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Abstract

This inter-disciplinary thesis addresses the long term continuity and change found in representations of Scottish royal authority through state ceremonial bridging the gap between medieval and early modern across four centuries. Royal ceremony in Scotland has received very haphazard research to date, with few attempts to draw comparisons that explore how these crucial moments for the representation of royal authority developed over the course of a number of centuries. Three key royal ceremonies – inaugurations/coronations, funerals and weddings (with consort coronations) – form the core of this study of the Scottish monarchy from c.1214 to c.1603, and were chosen due to their integral position in the reign of each monarch. The issues of succession and security of hereditary monarchy dictate that the ceremonies of death and accession are inescapably intertwined, and funerals and coronations have been studied in unison together for other European comparators. However, the frequency of minor accessions, early and violent deaths, absentee kingship and political upheaval in Scotland across the time period determined from an early stage that weddings – often the first occasion for Scottish monarchs to project their personal adult authority and the point at which Scotland had the widest European audience for their display – were essential to forming a rounded view of developments. By offering a detailed analysis of these ceremonial developments across time, this study will provide the framework from which further research into royal ceremony and its place as essential platform for the dissemination of royal power can be undertaken.

The thesis focuses upon key questions to illuminate the developments of these ceremonies as both reflectors of a distinct Scottish royal identity and representative of their integration within a broader European language of ceremony. How did these ceremonies reflect the ideals of Scottish kingship? How were they shaped to function within the parameters of Scottish governance and traditions? How was the Scottish crown influenced by other monarchies and the papacy? How did it hope to be perceived by the wider European community and how was royal
power exercised over its subjects in this transitional period of Scottish history? The focus upon Scotland’s visual forays on the international stage and varied relations with European actors has required a continual comparison with other European countries across this time period, with particular attention being paid to England, France, Ireland and the Low Countries. Within the context of a highly public and interactive era of display and posturing by great leaders across Europe, crucial points this thesis engages with include: what made the Scottish ceremonies unique? And how can this further our understanding of that which lay beneath such representations of royal authority?
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Note on Money

All values are in £ Scots unless otherwise stated. Across the four centuries under consideration the value of the Scottish coinage fluctuated substantially against other currencies. It was not until the fourteenth century that Scotland formally broke away from English Sterling, although there had been Scottish coins minted from substantially earlier and they were increasingly common in the thirteenth century under Alexander II and Alexander III. When Scotland broke away from the sterling in 1390, the English enforced an exchange rate of 2:1 (Scots: sterling); Gemill and Mayhew have noted that this vastly undervalued the Scottish coinage at this time and rather than half the value of the sterling the Scots coinage was probably close to two thirds of the value of its English counterpart.¹

Some Useful Exchange Rate Information:²

Until around 1360 the Scottish coinage held value against the English sterling.

1390 – 1430s: 1 (sterling): 1½ - 2 Scots  
1430 – 1480s: 1 (sterling): 2 to 3 ½ Scots  
1483: 1 (sterling): 5 Scots  
Late 1480s to 1530: 1 (sterling): 3 to 4 Scots

There are sharper rises and falls in value in the 1530s and then steady devaluing across sixteenth century that saw 6 Scots to a sterling in 1560s, 7 Scots to a sterling in 1580s and 10 Scots to sterling by the 1590s.

In relation to the French currency in the fourteenth century it was roughly 1:6 (with the Scots this time the stable at 1), fluctuated between 1:3 and 1:1 ½ through fifteenth century, plateaued

¹ E. Gemmill and N. Mayhew, Changing values in medieval Scotland: A study of prices, money, and weights and measures (Cambridge, 1995), 111-42.  
at 1:2 through 1500–1550, but steady drops so that the coinage is of roughly equal value in the
1580s and 1590s.

A merk was worth 13s. 4d.

There was a huge variety of coinage in use in each country (with a variety of values), but this
note can act as a rough guide in most cases, and where a direct exchange rate can be drawn
from financial material used this will be noted in footnotes.
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Introduction

To be accepted as a king, one had to behave like a king.¹

When Grant Simpson made this statement about Robert I and his burial preparations, he referred to a king whom many saw as an imposter when he took the throne in 1306, and for whom being accepted as king by all was paramount. For each of the Scottish monarchs from 1214 to 1603, the desire to be accepted as an equal independent power by larger wealthier neighbouring monarchies, such as the English and French, and to be raised above the high ranking levels of their own subjects, fuelled the creation and development of the royal image. The life stage ceremonies that marked out the key milestones of their reigns from inauguration to marriage and finally death were primary platforms for the display of royal authority. Nevertheless, these ceremonies, and a wealth of other ceremonial occurring around them, have not yet been scrutinised over a long time period to assess the continuity and change in the manner in which the monarchs of Scotland ‘behaved’ to ‘be accepted as king’ both at home and abroad.

Historiography

The monographs and essay collections produced over the last 25 or so years on the monarchs of Scotland from 1214 to 1603, added to most recently in 2012 by Richard Oram,² along with the

¹ G.G. Simpson, ‘The Heart of King Robert I: Pious Crusade or Marketing Gambit?’ in B.E. Crawford (ed.), Church, Chronicle and Learning in Medieval and Early Renaissance Scotland: Essays presented to Donald Watt on the Occasion of the Completion of the Publication of Bower’s Scotichronicon (Edinburgh, 1999), 180.
renewed Edinburgh history series on the history of Scotland\(^3\) and works on the parliament and key figures and families,\(^4\) have provided the political framework around which scholars of kingship and power structures have been able to expand research into a variety of interlinked socio-cultural avenues. There have been prominent discussions circling around heraldry, chivalry and royal iconography,\(^5\) the piety and religious devotion of Scottish monarchs,\(^6\) the growth of national identity;\(^7\) music,\(^8\) literature and print,\(^9\) court culture and royal household,\(^10\) and architecture\(^11\) feed into the broadening picture of kingship and display particularly in the balanced assessments of Mary Queen of Scots see: G. Donaldson, *All the Queen’s Men. Power and politics in Mary Stewart’s Scotland* (London, 1983); M. Lynch, ‘Introduction: Mary Queen of Scots’ and A. White, ‘Queen Mary’s Northern Province’ IR, Vol. 38 (1987), 1-29, 53-70.


\(^5\) See works of Roger Mason, Katie Stevenson, Alastair A. MacDonald, and others referred to throughout, including essays from J.H. Williams (ed.), *Stewart Style 1513–1542: Essays on the Court of James V* (East Linton, 1996).


\(^8\) See works by D.J. Ross, Isabel Woods Preece, and Jamie Reid-Baxter referred to throughout.


\(^10\) See works by Carol Edington, Andrea Thomas, and Nicola Scott referred to throughout. In addition, the court and household of James IV is under consideration for a PhD thesis by William Hepburn (University of Glasgow), to whom the author is grateful for discussions and the opportunity to hear a number of papers presented at workshops and conferences.

later fifteenth and sixteenth centuries. All these subjects provide valuable insights for the study of ceremony, and will be drawn upon throughout, but on the whole the treatment of the ceremonial of Scottish monarchs across this time period has been approached haphazardly. Many of the current works considering royal ceremonies in part, or as the main focus, concentrate predominantly on the sixteenth century, or the early inaugural ceremonies up to and including Alexander III in 1249. This uneven view of Scottish royal ceremony, with a subsequent lack of understanding of the long term developments, has led to a number of biased

\[\text{References}\]


2. G.P. Haven, 2011). In addition there are numerous detailed works and guides for a variety of Scottish castles, abbeys and churches (many by the architectural historians here listed). The author would also like to thank Katherine Buchanan for discussions on her current PhD research into: ‘The Social, Geographical, and Structural Environments of Minor Noble Castles in Angus, 1449–1542’ (ongoing, University of Stirling).
generalisations – particularly on the part of some sixteenth-century historians – emphasising an apparent surge towards a far more advanced and highly developed form of ceremonial display in the sixteenth century. For example, Michael Lynch has claimed of the baptismal celebrations for Prince James orchestrated by Mary Queen of Scots in December 1566 should be recognised as the: ‘first truly Renaissance festival which Great Britain had ever witnessed.’

Ignoring the fact that there would be many English ceremonial historians who would firmly disagree with this, even within Mary’s own reign following her return in 1561 there are examples that contradict this conclusion. This ceremony was indeed one that deserved the attention of historians, but such claims have the potential to belittle the representations of royal authority made by earlier Scottish monarchs through a range of complex and intricate state ceremony.

The ceremonies which will form the core of this study – inaugurations and coronations, funerals, and weddings and consort coronations – are by no means the only important events utilised by the monarchs and princes of Europe in their demonstrations of royal authority. As Bak states, ‘ritual and royal ceremonial were [...] parts of a whole world of symbolic action, gesture, and behaviour.’ However, considering the lack of a comprehensive study on these arguably most important ceremonies marking key moments in the reign, alongside the practical considerations of space in a thesis, this focus is intended to provide a platform for further research into the multitude of other ceremonial customs and rituals of the Scottish monarchy across this time period. Where the current Scottish historiography has very few studies that span a number of ceremonies across more than one reign, there has been an increasing number

---

14 Lynch, ‘Queen Mary’s Triumph’, 21.
16 Additional work looking at other ceremonies undertaken or in progress by the author to date: ‘Enter the Alien: Foreign Consorts and their Royal Entries into Scottish Cities, c. 1449–1590’ in R. Mulryne and A.M. Testaverde with I. Aliverti (eds), The Iconography of Power: Ceremonial Entries in Early Modern Europe (Farnham, forthcoming); ‘Royal Births and Baptisms in Scotland: Projections of Royal Authority or Private Sacrament?’ presented at Representations of Authority to 1707: Scotland and Beyond, University of Stirling (August 2012) and now work in progress for publication; ‘A Scottish Queen or Catholic Princess: The Ceremonial Representations of Authority by Marie de Guise and Mary Queen of Scots, c. 1550–1566’ in K. Buchanan and Dean, with M. Penman (eds), Medieval and Early Modern Representations of Authority in Scotland and Britain (Farnham, forthcoming).
of such studies in English and European scholarship for some following seminal works by the likes of P.E. Schramm and Ernst Kantorowicz.¹⁸

Some studies are primarily focused on one ceremony, such as Giesey’s work on royal funerals in Renaissance France, Richard Jackson’s study of French coronations from the thirteenth to nineteenth centuries, Jonas Bak’s collection on medieval and early modern coronations, and Roy Strong providing a new look at the English coronation.¹⁹ However, the Tudor period in England and the development from medieval ceremony to Renaissance ‘festival’ have generated a range of studies that take a broader look at a variety of ceremonies.²⁰ This increasingly large and rich field of study in comparative realms will be drawn upon in the main body of this thesis, but there are a number of interlinking themes to raise at this juncture that are central to the importance of ceremonies as a whole.

Dynasty, sanctity, mystery, virtue, cast within visionary and often apocalyptic terms, provide us with the thought context of late medieval kingship, themes which were not lost, but rather reinforced by the Renaissance.²¹

Strong demonstrates that the progression of the Renaissance and the development of ceremony under such guises would not have been possible had the foundations not been laid throughout the medieval era.²² Yet, until fairly recently, with the exception of Johan Huizinga’s The

---

¹⁸ P.E. Schramm, A History of the English Coronation. Translated by Leopold G. Wickham Legg (Oxford, 1937); E.H. Kantorowicz, The King’s Two Bodies: A Study in Medieval Political Theology (Princeton, reprint 1997, originally published 1957). The former made the visual symbols, particularly the regalia, a central aspect of his discussion on the coronation in England, and the latter was the first historian to draw rituals of death and succession together in such a context.


²¹ Strong, Art and Power, 9.

²² Ibid, 6-11.
Waning of the Middle Ages, the expansion of festival and ceremonial studies has held a firmly Renaissance and baroque bias. A trait that Scottish historians, drawn by survival of source materials to investigate predominantly the later sixteenth-century ceremonies, could be accused of following. Gordon Kipling and others have begun challenging the use of earlier ceremony merely as a preliminary introduction before marching past to that which lies beyond, a challenge that this thesis also attempts to make in regard to Scottish ceremonial.

That change and development occurred in ceremonial was crucial to its survival, as a continuously prominent aspect of the projection of royal power. The societies which fostered them did not remain static and, therefore, neither did rituals or symbols. The expansion and cultivation of the symbols of power adopted by the Scottish monarchs, including the imperial crown, royal arms, heralds and architecture, have been central to the work of Roger Mason, Katie Stevenson and others. By reaching back into the fifteenth century (and occasionally earlier), these debates have challenged presumptions that Scotland laboured far behind her foreign counterparts. Stevenson and MacDonald advocate a vivid and lively chivalric culture fostered by the nobility and the crown, with rapid developments in the use of heraldic symbols and officials in royal propaganda as the fifteenth century progressed coloured by a fusion of

24 For example: Giesey, The Royal Funeral Ceremony; M. McGowan, L’Art du ballet de cour en France, 1581–1643 (Paris, 1963); D. Bergeron, English Civic Pageantry, 1558–1642 (Columbia, 1971); Strong, Art and Power; S. Orgel, The Illusion of power: Political Theater in the English Renaissance (California, 1992); Strong, The Tudor and Stuart Monarchy: Pageantry, Painting, Iconography (3 vols. Woodbridge, 1995–8). This focus has continued to be prevalent in festival and ceremonial studies; while the Society for European Festivals Research, of which the author is a member, include a time range from 1450 for their conferences and publications, there is still a heavy weighting towards the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries: M. McGowan (ed), Dynastic Marriages 1612/1615: A Celebration of the Habsburg and Bourbon Unions (European Festival Studies: 1450–1700) (Farnham, 2013); M. Shewring and L. Briggs (eds), Waterborne Pageants and Festivitites in the Renaissance: Essays in Honour of J.R. Mulryne (European Festival Studies: 1450–1700) (Farnham, forthcoming).
25 G. Kipling, Enter the King: Theatre, Liturgy, and Ritual in the Medieval Civic Triumph (Oxford, 1998), particularly 8; and amongst others: Arnade, Realms of Ritual; Burden, ‘Rituals of Royalty’; Bryant, Ritual, Ceremony and the Changing Monarchy in France; Brown, Civic Ceremony and Religion in Medieval Bruges. Malcom Vale’s work: The Princely Court: Medieval Courts and Culture in North-West Europe, 1270–1380 (Oxford, 2001) makes a similar challenge in regards to courts and culture pushing back into the late thirteenth and fourteenth centuries to explore the foundations of the later medieval and early modern courts which have been the predominant focus in this interconnected sphere.
26 Bertelli, The King’s Body, 2.
European and English influences. Moreover, Mason’s discussions regarding the expanding reach of humanist and Renaissance ideals beyond the clerical estate in Scotland through the same century demonstrate an equally vibrant intellectual society feeding into the royal arsenal of image projection. These studies have been invaluable to this research, providing a preliminary framework for a number of the essential tools utilised within ceremonial display.

Lawrence Bryant considers the manner in which the contents and underlying meanings of ceremonial events developed, and the extent to which earlier ceremonies may have been more effective for their simplicity, particularly regarding what they can tell us as historians about how such occasions facilitated the interactions between king and people. Bryant hints at how ceremonies can provide windows to the past in a more general sense of understanding the period that created them. Sydney Anglo emphasises this implication when he demonstrates how the ‘fluctuations of English policy’ can be read in the ceremonial decisions of the Tudor monarchs. An assessment of ceremony, therefore, can provide a deeper understanding of the political and social sphere in which it developed, and demonstrates one of a number of important reasons why an investigation of Scottish ceremony over a broad time period can benefit the wider study of the realm’s history. Moreover, as Sergio Bertelli, Andrew Brown and


31 S. Anglo, Spectacle, Pageantry and Early Tudor Policy (Oxford, 1969), particularly 3-4, but rest of volume works through the monarchs and their key ceremonies chronologically.
others have demonstrated, ceremonies can also reveal details of the social structure and hierarchy which surrounded the monarch. For example, processions in royal entries and civic entries, coronations, and funerals were all highly ritualised and displayed a snapshot of the social order of those taking part:32 this has been observed by Alastair Mann in relation to the ‘ridings of parliament’ in Scotland in the sixteenth century and later.33 When Louis XI of France broke the mould, lessening the royal entourage at certain events and removing traditions in the mid-late fifteenth century, particularly his foregoing of the usual extravagant funeral, the general reaction from contemporaries was that ‘he lacked decorum’ and left a ‘ceremonial void’.34 This was not the only view, as Bryant has shown, but it was the predominant one and illuminates the central place of ceremony for the societies that witnessed them as much as for the monarchs themselves.

These ceremonies, as Anglo has argued, were ‘no mere embellishment [...]’ In the case of the Tudor dynasty, he has explored how the early ceremonies of Henry VII’s reign – his entry and coronation, the first parliament and marriage to Elizabeth of York, a northern progress, the baptism of their first child, and Elizabeth’s subsequent coronation – provided the foundations upon which the Tudor dynasty established legitimacy.35 The traditional aspects of ceremonial were often adopted by usurpers such as Henry VII to provide continuity and encourage stability; however, as Burden has demonstrated, there was always a degree of invention as far as tradition was concerned. The usurping monarchs of fourteenth and fifteenth century England, particularly Edward III and Henry IV, whose predecessors were forcibly removed and unquestionably dispatched, saw innovation and invention in the burial of these deposed kings.36 The ability to bend and adapt the ceremonial that marked the exit and entry to

32 For example: Ibid; Giesey, The Royal Funeral Ceremony, 53-78; Jackson, Vive Le Roi! particularly 155-67; Arnade, Realms of Ritual; Bertelli, The King’s Body, 67; Brown, Civic Ceremony and Religion in Medieval Bruges, 39-72.
34 Bryant, Ritual, Ceremony and the Changing Monarchy of France, 96-122.
35 Anglo, Spectacle, Pageantry and Early Tudor Policy, 11-51.
kingship, plus all those in between, relied upon the audiences being persuaded by innovations cast as tradition. In Scotland, there were prominent reasons why such malleability of ceremony was essential considering the political context of the era in question.

One of the predominant political circumstances that must be considered for Scotland was the frequency of minorities across the time period in question. Shaw has proposed that one of the key issues affecting the forming of a strong coronation tradition in Scotland was the number of minors; who, in his words, ‘could not physically manage to take part in full-scale coronation ceremonies, and so the country’s coronation remained correspondingly immature’. It is indeed true that the infant monarchs of Scotland would certainly have been assisted during this ceremony. It is also true that the majority were unlikely to have had any involvement in the projections of authority made in them (with the possible exceptions of Alexander II and James IV who were in their mid-teens). However, they were surrounded by adults – secular and ecclesiastic – who fully understood the magnitude of the event and who often had a vested interest in the way that the authority of the crown was visually represented to the kingdom. This thesis will argue that the fact the monarch was a minor amplified the need to do this, while also allowing for the development of a unique relationship between the parliament and other elements of the political community, such as the church, and the monarchy; and that this can be seen visually reflected in aspects of the inaugural and coronation rite.

Charles Beem’s edited collection on the medieval and early modern minorities in England, Henry III (crowned 1216) to Edward VI (crowned 1547), proposes to show how the need to legitimise power for a variety of regents, councils and protectors during this period led

---


37 Of the fifteen monarchs between 1214 and 1603 there were nine minors. Seven of these minors were under ten years of age, with three of the seven being crowned as infants before they were two years old. The total number of monarchs includes both John Balliol and Edward Balliol.

38 D. Shaw, ‘Scotland’s Place in Britain’s Coronation Tradition’, Court Historian, Vol. 9, Issue 1 (July 2004), 47.

39 Shaw’s proposal implies that the development of the Scottish ceremony was stunted by the number of minorities, yet Scotland was not the only country to crown children and no such claim has been made against other countries that had minor rulers in this era. The coronations of England and France, to which most others are compared, show little hindrance to ceremonial development despite minors being crowned at critical junctures. In fact the Liber Regalis, perhaps the best known recension of the English coronation ordo, is dated to the mid to late fourteenth century, when two minors were crowned.
to significant permanent and non-permanent developments in the way that political authority was executed while the sovereign power of the realm lay with an infant monarch, as well as the changes that were to arise at the emergence of these minor kings as adults.\textsuperscript{40} Beem’s collection and other works on English minorities, such as those of David Carpenter and Burden, all highlight the need for the enhancement of authority of both the minor king and his regency government using public events including the funeral of the previous monarch and the inaugural ceremonial.\textsuperscript{41} These were often undertaken in the face of extreme adversity, but provided the first crucial moments at which there was the chance to project the authority of the new monarch. As such they were utilised in the strategies of the minority governments to make forceful connections to the dynastic links of their predecessors, to express stability, continuity, reconciliation, and even saw the introduction of new ceremonial elements.\textsuperscript{42}

The current Scottish historiography cannot boast a collection that draws together evidence from the various minorities as Beem has done for England.\textsuperscript{43} The monographs and collections published on Scottish kings have greatly improved our understanding of each reign and the complex minority power struggles that ensued prior to the king’s majority and in the wake of the transition.\textsuperscript{44} Yet, where discussions of the use of ceremonial display in periods of minority regimes occur they are brief, and it is consequently difficult to assess the impact that these minorities had on the long term development of the ritual and ceremonial rites of passage of these minor kings. Recent scholarship on the Scottish parliament has discussed how periods

\textsuperscript{40}C. Beem (ed.), \textit{The Royal Minorities of Medieval and Early Modern England} (New York, 2008).
\textsuperscript{42}For example, Burden highlights that the coronation of Richard II included the first recorded royal entry pageant procession from the Tower to Westminster as a reciprocal gesture from the city in response to crown and government efforts to re-establish strong relations between the king and the city, but this then went onto become a ‘stock element’ of the English coronation in subsequent centuries. \textit{Ibid}, pp. 185-9.
\textsuperscript{43}The author is currently looking into organising a conference (2015), with Amy Hayes (PhD Research student, University of Aberdeen) on the theme of ‘Queenship, Minorities and Guardians in Medieval and Early Modern Scotland’. This project has already had interest for a possible post-conference publication from Charles Beem and Carole Levine, editors of the \textit{Queenship and Power series} (Palgrave MacMillan).
of minority and absentee kingship affected the development of this body in the late thirteenth century through the period of the Guardians following the death of Alexander III in 1286 and the growth of ideas such as the ‘community of the realm’. If the political landscape could be so significantly changed while the monarch was an infant, or in fact when the succession was left open-ended as with death of the Maid of Norway in 1290, why then should the ceremonial development be seen to be stunted by these episodes in Scottish history?

A further influence that must be considered in regards to the ceremonies involving minor kings is the queen consort, who on numerous occasions buried the king and was there at the crowning of his child successor. The studies by Fiona Downie on Joan Beaufort and Mary of Guelders (1424–1463), and Pamela Ritchie on Marie de Guise (1538–1560), have begun important work on the role of queen consorts in these minority periods. However, these works focus predominantly on the political sphere in which these queens functioned with queenly ritual considered in a secondary manner. Moreover, these works cover only three of the consorts from this period, and there is much to be learnt about the possible influence that they had upon the ceremonies surrounding the accession of their children. The discussions of queenly ritual by Downie, who perhaps offers most on ritual, sit comfortably in a wider historiographical trend that focuses on the consort and the rituals she underwent as queen. One prominent point to lift from these debates concerns the arrival, wedding and coronation of the consort, which are posited as an affirmation of the power of the monarch, as much as to raise the status of the consort, and were frequently linked to the ‘completion of kingship’.

---

47 Downie, She is But a Woman, 81–98.
48 The author would like to thank Amy Hayes for discussions on her current PhD work being undertaken at the University of Aberdeen, considering elements of queenship such as households, patronage and motherhood: ‘Scottish Queenship c. 1371–1528’ (working title).
realm where so many kings came to the throne as children, with the representations of authority projected in their coronation orchestrated by others, the importance of the wedding as a personal representation of authority, often marking the end of minority, rose exponentially. Moreover, where the queen consort was not a native Scot, these marriages also provided the most high profile ceremonies for projecting the image of Scottish royal authority onto the European stage.

From 1214 to 1603 there were essentially only three reigning dynasties, but the confusion caused by the end of the Canmore line, with the death of Alexander III in 1286, saw descent into long periods of war and a fourth dynasty raised briefly to power by the hand of the English kings. These events had a significant impact upon kingship and power in the late thirteenth and early fourteenth century. Mason, Dauvit Broun, and Fiona Watson have argued that, while the wars of independence certainly marked a demonstrable enhancement of Scottish national identity, the situation did not create this identity. Scottish identity was firmly rooted in the previous centuries of consolidation of the realm and monarchy, for without a shared ‘usable past’ identifying them as unique the Scots would not have risen against Edward I. Such assertions firmly support the likelihood of the ceremonies of Scottish kingship retaining aspects of tradition and heritage across this divide. The accession of the Stewart dynasty may have been relatively peaceful in comparison with the wars that heralded the Bruce accession, but the transition was nonetheless complex with two older kings pushed out of power and the subsequent capture of James I by the English in 1406 leaving Scotland without a crowned king for eighteen years. These periods of political upheaval caused challenges in representing royal authority, just as the advent of a queen regnant in 1543 and the Reformation of 1560 would impact upon the sixteenth century. By offering a long term look at royal ceremonial, and

J. Laynesmith, *The Last Medieval Queens: English Queenship 1445-1503* (Oxford, 2004), particularly 72-110; and for further wider examples see bibliographical work in Downie, *She is But A Woman.*

50 Canmore (until 1286/90), Bruce (1306–1371) and Stewart (1371–1603). See next footnote for Balliol.

51 Fourth dynasty was the Balliol rival claimants to the throne (some may say the rightful claimants): John Balliol (1292–1296) and Edward Balliol (1332–1334, 1335–1336, restored again 1346 following Hallidon Hill when David II was captured by the English, but finally relinquished claim to the throne in 1356. For more on Balliol family see: A.G. Beam, *The Balliol dynasty 1210-1364* (Edinburgh, 2008).

projections of royal authority made in them, this study intends to map the developments occurring within these ceremonies, to explore fully the manner in which they parallel the Scottish experience, and to identify the unique aspects created.

**Sources and Methods**

One dominant source type utilised in the study of ceremony and festival in England and Europe is the order of ceremony or *ordo*, particularly for coronations and funerals, but official orders of ceremony for Scottish ceremonies are in short supply. As will be explored, there may have been a record made for the first official coronation with anointing following the grant of unction in 1329, but this document has not survived.53 The documents that survive recording orders of ceremony are found in sixteenth and seventeenth-century heraldic collections, and therefore are to be treated with the utmost caution.54 Yet, as Bryant has stated, the political rules of medieval and early modern ritual existed long before they were written down.55 Recent work on ceremony further afield, where such *ordines* are more prolific, has argued that the prescriptive nature of these documents should push historians away from their heavy reliance upon them in evaluations of specific events and analysis of ritual development.56 Both Burden and Brown express the need for historians of ceremony and ritual to place the events that they analyse firmly within the political and social context of the time, as the place, people and politics of each event can affect the shape of the ceremony, whether or not that ceremony has been

---

53 See Chapter 2, Section II, 125.
54 For funeral order see NLS, Adv. MS. 31.5.2 ff. 15r-16v, John Scrymgeour’s heraldic collection: ‘The maner hou herraualdis and purevants fould know of oblesquis’; and further discussion in Chapter 1, Section II, 45; Section IV, 67; Section V, *passim*; Appendix A. For coronation orders of ceremony see Jerome Lindsay, ‘Forme of the coronatouin of the Kings of Scotland’ in *RPC*, Second Series, Vol. II, 393-5; NLS, Adv. MS. 33.7.10, ff. 6-14r and Adv. MS. 33.2.26, ff. 30-1, Sir James Balfour of Demnill’s manuscript collection, Coronations: Descriptions of coronations and other ceremonies in the hand of Sir James Balfour, 17th century; R. Lyall, ‘The Medieval Coronation Service: Some Seventeenth Century Evidence’, *IR*, Vol. 28, no.1 (Spring, 1977), 3-21; and further discussion in Chapter 2, Section II, 131-3; Section III, 159-165.
recorded in a prescriptive text. In the absence of prescriptive texts, and the questionable nature of those which remain, this work will draw on a wide range of sources to both illuminate the ceremonial of Scottish kings and attempt to further qualify those orders of ceremony which have survived. As with Malcolm Vale’s study of the princely courts and culture in medieval Europe, this thesis will encompass ‘both the material and non-material aspects’ within a single framework drawing upon the visual, artistic, literary and musical sources available alongside the more traditional financial, parliamentary and other textual sources to place the discussion of ceremonial development firmly within the political, physical and social surroundings within which it was created.

There are significant issues regarding survival of documents affecting a number of the ceremonies involved, but the available sources have much to offer despite these hindrances. For the first hundred years or so from 1214 the financial accounts of Scotland are sadly lacking and may have been amongst the wealth of documents removed by Edward I between 1290 and 1307. There are a few fragments of the Exchequer Rolls surviving in copies for the 1260s, which highlight that records were kept; but it is not until the mid-fourteenth century when the records begin to survive with any consistency and even after this there are numerous missing years and sections of incomplete material. An overhaul of the financial administration occurred in Scotland following the return of James I in 1424, and this saw the introduction of both the Comptroller and the Treasurer. Unfortunately, the Treasurer’s Accounts which remain extant do not begin until a section from August 1473 to December 1474, and only continue with consistency after 1488. Significant gaps still occur throughout the sixteenth

---

58 Vale, The Princely Court, particularly 1-11.
59 See Chapter 2, Sections I and II, passim.
63 There could be grounds to suggest that a purging of records occurred following the ‘murder’ of James III in 1488 and the subsequent accession of his minor son, yet this would presumably have only been those records relating to James III’s reign and does not explain why no Treasurer’s Accounts survive from the reigns of James I and II.
century and the published volumes cease in 1574, although the manuscript accounts survive up to 1630s.\textsuperscript{64} The survival rate for supplementary accounts, such as household books and accounts of individual officials, is poor and fragmentary with the majority that remain from the mid to late sixteenth century, and where they exist such accounts are predominantly in manuscript.\textsuperscript{65}

These supplementary accounts are frequently under quarried goldmines for additional finer detail. Yet, rigorous research into the major accounts has proven equally profitable for material. Where published account material survives, this has formed the main basis for research, but in the case of both the \textit{Exchequer Rolls} and \textit{Treasurer’s Accounts} spot checks of the manuscripts have been undertaken and any minor anomalies have been recorded.

Beyond the financial material there are other official records which have proven valuable in the understanding of ceremony in Scotland. For example, it has been possible to extrapolate from the parliament records\textsuperscript{66} along with charters recorded in the registers of the great seal\textsuperscript{67} and acts of lords of council,\textsuperscript{68} information regarding attendance at a range of coronations.\textsuperscript{69} On some, albeit rare, occasions these official sources record the actual occurrences within ceremonial occasions, including some limited orders of events, prominent actors and the roles that they undertook.\textsuperscript{70} The survival of these sources is also patchy at times, with the earlier periods the most fragmented, and there are issues of bias in the recording of events in a certain way, particularly with outlines of ceremonial events or lists of attendees. However, charters and official documents were equally open to manipulation as other sources. The Declaration of Arbroath and earlier documents produced by the Bruce government provide prominent examples of documents created for a target audience with a specific purpose, ‘intelligent propaganda’ which included seals of men who were enemies of Bruce, or incapable

\textsuperscript{64} TA, Vols. I-XII, \textit{passim}.
\textsuperscript{65} The Accounts of the Masters of Works (AMW) is one of the only additional accounts which has been published in two volumes.
\textsuperscript{66} RPS, \textit{passim}; APS, Vols. 1-3, \textit{passim}.
\textsuperscript{67} RMS, Vols. 1-6, \textit{passim}.
\textsuperscript{68} ADCP, \textit{passim}.
\textsuperscript{69} See Chapter 2, Sections II-IV, \textit{passim}.
\textsuperscript{70} For an example: Lindsay, ‘Forme’, in RPC, Second Series, Vol. II, 393-5.
of signing through imprisonment. The correspondence of Scottish monarchs and their officials with their counterparts in foreign realms can also provide valuable material, as long as similar caution is utilised to consider the context and biases surrounding their creation. Royal correspondence survives most prolifically in the latter centuries of the period, with collections of letters published for Scottish monarchs from James IV onwards. Ambassadorial correspondence reporting on events in detail becomes more prominent in the sixteenth century; however, there are examples of correspondence and communication between Scotland’s monarchs and the wider European community throughout the time period that have been utilised to illuminate details of ceremonial occasions. Such official materials also record the manner of delivery of messages between the realms, through payments or instructions to messengers and ambassadors or warrants for safe conduct, which can add greatly to our understanding of how Scottish royal authority was represented beyond the realm.

Just as the author, recipient and context of correspondences and official documents must be a consideration when discussing them, the same factors must be raised when looking at chronicles and descriptive accounts. Yet, these sources are essential in building a broader understanding of the ceremonies and the political backdrop against which they developed.


73 CDS, Vols. 1-5, passim; CSP Scot, Vols. 1-11, passim. These two calendars of documents and state papers relating to Scotland have provided the starting point for the investigations into a wealth of both published and manuscript material for a range of European countries, most prominently England and France, as well as papal material, which will be drawn upon throughout.

74 Discussions regarding this are drawn into this analysis; however, the broader subject of messengers and ambassadors travelling in Europe as the front line of Scottish diplomacy and the ceremonial interactions they undertook is a study that deserves a dedicated study of its own (which the author hopes to pursue in the future) to build upon the valuable works by the likes of Katie Stevenson into heralds.

75 For discussions of the caution to be used in regards to descriptive and textual sources see: Buc, Dangers of Ritual, 1-258; A. Walsham, ‘Review Article: The Dangers of Ritual’, Past and Present, Vol. 180 (Aug 2003), 277-87; C. Given-Wilson, Chronicles: The Writings of History in Medieval England (London and New York, 2004). For an example specific to Scottish chronicles see: S. Boardman,
There are a significant number of chronicles, both Scottish and European, which can provide various levels of detail for the exploration of ceremonial occasions in Scotland. The fifteenth century suffers the most from a distinct shortage of this kind of source, particularly the reigns of James III and James IV, and much that remains to assess the period comes from sixteenth-century or later retrospective reports. This is also the case for much of the earlier chronicle works, including the most famous Bower, Wyntoun, and Fordun, who might better be titled compilers rather than chroniclers. There are very few town or monastic chronicles, kept more in the style of annals of events, which survive for Scotland; although the chroniclers were often clerical men with biases focused on particular geographical areas or families. The Chronicle of Melrose provides an example of a monastic chronicle that was probably updated at regular intervals, but the iconoclastic destruction during the Reformation resulted in the loss of numerous other chronicles of this type. Foreign chroniclers and observers of Scottish ceremony, and of ceremonies beyond the realm in which Scots took part, are also highly valuable.


76 These will not be individually listed here but referred to throughout.

77 Chron. Bower. Walter Bower’s Scotichronicon covers Scotland from the earliest times until the early reign of James II with additional material provided in the ninth volume of the new edition of the chronicle overseen by general editor D.E.R. Watt between 1987 and 1999. The author himself was a royal servant and Abbot of Inchcolm in later life. For the most detailed biography material and literature on sources used by Bower see: Chron. Bower, Vol. IX, particularly 204-9, 315-64.

78 Chron. Wyntoun. Wyntoun was a canon at St Andrews until c. 1393 when he was elected to the position of Prior at St Serf’s, Loch Leven. Wyntoun states himself that he is indebted to an ‘Anonymous Chronicler’ (known to also have been used by Bower and probably Fordun). However, his chronicle from the late fourteenth century through to its conclusion in 1420 must also have relied on eye-witness or first-hand knowledge of current affairs, with additional information in Wyntoun not found in Bower for these years. See: C. Edington, ‘Wyntoun, Andrew (c. 1350–c. 1422), prior of St Serf, Lochleven, and historian’ (2004), ODNB, http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/30164. Accessed 18 Aug 2013; Boardman, ‘Chronicle Propaganda in Fourteenth-Century Scotland’, 23-43.

79 Chron. Fordun. Little is known of John of Fordun, although biases in his work certainly reveal various details about him as Boardman has discussed. Gesta Annalia makes up a significant part of Fordun’s chronicle and had long been attributed to him but recent scholarship, by the likes of Dauvit Broun, has challenged this. Broun proposes Gesta Annalia is formed of two parts: Gesta Annalia I which starts with the English royal ancestry of Saint Margaret and continues to 1285 (the year that Broun convincingly argues it was written/ compiled at St Andrews in the thirteenth century); and Gesta Annalia II which was a fourteenth-century addition covering 1285 to 1363 that has points of similarity with Wyntoun and Bower, leading to the conclusion that all these writers/ compilers had access to the same ‘Anonymous Chronicler’. See Boardman, ‘Chronicle Propaganda in Fourteenth-Century Scotland’, 23-43; Broun, ‘A New Look at Gesta Annalia attributed to John of Fordun’ in Crawford (ed.), Church, Chronicle and Learning, 9-30; and Ibid, Scottish Independence and the Idea of Britain From the Picts to Alexander III (Edinburgh, 2007) particularly, 161-88.

same caveats regarding biases must be raised, but some of the most eloquently detailed descriptive accounts of individual ceremonies found are penned by foreign hands.  

There a number of ‘miscellaneous’ written sources which have been utilised in this study that do not fall easily into a category, including burgh records, liturgical texts and heraldic treatises. The burgh material, as with much Scottish material, has a rather erratic survival rate. For the era being studied here, particularly the sixteenth century, the burgh records of Aberdeen and Edinburgh are essential for ceremonies that took place in the towns themselves. They also provide valuable material for assessing the manner in which money, goods, and ships were raised for ceremonial occasions and ambassadorial trips. Liturgical sources, both written and material, were certainly victims of the iconoclasm surrounding the Scottish Reformation, with many written records that survive doing so only in a fragmented form. Where they do survive, they offer interesting insights; such as the Book of Hours of Margaret Tudor and the Aberdeen Breviary, both early sixteenth century, and a pontifical containing a manuscript of Charles V’s Coronation Book. Comparable liturgical sources have also been consulted; in particular the Sarum Usage which Stephen Holmes has noted formed the basic plan for the Aberdeen

---

81 Two prime examples record weddings, firstly that of James II recorded by Mathieu d’Escouchy: Chron. D’Escouchy, 175-83; and secondly of James IV recorded by the Somerset herald, John Young: Fyancells MS ff. 75-115; Fyancells Coll., 258-300.

82 The major work on the burgh records and performance was undertaken by A.J. Mill, Medieval Plays in Scotland (Edinburgh, 1927) and has provided a crucial starting point. There are extract collections for both of these burghs: Extracts Aberdeen; Extracts Edinburgh (1); Extracts Edinburgh (2). Research was undertaken into the original records initially comparing extracts and originals for Aberdeen, which highlighted issues regarding selection of material, dating errors and much evidence that remains unpublished, subsequently where possible or necessary the original records have been consulted. However, the surface has only been scratched and a further exploration of these records would prove an excellent basis for a study of itinerant kingship and the ceremony attached, and would certainly be an avenue this author wishes to pursue in future work.


Breviary, prior to the additions of Scottish saints, as it provided the core of much of Scottish liturgy from the twelfth century onwards.\textsuperscript{85} As noted above, the extant orders of ceremony for the Scottish coronation and funeral are not found in liturgical sources but in heraldic treatises and these materials can be useful in other ways.\textsuperscript{86} The majority of these heraldic documents and collections are sixteenth and seventeenth century; however, there are earlier examples such as the prose of Gilbert Hay.\textsuperscript{87} Mapstone’s work on ‘advice to princes’ literature in the fifteenth century, featuring Hay, John Ireland and ‘The Thre Prestis of Peblis’, illuminates the value and importance of literary sources for gauging contemporary understandings of kingship and ceremony.\textsuperscript{88}

Both liturgical sources and heraldic collections cross the divide between material and non-material, as does the music which has survived the Reformation.\textsuperscript{89} Liturgical works, such as the Book of Hours of Margaret Tudor, were highly decorative items and this particular item contains a contemporary portrait of James IV.\textsuperscript{90} Although the piece was made in the Low Countries, Macfarlane has highlighted that the coats of arms in the image was expertly executed

\textsuperscript{85} Duncan, \textit{Making the Kingdom}, 282-3; Barrow, \textit{Kingship and Unity}, 70-71; Holmes, ‘Catalogue of Liturgical Books and Fragments’, 174-7; Holmes, Personal Communication by email, 18 May 2013. Barrow notes that two usages were found influencing the Scottish Church - Sarum or Salisbury, and in some cases Lincoln, which had some variations.

\textsuperscript{86} The author has utilised a number of heraldic collections in this thesis, to be referred to individually when relevant; however, during the process of research and discussions with Katie Stevenson about the understudied nature of many of these such collections – many belonging to a much later time period than that under scrutiny here – should be addressed in future work, in which a full survey of surviving heraldic treatises and documents across archival and private collections in Scotland should be a priority.


\textsuperscript{88} Sally L. Mapstone, ‘The Advice to Princes Tradition in Scottish Literature, 1450–1500’ (Unpublished PhD, Oxford, 1986). For more analysis and discussion on the advice to princes tradition and Gilbert Hay in fifteenth-century Scotland in particular, see: 45-142.

\textsuperscript{89} Carver’s Choir book provides one of the only collections of pre-Reformation Scottish music records surviving to the present day and has thus been the focus of the research into choral music including recreations and performances: D.J. Ross, \textit{Musick Fyne: Robert Carver and the Art of Music in Sixteenth Century Scotland} (Edinburgh, 1993); I. Woods Preece et al, \textit{Our awin Scottis Use’: Music in the Scottish Church up to 1603}, ed. S. Harper (Glasgow, 2000); J. Reid-Baxter, ‘Robert Carver and Sacred Music in Sixteenth-Century Scotland’, in G. Hair and G.M. Hair (eds), \textit{Proceedings of the Pluscarden Abbey Conference on Scotland and Sacred Music, Sept 2009} (forthcoming). Thanks must go to Jamie Reid-Baxter for kindly letting the author read this work prior to publication. The financial accounts can provide limited material upon a further understanding of court music in the context of ceremonies through payments for musicians and instruments, but this element of ceremony is one that sadly remains on the periphery of this study – despite its obvious place as a central feature of ceremony – due to the lack of material to assess it.

\textsuperscript{90} Österreichische Nationalbibliothek, Cod.1897, \textit{passim}. 

by someone who was well informed on the Scottish heraldic developments. Liturgical sources also include material objects such as relics, and ecclesiastical and monastic structures. Many of Scotland’s great abbeys and cathedrals stand in ruins now, but these monuments to the wealth and prestige of the Catholic Church in Scotland provided the performance spaces for a large proportion of the key life ceremonies of the Scottish monarchy. The destruction of buildings, tombs, decorations and ornamentation during the Reformation poses significant challenges in the Scottish context. Yet, combined with documentary sources and continuing work undertaken by archaeologists and historians, it is possible to posit far more about such material culture than would appear likely at first sight. Moreover, while few actual relics remain the importance of saints’ cults and objects of worship and veneration connected with them, particularly national ones, in representations of authority of the church, realm and monarchy certainly continues to be explored in a range of scholarship and is expanded here in regards to ceremony.

Taking pride of place amongst heraldic collections are illustrated armorials portraying the developments in heraldic design of royals and nobles of Scotland. These brightly decorated works, including examples from abroad which include Scottish arms, exemplify the manner in which this European visual language crossed borders and divides. While many remnants of Scotland’s material culture in this era do not remain extant, these heraldic symbols are found decorating everything from seals and coins to palaces and books to banners and clothing. There are no illustrative records of ceremony prior to the seventeenth century, although this should perhaps not be considered wholly unusual as Anglo has noted that in Tudor

92 For example the survival tombs of English and French royals, particularly at Westminster and Saint Denis, reveal numerous tombs and architectural developments spanning across the centuries, whereas few Scottish royal tombs from 1214 onwards have survived and none of them in their entirety. See Chapter 1, particularly Sections I and II.
93 See above fn. 11, 3.
94 See above fn. 6, 2.
95 Three of the most well-known Scottish rolls date from sixteenth century: NLS, Lindsay Armorial, Adv. MS 31.4.3; NLS, Seton Armorial, Acc 9303; NLS, Sir Robert Forman’s Armorial, Adv. MS 31.4.2.
England there are few recorded images of the festivals he discusses.\textsuperscript{97} Festival books became prolific across Europe by the seventeenth century, but had appeared much earlier in France. A complex series of printed images exist of the Rouen celebrations, in which Mary, Queen of Scots, and Marie de Guise took part in 1550;\textsuperscript{98} however, there was a far slower development of the printing press in Scotland in comparison to France.\textsuperscript{99} The royal honours of Scotland surviving in Edinburgh castle and the palaces of Scottish monarchs have all undergone developments and alterations in the course of the centuries, but as material evidence they still provide tangible links to follow. Perhaps the most profuse material sources remaining extant are coins and seals.\textsuperscript{100} Their stylised designs cannot provide concrete evidence in regards to actual regalia design, yet, there is equally much to learn from the symbolism adopted and Latin phraseology on them to elaborate upon the ages in which they were created and the monarch – or guardian, regent or council – who created them.

The inconsistency of Scottish source survival is an issue that cannot be ignored; however, rarely does one of the source types, whether material or non-material, have to stand alone. By drawing upon this full range of source materials this study intends to build upon a growing historiography on monarchy, culture and power by presenting chronological analysis of each of the three key ceremonies: funerals, inaugurations and coronation, and weddings and consort coronations. Due to the nature of the extant materials (particularly where that which remains is predominantly financial) and the lack of attention many of the ceremonies have received, it has been crucial to offer descriptions by piecing together disparate extant materials to be able to explore them fully. Throughout these analyses the events along with their continuities and

\textsuperscript{97} Anglo, \textit{Spectacle, Pageantry and Early Tudor Policy}, 5.
\textsuperscript{100} See examples in: W. de Gray Birch, \textit{History of Scottish Seals from the eleventh to the seventeenth century, with upward of two hundred illustrations derived from the finest and most interesting examples extant} (Stirling, 1905), Vol. I, passim; I.H. Stewart, \textit{The Scottish Coinage} (London, 1955), passim.
changes will be placed firmly in the context of wider developments both within the realm and
beyond, addressing how the political, economic and social landscape impacted upon the
ceremonial representations of authority. The breadth of the study in terms of its date range has
been specifically designed to allow an evaluation of the core makeup of each ceremony, as well
as a fuller understanding of the use of the many elements of ceremonial, to link together the
isolated works across the centuries and readdress the balance of a historiography heavily
dominated by a sixteenth century bias.
Chapter 1: Royal Funerals from 1214 to 1542

‘There he was honourably buried – may God have mercy on his soul.’

From the death of King William I in 1214 through to the late sixteenth century the various Scottish chroniclers recall how the king and other royals were ‘honourably buried’, or buried with royal honours, or buried with the expected pomp and ceremony. These vague descriptions are predominantly all they give regarding the funerary ceremonial, except for date and place of death and burial, presumably due to the chroniclers expecting their contemporary audience to understand the meaning of ‘honourably buried’. This would imply that a certain number of key elements were to be found in Scottish royal funeral ceremonies from as early as the thirteenth century, if not earlier. From 1214 to 1542 there were twelve funerals of monarchs in Scotland, not to mention the funerals of numerous consorts and regents, yet only the funerals of James V (1542), and those he buried, seem to have been discussed in any detail beyond debates on burial place and tomb design. Andrea Thomas’s work sits in isolation in considering the funerary

2 Although the overall thesis looks at c. 1214 to c. 1603, Mary Queen of Scots and James VI are not considered here as their burials occurred in England. Similarly, while Marie de Guise, second wife of James V, died in Scotland in 1560, her body appears to have been quietly shipped from Leith to France and buried at Reims: Diurnal, 64. There is little evidence to suggest that a Scottish funeral was held for her, although there is evidence that she was laid in state, with black cloth of estate sporting a cross of white taffety, and a simple lead coffin (probably for transporting her body in): TA, Vol. XI, 24.
ritual, and as a result assumptions have been made that certain ceremonal elements were brought to Scotland by James V and his French queens.\textsuperscript{4} In the wider Scottish historiography there are occasional seeds of information, such as Michael Brown’s suggestion that James I’s body was placed on display prior to burial;\textsuperscript{5} however, little is offered to illustrate when and how the funerary ritual developed to the stage described by Thomas for James V and those he buried. This chapter will analyse the rituals of royal death from 1214 to 1542 to outline how being ‘honourably buried’ as a Scottish royal developed over this period, what influences and challenges changed it, the elements that remain consistent, and the means by which the ceremony of death could be used to represent royal and dynastic authority and power.

\textsuperscript{4} Thomas, \textit{Princelie Majestie}, 210-17.

\textsuperscript{5} Brown, \textit{James I}, 194.
Section I: Thirteenth-Century Canmore Burials

The twelfth-century Canmore burials at Dunfermline until c. 1165 suggest the creation of a family mausoleum, based around veneration of Queen Margaret. This would have been comparable to the developments of Saint-Denis in Paris, and occurring significantly earlier than the thirteenth-century focus on Westminster as a mausoleum by the English monarchy. William I was the first to move away from Dunfermline when he chose to be buried at Arbroath, a Tironensian abbey which he founded in 1178 and dedicated to St Thomas of Canterbury. While his decision seemed to break a growing tradition, burial at a personal foundation was undertaken by numerous foreign counterparts in the wake of new religious orders fuelled by eleventh-century religious reforms and the desire for ‘personal intercession’ rather than being one among many. The chronicle accounts for William I’s funeral supply some interesting details including the order of ceremony. In both Gesta Annalia and Bower the inauguration of Alexander II is recorded as occurring between the old king’s death and his burial. Bower proposed that this was to enable the grieving widowed queen, who was charged with orchestrating the funeral, time to make the required preparations.

Queen Ermengarde was a French born noblewoman, daughter of Viscount Beaumont, and the king himself had travelled in both France and England, so gaining a reputation of being

---

6 Boardman, ‘Dunfermline as a Royal Mausoleum’, 140-42.
a ‘French’ monarch.\textsuperscript{11} Alexander was only fifteen years of age, and the threat of challenge to his succession from other branches of the royal family can be seen as practical reason for this order of ceremony in 1214. Such reasoning can also be found at the core of death and succession ritual in these neighbouring realms.\textsuperscript{12} The twelfth-century Capetian dynasty\textsuperscript{13} saw the crowning of the heir to the throne prior to the death of his successor to secure the transition from elective to hereditary monarchy.\textsuperscript{14} While in England in 1170, Henry II had crowned his eldest son, the Young Henry, long before his death to attempt to tackle the impending issues of succession upon his death.\textsuperscript{15}

There is no evidence that Alexander II’s inauguration took place prior to 1214; however, King William clearly wanted his heir publicly recognised from an early stage.

[...] He [Alexander] was born at Haddington, on Saint Bartholomew’s Day,\textsuperscript{16} in the year 1198. In every place in the whole country, the common folk used to for sake their menial work on this day, wherein they first heard tidings of his birth, and spend it in joy; while priests and churchmen donned the alb, and walked in procession, with loud voice glorifying God in hymns and canticles, and humbly praising Him.\textsuperscript{17}

The birth of Alexander II was marked by \textit{Gesta Annalia} as a national occasion of joy, coinciding with a feast day.\textsuperscript{18} There was a strong ecclesiastical presence: Jocelin, bishop of Glasgow, officiated at the baptism, and thanks were given to God in public processions, prayer, and song.\textsuperscript{19} At the age of three, according to \textit{Gesta Annalia}, William had the nobles swear fealty to the infant prince at Musselburgh on the Feast of St Simon and St Jude.\textsuperscript{20} Alexander’s public
profile was raised still higher by his journey to London in spring 1212, aged fourteen, to be knighted by King John of England after his betrothal to John’s daughter, Joanna. The prince was sent with ‘the greatest pomp and state […] together with some noble and high born boys of the kingdom […]’ The actions of William were often dictated by events of his own reign but, at a time when hereditary kingship through primogeniture was still developing as a means of succession, his actions show an understanding of the importance of publicly pronouncing his son’s right to succession and the order of events following his death continue to focus upon this.

William I died at Stirling on 4 December 1214 and Alexander II was enthroned at Scone the following day with celebrations and feasting lasting three days from Friday to the Sunday. The nobility and prelates were divided so that some accompanied the young king to secure his inauguration at Scone, while the queen, Walter bishop of Glasgow, Robert bishop-elect of Ross, William de Blois the Chancellor, and servants remained with William. *Gesta Annalia* recorded that the queen and those who remained in Stirling did ‘abode with the king’, which indicates that his body was laid in state at Stirling to be viewed or for a vigil to be held. While the inaugural party could have made a quick journey to Scone, perhaps covering the thirty miles within a day, ready for the inauguration on 5 December, the funeral procession from Stirling to Perth would have been considerably slower. Vigils over the dead had strong roots in Christian liturgy, particularly the liturgy of the Easter vigil from Good Friday to Easter Eve or Easter morning, acting as protection for the soul and a point for further intercessory

---


23 The king’s entourage is listed in *Gesta Annalia* and Bower to have included the earls of Strathearn, Atholl, Angus, Menteith and Buchan, as well as the bishop of St Andrews, William Malveisin: the significance of the figures that accompanied the young king will be discussed in Chapter 2.

24 *Gesta Annalia* stated his name as William of Boscho.
prayers.\textsuperscript{25} It was likely that vigils were held at two or three stopping points and, although these are unknown, Dunblane cathedral may well have been utilised as a place of vigil.\textsuperscript{26}

The progress would have been particularly slow if the body was carried all or some of the distance on the shoulders of mourners. \textit{Gesta Annalia} suggests this occurred at Perth Bridge on Monday 8 December, when the funeral party met the coronation party, which by then included William’s aging brother David, earl of Huntingdon:

\[\text{[\ldots] getting off his horse, he [Earl David] took upon his shoulder one handle of the bier, and, with the rest of the earls who were there, devoutly carried the body as far as the boundary, where a cross was ordered to be set up [\ldots]}\textsuperscript{27}\]

David’s health and age would have determined that any distance carrying the bier with his fellow peers was likely to be short, but his positioning near to the body of his brother would appear likely, as the positions in close proximity to the king – even in death – carried symbolic value and status. The convergence of these two processions, with the young king and the members of the court who had taken part in his inauguration, would not only have seen the processional swell in size to honour the dead king but acted to further emphasise the stability (real or imagined) of the hereditary succession. As Erlande-Brandenburg has posited the presence of the successor was centrally important in this era, even in France where later ideological developments saw the successor excluded from the funeral.\textsuperscript{28} Although Alexander’s position in the procession was not specifically mentioned by the chronicles, his position close to the coffin would seem likely.

From Perth the combined entourage travelled to the king’s chosen burial place at his foundation of Arbroath, where he was buried before the high altar on Wednesday 10


\textsuperscript{26} See Map I.

\textsuperscript{27} \textit{Chron. Fordun}, 276.

\textsuperscript{28} According to Erlande-Brandenburg a turning-point occurred in 1223 following the death of Philippe August as Louis VIII was not crowned prior to the funeral; however, his presence at his father’s funeral was still central: \textit{Le Roi Est Mort}, 18-19.
The journey between Perth and Arbroath was approximately thirty-five to forty miles and, with the funeral procession moving slowly, this would have required two overnight vigils. The route taken is unknown, but the most direct modern route along the coast passing Dundee is unlikely. Rather Forfar, which was a royal castle and favourite residence of the later Canmore kings, would have provided a fitting environment for an overnight vigil. If the procession had travelled via Forfar, the distances involved would have required a further stopping point and Coupar Angus Abbey, the Cistercian foundation of William’s brother Malcolm IV, would have provided suitably austere surroundings and the monastic community’s prayers for the dead. Adding this site as a stopping point on the funeral procession would have made a discernible link to William’s predecessors and emphasised the line of succession in both directions.

The king’s body could have travelled over seventy miles from Stirling to his burial site and in view of the timescale involved it is likely that embalming was undertaken for the comfort of those travelling with the corpse, particularly if the corpse was viewed during overnight vigils. This may have involved removal of heart and entrails as was found elsewhere in Europe at the time. The burial of entrails at the site of death and embalming, as well as separate heart burial at a chosen site, were increasingly common. Both practices rose in prominence in Scotland, but unfortunately there is no evidence to confirm whether it occurred on this occasion. The details of William’s funeral emphasise the processional aspect of the proceedings involving all the major prelates and nobility after the two parties joined at Perth, including the king’s brother acting as chief mourner, along with the widowed queen and the newly crowned heir. The gathering of this august entourage to accompany the king on his final journey would have provided an impressive public projection of royal authority.

30 Oram has noted that Alexander II and his court returned there for the Christmas festival period later that year, Alexander II 1214–1249, 27.
31 See Map I.
Queen Ermengarde and Alexander II’s first wife Queen Joanna both followed William by being buried at foundations of their own or to which they were strongly linked in life. Ermengarde was buried at the Cistercian abbey of Balmerino in Fife dedicated to the Virgin and St Edward the Confessor, which she founded with Alexander II, and the charters to the foundation indicate that Ermengarde was a significant patron as well as her son. Joanna was not buried by her husband despite passing away in 1237, more than ten years before him. She had been in England on a pilgrimage at the time of her death, and Henry III provided her tomb at Tarrant Crawford nunnery church. Duffy has suggested the fact that the church held no other royal tombs can be seen as an indication that Joanna had chosen the location herself. This state of affairs was more likely to reflect the unhappiness of Alexander and Joanna’s childless union rather than a lack of understanding of ceremonial burial on Alexander’s part. Alexander’s own choice of burial site, the Cistercian abbey of Melrose, seems to follow this pattern; however, there was more to this choice in view of the refocusing upon Dunfermline and Queen Margaret through attempts for her canonization in the 1240s.

Bartlett and Penman both highlight that the first translation of the relics of Queen Margaret could have been as early as c. 1180, when the miracles of St Margaret record an artist named Ralph being commissioned by the abbey to make a reliquary decorated ‘with gold leaf and carved images’ ready for moving her to the ‘north-side of the altar’. The date of this translation, just two years after William’s foundation of Arbroath with its dedication to St Thomas of Canterbury, could have been a reaction on the part of the Dunfermline community who saw their pre-eminence as royal burial site being threatened by William’s focus elsewhere.

33 The Chartularies of Balmerino and Lindores, ed. W.B.D.D. Turnbull (Edinburgh, 1841), i-ii, plus plate of the plan of the abbey proposing Ermengarde’s burial place before the altar (as found for William), nos. 1, 4-7, 10; M. M. Hammond, ‘Queen Ermengarde and the Abbey of St Edward, Balmerino’, Citeaux: Comentarii cistercienses, t. 59, fasc. 1-2 (2008), 1-15; Oram, Alexander II 1214–1249, 133-4, 213-16.
35 Duffy, Royal Tombs, 69; Chron. Fordun, 287; Pluscarden, 52. The Book of Pluscarden or Liber Pluscardensis is an anonymous chronicle written in the reign of James II as an abridgement of Bower (see Skene’s ‘Preface’, xxv.)
While the request for the canonization of St Margaret in the 1240s came from Alexander II, both Bartlett and Taylor have brought to light documentary evidence that supports the heavy involvement of the Dunfermline community, particularly the abbot who was a highly influential figure becoming royal chancellor in the latter years of Alexander’s reign and during his heir’s early minority.

