to the duke’s niece in 1449 – a bombard named Mons, after the town where it was made.⁴³ Today, of course, the gun is better known as ‘Mons Meg’ – the longer name is first recorded in the 1630s, reflecting an unexplained tendency to nickname big guns ‘Margaret’ – a tendency which is also represented by the names of Dulle Griet and Faule Mette. Her arrival at Edinburgh is corroborated in the Scottish documents, which show that the king borrowed 60 *écus* from local bankers to pay the ‘seamen bringing the great bombard’.⁴⁴ The name ‘great bombard’ had previously been an alternative name for the Lion, and its immediate application to Mons Meg is a testimony to the instant importance she assumed in the new arsenal. A second smaller bombard was also given at the same time and is mentioned in both the Burgundian documents and Scottish records, but the extent to which Mons dominates the documentation is a further indication of her size and significance, and the extent to which she now dominated the Scottish arsenal.

The bombard called Mons had been built in 1449, by Jehan Cambier, who was the primary manufacturer of wrought-iron artillery for the Duke of Burgundy. It seems that the gun was produced by Cambier on his own initiative rather than being specifically commissioned, and it is notable that that the tentatively reconstructed history of Dulle Griet, probably the largest-calibre weapon in the Burgundian arsenal, implies that she had been seized by rebels in Ghent a few months earlier. Mons can thus be seen as a replacement for Dulle Griet, but the duke temporised until 1454 before acquiring her, and she became surplus when Dulle Griet was recaptured a few months later, prompting her gift to the Scots in 1457: Mons Meg

thus made her home in Edinburgh Castle, and she still stands with some of her original ammunition brought with her to Scotland over 550 years ago. She was certainly one of the major guns of the Burgundian arsenal, and, if this interpretation of her origins is correct, then she was built to serve as the premier weapon of the most powerful European artillery force of the age.

Nonetheless, Mons would have looked rather different at her arrival than she does today – in the 15th and 16th centuries, she was painted with red lead, giving her a bright colour similar to Iron-Bru, and her current carriage is a replica of a 16th- or 17th-century design; while she probably used a wheeled carriage for transport, standard practice with a 15th-century bombard was to transfer it by crane to an immobile wooden flatbed before firing.

Mons Meg's arrival was followed by an unprecedented concentration of the Scottish artillery at Edinburgh Castle: the Lion and the bombard from Threave were brought back from Linlithgow, and the Lion was parked outside the castle while her damage was properly repaired;⁴⁵ additional artillery was shipped from Perth, and more bombards were brought directly from Threave – presumably some of the small defensive guns of 3in and 2½in calibre whose gunstones and gunloops survive.⁴⁶ Massive supplies of gunpowder were obtained on the Continent, even more was made in Edinburgh Castle itself,⁴⁷ and the number of artillery experts in royal pay multiplied. It has been suggested that the wide approach road into the castle through the Portcullis Gate was built to move the guns in and out at this date, but in fact the road was constructed in 1339 to facilitate access for columns of mounted men-at-arms; however, extensive building work on the castle is certainly recorded at this time, and it is possible that the inner approach at **Foog's Gate** was built around 1460 to facilitate the movement of artillery.

Numerically, the Scottish artillery arsenal does not seem to have been particularly large – the evidence would fit with a figure of just a couple of dozen guns, and many of those had originally belonged to the Douglases. For comparison, Duke Philip the Good of Burgundy had brought over 500 guns to the siege of English-occupied Calais in 1436, including a dozen bombards, and at least 170 other pieces of carriage-mounted artillery; but in the 15th century the smaller guns were secondary to the largest-calibre bombards, and it is notable that England had regarded the capture of around 20 Burgundian guns as a massive gain when the siege of Calais failed in 1436; these included just one large bombard, an old and somewhat battle-damaged bronze gun named Dijon, supported by two smaller wrought-iron guns; in the 1460s, these remained the mainstay of England's artillery arsenal, with only two other small guns in addition. By way of comparison, the presence of Mons and the Lion, supported by the two smaller bombards obtained from Threave and Burgundy, gave the Scots a serious punch when it came to artillery.

The concentration of artillery activity at the castle in 1458–60 marked a decisive shift away from alternative bases such as Linlithgow and Stirling: henceforth, Edinburgh was the home of Scotland's heavy guns. This move was probably also connected with a plan for Scottish intervention in the Wars of the Roses: Henry VI of England and his French wife, Margaret of Anjou (the Lancastrians), had asked James II for military support against an uprising led by the Duke of York (the Yorkists), and the Scottish artillery went into action in June 1460, when the guns were hauled south and emplaced for an attack against an English garrison occupying Roxburgh Castle. The entire campaign almost ended in disaster, when

a bombard misfired during a salvo against the English fortifications, fatally injuring King James II, who had been personally directing the gunner's aim.

This accident is normally described as the catastrophic explosion of a bombard, sometimes specifically identified as the bronze Lion; but this version of the story was deliberately fabricated in 16th-century England: the description of the Lion is borrowed from a passage in the earlier chronicle called *Scotichronicon*, and the rest seems to have been, at best, a guess. Other sources indicate that the king was fatally wounded by a 'piece of metal thrown with great force from the chamber' of a gun during firing, specifically a 'wedge or slice' – these references indicate a relatively small gun with a detachable breech containing its powder and ball, which was removed and replaced for rapid reloading, and bolted in place by an iron wedge – it was this last component which was dislodged by the recoil, shooting out sideways and shattering the king's leg. The existence of smaller artillery of this sort is not surprising – a gun like this had been imported in 1455, and the guns brought from Threave were probably also of this sort, but, with so few references to these smaller weapons, this incident provides an important insight into their presence in the Scottish inventory, and how they were used in action.

Roxburgh soon fell to the artillery, without a single Scottish casualty apart from the king himself, and the Scots moved south across the English border. The campaign is frustratingly poorly documented, but it is clear that the castle at Wark-on-Tweed in Northumberland was pounded into surrender. The Lancastrians used the Scottish victories at Roxburgh and Wark as the springboard to launch a successful winter campaign, which destroyed both the main Yorkist armies at Towton and St Albans, and was only halted at the gates of London; it seems that a contingent of the Scottish army marched with them, and a contemporary Scottish source suggests that the bombard called the Lion had accompanied them. Early in 1461, the Scots also regained Berwick-upon-Tweed, which had been under English rule for over a century – modern sources normally claim that the town was simply handed over by Henry VI to secure continued Scottish support after the Yorkist victory at Towton, but the primary sources suggest that it was in Yorkist hands, and was compelled to surrender by a gun sent from Edinburgh, described as 'the Queen's bombard' – perhaps Mons Meg, a gift from her uncle.⁴⁸ Scottish artillery also seems to have been deployed against Carlisle, and in 1463, it was certainly ranged against Norham Castle, with a 'great bombard' – either Mons Meg or the Lion – spending two nights at Haddington en route.⁴⁹ At both Carlisle and Norham, the Scots' artillery seems to have caused significant damage to the English defences, and although the arrival of a Yorkist army from the south saved Carlisle a similar expedition to save Norham the next year was not as successful as secondary sources generally claim – the Scots withdrew temporarily, but the battered castle surrendered once the Yorkist relief army had returned south. The proximity of the Scottish artillery may have also contributed to the prompt surrender of Dunstanburgh, Alnwick and Bamburgh, while Edinburgh Castle itself seems to have provided a secure refuge for Henry VI. By 1464, however, Lancastrian resistance had ceased in the rest of England, and the new Yorkist king, Edward IV, had the English siege artillery brought north from its bases at London and Calais to compel the northern castles to surrender – it is notable that England's primary siege gun was still the big bronze Burgundian bombard captured nearly 30 years earlier. In addition, a semi-permanent ceasefire in the war with Scotland was considered a vital prerequisite before digging in the guns for the bombardment. Otherwise, it was evidently felt that emplacing the

cumbersome guns in siege lines so close to the Border would place them at severe risk of capture by the Scots.

The Scottish bombards had thus proved their worth in 1460–3, facilitating the recapture of both Roxburgh and Berwick, and destroying key English strongholds. It is hard to say much about the subsequent employment of the guns from records of upkeep in 1464, 1466 and 5–11 July 1486, but it is clear that they were now concentrated permanently in Edinburgh Castle. The bronze Lion cannot be traced in the sources after the 1460s, and may have been captured when assisting the Lancastrians, but Mons Meg continued in use, being deployed against Dumbarton Rock in 1489 and at Norham again in 1497 – several of her gunstones have been recovered from the latter castle, though they might date from either of the Scottish sieges in 1463 or 1497. Evidence that she continued to be used in anger in the 16th and 17th centuries will be discussed separately below.

Sources relating to the artillery in Edinburgh Castle under James IV also mention two additional wrought-iron bombards of significant size, normally identified as ‘Messenger’ and ‘Tabard’, names which perpetuate the same heraldic imagery as the Lion, but also suggest a more complex metaphor; like heralds, their gunstones would be sent ahead to proclaim the authority of the Scottish king and summon his enemies to justice. A reference pairing Tabard with a bombard called the Gun of Threave hint that Messenger was the big gun brought from Threave Castle in 1455, originally the centrepiece of the Earl of Douglas’s private arsenal, and if Messenger was the Gun of Threave, then Tabard can be tentatively identified as the second Burgundian bombard which arrived with Mons in 1457.

The Douglas arsenal at Threave certainly made important contributions to the royal artillery in Edinburgh after 1455. John Dunbar, the Douglas artillery expert, entered royal service immediately. The Douglas castle also had defensive guns, small bombards of 2½in and 3in calibre, firing through around 20 gunloops in the curtain wall, and up to 18 more firing positions in each of the three corner towers (although there was not necessary a separate gun for every gunloop, especially in the towers – the defences could probably be worked with around 16 guns); gradually, most or all of these guns seem to have also been removed to reinforce the Edinburgh Castle arsenal. A further consignment of ‘bombards’ was brought from there to Edinburgh in 1458 for the campaign against England; and in 1473 the Edinburgh arsenal was reinforced again with more guns brought from Threave Castle – ‘six small bombards called serpentines’. Serpentines were small-calibre guns of long and slender design, often fired from swivel mountings, whose length and position necessitated a removable powder-chamber for breech-loading – all details which fit with the design of the Threave gunloops; but the description of the Threave weapons brought to Edinburgh Castle in 1473 as ‘small bombards’, and the 2½in and 3in gunstones found at Threave itself suggest relatively large serpentines of traditional hoop-and-stave barrel construction. It is unclear whether the Scots employed the smaller type of serpentines recorded in England, forged into a single narrow cylinder of wrought iron, and firing lead bullets. The ways in which these guns were used in the Edinburgh Castle arsenal probably varied depending on context: the weapons transferred in 1458 were probably simply being stored in preparation for use in siege warfare against English garrisons – one of them may have been the gun which misfired at Roxburgh in 1460 and killed James II. The six guns in 1473 are more likely to have been designed to defend the castle itself, in the context of the political instability in the kingdom at that date.

By 1497, an arsenal of as many as 30 wrought-iron, breech-loading guns is reported in Edinburgh Castle, all of them mounted on wheeled carriages as part of the siege train – contemporaneous illustrations from Germany show that precursors of the classic two-wheeled gun-carriage now existed, but there were also four-wheeled platforms carrying entire batteries of mobile light artillery with turnstiles and elevating mechanisms to aim them. Bombards were still used in the traditional way without firing-carriages, however, and payment records from 14 May 1501 and 15 May 1501 record the three bombards in the castle being lifted up on trestles, repainted with red lead, and put on display in a new shelter. By the end of the 15th century, when the technological emphasis shifted to bronze guns of a new type, the Scots had assembled a respectable national arsenal of wrought-iron artillery in Edinburgh Castle.

Mons Meg remains a potent symbol of this early period in the castle's history as an artillery arsenal, and Mons' survival means she is also the benchmark weapon by which 15th-century Scotland's artillery can be placed in its international context. The calibre of the bombard's barrel is around 20in at the muzzle, but it tapers slightly towards the breech to 18in. The powder-chamber in the breech is comparatively large, with a diameter of 9in and a length of 3ft 8½in. The overall length of her iron barrel and chamber is some 13ft 4in, and her and total weight is around 6½ tons.

Until the 19th century, Mons Meg was widely believed to be the largest gun in the world – but, if we assess her by calibre, it has to be conceded that she appears fairly typical among the very large bombards of her era. Mons *may* be slightly larger than most, but she is certainly one of a large number of bombards of approximately 18in calibre. Where Mons differs from the rest of the group is in her overall length and weight, and above all in the impressive size of her powder-chamber – it is, in fact, the second-widest chamber of any bombard after Dulle Griet, and proportionally the largest compared with barrel calibre, with a ratio of just 1:2.2; this chamber is, moreover, a single forged iron construction, stronger and more technically impressive than the breeches of any of the other wrought-iron bombards, all of which have the same hoop-and-stave construction as their barrels.

This impressive breech chamber is also a significant factor when Mons is compared with the larger-calibre guns. The 23in Bombarde d'Aubusson, the 30in Grosse Pumhart in Vienna and the similarly large Faule Mette formerly in Brunswick, discussed above in the context of the Lion of 1430, are all much larger guns by calibre, but these were much shorter-barrelled weapons with proportionally much smaller powder chambers. Nor is it clear that they were ever used effectively: Faule Mette proved too bulky to ever leave the town square where she had been manufactured, and her career appears to have been limited to five shots in anger against besieging armies in 1492 and 1550, and six subsequent ceremonial salutes, three of them being fired in the late period between 1717 and 1730. The only incident with which Grosse Pumhart is associated is the abandonment of the bogged-down Ottoman heavy artillery at the siege of Vienna, and there seems to be no clear documentary record to show if or how Bombarde d'Aubusson on Rhodes was used in anger.

In fact, by any criterion except her calibre, Mons Meg is the second-largest surviving European bombard after her 'sister' Dulle Griet, which is a massive 16½ft long and over 15 tons in weight; but even when set against Dulle Griet, her proportionally large powder chamber remains particularly impressive: Dulle Griet's

is slightly bigger, 10in wide by 4½ft deep, but it is *proportionally* slightly smaller, with its bore and depth standing in ratios of 1.2:3 and 1.8:1 to her shot calibre, in contrast with Mons' 1:2.2 and 2.4:1, and the relatively larger powder charge would have added extra force and range to her shot.

Mons Meg, and indeed the entire range of European artillery in this period, is often compared less favourably with the Ottoman artillery tradition, embodied by the vast bronze Dardanelles Gun created for Mehmed the Conqueror in 1464, 17ft long, 15 tons in weight, and now preserved in the Royal Armouries collection at Fort Nelson, but the relatively weak bronze construction meant that the Dardanelles Gun's firepower did not increase in proportion with its bulk: the weapon's 24in calibre was no better than Dulle Griet's, and she had a similarly narrow breech, with a 10in internal diameter. In short, the Dardanelles Gun was slightly underpowered for its calibre, which was in turn relatively modest for its vast size and weight – and this size and weight rendered it utterly immobile and useless. Parked in the Topkapi Palace, the Dardanelles Gun was eventually test-fired just once by a German mercenary in the mid-18th-century, with a very light powder charge. A single shot was fired, and it shattered into ineffectual fragments in its flight across the waters of the Bosphorus.

The famous bronze bombard used by the Ottomans at the siege of Constantinople in 1454 was probably rather smaller – contemporary sources speak of its calibre as being in the region of 20 or 30in, and the most detailed description indicates a very small powder chamber in the region of 4–5in diameter. It is possible that it may, in fact, have been fractionally smaller than Mons Meg and other European bombards in every practical sense, though, as with the Dardanelles Gun and the Faule Mette, the vast bronze barrel was unwieldy. It was hauled with great difficulty across impractical terrain, then exploded after firing a limited number of shots. While this gun had a great psychological impact, it did not significantly contribute to the Ottoman success in the siege.

Mons Meg was unquestionably a weapon of the first rank in 15th-century Europe, and she has a claim to be considered the best artillery weapon of the period, due to her superior design and unparalleled effectiveness. She is not the largest gun of the period by calibre – her 18in calibre seems to have been relatively standard for Burgundian bombards of the 15th century; but this was offset by her proportionally greater powder charge and above all by her relative mobility compared with the larger guns. Except for her own Scottish precursor, the Lion, no other bombard of this period was used so effectively, and she was also noteworthy for her long career – Mons Meg continued to be regarded as a useful weapon until 1680, when her breech was damaged due to misloading when firing a salute to the Duke of York. Even in the 18th century, notwithstanding the damage, British Army artillery officers appear to have regarded her as still to some extent serviceable – especially with her explosive shells, one of which still survives, as these comparatively lightweight projectiles required only a modest charge of powder which the damaged breech could tolerate; once this is realised, it is even possible that she was the '14-inch mortar' used in the 1689 siege, when the garrison of the castle remained loyal to the ousted James II, and used whatever guns were available to defend itself against the besieging army of William of Orange. Other guns, such as Faule Mette, the Dardanelles Gun and the Eridge Mortar, could boast of similar longevity, but this was due to inertia rather than any real military effectiveness.

By any criterion, Mons Meg remained by far the largest artillery piece in the British Isles until the Victorian era, when the two 36in, 42-ton Mallet Mortars, produced for the army in 1857, dramatically surpassed her in both calibre and weight; yet it is a measure of Mons Meg's size that these were the *only* British artillery to ever better her muzzle width, and in contrast with Mons they were never fired in anger: the two prototypes both failed their acceptance trials, proving completely unable to take an adequate powder charge. Artillery of more modest calibre but heavier barrel weight began to be produced in the mid-1860s with the 12in '25-ton gun' for the Royal Navy, but, in terms of *surviving* guns in the United Kingdom today, her calibre is bettered only by the useless Mallet Mortars and the old Dardanelles Gun which arrived as a diplomatic gift from Turkey a decade later – weapons whose ineffectiveness has already been discussed – while her weight is roughly equal to one of the 6in guns of the museum ship HMS *Belfast* and is only significantly outclassed by the 15in battleship guns preserved as 'gate guards' at the Imperial War Museum in London.

Part II: James IV and the new artillery, 1488–1513

The late 15th century saw a rapid development in artillery technology, with improved metallurgical techniques enabling the production of stronger bronze guns which could take heavier charges of gunpowder, firing cast-iron cannonballs and big lead bullets rather than bulky and laboriously carved gunstones, and pivoting on lugs known as trunions, which made it much easier to adjust their aim. Their calibre was modest compared with the bombards – rarely above 8in – and the very largest weapons weighed rather less than 3 tons – but their strong powder charge gave impressive force and range to their dense metal cannonballs, and when this was combined with the comparative speed with which they could be reloaded it meant that the new bronze artillery brought about a revolution in warfare. The new guns were pioneered by the French, who established an artillery foundry at Tours in the 1470s. In the 1490s, they were deployed in Renaissance Italy, and rapidly proved their ability to batter down the previously impregnable ramparts of walled towns and fortresses.

Scotland's military alliance with France meant that the Scots gained early access to this prized technology – the Spanish ambassador Pedro de Alaya, writing in 1498, reported that the Scots had received bronze artillery from Louis XI before 1483, but in fact the Scottish kings were not content to simply rely on the French alliance for their guns; as early as 1473–4, the substantial sum of £780 6s 5d was spent on the production of bronze guns under the supervision of a French gunner called Reinauld, at a foundry in the suburbs of Edinburgh, and during the period of renewed warfare in 1496–8, we hear of the production of bronze guns, breech-chambers and lead bullets, at least part of the work being done within the castle. By 1497, James IV is said to have assembled a train of two large bronze guns, of the type sometimes described as *courtaulx*, and ten small ones, called 'falcons' – they were, as usual, housed in Edinburgh Castle.

In the early years of the 16th century, a bronze foundry to produce indigenous Scottish artillery was established inside Edinburgh Castle itself. The basic story of James IV's artillery production has never been completely forgotten, thanks to a number of literary references and what was evidently an accompanying oral tradition; many of the underlying facts were rediscovered by early documentary

research in the 19th century, and the work of Dr David Caldwell has refined and expanded our knowledge of this aspect of the castle's history immeasurably; but recent research allows a fuller understanding of where the Edinburgh arsenal stood in the history of military technology in the European Renaissance, through a synthesis of Dr Caldwell's work in Scotland with reliable scholarly surveys of other 16th-century states' artillery which have become available in recent years. But in order to fully understand the castle's role as a foundry and arsenal for artillery in the 16th century, it is necessary to digress and first provide an outline of the evidence for the state of gunnery in the rest of 16th-century Europe: this is based largely on secondary material, though reference will be made to one important and early source, the notes of Leonardo da Vinci in the *Codex Atlanticus* – as a bronze-sculptor, engineer, mathematician and scientist, the great artist was highly valued as an artillery expert.

A complex and specialised terminology was used to describe the new guns, and at first sight the detailed nomenclature appears very confusing and inconsistent: modern overviews in English have usually argued that there was a lack of real systematisation, due to the technical challenges involved in casting every bronze gun individually in a unique mould. A closer look at the evidence suggests that this conclusion is somewhat misleading – while some states, such as England and Spain, failed to systematise their artillery effectively, this was due to complex factors that were not directly related to the skill of the gunfounders. Once the nature of the problem is understood, it becomes apparent that the Scottish guns produced in Edinburgh Castle were weapons of high quality – and they had important design differences from contemporary English artillery.

A key feature of the new artillery was a basic division into three types of gun: cannons, culverins and falcons. Their history can be most easily outlined from a European perspective. The cannon and the falcon were rapidly adopted after the successes of the French in Italy in 1494 – guns of both types had entered the arsenals of Scotland and Genoa as early as 1497. The origins of the culverin cannot be ascertained so precisely, but it rapidly assumed its place in a system of artillery that was to a large extent standardised across the entire Continent.

