

Compiled by Direction of H.M. Office of Works

---

OFFICIAL GUIDE  
To the Abbey-Church, Palace,  
and Environs of  
**Holyroodhouse**  
WITH A  
*HISTORICAL SKETCH*

BY  
THE RIGHT HON.  
**SIR HERBERT MAXWELL, BART.**  
F.R.S., LL.D.  
President of the Society of Antiquaries of Scotland

**WILLIAM BLACKWOOD AND SONS**  
EDINBURGH: MCMVI

*SIXPENCE net*

Official Guide  
to  
Holyroodhouse

# Official Guide To the Abbey-Church, Palace, and Environs of Holyroodhouse

WITH A

*HISTORICAL SKETCH*

BY

THE RIGHT HON.

SIR HERBERT MAXWELL, BART.

F.R.S., LL.D.

PRESIDENT OF THE SOCIETY OF ANTIQUARIES OF SCOTLAND

Compiled by Direction of H.M. Office of Works

WILLIAM BLACKWOOD AND SONS  
EDINBURGH: MCMVI

## CONTENTS.

---

	PAGE
THE PALACE . . . . .	I
THE PICTURE GALLERY . . . . .	6
THE PORTRAITS OF JAMES III. AND HIS QUEEN, MARGARET OF DENMARK . . . . .	12
LORD DARNLEY'S ROOMS . . . . .	18
THE DUCHESS OF HAMILTON'S DRAWING-ROOM . . . . .	19
LORD DARNLEY'S BEDROOM . . . . .	20
LORD DARNLEY'S DRESSING-CLOSET . . . . .	22
QUEEN MARY'S PRIVATE STAIR . . . . .	22
QUEEN MARY'S CHAMBER OF PRESENCE OR AUDIENCE CHAMBER . . . . .	22
QUEEN MARY'S BEDROOM . . . . .	26
QUEEN MARY'S DRESSING-CLOSET . . . . .	28
QUEEN MARY'S SUPPER-ROOM . . . . .	28
THE ROYAL APARTMENTS . . . . .	31
THE QUEEN'S BREAKFAST-ROOM . . . . .	31
THE VESTIBULE . . . . .	31
PRINCE ALBERT'S DRESSING-ROOM . . . . .	31
QUEEN VICTORIA'S BEDROOM . . . . .	32
THE QUEEN'S DRAWING-ROOM . . . . .	32
THE EVENING DRAWING-ROOM . . . . .	32

THE PALACE—*continued.*

THE THRONE ROOM . . . . .	32
PRINCE ALBERT'S DRAWING-ROOM . . . . .	33
THE ABBEY CHURCH, NOW DESIGNATED THE CHAPEL ROYAL . . . . .	34
THE ENVIRONS OF HOLYROOD . . . . .	58

---

## HISTORICAL SKETCH.

## CHAP.

I. ANNALS OF HOLYROOD ABBEY, A.D. 1128-1498 . . . . .	69
II. HOLYROOD AS A ROYAL PALACE . . . . .	93
III. TROUBLED TIMES AT HOLYROOD . . . . .	109
IV. THE YEARS OF BLOOD . . . . .	130
V. HOLYROOD ECLIPSED BY ST JAMES'S . . . . .	143
VI. FROM CHARLES I. TO EDWARD VII. . . . .	158

## ILLUSTRATIONS.

---

FIG.	PAGE
I. HOLYROODHOUSE AND ARTHUR'S SEAT FROM THE NORTH-WEST . . . . .	3
From photograph by A. A. Inglis, Edinburgh.	
2. PLAN OF GROUND FLOOR, HOLYROOD PALACE . . . . .	4
3. PLAN OF FIRST FLOOR, HOLYROOD PALACE . . . . .	5
4. ARMS OF MARGARET, QUEEN OF SCOTLAND, A.D. 1469	14
5. QUEEN MARY'S BED-CHAMBER . . . . .	27
From photograph by A. A. Inglis, Edinburgh.	
6. WESTERN FRONT OF THE ABBEY CHURCH OF HOLYROOD . . . . .	35
From photograph by A. A. Inglis, Edinburgh.	
7. HOLYROOD PALACE, SHOWING LORD ROBERT STUART'S HOUSE . . . . .	37
From a Drawing by Blore, published 1826.	
8. THE PALACE OF HOLYROODHOUSE, SOUTH AND NORTH GARDENS, THE ABBEY KIRK, AND THE KIRKYARD . . . . . <i>facing</i>	58
After Gordon of Rothiemay's Plan.	
9. SEAL OF THE BURGH OF CANONGATE . . . . .	68
10. JAMES V.'S TOWER, FOUNTAIN, AND MAIN ENTRANCE, HOLYROODHOUSE . . . . .	70
From photograph by A. A. Inglis, Edinburgh.	

II. SEAL OF THE MONASTERY OF HOLYROOD, A.D. 1141	72
12. HOLYROODHOUSE AND ARTHUR'S SEAT	110
Drawn by an English Spy in 1543-44.	
13. HOLYROOD PALACE AS IT WAS BEFORE THE FIRE OF 1650	121
After Gordon of Rothiemay.	
14. SEAL OF THE ABBEY OF HOLYROODHOUSE, FOUR- TEENTH CENTURY	129

# Guide to the Palace and Abbey Church of Holyroodhouse.

---

## The Palace.

THE main entrance to the Palace of Holyroodhouse is in the west front, access to which from the Canongate lay through a vaulted Gothic gatehouse giving into a fore-court, now thrown open. This picturesque feature, the “foir-werk” of James IV., of which traces may be seen in the shape of the wall-ribs of the vaulted passage remaining in the wall of the building containing the Abbey Court and Royal Mews, was removed in 1753. Except the north-west tower, these arched wall-ribs, together with the lower part of the round turret at the north-east angle of the Abbey Court House, and some of the ground-floor chambers, including the vaulted prison-cell, are all that now remain of the Palace erected in 1501-3 for the reception of Margaret Tudor as the bride of James IV. Not without remonstrance and popular indignation was the destruction of this “foir-werk” wrought. In some

doggerel verse circulated in the city, entitled "The Echo of the Royal Porch of the Palace of Holyrood House, which fell under Military Execution, Anno 1753," "Auld Reekie" is represented as saying, with too much truth as was to turn out—

" My Cross, likewise, of old renown  
Will next to you be tumbled down ;  
And by degrees each ancient place  
Will perish by this modern race."

The beautiful old cross of Edinburgh, with a shaft 40 feet long in a single piece, was destroyed on 13th March 1756 by order of the magistrates, as being, in the words of Maitland, one of those erections whereby "the High Street was greatly pestered and obstructed, and whereby the beauty of the noble street was greatly eclipsed." So different are the judgments of men of different generations in matters of taste!

The present approach to the Palace from the north was made by direction of Prince Albert in 1857, and was laid through the north garden, which was Queen Mary's favourite resort.

The first object to catch a visitor's eye upon entering what used to be the Fore Court, now called "the Place," is a fountain with octagonal base, erected in 1859 after the style of one in Linlithgow Palace which dates from the earlier half of the sixteenth century. Built in three stages, this modern fountain is surmounted by an imperial crown, supported by the figures of four yeomen of the guard. Herein James VI. would have found much to please him, for in this design the crown serves as a cistern to supply water through lions' mouths to the basins below, thereby illustrating, accidentally or by design, an ancient principle




FIG. 1.—HOLYROODHOUSE AND ARTHUR'S SEAT FROM THE NORTH-WEST.

*From photograph*

by A. A. Inglis, Edinburgh.

of monarchy—to wit, that the Crown is the sole fountain of honour.

Passing into the grand entrance, under a sculpture of the royal arms of Scotland, the visitor has on his left hand




FIG. 2.—PLAN OF GROUND FLOOR, HOLYROOD PALACE.

what is usually called James V.'s tower, but should be properly called James IV.'s, as there is good evidence to prove that it was begun by that monarch before 1501. It is the only part of the present building older than 1672. On his right is the tower erected in that year to correspond with the other, the whole front measuring

215 ft. in length. He is now in the quadrangle designed by Sir William Bruce, built to the order of Charles II., measuring 94 ft. square, and consisting of three storeys, the court being surrounded by a piazza of nine arches




FIG. 3.—PLAN OF FIRST FLOOR, HOLYROOD PALACE.

on the east, north, and south sides respectively. On the inside of the arcade is the inscription

FVN : BE : RO : MYLNE : MM : 1671 :

That is, “Founded by Robert Mylne, Master Mason, 1671.” The architect’s original design for these façades

was more ornate than the somewhat severe style which they now exhibit; but the Lords of the Treasury were inexorable, and cut down the expenses upon a Palace which, as it turned out, Charles II. was never to see.

Turning to the left upon entering the west front of the Palace, the visitor passes along the colonnade to the north side of the quadrangle, enters the first door he comes to, and ascends a staircase which is remarkable only for its wrought-iron railing, dating from the seventeenth century, and exhibiting a bold design of crowned thistles. Opening off the landing is what was designed as a Council Chamber in the Palace, built by Sir William Bruce for Charles II., but it is now known as

### The Picture Gallery,

from the spurious portraits of one hundred Scottish kings which line the walls. These effigies were executed in fulfilment of a contract, dated 26th February 1684, between Hugh Wallace, his Majesty's Cashkeeper, on the one part, and "James de Witte, Painter, Indwellar in the Cannogate," on the other; whereby the said James "binds and obligeis him to compleatly draw, finish and perfyte The Pictures of the haill Kings who have Reigned over this Kingdome of Scotland, from King Fergus the first King, to King Charles the Second, our Gracious Soveraigne who now Reignes Inclusive, being all in number One hundred and ten, . . . and to make them like unto the Originalls which are to be given to him." It was stipulated that the portraits were to be finished "in large Royall postures" within two years, the artist's fees being at the rate of £120 per annum. Originally in hanging frames, the canvasses were badly slashed by the sabres of Hawley's

dragoons, who, having been routed by Prince Charlie's Highlanders at Falkirk on 17th January 1746, vented their ill-humour upon these works of art. The pictures were subsequently removed from the frames, repaired, and fixed in the panels of the wainscoting. Part of de Witt's duty was to inscribe each portrait with the name of the subject, "the names of the Kings most famous in large characters, and the remanent in lesser characters." All the likenesses and many of the very names of the earlier monarchs are fictitious ; others represent but the kings of the various divisions—Pictish, Scottish, Cumbrian, &c.—which cannot be considered as consolidated into a single realm until Malcolm Ceanmor defeated and slew Macbeth in 1057. No doubt, in depicting some of the later kings de Witt had authentic originals to work from.

The catalogue, taken for what it is worth, is as follows, the figures within parentheses being those inscribed by de Witt, who is not responsible for the grotesque chronological jumble of the present arrangement :—

- 1 (97) Robert I., "the Bruce," 1306-29 ; restored Scottish independence.
- 2 (47) Congallus II., 558. Probably Conall the son of Comgall, King of Dalriada. Died in 574.
- 3 (57) Eugenius VI., 688.
- 4 (56) Eugenius V., 684.
- 5 (100) Robert II., 1371-90.
- 6 (61) Etfinus, 730.
- 7 (60) Mordacus, 715.
- 8 (64) Solvathius, 767.
- 9 (96) John Baliol, 1292-96 ; dethroned by Edward I.
- 10 (101) Robert III., 1390-1406.

11 (36) Romachus, 348.

12 (102) James I., 1424-37; murdered at Perth.

13 (91) Donaldus I., 199. Erroneously inscribed David I. [See No. 66.]

14 (59) Eugenius VII., 699.

15 (63) Fergus III., 764.

16 (62) Eugenius VIII., 761.

17 (103) James II., 1437-1460; killed at the siege of Roxburgh Castle.

18 (68) Alpinus, 831; slain in battle at Pitelpin, 834.

19 (67) Dungallus *sive* Dugallus, 824.

20 (66) Convallus III., 819.

21 (104) James III., 1460-1488; murdered at Milton of Bannockburn.

22 (73) Gregory, 876; properly Ceric or Grig; expelled in 889; died at Dundurn, 896.

23 (71) Constantinus II., 859.

24 (70) Donald V., 854.

25 (105) James IV., 1489-1513; killed at Flodden.

26 (79) Culenas, 966; properly Culen Finn or White Colin; killed by the Britons, 971.

27 (72) Ethus, *cognomento* Alipes (that is, Wing-footed), 874.

28 (75) Constantine III., 904.

29 (106) James V., 1513-1542; father of Mary Queen of Scots.

30 (89) Edgar, 1097-1107.

31 (80) Kenneth III., 970; slain in civil war on the Earn in 1005.

32 (76) Malcolm I., 943; slain near Fetteresso in 954.

33 (107) Mary Stuart, 1542; abdicated, 1567; executed at Fotheringhay, 1587.

34 (95) Alexander III., 1249; killed by a fall from his horse near Kinghorn, 1285.

35 (94) Alexander II., 1214-1249.

36 (90) Alexander I., "the Fierce," 1107-1124.

37 (108) James VI., 1567-1625; succeeded to the throne of England, 1603.

38 (83) Malcolm II., 1005-1034.

39 (82) Grimus, 996.

40 (74) Donald VI., 904.

41 (109) Charles I., 1625-1649; executed in London.

42 (86) Malcolm III., "Ceanmor" or Great-head, 1057-93; practically the first King of all Scotland; slain in Northumberland.

43 (85) Macbeth, 1041; slain at Lumphanan in 1057.

44 (52) Duncan I., 1034. The real date of his accession as King of the Cumbrian Britons was *c.* 1018; slain by Macbeth in 1040.

45 (110) Charles II., crowned at Scone in 1651, and at Westminster in 1661; died in 1685.

46 (52) Ferchardus I., 621.

47 (111) James VII. and II., 1685; dethroned, 1688.

48 (93) William "the Lion," 1165-1214.

49 (32) Donald II., 264.

50 (48) Kinnatellus, 569; probably intended for Conad Cerr—Kenneth the Left-handed—who ruled the Scots of Dalriada for three months about 607.

51 (88) Duncan II., 1094; murdered by direction of his uncle, Donald Bane.

52 (92) Malcolm IV., "the Maiden," 1153-65.  
 53 (35) Fincormacus, 301.  
 54 (77) Mainus, 291 B.C.  
 55 (98) David II., 1329-71.  
 56 (99) Edward Baliol, 1332; surrendered the kingdom to Edward III. of England in 1356.  
 57 (2) Feretharus, 305 B.C.  
 58 Fergus I., 330 B.C.  
 59 (5) Nothatus, 233 B.C.  
 60 (4) Dornadilla, 262 B.C.  
 61 (3) Indulfus, 969, son of Constantin. His actual reign was 954-963.  
 62 (18) Caratacus, 63.  
 63 (9) Josina, 169 B.C.  
 64  
 65 (6) Rutherus, 231 B.C.  
 66 (27) David I., 1124-1153; founder of the Abbey. This painting is wrongly inscribed Donaldus I., but the scene with the stag in the background clearly indicates whom it was intended to represent.<sup>1</sup>  
 67 (25) Ethodius I., 165.  
 68 (19) Corbredus I., 55.  
 69 (14) Evenus II., 77 B.C.  
 70 (40) Fergusius II., 404.  
 71 (15) Ederus, 60 B.C.  
 72 (65) Achaius, 787.  
 73 (11) Durstius, 10 B.C.  
 74 (12) Evenus I., 98 B.C.  
 75 (13) Gillus, 79 B.C.  
 76 (16) Evenus III., 12 B.C.

<sup>1</sup> See *Historical Sketch*, p. 71.

77 (20) Dardanus.  
 78 (24) Conarus, 149.  
 79 (23) Mogaldus, 113.  
 80 (22) Lugtacus, 110.  
 81 (21) Corbredus (Galdus), 76.  
 82 (31) Findocus, 253.  
 83 (29) Athirco, 231.  
 84 (37) Angusianus, 321.  
 85 (33) Donald III., 265.  
 86 (34) Crathilinthus, 277.  
 87 (41) Eugenius II., 420.  
 88 (38) Fethemachus, 354.  
 89 (39) Eugenius I., 357.  
 90 (42) Dongardus, 451.  
 91 (44) Congallus I., 479.  
 92 (45) Goranus, 501.  
 93 (46) Eugenius III., 535.  
 94 (49) Aidanus, 570; inaugurated by St Columba;  
 died in 606.  
 95 (50) Kenneth I., 605.  
 96 (58) Amberkeletus, 697. His true name was  
 Ainbhceallach; slain in 719 by his brother  
 Selvach.  
 97 (54) Ferchardus II., 646. Ferchar fada, Far-  
 quhar the Tall, father of Ainbhceallach  
 and Selvach; King of Dalriadic Scots;  
 died in 697.  
 98 (55) Malduinus, 664.  
 99 (69) Kennethus II., 834, conqueror of the Picts.  
 Kenneth Macalpin; died in 860.  
 100 (51) Eugenius IV., 606. Probably Ewen or  
 Eugene, King of Strathclyde.  
 James VII. and II.

The visitor probably will give but fleeting attention to this collection, and will pass forward to examine a work of rare merit, which is displayed upon two oaken stands in the middle of the floor, namely—

### The Portraits of James III. and his Queen, Margaret of Denmark.

This painting is on both sides of two panels of fir, covered with gypsum, each measuring inside the frames about 6 ft. 10 in. by 3 ft. 8 in. The subject, the identity of the persons represented, the artist, and the original arrangement of the pieces, have been matter of animated discussion among experts in history and art. It is needless to mention all the divergent views which have been propounded from time to time ; those, probably, will come nearest the truth who accept the opinion expressed by Mr James Caw, Curator of the Scottish National Portrait Gallery, in his monumental work on Scottish portraits.<sup>1</sup>

First, as to the personages represented. On the front of the right panel (left as you look at it) is James III. kneeling, a figure of St Andrew standing behind him supporting the crown upon the King's head, which has caused these paintings to be known popularly as a coronation piece ; but James III. was only nine years old when he was crowned at Kelso in 1460—nine years before his marriage with Margaret of Denmark, whose portrait appears in the corresponding panel. It has been surmised that in St Andrew was represented Schevey, Archbishop of St Andrews ; but, as observed by the late Mr David Laing, the painting bears no resemblance to the fine medallion

<sup>1</sup> *Scottish Portraits.* Edinburgh, 1902.

portrait of that prelate by an Italian artist. A youth kneeling behind the King is probably his son, afterwards James IV., who was more than twenty years younger than his father—a considerably greater difference in age than that indicated in the picture. But, as Mr Caw has pointed out, “as this altar-piece was probably painted in Flanders from material supplied by the donor, Sir Edward Bonkil, the apparent ages of king and prince are not of first-class importance. Moreover, the anomaly of representing even a very young prince as of older years is not unknown in fifteenth and sixteenth century art.”

On the front of the second panel Queen Margaret is shown kneeling. Behind her stands a saint in plate armour, holding a standard in his left hand charged with a red cross and the inscription *Ave Maria*. His right hand is extended, as if indicating delivery of the Princess to her adopted realm. The kingdoms of Norway, Sweden, and Denmark at the time of this marriage, 1469, were united under one crown ; it is doubtful, therefore, whether this figure may represent Cnut, patron saint of Denmark, or Olaf, patron of Norway. The identity of the Princess is put beyond all doubt by the lozenge on the cover of her *prie-dieu*, displaying the royal arms of Scotland impaled with those of the triple kingdom of Scandinavia.

Turning to the reverse of the King’s panel, we find a powerful representation of the Trinity—the Father seated on a golden throne, with a crystal sphere rolling at his feet, supporting the crucified Son, above whose head hovers the Holy Spirit in the form of a dove.

The back of the Queen’s panel displays an ecclesiastic on his knees, with an angel seated at the organ behind him, and another angel standing at the back of the organ. An escutcheon displayed on the organ-seat bears the arms

of Sir Edward Bonkil,<sup>1</sup> the subject of the portrait, first Provost of Trinity College, and confessor to its founder, Mary of Gueldres, widow of James II. This panel is accounted the finest piece of painting in the whole composition.

So much for the personages represented in this beautiful painting. As to the occasion for which it was painted, we




FIG. 4.—ARMS OF MARGARET, QUEEN OF SCOTLAND, A.D. 1469.

may dismiss the idea that it was the coronation of Queen Margaret. It appears to be a votive piece, executed to the order of Provost Bonkil, and dedicated by him as an altar-piece in the Church of the Holy Trinity, built by Mary of Gueldres to commemorate her husband, James II., who was killed at the siege of Roxburgh Castle in

<sup>1</sup> The prefix "Sir" does not here indicate secular knighthood, but the honorary title commonly accorded to priests as "the Pope's knights."

1460. Queen Mary died in 1463, when no more than the choir and transept of the church were built. Mr David Laing suggested that the angel wearing a diadem, seated at the organ in the portrait of Bonkil, represented the deceased Queen, but that cannot be considered as more than ingenious conjecture. The whole composition may be understood to depict the King and Queen of Scots and the Heir-Apparent, supported by the patron saints of their respective countries, worshipping the Holy Trinity, to whom the church was dedicated, and whose simulacrum, whether carved or painted, probably formed the subject of the centre-piece. This centre-piece has disappeared—perhaps destroyed as idolatrous in the fervour of the Reformation. When these folding panels were closed in front of the centre-piece, Provost Bonkil, on the reverse of the Queen's panel, would appear adoring the Holy Trinity depicted on the reverse of the King's panel.

Assuming that the youth kneeling behind the King represents Prince James, who was born in 1473, and that the painter followed precedent by giving him an indefinite age, the composition appears to date not later than 1476, when the King's second son was born, also named James,<sup>1</sup> else he, too, would have been included in the group.

This fine painting has been attributed to a variety of masters. The first mention of it as part of the royal collection occurs among the Public Records, apparently of date about 1623 or 1624, in a document entitled “A Note of all such Pictures as your Highness [James VI. and I.] hath at this present, done by severall Famous Masters owne hands, by the Life: *In primis*, King James the Third

<sup>1</sup> Afterwards Duke of Ross, Archbishop of St Andrews at the age of twenty-one, and Chancellor of Scotland at the age of twenty-six. Died aged twenty-seven.

of Scotland, with his Queene, doun by Joan Vanek [Jan Van Eyck]." After that period the identity both of portraits and painter became confused, and gave rise to considerable controversy. In a catalogue of pictures at Hampton Court, compiled during the brief reign of James VII. and II. [1685-88], the altar-piece appears as follows :—

No. 955 One of the Kings of Scotland at devotion, crowned by St Andrew ; James the Fourth.  
No. 960 One of the Queens of Scotland at devotion ; a Saint in armour by her.

When William III. bought Nottingham House in 1691 and transformed it into Kensington Palace, it was furnished with pictures from St James's, Windsor, and Hampton Court. Accordingly, in Faulkner's *History of Kensington* [1820, pp. 516, 517] these panels are mentioned as hanging in the Queen's dining-room, are described as portraits of James IV. of Scotland and his brother Alexander [he had no brother of that name] and of Margaret his Queen, and are assigned to a painter of the fifteenth century, although the marriage of James IV. did not take place till 1503. In 1836 they were taken back to Hampton Court, where they remained till 1857, when, in compliance with the prayer of a memorial prepared by the late David Laing and the late W. B. Johnstone, R.S.A., Queen Victoria was graciously pleased to restore this historic work of art to Holyrood.

Now the attribution of the work to Van Eyck is obviously wrong, for that master died shortly after 1440. After examining all the evidence in favour of other painters, Mr Caw concludes that "Hugo van der Goes seems the most likely to have executed these panels. His work is

exceedingly rare. . . . The famous Portinari altar-piece, now in the picture gallery of the Hospital S. Maria Nuova, Florence, which is mentioned by Vasari, and is dated by M. Wauters 1470-75, seems the only one upon the authenticity of which experts agree." He proceeds to point out many features in which the Portinari and the Holyrood compositions resemble each other. Van der Goes was dean of the Guild of Painters in Ghent, 1473-75; in 1476 he retired to the monastery of Rouge-Clôitre, and died in 1482.

It is indeed wonderful that this work of art escaped the destruction to which the zeal of Reformers doomed so much excellent work in Scotland. In 1567 Trinity College was conveyed by gift of the Crown to the Provost and Magistrates of Edinburgh; in 1574 the collegiate authorities condemned their own ancient seal as idolatrous, because "it contenis the ymage of the Trinitie efter the auld maner," and directed that a new one should be made. Now one of the compartments in this altar-piece represents the Trinity, wherefore it is well that it had been removed at the time of the transfer, probably to the Chapel Royal of Holyrood.<sup>1</sup>

This Picture Gallery was the scene of the grand ball given by Prince Charles Edward in 1745, so graphically described in the pages of *Waverley*. Since the Union it has been the place of assembly for the election of Scottish representative peers, and here also the Lord High Commissioner to the General Assembly of the Church of

<sup>1</sup> Not to be confounded with the Abbey Church, afterwards constituted the Chapel Royal. The "chapel royal of Halyrudhous," where mass was sung for Mary Queen of Scots, is believed to have stood on the south side of the old Palace, and was removed when Sir William Bruce erected the present one.

Scotland holds his annual levees. The Gallery measures 150 ft. in length, 24 ft. in breadth, and is about 20 ft. high.

On returning from the Picture Gallery to the staircase, the visitor enters through a door on the left what are known as

### Lord Darnley's Rooms,

which are situated in James V.'s tower, the only part of the building older than 1672. The first of these apartments is called the Audience Chamber, of which three of the four walls are covered with old tapestry representing nude boys at play, gathering fruit in rich landscapes. The pictures in this room are thus numbered and described :—

- 105 James Stuart, the Chevalier Saint George [1688-1766], when young.
- 106 James Crichton, scholar [1560-*c.* 1585], "The Admirable Crichton," known chiefly through Sir Thomas Urquhart's biography. Killed in a duel at Mantua. A version of this picture is at Airth.
- 107 King Charles II. in armour.
- 108 Anne of Denmark, Queen of James VI. and I.; full length; probably by Van Somer. The sacred monogram I.H.S. is curiously painted on the Queen's collar under her left ear.
- 109 James VI. and I., by Van Somer.
- 110 Queen Elizabeth of Bohemia [1596-1662]; daughter of James VI. and I., mother of Prince Rupert and Prince Maurice, and grandmother of George I. Painted on copper by Cornelius Janssen; dated 1624.
- 111 Frederick V., King of Bohemia, husband of No. 110. Painted on oak panel; attributed to Cornelius Janssen.
- 112 The children of Charles I., after Sir Anthony Van Dyck.
- 113 King Charles II., by Theodore Russel; painted on oak panel.

- 114 King James VII. and II., by Theodore Russel ; painted on oak panel.
- 115 Lady unknown, sixteenth century.
- 116 Henry Prince of Wales, elder brother of Charles I.
- 117 Female Head.

From this apartment a door opens into a square one in the new Palace, formerly called

### The Duchess of Hamilton's Drawing-Room.

It has a fine ceiling, with a circular panel within a wreath of good plasterwork, and the initials C. R., crowned, in the corners. On the walls are two pieces of old tapestry, one representing the vision of the flaming cross vouchsafed to Constantine the Great shortly before his battle with Maxentius under the walls of Rome in A.D. 312, and the other showing the said battle in progress. The pictures in oval frames probably belong to a set painted to the order of James VII. and II. from originals elsewhere.

- 118 Portrait of James Douglas, 4th Duke of Hamilton [1658-1712], leader of the opposition to the Union in the last Scottish Parliament ; killed in a duel in Hyde Park by Lord Mohun, 15th November 1712.
- 119 Lady Anne Spencer, Duchess of Hamilton, daughter of the 2nd Earl of Sunderland.
- 120 Henry, 2nd Earl of Pembroke, [1534?-1601]. One of the 36 commissioners appointed by Queen Elizabeth to try Queen Mary. A fine painting.
- 121 William, 2nd Duke of Hamilton [1616-1651] ; Secretary of State for Scotland, 1640-3 and 1646 ; mortally wounded at the battle of Worcester.
- 122 King James VI. and I.
- 123 King Charles II.
- 124 A whole-length portrait, probably James, 5th Duke of Hamilton [died 1743] ; apparently painted by Allan Ramsay.

125 William, 3rd Duke of Hamilton ; died in 1694.

126 King James VII. and II.

127 James, 2nd Marquess of Hamilton, High Commissioner to the Scottish Parliament, 1621 ; Lord Steward, 1624 ; said to have been poisoned by Buckingham, whose French policy he opposed, in 1625. Several whole-length versions of this picture exist — at Hampton Court, at Hopetoun House, and at Hamilton.

128 King Henry VI.

129 Formerly said to be John, Lord Belasyse [1614-1689], but now believed to be Thomas Killigrew the elder [1612-1683], page to Charles I. ; dramatist ; groom of the bed-chamber and master of the revels to Charles II. Built a play-house on the site now occupied by Drury Lane Theatre.

Returning now to the older part of the building, the visitor passes through Lord Darnley's Audience Chamber, and enters what is reputed to have been

### Lord Darnley's Bedroom,

hung with tapestry in design and substance similar to that in the Audience Chamber. It should be noted that all this tapestry probably was introduced at a period long subsequent to the reign of Queen Mary, perhaps when the new Palace was built in 1672-79. In the fireplace may be noted some excellent old Dutch tiles, half concealed by an eighteenth-century grate.

131 William, 2nd Duke of Hamilton, mortally wounded at the battle of Worcester in 1651. Both this and No. 133 are versions of Hanneman's portrait of this Duke at Windsor, which is signed, and dated 1650.

132 Lord Darnley and his brother Charles Stuart, afterwards Earl of Lenox, father of Lady Arabella Stuart, who died a prisoner in the Tower in 1615. This painting

is a larger version of one at Windsor Castle, which was appraised at £6 when the collection of Charles I. was sold by order of the Commonwealth. Both pictures are by Lucas de Heere, and at one time hung in Hampton Court. They differ from each other in details of background and position of the inscription, which runs as follows: "Thes be the sones of the Right Honorable therlle of Lenox and the Lady Margaret-Grace, Countes of Lenox and Angwyse: Henry Stewarde Lord Darnley and Dowglas, ætatis 17: Chariles Stewarde his brother, ætatis 6." The date of the Holyrood picture is 1562, that of the Windsor picture 1563; in spite of which Mr Caw considers the Windsor picture to be the original.

133 William, 2nd Duke of Hamilton. [See No. 131.]

134 St Francis of Assisi.

135 Portrait of a Lady.

136 Female figure and child.

137 Nymphs and Satyrs.

138 Sir William Hamilton [1730-1803], diplomatist. Grandson of William, 3rd Duke of Hamilton; plenipotentiary at Naples, 1764-1800; married Emma Hart, the "Mistress of the Attitudes."

139 Pastoral landscape, with ruins.

140 Mary II., Queen of England, Scotland, and Ireland [1662-1694], eldest daughter of James VII. and II., and sister of Queen Anne.

141 Margaret, Countess of Lenox [1515-1578], daughter of Archibald Douglas, 6th Earl of Angus, by Princess Margaret Tudor. Married Matthew Stewart, 4th Earl of Lenox, Regent of Scotland, and became mother of Henry, Earl of Darnley. Painted by Sir Anthony More [Antonio Moro].

142 Apparently a mathematician, long erroneously supposed to be John Knox.

143 Said to be a portrait of Mary Queen of Scots, but the picture is signed by Lucas de Heere, dated 1565, and the age of the subject is stated to be 16. Mary was 23 in that year.

144 Lady Dorothy Sidney, 1st Countess of Sunderland [1617-1684], the "Sacharissa" of Edmund Waller.  
 145 King William III. in armour.

Opening out of this room is a turreted room known as

### Lord Darnley's Dressing Closet.

147 Lady Anne Cochrane, daughter of the 4th Earl of Dundonald; married in 1723 to James, 5th Duke of Hamilton, and died in the following year.  
 148 St Margaret.  
 148A Piazza di San Marco, Venice.

The corresponding turret of this tower communicates with what is known as

### Queen Mary's Private Stair,

a narrow newel flight, built in the thickness of the wall, which here amounts to  $7\frac{1}{2}$  ft., leading from the strongly vaulted basement and passing Darnley's apartments on the first floor to the second floor, where Queen Mary's suite of apartments remain. It was by this staircase that the conspirators against David Riccio ascended, first to Darnley's chambers, and thence to those of the Queen. The principal room in this suite, measuring 34 ft. by 22 ft., was

### Queen Mary's Chamber of Presence or Audience Chamber,

and contains one of the few internal features of the Palace which escaped alike destruction in the fire of 13th November 1650, alteration in the rebuilding undertaken by Cromwell, and, lastly, the sweeping reconstruction by Sir

William Bruce in 1672-79. The feature in question is the ceiling of this Audience Chamber, the decoration of which fixes its own date with singular accuracy. It is divided into sixteen panels, whereof the central group of four contain coats of arms, showing that the whole design was intended to commemorate the alliance of the House of Stuart, in the person of Mary Queen of Scots, with the Houses of Lorraine and Valois in that of François, Dauphin of France, afterwards King François II. The intersection of the four central panels is surmounted by a lozenge showing eight heraldic quarters, with the alerions or eaglets of Lorraine on an "escutcheon of pretence." These are the arms of Mary of Lorraine, wife of James V. and mother of Mary Queen of Scots, the lozenge being the correct substitute for a shield, denoting a widow. The first of the four panels shows the lilies of France, being the arms of Henri II., with the initials H. R. Next below this are the arms of his son the Dauphin, being the lilies quartered with the dolphin of Dauphiné, and the initials F. D. In the panel beside King Henri's are the royal arms of Scotland—the lion rampant within the double tressure—and the initials I. R. for James V., father of Queen Mary. Below, in the next panel, the same arms are repeated, but on a lozenge, as indicating a female, with Mary's initials, M. R. Of the remaining panels eleven are filled with the initials I. R. and M. R., crowned, like the shields of arms, and like them set within circular wreaths of renaissance design; while the twelfth panel contains a wreath of similar design, but ornamented with a crescent at top and bottom, and a fleur-de-lys at each side, and containing a plain cross under a crown. The meaning of this last device, which was repeated a hundred years later on the ceiling of the bed-chamber next door, has been the subject of some

controversy. Perhaps it may indicate the Holy Rood, whence the Palace and Abbey were named. To a heraldic student the date of this ceiling is expressed as clearly as if written in Arabic numerals. It must be between 20th April 1558, when Mary married the Dauphin François, and 10th July 1559, when François succeeded his father Henri II., and, of course, ceased to bear the arms of Dauphiné. This Presence Chamber, which is hung with faded tapestry, contains a large catafalque bed, with hangings of embossed velvet, much decayed. Such a piece of furniture is incongruous with the original purpose of the chamber, and is believed to have been placed there for Charles I. during his residence in the Palace. Prince Charles Edward slept in it during his brief but brilliant sojourn at Holyrood in 1745, and the following spring it received the person of his conqueror, the Duke of Cumberland, when on his way south from Culloden.