Alexander II’s choice of Melrose abbey and favouritism of the abbey, perhaps as early as 1231, could at first sight suggest a lack of interest in the growth of this cult around Margaret. It has been suggested this showed a focus on repaying debts following the wars of his youth, which had seen wholesale destruction at the border abbey. It may, however, have been equally linked to his veneration of the saintly queen and sprung from a renewed interest in Northumberland, an area which also held indisputable links to Margaret and her Anglo-Saxon heritage. The fact that he was buried alongside the relics of another saintly ancestor, Wultheof, provided a further emphasis on the sanctity of his dynasty. In addition, the excavation at Dunfermline (1818–9) to exhume what was presumed to be Robert I from in front of the altar located a separately buried encased heart, and considering the complex variety of devotions of Alexander II outlined by both Penman and Oram, it could be posited that this heart belonged to Alexander II. While a separate heart burial has not been specifically recorded for Alexander II, it was more than likely for reasons to be outlined below.

Oram has identified that Alexander II had been unwell for some time prior to his death in 1249; therefore, it was likely he began preparing for his funeral having already made his

---

37 Registrum de Dunfermlyn, ed. C. Innes (Edinburgh, 1842), no. 281.
38 The Miracles of [...] Saint Margaret, xxxvi – xxxvii; A. Taylor, ‘Historical Writing in twelfth- and thirteenth-century Scotland: the Dunfermline Compilation’, Historical Research, Vol. 83, no. 220 (May 2010), 228-52. For more discussion on the role of Dunfermline in regards to possible attempts to be recognised as a coronation church, see: Chapter 2, Section I, 104-105; Section II, 122-3.
39 Oram, Alexander II 1214–1249, particularly 221.
41 This could not have been Robert’s own, which is known to have been buried at Melrose. See below Chapter 1, Section II, 39-42.
choice of burial site.\textsuperscript{43} He was old enough to have remembered his father’s funeral, with the processional mourning and the inauguration prior to burial. His death, when his heir was just nine years old, on the west coast island of Kerrara over 150 miles from Melrose, must have created difficulties, but there is little remaining extant material to address this. \textit{Gesta Annalia} and Bower record that the king was laid to rest at Melrose on Thursday 8 July and that Alexander III’s inauguration took place on Tuesday 13 July at Scone.\textsuperscript{44} However, \textit{the Melrose Chronicle} and a charter made by Alexander II, presumably on his death bed, date the death of the king on Kerrara to the 8 July.\textsuperscript{45} If Alexander III’s inauguration took place on 13 July and his father died on Kerrara on 8 July, the practicalities demanded a situation similar to 1214 when the members of the minority government split to make sure that the inauguration took place suitably promptly and the funeral with the reverence required.

The five days from 8 to 13 July should have provided enough time for a party to ride from Kerrara to Scone, although at approximately one hundred miles these would have been long days of riding and suggest that the young heir did not travel with them. Prince Alexander was unlikely to have travelled on campaign with his father aged just nine, and the extant records do not indicate whether he was with his mother or where he resided.\textsuperscript{46} Only Alan Durward, justiciar, of those signatories of the charter signed at Kerrara on 8 July, was also recorded in the chronicle accounts as playing a prominent role in the inauguration proceedings at Scone.\textsuperscript{47} The full extent of the fleet that accompanied Alexander in the ‘pacification of Argyll’ remains unknown. Clement, bishop of Dunblane, another signatory and member of the council which met in Stirling prior to the fleet being collected earlier in 1249, was not listed as one of the ecclesiastics at Scone and was likely to have been one of those who accompanied the body of the dead king to Melrose, probably by sea to the west coast or up the Clyde and then over

\textsuperscript{43} \textit{Ibid}, 190.
\textsuperscript{44} \textit{Chron. Fordun}, 288; \textit{Chron. Bower}, 191.
\textsuperscript{46} Michael Penman proposed in discussion that Prince Alexander was most likely in tutorage somewhere, perhaps at St Andrews or at Dunfermline (23 May 2013).
\textsuperscript{47} See Chapter 2, Section I, 105.
land. This was a minority funeral, but the role of the queen mother, Marie de Coucy, is never made explicit. While there is little detail left to assess Alexander II’s funeral and how it linked into the inaugural ceremonies of his son, the fact that he died at such a distance from his burial site must have determined that the corpse be embalmed for this journey. If the body were embalmed on Kerrara, there may have been an entrails burial on the island and at this point the heart too would have been removed. If the heart was buried at Dunfermline, those who left Kerrara for the inauguration may have carried the heart with them and the heart burial may have occurred en route between Scone and Melrose with the newly crowned king in attendance, allowing a further opportunity for public mourning and a tangible dynastic statement.

Both Boardman and Penman have emphasised the renewal of interest in Dunfermline as a royal mausoleum which occurred under Alexander III’s rule, but the questions of who or what was influencing Alexander III’s choices is still debated, particularly as there are no surviving tombs or financial records for funerals or monuments. The initial focus was probably directed by the Chancellor, Robert de Leldeleth, who was also abbot of Dunfermline and justiciar, combined with English influences from Henry III following Alexander III’s marriage to his daughter Margaret in 1250. Alexander III actually saw the multi-functional ceremonial centre in the making at Westminster. The Scottish king received 100s. per day from English crown funds for a five week visit to London in 1274, including the cost of ‘daily coming to Westminster’, for the coronation of Edward I.

---

48 See Map II.
49 Queen Marie was Alexander II’s second wife.
50 It would be approximately 80 miles by land and water if the Forth was crossed by boat near Edinburgh; however, to go entirely by land would have taken the distance to over 100 miles. For the heart burial at Dunfermline to have occurred between the inauguration and Melrose the former journey would have been the more practical.
51 Boardman, ‘Dunfermline as a Royal Mausoleum’, 139-54; Penman, ‘Royal Piety in thirteenth-century Scotland’, 22-6.
52 The Heads of Religious Houses in Scotland form the Twelfth to the Sixteenth Centuries, eds. D.E.R. Watt and N.F. Shead (Edinburgh, 2001), 68. While the abbot was initially influential, his support of Alan Durward, justiciar, in the early years of the minority saw his removal from office in 1250 and a decline in his influence.
53 For more on multi-functionality of Westminster as burial, coronation and relic church see: Palliser, ‘Royal Mausolea in the Long Fourteenth Century’, 3-4; Griffiths, ‘Succession and the Royal Dead’, 105; Binski, Westminster Abbey, particularly 5-8.
The nobles of the land attended the ceremony with a countless multitude, redoubling the display of their magnificence in honour of the new king. But my lord Alexander King of Scotland, who attended with his consort and a train of nobility, exceeded all others in lavish hospitality and gifts.55

These remarks imply that Alexander III was very capable of representing an image of kingly grandeur that impressed even the Anglophile compiler of The Chronicle of Lanercost. Yet, in 1274 Westminster would have simply appeared as a coronation church housing the magnificently entombed relics of Saint Edward the Confessor. Henry III was buried in the abbey in 1272, but his glorious tomb effigy was not installed until 1290 and its multi-functional nature, that extended focus upon the site as a mausoleum and centre of power, would not occur until after the death of Edward I’s wife Eleanor in 1290.56

The focus on Dunfermline as a royal mausoleum may have been in line with the development of Saint-Denis (Paris) by Louis IX, where a grand total of eighteen black-based tombs with white marble effigies installed in the 1260s.57 The rearrangements there saw a concentrated programme of tomb redesign and installation to underline the lineage of the French monarchy in a manner that truly affirmed the abbey’s status as ‘cimetière aus Rois,’58 as well as making an overt dynastic statement for Louis’s royal authority. Scotland had increasingly strong French ties in the closing years of Alexander’s reign, with his second marriage to Yolande of Dreux in 1285 at Jedburgh. Bower’s account describes ‘very many nobles of France and Scotland...’ emphasising the cross continental relations.59 The deaths of both his first wife, Margaret (died 1275) and of his son and heir Alexander (died 1284), receive only passing reference in chronicle accounts,60 and one known letter of condolence from Edward I survives in regards the death of the young prince of Scotland.61 The lack of any remaining tombs at Dunfermline poses a further problem; however, the surviving base of the

56 See above 25, fn. 8.
57 For images of all the tombs as well as placement of tombs in Saint-Denis see: Erlande-Brandenburg, Le Roi Est Mort, 81-3, figs. 131-51.
58 Ibid, 68-96, particularly 81-3.
60 Chronicle of Lanercost, Vol. I, 8, 32.
tomb of St Margaret made of highly polished black Frosterly marble offers a possible point of contact. By drawing inspiration from both his French counterpart and the existing tombs of St. Margaret and other ancestors at Dunfermline, it would be logical to suppose Alexander III designed a similar scheme with the use of materials acting as a clear visual link. An additional large slab of this black marble remains at Dunfermline, highlighted by Penman, which could be the base of a further tomb and there were strong links between Alexander’s ancestors and county Durham where the marble came from. The increasingly popular use of familial statuettes upon tomb chests emerging in the Low Countries and northern French regions such as Champagne, which Anne Morganstern has illuminated as dynastic display ‘formed within a theological matrix’, may also have been adopted by Alexander to emphasise his dynasty’s lineage, particularly in the face of extinction.

Gesta Annalia records that the king was buried in state at Dunfermline, after meeting his end in an accident near Kinghorn on 19 March 1286. The Chronicle of Lanercost suggests the positioning of the tomb was in the south aisle of the choir near the presbytery. The distance from Kinghorn to Dunfermline is roughly thirteen miles and would have been manageable in a day. The slow progress of a funeral procession carrying the king by carriage or on the shoulders of nobles over this distance would suggest that the ceremony did not occur immediately on arrival, but that there was one or more overnight vigil at Dunfermline to allow time for public mourning. It would appear from the limited chronicle accounts that Alexander III’s heart was removed and buried separately at Perth, which indicates embalming took place. Considering Perth’s close vicinity to Scone, where a ‘parliament’ was held fourteen days after

---

62 See Plate 1.
64 Yolande of Dreux would have been resident further west than Champagne, with her father’s lands primarily in the regions of Normandy and Ile de France; however, these northern lands had strong links both with each other and the Low Countries, therefore, such an influence could well have emerged with her arrival.
Easter (14 April 1286) according to Bower, the heart burial may have occurred on the journey.\textsuperscript{68} This would have increased the time for mourning and intercessory prayers to the funerary arrangements, and also physically linked the death with the temporary succession of the guardians, placing royal authority symbolically in their hands.\textsuperscript{69}

The illustration of the funeral of Alexander III in the manuscript known as the ‘working copy’\textsuperscript{70} of Walter Bower’s *Scotichronicon* reveals four nobles carrying the coffin of the king, covered by a rich cloth decorated with a large cross, and followed by long habited monks, the foremost of them carrying an open prayer or psalm book evoking an ecclesiastical ceremony and the singing of the office of the dead.\textsuperscript{71} The sketch represents the two main forces involved in the ceremonial of succession – the nobility and the clerics. As James I’s funeral in 1437 was concurrent with the compilation of the chronicle, the drawing could well be symptomatic of the fifteenth-century funeral. However, these two prominent estates would have been found vying for a position of prominence on both occasions. An extant ‘Scottish poem’ (c. 1290) implies that perhaps the tomb was left unfinished:

\begin{verse}
The tomb of such a great man should have been polished with better care 
on the part of the craftsmen, but he should have had a sympathetic funeral. 
After Death’s savage bite, affection turns its back: 
love ends with the end of life.\textsuperscript{72}
\end{verse}

The circumstances of Alexander III’s passing and the ensuing issues of succession created a situation in which elaborate ceremonial was overshadowed; but in 1286 the full impact of the succession crisis had yet to be felt as the infant queen, Margaret Maid of Norway, still lived and, therefore, it was imperative to present at least the show of stability through the ceremonial marking the king’s death.

\textsuperscript{68} Ibid, Vol. VI, 9; Barrow, *Robert Bruce*, 15 (Barrow states 1280 in regards this parliament but this must be misprint or a mistake in the context of the discussion.)

\textsuperscript{69} The actual time span from death to burial is not clearly recorded, but there may have been a purposeful delay to connect the king to this sacral festival of Easter which occurred approximately a month later.

\textsuperscript{70} For a further break down on the manuscript versions of Walter Bower’s work see Vol. IX, 186-202.

\textsuperscript{71} See plate 2.

\textsuperscript{72} The poem is found in the appended material linked to *Chron. Bower*: Vol. IX, 77.
There were varied avenues through which influences came to shape royal burial and funeral arrangements in thirteenth-century Scotland, which included French and English queens, the kings’ own journeys beyond the realm, ancestral traditions, and influential royal and clerical officials. Details are regrettably sparse, but through what remains the blend of ideals and circumstance that can be found at the core of developments in this period reflect the myriad of influences. The resting places of these kings and their close family reveal two distinct phases, with a focus on personal intercession followed by a return towards a scheme of dynastic burial, revealing correlation to varying aspects of the wider contemporary patterns of royal burial sites in Europe. The order of ceremony with inauguration occurring prior to burial was indicative of the need to secure a smooth succession and provide stability. As in other kingdoms, primogeniture and hereditary succession was a developing concept and the presence of the successor was central at the funeral of the king at the start of this period. The presence of an inaugurated heir at the funeral of William I was a certainty and the practicalities surrounding Alexander II’s burial suggest that the same ceremonial outline to 1249; however, the threats to hereditary succession in 1249 were significantly reduced and the ceremonial order may have been far more symbolic. The death of Alexander III, leaving no heir to physically inaugurate, meant that this ceremonial order did not occur in 1286, but this was determined by situation not ideology or tradition. Yet, if Alexander III’s heart had been separately buried at Perth during the ‘parliament’ that would decide upon the guardianship, the ceremonial connection between death and succession was remade.

The processional element emerges as prominent in the thirteenth-century royal funerals, along with the probability of vigils and embalming and separate burials. The procession was emphasised by Audrey-Beth Fitch as a key visual medium at the core of lay faith in later medieval Scotland, while works on processions in the broader European context

73 Hallam suggests that processions really come to the fore in England and France in the thirteenth-century also, particularly the elaborate processions for Queen Eleanor (wife of Edward I) in 1290 and Louis IX (who has to be transported back from the Holy Lands before his procession through France) in 1270: ‘Royal Burial’, 367.
have expressed how processions were central to public life at all levels of society and provided ‘fundamental building blocks of liturgy’. William I’s funeral procession was the backbone of the ceremonial. It was also intrinsically conjoined with the inaugural ceremonial of his son and, if it took the suggested route stopping at Coupar Angus and Forfar, connected the hereditary line of the succession both backward and forward. Processional routes in towns and burghs can often provide maps to the main power structures, whether secular or religious. The proposed stopping points in 1214, and more hesitantly in 1249, of inaugural and funeral processions suggest the linking of key royal and ecclesiastical sites. More important in the context of Scotland and funerals in particular was the way in which these processions mirrored the itinerant kingship of this active monarchy, where access to the monarch was important. The journeys had to take place, as rarely did a king die within an easy distance of his burial site; however, not only did they allow time for vigils to increase intercessory prayers but also made the royal body accessible, offered proof of death and provided opportunity to project royal authority in this moving ceremony of mourning leading to a new future. The deaths of Alexander III and Margaret Maid of Norway broke this chain of succession, and were to be followed by a descent into war and instability. The dynasty that rose in the following century was ‘starting over’ in many ways and links to the hereditary line were ever more important.

76 Ashley, ‘Introduction’, 17.
Section II: Robert the Bruce and Early Fourteenth-Century Scottish Funeral Ceremonial

[...] one thousand, three hundred, twice ten and nine; good Robert de Bruce assuredly had his funeral [in that year].
He reigned as king for the Scots for twice ten and four years. The letter D contains the first rule before Columba;
By a beautiful allegory Dunfermline provides him with a tomb
Our king, the flower of chivalry, died at Cardross.
He ruled us well; may God lead him to Heaven.\textsuperscript{77}

Robert I’s funeral in 1329 offers a beacon of light in regards to recorded specifics for the ceremonial surrounding royal death and burial in Scotland. Although there are no fuller descriptive accounts of the ceremony than the above from Bower, the entries found within the \textit{Exchequer Rolls} can add volumes to the understanding of early Scottish ceremonial.\textsuperscript{78}

The choice of Dunfermline as his place of rest was made by 1314, if not earlier, as shown by a letter to William, bishop of St Andrews, stating that he wished to be buried ‘\textit{propter honorem sepulture regum predecessorum nostrum}’\textsuperscript{79} Both Boardman and Penman agree that the king’s choice was strongly linked to his attempts to bolster his own fledgling dynasty and firmly unite it with that of the former Canmore kings and St Margaret.\textsuperscript{80} Another example of these attempts can be seen in 1315 when a payment of four marks was made for perpetual candles around the tomb of his predecessor, William I.\textsuperscript{81} The effigy at Arbroath has been the focus of much discussion with a general consensus that the tomb is that of William I, and the likelihood of Robert I’s remodelling of it. In these discussions, the use of Frosterly marble from

\textsuperscript{78} Fraser has briefly discussed the funeral itself; however, the primary focus of his work regards the burial, the exhumation and the tomb of Bruce: ‘The Tomb of the Hero King’, 156-9. Some of the Latin from the \textit{Exchequer Rolls} is reprinted without translation as an appendices to Jardine’s account of the excavation of the tomb, but he only makes brief comment about the tomb coming from Paris and no expense being spared on it: ‘Extracts from the Report [...] relative to the Tomb of King Robert Bruce’, 447, Appendix B, 451-4.
\textsuperscript{79} \textit{RRS}, Vol. V, ed. A.A.M. Duncan (Edinburgh, 1988), no. 44. The phrase has too many accusatives to make complete sense; the literal translation would be: ‘he will be buried near the honour of our proceeding kings’ but in context the following is a more likely translation: ‘[buried] with honour near the tombs of our royal predecessors’.
\textsuperscript{80} Boardman, ‘Dunfermline as a Royal Mausoleum’, 144-5; Penman, ‘A Programme for Royal Tombs’, 244-47. For further discussion on the king’s pious offerings and devotions emphasise a desire or need to draw his own hereditary line closer to traditional Scottish saints see: Penman, ‘Sacred food for the soul’: in search of the personal piety and devotions to saints of Robert Bruce, king of Scotland, 1306–1329’, \textit{Speculum}, Vol. 84, no. 4 (Oct 2013), 1035-1062, particularly 1058 in regards to Dunfermline and perpetual light installed for Margaret by Bruce in 1321.
\textsuperscript{81} \textit{RRS}, Vol. V, no. 74.
Durham, also used in the tomb of St Margaret at Dunfermline, has been identified and Penman proposes this material was specifically chosen by Bruce to forge a tangible kinship link. These actions emphasise Robert I’s awareness of the potential political power in the use of memorials. Penman suggests he may have gleaned this trait partly from his time in the court of Edward I of England, but it may equally have been inspired by work undertaken by Alexander III at Dunfermline for his wife and children.

Robert’s own tomb was carved from white marble in Paris before being shipped via Bruges and England to Dunfermline, and cost over £154 between 1329 and 1330. The Parisian roots of this marble creation have lead Fraser and Penman to link it to French rather than English comparators featuring a white effigy atop a tomb chest carved with ‘weepers’ or familial statuettes identified by heraldic symbols, which would have marked a sharp contrast to the simple effigy-less tomb of Edward I. Robert’s tomb was definitely engraved with an epitaph, possibly the one above recorded in Bower, and was surrounded by the final addition of iron railings in 1330. Penman has proposed that the protection of the structure in this way was indicative of its position in a perambulatory space, such as before the altar or in an aisle; while Bower’s statement that the tomb was ‘in medio chori’ was suitably ambiguous and vague as not to confirm the positioning. Robert had requested that his heart be carried on crusade to Jerusalem and Barbour’s Bruce relays how ‘the good lord Douglas then had a case of fine silver
made, cunningly enamelled he [put] the king’s heart in it and wore it always round his neck.89 Douglas’s death meant the heart did not reach its destination but the journey itself was a comprehensive propaganda exercise with Douglas arriving in the Low Countries with an entourage including knights and providing rich entertainment for guests on his ship.90 Once returned to Scotland, Robert’s heart was buried at Melrose, the choice of which deserves a little more attention. Evidence shows the generosity shown to Melrose during the king’s life time – through patronage, rebuilding and protection – and following his death Melrose abbey petitioned the young King David II and his councillors for the funds they were promised by Robert for the perpetual prayers and keeping of his heart.91 As with Alexander II, there was a further dynastic and royal assertion made with this separate heart burial alongside the bones of the miraculous Waltheof.92 The separation of body and organs found in the case of both Robert and Queen Elizabeth followed after the Bull Derestande feritatis, with which Pope Boniface VIII attempted to ban the practice, and subsequently it was only permitted through supplication to the pope.93 It was not until 1331 that retrospective absolution for those who carried Bruce’s heart was granted,94 suggesting the body division was openly flaunting disobedience to papal attempts to curb this practice.95 The practice itself was still relatively common in France. Yet, the sending of Bruce’s heart on crusade was unusual and, as Simpson concludes, earned him the reputation as one of those who went on crusade ‘but as no other had done.’96

90 Simpson, ‘The Heart of King Robert I’, 180–82. Simpson looks at contemporary account of Jean le Bel from which this information comes with much more detail.
91 RRS, Vol. V, nos. 64–5, 96, 100, 110, 120, 122, 169, 180, 201, 269, 287–9, 308, 379–80, 385, 408. (The letter is no. 380); Penman, ‘Sacred food for the soul’, 1059.
93 Penman, ‘A Programme for Royal Tombs’, 244; Ibid, ‘Sacred food for the soul’, 1057–9; Steane, Archaeology of the Medieval English Monarchy, 43; Duffy, Royal Tombs, 22–4. Elizabeth’s entrails were buried at Cullen and her body at Dunfermline.
95 The man he entrusted as regent for his infant son, Thomas Randolph, was recorded requesting and being granted permission for his heart and body to be buried separately. CPL, Vol. II, 312.
Robert died in his manor of Cardross near Dumbarton, a good sixty to seventy miles from his chosen burial site at Dunfermline. The evidence of the embalming process and the distance the body then had to travel certainly support a separate entrails burial nearby for practical reasons if nothing else, and Penman’s proposal of St Serf’s at Cardross appears likely. A payment of £20 recorded in the Exchequer Rolls to the Rector of Cardross to perform oblations indicates that these took place at Cardross and may have been offered as part of the ceremonial involved in burying the viscera. The king was likely laid in state prior to his journey to Dunfermline while these preparations were undertaken. Although whether his body would have been on show or covered is debatable considering the possible illnesses that could have caused his death, such as leprosy, which would have caused disfigurement. Determining whether the display of the bodies was integral to thirteenth-century and fourteenth-century royal burials is difficult, but the use of embalming would have allowed the possibility. The condition of Robert’s body may have led to the adoption of the funeral effigy, first used in England for the funeral of the deposed Edward II in 1327.

Unlike the other funerals thus far, where the body travelled a long distance from place of death to burial, there is clear indication as to where this funeral party stopped on route, with expenses of £14, 13s. 4d. being accrued at Dunipace and Cambuskenneth. The expenses are

---

97 Barbour describes that the king was ‘cleanly disembowelled, then very richly embalmed’ and evidence remains for the payment of John the Apothecary for fees around the time of death of the king. Barbour, Bruce, 756; ER, Vol. I, 213, 238.
98 Penman, ‘Sacred food for the soul’, 1059.
99 NAS, E38/10; ER, Vol. I, 215. There is a similar reference for a payment to the abbot of Dunfermline but this specifically highlights that the oblations were to take place on the day of the funeral, whereas the Cardross payment does not.
100 For example see: Chronicle of Lanercost, Vol. II, 264. Barrow has pointed out that there does not seem to have been a marked attempt to keep the king at a distance from others, which would be perhaps expected considering the usual medieval reaction to segregating lepers. While the king does not attend his son’s marriage, quite probably due to ill health as will be discussed later, he is still involved in public life sporadically in the year to eighteen months prior to his death: Robert Bruce, 322-3 and fn. 43.
101 This is a different entity to a tomb effigy, usually made of wood or other perishable material and often modelled on a death mask; it was often dressed in royal robes and regalia.
not broken down to reveal exactly what they were used for, but comparative examples might suggest that it was utilised for overnight vigils and saying of masses, candles or temporary simpler wooden chapels erected over the body, at the various stops on the route.\textsuperscript{104} The distance between Cardross and Dunipace would have been between thirty and thirty-five miles, so there may have been two further breaks in this section of journey. At near ten miles, the distance between Dunipace to Cambuskenneth could certainly have been undertaken in a day, while Cambuskenneth to Dunfermline would have been closer to twenty miles and was perhaps broken by a further stop at Culross, which was central to the cult of St Serf, mirroring the dedication of Cardross where the procession had begun.\textsuperscript{105} It would also be likely that the body or effigy was laid in state on arrival at the abbey of Dunfermline prior to the royal funeral occurring the next day. Although there is no solid evidence of this final overnight vigil at Dunfermline, it would fit comfortably with European examples. This journey would have taken in a large stretch of the central belt of the realm and allowed many people to observe the sombre procession, providing proof of the king’s passing and allowing for public mourning. A sum of £4, 3s. 9d. was paid to Thomas of Kirkcudbright to be distributed amongst the poor at the time of the funeral and this could potentially have been payment for these paupers to take roles as mourners.\textsuperscript{106} While Penman has also highlighted that prior to death Robert I had prepaid for a large number of obsequies of a scale comparable to the English Plantagenets.\textsuperscript{107}

The date of the actual burial at Dunfermline is unclear.\textsuperscript{108} Evidence suggests Robert had an awareness of how to extract the most value from ceremonial memorialisation, and with his ill health and awareness of his own mortality,\textsuperscript{109} he may have requested a specific date for burial. One of the most significant dates for Robert I would have been his victory at the battle of

\textsuperscript{107} \textit{ER}, Vol. I, 450-51; Penman, ‘A Programme for Royal Tombs’, 244.
\textsuperscript{108} Froissart suggests 7 November for Bruce’s death, but he also states 1337 and that it occurred prior to the wedding of David II and Joan: \textit{Chronicles of England, France, Spain}, Vol. I, 74-8.
\textsuperscript{109} Apothecary and physician fees: \textit{ER}, Vol. I, 176, 213, 238.
Bannockburn on 24 June and combining the funeral ceremomial with this key event would have emphasized the king’s most glorious moment in the memories of those who buried him. This could be comparably linked to suggestions that the use of regalia in English royal funerals was designed to have the king’s funeral emulate the pinnacle of his majesty – the unction and coronation. Yet, having had a less than auspicious inaugural ceremony, Bruce may have seen this victory as his ‘crowning’ moment and one which could forcefully project his authority. Practically, even if Bruce had not specified this date, the time from his death on 7 June to 24 June would have allowed for two weeks of preparations and to move the body from Cardross to Dunfermline, a journey which perhaps also by design passed the site of his Bannockburn victory.

The financial records for Robert I’s funeral establish that a painted chapel was erected over the king’s body at Dunfermline made of ‘Boards of Eastland’ decorated with black material, candles and 2 lb of gold leaf. It is interesting that the entries use both the English ‘hearse’ and a derivative of the French term ‘chapelle ardent’ to indicate the structure in the accounts, and reveals the dual impact of ideas upon Scotland from its two most influential neighbours. The fact that the black material and wax were reserved for it suggests that the ‘chapel’ would have been illuminated. In addition, the fact it was painted could imply some kind of heraldic or dynastic decoration, but there are no direct references to escutcheons or arms. Peter Coss has emphasised how the Edwardian era of war across Europe saw a proliferation of heraldic symbolism and chivalric culture, and while the heraldic nature of Robert I’s hearse cannot be confirmed, the presence of knights certainly can. Three surcoats and two hooded cloaks of black high grade lambskin were purchased for dule wear for knights, as

---

110 Griffiths, ‘Succession and the Royal Dead’, 102-103.
111 See below Chapter 2, Section I, 113-19.
113 Coss classes the Edwardian era as ‘the period, roughly speaking, from the Welsh Wars of Edward I to the great victories of Edward III in the first stages of the Hundred Years War’: ‘Knighthood, Heraldry and Social Exclusion in Edwardian England’ in Ibid and Keen (eds.), Heraldry Pageantry and Social Display, 39-68. For a more general discussion of the introduction and expansion of heraldry Europe-wide see: M. Keen, Chivalry (New Haven and London, reprint 2005), 125-34.
well as 29 elnes of black ‘cindonis’ and 3 ½ pieces of black ‘persico’ cloth for the vestments and cover for the horse-drawn litter carrying the king. There are also entries relating to pieces of crepe or silk and a further 2600 leaves of gold – 600 of which appear to have been backed with papyrus paper – the purpose of which is not specified. Moreover, the Steward (Robert Stewart, later Robert II) is singled out in the accounts as being provided with a piece of cloth, but not one specifically deemed for clothing. Due to David II’s infancy the Steward was likely to have been chief mourner by default, and it is possible that these pieces of cloth and gold leaf on papyrus paper may have been given as offerings by the nobility with the Steward leading the way. The offering of pieces of cloth can be found described in both the English fifteenth-century Liber Regie Capelle and in the sixteenth-century Scottish heraldic manuscript from John Scrymgeour’s collection, in which the cloth offered is described respectively as gold and black. There can also be found a fee to an ‘overseer’ of the king’s interment, lord David of Barclay, who was paid £28 for his expenses in connection with the ceremony, as well as other payments to the ‘court officials’, perhaps suggesting the encroachment of secular royal officials on the religious ceremony.

The illuminations at the ceremony must have been staggering with 563 stone, 5 lb or 8,062 lb of wax released to John of Linlithgow for use throughout the funeral. Such vast quantities of wax certainly imply that candles or other illuminations paid for with crown funds

---

114 Laun or fine muslin.
116 Ibid, 221; NAS, E38/10.
117 Liber Regie Capelle was written by the Dean of the Chapel Royal, William Say, c. 1448; however, it is an extended version of ‘Rubrica de Regis Exequis’ from the Liber Regalis seu Ordo Consecrandi Regem Solum, Ordo Reginam cum Rege, Ordo Consecrandi Reginam Solam, Rubrica de Regis Exequis, a work which is originally thought to date from the reign of Richard II, c. 1380-1390. Version referenced herein: Liber Regie Capelle: A Manuscript in the Biblioteca Publica, Evora, ed. W. Ullmann (London and Cambridge, 1961), specifically 112-13.
118 Liber Regie Capelle, 113; NLS, MS. Adv. 31.5.2 ff. 15r-16v: see above Introduction, 13, fn. 54; and Appendix A for transcript.
119 Sir David de Barclay was a royal official (appointed Sheriff of Fife in 1328) and Steward of Prince David’s household until some point in 1328/9. See RRS, Vol. V, pp. 112-3, 155, 211-2 (raised by Duncan in the introductory notes) and found as witness on a number of charters from 1315 through to 1328 (see range from c. 1315: nos. 46-7, 78, and c. 1328: nos. 332-4, 337, 352, 354); ER, Vol. I, 137-9 (shows account of David Barclay as the Steward for the prince); Penman, David II, 24.
120 Ibid, 151, 215; NAS, E38/9-10.
121 Ibid; ER, Vol. I, 150-51, 193, 232. The price of the wax for the funeral is not listed; however, for the wedding of David II and Joan in 1328, there is an entry for 2,800 lb of wax costing £51, 13s. 6d., which would imply that the total cost of the wax for Robert I’s funeral was well over £150: ER, Vol. I, 119.
were utilised at some or all of the other calling points along the processional route, and may be relative to the length of the journey. Although the quantity of wax used was not quite as extravagant as the 13,000 lbs ordered for the funeral of Philip V in 1322, it was over 1,000 lbs more than used at the funeral of Louis X in 1316, the cost of which had made up almost a third of the total funeral cost, and more than double the 3606 lbs used at Henry VII’s funeral in 1509. There was also £7, 6s. 1d. paid for the work done with the wax by church servers at Dunfermline, and Hugh, the Clerk of Perth, was paid for making the torches or lamps for the funeral, confirming a torch lit procession accompanied the body at some stage. While the volume of illuminations suggests an elaboration of ceremony for the king, their use held layers of religious meaning including the apotropaic powers of candles in banishing demons and evil spirits, as well as connections to Christ as the ‘light of the world’.

The illuminations at the funeral of Robert I were clearly an essential and prominent feature, putting the displays held for Robert’s passing on a level with contemporary monarchs and perhaps indicative of conscious attempts to engage in the game of ‘medieval upmanship’ with them. The 1818 excavations at Dunfermline, at the supposed site of Bruce’s burial, recorded a lead crown and ‘a cloth of fine linen, with a gold thread running through it’. Penman and Fraser have, however, raised doubts as to the correct identification of the remains. The undeniable scale and glitter of Robert I’s funeral make it very hard to believe that the full advantages of the regalia, mock or otherwise, were not taken at the burial ceremony of a king who strove consistently to compete with contemporaries in his projections of royal

---

122 Cost of wax for Louis X’s funeral: 811 livre 5s. 14d. The exchange rate later in thirteenth century was approx. 1 Scots: 5 or 6 livre, thus roughly £135-£160 Scots. See above Note on Money, xii-xiv.


authority. Edward I was certainly buried with mock regalia in 1307, including a crown, sceptre, rod, and a red and gold royal mantle, and Simpson has posited that it was upon this adversary that Robert modelled himself. From his extravagant Parisian tomb and heart sent on crusade to the extended illuminated procession to the shimmering gold and knightly display, Bruce intended his final hour to continue to amplify the royal image he had forged for his fledgling dynasty. Yet, the succession in 1329 was by no means certain, with the heir aged just five years, and Bruce’s visual projections of authority faced very real challenges in the minority of his son.

---

128 This was recorded when Edward I’s tomb was opened in 1774: J. Ayloffe, ‘An Account of the Body of King Edward the First, as it appeared on Opening his Tomb in 1774’, Archaeologia, or miscellaneous tracts relating to antiquity, Vol. III (1775) particularly 380-85.
Section III: Forging of the New in the Ashes of the Old: David II & the Early Stewarts

The lack of references in the Exchequer Rolls for the funeral of David Bruce would appear to support a conclusion that the incoming Stewart monarchy swept aside much of the court legacy of David II with a hurried burial at Holyrood, halting a second ‘Bruce state burial at royal Dunfermline’.\(^{130}\) However, there is far more to this picture. The lack of information regarding the funeral in the financial accounts is misleading as the records are incomplete. The custumar and baillies account for 1370–1371 has not survived and although summaries of accounts of the clerks of liverance and wardrobe have, they are not broken down to indicate what specific items were used for. In addition, the only extant record of Robert II’s coronation in these financial records is for purchasing wine,\(^{131}\) yet it is unlikely that Robert II did not spend far more on his coronation.\(^{132}\) Boardman has proposed that the evidence points to a rapid funeral occurring at Holyrood with no ‘symbolic continuity’ made to Robert’s coronation over a month later at Scone, and that the gap between them was caused by challenges to the Stewart accession.\(^{133}\) Yet, Robert II stood to gain more from building his own dynastic glory on the foundations of his Bruce and Canmore predecessors than from tearing them down.

The death of David II occurred on 22 February 1371, the Feast of Saint Peter’s Chair, but the gap from this date until Robert II’s coronation on 25 March\(^{134}\) was not necessarily unusual. The standard length of time allowed for the calling of parliament by the fourteenth century was forty days, so if anything the gap between the death of David and Robert’s coronation, which essentially started the first parliament, was too short. The inaugurations of the thirteenth-century kings had indeed taken place quickly before the funeral of the predecessor; however, a two year gap occurred between Robert I’s burial and his son’s formal coronation and there is no solid proof that David II’s funeral took place in a rushed manner.

\(^{132}\) See below Chapter 2, Section II, 135.
\(^{134}\) *Chron. Fordun*, 370-71.
prior to the coronation. In fact, a safe conduct produced by Edward III for Andrew Peyntour [sic] and Henry Tankard on 14 July 1371 to pass to Scotland carrying items necessary for the funeral of David II could mean a number of months passed before the burial actually took place.

While evidence for the funeral itself remains elusive, the tomb of David II offers more to analyse. The suggestion that Robert II swept aside plans for a second ‘Bruce state funeral’ at Dunfermline must be challenged, as Penman has noted, due to evidence that suggests David had intended to be buried at Holyrood abbey for many years before his death. There were numerous signs of David’s favour for this abbey, including the granting of the ‘office of the chaplain of the royal chapel’ in 1342, which was confirmed again in 1343, and grants of land. Moreover while the purchase of stone and alabaster for the tomb of his second queen, Margaret Drummond, suggests her burial was planned at Dunfermline, a further entry regarding carriage of stone for the tombs of both king and queen does not specify Dunfermline as its destination, perhaps due to the burial sites chosen being different. The style of David’s tomb is unknown, but as with his predecessors both French and English influences must be considered, as David had spent a number of years in each. Even once released from his imprisonment in England David spent large amounts on further trips south from 1360 to the year of his death. The materials for his tomb ordered in his lifetime came from London, and fourteenth-century English tomb design favoured alabaster effigies which his purchases hint at. The tomb itself was continued by David II’s successor, as a steady stream of stone specifically for this

135 See above Chapter 1, Section I; and details in Chapter 2, Section II, 121-9.
136 Rot. Scot., Vol. I, 945-6. Unlike other safe conducts to be discussed below, this one specifically state ‘pro funere’ rather than ‘pro monumento sepulchral’.
140 He was sent to France from 1334–1341, and was captive in England from 1346–1357.
141 For example in 1360 he spent £666, 13s. 4d. on a visit to England, then in 1364 a staggering £1337, 7s. 3d., and in 1370 a further £966, 13s. 4d.; ER, Vol. II, 48, 172, 356.
142 The use of alabaster can be found in the tombs of Edward II (d.1327), John of Eltham (d. 1336), William Hatfield (d.1348), Isabelle de Valois (d. 1356), and the joint tomb of the infant children of Edward III and Philippa, Blanche of the Tower (d. 1342) and William of Windsor (d. 1348). The unusual tomb of this era was that of Philippa of Hainault (d. 1369, but tomb may have been worked on from 1362), which had an effigy of white marble, and unlike the others was probably the work of foreign craftsman Jean de Liège; see Morganstern, Gothic Tombs of Kinship, 82-102, 117-26; Duffy, Royal Tombs, 109-37.
construction made its way to Scotland with Andrew Peyntour and other craftsmen from both London and Flanders in 1372 and 1373. In addition, Edward III provided a licence for the English William Patryngton [sic] and other workmen to work on the tomb of David II in 1372. Such workmen would have been immersed in memorial culture of kinship tombs, prolific across England, the Low Countries, and France by the fourteenth century, and as the deceased king’s cousin and heir, had statuettes of kin been included Robert II himself would have featured, probably in a place of honour near his uncle’s head.

There is no evidence that William Patryngton remained in Scotland after his work of David II’s tomb was complete; however, other names and material sourcing reappear in the programme of tombs and memorials that Robert II embarked upon for his Stewart family as his reign continued. Robert II’s own tomb is referred to in the Exchequer Rolls from 1377 onwards with various entries regarding the carriage of stone and alabaster by Andrew Peyntour, work carried out on the tomb by Nicholas the mason both at Holyrood and once it was moved to Perth, and payments for moving the monument from Perth to Scone in 1394. The same craftsmen and materials also crop up in the king’s memorialisation for his wider family, with stone and alabaster monuments being crafted for the tombs of his mother, father and first wife in the ancestral Stewart mausoleum at Paisley. Boardman has proposed that this tomb building program, combined with remodelling of Dundonald castle and the patronising of literature such as Barbour’s Bruce, were ‘a co-ordinated celebration of the monarch’s paternal as well as maternal ancestry.’ There appears to be a heightened sense of awareness in the actions of Robert II of the importance of securing visual and permanent recognition of the

145 Morganstern’s chapters on the monuments of Edward III’s reign and that of Edward III in particular offer key insights into the contemporary work in England at the time: Gothic Tombs of Kinship, 82-102, 117-32.
149 Boardman, ‘Robert II’ in Brown and Tanner (eds), Scottish Kingship, 85.
previous members of his family in the creation of his own royal dynasty, as well as building on the memories of his monarchical predecessors.\(^{150}\)

The chronicle accounts of Robert II’s funeral in 1390, particularly Wyntoun and Bower, stress the continuity provided by the burial of the king at Scone followed the next day by the crowning of his son, Robert III, whose queen, Annabella, was crowned on the third day.\(^{151}\) It was surely the intention of Robert II that these ceremonial occasions should be united for the sake of the stability of the transition from one monarch to the next. Moreover Robert’s chosen burial site was strongly linked to governing and a prominent meeting place of parliament, at least until Carrick was made guardian. Of the seven parliaments and councils with extant records prior to 1384, five were held at Scone or neighbouring Perth;\(^{152}\) and all declarations regarding succession that remain also took place in parliaments at Scone.\(^{153}\) There was a definite shift in focus that attempted to centralise government and ceremonial at Scone and its environs, in a manner similar to fourteenth-century Westminster. The political situation of 1390 was indeed fraught with complexities, not least of which was that in 1388 Carrick had been removed as unfit to govern on behalf of his father and his brother, Robert earl of Fife,\(^{154}\) had been nominated governor.\(^{155}\) These political reasons are posited by Boardman as the cause of the lengthy gap between the king’s death and his burial.\(^{156}\) Robert II was buried on 13 August and Robert III crowned on 14 August,\(^{157}\) but as the Book of Pluscarden relates, the king passed away nearly four months earlier on 20 April 1390.\(^{158}\)

\(^{150}\) Robert II’s overarching tomb program may have included the use of familial statuettes, his own perhaps following in the lines of Edward III marking progeny rather than looking back to previous dynastic lineage due to concerns around succession and considering the place of his burial at the site of Scottish coronation. Not to mention the fact that he had plenty of children, mostly all with spouses, who would have filled the sides of a tomb, as Morganstern notes of Edward III: *Gothic Tombs of Kinship, 117-26.*

\(^{151}\) See below Chapter 2, Section II, 139-40; Chapter 3, Section II, 240-1.


\(^{153}\) *Ibid*, 1371/4, Non-parliamentary record: declaration that John Stewart [...] is heir to the throne of Scotland (Scone: Coronation Assembly, March 1371); *Ibid*, 1373/3, Legislation: [...] entailing the Crown on the sons of Robert II (Scone, Parliament, April 1373).

\(^{154}\) Later duke of Albany.


\(^{158}\) *Pluscarden*, 252.
A gap of four months between death and burial, though long, was not unique and certainly had near contemporary comparators, particularly in the context of political confusion. For example, the murder of Edward II in September 1327 took place over six months after his deposition, and three months before his eventual regal burial at Gloucester.\textsuperscript{159} There were also examples where the gap between death and burial was dictated by the monarch to tie the ceremony to significant dates. Such gaps could range from a number of weeks to a number of months, such as Henry IV who died in late March but was not buried until 18 July, due to his request to be buried on Trinity Sunday in the Trinity chapel at Canterbury.\textsuperscript{160} The gap between Robert II’s death and burial was certainly elongated by political confusion; however, there could have been a purposeful extension of the gap. The Assumption of Our Lady day feast, on 15 August, may have been specifically chosen for the coronation of Queen Annabella, or to link Robert III’s succession to a feast of the Blessed Virgin.\textsuperscript{161}

Whatever the true cause of the delay, such an extended time between death and burial meant that the body would have been embalmed and implies the use of an effigy, but the financial and descriptive accounts do not confirm either. The ceremonial unification of the funeral and coronation does cause some issues in regards to the expenditures recorded in the \textit{Exchequer Rolls} as some of the costs – those to John de Spesa [sic], clerk of the king’s household – have been combined: £279, 19s. 11d. can be linked directly to the funeral, but a further £402, 15s. 4d. was spent on the two celebrations combined.\textsuperscript{162} Moreover, the amounts entered are primarily bulk payments to the officials who would have dealt with individual purchases of specific items, such as just over £250 paid to ‘\textit{Waltero Forster, clerico gardrobe regis}’ for ‘\textit{exequiis et sepultra regis nuper defuncti}’.\textsuperscript{163} The figure £279, 19s. 11d.\textsuperscript{164} was a considerable amount, even without including any funeral costs lost in the combined figure.

\textsuperscript{159} Burden, ‘Rewriting a Rite of Passage’, 14-17.
\textsuperscript{160} Griffiths, ‘Succession and the Royal Dead’, 102.
\textsuperscript{161} See below Chapter 2, Section II, 139-40; Chapter 3, Section II, 240-1.
\textsuperscript{162} \textit{ER}, Vol. III, 279-80.
\textsuperscript{163} \textit{Ibid.}
\textsuperscript{164} This total does not include all/any tomb costs, as much of this was paid for previously as will be discussed, or costs of various masses for the soul of the king set up at other sites, for example, at Dunbarton offerings for masses for his soul were set up for £6, 13s. 4d. (\textit{ER}, Vol. III, 231)
which could have provided a suitably elaborate occasion. Duffy states that the funeral of Henry IV in 1413 was estimated to have cost around £330 (sterling) and gives some individual prices for items at funerals, including a hearse costing £59, 16s. 8d. (sterling) at the funeral of Edward III in 1377 and an effigy costing only 40s. at the funeral of Edward II in 1327.165

Where the financial accounts are found wanting, there are noteworthy details in the extant chronicles and Wyntoun describes the event of Robert’s death thus:

At Dundonald in his cuntre
Off ane schort seiknes deyt he;
Fra þine to Scone his men him bair,
And richely was he bereyt þair.
Off all his kinryk þe prelatis,
And uthir lords of hie estaitis
At his entyrment war their [...]166

The account relays that he died at Dundonald and was buried at Scone, confirmed in the majority of other accounts,167 and implies a processional aspect to the proceedings with his men ‘carrying’ him to his final resting place. This procession was made up of his men, perhaps all dressed in black or blazoned with the royal arms,168 and the prelates and lords of the estate attend his funeral at Scone. The journey would have been between 90 and 100 miles, starting in the Stewart territories of the south west and making its way north and east. The exact route is not known, but a number of prominent stopping points can be plotted out between Dundonald and Scone: the family mausoleum at Paisley, the church at Dumbarton where offerings for masses for the king’s soul were paid for, Dunblane or Stirling, and finally Perth.169 There would clearly have to be other stopping points between these sites and probably an increasing retinue stop by stop. Perth would have provided a fitting place for the penultimate vigil, as well as enough accommodation and supplies for the members of the estates gathering for a funeral,

165 Duffy, Royal Tombs, 118, 147, 200. The exchange rate in the late fourteenth to early fifteenth century was fluctuating, the values could be equal or up to £2 Scots per £1 sterling. See Note on Money, xii-xiv.
167 Chron. Bower, Vol. VII, 445-7; Maior, History, 331; Boece is the only one with an alternative of Dundee: Boece, Chronicle, 353.
168 The use of the lion rampant as the Scottish royal arms likely dates back to William the Lion, with the symbol appearing on seals and coinage in the thirteenth century and the Lyon herald is first referred to in the reign of Robert II. See Chapter 3 for more details on the development of heraldic symbols.
169 See Map IV.
coronation and parliament. Furthermore, if the king was borne ceremonially on the shoulders of his men (possibly knights, officers of arms or cadet family members), as the rhyming verse of Wyntoun suggests, this last two and half mile stretch would provide the opportune time for such ceremonial display.

The officiators of the funeral ceremony are also offered in the Cottonian manuscript of Wyntoun, a luxury rarely found in relation to Scottish funerals:

\begin{verbatim}
Þe Bischop þat tyme of Glasgu,
Off Glendenwyne Shir Mathew,
Off þe Requiem did þat mese;
And þar þat day alssua was
Þe Bischop of Sancte Androwis se,
Schir Walter Trayl þan callit was he.
He made þe collacion
In gret commendacion
Off þe body, þat on þat wisse
Þat day þai did þan þat serwice.\end{verbatim}

The Requiem Mass was led by the bishop of Glasgow and Walter Trail offered a ‘collacion’ over the body, which would most probably have rested on a temporary structure similar to that described for Robert I surrounded by candles. Both the bishop of Glasgow and the bishop of St Andrews went on to be involved in the coronation, once more linking death and succession in a clearly visible manner. Robert II’s projection of royal image through his own funeral ceremonial and choice of burial site, that re-forged connections between crowning and succession, and the subsequent focus upon Scone and Perth as a centre for administration and government as well as for royal ceremony, are all suggestive of a keen understanding of how to represent authority visually, and of contemporary European fashions and ideals.

Robert III’s funeral was one shrouded by his own claims of political failure; he had effectively lost control of his country to his brother before he was crowned, with a brief

171 Collacion/ collacioun/ collation has a number of possible definitions – in this case it was probably similar to a summarising sermon drawing from scriptures used in the main liturgy and the lives of appropriate saints, while it may have also included a eulogistic section in memory of the king.
intermission when his eldest son David was governor.\textsuperscript{172} Prior to his death in 1406, Robert III had buried his wife and his eldest son, the latter possibly left to starve by his uncle.\textsuperscript{173} The expenses recorded for the funeral of David, duke of Rothesay, at Lindores were just £2, 1s. 4d..\textsuperscript{174} A lowly end for this Prince of Scotland, showing how the circumstances of his death and political situation his father faced meant that an elaborate funeral for his son was beyond the king’s reach. It is notable though that in the aftermath of the prince’s burial a popular, if short-lived, cult grew up around the ‘martyr’ Rothesay and Lindores.\textsuperscript{175} The \textit{Exchequer Rolls} also indicate numerous offerings from the king in memory of his son, wife, mother and father. For example, a chaplainry was founded for perpetual prayers to be said for David’s soul at Dundee;\textsuperscript{176} at Deer offerings were made for daily masses for David, Queen Annabella,\textsuperscript{177} Robert II and Elizabeth Mure;\textsuperscript{178} in 1392 and 1393 a canon of Scone was paid £5 for masses for Robert III;\textsuperscript{179} and a pension of £73, 3s. 6d. was paid to the abbot of Holyrood for the preservation of the memories of Queen Annabella and David, duke of Rothesay.\textsuperscript{180}

Robert III’s end is known primarily for the political crisis that threatened the existence of his line of the Stewart dynasty and his desire to be buried without an epitaph in a midden, rather than for any ceremonial reasons.\textsuperscript{181} The chronicle accounts that cover the era

\textsuperscript{172} For further discussions on this see: Boardman, \textit{Early Stewart Kings}, 142-313; Boardman, ‘Robert III (1390–1406)’ in Brown and Tanner (eds), \textit{Scottish Kingship}, 109-125.


\textsuperscript{174} \textit{ER}, Vol. III, 549.

\textsuperscript{175} For further discussion see: S. Boardman, ‘A saintly sinner? The ‘martyrdom’ of David, duke of Rothesay’ in Boardman and Williamson (eds), \textit{The Cult of Saints and the Virgin Mary in Medieval Scotland}, 87-104.

\textsuperscript{176} \textit{Ibid}, 626; this payment would continue almost annually right through to the Reformation, the final recorded payment of £5 made in 1558/9 accounts: \textit{Ibid}, Vol. XIX, 83.

\textsuperscript{177} Buried at Dunfermline – as also was Euphemia his mother – Boardman suggests the fact that they were native Scots might have led to this choice, with more historical understanding of the significance of St Margaret. See Boardman, ‘Dunfermline as a Royal Mausoleum’, 147-8. There are very few expenses remaining extant for Annabella’s funeral, although her expenses prior to death at Perth included money spent on veils (apparently multiple) and were perhaps purchased for her ladies for mourning. (\textit{ER}, Vol. III, 561)

\textsuperscript{178} \textit{Ibid}, 651.

\textsuperscript{179} \textit{Ibid}, 307, 336.

\textsuperscript{180} \textit{Ibid}, 545.

\textsuperscript{181} Bower records that Queen Annabella asked Robert III why he was not preparing ‘an honourable monument like other kings who had been his predecessors’ to which he replied that his nature, personality and life lead him to feel he desired no ‘proud tomb’ and stated: ‘Bury me therefore, I beg you, in a midden, and write for my epitaph: “Here lies the worst of kings...”’ Chron. Bower, Vol. VIII, 64-5. See also: Boardman, \textit{Early Stewart Kings}, 278–312; Penman, ‘Robert III’ in Oram (ed.), \textit{Kings and Queens of Scotland}, 134; Nicholson, \textit{Later Middle Ages}, 227-8.
unanimously agree on Robert III’s burial place of Paisley, with Bower and the *Book of Pluscarden* adding that he was placed in front of the high altar.\(^{182}\) There are two locations proffered as his place of death: Dundonald and Rothesay on Bute. The route from either destination to Paisley would have been reasonably short and taken only a few days,\(^{183}\) and either would support Boardman’s statement that ‘the final sombre royal progress was confined, appropriately, to the Stewart lordships clustered around the Firth of Clyde.’\(^{184}\) The preface to the *Exchequer Rolls* proposes that the simplicity of the ceremony was by his own design, which would tie in with the request referred to above. The actual accounts offer little in regards to funeral ceremonial costs, except payments made by James I in 1424–5 on his return to Scotland, when six stone of white wax were purchased for obsequies for his father at Paisley.\(^{185}\)

With his surviving heir a prisoner in England, the still fledgling Stewart dynasty was seriously floundering in 1406 and the choice of burial at Paisley over Scone, where burial could be so poignantly followed by coronation, may have been a conscious decision to escape attention being drawn to the lack of an heir to be crowned.\(^{186}\) Such reasoning, when combined with Robert’s use of masses for the dead and the completion of his father’s tomb at Scone in 1394,\(^{187}\) suggests that, despite an awareness of his own inability to represent his personal royal authority in the manner it should be, Robert III was deeply concerned about the image of his dynasty.

The evidence regarding Robert II’s own burial and his employment of ceremonial memorial for both his maternal and paternal lines make it hard to believe that he did not commemorate David II, particularly when he had David’s father immortalized in words through the iconic John Barbour’s *Bruce*. Boardman suggests the impression that Robert II and Robert III’s reigns present a ‘cultural dead zone’ should be forcefully challenged, proposing that both politically and culturally Robert II’s reign in particular saw continued development and


\(^{183}\) See Map IV.

\(^{184}\) Boardman, *Early Stewart Kings*, 312.

\(^{185}\) *ER*, Vol. IV, 390-1.

\(^{186}\) Boardman, *Early Stewart Kings*, 312.

innovation.¹⁸⁸ Both kings continued the work upon their predecessors’ tombs, and Robert II utilised the same workmen and materials in the creation his own and his familial ancestors as for David II, in his promotion of his dynastic roots through memorialisation. This promotion combined with Robert II’s attempts to centralise government and ceremonial, amplify the idea that this period should by no means be considered null or void in Scotland’s cultural and political development. All the same, the situation in 1406 was bleak and the minimal focus upon the passing of Robert III may have been dictated as much by his brother, Robert Stewart duke of Albany, as by Robert III’s own wishes.

Section IV: From James I to James IV – the Wilderness Years?

It is suggested by Edington that the amount of material on earlier Scottish royal funerals is ‘meagre’ and ‘far from satisfactorily recorded’, primarily due to the unexpected and often violent deaths of the kings prior to James V. In comparison to the records brought to light for the English funeral ceremonies as far back as Henry III with extant wills dating back to William the Conqueror, the Scottish sources are minimal, but this is hardly a new problem in the context of this study. Unlike the previous two centuries, there were no dynastic changes in the fifteenth century. The projection of dynastic continuity and royal authority faced different challenges, those of early deaths and subsequent minority accessions. From James I to James IV the organisation of the king’s funeral lay in the hands of foreign widowed queens and minority leaders.

The murder of James I in 1437 at Blackfriars in Perth left a young heir and his queen with the complexities of a minority government; however, the king was forty-three years old and it is unlikely that he had not considered his death and funeral arrangements. His time as a captive of the English kings – Henry IV, Henry V, and Henry VI – from 1406 to 1424 has frequently been raised as an influence on his kingship mirrored by his representations of authority and political actions upon his return to Scotland. Whether these influences were good or bad is still debated. Both James and his wife-to-be Joan Beaufort, daughter of the earl of Somerset and descendant of John of Gaunt, would have witnessed part or all of Henry V’s funeral procession in 1422, which travelled from Paris to Westminster in one of the most elaborate funeral processions of the fifteenth century. This ceremony included most of the key elements of the fully developed medieval funeral: from an effigy to the offering of knightly

189 Edington, Court and Culture, 113.
190 A Collection of All the Wills now known to be extant of the Kings and Queens of England, Princes and Princesses of Wales and Every branch of the Blood Royal, from the reign of William the Conqueror, to that of Henry the Seventh exclusive, with explanatory notes, and a glossary, ed. J. Nichols (London: Society of Antiquaries, 1780).
191 Brown, James I, 186-8.
192 Ibid, 125; Nicholson, Later Middle Ages, 281; Scott, ‘The Court and Household of James I’, 125.
accoutrements, the use of regalia and an illuminated hearse to black-clad mourners and torchbearers dressed in white.\textsuperscript{193}

Little evidence remains to show whether such an elaborate funeral ceremony was provided for James I with the fraught political situation his murder caused. An account from the contemporary \textit{Book of Pluscarden} described the visiting papal legate Bishop Urbino’s reaction on seeing the body of James I, which was displayed before burial.

[The bishop of Urbino] uttered a great cry with tearful sighs and kissed his piteous wounds, and said before all bystanders that he would stake his soul on his having died in a state of grace, like a martyr...\textsuperscript{194}

Brown has proposed that this was a conscious political move by Queen Joan to have James I recognised as a martyr.\textsuperscript{195} As Boardman has demonstrated, the brief rise of popular devotion connected to the ‘martyrdom’ of James’s older brother David in 1402 were not common in Scotland either before or after the early fifteenth century; however, they were more prominent in England with figures such as Thomas of Lancaster (executed 1322 but still venerated in the fifteenth century).\textsuperscript{196} Joan’s actions illustrate an understanding of the representational tools – even if ones more prominent in her country of birth – that she could use to engage European interest in the memory of her husband, and in so doing secure power for and over her infant son. There had been distinct moves by James to raise his queen to second person of the realm; for example, the parliament records illuminate that he insisted upon oaths of fealty being sworn to Joan in a General Council of 1428, and then again in 1435.