The cannon was a heavy gun similar to a small bombard, but it used a proportionally much bigger powder charge, and fired dense iron cannonballs. Cannons remained largely consistent in calibre throughout much of Europe. The Genoese *cannone* was standardised from 1497 onwards at a calibre of approximately 6.9in, which was explicitly said to be a direct copy of the French type, while Leonardo's designs, including both the 'French canon' (*cannone Francese*) and a 'small old cannon' (*cannone piccolo vecchio*), both have a consistent calibre of approximately 6.8in (3½ Milanese *oncie*). Early documentation from France itself is not widely available, but surviving examples of the French *canon* from the reign of King François I (1515–47) are very large, around 7in in diameter (6⅔ *pouces*), but the calibre was officially standardised by Henri II at around 6.7in (6¼ *pouces*) in the 1550s, and climbed back up to 6.9in (6½ *pouces*) in the 17th century. The Venetians rounded their calibre to carry a cannonball of 50 *libbre* (around 33lb) with a barrel diameter of approximately 6.7in. The slight variations between the calibres are largely due to small rounding errors in conversion between local units of measurement, and to a certain extent also reflect a level of imprecision in Renaissance bronzecasting techniques – the actual calibre of an individual gun might vary from its intended size by a small fraction of an inch. To accommodate these manufacturing variations, the diameter of cannonballs was a fraction of an inch less than that of the barrel – a difference

known as 'windage'. These design tolerances mean that most cannons were capable of using the same ammunition, regardless of the slight variations in theoretical calibre and actual size. The type will be referred to in this discussion as either simply the 'cannon' or as the '36-pounder' – a generic designation used in 16th- and 17th-century Scotland, reflecting the fact that the cannon's cannonballs weighed approximately 36lb.

Neither France nor Genoa (nor indeed Scotland) ever saw any requirement for another heavy calibre alongside this standard cannon type. The Venetians differed, in that they manufactured *cannones* of a wide range of other sizes, ranging from small guns of what other states would call culverin calibre, upwards to massive and unwieldy siege guns firing 120 *libbre* cannonballs (approximately 80lb), but they used their 50 *libbre* gun, derived from the standard cannon type, as their main heavy artillery piece.

There was only one standard heavy artillery type that was not directly derived from the French *canon*. This type was produced in Burgundy and Germany, which had been united under the rule of the Holy Roman Emperor since 1477, and the addition of Spain to the imperial union in 1519 saw this system adopted in the Iberian peninsula as well. The weapon in question had a bore of around 7in and fired a cannonball of 40lb, being known as a *Kartaune* in German, a *kartouwe* in Dutch and in Spain as the *cañon de abatir*. It was associated with a range of different 'fractional' calibres – including the massive *Doppelkartaune* or 'double cannon' and smaller guns such as the 'half-cannon' and 'quarter-cannon' (*Halbekartaune* and *Viertelkartaunen*, or *medio cañon* and *cuarto cañon*). This system seems to be less well documented – it is often assumed to be German in origin, but the main foundries were Burgundian, and consistent and reliable information on the 'fractional cannon' calibres seems to be hard to obtain. It is also unclear whether these Habsburg artillery types underwent the important improvements in design which were implemented by most users of the standard 36-pounder in the early 16th century.

With the standard cannon calibre rapidly established throughout much of Europe, the main innovation was that cannons quickly became heavier in the first quarter of the 16th century, using more bronze in their construction. Their barrels became longer, and the width of metal around them became thicker, especially around the breech, the section at the rear of the barrel where the gunpowder charge and cannonball were pushed down. The Genoese *cannone* of 1497 had weighed around 1 ton, but in the early 16th century the 'standard cannon' (*cannone commune*) had increased in weight to around 2 tons, and an even heavier 2½-ton type known as the 'reinforced canon' (*cannone rinforzate*) was pioneered around 1510 and became standard for the siege artillery later in the 16th century; Leonardo's designs of around 1512 include the short-barrelled 'old small cannon' (*canone piccolo vecchio*), and two longer and heavier 'new' types that may be his own designs.

These changes in cannon design conferred three simultaneous advantages. Firstly, the thicker and longer barrel acted as a cooling device – the greater volume of metal had a greater heat-loading capacity, allowing it to absorb the energy of each shot more efficiently, and its proportionally larger surface area could also distribute that heat more efficiently, two factors which allowed more rapid and sustained firing without damaging the gun through overheating. Secondly, an increased thickness of metal around the breech enabled the gun to be fired with a stronger powder charge, giving the cannonball extra speed and force. Last, but

not least, a heavier gun had a greater inertial weight, which meant that it did not recoil as violently when it was fired.

These three developments produced high-performance cannons, but they are even more closely associated with the medium-calibre gun known as the culverin. This class of artillery has a more complex and less clearly understood history than either the larger cannons or the smaller falcons. The word *couleuvrine* meant 'snake-like' in medieval French, and was originally synonymous with 'serpentine', describing relatively small hand-operated guns with comparatively long barrels. By 1489, however, French artillery companies included *grosses couleuvrines* and *couleuvrines moyennes* ('large culverins' and 'half-culverins') as their medium-calibre types of carriage-mounted artillery.⁵⁰ These early culverins were probably already rather longer than contemporary *canons*, and thus would have had better heat-loading characteristics that enabled them to be used for more rapid, sustained firing. However, they do not seem to have attracted the same level of international attention as the cannon and falcon types in the 1490s, and it is not clear when the type acquired what would become its defining feature – a very heavy and strong barrel construction for its size.

At a relatively early date, however, the advantages of a thick barrel were recognised; a stronger powder charge, better heat loading and less violent recoil, and, because a culverin was a proportionally smaller gun than a cannon, these advantages could be exploited even more intensely than with cannons. In practice, culverins were often similar to cannons in external size and overall weight, and they were often longer; but they had a narrower bore and a proportionally even thicker metal barrel, so, although the culverin fired smaller cannonballs than a cannon of comparable weight and size, it could take an even bigger charge of gunpowder, imbuing its shot with immense speed, force and range.

Strong and heavy barrel construction also enabled the culverin to fully exploit the invention of a more powerful form of powder, in which the basic ingredients – saltpetre, sulphur and charcoal – were mixed with an alcoholic liquid such as brandy. The resulting paste was dried and sieved to produce comparatively large particles bound together by the alcohol, known as 'glazed' or 'corned' gunpowder – or, in Scotland, simply as 'culverin powder'. It seems unlikely that Renaissance gunners fully understood the reasons why this formula was more effective, but weight for weight they knew that it was around twice as powerful as ordinary gunpowder.⁵¹

Thus, the culverin came to be defined as a relatively long-barrelled, thick-breeched gun, with a strong powder charge. Most states also manufactured the culverin in several distinct calibres, a feature already evident in its prototypes in France in the 1480s. It hard to say precisely when this distinctive combination of features came together, as the culverin type was not adopted internationally with quite the same rapidity as the larger cannon and smaller falcon.

Leonardo's *Codex Atlanticus* diagrams include four types of culverin: the *culebrina mezzana* with a calibre of $1\frac{2}{3}$ *oncie* (3.25in) and *culebrina grande*, with a bore of $2\frac{2}{3}$ *oncie* (5.2 in) are the established types, retaining the original *couleuvrine moyenne* and *grande couleuvrine* designations which had been adopted in France by 1489. Leonardo also offers a 'new' design of *culebrina mezzana* with a shorter barrel and a slightly less thick-walled breech, presumably designed to be lighter and more manoeuvrable, and two completely 'new' guns of intermediary calibre,

the *culebrina piu che mezzana* and the *culebrina maggiore* ('more-than-half culverin' and 'larger culverin') with calibres of $2\frac{1}{4}$ *oncie* (4.5in) and $2\frac{1}{2}$ *oncie* (4.9in) respectively.

Surviving examples of the French *coulevrine* types suggest a slight but perceptible adjustment in calibre over the first half of the century. Extant *grandes coulevrines* from the reign of François I are centred on a 5.5in calibre, but Leonardo's 5.2in calibre had become the standard bore by the 1550s. The *coulevrine moyenne* similarly fell from 3.25in to 2.9in. The French had a single intermediate calibre, the *coulevrine bâtarde*, which shows less clear variation: examples from the reign of François I use calibres of 4.1in or 3.9in, and the type was standardised at 4in in the 1550s. The Genoese, however, adopted the *bastardo* designation with Leonardo's 4.5in calibre, and a *moiana* with a relatively large 3.5in calibre – the divergence of this last gun from the rest can probably be explained by a desire to prevent an overlap in calibre between the culverin class of guns and the smaller falcon types to be discussed below. There is no early mention of a Genoese 'great culverin' in the extant literature, but the *mezzo cannone rinforzato* which appears later in the century was a great culverin in all but name, and its superior range and heat-loading meant that it eventually replaced the *cannone comune* as Genoa's preferred naval gun in the 1590s.

Venice produced a somewhat confusing variety of culverins, although on close examination their derivation from the standard system was clear – they did not have a 'half-culverin' type (for reasons to be outlined below), but they produced guns corresponding to both the French 4in *bâtarde* and the 4.5in type represented by Leonardo's *culebrina piu che mezzana* and the Genoese *bastardo*, then added a heavier 20 *libbre* type which roughly corresponds to Leonardo's *culebrina maggiore*, and rounded their equivalent of the 'great culverin' up to 30 *libbre* (around 20lb), before going on to designate their more strongly reinforced cannons as large *culebrinas*. As mentioned above, the Venetians also manufactured small *cannone* types – lightweight, short-range guns of culverin calibre, using the same sizes of cannonballs.

Taken together, French and Italian evidence suggests a progressive reduction in the size of the great culverin and half-culverin types, with the earliest guns probably having calibres of 5.5in and 3.25in; a large number of intermediate 'bastard' types are in evidence, of very varied calibre, but the 4.5in type was popular in Italy.

There is little available evidence to show whether culverins were adopted in the Hapsburg system, but it is notable that the Spaniards clearly distinguished the short-range, lightly constructed (and generally useless) 'fractional cannons' of Hapsburg design from the heavier, more potent *culebrinas* of similar calibre. The main result of this was that they had too many medium-calibre types, a problem compounded by unhelpful theoretical tables and attempts to rectify the situation by introducing new revised designs which just added even more calibres to the mix, but the Spaniards stuck doggedly to the certainty that a *culebrina* and a 'fractional cannon' were very different guns. They had a very large 25-pounder *culebrina ordinaria*, and a bewildering variety of 'bastard' calibres, which they called *medias culebrinas*, and a proper 'medium culverin' type, which they classed as a large falcon.

The falcon appears in the French classification system in the 1480s and emerges into clearly defined view alongside the cannon in the 1490s. This was a smaller

and more mobile type of gun than the others, which often fired large lead bullets rather than small iron cannonballs. Breech-loading variants are also known, with the guns made in Edinburgh Castle in the 1490s being very early examples of this type.

Once again, Genoese documents constitute our earliest precise evidence for the calibre: when they officially adopted the gun from the French in 1497, they stated a calibre of approximately 2.5in. Shortly afterwards Genoese sources also begin to speak of a smaller falcon variant called the *smoriglio*, named after the smaller bird of prey called the merlin, with a calibre of 1.9in. Venice had actually begun to produce the falcon even earlier than Genoa, under the guidance a French defector in 1496, and, although the Venetian sources which specify the calibre of their *falcone* are not quite so early, they use the same two calibres, a *falcone* of 2.5in and a *falconetto* of approximately 2in, which roughly corresponds to the 'merlin'. The parallels help to make clear the early development of the type – the original French *faucon* of the 1490s was a 2.5in gun, promptly followed by a variant with a slightly smaller calibre around 1500. French documents of the 1550s distinguish between a *faucon* of the original 2.5in calibre and a *fauconneau* with a clearly differentiated 1.9in calibre – the same type attested much earlier as the Genoese *smoriglio*.

However, Leonardo only acknowledges one calibre designation, the *falcone* – for him, a *falconetto* seems to be a short-barrelled, lightweight variant; but his *falcone* is the only type of gun for which he introduces a change of calibre without introducing a new name, down from $1\frac{1}{4}$ *oncie* (2.45in) to a new calibre of just over 1.15 *oncie* (2.25in). In Spain, similarly the *falconete* name came to be applied to the larger calibre, while the smaller one was called the *esmeril* or 'merlin'.

It seems that there was a relatively rapid reduction in the calibre of the falcon from 2.5in to 1.9in, with Leonardo's 2.45in and 2.25in variants and the Venetian 2in *falconetto* representing stages in the process; in most arsenals, the end result was that the 'falcon' designation came to be restricted to the original 2.5in guns, while the new reduced-calibre versions came to be regarded as a distinct subtype, the 'merlin' or 'falconet'; but this was a rationalisation of what was essentially an attempt to improve a single type of gun.

Distinct from the main evolution of the falcon designs was a larger variant called the *sacre* (named after the saker, a large breed of falcon). This type, too, was originally a French design, mentioned in passing in the 1490s, but it quickly disappeared from the French arsenal, probably because it was too close in calibre to the *couleuvrine moyenne*. It owed its perpetuation to the Venetians, who adopted it in 1496 along with the falcon – and, accordingly, omitted the 'medium culverin' type from their otherwise very varied inventory. In Venice, the saker is subsequently documented as a gun of around 3.75in calibre, but it also spread to Spain and Genoa. This posed a problem for neat categorisation, as the largest falcon type overlapped with the smallest culverin: the Genoese solution was to adjust the calibres, with a 3.3in *sacre* and a 3.5in *moiana*, while in Spain the 'medium culverin' type remained smaller than the *sacro*, but was renamed as a *medio sacro* to rationalise the terminology.

In addition to the artillery system, mention should be made of a type of heavy handgun which came to be associated with it, known as the swivel-mounted arquebus: this had a bronze barrel like a small cannon, whose most notable difference in design was a bronze spur projecting downwards underneath the gun.

The barrel was set in a wooden stock similar to that of an early musket, with the keel projecting through a slot – a Y-shaped pintle was attached to it and fitted in turn into a socket on a structure designed to take the recoil, such as a wooden tripod. Leonardo illustrated these guns in *Codex Atlanticus*, while in French they were named as *arquebuses à croc* – and, as will be shown below, they also remained popular in Scotland into the second half of the 16th century.

It should be relatively unsurprising that Scotland, a close military ally of France, adopted this new artillery technology at a relatively early date, and that Scottish artillery experts acquired a clear understanding of the different types involved.

The largest type in general use was the 36-pounder cannon, derived from the French *canon* – though its calibre is explicitly documented in Scottish evidence much earlier than in any other source outside Italy, with a consignment of cannonballs being purchased before Flodden. The calibre recurs throughout the history of the Scottish artillery, being stated in terms of both the 36-pounder ball and 6.9in calibre by Thomas Binning in the mid-17th century. One 36-pounder gun and a stockpile of 250 cannonballs for her remained in Edinburgh Castle until the reign of George I.

With a single standard calibre of cannons, the main diversity in Scotland's artillery was in the array of culverins. Sources from the reign of James IV refer to the 'gross culverin', the 'pikmoyane' and the 'moyane'; the middle type here is evidently Leonardo's *culebrina piu che mezzana*, an apparently unique reference to this designation outside the *Codex Atlanticus*, though the triple division corresponds to the French *gros coulevrine*, *bâtarde* and *moyenne* (or the Genoese *mezzo cannone*, *bastardo* and *moiana*), and the corresponding intermediate-calibre term 'battard' is attested from the 1520s.

The gross culverin had a weight of shot asserted as 16lb in the reign of James IV, but it is not entirely clear which of the various weight systems then in use is meant. A massive lead bullet that probably belonged to a Scottish gun of gross culverin type survives, however – it weighs around 28lb, corresponding to an iron cannonball of closer to 18–19lb weight. This would be an appropriate calibre for the larger 5.5in type of great culverin; a surviving example of this type exists in Scotland, a French gun originally produced between 1515 and 1547, which came to be owned by the Duke of Argyll. The 18-pounder ball and 5.5in calibre are also supplied for the 'Culvering, or Demi-French Cannon' by Binning, though, at that date, French guns had long been manufactured to a slightly smaller calibre.

The pikmoyane or battard is the least clearly documented weapon in the Scottish inventory. Leonardo's *culebrina piu che mezzana* and the Genoese *bastardo* were 4.5in weapons and would have fired cannonballs weighing around 12lb, whereas their French counterpart the *bâtarde* was standardised by the 1550s as a 4in gun firing 8lb shot. In addition, although it was probably once a common type in Scotland, few guns of this type survived past 1580, and none is known to have ever received a detailed description. Binning's 'Demi-culvering', an 8-pounder with a 4.2in bore which does not correspond directly to the contemporary French or English standard, is perhaps a glimpse of it.

The moyen was a gun of much smaller calibre – two well-documented Scottish-made examples are described in a series of artillery inventories for Dumbarton Castle, spanning the period from 1571 to 1714. Firing shot of between 3lb and 4lb weight, they correspond closely to the 3.25in *culebrina mezzana* as defined by the abstract specifications in *Codex Atlanticus*, moreso than the 2lb, 2.9in version

defined in the 1550s by Henri II. Guns of this same 3.25in calibre remained the predominant light artillery in Edinburgh Castle into the early 18th century, much to the confusion of English gunners.

As in France, the smallest types of guns were the falcon and falconet, though additional variety in design was indicated by uniquely Scottish references to 'double', 'single' and 'quarter' falcons. However, the fact that ammunition for all classes of falcons was categorised together suggests that the guns in royal inventories were built to a single calibre – and the fact that the falconet was equated with the quarter falcon suggests that it was simply a lighter gun of the same calibre, as with Leonardo's reference to the 'shortest *falconetto*' when citing minimum lengths for the *falcone*. It is this category that is represented by the single surviving artillery piece of unquestionably Scottish manufacture, found at Castle Semple around 1850, which has a calibre of 1.8in, and a very short barrel length of 5ft 10in. A gun produced in France before 1515, and recorded at Dumbarton Castle between 1571 and 1714, is described as 7ft or 8ft long with a 2in calibre. These guns are close to the 1.9in bore which would be standardised for the *fauconneau* in the 1550s, which has been suggested above as the result of a rapid reduction in calibre from a larger bore of around 2.5in. In the absence of evidence for larger guns of the 2.5in type, it is possible that most Scottish falcons were constructed to this smaller size. Like the French, the Scots avoided the saker classification, and, when guns of this calibre are mentioned, it seems likely that they are of foreign manufacture – almost all of them can be confidently identified as English.

It is also necessary to mention some very small-calibre carriage guns – a 1.45in gun associated with Kames Castle on the Isle of Bute, and a pair of 1.33in guns produced for Tolquhoun Castle in the 1580s; other broadly similar weapons are known from elsewhere, such as a surviving 1.25in French gun of the 1520s in the Musée de l'Armée. These guns have sometimes been identified as falconets, but they seem to be centred around 1.35mm calibre, and they should probably be thought of as robinets, named after the robin redbreast in contrast to the falcon – a type of gun whose production and use in Scotland is confirmed by documentary sources. All known examples seem to have been manufactured for private individual rather than the royal arsenal, explaining their absence from the main artillery system.

Lastly, there were hackbuts of crock, the Scottish version of the swivel-mounted arquebus, whose name was a direct calque on the French term *arquebuse à croc*. A relatively large number of these guns survive, the largest group of them being from the large output of 'double hackbuts' produced in the castle foundry in the early 1550s. These are 4ft-long guns with a 1.1in bore – all known examples of ordinary hackbuts fall within 0.1in of their calibre, but use less metal so they have thinner construction and shorter barrels, usually about 3½ft long, thus adding further evidence to support the hypothesis that Scottish 'double' guns were made to the same calibre as 'single' ones, but with thicker and longer barrels, for added strength to take a heavier powder charge. Two carriage-mounted guns of 1.16in calibre with 3½ft barrels procured for Tolquhoun Castle in 1588 should probably also be thought of as a sort of hackbut – given their precisely matched lengths, it seems clear that they were intended to have a different character from the pair of slightly larger robinets supplied alongside them.

The consistency of terminology and implied calibre might to some extent reflect a reliance on French guns, and it is clear from the inventories that French artillery

was regarded as fully interchangeable with Scottish weaponry. However, efforts to establish a domestic production of bronze guns had been underway since the 1470s, and the artillery produced by James IV has been regarded as an impressive achievement. The English and the Scots alike were particularly impressed with the Seven Sisters captured at the Battle of Flodden in 1513, seven large guns of identical proportions, proudly emblazoned with an inscription proclaiming their Scottish origin. The main puzzle is how to reconcile their numbers with the divergent numbers of guns in the detailed inventory of the Flodden artillery recorded in multiple sources – five cannons, two gross culverins, four ‘pikmoyanes’ and six moyens.

In general, modern scholarship has inclined to suspect that the Seven Sisters were guns of one of the smaller calibres – perhaps the number of moyens was miscounted. The real answer is rather more impressive and can be found by tracing the guns forward from their capture at Flodden. Three were carried off by Lord Clifford and installed at Skipton Castle, where they can be traced subsequently: an Elizabethan inventory describes them as ‘three of the Seven Sisters’, the pride of the Clifford arsenal, and in the 1640s they recur as two 18-pounders and one larger-calibre gun which must be a 36-pound cannon. An exiled Scottish royalist mathematician discovered them there during the Civil War and put them into action against attacking Roundheads. It thus appears that the Seven Sisters included both cannons and gross culverins, and they can therefore be identified with the five cannons and two gross culverins which formed the heavy artillery of James IV’s siege train at Flodden. The combination of two calibres is what has prevented them being identified previously: the fact that they were of identical appearance means that they shared the same dimensions externally, but with two separate styles of barrel design. The gross culverins, although smaller in calibre and weight of shot, were the heavier and more technologically complex guns, with their greater barrel weight and powder charge, and the option to fire lead bullets whose increased density paradoxically improved their ballistic performance and range.

The production of seven guns of such scale and sophistication places the Edinburgh Castle foundry in the forefront of European artillery production in the early 16th century and confirms the level of ambition and attainment which historians have attributed to James IV’s gunnery organisation. As the king himself was well aware, their numbers compared well with the French royal siege train in the Italian Wars of the 1490s, and their long history as front-line artillery confirms their quality as weaponry. James IV’s artillery foundry was making guns equal in size and sophistication to the biggest and most advanced continental pieces, using principles of design and manufacture which would not really be surpassed until the entire system of muzzle-loaded smoothbore roundshot was superseded by breech-loading rifled shell guns in the reign of Queen Victoria.