Until recently the south end of this apartment was disfigured by a wooden partition, screening the entrance and cutting through the design of the ceiling. Tradition affirmed that this was erected by order of Queen Mary in order to screen the place where the wretched Riccio expired under the daggers of his assassins. The exact spot is now marked by a brass plate in the floor. A dark stain, explained as being that of the Italian's blood, was hacked away long ago by the knives of unscrupulous curiosity-hunters. The partition, now happily removed by direction of the Office of Works, was probably put up when the rooms were being renovated for occupation by Charles I., or even later, when Sir William Bruce was connecting his new Palace with the old tower.

In the south wall of this chamber is a deep recess, usually termed Queen Mary's private oratory. It has

been suggested that it was originally a window in the tower, but the sides have little splay, while there is no splay shown in Mylne's plan prepared in 1672 for Sir William Bruce. When the new Palace was built this recess formed a passage to it from the tower, but that is now closed. It is not improbable that it served the purpose of an oratory, and if that was so, it may be imagined that the painted alabaster now preserved in the supper-room was set before the *prie-dieu*. The ceiling of this recess is richly carved, painted, and gilt, the white cross of St Andrew on its azure field being set within a wreath of late renaissance design.

It was in this Chamber of Presence that Queen Mary used to hold her famous disputation with John Knox. The furniture, for the most part, dates, like the bed, from the reign of Charles I. The pictures are numbered thus:—

- 146 Mary, Duchess of Hamilton, daughter of William Feilding, 1st Earl of Denbigh, and wife of James, 1st Duke of Hamilton.
- 149 Battle of the Boyne.
- 150 Head of a boy.
- 151 James Stuart, Earl of Moray [1531-1570], Regent of Scotland; natural son of James V. and half-brother of Mary Queen of Scots. Murdered at Linlithgow by James Hamilton of Bothwellhaugh in 1570. On panel; a good painting of the French School.
- 152 Hortense Machini, niece of Cardinal Mazarin.
- 153 A Magdalene.
- 154 Bacchic scene.
- 155 A game at nine-pins.
- 156 John Maitland, Duke of Lauderdale [1616-1682], taken at the battle of Worcester and imprisoned 1651-1660. Secretary for Scotland 1660-80, directing Charles II.'s whole policy for that country. In crayon.

157 Elizabeth Murray, Countess of Dysart, married Sir Lionel Tollemache in 1647 and the Duke of Lauderdale in 1672. One of the beauties of Charles II.'s Court. Died in 1697. In crayon.

Opening out of the Audience Chamber is

### Queen Mary's Bedroom,


an apartment measuring 22 feet by 18½ feet, with two windows looking south and west. The whole of the fittings and decoration of this room have been renovated in the seventeenth century, although the bed, hung with what was once crimson damask, fringed and tasselled with green, is alleged to have been that once occupied by Queen Mary. The flat timber ceiling is adorned with heraldic bearings and badges,—the portcullis of Westminster, the harp of Ireland, the rose, the thistle, and the red cross of St George, all crowned, together with the initials C. R. and C. P.—*Carolus Rex* and *Carolus Princeps*—with the feathers of the Prince of Wales. I. R. and M. R. appear to stand for James VII. and II. and his second wife, Mary of Modena, whom he married in 1673. The walls are hung with tapestry representing the fall of Phaëton. In this room is preserved a lady's work-box, with rich embroidery on the exterior, said to be Queen Mary's own handiwork. Inside are some curious relics—a black felt cap, said to have belonged to Queen Mary's father, James V., a gauntlet said to have been Darnley's, a lachrymatory, &c.

158 Queen Elizabeth. This portrait is said to have been a birthday gift from Elizabeth to her cousin Queen Mary; but it is considered to belong to the school of Gheeraedts, a painter who did not come to England

A. A. Inglis, Edinburgh.

FIG. 5.—QUEEN MARY'S BED-CHAMBER.

From photograph by



till 1580, when Mary was Elizabeth's prisoner. A version of this picture, with variations in the background, has been discovered lately at Siena, and is supposed to have been a present to the Grand Duke about 1588. In both pictures, on the edge of the colander in the Queen's left hand, is the puzzling inscription: *A terra il ben il mal dimora in sella*—i.e., "The good [falls] to the ground, the evil remains in the saddle." This might appear at first sight to be a sarcastic allusion to the fate of Queen Mary compared with that of Queen Elizabeth, but the repetition of the inscription on the Siena painting puts that out of the question. The reference seems to be to the action of the colander in sifting the good from the worthless.

159 Henry VIII.

160 Elizabeth of York, Queen of Henry VII.

161 A picture said to represent Mary Queen of Scots.

In the south-west corner of the bed-chamber a narrow door gives access to

### Queen Mary's Dressing-Closet,

about  $10\frac{1}{2}$  feet square, hung with decayed tapestry; and another door in the north-east corner of the bed-chamber leads to the diminutive apartment called

### Queen Mary's Supper-Room.

It is no more than a closet, yet does it possess a tragic interest out of proportion to its dimensions; for it was here that Mary sat at supper, with Lady Argyll, Lord Robert Stuart, and David Riccio, on the night of the 13th February 1565, when Darnley burst in upon the little party, followed by Ruthven, the rest of the con-

spirators remaining outside till the hated Italian was haled out, dragged through the bed-chamber, and done to death at the farther end of the Audience Chamber beyond. Hither returned Ruthven after the deed to claim a cup of wine, for he had barely recovered from severe illness. The Queen made as though she would cry for help from the window, whereupon a Scottish gentleman declared he would "cut her into collops" if she stirred.

The only pictures in this room are—

162 Portrait of a youth, after a painting by Parmeggiano now at Windsor Castle.

130 An ecclesiastic of the seventeenth century, long, but erroneously, supposed to be Cardinal Beaton.

Here is an exceedingly beautiful painting on a slab of alabaster, measuring  $22\frac{1}{4}$  in. by  $16\frac{1}{4}$  in., which has been broken to fragments and but indifferently repaired. Apparently by a Spanish painter, it represents the Virgin Mary, clothed in blue and red, trampling under foot a dragon, the emblem of sin. It was not improbably an altar-piece in Queen Mary's private chapel. As for the block of white marble upon which this work of art is set at the time of writing, it used to be shown as the altar-step upon which Queen Mary knelt at her marriage with Darnley. Unluckily for tradition, which is nowhere less trustworthy than at Holyrood, the true origin of this stone was explained by the late Mr Charles Mackie :—

"We know the whole history of this pretended relic. It was introduced by Mr Meyer, French cook to the Duke of Hamilton, having brought it from Hamilton Palace prior to the birth of Lady Susan Hamilton, to knead his pastry on, marble being preferable for that culinary process; and the other servants having had it expelled the

kitchen as too cumbrous, in the course of time it has undergone an historical metamorphosis, and is unblushingly represented as the coronation seat of Queen Mary ! ”<sup>1</sup>

Reviewing the general arrangement of the apartments in this tower, it seems clear that it has undergone no important structural change. The immense thickness of the walls has repelled the repeated conflagrations which destroyed the Abbey Church and the rest of the old Palace. The vaulted basement remains as originally constructed. The window openings of Lord Darnley’s suite on the first floor have been enlarged: Gordon of Rothiemay’s sketch in 1650 show them small and prison-like.<sup>2</sup> Queen Mary’s suite on the second floor retains its original disposition, although all the interior fittings, except the ceiling of the Audience Chamber, have been replaced by seventeenth-century work.

On the third floor, immediately above the Queen’s apartments, is a chamber long used as a jail. At what period it was devoted to this lugubrious purpose there is no evidence to show,—perhaps after James VI. and I. took his departure after the union of the Crowns, although it is to be noted that in 1515 the Duke of Albany imprisoned the Earl of Home in Holyrood before bringing him to trial for high treason. Marjoreybanks, in his *Annals*, says that Home was committed “to the auld toure of Holyrudhouss, which was founded by the same Duke,” which does not help us much; because, supposing that Albany, who certainly directed some building in Holyrood, was the actual author of what is known as James V.’s tower, how could it have been an “auld toure” in 1515, only two

<sup>1</sup> *The Castles, Palaces, and Prisons of Mary of Scotland*, by Charles Mackie (1854), p. 200.

<sup>2</sup> See fig. 13, p. 121.

years after James IV.'s death? Probably the reference was to the "fair-werk" or gatehouse described on page 1, the cells in which were used as a prison until the debtors' sanctuary fell into disuse. A private staircase in the thickness of the wall leads from Queen Mary's Audience Chamber to a point opposite the jail door. There is nothing more of interest before reaching the roof, only some store-rooms full of lumber, decayed furniture, &c.

### The Royal Apartments.

Although these are not open to inspection by the public, a brief survey of their character and arrangement may not be deemed out of place. Access is given from the east end of the Picture Gallery to the suite renovated in 1857 for the residence of Queen Victoria and her Consort. The first apartment is called

### The Queen's Breakfast-Room,

measuring 24 feet by 19 feet 8 inches, and in height 16½ feet. The decoration dates from the seventeenth century, the ceiling being coved and deeply coffered, with a circular panel in the centre, and the ornaments are of fine plaster-work. The walls are partly panelled with oak, the chimney-piece being of the same material, richly carved. Beyond is

### The Vestibule,

a small square room, panelled with oak, the ceiling being domed, painted blue with silver stars. Next in order is

### Prince Albert's Dressing-Room,

measuring 26 feet 5 inches by 24 feet. The doors are deeply carved, as is the mantelpiece, and in the centre of

the ceiling is an oval panel, painted with a representation of the expulsion of Vulcan from Olympus.

### Queen Victoria's Bedroom

is hung with tapestry representing the destruction of Niobe's children and other mythical subjects. The panel in the centre of the ceiling is octagonal. After this comes

### The Queen's Drawing-Room,

measuring 38 feet 6 inches by 29 feet 8 inches. Like the other rooms in this suite, it is 16½ feet high. The ceiling is a fine bit of plasterwork, with the initials C. R. in the corner panels and the monogram of Victoria and Albert in the central panel. The oak mantelpiece is well carved, and on the walls hang pieces of tapestry showing some of the adventures of Diana. The windows of all these rooms look upon the grounds to the east of the Palace.

### The Evening Drawing-Room

is a slightly larger apartment, measuring 40 feet by 30 feet. Its windows open upon the interior of the quadrangle. Four pieces of tapestry on the walls were brought here from Buckingham Palace. The decoration of the ceiling is of the same character as that of the other rooms, but in

### The Throne Room

the ceiling is plain. This apartment, measuring 56 feet by 29 feet, was used by Queen Victoria as a dining-room. At one end is the throne, erected for the levees of George IV. in 1822, and occupied for the same purpose by Edward VII.

in 1903. Wilkie's full-length portrait of George IV. in Highland dress hangs opposite the throne; over the fireplace is Queen Victoria, painted by Sir George Hayter; to the left of the fireplace is Van Somer's portrait of James I. and VI., dated 1615, and that of his Queen, Anne of Denmark, attributed to the same artist, but probably a copy by Belchamp of the original formerly in Hampton Court. To the right of the fireplace is a portrait by an unknown artist of James II. and VII., and one of his wife, Anne Hyde, perhaps by Lely.

By far the most important picture in the Palace is a painting by Levinus (? Vogelnarius), representing King James VI. at his father's tomb, and known as "the Darnley Memorial Picture." The Earl and Countess of Lennox, parents of Darnley, James VI. and his brother Charles, sons of Darnley, are represented kneeling before an altar in a chapel containing the effigy of the murdered Prince, and praying for vengeance on the assassins. In the lower left-hand corner is a painting of the surrender of Queen Mary to the Confederate Lords at Carberry. This famous picture, of which there is a French version at Goodwood, passed by marriage into the possession of the Earl of Pomfret, who presented it to George II. in 1738, and in 1900 it was sent to Holyrood by command of Queen Victoria.

The Throne Room opens upon the landing of the grand staircase, where is a door leading to what used to be Prince Albert's Drawing-room.

## The Abbey Church, now designated the Chapel Royal.

THE roofless ruin which still goes by the name of the Chapel Royal is all that remains of the Abbey Church built by David I. between 1128 and 1141, and reconstructed by Abbot Crawfurd in the latter part of the fifteenth century.<sup>1</sup> It formed the nave of the original structure, and was the scene of many imposing ceremonies and memorable events, as described in the Historical Sketch in the latter part of this volume.

Standing before the western or main entrance, one notes how grievously the symmetry of the façade has been destroyed by the encroachment of the seventeenth-century Palace, which has wholly effaced one of the western towers. The full effect of this mutilation would not be apparent at the time it was perpetrated, because the entire west front of the Abbey Church was then screened by a house occupied by, if not built for, Queen Mary's half-brother, Lord Robert Stuart, Commendator of Holyrood, to the north of and communicating with James V.'s tower.<sup>1</sup> Of the removal of this house we have no certain information. It must have remained erect till well into the nineteenth century, for it is plainly shown in Edward Blore's drawing published in 1826.

The remaining north-west tower of the Abbey Church

<sup>1</sup> Usually referred to as Regent Moray's House; but Moray almost certainly lived in the house of Croft-an-righ, still inhabited.




FIG. 6.—WESTERN FRONT OF THE ABBEY CHURCH  
OF HOLYROOD.

*From photograph*

*by A. A. Inglis, Edinburgh.*

bears testimony to the barbarous nature of the treatment to which the building has been subjected, for it is a fine example of first pointed or early thirteenth century Gothic, 24 feet square, without buttresses. Its western side carries two tiers of arcades, continued upon the southern re-entrance to the doorway. The arches of the lower arcade rest upon triple shafts with carved capitals and rounded abaci. Above each group of shafts and between the arches is carved a disc carrying a boldly carved human head,—an unusual arrangement, of which the effect is very striking.

The west doorway remains a magnificent piece of work of the same period, badly as it is jostled by Sir William Bruce's renaissance palace, and severely as much of the carving has suffered through weather and violence. But the window above the door, which may have been a great rose, was replaced when the church was being prepared for the coronation of Charles I. in 1638 by a pair of windows in the deplorable Gothic of the seventeenth century. Between them a tablet was inserted by command of that king, bearing a legend of double irony, considering his own fate and the present plight of the building.

HE SHALL BUILD ANE HOUSE  
FOR MY NAME, AND I WILL  
STABLISH THE THRONE  
OF HIS KINGDOM  
FOR EVER.

BASILICAM HANC SEMI-  
RUTAM CAROLUS REX  
OPTIMUS INSTAURAVIT  
ANNO DONI  
MDCXXXIII.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> The most excellent King Charles restored this half-ruined church A.D. 1633.




FIG. 7.—HOLYROOD PALACE, SHOWING LORD ROBERT STUART'S HOUSE.

FROM A DRAWING BY BLORE, PUBLISHED 1826.

Visitors are admitted to the Chapel Royal from the north-east angle of the Palace quadrangle. On the left of this entry and within the church are two carved slabs, one bearing the arms of the Duke of Hamilton, Hereditary Keeper of the Palace, and therefore not earlier than 1646; the other a far older and more interesting piece of sculpture, being one of the stone panels removed from the exterior of James V.'s tower by order of the Parliamentary Commissioners in 1650. It bears the royal arms of Scotland, supported by a unicorn, which also carries the banner of St Andrew. The ground of the panel is decorated with thistles, finely designed, with the initials I. R. in base. Above these stones a massive piece of oak carving, no doubt originally painted and gilt, is fixed to the wall, much defaced. Formerly it was placed on the exterior over the west doorway, and bore the arms of Charles I. surrounded by the Garter.

In this south-west angle of the church may be seen a fragment of the vanished tower, with a doorway. Passing in front of the west doorway, and looking east, the visitor sees before him the nave of the Abbey Church as far as the crossing, the walls having been diminished in height by the fall of the roof and destruction of the clerestory in 1768. Of the crossing itself, only the two western piers remain, the arch between them being filled with a large window, and the place below the window built up with the materials of the choir and transepts when these were pulled down after 1569. If, as is probable, there was a tower or spire over the crossing, it had been removed before the sketch made in 1543 (fig. 12, p. 110). It may have been taken down in the course of Abbot Crawfurd's reconstruction c. 1460. This window was blown in by a gale in 1795 and not repaired till 1816,

when it was reconstructed from the old work still lying where it fell. It consists of five lights, with transom and quatrefoil tracery without caps. In like manner the eastern ends of the side aisles have been built across, leaving a window in the archway of each.

The nave contained eight bays in the first pointed style, of which the main piers remain complete on the south, as well as the vaulting of the south aisle; but the north aisle is roofless, only two shattered piers remaining on that side of the church.

The wall of the north aisle appears to be the oldest remaining work in the building, except the doorway, now built up, at the south-east angle of the nave, which formerly gave access to the church from the vanished cloister. The rich mouldings on the exterior of this doorway, of which the nook-shafts have disappeared, being of late Norman work, indicate that it was part of the original church founded by David I., built between 1128 and 1141. The round-headed window above this door, and that to the left of it, are restorations, probably representing genuine Norman work which they replaced. On the north side of the church, opposite this doorway, may be traced the transition from Norman work in a fine arcade of intersecting semi-circular arches along the north aisle, the shafts bearing abaci, with richly carved capitals. In the second bay from the west a north doorway has been inserted during the reconstruction of the church by Abbot Crawfurd, A.D. 1460-83. It has a semicircular arch under an ogee canopy on the exterior with eight niches, formerly containing images. On the interior face this doorway is undecorated, and would probably be concealed by tapestry or a curtain. The south side of the church has suffered much less than the northern one, the details being rather later in

character. The wall arcade in the south aisle consists of single arches of the first pointed period, the windows above them being single lancets, as in the north wall, but shortened externally by the roof of the cloister, which gives them long sloping sills on the inside. The vaulting of the south aisle is the only part of the roof of the church which remains: above this the triforium still stands, divided by two arches in each bay, each arch containing two smaller arches, with an inner trefoil arch forming the window.

Outside the south wall of the church, below the aisle windows and westward of the Norman doorway above mentioned, was the cloister walk, whereof the back wall is wrought into an arcade of large pointed arches, each enclosing five smaller ones, with round abaci and boldly carved capitals. Nothing remains to show whether the roof was groined.

The buttresses which form such a conspicuous feature on the exterior of the present ruin were part of Abbot Crawfurd's reconstruction in the fifteenth century. Each of the seven large buttresses on the north side carries a canopied niche, with carved panels above and below them, formerly enclosing coats of arms, now much defaced by time and weather. On the inner face of these buttresses may be seen the springing of flying arches supporting the clerestory; but these must have fallen with the roof. The buttresses on the south side are of different design, having been set outside the cloister walk and carried as flying arches over the cloister roof, while an upper series of flying arches connected them with the clerestory.

Returning to the western entrance, the visitor will note the newel staircase, still perfect, leading to the triforium, and formerly to the clerestory, now destroyed. The arches

of the triforium remain entire on the south side, but have been walled up when the building was adapted for use as a Presbyterian place of worship.

The sepulchral monuments and slabs will next claim attention. Numbered in succession from the west door along the south aisle, the more notable of these are indicated by black numerals on a plain white ticket. Permission to bury in the Abbey Church was vested in the Dukes of Hamilton as Hereditary Keepers.

No. 1. An altar tomb inscribed thus:—

Under this stone  
Are laid the remains of  
The late Right Honourable GEORGE, LORD REAY,  
And ELIZABETH FAIRLEY, his wife,  
In the grave thus undivided,  
As in life they were united  
In that Divine bond  
Of Christian Faith and Love,  
Which ennobled their earthly affection,  
By elevating each vow and desire  
In one undeviating course,  
Towards another and a better world.

GEORGE, LORD REAY, died 27th February 1768,  
Aged 34.

ELIZABETH, LADY REAY, died 10th November 1800,  
Aged 61.

This stone is Inscribed, January 1810,  
In token of grateful respect and affection,  
By their Daughters,  
The Honourable Mrs H. FULLARTON  
And the Honourable GEORGINA M'KAY.

No. 2. In the north-west tower is the mural monument of Robert Douglas, Viscount Belhaven, a peerage bestowed in 1633 on the occasion of Charles I.'s coronation in Holyrood, and not to be confused with the sub-

sequent creation in 1647 of Sir John Hamilton of Broomhill as Baron Belhaven, the viscountcy having expired with the death of Douglas in 1639. The monument is the work of the sculptor John Schurman, and presents the peer in robes and coronet, recumbent, but with head erect, as if listening for a summons. Above the figure is a biographical epitaph in Latin, of which the following is a translation:—

“Here are buried the remains of Robert, Lord Viscount Belhaven, Baron of Spot, &c., Councillor to King Charles and most intimate in his favour, by reason that formerly he had been most dear to Henry Prince of Wales, and Master of his Horse. But he being dead and Charles his brother now reigning, he [Douglas] was made Chamberlain to the King’s Household, was treated with singular favour, and advanced to great honours and wealth. In his youth he enjoyed the sweet society of Nicolas Murray, daughter to the Baron of Abercairney, his only wife; who lived with him not more than eighteen months, and died in child-bed with her child. When grievous old age overtook him, he withdrew from the turmoil of the Court, as though weary of bad times and customs, and returned to his own country. He appointed as his heirs Sir Archibald and Sir Robert Douglas, baronets, sons to his eldest brother [Douglas of Mains], dividing all his lands and goods equally between them, except some legacies; and they erected this monument to his memory, in token of their gratitude.

Nature by giving him sagacity supplied what his intellect lacked in education. He was inferior to none in a good capacity and candour. He would soon be angry, but as soon appeased. This was the one thing in his life which could scarcely be approved by all men. In loyalty to his prince, in love of his country, in kindness to his kindred, and in charity to the poor, he was remarkable. In prosperity he was meek and moderate; in adversity his constancy and magnanimity endured to his very end. He died in Edinburgh the 12th day of January, and from the Incarnation of the Messiah 1639, and of his age 66, being the third year above his great climacteric.”

No mention is made here either of a certain Miss Whalley of Northampton, by whom this exemplary gentleman had two illegitimate children, legitimated by letters

under the Great Seal in 1631, nor of an incident related by Bishop Burnet in the following words :—

“ In the third year of King Charles’s reign [1627-28] the Earl of *Nithisdale* . . . was sent down with a power to take the surrender of all church lands, and to assure all who did readily surrender that the King would take it kindly, and use them all very well, but that he would proceed with all rigour against those who would not submit their rights to his disposal. Upon his coming down, those who were most concerned in those grants met at *Edinburgh*, and agreed that when they were called together, if no other argument did prevail to make the Earl of *Nithisdale* desist, they would fall upon him and all his party in the old *Scotish* manner, and knock them on the head. *Primrose* told me one of these Lords, *Belhaven* of the name of *Dowglass*, who was blind, bid them set him by one of the party, and he would make sure of him. So he was set next the Earl of *Dunfrize*. He was all the time holding him fast ; and when the other asked him what he meant by that, he said, ever since the blindness was come on him he was in such fear of falling that he could not help the holding fast to those who were next him. He had all the while a poynard in his other hand, with which he had certainly stabbed *Dunfrize* if any disorder had happen’d.”

Probably the Bishop mistook the name of the hero of this incident, seeing that Douglas was not raised to the peerage until five or six years after the Act of Revocation, and no mention occurs elsewhere of his blindness.

Lady Belhaven died in London in 1612, and was buried in the Chapel of the Savoy, where there is a monument to her memory, and above it a recumbent figure of her husband.

No. 3. A broken slab with illegible inscription. Upon it are carved the figures of a cross and chalice, indicating an ecclesiastic.

Near this slab is a monument, not numbered, to Captain William Graham of Hilton, in Clackmannanshire, and his wife Margaret Stuart, probably of the family of Inner-

meth. The shield bears on the dexter side the chief and escallops of Graham, with a crescent in the field, impaled with the fess chequy of Stewart, with a fleur-de-lys in chief on the sinister. The initials C. W. G. and M. S. and the date 1656 accompany the shield, beneath which is a long epitaph, ending in a way which suggests that Captain Graham was a member of Parliament.

The world may burn,  
Yet shall his ashes from his urne  
Muster his out-side, and present  
Christ's all-monarchick parl'ment.

No. 4. A floriated cross, and base bearing the following inscription:—

“ Hic jacet Dns Robertus Cheyne, XII prior hujusce monasterij qui obiit XVII. die Sept. An. Dni. MCCCCLV.”

[Here lies Lord Robert Cheyne, twelfth Prior<sup>1</sup> of this Monastery, who died on the 17th day of September in the year of our Lord 1455.]

No. 5. A plain cross and calvary, with the following inscription:—

“ Hic jacet Marjoria Duncan uxor Thome Duncan qui obiit XVI. die me. Octob. A.D. MC\*\*\*.”

[Here lies Marjorie Duncan, wife of Thomas Duncan, who died on the 16th day of the month of October, MC\*\*\* : *year obliterated.*]

Mr Cutt says that the plain cross is very seldom found upon English monuments, having been considered the Cross of Shame, the floriated cross being the Cross of Glory. Out of one hundred examples given in his *Manual*, only one resembles the plain crosses at Holyrood.

No. 6. A slab inscribed round the margin—

“ Heir lyes ane honourable woman callit Margaret Erskin Lady Alerdes [Allardyce] and Bamff XVII. July 159[9].”

---

<sup>1</sup> Priors were Lords of Parliament.

In the centre of the stone is a shield between the initials M. E., bearing the arms of Erskine—a pale sable, charged for difference with a cross - crosslet, within a crescent. Below the shield are a skull, a bone, and the legend “Memento mori.”

This stone commemorates Margaret Erskine, who married, first, John Allardyce of that ilk, who was killed at the battle of Pinkie in 1547; secondly, William Stewart; and thirdly, George Ramsay of Bamff, who died in 1580.

No. 7. A plain slab without inscription, bearing incised figures of two double-handed swords, about five feet long, indicating, probably, the burial-place of two brothers.

No. 8. A floriated cross and calvary, without inscription.

No. 9—

“Heir lyis ane honest man Robert Votherspone Burgis and Deacon of ye Hammermen in ye Canogait, R. V. 1520.”

No. 10. A broken slab showing a plain cross and calvary, with a mallet surmounted by a crown on the dexter side, and another figure, now defaced, on the sinister side. The inscription is illegible, except the date 1543.

No. 11. The legend on this stone begins round the margin, and is continued across the face of it.

“Heir lyes ye noble and poton Lord James Douglas, Lord of Cairlell and Torthorall; wha married Dame Eliezabeth Cairlell, air and heretrix yarof; wha was slaine in Edinburghe ye xiii day of July in ye zeier of God 1608. Was slain in 48 ze.”<sup>1</sup>

Sir James Douglas of Parkhead was the eldest son of George Douglas of Parkhead, an illegitimate son of Sir George Douglas of Pittendriech, who was legitimate father of David 7th Earl of Angus, and of James 4th Earl of Morton, Regent of Scotland. Sir James therefore was nephew, though illegitimate, of the Regent Morton, to

<sup>1</sup> In his forty-eighth year.

avenge whose death on the scaffold in 1581 he slew Captain James Stewart of Newton, sometime Earl of Arran and Chancellor of Scotland, Morton's chief accuser. This was in 1596; the blood-feud ran on till 1608, when Captain William Stewart, nephew of the slain Chancellor, slew Sir James in the High Street of Edinburgh. Sir James Douglas's eldest son by his wife, the heiress of Carlyle and Torthorwald, was created Lord Carlyle of Torthorwald in 1609. Sir James's arms, impaled with those of Carlyle, have been carved below the epitaph; but of the figures on the shield only the three stars of Douglas remain traceable in the chief on the dexter side.

No. 12. A plain cross and calvary, with a pair of compasses over what looks like a book on the dexter side, and a carpenter's square over a mallet on the sinister side. Of the inscription all that can now be deciphered runs—"Hic jacet honorab: vir Iohannes . . . et . . . Anno dni 1543." It will be remembered that this was the year when the Abbey and Palace were wrecked and plundered by Hertford.

No. 13. A stone dated 1592. Beneath the date is a hammer surmounted by a crown, between the initials B. H. Beneath these is a version of the Hamilton arms, a galley with three cinquefoils in chief; and lowest of all, the usual emblems of mortality. Round the margin runs, "Heir lyis ane honest woman calet Marget Baxter spous to Bartel Hamelton Dakmaker<sup>1</sup> Burges of y<sup>e</sup> Canengait."

No. 14. The mural monument of George Wishart, Bishop of Edinburgh [1599-1671], commemorates one who suffered severely in the religious war of the seventeenth century. Taken prisoner by Leslie at Newcastle in 1644, he was sent to Edinburgh and thrust into the

<sup>1</sup> Pistol-maker: "dag" or "dak" being the old name for a pistol.

Thieves' Hole, the most poisonous part of the Tolbooth, and was not released for nearly a year.

On a shield within the pediment appear the arms of the see of Edinburgh, impaled with those of Wishart. The windy Latin epitaph is thus translated in Menteith's *Theater of Mortality* :—

“Another famous Doctor Wisehart, here  
 Divine George Wiseheart lies, as may appear ;  
 Great orator, with eloquence and zeal,  
 Whereby on hardest hearts he did prevail.  
 Three Wisehearts, Bishops, so the third was he,  
 When Bishop of fair Ed’nburgh’s diocie.  
 Candour in him was noble ; free of stain ;  
 In cases all, the same he did remain—  
 Above four hundred years great *Wiseheart’s* name,  
 For honours, has pure and untainted fame ;  
 While one thereof both purse and mitre bore,  
 Chancellor and Bishop near St Andrew’s choir ;  
 And when brave *Bruce* did for his nation plead,  
 At Norham, with undaunted hand and head,  
 Then Robert Wisheart sat in Glasgow’s chair,  
 With courage for his bounty singular.  
 To these great *George* was not inferior  
 In peace, and was elsewhere superior.  
 High, without pride ;—his bounty had no guile,  
 His charity to th’ poor nought could defile,  
 His loyalty untainted—faith most rare,  
 Athenian faith, was constant every where,  
 And though a thousand evils did controul,  
 None could o’ercome his high and lofty soul—  
 To King and Country he was faithful still ;  
 Was good and just, ev’n from a constant will.  
 Thrice spoil’d and banish’d, for full fifteen years,  
 His mind unshaken,—cheerful still he bears  
 Deadly proscription, nor the nasty gaol  
 Could not disturb his great seraphic soul.  
 But when the nation’s King, CHARLES the second blest,  
 On his return from sad exile to rest ;  
 They then received great *Doctor Wiseheart*—HE  
 Was welcome made, by church and laity ;

And where he had been long in prison sore,  
 He nine years Bishop, did them good therefore.  
 At length he dy'd in honour : where his head  
 To much hard usage was accustomed.  
 He liv'd 'bove seventy years—and Edinburgh town  
 Wish'd him old *Nestor's* age, in great renown ;  
 Yea Scotland, sad with grief, condol'd his fall,  
 And to his merits gave just funeral.  
 Montrose's acts, in Latin forth he drew ;  
 Of one so great, ah ! monuments so few."

No. 15. This monument to George, 14th Earl of Sutherland, originally a work of great merit, has suffered considerably in the necessary work of restoration. It is a cenotaph—that is, the remains of him whom it commemorates lie elsewhere. The arms of the Earl, in the upper part of the stone, have been renewed, but the side pillars are of the original work, bearing medallions indicating the allied noble houses of Gordon, Lennox, Elphinstone, Perth, Eglinton, &c.

"To the memory of the most illustrious Lord George, Earl of Sutherland, Lord Strathnavar, &c., heritable Sheriff of said lands, and lord of the regality thereof; one of the Keepers of the Great Seal, under the most renowned Prince KING WILLIAM, one of the Lords of Privy Council, and the nineteenth Earl descended in a right line from ALLAN, Thane of Sutherland, whom MACBETH, in the rage of his usurping tyranny, about the year of Christ 1057, made away with for endeavouring to restore the Kingdom to MALCOLM III., lawful heir to the Crown. His mournful widow, JEAN WEMYSS, eldest daughter to David, Earl of Wemyss, erected this monument of everlasting fame.

"To the defunct Earl she brought forth John, now Earl of Sutherland, and Anne, Viscountess of Arbuthnot. And to her former husband, Archibald, Earl of Angus, eldest son to the Marquis of Douglas, she brought forth Archibald, Earl of Forfar, and Margaret, given in marriage to the Viscount of Kingstoun. Five other children of the said Lady Dowager died in their nonage. The Earl himself was born in his own Castle of Dornoch 2nd November 1633, and died at Edinburgh, 4th March 1703."