[... the king [...] decreed that all and singular successors of the prelates of the kingdom whomsoever, and also all [...] heirs of earls, barons and all freeholders of the lord king should be held to make a similar oath to our lady queen [Joan Beaufort], and no prelate henceforth should be admitted to his temporality, or the heirs of any tenant of the lord king to his tenancy unless he has previously performed that oath to the queen.\textsuperscript{197}

\textsuperscript{194} \textit{Pluscarden}, 290.
\textsuperscript{195} Brown, \textit{James I}, 194-5.
\textsuperscript{196} Boardman, ‘A saintly sinner?’, particularly 94-104.
\textsuperscript{197} \textit{RPS}, 1428/7/2, Legislation (Perth, General Council, 12 July 1428).
Letters in the parliamentary record, also from 1428, indicate James’s desire to involve his queen in government as a renewal of the Franco-Scottish alliance was only to proceed with the ‘firm and secure support of our beloved consort Queen,’ who was listed first in the named nobles, lords and members of the estates.\(^\text{198}\) Brown and Downie both comment on the unusual nature of these actions and the tensions that they caused,\(^\text{199}\) nevertheless James’s actions certainly emphasised Joan’s political role in the eyes of her husband and the likelihood of her involvement, if not control, of his burial arrangements.

It is perhaps no coincidence that James I’s foundation at Perth, where he chose to be buried, was a Carthusian convent. It was the first and last of its kind in Scotland\(^\text{200}\) and one of only a handful in the British Isles, along with Mount Grace Priory in North Yorkshire founded by a relative of Queen Joan, and another having been founded in 1414 by Henry V at Sheen.\(^\text{201}\) The setting up of such a personal foundation suggests a decision by the king to be buried there and could have been influenced by the chantry chapel created by Henry V at Westminster. There were also efforts to centralise government, court and royal ceremony around Perth and Scone that were unmistakably reminiscent of James’s grandfather’s policy 50 years earlier. During the reign 13 out of 18 parliaments occurred there, as well as five out of six General Councils,\(^\text{202}\) coupled with the foundation of the Charterhouse at Perth and his joint coronation with Joan at Scone,\(^\text{203}\) there was a clarity in James’s policy of visually and physically centralizing his court activities there.

The *Exchequer Rolls* do not give much detail on the actual funeral itself; however, there are entries regarding his tomb at the Charterhouse and the use of memorial candles in


\(^{200}\) Remaining evidence suggests that the fourth earl of Douglas had requested permission to found a Carthusian charterhouse c. 1419, but the actual building and community never came into being. W.N.M. Beckett, ‘The Perth Charterhouse before 1500’, *Analecta Carthusiana*, 128 (Salzburg, 1988), 1-11.


\(^{202}\) See *RPS*. Parliaments at Perth: 1424, 1425, 1426 (x2), 1427 (x2), 1429, 1430, 1431 (x2), 1432 (x2), 1435; General Councils at Perth: 1428 (x2), 1429, 1433, 1437.

\(^{203}\) See below Chapter 2, Section III, 155-6; Chapter 3, Section II, 238-41.
Edinburgh,\textsuperscript{204} as well as entries regarding James I’s heart being buried separately to his body. The chronicles that report James’s death focus almost exclusively on the murder, and the fact that James I’s heart was taken on crusade is not mentioned in any of them.\textsuperscript{205} Yet, the \textit{Exchequer Rolls} of 1444-5 highlight two payments to a knight of Saint John of Jerusalem, who had returned from Rhodes bearing the heart of King James I, which was then to be displayed at the Carthusian Charterhouse at Perth.\textsuperscript{206} This post-death heart crusade was of course reminiscent of that of Bruce just over 100 years earlier,\textsuperscript{207} but the events as recorded here suggest that the eventual resting place of James I’s heart was unusual in that it was returned to the same burial site as the body. Despite this, the journey of his heart on the crusade against the infidel would have held great value for the representation of Scottish royal authority had it been widely known at the time.

The removal of James I’s heart would have taken place along with embalming. While Joan’s display of James’s wounded body served a certain purpose, it was not a dignified way for the king’s body to have been laid to rest and, considering the wounds James incurred,\textsuperscript{208} it may have called for the practical use of an effigy in the funerary arrangements. The records do not specify whether James I’s funeral occurred before or after the coronation of his son at Holyrood Abbey but the relocation of the queen and heir to Edinburgh suggests that the funeral took place prior to this move.\textsuperscript{209} The proximity of James’s place of death to his burial site did not call for a long journey with multiple vigils; however, the urban setting of Perth provided numerous religious establishments around which a sombre procession could have made its way through the burgh, stopping at each to maximise intercessory prayers.\textsuperscript{210} Such a procession, if it occurred, may have been modelled upon the burgh’s Corpus Christi or Holy Blood procession

\textsuperscript{204} Five stones of white wax are paid for the masses said for the soul of the late king at the parish church of Edinburgh. \textit{ER}, Vol. V, 27.
\textsuperscript{206} \textit{ER}, Vol. V, 156-79.
\textsuperscript{208} This included wounded hands from defending himself and reportedly sixteen stab wounds. Brown, \textit{James I}, 187-8.
\textsuperscript{209} See Chapter 2, Section III, 157-9.
\textsuperscript{210} Mann has highlighted that as well as a parish church, which was ‘of almost cathedral-like proportion, with its forty altars’, Perth boasted three convents of friars (Blackfriars, Greyfriars and Whitefriars) and was less than three miles away from the royal Augustinian abbey of Scone: \textit{A Cloistered Company}, 112.
route, which along with other forms of Eucharist worship, rose in prominence across the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries.\textsuperscript{211} Joan’s attempts to have James projected as a martyr would have been symbolically amplified by making a coherent link to the annual procession centred on the body of Christ the ultimate martyr.\textsuperscript{212}

James I’s use of parliament to ensure visual and oratory praise and celebration of his royal status, along with that of his queen and his children, can be located in legislation passed that instructed the clergy to ‘make processions and special prayers’ for the royal family.\textsuperscript{213} One entry in the parliamentary records specifies that the bishops were ordered to instruct each priest in the diocese to ‘say certain collects each time he says Mass’.\textsuperscript{214} ‘Collects’ in the Sarum Mass (c. 1400)\textsuperscript{215} were placed between the \textit{Gloria in excelsis} and the Epistle, usually corresponded with the prayers used in the Mass, and contained some of the most ancient Christian prayers. ‘Collects’ were also said in a standard formula, starting with an antiphon, a versicle and response, and ending with a collect, which Harper describes as ‘a highly condensed office’, during processions and for memorials and suffrages to specific saints.\textsuperscript{216} Perhaps the king’s prayers were said in this format combined with those for St Margaret and St Andrew, the dynastic and patron saints respectively. With no further evidence from the extant documents that record the order sent out for these royal prayers to be undertaken, it is impossible to reconstruct the prayers which were said; however, this is the first occasion that such orders

\textsuperscript{211} Miri Ruben, \textit{Corpus Christi: The Eucharist in Late Medieval Cultures} (Cambridge, 1991), particularly 243-70; Brown, \textit{Civic Ceremony in Medieval Bruges}, 39-72. The first recorded ‘haliblude’ procession in Scottish burgh records is found in Aberdeen in 1440 with payments for a new ‘play’ written for the procession in 1449; however, very few burgh records survive prior to this date and even for Aberdeen early records are patchy: see Mill, \textit{Medieval Plays}, 60-73.

\textsuperscript{212} Such connections between king and Christ, particularly those deemed martyrs, would certainly be no new thing; Morganstern’s discussions of Edward II’s tomb at Gloucester discuss how the orb held by the royal effigy and the kin statuettes interspersed with apostles were utilised to forward the holiness of this murdered king, probably by his widow who had conspired to bring about his abdication: \textit{Gothic Tombs of Kinship}, 82-91.

\textsuperscript{213} RPS, 1425/3/19, Legislation: Touching the ordinance of processions (Perth, Parliament, 12 March 1425); \textit{Ibid}, 1426/15, Legislation: Note concerning the orations and processions to be made for the king (Perth/Edinburgh, Parliament, 11/13 March 1426).

\textsuperscript{214} \textit{Ibid}.


\textsuperscript{216} \textit{Ibid}, 127, 130-1; Harper, \textit{The Forms and Orders of Western Liturgy}, 85, 116, 122, 294.
regarding ecclesiastical acclamation217 of a living king appears as a parliamentary ordinance implying that this may have been adopted from James’s time in the English court.

Due to the iconoclastic zeal of the Reformers who descended on the charterhouse at Perth in 1559, neither the building nor the tomb remains intact, but Beckett has shown how money was diverted to its construction and chroniclers who would have seen it prior to destruction recorded its grandeur and craftsmanship (if not, unfortunately, any more detailed descriptions).218 When the necrology of the Carthusian General Chapter recorded Joan’s death (15 July 1445), it emphasised her shared role in the founding of the house listing her as ‘fundatrix’ and both were accorded the benefits of being recorded in the order’s kalendars which would have brought them intercessory prayers from across the European community.219 The expenses put towards the tomb in the years following James’s death point to the queen’s continued involvement in its completion. The extant financial accounts record expenses in 1438 and 1440 for £30 on Spanish iron to enclose the tomb and £50 for further metalwork and painted decoration around the tomb.220 The work that was undertaken intimates that the tomb had been well underway before James’s death. Moreover, the iron railing implies it required protection due to positioning in an ambulatory space.221 This may have been in an aisle but equally likely for the co-founders of the convent was a position in front of the high altar, with the railings more for show than protection. The overt manner in which James projected Joan’s importance as the second person of the realm gives solid foundations to the argument for a joint tomb marking their unified royal authority even in death. While the painted decorations are not

217 James I’s ordinance records prayers rather than specifically referring to an acclamation; however, Kantorowicz states that: ‘The ordinary place for the acclamations intended for the ruler was between the first Collect and the Epistle’, so it may be that an acclamation was included with the collects said for the king and queen of Scotland: E. Kantorowicz, Laudes Regiae: A Study in Liturgical Acclamations and Medieval Ruler Worship (Berkley, 1958), 87.

218 A remaining artefact of a flat slab of blue marble, now housed at St John’s church, which is said to have the outline of two figures upon it (indicating a joint tomb) has been posited as part of that made for James I and his Queen by Beckett: ‘The Perth Charterhouse before 1500’, 8–11. However, it has been argued since that this slab is more likely to have been that of a noble couple. See Penman, ‘A Programme for Royal Tombs’, 250.


221 Penman discusses the expense on iron railings for the tomb of Bruce and proposes the idea of the railings being protective in nature due to positioning in an ambulatory space such as an aisle: ‘A Programme for Royal Tombs’, 243.
described, comparative examples such as the luxurious double tomb of Richard II and Anne of Bohemia at Westminster, which both James and Joan would have seen, would lead to the conclusion that these included coats of arms and ‘weepers’ or familial figures, perhaps combining progeny as well as dynastic ancestry.\footnote{Ibid, 250. Morganstern notes that where lineage and powerful connections had been favoured in earlier centuries, the progeny of the deceased as an illustration of succession became more common in the choice of figures on tomb chests of the fifteenth century in England, the Low Countries and France: \textit{Gothic Tombs of Kinship}, 117-49.}

Joan Beaufort died on 15 July 1445, when her son was around fifteen years old, and there is very little evidence to reveal anything about the ceremony or burial monument, but what does remain adds weight to the conclusion that the couple were buried together. The \textit{Auchinleck Chronicle} states that she died at Dunbar and was interred at the Charterhouse at Perth, while Pitscottie adds that this interment was alongside her husband, James I.\footnote{\textit{Chron. Auchinleck}, 162; \textit{Pitscottie, Historie}, Vol. I, 58-9. Pitscottie was living and writing/ compiling in the sixteenth-century, but his chronicle bears witness to his Fife heritage through its biases, with the burgh of Perth not too far from his home turf he may have seen the tomb in situ before its destruction.} The journey from Dunbar to Perth by land would have been around 100 miles, or around 80 if the Forth ferry was used, which would suggest that a number of stops would have been required.\footnote{Edinburgh, Linlithgow, Stirling and Dunblane would all be on the land route providing prestigious stopping points, but the ferry crossing was likely used to shorten the journey and this route would still have included Edinburgh and Dunfermline, although less obvious stopping points occur on this route.} The lack of information for a tomb at the point of Joan’s death adds further weight to the creation of a double tomb at the charterhouse. The \textit{Exchequer Rolls} record purchases of black clothing for both the young king and his sister in 1445, but the entry does not tie the purchase to her funeral. Under a full adult monarch the opportunity to have a further elaborate ceremony around the couple’s joint tomb would have been likely; however, with the king still a minor and the slow political eclipse of Joan following her remarriage, it is uncertain how much attention her passing would have received.

The events surrounding James II’s burial and the coronation of his son in 1460 are confusing and like much of the mid-fifteenth century hampered by a scarcity of extant material. After James’s death aged thirty at the siege of Roxburgh, his son was brought from Edinburgh
to be crowned at Kelso near the site of battle, while the king’s body was interred at Holyrood. The dating for these events is not entirely certain, but it is generally agreed that James II died on Sunday 3 August 1460 and that the siege of Roxburgh was concluded on the following Friday. In the meantime lords were sent to Edinburgh to bring back the prince, queen, bishops and nobles to Kelso by Friday for the coronation of the king. The journey from Kelso to Edinburgh would be approximately forty-five miles. This distance may have taken three to four days with a large entourage including a young king, meaning the messengers would have had two days or less to make the journey. For James III, along with his mother and their entourage, to have arrived at Kelso by Friday for the coronation on 10 August, as the chronicle suggests, the body of James II could not have been returned to Edinburgh prior to the coronation, due to the practical logistics of moving the body in such a short time.

The fact that the king was buried at Holyrood but his son was brought with haste to be crowned at Kelso, suggests that James II must have requested burial at the former as the practical solution would have been to inter him at Kelso had this not been the case. It also provided a vast procession to return from Kelso to Edinburgh. All the nobles and clerics, not to mention the hundred newly made knights presumably wearing liveries or carrying the royal arms, would have been present to accompany the body of the old king and the newly crowned James III back to Edinburgh. The route from Kelso to Edinburgh is not marked with prominent stopping points for vigils; Lauder and Dalkeith were likely choices with the latter positioned less than seven miles from Edinburgh. Gerard Nijsten highlights that in fifteenth-century Guelders death was very much the concern of civic administrators, a factor that may well have influenced Mary’s decisions and expectations in this respect. On arrival at Edinburgh it is

---

225 Pitscottie is the only chronicle to report a different coronation site, he proposes Scone: Historie, Vol. I, p. 169. See also: Chapter 2, Section III, 168-9.
226 McGladdery, James II, 111-12; Macdougall, James III, 34.
227 Chron. Auchinleck, 169.
228 Ibid.
229 Ibid.
230 See Map V. With hindsight, Lauder would have been ironic, as it was the place James III was arrested by his nobles in 1482. Dalkeith outside Edinburgh was favoured some forty or so years later in the arrival of Margaret Tudor.
231 Gerard Nijsten, In the Shadow of Burgundy: The Court of Guelders in the Late Middle Ages (Cambridge, 2004), 372. Mary was brought up in the court of Burgundy from a fairly young age, but she
likely that further vigils were held for James II and that Mary of Guelders organised a public funeral procession through the burgh, perhaps entering the city past the site where she would later found Trinity College in his memory.

The *Exchequer Roll* entries also hint that, despite his relatively young age, James II had already begun designing his tomb. The two entries for 1460-1 account, which specifically reference the funeral, refer to small fees for a painter and carpenter, along with wax and black cloth, rather than materials for the tomb itself.232 These suggest the need for last minute works to make it suitable for the occasion. The term used for the tomb in this case was *sepulcrum* or *sepulcri*, rather than *tumba* found in other cases, and translates to tomb-shrine, a term also found in the Easter festival referring to the structure placed in the north chancel utilised as the tomb of Christ that became the focal point for prayers over Easter and Holy Week.233 It is not known where James II’s tomb in Holyrood stood, or how long it stayed in its original position, but as the second king buried in the abbey church the high altar may have been taken.234 However, the black cloth and wax, as well as the finishing touches of the painter and carpenter, could indicate that James II’s partly finished tomb was utilised as a base for the hearse for the king to be elevated centre stage, surrounded by candles, if an entirely temporary structure was not used.

There are a few further entries that do not relate to the funeral directly, but refer to the late king, which suggest new clothing and armour purchased for either the body or perhaps an effigy, or in the case of the armour to be utilised in offerings.235 For example, a payment was

---

233 These structures were utilised in England across the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries and were placed in the north chancel. They were sometimes built temporarily for the occasion and designed much like the hearse used in the funeral liturgy, but wealthy patrons began to request burial in this area so that their tombs would become the focus of the prayers of Easter and the Holy Week as the sepulchre of Christ. Duffy, *Stripping the Altars*, 29-35.
234 David II was the first monarch to be buried at Holyrood, but there is no indication of his tomb position. However, even if he was buried in front of the high altar in 1371, it was not uncommon for tombs to be moved and his tomb may have been moved to make way for that of James II. Penman suggests such a movement was possible in the case of Robert I, see ‘A Programme for Royal Tombs’, 243.
made to ‘Gallico’ for two pieces of armour ordered by the queen and council, perhaps to replace armour damaged by the explosion that killed James II so it could be presented as an offering at the altar in the fashion of the English fifteenth-century Liber Regie Capelle and the sixteenth-century Scottish heraldic manuscript from John Scrymgeour’s collection. The latter document was compiled in the sixteenth century but appears to be a copy of the late fifteenth-century compilation by Adam Loutfout. Loutfout was in the service of the Marchmond herald, Sir William of Cummyn of Inverlochy, and Loutfout along with figures such as Gilbert Hay, whose works were compiled in the mid-fifteenth century, bear testament to the vivid and established understanding of contemporary European – particularly French – developments in heraldry, chivalric values and advice to princes literature in Scotland.

There are intriguing references to a ‘satyn figury’ and red silk purchased for undergarments for the dead king, along with other clothing, paid for at the time of death of James II in 1460. The Scoticised Latin appears to translate quite simply to ‘satin figure or form’, which could suggest that some form of effigy was utilised. Harvey and Mortimer note that various terms have been found in English documents, such as ‘pycture’, persoange’, ‘image’ and ‘cast’. Most effigies had wooden heads and arms, but other materials were often used for the body, and in the case of Henry V the entire effigy was made out of boiled leather; therefore, the use of satin to make an effigy may be unusual but not impossible. The term ‘figury’ could have been utilised in place of the aforementioned English terms. There was at least a ten days to two week hiatus between James II’s death and burial, not to mention the fact

236 Ibid, 34.
237 Liber Regie Capelle, 112-114; NLS, MS. Adv. 31.5.2 ff. 15r–16v. See Appendix A for transcript of the latter.
242 The word ‘figury’ is found in other forms, such as ‘figuree’ or ‘figory’, in the context of women’s ‘shaped’ or fitted or boned gowns in both Latin and old Scots, so it cannot be entirely certain that it references an actual figure made of satin, although it is most definitely linked to the dead king rather than a woman.
that he was wounded. Therefore, if a body were to be on show at this funeral, which the
purchasing of new garments for a dead king could imply, the need for an effigy would be easily
explained. Mapstone’s analysis of Gilbert Hay’s works emphasises the French influences and
sources he utilised in his work, as well as his probable post as the Chamberlain of Charles VII
during his extended time in France.\footnote{The prose works of Hay were commissioned for William Sinclair, earl of Orkney (Chancellor for part
of James II’s reign) and the poetic \textit{Buik of King Alexander} for Lord Erskine.}
She notes that his work implies a broad understanding of
the theories of the king’s two bodies circulating at that time, based upon the earlier ideology of
dignitas non moritur.\footnote{Mapstone, ‘The Advice to Princes Tradition’, 70.}
In these theories the effigy represented the body politic that continued
to exist eternally – as did the ‘Dignity’ and justice – and the lead-encased body represented the
body corporal which in life had been visible but through its mortality could die.\footnote{Kantorowicz, \textit{The King’s Two Bodies}, particularly 383–437.}
Whether such theories had crystallised into a tangible representation of the body politic and body natural
in the royal Scottish funeral in this period is debateable, but the evidence for an effigy must
make it a possibility.

The death and burial of James II’s wife, Mary of Guelders on 1 December 1463,
ocurred when James III was around twelve years old, so the young king’s involvement would
have been limited. Despite a lack of \textit{Treasurer’s Accounts},\footnote{The first extant volume begins in 1473–1474. See above Introduction, fn. 62–3, 15.}
there are some intriguing references to the event; for example, all three of the chronicles note that Mary was buried in her
own foundation of the college of Holy Trinity\footnote{The \textit{ER} can reveal that the whole cost expended on the College by Mary could have been in excess of
\textsterling}1,100, see \textit{ER}, Vol. VII, 91, 164, 167-8, 173, 217, 241, 248. It was designed to house a provost, eight prebendaries, two choristers and a hospital to house 13 poor persons, the College was authorised by a
papal bull of 23 Oct 1460, and then further 2 bulls of 1462; from G. Burnett, ‘Preface’, to \textit{ER}, Vol. VII, lii-liv.}
in Edinburgh.\footnote{Leslie, \textit{Historie}, 157; Pitscottie, \textit{Historie}, 157; Maior, \textit{History}, 388.}
The burial site at her own
foundation suggests that Mary had requested this in a will or final testament, and also links to
both the traditional manner of burial of earlier Scottish royals at their own foundations. While
Mary’s choice may have been following the rising popularity of chantry chapels in place of new
foundations in England in the fifteenth century,\footnote{Duffy, \textit{Royal Tombs}, 191-2.} it may equally have been mirroring the
developments of her own Guelderian family mausoleum in a monastery founded outside the walls of the prominent ducal city of Arnhem.\(^{250}\)

The *Exchequer Rolls* show the largest payment went to her Steward, Henry Kinghorn, for expenses incurred by her ‘obitum ad exequias et funeralia’ but, unfortunately, it is not broken down to give the details of the expenditure.\(^{251}\) There is evidence of a memorial service at Brechin cathedral, where 27s. 4d. was spent on lights, paintings of escutcheons, and obsequies.\(^{252}\) The lordship of Brechin had formed part of the second wave of grants to the queen for her dower from James II in July 1451,\(^{253}\) and the memorial with escutcheons undoubtedly of Mary and James’s joint and separate arms shows how symbols of royal authority could permeate beyond the vicinity of the burial site.\(^{254}\) There was also a payment of over £80 to the abbot of Holyrood by order of the king in relation to the deceased queen, along with a further £16, 7s. 6d. for wax to be used in obsequies for the queen paid to her Steward.\(^{255}\) The inclusion of payments to the abbot of Holyrood indicates his involvement in the ceremonial and the queen’s body may have lain in Holyrood alongside her husband for vigils held prior to a final procession and burial at her incomplete Trinity foundation. The total of these entries is considerable, reaching £212, 16 s. 2d., and this does not appear to include a tomb of any description. Considering that the funeral expenses for Henry IV (d. 1413) were around £333 (sterling),\(^{256}\) this would suggest a ceremony of some scale. It is unfortunate that the main bulk

\(^{250}\) Mary’s family in Guelders forged a strong connection with the Carthusian monastery, Monnikhuizen, situated just outside Arnhem. It was set to become the Juliers dukes’ mausoleum with both her grandparents, Duke William and Duchess Catherine, buried there and her father Arnold had a private cell there and plans to be buried at the site (this did not come to fruition due to his diminishing power by the time of his death). Nijsten, *In the Shadow of Burgundy*, 83-4, 280-8.

\(^{251}\) *ER*, Vol. VII, 243. It is worth noting that the largest payment in this total of £111, 15 s. 8 d. to Mary’s Steward covered both outstanding expenses of her household as well as expenses for her funeral and obsequies. Unfortunately, there is just one total so it is not possible to be exact in how much went towards the funeral.

\(^{252}\) Ibid, 241.


\(^{254}\) This memorial at Brechin – if requested by the queen – echoed the manner in which ducal death was commemorated in Guelders and Burgundy. Both duchies were made up of clearly defined areas and mourning ceremonies were held at various towns, following her father Arnold’s death local authorities provided mock funerals, with mourning clothes and an imitation tomb: see Nijsten, *In the Shadow of Burgundy*, 375.


\(^{256}\) Duffy, *Royal Tombs*, 200. In the 1460s there were approx. £2 to £3 Scots to £1 sterling, see above Note on Money, xii-xiv.
of the cost of the funeral is not broken down; however, the details that remain do imply an
importance placed on illuminations and memorials, as well as the use of heraldic escutcheons,
by the mid-fifteenth century.

The passing of both James II and his queen had an impact beyond the bounds of the
realm, as memorial funeral ceremonies were held in Guelders orchestrated by Mary’s father,
Duke Arnold, at Arnhem in the north and Venslo in the south of the duchy. These ceremonies
involved civic participation with bailiffs ordered to send men to attend from surrounding towns
and orders were relayed for bells to be rung in all towns to ‘commemorate the passing of the
king of Scotland with all possible honour.’ Amongst the trains of mourners dressed in black in
Venlo were the duke and his grandson, Prince Alexander, Mary’s second son sent to the
continent for his education, and a bier – possibly with an effigy – was placed in the centre of the
church for the focusing of prayers. Nijsten’s account of the ceremony does not contain details of
the decoration of this object, but as representative symbols for both James and Mary their arms
would have provided the perfect iconic image. Although the evidence for James II’s funeral
is far from complete, there were many of the aspects of the contemporary heraldic funeral and
clear implications of the manner in which the Scottish ceremony was developing. The use of
illuminations and heraldic devices, the possible offering of the king’s arms, the use of an effigy
and an extended procession, including one hundred newly-made knights all featured in the
proceedings between 1460 and 1466.

The last reference to James II’s burial comes in 1466, and shows satin and buckram
being paid for to ornament the tomb, which also receives further decoration in the form of
painted arms of the king – the lion rampant in double tressure flory counterflory – and four
smaller escutcheons, presumably under the orders of the now fifteen year old James III.

---

257 Nijsten, In the Shadow of Burgundy, 372-5. The Scottish royal arms would have been known in the
Low Countries and France, not only from soldiers found fighting there and the ambassadorial interactions
surrounding the marriages of James II and his sisters, but also in heraldic records such as the Armorial de
Gelre created in the latter decades of the fourteenth century: Armorial de Gelre, eds. M. Popoff and M.
258 ER, Vol. VII, p. 422. While these, along with the memorials for Mary at Brechin, are the first explicit
references to arms and escutcheons in the funerary ceremonial and memorial of Scottish royalty, and her
Burgundian upbringing and the impact of Burgundian interaction more generally could be raised as
Whereas his father died a young and popular warrior king, the circumstances of James III’s own death in June 1488 were complicated for the projection of royal authority. The Treasurer’s Accounts that remain extant from June 1488 do not give any evidence for the funeral of James III, despite there being some references from late June onwards in the accounts for clothing being purchased for James IV’s coronation on 24 June. The only chronicle/history which relates information regarding James III’s funeral is George Buchanan, writing in the late sixteenth century, who states:

The council then breaking up, proceeded to Edinburgh, where, having ascertained the truth of the king’s death, they caused a magnificent funeral to be given to him, at the abbey of Cambuskenneth, in the vicinity of Stirling, on the 25th June.

The parliament records reveal that a formal declaration regarding the death of James III was not produced until the first parliament of James IV’s reign on 8 October 1488 and calls into question Buchanan’s retrospective dating, if nothing else.

The nineteenth-century excavations of the remaining tombs at Cambuskenneth confirmed that a double or triple tomb, with monumental brasses attached to a bluish marble top slab that was approximately seven inches thick, was that of James III and Margaret of Denmark. On the death of his queen in 1486 James III wrote a letter to her brother, the King of Denmark, which Macdougall has suggested was partially in an attempt to better relations between the two nations and he also highlights James’s attempts for the canonisation of his late

reason for this, the implication that such designs were not used previously is one contradicted by much of the earlier evidence in the case of both funerals and the other ceremonies discussed here. In particular, see Chapter 3 for more detailed discussions of the developments in the use of heraldic designs and symbology.

This section of extant Treasurer’s Accounts begins in June 1488, prior to this there is just one section extant from August 1473–December 1474.

TA, Vol. I, 139-140, 145, 147-8, 150, 164. The references include clothes purchased for the new king, his brothers and sister, henchmen and heralds; however, at this stage the entries are still a little patchy and do not really appear to become consistent until around the autumn/ winter of 1488.

Buchanan, History, Vol. II, 223

RPS, A1488/10/1, Declaration: regarding the death of James III and the articles of Aberdeen (Edinburgh, Parliament, 8 Oct 1488).

queen, proposing it would ‘enhance his own position’ through association.\(^{264}\) It seems unlikely, therefore, that he would have left her without a suitably elaborate tomb for two years and more likely that he would have commissioned a double tomb so that his body would be physically close to hers in death. The tombs of most of the kings thus far were started prior to their death and there would have been plenty of tombs for inspiration in late fifteenth-century Scotland, including a possible double monument to his grandfather and Joan Beaufort at Perth.

James III’s death at Sauchieburn on 11 June 1488, meant that it would have been possible to bury the king with due magnificence at Cambuskenneth prior to the young king’s coronation, which took place on 24 June at Scone, to provide symbolic stability for the incoming regime. The order of burial and coronation seems to have fluctuated dependant on situation and there is a severe lack of evidence to confirm either this order of events, or a burial after the coronation as stated by Buchanan.\(^ {265}\) Yet, the fact that Cambuskenneth and Scone were over thirty miles apart would mean that the pattern of events with the coronation occurring on 24 June at Scone and the funeral at Cambuskenneth on 25 was practically impossible. The Book of Hours created for Margaret Tudor as wedding gift from James IV includes an image that may be a representation of James III’s funeral, providing potential evidence of a heraldic funeral.\(^ {266}\) The scene is set in a church decorated with Scottish heraldic flags and escutcheons, featuring a wooden hearse or *chapelle ardente* that is covered by black cloth and candles, and surrounded by nine mourners clad in black, as well as canons in the stalls of the choir. Leslie Macfarlane argues that while the artist was not Scottish, the piece shows ‘considerable and accurate knowledge of Scottish and English heraldry,’ but the similarities to other contemporary illustrations in Books of Hours suggest this was a standardised image into which the Scottish flags and escutcheons were painted.\(^ {267}\) However, the Snowdon herald had taken part in the

\(^{265}\) Buchanan, *History*, 223.
\(^{266}\) Plate 3.
\(^{267}\) Macfarlane, ‘The Book of Hours of James IV’, 8, 12, 21. There is the suggestion that the image of the funeral could be illustrative of the first son of James IV and Margaret Tudor, who died in infancy; however, the Book of Hours was a wedding gift from James to Margaret, and most probably given to her between 1502 and 1504 long before the first son was born.
elaborate reburial ceremony of Edward IV’s father and brother in 1476 in England, where he and the Windsor herald are reported to have offered up the helmet of the duke in the ceremony, and there would be Scots who remembered the funeral of James II.

In articles on the funerals of the deposed English kings Richard II and Edward II, Burden analyses the function and undeniable political importance of these two events for the stability of the succession of the following monarch, whose claim to power in both cases arose from the bad government of their predecessor, rather than the former monarch’s hereditary legitimacy to the crown. Rituals had to be adapted for the situation, but at the same time the traditional elements within these rituals allowed political stability to be fostered. The incoming ‘rebels’ of 1488 were in a similar position to their English counterparts in 1327. The reigning king had been deposed, in James III’s case rather more swiftly dispatched, leaving a minor son as a symbolic figurehead for the authority of those who had rebelled. Edward II’s death and funeral did not occur until sometime after his son’s coronation, but the ensuing funerary arrangements were a mixture of innovation and tradition in an attempt to stabilise the minority replacement whilst allowing for the obvious abnormalities of the situation. Despite the benefits that could have been gained in regards to stability, the suggestion of Buchanan that James III received a magnificent funeral is hard to accept. The October parliament, which ‘ascertained the truth of the king’s death’, may have proven the most prominent time for a magnificent burial but the Treasurer’s Accounts for this month do not record any evidence of such. There is a very real possibility that Buchanan was retrospectively legitimising a rather messy period for the would-be prodigal king James IV.

Sixteenth-century historian Polydore Virgil relates that James IV’s death at Flodden on 9 September 1513 prevented the possibility of the glorious funeral he would have expected. His body was removed from the battlefield by the English to Sheen, where it lay unceremoniously

270 Burden, ‘Rewriting a Rite of Passage’, 14.
271 For further discussion of this see: Ibid, 13-29.
272 RPS, A1488/10/1, Declaration: regarding the death of James III and the articles of Aberdeen (Edinburgh, Parliament, 8 Oct 1488).
for at least two months, while Henry VIII attempted to have the excommunication lifted so that he could be buried with honours. The absence of a body around which to centre the funeral combined with the tragedy and confusion of the minority appears to have hampered any projection of authority. While a total lack of ceremony seems unlikely, there is little evidence to indicate that any occurred. James V was crowned on 21 September less than two weeks after the battle of Flodden, which suggests any funeral or memorial was probably postponed until after the coronation. The missing Treasurer’s Accounts from summer 1513 to 1515, therefore, undoubtedly hold crucial information of the manner in which Margaret Tudor and minority leaders represented royal authority in the interim prior to Albany’s arrival in 1515. The Exchequer Rolls survive in part and a payment was set up by the queen ‘at her time of bereavement and widowhood to Patrick, deacon of Restalrig,’ between summer 1513 and July 1515 to sustain the collegiate church to ensure the chaplains offered prayers and honours for the souls of both James IV and his father. Beyond this, the records are silent.

Nevertheless, the development of Cambuskenneth as a royal burial site, the expenses for the funeral of James IV’s brother in 1504 and the memorialisation James IV undertook, all offer interesting material for analysing how he used death and memorial in his representations of authority in the early sixteenth century. In 1502 the first entry specifically relating to the ‘lair’ or burial site of James IV was a payment of workmen for digging out and laying the lair at

273 Polydore Vergil, *The Anglica Historia of Polydore Vergil, A.D. 1485–1537*, ed. and trans. D. Hay (London, 1950), 221; Macdougall, *James IV*, 300. Macdougall states that permission was granted for James IV’s burial; however, in a recent article Tony Pollard has argued that despite this no such honourable burial occurred and James IV’s body rotted away at Sheen and the head may have been separated from the rest: Pollard, ‘The Sad Tale of James IV’s Body’, *BBC News Scotland* (9 Sept 2013), http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/uk-scotland-23993363. Accessed 20 Sept 2013.


275 While James IV and Margaret Tudor lost a number of children in infancy, there is no evidence to suggest what funeral ceremonial occurred. This is partially due to gaps in the records covering their deaths, but even their first born son James (James V’s older brother) just disappears from the records about a year after his birth with the last entries regarding the Prince dated 13 February 1508 (*TA*, Vol. IV, 33). Yet, Prince James was christened at Stirling castle chapel in 1507 amidst overt glory and at great expense including: £52, 14s. was spent on the prince’s cloth of gold trimmed with ermine; and the ‘gret cradil of stait’ decorated with ribbons, ermine, and gold and scarlet cloth, and held together with gilt nails, costing nearly £85 (*Ibid*, Vol. III, 272-7). Paper presented by author on this subject: ‘Royal Births and Baptisms in Scotland: Projections of Royal Authority or Private Sacrament?’ at *Representations of Authority to 1707: Scotland and her nearest neighbours Conference* (University of Stirling, August 2012), which is being developed for publication at a later date.
Cambuskenneth, a structure which appears to have been painted by David Pratt. Gaps in the *Treasurer’s Accounts* between 1506 and 1508 have meant a loss of main material purchases, but a later payment to an ‘Almayne’, probably a Flemish or German craftsman, working on the marble in the ‘kingis lair’ at least confirms the material used was marble. This missing account section could explain why there are no extant expenses for metalwork on the tomb despite the fact that, as Penman notes, it is highly likely that James IV was well aware of his father-in-law Henry VII’s great double tomb project at Westminster for himself and his wife, for which £1050 of the £1258 (sterling) spent was for metalwork.

The accounts have separate references to the making of the ‘sepultur’ and of a lair indicating the tomb was positioned in an alcove. The idea of a decorated niche, particularly as the tomb of his parents probably stood before the high altar, suggests a different position of burial chosen by James IV. Such alcove monuments for wealthy patrons have been found placed in the north chancel of late fifteenth and sixteenth-century English churches specifically so that their tombs would become the focus of the prayers of Easter and the Holy Week as the sepulchre of Christ. John Ireland’s *Meroure of Wysdome* and other later fifteenth-century theological works compiled in and around the court of James IV, despite emphasising the responsibilities of earth-bound kings and the supremacy of God, draw comparisons with Jesus and earthly kings as the fountain of justice. Overt demonstrations of piety are well known in relation to James IV and, while this tradition has been drawn from an English comparison, by placing his tomb thus he became the focal point of the most solemn prayers of the religious year and linked himself explicitly with Christ.

---

276 *TA*, Vol. II, 130, 140, 150, 289-90, 360. It has been commented that the tomb being built may actually have been for James IV’s father, but the language used in the *Treasurer’s Accounts* implies otherwise. It uses the terms ‘the kingis lair’ and ‘the kingis sepultur’ referring to living king; whereas, earlier financial accounts specify quite clearly whether the king being referred to is alive or dead with various terms, such as ‘quondam’ for late or ‘moderno’ for the living.


The nineteenth-century excavations at Cambuskenneth also found the skeleton of a child in the tomb of James III and Queen Margaret.\textsuperscript{281} If this child was one of James IV’s sons, and James IV was planning his own burial there, this certainly suggests a new program for royal burial at the abbey. This combined with his increasing focus on Stirling Castle and its surroundings reveal clear intentions for moulding the area into a royal show piece.\textsuperscript{282} From Cambuskenneth Abbey the newly completed great hall of Stirling Castle\textsuperscript{283} would have been clearly visible on the ridge overlooking primarily open hunting land, and the abbey would have provided perfect overspill accommodation or stopping off point en route to the castle. Moreover, the view from the large oriel window beside the head table of James’s magnificent great hall looks out across the burgh to the river, parkland, and tower of Cambuskenneth Abbey where his own tomb was being prepared to accompany those of his parents, and at least one of his infant children.\textsuperscript{284}

The records for James IV’s offerings for the souls of his parents and others, as well as other forms of remembrance and mourning assist in further developing an understanding of how James projected royal authority through funeral and memorial. The \textit{Registrum de Cambuskenneth} highlights James’s reconfirmation of the privileges of the abbey and the canons at the church of Kippen and requests that prayers be said for the souls of the king’s mother and father, as well as for the souls of their successors and predecessors.\textsuperscript{285} The \textit{Treasurer’s Accounts} have multiple entries recording offerings for James III and Margaret’s soul masses from 1488 fairly consistently, both separately and combined, such as a payment of £6, 13s. 4d. on 24

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{281} Alexander, ‘An Account of the Excavations of Cambuskenneth Abbey in May 1864’, 20-21.
\item \textsuperscript{282} TA, Vol. II, 130-2, 140, 150, 289-90, 360 (NB. The TA from 1502 to 1511 are not complete with two gaps between 1504 and 1506, and 1508 and 1511, and therefore the expenses on the tomb and preparations at Cambuskenneth are unlikely to be complete); Alexander, ‘An Account of the Excavations of Cambuskenneth’, 20-4; Laing, ‘Notes relating to the interment of King James III’, 28-9; Penman, ‘A Programme for Royal Tombs’, 252-3. On developments at Stirling under James IV (including royal lodgings, completing the Chapel Royal, and the foreworks) see: Dunbar, \textit{Scottish Royal Palaces}, 40-9; J. Harrison, \textit{Rebirth of a Palace: The Royal Court at Stirling Castle} (Historic Scotland, 2011), 15.
\item \textsuperscript{283} Completed between 1501 and 1503.
\item \textsuperscript{284} Alexander, ‘Excavations of Cambuskenneth’, 21; Dunbar, \textit{Scottish Royal Palaces}, p. 44; Harrison, \textit{Rebirth of a Palace}, 15. Thanks to Katherine Buchanan for inspiring me to look out of windows to find that perfect view. See Plate 4.
\item \textsuperscript{285} \textit{Registrum Monasterii de Cambuskenneth}, A.D. 1147–1535 (Edinburgh, 1872), no. 129.
\end{itemize}
\end{footnotesize}
January 1489 for Thomas Merschall to sing for the king and queen at Cambuskenneth.\textsuperscript{286} In 1488 there are three separate entries for the queen totalling £18, 11s. for soul masses, a priest at Stirling singing for her soul and a further payment for an obit and a priest.\textsuperscript{287} Whilst in 1491, 1492 and 1494, there are payments for the ‘kingis derige’ – probably entailing full Office for the Dead and \textit{Requiem Mass} – on the anniversary of James III’s murder at Sauchieburn on 11 June. In 1491–2 this was accompanied by ‘armis to set on torchis, candillis and alteris’ adding the stamps of the royal dynasty to these highly religious acts. This fits with James IV’s penitential offerings linked to his involvement in the death his father,\textsuperscript{288} as well as practices witnessed elsewhere in Europe at the time.

In November 1511 James IV provided a tomb cloth for James II’s tomb at Holyrood, perhaps for part of an elaborate ceremony on All Souls’ Eve. The black velvet cloth was lined and fringed and embroidered with the king’s arms in gold thread, red silk and yellow taffety and cost £43, 8s. 11d.\textsuperscript{289} Financial records also reveal numerous offerings for dirge masses for others, including the King and Queen of England, Bernard Stewart Lord of Aubigny and the king’s brother.\textsuperscript{290} James IV’s brother, James Stewart, duke of Ross and archbishop of St Andrews, died in Edinburgh in January 1504, and was buried at St Andrews under a vast Tournai limestone slab paid for by the duke prior to his death.\textsuperscript{291} On 13 January the \textit{Treasurer’s Accounts} record payment to Master Thomas Di[c]kson for the expenses accrued in bringing the body of the archbishop back to St Andrews for burial, and the journey included expenses ‘in fraucht’ or paying for passage over water, as well as preparation and carriage of the body and wax used along the way.\textsuperscript{292} The king and court also crossed the Forth at Queensferry and were

\textsuperscript{286} TA, Vol. I, 102.
\textsuperscript{287} Ibid, 89-91.
\textsuperscript{288} Macdougall, \textit{James IV}, 52-3.
\textsuperscript{289} TA, Vol. IV, 189.
\textsuperscript{292} T. Chalmers, 'James Stewart, duke of Ross (1476–1504), archbishop-designate of St Andrews’, in \textit{ODNB} (Sept 2012) \url{http://www.oxforddnb.com.ezproxy.stir.ac.uk/view/article/26477}. Accessed 2 June 2013. Chalmers suggests that he had a tomb made and imported from Bruges in 1498, when he was only 22 years old. Also see: Oram, ‘Bishops’ Tombs in Medieval Scotland’, in Penman (ed.), \textit{Monuments and Monumentality}, 183. Oram notes that the huge slab (3.175m x 2.32m) was cut to hold a monumental brass and the immense size would indicate that this could be reckoned as one of the largest of such brasses in Europe from this era.
\textsuperscript{292} TA, Vol. II, 415.
resident at Falkland at the time between his brother’s death and funeral, but the departure and
destination point of the journey for the body by water are unknown.\textsuperscript{293} The use of wax on this
journey could suggest either overnight vigils,\textsuperscript{294} or perhaps candles on the boat if the boat
carried him all the way round to St Andrews. On 18 January letters were sent out for attendance
at the archbishop’s ‘tyrment.’ Further expenses illustrate that the grey friars and priests of St
Andrews received over £100 for preparations for the funeral, near £70 was additionally spent on
torches and candles taken to St Andrews for the funeral and a further £28, 2s. spent on 303
‘dosane armes,’ which equates to 3,636.\textsuperscript{295} The court movement to within reasonable riding
distance of St Andrews and the letters sent out emphasise that James IV intended for his
brother’s funeral to be a very public display, and the phenomenal number of coats of arms\textsuperscript{296}
would likely have included the royal arms as well as Ross’s own arms as duke, as archbishop-
designate, and possibly of other religious houses – such as Holyrood, Dunfermline and
Arbroath of which he had been made commendator – and secular lordships, such as Brechin
granted to him in his infancy.\textsuperscript{297} This visual display of the coats of arms would have been a
clear demonstration of the power, not just for the young duke but also for the king.

The *Treasurer’s Accounts* also allude to James IV’s desire to adhere to contemporary
ideals of public mourning, through the purchasing of dule gowns at the time of the death of the
King of Denmark. Dule attire worth over £66 was purchased for the king, queen, Lady Gordon
and others.\textsuperscript{298} These purchases by James IV for the death of a fellow monarch\textsuperscript{299} add further
doubt to the observation of Buchanan, cited by Thomas, recording that the public wearing of
dule garments did not occur until the funeral of Queen Madeleine in the sixteenth century.
James IV made displays of remembrance and mourning as an adult that can indicate further
understanding of the significance of such ceremonial ritual in the projection of image. This

\textsuperscript{293} Ibid, 416.
\textsuperscript{294} Ibid, 257, 416-17. The number of arms used is not clear from the printed text, so this has been cross-
referenced with original manuscript which lists ‘iij‘iij dosane’: NAS, E21/6, f. 285, Treasurer’s Accounts,
September 1502–February 1504.
\textsuperscript{295} Ibid, 416.\textsuperscript{17} The number of arms used is not clear from the printed text, so this has been cross-
referenced with original manuscript which lists ‘iij‘iij dosane’: NAS, E21/6, f. 285, Treasurer’s Accounts,
September 1502–February 1504.
\textsuperscript{296} This is the highest number of arms for use in a funeral located across the four centuries.
\textsuperscript{297} Chalmers, ‘James Stewart, duke of Ross (1476–1504)’.
\textsuperscript{298} *TA*, Vol. IV, 422.
\textsuperscript{299} King of Denmark was also James IV’s uncle.
understanding, Penman has suggested, reveals the influence of Henry VII through his marriage to Margaret Tudor; however, it equally reflects the varying memorials put in place by earlier Scottish monarchs and consorts.

The details of the ceremonies may be ‘far from satisfactorily recorded’; however, in the first half of the fifteenth century the evidence that remains demonstrates the religious and secular developments of Scottish royal funerals even in complex minority situations. These funerals illustrate the involvement of widowed foreign queens in finalising arrangements, even drawing in new elements or developing existing ones, and in James II’s case the international resonance of his death through foreign extended family. All four kings had begun to plan for their deaths at an early stage, with evidence for tombs and even whole religious foundations being underway certainly for James I, II and IV, and most probably for James III alongside his queen. The loss of James IV’s body in 1513 and the apparent lack of ceremonial in the cases of James III and IV, however, epitomise the kind of crisis situation that surrounded the deaths of these monarchs and the ease with which the best made plans of any king could be unravelled following their death. While the funerals of James I and II appear to have been carried out with as much dignity as could be mustered in the aftermath of tragedy, the minority regimes of 1488 and 1513 appear to have struggled to use these occasions to restate royal authority in difficult times.

---

301 Edington, *Court and Culture*, 113.
Section V: The funerals of James V and those he buried, 1537–1543

Works by Thomas and Edington have shown the comparative wealth of material available surrounding the funerals of James V and the people he buried between 1537 and 1543, and utilising the financial accounts alongside Sir David Lindsay’s poem *The Testament of Squire Meldrum*, have sketched an outline of what may have occurred.\(^{302}\) As Lyon herald by this point, Lindsay was present at James V’s funeral and played a prominent part in the organisation,\(^{303}\) making the account valuable evidence. The near-contemporary collection of John Scrymgeour,\(^{304}\) containing an order of ceremony for heralds and pursuivants, holds key details that link to both Lindsay’s poem and the financial framework provided by the *Treasurer’s Accounts*.\(^{305}\) As with the poem, the funeral described is a noble heraldic one rather than a specifically royal one, nevertheless both give a contemporary Scottish herald’s view of how a heraldic funeral should be carried out and one presumes that an amplified version would have been conceived for the king. By reanalysing the finer detail of the extant financial material and heraldic funeral portrayed in sixteenth-century literature, this final section of the chapter builds upon the understanding of the ritual elements of royal death that have been observed in previous centuries.

Thomas highlights that John Leslie’s account of James V’s funeral in January 1543 tells of a procession from Falkland to Holyrood accompanied by torchbearers, members of the nobility, and ‘lamentable trumpetis’ and ‘qwisselis of dule’\(^{306}\). However, Leslie does not say that this journey from Falkland to Edinburgh by land was roughly seventy miles. The *Accounts of the Lord High Treasurer of Scotland* highlight a payment made to tell the ‘[...] gentill men in

---

\(^{302}\) Edington, *Court and Culture*, 112-14; Thomas, *Princelie Majestie*, 210-17.

\(^{303}\) Entry regarding Lyon Herald’s involvement in paying people or receiving goods, and for dule gown purchased for him: NAS, E21/40, f. 4v, 6v, Exchequer Records: Accounts of the Treasurer; *TA*, Vol. VIII, 142-3.

\(^{304}\) NLS, MS. Adv. 31.5.2, ff. 15-16v. See Appendix A for transcription. It is worth noting that a James Scrymgeour can be located in the financial accounts at the time of Madeleine’s funeral as receiving the black cloth for uniforms for the queen’s pages dule attire. NAS, E21/32, f. 20, Exchequer Records: Accounts of the Treasurer; *TA*, Vol. VII, 342.

\(^{305}\) *Ibid*, 141-167; NAS, E21/40, ff. 4r-14v. Note that the original manuscript has recently been re-foliated by an archivist following various anomalies with the folio numbering being highlighted by the author. The folio numbers used herein are the current ones following these amendments.

Fife for conveying the Kingis grace body fra Falkland to the ferry [...] 307 but even with the route shortened by the king’s body crossing the Forth it would have still been near forty miles. A logical symbolic stop on this route would be Dunfermline. 308 The abbey would have been roughly half way and would have been both large enough and prestigious enough to house the king’s body, as well as any entourage that accompanied it. Placing James’s body amongst the tombs of Saint Margaret, David I, Alexander III and Robert I for an overnight vigil, or perhaps longer, would have made a resonant dynastic statement. The use of the ferry to transport the body calls into question Leslie’s suggestion that the procession accompanied the king the whole route from one destination to the other. Messengers were sent to various parts of the country to summon nobles and lords to ‘[...] gif presence at the kingis grace eterement [...]’, 309 but these entries are not specifically dated. The entry regarding the message sent specifically to the men of Fife requesting that they accompany the king’s body to the ferry suggests that they accompanied the body at this stage, while the majority of the ‘procession’ met the king’s body on the other side of the Forth, particularly as there is no record of costs for a ‘procession’ crossing the Forth.

Various dates are recorded for James V’s death between 14 and 20 December, but he was not buried until around 8 or 9 January. 310 The payment for the ferry is dated 3 January, which would infer that the king lay presumably in state at Falkland for nearly three weeks while preparations for the ensuing ceremony took place. The Exchequer Rolls give little information for this ceremony, but they do have an entry regarding a payment to the chaplain of the chapel at Falkland Palace for conducting prayers ‘pro salute anime quondam domini nostri regis defuncti et domine nostre regine moderne’ (for the soul of the dead king and the health of the

307 Ibid, 143; NAS, E21/40, f. 6r.
308 See Map VI. Thomas suggests that the body crossed the Forth from Kinghorn; however, the account just states that the king’s body was taken to the ferry not where it sailed from and to.
309 NAS, E21/40, f. 6r; TA, Vol. VIII, 143.
310 The king’s death is dated 14 December by Leslie and in the Diurnal (the latter states 8 January for burial), 16 December is recorded in the Treasurer’s Accounts, and Robert Lindesay of Piscottie suggests 20 December: NAS, Exchequer Records: Accounts of the Treasurer, E21/40, f. 1; TA, Vol. VIII, 141; Leslie, Historie of Scotland, 212; Piscottie, Historie, 407-408; Diurnal, 25.
Unfortunately, the Treasurer’s Accounts do not make it clear whether the funeral preparations took place solely in Edinburgh or if some of the pomp had accompanied the procession from Falkland.

The cloth of estate was paid for on 21 December, along with a substantial amount of the black cloth of varying types delivered to the queen’s comptroller for the dule clothes of the queen, her ladies, and her servants, which was followed by a second batch paid for on 5 January. It is not clear in the accounts whether Marie de Guise, who had recently given birth to Mary at Linlithgow, went to Falkland or if she joined the procession once the king’s body had crossed the Forth. The dule gowns for her and her household were provided long before the king’s body had arrived in Edinburgh, but whether with the body or not she would have been expected to be in mourning. The items purchased after 5 January, however, indicate that the queen and her household joined the ‘procession’ at a later date as the queen’s ‘cheriot’ and harnessing for her horses was being covered with black cloth in preparation on or after this date, and it would seem unlikely that the queen made unnecessary journeys having recently given birth.

Leslie’s account of James V’s funeral records that torchbearers accompanied the procession and, while the Treasurer’s Accounts do not refer to wax or candles, the fragmentary Liber Emptorum of James V refers to four hundred torches being carried from the burgh to the monastery on 9 January 1543. Money can be found being distributed amongst the poor for the mass, procession and dirge confirming the inclusion of paid mourners—presumably outfitted in black – accompanying a procession through the burgh.

---

311 ER, Vol. XVIII, 19.
312 NAS, E21/40 f. 4r-8v; TA, Vol. VIII, 141-7.
313 Donaldson, James V–James VII, 63.
314 NAS, E33/2/4, Despence de la Maison Royale of Mary of Guise (incomplete), 1541–Feb 1543. This household account of Marie de Guise has large sections missing including the crucial November 1542 to February 1543, therefore, cannot provide proof of the queen’s movements.
316 There are two missing pages of the original Treasurer Account between small expenses for carving the tomb and payment of the ‘poll penny’ in or after the Mass (further discussion below).
317 Leslie, Historie, 259-60; NAS, E32/8, f. 127v, Exchequer Records: Libri Emporum.
318 NAS, E21/40, f. 6r; TA, Vol. VIII, 143.
been rooted in tradition at least as early as fourteenth century and Robert I, but most likely earlier. While their presence would have undoubtedly added to the elaborate nature of the procession, its sacral significance would not be wasted on its sixteenth-century viewers and participants. The shortest crossing would have meant that the ferry carrying James V docked at Queensferry, about ten miles from Edinburgh, and there may have been a preliminary stop somewhere on the edge of the burgh. The Trinity College foundation of Mary of Guelders was perfectly situated for such a pause. It would have provided suitably grand and austere surroundings for the king’s body to be laid in state for a further vigil, perhaps the first for Marie de Guise if she and her ladies had joined the procession near Edinburgh, and would have allowed a full day for the grand sombre procession through the town.

The processions for Queen Madeleine (d. July 1537) and Margaret Tudor (d. October 1541) had much shorter distances to travel, the former died in Edinburgh where she would be buried and the latter at Methven just seven miles from her resting place at Perth. The preparations, in particular the provision of dule attire and the range of people invited to attend, imply that the aim was to make a magnificent sombre display even if over a relatively short distance. In summer 1537 Madeleine had only been in Scotland around seven weeks prior to her death and a large entourage still waited in attendance for her coronation and entry which would never occur. The extensive lists of black cloth and dule attire purchased included those of four French ladies and two ladies of honour, with the latter receiving fur-lined hoods for their gowns, indicating the importance of female mourners for the young queen. The Treasurer’s Accounts also emphasise that a large number of prominent members of the clergy were requested to attend. It must be noted that messengers were paid for this task on 13 July, just one day prior to the date Thomas has proposed for the funeral due to the expenses for the funeral petering out on this date. The messages were being sent as far afield as the abbeys of Melrose

---

319 See above Chapter I, Section II, 43.
320 Duffy, Stripping the Altars, 361-2.
and Dryburgh. At approximately 45 miles from Edinburgh, it would have taken near two days for the messages to reach these border towns let alone the abbots’ return, which would likely have been slower. While the exact dating for the funeral is not known, a week between funeral and burial for a major royal figure would have been relatively short in Scottish terms, and such ceremonies in France were extended to elaborate lengths by the mid-sixteenth century.324

In Margaret Tudor’s case, in 1541, the seven mile journey from Methven to Perth could be achieved easily in a day; however, there is perhaps as much as three weeks between her death and burial. This elucidates a continued understanding of the impact of extending the time span of funeral ceremonial,325 as well as indicating the funeral was of significant grandeur to require substantial planning. The accounts reveal that black attire of silk and velvet, costing £35, 15s. 6d., was purchased for the king on 25 October, then on the last day of October £25, 15s. was spent on “ane dule goune, huid and cote” as well as “twa dule bonettis”.326 Yet, the main bulk of the purchases are dated to November, including £208, 6s. spent on ‘fute mantallis’, ‘harnessingis’, ‘renzeis of silk’ and French black cloth ‘to cover the Queinis chariot’ for Queen Marie and her ladies.327 As with Madeleine’s funeral the ladies of the court, this time headed by the queen, were central to the procession. This proximity of the women of the court to the corpse can also be found featuring in the funeral of Margaret Tudor’s mother, Queen Elizabeth, wife of Henry VII, who died in 1503. On this occasion the ladies of the court and ‘genty!women’ rode in the procession on ‘Charys’ and ‘palffreyes’ decorated with black cloth in close proximity to the body and effigy of the queen.328

The messages sent out summoning the earls and lords of the realm to Margaret’s funeral were not recorded until 1 and 5 of November, suggesting that the ceremony cannot have occurred until later in the month.329 There are also records regarding the carriage and hangings

324 Gieseys provides a case study of the funeral of Francis I (d. 1547) to introduce the epitome of French Renaissance royal funerals: *The Royal Funeral Ceremony*, 1-17.
325 Griffiths, ‘Succession and the Royal Dead’, 103.
of tapestries, the carriage of chapel ‘gair’ and one for the carriage of the queen’s ‘gair’ between 16 November to 24 December. Unfortunately, none of these carriage payments indicate the places the loads were being moved between, but the reference to 16 November is intriguing. This was Saint Margaret’s feast day and James V may have specifically chosen this significant day in the national religious calendar to hold his mother’s funeral, particularly as the saint was his mother’s namesake. Such practice can be found in contemporary English royal burials, such as the burial of Henry VII’s eldest son, Arthur, whose funeral was postponed over three weeks so that it would coincide with St George’s day. In James V’s case the burial of his mother during the octave of the feast of St Margaret would have made a determined statement about his own dynastic heritage in the face of the loss of two heirs in rapid succession.

Leslie’s account of Margaret’s burial, while brief, offers an insight into where the dowager queen was laid to rest:

The grafe in the Chartusianis of S. Johnes toune [Perth], quhilke couerit King James the first, to the Quene was preparet for honouris cause; the quha in the effairis of the Realme war noble and seine lustie and cleirlie schine, als thair bodies mycht be includet in the boundes of this sam sepulchre ryctuouslie.