In addition to the Seven Sisters, we can document the production of at least two further 36-pounders in Scotland, and a considerable number of guns sailed with the fleet that was sent to support France in 1513. The flagship *Great Michael* carried 32 bronze carriage-guns, compared with 16 on the Breton *Cordelière* destroyed in 1512, and ten on *Mary Rose*. As many as 12 may have been 36-pounders, and there were 14 more bronze guns aboard the smaller royal warships *Margaret* and *James*.

The Scots thus produced good guns, comparable with those of the other ‘national’ artillery systems throughout Western Europe. Equally striking is early evidence for

mixing gunpowder with whisky, a process documented in Edinburgh Castle as early as 1507. This might seem like an act of eccentric nationalist alchemy, but, in fact, what is being described is the production of glazed powder – proof that the Scots were promptly adopting the latest technological innovations.

Thus, the evidence confirms the long-standing belief that the artillery foundry in Edinburgh Castle in the reign of James IV was an impressive achievement appropriate for a Renaissance monarchy, embodying the international best practice of the era. The technological knowledge of its personnel also served as the basis for the understanding of artillery in Scotland into the 17th century – and Scotland also contributed to the international propagation of Renaissance artillery technology; by 1507, Scottish specialists had introduced the new artillery technology to Denmark – and they then moved on to Muscovy, to spread the knowledge further (nor does this seem to have been entirely random; James IV was acting as intermediary in an attempt by the Tsar Basil III to resolve the 450-year-old Great Schism between the Orthodox and Catholic Churches).

It is natural to ask how Scotland's artillery in the 16th century compared with that of England, the inevitable rival on the far side of the Border. Up to this point, this question has been deliberately sidestepped. Instead, this appendix has approached the question of Renaissance artillery from an international perspective, to show how Scotland's guns were representatives of a European technological mainstream, reflecting widespread design and production principles and manufactured to precise calibres.

This approach, made possible by the work of Dr Caldwell and recent foreign scholarship, contrasts with the usual methodology, in which historians *begin* with the evidence for artillery in Tudor England, drawing on an accessible tradition of secondary scholarship, and use the Tudor artillery system as a basis for their interpretation of the Scottish evidence. Such an approach has perhaps been counter-productive. When the Scottish evidence is instead approached from a continental perspective, it becomes clear that Scotland's Renaissance artillery was manufactured to what might be called international standards; but when the same international standard is applied to England, a different truth becomes evident – the Tudor kingdom was *not* part of the technological mainstream.

English artillery had certain anomalous features. Although the English used more or less the same terminology as everyone else, they applied it in a unique way, treating the different designations as nothing more than a list of calibre sizes, the boundaries between which were very inconsistently defined, and they rarely showed any real appreciation of the fundamental design difference between a culverin and a cannon. England was also the only state that continued to produce old-fashioned bombard-type artillery firing gunstones.

The largest bronze guns whose manufacture is recorded in England in the first quarter of the 16th century are called 'demi-culverins', a term which English artillerists subsequently applied to guns firing 9lb and 12lb shot (they never managed to define distinct names for the two sorts); if the limit of English technological attainments in this period was a 12-pounder, that would be humiliating enough when the Edinburgh Castle foundry was readying the Seven Sisters and the other Scottish 36-pounders for war – but it is possible that these early 'demi-cannon' were much lighter weapons, more directly analogous with foreign guns with synonymous names, the *culebrina mezzana* and *couleuvrine moyenne*, firing shot of just 3lb or 4lb in weight.

For his larger guns, Henry VIII was initially dependent on Hapsburg foundries in the old Burgundian territories of the Low Countries – but, although some sources make great claims for the guns produced here for him, a close reading of the evidence reveals that they were very lightly constructed, and many of them were of much smaller calibre than is normally claimed. English gunfounders did begin to manufacture heavy artillery in the late 1520s, producing guns of unquestioned technical competence and great aesthetic sophistication; but they were a decade or two behind the Scots, and their guns continued to be lightly built, and made without a clear typology of calibre and design. Some guns of good design were included among them, as were some massive 68-pounders, but even in the most prestigious of positions, like the gundeck of the *Mary Rose*, these were not necessarily equipped with any appropriate ammunition. It would be 1574 before a review of the English artillery finally initiated widespread production of a proper culverin-type gun with an adequately thick barrel, in the form of a 9-pounder ‘demi-culverin’ closely resembling a Scottish battard. It is perhaps more than a coincidence that England’s royal artillery had fought alongside Scottish gunners equipped with a number of battards the previous year, when they intervened in the ongoing civil war north of the Border and joined the siege of Edinburgh Castle as allies of the Regent Morton.

Equally remarkably, the review of 1574 also belatedly introduced glazed powder to England, when the Scots had been making it for about 70 years. Even then, it was adopted in a weakened form known as ‘corned cannon powder’ – perhaps English gunners doubted the ability of their under-built guns to cope with a charge of full-strength powder? Still, at least the English learned how to make gunpowder properly within the 16th century – unlike the procedure of casting each gun as a solid bronze cylinder and then drilling out the bore, which was standard at Edinburgh Castle by the 1540s, if not earlier, yet would not be adopted in England for a further 200 years.

These contrasts have important implications for our understanding of the relative quality of artillery in the two kingdoms, and thus help us to appreciate the full significance of the Scottish royal foundry on the Castle Rock. Edinburgh Castle under James IV can be described without exaggeration as the first and foremost centre of production for Renaissance artillery in the British Isles.

Yet, in 1513, these promising beginnings seemed to be swept away in the disaster at Flodden Field – the entire siege train was captured by the English, the fleet was away in France and the throne had passed to the infant James V. The heir-presumptive was his French cousin, the Duke of Albany, who was acceptable as regent largely because he was completely disconnected from the Scottish political scene. Nonetheless, Albany also offered the Scots another advantage – French military assistance to rebuild their artillery arsenal.

Part III: the French phase, 1513–61

After Flodden, it seems that only one gun of significant size remained in Scotland – a single 36-pounder cannon, probably intended to replace the bombard on the *Margaret* but completed too late for the campaign. The capture of the Seven Sisters had dealt a serious blow to Scotland’s artillery establishment, and the subsequent sale of the *Great Michael* to the French by the Duke of Albany has usually been described as an equally humiliating loss.

However, a closer reading of the evidence indicates a somewhat different narrative. Contrary to the claims made later in the 16th century by pro-English historians, the French government paid a good price for the Scottish flagship, one-third higher than the generous sum for which their powerful Mediterranean flagship *Grande Maîtresse* was procured in 1525.⁵² On top of this price, they provided a consignment of French bronze guns in exchange for her artillery, which seems like the only realistic decision that could have been made at the time – she had become the mainstay of the French fleet, and the alternative would have involved bringing her into harbour, hauling all her artillery ashore, bringing other guns to rearm her, running new sea trials and laboriously adjusting her ballast to compensate for the shift of weight. The chronicler Pitscottie says that, when Albany arrived in Scotland in 1516, he brought six cannons and six other large guns, plus light artillery and arquebuses. Other guns followed later, and the guns carried aboard the other Scottish royal ships had already come back to the castle from the Clyde in July 1515.

Simultaneously, the Scottish government was taking steps to strengthen Edinburgh Castle's artillery defences, with the mobilisation of Robert Borthwick as master gunner and the appointment of a company of six of his subordinates as 'ordinary gunners' – that is to say, artillerymen ordinarily resident in the castle and available at all times for duty in its defence. An ambitious plan was also presented for the construction of an artillery fortification described as 'trenches and bulwarks', perhaps the precursor of the Forework that was in place by the 1540s. Work continued for several years, strengthening the castle's fortifications and improving its garrison facilities.

Among these improvements, a new gunmaking forge was built in 1515, replacing the one which had produced the 'Seven Sisters' – in an odd instance of the cross-training so typical at the Scottish court, the Italian trombone player who led the royal brass band oversaw the production of the clay tiles used in its structure. The plan was presumably to improve the gunmaking facilities, but there is no clear indication of gunmaking in the decade after Flodden, and it is odd that there is no further record of the production of 36-pounders at all; however, culverins of impressive weight and greater bulk were produced in the 1540s, and it is possible that, with the delivery of replacement artillery from France, additional heavy guns were simply not regarded as a necessity.

Even so, the efforts made after Flodden ensured that the castle soon had enough guns for its own requirements again. By 1528, a siege train of four 36-pounder cannons and a battard could be brought out of the castle to the siege of Tantallon. The quartet of cannons may be the same as the four longest-serving guns identifiable in the inventory of 26 March 1579, one of Scottish manufacture and three French guns made no later than 1515. Other sources refer to more grandiose totals for the Scottish artillery arsenal – according to the experienced Scottish naval officer Dougal Campbell, who was taken prisoner by the English in 1522, there were 13 'double cannons' and perhaps 17 small guns such as falcons. In 1523, Albany brought more guns, presumably the rest of what France owed in exchange for the ones aboard *Great Michael*. According to a letter from the queen dowager to her brother Henry VIII, he now controlled a total heavy artillery arsenal of four 'double cannons' even larger than the Seven Sisters, and 28 other cannons, while an English spy reported that the siege train with which he attacked the Border included Mons Meg, two 'double cannons', eight ordinary cannons and 24 culverins and falcons. To the English, a 'double cannon' would later come to mean a massive gun like an Imperial *Doppelkartaune*, but at this date, and in a

Franco-Scottish context, it seems more likely that the weapons in question were reinforced 36-pounders with a weight of around 2.5 tons. The gun which was completed too late to join the fleet in 1514 may have qualified (as it was certainly manufactured subsequent to the Seven Sisters), but the two double cannon present on the Border can probably be identified with a pair of big French guns which appear in documents of the period as the kingdom's main siege weapons, and which were clearly under Albany's control. However, by 1528 he had placed these two guns in his own private arsenal at Dunbar, marking the emergence of a second major artillery base alongside the castle; it is possible that these two guns were mostly kept in Edinburgh Castle after 1536, but they were not permanently moved until 1567, so they will thus be discussed in more detail at the appropriate point in this appendix.

Nonetheless, even the four 36-pounders documented at Edinburgh Castle in 1528 were an impressive battery of artillery, and if they could be positioned defensively they would give the castle a good claim to be the strongest artillery fortifications in the British Isles at this date – apart from the two double cannon, nothing heavier than a battard is recorded in Dunbar, while for comparison, as late as 1547, the strongest heavy artillery positions in England were at Berwick, with two cannons and two culverins to defend the entire town, and Tynemouth, with three cannons and one culverin. The Tower of London had more big guns, but they were there for storage and display and there seems to be no readily available evidence that they could be deployed defensively at all.

Another remarkable feature of Albany's 1523 campaign, and one that can be definitely associated with Edinburgh Castle, was the arrival of a platoon of what can only be described as horse-drawn tanks, which were mustered at Edinburgh before advancing to the Border. These had a crew of eight men in a metal-plated wooden chassis, being pushed from behind by armoured horses, and, as well as carrying guns, they had sword-blades projecting at the front and sides to prevent concerted attacks – like their successors in 1917, their purpose was to break through the infantry stalemate into which contemporary warfare often degenerated, and like the pikmoyanes at Flodden, they may find their clearest parallels in Leonardo's sketchbooks – they appear to combine the features of his famous 'tank' design with the horses and sword-blades depicted immediately above it on the same page. The English greeted the first reports of their arrival with incredulity, but, as they learned that they were real, their invasion army made a hurried retreat rather than experimenting with combat against them.

It is thus clear that, in spite of the challenges which the kingdom faced in the turbulent period after Flodden, the castle's capabilities as an artillery base were sustained and strengthened. If artillery production in the castle was interrupted during the regency, it had resumed by 1526, when four small falcons were cast by Robert Borthwick. The short-barrelled falcon from Castle Semple may be one of these guns – it is usually dated to the reign of James V, though its sleek octagonal form and cylindrical cascabel, close in style to the designs in the *Codex Atlanticus*, suggests the earlier part of the reign. Later, in the personal reign of James V, documentary references indicate a shift to a more ornate style of artillery, representing a type which was already being pioneered on continental falcons in Leonardo's time, and which became widespread in the later guns of François I and Henry VIII – the forward section of the barrel was made cylindrical, and studded with national symbols (Scottish ones carried thistles and fleurs-de-lis, symbolising the French alliance and the royal marriages that embodied it, or lions' heads and

fleurs-de-lis, where the flowers might alternatively represent the heraldic treasure round the lion on the royal coat of arms).

The quality and style of the craftsmanship on these later guns can be gauged by the involvement of Andrew Mansioun, the carver who is thought to have created the 'Stirling Heads', who was responsible for decorating them with both etched designs and moulded three-dimensional bronze sculpting. An oversight role was performed by John Drummond, the veteran master carpenter who produced the hammerbeam roof of the Great Hall, while a reference in the 1530s may mean that his daughters were making wooden stocks for handguns. In an indication of the tightly knit nature of the artillery organisation, both Mansioun and Drummond cross-trained as gun captains and saw active service in that role – Drummond was regarded along with Robert Borthwick as one of the kingdom's two top siege-warfare experts by 1528. This is a surprising role for a civilian principally regarded by historians as a gentleman-architect, but the knowledge of geometry necessary in Drummond's role designing roofs would have been equally applicable in scientific gunlaying, and this probably explains his cross-training. It also implies that the Scottish artillery was being directed by men who had a practical understanding of ballistics – they were not simply pointing their weapons at large targets like castles and phalanxes of soldiers but striving to obtain an accurate aim.

As well as the increasingly sophisticated craftsmanship of the design process, and the evidence for a scientific understanding of how to aim the weapons, there was also an air of experimentation to the artillery of James V's personal reign. In 1539, we hear of bronze guns with removable breech-chambers for rapid reloading, but the main effort was focused on the construction of 'double' guns – like the 'double falcons' and 'double cannons', these were probably variants using additional bronze in their construction – one of them was certainly remarkably long, and their heavy construction allowed for longer sustained use in siege campaigns, but the main aim was presumably to produce a very thick-walled breech for an enlarged powder charge, providing extra range and force to their shots. Two 'double moyens' were produced on 24 March 1540 by the master gunner and foundry supervisor Hans Cochrane. One of these guns is described on 26 March 1579 as 'thrawin-mowit', which probably means that its muzzle had not been properly cast, requiring the barrel to be shortened – a problem often faced by large guns in this period; the fact that it was also 'without armes' suggests that the process was regarded as sufficiently risky to eschew the extra effort of making sculpted decoration, and that the completed gun was not enriched with the conventional alternative of engraved decoration either.⁵³

Next, in August 1540, the French gunfounder Paris Rowan embarked on an ambitious attempt to manufacture what was described as a 'double culverin', with an immense barrel 16ft long; the resulting gun, cast on 14 October 1540, seems to have been somewhat 'thrawn-mouthed' – William Drummond and his men spent ten days cutting down the muzzle – but it received engraved decoration nonetheless; the casting of another double culverin attempted on 30 October 1541 was a more dramatic failure, 'becaus of ane vent in the cuppling of the mulde with the tayll', but the spilled bronze was melted down again; another attempt on 31 December 1541 also failed, but the second double culverin was successfully produced at the third attempt around 25 February 1542; both of the guns were successfully test-fired on 18 March 1541, and the newer one was now engraved with the king's lion rampant shield and flanking unicorns on its breech, thistles and fleurs-de-lis around the barrel and the year '1540' at its muzzle.⁵⁴

Given their immense length and implied weight and thickness of construction, these were probably the two most technologically sophisticated bronze smooth-bore guns ever produced in the British Isles. It is also notable that the Scots were now using the relatively new technology of casting the guns solid and boring out the barrel to the required calibre, which enabled them to be manufactured with very precise calibres. As mentioned above, this technique would not be emulated in England until the late 18th century.

At least one gun was also procured from abroad, described as a 'double cannon', bought from Flanders and bearing the arms of the Lord of Veere (a cousin of the king, protector of the main Scottish trading enclave and commander of the Flemish navy) – the delay in producing the second double culverin may have been what prompted its acquisition, but it arrived in Edinburgh on 9 March 1541 when the double culverin was almost ready for testing; 'twa grete culvering moyanis' brought to the castle at the same time are also likely to have been imports, as they were brought ashore without gun-carriages, but, alternatively, they may simply have been the defensive armament carried aboard the ship which brought the big gun home.

After their testing, the two new double culverins were brought into the castle's new Mmunition House, converted from the secularised Great Chapel in a major construction and logistics project that had taken place alongside the gunfounding programme – the ground floor provided a home for the artillery and artillery supplies, but two upper storeys were full of armour, pikes and halberds, and an arsenal of over 400 'half hacks', scaled-down hackbuts for use as handguns, each supplied with a bullet-mould and a quantity of slow-match.

While the Mmunition House placed the big guns in the context an arsenal of army equipment, the ambitious new artillery procurement programme was probably more directly connected with James V's rebuilding of the fleet – new ships required new guns, and equipment ranging from shipboard gun-carriages to loading scoops also needed to be supplied in large quantities. In addition, the king was personally involved in the invention of an arsenal of incendiary ammunition, fuelled by concoctions involving whisky, walnut oil and petrol. In 1540, the king had undertaken a major campaign to enforce royal authority in Orkney and the Hebrides, with the artillery brought down from the castle to equip a fleet: even 'the great bombard' – Mons Meg herself – seems to have been taken on campaign again.

James V's navy was built around a squadron of four royal warships – a single big sailing galleon called *Lion*, probably armed with at least two 36-pounder cannons and a considerable number of smaller guns,⁵⁵ plus two oared war-galleys, *Salamander* and *Unicorn*, and a smaller scout galley called *Little Unicorn*. Galleys were the iconic warships of the Renaissance, a bold revival of Graeco-Roman concepts that was also a princely statement of modern high technology, and the royal enthusiasm for oared warships was also embodied in the castle itself – the artillery fortification called the Spur was designed to resemble the ram bows and forward-firing gun battery of a massive war galley. The new double culverins were ideal galley weapons, prestigious statements of technological sophistication which could outrange any other naval weapons and conduct a sustained bombardment due to their excellent heat-loading qualities; it is tempting to think that one of them was intended for each of the big war galleys, but it would be 50 years until these advantages were widely appreciated.

James V died suddenly in 1542, leaving Scotland once again at war with England. An English invasion force landed at Leith in 1544 and captured the galleys *Unicorn* and *Salamander*, which hampered the Scots' ability to project their artillery power at sea, but, as the ships were in harbour at the time, it seems unlikely that the guns themselves were aboard. The main aim of the English commander was to capture Edinburgh Castle – **but the castle's artillery** achieved a level of revenge by demolishing an English siege battery and causing the entire English army to flee in panic. English sources prefer to omit this ignominious part of the invasion – the arrival of a force of Border reivers who broke back into the town and plundered it two days later allowed the Tudors to claim a face-saving victory, but the fact that **the expedition's real objective had been the installation of an English garrison** in the castle was quietly forgotten.

Nonetheless, only a relatively modest number of big guns seem to have been available for siege duty in the 1540s. A small siege train led by a single cannon left Edinburgh Castle to besiege Glasgow in 1543, and again to attack Coldingham in 1544, while the regency regime cited a lack of heavy guns as an excuse for not even showing up to support a French expeditionary force at the subsequent siege of Wark – the French expeditionary force had brought light artillery with them in large quantities, but their only guns suitable for siege work were two *grandes coulevrines* and two *bâtardes*.⁵⁶ In part, this strange lack of heavy artillery probably reflects the fact that many of the guns had been moved out of Edinburgh and divided between various locations in an effort to impose strong government across the kingdom. In 1543, the earls of Argyll and Huntly had each received an artillery train of a cannon and two falcons to enforce authority as viceroys in the west and north, while at least one more cannon seems to have been in St Andrews Castle by 1546. The castles at Tantallon, Hailes, Seton and Hume, in the area most vulnerable to English attack, all seem to have been issued with some light artillery from the royal arsenal. The royal flagship *Lion* also carried a battery of guns, probably including at least two more cannons and perhaps as many as four: she cruised with impunity as a heavy commerce raider until 1547, when she was deliberately ambushed by the Royal Navy while sailing on a peacetime diplomatic mission.

The largest problem, however, seems to have been a matter of leadership: the regent James Hamilton, Duke of Châtellerauld, was more concerned with maintaining his own position than providing effective national leadership, and, to make matters worse, his trusted Secretary of State was in league with the invading English. In addition, Châtellerauld had appointed a kinsman to control the artillery, who seems to have had little practical capability to perform the role, but nonetheless ensured that the salary was diverted to the Hamilton cause, and used his authority to prevent anyone *else* from mobilising the guns. Soon after his failure to appear at Wark, the duke dramatically gave the lie to his claim that he had no capacity to deploy a siege battery – it emerged that he had moved at least two cannons and two battards to his own castle at Cadzow on the Clyde, and he now hauled them energetically south over the Southern Uplands to attack a more congenial target in the form of the Border powerbase of his political opponent Lord Maxwell. There may also have been difficulties procuring enough draft animals to move the guns, and enough powder and shot to conduct sustained sieges, but these claims were presented primarily by Hamilton sources, and it is unsure how much they were simply excuses, either to conceal their incompetence or simply facilitate their inaction.

The most important artillery action of this period was the siege of a garrison of English-backed insurgents in St Andrews Castle, but it is also the most complex and hard to follow in detail. The sources do not even agree closely on the number of guns Châtellerauld was able to deploy, and it is clear that even contemporaries disputed the reasons for his abject failure. With predictable absurdity, the regent next learned that a few English moss-troopers had seized Lord Maxwell's little Border peel at Langholm, and promptly led off a competent-looking siege train to ruin it; but in his absence a French naval squadron arrived at St Andrews and pummelled the castle into surrender in a matter of hours. The arrival of the French marked a shift in initiative – in 1548, they sent a strong military expedition, built powerful modern artillery fortresses at Leith and Dunbar to help defend the kingdom and proceeded to rapidly eliminate the English garrisons which had been established during the Hamilton ascendancy. Châtellerauld's incompetence could not stop the French gunners doing their job – and a close reading of the evidence makes clear that the Scottish artillery also joined in these successful French-led sieges, and may indeed have provided the main firepower – but one inevitable result was that Edinburgh and the Scottish arsenal were somewhat overshadowed for the next few years by the very visible French presence.