Here are also deposited the remains of William, seventeenth Earl of Sutherland, and his amiable Countess Mary, daughter of William

Maxwell of Preston, Kirkcudbright. His Lordship died at Bath, June 16th, 1766, just after he had completed his 31st year; and the Countess, June 1st, 1766, in her 26th year, 16 days before the Earl.

The bodies of this illustrious and affectionate pair were brought to Scotland, and interred in one grave in Holyrood Abbey, 9th August 1766.

“Beauty and birth a transient being have,  
Virtue alone can triumph o'er the grave.”

No. 16. This slab bears a shield surmounted by a viscount's coronet and charged with the arms of the Lothian Kerrs. Round the shield is the epitaph, “Heir lyeth ane noble lady D. Isobel Ker Vicountes of Drumlanrig 1628.” She was daughter of Mark Ker, 1st Earl of Lothian, and married William Douglas, 9th Baron and 1st Viscount Drumlanrig (afterwards 1st Earl of Queensberry). Needless to point out the erroneous heraldry on this monument, which gives the lady's arms only, without her husband's, through whom came her sole title to the coronet.

No. 17. Within an arched recess is the mural tablet to the Countess of Hugh, 3rd Earl of Eglinton, a devoted adherent of Mary Queen of Scots. She was the daughter of James Hamilton, Earl of Arran and Duke of Chatelherault, and was divorced in 1562, poor lady, on the pretext of consanguinity, but really, no doubt, because she remained childless after seven years of married life. The inscription is barely decipherable.

D. I. H.<sup>1</sup>

Here lyes ane Nobil and maist  
vertuous Ladie, Deame Jeane  
Hamilton, Countas of Egling-  
toun, Dochtor to JAMES Duke  
of Schattillarot, sometyme  
Governor of this Realme.  
She deceast in December  
MDXCVI.

<sup>1</sup> These initials stand for “Dame Jean Hamilton.”

No. 18. The tomb of the Right Hon. Sir John Sinclair of Ulbster [1754-1845], a great agriculturist and compiler of the *Statistical Account of Scotland*.

Near this monument is one to Robert Milne, who was architect under Sir William Bruce in building the present Palace. It used to stand on the site of the choir, but was removed within the nave in 1857, the original position of the interment being marked by a recumbent tombstone. The monument bears the following inscription in Latin and English:—

A. TAM ARTE QUAM MARTE. M.

In clarissimum virum, *Alexandrum Milnum*, Lapidam

egregium, hic sepultum, Anno Dom. 1643 Febr. 20.

Siste Hospes ; clarus jacet hoc sub Marmore *Milnus* ;

Dignus cui Pharius conderet ossa labor :

Quod vel in ære Myron fudit, vel pinxit Appelles,

Artifice hoc potuit hic lapticida manu.

Sex lustris tantum vixit, sine labe, senectam

Prodidit, et medium clauserauit ille diem.

Here is buried a worthy man and an

Ingenious Mason, *Alexander Milne*, 20th Feb. A.D. 1643.

Stay Passenger, here famous Milne doth rest,

Worthy to be in Ægypt's Marble drest ;

What Myron or Appelles could have done

In brass or paintry, he could that in Stone ;

But thretty yeares hee (Blameless) lived ; old Age

He did betray, and in's Prime left this stage.

Restored by Robert Mylne,

Architect, MDCCCLXXVI.

No. 19. The ROYAL VAULT contains all that could be collected of those royal remains which were brought from the vicinity of the high altar when the choir and transepts were wrecked in 1543. They were laid in the south-east angle of the nave, but were desecrated and thrown about, first in the religious riots of 1688, and again when the new roof fell in 1768, breaking up the floor of the church.

A few years earlier than the disturbance of the remains in 1688 they were inspected by some one who, fortunately, left the following detailed account preserved in manuscript in the Advocates' Library.

"Upon ye xxiv of January MDCLXXXIII. by procurement of ye Bischop of Dumblayne, I went into ane vault in ye south-east corner of ye Abbey Church of Halyrudehouse, and yr. were present, ye Lord Strathnavar and E. Forfare, Mr Robert Scott, minister of ye Abbey, ye Bishop of Dunblayn, and some uthers. Wee viewed ye body of King James ye Fyft of Scotland. It lyeth within ane wodden coffin, and is coveret wyth ane lead coffin. There seemed to be haire upon ye head still. The body was two lengths of my staf, with two inches more, that is twae inches and mare above twae Scots elne ; for I measured the staf with ane elnwend afterward.

"The body was coloured black with ye balsom that preserved it, which was lyke melted pitch. The Earl of Forfare tooke the measure with his staf lykeways. There was plates of lead, in several long pieces, louse upon and about the coffin, which carried the following inscription, as I took it from before the bishop and noblemen in ye isle of ye church :—

"ILLVSTRIS SCOTORVM REX JACOBVS EJVS NOMINIS V. ETATIS  
SUE ANNO XXXI REGNI VERO XXX MORTEM OBIT IN  
PALACIO DE FALKLAND 14 DECEMBRIS ANNO DNI. MDXLII  
CVJVS CORPVS HIC TRADITVM EST SEPVLTVRE.

"Nex ye south wall, in a smaller arch, lay a shorter coffin, with ye teeth in ye skull.

"To the little coffin in the narrow arch, seemeth to belong this inscription made out of long pieces of lead in the Saxon character :—

"MACDELEENA FRANCISCI REGIS FRANCIAE  
Primo-genita Regina Scotiæ, Sponsa Jacobi V.  
Regis. A.D. MDXXXVII. OBIIT.

"There was ane piece of a lead crown, upon the syde of whilk I saw two *floor de leuces* gilded : and upon ye north side of ye coffin lay two children, none of the coffins a full elne long, and one of them lying within ane wod chest, the other only the lead coffin.

"Upon the south syde, next the King's body, lay ane gret coffin of lead, with the body in it. The muscles of the thigh seemed to be entire ; the body not so long as King James the Fyfth, and ye balsam

stagnating in sum quantity at ye foote of ye coffin ; there appeared no inscription upon ye coffin.

“ And at ye east syde of the vaults which was at the feet of ye other coffins, lay a coffin with the skull sawen in two, and ane inscription in small letters, gilded upon a square of ye lead coffin, making it to be ye bodye of *Dame Jane Stewart, Countesse of Argyle*, MDLXXXV, or thereby, for I do not well remember ye yeare. The largest coffin, I suld suppose to be that of Lord Darnley’s, and the short coffin, Queene Magdalene’s.”

In July 1848 the remains of Mary of Gueldres were removed from Trinity College Church, erected by her in memory of her husband James II., when that building was razed in the formation of the railway. They were brought to this royal vault, where they repose in a large decorated coffin, beneath another shelf which supports the coffin in which Queen Victoria caused the confused remains of the royal Stuarts to be entombed.

No. 20. In this vault of the Kers of the ducal line of Roxburghe lie the remains of Jane, daughter of Patrick, third Lord Drummond, and second Countess of Sir Robert Ker, first Earl of Roxburghe. She acted as governess to the family of James VI. and I., and died 7th October 1643.

No. 21. On the third pier from the east end of the south aisle is affixed a tablet commemorating Adam Bothwell, Bishop of Orkney and Shetland, Commendator of Holyrood, with his arms, between three cinquefoils a chevron charged with a mullet or star. The Latin inscription below reads thus in English—

M. H. R.<sup>1</sup>

Here lies interred a most noble man, LORD ADAM BOTHOVEIL, Bishop of Orkney and Zetland ; Commendator of the Monastery of Holy Rood, Senator of the College of Justice, and one of the Lords of his Majesty’s Privy Council ; who died in the 67th year of his age, 2nd day of the month of August, in the year of our Lord 1593.

---

<sup>1</sup> The initials of Master Herbert Rollock, who composed the epitaph.

Thy praise is triple sure ; thyself, thy Sire,  
 Thy Son, all Senators, whom men admire.  
 The stagg'ring state by thee was quickly stay'd,  
 The troubled church from thee got present aid.  
 Thou livedest at thy wish ; thy good old age  
 In wealth and honours took thee off the stage.  
 Thine aged corps interred here now lie,  
 Thy virtues great forbid your name to die.  
 Go ! happy soul, and in thy last repose,  
 Vanquish thou death, and all its fatal blows ;  
 Thy fragrant frame shall thus eternal be,  
 Unto thy country and posterity.

It was this prelate who performed the Protestant marriage ceremony between Queen Mary and the Earl of Bothwell in the Council Chamber of Holyrood on 15th May 1567, having previously, as was believed, married them in the private chapel according to the Romish rites.

No. 22. This monument on the south wall bears the arms of Hay—three escutcheons, with a Latin inscription thus translated, “Here lies ALEXANDER HAY of Easter Kennet, Clerk Register, who died 19th September A.D. 1594.”

No. 23. The tomb of an ecclesiastic. A flat slab towards the west end of the south aisle, exhibiting a plain cross and calvary, with a simply shaped chalice on the sinister side. The stone has a border formed of two parallel lines, but bears no date or inscription.

Besides the monuments and inscriptions noted above, the following interments within the Abbey Church may be noted :—

1. Jane, Countess of Caithness, wife of James, twelfth Earl, died 1853.

Hon. James Sinclair, third son of the above, died 18th January 1856 ; and Elizabeth, his wife, died 7th January 1856.

2. Eleonora, Dowager Lady Saltoun, widow of George, fourteenth Baron Saltoun, died 1800.

3. A tombstone inscribed as follows:—

“FRANCIS, 10th LORD SEMPILL, was interred 4th August 1716, and lies 8 feet from wall of 4th window N.E. end of Chapel, betwixt 3rd and 4th Pillars.

“JOHN, 11th LORD SEMPILL, interred on the South side of his brother, 20th January 1727.

“Beneath this stone lie the remains of the Honourable MARION SEMPILL, daughter of Major-General the Right Honourable Hugh, 12th Lord Sempill, and of Sarah Gaskell his wife, who died 14th and interred 19th May 1796.

“The Honourable JANE SEMPILL, died 6th, and was buried on the South side of her sister, the above Marion Sempill, the 10th of July 1800.

“The Honourable REBECCA SEMPILL, died 16th, and was buried between the broken pillars in the centre of the Chapel Southward of Her two Sisters, the aforesaid Marion and Jane, on the 21st Sept. 1811.”

4. Hon. Sarah Sempill, daughter of Hugh, fourteenth Lord Sempill, died 1866.

5. Elizabeth Clavering, daughter of Sir James Clavering, died 1799.

6. A stone inscribed as follows:—

“To the memory of LORD WEBB JOHN SEYMOUR, whose long residence in Edinburgh was occasioned by the scientific enquiries in which he was engaged, and to which he devoted the best part of his time. He was born on the 7th of February 1777, and died on the 19th of April 1819.”

He was second son of the tenth Duke of Somerset.

7. Mary Dunbar, widow of Lord Basil Hamilton, sixth son of the first Duke of Hamilton. She died in 1760.

8. Mary, daughter of Lord Edward Murray, eighth son of the first Duke of Atholl. She died in 1804.

9. John Carr of Ryehope, Durham, died 1820.

10. A stone on which the inscription is now illegible, but it is given in the Guide Book of 1819 as follows:—

“Under this stone lie the remains of the Honourable JOHN MAULE, Esq. Thirty-two years one of the Barons of Exchequer, Scotland. Died the 2nd of July 1781, aged 75 years.”

11. Dame Margaret Scot, died 1633. (Inscription now illegible.)

12. Dame Matilda Theresa Cochrane Wishart, wife of Captain Sir Thomas John Cochrane, R.N., died 1819. She was the mother of Alexander Cochrane Baillie, first Lord Lamington.

13. Dunbar Douglas, fourth Earl of Selkirk, died 1799; and Lady Isabella Margaret Douglas, his eldest daughter, died 1830.

14. George, fifteenth Earl of Caithness, died 1889.

15. Louisa Georgiana, Countess of Caithness, first wife of fourteenth Earl, died 1870.

16. James, fourteenth Earl of Caithness, died 1881.

17. Marie, Duchesse de Pomár, Countess of Caithness, widow of fourteenth Earl, died 1895.

18. The Hon. Alexander Sinclair, third son of thirteenth Earl of Caithness, died 1857.

19. James, twelfth Earl of Caithness, died 1823.

20. Francis Harriet, Countess of Caithness, wife of thirteenth Earl, died 1854.

21. Alexander, thirteenth Earl of Caithness, died 1855.

22. Sir John Sinclair, seventh baronet of Dunbeath, died 1873: and Dame Margaret, his widow, died 1879.

23. John William, son, Wilhelmina and Isabella (Mrs Hume), daughters, of William Sinclair of Preswick, 1831-1840.

24. Mary, widow of Francis, Lord Seaforth, died 1829.

25. Euphemia, widow of William Stewart of Castle Stewart, died 1817.
26. Leveson Douglas Stewart, third son of Admiral the Hon. Keith Stewart of Glasserton, died 1819; also his widow, Elizabeth Dalrymple Hay, died 1841.
27. Maria Janet, Baroness Sempill, died 1844; and her husband, Edward Sempill of Moreton Pinkney, Northamptonshire, died 1871.
28. John Woodford, late Lieutenant-Colonel of the North Fencibles or Gordon Highlanders, died 1800.
29. Lady Elizabeth Wemyss, widow of the Hon. James Wemyss of Wemyss, died 1803.
30. The Right Hon. Sir John Sinclair of Ulbster, Bart., died 1835; and his wife, the Hon. Diana Lady Sinclair, died 1845.
31. Ann Watts, Countess of Cassillis (second wife of Archibald, eleventh Earl), died 1793.
32. Lady Charlotte Erskine, daughter of John Francis, seventh Earl of Mar, died 1852.
33. Ann, wife of Richard Mercer, "of the kingdom of Ireland," died 1802.
34. Erected by the Earl of Erroll to the memory of —amond Livingstone, Esq., died 1820.
35. Isabella, Countess-Dowager of Erroll (widow of the fourteenth Earl), died 1808.
36. Thomas, eleventh Earl of Strathmore, died 1846.
37. The Lady Caroline Edgcumbe (daughter of the second Earl of Mount Edgcumbe, and wife of Ranald Macdonald, chief of Clanranald), died 1824.

The stone coffins lying towards the west end of the south wall were exposed on the site of the choir when the ruins were cleared away and the ground levelled in 1857 under direction of Prince Albert. They date probably from the

thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, and no doubt contained at one time the remains of abbots and other ecclesiastical dignitaries ; but at the time they were last exhumed it was evident that they had been rifled at some former period.

The dimensions of the surviving portion of the Abbey Church are as follows :—


		Feet.	Ins.
Length within walls . . . . .		127	0
Breadth within walls . . . . .		59	6
" of the Middle Aisle . . . . .		29	6
" " North Aisle . . . . .		14	9
" " South Aisle . . . . .		14	9
Height of the East End Wall, to the top of the Fleur-de-lis . . . . .		70	0
Height of the East Window . . . . .		34	2
Breadth of it . . . . .		20	0
Width of the original Arch in which it is placed . . . . .		21	9
Height to the point of the Arch, being the original height of the inner vaulting, about . . . . .		60	0
Height of Columns . . . . .		28	0
Girth of each . . . . .		16	8
Width of the Arches . . . . .		10	0
Height of the Side Walls . . . . .		28	0
" " West End Wall . . . . .		59	0
" " Arch over West Entrance (inside) . . . . .		22	4
Width of the West Door . . . . .		9	6
Height of the North-West Square Tower . . . . .		52	0
Breadth of it outside . . . . . (square)		23	0
" " inside . . . . . (square)		15	6
Width of the Windows in the North and South Aisles . . . . .		2	11
Except the two eastmost in the south wall next the cloister, one of which is . . . . .		4	0
And the other . . . . .		4	7
Width of North Side Door . . . . .		6	4
Depth of Piers of Buttresses in the Cloister . . . . .		6	6
Breadth of these Piers . . . . .		4	8
Width of the Walk in the Cloister . . . . .		10	1

## The Environs of Holyrood.

OF all the royal or public parks in Great Britain, there is none, it may safely be affirmed, to compare with that of Holyrood for natural beauty. Embracing a circuit of four miles and a half, it rises to the respectable height of 822 feet at the summit of Arthur's Seat, and assumes a rugged grandeur in the precipitous scarp of Salisbury Crags. Between these two hills lies the upland glen known as the Hunter's Bog, a name recalling the time when the Forest of Drumselch clothed what is now bare pasture—"ane gret forest full of hartis, hyndis, toddis and siclike maner of beastis." One sighs to reflect what a paradise this might have remained had any care been taken to preserve the woodland—such care, for instance, as has been rewarded with such splendid landscape effect in Windsor and Richmond Parks, and the Phœnix Park in Dublin. But the poverty of Scotland—the perpetual drain of war upon the resources of the realm—caused her rulers to adopt a rigidly utilitarian policy in these matters until long after the union of the kingdoms.

Oak and pine were materials too precious to be spared for park scenery. As early as 1556 the land had been turned to purposes more quickly remunerative than forestry, for in that year Thomas Bullerwell was banished the realm for "the thiftuous Steling of certane scheip fra the Quenis Grace furth of hir Park of Edinburgh,"—"the Quenis Grace" being Mary Queen of Scots, at that time








FIG. 8.—THE PALACE OF HOLYROODHOUSE, SOUTH AND NORTH GARDENS, THE ABBEY KIRK,  
AND THE KIRKYARD.

AFTER GORDON OF ROTHIEMAY'S PLAN.



a happy maiden of fourteen, far away in sunny France. Forty-two years later Fynes Moryson describes the Palace as surrounded by "a park of hares, conies and deare," a kind of stock which would effectually prevent the growth of young trees.

In 1646 Charles I., in discharge of a debt due by him to Sir James Hamilton, younger brother of the 2nd Earl of Haddington, appointed him *in hereditario officio custodiae robورarii lie Park de Holyrudhous* — that is, hereditary keeper of the Park of Holyroodhouse, with all the rents, privileges, &c., belonging thereto. Thomas, 6th Earl of Haddington, received a fresh charter of this office and its rights, dated 23rd January 1691, he being then but ten years of age. The office remained in possession of his descendants till the year 1843, when it was resumed by the Crown, the sum of £30,674 being paid to Thomas, the 9th Earl, in compensation; wherefore Charles I.'s debt to the first hereditary keeper may be considered as having been handsomely liquidated. The park is now administered by H.M. Office of Works and Forests.

Though the later Scottish monarchs allowed the ancient forest to vanish, it does not appear that expense was stinted in horticulture. When Queen Mary reigned at Holyrood the north and south gardens were places of delight, as well as St Ann's Yards, south-east of the Palace. All this is shown in Gordon of Rothiemay's plan, drawn about the year 1648; but these parterres and pleached alleys had been allowed to grow wild or been uprooted when the late Prince Consort took in hand to bring the ground into some order in 1857. The intention was good, but the design has been imperfectly carried out. The seclusion of the north garden, Queen Mary's own, has been violated by the new approach from Abbey Hill being driven

through it, and the ground to the south of the Palace has never been furnished and planted in the manner probably contemplated. Hence the impression given by these pleasure-grounds is one of laborious bleakness, added to which is the detriment to verdure arising from the close neighbourhood of coal-consuming industries.

The chief ornament in the north garden of Holyrood is the beautiful sun-dial, of the facet-headed type, which dates from 1633, the year of Charles I.'s coronation. It was made by his master-mason John Milne, assisted by his sons John and Alexander, who received £408, 15s. 6d. Scots, besides which there was paid 26s. 8d. to David Yuill for white wax; to "Johne Bartoun for gilding, making and graving the dyell, £66, 13s." and "twa rosnobillis [rose-nobles] and ane halff to gilt the dyell £26, 11s. 8d."; and to "Johne Andersone, painter, for painting the dayell and counsell hous conforme to his contract £290." Allowing £90 Scots as the proportion due to Anderson for painting the dial, it appears that the whole work was done for less than £50 sterling, and must be pronounced good value for that money.

We owe its restoration and erection in the present position to Queen Victoria, who, when she came to Holyrood, found it lying broken and uncared for. It stands on a high and wide base of three steps, the total height being ten feet. The head is supported on a delicately carved pedestal, and presents twenty facets, each presenting a dial, which originally had twenty-nine gnomons to indicate the hours. "The dials," write Messrs M'Gibbon and Ross, "are hollowed out with figures of various shapes. In one, the gnomon is formed by the nose of a grotesque face; in another, by the points of a thistle-leaved ornament. The under surfaces have no dials, except on one heart-shaped

lozenge, but are decorated instead with heraldic and other devices. There are also the initials of Charles I. and his Queen, Henrietta Maria, for whom Charles is said to have had the dial made."<sup>1</sup>

The seventeenth-century garden door, facing the "place" in front of the Palace, bears the royal arms on the lintel, surmounted by the Scottish thistle. On the west side of the said place, facing the street called Abbey Hill, is a curious building of two storeys, which has furnished an enigma to generations of antiquaries. It is popularly known as Queen Mary's bathhouse, where she is supposed to have indulged in baths of red wine; but tradition is peculiarly untrustworthy in relation to this fair monarch. It seems most unlikely that she should have had to pass through the open air to such a conspicuous and public position before bathing, although it may be remembered that before the formation of the new approach, bisecting the old north garden, access could be had to this building without leaving the grounds. When it was under repair in 1852 a richly inlaid dagger was found concealed in the sarking of the roof. It has been suggested that the building may have been a bakehouse or laundry, or both; but before dismissing the idea of a bathing-house, it has to be remembered that close by, within the Palace precincts and at the foot of the Canongate, stood the tennis-court, which was burnt down towards the end of the eighteenth century. Both James IV. and his son James V. were great tennis players, as is testified by many entries in the Records referring to the game of "caitcepelle," or "caiche," as it was termed. For instance, on 29th June 1527 the Lord Treasurer disbursed twenty shillings Scots (about 1s. 8d. sterling) "for ballis in Crummise cache-

<sup>1</sup> *Castellated and Domestic Architecture of Scotland*, v. 441.

puyll,<sup>1</sup> quhen the Kingis Grace plays with the Lord Glammis." Lord Glamis died in the following year, and his widow was made the victim of one of the most shameful acts of King James's whole reign. She had the misfortune to be a Douglas, sister of Archibald, 6th Earl of Angus, a family which had earned the bitter displeasure and suspicion of the royal family of Scotland. In 1531 Lady Glamis, who had married in the interval Archibald Campbell of Kepneith or Skipness, was arrested on a charge of witchcraft, brought against her by a wretched creature, William Lyon, a relative of her first husband, whom she had offended by refusing to permit his dishonourable attentions. The proceedings lasted for years, the charge at length crystallising itself into "art and part of the tressonable conspiratioun and ymaginatioun of the slauchter and destruction of our souerane lordis maist nobile persone be poysone." Upon this trumped-up accusation she was tried, and, horrible to say, sentenced to be "brent in ane fyre to the deid"—burnt to death—which execrable act was performed on 17th July 1537 on the Castle Hill, almost within sight of the tennis-court where King James had played with her first husband. Campbell, Lady Glamis's second husband, lying in Edinburgh Castle under sentence of death for alleged complicity, attempted to escape, but fell over the rocks and was dashed to pieces. The Master of Forbes, and John Lyon, a relative of Lord Glamis, being involved in the same accusation, were decapitated, and the tale of blood was only stopped short of including Lady Glamis's son, the 7th Lord Glamis, who was imprisoned until the king's death in 1543, when he was released and his honours restored by Parliament.

<sup>1</sup> Crummy probably was that John Crummy who received a grant of "the Abbot's Medow . . . wyten the park for all the days of his life"; 31st May 1544.

Sir Thomas Clifford, writing to his master Henry VIII. an account of these gruesome proceedings, declared that they were, "as I can perceyue, without any substanciall ground or proyf of mattir."

To return to the tennis-court and its surroundings, it was the scene of other games besides "caitchepell." On the same day that James V. played Lord Glamis, there was 15s. 6d. "gevin for eggis to bicker the Castell," indicating an assault upon a mock fortress erected in this playground. The munitions of this mimic war were not always fairly come by; for on 17th July following the Lord Treasurer records a payment of twenty shillings "gevin at the Kingis command till puyre wivis that come gretand [weeping] apone his Grace for eggis takin fra thaime be his servandis." The proximity of a bathing-house, if such the building in question was, must have been a convenience to combatants who had been under fire of such artillery as this, and indeed it must have formed a useful adjunct to a tennis-court at all times.

Dramatic performances were rigidly suppressed by the General Assembly, and were prohibited in all places under their control; but the precincts of Holyrood were not under their authority. They could but gnash their teeth and predict divine vengeance upon James VI., never a very keen Presbyterian, when in 1599 he borrowed a company of actors from Queen Elizabeth, and licensed them to act plays in the tennis-court. Fourscore years later, in 1680, James Duke of York brought a company down to lighten the tedium of his residence in Holyrood. These also gave their performances in the tennis-court, which was used for concerts and theatrical pieces in Queen Anne's reign.

Outside the north-east corner of the north garden stands a picturesque dwelling well worthy of inspection, as an excellent example of a sixteenth century Scottish house.

As it is occupied by the gardener to the Palace, the interior cannot be viewed without consent of the inmates. It is called Croftangry or Croft-an-righ, the King's croft, and was the town residence of Queen Mary's half-brother, Lord James Stuart, afterwards Earl of Moray and Regent of Scotland. The most notable feature of the interior is the fine plaster-work of the ceilings on the first floor.

The level ground extending eastward from the Palace to the gate near Parson's Green bore of old, and still bears, the name of St Ann's Yards. Much of it used to be crowded with dwellings, removed in the Prince Consort's improvements from 1851 to 1862. Part of this land is still called the Duke's Walk, from James Duke of York, who made it his favourite place of exercise when residing in the Palace before he succeeded to the throne.

The bowling-green exists no longer, but in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries no pleasure-grounds were reckoned complete without one. Accordingly we find mentioned in the charter appointing the Duke of Hamilton hereditary keeper that *parvus hortus infra idem palatium sphæristerius lie bowling green*—"the little garden for bowling beside the said palace, called the Bowling Green." It appears to have been close to the south side of the Abbey Church, on so much of the ground formerly in the cloister garth as was not covered by the new Palace.

To one entering the Queen's Park by the Holyrood entrance and turning to the left along the Queen's Drive,—a fine carriage-way, which was begun in 1844 and carried right round the royal demesne,—the first object to attract attention will be the iron bars of a door protecting an opening on the north slope of Salisbury Crags. Within the door is a hexagonal vaulted chamber, the history of which is rather curious. Originally it was erected at

Restalrig over St Margaret's Well; but that site having been invaded by the North British Railway Company, and the well having been first polluted and then having failed altogether—the water finding its way through another channel—the Society of Scottish Antiquaries obtained leave to remove the ancient structure and rebuild it, stone for stone, over what had long been known as St David's Well,<sup>1</sup> identified doubtfully with the original well of the Holy Rood.

A little farther on, a path winds up the steep green brae to the right, leading past another holy well to a rocky knoll on the north-western slope of Arthur's Seat. Here once stood St Anthony's Chapel, which Arnot, writing towards the close of the eighteenth century, described as "a beautiful Gothic building, well suited to the rugged sublimity of the rock." Nothing remains now except a fragment of the western tower, and one cannot but feel indignation that the Hereditary Keepers of the Park, who were responsible for its protection till 1843, were so careless of their trust as to allow this ancient shrine to be used as a common quarry. It is curious that so little should be known now of the chapel, which was probably a cell of the preceptory of St Anthony of Leith; but tradition connects it with the Abbey of Holyrood, which derived part of its revenues from shipping. A light was displayed, it is said, from the tower as a guide to vessels entering the Forth. James IV., ever assiduous to propitiate the Church, as if in atonement for the irregularity of his private morals, gave fourteen shillings "to Sanct Anthonis Chapell of the Crag." There was a hermitage close by, but that has disappeared. The well beside the

<sup>1</sup> St David was David I., King of Scots (1124-53), and St Margaret was his mother, sister of Edgar-Atheling and Queen of Scots (1070-93). She was canonised in 1251.

path below the chapel is mentioned in the tragic ballad of “The Marchioness of Douglas”—

“Oh waly, waly up yon bank,  
And waly, waly doun yon brae,  
And waly, waly by yon burn side  
Whaur I and my true love were wont to gae.

Now Arthur’s Seat shall be my bed,  
Nae roof henceforth shall shelter me ;  
St Anton’s Well shall be my drink,  
Since my gude lord’s forsaken me.”

This ballad, some stanzas of which were borrowed from one in manuscript in 1566, is founded on the unhappy married life of Lady Barbara Erskine, who in 1670 became the bride of the second Marquess of Douglas, a selfish, sour-tempered aristocrat of small ability, which he seems to have devoted entirely to the pursuit of his own pleasure. The well, which flows into a stone basin, has been resorted to from immemorial time by persons afflicted with love or other less romantic ailments. In a paper which Mr Russel Walker contributed to the *Proceedings of the Society of Scottish Antiquaries* in 1883, he describes a scene at this spot, showing how traits of the past linger even in the bustling present.

“While walking in the Queen’s Park about sunset a few months ago, I casually passed St Anthony’s Well, and had my attention attracted by the number of people about it, all simply quenching their thirst, some possibly with a vague idea that they would reap some benefit from the draught. Standing a little apart, however, and evidently waiting a favourable moment, . . . was a group of four. . . . The crowd departed, and the group came forward, consisting of two old women, a younger woman of about thirty, and a pale, sickly-looking girl three or four years old. Producing cups from their pockets, the old women

dipped them in the pool, filled them, and drank the contents. A full cup was then presented to the young woman, and another to the child. Then one of the old women produced a long linen bandage, dipped it in the water, wrung it, dipped it again, and then wound it round the child's head, covering the eyes, the younger woman carefully observing the operation and weeping gently all the time. The other old woman carefully filled a flat glass bottle with the water, evidently for future use. Then, after the principal operators had looked at each other with an earnest and half-solemn sort of look, the party wended its way down the hill."

Resuming the course of the Queen's Drive in its easterly direction, we pass St Margaret's loch, a little tarn on the right hand, and arrive at the park gate opening upon Jock's Lodge—a hamlet which already bore that quaint name when Cromwell laid his iron hand upon Mid-Lothian in 1650. "The enemy," says the diarist Nicol, "placed their whole horse in and about Restalrig, the foot at that place called Jockis Lodge, and the cannon at the foot of Salisbury Hill."

A faithful description of this part of the Queen's Park was rendered many years ago in the *Heart of Mid-Lothian*, and the scene has altered little since, although the railway station of St Margaret's just outside the gate would present a perplexing phenomenon to Sir Walter Scott's eyes could they rest again upon a scene he knew so well. Muschat's Cairn, a heap of rough stones near the park gate, still commemorates the murder perpetrated here by Nicol Muschat, a surgeon, in 1720. A dissipated scoundrel, this fellow tried many expedients for getting rid of his wife, and after several failures on the part of himself and his accomplice, Campbell of Burnbank, he finally cut her throat in this lonely spot. Muschat was hanged in the Grassmarket, and the cairn was raised in the ancient manner as a memorial of the deed of blood.

Turning now south-west, the Drive sweeps round the eastern flank of Arthur's Seat, rising and falling in easy gradients, and commanding noble prospects of the Firth of Forth, the fine champaign and woodlands of the Mid and East Lothians, the loops and crests of the Pentland Hills, until, with Duddingston Loch glittering below us in the foreground, we pass the basaltic pillars on the west face of Arthur's Seat, then under beetling Salisbury Crags, and so come in view of "Auld Reekie" once more, not crouching, as of old, along the ridge dominated by the Castle Rock, but spreading far beyond the old walls—a mighty modern capital. It has swallowed up the ancient burgh of the Canongate, once the busy scene of monastic industry and learning, afterwards the crowded centre of Scottish political and aristocratic society, to descend in turn to the lowest grade of slum life, whence municipal energy has rescued it at a sacrifice of much that was picturesque and hallowed by romantic association. Not to be deplored, this last, if it has brightened and sweetened the lives of its inhabitants, even though the realisation of the ancient motto which is graven round the figure of King David's stag bearing the Holy Rood upon the burgh seal still seems far distant—*Sic itur ad astra*, "This Way to the Stars"!



FIG. 9.—SEAL OF THE BURGH OF CANONGATE.

# Historical Sketch.

## CHAPTER I.

### ANNALS OF HOLYROOD ABBEY, A.D. 1128-1498.

Foundation of the Abbey of Holyrood	.	.	.	A.D. 1128
Legend of the Miraculous Cross	.	.	.	1128
Fresh grant of Charter by David I.	.	.	.	c. 1143
The true origin of the Black Rood of Scotland	.	.	.	1070
The Right of Sanctuary, from 1128 to the present time.				
The Abbots of Holyrood	.	.	.	1128-1503
The War of Independence	.	.	.	1291-1327
John of Gaunt at Holyrood	.	.	.	1381
James I. at Holyrood	.	.	.	1424
Birth of James II. at Holyrood	.	.	.	1430
His coronation there	.	.	.	25th March 1437
His marriage to Mary of Gueldres	.	.	.	3rd July 1449
His burial in the Abbey Church	.	.	.	August 1460
Restoration of the Abbey Church by Abbot Crawfurd	.	.	.	c. 1464
Marriage of James III. with Margaret of Denmark	.	.	.	18th July 1469
Abbot Bellenden's benefactions	.	.	.	c. 1487-1503

DAVID I., King of Scots, reigned for nine-and-twenty years (1124-1153), and earned a well-merited panegyric from Bishop Ailred of Rievaulx—"A gentle king, a just king, a chaste king, a humble king." More discriminating, if not less sincere, was the comment of one of David's successors,




FIG. 10.—JAMES V.'S TOWER, FOUNTAIN, AND MAIN ENTRANCE, HOLYROODHOUSE.

by A. A. Inglis, Edinburgh.