The use of James I’s tomb for the burial of Margaret may appear an odd choice, but it is not clear whether James IV’s tomb was completed, and his body was never laid to rest there. The choice of Perth rather than Holyrood, which was becoming a royal mausoleum under James V with his first wife and children laid to rest there, could imply that the decision was made by

---

331 The household accounts of Marie de Guise are extremely patchy, the months of September and November 1541 survive; however, they do not suggest a long term movement of the queen’s household (although the queen may have moved with a smaller group for the funeral). The lists of expenses throughout November are recorded at ‘Lisco’ [French derivative of Linlithgow], but unfortunately neither the accounts for October nor December survive to build a better picture of her household’s movements: NAS, E33/2/2, Nov 1541, ff. 1r-22v, Despence de la Maison Royale of Mary of Guise (incomplete), April 1541-May 1542.
332 If not on the actual saint’s day, the funeral may have been held in the octave of this feast.
333 Griffiths, ‘Succession and the Royal Dead’, 102.
334 James V and Marie de Guise’s two infant sons passed away within forty-eight hours of each other, according to Pitscottie, in April 1541, but little evidence can be found in regards to the funeral. The only reference in the financial accounts is for ‘ane cap of leid that my lord Duke was buriit in’, which is listed alongside a brief entry regarding Prince James’s baptism. TA, Vol. VII, 442; Pitscottie, Historie, Vol. I, 394; Thomas, Princelie Majestie, 211.
335 Leslie, Historie, 243-4.
Margaret. Placing Margaret in James I’s tomb along with Joan would not only have cut costs, it firmly drew further dynastic attention to the longevity of the Stewart dynasty. In 1543 the Treasurer’s Accounts record that a ‘carvour’ was paid for an epitaph ‘in Roman letters’ and a lion above a crown for James V’s tomb. The fact that these expenses were finishing touches rather than materials could be due to the missing pages from the accounts, but could equally suggest that the tomb was well on its way to being complete. Madeleine’s death so soon after her arrival would have meant that a tomb must have been installed significantly later and its highly probable that James V began a joint tomb at Holyrood with his first wife despite remarriage, as was found in the case of many remarried royals. Further details of the tomb – another victim of the Reformation and later damage – are unknown, but it was clearly the body or the effigy that was the central focus in the ceremonies for both Madeleine and James, and probably also for Margaret.

In the case of Madeleine and James V a ‘castrum deloris’ or ‘chapelle ardent’ was constructed, and this newly adopted term for the decorative structure gives a clear impression of its size and grandeur. For Madeleine the structure itself would have been glittering with candlelight and colour in the black-clothed surroundings, with two hundred ‘prekattis’ and four hundred coats of arms. These escutcheons would have placed palpable visual symbols of power – most likely displaying the combined arms of Scotland and France – at the centre of the prayer and mourning for an international audience. It is not clear whether Madeleine’s body lay in view under the structure and no effigy appears amongst the expenses. However, a large amount was spent on the provision of a black and purple cloth embroidered with ‘sex grete armys and sex small’ along with one large cross and one small cross suggestive of an elaborate
pall cloth draped over the coffin, rather than an effigy.\textsuperscript{341} The flickering centrepiece of Holyrood abbey was a sombre but very real statement of James V’s royal authority, and her memorial ceremonies each year would continue to restate this with up to seventy-two escutcheons used in the ceremonial that involved the abbey being re-hung in black and mass sung by 150 to 200 chaplains.\textsuperscript{342}

The enormous quantities of black cloth and dule attire purchased in July 1537 leads near-contemporary Buchanan to comment that the very public nature of the mourning and the wearing of dule clothes on such a scale had rarely been seen in Scotland.\textsuperscript{343} While there is plenty of evidence to argue that this statement is not true, there was a large outpouring of public grief in print that was unknown earlier. Lindsay composed ‘The Deploratioun of the Deith of Quene Magdalene’, primarily describing the preparations for the queen’s first formal entry, which he was probably involved in organising, and how the joy was turned to grief before the country had chance to welcome the queen.\textsuperscript{344} The death of Madeleine had a ripple effect across the channel and the \textit{Cronique du Roy François, premier de ce nom} records her death inspiring poetry, deplorations and epitaphs.\textsuperscript{345} Alongside Lindsay’s Scottish literary offering there were a number of French and Latin poems and epitaphs. These included three Latin epitaphs appended to a document describing Scotland to the young queen by Jehan Desmontiers, which was not printed until after her death,\textsuperscript{346} and poems by the likes of Giles Corozet.\textsuperscript{347} The advent of print meant that such literary offerings of remembrance were more readily and widely available, but it was volume and availability that were new rather than the medium. Bower records a number of epitaphs, including one of eighty-eight lines, composed in memory of Robert Bruce, and Pluscarden records that James II had an epitaph in memory of his sister, Margaret dauphin of

\textsuperscript{341} NAS, E21/32, f. 26; \textit{TA}, Vol. VI, 352.
\textsuperscript{342} \textit{Ibid}, Vol. VI, 422-3; Vol. VII, 181, 321, 466; Vol. VIII, 90-91; NAS, E31/8, ff. 126v, 131v.
\textsuperscript{344} Lindsay, \textit{Selected Poems}, 101-108.
\textsuperscript{345} \textit{Cronique du Roy François, premier de ce nom}. Publiée pour la première fois d’après un manuscrit de la Bibliothèque Impériale, ed. G. Giffrey (Paris, 1860), 216-17.
\textsuperscript{346} Both the Latin and translations of these epitaphs can be found in: A.H. Miller, ‘Scotland Described for Queen Magdalene: a curious volume’, \textit{SHR}, Vol. I (1904), 37-8.
\textsuperscript{347} Giles Corozet, \textit{Deploration fur le treſpas de tref noble Princeſſe dame Magdeleine de France Royne Defcoce} (Paris, 1537); also found in the \textit{Cronique du Roy François}, 217-20.
France, translated into Scots. Nevertheless, the outpouring of printed memorials for the young queen illuminates the fact that a wider sixteenth-century European audience was aware of what was going on in Scotland, making the projection of image all the more important.

A further entry reveals that ‘ane grete suerd’ was carried to and from the abbey at the time of Madeleine’s funeral on the king’s command. This entry is then followed by the king receiving ‘mailze and ane hudskull’ at the abbey, as well as his saddle being newly covered with black. There were also nine full outfits in black purchased for nine pages of the queen and ten black coats for the king’s pages, the former were provided with black caps. The division of the clothing for the king’s and queen’s pages could imply that they had representative arms upon their livery. While the heraldic funerals described in Lindsay and Scrymgeour were for knights, it would appear that the king or a representative may have ridden in the funeral procession in knightly attire with the sword carried before him. This could have been the papal sword gifted to James V in 1537. The account does not specify a particular sword but having recently received this honour (while in France) one could conclude that James V would have taken the opportunity to parade this symbol of international acclamation. Such a display would have amplified the royal power and status of the king for the French visitors, while suitably honouring the young queen.

The heraldic aspects of James V’s own funeral in January 1543 were unsurprisingly prominent. The procession to the church included the Lyon herald accompanied by the heralds of Rothesay, Snowdon, Ross, Albany and Marchmont; the Unicorn pursuivant along with those of Carrick, Bute, Dingwall, Ormond and Kintyre; and four macebearers, all of whom were provided with fine black dule wear and possibly carrying a black paill over the king. In addition there were 648 great and small arms, a black velvet cloth of state with a white satin cross, and a painted banner of ‘gold and fyne colLOURis’ with a coat of arms in cloth of gold, red

---

satin and purple taffety. The full extent of the symbolism used in this decoration is not recorded, but alongside the royal Scottish lion, unicorns and thistles, the emblems of chivalric Orders that James V belonged – such as the Order of St Michael and of the Garter – and those of the houses he married into were likely to have been represented alongside lands under crown control. The marginalia around the title pages of one of the household books in the latter years of James’s reign included sketches of a chained unicorn, the Scottish thistle and a Tudor rose amongst others, and are certainly suggestive of the chivalric culture in which such symbols of royal authority were dominant. All this heraldic display surrounded a ‘dolorus chapell’ designed to hold candles decorated in black with clubs and spears, under which lay an effigy of James V with painted replica crown and sceptre. The effigy with its mock regalia provided an embodiment of royal authority surrounded by the symbols of his majesty and dynastic heritage.

Although James V was only thirty years old when he died, the large doctor’s fee paid shortly after his death is a reminder of the illness that caused the king’s death. In addition to damage to his body through disease, there were four weeks between his death and burial, and so the body would certainly have required embalming, while evidence implies that king’s body was encased in lead. The effigy, therefore, may have been provided for purely practical reasons of replacing the body as a focus of prayer. Evidence from earlier funerals has indicated that such effigy usage had been found in previous centuries and that the physical presence of a visible body or representation of it was central to this final projection of authority. The use of an effigy also calls upon the contemporary ideas regarding the king’s two bodies. In France particularly, this led to a splitting of the ceremony between mourning the body and celebrating the continuation through the effigy, from which the cries of ‘Le Roi est Mort. Vive le Roi!’ evolved, all of which was showcased in the funeral of James V’s father-in-law, Francis I, in

353 NAS, E21/40, f. 4r-v, 6v; TA, Vol. VIII, 141-2.
354 See Plate 5. These sketches accompany the heading for the annual ‘spices and chandlery’ section of the household account, and there is also a sketch of a woman with a headdress topped with a cross and cross around her neck pushing a dagger into her chest, the latter’s significance is less clear. See also Thomas, Princelie Majestie, 202-204.
355 NAS, E21/40, f. 4r-v; TA, Vol. VIII, 141.
356 Ibid, p. 148; NAS, E21/40, ff. 9r-10v.
Thomas proposes that the evidence for such ideology in Scotland is not strong but that James V’s French connections made knowledge of such concepts highly likely. However, the influx of continental ideologies had not begun with James V crossing the channel. Throughout the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries there is evidence of various ideals regarding kingship and theology of rulership being drawn into the court. Gilbert Hay and John Ireland, amongst other fifteenth-century scholars and writers, showed understanding of the ideas of the king’s two bodies, even if their use of such ideologies were ‘essentially pragmatic.’ Neither expounded quasi-divine absolute right to the throne in the mid to late fifteenth century, but the concepts that fuelled the funerary developments in France and England had long been circulating in Scotland. Moreover, while an effigy was clearly provided for James, the evidence implies this was not the case for his young wife Madeleine. This certainly draws attention to the effigy usage and possible ideologies connected to it as it would seem to have been a practice reserved for the king only.

One key issue that faced James V on his deathbed which, according to his alleged last words of ‘it come withe ane lase, it will pase withe ane lase’, plagued him to the end, was that of succession and the continuity of his hereditary line. Ultimately, all the elaborate demonstrations of royal authority would mean nothing if his dynasty was to end at his death and all the hopes rested on a baby girl. While the widowed queen Marie was clearly prominent in the display and processional, it is not clear whether the infant Mary was present and there were already signs of the ensuing power play that was to commence once the burial was over. The other prominent figure who vied for power with his own displays was Governor Arran, who purchased ‘ane dule cape of srait’ along with dule attire in fine Paris black cloth with a Spanish cloak, and outfitted his wife, her ladies, kin and adherents with his newly acquired access to crown funds. In addition, he took a prominent part in the funeral ceremony offering up the

---

361 NAS, E21/40, ff. 13r-14v; TA, Vol. VIII, 163-5.
‘poll penny’ and the missing pages may have indicated further involvement. Thomas comments that the disbandment of James V’s household following the burial could be indicative of the ceremony of breaking the staffs of office to the cries of ‘Le Roi est Mort’; however, the celebratory cries would have had an obvious difference as it would have been ‘Vive la royne!’ While such a show would have emphasised the continuation of the Stewart line through the infant queen, the wholesale disbandment of the royal household was at the behest of the governor. Therefore, the overt statement of dynastic royal authority made by James V, the Lyon herald and Marie de Guise at the funeral, was shaped as much by the threats to dynastic continuity, as the belief in any persisting stability provided by the ceremonies.

362 Ibid, 143; NAS, E21/40, f. 6r.
363 Thomas, Princelie Majestie, 214-16.
Chapter 1: Conclusion

Edington states that James V’s funeral was a ‘crucial expression of kingship’ over which he could have little control. In many ways such a statement could be made about all of the monarchs whose funerals have been addressed here, especially with little in the way of official wills to outline what the individuals had requested at their funeral. However, even with the youngest monarchs – James II and James V – there are clear implications that plans were already being laid out in preparation for death. The frequency of early deaths and long minorities, changing dynasties, and political complexities that are found across the centuries certainly present challenges for the utilisation of the funeral ceremony as a comprehensive representation of authority for the Scottish monarchy. Nevertheless, the prominence of widowed queen consorts and other minority figures in the orchestration of minority funerals, particularly in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, were likely to have provided the impetus behind some symbolic changes and developments. There are certainly occasions where full advantage of the commemoration of monarchs through elaborate funeral ceremonies was not taken, or the lack of evidence suggests this was the case, for James III and IV. Yet, the evidence for funerals either side of these and the use of display, memorial and mourning of other royals during a king’s lifetime can certainly provide an outline of what being ‘honourably buried’ as a Scottish royal entailed, how this developed over the centuries, and how effectively funerals were used to project royal authority.

From the thirteenth century there were key elements already in place or emerging to prominence, including the procession, separation of heart and body, vigils and clear emphasis upon succession. Of these only the separation of the heart and body appears to fade by the sixteenth century with the last confirmed separation for a Scottish monarch being that for James I in 1437. The culture of separate heart burial was still prominent for knights and nobility in the

---

364 Edington, Court and Culture, 112.
365 Perhaps the king for whom we have most in the way of extant instruction is Robert Bruce, see above Chapter 1, Section II.
366 Important to note that the changes of dynasty were all by natural succession and ending of lines rather than forcible removal; however, there were of course forcible removals during the fifteenth-century Stewarts.
sixteenth century, as the practice occurs in Lindsay’s poem Testament of Squyer Meldrum, and it would appear James V’s entrails were removed and he was embalmed.\textsuperscript{367} The value of intercession, the increase of prayers and public mourning were consistently important to various ceremonial choices in regards to the funerals of Scottish monarchs across the whole period. The use of candles and torches, offerings and prayers, long-term memorial practices, processions, mourners – more particularly poor mourners – and vigils, as well as the choice of burial site, were often fuelled by religious beliefs and practices as much as the more grandiose ideas of royal representation of authority. As Simpson has noted, modern day scholars may struggle with ‘affirming that the primary impulse in the king’s thinking was religion’.\textsuperscript{368} Yet, the importance of piety and the contemporary desire to speed past purgatory to heaven must not be underestimated. Piety was a holy tool of princely propaganda, but this was primarily due to its potency among society and very real belief in the benefits beyond life.

There were more secular expressions of power, authority, royalty and hereditary right exposed throughout these centuries too. The processions mirrored the manner of itinerant kingship so prevalent in governing Scotland, particularly in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries. Robert Bruce and Robert II made their final journeys through their familial heart lands and across the central zone of power in the realm. While the fifteenth and sixteenth-century burials of James II and Mary, and Madeleine and James V emphasised the increasing prominence of Edinburgh as the capital and seat of administration, and the use of a procession through the burgh to Holyrood reflects the public involvement in grief. The actual organiser of each ceremony is not possible to trace throughout; however, the ‘overseer’ of Robert I’s funeral, David de Barclay, was a royal official and the Steward of Prince David’s household. Those figures receiving large fees or reimbursements for the organisation of the funerals of Robert II and Mary of Guelders were also royal officials. By the sixteenth century, it appears that the role of funeral coordinator lay with the Lyon herald, as David Lindsay certainly received fees in relation to James V’s funeral and was likely involved in the preparations for Madeleine’s

\textsuperscript{367} Lindsay, Selected Poems, 176; Thomas, Princelie Majestie, 214-15.
\textsuperscript{368} Simpson, ‘The Heart of Robert I’, 179.
funeral. On the occasions where mourners are mentioned, it is clear that high status relatives, such as William I’s brother, earl David, Robert the Steward in the case of Robert I, and widowed consorts such as Ermengarde, Joan Beaufort, Mary of Guelders and Marie de Guise, played prominent roles and status determined those in closest proximity to the dead.

Other secular aspects of the ceremony, such as the encroachment of heraldic symbology and practice, were visible as early as 1329 when black-clad knights took part in the funeral of Bruce. However, these knights may well have held specific spiritual value if they were linked to the subsequent travels of Bruce’s heart. The use of heraldic symbols was increasing throughout the era with the flourishing heraldic culture of the continent reaching Scottish shores in treatises and poetry, and likely appearing to identify familial figures on tomb chests from the fourteenth century or earlier. The use of heraldic escutcheons in memorials and funerals are first explicitly mentioned with Mary of Guelders and James II, both heavily influenced by her Burgundian background, and this usage escalates across the fifteenth century.369 From the offerings of cloth made by the Steward and others in 1329 to the sword and helm of Madeleine’s funeral and the clubs and spears adorning James V’s ‘castrum deloris’ there are clear hints at the ceremonial found in the fourteenth-century Liber Regie Capelle, featuring the offering of heraldic accoutrements. This act of offering the king’s armour during the requiem mass is not something that can be proven without doubt in any of the ceremonies that have been discussed here. Yet, sixteenth-century Scottish heraldic literature, such as John Scrymgeour’s collection and David Lindsay’s poetry, show a full awareness of this element of funerary ritual, and the funerals of other earlier kings, including Robert I and James II, have evidence suggestive of the earlier arrival of this aspect in the Scottish royal funeral ceremonial. These methods of heraldic display made parallel statements of individual royal dynastic power and a Scottish immersion in the wider European culture.

The ideologies circulating in sixteenth-century Europe regarding the king’s two bodies and effigy usage – particularly those emanating from France with the complex and elaborate funeral of François I in 1547 – are hard to quantify absolutely within Scottish royal practice.

369 For more on the development of heraldic symbology and royal iconography see: Chapter 3, passim.
There are a number of occasions when the practical use of an effigy as a body ‘replacement’ would have seemed likely, had the display of the physical body been required. Yet, while there were vigils and a centralising of prayers around a coffin on a bier or under a *chapelle ardent*, the image from Bower’s ‘working’ chronicle that portrays Alexander III’s burial shows a coffin covered with a pall cloth decorated with a cross. The sketch must be considered in the context of the 1440s when it was drawn, as much as the era it intends to represent, and may indicate that no effigy was utilised prior to this. Nevertheless, the introduction of the effigy in the English funeral in 1327 following the death of Edward II does raise the possibility that Robert I’s funeral, where the king’s body travelled a long distance and may have been deformed, saw such an introduction. The evidence for James II with the ‘satyn figury’, armour and clothing purchased for the dead king all point to an effigy or body dressed in armour in 1460, and by this point the ideological grounding was certainly circling in the consciousness of Scottish elites. The distinct lack of information of James III and James IV leaves a blank where, had effigies been used, we might have seen the clearest expression of this ideology. If Margaret Tudor, or other minority leaders, had provided an effigy around which to focus prayers in 1513, this would have emphasised the continuance of the body politic while the body natural had been forcibly removed. By 1543 and the burial of James V, the effigy was central to the mourning of the king but cannot be confirmed for the consort, making the adoption of the idea of the king’s two bodies ever more likely by this stage.

James V’s effigy had regalia made and painted for it providing a visual embodiment of royal authority amidst a plethora of royal symbols, but unfortunately, the significance of the use of regalia in Scottish monarch’s funerals is not something that can be easily deciphered from the extant material without a considerable supposition. The excavation of Robert I’s tomb in the nineteenth century revealed a lead crown, presumably once decorated. The financial records do not list mock regalia or specific clothing made, but the undeniable opulence and
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370 For example, the distance travelled by Alexander III’s and Robert II’s body, the fact that Bruce’s corpse may have been disfigured with illness and the mutilation of James I’s body in the murder of 1437 all would suggest the requirement of an effigy if there was a practice of having the body on show.

demonstrations of royalty of Robert I’s funeral make it very hard to believe that full advantage of the regalia was not taken at the burial ceremony. The pretensions of subsequent monarchs would imply that the opportunity to emphasise the full regal qualities of the deceased would not be one easily missed. Particularly in the case of Robert II, who buried the first fully anointed king of Scotland, David II, and though the extant records cannot prove what form this ceremony took, it is unlikely that Robert II did not advertise the regal status of his predecessor to amplify his own status.

The use of regalia cannot be deduced from the records of Robert II’s funeral, but it is this ceremony which reveals one of the clearest attempts to link death with the succession of his heir through his choice of burial site. Scone was the ancient site of royal inauguration in Scotland and a prominent site for political activity during the reigns of the early Stewarts, in a manner reminiscent of earlier ‘colloquia’ and outdoor gatherings of the estates of the realm. The political realities of 1390 challenged the smooth succession from one monarch to the next; but this strengthens the argument for Robert II’s keen understanding of the stabilising and legitimizing qualities of ceremonial occasions and the importance of the place. Robert II cannot have been anything but sorely aware of the potential political crisis that loomed as his sons vied for power in the closing years of his life; therefore, the focus upon Scone can be suggested as this king’s final attempt to offer his fledgling dynasty at least the facade of stability.

This need to project an image of stability in times of crisis was a recurring theme for the Scottish monarchy, and one which they could not always achieve, particularly in 1406, 1488 and 1513. A fully formed understanding of the employment of funeral ceremonial in the securing of the succession of the following monarch in medieval Scotland may be fraught by the lack of extant material, but the evidence needs to be carefully considered alongside that of the rituals of accession so that the contemporary awareness of the importance of the funeral and memorial ceremonies can be fully assessed, as the next chapter on inaugurations and coronations will further illuminate.
Chapter 2: Making Kings from c. 1214 to 1567

‘[...] some ceremonyes accustabyley used at the Coronatioune of theyre Princes weere omytted and mony reteyned [...]’

When Sir Nicholas Throckmorton wrote to Queen Elizabeth I regarding the coronation ceremony of James VI in 1567, his statement regarding aspects that were omitted and retained is unknowingly helpful in its recognition that there were ‘accustabyle’ or customary elements to the Scottish ceremony. But what were these customary elements? Would Throckmorton have really been fully versed in the customs of the Scottish ceremony as an English observer? A glance at the current historiography of Scottish inaugural ceremonial highlights that the only studies which attempt to cover a broad time span were published in the first decade of the twentieth century. Indeed, all three of these studies hurry through from the inauguration of Alexander III in 1249 to the late sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. Moreover, the majority of more recent studies generally either focus on the inaugural ceremonies of Scottish monarchs from the earliest recorded, that of Aedan c. 542 to Alexander III in 1249, or alternatively consider individual ceremonies in the sixteenth century, particularly work by Lynch upon ‘the first Protestant coronation’ in 1567. Roderick Lyall’s work, which assesses the variations on a ‘medieval’ order of ceremony found in a number of seventeenth-century heraldic collections, has illuminated the potential for further discoveries between these two mileposts of 1249 and 1567; however, Lyall’s work focuses on a specific selection of sources rather than the wider pattern of development of the ceremony. Between 1214 and 1567 nine of the fifteen monarchs
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1 TNA, SP52/14, f.43, State Papers Scotland Series I Elizabeth I, Letter from Throckmorton to Elizabeth, Edinburgh, 31 July 1567.
3 Such as: Legge, ‘Coronation of Alexander III,’’ 73-82; Bannerman, ‘The King’s Poet,’ 120-49; N. Aitchison, Scotland’s Stone of Destiny; Duncan, Kingship of the Scots, 127-50; Welander, Breeze, and Clancy (eds), The Stone of Destiny.
inaugurated or crowned were minors. Seven of these minors were under ten years of age, with three of the seven being crowned as infants before they were two years old. Furthermore, the period also saw two changes of dynasty, two English sponsored kings, three long periods of absentee kingship, a number of violent royal deaths, a couple of depositions, one queen regnant, and the Reformation. This chapter intends to build upon the existing literature to better understand the developments of the Scottish coronation ceremony (in short, what was ‘accustablye’ to be ‘omitted’ and ‘reteyned’ by 1567) and how royal authority was projected in the making of Scottish kings against the context of the many challenges to succession, power and stability.

6 Alexander II, inaugurated aged 16 in 1214; Alexander III, inaugurated aged 8 in 1249; David II, king from age of 5 in 1329 and crowned aged 7 in 1331; James II, crowned aged 6 in 1437; James III, crowned aged 9 in 1460; James IV crowned aged 15 in 1488; James V, crowned aged 13 – 14 months in 1513; Mary Queen of Scots, queen at approximately 9 days in Dec 1542 and crowned aged 9 months in 1543; and James VI, crowned aged under 18 months in 1567. [It could be made 10 minors if the anomaly of James I is discussed, as in 1406 at the age of 12 he was king in name. When Robert III died, however, James I had been captured by the English and was not crowned king until his thirtieth year in 1424.]

7 The official forced abdication of Mary in 1567 was a clear deposition of a monarch; the overthrow of James III through ‘murder’ at Sauchieburn at the hand of rebels led by his son was essentially a deposition, although they might not have intended for his death.
Section I: Pre-Anointing: The Inaugurations of Scottish Kings, c. 574–c.1306

The historians of the Scottish ‘coronation’ begin their discussions with the inauguration or ordination of King Aëdan (c. 574) at the hand of St. Columba that can be found in Adaman’s life of the saint from the late seventh century.\(^8\) If accurate, this event is the first recorded inauguration of a king by an ecclesiastic, not just in Scotland but in Europe. In this account, at the behest of an angel of God, Columba sailed to Iona:

> [...] and there ordained [...] Aedhan [sic] to be king [...] and laying his hand upon his head, he ordained and blessed him.\(^9\)

The role of the ecclesiastic in this ceremony is paramount but the fact that this comes from a saint’s life written by another saint means that caution must be used in taking this account at face value. Cooper and Stuart also draw in evidence from a mid-eleventh-century Northumbrian pontifical that indicates the process of inauguration, which they present as a ten point list. Their use of this source is justified through the strong links found between Northumbria and Iona, and it is suggested that this document may have been copied or developed from a manuscript originally used at Iona.\(^10\)

The list is made up of an election, white robes being invested upon the king-elect, use of an inaugural stone, an oath, an assembly of people of the realm, investiture with a sceptre or rod, investiture with a sword, recitation of genealogy, Mass, and lastly feasting. This list includes many elements that will be found to continue in prominence, but is also noticeably lacking in any mention of anointing or crowning, as found in Irish ceremonies.\(^11\) These two aspects can be found dominant in French and English *ordines* and ceremonies from as early as
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the eighth and ninth centuries, but remained absent from the Scottish ceremony until the fourteenth century and the 1329 Papal Bull of Unction. There was, however, a persistent desire to attain this rite from the Pope that can be found from Alexander II onwards and the use of crown-wearing, even if not crowning itself, in imagery and ceremony was rising to prominence through the Canmore line. The inauguration of Alexander II took place at Scone, the traditional site for the making of Scottish kings and the predominant site for early medieval gatherings of the political community. The ceremony occurred the day after the death of his father in 1214, demonstrating that the point of legal accession at this time in Scotland appears to have been the inaugural ceremony. The rapid moves to have Alexander II ‘raised to the throne’ were, therefore, hardly surprising in a realm where clear threats to the succession remained potent. A further reason for the haste with which Alexander was taken to Scone could be linked to the dates involved and subtler ceremonial meanings. William died on 4 December 1214, and the following day would have been the twenty-fifth anniversary of the Quitclaim of Canterbury on 5 December 1189. This saw William’s realm restored following the Treaty of Falaise in 1174, and holding the inauguration on this day would have emphasised the regaining of independent royal authority at the point of transfer of power.

_Gesta Annalia_ and Bower both suggest that the occasion was one with more ‘pomp and ceremony’ or ‘grandeur and glory’ than any before it, and it was followed by three days of
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feasting prior to the party joining the sombre funeral procession heading from Scone to Arbroath.\textsuperscript{18} The finer details of how this ceremony was more glorious than what had gone before are lacking in extant material; however, there are facts to consider as to how it may have been so. William I was an old man when he died in 1214 and had suffered bouts of sickness before Alexander’s birth in 1198.\textsuperscript{19} William was definitely concerned about the succession of his son and the projection of his royal status. For example, he arranged for his nobles to publicly swear fealty to Alexander in 1201, as well as securing a marriage for his son, who was also knighted in London.\textsuperscript{20} There are a number of reasons why William’s own experiences may have prompted him to plan an event with more pomp and ceremony. The length of his reign could also have allowed for the acceptance of new ceremonial elements; particularly as there is little evidence to suggest such ceremonies in the eleventh and twelfth centuries were well recorded, and in the near fifty years William had been king the form and structure of the ceremony would have become a distant memory.\textsuperscript{21} 

It is certain that during his lifetime King William I received a papal gift of a golden rose, though the chronicles seem to disagree on the details of the event.\textsuperscript{22} Fifteenth and sixteenth-century writers record that the rose was ‘a marvellously-fashioned and valuable gold rose to fix upon his sceptre or golden wand,’ and ‘of gold [...] of balsamon fulfillit [...] and als odour sweit [...].’\textsuperscript{23} These descriptions fit with Burns’ descriptions of the blessing of the papal rose, a process which involved prayers, blessings with Holy water, incensing, as well as the

\textsuperscript{18} Ibid; Chron. Bower, Vol. V, 3.  
\textsuperscript{20} Oram, Alexander II 1214–1249, 14-24. See above Chapter I, Section I, 26-7.  
\textsuperscript{21} A.A.M. Duncan, ‘Making a King at Scone in the Thirteenth Century’ in Welander, Breeze and Clancy (eds), The Stone of Destiny, 139-40.  
\textsuperscript{22} The majority of sources claim that Pope Lucius III was the pope who made the gift. Gesta Annalia, Bower, and Liber Pluscardenis all link this event to William’s death in 1214, whereas the Chronicle of Melrose dates the event to 1182: Chron. Fordun, 275; Chron. Bower, Vol. IV, 475; Pluscarden, 38; Chron. Melrose, 22. Charles Burns has pointed out two reasons why the Chronicle of Melrose date of 1182 was the more likely: firstly, as Pope Lucius would have been dead in 1214, and secondly, it was in 1182 that the papal interdict had been lifted and William and his realm absolved, an occasion which would definitely warrant William’s gift: Burns, ‘Papal Gifts’, 150-95, specifically 155-6, sketch of a papal rose opp. 156. See also: Duncan, Making of the Kingdom, 272-3; Ibid, Kingship of Scots, 137-8.  
pope pouring ‘balsam into the cusp of the centre of the rose.’

Although William himself could not have been inaugurated with this rose-topped sceptre, there is every likelihood that this glittering gift took pride of place at his son’s inaugural ceremony, adding glory by association through the special status this object accorded to William’s realm. A rose of gold is recorded in the inventory of the regalia when it is removed by Edward I in 1296, its position alongside the rest of the regalia emphasising the likely use of this item in the inaugural ceremonies of the kings following William to the date of removal.

The first gift of a papal sword to Scotland is usually dated to the reign of James IV in the late fifteenth century, but Burns’ article raises evidence to suggest that William too was presented with this honour in the early thirteenth century and offered one of the earliest examples of the presentation of this gift by the papacy. One foreign chronicler records that the papal legate’s presentation of the sword coincided with the swearing of fealty of the nobility to the young Alexander at Musselburgh, while a number of Scottish chronicles confirm the attendance of the papal legate Giovanni di Salerno. Broun demonstrates the increasing confidence of William and more particularly his son in claiming their royal sovereignty publicly, culminating in the statements made by Alexander III’s inauguration. William united his nobles’ oaths to his son with the receiving of significant papal gifts in the attendance of a papal legate. This suggests that William could have been attempting to create a kind of pseudo-anointment for his son, and in doing so brazenly emphasising sovereignty of the highest manner for his young son if not himself. Sixteenth-century chronicler Boece states:

The samin yeir, was send ane legat fra the Paip, to King William; and presentit to him ane sword, with hiltis and scheith of gold, set with mony precious stanis. This legat als presentit ane bonat of tire, maid in maner of a diademe, of purpoure hew; to signify he was a defendar of the faith.
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29 Boece, *Chronicle*, 327.
If the sword he describes was in fact presented to William, there is no suggestion of how it was utilised in Alexander II’s inauguration. Yet, William was well aware of the contemporary English coronations and more specifically the role which the sword of honour played in this ceremony as he carried this object in the second coronation of Richard I at Winchester in 1194.\textsuperscript{30}

An account of Richard’s first coronation in 1189 remains extant, recording near-contemporary liturgy and instructions for the English ceremony. If such rubrics were followed in 1194, William I would have taken part in a formal and complex ceremony in a cathedral including anointing and investiture with regalia, made up of ring, sword, armils (bracelets), mantle, crown, sceptre and rod.\textsuperscript{31} The account indicates the pomp and ceremony that would have been witnessed including a procession of clergy ‘with cross, torch bearers, censers and holy water going before them.’ The king was led into the abbey flanked by bishops and barons carrying ‘a silken canopy on four tall lances’ aloft above him.’\textsuperscript{32} William may have left written or verbal instructions for the inauguration of his son drawing on these experiences. The fact that the ceremony took place the day after William’s death but was still recorded as having more ‘pomp and grandeur’ than its predecessors,\textsuperscript{33} suggests that there was a pre-planned event on standby.

The high ecclesiastical presence witnessed by William I at the coronation of Richard I does not appear to have been employed for Alexander II’s inauguration. Duncan states that the church evidently had a role to play in the Scottish inaugural ceremony by 1249 and that there was a clear push towards the ‘liturgification’ of this ceremony as the thirteenth century advanced into the fourteenth. However, there were limits to further church involvement in the inaugural rite up until the fourteenth century due to the lack of a papal sanction of full unction.\textsuperscript{34}

In the case of Ireland, Fitzpatrick has proposed that ‘at its most potent, ecclesiastical resolve

\textsuperscript{31}‘Twelfth Century Coronation Order’ in Legge (ed.), \textit{English Coronation Records}, 30-42.
\textsuperscript{33}It is worth noting the Saturday following the inauguration of Alexander II on Friday was the feast day of St Nicholas and feasting may have been planned anyway.
\textsuperscript{34}Duncan, \textit{Kingship of the Scots}, 150; Broun, ‘The Church and the Origins of Scottish Independence’, 1-35.
was capable of translating an inauguration ceremony from a traditional royal assembly to a church site. While there was a consecrated abbey at Scone from the reign of Alexander I (1078–1124), the enthronement of Scottish kings continued to take place on the Moot Hill, suggesting that the church faced similar challenges on influencing this secular rite in Scotland.

The only prelate named as accompanying Alexander II to Scone was William Malveisin, bishop of St Andrews, while his other named attendees were all secular earls. The bishop of Glasgow and the bishop-elect of Ross, as well as the Chancellor and household members appear to have remained at Stirling with the queen to hold vigils for William I. What roles any of these actors played in the ceremony is unclear, but the account appears to suggest that there was a large assembly of key earls, bishops, and other members of elite society, and that the royal household that split into two.

Despite the statement by Bower that Alexander II was ‘crowned’ this was an addition to the ceremony that William is unlikely to have stipulated, despite witnessing it, as the act of crowning (and accompanying unction) had to be sanctioned by the pope. Alexander II would make a number of bids in his adult reign to acquire this rite and the minority government of his son would continue in these attempts. Alice Taylor has proposed that the abbot of Dunfermline’s unusual post of chancellor allowed him to play a key role in ‘raising the status’ of Scottish kingship through involvement in the canonisation of St Margaret (1249), the saint’s translation (1250), papal interactions, and attempts to gain the rite of unction. Moreover, she posits that the abbot was attempting to raise Dunfermline to the position of coronation church and mausoleum in the style of Henry III’s project at Westminster. It was the vested interests of

35 Fitzpatrick, Royal Inauguration in Gaelic Ireland, 177.
36 Gesta Annalia lists seven earls, that would link to the suggestions made in the later ‘Appeal of the Seven Earls’ sent to Edward in 1290s (see below 111, fn. 83); Fife, Strathearn, Atholl, Angus, Menteith, Buchan and Lothian. Chron. Fordun, 275-6. However, Bower only lists five earls, missing out Fife and Lothian, but indicates that others were selected to accompany the young king from across the three estates; Chron. Bower, Vol. V, 3.
37 Ibid, 3; Chron. Fordun, 275-6.
39 Neither Alexander II nor William I’s seals depict them crowned, for the latter the papal cap is worn, but some of their coins show a crown: See Plates 7a, b and c.
those surrounding infant kings, such as the abbot of Dunfermline, which would prove crucial in preventing any stagnation in ceremonial developments during minorities.

Alexander III’s inaugural ceremony in 1249 has received a comparably large amount of historical attention. There are no official records, financial or parliamentary, for 1249; however, there are a number of key sources utilised in the discussions of Alexander’s inauguration: *Gesta Annalia*, Bower’s *Scotichronicon* (1440s) along with a manuscript illustration in this work, and the Scone seal. In the chronicle accounts there are two distinct sections: the first deals with the debates that take place between the gathered nobles regarding whether the young king should be knighted prior to being made king, while the second deals with the inauguration itself. Alan Durward, justiciar of Scotia, raised the act of knighting the king with the assembled estates gathered prior to the king’s inaugural ceremony. *Gesta Annalia* and Bower present different conclusions on the outcome of this discussion, the former stating the inauguration took place without knighting and the latter that knighting took place. Duncan posits that Fordun’s account is correct, yet he highlights that Bower’s inclusion of the ‘girding’ of the king perhaps has some foundation, not in relation to knighthood as Bower supposes, but in relation to the king being invested with a blessed sword as part of the inaugural ceremony as found in *ordines* for such ceremonies elsewhere. Having carried the sword of honour in Richard I’s coronation at Winchester, William I would have seen such a rite in action and it is, therefore, credible to believe that the blessing of and investiture with his papal sword

---

42 It is worth noting here that both Dunfermline and Westminster were both Benedictine monasteries.
44 See above Introduction, 16, fn. 79 for discussions on Fordun/ *Gesta Annalia* and value to studying the thirteenth century: *Chron. Fordun*, 289-90.
46 See Plate 9: The seal was in use by 1280s but depicts a youthful king without a beard and both Duncan and Broun have suggested there should be no doubt that it depicts Alexander III: Duncan, *Kingship of the Scots*, 136; Broun, *Scottish Independence and the Idea of Britain*, 172-4.
47 Scotia: Scotland north of the Forth.
49 Ibid; *Chron. Fordun*, 289-90, Duncan notes that young Alexander III was not knighted until December of 1251 when he marries Margaret and is knighted by Henry III: ‘Making a King at Scone’, 140-2. For further evidence on this knighting ceremony see: *CDS*, Vol. I, (20 Nov. 1251), no. 1824; (24 Nov. 1251), nos. 1826 & 1828. Also see Chapter 3, Section I, 223-4.
50 Duncan, ‘Making a King at Scone’, 133-4.
could have been drawn into the Scottish ceremony for both Alexander III and his father, if it had not already existed.\textsuperscript{51}

Bower’s description clearly separates the ceremony itself into two sections, with the girding with the sword by the bishop of St Andrews, the oaths and promises of the king, and the blessing and ‘ordination’ occurring separately to the enthronement ceremony.\textsuperscript{52} Duncan proposes that the former of the two parts took place in the abbey church, from whence the king was led outside to his secular enthronement, an act which the ecclesiastics appear not to have been involved in.\textsuperscript{53} William’s interaction with the ecclesiastically-dominated English ceremony, combined with Scotland’s growing papal interactions – including the ‘special daughter’ status granted to Scotland,\textsuperscript{54} papal gifts, and attempts in the reign of Alexander II to gain the right of unction – give grounds to suggest that more substantial portions of the ceremony were occurring within the church by the thirteenth century.\textsuperscript{55} However, the fact that the ceremony remained in two distinct parts implies a still strong secular dominance, and opens a clear link to the Irish situation where, as Fitzpatrick has noted, the ecclesiastics came to the king and the most the church could hope for was that part of the ceremony occurred inside the church or on church land.\textsuperscript{56} Moreover, this division of space marks a certain distinction between private and public spaces, with the outdoor ceremony of enthroning and acclamation being allowed unqualified access, whereas access to the indoor ritual could be limited and controlled.\textsuperscript{57}

In regards to enthronement itself there are pictorial as well as written sources, with the Scone seal and Bower illustration. The nobles and clergy, among whom the earls of Fife and

\textsuperscript{51} The Northumbrian Pontifical utilised by Cooper and Stuart in their analysis of earlier ceremony includes the investiture with a sword and therefore this could be posited as a traditional element: Stuart, \textit{Scottish Coronations}, 13-8; Cooper, ‘Four Scottish Coronations’, 5-7.

\textsuperscript{52} Legge notes that Bower may have emphasised the role of the church figures due to his ecclesiastical background: ‘The Inauguration of Alexander III’, 78-9; \textit{Chron. Bower}, Vol. V, 295.


\textsuperscript{54} The \textit{Cum Universi} bull was received in Scotland approximately 1192, and the ‘special daughter’ status it provided meant that the jurisdiction on the archbishop of York over Scottish bishops was pushed aside and the prelates of the Scottish church dealt directly with Rome or a papal representative. Amongst numerous references to this landmark moment see: Duncan, \textit{Making of the Kingdom}, 264.

\textsuperscript{55} The fact that the abbey church was erected in the reign of Alexander I (1107–1124) has been raised by Duncan to suggest that an inaugural Mass occurred much earlier: \textit{The Kingship of the Scots}, 149.

\textsuperscript{56} Fitzpatrick, \textit{Royal Inauguration in Gaelic Ireland}, 155-8.

\textsuperscript{57} For more discussion on this see Dean, ‘Making the most of what they had: adapting indoor and outdoor spaces for royal ceremony in Scotland, c. 1214 to c. 1603’ in K. De Jonge and R. Mulryne with R. Morris (eds.), \textit{Architectures of Festival in Early Modern Europe} (Ashgate, forthcoming).
Strathearn, the bishops of St Andrews and Dunkeld and the abbot of Scone were central, led the king to the royal throne bedecked with gold silk by a cross in the churchyard at Scone. The ceremony concluded with a poet kneeling before the king who recited the royal genealogy in Gaelic.\textsuperscript{58} Duncan also highlights the speckled background of the seal which he suggests is indicative of grass and the outdoor nature of the enthronement it depicts, while the illustration in Bower clearly depicts the enthronement as both set out-of-doors and secular with only the two earls and poet in attendance.\textsuperscript{59} Bower records a crown, a sceptre and a robe of purple, and indicates that a sermon was said, but he does not mention the ‘Stone of Destiny,’ only a royal seat.\textsuperscript{60} \textit{Gesta Annalia} does not refer to the crown and sceptre, perhaps indicating that these additions could be elements from 1390 or 1424 that Bower witnessed and dropped into the description of 1249. However, there is a description of nobles laying their garments under the enthroned king’s feet in \textit{Gesta Annalia} and a passage referring to the stone emphasising its key place in the ceremony of old.\textsuperscript{61} The laying of the clothes of the nobles on the ground before the king has been linked by Cooper to biblical references in the Old and New Testaments.\textsuperscript{62} Duncan and Broun have suggested that by the later thirteenth century the stone already played a lesser role in the ceremony. Through their discussions of Fordun and \textit{Gesta Annalia}, the scholars emphasise that the section stressing the importance of the stone may be an addition to the original material, and that its fame at this stage came largely through its removal by Edward I in 1296.\textsuperscript{63}

The complexities of the circumstances of Alexander III’s death (1286), the rule of the Guardians (1286–1292), the succession crisis following Margaret of Norway’s death (1290), and the involvement of Edward I in Scottish affairs (1290–1306) undoubtedly affected the


\textsuperscript{59} \textit{Ibid}, 136-7.

\textsuperscript{60} \textit{Chron. Bower}, Vol. V, 295.

\textsuperscript{61} \textit{Chron. Fordun}, 289-90.


course of Scottish history. As Bannerman has proposed, it is fair to say that these were, to an extent, 'abnormal circumstances.' But to what degree did these influence the Scottish inaugural ceremony in the late thirteenth and early fourteenth centuries? An obvious difference between John Balliol and his Canmore predecessors was the long drawn out method of his selection as prime candidate for kingship and the increasing role of parliament in the interim that continued into John’s reign. The *Chronicle of Lanercost* and *John Hardyng’s Chronicle* both reveal how forty men from each realm, twenty from Scotland and twenty from England, gathered at the behest of Edward I to essentially elect a king from the main competitors. Although John was chosen due to his lineage, the end of the Canmore dynasty meant that accession by primogeniture, despite seeming successful with the estates swearing allegiance to the infant Princess Margaret and the Guardians ruling in her name, was disrupted. Alexander III mirrored the actions of his father, and those in power during his minority, in attempts to secure the rite of unction and full crowning. However, there appears to be no evidence that the Guardians continued such efforts on behalf of Margaret, or that John undertook them once he was king.

Bower’s account of Alexander III’s inauguration records that the bishop of St Andrews:

[...] set out rights and promises which pertain to the king, first in Latin and then in French, the king graciously conceded and accepted all of this [...]

---

65 Bannerman, ‘The King’s Poet’, 137.
67 *Chronicle of Lanercost*, Vol. I, 84-5; *The chronicle of Jhon Hardyng, from the firste begynnynge of Engelande, vnto the reigne of kyng Edward the fourth And from that tyme is added a continuacion*, ed. R. Grafton et al. (Amsterdam, 1976), ff. cxii-v-clxiii r.
69 TNA, SC7/20/11, Special Collection: Intimation to the king of England that the Pope cannot grant his request regarding the King of Scots [6 April 1251]; *CDS*, Vol. I, no. 1798 (April 6 1251) and no. 2157 (May 1259); *Handlist of the acts of Alexander III, the guardians*, John, 1249–1296, ed. G.G. Simpson (Edinburgh, 1960), no. 232 (ante. 1261).
70 *Chron. Bower*, Vol. V, 293. Discussions have arisen regarding the likelihood of both French and Latin being used. Legge notes that repetition in French was conducted in England in this era, and Duncan comments that, due to the unlikelihood of French being used in Bower’s own era, this fact perhaps adds authenticity to Bower’s report on the event: Legge, ‘The Inauguration of Alexander III’, 81-2; Duncan, *Kingship of the Scots*, 134-5.
The actual content of this oath when taken by Alexander III is unknown; however, the chronicle of Guisborough records that Balliol’s oath of 1292 outlined his responsibility to uphold justice and the laws of his people and the Holy Mother Church until his death.\(^{71}\) There are some similarities between this core content and that recorded for Richard I.\(^{72}\) As Guisborough was an English chronicler and John Balliol’s ceremony marked by an English presence, this is perhaps not surprising. However, the fact that William I had attended and been involved in the second of Richard I’s coronations, where a repeat oath was likely taken, meant that importation of oath elements may have occurred previously. Details of John’s inauguration are unfortunately scarce; despite this it is possible to pick out a number of elements, such as the date of the ceremony, held on 30 November 1292, St Andrews’ Day.\(^{73}\) All the accounts record the fact that John was raised onto the royal throne, similarly to his predecessors, but only Guisborough, Pluscarden and Hardyng record the Stone of Destiny as an element of this throne,\(^{74}\) while only two records indicate who may have raised him to it.\(^{75}\)

Guisborough and Hardyng’s accounts go into the most detail about the stone, promulgating its traditional importance:

Sitting vpoun the regal stone ful sound
As al the kinges, there had a afore […]\(^{76}\)

This fits with Duncan’s theory, discussed earlier, that the stone’s importance was inflated by the English removal of it and its rehoming in Westminster Abbey.\(^{77}\) Guisborough’s account appears to indicate that by this time the ‘large round and concave’ stone was housed within a throne,

---

\(^{71}\) Latin text: ‘[…] facto tamen iuramento quod sanctam matrem ecclesiam populum que sibi subiectum iuste regendo leges bonas conderet usitatasque et iuentas vsque ad mortem continuaret.’\(^{72}\) The Chronicle of Walter of Guisborough: previously edited as the Chronicle of Walter of Hemingford or Hemingburgh, ed. H. Rothwell (London, 1957), 239; Duncan, Kingship of the Scots, 135.

\(^{73}\) Ibid, 136.

\(^{74}\) Chronicler of Lanercost, Vol. I, 86; Pluscarden, 104; Chronicle of Guisborough, 238-9. Beam considers the poignancy of this choice of date alongside others in the process of making John Balliol king; for example, it was 20 November when John made homage to the English king and this was both St Edmund’s day and the official date from which Edward’s reign began:\(^{75}\) The Balliol Dynasty, 113.

\(^{75}\) Pluscarden, 105;\(^{76}\) The chronicle of Jhon Hardyng, ff. clxii v-clxiii r; Chronicle of Guisborough, 239.

\(^{76}\) Ibid, 238-9; Foedera, Vol. I, Part II, 115-6.

\(^{77}\) The chronicle of Jhon Hardyng, ff. clxii v-clxiii r.

and this throne housed ‘in ecclesia.’\textsuperscript{78} The Scottish accounts, such as \textit{Gesta Annalia} and \textit{Pluscarden}, make no such claim but neither do they state that any of the ceremony took place outdoors. There are three things to consider here: firstly, Duncan’s theory regarding the gradual ‘liturgification,’ which had seen some of the ceremony move inside prior to the inauguration of 1292.\textsuperscript{79} Secondly, by holding the entire event within the church, Edward was able to control access to the space; however, this may have had a detrimental effect for John’s legitimacy as he was not raised to the throne in a truly public space. The final consideration is more practical in that the event was taking place in late November in Scotland and, even if plans to hold the enthroning outside had been made, the weather could easily have forced a rapid change of plan.

A list remains extant of those present at Norham when John Balliol gave homage to Edward I on 20 November. The list includes both ecclesiastics and nobles, such as William, bishop of St Andrews, Robert, bishop of Glasgow, and William, earl of Ross.\textsuperscript{80} Yet, none of the accounts of the inauguration speaks of a bishop involved in the ceremony despite references to the event taking place within the abbey church. The lack of ecclesiastical involvement in John’s inaugural ceremony may stem from a document produced c.1290/1 by Robert Bruce, lord of Annandale,\textsuperscript{81} on behalf of the estates with the proposed intention of upholding the rights of the secular earls of the realm in the ‘election’ and enthroning of the king of Scots.\textsuperscript{82} Amongst other things the document claims:

[...] it is one of the rights and privileges and liberties of the seven earls of the realm of Scotland, and the community of the realm of Scotland, to make a king of that realm, and to set him upon the royal throne, and to confer him the honours which go with the rule of the realm of Scotland [...]\textsuperscript{83}

\textsuperscript{78} \textit{Chronicle of Guisborough}, 239.
\textsuperscript{79} Duncan, \textit{Kingship of the Scots}, 150.
\textsuperscript{80} \textit{Foedera}, Vol. I, Part III, 112.
\textsuperscript{81} This is Robert Bruce the contender in the choice of king in 1290s, the grandfather of Robert I.
\textsuperscript{82} Such claims of kingly power being rooted in a choice of the people were a force being felt across Europe at the end of the thirteenth-century. The spread of ideas deriving from Roman canonical law included the \textit{Lex Regia} or royal law, which gave kings sovereignty. However, as power was given by the people and realm, the king could be challenged if he did not protect the realm and its people. For more on broader European political developments see: J. Watts, \textit{The Making of Polities: Europe, 1300–1500} (Cambridge, 2009), 43-157, particularly 73-98.
There are obvious inconsistencies in the Bruce claims regarding the making of kings, as the Bruce line can be found promulgating hereditary rights to the throne that are based on lineage rather than ‘election’; these have been raised by historians and cannot be ignored in the analysis of this document.\textsuperscript{84} However, Stevenson suggests that the date of the document was between September 1290 and May 1291, and that it was written to be sent to Edward I.\textsuperscript{85} If Edward did receive such a document emphasising the secular, and perhaps in his eyes less austere and underdeveloped, qualities of the Scottish inaugural ceremony, would he then have considered it an instructional document in the organising of John’s inauguration?\textsuperscript{86}

The archbishop of Dublin, bishop of Carlisle, and earl of Lincoln were all in attendance at Norham when John gave homage to Edward\textsuperscript{87} and this English intrusion likely stretched to the inauguration itself. A mandate from the English king instructs nostrum (our) John de St John to take the role of earl of Fife, who was a minor and whose hereditary role it was to enthrone the king.\textsuperscript{88} This gave an English noble a key role in the making of this Scottish king and provided a vivid demonstration that it was Edward from whom John’s power emanated. Despite this confirmed English presence, the sources do not necessarily indicate that these intrusions by the English had a marked influence or effected radical changes in the Scottish inaugural ceremony. There is certainly indecision in the accounts as to whether John was crowned during the ceremony, with Hardyng’s chronicle and Buchanan’s sixteenth-century account implying he was and more contemporaneous accounts recording the event without explicit reference to a crown.\textsuperscript{89} Previous Scottish inauguration ceremonies likely included new monarchs wearing a crown, and Duncan posits such a coronet was likely placed on the king’s head by his own hand.\textsuperscript{90} However, it is highly unlikely that Edward I sanctioned the ‘crowning’

\textsuperscript{84} Penman, ‘Defficione successionis’, 46-8; Duncan, Kingship of the Scots, 137.
\textsuperscript{85} ‘Appeal of the Seven Earls’, 44, fn. 2.
\textsuperscript{86} A range of documents surviving in England indicate Edward I’s keen interest in the mechanics of Scottish rulership, such as a household ordinance (copy dated c. 1305): M. Bateson, ‘The Scottish King’s Household and other Fragments from a fourteenth-century manuscript in the library of Corpus Christi College, Cambridge’, Miscellany of the Scottish History Society (Edinburgh, 1904), 1-43.
\textsuperscript{87} Foedera, Vol. I, Part III, 112.
\textsuperscript{88} Ibid, 115-6.
\textsuperscript{89} The chronicle of Jhon Hardyng, ff. clxii v-clxiii r; Buchanan, History, 395-6; Chronicle of Lanercost, 86; Chron. Fordun, 315; Foedera, Vol. I, Part III, 115-6.
\textsuperscript{90} Duncan, Kingship of the Scots, 138-9.
of John Balliol by another’s hand, as such an action would have raised the status of the Scottish king, something Edward and his father had thus far actively attempted to avoid. If Edward’s involvement affected the ceremony, it was by holding back developments – such as the attempts to receive rite of unction – or even through censorship of traditional elements. For example, there is no evidence to suggest that the Scottish royal genealogy was recited to assert John Balliol’s royal lineage; instead, the inauguration was hemmed in by events that emphasising John’s vassal status.

Edward’s involvement in Scottish affairs led, however, to the production of numerous documents that add detail to our understanding of the Scottish inaugural ceremony during the thirteenth century, including a list of the regalia removed from Scotland in 1296. This list, along with another found in the Acts of Parliament from 1291, provide essential details of the Scottish regalia. Items that Edward I valued and offered to the shrine of St Edward the Confessor on 28 June 1297 included: a gold sceptre, a gold crown, a silver apple, a rose of gold, and the Stone of Scone, as well as a pallium to hang in the church.

Duncan posits that the vicinity of the pallium, or mantle, to the Stone of Scone on the list suggests it was a rectangular cloth displayed above or near the altar and stone. It was a sign that the king who sat below it ruled under God. The illustration in Bower and the Scone seal show Alexander III dressed in a mantle, while Bower’s description of Alexander III’s

---

94 ‘Pallium’ is the English word for a mantle in comparative documents and in old Scots it usually refers to some kind of cloak, often that worn by a bishop. The Latin translation, however, is coverlet or cover.
95 Documents illustrative of the history of Scotland, Vol. II, 142, 144. The rose, apple and sceptre are listed separately in the 1296 list, but Duncan has proposed that the silver apple may have been an appendage screwed onto the rod of the golden rose, which could indicate the use of a rod topped with the rose as well as a separate sceptre, perhaps with a floriated design such as that found on John Balliol’s seal. This floriated design may have been based on Edward I’s sceptre, although that found in his tomb included a dove atop the floriation. For John Balliol’s seal, see Plate 10. Aloffe, ‘An Account of the Body of Edward I’, 384; Duncan, Kingship of the Scots, 137-8.
96 Ibid, 144-6.
inauguration indicates that the king was robed in a ‘royal purple’, although it is important to remember that the colour in the description could have been based on the ceremony of James I in 1424 that occurred within Bower’s lifetime. The 1291 inventory of the Scottish treasury includes, amongst others, two purple copes that appear to confirm the possibility of the purple robe described by Bower for Alexander III. However, a cope is more commonly associated with a bishop or cleric, and these may have been the copes worn by the officiating ecclesiastics, the bishops of St Andrews and Dunkeld or perhaps the abbot of Scone, reserved for use in the inaugural ceremony. There is no indication from the 1296 listing that the pallium was purple or what exactly it was used for in the Scottish ceremony. It is possible that the pallium, like the Stone of Scone, was a relic particularly attached to the abbey and kings of Scotland, perhaps the abbey’s founder Alexander I. Its royal ‘purple’ nature as well as Edward I’s positioning of the object in the shrine of St Edward at Westminster could be seen to suggest its importance in the king-making of the Scots, but Broun and Duncan’s proposals regarding the inflated importance of the Stone of Scone must be considered here, as the importance of this object may too have been exaggerated.

Following the murder of his rival John Comyn on 10 February at Greyfriars in Dumfries and the crisis this act incited, Robert the Bruce’s inaugural ceremony took place at Scone in late March 1306. He was enthroned, and possibly crowned, by Isabella Countess of

---

97 The use of purple, and other colours specifically linked to royalty, is in area of some scholarly study and one I would like to follow up in more detail in relation to Scottish monarchy and court although space does not permit such a detailed investigation of this here. For some further work on the colours of silk/royal coronation garments see: D. Jacoby, ‘Silk Economics and Cross Cultural Artistic Interaction: Byzantium, the Muslim World, and the Christian West’ in Dumbarton Oaks Papers, Vol. 58 (2004), 197-240, particularly 209-12 discussing the high cost of producing purple pigment; and A. Hunt, The Drama of Coronation: Medieval Ceremony in Early Modern England (Cambridge, 2008), particularly 22-33, discussing the coronation of Henry VIII, specifically the robes of ‘imperial purple’ being put onto the king and queen following their coronation (33). Thanks must be given to Dr Ben Marsh for his further reading suggestions on this subject.


100 For example see: Barbour, Bruce, 78-81; Nicolson, Scotland the Later Middle Ages, 71; Barrow, Robert Bruce, 145-52; Oram, The Kings and Queens of Scotland, 144; Brown, Wars of Scotland, 199-200. There is much discussion regarding whether murder was Bruce’s intention or whether a personal feud got out of hand. As Oram notes, though it is unlikely that the crown was ever far from Bruce’s thoughts in this period, it seems equally unlikely that he planned to take the throne in this manner.

101 See below (119) for dating of ceremony.
Buchan, as the adult representative of the earldom of Fife, and the collected ‘baronage’ are recorded as giving their oath of fealty to the new king. Much about this ceremony is speculative; however, subsequent retrospective legitimisation of the Bruce claims to the royal succession, highlighted by Penman, would suggest that all possible means by which Robert’s inauguration could emulate his Canmore predecessors and outline his right to rule on a level playing field with his contemporaries were amplified, particularly where they served the common purpose of legitimising Robert’s contested hold on power. A letter recently attributed to Bruce c. 1310 by Dauvit Broun has served to emphasise the eloquent manner in which Robert conversed in correspondence with Edward II and the manner in which he demanded to have his kingship recognised along with the independence of his realm.