Some artillery production evidently continued in the castle during the Hamilton ascendancy. Châtellerauld's coat of arms was blazoned on a quarter-falcon recorded in Edinburgh Castle's own arsenal on 26 March 1579, and he also commissioned a number of 'double hackbuts' produced in 1552–3, some of which survive. These weapons are all of relatively modest size, however, and it is notable that the largest guns known to have been produced during Châtellerauld's regency were not made by the Edinburgh Castle foundry at all, but a group of moyens cast in St Andrews Castle for the cardinal in 1543–4, by Albany's former master gunner, Wolf of Nürnberg.

A renewed vigour is evident when the queen dowager, Mary of Guise, took power as regent for her daughter in the 1550s. The French fortresses at Leith and Dunbar remained the main military garrisons in the kingdom, but a renewed appreciation of Edinburgh Castle's continuing strength and significance is reflected in the fact that the queen regent chose it as her personal headquarters. Energetic construction work was carried out, including the strengthening of the forework with a heightened parapet containing gunloops, and the construction of a new Renaissance entrance gateway on the south side of the spur, with a sculpted pediment.

The traditional policy of using a single cannon, often shipborne, to enforce royal authority on the kingdom's periphery was also revived. The Mackays of Strathnaver had fought for the English and relied on the remoteness of their Sutherland powerbase to escape punishment, but in 1554 the master gunner Hans Cochrane took a cannon out of Edinburgh Castle, and sailed north aboard a little merchant ship, escorted by the master of the artillery's stepson and a company of 50 soldiers. Borge Castle promptly fell, confirming the continued effectiveness of this peculiarly Scottish single-cannon tactic pioneered by James IV.

Guncasting also recovered, as the largest recorded guns produced by the castle foundry after 1542 appear to have been cast under the queen regent's oversight – a 1578 inventory of the castle's guns mention a double falcon and moyan emblazoned with her coat of arms, probably the same two guns whose production is documented in 1558. This was part of ambitious attempt to resume production, followed by a gross culverin, and it seems that there were plans to

follow it with new double culverin, battard and moyan designs, for which schematics were drawn up; but an accident in the casting of the gross culverin seems to have destroyed the furnace, and, although a rebuilding of the foundry was promptly begun, it does not seem that any artillery production was ever resumed – no further attempt to manufacture guns larger than 3-pound calibre are recorded in Scotland until the Carron Iron Works began making cast-iron guns in the 1760s, over two centuries after the Edinburgh foundry ceased production.

Part IV: sieges, stabilisation and Spanish guns 1561–1613

The final phase of the castle's history as the home of Scotland's national artillery arsenal can be defined by the end of gun production in 1558, neatly approximating with the return of Mary Queen of Scots in 1561, and the abandonment of the French fortifications at Dunbar and Leith, which restored Edinburgh Castle to its pre-eminence as the kingdom's main artillery fortress. For the purposes of this report, a detailed summary can end in 1603 when James VI moved south to London.

The guns fired a salute as part of the ceremonial welcome pageant when the queen arrived in Edinburgh on 2 September 1561. The start of the young queen's government is also symbolised by the appointment of James Chisholm as 'Controller of the Artillery' – a nephew of the staunchly Catholic bishop of Dunblane and a grandson of the Lady Margaret (see Appendix 8: **The King's Daughter and the Moorish Lassies**), he was a young man with no obvious qualifications to command a military arsenal, but he evidently took an active interest in his new duties, commanding the artillery on Mary's northern campaign in 1562, and was quickly accepted as de facto master of the artillery. The importation of four new cannons from France, emblazoned with the coat of arms of King Charles IX, represented a significant addition to the castle's arsenal.

A detailed inventory of the artillery in Edinburgh Castle was produced on 20 March 1567, as the command of the garrison changed hands. This is the first systematic statement of the castle's artillery that is known. It reveals a battery of six heavy guns in the Fore Wall, including the four new French *canons* and two gross culverins, plus a further four cannons mounted in higher positions – two of them on the upper ramparts stretching towards the Portcullis Gate, two more near **St Margaret's Chapel**, all perhaps recently moved up from the Fore Wall when the newer guns had arrived. A moyen was set up on the top of **David's Tower**, while two more moyens and two larger battards stood within the higher ramparts.

The western parts of the castle were guarded by a more miscellaneous selection of guns, with the massive double cannon procured in 1541 being the largest weapon here. It was supported by four English guns of medium calibre – two culverins and two sakers – plus a double and single falcon (perhaps, in fact, the two English minions subsequently recorded in the castle on 26 March 1579) and three moyens of French or Scottish manufacture.

This assemblage of artillery was impressive: the eight 36-pounders which glowered from the gunports and ramparts on the castle's main approach were perhaps still the most impressive single gun battery emplaced in any fortress in the British Isles. It is hard to find accurate figures for artillery in early Elizabethan

England, however, and by the time of the Spanish Armada in 1588 the arsenal at Berwick would be considerably larger, with 35 guns of culverin calibre and upwards. Within Scotland, the castle's status as an artillery fortress was certainly still dominant. The Hamilton fortresses at Cadzow and Craignethan are something of an unknown quantity, as Châtellerrault had helped himself to an unknown number of royal guns in the 1540s, including at least two cannons, and it is not quite clear if he had ever given them back. We are on surer grounds with the other royal fortresses: Dunbar seems to have had just two cannons, while inventories from Stirling and Dumbarton reveal that each had a single gross culverin and two battards. Huntly and Argyll may have retained a single cannon each, but the powerful private arsenal at the Earl of Angus's castle at Tantallon in the 1550s had just two battards, and this was probably at the top end of what noblemen could deploy.

A few months after the 1567 inventory was made, the artillery from Edinburgh Castle was deployed for the siege of Dunbar, with a powerful battery of four cannons and two gross culverins – presumably the six guns from the Fore Wall, doubling as the main siege artillery battery – plus a single battard; Dunbar's surrender and subsequent demolition seems to have further strengthened Edinburgh's arsenal, as by 1578, notwithstanding the effects of a civil war and siege, Edinburgh Castle's artillery inventory had been augmented by several more guns, including two falcons blazoned with Albany's coat of arms, and the two 'double cannons' he had brought from France in 1523. These two big siege guns were probably the most distinctive weapons in the Scottish arsenal, and were evidently attributed a sort of personality by the Scottish public – they are generally known today under the names of 'thrawn-mouthed Meg and her marrow', popularised in the 19th century by Sir Walter Scott, though in this case the 'Meg' nickname seems to be derived from a printer's error in an early edition of Pitscottie's *Chronicles*, and this gun should not be confused with Mons.

Primary sources generally call the big gun simply Thrawn Mouth, and show that she was originally made for Louis XII of France before 1515, while her 'marrow' or working companion is nicknamed 'Little Thrawn Mouth', suggesting she was in some way smaller, though her calibre was apparently the same – she was blazoned with 'the marschell of Frances armes', perhaps the shield of Robert Stewart, *sieur d'Aubigny*, who was appointed to that rank in 1514; one manuscript of Pitscottie renames them 'Cruik mow and Deaf Meg'. The term 'thrawn-mouthed' probably means that their muzzles had been shortened due to damage, which made them less pretty, but reducing their length and weight made them easier to transport without really reducing their firepower. They had been the main Scottish guns at the siege of Tantallon in 1528, and they were deployed again at St Andrews Castle in 1547 and against the English fort at Haddington in 1548; it seems clear that they were based at Dunbar, but there are some grounds to think that they were moved to Edinburgh in 1536–44, and they may have been moved again for part of the period from 1548 to 1567. After Dunbar's demolition, they were permanently based in Edinburgh Castle, however, and Thrawn Mouth was still the first choice for siege artillery in 1614, when she was sent to Orkney to bombard Kirkwall Castle.

A glimpse of the appearance of the gunners in this period is provided by an inventory of the equipment of Michael Gardiner, who moved from the castle garrison to Stirling in the 1560s: he had a suit of plate armour and a hat which concealed a steel skullcap, spurs on his boots, a swordbelt round his waist and a halberd with which to stand guard or fend off attackers during battle, while his

professional accessories consisted of a powder-horn, a lintstaff with which to fire his guns, a big powder chest which also contained a set of scales to carefully weigh out the required quantity for each gun and a case of gunner's tools. This impressive panoply identified the gunner as an elite military specialist comparable to both the chivalric man-at-arms and the Renaissance alchemist, but it was not unique to Scotland – similar equipment is shown in sculptures of the gunners of François I of France; and, as in France, the Scottish gunners' skill was also honoured in Renaissance sculpture: a bas-relief depicting the guns, with Mons Meg immediately recognisable among them, has been the main architectural feature of successive entrance to Edinburgh Castle, and is still displayed in the entrance of the current 19th-century gatehouse.

In the personal reign of Mary Queen of Scots, the role of the artillery embodies an odd juxtaposition of celebration and crisis – firing salvos against a rebel army on 31 August 1565, saluting the birth of the future James VI on 19 June 1566. Sometimes, the contradictory messages formed part of the same sequence of events: on 24 April 1567, a warning gun announced the queen's kidnap by the Earl of Bothwell and his reivers, and then on 6 May 1567 a salute celebrated her return to the capital, with her kidnappers transformed into her new husband and new mounted bodyguard.

The Long Siege of the early 1570s saw the artillery put to the test in a military role: with Mary Queen of Scots now exiled, the castle became the headquarters of a loyalist regime, the 'Marians', fighting against a rival regency government led in turn by the earls of Moray, Lennox, Mar and Morton (called the 'King's Men' due to their notional allegiance to the infant James VI, whom Moray had declared king to legitimise his own usurpation of power). The castle's guns were still used to provide ceremonial salutes, hailing new parliamentary legislation, welcoming returning troops and greeting foreign ambassadors (see 13 June 1571, 15 June 1571, 21 February 1572 and 21 May 1572), but they also served to threaten the queen's enemies.

On 3 March 1572, one of the gross culverins on the Fore Wall fired a single shot at extreme range, targeting a squadron of the Regent Mar's cavalry as they returned from a sortie around Edinburgh. They had reached the head of Leith Walk, nearly three-quarters of a mile distant from the castle – but, with fearsome aim, the cannonball cut in half the young Lord Methven, and decapitated his horse for good measure. Several sorties also saw the castle's artillery wheeled out to attack nearby positions occupied by regency supporters. On 15 May 1571, a double cannon – probably the one acquired at Veere in 1541 – was wheeled out of the castle and set up in the area now known as High School Yards, to bombard a house in the Cannongate where the Regent Lennox's rival regime was holding a token parliament for propaganda purposes. The double cannon was one of the largest pieces of artillery in the castle but was probably relatively easy to deploy at short notice, as it was located in the Middle Ward, close to the roadway out through the Portcullis Gate. A contemporary diarist records that the two sides exchanged over 500 shots that week, with the discordant sound of artillery replacing the ringing of church bells which normally marked the time in Scotland's capital. On 25 July 1571, a cannon and a gross culverin, probably from the Fore Wall, were brought to the same position to bombard the regent's men at Holyrood. On 10 June 1572, a cannon or culverin was again marched out, escorted by the entire Marian army, to attack Merchiston Castle, held by a garrison loyal to the rival regime; the gun proved capable of punching holes straight through the tower, and the defending soldiers sent a man up to the roof to wave a white flag –

but, just as he was about to signal their surrender, he spotted the Regent Mar's entire army hurrying up from Leith. Huntly's army turned away to do battle, and the gun was safely hurried back to Edinburgh.

A ceasefire was agreed on 22 July 1572, but the regent's men and their English backers had never intended to play fair. They occupied the city, oppressed the Marian inhabitants, confiscated the Marian gold coinage to economically cripple their opponents and enrich their own coffers, and progressively isolated the castle garrison. On 25 December 1573, they asserted their Protestant principles by compelling the townsfolk to spend Christmas Day building artillery fortifications across the Royal Mile, and on 1 January 1573 a gunshot from the castle signalled the end of the truce.

On 2 January 1573 the castle sent six cannon-shots down the Royal Mile, disrupting an attempt by the regent's supporters to hold a fishmarket as a way of displaying their control of the city – the shockwave threw the fish from their stalls, and stripped the slates off the city's roofs. The threat of further artillery imposed embarrassing constraints on the Regent Morton's parliament when it met on 17 January 1573 and 26 January 1573; the procession which should have paraded down the High Street was held inside the High Kirk, using cheap brass copies of the Crown Jewels, and the legislature convened in the protection of a vaulted basement rather than the parliament chamber in the church's nave.

The castle was also pounded by attacking artillery. Much of the damage which can still be recognised in the palace and the southern flank of the castle was perhaps inflicted by the Regent Lennox's unsuccessful bombardment in May 1571, but, during periods when the Marians' control of Edinburgh was relatively secure, the fortifications and buildings were also extensively modified by the garrison for defensive purposes – the slighting of the tower at the south-west corner of Crown Square to create a gun platform may have been part of this campaign. Beginning on 1 April 1573, the arrival of English siege troops and artillery gave the siege a new intensity. For unknown reasons, the castle's guns did not fire against the English as they were setting up their batteries, and the English artillery opened fire on 17 May 1573. They began by silencing the guns in the Fore Wall – the solid structural parapet and big gunloops added in the 1550s seem to have just presented them with an easy target – and then focused their gunfire on **David's Tower**, reducing it to a heap of rubble. The Spur was stormed by infantry on 26 May 1573, prompting the surrender of the castle on 29 May 1573 – with the Regent Morton's troops occupying it rather than the English.

The capture of the spur, and the damage inflicted on the Fore Wall and David's Tower, may account for the decision to rebuild the defences with a new Half-Moon Battery set high above the esplanade: the elevated guns would be harder to target, and the solid platform was obviously designed to resist artillery fire; it was certainly an intimidating gun position, and as late as 1779 the imagined threat of long-range gunfire from the Half-Moon Battery played a role in persuading the American squadron led by John Paul Jones into turning around off Inchkeith and abandoning a planned attack on Edinburgh. In fact, the castle's defence continued to rely for practical purposes on the older defensive positions: the Fore Wall, reduced to the barbette design it had before the 1550s, continued to serve as the castle's main defensive bulwark until any pretence of being a genuine artillery fortress was abandoned in the 1880s, while in the 1689 siege the western side of the castle was still protected by the old expedient of setting up a somewhat

improvised battery of guns above the postern, replaced by the 'Butts Battery' in the early 18th century.

The surrender of the castle to the King's Men in 1573 was inevitably followed by the appointment of a new master of the artillery, who seems to have done little beyond collecting the salary. Documented activities are limited to attempts to repair damaged guns, led by a relatively young and low-ranking ordinary gunner named James Murray, who was still officially assigned to the demolished Dunbar Castle.⁵⁷ In 1579, when Morton sought to assert his continuing power with an attack on the Hamilton strongholds at Cadzow and Craignethan, purpose-built artillery redoubts built in the 1530s and 1540s that had remained impregnable during the long wars, he could only dispatch Michael Gardiner from Stirling, with two small culverins; nonetheless, the arrival of the guns at Cadzow was enough to persuade the garrison to surrender, and the garrison at Craignethan fled. With the elimination of these two Hamilton redoubts, Edinburgh Castle may have gained some extra guns from their arsenals – and it was now unquestionably the paramount artillery fortification in the kingdom.

A few months later, James Chisholm was reinstated as comptroller, along with three of the former Marian garrison; this has been rightly seen as part of a wider policy of rehabilitation carried out by the teenage James VI under the guidance of his French cousin Esmé Stuart, but it may have also reflected a tacit acknowledgement that the guns in Edinburgh Castle arsenal had proved incapable of siege deployment when required. The military materiel of the artillery arsenal had survived the troubles of the 1560s and 1570s surprisingly intact, but the documentation gives the impression that the gunners were doing little more than keeping the guns in repair and putting on occasional firework displays. The comptroller does seem to have brought some order to the situation, insofar as guns were always subsequently made available when required, but he was subject to increasing financial pressure as factionalism and economic troubles continued to destabilise the government.

By 1582, Chisholm evidently had enough spare time to take on a second job, the important position of steward of the household, which he seems to have performed without additional pay. In an effort to fund the artillery, a tax was imposed on salt exports in 1583, with 5 per cent being assigned to supplement Chisholm's own pay, but this seems to have been of little effect, since there was no effective provision to enforce its collection. By the early 1590s, the guns themselves were being used as copper bullion to cover the government's debts – Chisholm was paid with an older French *canon*; and a man named Henry Home (apparently the constable of Edinburgh Castle), was given the solitary remaining Scottish 36-pounder; the Earl of Bothwell received the double cannon from Veere, now described as 'broken'; he had also obtained six or eight other guns of varying sizes to fit out a warship in connection with his duties as admiral before his recent exile, but he absconded with the ship, and used at least one of them as currency to pay his way – a moyan given to Sir Duncan Campbell of Glenorchy.⁵⁸ The secretary of state was paid with a broken cannon, and a hint of disapproval is perhaps found in Chisholm's note that two of the 'best' French 36-pounders he had imported in the 1560s were gifted by James VI to the soldier and diplomat Sir James Colville. Not only was this an unnecessary waste of good artillery when there were other guns in the inventory, but there were probably personal and political issues involved as well: Colville was driven by a vision of Protestant military hegemony based on political union between Scotland and England and a Huguenot conquest of France; for Chisholm, who had fought against the English

in the Long Siege, and whose brother was a Catholic bishop in a very bitterly divided area of France, these policies were hardly likely to elicit sympathy or approval. Such profound contrasts of attitude certainly contributed to the underlying instability which placed severe restrictions on the activities of the arsenal in the reign of James VI.

Nonetheless, the castle's diminished arsenal was about to be replenished from an unexpected source – the Spanish Armada. In 1588, one of the most powerful warships of the Spanish Armada, the mighty Neapolitan galleass *Girona*, had been shipwrecked near Dunluce Castle in Antrim, the capital of a small Irish principality which had been annexed since the 15th century to the Hebridean territories of the MacDonalds.⁵⁹ The guns were salvaged the next year by the local MacDonald chieftain, with the assistance of a Scottish captain and two shipwrecked Spanish officers (one was presumably the *Girona's* gunner, who was still at Dunluce, the other was perhaps Don Antonio Manrique, nephew of the *Capitán General de Artillería*, shipwrecked in the Hebrides). The fact that a 'wild Irish' leader had acquired a powerful artillery battery was unacceptable to the English colonial administration, and in 1597 young James MacDonald responded to their demands by presenting some of *Girona's* guns to James VI instead – a move that *may* have been designed to placate the English governor in Carrickfergus by removing the three guns already emplaced at Dunluce, but which was certainly geared towards securing Scottish royal support.⁶⁰

The first gun to arrive in Scotland was a massive cannon, either a 36-pounder or a 40-pounder, emblazoned with a new Latin inscription, which proudly proclaimed it as a gift from the Lord of Dunluce to the King of Scotland. In exchange, the king gave James MacDonald a knighthood, a vast lordship in Kintyre and a tour of the artillery defences of Edinburgh Castle (on 4 April 1597), where the gun itself was eventually installed. Six more guns were promised, and *Girona* may be the source of at least some of the other Armada guns recorded in 17th-century Scotland. Other Armada wrecks may have also provided additional guns – in 1595, the Earl of Orkney had managed to salvage half a dozen guns from the wreck of *El Gran Grifón* on Fair Isle,⁶¹ which might have eventually found their way into the royal arsenal, while there is a longstanding belief that additional Armada guns were salvaged from the argosy *San Juan de Sicilia* sabotaged at Tobermory, though it is possible that there has been some confusion here with the *Girona*.

In addition, it is clear that the castle's artillery continued to perform its basic role – in 1584, a battery of siege guns was hauled out to besiege Stirling Castle, its appearance immediately ending a brief revolt; the ship which brought an ambassador to Denmark in 1596 was armed from the castle arsenal, and in 1598 a cannon and two battards joined an expedition to Kintyre. In 1601, the Duke of Lennox's ship was armed with a moyen and four falcons for a voyage to France. The departure of the king to England in 1603 does not seem to have significantly affected the arsenal – Chisholm and Murray remained in their posts, and in 1614 the century-old cannon known as 'thrawn-mouth' was dispatched to Orkney to besiege Kirkwall Castle. When HMS *Charles* was transferred from the Royal Navy to Scotland in 1616, it probably arrived with English guns aboard, but the castle arsenal was used to provide powder and shot, and to store her weaponry when she was out of commission. The ability of the castle to furnish artillery for sieges and warships whenever required implies that the guns remained in good repair within the fortress itself, and ready for defensive use if required.

A further indication of general competence and efficiency was the fact that the artillery personnel were gradually taking over the administration of the kingdom. As noted above, Chisholm served in the important position of steward of the household from 1582 to at least 1591, while James Murray, originally an ordinary gunner in Dunbar, became master of the king's works, and laird of Kilbaberton; his son, initially recorded as a young gunner on the 1598 Kintyre campaign, became a gentleman architect, notable for his reconstruction of the castle's royal apartments as a neat baroque palace, and for his own elegant northern Renaissance villa at Baberton; this rise from 'ordinary gunners' to major national figures and indispensable administrators was partially achieved through family networking, but it was nonetheless an impressive achievement, and the figure of the versatile gunner-architect-laird is not without precedent in William Drummond of Milnab. The departure of James VI to England in 1603 meant that, if anything, the importance of the artillery organisation within the reduced resident corps of the King's House increased.

Nonetheless, the Scottish artillery establishment was increasingly characterised by its reliance on old men, and even older guns. The return of at least one of the Seven Sisters, after a century in England, was a symbol of national pride, but also suggests a tendency to focus on the memory of past glories; the foundry had been lying idle for over 50 years, and it was fully seven decades since the last successful production of a major artillery piece. Chisholm remained in post as comptroller until 1613, when, after a brief dispute over the appointment, it went to the young laird of Kilbaberton. Since the 1560s, the artillery at Stirling Castle – and the rest of the stores in that fortress – had been kept in order by Michael Gardner and then his son James, the latter without any proper pay since 1588 – it is perhaps a sign of the loss of skills in Edinburgh that he was one of the gunners who was sent to Kirkwall in 1614, but, in a way, the reliance on old men and their sons had its advantages – they clearly still belonged to the tradition of the artillery establishment, and seem to have understood their inventory of cannons, culverins and falcons, and how to use them.