*From photograph*

James I., who, standing beside his tomb in Dunfermline, observed with a sigh that he had been “ane sair sanct for the Crown,” alluding to the vast tracts of Crown lands with which this monarch endowed the numerous churches and religious houses which he founded. These fill a long list—namely, the abbeys of Kelso, Holyrood, Melrose, Jedburgh, Dryburgh, Newbattle, Cambuskenneth, Kinloss, Dundrennan, and Holmecultran; the priory of Urquhart; a convent of Benedictines and another of Carmelites at Newcastle-on-Tyne; nunneries at Carlisle and at Berwick; and the cathedrals of Glasgow, Dunkeld, St Andrews, and Aberdeen.

The abbeys of Kelso and Holyrood were founded in the same year—1128. To account for that of Holyrood,

**Abbey of Holy-** there was invented in later centuries a monkish **road, founded** legend—a typical specimen of those unscrupu-

**A.D. 1128.** lous fictions which it became the practice of

ecclesiastics to fortify the faith of their people withal, and to encourage benefactions to the Church. Evidence of the comparatively late origin of this fable is to be found in the fact that the early annalists make no mention thereof; even the *Chronicle of Holyrood*, compiled within the Abbey, and carried down to the year 1163, is silent on the subject. It was a story after Hector Boece's own heart, yet, although he lived till 1536, it found no place in his history; and it appears first as an interpolation in Bellenden's translation of Boece, dated about the time of Boece's death. Nevertheless, it had been current and officially accepted as authentic fully a hundred years before that; because in the reign of James I. (1406-37) a stag's head, bearing a cross between the antlers, is represented on the seal of the convent. Bellenden probably found the story in the *Holyrood Calendar*, a Latin

manuscript still in existence, apparently not earlier in date than the first quarter of the fifteenth century.<sup>1</sup> His translation is delightfully quaint, but it will be for the convenience of readers to render it in modern language.

We are to understand, then, that a wide tract of land




FIG. II.—SEAL OF THE MONASTERY OF HOLYROOD,  
A.D. 1141.

to the south of Edinburgh Castle was clothed, in the twelfth century, with “ane gret forest full of hartis, hyndis, toddis [foxes], and siclike maner of beastis.” This was the favourite hunting-ground of King David when residing in the Castle, and was called Drumselch, or the hunting hill.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Printed in the *Miscellany* of the Bannatyne Club, vol. i.

<sup>2</sup> Now written Drumsheugh. It represents the Gaelic *druim sealg*, the ridge of the chase. The barony of Penicuik, on the borders of this chase, was held of old for the *reddendo* or rent of the annual blowing of six blasts *in cornu flatili*—on a hunting-horn.

**The Miraculous Cross, 1128.** On Holy Rood Day—the feast of the Exaltation of the Cross (14th September)—the King “past to his contemplation,” but no sooner had mass been sung than a number of young barons presented themselves and begged him to go out hunting. David’s confessor, Alwin, warned him against profaning a solemn festival in that manner; but in vain. The gay company rode forth through the wood on the east of the Castle “with sic noysis and dyn of rachis [hounds] and bugillis, that all the bestis wer raisit fra thair dennys.” They arrived at the foot of Salisbury Crags, when the party separated “at thair game and solace,” leaving the King unattended. This is to be regretted, for it would be satisfactory had witnesses remained to corroborate the King’s account of what followed. He spied suddenly “the farest hart that evir wes sene . . . with auful and braid tyndis [antlers].” The beast charged; the King’s horse bolted “ovir myre and mossis”; the stag, which doubtless was the evil one himself, overtook him and “dang [threw] baith the Kyng and his hors to the ground.” The King threw up his hands to seize the antlers; instead of which, he found himself grasping a cross which was miraculously extended to him; whereupon “the hart fled away with gret violence and euanist [vanished] in the same place quhare now springis the Rude Well.” That night the King was warned in a dream that he should found an abbey on the very scene of his deliverance. Acting on Alwin’s advice, he sent to France and Flanders for “rycht crafty masonis,” built the abbey, dedicated it to the Holy Cross or Rood, and placed the miraculous cross upon the high altar.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Bellenden’s translation of Boece, B. xii., c. 16. The story does not appear in the earlier MS. copies.

The convent was formed of Augustinian Canons Regular brought from St Andrews, and the first site chosen appears to have been upon the Castle Rock of Edinburgh, where it is hardly possible that the adventure attributed to David could have taken place.

Alwin, the king's confessor, was appointed the first abbot, and held office till 1150, when he resigned in favour of Osbert, who died the same year. By that time, so far as can be gathered from the scanty records, a fresh site had been chosen for the Abbey—that on which Holyrood-house now stands,—a fair new church of the Holy Rood had arisen, and the canons had found roomier quarters than could be provided for them within the precincts of the Castle. Between the years 1143 and 1147,<sup>1</sup> King David had granted to the canons a foundation charter, still extant, securing them in possession of this Church of the Holy Rood of Edwinesburg [Edinburgh], as well as of their old Church of the Castle, St Cuthbert's church and parish, and extensive property in lands, fishings, &c., in various parts of the realm; together with all the right of trial by duel, and of ordeal by fire and by water, "so far as pertains to the ecclesiastical dignity."

Now of the original Church of the Castle, it is probable that a representation has been preserved in a seal appended to a notification by Abbot Alwin, dated 1141. It shows a curious wooden building, of the kind still to be seen at East Grinstead in Essex, made in the primitive manner of massive slabs of oak hewn from the neighbouring forest.

The new Abbey of Holyrood would be in the prevailing

<sup>1</sup> The date is fixed between these years by the fact that the charter is witnessed by David's nephew, William (afterwards King William the Lion), who was born in 1143, and John, Bishop of Glasgow, who died in 1147.

Romanesque or Norman Gothic, of which a doorway at the south-east angle of the present ruin, leading from the cloister into the nave, is the only architectural feature remaining. It is probable that the choir, with its apse and crossing, were the only parts of the church finished in King David's reign,—the nave, of which we have but the shattered remains, being added in the first pointed style during the thirteenth century.

In addition to the grants of land, &c., conveyed to the canons by the aforesaid charter, it contained permission to them to found a burgh between the new Abbey and the King's burgh of Edinburgh. Here they built their houses, the main street receiving the name of Canongate, which it still retains. "Gate," it may be noted, does not bear the same significance in Scots as in English: it is the equivalent of "way" or "road," as one may often hear people at this day talking of "ganging their ain gate." The Scots for "gate" is "yett," or "port" for a town-gate. John of Fordun, writing in the fourteenth century, refers to the Abbey as the Monastery of the Crag of the Holy Rood; in the continuation of Simeon of Durham's chronicle it is styled simply the Monastery of the Crag. It is doubtful whether this title is derived from the original site on the Castle Craig, or from the proximity of the new Abbey to what is now called the Salisbury Crags. Father Hay (1661-1736), canon regular of S. Geneviève's, Paris, gave much attention to the early records of the Abbey, and came to the conclusion that it remained on the Castle rock till the reign of William the Lion (1153-1214), because many of the charters of that king were dated *apud Monasterium Sanctæ Crucis de Castello Puellarum*—at the Monastery of the Holy Rood of the Castle of the Maidens. But most of the deeds of gift to the convent in that reign were made

to the Church of the Holy Rood of Edinburgh. *Castellum Puellarum* was a frequent synonym for Edinburgh Castle, derived, says Father Hay, from the nuns who were displaced in order to make room for the Augustinian canons, "as fitter to live among soildiers."

Having thrown discredit upon the legend of the Miraculous Foundation, it is proper to state the true origin of the dedication to the Holy Rood.

**The "Black Rood" of Scotland.** Margaret, daughter of Eadward Ætheling and land, 1070. grand-niece of Edward the Confessor, was a personage of extraordinary distinction. The wife of one King of Scots—Malcolm III.,—she became the mother of three others, Eadgar, Alexander I., and David I., and of a Queen of England, "the good Queen Maud," wife of Henry I. Being a lady of intense piety, she introduced and established in Scotland the observance of the Lord's Day and the Lenten Fast according to the Roman usage, and, after death, was canonised as St Margaret of Scotland. Ailred of Rievaulx informs us that she brought with her to Scotland a golden casket in the shape of a cross, bearing on the outside an image of the Saviour carved in ebony, and containing within a piece of the True Cross. Queen Margaret, hearing of her husband's death at Alnwick, died of grief in Edinburgh Castle on 16th November 1093, and bequeathed the cross to her sons as a sacred heirloom. When it came into the possession of David, who, not inferior in piety to his mother, also was to receive canonisation, he presented it to the monks of his new Abbey, which he dedicated appropriately to the Holy Rood.

Thenceforward this reliquary, known as the Black Rood of Scotland, was regarded as the most sacred of all the national emblems: for greater security it appears to have been kept in the chapel of the Castle, and

was surrendered to Edward I. in 1291 with the other insignia of royalty, not to be restored until, by the treaty of Northampton in 1328, the independence of Scotland was formally recognised. Eighteen years later it left Scotland a second time, never more to return. Young David II., taking advantage of Edward III.'s absence in war with France, invaded England in great force in the autumn of 1346, and sought to ensure success by carrying with him the Black Rood. It availed him nothing. He encountered Percy, Rocheby, and the Archbishop of York at Nevill's Cross on 17th October, was completely defeated, was taken prisoner, and entered upon his captivity of eleven years. His barons and knights were slain by the score ; among the booty that fell to the victors was the Black Rood, which remained in the south aisle of Durham Cathedral, deeply venerated, until it disappeared in the disorders of the Reformation.

By the foundation charter of King David the Abbey was invested with right of sanctuary for offenders fleeing from justice, the first to avail himself thereof being Fergus, Celtic Prince of Galloway, only two or three years after the foundation.

**Right of  
Sanctuary.** Fergus married Elizabeth, natural daughter of Henry I. of England, and sister of Sibilla, the queen of Alexander I., King David's elder brother. He was the rival of David himself in munificence to the Church, but he could not brook the feudal institutions introduced from England by that monarch. He joined Angus of Moray's insurrection in 1130, and, on its suppression, sought and found refuge in Holyrood Abbey. He regained King David's favour by a ruse. When David visited the new Abbey, Abbot Alwin allowed Fergus to put on the dress of a canon regular and sit among the brethren assembled in the

chapter-house to receive the king. Then Alwin addressed his sovereign, praying him to pardon all present every fault committed against him, and in token thereof to bestow upon each one the kiss of peace. Fergus the rebel received the royal embrace with the rest; and King David, when this was explained to him, was too magnanimous to resent the trick, but restored Fergus to freedom and favour.

After David's death, in 1153, Fergus joined the rebellion against his grandson Malcolm IV., and in 1160 was forced to seek sanctuary in Holyrood Abbey once more. This time he became a monk in good earnest, and greatly did the monastery profit by his penitence; for he and his son Uchtred enriched it with great possessions in Galloway, handing over, among others, the churches of Dunrod, Tungland, Twynholm, Anwoth, Traill (now St Mary's Isle), St Cuthbert's of Denesmor (now Kirkcudbright), Colmonell, and Balmaghie, with the lands pertaining to each.

This privilege of sanctuary, whereby the Abbey derived such material advantage from the gratitude of refugees, has been the subject of legal controversy in comparatively recent times, long after the brethren had been dispersed and the church itself had fallen to ruin. At the foot of the Canongate, opposite the archway, now removed, which formed the entrance to the fore-court of the Palace, there is a cross marked in the pavement. Here used to stand the Girth Cross, which, if a fugitive could touch, rendered him safe from arrest or process of law. Not until the Act abolishing imprisonment for debt came into operation in the year 1880 did this sanctuary cease to exist as a protection for debtors. When the Earl of Strathmore availed himself of it in 1823, it was argued

before the courts that the privilege of the Abbey was derived from these words in the charter of David I. : “I prohibit any one from executing a poinding [*ne aliquis capiat pandum*] on the land of the Holy Rood, unless the Abbot of that place shall have refused to do right and justice.”

But it is pretty clear that this right of sanctuary for debtors, which has only fallen into desuetude owing to a change in the law rendering it unnecessary, had no connection either with the specific terms of the charter of 1143-47 or with the general right of sanctuary attached to most religious houses. The bounds of the modern sanctuary are not the same as those of the old one. They do not include the Canongate, which was within the demesne of the monastery, but are co-extensive with the royal park of Holyrood, containing part of the lands of Duddingston, which never belonged to the monastery, but was bought by James V. from Sir David Murray of Balvaird. The sanctuary of the Abbey, which was open to all criminals, ceased with other ecclesiastical privileges at the Reformation. The sanctuary for debtors was the only one in Scotland, and derived its virtue not from the Abbey, but from the royal Palace which James IV. built beside the Abbey. The earliest notice of any debtor availing himself thereof is made by Buchanan, who states that in 1531 John Scot, “having lost a certain lawsuit, became insolvent, and remained for several days without food or drink in the monastery of the Holy Rood.”

The roll of the early abbots of Holyrood is of little interest to the general reader—partly because surnames did not become generally fixed until towards the end of the thirteenth century, which makes it impossible to identify

the families to which these abbots belonged, and partly because of the extremely meagre character of  
**The Abbots of Holyrood.** the chronicle compiled in the Abbey. Of Alwin

or Alcuin, the first abbot, it is known that he was confessor to David, Earl of Huntingdon, before he became King of Scots. He is believed to have lived till 1155, but resigned the abbacy in 1150, and was succeeded by Osbert, who died in December of the same year. Next came William, who witnessed many charters in the reigns of Malcolm IV. and William the Lion, followed by Robert. John was abbot in 1173, in whose time Cardinal Vibianus Tomasi came as Papal legate, and summoned the Scottish bishops to meet him at Edinburgh — no doubt in Holyrood. Much friction existed at that time between the Church of Scotland and the Papal authority. Christianus, Bishop of Galloway, was suspended from his see for refusing to obey the legate's summons; and in the *Melrose Chronicle* Vibianus is described in no complimentary terms — “trampling upon and pulverising everything in his way: eager to receive and not unwilling to take by force.” In 1189 an important national council assembled in the monastery to receive the proposals of Richard Cœur de Lion for annulling the treaty of Falaise, whereby his father, Henry II., had secured the suzerainty of Scotland. Richard, being in want of cash for a crusade, agreed to surrender all claim upon the independence of Scotland in return for a payment of 10,000 marks. The transaction was completed, England and Scotland remaining good neighbours for a century following.

Of William, who was abbot in 1206, nothing is recorded. Walter, Prior of Inchcolm, was appointed in 1210, and held office until 1217; to be succeeded by a third William,

who, in 1220, granted certain lands to the Lady Aufrice (Affrica), daughter of Eadgar.

He was released from the charge in 1227 by the Papal legate James, canon of St Victor, and William the son of Ovinus was appointed in his place. *Vix in omnibus commendabilis*—not very praiseworthy in everything—is the comment upon this William in Father Hay's ill-arranged notes. Inconstant in purpose, in the very first year of his abbotship he handed over the government of the convent to his ordinary, and retired as a hermit to Inchkeith. Nine weeks of that life cured him of the love of solitude, and he found his way back to Holyrood. Being asked why he had changed his mind so soon, he replied in doggerel—

“Quid faciam cum nudus eam? jam præterit æstas;  
Ad patriam remeare meam me cogit egestas.”

Which may be freely rendered thus—

My clothes are thin and rent; the summer's nearly spent;  
What can I do? Stern need drives me home with utmost speed.

He died soon afterwards, and was followed by Abbot Helias or Elias, “son of the priest Nicolas, a man of the utmost tenderness, merry withal, devout, and affable in conversation.” During his time the drainage of Holyrood caused much trouble, as it may be remembered happened more than six hundred and fifty years later, when Edward VII., visiting his Scottish capital in 1902, could not be lodged in Holyrood Palace because the drains were out of order. Abbot Elias rearranged the drains on a new system—*opus egregium, ex quo salubrior habitatio*—“a noble work, which made the monastery a healthier residence.” Also he enclosed the cemetery with a stone wall,<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> *Muro e lapide coctili*—which perhaps means concrete.

he himself being buried in St Mary's Chapel behind the high altar.

The next abbot, Henry, "a discreet and holy man, very careful for his house and parish," was appointed Bishop of Galloway<sup>1</sup> in 1253 by Alexander III.; but John de Baliol opposed the election, claiming, as husband of the eldest daughter of Alan, last Celtic lord of Galloway, the right of nominating to that see. The controversy was not settled till 1255, when Henry was consecrated at Richmond in Yorkshire by the Bishop of Durham.

To Abbot Henry succeeded Abbot Rafe, a canon of Holyrood, about whom history has nothing to say save that he alienated the abbey lands of Pittendriech in favour of the monks of Newbattle. This brings us to the crucial period of the interregnum following upon the death of Alexander III. in 1286, when Adam (de Montgomerie?) was abbot.

Down to this point in its history, nothing seems to have interrupted the progress and prosperity of the monastery; but its outward aspect had undergone sweeping changes. To the Norman building of David I., which probably did not extend westward of the crossing, had been added the nave with its aisles, a beautiful and stately example of pointed Gothic at its best period, whereof the shattered remains still attest the splendour. It was doomed to suffer sorely during the War of Independence. When Alexander III., last of the "Kings of Peace," died in 1286, Scotland entered upon three centuries of stress and storm. Andrew of Wyntoun, composing his metrical chronicle about the year 1400, had good cause to look wistfully back to the days when good understanding pre-

<sup>1</sup> The name of the see was *Candida Casa*—*i.e.*, Whithorn.

vailed between the two realms. All that came to an end with Alexander's wise reign.

“Quhen Alyssandyr oure Kyng wes dede  
 That Scotland led in lube and le,  
 Away wes sons off ale and brede,  
 Off wyne and wax, off gamyn and gle;  
 Oure gold wes changyd into lede.  
 Cryst, borne in to Vyrgynite!  
 Succoure Scotland and remede,  
 That stad is in perplexite.”<sup>1</sup>

Adam Abbot had a difficult course to steer through the years of the disputed succession. He declared for

**The War of  
 Independ-  
 ence,  
 1291-1327.** Edward I. and the English, performing his homage on 8th July 1291 in the chapel of Edinburgh Castle, where the English king was lodged. In the following month he was appointed one of the commissioners charged by Edward to examine and report upon the Scottish national records, in connection with the competing claims to the crown. Five years later, in January 1296, Adam and the brethren renewed their fealty, swearing on the *Corpus Christi* before Sir John de Kingston, English governor of Edinburgh Castle, thereby securing their reinstatement in the Abbey lands, which the King of England had seized.<sup>2</sup>

Abbot Adam's policy secured the safety of his convent during his life; it is not known when he died, but Helias

<sup>1</sup> Wyntoun's *Cronykil*, B. vii.

<sup>2</sup> Attached to this deed of homage, which is preserved in Westminster Chapter House, there appear, after Abbot Adam's, the names of William, “formerly abbot,” John the Prior, Thomas sub-Prior, Simon the Precentor, Adam the Sacrist, Elias the Land-factor [*terrarius*], Robert, Keeper of the Granary, Thomas the Cellarer, John the Almoner, and nine others.

or Elias, second of the name, was head of the monastery in 1316, and probably was still in office when its first disaster befell. Hitherto, by common consent, Church property and buildings had been respected generally in the operations of war; henceforth they became special objects of fire and plunder. So in 1322, when Edward II. led a futile invasion as far as Edinburgh, and found the country so scrupulously laid bare by King Robert's command that he was forced to retreat in haste in order to escape starvation, he plundered the Abbeys of Holyrood and Melrose, and set fire to delectable Dryburgh.

In 1327, after Edward II.'s abdication, King Robert the Bruce held a parliament in Holyrood Abbey, Simon of Wedale (Galawater) being abbot, and received supplies for the last invasion of England that he was ever to send forth. He died in 1329, and was succeeded by his son David II., who had married Princess Joan, daughter of Edward II.; but in 1332 Edward Baliol, having secured the support of Edward III. by acknowledging his suzerainty, raised his standard and was crowned at Scone. King David, after the crushing disaster to his cause at Halidon Hill, 19th July 1333, went to France, leaving his realm rent with civil war. In February following Edward Baliol held a parliament in Holyrood Abbey, when Geoffrey Scrope, Chief Justice of England, demanded the ratification of the agreement between Baliol and his liege lord Edward III., whereby Baliol had bound himself to serve with all his forces in the wars of the King of England, and to make absolute surrender of the town, castle, and territory of Berwick. The assembly was composed of seven bishops, Dunbar, Earl of March, and a number of "disinherited lords"—barons who had been forfeited for resisting King Robert Bruce. But for these last, the cause of King David

would never have been in jeopardy. On the other hand, the action of these disinherited lords, as claiming lands which King Robert had bestowed upon others, consolidated the national party, and ensured the fidelity of the men in possession to "the King over the water." On 16th December 1334 Edward Baliol was driven across the Border in the famous camisade of Annan, and although restored by English arms in the following year, his cause never prospered again. The King of England, occupied with schemes of aggression and defence in France, could only give intermittent attention to the Scottish war, and the disinherited lords fell to bitter disputes among themselves.

King David returned from France in 1341, and, five years later, undertook his fatal expedition into Durham which, as mentioned above, cost him his liberty and the loss of the Black Rood of Scotland. He obtained his release upon a ransom of 100,000 marks in 1357, and, dying in February 1371, was buried near the high altar of Holyrood. In the following year Edward III. granted safe-conduct to persons going from Scotland to Flanders to get a stone for his brother-in-law's tomb.

It is not recorded that the Abbey had suffered in King Edward's destructive foray of 1355—remembered as the "burnt Candlemas"—when the beautiful church of Haddington, the Lamp of Lothian, was burnt to the ground. The Scottish kings continued to hold councils or parliaments at Holyrood, and in 1381 the Abbey received a distinguished foreigner as guest of the nation at Holyrood, in the person of John of Gaunt, Duke of Lancaster, son of the deceased Edward III., whose palace of Savoy had been plundered by the Tyler rioters, and who found it expedient to remain out

**John of Gaunt**  
**at Holyrood**,  
**1381.**

of England until matters should settle down. He was received with royal honours, the Earl of Douglas and Archibald Douglas "the Grim," Lord of Galloway, escorting him from Haddington, and the Earl of Carrick, Heir-Apparent (afterwards Robert III.), acting as host. The visit being of good augury for future relations between the kingdoms, no expense was spared, the large sum of £597, 14s. 9d. appearing in the Chamberlain's accounts as disbursed for the entertainment of this puissant guest.

It has been commonly stated that Richard II. burnt and sacked Holyrood Abbey when he invaded Scotland in 1385. No doubt he destroyed the town of Edinburgh with fire, including St Giles's Cathedral, as well as the abbeys of Melrose, Dryburgh, and Newbattle; but both Bower, the continuator of Fordun, and Wyntoun expressly state that Holyrood was spared at the intercession of John of Gaunt, out of gratitude for the hospitality he had received therein.

"Bot the duk for his curtasy,  
Syne he hadde qwhylum thare herbry  
Quhen he wes owe to his cuntré,  
Gert it at that tyme sawffyd he."<sup>1</sup>

John of Gaunt died in 1399; and when his son Henry IV. invaded Scotland in the autumn of 1400, he is said to have spared Holyrood in remembrance of the kindness of the convent to his father. It is not unlikely that, while Henry was besieging the Duke of Rothesay in Edinburgh Castle, he paid some civil compliments to the monks; but, in fact, during this invasion he caused all religious houses to be respected.

Dean John of Leith was abbot at this time, about whom nothing is known save that he held office for an unusually

<sup>1</sup> Wyntoun's *Cronykil*, B. ix.

long term, as shown by the appearance of his name in charters from the year 1386 to 1423.

James I. was a captive in England when he succeeded his father Robert III. in 1406, and his coronation was delayed until he regained his liberty and returned to Scotland in 1424. He began to reign with vigorous intention, carried into measures not less vigorous, of remedying the misrule and anarchy which had grown up under the regency of his uncle Albany and his cousin Murdoch. Albany was dead; Murdoch, his two sons, and Duncan, Earl of Lennox, were sent promptly to the scaffold; after which the King directed his attention to the suppression of humbler malefactors—a process in which mercy seems to have been wholly eclipsed by justice. Having caused all the Lowlands to cower, he proceeded to quell disorders in the Highlands by setting the chief and thieves to catch each other. Alastair, Lord of the Isles, saved his life by anticipating arrest. The King and Queen were in the Abbey Church on the eve of St Augustine, when the rebel lord appeared before them suddenly, clad, says the chronicler Bower, only in shirt and drawers,—unless, as Mr Lang suggests, “his romantic national costume was mistaken by the Lowland Bower for these garments.” Holding a naked sword by the point, he knelt before his sovereign and craved pardon. His life was spared, but he was sent to ward in Tantallon Castle, the grim fortress built by the dead Murdoch.

From this time forward Holyrood Abbey became more and more the favourite residence of the royal family when in their capital.

“In the year 1430,” writes the Latin annalist of Pluscardin, “there were born unto the King two male twins, the sons of the King and

**Birth of  
James II. at  
Holyrood,  
1430.**

Queen, whereat all people rejoiced with exceeding gladness throughout the realm, and because they were born in the monastery of Holyrood, bonfires [*ignes jocunditatis*] were lighted, flagons of wine and free meals were offered to all comers, while the most delectable harmony of musical instruments proclaimed all night long the praise and glory of God for all his gifts and benefits.”<sup>1</sup>

Alexander, the elder twin, died an infant; the younger lived to become James II. After his grand-uncle Walter Stewart, Earl of Angus, with some of the other assassins of his father James I., had been tortured and executed in Edinburgh, the young king, aged seven years, rode in procession from the Castle to the Abbey on 25th March

**His coronation, 25th March 1437.** 1437, there to be crowned in presence of the Three Estates. This king had a red birth-mark on his cheek,—hence, with the schoolboy frankness of the period, he was distinguished among other sovereigns of his line and name as “James with the Firye Face.” A contemporary chronicler records the ceremony with engaging naïveté: “1436 wes the coronacioun of King James the secund with the Red Scheik [cheek], callit James with the fyr in the face, he beand [being] bot sax yer ald and ane half, in the abbay of Halyrudhous, quhar [where] now his banys [bones] lyis.”<sup>2</sup>

The next great ceremony in this church took place on 3rd July 1449, when this James married Marie, daughter of Arnold, Duc de Gueldres. “Thar come with hir xiii gret schippis and ane craike [carrack], in the quhilk ther was the Lord of Canfer [Campvere]<sup>3</sup> with xv score of men in harnes.”<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup> *Liber Pluscardensis*, xi. 5.

<sup>2</sup> Winton MS.

<sup>3</sup> Campvere’s son and heir, Wolfaert, had married in 1444 Mary, sister of James II.

<sup>4</sup> *Auchinleck Chronicle*, p. 41.

A minute and enthusiastic account of the proceedings is preserved in the French chronicle of Mahieu d'Escouchy. The wedding feast, says he, lasted four or five hours, "wine and other beverages being grudged as little as if they had been so much sea-water." Finally, in August 1460, after King James "unhappely was slane with ane gun, the quhilk brak in the fyring" <sup>1</sup> at the siege of Roxburgh Castle, his body was brought to the Abbey to be laid near the altar. Born, christened, crowned, wedded, buried

**His burial,  
August 1460.** there — no King of Scots ever was more closely associated with Holyrood than James

with the Fiery Face. His queen, Mary of Gueldres, survived him for three years, and was buried, not in Holyrood, but in the Church of the Holy Trinity, which she herself had founded after the death of her husband. It must be matter for perpetual regret that the North British Railway Company was allowed to destroy and remove this building in 1848.

At this time Archibald Crawfurd, son of Sir William Crawfurd of Haining, was Abbot of Holyrood, having previously been Prior of the same. He was an active politician, frequently engaged in diplomatic negotiations with England, and was appointed Lord High Treasurer in 1474. But what chiefly concerns us at this day is the change which he wrought in the fabric of the Abbey. Although, as has been shown above, it is probable that Richard II. did not, as alleged, apply fire to the building,

**Restoration of  
the Abbey by  
Abbot Craw-  
furd, c. 1464.** yet it must have fallen into some disrepair, and perhaps anxiety was felt for its security.

At all events, about the year 1460 Abbot Crawfurd, encouraged by the striking of a truce with England for fifteen years, undertook its res-

<sup>1</sup> *Auchinleck Chronicle*, p. 57.

toration. He strengthened the walls of the north and south aisles with those buttresses which stand out so gaunt and conspicuous in the present state of the ruin ; but the flying buttresses which connected them with the clerestory, and which must have greatly enriched the aspect of the church, have disappeared long ago. The arched doorway, with ogee canopy, on the north side of the building, seems to have been erected at the same time. Each buttress bears on its outer face a canopied niche, richly ornamented ; above and below each niche is a panel for arms, but most of the shields carved thereon are indecipherable through decay, and the figures of saints or heroes which probably occupied the niches have been torn down by over-zealous reformers. It is said that Abbot Crawfurd's arms, which may still be recognised on some of the shields, were repeated thirty times.

The work on the Abbey may have been completed in time for the marriage on 18th July 1469 of James III., at

**Marriage of  
James III.  
with Margaret  
of Denmark,  
18th July  
1469.**

the age of eighteen, with Princess Margaret of Denmark, aged thirteen. This proved to be a union of unusual importance to the realm of Scotland and the United Kingdom. The father of the bride, Christiern I., third King of Denmark and Norway, had assigned to his daughter a dowry of 60,000 florins, whereof 10,000 were to be paid down, and the Orkney Islands, hitherto Norwegian territory, were to be given in pledge for the remaining 50,000. But cash being very scarce at that time in King Christiern's exchequer, he failed to find more than 2000 florins, and the Scottish ambassadors accepted the Shetland Islands in pledge for the other 8000. It was provided that if Queen Margaret survived her husband and left Scotland, Orkney and Shetland should revert to the Crown of Denmark and

Norway ; but Margaret having died in 1486, two years before King James was murdered at the Milltown of Bannockburn, this provision never took effect. The Danish Government frequently in after years opened negotiations for reclaiming the pledged islands, but never found it convenient to redeem them ; wherefore they have remained to this day part of the realm of Scotland. In November following the marriage, the Three Estates assembled in Parliament at Holyrood for the coronation of Queen Margaret.

The reign inaugurated with so much splendour and promise turned out one of the most melancholy in the annals of Scotland. James was of a dreamy, intellectual temperament, ill fitted to cope with the violence of the times, preferring, like Louis XVI. of France, to shun affairs of State and to shut himself up with artists and musicians. In the quaint words of Pitscottie, “he was ane that lowit [loved] sollitarnes, and desyrit never to heir of weiris [wars] nor the fame thairof, bot delytit mair in musik and pollicie of beging [building] nor he did in the goverment of his realme.” He spent much of his time at Holyrood in study of these arts, to the intense disgust of his barons, which led to the terrible scene at Lauder, when Angus “Bell-the-Cat” and his peers, determined to purge the Court of “fiddlers and bricklayers,” seized Robert Cochran, an architect, whom the King had created Earl of Mar, hanged him, with some of the other favourites, over the

parapet of the bridge (22nd July 1482), and confined the King in Edinburgh Castle.

**Abbot Bellenden's benefactions, c. 1487-1503.** The next abbot after Archibald Crawfurd was Robert Bellenden or Ballantine, who presided over the convent for about sixteen years. John Bellenden, Archdeacon of Moray, in translating Boece's

history, interpolated a warm encomium upon his namesake, who was probably a near relative.

“This abbay was laitly in gouernance of ane gud man den [Dean] Robert Bellenden abbot xvi yeris. He delt ylk owlk [each week] iiiii bowis of quheit [wheat] and xls of syluer [silver] amang pure [poor] houshaldis and indegent pepil. He brocht hame the gret bellis, the gret brasyn fount, xxiiii capis [copes] of gold and sylk. He maid ane chalice of syne gold, ane eucharist, with sindry challicis of siluer; he theikkit [thatched] the kirk with leid; he biggit ane brig of Leith, ane othir ouir Clide; with mony othir gude workis, qwhilkis war ouir prolix to schaw [which it would take too long to explain]. Nocht theless he wes sa inuiit [envied] be sindry othir prelatis, becaus he was not gevyn to lust and insolence efter thair maner, that he left the Abbey, and deit [died] ane Chartour monk.”<sup>1</sup>

The fate of two of Abbot Bellenden’s gifts—the brazen font and the leaden roof—will fall to be recounted later.

It is doubtful whether Bellenden was still in office, or whether he had retired to the cloister as stated by his namesake, when the marriage of James IV. to Princess Margaret of England took place in Holyrood in 1503. Before that event, great changes had been wrought in the precincts of the Abbey, marking a fresh departure in its history.

<sup>1</sup> Bellenden’s *Boece*, xii. 16.