The removal of the regalia by Edward I in 1296 clearly left a gaping hole in the ceremonial rite for the next king, but there were several items not listed including the papal sword. The circumstances surrounding Robert I’s accession ten years later may have hindered the provision of regalia for Bruce, particularly the haste with which the ceremony was orchestrated, and more importantly the lack of funds for the event. However, a royal mantle was certainly given to the king by Robert Wishart, bishop of Glasgow. The provision of a banner of the arms of the king of Scots as well as this mantle to ‘enrobe or dress’ the king, is recorded in a document written to the pope by the English expounding the rebellious actions of Bishop

---


103 Barbour, Bruce, 88-9.

104 Penman, ‘Deficiene successionis’, 50.

105 There are a number of documents that reveal the importance of genealogy and legitimate claims to power; two key documents: RPS, 1309/2, Declaration of the Clergy, 1309 (St Andrews, Parliament, 17 March 1309); and RPS, 1320/4/1, Declaration of Arbroath: letter of the barons of Scotland to Pope John XXII, 1320 (Arbroath, Record of Assembly, 6 April 1320).

106 M. Penman proposes the letter is dated 1320 (personal communication).


108 Duncan has suggested that this banner may have held a ‘talismanic status’ comparable to the Montjoie banner of the Capetian dynasty found at St Denis. The office of ‘carrier of the royal banner’ was created in 1298 and granted to the Scrymgeour family: ‘Making a King at Scone’, 163.
Wishart, including the hand he played in Robert’s inauguration.\textsuperscript{109} The bishop’s role, along with that of Bishop Lamberton of St Andrews (who trained in part under Wishart at Glasgow in his early ecclesiastical career) should be drawn into the foreground briefly.\textsuperscript{110} Both bishops later denied their presence at Robert’s inaugural ceremony to Edward I, but such denials were likely for their own protection.\textsuperscript{111} The papal bull that granted Scottish kings the right to full coronation with unction was not granted until twenty-three years later in 1329. However, it clearly specified these two prominent church men (bishops of St Andrews and Glasgow) as those who ‘traditionally’ invested the monarch, despite the inauguration of Alexander III recording the bishop of Dunkeld,\textsuperscript{112} and it is possible that the bull provided retrospective permission for actions taken in 1306.\textsuperscript{113}

Most of the accounts record Robert I ‘being set on the royal throne’ where he was ‘crowned […] in the manner wherein the kings of Scotland were invested […]’\textsuperscript{114} with crowning linked to ‘custom’ or ‘tradition’ when previous evidence would suggest that, though perhaps wearing a crown, the kings of Scotland were not physically crowned in the ceremony.\textsuperscript{115} Guisborough gives more detail than most about the actors, and more particularly the actress, involved in the ceremony. Firstly, the source claims that Bruce ‘made himself king,’ an act that took place ‘presentibus et conscientibus quatuor episcopis quinque comitibus et popolo

\textsuperscript{109} BL, Add. MS 4575, ff. 247 r.-252 v. (specifically f. 250 v.), ‘Articuliproponendi contra Epis(a)copum Glasguensis super consilioassensu et adhorentia per ip[su]m factis Roberto de Brus in principio rebelliosis contra Angliæ’ in Thomas Rymer Collections Hen. I–Edw. I, presented by the House of Lords; Palgrave’s Documents, 366-7. With these two items being retained by Wishart, it is perhaps worth positing that the cloth taken by Edward I and displayed in Westminster had been utilised in earlier ceremonial as a pale of some description held over the king in a procession perhaps, as seen in the Richard I ord.\textsuperscript{110} Thanks must be given here to Dr Alasdair Ross and Dr Sonja Cameron for letting the author read a work-in-progress article on Bishop Robert Wishart: ‘The Bad Bishop: Robert Wishart and the Scottish Wars of Independence’ (forthcoming).
\textsuperscript{111} See above, fn. 109.
\textsuperscript{113} ‘XXX. Bull of John XXII Concerning the Coronation’, 24-5. Retrospective permission for anointing was not as uncommon as might be assumed. The kings of Norway did not receive the papal grant allowing unction until 1249; however, during the civil wars of the twelfth century various competitors for the throne had themselves anointed in attempts to stake their rightful claim to the fullest degree: S. Bagge, From Viking Stronghold to Christian Kingdom: State Formation in Norway, c. 900 – 1350 (Copenhagen, 2010), 89-90, 163.
\textsuperscript{114} Chron. Fordun, 333. See also: Chron. Bower, Vol. VI, 317; Pluscarden, 176; Chronicle of Guisborough, 367; Barbour, Bruce, 88-9;
The four bishops and five earls who presided over the event are not named individually; however, the documents state that they were joined by the Countess of Buchan. As the Fife family’s representative, the countess carried out her inherited right in the making of Scots kings. The countess’s role as a stand-in for an adult male earl of Fife represents the restoration of the traditional importance of the earldom in the inaugural ceremony. Guisborough’s account specifically states that the hereditary right held by the family was to put the crown on the head of the new king, rather than the traditional enthroning: ‘cui de iure hereditario competit coronam apponere capiti noui regis.’ Whilst misinformation regarding the earl of Fife’s traditional involvement and confusion caused by an English understanding of coronation may explain this, various accounts refer specifically to the crowning of the king, including a curiously unpatriotic fourteenth-century parody found embedded in a Scottish chronicle manuscript.

And [before] the Abbat of Scone, John Earl of Atho, Simon Frase, and his brothers [...] and many [more] was he crowned first by the abominable Bishops of Glasgow and St Andrews, and on the third day afterward, by the Countess of Buchan [...] An English document also reveals Geoffrey de Coigners had concealed ‘a certain coronet of gold with which Robert de Brus lately caused himself to be crowned in,’ and in both of Robert I’s seals discussed by Birch he is pictured crowned. However, the same is true of the two preceding monarchs. Robert’s first seal is similar to the English seal of Edward I, including

117 Ibid.
118 Ibid.
120 ‘Notice of a manuscript of the latter part of the fourteenth century, entitled Passio Scotorum Perjutatorum’, trans. and ed. Marquis of Bute, PSAS, Vol. XIX (1884-5), 166-192, for the poem/parody see 167-84. The Passio covers 1306 to 1307 and was located within a longer Scottish history in Reigate Public Library in Surrey. The piece is certainly a copy but the end date of the overall chronicle of 1346 and the capture of David II at Neville’s Cross suggests the original was compiled in the mid-fourteenth century, perhaps by someone captured at this time although the authorship is unknown and could be English. The text is Latin and is based on a parody of biblical texts, starting with an episode in which various Scottish nobles are offered the crown of Scotland before Bruce is finally turned to. Once chosen, Bruce immediately makes demands stating his royal rights and demanding the collection of bishops, abbots, earls and others to his coronation.
the fact that both hold an orb topped with a cross, suggesting a poor copy was made for Robert’s initial seal that would later be replaced by one more identifiable with the monarch it represented.¹²³

If both bishops were in attendance – as the parody suggests – they may have gone even further than crowning Robert Bruce in 1306. The king had just committed a heinous crime and it was to Wishart that Robert turned for absolution. For this reason, Wishart may have pushed to anoint Robert in order to absolve the king, making him ready to receive his crown in the eyes of God, for the bishop’s own piece of mind as much as the aggrandizement of Bruce.¹²⁴ This action would have gone against papal restrictions on Scottish royal (and ecclesiastical) power, but papal relations were unlikely to have featured heavily in the mind of a king who had just murdered a man in a church. Edward I’s angry reaction to the ceremony, which included the imprisonment of Bishop Lamberton, Henry Man abbot of Scone,¹²⁵ Bishop Wishart, and Isabella Countess of Buchan (infamously imprisoned in a wooden cage at Berwick), as well as continued searches at Scone for relics and other valuable items until at least 1307, speaks volumes. His response suggests that these four had gone beyond merely raising Bruce to the throne in the manner of his predecessors.¹²⁶ Bruce and his supporters had to make an overt

¹²³ Plate 11 a and b: Robert’s second seal is the more interesting of the two as it shows the Bruce king setting himself apart from the English monarchs, Birch has commented that the French style he took up was perhaps consciously contentious: *Ibid*. Katie Stevenson has suggested that a further statement of dynastic right and independent kingship was made by Bruce with the reverse of the seal through the positioning of his shield to clearly show the heraldic symbol of the Scots, the lion rampant: ‘Heraldry, Iconography and Dynasty in Representations of Royal Authority,’ paper delivered at *Representations of Authority to 1707: Scotland and her Nearest Neighbours Conference*, University of Stirling, 20–21 August 2012.

¹²⁴ Thanks to Dr Michael Penman for much discussion on this topic. For more on the ‘cleansing functions’ of religious ritual and the need to readdress ceremonies in a religious context see: Boogaart II, ‘Our Saviour’s Blood’, 69–116, particularly 70–72.

¹²⁵ *Heads of Religious Houses*, 199.

¹²⁶ Barbour, *Bruce*, 88-9; *CPL*, Vol. II, 6-7; *CDS*, Vol. II, nos. 1777, 1780, 1785-6, 1812-6, 1818, 1824-5, 1827-8, 1903, 1906; and *Ibid*, Vol. III, no. 24. No. 1903 refers to a letter of February 1307 from Clement V to Edward I regarding the ‘translation of the monastery of Scone’, and the second records the removal of important documents – primarily charters dating back to David I – to the abbey at Reading. Further to Edward I’s punishment of those involved Ross and Cameron emphasise the fact that, while Lamberton is realised relatively quickly, Wishart’s punishment and exile from his country is far more extreme than his ecclesiastical colleague and continues well into the reign of his son, Edward II. (See: Cameron and Ross, ‘The Bad Bishop: Robert Wishart’.”) Interestingly, the length incarceration and severity of punishment was equally harsh for Isabella, Countess of Fife, implying that it was by these two that the English monarchy felt most betrayed and who were most involved in the action of ‘making Bruce king’.
statement emphasising his unequivocal royal status and such a shift would certainly have accomplished this.

Both 27 March (Palm Sunday\textsuperscript{127}) and the Feast of the Annunciation of the Blessed Mary (25 March) are recorded for the ceremonial surrounding Robert I’s inauguration.\textsuperscript{128} After his capture by Edward I, William Lamberton’s defence stated that he was only present on Palm Sunday, a number of days after the ‘coronation’, when he celebrated mass for the king and ‘offered fealty to him for the temporality of his bishopric, and had sworn the oath of fealty [...]’\textsuperscript{129} His statement differentiates between the two events to deny his presence at the first. However, he frequently changed allegiance and was threatened with punishment, so the veracity of his testimony is questionable.\textsuperscript{130} The Palm Sunday Mass undoubtedly occurred within the abbey church at Scone, but the emphasis on tradition suggests that the enthroning took place outside to emulate the Canmores, from whom Robert claimed direct descent.\textsuperscript{131} Given the ceremony’s emphasis on tradition and the need to compensate for absent items (such as the stone and items of regalia), this attention to lineage would seemingly call for the recitation of the genealogy by a Highland poet. None of the sources reveal his presence. The Gaelic format of the recitation of the genealogy worked through the male line (listing each as son or ‘mac’ of predecessor), while Bruce’s royal claim came through the female line. Bannerman suggests that

\textsuperscript{127} Palm Sunday was the day that Christ entered Jerusalem; the symbolism and liturgical significance of the entering king would have been emphasised, and this link is discussed in more detail in regards to James I in the fifteenth century – see below Chapter 2, Section III, 151-2. For more on Palm Sunday some works include: Harper, \textit{The Forms and Orders of Western Liturgy}, 51-3. 137-152; C. Wright, ‘The Palm Sunday Procession in Medieval Chartres,’ in R.A. Baltzer and M.E. Fassler (eds), \textit{The Divine Office in the Latin Middle Ages: Methodology and Source Studies, Regional Development, Hagiography} (New York, 2000), 344-71; M.B. Bruun, ‘Procession and Contemplation in Bernard of Clairvaux’s First Sermon for Palm Sunday’ in N.H. Petersen, Bruun, J. Llewellyn, and E. Østrem (eds), \textit{The Appearance of Medieval Rituals: The Play of Construction and Modification} (Turnhout, 2004), 67-82.


\textsuperscript{129} Anglo-Scottish Relations, 1174–1328: Some Selected Documents, ed. and trans. E.L.G. Stones. (London, 1965), 138. The account here records that the Palm Sunday mass occurred three days after the inaugural ceremony, which could imply the inaugural ceremony was held on 24 March.

\textsuperscript{130} Marinell Ash discusses Lamberton’s double-dealings in regards to being present at English parliaments, but also making a pact with Bruce and reporting to Wishart on the prospective state of Scottish independence (particularly that of the Scottish church) under Edward’s rule, and posits the likelihood ‘that the two bishops also discussed Robert Bruce’s plans to take the crown of Scotland.’ M. Ash, ‘William Lamberton, Bishop of St Andrews, 1297–1328’ in G.W.S. Barrow, \textit{The Scottish Tradition: Essays in Honour of Ronald Gorddon Cant} (Edinburgh, 1974), particularly 47-8.

\textsuperscript{131} Duncan, \textit{Kingship of the Scots}, 149.
the ‘abnormal circumstances’ of the ina
gurations of John Balliol and Robert I post-1249, and
Robert I’s efforts to raise himself to European kingly status, may have brought an end to the
role of the poet and the recitation of genealogy. The importance of lineage for the
Scottish kings was emphasised in contemporary thirteenth-century documents, such as the
Dunfermline compilation discussed by Taylor. The emphasis on genealogy and the royal line
was clearly seen by contemporaries as a representation of dynastic right and royal authority. As
Duncan has suggested it was ‘a triumphant proclamation that the new king was descended from
founding kin,’ and emphasises the Scottish understanding of a commonly shared European
dynastic language. Documents such as the Declaration of Arbroath in 1320 reflect the
importance of genealogy, as does the Forme compiled three hundred years later for Charles
I. The recitation of genealogy within the inaugural ceremony has been posited as particularly
Scottish, and rather than the role of the poet ending, Legge has suggested that the role of the
poet was subsumed by that of the herald. Yet, the Gaelic format of the royal lineage would
not illuminate Bruce’s royal lineage, there could have been a shift away from the use of Gaelic
for the recitation here and the start of the shift towards a lowland herald rather than a highland
poet proclaiming the king.

132 Bannerman, ‘The King’s poet’, 137.
133 Taylor’s article considers the Vita S. Margarete, the Dunfermline Continuator, and the Dunfermline
Dynastic Chronicle, which all reveal a conscious and strong awareness of the importance of a clear royal
genealogy: Taylor, ‘Historical Writing in twelfth- and thirteenth-century Scotland’, 236-43. Also see:
Broun, ‘Contemporary Perspectives on Alexander II’s Succession’, 79-97. These works discussed by
Taylor, particularly the genealogical material, could be based on a now lost necrology or obit book of the
abbey library, but as John Higgit has discussed, the Reformation saw the destruction of the majority of
the abbey’s library: John Higgit, ‘Dunfermline Abbey and its Books’ in Fawcett (ed.), Royal
Dunfermline, 177-86.
134 Duncan, Kingship of the Scots, 147.
135 The end of the second opening paragraph of the Declaration of Arbroath states: ‘In their kingdom
there have reigned one hundred and thirteen kings of their own royal stock, the line unbroken a single
Declaration of Arbroath, xiii-xv.
136 Lindsay, ‘Forme of the coronatioun’, 393-5.
137 Lyall, ‘The Medieval Coronation Service’, 18-9; Shaw, ‘Scotland’s Place in Britain’s Coronation
138 Legge, ‘The Inauguration of Alexander III’, 75. Thanks must go to the current Lord Lyon King of
Arms, David Sellar, who is working on a paper on this same topic, and took the time to discuss this with
the author (D. Sellar, Personal Communications, 19 September 2012). A synopsis has been published of a
paper presented on the subject: D. Sellar, ‘The Lyon and the Seanchaidh’, The Heraldry Society of
Scotland’s Newsletter, no. 54 (Winter 2012).
There are numerous patterns and similarities that can be drawn out from this analysis of pre-unction inaugural events with the enthroning of the king. It is clear that the secular earls, particularly the earl of Fife or a representative, were dominant in this part of the ceremony. The presence and involvement of bishops and other ecclesiastics was increasingly important: such figures were the driving force behind attempts for recognised sacral kinship; and they were also possibly responsible for the first anointing, which required retroactive permission. The use of regalia, though limited by the removal of items by Edward I, was clearly prominent in the pre-1300 ceremony, with sceptre, sword and mantle bestowed upon the king. The mantle and banner were subsequently deemed of great enough consequence that, in the absence of other regalia items, Bishop Wishart made sure Robert I was able to have them prior to his inauguration. Though there are many similarities, the differences must also be recognised. For example, John’s ceremony may have occurred wholly indoors, removing the traditional outdoor public aspect of the ceremony, and Robert I may have been physically crowned, although this is highly debateable. The Mass was prominent in Robert’s inauguration, although it occurred on a different day, whereas the accounts for Alexander II or III lack specific reference to its use. In contrast, the feasting so ubiquitous at Alexander II’s inauguration and hinted at in that of Alexander III via the harper on the Scone seal,\textsuperscript{139} was not found recorded for the subsequent two inaugurations. However, the context of 1292 and 1306 likely dictated muted post-coronation revelry. The context of the current circumstances dictated and shaped the inaugural ceremonies of these kings. While traditions were important, there was a flexible quality in the organisation of such events, and the pressures of 1306 may have brought about the introduction of anointing long before the sought after rite of unction was granted to the Scots by papal bull in June 1329,\textsuperscript{140} the month of Robert I’s death.

\textsuperscript{139} Duncan, \textit{Kingship of the Scots}, 134-9.
\textsuperscript{140} ‘XXX. Bull of John XXII Concerning the Coronation’, 24-5.
Section II: The First Anointed: David II, Edward Balliol and the Early Stewarts

In 1331, David Bruce became the first officially anointed king of Scots. Despite the momentous nature of David II’s coronation in the development of Scottish kingship, the chronicle accounts are not forthcoming with finer details. The date given for the coronation is 24 November 1331, over two years after the death of Robert. Penman has posited a number of reasons, both political and ceremonial, as to why this two year gap occurred. These include the possibility that written instructions from Rome had to be acquired before undertaking the ceremony. However, despite the appeal of a ceremonial reason for the delay, the Papal Bull produced in June 1329 included limited instructions. These dictated that the anointing should be undertaken by the bishop of St Andrews, or the bishop of Glasgow in his stead, and that the king should take an oath promising to defend the Roman Catholic Church and ‘exterminate all heretics’. Within the context of his father’s ‘coronation,’ and the proposed retroactive permission, it is more likely that the details were dictated by the Scots to the papacy than vice versa.

There are a number of other ceremonial issues that could have caused delays, including the return of the Stone of Scone, which had been a provision of the Treaty of Edinburgh-Northampton of 1328, and possibly more of the regalia that had been taken along with it. Penman suggests that ‘the Scottish political community may have viewed the fulfilment of its treaty obligation [...] as so important as to warrant the postponement of the new king’s installation [...]’ As this was the first ‘legitimate’ anointing to take place in Scotland, it is

---

141 Chron. Bower, Vol. V, 71-3; Leslie, Historie, 14; Chron. Wyntoun, 46; Boece, Chronicle, 410. The latter three give minimal detail but confirm date and place. Curiously Maior does not mention the coronation itself, despite a section on Robert’s death, Randolph’s guardianship, David’s youth as reigning king in relation to Randolph’s guardianship, and David fleeing to France; Maior, History, 263-70.
142 The only account that dates the coronation differently is Barbour’s Bruce. The account suggests that the crowning of David II and Joan occurred straight after their wedding (1328) and ties this crowning to a parliament at which succession and guardianship in reconfirmed (recorded by other sources to have occurred 1326). The manner Barbour records the coronation implies it was orchestrated thus by Robert I, perhaps in the style of the early Frankish Capetians who sought to secure their dynasty by crowning infant sons prior to death of the preceding monarch: ‘For he meant in his lifetime to crown his young son [...]’ (Barbour, Bruce, 746-9) See also: Chapter 2, Section II, 124; Chapter 3, Section I, 237.
143 Penman, David II, 44.
144 ‘XXX. Bull of John XXII Concerning the Coronation’, 24-5.
146 Penman, David II, 44-5.
possible that the oil had to be blessed by the pope in Rome and transported to Scotland, although this would have taken a matter of weeks or months rather than years. The English and French holy oils were contained within precious *ampullae* that took pride of place alongside the regalia and had miracle stories attached to their origin. No such miracle story remains extant relating to the holy oil used to anoint Scottish kings; however, the connection between Dunfermline, St Margaret, and the Bruce dynasty could raise a point of consideration. Since David II’s coronation occurred on 24 November, the end of the octave of the feast of St Margaret on 16 November; perhaps the holy oil of Scotland was that of St. Margaret? The miracles of St Margaret include several references to the miraculous qualities of the dust around her grave and the water from her well, sometimes mixed together, and it is not unreasonable to suggest that one or both of these were added to the anointing oil of Scotland.

Scone was the traditional inaugural site but, following the thirteenth-century burial of Alexander III and relocation of the relics of Saint Margaret, there was a firm focus on Dunfermline as a royal mausoleum in which Robert I exploited his connections to the Canmore dynasty. It is possible that Robert had grander ideas for Dunfermline, in line with Edward I’s conscious effort to make Westminster the royal centre for both state funerals and coronations. Various parliamentary records highlight increasing favour being shown to the abbot of Dunfermline post-1314, and sometime between 1320 and 1321 Robert granted a charter to

---

147 The papal calendars do not indicate such an action took place, and further investigation into the papal records held in the School of Humanities at Glasgow has also thus far proven unfruitful.


150 RPS, 1314/1, Legislation: ordinance, judgement and statute of disinheritance [...] (Cambuskenneth, Parliament, 6 November 1314); the abbot of Scone, Thomas de Balmerino, is listed first of abbots. However, in further legislation regarding the entailing of the crown: RPS, 1315/1 (Ayr, Unidentified Assembly, 26 April 1315), 1315/1, and 1318/30 (Scone, Parliament, 3 December 1318); the abbot of Dunfermline tops the witness list. Moreover, in 1323 the records show petitions regarding lands being settled in Dunfermline’s favour: Ibid, 1323/7/1–2, Letter: recording that Dunfermline abbey obtained entry to the lands of Moulin and Letters etc. (Scone, Parliament, 25 July 1323).
Dunfermline that included a permanent light in the choir for the Blessed Virgin and Saint Margaret. Yet, in 1325, Robert I made a grant that confirmed possessions of Scone Abbey, restating its rights as the place where the kings of Scotland received their dignity and honour. With the fluctuating favour offered to these two religious houses, it is reasonable to posit that Dunfermline Abbey laid claim to the right to look after the holy oil, and perhaps even the rite of unction itself. Robert’s grant to Scone confirmed their rights as the place that the honours were bestowed, but said nothing of the receiving of unction. Such ambiguities could have instigated a clash between these two illustrious religious centres that may have in turn caused further delay.

Such ceremonial reasons may have contributed to the extent of the delays. However, as Penman concludes, the uneasy political situation following Bruce’s death – with an infant left to take the throne and an adult Balliol claimant waiting in the wings – was at the root of this hiatus. It was only once Edward Balliol’s allegiance to Edward III of England and the ‘Disinherited’ Scots, who rallied south of the border to challenge the Bruce royal claim, was fully realised in the summer of 1331 that moves were made to crown the child king by the minority government. However, once the decision had been made it became crucial to project a strong image of royal authority through the ceremony.

The records of the early parliaments during David II’s reign are limited, but a brieve containing a summons to the Sheriff of Berwick in September 1331 illuminates a firm link between the coronation and parliament:

David, by the grace of God king of Scots, to his sheriff and bailies of Berwick upon Tweed [...] Since we have ordained our parliament to be held at Scone on the first Friday before the feast of [St Katherine] next to come [22 November 1331] with a continuation of seven days following [...]"
This document indicates two things. Firstly, David was considered king prior to his coronation and the actual act of accession did not occur at this coronation. Whereas, the rushed manner of Alexander II and III’s inaugurations would suggest that the ceremony was the point of legal accession in the previous century. Barbour’s *Bruce* implies that a pre-accession recognition of David and a confirmation of succession with a crowning ceremony occurred in parliament during Robert I’s lifetime, following David’s wedding to Joan of England in July 1328. Bruce’s second heavy-weight ecclesiastic pillar, William Lamberton, died in May 1328 and he was one of a number of Bruce’s long-term supporters passing away or advancing into senior years. By undertaking such a ceremonial display, the aging king’s actions would have visually enhanced the prince’s authority by projecting the rights of his dynasty and heir.

Secondly, the full coronation on 24 November 1331, took place within a ‘coronation parliament’ starting on 22 November. The gathering of the three estates for a parliament guaranteed high attendance and, as Penman states, by placing David’s coronation thus the minority government forged a direct link between the king’s investiture and oaths, and the ‘political role of his subjects.’ The political anxiety surrounding the accession of a child further enmeshed the role of the estates and parliament into the ceremonial investiture of royal power. Therefore, where the power of the English parliament grew through the king’s need for taxes for war, the parliamentary prominence and authority in Scotland was strongly linked to its role in royal succession and acclamation, minorities and the provision of lieutenants.

---

157 Robert Wishart, bishop of Glasgow, had died in 1316.
158 *RPS*, A1331/1; *ER*, Vol. I, 376-92. In the rolls it is noticeable that there are more entries that refer to provisions for the parliament rather than the coronation itself; much of the food and wine supplied appears to be for the parliament, and there also expense for the travel of the king and queen to and from the parliament. (The carriage of king and queen, 381-2).
161 It is interesting to compare this to England where, even in 1553 when Mary Tudor succeeds to the throne, the idea that the new parliament would open prior to the coronation was refused by the queen, illustrating an important difference between the political bodies north and south of the border. See A. Hunt, ‘Legitimacy, Ceremony and Drama: Mary Tudor’s Coronation and *Respublica*’, in P. Happé and W. Hüskens (eds), *Interludes and Early Modern Society: Studies in Gender, Power and Theatricality* (Amsterdam and New York, 2007), 331-51, particularly 336-40.
How much the ceremony changed with the formal addition of unction is hard to gauge without descriptive or prescriptive texts detailing the ceremony. Duncan makes a throw away comment about ‘the composition of a written ordo for the 1331 coronation’ but provides no reference. The Exchequer Rolls include an intriguing payment for ‘scriptura cuiusdam rotuli de officio coronacionis’ combined with some other small expenses at the time of the event totalling 49s. Though ‘rotuli’ usually indicates an expense roll, the ‘de officio coronacionis’ would appear to translate as ‘of/ concerning [the] duty/office/service of the coronation.’ This sounds suspiciously like a payment for the writing of an order of ceremony, although the low price paid for writing it suggests a working copy. Unfortunately, such an order of ceremony no longer appears to exist.

The existence of a specific set of royal regalia in Scotland by 1331 is highly debateable due to the removal of a large number of items by Edward I in 1296. Yet, Robert I’s manner of representing Scottish royal authority, as seen in the ceremonies of his later life, seemed to spare no expense in creating the kind of image that would promote Scotland’s capacity to compete on the European stage, particularly with England. It is, therefore, highly probable that items of regalia were made or purchased for the young king for his wedding to Joan Plantagenet, held three years previously at Berwick in front of English and Scots observers. The Exchequer Rolls for David II’s wedding refer to various merchants procuring goods on the continent for the wedding. One merchant, Thomas of Carnato, definitely purchased precious metals:

---

162 Duncan, ‘Making a King at Scone’, 153.
163 The first volume of which covers the fragmented remains of the source from the reigns of Alexander III, Robert I and David II.
164 ER, Vol. I, 381. The other expenses lumped together with this item include renting a horse, cord (possibly for stringing a musical instrument) and other diverse expenses.
165 As the ER themselves are referred to.
167 See Chapter 1, Section II; Chapter 3, Section I, 235-6.
168 Peter the Machinist’s account has a breakdown of items purchased which will looked at in more detail in Chapter 3, Section I; however, a declaration by the king below the entry with the total for Thomas of Carnato’s purchases record he was exempt by the king from providing a full list (thankfully a few of his individual purchases out with this list survive): ER, Vol. I, 119, 149.
Therefore, to suggest that Carnato may have been entrusted to acquire items such as a crown is definitely not unreasonable. In the coronation expenses, there was a payment of 100s. to Copyn the goldsmith. The payment is not linked to specific work undertaken, but this could indicate that already purchased regalia items\textsuperscript{171} were worked on in preparation for the event. Alexander Brook has suggested that the cut of the diamonds found in the crown that remains extant today were of Indian origin, the style of which can be dated back to the fourteenth century or perhaps earlier.\textsuperscript{172} It is highly improbable that Robert would have been in the position to purchase diamonds and fit them to his crown for his own inaugural ceremony, but he could have done so at a later date for his son.

The mantle, royal banner, and possibly the elusive papal sword, were the only historic remnants of the Canmore regalia in Scotland, but the only known item made in 1331 was a small sceptre. The sceptre, fashioned by the same goldsmith, Copyn, and costing only twenty shillings, has previously been assumed to have been made for the king.\textsuperscript{173} However, the entry occurs in the account of the queen’s clerk of the wardrobe’s accounts; therefore it could as readily be ascribed to her. Either way, the distinct lack of other recorded regalia further warrants that Robert had already invested in purchasing or fashioning regalia to replace that which Edward I removed in his mission to glorify his dynasty. Any regalia Robert commissioned would undoubtedly have been for an adult; however, on the whole there are few references to minor kings’ coronations that indicate that they wore suitably-sized regalia. The use of specific historic regalia and robes in these ceremonies was more important than the

\textsuperscript{169} Ibid, 150.
\textsuperscript{170} Direct translation for the heir or prince is ‘the king playing at king’.
\textsuperscript{171} Ibid, 376.
comfort of minor monarchs. On David II’s seal the sceptre he holds in his right hand is floriated and bears a strong resemblance to that depicted on his father’s. This could merely demonstrate how the craftsmen reused designs, but it could equally indicate that the sceptre was passed from father to son, even if Robert had had the item made some time after 1306.

Further entries from the queen’s clerk of the wardrobe’s account include silk cloth from Antioch, large amounts of red and white velvet, Parisian silk, a chair for the king, furs, four pieces of gold cloth, and expenses for merchants. Over 114 ells (over 100 metres) of red and white velvet were used for the child king and queen suggesting mantles with long trains of ruby red and white, probably fur lined or trimmed. The colour listed here is red rather than the ‘royal purple’ previously used for the Scottish coronation mantle. Alice Hunt notes that during the coronation of Henry VIII (1509), the king entered the coronation ceremony in a red silk and velvet mantle, described as a parliament robe, but was redressed in a purple robe following anointing. A similar rerobing procedure may have occurred for David II, where the newly made red and white velvet robes were replaced following anointing by the purple mantle that was deemed valuable enough for Bishop Wishart to retain from Edward I. However, there are payments indicating that the young king and queen were transported to and from the parliament; therefore, the red fur-lined mantles may have been parliament robes.

The ceremonies were accompanied by music from minstrels, perhaps employed to entertain during the feasting that undoubtedly took place considering the quantities of food

---

174 Most contemporary comments made appear to be in regards to the strains on young kings enduring the weight of adult royal regalia, such as the fact that the crown ‘was held near (instead of on)’ the head of ten year old Charles IX in 1561, or that Richard II infamously had to be carried from his coronation for a rest in 1377, although this is not blamed on the weight of regalia alone: Jackson, Vive le Roi!, 46; Burden, ‘Rituals of Royalty’, 189.

175 Plate 12.

176 Antioch is located in modern day Turkey.

177 ER, Vol. I, 380-1. This section of the account totals £228, 4s. 6d.

178 Ulnis translates to ‘ell’ in Old Scots and was the equivalent to just over 3 foot or approx. 94 cm.


180 Hunt, The Drama of Coronation, 22-33. This is by no means the first English reference to the changing of robes in an English coronation – it occurs in accounts of Richard I’s coronation and the removal and gifting of the robe the king arrives in is recorded in the fourteenth-century Liber Regalis, see ‘Coronation of Richard I’ and ‘Liber Regalis’ in Legge (ed.) English Coronations, 46-53, 81-130.

consumed. The chronicles and financial accounts record the girding of knights. John Stewart, earl of Angus, and Thomas Randolph (junior) were two of those named by Bower as being girded with the belt of knighthood, and the expenses record that ‘trappings/apparel’ were supplied to these two men and their associates for their admission into knighthood. Antioch silk was purchased for ‘certain knights’ at the coronation, and the four pieces of gold cloth listed are recorded as being used ‘in the making of the knights’. Knighting ceremonies frequently coincided with Scottish coronations after 1331 and are generally linked to the rallying of support around a leader. The knighting ceremony, combined with the calling of the parliament, were concerted attempts to create a united front behind the young king. Unfortunately, neither gives any indication of the roles given to secular nobility within the anointing and crowning ceremony. The accounts tell that David ‘was anointed king of Scots, and crowned at Scone’ by James Ben, bishop of St Andrews, whose role had been outlined in the Papal Bull of 1329, but there is no mention of the earl of Fife, or any other earls, or the poet or herald. Thomas Randolph, earl of Moray, is named guardian, but even his role as an actor within the liturgy and procedure of the ceremony is unknown. A description of Randolph in the fifteenth-century Liber Pluscardenis records that he held court in robes of cloth of gold following Bruce’s death in 1329, which certainly suggests that the guardian had a keen understanding of the use of display; but this is not supported by any other material and no records of his clothing for the coronation survive.

The extant sources suggest that David II’s joint coronation with his queen and the surrounding parliament were regal and magnificent, with the Bruce propaganda machine working hard under the guardian Randolph in these early years to project royal authority. Yet, subsequent events support Penman’s proposal that ‘it may not have done enough to alleviate widespread doubt.’ There is no full list of attendees at David’s coronation parliament by

[182 Ibid, 375-404. For minstrels specifically: 398; the food purchases are throughout the whole section.]
[183 Ibid, 385.]
[185 XXX. Bull of John XXII Concerning the Coronation’, 24-5.]
[186 Pluscarden, 195-6.]
[187 Penman, David II, 46.]
which to assess the attendance at the ceremony; however, the earl of Fife was conspicuous in his absence considering his traditional role in enthroning Scottish kings. Fife did go into battle at Dupplin Moor in 1332 on the side of the young king, but in its wake was soon found alongside Balliol and the ‘Disinherited’. This defection from the Bruce cause illustrates the fragility of the new dynasty, with the impending Balliol threat revealing cracks in the facade Robert I had carefully constructed, particularly following the death of the Guardian. By September 1332 the ‘Disinherited’ placed Edward Balliol on the royal throne at Scone, less than a year after David Bruce’s coronation.

Edward’s inauguration is commonly recorded on 24 September, which was neither a Sunday nor a Saint’s day; however, the Lanercost Chronicle dates it to Saint Francis the Confessor’s feast day, 4 October, and proposes that a miracle accompanied the ceremony:

[...] whereas there were in that place an immense multitude of men but slight means of feeding them, God nevertheless looked down and multiplied the victuals there as he did of old in the desert, so that there was ample provision for all men.

Gesta Annalia and Pluscarden do not record a miracle and, although they suggest reasonable attendance at the ceremony, both identify that only men of specific areas of the realm were in attendance, revealing a clear split in support and consequently a great number of absentees: ‘there gathered together the abbots, priors, and estates of Fife and Fothreve, Stratherne and Gowry, whose submission had already been received by the abovementioned Edward.’ One key figure, seemingly absent from David II’s coronation, is found returning to his traditional role; Duncan earl of Fife ‘makes’ Edward king along with William of St Clair, bishop of Dunkeld and a former Bruce supporter. Neither of the two bishops who had received the papal

---

188 Ibid, 44-8.
192 Lanercost Chronicle, 271-272.
193 Chron. Fordun, 347; same list found in Liber Pluscardenis, 199.
sanction to crown and anoint Scottish kings, St Andrews and Glasgow, appear to have been
involved in this ceremony. James Ben, the bishop of St Andrews fled Scotland after the battle of
Dupplin, and died later that year abroad.\textsuperscript{194} However, the bishop of Glasgow, John de Lindsay,
witnessed a charter under Balliol in 1334 that granted Berwick (castle, town and earldom) to
Edward III, so if he was absent in 1332 he soon turned.\textsuperscript{195}

There are no references to anointing in any of the accounts of Edward Balliol’s
coronation;\textsuperscript{196} but considering Balliol’s submission to Edward III, including the aforementioned
grants and his English sponsorship, this is not surprising.\textsuperscript{197} Edward III would not have tolerated
such a display of sacral royal authority for his vassal king, likely censoring the newly acquired
rite. The parliament that followed the coronation has left no record,\textsuperscript{198} so a detailed list of
possible individual coronation attendees cannot be made. \textit{Pluscarden} states that Edward Balliol
was crowned, but there is no indication of the regalia used. If David had been crowned in
‘child-sized regalia’ this would have been of no use to the adult Balliol, and if adult regalia
existed would the ‘invaders’ have access to it or the holy oil?\textsuperscript{199} It is possible that the regalia
utilised by Edward Balliol was that removed from Scotland by Edward I and in turn bestowed
upon Balliol as a vassal king.\textsuperscript{200}

Perhaps unsurprisingly, Edward Balliol’s seal design abandons the French influence
found in both of the Bruce’s seals and returns to an English style. The extremely ornate high-
backed throne is typical of that used by the Plantagenet kings, while Edward Balliol holds both
a sceptre and an orb, though Birch has pointed out the orb was not topped with a cross.\textsuperscript{201} The
sceptre is far simpler than the floriated design of the Bruce, with what appears to be a single

\textsuperscript{194} N. Reid, ‘Ben, James (d. 1332), bishop of St Andrews’ \textit{ODNB} (2004),
\textsuperscript{195} RPS, 1334/4, Charter to Edward III, of the castle, town and earldom of Berwick upon Tweed
(Edinburgh, Parliament, 9 Feb 1334).
\textsuperscript{196} \textit{Chron. Fordun}, 347; \textit{Lanercost Chronicle}, 271; \textit{Pluscarden}, 199.
\textsuperscript{197} \textit{Foedera}, Vol. II, Part II, 84-84; \textit{CDS}, Vol. III, nos. 1108-1112.
\textsuperscript{198} Brown, \textit{Wars of Scotland}, 234-235.
\textsuperscript{199} It is possible that the Balliol party could not access the anointing oil, if earlier discussions of the Holy
Oil being that of St Margaret and held at Dunfermline are deemed correct.
\textsuperscript{200} See above Chapter 2, Section I, 112, fns. 92-5.
\textsuperscript{201} Birch, \textit{History of Scottish Seals}, 46-8.
flower, indicative of the rose sceptre of the Canmore regalia. There are traditional aspects to Edward Balliol’s coronation, such as the use of Scone, the reappearance of Fife in the making of the king, an assembly of the three estates (if from a limited geographical area), and a crowning and enthronement appear to have taken place. However, there are no records of anointing. Any oath to uphold Scottish laws and justice, and protect an independent Scottish church, would have been a hollow gesture in the light of that which was ceded to Edward III as Balliol’s sponsor, if one occurred at all. The inauguration of Edward Balliol, as with that of his father and perhaps more so, saw the ceremonial display of Scottish royal authority of the Canmores and Bruces receding under the weight of English censorship actively restricting elements that marked any independent authority.

The challenges to royal authority and national independence from the late thirteenth century onwards, particularly the vassal kingship of Edward Balliol, seem to have directly affected David II’s successor in 1371 by refocusing an increased emphasis on public acclamation outlined in documents such as the Appeal of the Seven Earls c. 1290/1 and the Declaration of the Clergy in 1309. At the accession of Robert II, despite succession legislation naming him heir from as early as 1318, the majority of the chronicle accounts imply some form of assembly to choose, or acclaim, Robert as king. This followed a stand made by Douglas at Linlithgow claiming the crown by the right of the Balliols and Comyns.

---

202 As yet no reference to the return of regalia in 1331 (or later) has been located in CDS or other documents, so this is very a very speculative statement.

203 'Appeal of the Seven Earls'; RPS, 1309/2, Declaration of the Clergy; see above Chapter 2, Section I, 110-111, fns. 83, 85 and 114, fn. 105. These documents encompass ideas based in Roman law that suggest the right of the political community to choose the monarch and challenge one who did not protect the ‘community of the realm.’ In fourteenth-century Europe there was a rapid increase in work being circulated that based on canonical laws (including Lex Regia) and drawing from works by Aristotle, Cicero and Augustine in treatises and royal handbooks. This was also combined with a general rise in representative political bodies around the ruler, such as the Scottish ‘colloquia’ that evolved into parliament. With such Europe-wide common themes it is unsurprising that the political instability of the late thirteenth and fourteenth centuries in Scotland led to a heightened awareness by king and political community of their mutual dependence on royal power to stabilise. An emphasis on public acclamation would provide a visual reflection of such tensions. For more on the wider European fourteenth-century context see: Watts, The Making of Polities, 233-86; for political writings in particular: 254-63.


but the ‘larger and wiser part agreed on Robert Stewart.’

The nature of this assembly and the suggestion of election reflect the earlier order of ceremony based upon the Northumbrian Pontifical, while also projecting forwards to a seventeenth-century document in Balfour of Denmilne’s collection claiming to describe the coronation of Robert II in 1371. The document is actually more significant to the fifteenth century, where it will be cautiously used later in discussions regarding James II’s coronation. However, in the third paragraph it states:

The Churchmen Nobles Barrons and Burgesses askit at ye king If he wer Lawfull successor or Not and wes villing to accept the dignity of ye Croune wich they did Now offer to his Ma[jes]tie:

This ceremonial offering of the crown suggests a far more stylised and symbolic form of acclamation than Boece stating that ‘the nobillis convenit at Linlithgow cheiss ane successoure to [th]e croun.’ Yet Boece’s description illuminates the gradual progression – shaped by the specific Scottish and wider European contexts – from what was undoubtedly an ‘election’ made from adult male candidates in the very early inaugural ceremonies, to the symbolic offering of the crown and accompanying acclamation relayed in Balfour’s document. The ‘election’ of 1371 could be used to suggest weakness of a king, but its success emphasised Robert II’s

---

206 Maior, History, 309.
207 Stuart, Scottish Coronations, 13-8; Cooper, ‘Four Scottish Coronations’, 5-7. Also see above Chapter 2, Section I, 99-100.
208 There are two copies of the manuscripts: NLS, Adv. MS. 33.7.10, ff. 6-14r and Adv. MS. 33.2.26, ff. 30-1. Adv. MS. 33.7.10, includes a note about the origin of the text, where Denmilne states that the account was ‘faithfully’ transcribed from material at Holyrood, and a full oath following the 1445 parliament record (see below Chapter 2, Section III, 159-65, for further discussions on this subject).
209 The fact that the coronation herein is described at Holyrood rather that Scone has led to concerns over its validity, but Lyall’s work has demonstrated similarities between it and the Forme (Lindsay, ‘Forme of the coronatioun’, 393-5; also compiled in the seventeenth century), indicating that both may have used the same source. Lyall proposes the original source could have been written by a fifteenth-century canon of Holyrood in an attempt to set precedent for James II’s coronation in 1449, following an apparent abandonment of Scone abbey post-1424, in support of Holyrood’s claim as permanent coronation church: Lyall, ‘The Medieval Coronation Service’, 6-17. There was a new abbot of Holyrood elected in 1450, Archibald Crawford, who became increasingly politically active throughout his post (see RPS), and there may have been a coinciding drive to raise the status of his monastery: Heads of Religious Houses, 95.
210 NLS, Adv. MS. 33.2.26, ff. 30-1.
211 Boece, History, Vol. II, 336-7
212 This very real elective system had re-emerged in the succession crisis after Alexander III’s death and into the early fourteenth century, and lead to the political community’s further involvement in royal power and sovereignty.
213 This can be compared to the English enthroning ceremony in Westminster Palace prior to the coronation: Liber Regalis, 83, 114; commented on by the likes of Burden, Rituals of Royalty, 35.
publicly acclaimed right to throne and stressed the authority of the 1326 act of succession.214 The Douglas outburst also allowed Robert the opportunity to show his true colours in settling the dispute through marriage alliance and negotiation, rather than bloodshed. The role of the nobility and other estates remained central to the legitimising of the royal claim, and given his past experience as lieutenant of the realm as well as heading parliament and the estates in power struggles with his predecessor, Robert II would have been keenly aware of the power of the political community.215 This opening act may not have been what Robert had planned, but he managed to take advantage of the situation and move rapidly to his coronation.

Kinloch suggested it was ‘indisputable’ that ‘the majestic ritual of Western Christendom was undertaken’ for Robert II.216 He does not provide references for the source of this information; however, from the rituals he proceeds to describe, it is likely that he utilised the *Ordo of Charles V* (c. 1364). A working copy of this beautifully illuminated manuscript was located in an ancient pontifical that suggests it was held by the bishop of Glasgow, whose title appears in the manuscript.217 Though the elusive ‘rotuli de officio coronationis’218 of David II’s reign may still have existed in 1371, as the first adult king officially anointed in Scotland and the first of his dynasty, Robert was undoubtedly looking to stamp his own mark on the ceremony. Kinloch’s claim is extreme, as no one European coronation directly mimicked another. However, Walter de Wardlaw, bishop of Glasgow, was present at the coronation,219

214 *RPS*, 1326/2.
219 *RPS*, 1371/1-2, Non-parliamentary record: account of the coronation of Robert II and the homage given to him by the prelates and magnates (Scone, Coronation Assembly, 26–27 March 1371).
and if the *Ordo of Charles V* had been in his possession,\(^\text{220}\) it seems probable that it was utilised in the planning of the ceremony. This is made all the more likely if we consider the rising power of Walter de Wardlaw, accelerated by the great papal schism from 1378 onwards,\(^\text{221}\) and the possibility that he may have been trying to replicate Wishart’s level of involvement in the ceremony of Robert I.\(^\text{222}\)

Yet, there is reason to suggest that, despite European influences, Robert II’s coronation would have retained traditional elements. The celebrated Barbour’s *Bruce* was written in the reign of Robert II which, along with a now lost history of the house of Stewart, *The Stewartis Oryginalle* and/or *The Stewartis Genealogy*, appear to have been sponsored by the king.\(^\text{223}\) Robert II’s sponsoring of such genealogical epics further demonstrates his understanding of the importance of the development and projection of strong dynastic roots. There is no evidence to confirm this – as with Robert I – but it seems highly likely that the recitation of genealogy, whether by poet or herald, would have occurred in this ceremony, particularly as Fordun’s chronicle compilation showcasing Alexander III’s inauguration may well have been circulating by 1371. Boardman has discussed the links between the early Stewarts and the Gaelic world; prior to becoming king, Robert the Steward’s acquisitions were primarily Gaelic-speaking and he acted as an intermediary for David II with the West and North. While Barbour’s contemporary descriptions of the Highlands and the Gaelic people reveal a sympathy and understanding that suggest he was better informed than other authors of the era, they also show his attempt to flatter the king’s known local loyalties. Boardman also highlights cultural links

\(^{220}\)There is some debate as to whether the fourteenth-century coronation order was added to the pontifical twelfth-century pontifical while it was in Scotland, or once it made its way into the Cottonian collection in the seventeenth century, see: McRoberts, *Catalogue of Scottish medieval liturgical books*, 4; Lyall, ‘The Medieval Coronation Service’, 17-20; Holmes, ‘Catalogue of Liturgical Books and Fragments in Scotland’, 138.

\(^{221}\)During the papal schism Scotland supported the Avignon antipopes, often reaping the rewards of this support as the two popes vied for power and support. In 1383 Wardlaw went on to be created Cardinal and in 1384 he was made papal legate for both Scotland and Ireland, both positions granted by a grateful Pope Clement VII: Nicholson, *Later Middle Ages*, 190-93; Lynch, *A New History of Scotland*, 101-102.

\(^{222}\)See above Chapter 2, Section I, 113-19.

\(^{223}\)Key records of payments include: *ER*, Vol. II, 566 (1377, £10 gratuity thought to be for the poem the *Brus* as received as an extra above his annual annuity from the fermes of Aberdeen); *ER*, Vol. III, 136, 675, 681 (respectively 1386, £5; 1384, £10; 1386, £6, 8 s., 4 d.); *ER*, Vol. III, 208 (1388–1389, charter granted for £10 annuity for life). In addition there are also annual reference to earlier annuities. *The Stewartis Oryginalle* and/or *The Stewartis Genealogy* is highlighted by Duncan as a work utilised, along with *The Bruce*, by Wyntoun in his chronicle; Barbour, *Bruce*, 3.
through Robert II’s veneration of St Brendan of Bute, and that Robert’s father had a ‘harpour’ of high status. The Gaelic connection, particularly the harpist (recognisable as one of the figures on the Scone seal depicting Alexander III’s inauguration) would strongly suggest that the poet undertook the recitation of the genealogy at Robert II’s coronation.

The extant Exchequer Rolls for 1371 are limited in scope, and only one reference to thirty-two gallons of wine being used at the time of the coronation costing a grand total of £4.6 s.8d. survives. However, the chronicles and parliamentary records can provide some detail.

‘Our Lady Day in Lentern’ or ‘the Annunciation of Our Lady’ was highlighted as the chosen day of the coronation, with Wyntoun emphasising the element of choice in a specific day when he states ‘The king gertset a certane day.’

The choice of the Annunciation feast meant that the attendees could receive indulgences. Moreover, it was also the anniversary of the inaugural ceremony of Robert I sixty-five years earlier. The coronation parliament records add more depth to the chronicle reports of the ceremony at Scone by revealing a clear separation of events across two days. On the first day, that recorded by the chronicles, the king:

[...] was crowned and anointed as king by the reverend father in Christ the lord William de Landels, bishop of St Andrews. At which coronation and anointing, the lords prelates, earls and barons and all the nobles written below were present, with a great assembled multitude of people from all parts of the kingdom of Scotland.

---

224 S. Boardman, ‘The Gaelic World and Early Stewart Court’, in Broun and M. MacGregor (eds), Miorun Mor nan Gall, The Great Ill-Will of the Lowlander? (Glasgow, 2007), 83-109, particularly 84.
226 If the poet had recited the genealogy, it is likely that he spoke in Scots rather than Gaelic as posited for Robert Bruce, due to the manner of listing each as son or ‘mac’ of predecessor not allowing for hereditary right from female line.
229 Chron. Wyntoun, Vol. VI, 264-6. It is worth noting here Boardman’s discussions on Wyntoun’s source of the ‘Anonymous Chronicler’, also utilised by Bower, for the reigns of David II and Robert II. The anonymous chronicler was probably a secular cleric in the service of noble family. See Boardman, ‘Chronicle Propaganda in Fourteenth-Century Scotland’, 23-48, particularly 23-8.
230 Indulgences were remissions of temporal punishment for sins, usually earned through good deeds and prayers, but often given more liberally on significant Marian feast days and Christmas/Easter.
231 RPS, 1371/1, Non-parliamentary record: account of the coronation of Robert II (Scone, Coronation Assembly, 26 March 1371).
The following day had a far more individually Scottish tone to it, suggestive of the inaugural ceremony described for Alexander III in 1249:

[...] the next day, with the king sitting on the royal throne upon the hill of Scone, as is the custom, the prelates, earls and barons and nobles written below assembled and compeared in his presence [...] All of whom individually made homage and oaths of fealty to our said lord the king [...]232

The inauguration day of Alexander II was extended to a three day celebration due to the addition of two days of feasting,233 and there is a separate Mass on the Sunday following Robert I’s inauguration,234 but this is the first incidence where the ceremony of enkinging itself took place on more than one day. Boece states in addition that the ‘king maid sindry erlis, baron and knychtis [...]’235 and as the first of his dynasty Robert II had every reason to include the public bestowal of honours upon his loyal supporters within his coronation, as had been the case with his predecessor David II.

The foreign *ordines* that may have been accessible to Robert II236 would have illuminated Jacques le Goff’s suggestion that: ‘Royal consecration is so much more than a mere inauguration.’237 The ceremony had grown to involve numerous elements including pre-coronation processions,238 and the introduction of late night vigils, prayers and preparations undertaken by the king the day prior to the coronation by the thirteenth century.239 The *Charles*
V ordo included the element of ‘waking or raising’ of the king, where the king was ceremonially woken by two bishops who, once he was dressed, led him in a procession to the coronation. The coronation ceremony was becoming a more extravagant representation of sacral monarchical power through a variety of elaborations and additional ritual. Whether directly influenced by the Charles V ordo or not, the Scottish ceremony in 1371 appears to have been expanding and developing in unison with its European counterparts. However, Robert II’s two day ceremony of coronation divided the first day’s religious and divine elements from a second day of ceremony that was centred round the public giving of homage. The latter retained a distinctly Scottish traditional air to it with the king enthroned outdoors to receive the homage and fealty of his people.

The records of the coronation parliament also provide a list of the individuals who paid homage to the king, all of whom were present at the coronation anointing the previous day. These included six bishops, five abbots and a prior, five earls, and whole host of barons, nobles, knights, and lords. From this list it is impossible to discern which individuals had specific roles, but the high placement of certain ecclesiastics in this listing is noteworthy. It is unsurprising that the bishops of St Andrews and Glasgow feature first and second; however, the unpositioning of the abbot of Dunfermline before all the other abbots could indicate his prominent

---


role. This perhaps links the possible housing of the Holy Oil and relics of St Margaret, on which the oath may have been made, or could be seen as a nod towards Bruce’s strong connections with Dunfermline. For the first time the list of attendees clearly indicates the presence of the High Constable of Scotland, Thomas de Hay, and the Marischal, William Keith. These two figures, along with the Lyon herald, had increasingly important roles according to the seventeenth-century compilations. Unfortunately, the listings of named Lyon heralds only record the names of the individuals who held the role from 1399 and, unlike the Constable and Marischal, the office of Lyon herald was not hereditary. A Lyon herald certainly functioned in the reign of Robert II, with £6 expenses found for the Lyon herald on envoy to London in 1384. However, the extant contemporary material does not reveal whether the Lyon herald, or Thomas de Hay, or William Keith took a ceremonial role in the coronation of Robert II. The other secular figure who appears absent was the earl of Fife; however, Boardman has proposed the possibility that Isabella, countess of Fife, may have taken this role as a charter locates her in Perth on 30 March following the coronation. This factor is also another link back to the inaugural ceremony of Robert I, where the countess took on the role of the earl.

There is no record of the oath that was taken by Robert II. However, the parliament records can add another detail through legislation regarding the installation of John, earl of Carrick, as guardian in 1384:

> And furthermore all and singular the prelates, procurators of prelates and others from the clergy, earls and barons, and the burgesses who were present in the said council, personally performed their oaths, touching the Holy Gospels, in presence of the king himself and in full council, for protecting all and singular of the foregoing as far as they are able, and for maintaining, strengthening and supporting the said lord earl of Carrick, appointed under the king to the

---


244 As she does not resign her title to the crown until 30 March, this would have been her right. Her fourth husband, John Dunbar who was styled earl of Fife, jure uxoris, but he died before 1371. See A. Weir, Britain’s Royal Families: The Complete Genealogy (London: Pimlico, 2002), 215-17.

245 Boardman, Early Stewart Kings, 50.
government of the law and fulfilling of justice, by the ways in which it is written.  

The document does not record either oath in full. Nevertheless, it indicates the type of language utilised, the manner in which the oaths were undertaken (with a hand on the gospel), and emphasises the importance of parliament and the estates to the power of the monarch or temporary guardian. Robert II retained the traditional site of Scone for his coronation, which he would go on to favour for parliament until 1384 and choose as a burial site. Thus he consciously exploited connections between death, accession, succession and governance by centralising all of them at Scotland’s ancient and traditional king-making site, and utilising public parliaments and ceremonies combined with the traditional site of inauguration in a programme to legitimise and strengthen his dynasty.

The coronation of Robert III showed a similar desire to compete with known European models while adhering to traditional aspects including the continual singling out of Scone. The linking of Robert II’s funeral to the coronation of his son essentially created a four day event starting with the funeral on Saturday 13 August, followed by Robert III’s coronation on Sunday, Annabella Drummond’s coronation as queen occurred on Monday, and the event was concluded on Tuesday 16 August with the giving of fealty ceremony. Holding Annabella’s coronation on the Feast of the Assumption of Our Blessed Lady (Monday 15 August) was perhaps a conscious decision. Robert III’s father and Robert I had both been inaugurated on the feast of the Annunciation, which was another prominent feast of Blessed Virgin Mary, providing a liturgical link back to them. Moreover, this prominent feast day would have featured an extended Mass and the possibility of indulgences being granted to further enhance the religiosity of the occasion.
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246 RPS, 1384/11/16, Legislation: [Re: Carrick being made governor] (Holrood, Council, Nov 1384).
247 There is no mention of a relic, but this may have been reserved purely for royal coronations.
248 See Chapter 1, Section III, 51.
249 Thanks to Richard Millar for highlighting the following references regarding grants to Scone (in this case regarding St Giles in Edinburgh) that make clear statements as to Scone’s right to stage the coronation for Scottish kings as had been done for their ancestors: Liber Ecclesie de Scone, Munimenta Vestustria Monasterii Sancte Michaelis de Scon, ed. W. Smith (Edinburgh, 1843), nos. 189, 191.
For Robert III’s coronation the account by Wyntoun provides a great deal more information about the ceremony itself, particularly regarding the regalia.

\[\text{Pe [The] Bischope of Sancte Androwis se,}
\text{Walter, with gret solemnyte}
\text{Gaf our kynge par [thar] pe [the] crowne,}
\text{His suerde, his sceptere, and vnccion.}\]

The reference to ‘our’ king, as well as the knowledge that Wyntoun was a canon of St Andrews priory at the time of the ceremony, is suggestive of either Wyntoun being present or having an eye-witness to rely upon when describing the event.\(^\text{252}\) The regalia of Robert III’s father was not referred to in the records of 1371; however, the obverse of Robert II’s seal shows him enthroned and crowned, holding a long floriated sceptre in his right hand and the cord of his mantle in his left.\(^\text{253}\) This pose, which draws attention to the mantle, can be found in a large number of Scottish royal seals, except those most heavily influenced by English design, and the mantle’s prominence can be found at least as early as the inauguration of Alexander III, suggesting its traditional roots in the Scottish ceremony. Birch comments that Robert II’s ‘seal is of elegant conception, and contrasts well with royal seals in England and other kingdoms of a contemporary date.’\(^\text{254}\) As with his coronation, the first Stewart king had taken the best of the rest and moulded it with Scottish tradition to make something that marked the dawn of his new dynasty. The seals of father and son are very similar with the key difference appearing in the superior elegance found in that of Robert III. Birch has proposed it was Italianate,\(^\text{255}\) a fitting observation since an Italian moneyer, Bonagio, worked in crown service at the royal mint during Robert III’s reign.\(^\text{256}\) How much the seals can be relied on as true representations of the

\(^{251}\) Ibid.
\(^{252}\) While Wyntoun owed much an ‘Anonymous Chronicler’ there is additional information in Wyntoun, not found in Bower who was also thought to have used the same source, in the case of the funeral of Robert II and coronation of Robert III, which could indicate Wyntoun’s personal presence in 1390 or a different eye-witness source of information. See above Introduction, 17, fn. 78.
\(^{253}\) See plate 15.
\(^{254}\) Birch, History of Scottish Seals, 50.
\(^{255}\) Ibid, 51-2. See plate 16.
\(^{256}\) ER, Vol. III, 82, 655. Both reference refer to Bonagio ‘the monetario’, the first regarding a gift from the king (both dated in 1380s); while Ian Halley Stewart notes that Bonagius can be found working in the Scottish mint from c. 1364 to post-1393, see The Scottish Coinage, 30-7.
regalia used by these kings is questionable, but they signify a desire to blend the old and traditional with the new and continental.