Epilogue: the arsenal after 1613

The subsequent history of Edinburgh Castle as an artillery fortress lies beyond the strict remit of this report, but it seems appropriate to conclude by outlining the gradual dispersal of the old guns. The arsenal continued to provide the small Scottish navy with cannonballs and gunpowder through the 1620s, but in 1629 Charles I commanded the removal of 'two broken canons' from the castle to provide bronze for new church bells in Holyrood Abbey, an ironic reversal of his great-grandfather's policy. Five 'French cannon' still dominated the defensive batteries in 1650 when the castle surrendered to Oliver Cromwell, but they, too, seem to have been removed and melted down to forge new guns for the English navy. When John Sleszer took charge of the artillery in the 1670s, he found that the entire personnel establishment consisted of single gunner in Edinburgh Castle, another at Dumbarton – who also acted as that castle's tour guide – and a member of the Gardiner family serving without pay in Stirling; a salary was finally regularised there after a gap of 90 years. Captain Thomas Binning, who had been master gunner of the castle in 1650, published *A Light to the Art of Gunnery* in 1675, which offered its readers an understanding of the artillery of the Scottish arsenal, as well as a good practical knowledge of gunnery, a remarkable store of

anecdotes and some deeply (and probably deliberately) misleading conversion tables for English artillery.

The final glimpse of the castle's old artillery is provided by a series of inventories from the late 17th and early 18th centuries. A large number of cast-iron artillery pieces had been acquired, but it seems very unlikely that any of these were older than 1603, and they can be set to one side. Mons Meg, of course, remained, albeit in a damaged condition. The Armada *cañon* acquired in 1597 was still there in 1689, but was gone by 1708, and can thus be identified with the cannon called the 'Gled' (named after the bird of prey known in England as the red kite), which the Duke of Argyll had hauled off to Inverary in 1701. There was also a single 36-pounder cannon called the 'Green Falcon', relatively short-barrelled at just over 10ft long – proportions appropriate for a French *canon* of the 16th century. The names of the two guns seem to describe the contrasting colours of red-gold Spanish bronze (a pure copper-tin alloy with no applied patina) and French *fonte verte* (mixing impure copper ore and a relatively small proportion of tin), standing out among the darker Renaissance patina of Scottish guns and the dull gunmetal of English imports.

A single culverin is mentioned in 1689, but a full inventory of the castle's guns in 1707 lists two of them, both very long guns of 11ft 5½in, strongly fortified to around 1.25 calibres in the breech – artillery of very superior design. A few guns of comparable strength were made in 17th-century England, such as the chase pieces manufactured for the flagship *Sovereign of the Seas* in the 1630s, but, given their relative rarity and prestige in the English arsenal, it seems reasonably likely that these were survivors of the old Scottish arsenal – they might have been the same two guns which had been in the castle in the late 16th century, or guns off the *Girona*, or perhaps even the two culverins from among the Seven Sisters.

There were also a number of other large bronze guns, generally described as 24-pounders; four are mentioned in 1689, rising to eight in later lists, and they are plausibly descendants of the 'nine Dutch half-cannon' listed in 1650 (i.e. 24-pounder *halve kartouwen*, a type inherited by the Dutch Republic from the Hapsburg overlords they had rebelled against); this would suggest that they were most likely 17th-century siege artillery, but a detailed survey in 1708 discovered that six of them were actually 30-pounders or thereabouts, and a calibre of 6.125in, guns for which Binning's designation of 'demi-cannon royal' was used: this was an odd calibre, and its presence here may indicate that these were of more exotic origin, although it is hard to say exactly what they were.

The final medium-calibre guns were a pair described as '12-pounders' or 'quarter-cannon' with a 4.75in bore; it is not beyond all possibility that these were a pair of old battards, but their calibre seems a little large, and they are more likely to have been the pair of 12-pounders which had been produced in the 1680s, heavy campaign guns manufactured under Slezer's supervision in a Dutch foundry, using the old metal of three large siege guns mounted defensively at Dumbarton, including another Armada *cañon* and an old Scottish 36-pounder.

The smaller guns were generally 3-pounders. One pair were incongruously misnamed as 'sakers' or even '6-pounders', while another pair were very short-barrelled but strongly fortified, similar in concept to the 'brass monkeys' made in Edinburgh's southern suburbs in the 1640s, but very different in proportion from the one extant example of that type. One pair or both might have belonged to Slezer's campaign battery. An early origin can be more credibly advanced for a

group of five '3-pounders' whose 9ft 3in length was even more unusually long for their calibre than that of the culverins; these might well have been old *moyens* – two ornate pieces from James V's reign were certainly still in use at Dumbarton.

A little gun known as 'Queen Mary's Pocket Pistol' completed the Edinburgh inventory; it is consistently described as a falcon, and had a short 6½ft length, with its trunions set proportionally far back to show that it is not a 'cut', but it also has an impressive thickness of metal, at least 1.2 calibres at the breech. Interpreting its calibre is complicated by the manuscript's often indistinguishable ways of writing the numbers '1' and '2', but, either way, it appears to be anomalous: if its bore is 1¾in, it was very tightly bored to the Scottish falcon calibre, with fully double-calibre fortification in the breech, and must have relied on the relative malleability of the lead bullet to make loading possible, and the strength of the breech to contain the powder charge – it might thus be the 'double falcon' produced for Mary of Guise in 1558. On the other hand, if we should read 2¾in, then it sits in the middle of the gap between the largest falcons and the smallest middle-culverins, and is presumably an awkwardly wide-bored attempt at the 2.5in calibre of the original French *faucon*, maybe even an early gun of the 1490s which had somehow been overlooked in subsequent centuries, or perhaps a conversion of the revised *couleuvrine moyenne* calibre of 2.75 *pouces* into Scottish inches, and it may in fact be the 'double moyan' cast in 1558 rather than the 'double falcon'. Whether it was designed for French *faucon* shot, or big lead bullets, it is perhaps no surprise that its ammunition stock in 1714 was precisely zero.

In March 1716, the seven big old bronze guns occupying the Half-Moon Battery were hauled off to London to be melted down for their metal. The majority may have been Dutch 24-pounders of the mid-17th century, but they had acquired the old name of 'Seven Sisters', and their departure was met by public protests on the Royal Mile: the 36-pounder and probably the two culverins must have been genuinely old pre-1603 guns, and the last of the original Seven Sisters from Flodden may even have been among them. On one level, the move seems to have been an assertion of power by the British Army establishment based in London, but there was clearly a need for bronze – the new Royal Artillery seems to have had nothing available for campaign deployment to compare with the two modern 12-pounders procured by Slezer for Edinburgh Castle's little artillery company, while the Royal Navy's flagships were still partially armed with guns that had fought against the Spanish Armada in 1588.

Mons Meg followed the bronze guns south in 1754, apparently due to a bureaucratic mistake, leaving only a few of her old gunstones to represent the long continuity of the castle's role as an artillery arsenal. Thanks to Sir Walter Scott, the old bombard returned to re-join her cannonballs in 1829 and restored a far more potent link to the past. Thus reunited, the gun and her ammunition embody the long, and ultimately unbroken, history of Edinburgh Castle as the home of Scotland's historic artillery arsenal, itself a symbol of Scotland's national pride.

ADDENDUM

The 'Black Lady' Tournaments in Primary Sources

The 'Black Lady' tournaments of 1507 and 1508 are regarded as the apogee of the culture of chivalry in Scotland. They are also documented by a uniquely comprehensive range of sources. This introduction to the evidence provides a brief guide to the primary sources, followed by a discussion of the evidence for key aspects of the physical staging of the events. For clarity, all quotations and technical terms are translated into modern English, and measurements are converted from the 37in ell to the more familiar foot.

The most detailed evidence for these tournaments is found in the accounts of royal expenditure, which record diverse payments for the physical staging of both events. The documents in question have been printed in full in the *Accounts of the Lord High Treasurer* series (the main groups of relevant entries are in *TA* iii. 254–61, 393–9; iv. 22–4, 64–6, 117–22).

The second source is the written text of the formal challenge used to advertise the 1507 tournament, which was preserved by a 17th-century French heraldic historian: Marc Vulson de la Colombière, *La science heroique* (Paris, 1644), pp 453–7. As well as Vulson's printed text, records survive relating to the original handwritten document, which show that it was highlighted with gold, and cost a total of £2 12s to prepare, and taken to France by Antoine d'Arces, a jousting knight-errant returning from a previous tournament at Stirling (*TA* iii. 365, 372).

Although Vulson's text is discussed briefly in the introduction of the printed *Treasurer's Accounts* (*TA* iii. Preface, xliii, xlvi–xlvi), it seems to have been overlooked in more recent scholarship. The NLS in Edinburgh appears to be the only reference library in Scotland which has the book, but the text is also freely available online:

<https://books.google.co.uk/books?id=WgHDlaWpPkUC&pg=PA453>

A third source consists of a set of portrait sketches of prominent participants. These are preserved in the form of copies in a mid-16th-century sketchbook known as the *Recueil d'Arras*, based on lost originals that are convincingly identified as the work of the court artist 'Piers the Painter'. It is not clear if the portraits were specifically associated with the 'Black Lady' tournament, but they certainly have a strong connection with tournament culture under James IV, and depict most of the leading participants.

There are portraits of four French participants in Scottish tournaments, Berault Stuart and Antoine d'Arces (who both played important roles in the 1508 tournament) Jean de Compans and a certain Chevalier de Beaufort. There is also an illustration of an Edinburgh tournament fighter named Sandy Halliburton, as well as portraits of James IV, his cousin Christian of Denmark (perhaps the Sir Christien who participated in the two Black Lady tournaments), the Archbishop of St Andrews and a gypsy woman at the court.

All of these were presumably drawn from the life by Piers, although the portraits of Henry VII and Queen Margaret Tudor are probably copies of paintings by the English court painter Maynard, and the portrait of Perkin Warbeck presumably dates from his Scottish sojourn in the 1490s (when he was also a notable tournament participant). The group can be extended stylistically (due to the

distinctive sanguine chalk used to draw the copies) to include several portraits of Flemish tournament fighters, perhaps dating from after Piers' return to the Continent, and a man named 'Delart Adagel' whose name may be a garbling of a Scottish one.

The book has recently appeared in a facsimile edition, *Visages d'Antan: Le Recueil d'Arras*, ed. Albert Châtelet (Arras, 2007). There are copies in the university libraries in St Andrews and Edinburgh.

The fourth category of evidence consists of two poems by William Dunbar. One of these is a famous burlesque address to the 'Black Lady' who presided over both the tournaments, the other is a much grander greeting to Berault Stuart, when he visited Scotland to serve as the judge of the 1508 event. Notwithstanding their very contrasting tones, both share the same formal role, introducing visitors from overseas who played a central role in these tournaments, and it seems plausible that both were written for public performance during the events, perhaps in the two consecutive years.

The final source is the narrative account given by the 16th-century Scottish historian Robert Lindsay of Pitscottie. This was written many decades later, by an author who was much too young to be an eyewitness, and was perhaps derived from stories handed down verbally rather than from any written sources. Pitscottie's account is inaccurate in some respects – he speaks of just one tournament, and places it in 1505 – but much of the underlying narrative appears to be correct, as it is supported by extensive corroborative evidence in the contemporary documents.

The standard printed text is still the Scottish Texts Society edition: Robert Lindsay of Pitscottie, *The Historie and Cronicles of Scotland*, ed. Æ. J. G. MacKay (3 vols, STS, Edinburgh, 1899–1901), vol. i, pp 242–4.

These sources all need to be used in conjunction with each other to gain a full understanding of the event.

The setting

The concept behind the tournament was a challenge issued by a group of mysterious strangers, the Wild Knight and the Black Lady, and two other knights, 'their companions' (actually disguised members of the Scottish court, apparently led by King James IV in person). The formal challenge text, issued on 22 January 1507, gives a detailed explanation of how the tournament was to be held:

... in the town of Edinburgh, within the Field of Memory, which shall be between the Castle of Maidens and the Secret Pavilion, and within the said Field shall be the Tree of Hope, which grows in the garden of patience, carrying leaves of pleasure, the flower of nobility, and the fruit of honour.

And at the base of the said tree, over the space of five weeks, five shields of different colours will be attached, one after another, one in each week.

The first will be white, the second grey, the third green, the fourth purple, and the fifth of gold; and each of these shields will have a crowned letter in gold, from the name of the Wild Knight and his Lady, or the said [companion] knights, or else their ladies ...

These statements can be largely corroborated by the expenses records, and the two texts help to explain each other more clearly.

The 'Field of Memory' (*Camp de souvenir*) next to Edinburgh Castle was the Barras, the tournament ground beneath the castle, located just west of the Grassmarket along the thoroughfare now known as King's Stables Road. For the 1507 tournament, the king's stables themselves, located at the east end of the tiltyard, were equipped with a red-and-green serge curtain, complete with rope, pulley and rings (*TA* iii. 265), and the grounds themselves received refurbishment, including some mason work which implies construction or repair in stone (*TA* iii. 384, 395).

The Tree of Hope (*l'arbre d'Esperance*) was decorated with 216 leaves and 72 flowers made out of various bits of metal foil, while the 'fruit of honour' are described simply as 'thirty-seven pears', although it is probably too early in the year for them to have been real pears, unless they were kept very cool over the winter (*TA* iii. 394).

The five shields representing the challengers are not explicitly mentioned in the documents, but their five distinctive colours do recur repeatedly in the expenses, and there is a reference to the use of identifying monograms in 1508. There is also a curious inconsistency here, although it probably conceals a useful clue – the challenge text mentions five shields but *six* monograms on them. Because the two 'companion knights' and their 'ladies' can each be associated with one shield colour, the initials of the Wild Knight *and* the Black Lady must have been paired on the Wild Knight's shield, and since the role of the Wild Knight seems to have been played by the king, this two-letter cipher was presumably the well-attested royal I+M monogram for King James and Queen Margaret.

The 'Secret Pavilion' (*le pavillon Secret*) was a giant tent, referred to in the expenses as the 'great high pavilion'. It took over 2,500 square feet of canvas (268 ells) to form its basic structure, and over 1,500 square feet of white and green silk taffeta (76½ ells of each, costing over £100 in total) in its colourful outer fabric (*TA* iii. 259, 256–7; two additional 'steiks' of outer fabric may have added considerably to the second total). From it flew five standards (*TA* iii. 260), swallow-tailed pennants with fringed edges, probably displaying the five bold colours of the challengers' shields, and perhaps their monograms as well. There was also a 'small pavilion', which still used over 800 square feet of coloured taffeta for its outer fabric, and a comparable quantity of canvas for its lining (*TA* iii. 259; secondary sources have sometimes posited more than two tents, on the basis of *TA* iii. 260, where two 'canvas' pavilions and two 'taffeta' ones are mentioned within the same entry, but this is simply another reference to the waterproof linings and the colourful outer fabric, and the payment for the actual assembly of the material).

Between them, the two tents required over 1,800ft of guy ropes, waterproofed with 4lb of varnish (*TA* iii. 259–60, 395) and used 555ft of multi-coloured silk fringes, plus leatherwork, blue buckram, wooden 'tops' where the guy ropes

fastened to the internal support poles, and ironwork for fittings such as tent pegs (*TA* iii. 259–61), to say nothing of gilding applied by the court painters (*TA* iii. 393). John Hartsheid, the king's 'pavilion man', was probably responsible for overseeing their design and construction, and the king bought the pavilion-makers a round of drinks when he visited them at work a few days before the tournament (*TA* iii. 392).

What did these tents look like? The typical pavilion was a cylindrical tent with a conical top rising to a central peak, but manuscript illustrations often show princes and generals using an oval variant with two peaks connected by a horizontal rooftree, and this design appears to have been used for King James's own travelling tent (*TA* iii. 188). The quantity of material supplied for the 'great pavilion' could have produced a tent of the two-peak type that was 45ft long, 15ft high and 15ft deep. However, the presence of five standards suggests an even more complex design, with five separate peaks for them to fly from. A possible parallel is suggested by an image of the tent used for the meeting of Henry VIII of England and Francois I of France at the Field of the Cloth of Gold, the great diplomatic tournament staged in 1520, which shows a free-standing central pavilion encircled by a larger C-shaped tent formed from rectangular corridor sections punctuated by eight separate cylindrical pavilions. So perhaps the 'great pavilion' could have been a U-shaped structure with four corner pavilions linked by three straight corridor sections, and the 'small pavilion' hidden in the middle – this would explain why it was the 'secret pavilion', with its peak and standard glimpsed above the roofline of the enclosing 'great pavilion'. One possible reconstruction allowed by the quantities of material recorded in the expenses would have four corner pavilions 15ft wide and 15ft high to the peaks, three straight corridor sections 15ft long and 8ft high, with a low central pavilion occupying the interior, perhaps 20ft wide and 10ft high to the peak of the roof.

Two other elements of the setting for the 1507 tournament are only mentioned in the royal expenses. One is the 'chair triumphal' for the Black Lady, which required over 200 square feet of taffeta fabric, embroidered with multi-coloured flowers and red pansies (*TA* iii. 258, 260). This was not a chair – that was a *chear* in Older Scots – but rather a chariot (*DOST*, *chair* n. 2). Evidence discussed below suggests that the horse that pulled it was dressed up as a unicorn. The second element that can be added from the accounts is the 'Queen's Window', which was given serge curtains with their curtain rings, cords and hooks (*TA* iii. 397). Pitscottie claims that the king had used a window in the castle to watch earlier tournaments (*Historie* i. 235), and the most probable location for the window(s) in question is the tower rising high above the southern ramparts, now incorporated in Crown Square between the Great Hall and the palace, but then probably the only structure in the castle which directly overlooked the tiltyard: the ashlar surround of a prominent medieval window is still recognisable on the top floor (Ewart and Gallagher (2014), pp 61–3).

There must also have been a place to display the gilded weapons which were given as prizes – these are mentioned by Pitscottie and confirmed by the expenditure for gilding 'spears, plate-armour gloves and prizes for the field' (*TA* iii. 255–6). Perhaps they were positioned near the Black Lady's throne.

There was also a display of royal firepower, and perhaps fireworks – heavy artillery was brought down from the castle, 24 smaller guns were brought from the naval arsenal Leith, and 'fire balls' were made (*TA* iii. 395).

In 1508, the tournament was repeated. The Tree of Hope was repaired, adding new leaves and flowers and repairing some of the old ones, and adding a new set of 49 pears, artificial this time (*TA* iv. 120-1 – the need to replace all the pears is one point that hints that the ones in 1507 might have been real). The king's pavilion (James IV's two-peaked travelling tent) was probably added to the setting, as it received new 'curtains' of red and white, finished with red ribbons (*TA* iv. 22, 121), and some sort of massive sedan chair seems to have replaced the 'chair triumphal' from the previous year: the Black Lady was carried down by 14 men from the castle to the tiltyard before the tournament, and then from the tiltyard to Holyrood after it (*TA* iv. 119).

One point of uncertainty about the 1508 tournament is its exact location. Pitscottie's narrative, written several decades later, states that it took place at Holyrood Palace, and the contemporary documents confirm that this was the location for evening events which followed the contest, which are discussed separately below. However, the documents are ambiguous about the location of the actual jousting – it is not immediately clear whether they are using the generic noun *barras*, 'jousting arena, tournament', or referring to the Barras, the dedicated tournament ground at the castle.

However, there are several reasons to suspect that the contest itself really took place in the Barras, as it had in 1507. On 16 May, the accounts show that the king had breakfast in the Grassmarket and then rode back from Holyrood to the Barras later in the day, activities which suggest that he was actively supervising activity there in the weeks before the tournament (*TA* iv. 117). He was there again on 20 May and on 30 May, as he heard mass in the tiltyard chapel on both days (*TA* iv. 41). This chapel, previously undocumented, seems to have been newly built for the occasion, and was given a red-and-white 'curtains and roof' – presumably a baldacchino canopy for its altar – as part of the same project as the refitting of the king's pavilion (*TA* iv. 22-3). Moreover, the reference to the Black Lady being carried 'from the Castle to the tournament, and then to the Abbey' implies that the tournament was not located *at* the abbey (*TA* iv. 119). This evidence seems strong enough to prove that the tournament element of the 1508 event remained at the Barras, and was not located at Holyrood, as Pitscottie believed.

One uncertainty concerns the actual timing of the events. Vulson's text sets the start date of the 1507 contest as 1 August (*le premier jour d'Aoust*), and claims that the challenge was set to remain open for five weeks, whereas the royal accounts indicate that it occurred in late June or at the latest around 1 July, and indicates that the king subsequently departed on a royal progress around Scotland (*TA* iii. 261, 400, and Preface, xxxv-xxxviii). Similarly, although Pitscottie claims that the 1508 tournament was a 40-day event, it must have begun some time after the arrival of its guest of honour on 12 May and seems to have concluded by the end of that month (*TA* iv. 119, and Preface, xviii-xix). More research might clarify the timing more precisely – for 1507, a tentative explanation might be that Vulson miswrote *Aoust* for *Juillet* (twice), and that the king ceded his role as challenger after the opening pageant and the first week of the event.

Costumes and armour

The costumes for the main participants in the tournaments can be reconstructed in great detail from the royal expense records.

The presiding figure of the tournament was the mysterious Black Lady. In 1507, she wore a gown of 'damask flowered with gold', i.e. a fabric into which a detailed floral pattern was woven in gold thread (based on the overall colour scheme, the background colour was probably green); it was bordered in yellow-and-green taffeta, and had sleeves made of a gauzy, semi-transparent fabric called 'pleasance', along with a kerchief of the same material which wrapped around her arm and would have served as the 'lady's favour' for the tournament. In addition, she wore sleeves and gloves of black chamois leather, a trick to create the illusion of bare, dark-skinned arms (TA iii. 259). This raises questions about her real ethnicity and identity, which will be considered in more detail below.