## CHAPTER II.

## HOLYROOD AS A ROYAL PALACE.

Holyrood Palace built by James IV.	.....	A.D. 1498-1503
Marriage of James IV. with Margaret of England	.....	8th August 1503
Pope Julius II.'s gifts to James IV.	.....	1507
"Cleanse the Causeway"	.....	30th April 1520
James V. arrives at Holyrood	.....	26th July 1524
William Douglas, Abbot of Holyrood	.....	1525-28
Robert Cairncross, Abbot	.....	1528-38
Persecution of heretics	.....	1534
Marriage of James V. with Madeleine of France	.....	1537

IT has been shown in the last chapter how the Scottish kings gradually came to regard and use the Abbey of Holyrood as their regular residence when in the capital. The royal family and their suite, with some members of the Court and State officials, would be lodged in the conventional buildings adjoining the church. But such accommodation had its limits ; it must have been taxed to the utmost during the state ceremonies which occurred from time to time ; and at last it was resolved by King James IV. to erect a regular palace upon the site which had become so closely identified with the work of government. Effect

was given to this resolve between the years  
**Holyrood Palace built 1498 and 1501.** Master Leonard Logy had  
 by James IV., the work in charge in the latter year, and the  
**1498-1503.** building was far enough advanced in 1503 to receive Princess Margaret of England when she arrived

from the south for her espousals with the King of Scots. The immediate effect of the new building must have been to spoil the appearance of the Abbey from the south and west ; for the palace was built against the west side of the cloisters, thus shutting off the east end of the church from view of the Canongate and city of Edinburgh.

John Younger, Somerset Herald, was in the English Princess's suite, and kept a most minute account of the

**Marriage of James IV. with Princess Margaret,** wedding festivities, which has long been the delight of antiquaries by reason of the vivid picture it preserves of the habits of the time.

**8th August 1503.** The treaty of marriage between the King of

Scots and the daughter of Henry VII. of England had been settled so long before as the autumn of 1499. Towards the end of July 1503 Princess Margaret set out from London "mounted on a faire palfrey," followed by a numerous suite, and made leisurely progress to the northern capital. Everywhere as she passed, the lords and gentry turned out to bid her God-speed, "well horsed upon fayre coursers, and maid gambads plaisant for to see," and the English guns of Berwick thundered a royal salute, "the which was fayr to here." Crossing the Border, she was met at Lamberton Kirk by Scottish gentlemen, "a thousand persons in company, five hundred mounted on horses of gret prece and well appoynted"; and on the third day after that, the King met her at Dalkeith "arayd of a jakette of cramsyn velvet borded with cloth of gold, . . . hys beerde somethynge long."

"The King was conveyd to the Quene's chamber, wher she mett hym at her grett chamber dore right honorable accompanyed. At the mettyng he and she maid grett reverences the one to the tother, his hed being bare; and they kyssed togeder, and in lykwyss kyssed the ladyes and others also. And he in especiall welcomed the Erle of Surrey varey hertly."

The Princess remained four days at Dalkeith and Newbattle Abbey, and each day the King rode out from Edinburgh to pay his court, entertaining his bride by his feats of horsemanship and playing to her on the clarycordes and lute, “wiche pleasyd hyr varey much, and she had grett plaisir to here hym.” On the morning of 7th August the Princess arrayed herself in “a rych gowne of cloth of gold, with a purfill of black velvet, and a rich coller of perle and stone,” and proceeded towards Edinburgh in a fine litter.

“Half of the way, the Kyng cam to mett hyr, mounted apon a bay horse, rennyng as he wolde renne after the hayre.” He wore a jacket of cloth of gold, a purple satin doublet, scarlet hose, a “schert” richly jewelled, and “hys spourris gylt and long. At the commyng towardes the Quene, he maid hyr varey humble obeyssance in lepynge downe from hys horse, and kyssed hyr in hyr litere.” He first tried to seat the Princess behind him on one of his own horses ; but the animal had not been trained to carry double, so he mounted the Princess’s palfrey, “and the said Quene behinde hym, and so rode towards the town of Edinburgh.” There they were received with a curious medley of pageants, “Paris and the three deessys [goddesses]” appearing in agreeable contrast to the Salutation of the Virgin by the Angel Gabriel. At the Cross there was a fountain “castynge forth of wyn, ychon [each one] drank that wold,” and gay tapestry flaunted from every window.

“Then the noble company passed out of the said towne to the Church of the Holy Crosse. . . . Ychon lept off hys horse and in fayr order went after the processyon to the Church, & in the entryng of that sam, the Kyng & the Quene light downe, and after he take the Quene by the body, doyng humble reverence, & led hyr to the grett awter [altar], wher was a place ordonned for them to knele apon two cuschyons of

cloth of gold. Bot the Kyng wold never knell downe first, bot both togeder. . . . After all reverences doon at the Church, in ordre as before, the Kyng transported himself to the Pallais, through the clostre,<sup>1</sup> holdynge allwayes the Quene by the body, and hys hed bare, tyll he had brought hyr within her chammer. . . . Then the Kyng kyssed her for hyr labor; and so tuke hyr ageyn with low cortesay and bare hed, and brought her to her second chammer, and kyssed her ageyn, taking his leve right humble. . . . The eighth day of the said monneth, every man apoynted hymselfe rychly for the honor of the noble maryage. Betuix 8 and 9 o the clock, everychon was rady, nobly apperyld, and the ladyes came rychly arayd, sum in gownys of cloth of gold, others of cremsyn velvet and blak, others of satyn and of tynsell, of damake and of chamlet, of many colours; hoods, chaynnes and collers apon ther neks; accompanied of ther gentylwomen arayd honnestly after ther gyse, for to hold company to the said Quene."

Then the Archbishop of York, the Bishop of Durham, the Earl of Surrey, and other English lords were brought before the King, who "sat in a chayre of cramsyn velvet, the pannells gylte, under hys cloth of astat [state] of blew velvet fygured of gold. . . . It was a noble thynge to se the sayd chammer so nobly founyshed."

As he proceeds with his narrative, Somerset Herald becomes sadly at a loss for epithets to describe withal the splendour of the scene. The English lords, having made obeisance to the King of Scots, withdrew, and presently returned, bringing with them the royal bride "arayed in a rich robe, borded of cramsyn velvet, and lyned of the self, with a varey riche coller of gold, of pyerrery [jewellery] and perles round her neck, . . . crowned with a varey ryche croune of gold, garnished with pierrery and perles, her hayre hangyng."<sup>2</sup> The King

<sup>1</sup> The eastern side of the present Palace occupies the site of the western side of the cloister.

<sup>2</sup> This was the fashion of the time, differing from that of 1469, as shown by the picture of the marriage of James III., in which Margaret of Denmark is represented with her hair elaborately dressed.

was no whit inferior in splendour of raiment, “rychly and honnestly arayd in a gowne of whit damaske, figured with gold and lynned with sarsanet. He had on a jakette with slyffs [sleeves] of cramsyn satin, the lists of blak velvett. Under that sam a dowblet of cloth of gold, and a payr of scarlate hosys [hose]; hys shurt broded with thred of gold; his bonnet blak with a rich balay [ruby], and hys swerd about him.”

The Archbishop of Glasgow performed the marriage ceremony; the King placed the sceptre in the Queen’s hand; the *Te Deum* was sung; and “that and all the ceremonyes accomlysched, ther was brought by the lordes bred and wyn in ryche potts and ryche cupps.”

The King and Queen dined in separate rooms.

“The Quene was served before the Kyng, with all th’ onner that myght be doon. . . . The chamber in which she dyned was rychly drest, and the cloth of astat wher she satt was of clothe of gold varey riche. At the first course sche was served of a wyld borre’s hed gylt, within a fayr platter; then with a fayr pece of brane [pork], and in the thyrd place with a gambon; which wer followed by divers other dyshys, to the nombre of xii, of many sortes, in fayre and ryche vesselle. . . . After this the Kyng was served in vesselle gylt, as the Quene. . . . The Archbyschops of Saunt Andrew [brother of the King] and of York, the Bischop of Durhame and the Erle of Surrey dyned with hym. The chamber was haunged of red and of bleu, and in it was a cylly of astate [canopy of state] of cloth of gold, bot the Kyng was not under it for that sam day. Ther wer also in the sam chamber a riche bed of astat, and a riche dresser, after the guyse of the countre; and the Lord Grays the father served the King with water for to wash, and the Erle of Huntlye berred the towaylle.”

Feasting went on in four other apartments—namely, the Great Chamber, hung with tapestry representing “the ystory of Troy towne”; the King’s Chamber, “the which was haunged about with the story of Hercules, togeder with other ystorys”; the King’s Hall, “haunged of th’

ystory of the old Troy"; and another chamber, where the adventures of Hercules again formed the subject of the decoration. There were also "grett syerges [*cièrges*, candles] of wax for to lyght at even," and "rych dressors, good chere and good wyn. . . . After dynnar, the mynstrells played, and the Kynge and the Quene, the ladyes, knyghts, gentylmen and gentylwomen daunced. Also some good bodys maid games of passe passe, and dyd varey well."

Next day there was a great tournament, in which

"sum brak speres, the others not. At the wyndowes was the Kynge, accompanied of th' Archbyschops of Saunt Andrew and York, and of the Byschop of Durham, and of other prelatts, the said windowes being well apoynted. The Quene was at the windowes of hyr grett chamber; . . . ageynst them was a scarfawld, whereon was my Lord of Surrey and the Erle Bothwell only."

And so this famous house-warming went on right royally until the 14th August, "and that doon, every man went his way,"—in the belief, no doubt, that in this union of the royal houses of England and Scotland was the quenching of that weary, wasteful war which had run, almost without intermission, for two hundred years. Ay, but it was the destiny of King James to meet Surrey once again, ten years later, on the stricken field of Flodden. Meanwhile, the King was so well pleased with the palace that had been prepared for his bride that on 10th September following the wedding he granted to Master Leonard Logy, who had charge of the work, a pension of £40 a-year for life, in acknowledgment of the "diligent and grete lawboure maid be him in the bigging of the palace beside the Abbay of the Halycroce."

The next important ceremony of which the Church of Holyrood was the scene took place in 1507, when the

Papal legate, Bishop Forman, and the Abbot of Dunfermline delivered to King James a sword of State,

**Julius II.  
sends a sword  
of State to  
James IV.,  
1507.** an embroidered belt, and a consecrated hat, the gifts of Julius II., most militant of Popes.

The sword and belt have been preserved in a remarkable manner, and are now kept

with the Honours of Scotland, or, as they are usually termed, the Regalia, in Edinburgh Castle. When Cromwell invaded Scotland in 1651, the Scottish Privy Council and Parliament committed these insignia of royalty to the keeping of William, 7th Earl Marischal, in Dunnottar Castle. The earl was absent in England with Charles II.'s army; but he had a faithful lieutenant in George Ogilvie of Barras, who, when closely besieged by Cromwellian troops under Lambert, perceiving that he would be forced by famine to surrender, managed to smuggle out the regalia into a place of safety. Mistress Granger, wife of the minister of Kinneff, applied to General Morgan for leave to enter the beleaguered castle in order to visit Mistress Ogilvie, wife of the lieutenant-governor, who was ailing. There was nothing unusual in the appearance of a huge distaff covered with lint which Mistress Granger carried with her, for it was the custom of industrious housewives to spin thread while moving about: when the visit was over, and the good dame was taking her leave, nobody suspected that the real distaff had been replaced by the Sceptre and Sword of Scotland. The Crown came nearer being detected, for that was concealed in Mrs Granger's apron under a lot of yarn, and when General Morgan courteously assisted the lady to mount her palfrey, the Crown was within an ace of rolling out. However, all went well; Mistress Granger carried her priceless burden safely to the parsonage, and that night her husband

buried the regalia under the pavement of his church, where they lay unsuspected until the Restoration in 1660, when Ogilvie delivered them to Charles II.

The belt was not buried with the rest of the Honours. Many years afterwards it was found concealed in the wall of the house of Barras, and having passed into the possession of Dr G. Livingstone Ogilvie, a descendant of the family of Barras, was restored by him to Queen Victoria, and now rests with the sword among the Honours of Scotland.

Margaret Tudor bore six children to King James, all of whom died in infancy save one, the future James V., born at Linlithgow, 10th April 1512. Two other sons, James and Arthur, were born in Holyrood House; the fourth son, Alexander, Duke of Ross, having been born at Stirling, was buried at Cambuskenneth. To the end of his life James IV. continued to spend money on the improvement and extension of his palace. It is not known when Robert Bellenden resigned the abbotship, nor is there any record of a successor to him until the year 1515, two years after King James's death at Flodden, when John, Duke of Albany, grandson of James II., and heir presumptive to the Crown, returned from France and was acknowledged by Parliament as Governor of Scotland during the minority of James V. This Prince, a Frenchman born and trained, could not so much as speak the language of the nation which he was called upon to govern. Nevertheless, he took up the unfinished work in the Palace and continued the expenditure thereon until his return to France on 8th June 1517. It is recorded by Marjoreybanks that when Albany arrested the High Chamberlain (Lord Home) and his brother William on a charge of treason, he warded them in the tower of Holyroodhouse, "which wes foundit by

the said Ducke." This, as observed elsewhere (see p. 1), probably referred to the "fair-werk" or gatehouse, where the prison still remains. Lord Home and his brother were executed on 8th and 9th October 1516, their heads remaining exposed on the Tolbooth till 21st July 1520.

At this time George Crichton, Lord Privy Seal, was Abbot of Holyrood, and continued so till 1522, when he was appointed Bishop of Dunkeld. The affairs of Scotland, political and ecclesiastical, had come to a deplorable pass. The realm was rent into two main factions, which it is difficult to keep clearly in view, so swiftly and so frequently did the leading members of each change sides in accordance with what seemed their interest at the moment. Queen Margaret had married the Earl of Angus within less than a year of her husband's death, and round these two, who had the infant king in possession, gathered those nobles who favoured the English interest. The head of the French faction was the Regent Albany, supported by James Hamilton, whom the late king had created Earl of Arran because of his prowess at the wedding tournament. The Church, now at its darkest hour of corruption and venality, inclined to either side according to the degree in which the benefices could be stuffed with the partisans of Angus or Arran. The feud culminated in the conflict

**"Cleanse the Causeway,"** 30th April 1520. known as "Cleanse the Causeway," which took place on the High Street of Edinburgh, 30th April 1520, when the Hamiltons were

routed by the Douglasses, and Arran fled to France. But the triumph of Angus was marred by the hatred which his wife, the Queen-mother, had conceived for him. In her anxiety for a divorce she did not scruple to intrigue against her husband with Albany and Arran.

She even encouraged Albany to look for her hand in marriage once she should be free. Angus himself found it convenient to retire to France in 1522. Margaret's brother, Henry VIII., sent Surrey, son of the victor of Flodden, to waste the distracted kingdom of Scotland. Repeated raids were made in the summer and autumn of 1523. The magnificent abbey of Jedburgh was burnt, and all the Border land wasted to such a degree that multitudes died of starvation.

Plot and counter-plot followed with so much intricacy and rapidity that it would be vain to attempt to follow them in this brief review of events. Queen Margaret shifted sides more frequently than anybody. The position in the summer of 1524 was that Albany had finally retired to France on 20th May, despairing of the country he had aspired to govern. Angus returned in June from his exile in France, seeking refuge in England, where he was received with favour by Henry VIII. and Wolsey,—quite enough to impel Queen Margaret towards the French alliance. The English Government, under pretext of arranging a peace with Scotland, continued diligent in nourishing the internal feuds of that distracted realm. Margaret cared for nothing in comparison with obtaining her divorce from Angus. Had this been granted in time for her to marry Albany, one can scarcely doubt that she intended to sacrifice her son's birthright to Albany's pretension to the crown; but now that Albany was off the Scottish stage, she bestowed her feverish affection upon Henry Stewart, captain of her Guard (whom ultimately she married in 1526), and took measures to obtain the official recognition of her son as King.

On 26th July, Angus her husband being still in England, Queen Margaret took James V., then aged twelve

years, left Stirling suddenly, and rode with him to Edinburgh, where they were received with great rejoicing by the people. Then they went in procession to Holyrood, where, according to Lindsay of Pitscottie, the King “tuik up hous, with all office men requisite for his estate, and changed all the old officeris, both treasurer, comptroller, secreitar, M<sup>r</sup> Maissar, M<sup>r</sup> Household, M<sup>r</sup> Stableris, copperis, carveris, and all the rest.”

**Arrival of James V. at Holyrood, 26th July 1524.** This “erection of the King,” as it was called, pleased the King of England and Wolsey, in so far as it seemed a discouragement to the French faction. Angus was permitted to return to Scotland, but not to his family circle; for Margaret withdrew from Holyrood at his approach, ensconcing herself with the young king in Edinburgh Castle, where she set at defiance the armed attempt of Angus and Lennox to get possession of her son’s person.

This anarchy proving intolerable, in February 1525 Parliament appointed a council of eight nobles to take the King in charge; in which body Angus, head of the dreaded house of Douglas, soon took the lead.

Church patronage being among the most coveted perquisites of office, Angus, as was to be expected, lost no time in finding comfortable appointments for his kinsmen. His brother, William Douglas, Abbot of Holyrood, 1525-28. had already acquired the Priory of Coldingham, by means which illustrate so vividly the condition to which affairs of Church and State had

fallen, that they may be briefly rehearsed. It should be remembered that the higher ecclesiastical benefices carried with them not only handsome revenues, but great political power and extensive patronage—bishops, abbots,

and priors being entitled *ex officio* to sit in Parliament, with precedence over lay peers and commoners.

The Priory of Coldingham had been for many years a subject of angry contention between the Douglases and the rising house of Home. In 1515 David, youngest brother of Lord Home, managed to get himself appointed prior. Next year, after Lord Home and his second brother had been executed for treason, David managed to retain the office, but was slain in 1519 by his kinsman James Hepburn of Hailes. Robert Blackadder succeeded to this much-coveted post, only to fall a few months later by the sword of David Home of Wedderburn, whereupon William Douglas stepped in and seized the priorate for himself. His right was challenged by Archdeacon Blackadder of Dunblane, cousin of the latest murdered prior, who declared that the Pope, at Albany's request, had conferred the priorate upon him—Blackadder. He had better have held his peace, such short work did John Home make of his claim. Meeting the archdeacon one day near Edinburgh, he ended the controversy by killing him outright; and Douglas continued to enjoy the benefice, *per vim*, till 1522, when he was charged with treason, and had to go into exile with his brother Angus.

When Angus returned to power in 1525, his uncle, Gavin Douglas, Bishop of Dunkeld, was dead. Abbot Crichton of Holyrood had been appointed to that see in 1522; Angus, therefore, gave rein to his fraternal feelings by appointing William to the abbotship of Holyrood, and allowing him to retain the priorate of Coldingham also.

The ascendancy of Angus boded no good to the French faction in Scotland, and their hopes seemed finally wrecked by the total defeat and capture of François I<sup>er</sup> at the battle of Pavia (24th Feb. 1525). A three years' truce, there-

fore, was patched up with England, and on 14th June 1526 the Three Estates in Parliament assembled decreed that, King James having reached the age of fourteen years, the "authority royal" was in his hands. This brought over Arran to the party of Angus; but it also brought about civil war. The Earl of Lennox, well knowing the young King's detestation of his stepfather Angus, and his anxiety to be freed from his thralldom, took the field in force, but was defeated and slain at Linlithgow by Angus and Arran on 4th September 1526. Two years later, when King James, detained against his will by Angus, escaped from Falkland, his first act was to avenge the blood of Lennox, whom he had loved, by causing Parliament to pass act of forfeiture upon Angus and the chiefs of Douglas whom he continued to hate; after which he began to rule for himself with precocious vigour.

William Douglas's tenure of his lucrative pluralities did not bring him much ease. He died in 1528, overcome, <sup>Robert Cairn-</sup> says Buchanan, not only by disease, but by cross, Abbot, anxiety and weariness of the condition of 1528-38. affairs. He was succeeded as abbot by Robert Cairncross, Provost of Corstorphine Collegiate Church, chaplain to the King, and Lord High Treasurer of Scotland—a person of whom Buchanan speaks in very uncomplimentary terms. Buchanan was not an unbiased judge of ecclesiastics; nevertheless, his charges of fraud and peculation against Cairncross appear to have solid foundation, for he was deprived of the Treasurership in 1529, recovered the office in 1537, and lost it again in 1538. In that year or the next he gave up his abbotship on being appointed Bishop of Ross, which see he held, in conjunction with the abbotship of Ferne, until his death in 1545.

Although, as will be shown presently, James V. remodelled and enlarged the Palace of Holyrood, he does not seem to have spent much of his time there. He was present, however, clothed in scarlet, at the **Persecution of heretics, 1534.** sinister proceedings of the ecclesiastical commissioners appointed to try heretics, who met in the Abbey in August 1534. Some of those examined before this court recanted and burned their faggots. King James, perhaps, was not willing that any should suffer, but the bishops vowed that he had no prerogative of mercy—that his coronation oath bound him to the extirpation of heresy. Two victims were condemned to the stake—David Straiton, a gentleman of Forfarshire, and Norman Gourlay, a priest. They suffered within view of the Palace, at the Cross of Greenside on the Calton Hill, 27th August 1534.

In February following, Holyrood was the scene of a less lugubrious ceremony. Since the fall of Angus, King James had gone over completely to the French alliance and the old religion. While he was burning Scottish heretics, his uncle of England was showing his zeal for the new doctrine by immolating Bishop Fisher and Sir Thomas More. Yet King Henry had not lost hope of securing a hold upon Scottish affairs; so, after the Emperor Charles V. had bestowed the Golden Fleece upon the King of Scots, and the King of France had conferred upon him the Order of St Michael, Henry followed suit with the Order of the Garter, with which James was invested in Holyrood Abbey Church on 21st February 1536, being the first Scottish monarch to receive that distinction. A contemporary diarist thus notices the occasion:—

“Vpoun the aucht day of Februare thair come ane ambassatour out of Ingland callit William, sone to the erle of Surreye, with certane greit horsis to the Kingis grace, with xxx horsis in tryne [train], with

the ordour of the knyght of the gartare. Vpoun the xxj day of Februare the Kingis grace ressauit the ordour of the gairter in the abbay of Halyrudhous with greit solemnitie."<sup>1</sup>

"The King's grace," be it observed; not his Majesty, which style, though borrowed occasionally by Scottish courtiers from the example of Henry VIII.'s magnificence, can scarcely be found as officially applied to Scottish monarchs before the union of the Crowns. The proper address to the King of Scots continued to be the ancient and simpler phrase, "the King's Grace."

On 19th May 1537 King James brought home his bride Madeleine, eldest daughter of the King of France,

*Marriage of James V. with Madeleine of France, 1537.* to whom he had been wedded in the church of Nôtre Dame at Paris. Landing at Leith, this new Queen of Scots knelt and kissed the soil of Scotland, and then proceeded to the

Palace of Holyrood amid the cheers of the people. The festivities were brief. Queen Madeleine's health was wretched; within eight weeks of her arrival she was laid in a tomb within the Abbey Church. "Doole weeds" — *i.e.*, mourning dress — were worn generally throughout the realm out of regard for her untimely fate — the first time, says Buchanan, when such an observance was known in Scotland.

A year had not elapsed when, in June 1538, King James married his second wife, the widow Madame de Longueville, Mary of Guise, who was crowned in the Abbey on 22nd February — a ceremony which, so far from being made the occasion of royal clemency, was followed by the burning of six heretics on the Castle Hill on the last day of the month. From that day forth matters went from bad to worse in Scotland. Queen Mary bore her

<sup>1</sup> *Diurnal of Occurrents.*

husband a son in 1540, another in 1541: both were buried in the Abbey of Holyrood in the latter year. Then King James undertook that invasion of England which miscarried so shamefully in the rout of Solway, 24th November 1542. He trailed himself, a broken-hearted man, to Falkland Palace. Word came to him there that his queen had been delivered of a girl on 8th December: the news brought him no cheer. "The crown," he murmured, "cam' wi' a lass,<sup>1</sup> and it will gang wi' a lass." He died on the 14th, and was buried beside his first wife in Holyrood Abbey, leaving the crown, with its train of sorrow and strife, to the babe Mary Queen of Scots.

<sup>1</sup> Referring to Marjorie Bruce, daughter of Robert I., whose son by Walter the Steward succeeded as Robert II., first of the Stuart dynasty.

## CHAPTER III.

## TROUBLED TIMES AT HOLYROOD.

James V.'s addition to Holyroodhouse	.	.	.	.	c. 1528
Burning of the Abbey by the English	.	.	.	.	1544
Second devastation of Holyrood	.	.	.	.	1547
Demolition of choir and transepts	.	.	.	.	c. 1569
Arrival of Mary Queen of Scots	.	.	.	19th August	1561
The raid against Huntly	.	.	.	.	1562
Execution of Chastelard	.	.	.	22nd February	1563
The Mass and the masses	.	.	.	.	1563
Marriage of Queen Mary with Lord Darnley	.	.	.	29th July	1565

ALTHOUGH the north-west tower of Holyrood Palace has been known for long as James V.'s, it was probably part of the original work of his father, James IV.

**James V.'s Tower ought to be known as James IV.'s—1505.** This appears pretty clear from the Treasurer's accounts, which contain notes of the final payments to Walter Merlioun in 1505 "for completing the tour in Halyrudhous," the last entry, on 13th November, ending with the words, "and sa all payet tharefor." During the rest of that reign payments were made in connection with the extension of the Palace towards the south; whereas after 1513, when James V. came to the throne, the entries refer only to repairs and minor alterations, glazing windows, adding iron stanchions to them, and suchlike. Dr Wilson, indeed, writing about the middle of the nineteenth century, stated that the legend *JAC : V : REX : SCOTORUM* remained in Roman

letters gilt on the bottom of one of the recessed panels on the front of this tower; but this has now disappeared. Probably it was placed there when the Palace was being rebuilt under Charles II. The position of this tower in relation to the Abbey Church is well shown in a sketch prepared, it is believed, for use in the Earl of Hertford's invasion in 1544. The fore-court shown in this




FIG. 12.—HOLYROODHOUSE AND ARTHUR'S SEAT.

DRAWN BY AN ENGLISH SPY IN 1543-44.

drawing, with its vaulted gatehouse, was taken down in 1755.

Hertford, as is well known, made use of his information in a manner most disastrous to the Scots, whom he was sent to chastise. Henry VIII., being determined that the infant Mary, Queen of Scots, should be wedded to his son, afterwards Edward VI., had the support of a powerful section of the Scottish nobles—the “assured Scots,” as they were

called ; but the majority of the nation clung to the French alliance, and refused to entrust their young Queen to Henry's keeping. The treaty of marriage was concluded, indeed, at Greenwich on 1st July 1543, but the distaste of the Catholic party for the English alliance was invincible. Regent Arran's hand was forced. Cardinal Beaton, with the Earls of Huntly, Lennox, Argyle, and Bothwell, appeared at Linlithgow with 6000 men, and the Regent consented to the removal of Queen Mary to Stirling, where she would be secure from any sudden attempt by the King of England.

On the very day of Mary's removal from Linlithgow, peace—perpetual peace—between England and Scotland was proclaimed in Edinburgh, and on 25th August Arran and the “assured Scots” assembled in the Abbey Church of Holyrood and ratified the treaty of Greenwich. But all this was upset by the Parliament which assembled on 3rd December. Beaton and the French party were in complete ascendancy ; even Arran had done penance for his apostacy and been received back into the Church of Rome ; rigorous laws against heresy were passed ; the treaty of Greenwich was declared null and void, and the alliance with France was renewed.

Henry's vengeance did not tarry. On 4th May 1544 the English fleet appeared in the Forth. Hertford landed

**Burning of the Abbey by the English, 1544.** at Leith at the head of a force far more powerful than any that Scotland, in her divided condition, could bring against it, and a devastation

began, fiercer than ever had been wrought in two hundred and fifty years of war. The town of Edinburgh was sacked ; the beautiful Abbey of Holyrood was laid in ashes ; James V.'s new palace was gutted. Only the Castle stood impregnable upon its mighty rock. Lord

Hertford recrossed the Border in May, having destroyed everything in his path.

One of Hertford's officers, Sir Richard Lee, has caused his name to be remembered with special bitterness by Scotsmen—a good soldier, no doubt, for Henry VIII. was well served in the field, but with a keen eye for loot. It has been mentioned in the first chapter how Abbot Robert Bellenden presented the Abbey, among other gifts, with a “gret brasyn fount.” Well, this brazen font Sir Richard Lee carried off to England, and presented it to the Abbey of St Albans, the clergy whereof caused it to be engraved with an inscription in Latin.<sup>1</sup>

The font was scarcely more secure at St Albans than it had been at Holyrood. For a hundred years it remained a noble ornament of the great Hertfordshire minster; but Thomas Fuller has recorded how it was “taken away in the late civil wars, as it seems, by those hands which suffered nothing (how sacred soever) to stand, that could be converted into money. . . . I could almost wish,” he added, “that the plunderers' fingers had found it as hot as when it was forged, that so these theives, with their fault, might have received the deserved punishment thereof.”<sup>2</sup>

So passed this “fair font of solid brasse”; but there remains in St Albans another work in the same metal which,

<sup>1</sup> The inscription as given in Camden's *Britannia* may be rendered in English as follows:—

“When Leith, a not inconsiderable town of the Scots, and Edinburgh, their principal city, had been destroyed by fire, RICHARD LEE, Knight, rescued me from the flames and brought me to the English. In return for this good deed, I, hitherto accustomed to wash none but the children of Kings, have now willingly yielded my office even to the meanest of the English. Such was the will of the victorious Lee. Farewell. In the year of our Lord MDXLIIII., and of Henry the Eighth XXXVI.”

<sup>2</sup> *History of the Worthies of England*, vol. i. p. 315.

it is almost certain, formed part of Sir Richard Lee's booty in this expedition—namely, the eagle lectern which was dug up in the chancel of St Stephen's Church at St Albans when a grave was being prepared about the year 1750. The base of this lectern bears the legend **Georgius † Crichtoun † Episcopus † Dunkeldensis**—that is, George Crichton, Bishop of Dunkeld—with the arms of Crichton, a lion rampant on a shield backed by a crozier and surmounted by a mitre. It seems pretty clear that this was a gift from Bishop Crichton to Holyrood, after he ceased to be abbot in 1522, on appointment to the see of Dunkeld, and that it escaped the fate which overtook the font only because the clergy of St Stephen's buried it out of sight. The inference is a pretty fair one that the lectern, as well as the font, were presents from Sir Richard Lee, seeing that on 7th January 1544-45, a few months after the sack of Holyrood, he received from King Henry a grant of the rectory and church of St Stephen's, which, until the dissolution of the monasteries in 1539, had been the property of the Abbey of St Alban's.

Lee doubtless had the will—he only lacked the leisure—to remove another of Abbot Bellenden's benefactions—namely, the leaden roof with which he had “theikkit the kirk.” That remained as a spoil for Hertford when, as Duke of Somerset, he renewed his invasion in 1547—the cruellest

**Second**  
**devastation**  
**of Holyrood,**  
**1547.** of all the visitations that the Scottish people ever had to endure. The monks of Holyrood had fled by that time,—the church stood silent

and bare; but the flames of Hertford had spared the roof,—probably it had been the Palace that suffered most in his conflagration. Lead, since the use of firearms had become general, was one of the most precious munitions of war, so Somerset's captains stripped the

rafters clean, and carried off that other gift of pious Bellenden—the church bells.<sup>1</sup>

All trace of these bells has been lost. The life of a bell is certainly precarious, and it may well be that these have been recast; but it is interesting to note that something is known of the fate of their successors. It is recorded in the Minute Book of the Barons of Exchequer that on 17th February 1773 a petition was received from the committee for erecting "the chapel in the Cowgate for publick worship after the usage of the Church of England," praying for the use of the two bells which were taken down from the steeple of the chapel at Holyroodhouse (*i.e.*, the Abbey Church, or what remained of it), "where they are now rusting and exposed to the open air." Leave was given to the petitioners for the use of the best bell, in the penalty of £150 to return the same when required. It is said that this bell now hangs in the south-east minaret of St Paul's Church in York Place.

Again, on 20th July 1774 the Lord Provost of Edinburgh

<sup>1</sup> This devastation is thus recorded in the official report on Somerset's operations: "Thear stode south westward, about a quarter of a mile from our campe, a monasterie: they call it Hollyroode abbey. Sir Water Bonham and Edward Chamberlayne gat lycense to suppresse it; whearupon these commissioners, makyng first theyr visitacion thear, they found the moonks all gone, but the church and mooth parte of the house well covered with leade. Soon after, thei pluct of the leade and had down the bels, which wear but two; and, according to the statute, did somewhat hearby disgrace the hous. As touching the moonkes, bicaus they wear gone, thei put them to their pencions at large." —[Patten's *The Late Expedicion in Scotland*.] A note scribbled on a fly-leaf of the ritual book of the Abbey was probably the last writing done by the monks before they fled: "Memorandum, vii Septembris A.D. xlviij, the Erle Hartfurde [Somerset] led ane army of xx m. men be land and xiii m. be see, and thair intendit be plain conques. Quhilk come the samyn day to Hadingtoun, and on Gladsmuir [Pinkie] wes feildit be the Governor of Scotland and Dowglas."

informed the Council that the great bell of St Giles's dating from 1460, the same that rang a summons to the citizens after the battle of Flodden, having been cracked, he had applied to the Court of Exchequer "for one of the bells in the chappell of the Abbey of Holyroodhouse, . . . which their Lordships had been pleased to grant, upon bond being given for the penal sum of £300 sterling to restore the same if called for." It is recorded in the Council Minutes that the said bell bore upon it this inscription :

SOLI DEO GLORIA JAN BURGERHUYSEN FECIT, 1608.