The coronation and unction took place within the abbey church and not one but two bishops were clearly involved:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Þe [The] Bischope þat [that] tyme of Glasgû,} \\
\text{Off Glendenwyn Schir Mathew,} \\
\text{Mad þe [the] collacion richt pleyssande,} \\
\text{And to þe [the] mater accordande.}^{257}
\end{align*}
\]

The specific reference to the separate roles of two different bishops can be linked to contemporary orders of ceremony from England and France. In the Liber Regalis the bishops of Durham and Bath ‘support on either hand’ of the king in the procession from Westminster palace to the abbey church;\(^{258}\) while in the French ceremony the king was woken by two bishops and taken to the ceremony.\(^{259}\) It is not clear from Wyntoun whether the two bishops led the king into the church or woke him from his bed; however, this confirms the role of the bishop of St Andrews as investor of the regalia\(^{260}\) and the bishop of Glasgow’s integral place in the coronation liturgy.

The ecclesiastical figures in the ceremony are brought to the foreground, while any secular involvement appears limited. In the chronicle accounts there are no references to the once essential secular figures, most specifically the earl of Fife. However, the power struggle between the earl of Fife as guardian of the realm and the king, his older brother, may have seen his ceremonial importance downplayed.\(^{261}\) Although Carrick [Robert III]’s position as heir was not questioned, Fife’s lieutenancy was confirmed in May 1390 prior to the coronation.\(^{262}\) If

---

\(^{258}\) Liber Regalis, 115.
\(^{259}\) See above Chapter 2, Section II, 137, fn. 239; also see Plate 14.
\(^{260}\) This is definitely not something that can be said pre-1329: the inauguration of Alexander III highlights that the sceptre was most likely invested by secular actor, while the crown was worn from outset of celebration. See Duncan, Kingship of the Scots, 138.
\(^{261}\) Fife was made guardian in 1388: ‘the three communities at length agreeing [...] have amicably chosen Sir [Robert Stewart] earl of Fife, second-born son of the king [...] guardian of the kingdom under the king, and his first born and [sic] son and heir [...]’, RPS, 1388/12/1, Legislation: roll of parliament (Edinburgh, Council, 1 December 1388).
\(^{262}\) Boardman, Early Stewart Kings, 173-5.
effectively handled by Robert III, the ceremonial handing over of the regalia by the earl of Fife on this occasion could have provided a powerful projection of the king’s authority with the lieutenant returning the power to rule back to his brother at his accession. Yet, Robert III’s stance remained too weak at this stage to have Fife involved in the ceremony on the king’s terms and ultimately it was better for his reputation if Fife was kept clear of the ceremony. An equally plausible explanation for the low profile of secular figures in the ceremony would be the religious commentators, such as Wyntoun and Bower, who perhaps saw no need to elaborate on secular involvement. The church even intruded on one of the most secular and traditional aspects, the giving of fealty before the enthroned king, in the case of Robert III: Thomas, bishop of Galloway, gave a ‘rycht pleyssande’ sermon following the homage ceremony on the final day. It is by no means clear whether the fealty ceremony occurred outside on this occasion. Yet, the fact that the event took place in August supports a case for the homage ceremony being held outdoors in the traditional manner.

The remaining Exchequer accounts only list total amounts spent, and the largest figure listed is bound up with the funeral expenses of Robert III’s father. The clerk of the wardrobe, Walter Forster, received £128, 16s. 5d. for ‘diverse wardrobe items for the king at the time of his coronation at Scone.’ However, no breakdown account of the clerk listing individual items purchased remains. Ricardo Bard, who appears in the rolls as the clerk of liverance, received £27, 6s. 8d. for expenses for the king’s household in Perth after the coronation, and two shillings were paid to the baillies of Perth for the delivery of letters at the time of the coronation. Henry Garland of Edinburgh also received £26 in connection with debts of the

---

264 The use of outdoor spaces for ceremony has a long heritage in Scotland, particularly for enthroning and gatherings of royal and judicial councils (see above Chapter 2, Section I; particularly O’Grady, ‘The Setting and Practice of Open-air Judicial Assemblies in Medieval Scotland’); and during the reign of Robert III and the guardianship of the earl of Fife there is clear evidence that a preference for outdoor spaces continues. For example, Bower discusses a council called to meet at Falkland and refers to the attendees being seated in the garden: Chron. Bower, Vol. VIII, 52-5.
265 There is a total of £402, 15s. 4d. listed, but this is for both Robert II’s funeral and the coronation, ER, Vol. III, 279.
266 Ibid, 279-80.
king and queen from the time of their coronation in the following year’s accounts. There is no record of provisions for food and wine for guests extant in the rolls, so Bower’s suggestion that ‘everyone passed the days of festivity most pleasantly’ is difficult to expand on. The expenses of the king in Perth and payments involving the burgh could indicate that the coronation party were accommodated in and around Perth, and that the burgh itself ended up footing some of the bill; unfortunately, burgh accounts for Perth are not extant for this period to confirm this. An indication of the volume of guests in attendance can be found in Bower:

So great was the crowd from every part of the kingdom that gathered for the king’s coronation that all the standing crops of the monastery of Scone nearby and in other places and granges round about were ruined by the horses.

This crushing of the crops by the crowds was the beginning of an interesting episode recorded by Bower that results in one of the earliest accounts of charivari in the northern British Isles. The courtiers’ reaction at the disturbance was to demand punishment, but the king, ‘wise man that he was,’ had the damage assessed and reparations paid. McGavin has suggested that this event went further than just illuminating his desire for justice, and demonstrated that Robert III understood the ritualised language of his people and allowed popular access to the king’s person.

268 Ibid, 311.
270 Ibid.
272 When an attempt to seek payment for the damage to crops by the granger canon of Scone, Robert Logy, was rebuffed by rude courtiers, the local people gathered at Logy’s request the following morning banging basins with sticks and blowing trumpets below the king’s window: Chron. Bower, Vol. VIII, 3-5; J.J. McGavin, ‘Robert III’s Rough Music’: Charivari and Diplomacy in a Medieval Scottish Court’, SHR, Vol. 74, 2, No. 198 (October, 1995), 144-58; Ibid, Theatricality and Narrative in Medieval and Early Modern Scotland (Aldershot, 2007), 70-84; Dillon, The Sense of Sound, 93-4, see fn. 2.
Parliament records for 1390 are scarce but they show that a council met at Scone on 18 August, two days after the close of the three day coronation ceremony. As during Robert III’s father’s reign, royal governance and ceremony were predominantly concentrated in the Scone and Perth area, with ten out of sixteen councils and parliaments occurring there. A document from the council held at Perth in January 1399, when Robert III’s eldest son, David duke of Rothesay, was made Lieutenant, offers further understanding of the Scottish royal oath:

And afterwards the said duke [will] be sworn to fulfil after his ability all the things that the king at his crowning was sworn to do for the Holy Kirk and the people, since he is to bear the king's power in these things, that is to say to keep the freedom and right of the kirk undiminished, to cause the laws and loveable customs to be kept for the people, to restrain and punish manslayers, robbers, burners and all misdoers generally through strength, and especially to restrain at the request of the kirk cursed men, heretics and [people] excluded from the kirk.

The start of this section clearly highlights that this oath was meant to mimic that which the king had undertaken at his crowning, and as such provides clues about the Scottish royal inaugural oath in the fourteenth century. The main focus upon protecting the kirk and people, upholding freedoms and privileges of the church and estates, keeping the laws and customs of the country are all indicative of the Scottish oath being comparable to those found in the European ordines. The fact that the taking of the oath was orchestrated within a council of the three estates further emphasises the crucial need for the crown to be seen to accept parliamentary consensus for monarchical power.

Robert III came to the throne amidst a political situation in which his authority was threatened by his younger brother and guardian of the realm, the earl of Fife. However, records of his coronation illustrate that the king was able to utilise this public occasion to enhance his image. With the estates, this was accomplished through the magnificence of his elaborate and

---

275 RPS, 1390/1, Letters: precept to the sheriff of Edinburgh and bailies of Linlithgow (Scone, Council, 18 August 1390); Chron. Bower, Vol. VIII, 3-5; ER, Vol. III, 227. There are some discrepancies about the timing following the oath of fealty on 16 August. The council is recorded as meeting at Scone on 18 August but Bower suggests they left the abbey of 17 August. The ER suggests movement back and forth between Scone and Perth during the parliament and coronation

extended coronation ceremonies, and with the common people of his realm, through his swift action to repair damages in response to their rustic ritualised messages. The king struggled through the remainder of his reign to uphold royal authority; however, over the days of the coronation, during the conspicuous absence of his competitor, the king was able to project a strong and all-encompassing royal image. This would be further fortified in the person of Robert III’s son and heir David, whose maturing on the political scene saw the eclipse of the earl of Fife for a number of years, a process that began with the demission of Fife’s own lieutenancy in 1393, and culminated with the aforementioned lieutenancy of David from 1399. Between these two events came David’s creation as the first Duke of Rothesay, again occurring at Scone:

In 1398 King Robert III held a great council at Perth where he raised his eldest son David Stewart from earl of Carrick to duke of Rothesay and Sir Robert his brother [...] from the earl of Fife and Menteith to duke of Albany [...] This ceremony was performed at Scone on [Sunday] 28 April, with sir Walter Trail bishop of St Andrews celebrating mass and preaching (about the state of the realm) before the king and queen.

This event encapsulates two of the most prominent features linked to the inaugural ceremonial that developed throughout the course of the fourteenth century: the ‘liturgification’ of secular royal ceremonial and the relationship between the parliament of three estates and the crown.

The fourteenth century was one full of complex rivalries and political power struggles. Nevertheless, hindsight should not overshadow the fact that each monarch, with perhaps the exception of Edward Balliol, was raised to the throne with an increasing awareness of European ceremonial developments to which they responded with the production of distinguished and impressive representations of royal authority even in the face of highly challenging political situations. Following the Bull of Unction of 1329, there was a marked acceleration in the

---

277 Boardman, Early Stewart Kings, 195-7.
278 Scone remained a prominent site for ceremonies in Robert III’s reign. The most prominent event being the creation of the titles of Duke of Rothesay and Albany for Prince David and the earl of Fife, and while the accounts of this event do not confirm if it occurred outside, the use of Moot Hill for the elevation of the heir to the throne to his dukedom would have been fitting and poignant, and an outdoor event would have allowed for far more attendees to view the ceremony.
‘liturgification’ process proposed by Duncan. This was fuelled in part by closer relations to France through the Avignon antipopes, and reflected in the choice of prominent religious feast days for the inaugural ceremonies. As Kantorowicz has highlighted:

The intention combined with the usage is obvious. The king’s day of exaltation was to coincide with the days of exaltation of the Lord in order to make [...] the terrestrial kingship appear all the more transparent against the background of Christ.

However, while the magnificence and liturgical complexities of Western Christendom were allowed to encroach upon the Scottish ceremony and the Scottish kings firmly embraced some aspects of the splendour of their contemporaries, there were also elements of the traditional emphasised and developed in unison with them. Some of the details of these traditional aspects – such as the recitation of the genealogy and the role of the poet – are hard to draw concrete conclusions about, but there are those that can be followed fairly consistently, such as the splitting of the secular and public enthronement undertaken by the nobility, usually headed by the earl of Fife or a representative, from the religious and private ceremony that now included the anointing of the king within the church. The secular nature of the Scottish ceremony was not smothered by the increased religiosity of the coronation ceremony, and it could be debated whether the Scottish kings had the same ideas about the sacral nature of kingship shared by their contemporaries. Fourteenth-century ceremonies were framed by a political backdrop in which the three estates of parliament played an increasingly important part in the acclamation of royal power, and the developments in the reciprocal oath emphasised the importance of this relationship in the projection of Scottish royal authority.

---

280 Duncan, *Kingship of the Scots*, 150.
Section III: Governors, Lieutenants, and Minorities: Fifteenth-Century

Our king fra [th]ine callit be,
Set he was in Ingland styll
Haldyn all agane his will,
[Th]at he mycht on nakyn wys,
Take ony of his insignyis,
As crowne, ceptoure, suerd or ring,
Syk as afferis till a king
Off kynd be rycht; [y]it neuir[th]eles
Oure lege lorde and king he was [...]

Wyntoun illuminates a major issue facing the Scottish political community in 1406 following the death of Robert III, the heir to the throne, James I, languished in the Tower of London after attempts to send him to France for his safety had gone terribly wrong. A document signed at Melrose marking the handing over of power to James in April 1424 notes that it was ‘Anno Regni nostri Decima Nono’ or the ‘nineteenth year of our reign’, and during James’s captivity he was referred to at various stages, usually when of benefit to his captors, as King of Scots. Moreover, Wyntoun states that ‘[th]e staitis of oure kynrik haile’ had announced the captive prince as rightful heir; however, he remained uncrowned for a further eighteen years and an interim solution had to be found. Through the power of the estates Robert, duke of Albany, was placed in a new position of authority as ‘governor’ of the realm, a title that had not been bestowed before. While the parliament records for 1406 do not survive, additional material reveals the outcome was ratified in Aberdeen on 5 July 1406. Whether there was a ceremony marking this appointment is uncertain; however, the fact that chroniclers recording the

284 Foedera, Vol. IV, Part IV, 115; also see RPS, 1424/1, ‘Procedure: Variant Preambles’ (Perth, Parliament, 26 May 1424).
285 CDS, Vol. IV, nos. 892, 895, 898. These entries predominantly date from when Henry V’s army was in France using James I as a figurehead, and the period prior to this. See also Brown, James I, particularly 22-4.
286 Chron. Wyntoun, Vol. VI, 416-17. Wyntoun’s chronicle ends with Robert III’s death and is commonly believed to have been written in the latter years of Albany’s governorship (Wyntoun died c. 1422) making it wholly contemporary. However, the historian’s bias was in favour of the Stewart line. See Boardman, ‘Chronicle Propaganda in Fourteenth-Century Scotland’, 23-48; K. Hunt, ‘The Governorship of the First Duke of Albany, 1406-1420’ (Unpublished thesis, University of Edinburgh, 1998), 2-5.
confirmation use the title ‘governor’ instead of ‘lieutenant’, suggests that this increase of power would have been publicly confirmed in a parliamentary ceremony. Wyntoun – who was writing before James I’s return – remarks on the duke’s virtue and his status as ‘full bro[th]ir to [th]e king’ [Robert III], in a manner which emphasised the duke’s dynastic rights to continue the Stewart line in his nephew’s stead.

Albany’s predominance can be illustrated by his governor’s seal, his role in granting and confirming legislation and charters (documents that made no reference to the absent king), and council records that dated items by the number of years of his governorship. These all show how the duke’s status was elevated during his nephew’s absence. The manner in which the governor and the estates, who confirmed his position, promoted his quasi-royal personal authority has led to suggestions of underlying moves to take the crown. However, while the seal is certainly modelled on royal examples, the royal arms are quartered with his own personal arms and the inscription clearly states that this was the governor’s seal rather than that of a king. Moreover, as Hunt has posited, the seal was a ‘necessary and practical prerequisite to good government,’ and Albany’s seal can be likened to that of the guardians in the succession crisis following the death of Alexander III in 1286. In both cases, the long term absence of a monarch encouraged the political community to adopt symbols of royal power in order to support the stability of the realm.

288 Chron. Wyntoun, Vol. VI, 416-7; Chron. Bower, Vol.VIII, 65. There is a switch back from this title of ‘governor’ in the minority of James II, when the minority leaders take the name Lieutenant General.


290 See Plate 17. The seal can be found referred to on two occasions, once in 1408-9 when £14 was spent on the silver required for the making and engraving of the seal, and in 1409-10 the Bishop of Aberdeen was paid £33, 6s. 8d. for expenses that included silver for the governor’s seal: ER, Vol. IV, 69, 86-7.

291 Some examples include: RPS, 1417/1-2, ‘Legislation’, (Perth, General Council, 17 March 1416) and ‘Letters: under the privy seal concerning the rights of the church of Aberdeen and the church of Brechin’ (Perth, General Council, 26 June 1417).

292 For example: RPS, 1410/1, ‘Charter to Thomas Corsby’ (Holyrood, General Council, 14 March 1410).

293 For example see: Nicholson, Later Middle Ages, 256; Grant, Independence and Nationhood, 184-6; Brown, James I, 26.


During his absence, the extent of James I’s role in his kingdom was ambiguous and debatable. However, following the deaths of Robert, duke of Albany (d. 1420) and Henry V (d. 1422), when the return of the king became a reality, the large number of safe conducts produced for Scottish nobles to visit the king suggest he was increasingly interacting with his nobility, particularly once he began moving northwards to Brancepeth, near Durham. These safe conducts reveal that nobles of a variety of ranks, accompanied by entourages sized according to status, were granted access to the king. These included eight earls (or heirs thereof): Lennox, Wigtown, Moray, Crawford, Orkney, Angus, Strathearn, (heir of) Atholl, along with the hereditary Constable, Hay, and the Marischal. Perhaps these nobles were giving fealty, which would have acted as a pre-cursor to formal proceedings. As Brown has demonstrated, James I had not been a complete stranger to his nobility during his captivity. Still, after eighteen years in England, his return was a crucial moment for both the king and his nobility. Though a prisoner, James had at times been a functional member of the English royal court. Through investigations of James’s royal court and household post-1424, Nicola Scott has challenged the traditional view of James I as a strong and successful monarch. She argues that James’s attempts to form a centralised English-inspired court demonstrated misconceptions of how to promote his power in Scotland which alienated a large proportion of his nobility. By Scott’s reckoning James’s time in England, when he adopted the overt shows of power of the Lancastrian court, set him up to clash with his own nobility.

The Calendar of Documents gives glimpses of James I’s time in England, including movements between various residences, as well as apparel, horses, and banners purchased for him, particularly during the preparations for his involvement in the Anglo-French wars. Brown does not discuss one of the key ceremonial events in which James was personally.

297 Ibid, nos. 698 (1407), 780 (1408), 824, 833 (1412), 911 (1421), 912 (1422), 918 (1421-1422); while at Brancepeth he had 160 knights and esquires in attending him, no. 984. Brown, James I, 18-9. For example, the earl of Orkney was James I’s guardian at the time of his capture and remained with him for some time. The king had as fellow captives the earl of Douglas and Murdach Stewart, and a flow of Scottish servants and officials suggest his household was made up primarily of Scottish men, even if most were by Brown’s reckoning of ‘limited political importance.’
involved. However, this is perhaps one of the most significant in terms of James’s exposure to highly ritualised English royal ceremony, for it involved the arrival and coronation of Henry V’s queen, Katherine de Valois, in February 1421. The marriage, which sealed Henry V’s regency of France and his heir’s rights to the French throne, took place in France on 3 June 1420, when James was on the continent. Moreover, the Scottish king was definitely present for the coronation feast in London:

 [...] and on the lyfte syde was the Kyng of Schottys sette in hys a-state uppon the lyfte syde of the quene, that was servyd alle way nexte the quene and byschoppys a-fore sayde [...] 

Burden discusses the coronation banquet of Katherine, particularly noting the use of ‘soltetes’ – ‘three-dimensional tableaux that were sculpted from sugar paste and then painted’ – and the myriad of imagery and iconography used in these exquisite displays. A ‘fitting procession’ led by horsemen made its way from the Tower of London to Westminster, which may have included recycled pageantry used six years earlier in the victorious return of Henry V to London in 1415 following Agincourt. Adam Usk records that ten thousand citizens and nobles dressed in red met the king on horseback outside the city at Black Heath in 1415, and the pageantry included a giant on London Bridge, St George, conduits flowing with wine, and a three storey castle decorated with coats of arms on which angels, singers and musicians played and sang. This gives a taste of what James likely witnessed at the ceremony held for Katherine six years later.
In regards to James I’s return to Scotland, Brown has proposed that ‘the formal transition of power occurred in two stages’: James I sealing the treaty and documents that confirmed his release at Durham on 28 March 1424; and the surrender of the seals of office by Murdac at Melrose on 5 April. These two events certainly mark the start of the process that saw James’s return to take up his active reign; however, the ceremonial transition up to his coronation took two months from the signing of the treaties in March, and included four or five major ceremonial events that emphasised the transfer of power. The two aforementioned events at Durham and Melrose were the first of these, while a possible entry to Edinburgh in April, followed in May by the coronation at Scone and the subsequent parliament at Perth, constitute the other key ceremonial events. Bocce records that James I came:

[...] to Edinburgh on Cair Sonndaye afoire Pasche, quhair all [th]e nobillis of Scotland mett him with maist triumfhe and honour [...] The pepill gaderitt with grete confluence oute of all boundis, richt desyrous to see him, because he was [th]air native prince and nocht sene be [th]ame mony [y]eris afoir.

One of the main features of the liturgy of Palm Sunday was an extended procession prior to the Mass. John Harper notes that these often ‘began at another church or outside the city walls’

favour, spending ten years in exile on the continent, but was back in England between 1411 and 1421. He showed admiration for Henry V, but also criticised the financial demands made on the country; therefore, he can be used a fairly reliable witness as long as his possible biases are considered:


Hector Boece, writing in the first half of the sixteenth-century, can be described as a ‘cut-and-paste’ historian as by self-admission he ‘gathered from writers both of our nation and foreign.’ As principal of Aberdeen University he would have had access to a wealth of material (much of which no longer survives); however, he was known to have been paid by the crown and the book is dedicated to James V (possibly as a ‘mirror to princes’ book as it is dates 1527 when James was nearing the end of his minority). In addition, he was a humanist scholar whose work shows a great interest in the representation of good government, so there are certain biases to be considered. His work is largely based on Bower’s Scotichronicon, but this event does not feature in Bower; therefore, he either had an additional source or was basing it on an event more contemporary to his own time (perhaps 1503 or 1513?). For more on Hector Boece see: N. Royan, ‘Boece [Boethius], Hector (c. 1465–1536), historian and college head’ on ODNB, http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/2760 Accessed 30 Sept 2012.

The Sunday before Easter would have been Palm Sunday, in 1424 this would have been 16 April, prior to Easter on 23 April.

Boece, Chronicle, 382.

Harper, The Forms and Orders of Western Liturgy, 139-40; Wright, ‘The Palm Sunday Procession in Medieval Chartres,’ 344-71; Bruun, ‘Procession and Contemplation in Bernard of Clairvaux’s First Sermon for Palm Sunday’, 67-82. Even in the latter articles, which discuss the Cistercian Palm Sunday processions, that did not venture beyond the bounds of the monastery walls, the processional aspect of the event within these confines was still central to the structure of the liturgy.
and that the liturgy of the ceremony included the gospel relaying Christ’s entry to Jerusalem. Boece’s description of the nobles meeting the king, separating them from the ‘people’ who gathered to greet him, suggests they came out of the city to lead him in, similar to the victorious return entry of Henry V. The use of this prominent liturgical event focusing on Christ entering Jerusalem would have been central in the minds of those who witnessed James I entering the city, magnifying the solemnity of the occasion. The description of the crowds awaiting him ‘with grete confluence oute of all boundis’ suggests that the gathering was of a size not seen before, or at least not remembered, and that they came from a wide geographical scope. The rather generic terms of ‘triumph’ and ‘honour’ used to describe the manner in which the king was received give little elaboration on what the city had prepared for the king’s return, and no burgh accounts for Edinburgh remain extant for this year to further expand this understanding.

The coronation itself took place at Scone on Sunday 21 May. The entry had been over a month early on 16 April, and it is likely that announcements regarding the coronation and parliament were made at this point. This allowed thirty-six days before the coronation, and between thirty-seven and forty-two days before the subsequent coronation parliament in Perth. This time span suggests the king attempted to give the forty days required for the gathering of the nobles for parliament, as well as his desire to link his coronation firmly to that parliament. As Brown states, the parliament was the first since the death of Robert III in 1406. Despite Albany’s elevated status as governor during James I’s absence, there had only been General Councils during the interim; the monarch alone had the right to call a parliament.

The importance of the parliament in consolidating James’s royal authority and projecting his
singular right to the position at the top of the hierarchy on his return was paramount. The parliament and coronation ceremony were truly royal occasions that no noble, however powerful, could utilise in competition with the king. Moreover, these events took place in lands at the heart of Albany Stewart power. The siting of key ceremonial moments for projecting royal authority – coronation, parliament, oaths of fealty, and eventually burial – in this region served as a continual underlying reminder of James’s initial victory in asserting his power upon his return.\textsuperscript{319}

Before discussing the coronation itself, it is pertinent to raise a further issue that may have pushed James I’s desire to visually and symbolically affirm his royal authority through emphasising the links between coronation and parliament. Between the time of the arrival of the king and the coronation, Charles VII made the earl of Douglas the duke of Touraine (29 April). The first and only non-Frenchman to be granted a French dukedom at this point, Douglas made his ducal entry to the city of Tours that spring. Burghers met the duke outside the city on horseback on 7 May and accompanied him into the city via ‘la Porte de Notre-Dame-La-Riche’, at which he received keys to the city and made promises to uphold privileges. A procession led him through streets decorated with ‘rapiresseries et jonchées de fleurs’ to the cathedral, where he was invested with blessed vestments\textsuperscript{320} and a book of hours, before taking his place in the choir of the church.\textsuperscript{321} The details of the entry itself may not have been known to James I prior to his coronation, but the news of the earl’s elevation to duke would certainly have had time to reach him. Douglas’s heightened status further compounded James’s challenges on his return and

\textsuperscript{319} In addition to these displays of royal authority around Perth and Scone, James I also attempted to have the recently established St Andrews University moved to Perth in 1426. See Nicholson, \textit{Later Middle Ages}, 300-301; ‘History of the University’ on University of St Andrews website: http://st-andrews.ac.uk/about/historyoftheuniversity/ Accessed 15 July 2013.\textsuperscript{320} He was presented or invested with a surplice (white ecclesiastical gown or vestments) and an amice (a vestment blessed before use).\textsuperscript{321} \textit{Le Écossais en France, Le Français en Écosse}, ed. F. Michel (2 vols, London, 1862), Vol. I, 139-40; W. Forbes-Leith, \textit{The Scots men-at-arms and life-guards in France. From their formation until their final dissolution A.D. MCCCCXVIII–MDCCCXXX} (Edinburgh, 1882), 24-7.
emphasised the importance of making a visual statement of his royal authority, above and beyond that of his nobility.\textsuperscript{322}

The only explicit reference to the coronation in the patchy \textit{Exchequer Rolls} was for expenses of £36, 2s. 9d. accrued in Dundee, where the entry suggests that the king stayed between his coronation and the parliament at Perth.\textsuperscript{323} The parliamentary records list abundant legislation produced and confirmed at the parliament, but the details of the ceremony are nearly non-existent.\textsuperscript{324} The fact that the king raised money through the three estates for his coronation is revealed through legislation setting out the manner of repayment.\textsuperscript{325} However, without further financial records it is impossible to assess how much money was collected or what it was spent upon, and it may have been unavoidably low-key despite the purveyance of goods. All the chronicles do discuss the fact that James I and his queen Joan Beaufort were crowned together,\textsuperscript{326} something which had not occurred since the coronation of David II in 1331.\textsuperscript{327} According to Bower and Pluscarden the crowning was undertaken by Henry Wardlaw, bishop of St Andrews, with the privilege of Murdach, duke of Albany, to enthrone the king or ‘set the said king upon the royal seat,’ occurring separately from the act of crowning.\textsuperscript{328} This traditional role of the Duke of Albany, as earl of Fife, is significant in this case for two reasons. Firstly, the enthroning of the king by Albany was a visual confirmation of James’s return and the final stage in the governor’s handing over of power. Secondly, it was the final official ceremonial duty undertaken by the duke before his arrest and execution the following year.\textsuperscript{329} At this point,
the crown seized his lands and titles, and the traditional role of the earl of Fife in the enthroning of the king was lost, leaving a gap in the ceremonial that may have paved the way for the increased role of the Lyon King of Arms and other officials.

Bower and Pluscarden both specify that James I and Joan were crowned together by the bishop, while only the king was enthroned by the earl for the oaths of fealty – and possibly the recitation of the genealogy. This separation of events, combined with Pluscarden linking the enthroning to the girding of knights, is reminiscent of the enthroning and homage ceremonies of earlier kings that occurred outside as a distinctly different and public ceremony from the ecclesiastical one which took place within the privacy of the church. At this point it is worth casting back to descriptions of the inauguration of Alexander III, Bower’s account suggests that the ceremony was split between the church and an outdoor setting, perhaps for the first time. This split does not occur in *Gesta Annalia* and there are other key elements that Bower includes but Fordun does not, including the crown, sceptre and robes of ‘royal purple.’ As Abbot of Inchcolm and a royal servant, Bower was likely to have witnessed or heard first-hand reports of James I’s coronation in 1424. Yet, here he gives no detail of the regalia or of purple robes. It is possible to propose that Bower combined his knowledge of contemporary events and projected such details back onto the events of 1249. Indeed, it seems possible that along with the crown and sceptre, James I was adorned in robes of purple for the enthroning ceremony. As with the earlier Stewart kings, James I’s seal shows him crowned and enthroned holding a sceptre in his left hand and his mantle with his right; therefore, the mantle continued to be shown as equally important amongst the other regalia. 

---

330 This may have been based on the aforementioned oath of David Duke of Rothesay when he was made Lieutenant of the realm in 1399: *RPS*, 1399/1/3; Legislation [r: David invested as Lieutenant] (Perth, General Council, 27 January, 1399).


332 Ibid; *Chron. Fordun*, 289-90.

333 Bower can be found listed as an auditor for the collection of taxes in the records of the 1424 parliament, *RPS*, 1424/31; and then again in 1431 (*RPS*, 1431/10/2) and in 1434 (*RPS*, 1434/2). See Introduction, 17, fn. 77.

334 Investiture with robes certainly occurred for English kings following anointing by this stage, see: *Liber Regalis*, 106-7, 127.

335 For seal, see Plate 18. In the case of James I there is another image showing him enthroned. However, the painting of ‘Aneas Sylvius Piccolomini meeting James I’ by Pinturicchio from a series of frescoes in
The inclusion of a knighting ceremony in the coronation ceremonies would have been a further visual statement of royal authority and one made to illustrate James I’s potential as giver of royal favour. The range of men favoured in this way included a number of those involved in his release, and reflected a varied segment of society. Moreover, this illustrates the diversity of people in attendance at the coronation including earls, the constable of Scotland and other officials, and lords. As Brown has discussed, the ceremony was designed to bring ‘political harmony’ and this was successful in raising the taxes for James’s English ransom on a scale that the returning king and later Stewarts would struggle to repeat. This kind of ceremonial display and giving of honours would be utilised again in 1430 at the baptism of James I’s twin sons, at which great celebrations were recorded including a knighting ceremony.

James I and Joan Beaufort had six daughters in total who survived into adulthood, but it was not until 1430 that they had a son. Twin boys, Alexander and James, were born on 16 October 1430 at Holyrood Abbey in Edinburgh, a place that would come to hold great significance for Prince James once he was king.

the Piccolomini Library in the Duomo in Siena is highly fantastical in its design considering it is supposed to be based in Scotland and it shows James I as an old white-bearded man, when his murder in 1437 meant that he died aged only 43. See cover of Tanner, *Late Medieval Scottish Parliament*. 
336 *Pluscarden*, 279; Maior, *History*, 354-5. Amalgamation of the two lists from both sources (underlined found only in Pluscarden and in square brackets only in Maior): [Alexander, second son of Duke of Albany]; Archibald, third earl of Douglas[*]; William [Douglas], earl of Angus; George [Dunbar], earl of March; [Adam Hepburn] lord of Hailes; Thomas Hay lord of Yester; Walter [Ogilvy]; Walter Haliburton; David Stewart of Rossyth; [Alexander Seton] lord of Gordon; lord Kinnaul; earl of Crawford; Patrick Ogilvy [of AUCHTERHOUSE]; John Red-Stewart [of Dundonald]; David Murray [of Gask]; John Stewart of Carden; William Hay of Errol Constable of Scotland; John Skirmegeour, [constable of Dundee]; Alexander Irvine [of Drum]; Herbert Maxwell [of Carlawrock]; Herbert Herries of Terreagles; Andrew Gray of Fowlis; [Robert Cunynghame] lord of Kilmours; [Alexander Ramsay] lord of Dalhousie; William Crichton, lord Crichton. [*] It is worth noting that the inclusion of Archibald, third earl of Douglas must be a mistake on the part of both chroniclers as the third earl died c. 1400, while the fourth earl remained in France until his death at the battle of Verneuil later in 1424. This certainly highlights the care required when employing such records. Archibald’s heir was possibly knighted in his stead, but the list could be misleading. See Brown, *The Black Douglases*, 220-3.
338 *Pluscarden*, 284.
[...] exulted with great joy all over the kingdom; and in the town of Edinburgh
[...] bonfires were lighted, flagons of wine were free to all and victuals publicly
to all comers, with the sweetest harmony of all kinds of musical instruments all
night long proclaiming the praise and glory of God for all his gifts [...] 340

At the time of the boys’ baptism, it must have seemed inconceivable that less than seven years
later the murder of James I would lead to the crowning of his six-year-old heir, but the baptism
was utilised as a further opportunity for the projection of royal authority and power nonetheless.
As with James I’s subsequent use of marriage, including the completed negotiations for his
eled daughter Margaret to the dauphin of France in 1436, 341 the king took every public
opportunity to advance his dynasty in the eyes of his nobles and, as the reign progressed, for an
increasingly wide European audience. As discussed, Scott concluded that James alienated much
of his nobility in his Anglo-inspired attempts to project power. 342 The assessment of his
coronation and related ceremony undertaken here clearly reveals a determination to elevate the
monarchy, by marking out distinctions between royalty and nobility, and moves to centralise
ceremonial and actual power in ways that ostensibly emulated his English experience. However,
neither were new to Scotland. The centralising of ceremonial and actual power, for instance,
was apparent under Robert II and others; therefore, the ceremonial activities of James’s return
to the realm were equally based in Scottish traditions and recognisable in the Scottish context.

The accession of James II in 1437 at the age of six has been briefly addressed by both
McGladdery and Brown. Both highlight a distinct gap between the murder of James I and James
II’s coronation, although Brown has proposed that the gap was not surprising. 343 The chronicle
accounts and parliament preamble show some variation regarding the date of the coronation but
suggest that the ‘coronation parliament’ occurred approximately a month after the murder of
James I on 20/21 February. This would have been a distinctly shorter period than the forty days
required for calling a gathering of the estates, a factor that Brown has suggested led to limited

340 Ibid.
341 See Chapter 3, Section III, 245-50.
343 McGladdery, James II, 10-11; Brown, James I, 196-8
attendance at both parliament and coronation. Yet, the coronation of James II was linked closely to parliament, perhaps even more so than that of his father in 1424. Bower and the editor of the *Acts of the Parliament of Scotland* date the coronation to 25 March 1437. The first day of Holy Week and the feast of the Annunciation of the Blessed Virgin Mary, which was also the anniversary of the coronations of both Robert I (1306) and Robert II (1371). With this in mind, it seems likely that Leslie, though a sixteenth-century commentator, was accurate when stating that the parliament began on 20 March and, after a few days of business, James II was conveyed from Edinburgh Castle to Holyrood Abbey where ‘with kinglie honour he receiuet, be the thrie estates, crounet, w[i]t[h] com[mon] handis clapping of al, admitted.’ This in turn would replicate the coronation of David II, which took place within a parliament in similarly turbulent political surroundings.

Leslie’s account and the parliamentary preamble also illustrate that the coronation took place at Holyrood not Scone, and that there was a procession from Edinburgh Castle to Holyrood Abbey. The route from Edinburgh Castle to Holyrood, later going via the West Port of the City, became the processional route by which kings and queens entered the city in the later fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, and it appears that in 1424 James I made a preliminary entry to Edinburgh via an unknown route. However, 1437 was the first occasion a processional aspect is unequivocally linked to a coronation. There are other earlier occasions when a procession seems likely, the king must have travelled to Scone from a residence that was probably in or near Perth (approximately two and half miles away), and he was most likely accompanied by at least household attendees in earlier coronations, but the evidence for a town-

---

344 See Brown and MacGladdery as above, fn. 343.
345 *APS*, Vol. II, 31; Bower, Vol. IX, 139; *RPS*, 1437/3/1-2, Procedure: Preamble (Edinburgh, Parliament, c. 20–25 March 1437) and Procedure: the king’s Coronation, Latin version [PA5/6(2)] and Vernacular version [PA5/6(1)]. The parliament records note that the first parliament of James II’s reign began on 20 March 1437 and the following entries suggest that the coronation started the same day, although they are not individually dated.
346 Easter Sunday in 1437 was 31 March.
347 See above, Chapter 2, Sections I and II, 118, 135. In addition, Robert III’s extended three day ceremony – with his wife’s coronation on 15 August, the feast day for the Assumption of the Blessed Virgin Mary – also took place within a prominent Blessed Virgin feast.
349 Ibid; *RPS*, 1437/3/2.
viewed procession as suggested here is lacking from extant sources. The processional aspect of this event contradicts the usual reasoning behind the choice of Holyrood/Edinburgh, that of safety. A public procession placing the boy king on show suggests a certain confidence, or at least the desire to project confidence. This may well have been Queen Joan’s intention in light of circumstances surrounding the coronation: the arrest of Walter of Atholl, one of those accused of the murder of James I, had occurred prior to the coronation, while Queen Joan was attempting in these early months to project her authority as mother of the king and possible guardian of the realm.

A further source that must be cautiously used regarding the finer details of James II’s coronation ceremony is the heraldic collection of Sir James Balfour of Denmilne, raised earlier in regards to Robert II. Lyall’s discussions suggest that the original document from which this was copied is from the mid-fifteenth century, but does not raise the possibility that it was based on James II’s coronation in 1437. Yet, it was the most recent coronation in memory and the only pre-Union monarch coronation to occur at Holyrood. A further indication that this document was based on James II’s coronation, rather than that of Robert II, can be located in the document itself. In the fourth paragraph it states: ‘then did [th]e Quier and sing God blisse him as he had done his father.’ Robert II’s father had never been king nor undergone a coronation; therefore, the document must have been based upon the coronation ceremony of a king who had succeeded his father. The manuscript stresses the heightened importance of the Lyon herald and other secular officials such as the Constable and Marischal, as also found in

350 There is the possibility of a ‘procession’ taking Alexander III (and therefore subsequent kings) from the church at Scone to the royal throne: see *Chron. Fordun*, 289-90; *Chron. Bower*, Vol. V, 291-93; Duncan, *Kingship of the Scots*, 131-50; and *Ibid*, ‘Making a King at Scone’, 139-67. Also, the episode at Linlithgow prior to Robert II’s coronation suggests there was some form of procession to Scone, but the record is not clear.
353 NLS, Adv. MS. 33.7.10, ff. 6r-14r and Adv. MS. 33.2.26, ff. 30 – 31. Adv. MS. 33.7.10, includes the note about the origin of the text (f. 14r) and an oath with the scratched out date of 1445 (ff. 12r-14r); see above Chapter 2, Section II, 131-3.
355 A number of consorts were crowned at Holyrood from Mary of Guelders (1449) onwards, but James II was the only reigning monarch to have his coronation there until Charles I in 1633.
356 NLS, Adv. MS. 33.2.26, f. 30r.
the seventeenth-century *Forme* composed by Lindsay.\(^{357}\) If we accept that Balfour copied an ecclesiastical record,\(^{358}\) this could confirm the secular aspects of the Scottish ceremony he presents since to emphasise these secular roles was of no benefit to the church. However, if this was an ecclesiastical record, one would expect there to be more detailed record of the liturgy.

The document reveals a number of potential new elements arising from the peculiarities of James II’s coronation alongside developments of traditional aspects.

In the Morning Befor ye king Came in publicke, there came to him tuo Bischopes tuo Abbot[is] with 24 vtherof the clergie 4 Noblemen, ye Constable and Marishall, hauing ther Battons of office in their handes sex commissioner[is] of the Barrons and als maney of the Burrowes.

The king wes brought fourth with ye Constable one hes Right hand and ye Marishall one hes Lefte, quher he wes sett wnder a clothe of Stait to declaire y[th]at as yet he had not received ye Croune

The Churchmen Nobles Barrons and Burgesses askit at ye king If he wer Lawfull successor or Not and wes villing to accept the dignity of ye Croune wich they did Now offer to his Ma[jes]tie: then wes hes Geneologie recitted.\(^{359}\)

The first paragraph clearly indicates the cross section of members from the three estates required to sanctify the legitimacy of the ceremony of crowning, while the third paragraph records the public acclamation by these figures and ends with the recitation of genealogy emphasising the young king’s dynastic authority. With the first words of the opening line there is the suggestion that the ceremonial was split into a ‘private’ ceremony and a ‘public’ ceremony, despite the ceremony being held entirely indoors. In the ‘private’ ceremony the king was brought forward by the Lord Marischal and the Constable and, between paragraphs seven and eight, the king was led to the public arena by the Lyon Herald\(^{360}\) following his

---

\(^{357}\) Lindsay, ‘Forme of the coronatioun’, 393-5.

\(^{358}\) This could well have been the same record utilised by Lindsay when compiling his *Forme* for Charles I, see earlier references to Lyall.

\(^{359}\) NLS, Adv. MS. 33.2.26, f.30r. The recitation of the genealogy may well have been based upon Barbour’s now lost, *Stewartis Original*.

acclamations; this emphasises the increasing ceremonial roles of all three.\textsuperscript{361} The absorption of the earldom of Fife by the crown in 1425 removed this important traditional secular figure from the enthronement, leaving a ceremonial gap to be filled and allowed for the advancement of other secular officials and heraldic officers within the coronation ceremony. This adds legitimacy to the claims that this account refers to James II’s coronation, as this would have been the first coronation where this ceremonial gap had occurred. Moreover, it is pertinent to highlight that the hereditary Constable and Marischal were both raised to earldoms during the reign of James II,\textsuperscript{362} perhaps adding landed-title gravitas to their official roles in the wake of their increased ceremonial duties. An aspect of this ceremony which has no known precedent in Scotland, or elsewhere, was the crowning of the Lyon King of Arms by his own hand within the coronation of the king,\textsuperscript{363} an element which may have been inserted to break up the ceremony for the child monarch.

Following this intriguing episode, the young king entered the public arena, led by the crowned Lyon King of Arms and bishops, with the crown, sword and sceptre carried before him.\textsuperscript{364} He was anointed on ‘the Croune of the head, boughes of hes armes, shoulder blades and palmes of hes handes’ by a bishop, through a specially designed ‘surples’ with holes to reveal

\textsuperscript{361} NLS, Adv. MS. 33.2.26, f.30r-v. paragraphs 6-8. This split of the ceremony could be linked to developments in English and French coronations that saw elements such as the ‘waking of the king’ ceremony at Reims and the pre-coronation enthroning in Westminster Palace. See: ‘Little Device for the Coronation of Henry VII’ in Legge (ed.), \textit{English Coronation Records}, 225-6; \textit{Plascarden}, 113-14; BL, Cottonian MS. Tiberius B. VIII, ff. 33-78; \textit{The coronation book of Charles V. of France}; Jackson, \textit{Vive le Roi}, 133-46.


\textsuperscript{363} NLS, Adv. MS. 33.2.26, f. 30r, paragraph 5. There is a crowning ceremony of the Lyon King of Arms described in NLS, Adv. MS. 31.3.18, ff. 24-8, Cap. 11: \textit{The usuall ceremone[s] [and] rites performed at [th]e corona[tiou]ne of Lyon king of armes in Scotland, 17th century copies of documents concerning 14th-16th Century}. However, this is a separate ceremony conducted outwith a coronation, occurring at Holyrood on 15 June 1630 with the Lord Commissioner presiding rather than the king. For more discussion on crowning of Lord Lyon: M.J. Enright, ‘The inauguration of the Lord Lyon of Arms’ \textit{Coat of Arms}, no. 97 (Spring, 1976) and J. Campbell-Kease, ‘Sir James Balfour of Dennlyne and Kinniard – and his coronation as Lord Lyon, 1630’ \textit{Ibid}, no. 179 (Autumn, 1997), both accessed at http://www.theheraldrysociety.com/articles/scotland/inauguration_of_the_lord_lyon.htm. Accessed 19 Sept 2012. The Garter King of Arms also wore a crown at his investiture to the role, however, no evidence has been found to suggest this crowning occurring in the coronation of any English kings.

\textsuperscript{364} NLS, Adv. MS. 33.2.26, f. 30v, paragraph 8.
his skin,\textsuperscript{365} in the first known description of how and where the holy oil was administered in Scotland.\textsuperscript{366} The manuscript does not specify which bishop anointed the king, the bishop of St Andrews is only mentioned specifically in the crowning of the Lord Lyon; however, there is a chronicle account that puts forward Bishop Ochiltree of Dunblane as the officiating bishop.\textsuperscript{367} Following the re-robing of the king, presumably in the traditional purple royal robe, the Lyon King of Arms placed his crown at the feet of the king before: ‘Coming to the Marischall says I surrender and Commands the king to be crowned.’\textsuperscript{368} The Lyon herald then proceeded to recite the king’s line of descent back six generations for a second time. This further demonstrates division in the ceremony between ‘private’ and ‘public’ sections, which required the genealogy to be recited at two different stages.

The Lyon herald then proceeded to recite the king’s line of descent back six generations for a second time. This further demonstrates division in the ceremony between ‘private’ and ‘public’ sections, which required the genealogy to be recited at two different stages. After the removal of the ‘pallium’ by Edward I in 1296, there have been no descriptions of a cloth of estate or ‘pale’ hanging over the throne. In the opening section the king is ‘sett wnder a clothe of Stait’, once the king has accepted the offered crown and his genealogy has been recited the cloth of state takes on a new guise when the ‘Byschopes and All the Rest Caused the pale to be halfe opened (which before is called the clothe of staite)’.\textsuperscript{369} It appears that the cloth of state was utilised as some kind of moveable canopy, with stages of open and closed indicating the progression of the king from pre-coronation state, through the acceptance of the people, to his final progress after being crowned. A moveable canopy, in addition to a

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{365} Ibid, paragraph 10.
\item \textsuperscript{366} This order of anointing reflects that used in the English ordines from the twelfth century onwards, including the Liber Regalis. There were two main differences, firstly, that the English orders additionally anointed the king on the breast with holy oil, and secondly, the chrism was used for the anointing on the head of the king (and this was then wrapped in a coif for one week). See: ‘Twelfth Century Coronation Order’ and ‘Liber Regalis’, in Legge (ed.), English Coronation Records, 30-42, 81-130.
\item \textsuperscript{367} Extracta E Varis Cronicis Scoie from Ancient Manuscripts in the Advocates Library, ed. J. Menzies (Edinburgh, 1842), 237; McGladdery, James II, 11; Brown, James I, 198. The choice of the bishop of Dunblane is interesting; John Cameron bishop of Glasgow was exiled (by the pope) to Bruges until c. April 1437, but it is not clear why Henry Wardlaw, bishop of St Andrews was not called upon, particularly as later in the year he was involved with Queen Joan’s second marriage to Sir James Stewart of Lorne: Dunlop, Life and Times of Bishop Kennedy, 21, 28; M.H. Brown, ‘Cameron, John (d. 1446)’, ODNB (2004): http://www.oxforddnb.com.ezproxy.stir.ac.uk/view/article/4443 , Accessed 15 July 2013.
\item \textsuperscript{368} NLS, Adv. MS. 33.2.26, f. 30v, paragraph 13. If the recitation of the genealogy missed out the Balliol kings the line back through six generations starting with James II would go back to Robert the Bruce, further emphasising the Bruce/Stewart links.
\item \textsuperscript{369} Ibid, f. 30r, paragraphs 2-4, f. 30v, paragraph 8.
\end{itemize}
cloth of state, can be located in the English *Liber Regalis*. There is no suggestion that the English cloth of state became the canopy in the manner described in the Scottish document, but the adapting of the cloth of state to provide a moveable canopy may have come from the English influence of Queen Joan, whose temporary position of power likely meant her involvement in the orchestration of the ceremony.

Balfour’s document includes an oath that bears a strong resemblance to the oath of 1399, but for the first time the placement of the oath within the ceremony is alluded to. The Scottish oath occurred after the acts of crowning and anointing, and immediately before the oaths of fealty from the three estates. This positioning of the Scottish king’s oath illuminates that his oath was not a pre-condition of receiving the crown, unlike his English and French counterparts. Conversely, an oath taken after the consecrating act of anointing may indicate the hand of a powerful churchman as this ceremonial ordering would make it sacrilege to break the oath made after anointing. The reciprocal nature of the oath of fealty could be symbolic of the partnership between the crown and parliament, a possible legacy of the intermittent periods without an adult monarch from the thirteenth century onwards. The manner in which the oaths of fealty were given was recorded thus:

> Then ye Constable tooke ye Croune from off the kinges head and Layed it downe befor ye king, and ye Bischope put one ye kingis hat

> The [...] Noblemen came one by one and touched the Croune sayning thesse wordes Sua Mote God helpe me as I shall supporte the[e] wich done they all of them againe holding ye ther hand[is] I sweare and holde vpe my hande to manteine defend and supporte the[e] as I vishe the Lord in my neid to helpe me &c.

---

370 *Liber Regalis*, 115.
371 See above Chapter 2, Section II, 144; Adv. MS. 33.7.10 version of the MS – used by Lyall – includes a copy of the 1445 oath, recorded in parliament records and discussed below. However, the author would propose that an oath reminiscent of that made in 1399 (found in Adv. MS. 33.2.26) would have been used in 1437, as there were clear reasons behind the estates' renewal of the oath in 1445, specifically in regard to protection of their powers in the control of the realm.
372 For detailed comparison between Scottish ceremony and English/French counterparts, see Lyall, ‘The Medieval Coronation Service’, 17-20.
373 If the first anointing in Scotland had occurred in 1306 undertaken by Bishop Wishart, of Glasgow, for Robert I, such an order would ultimately have been highly desirable for the bishop who had absolved the king of his sacrilegious act of murder in the church, putting his own career in jeopardy in the process. See above Chapter 2, Section I, 113-119.
374 NLS, Adv. MS. 33.2.26, f. 31r, paragraphs 18-9.
The giving of homage in the previous coronations of Robert II and Robert III, and possibly James I, all appear to have taken place as a separate ceremony with the king enthroned outside the ecclesiastical building. Here all occurred within the church, and for the first time a raised platform was constructed for the king. Joan Beaufort’s influence could again account for these changes; however, other practical reasons could also be key. Firstly, the vulnerability of the child king provided a valid reason for the indoor nature of the whole ceremony. Secondly, the elevated site of the Moot Hill at Scone had been the traditional place for this outdoor portion of the ceremony in the past, but no such natural position of elevation existed in the grounds of Holyrood Abbey. The stage within the abbey church in 1437, therefore, likely featured for the purpose of raising the king physically above his people as the Moot Hill would have done naturally.

The manner in which the crown was laid before the king’s feet for the nobles to touch during their oath of fealty would appear to originate in this fifteenth-century ceremony and is seemingly unique to Scotland. The traditional image of the enthroned king receiving homage outside Scone certainly implies that the king was crowned and attired in full ceremonial regalia, but the chronicles have never mentioned laying the crown at his feet. If 1437 was the first occasion when this removal of the crown occurred, it further supports the validity of the origins of Balfour’s source relating to a boy king attired in adult regalia. Even with adult support, the six-year-old James II would have struggled to remain seated with the heavy crown on his head for the length of time it would have taken the nobility to swear individual oaths of fealty. The removal of the crown at this stage would have solved a practical issue that would arise again for his son, and throughout the sixteenth century, leading to it becoming tradition in future

---

375 Liber Regalis, 112. The Liber Regalis specifically states that the platform in Westminster Cathedral was designed to lift the throne so that the king could be seen by all.
376 This was certainly the case elsewhere as earlier references to Charles IX indicated (see above Chapter 2, Section II, 127, fn. 173). There is an illustration of the coronation of James II, though by no means contemporary (c. 1914), which gives the impression of a child swomped by an adults clothing: V. Bryce et al., The Book of History: A History of All Nations from the Earliest Times to the Present, Volume IX (London, 1914), 3928. Thank you to Robert Sewell for the reference to the book from which this image has been located. This image shows a clear contrast to the image of the king found on his seal where he is represented as an enthroned adult in much the same style as that of his father [See Plates 19 a and b].
coronations and explaining its recurrence in the seventeenth-century *Forme*.\(^{377}\) The Balfour document does not specifically mention the occurrence of a Mass, but it does indicate that portions of the ceremony went unrecorded: ‘All wich Ceremonies performed, with maney more not heir Sett done [...]’\(^{378}\) The authorship of this document and the *Forme*, which also excludes the Mass,\(^{379}\) must be taken into account here as both were compiled post-1560; therefore, despite ‘copying’ earlier documents, they may have purposefully side-lined Mass.

The ceremony concluded with the king and the members of the estates leaving the abbey for the abbey hall for ‘ye Royall feast prepared for them;’\(^{380}\) an element that has strong roots to past ceremonies dating well before the start of this study. On the siting of the feast there is a conflict between Balfour’s manuscript and other sources, as the expenses recorded in the *Exchequer Rolls* show preparations for the feast at Edinburgh Castle. William Crichton the keeper of Edinburgh Castle, was reimbursed for provisions such as Greek wine, Hamburg ale, and food for the ceremonies following the actual coronation, and there were also payments to stage players led by Martino.\(^{381}\) A total of £516, 8s. 4d. can be linked directly to the coronation.\(^{382}\) Since the only explicit reference was to the cost of his father’s coronation in 1424 was £36, 2s. 9d., this indicates a dramatic increase in cash expenditure for the event.\(^{383}\) Unfortunately, the entries for James II’s ceremony are primarily total sums, with no indication of what specifically was purchased, and the *Treasurer’s Accounts* are not extant.\(^{384}\) Brown’s proposal that the coronation feast took place at the castle for reasons of protection\(^{385}\) would appear valid as the payments indicate that the royal household was based in the castle for the time around the coronation and parliament, with feather pillows and mattresses also sent.

\(^{377}\) Lindsey, ‘Forme of the coronatioun’, 394.
\(^{378}\) NLS, Adv. MS. 33.2.26, f. 31r, paragraph 20.
\(^{379}\) One of the concerns raised by Thomas regarding the accuracy of the *Forme* is the absence of Mass: Thomas, ‘Crown Imperial’, 55.
\(^{380}\) NLS, Adv. MS. 33.2.26, f. 31r, paragraph 20.
\(^{381}\) *ER*, Vol. IV, 678. ‘Martino’ may refer to Martin Vanatyne, a Flemish stage-player brought to Scotland by James I.
\(^{384}\) *Ibid*, Vol. V, 24-53. By this date it is likely that *Treasurer’s Account* existed, since the offices of Treasurer and Comptroller were both instigated in James I’s reign. However, these accounts are not extant for this period of the fifteenth century: Dickson, ‘Preface’, *TA*, Vol. I, xiii-xiv. See Introduction, 14-15, fn. 62-3.
Holyrood Abbey was favoured throughout James II’s reign; however, work to provide a royal palace to replace adjoining royal lodgings at the abbey only began in earnest under James IV. In 1437, therefore, the castle would most likely have been the more suitable venue for accommodating grand feasting.

The king’s youth did not mean he disappeared from public view until his majority. Instead, during the shifts of power in his minority in the years between his coronation and his marriage in 1449, the control of the king’s person was accompanied by continued efforts to raise his public profile. In August 1440, when the king would have been nearly ten, parliament concluded ‘that our sovereign lord should ride through the realm immediately, as shall be seen [expedient to his council]’ in an attempt to settle unrest in the realm. In November 1440 the king witnessed the brutality of court factionalism at its darkest when leading councillors, Livingston and Crichton, probably in connection with James Douglas, earl of Avandale, tried and executed William, sixth earl of Douglas, who had been invited to dine with the young king. During the Douglas attacks on Crichton in 1443, the king and household accompanied the host and his royal banner was used in the siege at Barnton. The thirteen-year-old king could be found ‘personally presiding’ over the subsequent parliament of November 1443.

Records from the 1445 parliament in Perth contain an oath of the king, along with the responses of the three estates, which coincided with a change in minority government that
saw the Crichtons out-manoeuvred by the Douglases. This could be perceived as the new minority government’s visual projection of crown and subject relations through public renewal of oaths. These oaths were recorded in the parliamentary records in vernacular Scots rather than Latin, as seems likely in 1437, 1399 and probably earlier, while the English coronation oath and the *Liber Regalis* would remain in Latin until James I’s English coronation in 1603. Placing the oath-taking in the parliament further underlined the central importance of the estates in the confirmation and, to an extent, restriction of royal authority. From the coronation in 1437 to the re-swear of the oaths in 1445, parliament was the essential body through which royal authority was sought and projected emphasising the crucial role it played in the making of kings and power in Scotland in the fifteenth-century. However, aged just fourteen, James II had already experienced over seven years as a central figure in the real and ceremonial power play of his realm, reflecting the equal significance of the monarch to those who governed in his minority. The 1445 oath specifically attempted to restrain the king’s actions by demanding ‘consent of the estates’ for actions affecting the realm, a significant change from the oath of 1399 which made no such demands. In so doing, as Tanner suggests, the new oath was underpinned by contemporary ‘political theory’ that increasingly referenced ideas of mutual obligations between the ruler and the ruled. Therefore, as the king’s majority drew nearer, by outlining the king’s responsibilities with the new oath the minority government specifically

---

397 Alice Hunt suggests that the first truly ‘Protestant’ coronation in England occurs in 1603 when the order of ceremony – both rubrics and speech – are translated into the vernacular English for the first time (Hunt, *The Drama of Coronation*, 174). The importance of the vernacular language used within a parliamentary setting will be raised again; however, it is indicative of a ceremony more readily malleable to the change to a Protestant ceremony.
398 See above Chapter 2, Section II, 144; Section III, 163, fn. 370; Lyall, ‘The Medieval Coronation Service’, 16.
targeted any right previous monarchs (particularly James I) deemed they had had to act independently without consent from the estates.