In 1508, this costume was replaced with a simpler and more practical version (TA iv. 64). The gown was now a sleeveless kirtle of plain green cloth, and the only accessories mentioned are 'malzeis' (eyelets for its lacing) and nearly 65ft of pleasance for kerchiefs 'at diverse times', implying that this gauzy accessory was now replaced several times through the proceedings - the matching sleeves had been eliminated completely, reinforcing the suggestion that the flimsy material had proved troublesome during the previous year's event. The black chamois sleeves were the only element of the costume design that was retained unchanged.

In both years, the Black Lady was attended by two ladies-in-waiting in simpler variants of her own costume. In 1507, they wore green taffeta gowns with yellow bordering. In 1508, their gowns were satin (colour unspecified, presumably green), and the bordering was once again yellow taffeta (TA iii. 259, iv. 64).

There is no reference to any headgear for the Black Lady and her ladies-in-waiting - perhaps they wore simple headbands, which were widely used by unmarried women in Scotland, or perhaps they were like the green-kirtled lassies who appear as a metaphor for a field of flowers in Dunbar's dream-poem, *The Goldyn Targe*, bare-headed except for some golden thread to assist the styling of their hair.

In 1507, the Black Lady also had two squires, though the expenses only record their 'half coats' of white damask (TA iii. 258). This shows that they wore parti-coloured costumes in which items of clothing were split vertically into boldly contrasting colours, a style adopted by many of the male participants. Perhaps the squires' coats were black and white, to match the trappings of the unicorn that pulled the Black Lady's chariot, or perhaps they were green and white, combining her livery with the colour of her paramour, the Wild Knight.

Pitscottie claims that the role of the Wild Knight was performed by the king. The contemporary sources do not bear this out explicitly, but they persuasively corroborate it, by providing detailed information on the king's equipment for both tournaments, which shows that he assumed an exotic-looking appearance, appropriate for the role of an anonymous and mysterious challenger.

In 1507, the king's armour seems to have been of an unconventional sort. We hear of an 'armet', a conventional helmet with a visor, for which a lining or cover of fine black cloth from Milan was supplied (*ermyt*, TA iii. 254), but almost everything else was old-fashioned chain mail. The King had chain-mail sleeves on his arms (*sleifs of mailzee*, TA iii. 250) plus chain-mail 'faulds' for his thighs (*fald of mailzie*, TA iii. 250) and a chain-mail 'pisane' worn around his shoulders, for which a large gold clasp was made (*pesan, pissan*, TA iii. 254, 259), plus chain-mail gussets for the armpits and perhaps the other-joints (*cressentis*, TA iii. 256). Perhaps the plate-armour gloves and chain-mail leggings acquired in February were also used (TA

iii. 367). The nature of his main torso armour or 'paunce' is less clear (*pans* TA iii. 250, 254); this could simply be chain mail, too (cf. TA iii. 34, viii. 30), but, although one reference seems to contrast it with the mail components, it was probably a flexible form of armour rather than a conventional solid steel breastplate, as all the armour was fitted with 'studs with rivets called eyelets' (*stuthes with ruffis called ulzeatis for the panses and mailzeis*, TA iii. 254), to secure it to the brand-new black doublet which the king wore beneath the armour (TA iii. 254, 261). Over the top of the ensemble, he wore a belt adorned with 13 carnelians, semi-precious stones (TA iii. 395).

This assemblage contrasts dramatically with the complete suit of polished steel plate-armour which was conventionally expected for tournament fighting and elite warfare. Chain mail was heavily anachronistic, and would have been evocative of remote and untamed regions – it was the armour of Highland chieftains, and also the armour of the African warriors who the king could have learned about from the 'Moors' at the royal court, as well as the armour of Ottoman and Balkan noblemen, appropriate for a king who was contemplating a crusade or pilgrimage. In short, this was armour designed to reinforce the persona of the Wild Knight, and it thus reinforces Pitscottie's claim that the king assumed that role in these tournaments. It was also a statement of the king's own confidence in his skill – by rejecting the comprehensive protection of conventional armour, he was asserting his ability to avoid being seriously harmed during the contest.

In the second tournament, a great deal more emphasis seems to have been given to the Wild Knight's heraldic trappings. In 1507, there is no evidence that the king wore any costume over his armour, though a simple surcoat could be concealed among generic expenses on the heraldic tabards (TA iii. 393–4), but this changed in 1508, when his colours became black and gold, lavishly displayed. His shield was covered half and half with black velvet and cloth-of-gold; its shoulder-strap was covered, too, and his sword-belt and scabbard were both completely sheathed in cloth-of-gold (TA iv. 22). References to coats which combined the two colours – one black velvet, one covered with a gold diamond pattern, another chequered in gold on one side, and the third simply divided half and half – probably relate at least in part to associated surcoats (TA iv. 23–4). These were emblazoned with 'letters' (TA iv. 22) – presumably the royal I+M monogram – and the same design scheme were evidently used for his horse's trappings (discussed separately below). At the last minute, the leather straps from which the king's stirrups hung were also covered half and half in black and gold (TA iv. 129).

It is unclear if the king wore the previous year's exotic armour for the jousting, or if he had exchanged it for conventional plate-armour. There is certainly evidence showing that the king had one set of conventional plate-armour (*harnes*) adapted into specialist equipment to participate in the broadsword-fighting contest on foot: we hear of 'piercing of holes in the king's harness' by one of the armourers (TA iv. 121), cutting a pattern of circular openings like a colander in order to make it light enough to be worn for sustained combat on foot – it would have been useless in a real fight, but it remained fully effective against slashing blows delivered with the edge of a sword.

The most enigmatic figures in the tournament are the 'companion knights' and their 'ladies'. According to the challenge texts, their colours were grey, green, red and purple, and these are corroborated by expenses on their horse-trappings, to be discussed in more detail below, but there is very little direct evidence for the

participants themselves. A combination of evidence suggests that the 'companion' knights used grey and green equipment – this is based on order in which the shields are listed, and the colours of the doublets worn by the two pairs of footmen added to the ensemble in 1508, who would more naturally attend the knights than the ladies. The two 'ladies' thus used purple and gold – though the fact that the 'ladies' had shields, horse-trappings and jousting saddles of their own hints that they were, in fact, two more men-at-arms participating in the contest. Similar 'cross-dressing' motifs reappear in tournament culture later in the century – for instance, 'amazons' formed one of the three teams in the joust to mark the baptism of James VI's eldest son in 1594. We can barely even hazard a guess at who these four participants were, though in 1507 two of them may have been the king's squires, his Danish cousin Christiern, who was preparing to be knighted, and Andrew Hume, perhaps a younger son of Lord Home (*TA* iii. 395 offers the strongest hint, with expenses on spurs for use with armour for the king and both of them, plus a bridle-bit, bow and cudgel for Christiern; payment for a saddle for Sir Christiern is again recorded around the time of the 1508 tournament, *TA* iv. 129).

The Wild Knight was also accompanied by 'allocayis' or lackeys, dressed in costumes of yellow and black. In 1507, there were two of them, with the two halves of their doublets made from cloth-of-gold and velvet, and parti-coloured leggings and bonnets. In 1508, there were three lackeys, their costumes being modified with red hats, and black-and-yellow fabric belts (*TA* iii. 258–9, iv. 63, 65).

In 1508, the companion knights seem to have acquired lackeys of their own: the documents show that two young courtiers were clad in green doublets, while two of the personnel from the king's stables, Lang Thom and his assistant, had grey damask doublets; all of them wore the black-and-yellow leggings of the Wild Knight's court (*TA* iv. 64–5). Their presence in the second year shows that the 'companion knights' remained a part of the pageantry, though whether the 'ladies' returned this time is not clear.

In 1507, the court of the Wild Knight and the Black Lady was completed by a group of 17 'wild men' clad in goat-skin coats and harts' horns (*TA* iii. 385–6, 393–4, 410). Perhaps their costumes were re-used in 1508 for the 14 men who carried the Black Lady on her sedan chair (*TA* iv. 119).

As well as what might be called the 'performance' roles, there were also a number of officials and performers associated with the management of the tournament as a sporting event. In 1507, Marchmont Herald and his assistants were paid £14 for the 'spulzie of the field', compensation for the stewards' traditional right to the equipment and detritus that had been left behind on the tiltyard (*TA* iii. 393). The assistants were perhaps the same three 'squires for the barras' who were given velvet for 'half coats from the waist up', though nothing else is recorded of their costumes (*TA* iii. 259). Mention is also made of six trumpeters and four musicians playing shawms, precursors to the oboe (*TA* iii. 393).

The accounts mention five banners displayed in some way by five of the minstrels, and six more flown on red-painted spears, though it is not clear if these were carried by flag-bearers or set up as flagpoles (*TA* iii. 260, 393–5). As with the five standards on the great pavilion, it seems likely that most of these bore the bold colours of the five challengers, with five square flags suspended beneath trumpets, and five more raised on the spears. The sixth banner was perhaps the royal lion rampant, and the sixth trumpeter was perhaps Julian Drummond, the

Italian band-leader and trombone player, whose instrument would be less easy to equip with a flag.

Impressive quantities of arms and armour are also referred to in connection with the tournaments, although their exact roles are unclear: daggers, maces, a mace with a concealed dagger inside, jousting lances, spurs, six swords, spears, black leather shields, cugels, battle axes and a gilded helmet given by Berault Stewart to the king (*TA* iii. 396–7, iv. 121–2). Caution is also needed, as not every contemporaneous reference to the preparation of armour necessarily relates to the jousting – at the time of the 1508 tournament a vast quantity of body armour, helmets, polearms and crossbows was removed from one of the royal warships and cleaned as if for display – but it all seems to have been promptly put back aboard, and never left the royal dockyard at Airth near Stirling (*TA* iv. 119–20).

Dragons, a unicorn and other unlikely animals

There are a number of references to ‘wild beasts’ in connection with the tournament. In 1507, four horses were needed to transport ‘the beasts’ to the castle and then the Barras, and in 1508 six horses were used to bring them out at the tiltyard (*TA* iii. 400, iv. 140).

Some of these were apparently fanciful dragon-like creatures, with heads of glued canvas and wooden wings (*TA* iii. 394), which must have been either automata, or else disguises for horses – there was also a unicorn, which was certainly a horse (*TA* iii. 257). They may have also included animals from the royal menagerie, which at this time included a lion and a wolf. In both years, the ‘wild beasts’ were also fitted with harnesses – in 1507, these include saddles and reins for riding, but it is also possible that they were to make the dragons appear to fly (*TA* iii. 397, iv. 129).

The contests may even have included fighting against wild animals in the manner of Roman gladiators and the ideal knights of Gilbert Hay’s 15th-century writings, and we can certainly see that the concept was understood in the context of these tournaments. Immediately after the 1507 event, the king and his companions went to Cumbernauld to fight and kill a bull from the famous herd of wild white cattle in the forest there (*TA* iii. 400), and in 1508 a tame hart was brought from Stirling and killed during the event (*TA* iv. 128).

Horse furniture

The colourful trappings for the horses played a prominent visual role in identifying the participants in the tournament, but the evidence for their design consists of a complex set of references which has to be disentangled carefully. The horses of the five challengers wore substantial fabric coverings known as caparisons, consisting of ‘bards’ (*bardis*) for the head and forequarters and ‘housings’ (*housuris*) for the body and hindquarters; there are also references to saddles, stirrups, spurs and other horse furniture.

As noted above, the written challenge mentions the five coloured shields of the challengers, and these appear to be echoed in the flags associated with the tent,

tiltyard and trumpets. Five sets of horse trappings in the appropriate colours also appear in the documents for the 1507 tournament.

In keeping with the Wild Knight's shield colour in 1507, the 'bard' which covered his horse's head and forequarters can be identified as the one made from white damask, a shimmering and subtly patterned fabric (*TA iii.* 255). This bard was sewn with silk thread, studded on the shoulders with 100 nails, and trimmed with half an ounce of green ribbons. A process of elimination enables us to identify a matching white damask housing (*TA iii.* 257-8; 6½ white damask housings are mentioned, but five of these evidently formed a group with distinctive trim, and the half was for a black-and-white set, leaving one for the king). The horse also wore some armour – the steel chamfron for its face and the metal jousting saddle were gilded and engraved with a decorative pattern (*TA iii.* 394, 396), and more protection may have been worn beneath the caparison – the king is known to have owned chain-mail horse armour for this purpose (*TA iii.* 34).

The 'companion knight' with the grey shield evidently rode a 'great horse' of unusual size. The amount of grey damask needed for its 'great housing' was 1½ times the usual quantity (*TA iii.* 255), and the impressive size of this knight's steed was further emphasised in 1508 by appointing the tall stable-hand Lang Thom as his chief lackey (*TA iv.* 65). The other 'companion knight' and the two 'ladies' had horses of more conventional size, with their appropriate housings of green damask, purple satin and cloth-of-gold respectively (*TA iii.* 257).

Oddly, there is no record for bards for the heads and forequarters of these four horses – perhaps their riders simply wanted to show off their horse-armour, but it is also possible that these horses played the role of the 'beasts' with their wooden wings and canvas and glue heads.

A reference to five housings being trimmed with cloth-of-gold (*TA iii.* 258) probably relates to the Wild Knight's, the unicorn pulling the Black Lady's carriage, and the green, purple and gold sets, all of which had been mentioned in the same series of entries; the great horse's grey housing – recorded separately in the accounts – was probably left plain.

The most unusual of the horses in the 1508 tournament is described in one reference as 'the unicorn' – presumably it was disguised with a horn on its forehead. This had a parti-coloured caparison, with one side of its 'housing' made from white damask and the other side from black velvet, and must have used the corresponding damask-and-velvet bard recorded slightly earlier in the accounts; like the Wild Knight's horse, it had 100 bright nails studded on the shoulders of its caparison, and a small quantity of green ribbon trim (*TA iii.* 255, 257). With all the other main participants accounted for, this seems to have been the horse that pulled the Black Lady's chariot.

There were also five more white damask housings without bards, these ones apparently trimmed in yellow silk embroidery (*TA iii.* 257-8, as noted above, the total of 6½ housings includes one for the king's horse and half for the unicorn). These were perhaps for competitors answering the challenge, who were expected to compete anonymously in 'white armour' without distinguishing heraldry, or else they may have helped the unicorn to pull the chariot – the queen's coach may have been borrowed for the role, and this lumbering vehicle was designed for a six-horse team.

There were also nine sets of much smaller housings made of yellow fabric with red trim and tassels – these were the royal colours, and these sets were presumably for the stewards and other official attendants from the court (*hors houses*, TA iii. 255, cf. TA iv. 88, where another set of three *hors housouris* of the same designs is recorded among regular household expenditure; based on the modest quantity of canvas used, these may have just been coverings for the reins and other horse leathers).

The majority of the horse trappings were probably re-used in 1508, but the ‘chair triumphal’ had been replaced by a sedan chair, and the change in the Wild Knight’s heraldry necessitated a new costume for the king’s horse; we hear of a silk-fringed bard decorated with the cipher letters in black and gold, and ‘half housing’ of cloth--old (TA iv. 22–3), which provide just enough evidence to confirm that the king’s horse had a parti-coloured caparison of black and gold – perhaps re-using the black sections from the previous year’s unicorn costume; four new stomachers for white housings were also made, which suggests that, notwithstanding the absence of the chariot, the set of five from the previous year were at least partially re-used (TA iv. 22).

The banquet, dance and play

As mentioned above, the second tournament in 1508 was followed by an event at Holyrood Palace. This has been made famous thanks to Pitscottie’s narrative account, which says that the feasting ran from dawn to dusk for three consecutive days, with a short theatrical performance between each course. Historians have been understandably doubtful of his claim about the length of the banquet, but the outline of his account is corroborated by the preparations recorded in the royal expenses, which confirm that it involved a banquet and several associated theatrical performances.

The documents even verify Pitscottie’s account of the climax at the end of the whole event, in which the Black Lady suddenly flew up into the scenery. The accounts include a payment for her ‘buckling and graithing’, which shows that she was equipped with a harness underneath her costume to allow her to be pulled up. Other performers included Little Martin, the king’s Spanish squire, who was dressed in a yellow gown and another similar harness (TA iv. 64), and a group of men-at-arms, who were provided with eight swords and a knife (TA iv. 126; although the index to the volume interprets the statement that they *brocht in a gys* as a reference to a goose, the word-forms given in *DOST* indicate a ‘guise’, i.e. a masquerade).

Aside from these players, a number of other performers provided entertainments during the banquet, all of them dressed in costumes combining red-and-yellow royal livery jackets with leggings in the Wild Knight’s black-and-yellow colours (TA iv. 64–5). These included two minstrels, a group of five dancers and ‘the French gunner’, who played a role in organising the effects, perhaps using indoor fireworks, and certainly some multi-coloured taffeta (cf. TA iv. 23, 125). The king’s fool was given new sleeves, hood and ‘taggis’ (ragged edgings) for his coat, presumably for the same effect (TA iv. 64).

We can probably identify at least seven separate performances – the masque by the men-at-arms, fireworks from the French gunner, a musical number by the minstrels, a performance by the fool, a dance by the dancers and the climactic play with the Black Lady and the flying harness; ‘the play and dance’ have been

given most emphasis in the secondary literature because they are specifically named in the accounts, and the play is also described by Pitscottie, but a close reading of the documents supports his account of a separate performance between each course – if not the purported three-day timescale.

Other preparations for the event cost over £30, involving materials such as gold leaf, blue buckram and over 100 bells of various sizes, probably for the dancers' costumes (*TA* iv. 23, 125). The accounts do not reveal specific details of the staging, however – we only have on Pitscottie's reference to a 'cloud' near the ceiling of the hall, into which the Black Lady was whisked up.

Who was the Black Lady?

It has generally been assumed that the Black Lady was one of the two 'Moorish Lassies' who arrived at the Scottish court in 1504, though another candidate is the gypsy woman whose portrait survives among the collection derived from Piers the Painter (Andrea Thomas, *Princelie Majestie: The Court of James V of Scotland* (Edinburgh, 2005), p 83).

A doubt about the genuineness of the Black Lady's 'African' identity is raised by the black chamois sleeves which she wore as part of her costume. These were conventionally used as part of a Renaissance 'blackface' disguise in court masques. It is credible that they could also be worn for purposes of modesty and warmth by a genuine African in the Scottish weather, but their presence raises doubts, and the oft-quoted evidence of William Dunbar's poetic address to the Black Lady does not do much to refute the uncertainty – it could simply have been a part of the illusion. The role might have been played by two separate people in the two different years, and could even have been played by a man. Nor do the records of the tournament expenses give up the secrets – the documents maintain the illusion, recording the outlay on the clothes of the Black Lady, just as they do when recording payments for the unicorn pulling her chariot.

It does seem likely that the Black Lady was someone of relatively high social rank, at least in 1507, as her attendant squires were gentlemen of the royal household, rather than servants of lower social rank playing the roles. We can probably eliminate Queen Margaret, who watched the 1507 event from her window in the castle, but, as noted above, the evidence suggests that James IV was using the I+M marriage monogram on his shield, showing that the connection between the Wild Knight and the Black Lady could be reconciled acceptably with the king's marriage to the queen.

Another possible clue is offered by the fact that the court's two genuine African girls, the 'Moorish lassies', were the ladies-in-waiting to the king's daughter, the Lady Margaret, who lived with her own small household in Edinburgh Castle; she is thought to have been about 12 in 1507, though she may perhaps have been a few years older. The Lady Margaret and the Moorish lassies neatly correspond to the roles of the Black Lady and her maidens, with the king's daughter adopting her friends' 'black' identity for the purposes of the masquerade.

The Lady Margaret was the result of a relationship before the king's marriage in 1503, but she received an unparalleled level of public acknowledgement and personal attention from her father, which lends some credibility to stories of a

secret betrothal to her mother (murdered in 1501). Regardless, as she was the king's daughter, her father could pose as her champion without compromising the integrity of his marriage to the queen.

Conclusion

This analysis of the evidence reveals that a great deal of information is available about the 'Black Lady' tournaments of 1507 and 1508, enabling a reconstruction of the visual pageantry in intimate detail. However, the survey also raises further questions, puzzles which invite answers, and raises the possibility that more information can be discovered, either through further close reading of the documents, or through bringing in additional sources and specialist knowledge.

ADDENDUM

The Royal Tapestries

Evidence may indicate that the renowned Devonshire Hunting Tapestries now in the V&A may have been part of the Scottish royal tapestry collection.

The documented history of the Devonshire Hunting Tapestries is traced forward from the 1590s, when they were in the tapestry collection assembled by Bess of Hardwick, who had previously been Mary Queen of Scots' host during her house arrest in England from 1569 to 1584. They are all early-15th-century pieces, depicting hawking, hunting and boar hunting.

Their origin has always been a mystery, as the Wars of the Roses had eliminated pretty much all the English families who could have acquired such a large collection of first-rate Arras tapestry at that date.

No one ever seems to have considered the Scottish connection, but a contemporary source, the well-informed diarist known as the *Diurnal of Occurrents*, records that Mary Queen of Scots had her tapestries shipped out of Edinburgh Castle in April 1572, so that she could have them with her while she was living under house arrest in England.

A hint that the tapestries remained behind when Mary moved out to new accommodation in 1584 occurs in a letter of January 1585, when Bess of Hardwick's estranged husband irritably denied that he had received any tapestries sent south for Mary by the pro-English regency in Scotland (technically true – they had been sent by the rival anti-English regency which controlled the castle). The tapestries Mary subsequently had with her in 1586–7 appear to be replacements, as an inventory of 26 March 1579 indicates that they were still in Scotland at that date.

We can infer what was taken by comparing the various inventories of the royal tapestries: the key documents are a 1561 inventory annotated in 1568, and another one made in 1579. The most striking absentees are a ten-piece 'history of hunting and hawking' series, part of which we know Mary Queen of Scots had previously had with her in Loch Leven Castle, and a six-piece boar hunt, both of which correspond directly to the subject matter of the Devonshire Hunting Tapestries.

The other absentees, a series about Solomon, a series depicting an encounter with Moors and a series depicting figures from Greek and Roman myth, also correspond to 16th-century sets from Bess of Hardwick's collection, elements of which also survive.