No bell so inscribed remains among the three-and-twenty bells of St Giles's Church ; and in fact it is known that the Holyrood bell was transferred from St Giles's Church to the Tron Kirk and destroyed on 16th November 1824, when the steeple of that church was burnt down.

Notwithstanding the stripping of the roof during Somerset's invasion of 1547, the nave remained, in name at least, the parish church of the Canongate. In 1569 Adam Bothwell, Bishop of Orkney, made an exchange with Lord Robert Stuart, Commendator of Holyrood, giving Robert the temporalities of his bishoprick, which were erected into an earldom in 1581, and taking those of Holyrood Abbey, while retaining the title of Bishop of Orkney. For this simoniacal bargain, among other offences, he was called to account by the General Assembly. In his defence, the Bishop declared that he was not responsible for the condition of

**Demolition of choir and transepts, c. 1569.**

"the Abbay Kirk of Halyrudhous, quhilk hath been, thir twentie yeris bygane, ruinous through decay of twa principall pillars,<sup>1</sup> sa that nane war assurit [safe] under it ; and twa thousand pounds bestowit upon it wald not be sufficient to ease men to the hearing of the word and

<sup>1</sup> The two eastern piers of the crossing.

ministration of the sacraments. Bot with thair consent, and help of ane established authoritie, he wes purposed to provide the means that the superfluous ruinous pairts, to wit, the Queir and Croce Kirk [the choir and transepts], micht be disponed be faithfull men to repaire the remanent sufficiently."

The age of great churches had passed away. "Faithfull men"—in other words, speculative contractors—were forthcoming. They made a quarry of all but the nave west of the crossing. Down went the choir and transepts, wherein, according to invariable practice, was the finest workmanship in the building; the material, so far as it was not required to build up a new east end, was sold "to provide funds for converting the nave into the Parish Kirk of the Canon-gate." One may see that the rubble work under the present east window of the nave is made up of fragments of Norman ashlar and thirteenth century mouldings and piers.

In such manner was one of the fairest churches in the land mutilated beyond redemption, and the tombs of Scottish kings and queens lying before the high altar were removed, to be huddled together in a vault at the south-east angle of the nave. All this was the ill-fortune of a brave war: worse was to follow, when the hands of Scotsmen themselves were laid to the work of desecration and pillage, as will be noticed in a later chapter. For the moment we must return to the early years of Queen Mary's reign.

Before Mary Queen of Scots arrived in her capital the Reformers had purged the Abbey Church of all semblance of the ancient worship. Instead of the Mass was read the new service of Common Prayer, accepted at first by the Presbyterians, whereat the French officers belonging to the troops brought over by the Queen Regent manifested their displeasure in an intolerable manner. They used to attend at public worship, laughing and talking all the time so loud

that the preacher could not be heard—conduct which contributed much to embitter the sects against each other at the very time when there was most need for conciliation. The Abbey Church was constituted the parish church of the Canongate, with Mr John Craig as minister, a colleague of John Knox in the ministry of Edinburgh. As to the Palace, undaunted by the cruel disasters of 1544 and 1547, the Scottish Government had repaired James V.'s tower, and built a new wing to the Palace between that tower and the church ; so that Queen Mary, coming to her

**Mary Queen  
of Scots comes  
to Holyrood,  
19th August  
1561.**

capital on 19th August 1561, took up residence at once in the royal apartments. Brantôme, who was in her suite, pronounced

*Holyroodhouse certes un beau bastiment, qui*

*ne tient rien du pays*—“undoubtedly a fine

building, little in keeping with the country,”—high encomium from one accustomed to the splendour of Blois and Chambord, the sombre magnificence of Lôches, and the sunny grace of Chenonceaux. Possibly the courtier's criticism was tempered by the native courtesy of a Frenchman, but even that could not bring him to tolerate the serenade with which the loyal citizens greeted her arrival. John Knox, on the other hand, thought it very fine. “Fyres of joy,” says he, “war sett furth all nyght, and a cumpany of the most honest, with instrumentis of musick and with musitians, geve thair salutationis at her chalmer wyndo. The melody (as sche alledged) lyked hir weill ; and sche willed the same to be contineued some nightis after.”<sup>1</sup> “As sche alledged” is good ; for we know from Brantôme how intolerable was the discord of wretched fiddles and rebecs, and how fatal to repose were the psalms droned from five or six hundred throats.

<sup>1</sup> Laing's *Knox*, ii. 270.

All this uncouth, though cordial, greeting was changed to angry murmurs on the first Sunday after the Queen's coming to Holyrood. She had declared her resolve to rule her Protestant lieges in a spirit of noble tolerance. "For my part," she had said to Throckmorton, the English ambassador in France, "you may perceive that I am none of these that will change my religion every year. . . . I mean to constrain none of my subjects, but would wish that they were all as I am, and I trust they should have no support to constrain me." But tolerance was a quality most alien from any form of sixteenth-century Christianity, as Mary speedily realised when, as had been stipulated, Mass was privately celebrated, not in the Abbey Church, but "in hir Hienes chappell within hir palace of Halyrudhous."<sup>1</sup> At this the Lords of the Congregation were "grittumlie annoyit"; the Master of Lindsay and the gentlemen of Fife declared that the priest should be done to death; the Queen's bastard brother, Lord James Stuart (afterwards Regent Moray), "whom all the godlye did most reverence," kept the angry crowd at bay at the chapel door, while the service proceeded within: when it was over, the priest was only saved from violence by the other brothers, Lord John and Lord Robert, escorting him to his chamber.<sup>2</sup> Next Sunday Knox opened his artillery against the Mass. "One messe," he declared, "was more fearful to him than gif ten thousand armed enemyes war landed in any pairete of the realme, of purpose to suppress the hoill religion."

Then followed the celebrated interviews in the Palace between the great Reformer and the Queen of Scots. Knox, proof against that charm of manner and speech

<sup>1</sup> *Diurnal of Occurrents*, p. 66.

<sup>2</sup> Lord John and Lord Robert were respectively lay commendators of Coldingham.

which had already mitigated the bitterness of some of the Lords of the Congregation, abated no whit of violence in denouncing the doctrines of Rome, and at the end of three weeks Mary, unconvinced, set out on a progress through her realm, in the course of which, according to Knox, many towns were “polluted with *hir idolatrie*”; in other words, the Queen worshipped her Maker according to the rites to which she had been accustomed.

Returning to Holyrood at the end of September, the young Queen made her Court as gay as the circumstances of a poor, war-wasted country would permit. On 30th November, the first anniversary of her husband’s death, there was a great *fête*, “the Lord Robert, the Lord John [Mary’s half-brothers], and others ran at the ring, six against six, disguised and apparelled, the one half like women, the other like strangers, in strange masking garments. The Marquis [d’Elbœuf] that day did very well; but the women, whose part the Lord Robert did sustain, won the ring. The Queen herself beheld it, and as many others as listed.”<sup>1</sup> She hunted and hawked; she played golf and pall (a kind of croquet), “biles” or billiards, dice and “the tables” or backgammon; she scandalised the godly by the splendour of her attire when presiding in Parliament—splendour wherein Knox could only perceive, and perceiving proclaim, the “*styncken prude of wemen*.” But the people in the streets cried, “God save yon sweet face!” a prayer to which there was to be sore need of answer in years to come. More equivocal was Mary’s fancy to wander through the streets disguised, sometimes in male apparel, which, as was to be expected, caused “men’s tongues to chatter faste.” But if Mary had learnt in the French Court to love a joyous life,

<sup>1</sup> Bishop Keith’s *History*, ii. 119.

she had also imbibed there the spirit of the Renaissance—the insatiable desire for learning. Randolph, English ambassador at Holyrood, informed Cecil that the Queen “readeth daily after her dinner, instructed by a learned man, Mr George Buchanan, somewhat of Livy”;<sup>1</sup> and it is known from inventories that her library, which she loved, was well stocked with books.

From these and other abundant sources a pretty accurate picture may be had of the mode of life in Holyrood Palace. That aspect upon which it is most agreeable to dwell is the daily routine in the private apartments, where Queen Mary was attended by Mademoiselle de Pinguillon and “the four maidis of honour quha passit with hir Hieness in France, of hir awin aige, bering the name everie ane of Marie”<sup>2</sup>—Mary Fleming, Mary Beaton, Mary Seton, and Mary Livingstone. There they sat and worked at embroidery, while one made music or read aloud. In sunny weather they would shift the scene to that garden which now lies so bare and cheerless, but which then, one may presume, was tastefully laid out in pleached alley and secluded “pleuse.”

The general appearance of the Abbey and Palace at this time probably was pretty much as shown in de Witt’s engraving, supposed to have been executed in the seventeenth century from a drawing by James Gordon, parson of Rothiemay. James V.’s tower is shown on the left, very much as it appears at the present day, except that an ogee gable, since removed, then rose between the flanking turrets, and the roofs of these turrets no longer support open crowns. Moreover, the two panels on the towers, now vacant, then displayed the royal arms of Scotland, which were defaced here, as on all public build-

<sup>1</sup> *Foreign Calendar, Eliz.*, iv. 584.    <sup>2</sup> *Bishop Lesley’s History*, p. 297.

PALATIVM REGIVM EDINENSE,  
quod & Canobium S. Crucis.  
*The royal palace of holy rood-hous. by I.G.*




FIG. 13.—HOLYROOD PALACE AS IT WAS BEFORE THE FIRE OF 1650.

AFTER GORDON OF ROTHiemay.

ings in Edinburgh, by order of the English Parliamentary Commissioners, sitting at Dalkeith on 7th February 1652

Taylor, the water poet, who visited Edinburgh in 1618, describes this palace in his "Pennylesse Pilgrimage" as "a stately and princely seat, wherein I saw a sumptuous chapell most richly adorned with all appurtenances belonging to so sacred a place or so Royall an owner."

From Gordon of Rothiemay's plan it may be seen that the Palace occupied the same quadrangle upon which the present building, erected to the designs of Sir William Bruce in 1679, now stands.<sup>1</sup>

In 1562 there befel an interlude in the merrymaking at Holyrood caused by the rebellion of the Earl of Huntly, head of the Gordon clan and of the Roman Catholic party **The raid against Huntly, 1562.** in Scotland. Queen Mary marched against him in person in the autumn of 1562, and defeated his forces at the battle of Corrichie about 20th October. The earl himself being taken prisoner, suddenly fell dead as he was being placed on a horse by his captor, thereby escaping, as might be supposed, the judicial penalty for treason. But the majesty of the law could not be vindicated thus easily. On 26th May following, Mary rode in procession from Holyrood to the Tolbooth to hold her first Parliament. The four Marys rode beside her; before her rode the Duke of Chatelherault carrying the crown, the Earl of Argyll the sceptre, and James Stuart, Earl of Moray, the sword. The sitting on 28th May was the occasion of a ghastly ceremony. The Estates being assembled, and the Queen present, an open coffin was set erect at the bar of the House, containing the corpse of the great Earl of Huntly, upon which Parliament passed solemn sentence,

<sup>1</sup> See fig. 8, p. 58.

decreeing that Huntly's lands and goods were forfeited, his arms cancelled, his name and memory extinct, and his posterity debarred for ever from office, honour, and dignity.

“Whatever the object of Mary's progress to the north may have been—whether it was planned by the Lord James for his own aggrandisement, as some Mariolaters affirm, or intended by Mary for his destruction, as Knox suspected, or undertaken for her deliverance from his power and for her marriage to Sir John Gordon,<sup>1</sup> as Huntly's grandson gravely records, or occasioned merely by Mary's desire to see the country and to establish good order—it had resulted in the disgrace, defeat, and death of the virtual ruler of the north.”<sup>2</sup>

Meanwhile, Holyrood had been the scene of the first of that long series of dubious transactions which so grievously obscure the lustre of this fair Queen. A young gentleman of France, Chastelard by name, nephew of the Chevalier Bayard, had arrived in November at the Court of Holyrood. Handsome, romantic, and fond of literature, he found easy favour with Mary, who never was prudent in her friendships. Randolph was shocked by her familiarity with “so abject a varlet.” Innocent as

**Execution of Chastelard,**  
**22nd Feb.** **1563.** one may assume that it was, it encouraged Chastelard to an unpardonable offence. On the night of 12th February 1563, before the

Queen retired to rest, he was found concealed under her bed. Informed of this in the morning, Mary dismissed the poet from her train; but he followed her to Burntisland, whither she went that day, and had the hardihood to repeat his offence on the night of the 14th, forcing his way into the Queen's bed-chamber as she was going to bed. This time he paid for it with his life, being executed at St Andrews on the 22nd—an exorbitant penalty, it may seem, for the escapade of a hare-

<sup>1</sup> Huntly's second son, taken at Corrichie and executed.

<sup>2</sup> D. Hay Fleming's *Mary Queen of Scots*, p. 80.

brained lad ; but it was alleged at the time that Chastelard was a Huguenot emissary, employed by persons in France to compromise the Catholic Queen.

All through 1563 and 1564 the chief subject of speculation and anxiety among courtiers and diplomatists was the marriage of the Queen, none doubting that the widowhood of such a sweet lady must be of short duration. "The mariage of our Queyn," says Knox, "was in all mannis mouth. Some wold have Spaine; some the Emperouris brother; some Lord Robert Dudlye; some Duck de Nemours; and some unhappilie gessed at the Lord Darnlye."<sup>1</sup> Mary, within the Palace, was quite of a humour to enjoy the situation which, we may feel sure, was discussed thoroughly and often as she sat with her four Marys over their needlework. Just outside the gates Knox was thundering against the Spanish match. Mary sent for him and begged him with tears, if he must reprove her, to do so in private, as prescribed in the Book of Discipline, and not to hold her up to public scorn. Knox protested that he "never delyted in the weaping of any of Goddis creatures," but that he might not hurt his conscience or betray the commonwealth by holding his peace. The Queen indignantly bade him "to pass furth of the cabinet." He spent an hour in the anteroom, scolding the light-hearted ladies of the Court because of their thoughtless lives and gay attire.

" 'Oh fair ladies !' quoth he, 'how pleasing is this life of yours if it would ever abide, and then in the end that ye pass into heaven with all this gay gear ! But fie upon the knave Death, that will come whether we will or not ; and when he has laid on his arrest, the foul worms will be busy with this flesh, be it never so fair and tender ; and the silly soul, I fear, shall be so feeble that it can neither carry with it gold, garnishing, targatting, pearl nor precious stones.' "

<sup>1</sup> Laing's *Knox*, ii. 360.

In August 1563, while Queen Mary was travelling in the west, Mass was celebrated in Holyrood Chapel for the Roman Catholic members of the royal household. Reasonable as this may seem to **The Mass and the masses, 1563.** a more tolerant generation, it was contrary to the settlement, which permitted the Mass to be sung only when and where the Queen herself was present. A crowd of angry “brethren,” headed by two zealots named Cranston and Armstrong, broke into the chapel, interrupting the service. On the Queen’s return the brawlers were apprehended and committed for trial on a charge of intended murder and invasion of the Palace. Knox espoused their cause, and collected a vast number of the faithful to intimidate the judges withal—a favourite expedient in the sixteenth century. Summoned to answer for his lawlessness before the Queen and Privy Council, he bade Mary “forsake her idolatrous religion,” and actually obtained acquittal for his offence. Already the pulpit was more powerful than the throne: the judges dared nothing against the preachers.

For more than a year intrigues and negotiations went forward on behalf first of one suitor, then of another, for Mary’s hand. In September 1564 the Earl of Lennox arrived in Edinburgh, released from two-and-twenty years of exile. The Queen having commanded him to her presence, he rode down to the Palace on the 27th, preceded by twelve gentlemen in black velvet, and followed by thirty serving-men in his liveries. It was no secret that Lennox had come to press the suit of his son, Lord Darnley, who, through his mother Margaret Tudor, stood next to Mary herself in succession to the English throne.

Mary received the earl very graciously, accepting costly

gifts from his hand. He also sought to win favour from the four attendant Marys by making them pretty presents. Lennox's restoration was made the occasion of banqueting and prolonged festivities in the Palace ; his forfeiture was reversed by Parliament, and in the following February Darnley was presented for approval by the Queen.

“ Hir Majeste tok weill with him, and said that he was the lustiest and best proportionit lang man that sche had sean ; for he was of a heich stature, lang and small [slim], even and brent up [well set up] ; weill instructed from his youth in all honest and comely exercyses.”<sup>1</sup>

On Monday 26th February Darnley attended a sermon by Knox, dined with Lord Moray and the English ambassador Randolph, and danced a galliard with the Queen. All men and women looked with favour on such a comely, courtly youth : Mary herself fell in love with him at once. Ah ! fatal caprice of a widow of three-and-twenty for a lad of nineteen.

Other actors in the approaching tragedy appeared on the scene about this time,—David Riccio, a Piedmontese musician, appointed secretary to the Queen in December 1564 ; and James Hepburn, Earl of Bothwell, who had obtained leave to return to Scotland from his exile in France, to answer charges laid against him by the Earl of Moray. A “day of law” was appointed for the trial ; but Bothwell prudently avoided the ordeal, for Moray came with 6000 troops at his back. Pitscottie puts it bluntly enough :—

“ In the moneth of Marche the erle bothwell came furth of france to Scotland bot he remanit nocht for feir of my lord Murray the quenis broder for the erle of Murray was ane protestane and the erle bothwell ane papist.”<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Sir James Melville's *Memoirs*, p. 134.

<sup>2</sup> Pitscottie's *Croniclis*, ii. 182.

Such free rein did Queen Mary give to her “vehement love” for the handsome Darnley, that rumours of a secret marriage were flying thickly about the town. On 16th July she left the Palace with him at 8 o’clock in the evening and rode to Seton, where they remained two days. “Here-upon,” wrote Randolph to Cecil, “rose maynie fowle tales, whear libertie inougue is geven for men to speake what theie wyll.”

Returning to Edinburgh on the 19th,

“she and my Lord Darlye walked up and downe the towne dysguised untill suppertyme, and retorne thyther agayne, but laye that nighte in the Abbaye; thys manner of passinge to and fro gave agayne occasion to maynie men to muse what might be her meaninge. The nexte daye in lyke sorte she comethe after dyner upon her feete from the Abbaye, the Lord Darlye ledinge her by the one arme and Fowler by thother. . . . These vagares mayke mens tonges to chatter faste.”

Let no man grudge the beautiful Queen of Scots the rapture of those fleeting summer days. If there was more than indiscretion, it was to be atoned for bitterly.

**Marriage of Queen Mary with Henry Darnley, 29th July 1565.** If Darnley and she had gone through a secret form of marriage, it was not legally done, for the Papal dispensation did not come

to hand till 22nd July, on which day the banns were proclaimed; and at 6 A.M. on Sunday the 29th, the marriage ceremony was performed by the Bishop of Brechin according to the Roman ritual in the Queen’s private chapel in Holyroodhouse. According to Randolph, who, though in Edinburgh, was not present, the Queen wore

“the greate mourninge gowne of blacke, with the greate wyde mourninge hoode, not unlyke unto that which she wore the dolefull daye of the buriall of her husbande [the Dauphin]. . . . She was ledde unto the chappell by the Erles of Lenox and Athol, and there she was lefte untill her housband came, who was also conveide by the same

lords. . . . The words were spoken ; the rings, which were three, the middle a riche diamonde, were put upon her finger, theie kneel together, and manie prayers saide over them. She tarrieth owte the masse, and he taketh a kysse and leaveth her there and wente to her chamber, whither in a space she followeth ; and there being required, accordinge to the solemntie, to cast off her care, and lay asyde those sorrowfull garments, and give herself to a pleasanter lyfe, after some prettie refusall, more I believe for manner sake than greef of harte, she suffreth them that stood by, everie man that coulde approche to take owte a pyn, and so being commytted unto her ladies changed her garments. . . . After the marriage followeth commonly cheere and dancinge. To their dynner theie were conveide by the whole nobles. The trumpets sounde, a larges [largesse] cried, and monie thrown abowte the howse in greate abundance to suche as were happie to gete anye parte. . . . After dynner theie dance awhyle, and retire themselves tyll the hower of supper, and as thei dyned so do theie suppe. Some dancing ther was, and so theie go to bedd."

Next morning the heralds proclaimed Darnley as Henry, King of Scots, in presence of the lords who happened to be in Edinburgh—an act of doubtful legality without the concurrence of Parliament. When it was declared that all letters henceforth should be set forth in the names conjointly of King Henry and Queen Mary, none responded save Lennox, who cried, "God save his Grace!"




FIG. 14.—SEAL OF THE ABBEY OF HOLYROODHOUSE,  
FOURTEENTH CENTURY.

## CHAPTER IV.

## THE YEARS OF BLOOD.

Moray's rebellion . . . . .	1565
Court of Mary and Darnley at Holyrood . . . . .	1565-66
Murder of David Riccio . . . . .	9th March 1566
Mary escapes from Holyrood . . . . .	12th March 1566
Birth of James VI. in Edinburgh Castle . . . . .	19th June 1566
The plot against Darnley . . . . .	1566-67
His murder . . . . .	10th February 1567
Bothwell tried and acquitted . . . . .	12th April 1567
Abduction of the Queen by Bothwell . . . . .	24th April 1567
Marriage of the Queen to Bothwell . . . . .	15th May 1567
Their flight from Holyrood . . . . .	6th June 1567

MEN will never be got to agree upon the Earl of Moray's character and motives. To some it appears that his opposition to the Darnley match was grounded upon sincere conviction that nothing but evil could follow upon Mary, as Queen of the Protestant Scots, taking a consort of the Roman Catholic faith. Others can perceive nothing but hypocrisy in his solicitude for the reformed religion, and believe that there was full justice in Queen Mary's assertion that her bastard brother wished to set the crown upon his own head. For the purpose of this rapid survey of events, it may be assumed that Moray, like other men, acted from mixed motives: in his earnest determination to maintain the

*Moray's rebellion, 1565.*

Protestant religion, he was influenced as much by political as by theological considerations ; and should events prove Mary's rule to be impossible, why, there was he ready to ascend the vacant throne.

Anyhow, by the end of August 1565 Moray was in arms against his Queen and sister. The insurrection was dispersed by the "Chase-about Raid," in which both the Queen's forces and those of the rebel lords melted unaccountably away. Moray and his confederates took refuge in England, and Bothwell, reappearing once more from France, took Moray's place at the Queen's right hand, and was appointed by her Lieutenant of the Marches.

During that winter—1565-66—Mary and Darnley kept their Court at Holyrood ; but the Queen's love for her boy husband had been cruelly strangled. The good impression formed of Darnley by men of all ranks had not survived the marriage. Intemperate, and violent in his cups, intolerably haughty to nobles, overbearing and cruel to inferiors, he had earned the hatred of all men except his immediate sycophants ; moreover, the grossness of his unveiled licentiousness put grievous affront upon the Queen. He took deep umbrage because, having received the kingly title, his name was not given precedence over the Queen's upon the coinage and in public acts. He absented himself for long periods from Holyrood "in hunting and hawking, and such other pleasures as were agreeable to his appetite."<sup>1</sup>

During his absence David Riccio was employed by the Queen so confidentially and constantly as to give rise to grievous scandal. Randolph mentioned it in his letters to Cecil as matter "not to be named for reverence sake" ; to Leicester he wrote that "many mislike that a stranger, a

<sup>1</sup> Laing's *Knox*, ii. 541.

varlet, shall have the whole guiding of this Queen and country." He declared that Darnley knew that the Queen was false to him ; that he and his father, Lennox, were conspiring to dethrone her ; and that "if that take effect which is purposed, Riccio shall have his throat cut, with Darnley's consent, within ten days." He even hinted that violence was intended against the Queen's life.

This was written on 13th February 1565 ; on the evening of 9th March Queen Mary, Lady Argyll, and Riccio were at supper in the small boudoir, little more than a closet, opening off her bed-chamber. Arthur Erskine, captain of the guard, and Lord Robert Stuart were also present. Suddenly the door of the boudoir was flung open, Darnley entering from the private winding staircase, which still communicates with the south-west corner of the church. He had been drinking heavily for some days, and now threw his arm round the Queen's waist. Behind

**Murder of  
Riccio, 9th  
March 1566.**

the King stalked Lord Ruthven, ghastly with the pallor of recent illness. Mary bade him begone ; but Ruthven drew his dagger, and Riccio screened himself behind the Queen. Poets who court immortality ought not to skulk behind petticoats. Douglas, Earl of Morton, who, as previously arranged, had secured the gates of the Palace, now passed up the main stair and through the gallery, leading his band into the Chamber of Presence and the Queen's bed-chamber. The din increased as other conspirators, headed by George Douglas, future Bishop of Moray, crowded up the private stairway. The little supper-room was crammed to suffocation ; the table was overturned, Lady Argyll seizing one of the candlesticks as it fell. Riccio was dragged out shrieking, Ruthven commanding that he should be taken to Darnley's room. Ker of Faldonside, as is said, held a pistol at the

Queen's breast, threatening to fire if she interfered. It was intended, probably, to put Riccio through some form of trial, but his executioners were short of patience. Huntly, Bothwell, and other friends of the Queen, were below, and would be roused by the scuffle. Somebody—the man of God, George Douglas, as nearly all writers avow—seized a dagger from Darnley's belt and plunged it into the victim's bosom. If that were not the death-blow, many others followed, and the carrion, at Darnley's command, was flung downstairs and taken to the porter's lodge. At the spot where the murder took place—at the outer door of the Chamber of Presence—certain dark stains used to be shown, alleged to be those of Riccio's blood. The place is now marked by a brass plate in the floor.

The deed done, Ruthven and Darnley turned back into the Queen's suite of apartments, where, the Queen meeting them, bitter altercation arose. Darnley accused his wife of infidelity with Riccio since the previous September. If that were true, then was the child, the future James VI. and I., with which she was five months pregnant, no son of his. It is supposed that had shock of her favourite's murder, committed in her presence, been fatal to the Queen's life, as it might well have proved to one in her state of body, neither Darnley nor the other leading conspirators had been disappointed of their reckoning.

Howbeit, Mary lived, and the sot, Darnley, sought to patch up peace with her. Never in the whole course of her stormy life did she display such ready resource — such grasp of circumstance. The Palace stairs had dripped with her favourite's blood, ostensibly because he was a Papist. Knox highly approved (retrospectively, at least) of his removal, for Riccio's ascendancy in the Queen's

counsels gave legitimate ground for apprehension on the part of all those who upheld the reformed religion with greater or less singleness of purpose. Riccio's murder was a stroke in the strife of party, little more reprehensible, according to sixteenth-century ethics and practice, than a "snap division" might be reckoned in the twentieth century. Mary's friends—Huntly, Athol, Bothwell, and the rest—accepted their defeat, escaping from the Palace that night, lest they, too, should share the secretary's fate. So the Queen, a close prisoner in her own house, had need to dissemble. True that on the morrow, standing with Darnley at Riccio's fresh-turned grave in the Abbey Church, she vowed "that a fatter than he should lie as low ere the year was out"; nevertheless, she cajoled her husband into the belief that she was all for amnesty. He disavowed his confederates; he did more, he ended by deserting them.

On Sunday morning, the 10th, the Queen wrung reluctant leave from Morton and Ruthven to have her ladies with her. This enabled her to have letters conveyed to Huntly, Bothwell, and the others. That evening Moray and the banished Protestant lords rode into Edinburgh, and Mary had a friendly interview with her brother. On Monday, the 11th, the guards were removed from the Palace, on Darnley's assurance that his Queen "was a true

**The Queen  
escapes from  
Holyrood,  
12th March  
1566.**

Princess, and he would set his life for what she promised." Next morning the birds had flown. Mary and Darnley had ridden out from Holyrood before dawn, and news came that they were safe in Dunbar Castle, with the forces of the Catholic lords mustering fast. That Mary had ridden five-and-twenty miles at speed in her then delicate condition must be esteemed striking testimony to a splendid constitution.

Even Elizabeth's gold, which they had in plenty, availed not to make the Protestant lords stand firm.

"Upon the xij day of Merche, quhilk wes Sonday, the haill Lordis, committaris of the slauchter and crymes abonewrittin, with the Lordis that was banist in Ingland of befoir (except Alexander, Erle of Glen-cairne, quha red to Dunbar to speak with our Soveranis), with all their complices and men of weir, with dollorous hartis departit of Edinburgh towart Lynlithgow, at sevin houris in the mornynge."<sup>1</sup>

On the 18th March Mary and Darnley made triumphant re-entry into Edinburgh. Had it been possible for these two to live together in harmony at Holyrood, good government might have been restored to their afflicted realm—a slender chance, at best, considering the inveterate cleavage between Protestant and Papist: as matters stood, no chance at all, so invincible was the disgust that Mary had conceived for her husband's double perfidy. He had sworn to her that he had no part in the plot against Riccio: there had been laid before her the "band" drawn up by the assassins before the deed, and there was Henry Darnley's signature appended thereto in his own hand. His price was provided for in the "band": he was to have the "crown matrimonial," hitherto withheld from him, which should secure the succession to himself should the Queen predecease him, thus excluding the legal heirs, the Hamiltons. He stood pledged to secure his confederates from punishment "of whatsoever crime"; the banished lords were to be restored; but he had betrayed all parties. Deeper treachery could hardly be; but that was not the whole mischief. Mary's "vehement love" was dead; nay, it was turned to bitter contempt, and her heart had gone out to another. At a time when all men failed her, there stood out James Hepburn, Earl of Bothwell, as her deliverer. Ruthless,

<sup>1</sup> *Diurnal of Occurrents*, p. 94.

reckless, profligate as he was well known to be, he had proved himself a man at her sorest need. Mary owed her restoration to his bold spirit and strong arm. He was not one to forgo his reward ; she had not the fortitude, perhaps not the inclination, to withhold it.

Meanwhile a grisly memorial of the murder had been displayed on Holyrood. Not Morton's head, nor George Douglas's, nor even the ruffian Ker's, who had threatened the Queen's life, but the head of Thomas Scott, Sheriff-depute of Perth, which was spiked on a pinnacle of the Palace. He had been hanged, drawn, and quartered on 2nd April for the offence of warding the Queen in Holyrood ! Thus rudely did justice jolt along in the sixteenth century.

After her return to the capital Mary disdained to reside in Holyrood—the scene of her humiliation. She occupied various houses in Edinburgh, until she went to the Castle

**Birth of  
James VI.,  
19th June  
1566.** in June 1566, where, on the 19th, she was delivered of a son, who, within thirteen months, was to be proclaimed James VI.

This event, peculiarly auspicious as it should have been deemed, appears to have softened Mary's heart towards Henry ; but he rudely repulsed all her advances, declaring that he intended to live on the Continent, and behaving in an utterly intractable manner.

The Queen was alone at Holyrood at various times during the autumn. On 29th September Darnley rode up to the Palace gate, but refused to enter unless Moray, Argyll, Rothes, and Secretary Maitland were sent away. The Queen, coming down to the entrance, persuaded him to pass within, and he spent the night in her apartments. Next day he attended a Privy Council held in the same suite of rooms, when Mary took him by the hand and

besought him for God's sake to declare if she had given him any reason to go abroad, and entreated him to deal plainly and not spare her.<sup>1</sup> He denied that he meant to leave the country, admitted that the Queen had ever been indulgent and affectionate, and, rising abruptly, left the Council chamber, saying, "Adieu, madame; you shall not see me for a long space. Adieu, gentlemen."

This was King Henry's last appearance in Holyrood. From this moment Scottish history assumes the character of a long-drawn criminal trial. The seven deadly sins hold secret orgy in the Court; the atmosphere is charged with treason and counter-plot. The Queen spent the winter of 1566-67 partly at Craigmillar Castle and partly at Holyrood. There is little room for honest doubt that she was earnestly looking for some means of release from her husband. Divorce was discussed and abandoned, because that would endanger the legitimacy of her son. She declared the only way she could see to freedom was through suicide. When Lethington undertook to find means to rid her of Darnley without disadvantage to the young prince, assuring her that the pious Moray would "looke throw his fingeris," she exclaimed that nothing must be done to lay a spot upon her honour or conscience, but that it must be left for God to remedy. To this Lethington made the significant reply—"Let us guyde the matter amongis us, and your Grace sall sie nathing but gud, and approvit be Parliament."<sup>2</sup> And so Queen Mary allowed this matter to rest. To a woman of her quick understanding, it must have been evident that it was her turn to "look through her fingers" at what was brewing.

<sup>1</sup> Du Croc to Archbishop Beaton.

<sup>2</sup> "Protestation" of Huntly and Argyll.

On Christmas Eve 1566 Queen Mary signed the pardon of the Earl of Morton and more than seventy others implicated in the murder of Riccio—an act viewed by some as one of Christian grace, appropriate to the season of goodwill towards men ; by others, as a deed of sinister import, setting free the assassins on the trail of a nobler victim.

Darnley was with his Queen at Stirling during that Christmas season ; many are the reports of the ill-will manifest between them. About that time, **The plot against Darnley, 1566-67.** 24th December, says Cecil in his *Diary*, Mary set out with Bothwell to pay some visits in country houses. Darnley went off to his father's castle in Glasgow, where presently he fell ill. Poison ! cried Mary's enemies ; but in those days of primitive leechcraft, the sudden illness of a public man was commonly attributed to that form of foul play. Probably Darnley was struck down by smallpox. Twice the Queen wrote offering to visit her husband's sick-bed, and twice he refused to receive her, adding imputations upon her honour which, if unfounded, were intolerably insulting. On 14th January, or thereabouts, the Queen was back at Holyrood with the baby James. On the 20th she travelled thence to Glasgow, and brought Darnley back to Edinburgh before the end of the month, but not to Holyrood. The King of Scots was lodged in a small house called Kirk-o'-Field, belonging to the Provost of St Mary-in-the-Fields, as "a plaice of gud ayre," says Melville, "wher he mycht best recover his health ; bot many ane suspected that the Erle Bodowell had some enterpryse against him."