Like his father, the young James III was thrust into the centre of the public consciousness as a child of eight following James II’s death at the siege of Roxburgh in 1460. The coronation of James III was unusual for a number of reasons, particularly in that the prince was brought to Kelso, near the site of the siege, to be crowned. 400

And the said lordis Incontinent sent till Edinburgh for the Prince and the said Prince with his modere the quene and bishopis and uther nobillis come to Kelso on the fryday efter the deid of the king and remanit ther quhill he was crownit [...] 401

The Exchequer Rolls record a payment of fustian and cotton purchased for James’s groom (veletis) for the ride to his coronation. 402 This project pursued possible associations between Kelso and either Scone or Holyrood to uncover reasons for the choice of Kelso. As the site of James II’s baptism, coronation, wedding to Mary of Guelders (and her coronation) and burial Holyrood seems particularly relevant. Holyrood was a house of Augustinian canons, whereas Kelso was a Tironensian monastery, so it was not simply a mother/daughter house connection. However, records of a settled land dispute show that the two foundations were linked through landholding agreements, 403 and Christine Henderson illuminates the elevated status of Kelso’s abbots: the third abbot John ‘obtained a mitre from the Pope, which gave the Abbot of Kelso equal status with bishops and meant the abbey was answerable only to the Pope’ in the twelfth-century. 404

400 See Chapter 1, Section IV, 64-5.
401 Chron. Auchinleck, 169. Other chronicles also state Kelso: Maior, 387; Leslie, Historie, 82; and Buchanan, History, Vol. II, 168. Pitscottie alone states Scone: Historie, Vol. I, 152-3. Extracta E Variis Cronicis Scocie suggests that the queen travelled to the siege site before she James’s death and that the cannon that malfunctioned and killed James was being fired to welcome her, but ends with James II’s death and does not mention the coronation of James III (243-4).
402 ER, Vol. VII, 34. This is the only financial record of James III’s coronation; however, no TA survive and the ER records are very patchy. See above Introduction, 14-15, fns. 62-4.
404 Henderson, Kelso Abbey: a brief history, 10-12.
The Auchinleck Chronicle records the knighting of one hundred knights at the coronation of the king on 10 August 1460.\textsuperscript{405} The account does not elaborate on who received the belt of knighthood on this occasion,\textsuperscript{406} but the knighting ceremony had become a common feature of the Scottish ceremony by this stage, particularly for the solidifying of a support network around the young king in potentially difficult times. Although unusual, the minority government made a clear statement about the continuity of the dynasty by combining the young king’s coronation, a large scale knighting ceremony at the siege site, and his father’s funeral procession.\textsuperscript{407}

The exact appearance of the regalia used in 1460 is unknown, but there are two surviving contemporary images of James III: the 1480s silver groat portrait and the Van der Goes Trinity Altarpiece. The latter was almost certainly commissioned by Edward Bonkill, the Provost of Trinity College, and predominantly completed outside Scotland. However, Lorne Campbell and Colin Thompson have posited that the face of the king was added at a later stage, perhaps to allow completion from life.\textsuperscript{408} Their analysis of the painting highlights that, although a dull brown now due to the loss of the original glaze, the ermine trimmed mantle of the king was once a far brighter red.\textsuperscript{409} Previously, this thesis has discussed several aspects of the king of Scots’ royal mantle history. Thus far both red and purple have been described or recorded, with the possibility of two mantles being worn during the coronation ceremony, and the red mantle worn by the king in majesty in parliament.\textsuperscript{410} The crown depicted in the Trinity Altar piece portrait is a bejewelled open crown with alternating crosses and tall fleur de lis. The silver groat, however, depicts a three-quarter portrait of the king crowned with a closed imperial

\textsuperscript{405} Chron. Auchinleck, 169.
\textsuperscript{406} Katie Stevenson puts forward ten names she has identified, see below 172, fn. 412: Chivalry and Knighthood, 183.
\textsuperscript{407} This is very similar to the inauguration of Alexander II and funeral of William I, and the inauguration of Alexander III and funeral of Alexander II in many ways. See Chapter 1, Section I, 25-33; and above Chapter 2, Section I.
\textsuperscript{409} Thompson and Campbell, Hugo Van der Goes and the Trinity Altar Panels, 20.
\textsuperscript{410} See above on the coronation of David II, particularly Chapter 2, Section II, 127.
The coin was not produced until c.1485, making the use of a closed imperial crown at James III’s coronation highly unlikely. However, it gives an insight into James’s view of his own position and kingship, and it is not a huge leap to suggest that had James lived longer that such adaptations to the existing crown would have been made to make this depiction a reality. It is pertinent to point out that the coinage of James IV does not follow this trend of using the imperial crown, which next appears on the later coinage and seals of James V. The removal of this aspect from the coinage post-1488 during James IV’s reign may have been due to initial concerns about the negative impact such obvious representations of imperial authority would have on good relations with the Scottish nobility.

The first parliament of James III’s reign did not occur until early 1461, over six months later, so there are no parliament records that can indicate who was present at the coronation. Macdougall has noted that holding the coronation at the site of the siege guaranteed high attendance, while Stevenson has highlighted that a few of the knights created at the event can be identified. Bishops certainly travelled with the queen and prince from Edinburgh, but the identity of the officiant is less clear. Kennedy, bishop of St Andrews, was not there to officiate as he did not return from foreign travels until c. May 1461. Five bishops were listed at the first parliament of 1461, including Andrew Durisdeer, bishop of Glasgow, and Thomas Lauder, bishop of Dunkeld; precedent for both of these bishops officiating in a coronation can

411 Ian Stewart observes that the coin was the ‘earliest Renaissance coin portrait outside Italy.’ He suggests that James III’s change to the imperial crown followed that made by Henry VII; however, the distinctive three-quarter life-like portraiture on James’s coin indicates the inspiration came from elsewhere and could have occurred earlier than that in England: The Scottish Coinage, 30-7. See Plate 21, also see sketch of crown in Brook, ‘Technical Description of the Regalia’, 57. For more discussion on the coin, the Renaissance and the imperial crown in the reign of James III, see: Mason, ‘This Realm of Scotland’, 76-80; Ibid, ‘Regnum et Imperium’, 128-33; for others works see: Chapter 3, Section III, 265, fn. 281.
412 Stewart, Scottish Coinage, 68-9.
413 Macdougall, James III, 40; Stevenson, Chivalry and Knighthood, 183, fn. 64. The ten names identified through various charters and registers of seals by Katie Stevenson: Patrick Maitland; James Crichton of Carnis; John Colquhoun of that Ilk; William Wallace of Craigie; Alexander Napier of Merchiston; John Herries, lord of Terregles; Alexander Forrester of Corstorphine; William Hay of Nactane; Alexander Lauder of Hatton; and William, thane of Cawdor.
414 Chron. Auchinleck, 169.
415 Dunlop, Life and Times of Bishop Kennedy, 211-15; MacDougall, James III, 46.
be found and they are listed first of the clerical estates in the parliamentary records.\textsuperscript{416} Three further figures, who rose in ceremonial importance from James II’s coronation in 1437, were likely to have been present on the battlefield with the king and so able to take up their ceremonial roles. Like the Lyon Herald (and other heralds and pursuivants) clad in his visually striking royal livery, the hereditary officers of Marischal and Constable took up military roles in times of war that would have led to them being at the late king’s side. For example, the Constable was responsible for the guards of the ‘king’s body’ or the king’s guards, meaning that if he had not been with James II, he would likely have accompanied James III.\textsuperscript{417} Moreover, these two hereditary officials had only recently been belted earls by James II, which suggests loyal service to the crown and further supports their involvement in the coronation.\textsuperscript{418}

The first parliament in 1461 left a great deal of power in the hands of the king’s mother Mary of Guelders, William Sinclair, earl of Orkney, and a council made up of numerous key members of the former king’s council, along with additional men favoured by the queen, such as James Lindsay, provost of Lincluden and, by the time of the parliament, Keeper of the Privy Seal.\textsuperscript{419} These powerful players likely featured in attendance at the coronation as well as parliament, but what is not clear in any of the extant documents, or discussed by Macdougall, is whether the young king was present at this first parliament. The \textit{Auchinleck Chronicle} suggests the king was present when it states ‘James ye thrid held his first parliament’ but his actual presence is not made explicit.\textsuperscript{420} Additionally, while parliament was opened in the name of ‘the most excellent prince and lord James III,’\textsuperscript{421} there is no full preamble laying down details of attendance, the young king’s role, or any ceremonial that may have occurred. The queen’s position of power in the early months could suggest a maternal instinct to shelter the boy-king

\textsuperscript{416} \textit{RPS}, A1461/2-3, Additional Sources (Edinburgh, Parliament, 22 Feb 1461); \textit{Ibid}, 1461/5, Judicial Proceedings (Edinburgh, Parliament, 22 Feb 1461).
\textsuperscript{417} \textit{The Scottish King’s Household’}, 39-40.
\textsuperscript{418} See above Chapter 2, Section III, 161: Marischal and Errol made earls.
\textsuperscript{420} \textit{Chron. Auchinleck}, 170; Tanner, \textit{Late Medieval Scottish Parliament}, 170.
\textsuperscript{421} \textit{RPS}, 1461/5.
rather than have him on display; however, she appears to have shown no hesitation in taking him to the site of the siege of Roxburgh the previous year for his coronation.

James Kennedy, bishop of St Andrews, took the king on a progress around the realm through the summer months of 1464, the year after Mary of Guelders’ death, giving many burghs their first opportunity to view the young king and his accompanying court. The charters produced under the king’s seal provide an outline of the king’s progress: he visited Dundee (7 July and 31 August–1 September), Aberdeen (17 July), Inverness (16–17 August), Elgin (21 August), and appears to return to Edinburgh in October.\(^\text{422}\) Preparations being made for the king’s progress included repairs to the king’s lodgings in Aberdeen ‘ergo adventum regis’ and in Inverness work was undertaken at the castle and ‘palacii’, including repairs to tables and chairs suggestive of the king entertaining guests during his stay.\(^\text{423}\) Evidence is slight but, as Macdougall has suggested, this progress would have raised the public profile of the king, as well as that of his current guardian and court.\(^\text{424}\)

The parliamentary records for October 1466 illustrate how this public arena was utilised in the representations of authority following the abrupt overthrow of the Kennedy government in July of that year by a faction headed by Robert Lord Boyd.\(^\text{425}\) There is no doubt that the now fourteen-year-old king was present at this event since Boyd literally put him centre stage to confirm and sanctify his highly questionable position as leader of the new minority government:

[... the same most illustrious prince sitting on his royal throne, the noble and mighty lord Robert [...] Boyd compeared, and sought that he might, humbly on his knees before the three estates of the realm [...] Our supreme lord, with mature and well-considered advice, declared before the said estates of the

\(^{422}\) RMS, Vol. II, nos. 796 (Dundee), 797-9 (Aberdeen), 800-5 (Inverness), 806 (Elgin), 807-10 (Dundee), 811 (Edinburgh, first charter after trip dated 11 October).

\(^{423}\) ER, Vol. VII, 304, 357-9. Unfortunately, there are no TA extant for this period and few burgh records survive from mid-fifteenth century. The Aberdeen burgh accounts do survive this early, however, preliminary searches of them have proven unfruitful for James III’s reign.

\(^{424}\) Macdougall, James III, 59-60.

\(^{425}\) Robert Lord Boyd was an Ayrshire lord made Lord of Parliament under James II, and whose younger brother, Sir Alexander of Boyd of Drumcoll, had been showered favour across the early 1460s. Robert was certainly a loyal servant of James II and Mary of Guelders, but his ambitions to overthrow the Kennedy government (after the death of Bishop Kennedy) were misguided and his brief glory lasted less than three years. The rapid aggrandisement of his family, particularly the marriage of his son Thomas to the sister of the king and the uplifting of crown rents, not to mention his ‘kidnapping’ of the king in 1466, lead to a rapid build up of powerful enemies, including the young king. See Macdougall for further discussions of the rise and fall of the Boyds: James III, 63, 68-83.
realm, authoritatively and in a clear voice, that he did not bear, nor wishes to bear in future, any manner of indignation, offence or rancour against the same Lord Boyd [...] [426]

Boyd recognised the importance of the public sanctioning of his actions through the voice of the youthful enthroned king before the gathered estates. Though heavily contrived and probably scripted, the theatre of power in which the performance was acted out made the coup official. This reveals the importance of parliament as a stage for the king and the audience of the three estates.

The leaders during James III’s minority manipulated ways of projecting the young king’s authority and often using the king’s person as a tangible proof of their right to power. From his mother’s decision to take the prince to the front line of the siege in 1460, James III became the prize possession of the minority council or leading individual guardian or lieutenant. James III’s opportunities to show his own personal representations of authority, such as that found on the silver groat (1485), would come from 1469 onwards with his marriage to Margaret of Denmark, followed by the downfall of the Boyds, and the effective end of his minority. [427] The siege of Roxburgh in 1460 was not the only occasion that the minor James III would become a figurehead of war, as Macdougall has noted; he was taken alongside Henry VI, Margaret of Anjou, his mother and Bishop Kennedy to the far less successful campaign at Norham in July 1463. [428] In the final year of his reign, James III found himself confronted by a comparable use of a royal minor in the second major rebellion against his own kingship. The opposition placed Prince James (later James IV) as their figurehead to mount a visual assault on the king and his supporters, an image at its most potent when Prince James rode onto the battlefield at Sauchieburn carrying the royal banner. [429]

---

[426] RPS, A1466/2, Letters: under the great seal narrating the king’s parliament declaration concerning his arrest at Linlithgow (Edinburgh, Parliament, 25 October 1466). In the same parliament James also declared Boyd’s position as the ‘governor’: Ibid, A1466/1, Letters: under the great seal concerning the appointment of Robert lord Boyd as governor of the king.
[427] See below Chapter 3, Section III, 260-65; Dean, ‘Enter the Alien’.
[429] Ibid, James IV, 42.
The circumstances of James IV’s accession to the throne in June 1488, following his father’s murder at the hands of ‘rebels’, meant that the projection of royal authority through his coronation had to legitimise the violent takeover and was paramount to the success of the incoming government. In some respects it may seem surprising that the coronation was not linked to a coronation parliament to add a further layer of legitimacy to the new government, but as seen with James III’s funeral there appears to have been a lack of confidence in the use of display in the early years. The choice to postpone the parliament probably rested on the weakness of the incoming regime, which had certainly planned for a serious challenge to James III but not necessarily for his death, and the fear of the political backlash that could accompany a full gathering of the three estates. Macdougall’s succinct assessment of James IV’s coronation proposes that great effort went into the hastily organised ceremony to provide highly sought after legitimacy. Yet, a more rigorous exploration of the available evidence can effect a deeper understanding of the political use of ceremony and the development of the coronation ceremonial in Scotland during the later fifteenth-century.

Macdougall discusses the significance of the date and place of James IV’s coronation. He raises the connection between Tuesday 24 June and the commemoration of Bannockburn, commenting on the dark irony found in such a choice since the events that led to James IV taking the throne played out near the site of the battlefield. This idea of irony can be taken still further when considering James III’s obvious reverence of the victorious Bruce king. It has been suggested that he carried the sword of Bruce onto the battlefield at Stirling, due to an Exchequer Roll entry rewarding someone for its return, and amongst the treasures of James III was the shirt of Robert I. The choice of Scone must be connected to its legitimising
qualities as the traditional historic site of Scottish inaugural ceremonies.\textsuperscript{437} The relocation to the former site could potentially have seen a return to more traditional elements, such as the separating of the religious ceremony in the church from secular ceremonial enthronement and giving of fealty occurring outside the church. James IV’s knowledge of the Gaelic language, relayed by contemporary visitor Pedro de Ayala,\textsuperscript{438} suggests connections to traditional native roots.\textsuperscript{439} The reinstatement of a poet would have provided a romanticised link to the past and, unlike the earlier Bruce and Stewart monarchs, James IV’s hereditary claim to throne could be traced back through five generations of the male line making the traditional Gaelic format a possibility.\textsuperscript{440} Ireland’s \textit{Meroure of Wysdome}, though presented to the king in 1490, illuminates the contemporary importance of succession over election, and his remarks that ‘quhen a linage excedis all laif in wirtu & dignite it is richt þat it have the dominacioun riall’ emphasise the contemporary understanding of lineage and thus the importance of the recitation of the genealogy, whether by poet in Gaelic or herald in Scots.\textsuperscript{441}

There was good reason for conspicuous absences in Scone in 1488, particularly given that less than two weeks between the death of James III and James IV’s coronation on 24 June.\textsuperscript{442} A document produced at Perth on 25 June 1488 under the royal seal can be used as an indicator of attendees.\textsuperscript{443} William Hay, third earl of Errol and hereditary Constable, and William

---

\textsuperscript{436} NLS, Adv. MS. 34.7.3, f. 23r [21r in old folio numbering], Gray’s Manuscript, Chronica Brevis; Leslie, \textit{Historie}, 107; \textit{TA}, Vol. I, p. 88. Of the other two chronicles that mention the coronation, Adam Abell does not designate a place (NLS, MS1746, f. 111r) and Pitscottie places the event in Edinburgh: \textit{Historie}, Vol. I, 216-7.

\textsuperscript{437} Macdougall, \textit{James IV}, 51.

\textsuperscript{438} Pedro de Ayala was the Spanish ambassador in Scotland during the 1490s. P. Ayala, ‘James IV and his People’ in P. Hume Brown (ed.), \textit{Early Travellers in Scotland} (Edinburgh, 1891), 39-40.

\textsuperscript{439} Macdougall highlights that the summer tours of 1493-5, including visits to Dunstaffnage and Mingary, would have given James ‘some proficiency in the language’ for the practical purpose of conversing with highland and isle lords. Moreover, James was known to venerate a range of saints including those of Gaelic origin, such as St Duthac of Tain who became part of his annual itinerary from 1493: \textit{James IV}, 102-104, 192.

\textsuperscript{440} The recitation of the genealogy in Gaelic would only work through the male line, see above Chapter 2, Section I, 118-19, and Section II, 135, fn. 225.

\textsuperscript{441} Ireland, \textit{Meroure of Wysdome}, Vol. III, Book VII, 144-54, quote 148.

\textsuperscript{442} Macdougall suggests that the coronation party left Edinburgh around 21 June for to Scone. It was approx. 50 and 75 miles (dependent on whether the party crossed the Forth by ferry), so this time frame would seem accurate, meaning that the letters would have had an even shorter time window to be received and responded to if they were sent at all: \textit{James IV}, 51.

\textsuperscript{443} Ibid, RMS, Vol. II, no. 1739. Witnesses: Robert Blacader, bishop of Glasgow; George Brown, bishop of Dunkeld; John Hepburn, prior of St Andrew (Keeper of the Privy Seal); Colin Campbell, earl of Argyll (the Chancellor); Archibald Douglas, earl of Angus; Patrick Lord Hailes; Robert Lord Lyle; Laurence
Keith, second earl Marischal and hereditary Marischal, were absent; therefore, if the order of ceremony reflected that proposed for James II, two key ceremonial figures required replacing with suitable stand-ins. It is possible that Patrick Lord Hailes, styled Master of the King’s Household, and Robert Lord Lyall, justiciar, replaced them as prominent officials, although neither were earls. The two earls in attendance were Angus and Argyll, but their roles are unknown.\textsuperscript{444} It is tempting to suggest that the king’s younger brothers, particularly the duke of Albany, would have been candidates for ceremonial roles; however, their youth may have restricted any ceremonial roles even if they were present. There was another absence that would have altered the makeup of the ceremony, but in this case the substitute is more certain. As Macdougall has pointed out, William Scheves, archbishop of St Andrews, was linked to the previous regime and this probably ensured his absence.\textsuperscript{445} However, Blacader, bishop of Glasgow, held precedence and official papal sanction of anointing officiator, as laid down in the Bull of Uction (1329), and as mentioned, the bishop of Glasgow has appeared as the stronger ecclesiastical force in the crowning of the king on a number of previous occasions.\textsuperscript{446}

The incoming government recovered a vast amount of treasure,\textsuperscript{447} but there were key missing items.\textsuperscript{448} The crown and sceptre were most notably absent, along with the papal rose presented to James III.\textsuperscript{449} Other items that appear in the records of the treasure that might have been utilised in James IV’s ceremony, including the sword of Bruce,\textsuperscript{450} which considering the date of the ceremony would perhaps have been seen as fitting. In addition, there were four

\begin{itemize}
    \item Lord Oliphant; Andrew Lord Gray; John Lord Drummond; Master Alexander Inglis, archdeacon of St Andrews (Keeper of the Rolls); Master Archibald Whitelaw, subdeacon of Glasgow (King’s Secretary); Master William Hepburn, vicar of Linlithgow (Clerk Register); and William Knollis, preceptor of Torphichin (Treasurer).
\end{itemize}

This list cannot be used as solid proof of attendance or to decisively confirm absences; however, the charter was produced the following day only two miles away in Perth and Macdougall has utilised the list, and with no other corroborating evidence this list has been utilised here also in this manner.

\textsuperscript{444} For more discussions on increased ceremonial roles of key earls in sixteenth century, see below Chapter 2, Section IV–VI, \textit{passim}.
\textsuperscript{445} Macdougall, \textit{James IV}, 51-2.
\textsuperscript{446} ‘XXX. Bull of John XXII Concerning the Coronation’, 24-5. In regards to bishop of Glasgow’s role see sections such as that on Robert the Bruce and Wishart, see above Chapter 2, Section I, 113-119.
\textsuperscript{447} Macdougall, \textit{James IV}, 50-1.
\textsuperscript{449} James III received a papal rose in March 1486 from Innocent VIII, perhaps this absence was due to James III being buried with the papal rose [?]: see MacDougall, \textit{James III}, pp. 294-5.
\textsuperscript{450} ER, Vol. X, p. 92. The \textit{Exchequer Rolls} entry here indicates that the sword seems to have been returned around the time of the coronation.
maces linked to Bruce and perhaps carried by officials, and a ‘couering of variend purple tartar browdir with thrisle and a unicorn’ listed with a roof and ‘pendiclis’. The latter item was royal purple and decorated with the unicorn and thistle decoration which was by this point synonymous with the Scottish monarchy; it may have been utilised as a paill or cloth of state during the ceremony. The lack of the main regalia items in the list could indicate that they were kept by a religious house and this was why they were not found amongst the king’s personal treasure, but the images that remain extant of James IV’s regalia leave a confusing picture. His coinage returned to the use of an open crown and his seal continued with an almost identical design to the three previous kings, likewise depicting an open crown. However, the king is depicted in a closed crown in his portrait in the book of hours, commissioned for Margaret Tudor on her marriage to James IV c. 1502/3. Thomas has stated that either one or both of these conflicting images must be inaccurate, but James IV did undertake work on the crown. There are payments in the year of James IV’s marriage (1503) for work done on the king’s crown and one for the queen. Since the total weight of gold used for the queen’s crown was less than twelve ounces, while the papal sceptre gifted to James IV in 1494 was just fifteen ounces, nearly two ounces purchased for the king’s crown could have been for an addition of arches. Over ten ounces of gold were used in 1532 to ‘make’ what Thomas has illuminated as probable arches for James V and thereby presumed that the smaller amount used in 1503 was for minor repairs rather than additions. Yet, James V would go on to add a further forty-one and a quarter ounces of gold to his crown in 1540, and it could be that James IV’s crown was just far lighter and more delicate.

451 TA, Vol. I, pp. 83, 85; A collection of inventories, 8, 11. The royal purple cloth with thistles and unicorns, and accompanying items, are listed with other belongings of the late queen (James IV’s mother). See Chapter 3, Section, III, 261.
452 For details on the use of the unicorn and thistle as insignia of the Scottish monarchy see: Stevenson, ‘The Unicorn, St Andrew and the Thistle’, 11-20.
456 Thomas, ‘Crown Imperial’, 55.
Despite the comparatively expansive *Treasurer’s Accounts* for James IV’s coronation, it is important to remember that the accounts are not complete. A number of folios at the start of the entries regarding items specifically for the king are found wanting, with the entries for gowns not beginning until January 1489 and the first actual reference to clothing for the king’s coronation being doublets. Seventeenth-century evidence implies that James IV wore a long purple robe ‘richly furred and laced with gold’ for his coronation, as it is said to have been worn by Charles I in the riding of parliament during his coronation visit to Edinburgh in 1633. The only evidence of the royal robe in the *Treasurer’s Accounts* suggests that this item was passed down to James IV, and likely kept with the regalia, as there is an entry referring to an elne of taffeta being purchased ‘to mende the Kingis rowbryall’. Unfortunately, the entry is not dated and is placed with other miscellaneous entries that seem to span the near two year time period of the account, so it may be that the royal robes were mended after the coronation for another event, such as parliament five months later.

The *Treasurer’s Accounts* refer to the purchase of a number of doublets for the king ‘sen the tyme of his entra’ around 15 June, while a black satin doublet that appears to have been specifically made for his coronation was purchased on 20 June. This implies there was a lengthier public ceremonial occasion than Macdougall’s short account gives credit for; perhaps including an entry at Perth, where it was likely the royal party stayed. Macdougall highlights that the king rode to the ceremony on a horse ‘arrayed with velvet,’ but the records specifically refer to velvet to cover the saddles and harnesses for three horses ‘to the king’ and indicate that

---

458 It is perhaps also prevalent to note that as well as some extant years of James IV’s reign being incomplete, some are entirely absent: between 1488 and 1503, over four years of accounts are entirely missing. Therefore, there could have been another occasion at which the crown was remodelled or had additions made.


460 J. Spalding, *The History of the Troubles and Memorable Transactions in Scotland and England from MDC.XXIV to MDC.XLV* (2 vols, Edinburgh, 1828-9), Vol. I, 18. Spalding was the clerk of the Constitutional Court of the Diocese of Aberdeen for the years on which he wrote his diary and was perhaps present in 1633 or if not had an eye-witness account. However, it is possible that the purple robe in question was that made for James V for the coronation of his queen, Marie de Guise, in 1540 when the second reworking of the crown took place. For more on discussions about Marie de Guise’s arrival and coronation, see Chapter 3, Section IV, 284-90, esp. 289, fn. 403; Dean, ‘Enter the Alien’.


462 Ibid, 139-40.

463 Approximately two miles distance between Perth and Scone.
all the items were ‘aganis the Coronatioune.’ This suggests either that his two brothers were provided with similar items, or that the king had more than one ceremonial journey requiring lavish harnessing. Four bonnets and two hats were also purchased for the coronation; the king may have had an eccentric attitude towards clothing and adornments, but four to six changes of head gear in a day, not including the crown, seems a little excessive.

The eight finely attired henchmen, who were dressed in black velvet gowns and satin doublets, added a further element to the processions to and from the ceremony; four of whom may have carried the Bruce maces. Macdougall refers to a man paid to ‘beyris Sanct Fyllanis bell, at the kingis commande’ in the procession. The Treasurer’s Accounts do not specifically link the bell carrier to the coronation; however, the importance of this relic in the Perthshire area, and the fact that St Fillan’s feast day was just four days prior to the coronation (20 June), could indicate that the bell was also carried in a procession from Scone to Perth following the ceremony. Work by Simon Taylor and Penman on the cult of St Fillan (or Fáelán) adds another layer of specifically royal significance to the inclusion of the saint’s bell in the ceremony. The cult, established in western Perthshire by the ninth century, underwent a revival and heightening in national status under Robert I and Bishop Lamberton in the fourteenth century, with thanks given to this saint for protection in 1306 and victory in 1314. Taylor argues that when Robert, duke of Albany, dedicated his chapel at the castle of Doune to Fillan he was at the same time ‘evoking the spirit of Robert I’. James IV’s coronation likely utilised the same saint for the same reason, particularly if the sword of Bruce was used in the regalia.

---

464 Of James’s two brothers, the earl of Mar was purchased new clothing around the time of the coronation, although the entry does not specifically link the purchase to the event: in June 1488, a chamlot coat and a satin gown were purchased for him, costing £8, 16s.: TA, Vol. I, 159. Notably the account refers to him specifically, therefore, if the additional saddles and harnesses were for the king’s brother’s the account would perhaps have listed them as such.


466 Ibid, 145.

467 See above Chapter 2, Section III, 177, fn. 450.


The royal party was definitely in Perth the following day\(^{472}\) and it would make sense that the party made its way from Scone to James I’s charterhouse foundation in Perth for a coronation feast after the official ceremony had taken place.

The first parliament of the reign did not occur until October 1488 in Edinburgh.\(^{473}\) Despite commenting on the high attendance of the parliament,\(^{474}\) Macdougall does not consider how king and crown were utilised to project the authority of the new government, even though for many present this was the first event at which they had seen the new monarch in state. In the legislation of a private act carried on 14 October regarding forfeiture of lands and privileges of John Ramsay, late Lord Bothwell, and re-granting it to Patrick Hepburn, Lord Hailes. The parliamentary records clearly indicate that the king was presented to his people in state:

> Our royal serenity, by express consent of the estates of the realm - the nobles personally and severally having requested that it be performed by his serenity enthroned on his seat of justice or royal throne, bearing the crown of the realm and the sceptre in his hand […]\(^{475}\)

Every effort was made by members of the new government, particularly the Hepburns (who had played a major role in the rebellion), to confirm their position of power with the public sanction of the three estates and the enthroned king. In fact, Pitscottie’s account would suggest that rather than just appearing crowned in the regalia, the estates were called together to ‘sie the king crownit’ in Edinburgh.\(^{476}\) The high attendance and need for a public sanctioning of

---

\(^{472}\) RMS, Vol. II, no. 1739.  
\(^{473}\) Macdougall looks at the time between and political business undertaken, see: James IV, 52-60.  
\(^{474}\) RPS, 1488/10/3, Sederunt (Edinburgh, Parliament, 7 October 1488). Condensed sederunt list: For the clergy: [William Scheves], archbishop of St Andrews; [Robert Blackadder], bishop of Glasgow, and five further bishops [including Elphinstone of Aberdeen], fourteen abbots, four priors, archdeacons of St Andrews and Lothian [the latter Archibald Whitelaw, royal secretary], the provost of St Salvator’s college, and five other officials and clerks [including Martin Wan, known ambassador for Scots kings]. For the barons: Ten earls were present Colin [Campbell], earl of Argyll, the Chancellor […]; Archibald [Douglas], earl of Angus; [George Gordon], earl of Huntly; James [Douglas], earl of Morton; William [Hay], earl of Erroll; William [Keith], earl Marischal; John [Stewart], earl of Lennox; George [Leslie], earl of Rothes; [John Stewart], earl of Atholl; [James Stewart], earl of Buchan; and twenty-three further lords and knights [including Patrick Hepburn], lord Hailes, the master [of the king’s] household, [Robert Lyle], lord Lyle, justiciar, and the Sheriff of Ayr and Constable of Dundee. For the Commissioners: Edinburgh; Dundee; Stirling; Perth; Linlithgow; Haddington; St Andrews; Renfrew; Rutherglen; Aberdeen; Dumfries; Elgin and Forres; Rothesay; Irvine; Ayr.  
\(^{475}\) RPS, 1488/10/29, Legislation: private act (Edinburgh, Parliament, 6 October 1488).  
\(^{476}\) Pitscottie, Historie, Vol. I, 216-17. At first sight this entry suggests Pitscottie gave site for coronation, but he comment on the movements of key individuals between the death of James III and the ceremony
coronation by a full complement of the three estates and possible ceremomial crowning, hints at a reciprocal oath similar to that of 1445. There are no records to suggest that a knighting ceremony had taken place at the coronation of James IV in June; however, the king belted Patrick Hepburn as the earl of Bothwell during the parliament. Hepburn was touched by the sword of the king ‘as is customary’ in a further display of royal power.

The king had three new doublets – one of black satin, one of crimson and one of purple – made for the parliament. There were also purchases that imply that James IV was accompanied by his royal siblings, who would have provided a united front that demonstrated the vitality and stability of the young royal regime. The first official record of a ‘riding of parliament’ (public procession to open parliament) occurred in 1578, when an act was passed to penalise members of the estates for not taking part in the procession, but Alastair Mann has proposed that this ceremony had much earlier origins.

The Treasurer’s Accounts covering the continuation of this first parliament in January 1489 indicate that the king rode in full view, with velvet being purchased to cover saddles and harnesses of his horse, possibly in a procession of the estates as described and analysed by Mann for the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. There are no such entries for the October parliament; however, numerous saddles that had been ornamented for his coronation could have been reused. Moreover, a further entry hints at the ceremonial nature of parliamentary proceedings and possible procession for October

---

477 RPS material for this parliament gives no evidence for oaths were taken in this parliament, or the format of oaths taken; however, the Regiam Maiestatem compiled by James Monynet, which included a copy of the 1445 oaths (those of king and estates), is dated c. 1488. While the manuscript cannot be taken as evidence to firmly advocate that these oaths were used, it is certainly interesting in terms of continuity that they were being copied at this time: NLS, Adv. MS. 25.5.6.

478 RPS, ‘Legislation: elevation of Patrick Hepburn, lord Hailes to the earldom of Bothwell’ (Edinburgh, Parliament, 6th October 1488), 1488/10/36.


480 Lady Margaret had a gown of French brown and black ‘Ryssillis’ with a brown kirtil bought specifically for the parliament; the earl of Mar received a velvet coat and a French green and brown gown, and the Duke of Albany two gowns – one of ‘satin cramymye’ lined with ‘mynnyfere’ and another French green gown lined with ‘buge’, both in October prior to the parliament. Ibid, 152, 159, 162.

1488, referring to silk, gold and assuere coats of arms being made for heralds and pursuivants. As the following chapter will address, these displays hint at the growing understanding and involvement of a king who would become synonymous with elaborate and cohesive projections of royal authority through an array of tournaments, ambassadorial interactions, royal entry, pious devotional journeys, judicial progresses and other one-off spectacles.

In the delicate task of representing the authority of the king, who had been the figurehead of a rebellion to overthrow the previous king, the minority government of James IV showed some initial hesitancy. However, the coronation took place with due splendour and ceremony, if for a relatively small audience with very few high powered attendees, and possibly included a public town entry at Perth. Both king and minority leaders’ increasing mastery of the use of such ceremonial occasions to legitimise royal power was evident in the parliaments of October and the following year. The key fault of the Hepburn-led government was their emphasis on raising their own status without considering the self-centred image they projected and the potential reactions to such an image. Yet, throughout the fifteenth-century, although the coronation provided a crucial ceremonial arena for the projection of royal authority, the context surrounding each accession brought an array of challenges to long-absent returning kings and minority governments alike. In turn, these circumstances expanded avenues of ceremonial development, with influences feeding into the ceremony from an ever broader spectrum of sources. While some traditional elements appear to fade in the confusion, the central role of estates and the public acclamation of power remained crucial, particularly for minority leaders vying for supremacy, and the secular continued to jostle with the ecclesiastical for dominance of the crowning of Scottish monarchs.

482 TA, Vol. I, 163, see fn. 1: item in MS entered before f.52a and deleted. The coyt armouris are there said to be for the parliament and the materials of them are ‘ix elne dowbill tartar; price of the elne xvj s.; summra viij li. iiij s.’ and ‘golde, silver, asyure and colouris to paynt thir ix coyt armourid, xij li, j s.’

483 See Chapter 3, Section III, 266-76. For others on the ceremonial and display of James IV see: Fradenburg, City, Marriage, Tournament; Ibid, ‘Sovereign Love: The Wedding of Margaret Tudor and James IV of Scotland’, 78-97; Gray, ‘The Royal Entry in Sixteenth-Century Scotland’, 16-22; Barrow, ‘the Kynge sent to the Qwene, by a Gentylman, a grett tame Hart’, 65-84; Carpenter, ‘To Thexaltacyon of Noblesse’, 104-120; Stevenson, ‘Chvalry, British sovereignty and dynastic politics: undercurrents of antagonism in Tudor-Stewart relations, c.1490-c.1513’, 1-18. More generally see: Macdougall, James IV, particularly from 112 onwards (although a more political study, James IV’s display was very much part of his politics and many key ceremonies are covered for this reason).

Section IV: The Long Road to Majority: Crowning Infants in the Sixteenth Century

The issues regarding long minorities and the affects these had on the representations of royal authority were only to be exacerbated and increased in the sixteenth century as all three monarchs would come to the throne before their second birthday and, unlike their fifteenth-century predecessors, these infants could not talk or walk unaided at the time of their coronation. The use of the person of a child-monarch in representations of authority by minority governments was a key factor in the minorities thus far discussed, but the minority leaders of the sixteenth century were faced with even smaller children and far longer periods in which their involvement in government was likely to be minimal. In addition to these issues the sixteenth century saw two further seismic occurrences – the accession of a queen regnant and the Reformation – both of which changed the shape of the following centuries. Representations of royal authority, particularly any Catholicised elements of the rituals of kingship, were undoubtedly to be affected by the fluctuating currents of change through the middle to late sixteenth century, and this section addresses how the governors and regents who promoted royal authority on the behalf of these infant monarchs of Scotland faced such challenges.

Like his father and grandfather, James V’s coronation in September 1513 was not accompanied by a coronation parliament, the first full parliament of his reign would not occur until the following February. However, Thomas and Emond have emphasised the speed with which a General Council was called at Stirling following the battle of Flodden. The Acts of the Lords of the Council of Public Affairs indicate that the main purpose of this meeting was to make the necessary provisions for orchestrating the coronation of the infant king. It states that

---

485 The poignant title of Alice Hunt’s book on the coronation ceremony in England during the sixteenth century – *The Drama of Coronation: Medieval Ceremony in Early Modern England* – speaks volumes about how the world was changing around the a medieval monarchical centre, the ceremonial of which had to adapt and evolve to fit around new theologies while retaining the gravitas and legitimacy of tradition.

486 Interesting to note that Buchanan’s account of the coronation mistakenly places the two occasions together in February 1514, perhaps his mistake is coloured by his beliefs in the importance of parliament in legitimizing royal power: Buchanan, *History*, Vol. II, 262.

the bishop of Glasgow [James Beaton] was to act as ‘officio’ at the ceremony, and provides a list of attendees. The meeting occurred in Stirling only a few days before the coronation, and so the appended list gives a tentative indication of those present. Although James V’s coronation has earned the title of ‘mourning coronation’ due to the high level of noble casualties at Flodden, the list reveals a total of thirty-three spiritual and temporal peers, including seven bishops and nine earls, who were ‘ordanit be the general council’ that day. In addition, the chronicles agree in their reports that Margaret Tudor was made tutor to the king and governor as long as she did not remarry, as requested in her husband’s will, but her role in the coronation is obscure.

The chronicle accounts are many but lack detail of the ceremony held at Stirling on Wednesday 21 September, St. Matthew’s Day. The Acts of the Council suggest a high powered audience but cannot furnish details regarding roles other than that of Archbishop Beaton. Thomas has created a speculative reconstruction of the ceremony utilising Jerome Lindsay’s seventeenth-century Forme as the structural base around which she layers known facts from the event in 1513; therefore, the full repetition of such a task is unnecessary. An element that Thomas does not draw into her reconstruction in any great detail for James V’s coronation is music. In D. James Ross’s work on Robert Carver he posits that the Dum sacrum mysterium Mass, although originally conceived in 1506, was re-dated in the manuscript

---

488 Alexander Stewart, bishop of St Andrews, James IV’s illegitimate son had died alongside his father at Flodden and the see was vacant at this point.
492 Ibid; ADCP, 1.
493 Thomas does mention that Robert Carver and the choir of the Chapel Royal would have provided the music (‘Crown Imperial’, 55); however, despite a lengthy section on Carver and the Chapel Royal in James V’s adult reign in her monograph (Princelie Majestie, 104-12), she does not consider the choral Mass of the coronation in any detail.
Choirbook to 1513 when the piece was revived for the prospective glorious return of James IV from battle with the English to avoid criticism for reuse of an ‘old’ Mass. Ross proposes it was ‘an ocean of sound [...] a sumptuous representation of his monarch’s dream of Christendom triumphant and at peace’. The outcome of Flodden was rather different than anticipated; however, this revival and rehearsal of the piece by Carver and the choir, probably of the Chapel Royal at Stirling founded by James III and lavished with attention by James IV, would have meant that ‘the most impressive work in the whole Carver Choirbook’ was ready and waiting for James V’s coronation despite the rapidity of the organisation.

Thomas raises reservations in regard to the accuracy of the Forme due to the high level of involvement of heralds and officials, particularly the suggestion that leading heralds carried the regalia in the coronation procession, which she posits was undertaken by important nobles by the later sixteenth century. Whilst the fifteenth century saw the advancement of the heraldic figures, principally following the loss of the earl of Fife as a key ceremonial figure, it is equally possible that these roles lessened or changed in the sixteenth century due to other uncontrollable factors. For example, both the hereditary Marischal and Constable – William Keith, second earl Marischal, and William Hay, fifth earl of Errol – were present at the November General Council, but neither were in attendance at the September Council meeting, possibly implying that neither was present at the coronation. If the Marischal and Constable were not present to carry the royal robe, seal and spurs this could have resulted in heralds taking this role, while leading earls took the role of carrying the regalia into, as well as out of,

494 Ross, Musick Fyne, 30-3; Robert Carver: O bone Jesu; Missa Dum sacrum mysterium; Magnificat, The Sixteen Harry Chistopers, Coro (2007) [CD].
495 Ross, Musick Fyne, xxiii-xxiv, 29-33.
496 Thomas, ‘Crown Imperial’, 53. Thomas references Pitscottie (Historie, Vol. I, p.15) in regard to the earls carrying regalia at the coronation of Mary Queen of Scots in 1543. On following this reference up it does not appear that Pitscottie ever stated this; however, such a comment can be found in the The Hamilton Papers: Letters and Papers Illustrating the Political Relations of England and Scotland in the XVIIth Century, ed. J. Bain (Edinburgh, 1892), Vol. II, no. 30. See further discussion below, 196, fn. 553.
497 RPS, A1513/1, Procedure: deliberations concerning the Scottish ambassadors’ mission to France (Perth, General Council, 26 November 1513); ADCP, I. The fourth earl of Errol was one of those killed at Flodden, his son and heir would have been approximately eighteen and would have taken up his father’s hereditary office and earldom, but in the wake of Flodden may not have been readily available to attend in September. The second earl Marischal survived Flodden (although he lost a son), his presence at the coronation was perhaps more likely.
498 The role assigned to them in Balfour’s manuscript: NLS, Adv. MS. 33.2.26, ff. 30-1; and in the Forme, 393-5.
the church. As with the English *ordines*, the fact that an order of ceremony existed did not mean that the order was followed explicitly, or even particularly closely; each ceremony saw adaptations and changes purely due to the physical and logistical practicalities on each individual occasion.  

Issues related to James V’s young age, such as the need for an adult to carry the infant and to speak on his behalf, are raised by Thomas. Yet, despite commenting on the need for a familial or close servant to carry the infant king to soothe him during the event, she does not raise the possibility that the ceremony was shortened in any way to accommodate the fact that the monarch being crowned was not yet two.  

The inclusion of a highly ornate Mass, proposed by Ross, implies a ceremony of some stature and elaboration, but there is the possibility that elements were removed to tighten the time span that the infant’s presence was required. There would be elements more readily removable than others as the core of the ceremonial was crucial; curiosities such as the crowning of the Lyon King of Arms may have been side-lined and while recitation of the genealogy was important, there was scope here to cut down the generations recited. Thomas proposes that the regalia could have been ‘passed before him, for him to touch’, the crown held aloft above his head at the point of crowning, and proposes that a small crown was perhaps worn very briefly. All the regalia pieces – the crown modified by James IV and the papal sceptre and sword presented to him – were all adult-sized pieces of regalia that a child of not yet eighteen months would not be able to hold, so Thomas’s suggestions seem sound. Moreover, the order of ceremony prescribed in Balfour’s document, and therefore the *Forme*, which saw the crown placed on the ground before the king while the oaths of fealty were taken, seems likely to have been followed.

---

503 Both the sceptre and the sword of state were gifted to James IV in 1494 from Pope Alexander VI and 1507 from Pope Julius II respectively: Macdougall, *James IV*, 196-7; Thomas, ‘Crown Imperial’, 55-6.
504 See above Chapter 2, Section III, 159-65, esp. 164-5.
The fact that James V was so young would also have a multitude of effects upon the projection of royal authority beyond the issues of organising his coronation. Emond appears to have superimposed the title of ‘regent’ upon Margaret Tudor and John Stewart, duke of Albany; however, a shift in focus with the arrival of the duke of Albany could excuse Emond’s slip in titling him regent. With the crowned monarch under four years old at the duke’s arrival in 1515, the adult duke becomes the central figure representative of royal authority and his arrival in Scotland, recorded by the *Diurnal of Occurents*, is suggestive of a royal entry:

[...] at Witsunday, Johne duke of Albanie come into Scotland and landit at Dumbartane, and thair wes ressaueit with greit hhonour, and convoyit to Edinburgh with ane greit cumpnay with blythnes and glore [...]  

The *Treasurer’s Accounts* also show repairs were undertaken at Holyrood Palace in readiness for the governor’s arrival and payments made to the masters of the ships, *James* and *Margaret*, sent to France to bring the duke to Scotland. Moreover, in the first parliament following Albany’s arrival, in July 1515, it is recorded in the *Acts of the Lords of the Council* that:

[...] the lordis forsaid being thar with ripelie avisit thinkis expedient that my said lord governour weir ane mantill of ane duk, the crounale of ane duke, the sceptour in signe of regiment and governyng the realme, and the suerd in signe of justice within the samin.

---

505 See Emond, ‘The Minority of King James V, 1513–1528’.
506 The titles given to minority leaders of the earlier centuries were either ‘lieutenant’ or ‘governor’, with ‘governor’ first appearing for Robert, duke of Albany, during the absence of James I (see above). The parliament records and other accounts of James V’s minority reveal that the terms ‘governor’ and ‘protector’ of the kingdom are most commonly found for John Stewart, duke of Albany, between 1515 and 1524. The only reference in official records to regent is when ‘vice-regents and lieutenants’ are being elected for one of the periods when Albany returned to France. It would appear that Emond superimposes this title ‘regent’ onto Albany in his study, but it is a term that became synonymous with Marie de Guise and later minority leaders, as will be discussed in proceeding sections of this chapter. For some examples of titles for Albany see: *RPS*, A1515/7/1, Procedure: Preamble (Edinburgh, Parliament, July 12 1515); *ADCP*, 3 and 11 July 1515, 40, 50; *LPHVIII*, Vol. II, Part I, no. 779, 15 August.
507 *Diurnal*, 5. Unfortunately there are no burgh accounts surviving covering this event.
508 *TA*, Vol. V, 13-14, 16. There is no evidence that the infant king was involved in any of these ceremonial occurrences marking the arrival of Albany. Letters from Dacre to London indicate the reason for this was the continued possession of the king and his brother by Margaret Tudor, who dropped the portcullis of [Edinburgh] castle when the commission of the parliament arrived to collect the prince: *LPHVIII*, ‘Letter from Dacre, English ambassador, to London’, Vol. II, Part I, no. 779.
The sword of state was carried by the earl of Arran before the duke, and the earls of Angus and Argyll set the coronet upon his head, in a ceremony that included oaths of fealty and in which the role of the three estates in shaping this ratification of the duke’s role as governor of the realm was central. The acquisition of the prince from his mother later in the year bolstered Albany’s position and in 1516 there are glimpses of evidence in the Exchequer Rolls of the king being taken on a Northern progress when he was around four years old.

Between 1524 and the official end of his minority in 1528, James V was declared to be ruling the country in his own name at least three times in 1524, 1525 and 1526. In both 1524 and 1525 these declarations were accompanied by publicly parading the young king before his people. In 1524 the king, his mother Margaret Tudor, and a great number of nobles and prelates made their way from Stirling to Edinburgh where ‘the communitie of the said burghe of Edinburgh ressauvit with greit triumphant and honoure.’ The burgh accounts support such a welcome with orders that ‘all the nychtbouris of this burgh craftismen vtheris till forgather in their best array.’ In 1525 the king was paraded through Edinburgh to Holyrood and Leslie records that:

 [...] the Parleament in Ed[inbu]r[gh] sulde sitt doune in ffebruar the xxiii, quhair the king selfe suld be present and principal, with al the ornamentis of his Realme, sceptre, croune, and suerode. And that this mycht be done with al

---

511 Ibid. Margaret Tudor retained custody of her sons for a number of months after Albany’s arrival, but there is little evidence to explore how Margaret attempted to forward the royal authority of her infant son. As noted in the previous chapter in regards to memorials for James IV (see Chapter 1, Section III, 73-4) a lack of Treasurer’s Accounts from summer 1513 to early 1515 leaves a large gap in understanding. Emond notes a number of factors restricting Margaret’s involvement beyond custodian of her son: she was pregnant between Sept 1513 and April 1514; James Beaton, archbishop of Glasgow – staunch supporter of the French alliance – was made the Chancellor in September 1513 and had monopoly of the Great Seal; the council were pursuing Albany as Governor; and she married Archibald Douglas, earl of Angus in August 1514 (and James IV’s will had specified her rights as guardian and tutor of her son ended when she remarried). See Emond, ‘The Minority of James V”, 1-59.
512 Expenses of the king and governor in Ross: ER, Vol. XIV, 144.
515 Diurnal, 9; ADCP, 1 August 1524, 204-5.
pompe and magnificence that could be deuyset, the king honorable was conuoyet fra the castell to his palise.  

On each occasion the change of power was accompanied by ratifications of the declarations made by the parliament, the changing of key offices, the handing over of the great seal, and oaths made by the lords and estates. The multiple changes in offices and holders of the royal seal did not lead to any great change in the seal design, which has been described by Birch as merely a lesser imitation of James I to IV’s seal. The use of parliament to announce the control of the king’s person and his ‘own’ rule, as well as changes to royal offices, reemphasised and enhanced the central importance of this body during the minority.

The birth of Mary in December 1542 appears to have left little mark on the records, and was overshadowed by the tragedy of her father’s premature death and the continued hostilities with England. Although the Diurnal’s entry regarding the queen’s coronation places it in the January following James V’s death, it is the only record to do so, with all others placing it in late August or early September 1543. There were innumerable reasons for the delay to Mary’s formal accession, not least of which being that the infant was only nine days old at her father’s death. However, it is worth bearing in mind that her gender was likely a predominant factor, particularly in regards to Arran’s negotiations with Henry VIII for a possible marriage between Mary and Prince Edward that would have seen Mary brought up in the English

---

517 Leslie, Historie, 202.  
519 Birch, History of Scottish Seals, 61-7. There was, however, an interesting development in the depiction of the king on coinage that would be issued around 1526, showing the king in side relief with a closed imperial crown. This change in design to include the imperial crown, following the third declaration of James V’s majority under his step-father Angus, could indicate that the young king was perhaps more influential in some decisions. See Plate 23a and b.  
520 There are few mentions of Mary’s birth and baptism, but little in comparison to the highly public affair orchestrated for James V’s first son and heir in 1540. For Prince: TA, Vol. VII, 303-5, 307-9, 315, 322, 328, 357; Pitscottie, Vol. I, 381-2; Leslie, Historie, 243; Diurnal, 23. For Mary: TA, Vol. VIII, 65. Secondary see: Marcus Merriman, The Rough Wooings, Mary Queen of Scots, 1542–1551 (East Linton, 2000), 1; Thomas, Princelie Majestie, 198-9; Dean, ‘Royal Births and Baptisms in Scotland’.  
522 This could have included those in power holding back to make absolutely sure that there was no posthumous pregnancy that would have seen Marie de Guise produce a son of James V after his death.
The first parliament of the reign occurred before Mary’s coronation to establish the minority government headed by James Hamilton, earl of Arran, but despite the fact that Mary remained uncrowned, it was opened in her name on 12 March 1543. The records have multiple declarations of Arran’s role as governor and tutor to the queen, with a copy of the letter written in Mary’s name, appended with the seals of fifty-seven members of the three estates that illustrates that the estates swore an oath to Arran ‘each one by themselves, by the display of their right hands.’ Arran’s role as governor was fully sanctioned and he had coinage produced on which he stamped ‘IG’ for ‘Iohn Gubernator’, but there were attempts to express crown authority through the infant queen. In April 1543 the TA reveals that a seal was cast for the queen by Patrick Lindsay, goldsmith, costing £31. There were a number of seals produced throughout Mary’s reign, the first shows her as a fully grown adult figure of authority resplendently enthroned with an imperial crown and a long sceptre topped with a fleur de lys. The throne she is seated upon shows the first distinctive change in seal design since the early Stewarts, introducing a highly Italianate design with a portico supported by columns. Birch has commented on the originality of the use of words derived from Psalm 27 on the reverse, which accompanied an elaborate coat of arms supported by gorged unicorns and topped with a resplendent imperial crown. This design of the royal arms had been developing throughout the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, but this appears to be its first extant realisation in seal form. James V’s own seal remained very similar to those of his predecessors and was comparatively poor in quality through much of his reign until the loss of one seal led to the

523 For further details on the situation in 1543 see: Merriman, The Rough Wooings, particularly 112-34.
524 Arran was next in line for the throne should anything happen to Mary.
525 RPS, 1543/3/1, Procedure: opening of parliament (Edinburgh, Parliament, 12 March 1543).
527 Ibid, A1543/3/1, Letters: declaring the Earl of Arran to be second person of the realm (Edinburgh, Parliament, 15 March 1543). Unfortunately, the parliament records do not indicate the manner in which Arran received these oaths or any specific mentions of use of all or some of the regalia, but Arran was not a duke like Albany in the minority of James V so would have had no ducal coronet.
528 Merriman, The Rough Wooings, 92.
530 See Plate 24 a and b.
531 ‘Salvum fac populum tuum domine’ is the inscription: ‘Lord, make your people safe’ derived from ‘O God of my salvation!’ Psalm 27: 9 ‘Psalm of David’.
532 Birch, History of Scottish Seals, 69-70. [Gorged: Collared with a crown.]
533 Stevenson, ‘The Unicorn, St Andrew and the Thistle’, 11-20; and Ibid, ‘Heraldry, Iconography and Dynasty in Representations of Royal Authority’. 
recasting of all in March 1540. This new design certainly included the imperial crown atop the royal arms at James’s request;\(^\text{534}\) therefore, the design of Mary’s seal was likely building on this latest addition to James’s imagery arsenal. The image of the queen herself is the least well executed element suggesting this image was perhaps a rushed addition to the design.

Despite such visual endorsements of the infant queen’s rights, the build up to the coronation reveals the unease felt by the dowager queen, Marie de Guise, and her followers in transporting the child amidst the complexities of Arran’s dealings with the English.\(^\text{535}\) Leslie reports that the earls of Huntly, Argyll, Lennox, Montrose and Menteith, along with Cardinal Beaton and others collected at Linlithgow in August:

\[
[\ldots] \text{and thairfra convoyit the Quene with ane greit army to Striveling; and thair for moir suir keeping of her persoun, the lordis Levingstoun, Erskyn, Fleming and Ruthwen wes appointit to remane with her, and the estaititis war warnit to cum to her coronatioune in September nixt following [\ldots]}\(^\text{536}\)
\]

The *Treasurer’s Accounts* confirms the army with £600 released to James Dog and Patrick Kyncaid to give out to the ‘meane of weir the tyme of the taking of the quenis grace furth Linlithgow.’\(^\text{537}\) As Merriman has noted, the decision to move Mary to the fortifications of Stirling and one step closer to her crown indicated the waning chances of Arran’s English union and increased the underlying disquiet that would lead to civil war before the year ended, so the dowager’s concerns about moving her daughter were well founded.\(^\text{538}\)

The queen’s coronation, in comparison to the events encircling it, is sadly lacking descriptive accounts and financial records. The event is recorded briefly by Pitscottie and Buchanan; however, both chroniclers date the event to late August, an assertion contradicted by Leslie and the English ambassador, Ralph Sadler, who both state that the coronation was postponed until September. Sadler’s correspondence of 6 September states that ‘the Coronation


\(^{535}\) See above 190, fn. 523.

\(^{536}\) Leslie, *History of Scotland*, 174.

\(^{537}\) *JA*, Vol. VIII, 224. This, however, is one of the only occasions that the *Treasurer’s Accounts* reveal anything in relation to the coronation as there are no other obvious references to the ceremony found in them.

of our Sovereign Lady is deferred while Sunday 9 September [...] None of the three Scottish commentators – George Buchanan, John Leslie, or Pitscottie – were present at court or its environs in 1543, and their personal biases, religious beliefs, and involvement in the politics of the years that follow must be remembered when utilising their works as sources, particularly for this period. Only Sadler would have been personally involved at the centre of court politics in 1543 making him a reliable witness in terms of bare facts, but even he did not attend the coronation and his biases as a loyal servant of the English crown must be remembered. Sadler comments that:

‘[...] the young Queen was crowned on Sunday last at Stirling, with such Solemnity as they do us in this Country, which is not very costly.’

His statement was tellingly derogatory and likely purposefully so, as he had been in Scotland five months attempting to fulfil his task of making a betrothal between Mary and Prince Edward, and had little reason to wax lyrical about this Catholic coronation, particularly as he did not attend personally. He had sent Henry Ray, the Berwick pursuivant, in his stead as a statement of English authority, perhaps contentiously so considering the long running feuds over the prosperous port well into the fifteenth century.

---

540 George Buchanan had escaped Scotland via England after being condemned as a heretic, so was in France from 1539 and did not return to Scotland until after Mary had returned as an adult in 1561. He received a crown pension from Mary in 1564, but he gravitated towards her Protestant half-brother, James Stewart earl of Moray, and became one of her most virulent opponents. See amongst others: C. Erskine and R.A. Mason, ‘George Buchanan: Influence, Legacy and Reputation’ in Erskine and Mason (eds), George Buchanan: Political Thought in Early Modern Britain and Europe (Farnham, 2012), 1-3; D.M. Abbott, ‘Buchanan, George (1506–1582), poet, historian, and administrator’ on ODNB (Online edition, May 2006), http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/3837 . Accessed 4 October 2012.
542 Robert Lindsay of Pitscottie (c.1532–c. 1586) would have only been a child when these events took place, so his knowledge came from other sources at this point. The editor of his work suggests he was primarily a truthful if careless historian, and it was only the years of his life time particularly later reign of Mary and James VI where his opinions begin to encroach upon fact. See Mackay, ‘Introduction’ to Pitscottie, Historie, xxxv-clx.
544 Sadler, Letters and Negotiations, 365-6.
Pitscottie offers a challenge to Sadler’s disparaging view of the coronation when he refers to great triumph, plays, ‘phrassis’, \(^{545}\) banqueting and dancing, and indicates the attendance of French ladies of Marie de Guise’s household amongst the guests. \(^{546}\) Pitscottie’s proposed entertainments and feasting are not supported by the *Treasurer’s Accounts*, which came under the jurisdiction of Arran as governor and make no mention of the queen’s coronation at all. \(^{547}\) However, the September section of de Guise’s ‘Expence Extraordinaire’ reveal the dowager’s involvement in at least partially funding her daughter’s coronation. \(^{548}\) There are payments to confectioner, butchers, and porters/bearers of food for their efforts, as well as silver dishes used to carry the food, all during the feast of the coronation. \(^{549}\) The musical aspect of the coronation ceremony is considered by Ross, who highlights the link between Mary’s coronation on 9 September and the celebration for the birth of the Virgin Mary (8 September). \(^{550}\) He proposes that the *Pater Creator omnium* Mass, dated 1543, was the kind of composition ‘reserved for solemnities of the highest order’ but he notes that the four-voice piece seems modest in terms of technical musical skill required to perform it, perhaps reflective of the time constraints to compose and rehearse with the coronation date being changed a number of times. \(^{551}\) The fact that the ceremony took place on the first Sunday in the octave of the feast of the Nativity of the Blessed Virgin Mary could have been chosen specifically for a number of reasons. Firstly, the Marian nature of the feast would hold increased potency due to the fact that this was a virgin queen, called Mary, being crowned. Secondly, there has been a trend noted particularly in fourteenth and fifteenth century Scottish coronations in regards to linking the solemn occasion of coronation to a feast in the cycle of the Blessed Virgin. Lastly, the complex political and religious upheavals in England circling around Henry VIII’s break

---

\(^{545}\) Farces or pageants.