As it stands, there are four large tapestries in the Hunting set, but until the 1890s they were cut up into a set of ten. It is possible that they are a fragment of a massive collection of 16 full-sized pieces, but my inclination is to suspect that they were already cut up that way in Scotland, to fit a room or suite in one of the Scottish royal residences, and that they correspond with the set of ten 'hunting and hawking' pieces, part of which Mary had had brought to her previously while under arrest at Loch Leven Castle.

It is possible to go further and speculate that they were the set of ten pieces described in the 1539 and 1542 inventories as 'old', 'doing nothing' and 'worth

nothing', but which were the ones actually hung on the walls in the palace where the other ones were being kept? The castle seems a likely candidate, based on its role as the main royal storehouse, and evidence that other tapestries tended to be hung at Holyrood.

These tapestries might have arrived here as early as 1449, when King James II married Mary of Gueldres (a nephew of the Duke of Burgundy who was the overlord and principal patron of the area where they were made).

In tapestry terms, the 'Devonshires' are considered very important, and being able to link them to Edinburgh is not just about being able to identify some of the palace's primary furnishings – it also puts the Scottish royal tapestries properly on the map as one of the major European art collections of the late medieval period.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Primary sources and standard reference works

- AM* *Annales Monastici*, ed. H. R. Luard, 5 vols, Rolls Series (London 1864–9).
- APS* *Acts of the Parliament of Scotland*, ed. T. Thomson and C. Innes, 12 vols (Edinburgh 1814–75).
- Balfour *The Historical Works of Sir James Balfour*, ed. J. Haig, 4 vols (Edinburgh 1824).
- Bede *Bede: Ecclesiastical History of the English People*, ed. and trans. B. Colgrave and R. A. B. Mynors (Oxford 1969, rev. edn 1991). References are to the book and chapter of the Latin text rather than the page.
- Binning Thomas Binning, *A Light to the Art of Gunnery* (London 1676).
- Black's *Surnames of Scotland* G. F. Black, *The Surnames of Scotland. Their Origin, Meaning and History* (Edinburgh 1946).
- Bruce* *John Barbour's The Bruce*, ed. A. A. M. Duncan (Edinburgh 1997).
- Burgh Records 1403–1528* *Extracts from the Records of the Burgh of Edinburgh, A.D. 1403–1528*, ed. J. D. Marwick (Edinburgh, Scottish Burgh Records Society, 1869).
- Burton* *Geoffrey of Burton: Life and Miracles of St Modwenna*, ed. and trans. R. Bartlett (Oxford 2002).
- CDS* *Calendar of Documents Relating to Scotland*, vols 1–4 ed. J. Bain, vol. 5 ed. G. G. Simpson and J. D. Galbraith, 5 vols (Edinburgh 1881–4, 1986).
- Chronicles* *Chronicles of the Reigns of Stephen, Henry II., and Richard I.*, ed. R. Howlett, 4 vols, Rolls Series (London 1884–9).
- Clonmacnoise* *The Annals of Clonmacnoise*, ed. Revd D. Murphy (Dublin 1896).
- Coldingham* *The Correspondence, Inventories, Account Rolls, and Law Proceedings, of the Priory of Coldingham*, ed. J. Raine (Surtees Society, 1841).
- Conchubran* *Conchubrani vita Sanctae Monennae*, ed. Mario Esposito, PRIA vol. 24 sec. C, No. 12 (Dublin 1910).
- CP* *The Complete Peerage*, ed. G. E. Cokayne, V. Gibbs, H. A. Doubleday, D. Warrand, Lord Howard de Walden, G. H. White and R. S. Lea, 2nd edn, 12 vols (London 1910–59).
- CSP* *Calendar of the State Papers relating to Scotland and Mary Queen of Scots, 1547–1603*, ed. J. Bain, W. K. Boyd, H. W. Meikle, A. I. Cameron, M. S. Giuseppi and J. D. Mackie, 14 vols (Edinburgh 1898–1969) .
- CSPS* *Calendar of State Papers relating to Scotland*, ed. M. J. Thorpe, 2

vols, Rolls Series (London 1858).

- Diurnal* *A Diurnal of Remarkable Occurrents that have passed within the Country of Scotland*, ed. T. Thomson (Edinburgh, Bannatyne Club, 1833).
- DOST* *A Dictionary of the Older Scottish Tongue*, ed. Sir W. Craigie, A. J. Aitken, J. A. C. Stevenson, H. D. Watson and M. G. Dareau, 12 vols (Chicago, Edinburgh, Aberdeen and Oxford 1931–2002); online edn, n.d., <http://dsl.ac.uk> (accessed 23 March 2015).
- Dunfermline* *Registrum de Dunfermelyn*, ed. Cosmo Innes (Edinburgh, Bannatyne Club, 1842).
- ER* *Rotuli Scaccarii Regum Scotorum. The Exchequer Rolls of Scotland*, ed. G. Burnett and G. P. McNeill, 23 vols (Edinburgh 1878–1908).
- ESSH* *Early Sources of Scottish History*, ed. and trans. A. O. Anderson, 2 vols (Edinburgh 1922, repr. Stamford 1990).
- Extracta* *Extracta e variis cronicis Scocie*, ed. D. Donald (Edinburgh, Bannatyne Club, 1842).
- Fergus* *Fergus of Galloway: Knight of King Arthur*, ed. and trans. D. D. R. Owen (London, Everyman's Library, 1991).
- Flete* *The History of Westminster Abbey by John Flete*, ed. J. Armitage Robinson (Cambridge 1909).
- Fordun* *Johannis de Fordun Chronica Gentis Scottorum*, ed. W. F. Skene, trans. F. J. Skene, *Historians of Scotland*, 2 vols (Edinburgh 1871).
- Froissart* *Les Chroniques de sire Jean Froissart*, ed. J. A. C. Buchon, 3 vols (Paris 1840).
- Gesta Regis* *Gesta Regis Henri Secundi Benedicti Abbas. The Chronicle of the Reigns of Henry II and Richard I, 1169–1192; known under the name of Benedict of Peterborough*, ed. W. Stubbs, 2 vols, Rolls Series (London 1867).
- Glasgow Registrum* *Registrum Episcopatu Glasguensis*, ed. C. Innes, 2 vols (Edinburgh, Bannatyne Club, 1843).
- Historie* Robert Lindsay of Pitscottie, *The Historie and Cronicles of Scotland*, ed. Æ. J. G. MacKay, 3 vols, STS (Edinburgh 1899–1901).
- Howden* *Chronica Magistri Rogeri de Houedene*, ed. W. Stubbs, 4 vols, Rolls Series (London 1868–71).
- Inventories* *A Collection of Inventories of the Royal Wardrobe and Jewelhouse; and of the Artillery and Munitioun in some of the Royal Castles, M.CCCC.LXXXVIII.–M.DC.VI*, ed. T. Thomson (Edinburgh 1815).
- Lanercost* Lanercost Priory Chronicle, ed. as *Chronicon de Lanercost*, ed. J. Stevenson (Edinburgh, Bannatyne Club, 1839), trans. as *The Chronicle of Lanercost*, trans. Sir H. Maxwell, Bt (Glasgow 1913). Page references are given to both the Latin and English texts.

- Le Bel* *Les Vrayes Chronique de Messire Jehan le Bel*, ed. M. L. Polain, 2 vols (Brussels 1863).
- Lesley* John Lesley, Bishop of Ross, *De origine moribus et rebus gestis Scottorum libri decem* (Rome 1578) / *The Historie of Scotland*, trans. Fr. James Dalrymple, ed. Fr. O. G. Cody and W. Murson, 2 vols (Edinburgh 1895).
- MW* *Accounts of the Masters of Works, 1529–1679*, ed. H. M. Paton, J. Imrie and J. G. Dunbar, 2 vols (Edinburgh 1957–82).
- Newbattle Registrum* *Registrum S. Marie de Neubotel*, ed. Cosimo Innes (Edinburgh, Bannatyne Club, 1849).
- OED* *The Oxford English Dictionary*, 2nd edn, 20 vols (Oxford University Press 1989); online edn, 2000, <http://oed.com> (accessed 23 March 2015).
- Perth Guildry* *The Perth Guildry Book 1452–1601*, ed. M. L. Stavert, SRS, n.s. 19 (Edinburgh 1993).
- Pipe R* *The Great Roll of the Pipe for the Twenty-First Year of King Henry the Second, A.D. 1174–1175*, The Publications of the Pipe Roll Society 22, Rolls Series (London 1897).
- Pluscarden* *The Book of Puscarden*, ed. F. J. H. Skene, 2 vols (Edinburgh 1880).
- POMS* A. Beam, J. Bradley, D. Broun, J. R. Davies, M. Hammond, M. Pasin, with others, *The People of Medieval Scotland, 1093–1314* (Glasgow and London 2012), www.poms.ac.uk (accessed 17 June 2012).
- Prost* *Inventaires mobiliers et extraits de comptes des ducs de Bourgogne de la maison de Valois (1363–1477)*, ed. B. and H. Prost, 2 vols (Paris 1908–13).
- RPS* *The Records of Parliaments of Scotland to 1707*, ed. K. M. Brown, G. H. Macintosh, A. J. Mann, P. Ritchie and R. J. Tanner; online edn, 2008, <http://rps.ac.uk> (accessed 23 March 2015).
- RRS* *Regesta Regum Scottorum*, ed. G. W. S. Barrow, Cynthia J. Neville, G. G. Simpson, A. A. M. Duncan and B. Webster, 6 vols (Edinburgh 1988–).
- Rymer, Foedera* *Foedera, conventiones, literae, et cujuscunque generis acta publica*, ed. T. Rymer, 20 vols (London 1704–32).
- SAEC* *Scottish Annals from English Chroniclers*, ed. and trans. A. O. Anderson (London 1902).
- Scalacronica* *Scalacronica: by Sir Thomas Gray of Heton, Knight*, ed. J. Stephenson (Edinburgh 1836).
- Sc. Ep. Act.* *Scottish Episcopal Acta*, ed. Norman Shead, vol. 1 (via POMS).
- Scotichronicon* *Scotichronicon by Walter Bower: in Latin and English*, ed. and trans. D. E. R. Watt *et al.*, 9 vols (Aberdeen 1987–98).
- Siege* *Siege of the Castle of Edinburgh, M.DC.LXXXIX*, ed. R. Bell (Edinburgh, Bannatyne Club, 1828).

- Somerville *Memorie of the Somervilles; being a History of the Baronial House of Somerville by James, Eleventh Lord Somerville*, ed. Sir W. Scott, 2 vols (Edinburgh 1815).
- SP *The Scots Peerage*, ed. Sir W. Balfour Paul, 9 vols (Edinburgh 1904-14).
- Stevenson, *Documents Documents Illustrative of the History of Scotland 1286-1306*, ed. J. Stevenson, 2 vols (Edinburgh 1870).
- St Giles *Registrum Cartarum Ecclesie Sancti Egidii de Edinburgh*, ed. D. Laing (Edinburgh, Bannatyne Club, 1859).
- Symeonis Opera Symeonis Monachi Opera Omnia*, ed. T. Arnold, 2 vols (London 1882-5).
- TA *Compota Thesauriorum Regum Scottorum. Accounts of the Lord High Treasurer of Scotland*, ed. Thomas Dickinson, Sir J. Balfour Paul and C. T. McInnes with A. Murray, 14 vols (Edinburgh 1877-1978).
- Vita *Vita Edwardi Secundi*, ed. and trans. W. R. Childs (Oxford 2005).
- Wyntoun *The Orygynale Cronykil Of Scotland. By Androw of Wyntoun*, ed. D. Laing, 3 vols (Edinburgh 1872-9).

Secondary sources

- Aird (1998) W. M. Aird, *St Cuthbert and the Normans. The Church of Durham, 1071-1153*, Studies in the History of Medieval Religion 14 (Woodbridge 1998).
- Anderson (1913) Sir R. R. Anderson, 'Notice of Plans, and a Bird's-Eye Perspective, believed to be the Oldest Authentic View of Edinburgh Castle, now in the King's Library, British Museum', *PSAS* 47 (1912-13), pp 17-29.
- Anderson (1953) M. O. Anderson, 'Chretien de Troyes and Scotland', *SHR* 32 (1953), pp 70-74.
- Ash (1974) Marinel Ash, 'David Bernham, Bishop of St Andrews', *Innes Review* 25 (1974), pp 3-14.
- Barrow (1992) G. W. S. Barrow, *Scotland and its Neighbours in the Middle Ages* (London and Rio Grande, OH, 1992).
- Barrow (2005) G. W. S. Barrow, *Robert Bruce and the Community of the Realm of Scotland*, 4th edn (Edinburgh 2005).
- Bartrum (1966) P. Bartrum, *Early Welsh Genealogical Tracts* (Cardiff 1966).
- Brook (1890) A. J. S. Brook, 'Technical Description of the Regalia of Scotland', *PSAS* 24 (1889-90), pp 49-141.
- Broun (1999) D. Broun, 'A New Look at Gesta Annalia attributed to John of

- Fordun', in *Church, Chronicle and Learning in Medieval and Early Renaissance Scotland: Essays Presented to Donald Watt on the Occasion of the Completion of the Publication of Bower's Scotichronicon*, ed. B. E. Crawford (Edinburgh 1999), pp 9–30.
- Broun (1999a) D. Broun, *The Irish Identity of the Kingdom of the Scots in the Twelfth and Thirteenth Centuries* (Woodbridge 1999).
- Caldwell (1981) D. H. Caldwell, 'Guns in Scotland. The Manufacture and Use of Guns and their Influence on Warfare from the Fourteenth Century to c. 1625', unpublished PhD thesis, Edinburgh 1981.
- Caldwell (2007) D. H. Caldwell, 'The Scots and Guns', in *England and Scotland in the Fourteenth Century: New Perspectives*, ed. A. King and M. A. Penman (Woodbridge 2007), pp 60–72.
- Caldwell (2014) D. Caldwell, *Edinburgh Castle Under Siege* (HES research paper, 2014).
- Caldwell (2016) D. H. Caldwell, 'Edinburgh Castle Under Siege 1093–1544', *Journal of the Sydney Society for Scottish History* 18 (2016), pp 43–66.
- Caldwell (2018) D. H. Caldwell, 'Edinburgh Castle Under Siege 1559–1573', *Journal of the Sydney Society for Scottish History* 18 (2018), pp 9–29.
- Cessford (1992/3) C. Cessford, 'The Gododdin: The Oldest Scottish Poem?', *Scottish Language* 11/12 (1992/3), pp 1–9.
- Charles-Edwards (1978) T. M. Charles-Edwards, 'The Authenticity of the Gododdin: An Historian's View', in *Astudiaethau ar yr Hengeredd/ Studies in Old Welsh Poetry*, ed. R. Bromwich and R. Brinley Jones (Cardiff 1978), pp 44–71.
- Charles-Edwards (2013) T. M. Charles-Edwards, *Wales and the Britons, 350–1064* (Oxford 2013).
- Contamine (1964) P. Contamine, 'L'artillerie royale française à la veille des guerres d'Italie', *Annales de Bretagne* 71 (1964), pp 221–61.
- Cornell (2006) D. Cornell, 'English Castle Garrisons in the Anglo-Scottish Wars of the Fourteenth Century', unpublished PhD thesis, Durham 2006.
- Cowan and Easson (1976) I. B. Cowan and D. E. Easson, *Medieval Religious Houses, Scotland, with an Appendix on the Houses of the Isle of Man* (London 1976).
- Cowan, Mackay and Macquarrie (1983) *The Knights of St John of Jerusalem in Scotland*, ed. I. B. Cowan, P. H. R. Mackay and A. Macquarrie, Scottish Text Society, n.s. 19 (Edinburgh 1983).
- Dixon (1947) N. Dixon, 'The Placenames of Midlothian', unpublished PhD thesis, Edinburgh 1947.
- Douglas (1898) W. S. Douglas, *Cromwell's Scotch Campaigns* (London 1898).
- Dunbar (1969) J. G. Dunbar, 'Some Little Known Early Drawings of Edinburgh Castle', *Book of the Old Edinburgh Club* 33 (1969), pp 10–12.
- Dunbar (1999) J. G. Dunbar, *Scottish Royal Palaces. The Architecture of the Royal*

Residences during the Late Medieval and Early Renaissance Periods (East Linton 1999).

- Duncan (2002) A. A. M. Duncan, *The Kingship of the Scots, 842–1292: Succession and Independence* (Edinburgh 2002).
- Emond (1989) W. K. Emond, 'The Minority of King James V, 1513–1528', unpublished PhD thesis, St Andrews, 1989.
- Ewart and Gallagher (2014) G. Ewart and D. Gallagher, *Fortress of the Kingdom* (Edinburgh 2014).
- Fernández Duro (1884) C. Fernández Duro, *La Armada Invencible*, 2 vols (Madrid 1884).
- Fradenburg (1990) L. Fradenburg, 'Narrative and Capital in Late Medieval Scotland', in *Literary Practice and Social Change in Britain, 1380–1530*, ed. Lee Patterson (Berkeley 1990), pp 285–334.
- Fraser (1874) William Fraser, *The Lennox*, 2 vols (Edinburgh 1874).
- Fraser (1878) W. Fraser, *The Scots of Buccleuch*, 2 vols (Edinburgh 1878).
- Fraser (2009) J. E. Fraser, *From Caledonia to Pictland: Scotland to 795* (Edinburgh 2009).
- Gaier (1967) C. Gaier, 'The Origin of Mons Meg', *Journal of the Arms and Armour Society* tom. V fasc. 12 (1967), pp 425–31.
- Gaier (1973) C. Gaier, *L'Industrie et le Commerce des Armes dans les Anciennes Principautés Belges du XIII^e à la fin du XV^e siècle* (Paris 1973).
- Gaier (2004) C. Gaier, 'L'origine de la "Mons Meg"', in C. Gaier, *Armes et Combats dans l'univers médiéval*, 2 vols (Brussels 2004), ii. 219–30.
- Gelling *et al.* (1970) M. Gelling, W. F. H. Nicolaisen and M. Richards, *The Names of Towns and Cities in Britain* (London 1970).
- Gemmill and Mayhew (1995) E. Gemmill and N. Mayhew, *Changing Values in Medieval Scotland. A Study of Prices, Money, and Weights and Measures* (Cambridge 1995).
- Gough (1900) H. Gough, *Itinerary of King Edward the First Throughout His Reign*, 2 vols (Paisley 1900).
- Guérout and Liou (2001) M. Guérout and B. Liou, *La Grande Maîtresse, nef de François I^{er}. Recherches et documents d'archives* (Paris 2001).
- Hannay (1916) R. K. Hannay, 'Incidents and Documents, A.D. 1513–1523', *Book of the Old Edinburgh Club* 9 (1916), pp 1–48.
- Haskell (1999) M. Haskell, 'Breaking the Stalemate: The Scottish Campaign of Edward I, 1303–4', in *Thirteenth Century England VII: Proceedings of the Durham Conference 1997*, ed. M. Prestwich, R. Britnell and R. Frame (Woodbridge 1999), pp 223–42.
- Heebøl-Holm (2003) T. Heebøl-Holm, *Ports, Piracy and Maritime War: Piracy in the English Channel and the Atlantic, c. 1280–c. 1330* (Leiden 2003).

- Herkless and Hannay (1907–15) J. Herkless and R. K. Hannay, *The Archbishops of St Andrews*, 5 vols (Edinburgh 1907–15).
- Hudson (1998) B. T. Hudson, 'The Scottish Chronicle', *SHR* 77 (1998), 129–61.
- Hunter (1856) J. Hunter, 'King Edward's Spoilings in Scotland in A.D. 1296 – The Coronation Stone – Original and Unpublished Evidence', *The Archaeological Journal* 13 (1856), pp 245–55.
- Innes (1872) C. Innes, *Lectures on Scotch Legal Antiquities* (Edinburgh 1872).
- Isaac (1990) G. Isaac, 'Mynyddawg Mwynfawr', *Bulletin of the Board of Celtic Studies* 37 (1990), pp 111–13.
- Isaac (2002) G. Isaac, 'Gwarcharn Maeldderw', *Cambrian Medieval Celtic Studies* 45 (2002) pp 63–96.
- Jackson (1969) K. H. Jackson, *The Gododdin. The Oldest Scottish Poem* (Edinburgh 1969).
- Koch (1993) J. T. Koch, 'Thoughts on the Ur-Gododdin: Rethinking Aneirin and Mynyddawc Mwynfawr', *Language Sciences* 15 (1993), pp 81–9.
- Koch (1997) J. T. Koch, *The Gododdin of Aneirin, Text and Context from Dark-Age North Britain* (Cardiff 1997).
- Lang (1900) A. Lang, *A History of Scotland from the Roman Occupation*, 4 vols (London 1900–7).
- Lloyd (1977) T. H. Lloyd, *The English Wool Trade in the Middle Ages* (Cambridge 1977).
- Loomis (1955) R. S. Loomis, 'Scotland and the Arthurian Legend', *PSAS* 89 (1955–6), pp 1–21.
- MacDonald (2007) A. R. MacDonald, *The Burghs and Parliament in Scotland, c. 1550–1651* (Aldershot 2007).
- Madden (1975) C. Madden, 'The Finances of the Scottish Crown in the Later Middle Ages', unpublished PhD thesis, Glasgow 1975.
- Malcolm (1925) C. A. Malcolm, 'The Gardens of the Castle', *Book of the Old Edinburgh Club* 14 (1925), pp 101–20.
- Maxwell-Irving (1994) A. M. T. Maxwell-Irving, 'Scottish Yetts and Window Grilles', *PSAS* 124 (1994), pp 433–54.
- McFarlane (1981) K. B. McFarlane, *England in the Fifteenth Century: Collected Essays* (London 1981).
- McKean (1997) C. McKean, 'The Palace at Edinburgh Castle', *Book of the Old Edinburgh Club*, n.s. 4 (1997), pp 89–102.
- McKean (2001) C. McKean, *The Scottish Chateau* (Stroud 2001).
- Moir Bryce (1912) W. Moir Bryce, 'Saint Margaret of Scotland and her Chapel in the Castle of Edinburgh', *Book of the Old Edinburgh Club* 5 (1912), pp 1–66.
- Murray (1961) A. L. Murray, 'The Exchequer and Crown Revenues of Scotland

1437–1542', unpublished PhD thesis, Edinburgh 1961.