The Queen remained at Holyrood, but actually spent two nights in the lower room of the ramshackle house at Kirk-o'-

Field. On Sunday, 9th February 1567, she had been several hours with her convalescent husband, entertaining him "verey familiarie," and had made arrangements to spend the night there;

**The affair of  
Kirk-o'-Field,  
10th Feb.  
1567.**

when she called to mind the promise she had made to attend the wedding masque of her *valet-de-chambre*, Bastien Pages. Giving the King a ring as a love-token, she rode back to Holyrood by torchlight. During that last interview between Henry Darnley and Mary, Bothwell and his accomplices were busily stuffing gunpowder into the room below the bed-chamber. At two in the morning a terrific explosion shook the neighbourhood. When the smoke thereof had cleared away, it was seen that the house of Kirk-o'-Field was no more. Its fragments lay scattered in a wide circumference. The body of the young King —he was not yet one-and-twenty—and that of his chamber-page Taylor were found several yards away in the garden, *without a trace of grime or fire upon them.*

Contemporary writers have described the almost incredible indifference manifested by the Queen and her Ministers in regard to the disposal of Darnley's poor remains and the pursuit of the murderers. The crime was committed on Monday morning; on Tuesday Margaret Carwood, Mary's favourite chamber-woman, was married in Holyrood, the wedding-feast being provided by the Queen. On the fifth day after the murder the body of King Henry was buried by night beside that of his father-in-law, James V., in the Abbey Church, "without any kynd of solemnitie or murnyng hard amang all the persounis at Court."<sup>1</sup> Next day, Sunday 16th February, she went to Seton, returning to Holyrood on the 19th. By this time bills and broadsides were flying about the town openly charg-

<sup>1</sup> *Historie of James the Sext*, p. 7.

ing Bothwell with the deed ; yet Bothwell continued first in favour with the Queen. What conclusion might not men draw ? Mary's friends — Archbishop Beaton and Catherine de Medici, as well as her father-in-law, Lennox, and Queen Elizabeth—wrote warning her of the sinister inferences arising from her conduct, and urging her to bring the murderers of her husband to justice. In consequence of these remonstrances, and, as one must infer, in deference to the angry public feeling, on 23rd March “ther wes ane solemne saule mass with a dergie soung after noone, and done in the Chapell Royal of Holyroodhous, for the said Henry Steuarte and hes saule, by the Papists, at her Majestie's command” ;<sup>1</sup> and on the same day the Queen wrote to Lennox to say that those whom he had denounced to her should be brought to trial. First on Lennox's list stood Bothwell's name,—Bothwell, ruler of the Queen's Court—Bothwell, who sat in the Privy Council on the 28th March to arrange for his own trial—Bothwell, to whom about the same day she made some costly presents, and whom, as Drury wrote to Cecil on the 29th, all men believed she was about to marry.

It speaks well for human charity that many persons have vehemently refused to admit Queen Mary's complicity in the murder of her husband, or even her foreknowledge thereof.

On 12th April Bothwell was put upon a mock trial. The town was full of his armed retainers : small wonder, therefore, that the jury “clengit [acquitted] **Bothwell tried and acquitted** him, some for fear and some for favour, and **12th April 1567.** the maist part for commoditie.”<sup>2</sup> Buchanan's words were no stronger than the occasion merited,—“ Bothwell was not clensit of the cryme, bot, as

<sup>1</sup> Birrell's *Diary*, p. 7.

<sup>2</sup> Melville's *Memoirs*, p. 174.

it wer, waschit with sowteris bleking.”<sup>1</sup> When Parliament rose on 19th April, Bothwell carried the sword of state in the procession back to Holyrood. On the 21st Queen Mary rode to Stirling to see her child. When she was returning to Holyrood on the 24th, Bothwell intercepted her with a great display of force, probably close to Gogar, and carried her off to Dunbar.

Now Bothwell had a wife already by this time, having married in the previous year Lady Jean Gordon, sister of the Earl of Huntly. Cross actions for divorce were now entered by Bothwell and his countess, undoubtedly collusive, Lady Bothwell, it is said, being coerced

**Abduction  
of the Queen  
by Bothwell,  
24th April  
1567.**

into this action by the threats of her husband to murder her. Decree of divorce was pronounced by the Protestant Commissioners on

3rd May, by the Papal Court on the 7th.

On the 6th the Queen returned to Edinburgh with Bothwell and Huntly, brother of the divorced countess; and

**Their  
marriage,  
15th May.** on the 15th Queen Mary married her third husband, created Duke of Orkney for the occasion, “in the Palice of Halyrudhous, within the Auld Chappell, be Adame, Bischope of Orknay, not with the mess, bot with preitching”—that is, according to Protestant rites in the Abbey Church. “Thair wes nathir plesour nor pastyme usit, as wes wont to be usit quhen princes wes mariit.”<sup>2</sup> Only fifteen months had passed since Bothwell had betrothed himself to Lady Jean, with “the advis and expres counsale” of his new wife; only three months and five days since he had murdered young Darnley. Three weeks more—weeks of recrimination between the mutually jealous pair—and, on 6th

<sup>1</sup> Anderson’s *Collections*, ii. 32.

<sup>2</sup> *Diurnal of Occurrents*, p. III.

June, Mary had left Holyrood never to return, she and her husband flying to Borthwick Castle to escape the vengeance of an outraged nation.

**The flight from Holyrood, 6th June 1567.** On the 15th Mary parted with Bothwell forever, on Carberry Hill, in presence of the army of the Confederate Lords.

With the rest of Queen Mary's dolorous life the story of Holyrood has no further concern. Yet the high spirit which carried her through all vicissitudes—her imprisonment in the island fortress of Lochleven, her abdication on 24th July 1567, her escape from Lochleven by the help of young William Douglas on 2nd May 1568, the dispersal of her forces at Langside on the 13th, her flight to England, her imprisonment for nearly nineteen years by command of her cousin, Queen Elizabeth, and her decapitation on 8th February 1587,—that dauntless spirit, I say, combining with the memory of her surpassing beauty, her matchless charm, her kindly ways, has effaced the dubious traits in her character; so that it has come to pass that Holyrood Palace is more closely associated with Mary Queen of Scots than with any other that has lived therein, and visitors dwell lovingly upon every memorial of her that remains, and pass the rest lightly by. Of the Palace, however, as she knew it, very little survived the sixteenth century, from causes which shall be described presently.

## CHAPTER V.

## HOLYROOD ECLIPSED BY ST JAMES'S.

Deposition of Regent Morton . . . . .	8th March 1578
His restoration . . . . .	April 1578
James VI. comes to Holyrood . . . . .	1578
Scene in the Council Chamber . . . . .	29th December 1580
Execution of Morton . . . . .	2nd June 1581
Love-feast in Holyrood Palace . . . . .	14th May 1586
Coronation of Anne, Queen of Scots . . . . .	17th May 1590
Francis Earl of Bothwell's rebellion . . . . .	1592
Bothwell's second attack upon Holyrood Palace . . . . .	24th July 1593
The Raid of Leith . . . . .	3rd April 1594
Christening of Prince Henry . . . . .	1594
James succeeds to the throne of England . . . . .	24th March 1603
He revisits Holyrood . . . . .	16th May 1617

ON 8th March 1578 the Earl of Morton, who had succeeded Mar as Regent in 1572, was deposed by a confederacy between the Catholic lords and the

**Deposition of Regent Morton, 8th March 1578.** Presbyterian General Assembly. A council of twelve was appointed for the guidance of

James VI., who had just completed his twelfth year. The young King had spent his boyhood in Stirling Castle, and was still there when Morton caused the

**His restoration, April 1578.** Earl of Mar to seize that place, and, reappearing himself, resumed authority over the King's person. In April 1579 the Earl of Athol died very suddenly, after dining with the Earl of

Mar in Stirling Castle. It was asserted roundly by Morton's many enemies that he had caused Athol to be poisoned—a groundless slander, probably, but readily believed about one who was well known to have been implicated in the murders of Riccio and Darnley.

To replace Athol as the head of the Catholic party came Esmé Stuart, Lord d'Aubigny, from France, first cousin of Henry Darnley, and therefore a bitter enemy to Morton. The confederacy which had been formed against the Regent between Catholics and Presbyterians proved too strong for him. He had designed to carry the King out of Scotland and place him in Queen Elizabeth's Court;<sup>1</sup> but that plan was thwarted by Esmé Stuart, for whom James had conceived from the first a strong liking, and presently Esmé's influence outweighed every other. He had been less than a fortnight in the

**James VI.**  
**comes to**  
**Holyrood,**  
**1578.** country when he conducted the King on a first visit to his capital, where "he was ane great delyt to the beholderis," especially to

tradesmen, whose business flagged sadly in the absence of the Court. James passed straight to Holyrood, where he revived the office of Lord High Chamberlain in favour of Esmé, and, a few months later, created him Duke of Lennox.

The new duke's foremost object was to bring Morton to justice, round whom the storm-clouds had been gathering for several months. They broke in terrible earnest on 29th December 1580. The King was presiding over a council at Holyrood, when Captain James Stuart was admitted, "with the previty," says Ambassador Bowes, "and especiall commandement of the Kynge."<sup>2</sup> Kneeling before his sovereign, he denounced Morton as

<sup>1</sup> Bowes's *Letters*, p. 68.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 159.

the murderer of Darnley. Morton replied coolly and at some length. "It was well known," he said, "that he himself had brought to justice all who were implicated in that crime."

"False!" exclaimed Stuart, starting forward as if to strike Morton. "Have not you caused your cousin, Archibald Douglas,<sup>1</sup> to pollute the bench of justice with his presence? whereas he is an infamous murderer."

Morton had half-drawn his sword, when the Lords Lindsay and Cathcart threw themselves between the disputants. Morton was then ordered to ward himself in his own apartments adjoining the Palace: two days later he was imprisoned in Edinburgh Castle, whence he was removed to Dunbarton to avoid popular tumult, for the Douglas was still a power in the land. "Out of sight, out of mind!" Never was there a clearer illustration of the proverb. Despite Queen Elizabeth's exertions to save him, despite the menace of invasion which she caused the Earl of Huntingdon to make on the Border, not a hand was raised by the Scottish people to ask mercy for their late ruler, who, how great soever may have been his private offences against morality, had governed the land with singular discretion at a most perplexing time, and had restored public prosperity by his wise measures. For

**Execution of Morton, 2nd June 1581.** On 1st June 1581, having been brought back to Edinburgh, he was arraigned upon a charge of having been "art and part of the King's murder"; on the

<sup>1</sup> Younger brother of the laird of Whittingehame, and one of the vilest characters in Scottish history. Trained as a Catholic priest, he became Protestant parson of Douglas, and afterwards of Glasgow. He was raised to the Bench in 1565, and was present at Darnley's murder in 1567.

following day he was executed by “the Maiden,” an instrument on the principle of the guillotine, which, it is said, he had himself introduced into Scotland after seeing the clean work it did at Halifax in Yorkshire.<sup>1</sup>

The Catholics and the Kirk had no sooner accomplished the downfall of Morton than they bent themselves to accomplishing the downfall of each other. Into the maze of plot and counter-plot it is no part of our present purpose to penetrate. Lennox harboured Father Holt, the Jesuit emissary, in Holyrood, and fanned the hopes of the imprisoned Queen of Scots with the prospect of a Spanish army coming to restore her. In August 1582 the Protestant lords had matured a plot against Lennox and the Catholic party, seized the King’s person in the famous Raid of Ruthven, and kept him practically a prisoner for ten months. James regained his freedom in 1583; but it is not till February 1586 that we find him back at Holyrood, busy with the English ambassador Randolph, who was charged to bring him into league with England and obtain his assurance to support the reformed religion. In this he succeeded on 1st April, and persuaded him to receive back Archibald Douglas—his father’s murderer, as James must have known from the confessions of Hepburn, Binning, and Morton, who had already suffered for that crime. This was the man whom James now selected as his ambassador at the Court of England.

On the 14th May King James, being now nearly twenty years old, gave “a love-feast” in Holyrood Palace to nobles of both parties, intending to quench for ever those private

<sup>1</sup> The Maiden remained in use there till 1650. The instrument by which Morton suffered, as well as the Marquess of Argyll in 1661 and the Earl of Argyll in 1685, is preserved in the National Museum of the Antiquaries of Scotland.

feuds which made all attempt at good government futile.

**Love-feast  
in Holyrood,  
14th May  
1586.** First he pledged his guests three times ; then he caused them to drink to each other and to shake hands. All complied except William,

Lord Yester, who refused to take the hand of his peculiar enemy, and was sent to prison in the Castle to reflect upon his contumacy.

Coming now to the year 1590, King James landed at Leith on 1st May, after an absence abroad of six months,

**Coronation of  
Queen Anne,  
17th May  
1590.** bringing with him his bride, Anne of Denmark, who was crowned and anointed in the Chapel Royal of Holyrood on the 17th, and festivities

went on in the Palace for the space of a month. The preachers, indeed, raised objection against the anointing, as being a Jewish ceremony ; but James had not turned Protestant in vain. He knew the importance of keeping the clergy on his side, and well he understood how to flatter their sensibility. He sent for Mr Andrew Melville, whose nephew James has recorded with pardonable pride how his uncle Andrew

“maid and pronuncit an Oration in vers to the grait admiration of the heirars and thair exceeding ioy and contentment, namlie of bathe thair Majesties. The King gaiff him grait thankes . . . and thereafter wad insist farder, and command him to giff the sam to the printar, that with diligence it might be exped, for ther was nan of the Ambassadours bot haid maid him requeiest for that effect. And indeid this was the wark of God to haiff his awin servand honored, for Mr Andro haid nocht bein warnit to this Coronation in anie convenient tyme, and haid na thing preparit bot sic as cam in his meditation a night or twa, anent the right way of rewling and government, the quhilk he vitterit with a meruelus dexteritie and grace.”<sup>1</sup>

After that, Mr Robert Bruce did the anointing without more ado.

Harmony was rudely interrupted in the following year

<sup>1</sup> Mr James Melville’s *Diary*, p. 188.

by the Earl of Bothwell—not that James Hepburn, the King's stepfather, who long ere this had finished his evil life in a Danish dungeon, but Francis Stuart, descended illegitimately from James V., his mother being a sister of Queen Mary's Bothwell. The vacant title had been conferred upon this Francis, who was certainly a man of talent, but of most irregular life. Ringleader in many disreputable affairs and deeds of violence, his offences were treated with singular leniency by King James, until at last his outrageous behaviour turned even his royal cousin against him. James, naturally of timorous nature, lived specially in terror of witchcraft, and, having had a very stormy voyage on returning from his wedding trip to Norway, was easily persuaded that witches had raised the tempest—nay, that Bothwell had hired them to do so.

Accordingly in April 1591 Bothwell was confined in Edinburgh Castle on this preposterous charge, but broke Bothwell's prison on 21st June and proceeded to organise rebellion, 1592. revolution. He had conceived a deadly hatred against the Lord Chancellor, Maitland of Thirlestane, whom Burghley declared to be “the wisest man in Scotland.” The King and his Chancellor were at this time involved in fierce controversy with the Presbyterian preachers, who had no scruple to avail themselves of Bothwell's impetuosity and territorial power to obtain Thirlestane's overthrow.

Bothwell had abettors within the walls of Holyrood. On the night of 27th December, while the King was at supper, he managed to fill the inner court of the Palace with a number of armed followers, whom he directed to break into the King's apartments with hammers. Failing in that, he turned to those of the Queen and the Chancellor, loudly crying for justice, and calling for fire to be

set to the stout panels. The King was hurried off to a remote turret ; Henry Lindsay kept the furious earl at bay in the Queen's gallery ; and word went for succour to the Provost of Edinburgh. "The bells were rung backward, the drums they were beat." Bothwell made good his escape before the town guard arrived ; but not before two of the King's servants had been killed and Scott of Balwearie's brother wounded. Eight or nine of Bothwell's men were caught, and being taken "red-hand," were hanged next morning without trial between the Girth Cross and the Palace gate. This, observes Mr James Melville, "I saw with my eis, as tragicall spectacles in the theater of this miserie of mans lyff. But," he adds philosophically, "things done be forme of Justice haid with thaim joyned sum comfortable consideration."<sup>1</sup>

"The bonny Earl of Moray," head of the Presbyterian party, and son-in-law of him whom that party remembered as "the Good Regent," being implicated in Bothwell's sedition, the King and the Chancellor commissioned Moray's hereditary foe, Huntly, head of the Catholic party, to bring him to justice. Huntly made short work of it by butchering "the bonny Earl" in his castle of Donibristle. The indignation aroused by this act was so fierce that the King summoned Parliament, which had not met for five years, to assemble at Holyrood in May 1592, for the double purpose of confirming the forfeiture of Bothwell and making that memorable concession to the Presbyterians which ratified all the liberties of the Kirk and cancelled all its disabilities. But at first this only served to whet the insatiable ambition of the preachers. They aspired to direct the policy of the State, and began by demanding that "all Papists within the realm be punished

<sup>1</sup> *Diary*, p. 198.

according to the laws of God and this realm.”<sup>1</sup> The King, who delighted in argument, could answer this by asking them to show him any passage in Holy Writ prescribing death to Roman Catholics ; so the preachers fell back upon Bothwell as the surer instrument.

This lawless earl was still at large. In July 1592 he made a desperate attempt to secure the King’s person at Falkland ; and, a year later, on 24th July 1593, actually succeeded in an attack upon Holyrood Palace.

**Bothwell’s second attack upon Holyrood, 24th July 1593.** Behind the Palace, and connected therewith by a covered passage, was a house belonging to the Earl of Gowrie, who was then but a lad at college. His father had been executed for treason in 1584 ; his mother, nursing vengeance, was deeply implicated in Bothwell’s sedition ; wherefore the King, little fancying such a dangerous neighbour, turned her out of the said house and occupied it himself. But the Countess of Athol, daughter of Lady Gowrie, continued in Queen Anne’s household. It is suspected that it was not without the Queen’s knowledge and consent that this lady, having “convaied awaie all the waipons of the guarde,” admitted Bothwell and John Colville to the Palace at evening ; while Bothwell’s followers, Stuarts and Hepburns, swarmed into the courtyards during the brief night. The King rose late next morning ; it was about nine o’clock before he went to his dressing-room ; he had “his breeks in his hand,” says one account, when Bothwell and Colville strode in with drawn swords.

“Francis !” cried the King, “thou wilt do me no ill !”

“No, my good bairn !” quoth the irreverent Bothwell. “You have given out that I sought your life : it is now in this hand.”

<sup>1</sup> Calderwood, v. 241.

“Treason!” shouted the King, and made a rush at the door of the Queen’s chamber, *but found it locked*.<sup>1</sup> Then James turned to bay, and bade the traitors strike if they durst. Athol and Ochiltree now arrived on the scene. A parley ensued, in which Bothwell compelled the King to agree to all his demands — namely, the dismissal of Chancellor Thirlestane and others, remission of his own attainder and forfeiture, and pardon for himself and his followers for their rebellious acts. By this time the alarm had been sounded in the city: the burgesses had been roused from their beds to the rescue, but James appeared with the Queen at the window and told them all had been settled amicably. Such queer sights might men see in the Scottish capital, were they astir early enough on a summer morning!

The concessions wrung from the King were afterwards revoked by him, on the ground that they had been granted under fear of death.

Yet another attempt did this extraordinary earl make upon the King’s person. On 3rd April 1594 he appeared at Leith with a mixed force of English and Scots, and the King mustered what force he could to oppose him. Bothwell’s cavalry made short work of the royalist troops, driving them back to Craigmillar; but his trumpets sounded a retreat at a moment when the capture of the King seemed imminent. Such was “the Raid of Leith.” A few months later Bothwell deserted the Kirk, became a Roman Catholic, joined Huntly and his confederates in open rebellion, was excommunicated by the preachers, his former allies, in February 1595, and disappeared into exile shortly after.

**The Raid of  
Leith, 3rd  
April 1594.**

<sup>1</sup> So reported by Bothwell himself a few days later to the Dean of Durham.—*Border Calendar*, i. 490.

When Queen Anne's first-born son, Henry, was christened in the Chapel Royal in 1594, the magistrates of Edinburgh sent ten tuns of wine to replenish the cellars of Holyrood. In recognition of their dutiful **Christening of Prince Henry, 1594.** liberality, the King and Queen invited them to be present at the baptism of Princess Elizabeth, future mother of Prince Rupert and Prince Maurice, on 28th November 1596—a compliment which the said magistrates acknowledged by promising the little Princess a wedding gift of 10,000 merks. Not only did they fulfil this pledge when Princess Elizabeth married Frederick, afterwards King of Bohemia, in 1613, but they increased the sum to 15,000 merks. Yet within three weeks of this token of mutual goodwill—to wit, on 17th December following the christening—King James came near losing his life at the hands of the Edinburgh mob. He had fallen out once more with the irrepressible preachers, who suspected him, not unjustly, of intriguing with the Catholic powers, and whose intolerant vehemence in the pulpit had inflamed the passions of the populace by rumours of a popish massacre—a Scottish Eve of St Bartholomew. James was sitting with the judges in the Tolbooth when Lord Lindsay, deputed by the convention of preachers, entered, followed by an angry armed crowd, which filled every corner of the building. The King was extricated from a very dangerous situation by the coolness of his standard-bearer, James Wat, who, being deacon-convener of the trades, drew up his craftsmen, “the lads of the Blue Blanket,” and kept the rabble at bay till a company of musketeers arrived from the Castle.

Next morning the town was dismayed by the news that the King had departed to Linlithgow, and a royal proclamation announced, in effect, that the riotous behaviour of its

citizens had rendered Edinburgh unsuitable for the seat of Government or justice, and that the courts would be held elsewhere. Even the preachers had business instincts. Were Holyrood Palace and the Court of Session to be permanently closed, the loss of custom to the shopkeepers of the capital would be ruinous. Pacific overtures were made: the King made his own terms. On 1st January 1597 he returned to his Palace of Holyrood, and during the rest of his reign kept the upper hand of the preachers.

The night of Saturday, 26th March 1603, is memorable in the annals of Holyrood. James had gone to bed King

*James succeeds to the throne of England, 24th March 1603.* of Scots; he was roused before midnight to receive Sir Robert Carey, and be hailed by him as King of England. Carey had chanced to be at the English Court during Queen Elizabeth's last illness. Determined to ensure a full

measure of warmth from the rising sun, he sent messengers to acquaint King James that the Queen could not live many days, and to arrange relays of horses along the northern road for his own use on emergency. No sooner was the breath out of the body of his benefactress than he set out early on the morning of Thursday the 24th, against the express commands of the Privy Council, and by dint of hard riding accomplished the journey to Holyrood by midnight on the 26th. His conduct was condemned as indecent and disobedient by the English Ministers; but we may bestow a word of admiration upon the hardihood of the horseman who traversed four hundred miles in sixty-two hours, being at the rate of six miles and a half in an hour. Truly the courtiers of those days behoved to keep in good training! Carey, of course, had no regular credentials to produce; but in proof of the soundness of his information he presented to the

King a sapphire ring which James had given to Lady Scrope, Carey's sister, a member of Elizabeth's household, and a regular correspondent of the King of Scots. This ring, it was understood between them, was to be returned by special messenger so soon as the Queen of England should expire. The King, still in bed, took the token, examined it, declared it was enough, and promised Carey to be as good a friend to him as the sovereign he had lost. Upon this Carey observes in his *Autobiography*, "I only relied on God and the King. The one never left me: the other, shortly after his coming to London, deceived my expectations, and adhered to those who sought my ruin." In fact, Carey, by his immoderate zeal for his own interest, had incurred the just displeasure of the English Government and made himself many enemies; but he fared quite as well as he deserved, being constantly employed at Court, and Charles I. created him Earl of Monmouth.

The first token of James's new sovereignty came to him in Holyrood in the shape of the keys of Berwick, which he handed to John Bothwell, Commendator of Holyrood, and sent him to take over the town. On Sunday, 3rd April, the King heard sermon in St Giles's Church, and afterwards addressed the congregation, promising to visit Holyrood every third year. He left the Palace on Tuesday the 5th, and rode to the Border with a great following of gentlemen, reaching London on 6th May. On 28th May Queen Anne and young Prince Charles arrived at Holyrood from Stirling; on the 30th they, too, "heard ane guid sermone in the kirke [St Giles's], and thereafter raid hame to Halyrudhouse."<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Birrell's *Diary*, p. 59.

Despite the King's undertaking, it was fourteen years before he returned to Holyrood. Immense preparations were made for his reception: lodgings were engaged for 5000 men, stabling for 5000 horses, and the magistrates of Edinburgh outdid themselves in demonstrations of loyalty.

King James  
revisits  
Holyrood,  
16th May  
1617.

At the same time, the Lords of the Privy Council bestirred themselves to set the Palace in order befitting the dignity of the sovereign, and to decorate the Chapel Royal in conformity with his Majesty's High Church proclivities. In the latter work they found no local artists equal to the task: it "could not be gottin so perfytlie and well done within this country [Scotland] as is requisite"; so they contracted with London tradesmen for the purpose. Mr Chamberlain, writing to Sir Dudley Carleton, mentioned that Inigo Jones had charge of the work, "with pictures of the Apostles, Faith, Hope, and Charity, and such other religious representations, which how welcome they will be thither God knows!" They turned out to be far from welcome. The aspect of the people became so threatening when the carpenters were fixing up the figures of the Apostles, that the bishops wrote to the King begging him "to stay the affixing of these portraits." King James had the sense to do so, but grumbling that "you can endure lyons, dragons, and devills to be figured in your churches, but will not allow the like place to the Patriarchs and Apostles."<sup>1</sup>

The 16th of May must have been a day of no common labour, even to one who delighted so thoroughly in ceremonial as did King James. He managed, indeed, to evade a windy oration with which Drummond of Hawthornden stood loaded to the muzzle at the West Port;

<sup>1</sup> *Register of the Privy Council*, xi. 66.

but he had to listen to a sermon in St Giles's by Archbishop Spottiswoode (Episcopacy had been restored in 1610), to an address of welcome on the threshold of his own palace pronounced by the Clerk-Register-Depute, and, after that, to attend in the Chapel Royal to a second sermon from the archbishop. Returning to the Palace, his Majesty was confronted by the professors of the University, for whom Mr Patrick Nisbet delivered a long speech in Latin, and presented the King with a superbly bound volume of Latin poems composed by the professors, which may be seen now in the British Museum. Then the King returned to Edinburgh, to be entertained at a banquet by the magistrates; and so home to bed once more in Holyrood.

Had James been the wise ruler he constantly claimed to be, the enthusiasm evoked by his return to Scotland gave him an opportunity which it had been well for the country had he taken. He had succeeded in delivering the civil power from the interference of the clergy and in re-establishing bishops in the Kirk; but the Scottish reaction from Papacy had taken the line of exceeding austerity of ritual, frequent sermons, infrequent communions, at which the partakers sat instead of kneeling, no instrumental music, no ceremonial lights, no rich vestments nor architectural adornment. Why could not the King allow his people to worship their Maker in their own way? Instead of that, he insisted on uniformity with the Church of England. They should conform, he said, else he "would harry them out of the land, or else do worse." In fact, James had become what we should now call a Ritualist, and he was determined that all his subjects should be the same. He had shown his purpose by sending down decorators from London

to prepare the Abbey Church, henceforth to be the Chapel Royal, for his coming. There “wis a glorious altar sett up, with two closed bybles, two unlightened candles and two basins without water, sett thereon.” There was an organ also; but Bishop Coupar of Galloway, Dean of the Chapel Royal, drew the line at certain carvings, representing the twelve Apostles, intended for the decoration of the stalls. These were suppressed, fortunately, else might James’s reception in Edinburgh have been less harmonious than it was. But for the first time since the Reformation the sacrament of the Lord’s Supper was administered to kneeling communicants, in which act lay the root of sore trouble for Scotland in days to come.

When Parliament, which had been sitting in the Over Tolbooth, rose on 28th June 1617, King James left Holyrood, to return there no more.

## CHAPTER VI.

FROM CHARLES I. TO EDWARD VII.

King Charles's Act of Revocation . . . . .	1626
Coronation of Charles I. at Holyrood . . . . .	18th June 1633
"Touching" for the King's evil . . . . .	24th June 1633
Laud's Liturgy . . . . .	1636
The National Covenant . . . . .	1st March 1638
Civil War . . . . .	1639
King Charles's last visit to Holyrood . . . . .	1641
The Duke of Hamilton appointed Hereditary Keeper of Holyrood . . . . .	10th Nov. 1646
Holyrood Palace burnt down . . . . .	13th Nov. 1650
Rebuilt by Cromwell . . . . .	1651-58
The Restoration . . . . .	1660
The Rescissory Act . . . . .	1661
The Palace rebuilt by Charles II. . . . .	1671-79
The Abbey Church reconstituted as the Chapel Royal . . . . .	1672
The Duke of York comes to Holyrood . . . . .	1679
The Revolution and the sack of Holyrood . . . . .	1688
The Act of Union . . . . .	1706
Departure of the Duke of Queensberry . . . . .	2nd April 1707
Prince Charles Edward at Holyrood . . . . .	September 1745
The March to Derby . . . . .	November 1745
The Duke of Cumberland at Holyrood . . . . .	1746
Final wreck of the Abbey Church . . . . .	2nd December 1768
The Comte d'Artois (Charles X.) at Holyrood . . . . .	1795-99
Visit of George IV. . . . .	August 1822
Queen Victoria at Holyrood . . . . .	September 1842
Edward VII. at Holyrood . . . . .	April 1903

FOR sixteen years after King James left Scotland for his seat of wider government, there was small stir at Holyrood,

save what was caused by the convention of the Estates—in other words, the meeting of Parliament—in 1630, 1631, and 1633. Indeed, the Palace seems not only to have been shut up, but to have been stripped of almost all the furniture described in an inventory dated 10th June 1603. Little as the northern people had seen of their sovereign since the union of the Crowns, they found good cause to

**King  
Charles's  
Act of Revoca-  
tion, 1626.** mourn his demise in 1625, for King Charles's earliest important act of governance was that memorable Revocation which Sir James Balfour

pronounced to be “the ground-stone of all the mischief that followed after, both to this King's government and family.”<sup>1</sup> The effect of this Act was to revoke every alienation of Crown lands which had been made since the death of James V. in 1542. Since that date—in 1587—the enormous possessions of the pre-Reformation Church had been made Crown property, and James VI. had only managed to maintain his precarious position by doling out these lands in grants to such lords and lairds as would consent to be loyal. The clergy, a potent agency for peace or disquiet, were allowed no more stipend than would keep them just clear of mendicity; but their discontent might be discounted so long as the barons were kept in good-humour. With the Act of Revocation there was an end to all good-humour. It affected almost every considerable family in Scotland by disinheriting landlords in large portions, sometimes almost the whole, of the estates which had been held without dispute for generations. The immediate effect was to unite the landowning class with the clergy, thus creating an opposition stronger than any Government could encounter without defeat. Yet this was the confederacy which King Charles set himself to crush.

<sup>1</sup> Balfour's *Annals*, ii. 128.

When Lord Balmerino got up a “supplication,” numerously and influentially signed, against the intolerable injustice of the Act, and against the presence of bishops in Parliament, he was imprisoned for many months: the Lord Advocate of the day denounced the document as a “scandalous, reproachful, odious, infamous, and seditious libel, most despitefully belched and vomited forth,” and called upon all true men “to crush the cockatrice in the egg, and to abhor it as a pestilential clout !”

In these untoward circumstances perhaps King Charles acted wisely, for once, in postponing his intended visit to Scotland till the year 1633. Although he was monarch of both realms, they did not yet form a “United Kingdom,” and Charles had to be crowned in both.

“There is,” says Sir Walter Scott, “a constant tradition, for which we are not able to produce a distinct or written authority, that Charles I. desired to have the Crown of Scotland sent up to London to be used in his coronation there; but this having been declined by the Scottish Privy Council as contrary to the law of the kingdom, he was induced to undertake a journey to Scotland in order to be there crowned King.”

When, at last, King Charles did arrive in his northern capital, he was received with much outward display of loyalty. A laudable attempt was made to cleanse the streets, whereof, in truth, there was crying need, for the homely custom of the citizens was to cast ordure and household refuse of all kinds into the causeway. Burgesses now were bidden by the magistrates to appoint “some honest man with ain kairt and hors” to remove the filth for the occasion, and the heads of malefactors, spiked on the city gates, were taken down so as to avoid unpleasant suggestion. Entering Edinburgh by the West Port, the King rode through the Grassmarket, the High Street, and Canongate, and so to Holyrood, among the numerous

train of English courtiers being one ominous figure—that of Bishop Laud of London.