- Oggins (2004) R. S. Oggins, *The Kings and their Hawks: Falconry in Medieval England* (New Haven, CT, 2004).
- Oldrieve (1914) W. T. Oldrieve, 'Account of the Recent Discovery of the Remains of David's Tower at Edinburgh Castle', *PSAS* 12 (1914), pp 230–70.
- Oram (2011) R. Oram, *Domination and Lordship: Scotland, 1070–1230* (Edinburgh 2011).
- Oschinsky (1971) *Walter of Henley and Other Treatises on Estate Management and Accountancy*, ed. D. Oschinsky (Oxford 1971).
- Perkins (1910) C. Perkins, 'The Wealth of the Knights Templars in England and the Disposition of it after their Dissolution', *American Historical Review* 15 (1910), pp 252–63.
- Powicke (1960) M. R. Powicke, 'The English Commons in Scotland in 1322 and the Deposition of Edward II', *Speculum* 35 (1960), pp 556–62.
- Prestwich (1967) M. T. Prestwich, 'Victualing Estimates for English Garrisons in Scotland During the Early Fourteenth Century', *EHR* 82 (1967), pp 536–43.
- Prestwich (2015) M. T. Prestwich, 'The Trebuchets of the Tower', in *The Medieval Way of War: Studies in Medieval Military History in Honor of Bernard S. Bachrach*, ed. G. T. Halfond (Farnham and Burlington, VA, 2015), pp 283–94.
- Prince (1933) A. E. Prince, 'The Indenture System under Edward III', in *Historical Essays in Honour of James Tait*, ed. J. G. Edwards, V. H. Galbraith and E. F. Jacob (Manchester 1933), pp 283–98.
- Puiseux (1863) M. L. Puiseux, 'Étude Sur un chartre relative a une grande ville de bois, construite en Normandie pour une expedition en Angleterre, en 1376', *Mémoires de la Société des Antiquaires de Normandie*, 25, 3rd series, vol. 5 (1863), pp 387–409.
- Rodwell (2013) W. Rodwell, *The Coronation Chair and Stone of Scone: History, Archaeology and Conservation* (Oxford 2013).
- Rollason (1998) L. Rollason, 'Spoils of War? Durham Cathedral and the Black Rood of Scotland', in *The Battle of Neville's Cross 1346*, ed. D. Rollason and M. Prestwich (Stamford 1998), pp 57–65.
- Rollason (1998a) D. W. Rollason, *Symeon of Durham. Historian of Durham and the North* (Stamford 1998).
- Sidwell (1995) K. Sidwell, *Reading Medieval Latin* (Cambridge 1995).
- Skene (1822) J. Skene, 'Remarks on the Well-House Tower', *Archaeologia Scotica* 2 (1822), pp 469–79.
- Slade (1985) H. G. Slade, 'The Tower and House of Drum, Aberdeenshire', *PSAS* 115 (1985), pp 297–356.
- Smith (1993) A. N. Smith, 'Ratho Quarry (Ratho Parish): Enclosed Cremation Cemetery and Sunken-Featured Building', *Discovery and*

Excavation in Scotland 1993 (1993), pp 59–61.

- Smith (1995) A. N. Smith, 'The Excavation of Neolithic, Bronze Age and Early Historic Features Near Ratho, Edinburgh', *PSAS* 125 (1995), pp 139–95.
- Smyth (1984) A. P. Smyth, *Warlords and Holy Men: Scotland AD 80–1000* (Edinburgh 1986; 1st published London 1984).
- Stair-Kerr (1913) E. Stair-Kerr, 'Randolph's Capture of Edinburgh Castle – Where Did He Climb the Rock?', *PSAS* 47 (1913), pp 423–6.
- Stevenson (1931) J. H. Stevenson *et al.*, 'The Bannatyne or Bute Mazer', *PSAS* 65 (1930–1), pp 217–55.
- Stones (1950) E. L. G. Stones, 'An Addition to the "Rotuli Scotiae"', *SHR* 29 (1950), pp 23–51.
- Stones (1957) E. L. G. Stones, 'The Folvilles of Ashby-Folville, Leicestershire, and their Associates in Crime, 1326–1347', *TRHS*, 5th series, 7 (1957), pp 117–36.
- Stones (1959) E. L. G. Stones, 'Allusion to the Black Rood of Scotland in 1346', *SHR* 38 (1959), pp 174–5.
- Stones and Simpson (1978) E. L. G. Stones and G. G. Simpson, *Edward I and the Throne of Scotland 1290–1296: An Edition of the Record Sources for the Great Cause*, 2 vols (Oxford 1978).
- Taylor (1950) A. J. Taylor, 'Thomas de Houghton: A Royal Carpenter of the Later Thirteenth Century', *The Antiquaries Journal* 30 (1950), pp 28–33.
- Taylor and Márkus (2006) S. Taylor with G. Márkus, *The Place-Names of Fife*, 5 vols (Donnington 2006–12).
- Tyson (2001) D. B. Tyson, 'A Royal Itinerary – The Journey of Edward I to Scotland in 1296', *Nottingham Medieval Studies* 45 (2001), pp 127–44.
- Vulson (1644) Marc de Vulson de la Colombière, *La Science Heroique* (Paris 1644).
- Watson (1906–7) G. Watson, 'The Black Rood of Scotland', *Transactions of the Scottish Ecclesiological Society* 2 (1906–7), pp 27–46.
- Watson (1926) W. J. Watson, *The History of the Celtic Placenames of Scotland* (Edinburgh 1926).
- Watson (1991) F. J. Watson, 'Edward I in Scotland: 1296–1305', unpublished PhD thesis, Glasgow 1991.
- Watson (2004) Fiona Watson, 'Sinclair, Sir William (d. 1299 x 1303)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004; online edn, January 2008, <http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/25632> (accessed 23 March 2015).
- Wilson (1848) D. Wilson, *Memorials of Edinburgh in the Olden Time*, 2 vols (Edinburgh 1848).

Wickham Legg (1900) J. Wickham Legg, *Three Coronation Orders* (London 1900).

Woolf (2007) A. Woolf, *From Pictland to Alba: 789-1070* (Edinburgh 2007).

Young (1999) A. Young, 'The Comyns and Anglo-Scottish Relations (1286-1314)', in *Thirteenth Century England VII: Proceedings of the Durham Conference 1997*, ed. M. Prestwich, R. Britnell and R. Frame (Woodbridge 1999), pp 207-22.

Arkady Hodge was born in Edinburgh and educated at Oxford University, where he has also tutored and lectured. His work has appeared in various academic publications, and in his spare time he has written fictions under a pseudonym.

Notes

¹ Ewart and Gallagher (2014).

² Caldwell (2014), now published as Caldwell (2016) and Caldwell (2018).

³ The 16th-century henchmen had an international character, including young men sent from Spain, Denmark and France. Among them was Pierre de Ronsard, later to become the ‘prince of poets’ of the French literary canon, who was at the court of James V in the 1530s – it seems to have been there that he discovered Greek and Latin poetry, inspiring him to become a writer. Although Ronsard was present at a time when the court did not frequent Edinburgh Castle, the wide cultural horizons which can be glimpsed during his stay need not have been confined to this period.

⁴ *RMS* ii. 3273, 3275, 3278–9, 3283, 3285–9, 3291. The initial number of commissions for two officers and ten gentlemen seems small compared with the 50-man platoon present at the French court, but it finds a Scottish precedent in the short-lived unit of ten halbardiers and two ‘trumpeters’ which had guarded James V in 1517–19, discussed below.

⁵ *RMS* ii. Nos. 1186, 1283, 1379, and for documents witnessed by the captain of the guard in 1473–4, *ibid.*, Index p 922. Macdougall (1982), p 100, identifies the ‘little Bell’ who was seconded to the henchmen in 1473 with the George Bell, styled archer of the king’s guard in a royal gift of land near Haddington in 1474, but there is no evidence to confirm this.

⁶ *ER* xiv. 285, 350, 459. The payments begin in July 1517 and conclude with a settlement of a little over four months’ pay for the period after 1 September 1518.

⁷ The original title of master of the household was simultaneously elevated to a ceremonial dignity for the Earl of Argyll, probably for the purposes of raising his ‘precedence’ – his place in formal seating arrangements and processions – above the level permitted by his relatively new earldom

⁸ *ER* viii. 488, for the facilities at Doune Castle in the 1460s.

⁹ *ER* x. 495; *TA* iv. 379.

¹⁰ *ER* xiv. 108.

¹¹ *ER* v. 619. Brewing was also taking place at Holyrood, where the monastic complex does seem to have contained a dedicated brewery.

¹² *RMS* ii. No. 3550. An earlier award of the same powers in 1482 is more often cited by historians, but it had been rendered ineffective for all practical purposes by 1488, and formally annulled by the Act of Revocation in 1493 (*RMS* ii. No. 1526; *RPS* A1493/5/23, cf. Fradenburg (1990), pp 330–2).

¹³ Fradenburg (1990), pp 330–2, cf. *RMS* ii. Nos. 1526, 1742.

¹⁴ Dixon (1947), pp 23, 44. The name may actually derive from Old Norse *seljas brá*, since the two Middle English elements used are respectively influenced and borrowed from that language (*OED* s.vv. *salow*, n., *brae*, n.); this would explain why a misinterpretation arose in the 12th century using elements of more purely Old English derivation (*OED* s.vv. *sorrow*, n. and adj., and *barrow*, n.). Whether there was an intermediary Old Norse form, the name is ultimately a translation of an older Celtic name meaning ‘ridge of willows’, which was remembered as the name of a large forest once surrounding Edinburgh and may be preserved in the modern place name ‘Drumsheugh’: Dixon (1947), p 63; Watson (1926), p 144.

¹⁵ Duncan (2002), pp 137–45.

¹⁶ *CDS* i. pp vii–viii.

¹⁷ *Lanercost*, p 261/260; Rodwell (2013), pp 39–42.

¹⁸ Watson (1906) believed there was just one casing, inconsistently described, but a double shrine, resolving the apparent inconsistency, seems to be indicated both in 1291 and by the 1346 reference that was unknown to him.

¹⁹ *Lanercost*, p 261/260; Watson (1906); Stones (1950), pp 32–3; Stones (1959), p 174; Rollason (1998).

²⁰ There would perhaps be no reason to mention them alongside the English regalia in contexts such as *Flete*, p 19, and Wickham Legg (1900), pp 121–4, but the lack of any subsequent mention of them

in the documentation surrounding Westminster is surprising – they are also entirely overlooked in modern discussions of the Stone and the royal burial chapel, such as Rodwell (2013).

²¹ Brook (1890), pp 71–80, 85–9.

²² Duncan (2002), p 145.

²³ Hunter (1856), p 148. I can find no explanation for *baud* – perhaps it is related to terminology such as bobbin, bodkin and *broderie*, or else the meaning is simply ‘bold verdure’?

²⁴ Duncan (2002), p 145, discusses its position, but does not distinguish the high altar and St Edward’s altar; see also Rodwell (2013), pp 39–42.

²⁵ *Flete*, pp 68–74.

²⁶ William Sinclair was among the Scottish barons from whom Edward I demanded military service on 29 June 1294 (Rymer, *Foedera* i. 804), but I cannot find a primary source supporting his attendance at the Stirling parliament in 1295, as claimed by Watson (2004), while the prisoner list from the Battle of Dunbar in 1296 indicates that the *monsieur William de Seint Cler* captured there was probably not him, but rather his son, Master William Sinclair, the future Bishop of Dunkeld (*CDS* ii. 177; Gough (1900), ii. 280; Tyson (2001), p 139).

²⁷ One possible candidate, noted by Duncan, is Sir William Francis of Ayton; alternatively, this might be a confused reference to Sir William Sinclair, the only explicitly documented Scottish keeper from this period, and his son Master William – there are various reasons why they might have earned the by-name *Francis*, i.e. ‘Frenchman’; if so, the source omits to mention the fact that the man who led the 1314 assault on Edinburgh Castle was by then the Bishop of Dunkeld, but the action would seem in character for a prelate who fought at Dunbar in 1296, staged a jailbreak from Gloucester Castle in 1303 that appears to have left the garrison commander dead, and saw off an English raid on Fife in full armour in 1317 (*CDS* ii. p 177 and Nos. 938, 1339; *Bruce*, pp 609–15).

²⁸ *CDS* ii. p 177 and Nos. 911, 925, 940, 957, 960, 1066, 1101, 1108, 1132, 1180, 1949; Barrow (2005), pp 138–9, and p 462 n. 62; Barrow (1992), pp 163–4; Watson (1991), pp 92–3. The chronology of Sir Herbert Morham’s career is complicated by the uncertain context of an incident involving him and the Countess of Fife, the young English widow of a Scottish magnate, who was both a cousin and step-granddaughter of King Edward. Barrow’s view is that Morham, probably already serving in the English garrison in Edinburgh with his father, surprised the countess around April 1299 with an ill-judged armed abduction and marriage proposal, for which he was prosecuted, prompting him to defect and lead the siege of Stirling to its successful conclusion, subsequently switching back to English pay in 1300 when he was not given command of the Scottish garrison there. Watson believes that Morham had switched sides and taken command of the siege *before* April 1299, that he was caught living with the countess and charged with her abduction, and *then* subsequently agreed to join the garrison.

²⁹ *CDS* ii. No. 1244; discussed by Watson (1991), p 165, but without observing the social limit in the earlier commission of 1298.

³⁰ A vernacular receipt appended to the document, drawn up in connection with the handover of the castle to a new commander, takes a rather more negative view of this work, noting that there was ‘no dwelling except a chapel a little unroofed, a little pentice above the chapel, and a stable newly built and all unroofed except a quarter’ (*nul habitacon’ fors une chapele apoy descouverte, [un petit] pentice sur le chapelle et un stable fait de novele a tout descouverte fors un quartre*).

³¹ Parliament sat *in the tolbutth*’ in 1451 (*RPS* 1451/6/1), and *in pretorio burgi de Edinburgh*, which probably referred to the same building, from 1438 onwards (*RPS* 1438/11/1, *RPS* 1441/6/1, *RPS* 1445/8, *RPS* 1455/6/6, *RPS* 1469/2 and *RPS* 1471/5/51).

³² MacDonald (2007), p 143.

³³ MacDonald (2007), p 132.

³⁴ MacDonald (2007), pp 140–9.

³⁵ *RPS* 1469/2, *RPS* 1472/3.

³⁶ For the use of ‘brown’ to describe deep colours beyond the usual shades of red, cf. the 14th-century references to ecclesiastical vestments *de bruno violeto*, *de bruno damasceno* and *de bruno cerico* in *Glasgow Registrum* ii. 331–5.

³⁷ *ER* iii. 672.

³⁸ Prost ii. 178, cited by Gaier (1973), pp 120, 200 and Caldwell (1982), p 27; a less scholarly text, perhaps more readily available for consultation, is in Puiseux (1863), pp 390–1.

³⁹ *ER* vi. 200, 204 show that the *Lion* had initially rested at Linlithgow between the sieges of Abercorn and Threave in 1455, and subsequently returned there rather than to Edinburgh; but this would make sense in the context of the potential need to threaten the northern Douglas strongholds such as Balvenie and Darnaway, which were not yet secured by the Crown at this date – the *Lion*'s gun-carriage may also have been the one damaged at Crawfordmuir on the return from Galloway, making further unnecessary travel undesirable (*ER* vi. 161); the war was effectively over by this point, but the subsequent winter would have held the gun at Linlithgow until the roads cleared 1457; repairs to the gate Linlithgow after the crash there are recorded among expenses for the period September 1456–July 1457, followed by repairs to the bombard itself under July 1457–July 1458 (*ER* vi. 293, 385), which fit better in the context of an abortive attempt to move her out of Linlithgow in early 1457 once the civil war was clearly over – rather than a crash at the time of her arrival in 1455; it may also be significant that seven new gunstones for the *Lion* and a consignment of gunpowder from Hamburg, all presumably procured to replace munitions expended during the campaign, were initially in Edinburgh before being brought to join the bombards at Linlithgow (*ER* vi. 295, 309–323), and it was not until 1459, after her return to Edinburgh, that the big bronze gun was fully repaired (*ER* vi. 563, 497).

⁴⁰ *ER* vi. 4.

⁴¹ *ER* vi. 6.

⁴² Although multiple 'bombards' were evidently brought to Threave (*ER* vi. 201–2, 456) payments for the outward journey generally focus on the *Lion* (*ER* vi. 122, 200, 209), whereas expenses on the return journey refer to 'bombards' (*ER* vi. 161, 204), and to 'two bombards' are subsequently recorded at Linlithgow, presumably the *Lion* and one other (*ER* vi. 563); this was presumably the bombard later recorded in the royal arsenal as the 'Gun of Threave'.

⁴³ The evidence has been decisively assembled by Gaier (1967) and the updated version in French in Gaier (2004).

⁴⁴ *ER* vi. 383, 386–7.

⁴⁵ *ER* vi. 563, 497.

⁴⁶ *ER* vi. 581, vii. 7.

⁴⁷ *ER* vi. 495.

⁴⁸ *ER* vii. 99 records the moving of 'the Queen's bombard' and its subsequent return from Berwick to Edinburgh, a quite separate event from the installation of permanent defensive artillery by the Scots in Berwick Castle, recorded in the *ER* vii. 152–3.

⁴⁹ *ER* vii. 214.

⁵⁰ Contamine (1967), pp 240–5, 247.

⁵¹ It was obvious that the glaze prevented the powder from separating into its component chemicals and also kept it dry, two factors which meant that it ignited more rapidly and reliably, and presumably the flammable alcohol also assisted with this. According to modern historians of early artillery, the combustion of the powder was also improved by the extra oxygen in the comparatively larger air gaps between the lumpy particles, while these air gaps also, paradoxically, slowed the overall rate of ignition and gas expansion. This had the effect of adding a split-second of extra initial acceleration to the cannonball, before the full force of the powder's ignition sent it shooting from the barrel at an even higher speed than usual.

⁵² NAS GD90/2/2, Guérout and Liou (2001), pp 37, 256, 272. The *Michael* was bought for 40,000 *livres*, and the 700-ton *Grande Maîtresse* for 30,000, which in turn represented a significant premium above her assessed value of 24,266. French sources also quote a 15,000-*livre* purchase price for the 500-ton *L'Hermine* in 1517 (citing Paris, BN, Pièces originales, vol. 307, dossier Berquetot, p 2).

⁵³ *TA* vii. 349, 350–1. No engraving is recorded for either of the completed guns, but the other may have been among the 'sundry other pieces' whose decoration is recorded in *TA* viii. 127.

⁵⁴ *TA* vii. 360, 488, viii. 124–7; the first two entries record the production of one double culverin mould in August 1540 and the subsequent casting and finishing of a gun, the second set record the making of another double culverin mould in October 1541, the failure of the first and second casting attempts, and the successful third attempt that followed.

⁵⁵ *TA* viii. 355–7: four or five 36-pounder cannons accompanied the expedition, and no more than two of these are likely to have been carried aboard the galleys *Unicorn* and *Salamander*, leaving at least two for the *Lion*.

⁵⁶ Paris, BNF, Fr.17890, f. 41, cited in Potter (2011), p 105, n. 77.

⁵⁷ *TA* xiii. 81, 87, 97; Caldwell (1982), pp 236, 591. Murray's formal appointment to Edinburgh was not made until 1579: *RSS* vii. No. 1986; in 1575, he was ten years into his 50-year career in royal service.

⁵⁸ NAS GD112/1/334–6. Glenorchy in turn gave the gun to the piratical Earl of Orkney in 1595.

⁵⁹ Much speculation is made about *Girona*'s armament in secondary sources, but a full inventory of her artillery was taken in July 1587, giving a total list of guns and their weight of shot in the Neapolitan *libbra* of 320g or 0.7lb (Fernández Duro (1884) i. 389–90): there were six *cañones* and six *medias cañones*, which included guns of the standard 36lb cannon form, the 24lb *Halbekartaune* type, and the 18lb gross culverin calibre; four *medias culebrinas* with cannonballs of three different sizes in the 8lb–12lb range; six sakers, four moyanes and 20 breech-loading merlins or falconets; and eight *pedreros* firing stone shot of unspecified calibre. The total may, of course, have been modified before the fleet sailed, and, like many other Armada ships, she may have carried 40lb siege guns as cargo in the hold, but the impressive strength of her armament is not in question (notably, *Girona* was one of only two Armada ships armed with 36-pounder naval guns).

⁶⁰ It is often suggested that the guns were shipped to Scotland to placate the English colonial regime in Ireland, but the English complaint that three guns had been emplaced at Dunluce was made two months *after* MacDonald's visit to Scotland; if MacDonald's plan was to placate the English, it certainly did not have that effect, and the local English authorities continued to apply pressure until they forced a direct military confrontation – in which they were brutally defeated by MacDonald.

⁶¹ NAS GD 106/135, Orkney Archives D8/1/3.



HISTORIC
ENVIRONMENT
SCOTLAND

ÀRAINNEACHD
EACHDRAIDHEIL
ALBA

We are the lead public body established to investigate, care for and promote Scotland's historic environment.

We want to make sure Scotland's heritage is cherished, understood, shared and enjoyed with pride by everyone.



© Historic Environment Scotland 2018

You may re-use this information (excluding logos and images) free of charge in any format or medium, under the terms of the Open Government Licence v3.0 except where otherwise stated.

To view this licence, visit <http://nationalarchives.gov.uk/doc/open-government-licence/version/3/> or write to the Information Policy Team, The National Archives, Kew, London TW9 4DU, or email: psi@nationalarchives.gov.uk

Where we have identified any third party copyright information you will need to obtain permission from the copyright holders concerned.

Any enquiries regarding this document should be sent to us at:

Historic Environment Scotland

Longmore House
Salisbury Place
Edinburgh
EH9 1SH
+44 (0) 131 668 8600

www.historicenvironment.scot

Scottish Charity No: SCO45925