Next day service was performed in the Chapel Royal by Bishop Bellenden of Dunblane, and on Monday the 17th, at a Court held in the drawing-room of the Palace, the first indication was given of his Majesty's predilection in the conflict of the Churches by William, 11th Earl of Angus, whom the General Assembly had prosecuted for "papistrie" in 1627, being created Marquess of Douglas. After this ceremony the King drove to the Castle, where he

**Coronation of  
Charles I.,  
18th June  
1633.**      spent the night in preparation for the Coronation on the morrow. That was celebrated with much splendour. The royal

train rode in procession from the Castle, six trumpeters in scarlet and gold leading the way. Then came the Barons in scarlet, followed by the Bishops in their robes, the Viscounts, and the Earls. The Archbishop of Glasgow rode by himself; behind him came six pursuivants, two and two; York Herald of England; six heralds, two and two; Norroy, King of Arms; the Master of Requests, and the Almoner, Bishop Guthrie of Moray. Next came a man of many cares that day, Sir James Balfour, Lyon-King-at-Arms, with two gentlemen ushers; then the Earl of Eglinton bearing the spurs, the Earl of Buchan the sword, and the Earl of Rothes the sceptre. The Earl of Arran carried the crown, with the Lord High Constable, the Earl of Errol, on his right, the young Duke of Lennox and the Earl Marischal on his left. It may seem of small concern at this time to note all these niceties of precedence, considering what was impending over the monarchy itself; but indeed they were reckoned matters of mighty moment then, disputes about them having been the frequent cause of the shedding of much good Scottish blood.

Behind the crown rode King Charles, robed in crimson velvet, grave and dignified, in the prime of his beauty, being then only in his thirty-third year. The Marquess of Hamilton, Master of the Horse, rode next after the King, with the Earl of Suffolk, Captain of the Gentlemen Pensioners, and the rear was brought up by the Earl of Holland at the head of the Yeomen of the Guard. All alighted at the Palace gate; the King walked across the courtyard, which was carpeted with blue, under a canopy of crimson and gold, supported by the eldest sons of six earls, supported by six barons. Archbishop Spottiswoode of St Andrews received his Majesty at the west door of the Chapel Royal, and the coronation went forward according to the usual forms, which it were wearisome to express in detail. The curious in such matters may study the minute account given by Sir James Balfour in his *Annals*. One breach of etiquette may be noted, being of the kind which are so eagerly interpreted as ominous of good or ill. A platform six feet high, covered with carpet, had been erected in the centre of the nave, and upon the platform a dais, two feet higher, whereon was set the throne. When the King ascended the platform he went straight to the throne and seated himself, in direct violation of the fundamental rule of coronation ritual that the sovereign must not occupy the throne until he is solemnly inducted into it.

Censorious eyes were not wanting to mark what went amiss, for beneath all this brave show smouldered those embers which were to burst forth before long as a devouring conflagration. There was much to remind those present that Charles had married a Queen of the old religion, and to confirm the rumours of a Papist conspiracy. No care had been taken to conciliate Presbyterian prepossession or prejudice, and Scotland was now

Presbyterian to the core. On the contrary, Archbishop Spottiswoode and some of the bishops wore white rochets and lawn sleeves, which the people had been taught to abhor as rags of idolatry: Spalding declares that the prelates bowed their heads as they passed a tapestry representing the Passion. In the first year of the King's reign he had reconstituted the Scottish Council, giving the Archbishop of St Andrews precedence as President of the Exchequer over Hay of Kinfauns, the Chancellor. With this order Hay had never complied, and now he swore roundly to Sir James that "never a stoned priest in Scotland should set a foot before him so long as his blood was hot!"

Sir James had plenty on his shoulders that day. As Lyon-King-at-Arms he was responsible for the niceties of precedence. He had to explain the dilemma to the King. "Weel, Lyone," quoth his Majesty, "letts goe to bussines! I will not meddle furder with that olde canckered gootishe man, at quhose handes there is nothing to be gained but soure wordes."<sup>1</sup>

On 24th June, St John the Baptist's Day, marked in the Scottish Calendar, more acceptably to Presbyterians, as the 319th anniversary of Bannockburn, King Charles attended "Touching" for the King's evil, 24th June 1633. in the Chapel Royal, where the service of the Church of England was performed in the presence of the Scottish bishops. Thereafter his Majesty "touched about 100 persons that wer troubled with the King's eiuell,"<sup>2</sup> putting about euery

<sup>1</sup> Balfour's *Annals*, ii. 141.

<sup>2</sup> King's evil or scrofula. Belief in the efficacy of the monarch's touch for the cure of this malady long survived the Reformation. A special service for administering the remedy may be found in the Book of Common Prayer in the reign of Queen Anne. On March 30, 1714, she "touched" two hundred persons, Samuel Johnson among them, who derived no benefit therefrom.

one of ther neckes a pice of gold (coyned for the purpos)  
hung at a whyte silk riband." <sup>1</sup>

Parliament rose on 28th June, and King Charles took his departure from Scotland, having sowed the seeds of bitter trouble among his lieges, given his assent to thirty-one Acts of Parliament, "not thre of them bot wer most hurtefull to the liberty of the subiecte," <sup>2</sup> created twenty-one new peerages, and dubbed fifty-four knights. Also, he made an important change in the constitution of Holyrood by erecting Edinburgh into a Bishopric and attaching to the new see the parish of Holyrood-house and much of the old Abbey lands. The parish minister was appointed one of the Prebendaries of St Giles's Cathedral. These measures were but mild for-runners of what was to follow. So little did King Charles and his virtual masters, Laud and Buckingham, understand the temperament of Scotsmen as to imagine that they could be forced to accept the Court religion. In the autumn of 1633, Bishop Bellenden received the King's command that divine service according to the English Liturgy was to be performed twice daily in the Chapel Royal; that Bellenden, as Dean, should preach in a surplice on Sundays and feast days; that the communion should be received kneeling, and that Privy Councillors, Judges, State officials, &c., should so receive it in the Chapel Royal once, at least, in each year. Bellenden, finding it impossible to enforce this decree, was removed from Holyrood and sent to Aberdeen, to make way for

**Laud's Liturgy, 1636.** Dr Wedderburn, Prebendary of Wells. Then followed on 18th October 1636 King Charles's memorable letter to Archbishop Spottiswoode, commanding that "Laud's Liturgy," practically the Eng-

<sup>1</sup> Balfour's *Annals*, ii. 201.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, 201.

lish Common Prayer with a few unimportant adaptations to Scottish use, be used in every church in Presbyterian Scotland. Let it be remembered what this meant: no nonconformity was tolerated in those days; all who resisted the order or neglected to conform were to be "condignly censured and punished."

The new Liturgy was appointed to be read for the first time in St Giles's Cathedral on 23rd August 1637. Both the archbishops and several bishops attended: the solemnity of the occasion was emphasised by the presence of the Privy Councillors and the Lords of Session; which notwithstanding, the service was not allowed to proceed, the congregation rising in loud tumult and pelting the Dean with stones and worse as he made his way back to Holyrood.

King Charles was a devout and pious prince, earnestly anxious to set public worship in Scotland upon a more dignified and comely model than had been followed of late; but he had no idea of allowing his subjects to be devout and pious in their own way. To the "general supplication" expressing what was practically the unanimous objection of the nation to the new Liturgy, he replied by proclamation at Stirling town-cross on 19th February 1638, declaring the supplication itself to be illegal, that the Liturgy would be enforced, and that further remonstrance would be treated as treason. The

**The National Covenant, 1st March 1638.** outcome of this was the National Covenant. Seldom has the preparation of any docu-

ment been fraught with more fateful consequences to king and people. The signing of the Covenant began on 1st March 1638 in Greyfriars' Church, Edinburgh. The King sent down the Marquess of Hamilton as his Lord High Commissioner to restore

peace, charged to reassure the people as to his Majesty's horror of "the popish superstition," and to induce them to forswear the Covenant. Those who would not do so must be dealt with as traitors. Hamilton might as well have stayed in London as bring terms like these. The Covenanters held every approach to Edinburgh Castle, which was strictly blockaded ; the preachers were thundering in the old style from all the pulpits. When the well-meaning Marquess repaired to the Chapel Royal for orthodox worship, he found that some Covenanters had nailed up the organ, and remained to warn him that he who should use the English service book again, it should be at the peril of his life. Hamilton did not dare to publish the King's declaration, being assured that to do so would "endanger his Maiesties honor, his auen sauete and peace of the publicke."<sup>1</sup>

Three times did Hamilton travel between London and Holyrood in that year ; in March 1639 the wind sown by

Charles and Laud had risen to a whirlwind. On  
**Civil War,** 1639. 28th May the King arrived at Berwick as an

invader ; but, having one nation in arms before him, another behind him grievously disaffected, he shunned battle and agreed to the "pacification." August 1640 saw Charles as far as York on a fresh expedition to quell rebellion in the north. His path was barred at Newcastle by Leslie with 20,000 Scots, and the storm was about to break behind him. On 3rd November the Long Parliament met, and now the King was fain to seek shelter in that part of his realm which he had done so little to conciliate.

Grim and ominously silent was the city when Charles

<sup>1</sup> Balfour's *Annals*, ii. 271.

dismounted in the courtyard of Holyrood on 14th August. No flutter of flags, no thunder of the Castle guns, no throng of lieges in the streets to welcome their sovereign. Safety! yes, he should be safe: no English rebels should harm the King while he was north of the Border; but it should be

safety on the people's terms, not on the King's.

**King Charles's  
last visit to  
Holyrood,  
1641.** “The nobility and barrons kist his hand in the longe gallerey.”<sup>1</sup> Charles was meek enough

now. On the day after his arrival he attended worship in the Chapel Royal, humbly joining in the “conceived prayers” of Mr Alexander Henderson, and hearing sermon from the lips of that chosen vessel. In the “afternoone he went not to sermon, bot being weirie, repossed himselue priaut.”<sup>2</sup>

His Majesty remained at Holyrood during the session of Parliament. On 17th November he gave a banquet to the nobility in the great hall of the Palace, and “solemly tooke his leue of them.”<sup>3</sup> At 8 o'clock on the following

**The Duke of  
Hamilton ap-  
pointed Her-  
editary Keeper  
of Holyrood,  
10th Nov.  
1646.** morning he rode forth from Holyrood for the last time, and took his way to England. One act, and one only, of King Charles remains valid to this day in the constitution of Holyrood. On 10th November 1646 he appointed

James, 1st Duke of Hamilton, Hereditary Keeper of the Palace, an office which continues to be held by the present Duke.

This first Duke of Hamilton, it may be observed, was the same who, as Marquess, had conducted the ineffective negotiations with the Covenanters in 1638. Failing the line of James VI. and I., he would have succeeded to the throne, in virtue of the decree of the Scottish Parlia-

<sup>1</sup> Balfour's *Annals*, iii. 39.

<sup>2</sup> Ibid.

<sup>3</sup> Ibid., 165.

ment, whereby, on the decease of James V. in 1542, his great-grandfather had been declared Heir-Presumptive to the infant Queen Mary and Guardian of the realm. As it was, the first Hereditary Keeper of Holyrood shared the fate of his royal master and relative, being taken at the battle of Preston in 1648 and beheaded in Westminster 9th March 1649.

The duties of the Hereditary Keeper are nominal and honorary, but he grants his commission to a legal official styled the Bailie of the Abbey, who used to be operative as chief magistrate of the debtors' sanctuary, now disused, and had, until quite lately, the appointment of servants, warders, &c. The Bailie appears on the occasion of the election of representative peers, when he summons the staff to muster under their officers as a guard at the Palace gate.

For nine years after the departure of Charles I. the story of Holyrood is a blank. The English monarchy fell in his person on 30th January 1649, but the Scottish Estates proclaimed Charles II. on the 5th February following. In July 1650 Cromwell entered Scotland to establish the authority of the Commonwealth. On 3rd September the veteran Leslie, sorely harassed by the preachers, was persuaded against his better judgment to repeat the fatal strategy of Flodden. He descended from his fine position on the Doon Hill of Dunbar, attacked the English on the low ground, and was thoroughly routed. After the battle some of Cromwell's troops were quartered

**Holyrood Palace burnt down, 13th Nov. 1650.** in Holyrood Palace, which on 13th November they managed to burn down, probably by accident. James V.'s tower stood fast, however; but it bore a symbol odious to the Commonwealth—to wit, the royal arms. These were removed and destroyed by order of the English Commis-

sioners sitting at Dalkeith : the vacant panels may still (in 1906) be seen on the outer face of the tower.

**The Palace  
rebuilt by  
Cromwell,  
1651-58.**

Cromwell caused the Palace to be rebuilt, and John Nicoll, writing in 1659, the year after Cromwell's death, noted that "the hole foir work, . . . quhilk was brint in November 1650, was compleitly biggit up."<sup>1</sup>

Such as Cromwell left it was the house which received the ex-Covenanter, John, Earl of Middleton, who arrived there on the last day of the year 1660 as Lord High Commissioner of the restored King. Parliament met on the following day, and speedily gave proof how little the rulers of Scotland had learnt from recent history. The House was carefully packed ; some of its legislation was practical

**The Restora-  
tion, 1660,  
and the  
Rescissory  
Act, 1661.**

and wise enough, but absolute monarchy was restored by law, and the Rescissory Act repealed every statute that had been passed since 1633. This was to put the clock back with a vengeance.

It cleared the ground for the work of the Privy Council, which, when Parliament rose on 12th July, met next day at Holyrood, and sent four gentlemen to England to be consecrated Bishops. One of these was James Sharp, who presently was made Archbishop of St Andrews and Primate of Scotland. On 7th May 1662 Archbishop Sharp, assisted by Archbishop Fairfoull of Glasgow and Bishop Hamilton of Galloway, consecrated seven other bishops in the Chapel Royal of Holyrood. The last great ceremony of which the old Palace was the scene took place on 9th October 1662, when the "riding of Parliament" was gone through in much state, the Earl of Rothes being Lord High Commissioner. This same

<sup>1</sup> This does not refer to James IV.'s "foir-werk," being the gatehouse, but to the western façade of the Palace.

Earl, having been created a Duke, died in the new Palace in 1681.

Charles II. never was in Scotland after the Restoration, but he was a great lover of architecture, among other things good and bad, as many noble edifices in the south remain to testify. Sir William Bruce of Balcaskie, his Majesty's Surveyor - General, was commanded in 1671 to prepare

**The Palace  
rebuilt by  
Charles II.,  
1671-79.** plans for a sweeping reconstruction of Holyrood Palace. It appears from his contracts with Robert Mylne, his Majesty's Master

Mason, that the west front, as rebuilt by Cromwell, was pulled down and rebuilt, and a new south-west tower was erected, corresponding with the north-west tower of James V. Behind this west front was built the Palace as it now stands, a creditable example of late Scottish renaissance architecture.

There is preserved in the General Register House of Edinburgh a volume containing Sir William's account, duly authenticated by the Lords of the Treasury, of his expenditure upon the King's palaces and castles in Scotland from January 1674 to March 1679, amounting in all to about £160,000 Scots, equal to £13,333 sterling, four-fifths of which sum was spent upon Holyrood Palace. From this we learn with satisfaction that the masons, wrights, smiths, glaziers, plumbers, and painters were Scots; but the plasterers were two Englishmen, whose names, John Houbert and George Demsterfield, deserve to be recorded on account of the fine work they put into the ceilings, which remain beautiful examples of their craft. Much of the woodwork was put up by Scots artisans, including "the turning of wanscott ballasters, standing and hanging knobs for the timber scaile stair"; but the finer carved work was executed in Holland. White lead, Dutch tiles, wainscot-

ing, and linseed oil were shipped from Rotterdam ; lead came from Newcastle, and nine marble chimney-pieces from London. Jacobus de Witt or de Wet, the Dutch painter, received £98, 12s. Scots (about £8 sterling) "for two several chimney-pieces paynted by him, and for paynting in marble collour ane chimney." But de Witt was more than a mere grainer. On 31st July 1675 he received £120 Scots (£10 sterling) "for ane piece of historie paynted and placed in the roofe of the King's bed chamber in the 2nd storie of the east quarter on the syde towards the Privie garden." Again, on 6th April 1677 he was paid £36 Scots (£3 sterling) for making two drawings of the King's coat of arms "to be a patern to the meason for cutting the saids coats of armes in stone," one to go over the main entrance, the other "upon the middle of the wpper part of the west fronteice of the east quarter of the Pallace."<sup>1</sup>

It is matter for regret that Sir William Bruce's plans have not been preserved as well as his account books and documents, for it is known that he designed to decorate the interior of the court at an expense which shocked the Lords of the Treasury. "His Majesty," they said, "thinks the way proposed for the inner court would be very noble, but he will not go to that charge, and therefore his pleasure is that it be plain ashlar, as the front is, with table divisions for storeys."

The spiritual wants of Charles II. were provided for as carefully by the Lords of the Privy Council as his physical comfort. In 1672, having arrived at the opinion that it was "necessary and suteing to his Majesty's pious and re-

<sup>1</sup> Sir William Bruce's contracts and Treasury warrants for various works will be found in the *Proceedings of the Society of Scottish Antiquaries*, vol. iii. pp. 113-117, and vol. xiv. pp. 324-337.

**The Abbey Church reconstituted as the Chapel Royal, 1672.**

ligious disposition that some convenient place be designed and sett apart, wherein his Majesty and those of his family at his Palace of Halirudhous may worship God," they decreed that the Abbey Church should cease to be, as heretofore, the parish church of the Canongate.

The congregation was directed to use Lady Yester's Church until a new parish church was erected, which was done by applying to this purpose the bequest of Thomas Mercer, merchant, who had left 20,000 merks in 1649 to build a church in the Grassmarket. The present Canongate parish church was erected by means of this fund, which Parliament handed over to King Charles, but it was not opened for worship until after the Revolution of 1688.

From 1672, therefore, the mutilated nave of the Abbey Church was reconstituted as the Chapel Royal of Holyroodhouse.

The erection of the new Palace being finished in 1679, the Duke of York, afterwards James VII. and II., took up his abode there as Lord High Commissioner. It was a black year for Scotland,—the year of Drumclog and Bothwell Brig ; the year when Archbishop Sharp was brutally butchered on

**The Duke of York comes to Holyrood, 1679.**  
Magus Moor in presence of his daughter ; the first of the five years of vengeance bitterly remembered as "the killing time." Under such conditions the presence of the Duke of York, an avowed Papist, at Holyrood was no source of satisfaction to Edinburgh citizens, nor was his Royal Highness at any pains to endear himself with them. Forasmuch as the Chapel Royal had been assigned to services according to the Protestant forms of the State Church, he caused the long gallery, designed by Sir William Bruce as a Council Chamber, to be fitted up as a Roman

Catholic chapel for the use of himself and his household. It is true that in 1681 the Duke wrote to Lord Dartmouth, "I live here as cautiously as I can, and am very careful to give offence to none." Nevertheless, offence did come, plenty of it and grievous enough—so much so, that the Duke was solemnly excommunicated by Cargill, the leader of the extreme Presbyterians. His Royal Highness, however, shared the sentence in good company, for it fell simultaneously upon himself, the King, Monmouth, Lauderdale, the Lord Advocate, and other distinguished personages.

When he became King, James of York threw off all mask of his purpose. A college of Jesuits was established in the Lord Chancellor's apartments for the work of proselytising; a private press was set up in the Palace, under the direction of Sir Roger l'Estrange, for the diffusion of propagandist literature; but Protestant publishers who ventured to utter anything against the King's religion were vigorously prosecuted. Although in September 1686 James had issued his warrant to the Lords of the Treasury to maintain the private chapel in the Palace, and by another warrant in May following authorised the payment of £100 annually for music therein, he gave orders in December 1687 that the Chapel Royal itself should be adapted for the Roman Catholic ritual, and constituted it the chapel of the Knights of the Thistle, an Order which he had revived in this year, conferring it upon one Duke, one Marquess, and six Earls. All was to be ready by 1st

The Revolu-  
tion and the  
sack of Holy-  
rood, 1688.

May 1688, on pain of his Majesty's severe displeasure. But when that month came round, Edward Russell was already at The Hague, persuading William of Orange to come to the relief of Protestant Britain. When William was

known to have landed at Torbay on 5th November, the fury of the Edinburgh populace broke forth. Lord Chancellor Perth hurriedly left Holyrood, and a huge mob gathered in front of the Palace. Captain Wallace was stationed in the Palace with a company of musketeers, and ordered them to fire from the windows to disperse the rioters; but although some fell, others took their places, and at last the Privy Council sent orders to Wallace to surrender his charge. This the brave captain disdained to do; whereupon the magistrates marched down the city guard and trained bands to dislodge them. He formed up his company before the Palace gate and kept his assailants at bay until the captain of the city guard took him in rear, having entered the Palace by a back way. Then Wallace had no choice but to yield. The people poured into the Palace and defaced the King's private chapel, burning books, vestments, ornaments—everything that seemed like a symbol of the hated religion. It is well that we at this day have not to deplore the total destruction of Sir William Bruce's handiwork.

From the Palace the angry people broke into the Chapel Royal—the old Abbey Church—and destroyed all the fine fittings with which it had so lately been equipped. Worse than that, they burst into the royal burial vault, tearing open the leaden coffins and casting out the bones of kings and princes.

King James VII. and II., whose indifference to the spiritual susceptibilities of his subjects thus brought ruin upon the fine Palace erected by his brother, left few in Edinburgh to mourn his dethronement. Yet he was a prince of much ability for rule; and it should not be forgotten that he was the first to perceive and propose the plan of the new town of Edinburgh, with a bridge over

the Nor' Loch, a full century before either design was carried into effect.

Something of the old stir came about Holyrood in 1706 during the last stage of the parliamentary contest about the Union of the Legislatures. James Douglas, <sup>The Act of Union, 1706.</sup> second Duke of Queensberry,—“the Union Duke” as he came to be called,—was Lord High Commissioner for Queen Anne, and had his residence and court in the Palace. The leader of the Opposition was also a Douglas—namely, James Douglas Hamilton, fourth Duke of Hamilton,<sup>1</sup> Hereditary Keeper of Holyrood Palace: the strife was as hot as it had been of yore between the Black Douglas and the Red. Although the weapons were but words this time, a resort to deadlier instruments seemed imminent. So violent was the agitation against the Union that the debates in Parliament had to be conducted under protection of troops, and the High Commissioner drove to and fro between Holyrood and Parliament House with a strong escort, which could not shield him from the imprecations, and even the missiles, of the populace. However, the Act of Union was driven through without shedding of blood. On the critical division, 118 members voted Aye and 83 voted No; and in July 1706 Queensberry signified the Royal Assent by setting his hand to the Act which dissolved the Scottish Parliament for good and all. On 2nd April 1707, just a month before that Act came into force, he rode forth from

<sup>1</sup> His father, William Douglas, Earl of Selkirk, was a younger son of the eleventh Earl of Angus, who was created Marquess of Douglas in 1633. Lord Selkirk married Anne, daughter and heiress of James Hamilton, first Duke of Hamilton, whom Charles I. made Hereditary Keeper of Holyrood Palace. Upon this Duke's widow surrendering the honours in 1698, his eldest son James became Duke of Hamilton by patent.

Holyrood Palace, escorted across the Border by a squadron of the Royal Horse Guards. He left behind him a sullen, angry nation ; but he bore the execration of his countrymen in the sure conviction that he had redeemed Scotland from the otherwise incurable poison of family faction, and united its destiny for ever with that of a powerful neighbour.

One immediate effect of the Union was that Holyrood was grievously shorn of its importance. Silent and solitary it stood, memorial of a checkered past, wakened only to light and movement by the annual visit of the Lord High Commissioner — Commissioner no longer to Parliament but to the General Assembly, when its courts and galleries were wont to be thronged by black-coated ministers. Before the opening of each new Parliament at Westminster, the Scottish Peers assemble to elect representatives to the House of Lords in what has been successively the Council Chamber and James VII.'s private chapel, but is now known as the Picture Gallery, in virtue of De Witt's grotesque portraits of one hundred Scottish kings.

There came a sudden and brilliant revival in 1745. On Sunday 15th September worshippers in the churches throughout the city were startled by the pealing of the fire bell, which was rung to summon the volunteers to arms. Hamilton's dragoons came clattering in from Leith, for word had come that Colonel Gardiner's regiment had retired before Prince Charlie's Highlanders as far as Costorphine, just outside the city bounds. The volunteers mustered ; they took up a position with the dragoons at Coltbridge, still nearer the city than Costorphine. Next morning the brave fellows were riding and running for their lives, scared by a reconnoitring party of Highland gentlemen, who had discharged their pistols at the cavalry

pickets. “The Canter o’ Colbriigg” carried some of these heroes as far as Dunbar, and the magistrates, left without defence, sent out a deputation to wait upon him

who had summoned the city as “Charles P.R.”

**Prince Charles**  
**Edward comes**  
**to Holyrood,**  
**17th Sept.**  
**1745.** On Tuesday the 17th the Heralds proclaimed King James VIII. at the Market Cross, the beautiful Mrs Murray of Broughton sitting on

horseback beside them, distributing white cockades to an excited crowd. But the Castle still held for King George; and Prince Charles, to avoid its fire, made a circuit to the south of the city, entered the King’s Park by a breach in the wall, and passed to Holyrood House by the Duke’s Walk, so named after his grandfather, the Duke of York, who had made it his favourite promenade. He started upon this march on foot, but so closely did the people crowd round him, eager to kiss his hand or only to touch his tartan doublet or plaid, that he could make no progress. He called for his horse, and, mounting it, rode forward with the Duke of Perth on his right and Lord Elcho on his left hand. By the time he reached the Palace, his very boots were dim with the kisses of the rabble, for his noble appearance won the hearts of all who beheld him.

Just as the Prince was about to enter the Palace gate, a round-shot from the Castle struck the north-west tower, and threw down some masonry into the courtyard. Then James Hepburn of Keith, who had been “out” in the ’15, drew his sword and marshalled the way before the Prince up the grand staircase. That night the Palace shone with a thousand lights, the Prince receiving the Jacobite gentry and their ladies at a ball, and winning all hearts by his grace and beauty. He remained all next day and night, the 18th, marching out to Duddingston

on the afternoon of the 19th, and pushing on next morning to oppose Sir John Cope's advance upon the capital from Dunbar.

The Prince had a disposable force of about 2500 men, and no artillery, except an old iron field-piece, useless, except for firing signal shots, but to which the Highlanders, who called it "the Mother of Muskets," were superstitiously attached, and insisted on dragging after them with a long team of ponies. Cope's troops numbered about 2200, with six guns. The two forces met on 21st September near the village of Prestonpans: the result was a complete and, it must be added, amazing victory of the undisciplined Highlanders over the troops of King George. Prince Charlie slept that night at Pinkie House near Musselburgh, returning on the 22nd to Holyrood. During the next six weeks levies continued to pour in from the Highlands, till about 6000 men were collected in the Jacobite camp at Duddingston. The Prince appointed a Council, which assembled every morning at ten in the drawing-room of the Palace, after the daily levee. After the Council he dined in public with his chief officers, and then rode out to Duddingston camp. The day's proceedings were brought to a close by a drawing-room, sometimes a ball, for the ladies in the picture gallery.

It is vain to speculate what might have been the result had Charles Edward listened to the chief Scottish Jacobites and been content to defend the realm of Scotland against all comers. The rising would then become national in character, on the traditional lines, instead of being partisan and sectarian.

**The March  
to Derby,  
November  
1745.**

The ancient War of Independence would have been renewed, bringing in its train the loss and suffering, the heroism and treachery, which marked its course during

three centuries. France, as of yore, would have been intermittently helpful, in such measure as it suited her purpose to strengthen Scotland as a foe on the flank of England, and England must have gone forward upon her troubled course without the advantage derived from her best recruiting-ground. All men at this day, however warm may be their sympathy with the gallant young Chevalier, must be grateful for the impetuosity which hastened, if it did not bring about, the ruin of his cause. Charles Edward was bent upon marching south to encounter Marshal Wade. The hardships of a winter campaign had no terrors for him. He left Holyrood Palace on the 31st October, slept that night at Pinkie House, marched southward next day, and crossed the border in Eskdale, about 5000 strong, on 8th November. On 20th December, dispirited by retreat, decimated by desertion, and drenched with rain, the Highlanders recrossed the flooded Esk; on the 26th they entered Glasgow, having marched in this astonishing expedition 580 miles in fifty-six days.

The star of the royal Stuarts having set for ever at Culloden on 16th April 1746, Holyrood received royalty

**The Duke of Cumberland at Holyrood, 1746.** once more in the person of the Duke of Cumberland, on his return from that dolorous campaign. He slept, it is said, in the very bed in which Prince Charles reposed during his brief splendour in the previous year.

In 1758 the attention of the Barons of Exchequer was directed to the dilapidated condition of the roof of the Chapel Royal, which, being no longer used as a parish church, had become too dangerous to permit of service being celebrated during the annual visit of the Lord High Commissioner to the General Assembly. They employed a

**Final wreck of the Abbey Church, 2nd December 1768.**

builder to put on a new roof, apparently without the advice of a competent architect. The result was disastrous. The ancient walls were called upon to support a mass of masonry and flagstones; they did so until 1768, when, on the night of 2nd December, the whole fell in with a crash, drawing down with it the whole of the vaulting and clerestory. Next morning the rabble swarmed in upon the ruins; once more the royal tombs were rifled,—Captain Grose testifies to having seen the bones thrown about from hand to hand. Since then the hallowed walls have stood mouldering, exposed to all the winds of heaven,—a forlorn monument alike of the piety and the checkered fortunes of the Scottish monarchy.

For forty years after Culloden, neglect and damp wrought their silent mischief upon Holyroodhouse; moths and rats held revel with little hindrance, until, in like manner as our own royal Stuarts had sought and found refuge in France in the hour of tribulation, so the heir-presumptive of the Bourbons, an exile from his own country, was offered and accepted shelter in the ancient Palace. In 1795 the apartments on the east side of the quadrangle were hastily repaired and refurnished for the reception of the Comte d'Artois, who afterwards

**The Comte  
d'Artois  
(Charles X.)  
at Holyrood,  
1795-1799.** succeeded his brother Louis XVIII. on the French throne. He lived at Holyrood for four years. The Duchesse de Grammont

continued there until her death in 1803, when she was buried in the royal vault; but her remains were removed to France after the restoration.

The summer of 1822 found Holyrood in a bustle of preparation for the coming of King George IV. Except the Duke of Cumberland, in his punitive expedition of 1746, no prince of the House of Hanover had ever set

foot on Scottish soil. The Jacobite cause had been laid to rest, never to wake again ; but there were reasons for misgiving as to the reception which King George might receive in his northern capital, arising out of recent domestic dissension in the royal family. But his Majesty had entirely gained one leal Scottish heart ; and it was mainly owing to the enthusiasm and personal popularity of Sir Walter Scott that the visit turned out a perfect success, and all unpleasant memories were buried out of sight. Time had been when the kilt and belted plaid were looked upon with little favour in Edinburgh, but Sir Walter now decreed that it should be reckoned the national costume of the realm of Scotland. Not only did he don the tartan himself (choosing that of Argyll Campbell in virtue of a great grandmother in that clan), but he persuaded grave burgesses to do the same, and paraded besides all the real Highland gentlemen he could find in Queen Street Gardens.

“ Lord ! how the pibrochs groan and yell !  
Macdonnell’s ta’en the field himsel’,  
Macleod comes branking o’er the fell—  
Carle, now the King’s come ! ”

The King, having arrived off Leith in his yacht on 14th August, was conducted in procession to the Palace on the 15th, and passed thence to Dalkeith Palace, where he was the guest of the Duke of Buccleuch. It was on his return to Holyrood to hold his first levee that the full extent was realised to which Sir Walter had Celticised the sober Scot, for here was his Majesty arrayed in the garb of Old Gaul, as interpreted by a nineteenth-century tailor, glowing in royal Stuart tartan from head to heel, barring the orthodox interval in the region of the knees. Nor he alone, for

rivalling his Majesty in stature and bulk came a London alderman, upon whom Byron has imposed immortality.

“He caught Sir William Curtis in a kilt,  
While thronged the chiefs of every Highland clan  
To hail their brother—Vich Ian Alderman.”<sup>1</sup>

Among the good results of King George’s visit to Holyrood must be reckoned the sum of £24,000 voted by Parliament for much-needed repairs on the Palace and for setting the grounds in order.

The next royal visitor was Charles X. of France, once more a fugitive, who in 1831 reoccupied the rooms in the Palace which had sheltered him in 1795. With him came the Duc and Duchesse d’Angoulême, the Duchesse de Berri, and her son the Duc de Bordeaux.

In September 1842, when Queen Victoria and Prince Albert first came to Edinburgh, they did not take up their residence in the Palace ; but, returning in 1850, **Queen Victoria at Holyrood.** they occupied the royal apartments, and in later years often made Holyrood a resting-place on their way to and from Balmoral. It was under Prince Albert’s direction that the present approaches to the Palace were made, superseding the ancient way through the Canongate. He also caused the ground to the east of the Abbey Church to be levelled and laid out as at present. It strikes the eye as somewhat bleak and bare, but it would not be difficult to restore the pleasure and gardens, to a considerable extent at least, according to the design shown in Gordon of Rothiemay’s plan. The date of Gordon’s work is 1646-47, and probably it represents the general disposition of the gardens as Queen Mary knew them.

The lowness of the site of Holyrood has caused the

<sup>1</sup> *Age of Bronze.*

drainage of the Palace to be a recurrent source of anxiety ever since the thirteenth century, when Abbot Elias laid out the great sewer of the monastery on a new plan. So in April 1903, when King Edward VII. paid at Holyrood, his first visit to the northern capital after his coronation in the previous year at Westminster, it was a disappointment to all Scotsmen that he could not establish his court at Holyrood, owing to the drains being under repair.<sup>1</sup> However, his Majesty drove in on two days from Dalkeith, where he was the guest of the Duke of Buccleuch, held a levee in the Palace, entertained a large number of peers, privy councillors, and city dignitaries at luncheon, and reviewed his bodyguard, the Scottish Archers, in the grounds to the south of the Palace.

<sup>1</sup> During these repairs a dagger was found in one of the drains, with an iron handle of elegant design, probably once gilt.

THE END.