\(^{547}\) The entries in the *Treasurer’s Accounts* from August through to the end of October make no mention of the queen, other than the aforementioned expenses to increase her personal body guards. The entries focus on the Governor and his family, along with preparations for war: TA, Vol. VIII, 223-9.

\(^{548}\) These expenses for Marie de Guise are patchy but do offer insights into the household of a Scottish queen that are unfortunately lacking for the majority of earlier consorts.


\(^{550}\) Feast of the Nativity of the Virgin Mary: 8 September.

\(^{551}\) Ross, *Musick Fyne*, 40-44.
from the Roman Catholic Church and a rising of Protestant ideology, could mean that the Marian feast was specifically chosen to underline the continuing Scottish royal allegiance to Rome. With the layering of French and Catholic statements over the event, there is perhaps no wonder that Sadler chose not to elaborate.

The regalia is referred to by Buchanan who is infuriatingly vague stating that ‘having received the insignia of power, with the usual ceremonies, Mary entered upon her reign [...]’ An additional English commentator, William Parr, records that Arran carried the crown, Lennox the sceptre, and Argyll the sword in the ceremony, although it is not clear whether this was both entering and exiting the ceremony or just the latter (as outlined in the orders of ceremony discussed above). The involvement of high born nobles carrying the regalia at some point in the ceremony was increasingly common, even if the heraldic officials also continued to feature in such duties. The complex political wrangling and delicate balance of power around the infant monarchs of the sixteenth century in Scotland could easily have dominated issues of ceremonial precedence and seen heraldic officials become more minor figures. A further consideration is the fact that the proposed rearrangement would have placed Arran and Lennox in closest proximity to the symbols of the monarchy and these two men were the next in line for the throne, the equivalent of French Princes of the Blood who rose in ceremonial prominence in the early sixteenth-century, particularly in the court of Frances I with which both James V and Marie de Guise were familiar.

---

552 It is worth noting that although Henry VIII split from Rome well before 1543 his own religious views were highly contestable, when he died in 1547 his will asked for masses to be said for his soul and there had been Marian imagery used in Anne Boleyn’s coronation entry ceremony in 1533. Moreover, Alice Hunt suggests that in 1547: ‘England still neither saw itself nor was identified as Protestant [...]’ Hunt, The Drama of Coronation, particularly 39-110, quote 80.
554 Parr was later made earl of Essex and marquis of Northampton. He was a member of Henry’s Council of the North in 1543.
556 At the coronation of Frances I in 1515 four out of six of the old peers involved in the ceremony (including carrying regalia) were Princes of the Blood, and these men followed directly after the king in the royal entry: Jackson, Vive le Roi! 155-167. On noblesse de robe and changing face of Scottish nobility in this era see: M. Lee Jr., John Maitland of Thirlestane and the Foundations of the Stewart Despotism (Princeton, 1959). Lee’s views on rising to prominence through royal office and the decline of the ‘old nobility’ are challenged in works including: J. Wormald, Lords and Men in Scotland: Bonds of Manrent, 1442–1603 (Edinburgh, 1985) and K.M. Brown, Noble Society in Scotland: Wealth, Family and Culture from Reformation to Revolution (Edinburgh, 2004 edition), particularly 1-24 & 271-6.
There is not a conclusive list of who was present at the coronation. Sadler and Leslie’s comments on those who would not attend the ceremony do not include the Marischal and Constable. The former is found listed at the following convention; therefore, the likelihood that at least he took his traditional role carrying the spurs and great seal behind the queen is fairly strong. Sir David Lindsay of the Mount was the Lyon King of Arms in 1542/3 and had been prominent in the orchestration of James V’s funeral, so his place at the coronation can be confirmed although the role he played is less clear. If the ceremony was shortened for either or both infant monarchs in 1513 and 1542, the crowning of the Lyon King could have been removed without damaging the core shape of the ceremony. However, even if this was the case, he likely acted as master of ceremony and played a central role in the public acclamation of the new queen including a recitation of the genealogy of the Scottish monarchy. Moreover, he and his fellow heralds and pursuivants dressed in tabards of the Scottish arms, would have made a vibrant visual statements of Scottish royal authority.

In the case of Mary’s coronation regalia, there are far more details due to extensive remodelling undertaken throughout James V’s reign. In addition to the survival of the key pieces of regalia at Edinburgh castle, an inventory of the jewels and clothing of James V was recorded in November 1542 and gives a full record of the regalia that was available to be used:

557 Questionable whether they would have also been carrying the royal robe as prescribed in the seventeenth-century manuscripts as the queen would be far too small to wear it.
558 ER, Vol. XVIII, 17. It is a shame that the actual report of the Berwick Pursuivant is not included in Sadler’s correspondence as it likely recorded any variations between the Scottish and English ceremony: Sadler, Letters and Negotiations, 363-6.
559 See Plate 25. The work on the regalia is discussed in detail by Thomas, ‘Crown Imperial’, 55-66. Also see Chapter 3, Section IV, 289-90; Dean, ‘Enter the Alien.’ Further additions were made to the crown of both king and queen in June 1542 (once Marie was pregnant with Mary following the loss of two male heirs). The gold purchased for the crowns (41 ¼ ounces for the king’s and 35 ounces for the queen’s) was exactly the same weights used just over two years earlier in the remodelling of the king’s and the making of the queens. It is unclear why such expense would be undertaken so soon after the works undertaken for Marie’s coronation: TA, Vol. VIII, xv-xvi, 82-3.
560 There is a record to a payment of 40s. in February 1543 to Henry Wardlaw to write a similar list, however, it is not clear if this is extant or not (TA, Vol. VIII, 170.) The following inventory was created before James V’s death if its opening lines are accurate: ‘Ane Inventur of the kingis graces abilyementis beand in his graces wardrop in Edinburgh givinup be Johne Tennand the xxviii day of November in the yeir of god Jm vè frouthy twa yeiris’: A collection of inventories, 76.
Item in the firft his graces croun full of precius flanis and orient perle with ane ſeptur fet with ane greit barrell
Item twa ſwordis of honour with twa beltis wantand four ſtuthis
Item ane rob royall of purpour velvott lynit with armin and ane kirtill of the ſamyne velvott lynit in the foir breifits with army and heid ficlyk
Item ane [hatt] that cam fra the paipe of gray velvott with the haly gaift fet all with orient perle
Item the ordour of the Emperour with the golden fleis
Item ordour of France with the cokill and fanet Michaell and the caip thairof of purpour velvott lynit with quhyte taffeteis and the kirtill of the ſamyne lynit with quhyt dalmes with ane hude of the ſamyne
Item the quenis graices crown sett haill with the perle and precius flanis with ane ceptour with ane quhyt hand.  

The inclusion of two swords on this list, one a papal gift to James IV in 1507 and the other to James V in 1537, introduces the possibility that a fourth earl was required in the procession if both swords were utilised in the ceremony. The earl of Moray was the queen’s uncle and could possibly have been a candidate for such a role. Marie de Guise’s crown and sceptre are also notable in the inventory. It is probable that the queen dowager would have been wearing this regalia to emphasise her own royal status and the proxy power she wielded as mother of the queen in this male-dominated arena.

None of the accounts give any indication of who carried the infant queen into the coronation. The queen mother could have carried her daughter, although not if carrying her sceptre also. Thomas does not suggest Margaret Tudor for this role in 1513, but her suggestion of David Lindsay as bearer of James V was based on familiarity to curb any unnecessary upset for the child. The infant Mary had been in the care of her mother; therefore, she or one of her ladies-of-the-chamber appear likely candidates. The involvement of Lindsay in the funeral of James V made him an equal possibility for this duty, and as Lyon Herald he would certainly have been prominent in the proceedings. Cardinal Beaton, archbishop of St Andrews, and Gavin Dunbar, archbishop of Glasgow, were both present and would presumably have supported the bearer of the infant queen, and Beaton likely officiated at the ceremony. The person who acted by proxy to recite the oaths in the ceremony is not named, but as the governor

561 Ibid.
563 See Chapter 1, Section V.
and second person of the realm it seems sensible to suggest that Arran took this role.\textsuperscript{564} The
 coronation at Stirling was not centred in a parliament; however, the gathered three estates held a
 convention to select a council,\textsuperscript{565} and there may have been a further giving of oaths – perhaps
 those prescribed in 1445 – between the estates and the governor.

One way in which Mary’s minority differed from those which encircled it was her
 absence from the country for well over ten years following the ratification of the Treaty of
 Haddington in parliament of July 1548. This saw Mary sent to France to spend the remainder of
 her childhood in the French court alongside the Dauphin François, whom she would marry in
 1558.\textsuperscript{566} The manner in which the royal authority of the Scottish crown was projected during
 Mary’s prolonged absence, particularly through the efforts of her mother Marie de Guise, are
 being considered elsewhere;\textsuperscript{567} however, one ceremony must be drawn briefly into this
 discussion.

The transfer of power from Arran to Marie de Guise, sweetened by ‘material
 persuasions’ and titles, was designed to project the complex quasi-regal status vested in the
 ‘regent’ Marie de Guise.\textsuperscript{568} Marie’s accession as governor in 1554 reflects the ‘riding of
 parliament’ ceremony as described by Mann, with the governor, lords and heralds riding from
 Holyrood to the Tolbooth with the royal honours taking the lead position.\textsuperscript{569} Both Buchanan and
 Pitscottie record the ceremonial surrendering of the regalia by the governor to the queen
 dowager, following which Pitscottie reports:

\textsuperscript{564} Parr’s letter to the duke of Suffolk also notes that Beaton made Arran repent and take the sacrament
 for the consenting to the sacking of a friary in Dundee in the days prior to the coronation, thus implying


\textsuperscript{566} RPS, 1548/7/1, ‘Legislation: treaty of Haddington’ (Haddington, Parliament, 7 July 1548).

\textsuperscript{567} Dean, ‘A Scottish Queen or Catholic Princess: The Ceremonial Representations of Authority by Marie
 de Guise and Mary Queen of Scots, c. 1550 - 1566’ in K. Buchanan and Dean, with M. Penman (eds),
 \textit{Medieval and Early Modern Representations of Authority in Scotland, England and Ireland} (Farnham,

\textsuperscript{568} Ibid, 93, 143.

 140-9. The parliament records are not complete for this parliament but they do contain documents read in
 regards to the discharge of Arran, including a letter from the absent Queen Mary that was ratified by the
 three estates, the total present was over sixty and included two archbishops, eight bishops and a bishop-
elect, and fourteen earls. \textit{RPS}, A1554/4/1, Legislation: discharge of James Hamilton, duke of
 Chatelherault, as governor of Scotland (Edinburgh, Parliament, 12 April 1554).
and the quene ressauwit, and the croun sett wpoun hir heid and suord deliuerit into hir, quho raid doune the gait triumphantie and the same scepter surd and croune borne befoir hir witht the lordis of Scotland they buire wpe the gait befoir the governour, in lyk maner they buire it doun the gait befor hir signe and taken that scho had ressawit the authorietie and sould rigne [reign] ower the pepill of this realme as regent and governour thairof [...]570

This ceremonial crowning of the queen dowager in this manner was new and unique, and Marie’s investiture with the royal honours is confirmed by the French ambassador D’Oiysel (who took part in the ceremony) in his report to the French royal court.571 Both Pitscottie and Buchanan name her regent, a title she also receives in parliament records and is the first to do so.572 It is perhaps questionable whether the crown she wore was her crown as consort or the monarch’s crown. Yet, it was the monarch’s regalia paraded to and from parliament to encapsulate the royal power in absentia, and Marie’s consort regalia would not have carried the same gravitas. Though hindsight allows the knowledge that Mary would ultimately return, in 1554 the Scottish queen’s absence would have appeared a near permanent arrangement. This ceremony was not an unknown entity for Albany had worn his ducal coronet in 1515; however, in the absence of the crowned queen, the symbolism of Marie de Guise enthroned and crowned in the parliament was a powerful representation of authority sanctioned by the estates.

The work undertaken by Mary to promote herself and her son on the European stage, following the ‘ambiguous triumph’ of her royal entry in 1561573 and culminating in the triumphant baptismal celebrations for James VI from 17 to 19 December 1566,574 would ultimately be rapidly and drastically undone. Dawson’s opinion that ‘as a celebration, the coronation [of James VI] was a pathetic damp squib’ does not inspire much confidence in the

---

570 Pitscottie, Historie, Vol. II, 114-6. See also Ritchie, Mary of Guise in Scotland, 94.
571 Archives du Ministere des Affaires Etrangères, Correspondence Politique, Angleterre, Vol. XII, doc. 379, f. 202r.
574 Lynch, ‘Queen Mary’s Triumph’, 1-21; Dean, ‘Royal Birth and Baptisms’.
new government’s attempts to produce a resounding visual statement of the royal authority of
the king they presented as the alternative to his Catholic mother. But the political situation
and upheaval that surrounded the coronation of the infant James VI in 1567 was one of the most
fraught and contentious periods of Scottish history. With the forced abdication of Mary
Queen of Scots causing reverberations around Europe, it was crucial for the Confederate Lords
and the new Protestant regime to legitimise their authority through the promotion of the infant
king as the rightful and recognised central figure of Scottish royal authority. In addition they
had to contend with adapting a ceremony imbued with Catholic tradition and liturgy into
something palatable to the Protestant community while upholding the majesty and legitimacy of
power that the coronation had to convey, but perhaps the secular nature of Scottish ceremony
allowed for a smoother transition than elsewhere. The Treasurer’s Accounts reveal that the
preparations began with messengers sent out on 26 July to announce the coming coronation
following the abdication of Mary at market crosses in Haddington, Duns, Peebles, Lanark,
Cupar, Dundee, Jedburgh, Lauder, Perth, and Linlithgow; while in Edinburgh ‘herauldis,
maseris and trumpettis passand to the mercat croce [...] to make publicatioun of the Forsaidis
letters.’

When the proceedings began on 25 July, bonds of loyalty to the young king were made
promising to ‘concur, assist and fortify our said native king and prince to [...] placing of him in
his kingdom, and putting the crown royal thereof upon his head’ in a convention at Edinburgh
four days before the coronation and pre-empting the oaths of fealty that would be made in the

575 Dawson, Scotland Re-formed, 267.
576 The subject of James VI’s coronation has been recently covered in more detail and with rounder
conclusions in work by Michael Lynch, published during the writing up of this thesis: Lynch, ‘Scotland’s
First Protestant Coronation’, 177-207.
577 Edward VI’s minority coronation (1547) saw Archbishop Cranmer dictating ceremonial changes –
such as relegating the oil to a purely ceremonial inclusion and introducing a triple imperial crown
(perhaps ironically or consciously similar to the papal diadem) – but the essence of the English ceremony
remained very similar and it was still wholly in Latin. Even for an adult monarch controlling her own
ceremonial, this was equally challenging for Elizabeth in 1559, who opted for making everything as
ambiguous as possible. See R.C. McCoy, ‘‘The Wonderful Spectacle’ The Civic Progress of Elizabeth I
and the Troublesome Coronation’, in Bak (ed.), Coronations, 217-27; Strong, The Tudor and Stuart
coronation. The first full parliament of the reign would not occur until December 1567, but James VI’s coronation on 29 July was placed within a coronation ‘convention’. The presence of members of all three estates and the careful manner in which the unusual circumstances were recorded indicate that the government attempted to stabilise their activities within a structured political environment, in the manner it followed previously in times of crisis. The records of the coronation convention provide a range of information about the event, including a list of those present at the coronation. Dawson and, more recently, Lynch have labelled this as the ‘worst-attended coronation in Scottish history’, noting that the number of earls was low with only five present. However, the population was split over two parties, with one of the estates almost entirely absent, and many neutrals choosing to stay away. The total named attendees numbered over thirty, including five earls, eight lords, six commendators, representatives from at least eight burghs, the comptroller, justice clerk, the secretary, and the bishop of Orkney. Five earls was a low number and there were prominent figures notably absent, but the sources for James IV’s coronation in 1488 record only two earls, along with just twelve others who...
represented only the noble and ecclesiastical estates. Under the circumstances, the total attendance at James VI’s coronation, particularly with the cross-section of the three estates present, was far from the ‘worst attended’.

The coronation took place on Tuesday 29 July 1567 although traditionally the Scottish coronations have occurred on Sunday or on a prominent saint’s feast day. Neither of these traditional day choices would have been acceptable to the Protestant organisers of this ceremony, with Sunday or the Sabbath to be kept free of frivolities and the veneration of saints being deemed a papist trait. The choice of the date, however, may have had a specific connection that the Confederate Lords wished to emphasise. On 29 July 1565 Henry Stewart, Lord Darnley, had married Mary Queen of Scots, the fruit of whose union was to be crowned exactly two years later. At Carberry Hill, when the Queen’s forces had confronted the Protestant lords on the battlefield on 15 June, the Protestant banner had shown the murdered body of Darnley with the infant king praying beside him and the motto ‘Judge and Revenge my Cause, O Lord’. The continuation of the symbolic value of the Protestant government’s support of the murdered Darnley’s cause was one which could potentially have driven the choice of James VI’s coronation date.

The ceremony took place in the Kirk of the Holy Rude in Stirling, which contrasted sharply with the Catholic baptism rite Prince James had undergone at the Chapel Royal in 1566. As Lynch points out, it also marked a distinct change in venue; while the Scottish coronation had moved a number of times from 1437 onwards, this was the first to occur in a parish kirk.

---

587 James IV was not the only coronation with low attendance prior to 1567, Mary’s coronation had key figures absent, while the inaugural ceremony for Bruce in 1306 was questionably attended, and there was limited attendance to James II coronation in 1460 (although with the latter two it is difficult to assess attendance fully due to source survival).

588 RPS, 1567/7/29/1-2.

589 There are two images extant (and accessible to view online) that record the banner and its use in the meeting between lords and the queen at Carberry: TNA, MPF 1/366/2-3, Meeting at Carberry Hill between Mary, Queen of Scots, and lords opposed to her, and banner used by the lords [...] 15 June 1567; see also T. Sabatos, ‘Thou shalt get kings, though thou be none’: The Body of Henry Stewart, Lord Darnley, King of Scots’, Conference Paper given ‘The Royal Body Conference, Royal Holloway, University of London, 2–4 April 2012. Paper explored how Darnley’s image in death was more powerful as a symbolic tool for the Protestant government than Darnley himself could ever have been as a live man. See also: T. Sabatos, ‘The Memorial of James Stewart, Earl of Moray, and the Visual Culture of Bloodfeud in Early Modern Scotland’, Review of Scottish Culture, Vol. 24 (2012), 34-49.

590 Lynch, ‘Scotland’s First Protestant Coronation’, 179.
In the *Diurnal* the ceremony began with the Countess of Mar carrying the infant king from Stirling castle to the kirk.\(^{591}\) This is not corroborated elsewhere, but as the earl and countess of Mar were the guardians of the infant king,\(^{592}\) it seems probable that the countess carried the infant. The *Treasurer’s Accounts* illuminate that the king was dressed ‘agane his heines coronatioun’ in ‘crammosie’ and blue velvet, red taffety, ‘crammosie’ silk, buttons, and gold ‘pratikis’ [ornamental lace] costing around £140.\(^{593}\) Lynch has compared costs of the 1566 baptism and what remains extant for the coronation revealing the huge difference in cost.\(^{594}\) However, ceremonial held during the adult reign of a monarch was in a different league, as the final chapter of this thesis and James’s baptism reveal, to those orchestrated in the times of minority governments and many of the coronations across the centuries were undertaken, for want of a better expression, on a shoe-string.

Amongst the ceremonial oddities caused by the unusual situation of Mary’s forced abdication, and the infancy of the monarch being crowned, the opening act of the coronation once the party got to the church was public reading of the Queen’s letters of demission and a presentation of the regalia.\(^{595}\) The reading of the demission within the church environment rather than a political arena is striking, with a blurring of boundaries between church and state that suggests demonstrating God’s perceived sanctification for their political actions was crucial.\(^{596}\) The letters of renunciation and demission of her royal rights as ‘subscribed by her

\(^{591}\) *Diurnal*, 118-9.

\(^{592}\) Mar was certainly made guardian which would normally suggest that he and his wife were godparents of the child. However, many of the Protestant attendees of the baptism spectacular at Stirling in December 1566 waited outside the chapel while the Catholic rite took place. Mar was not named specifically as one of them but his appearance in the baptismal rite to become a godparent seems unlikely. Queen Elizabeth was certainly approached regarding being a godparent and asked the countess of Argyll to take her place. The countess along with the French and Savoyan ambassadors were those who conveyed the young prince to the baptism ceremony. Mary may have made Mar and his wife secular guardians to include some Protestant figures in the welfare of her child, due to the roles of godparents being given to Catholic figures. *Diurnal*, 103-5; TNA, SP52/12, f.110r, Letter from Queen Elizabeth to the Countess of Argyll, October 1566; Lynch, ‘Queen Mary’s Triumph’, 10-11.

\(^{593}\) NAS, E21/57, fol. 20r, Accounts of the Treasurer, 1 July 1567–14 Feb 1567/8; TA, Vol. XII, 67.

\(^{594}\) Lynch estimates approximately £30,000 was spent on the baptismal celebrations in 1566, compared to a known expenditure of under £200 in 1567, although he does note the significant gaps in material for the latter date: ‘Scotland’s First Protestant Coronation’, 183.

\(^{595}\) RPS, 1567/7/29/2.

\(^{596}\) Lynch provides a detailed analysis of the demission itself, so this will not be explored in more detail here, see: ‘Scotland’s First Protestant Coronation’, 197-201.
hand and under her privy seal’ were presented by Patrick, Lord Lindsay of the Byres and William, Lord Ruthven, who also ‘presented’ the regalia:

And in sign and token thereof, the said Lord Lindsay and Ruthven presented before the said lords of the nobility, spirituality, commissioners of burghs, barons and people convened, the sword, sceptre and royal crown of this realm, requiring the said letters and commission to be read and inserted in the books of secret council to remain for perpetual memory [...]

Unfortunately, it is unclear whether this meant that the regalia was carried to the church by Lindsay and Ruthven or others. A procession of earls accompanied the Countess and baby king to the ceremony, but there is no reference to the regalia. The journey of the regalia after the ceremony back to the castle was recorded by the Diurnal with the attending earls carrying the regalia, as laid down in the Forme and other records. The secret council released £29 to the Lyon King of Arms, heralds and pursuivants who had come to Stirling for the coronation. This could indicate that the heralds were involved in carrying the regalia to the ceremony, in addition to traditional acclamation and recitation, or that they took up the roles of Marischal and Constable. Both William Keith, fourth earl Marischal, and George Hay, seventh earl of Errol, were members of Queen Mary’s Privy Council and therefore highly unlikely to be involved.

The proceedings as recorded in the convention documents imply that the ceremony moved swiftly on from the reading of the letters of demission to the oaths and coronation; although various chronicle accounts highlight that John Knox delivered a sermon prior to the oaths and crowning ceremony. The sermon that he gave does not survive, but the general consensus posits that Knox’s sermon focused on the theme of being crowned young in place of a deposed mother, based upon the Old Testament story of the boy king Joash: ‘the young ruler

597 RPS, 1579/7/29/2.
598 Diurnal, 118-9.
599 Ibid. Atholl carried the crown; Morton the sceptre and Glencairne the sword of state, with Mar carrying the infant king.
600 Sir William Stewart in recorded as Lyon King of Arms in 1567: Grant, Court of the Lord Lyon, 1.
601 NAS, E21/57, fol. 20r; TA, Vol. XII, 67. This payment was in addition to both their annual fees and a fee for the specific task of proclaiming the coronation at market crosses around the realm following the event: NAS, E21/57, fol. 22r; TA, Vol. XII, 69.
602 For additional on the political background of these two men see: Lynch, ‘Scotland’s First Protestant Coronation’, 186-7.
of Israel who had led his people back to the true religion’. 604 James VI’s young age meant that the oath had to be taken on his behalf and this task was undertaken by Morton, 605 and was undertaken prior to the coronation rites. This was another gargantuan shift whereby the king’s oath became a prerequisite to the anointment; a change that Lynch argues came from George Buchanan and was certainly a decision that was frequently debated by an adult James VI. 606 In addition to the contractual nature this new order presented, it also split apart the oath of the king from those of fealty from the estates (which were still placed in the traditional position after anointing) and seemingly broke the reciprocal obligation between king and estates that had been at the core of this ceremonial rite.

This post-Reformation oath is significantly longer that its predecessors and, as Lynch notes, ‘was less an oath than the speech of a godly prince’. 607 Much of the core content, such as upholding of liberties and privileges, being loyal to the church, and providing justice through the laws of the country, was similar to what had come before. Yet, the overbearing elaborations centred upon promising all in the name of God, rather than the estates – who appear dominant in earlier oaths at least after 1445 – was a notable step away from what preceded it. Lynch also notes the insertion of a reference to ‘empire’ drawing on imperial visual symbols connected to the Stewart monarchs, built up through the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries. 608 The inclusion of the promise to ‘root out all heresy’ remained, despite its origins in the Papal Bull of Unction for the Scots in 1329, 609 highlighting that the fledgling Protestant church in Scotland obviously saw its inclusion as essential, even if the ‘heretics’ in question were those who designed the original

605 RPS, 1567/7/29/2.
607 Ibid, 192.
608 Ibid.
609 ‘XXX. Bull of John XXII Concerning the Coronation’, 24-5.
oath and ceremony. The oath was recorded in vernacular Scots, but this was a continuation of a previous norm.\footnote{This started at least as early as the 1445 oath in parliament, but may have occurred much earlier. See above Chapter 2, Section III, 159-68; and Hunt, \textit{The Drama of Coronation}, 174.}

Following this the infant James VI was anointed by the bishop of Orkney. Despite the Reformation this element remained and without the prologue removing any religious significance to the act, which occurred in the coronation of his wife, Anne of Denmark, in 1590.\footnote{See Chapter 3, Section VI, 315. Moreover, this occurred in the coronation of Edward VI’s coronation, when Cranmer announces that ‘the oil, if added, is but a ceremony’ (see Hunt, \textit{The Drama of Coronation}, 79-86).} The crowning, however, was done by the secular hands of the earl of Atholl.\footnote{\textit{Diurnal}, 118-9; \textit{RPS}, 1567/7/29/2} The procedure states that the investiture of regalia occurred in the following manner: ‘delivered into his [James VI’s] hands the sword and sceptre, and put the crown royal upon his head, with all the due reverence, ceremonies and circumstances accustomed...’\footnote{\textit{Ibid.}} and that the ceremony concluded with the oaths of fealty. There is no suggestion of the regalia being supported by adult actors, despite the fact that a not yet eighteen month old James would certainly have struggled to hold a full-sized sceptre and sword, and wear a full-sized crown. It is likely that the crown was probably held above the child at the point of crowning, as Thomas proposed in regard to James V, and perhaps placed before the infant whilst the oaths were being made, as specified in the \textit{Forme} and Balfour’s manuscript.\footnote{See a above Chapter 2, Section III, 164-5; Thomas, ‘Crown Imperial’, 54.} The very inclusion of Catholic gifts – the papal sword and sceptre – in this ceremony was perhaps surprising but, as Lynch too has asserted, this and other key features remained due to the ‘historical legitimacy’ these emblems of royal power held.\footnote{Lynch, ‘Scotland’s First Protestant Coronation’, 201.}

Although James VI became a keen supporter of the Scottish ‘Sang Schules’ and a great lover of music, the early Reformation was dominated by strong Calvinist ideas with Knox and others preaching against the papist ostentation of organs and complex choral music, causing havoc and destruction in regards to the highly developed musical culture supported by the
Catholic Church and the crown. Therefore, the Protestant service of James VI’s coronation was unlikely to have had any music, except the singing of psalms by the congregation as a whole without accompaniment, rather than by a highly trained choir with elaborate musical compositions. The Treasurer’s Accounts add some evidence of sound to the proceedings with a payment to three trumpeters for their services at the time of the coronation, who perhaps accompanied the procession to and from the kirk to the castle, but they were the only musicians paid. The account of Pitscottie and correspondence of Nicholas Throckmorton reveal public celebrations and entertainments occurred, with reports that cannons were fired in Edinburgh and Dundee, while in these and other burghs great fires were lit in celebration. Throckmorton, who was in Edinburgh rather than Stirling, related the evening of the coronation with a hint of criticism lacing his words as the Scottish people celebrated the incoming prince with little sorrow for their queen. The news of the coronation was spread far and wide in the days following the event, with the Islay herald, Marchemond herald, and Kintyre pursuivant all paid fees for ‘makand publicatioun of the Kingis hienes coronatioun’ at market crosses from Dumbarton to Wigtown, Jedburgh to Inverness, Aberdeen to Dumfries, and a host of towns between. Yet, there were signs of dissension in Edinburgh, where the burgh accounts recorded fines being levied against those who did not light fires as requested by the provosts, baillies and commissioners.

Whilst there were noticeable deviations from the ceremonial norms for the Scottish coronation in 1567, the most interesting factor, as Lynch too has concluded, is the weight of ceremonial elements which remained unaltered. The new regime was still ‘anxious to preserve
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616 Ross, Musick Fyne, 84-8, 96-7.
617 For further discussions of the effect of the Reformation on religious music, including the interesting involvement of many Catholic trained musicians and musically trained men from monastic backgrounds in the collection and composing of canticles and psalms to be sung by the congregation, see: J. Reid-Baxter, M. Lynch and E.P. Dennison, John Angus: Monk of Dunfermline and Scottish Reformation Music (Dunfermline, 2011), particularly 33-41.
618 TA, Vol. XII, 67.
619 Pitscottie, Historie, Vol. II, 198; TNA, SP52/14, fol. 43, Letter from Throckmorton to Elizabeth.
620 Like his predecessor, Sadler, he had sent a representative to Stirling; although in this case, it was due to fear of the illegality of the event as much as his own monarch’s displeasure at events.
621 TNA, SP52/14, f. 43.
622 TA, Vol. XII, 69.
623 The fines were levied in an entry dated 30 July 1567: Extracts Edinburgh (1), Vol. III, 283.
[as much of the] cultural treasury of the past’ as it could to project a recognisable and convincing display of royal authority. The representation of royal authority and sovereignty were just as important, if not more so, in 1567 as it ever had been. Throughout the volatile years of James VI’s minority, when at times the two opposing parties even ran parallel parliaments with different lieutenants and regents, clear efforts were made by the Protestant regents to raise the king’s profile in a manner witnessed across the centuries. When James was just four years old in 1571, he was paraded through Stirling to parliament ‘cled maist magnificentlie with rob royall’ and newly made regalia costing near £100, surrounded by liveried trumpeters and handing out monetary gifts to the poor. As the civil war raged on, the young king dressed in his finery was presented to his people and gave a short speech to the collected members of three estates:

My lordis and vtheris trew [s]ubjectis, we ar convenit heir as I wnder[s]tand to doe ju[s]tice, and becaus my aige will nocht [s]uffer me to doe my chairge be my [s]If, I haue givin my powar’ to my guid[s]chir as regent [...] 

The speech saw an attempt to legitimise the current government with the publicly spoken words of the young enthroned king who, although still an infant, was the figurehead of the government’s campaign and one of the key visual symbols of their authority. Such use of the young king’s person continued in demonstrations of royal authority as the reign progressed,

625 The regalia included a silver crown with a blue taffety and silk bonnet inside and a sword with a black velvet scabbard and slip, as well as a ‘rob royall’ of white ‘Armoseene’ taffety and purple silk decorated with silver and gold thread, and coat for which three dozen gold and silver buttons were purchased. The total listed above does not include the expenses paid to the goldsmith Mungo Bradie for his horses and accommodation while in Stirling completing the work: NAS, E21/60, ff. 52r-52v, Accounts of the Treasurer, 1 July 1571–1 June 1574/6; TA, Vol. XII, 278-80.
626 A sederunt list for the 5 September (the parliament continued from 28 August through to 7 September) indicates the following attendance: eleven earls and seven lords, nine commendors along with the John Douglas, archbishop of St Andrews and Adam Bothwell, bishop of Orkney representing the church, and nine burgh commissioners from six burghs, as well as seven further named attendees including the comptroller and clerk register. RPS, A1571/9/1 Additional Source: Sederunt (Stirling, Convention, 5 September 1571).
627 Ibid, 1571/8/1, Procedure: Opening of session (Stirling, Parliament, 28 August 1571).
including a spectacular royal entry on 19 October 1579 that heralded his move from the schoolroom to a more active role in government aged fourteen.628

Unlike his predecessors, James VI’s portrait on his coinage from 1571 to 1580 depicts him as a youth,629 further endorsing his image as the ‘godly prince,’ but the manner in which the king – even as a child – was put centre stage in the battle for power was reminiscent of many of his forebears. The coronation ceremonies of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries were dominated by the issues faced in projecting royal authority effectively through the figure of a child, or in some cases in the actual absence of a monarch entirely. This was not a new problem, nor was it unique to Scotland, but the frequency of minor accession and the decreasing age of minors through the sixteenth century appear unmatched in Scotland’s own history and that of comparable European kingdoms. The political tensions caused by the first accession of a queen regnant, the Reformation, the forced abdication of the queen, and the rapid changing over of power between major political players during the sixteenth century undoubtedly reshaped and moulded the ceremony, forcing the flow of ceremonial development off its natural course and away from some traditions, particularly in 1567, that had withstood several centuries of turmoil. The evidence analysed here reveals that the Scottish coronation ceremony retained much of its ‘cultural treasury of the past’ while adapting to respond to changing times, challenging suggestions that Scotland’s coronation ceremonial was in some way retarded or held back by the frequency of minority successions.630

629 See Plate 26.
630 Shaw, ‘Scotland’s Place in Britain’s Coronation Tradition’, 47.
Chapter 2: Conclusion

When Throckmorton states ‘[...] some ceremonyes accustablye used at the Coronatioune of theyre Princes were omytted and mony reteyned [...]’ in his letter to Queen Elizabeth in 1567, he could as easily have been commenting on his own monarch’s inaugural events – full of ambiguities and adaptations of traditions – as that of James VI in Stirling. However, his statement can equally be cast back across the three hundred and fifty-three years between 1214 and 1567, where one of the key consistencies in the ceremonial making of kings in Scotland across this era appears paradoxically to be its ability to adapt whilst retaining enough of that which was recognisable of what preceded it, and retaining some deeply Scottish traditional and secular aspects despite a desire, often wanton, to compete with European counterparts in the representations of kingly authority.

In the Scottish ceremony prior to anointment a number of key elements rise to prominence. The regalia including sceptre, sword and mantle, along with the crown that was first debatably placed on the head of Robert I within the ceremony itself, were all found from this early stage onwards, if in many guises, through to 1567. The outdoor enthroning of the king in public space that lay central to the thirteenth-century ceremony was retained through the fourteenth and early fifteenth centuries, with the possibility it was reinstalled as a feature in 1488 and more questionably in 1460. The decreasing age of the monarchs in the fifteenth and more particularly sixteenth centuries, along with changes of location, increasing ecclesiastical and minority government involvement, and the influences of foreign consort-dowagers were undoubtedly involved in the disappearance of this traditional customary outdoor act. However, the giving of homage that accompanied this outdoor ceremony continued unstilted into the sixteenth century, despite relocating entirely indoors and the movement of the crown from the

631 TNA, SP52/14, f. 43.
632 Hunt, The Drama of Coronation, 146-72.
633 The importance of place in the Scottish coronation and the move from Scone will be considered in more detail by the author in a forthcoming conference paper: ‘Where to make the king (or queen): the importance of place in Scottish inaugurations and coronations from 1214 to 1651’ being presented at the Royal Scone Conference (5-7 Dec 2014, Scone)
head of the king to a prominent position before the monarch to allow for the complexities of ‘crowning’ small children and infants. Moreover, once the ceremony was moved to a wholly controllable inside space, it is interesting to note the corresponding rise in prominence in the fifteenth century of a procession to and from the coronation that placed the newly crowned monarch in a publicly accessible space.\textsuperscript{634}

The ‘liturgification’ of the ceremony had begun long before the loss of this secular custom of enthronement. Ecclesiastical involvement in the ceremonial act of succession can be seen in the thirteenth-century churchmen involved in the drive for the rite of unction from the Pope and the position of the bishop of St Andrews in the earliest ceremonies considered in the main body of this analysis. Papal interactions and gifts, along with continental and English influences, can be seen shaping aspects of William I’s projection of authority through his son Alexander II, a trend which continued in the increasing elaboration and drawing out of ceremonial seen as the fourteenth century progressed. The Bull of Unction in 1329 added long sought after legitimacy to Scottish kingship; however, the kings to first enjoy this privilege, particularly the early Stewarts, retained proudly a distinct Scottish face to their coronations even if dressed up with elaborate Roman and European frills.

As well as influential churchmen promoting and advancing the rite to full coronation, liturgically significant dating of the inaugural ceremonies seems to arise consistently throughout the centuries with the feasts of the Blessed Virgin Mary standing most prominent, but other feasts such as Palm Sunday, St Margaret’s octave, and St Michael also feature. Yet, equally customary and time-honoured within the ceremonies are the aspects trumpeting genealogy and royal lineage, particularly the evoking of Bruce connections, that would still remain a pronounced feature in the seventeenth century \textit{Forme} provided for Charles I, and throughout the period there were secular actors who dominate the ceremony. The earl of Fife, or a representative, who enthroned the king, and the poet were central to the thirteenth and fourteenth century ceremonies; while the heralds, officials such as the Marischal and High Constable, and a variety of prominent nobles, often blood relatives of the king, were key figures.

\textsuperscript{634} See also forthcoming chapter by the author: ‘Making the most of what they had’.
as the ceremony developed. The poet’s continuation in the role of he who acclaimed the king cannot be clearly tracked back to his known appearance in 1249, but the continuation of Gaelic traditions and patronage under the early Stewarts surely fostered a ceremonial environment in which this figure would neatly fit. If Balfour’s description of Robert II’s coronation can be presumed to have fifteenth-century origins, along with its close comparator the *Forme*, it would seem safe to say that the role of the poet in the ceremony was subsumed in the late fourteenth or early fifteenth century by that of the herald, although the point of transition is unlikely to be pinpointed any more specifically. The *Forme* and Balfour’s manuscript may both be seventeenth-century compilations by men perhaps confused by remaining medieval material and eager to promote the prominence of heraldic figures within their work; but the shifts that occur from the late fourteenth-century ceremony to that which they describe are not so vast. The swallowing of the earldom of Fife by the crown left a ceremonial gap to be filled, while the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries saw the escalating prominence of the herald in the royal household and as a physical projection of royal power as the deliverer of royal messages.

There was increasing ecclesiastical encroachment upon the ceremony across the period and some elements were seemingly abandoned in the wake of the Reformation, such as the high choral Mass that had risen to prominence particularly in the coronations of James V and Mary, although probably long before, and this must not be dismissed. However, the late granting of the Bull of Uction combined with deep-rooted secular elements perhaps allowed the Scottish inauguration to be more readily adopted by the post-Reformation organisers in 1567. Evidence would suggest, for example, that the king’s oath and that of the three estates had been spoken in vernacular Scots since at least the mid-fifteenth century, whereas Latin remained awkwardly dominant in the supposedly reformed English ceremony until the early seventeenth century. From the early medieval period, when Caldwell argues that there was no coincidence that early medieval enthronements and *colloquia* both took place at Scone, as the former took place at annual assemblies of the latter, the involvement of the politically active society was a latent traditional aspect, shaped by time and circumstance, to form the core around which the making

---

635 Caldwell, ‘Finlaggan, Islay’, 71.
of kings in Scotland developed. The enthroning of the king by secular earls was a strong symbolic action that encapsulates the traditional aspect of the early Scottish ceremony; however, the decline of this act within the ceremony did not see a concomitant decline in the importance of the public sanctification of royal power, seen poignantly present throughout in some form or other.

David II’s coronation was the first to be clearly placed within a coronation parliament, but the increasing recognition of the vigour with which the community of the realm could act through the succession crises of the late thirteenth and early fourteenth centuries, followed by the early Stewart centralising of ceremonial and judicial power, shaped the manner in which the estates and parliament became woven into the ceremony of succession in Scotland. During the fifteenth century the retaking of the oaths – rewritten and acted out in the political arena – in 1445 further demonstrated the involvement of the estates in the fashioning of royal power. Moreover, the reciprocal nature of the placement of the oaths of king and estates together at the close of the ceremony reflected their inescapably shared interests in the projection and legitimisation of royal authority. The long minorities of the sixteenth century would see a further cementing of the role of this body in the ceremonial ratification of guardianships, regencies and the coming of age of minor monarchs. However, the alterations of the order of ceremony that placed the oath as a pre-requisite to crowning in 1567 forced a contractual element upon the anointing, and pushed a metaphorical wedge between the king and the government who placed him on the throne that would be found haunting the pages of James VI’s adult polemic.  

It must be remembered, of course, that the young ages of Scottish monarchs at their inaugural ceremonies across these centuries – in particularly the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries – meant that the monarch was rarely the organiser of his own coronation and increasingly, therefore, the representations of authority found in this ceremony were not those of an individual but of a community of the political elite, often vying for power against each other. For most of the fifteenth and sixteenth century monarchs particularly it would be their

---

636 See above Chapter 2, Section IV, 204, fn. 605.
marriage and the coronation of their consort that allowed their true colours as adult monarchs to be blazoned across the metaphorical canvas of history, while equally for earlier monarchs whose own inaugural ceremonies were understated through necessity utilised the marriages of their children in a similar way. Before moving onto this next ceremonial occasion in which the representations of Scottish royal authority can be observed, it is first pertinent to return to an opening thought. The ceremony of 1567, on which Throckmorton made his comment above, was not an exact replica of those that came before it, but nor was it unrecognisable as a Scottish coronation. Through necessity, the Scottish coronation ceremony had to be adaptable and fluid to encompass the changing climate and actualities of the times in which it existed, while providing a recognisable and constant feature in the representations of royal authority. There may still be some gaps to straddle a little precariously in the understanding of the developments of the Scottish ceremony of inauguration and coronation. However, it is clear that the lack of an official *ordo* need not daunt investigators of these ceremonies, and that there is every occasion to contend with Shaw’s off-hand comment that there can be little more to say about the pre-Reformation Scottish inauguration than ‘it was a hybrid of Christian and Celtic rites.’
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637 Shaw, ‘Scotland’s Place in Britain’s Coronation Tradition’, 47.
Chapter Three: Royal Marriage and the Crowning of Consorts

For this reason a man shall leave his father and mother and be joined to his wife, and the two shall become one. This is a great mystery, and I take it to mean Christ and the church […]

The conclusion of chapter two alluded to the importance of marriage – the only ceremony discussed here that was one of the seven holy sacraments – and consort coronation in the representations of royal authority in the case of those kings who came to the throne as children. In many cases it offered their first or one of their first opportunities to project their own image and not one construed by the political figures around them. Yet, across the four centuries that this thesis stretches not all of the monarchs were children at the time of their accession, nor did they all come to the throne unmarried, and not all of the consorts in question were crowned. Moreover, there is not just one ceremony under scrutiny here, for the marriage of a monarch involved far more than just a wedding and a consort coronation, where applicable, it also encompassed ambassadorial interactions and gift giving, proxy marriage ceremonies, royal entries, as well as feasting and entertainments. Therefore, this final chapter throws up a variety of complexities to overcome in building up an understanding of the ceremonial continuity and change that marriage encompassed.

The marriages of Scottish monarchs, as well as their daughters and sisters, have perhaps received the most attention in the current historiography of the three life-stage events considered within this thesis. However, marriage is primarily considered as a by-product of political study, with the intricacies of the foreign policy surrounding the marriages of royalty

---

1 Ephesians 5: 31-32.
2 The topics of ambassadorial interactions (in a broader sense to encompass a wider range beyond marriage) and gift-giving are ones that the author intends to pursue in a further research, particularly the culture of royal gift-giving in Scotland around annual religious feast days such as New Year, Yule and Easter, as well as the relation between luxurious gift-giving and the giving of alms.
3 The royal entries are dealt with in a forthcoming book chapter by the author: Dean, ‘Enter the Alien’. See also A.J. Mill who introduced burgh records as a source for fifteenth- and sixteenth-century public performance, including bringing to light how the burghs welcomed Scottish queens. This subject was not Mill’s focus; however, the incredible value of the burgh records as a rich source base for understanding the ceremonial, festival and drama of Scotland that her work illuminated must be recognised.
taking centre stage. Downie’s work has the most to offer on rituals of queenship in fifteenth-century Scotland, but her study tends to emphasise how Scotland fit into a general European trend and consequently finds few distinguishing features in the Scottish ceremony. The sixteenth-century foreign unions have seen far more attention with discussions by historians, drama and literature scholars, and art historians. In particular, the elaborate pageantry of the marriage entry of Margaret Tudor and James IV, described in vivid detail by John Young, the Somerset herald, as well as the marriage of Mary Queen of Scots to the Dauphin François, and that of James VI and Anne of Denmark. These works have added greatly to an understanding of specific events or, to a lesser degree, small groups of events related, but this focus is quite insular when addressing the development of ceremony over a number of centuries and leaves many a stone unturned, as this chapter intends to demonstrate.

---


5 Downie, *She is But A Woman*. For works on wider European queenship ritual see: Parsons, ‘Ritual and Symbol in the English Medieval Queenship’, 60-77; McCartney, ‘Ceremonies and Privileges of Office: Queenship in Late Medieval France’, 178-220; Laynesmith, *Last Medieval Queens*, particularly 72-110; and for further examples see bibliographical work in Downie.


7 *Fyancells MSf*. 75-115; *Fyancells Coll.*, 258-300.

8 Carpenter and Runnals, ‘The Entertainments at the Marriage of Mary Queen of Scots,’ 145-61. In addition, the ceremonial of Mary’s Scottish court, much of which centred on the marriage of others, has also received some attention: Carpenter, ‘Performing Diplomacies’, 194-225.

Section I: Royal Marriages to 1328

The marriages of James I’s daughters in the 1430s and 1440s are discussed as a turning point that heralded a new era of Scottish foreign policy, with the fifteenth century posited as witnessing a ‘voguish desideratum’ for continental marriages.\(^\text{10}\) Yet, the Scottish kings of the thirteenth and early fourteenth century can be found making bold steps beyond their regional nobility in search of suitable queens to enhance their own royal status, in the footsteps of their eleventh and twelfth-century predecessors.\(^\text{11}\) Although the queens of the Scottish kings prior to the Papal Bull of 1329, permitting the unction and coronation, were not crowned, the weddings of Alexander II, Alexander III and his children, as well as David Bruce deserve further attention as ceremonial statements of independent Scottish royal and dynastic authority within the context of the foreign policy of the era. All three kings were married twice,\(^\text{12}\) two out of three were married as minors and two out of three were married on English soil. During the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries the claims of supremacy and overlordship by the English increased the challenges faced by the Scottish crown in projecting an image of royal authority that asserted their independent royal status.

The marriage of Alexander II and Joanna Plantagenet in June 1221 was the culmination of many years of ambassadorial interaction at a time of unsettled Anglo-Scots relations.\(^\text{13}\) In June 1220 Alexander II, nearing his twenty-second year, travelled to York to sign agreements.

\(^\text{10}\) Ditchburn, ‘The Place of Guelders in Scottish Foreign Policy’, 60. Also see above 1-2, fn.4.

\(^\text{11}\) From 1070, when Malcolm III married Margaret, daughter of the exiled heir to the Anglo-Saxon throne of England, there were numerous matches made with England and on the continent. For example: Edith (Matilda), eldest daughter of Malcolm III and Margaret married Henry I of England (c. 1100); Mary, her younger sister, married Count Eustace of Bologne (and the daughter of this marriage married King Stephen of England); and Malcom IV married two sisters to continental allies: Mary to Conan Duke of Brittany (c. 1160) and Ada to Florenz III Count of Holland (1162). Additionally, William I’s discussions with Philip Augustus, king of France, about a marriage between the French king and William’s daughter likely led to the complete breakdown of Anglo-Scot relations in 1209. See Oram, *Domination and Lordship*, 16, 51-7, 96-7, 118, 123-4, 146-7; A.A.M. Duncan, ‘John King of England and the King of Scots’ in S.D. Church (ed.), *King John: New Interpretations* (Woodbridge, 1999), 259-61.

\(^\text{12}\) The second marriage of David II will be considered in the following chapter alongside the coronation of his first wife Joan.

with the English minority government regarding his wedding to Henry III’s sister as part of a much broader treaty of peace, with the Papal legate Pandulf watching over the proceedings.\textsuperscript{14} The wedding itself took a further year of diplomacy to bring about; however, the prolonged issues of the English minority government in providing the proposed bride may have been quietly welcomed by Alexander. Oram has noted the delay coincided with one of Alexander’s known attempts to gain the sanction of coronation and unction from the Pope.\textsuperscript{15} This suggests his determination to have his kingship recognised as equal to the English king. Considering the long-lived ecclesiastic conflict between York and the bishops of Scotland, due to the former’s metropolitan status claims over Scotland, Alexander’s attempts are made all the more pertinent.\textsuperscript{16} However, York may also have offered a more level playing field for this union than first presumed, as it was the barons of York who had sworn fealty to Alexander in 1216 in uprisings against King John and there were Scottish links with the city – particularly its churches – going back many generations.\textsuperscript{17}

In May 1221 Alexander II began his journey to York, along with a retinue of Scots and ‘as Alexander desires, according to his own and his predecessors’ custom’ they were greeted at various points by members of the English king’s court.\textsuperscript{18} The progress of the royal party can be tracked from Berwick and the Tweed onwards,\textsuperscript{19} and the instructions indicate that the Archbishop of York [Walter de Gray], William de Warenne [earl of Surrey], Robert de Vieuxpont and Geoffrey de Neville met and accompanied the king of Scots to York in person

\textsuperscript{15} Giving Scottish ambassadors permission to agree to a postponement of the date of the wedding with Joanna: TNA, SC1/5/9, Special Collections: Ancient Correspondence: Alexander II, king of Scots, to Henry III. Supplication to the Pope at this time: CPL, Vol. I, 83; Duncan, Kingship of the Scots, 118-9; Broun, Scottish Independence and the Idea of Britain, 203; Oram, Alexander II, 60-69. See also above Chapter 2, Section I, 104-105.
\textsuperscript{16} Duncan, Making of the Kingdom, 256-80; Oram, Domination and Lordship, particularly 334-46.
\textsuperscript{17} See above fn. 14 re: Alexander and northern nobles. For references to Scottish royal patronage in York from David I to William I (particularly of the hospital of St Peter’s in York) see: RRS, Vol. I, nos. 17, 76, 141, 318; RRS, Vol. II, nos. 103, 225.
\textsuperscript{18} TNA, C54/24, m.11 dorso, Close Rolls, 5 Hen. III, part 1 [1220–1221]. Jenny Benham the Bishop of Durham was oft sent to meet the Scottish kings to escort him and his entourage safely through England to peace talks in the twelfth century. However, the orders in 1220 came from the Scottish king via Henry’s officials suggesting further attempts to have his status recognised despite his journey into England for his marriage. See J. Benham, Peacemaking in the Middle Ages: Principles and Practice (Manchester, 2011), 44-56, 83-4.
\textsuperscript{19} See Map VII.
on the ‘morrow of the Holy Trinity’, along with the sheriffs and nobles of Northumberland. When the party reached the Tees it was to be met by the sheriff and barons of York, illustrating the makeup of the entourage from across the three estates and the manner it swelled gradually in size as it approached the city. At Easingwold, around fourteen miles north of York, Alexander heard of delays to Henry’s arrival and announced that he would await the English king’s arrival at York before making his own entry. All the communications refer to the ‘adventus’ of the kings to York, indicating a formal entry. Moreover, Alexander’s insistence on waiting for Henry emphasised the Scottish king’s expectations of a regal welcome on equal terms, despite being in English territory.

There are many English and Scottish chronicles that record the occurrence of the marriage of Alexander II and Joanna Plantagenet, but specific details are sparse. Those which record the date state that the ceremony took place on the Friday or Saturday in the week prior to the feast of the nativity of John the Baptist, or 24 June, pointing to either 18 or 19 June. The document recording the confirmation of lands given to Joanna for her dower – worth a total of £1000 – was signed at York on the 18 June, and supports a conclusion that the wedding itself took place the following day ‘with the exceeding splendour that was fitting such an occasion’. The English documents record that the king of Scotland was granted £15 expenses during his visit, while the city and mayor of York were reimbursed £50 and a further £14 to the city farm

20 TNA, C54/24, m. 11 dorso; CDS, Vol. I, no. 803; Oram, Alexander II, 68.
22 Benham discusses the importance of place for peace-making meetings between Scottish and English king in the twelfth and early thirteenth centuries in an argument regarding Scotland’s inferiority in the relationship. However, while Alexander had to travel to York for the union with Henry’s sister this was a different situation to these peace-making meetings and the Scottish monarch appears to be challenging such presumptions of his inferiority: Peacemaking in the Middle Ages, 44-56.
23 24 June 1221 was a Thursday.
25 At this point Scots and sterling currency of equal value; see above Note on Money, xii-xiv.
26 TNA, C66/24, m. 6 dorso, Patent 5 Hen. III, part 1: Foedera, Vol. I, Part 1, 85; CDS, Vol. I, no. 808; Chron. Melrose, 56; Everett Green, Lives of the Princesses of England, Vol. I, 386-7; Oram, Alexander II, 68-9. Oram highlights that it was probably in the days of business prior to the actual ceremony that the marriage of Alexander’s eldest sister Margaret to Hubert de Burgh was discussed and perhaps finalised.
between the 20 and 22 June; however, these expenses hardly seem to amount to the nineteenth-century conclusion that the entirety of the expense was shouldered by the English crown.  

Furthermore, the account recording the payment to York following the celebrations is expressed in such a way that the town, and probably the Archbishop, footed far more of the bill than the records can illuminate.

There are no Scottish financial accounts for Alexander II’s reign to expose how he used his attire, entourage, horses, or gifts; but the attitude he projected through his demands in regards to a suitable entry and envoy to greet him would suggest he made a fine show. The lion rampant of Scottish heraldry, thought to have originated with William the Lion, was first utilised on the reverse of Alexander II’s great seal, suggesting that there may have banners or tabards featuring this symbol amongst the young king’s entourage. Alexander’s inauguration did not include a crowning and he does not appear crowned on his royal seal, conversely some of his coins show him crowned. A crown cannot be unquestionably placed on Alexander’s head at any part of the ceremony, nevertheless he was unlikely to have appeared alongside a crowned Henry III without one when so keen to emphasise the equality of their status. Similarly he could have strengthened the visual link to his ancestors and emphasised his special relationship with the papacy by carrying the papal sword and rose sceptre from the regalia. Unfortunately, as with the duration of feasting and the return journey to Scotland, the details of

---

28 TNA, C54/25, m. 7, Close Rolls, 5 Hen. III, part 1 [1220–1221]; CDS, Vol. I, nos. 809-10; Everett Green, Vol. I, 387. The extant registers and rolls of the Archbishops of York do start with the Register of Walter de Gray (Archbishop of York at this time of the wedding) but the first ten years of his pontificate are no longer extant/missing (1215–1225).
29 McAndrew, *Scotland’s Historic Heraldry*, 23-4; Birch, *History of Scottish Seals*, 26-7 (and accompanying plates); see Plate 27.
30 In the wider European context, heraldry and heraldic devices had developed through war and the mêlée over the course of the twelfth-century from a simple method of identification to being governed by rules, and in the thirteenth century some chroniclers recorded great men just by referring to their devices, suggesting the prominence of such devices within society. The use of the lion on his great seal implies that Alexander II was well aware of the power of symbols, and it is not too greater leap to suggest such symbols adorned the king’s horse or banners. For discussions of early development of heraldry see: Keen, *Chivalry*, 125-34; A. Ailes, ‘Heraldry in Medieval England: Symbols of Politics and Propaganda’ in Coss and Keen (eds), *Heraldry, Pageantry and Social Display*, particularly 83-5.
31 Stewart, *Scottish Coinage*, 134. There were a number of coins produced, some with and some without crowns; unfortunately, the surviving examples Stewart includes in his plates are those without crowns.
32 See Chapter 2, Section I, 101-103.
the nuptials themselves remain unknown. The actual order of a wedding ceremony in the period was likely to have been heavily influenced by the Fourth Lateran Council of 1215, which extolled rules regarding the public nature of marriage. Jennifer Ward draws attention to orders of ceremony found in France, England and Italy that emphasise the increased involvement of the church; with nuptials taking place publicly before the church doors prior to a Mass within, and the priest overseeing the giving of wedding gifts, blessings and the exchange of rings and often also blessing the couple in their bed chamber prior to the consummation of their union. The increasing imposition of liturgy and the church upon the marriage ceremony mirrors that occurring in other ceremonial, such as the liturgification of the Scottish inauguration.

This was a highly prestigious match for Alexander II, despite the fact that it brought him no money or land, for ‘none of his predecessors had secured so exulted a bride’ as the eldest sister of the king of England. This union also allowed Alexander a more powerful position in the orchestration of the marriages of his sisters. Shortly after Alexander’s own marriage, his eldest sister Margaret was married to one of the most prominent figures in Henry III’s minority court, Hubert de Burgh – a match that may have been arranged in June 1221 – and, as Oram has explored, Alexander went on to utilise his female relatives to advance his own ambitions, even if his ultimate goal of further royal marriages was never realised. The marriages of Isabella to Roger Bigod, heir of the earldom of Norfolk, and Marjery to Gilbert Marshal, earl of Pembroke, tied the Scottish royal house into two prominent noble families in England. Alexander II provided handsomely for his sisters’ dowries, but little evidence remains

---


36 See above Chapter 2, particularly Sections I-II.

37 Oram, *Alexander II*, 69. Although as noted earlier, female relatives of Scottish monarchs (such as Edith/ Matilda) had been married to English kings. See Chapter 3, Section I, 216, fn. 11.

regarding the specifics of the ceremonies or how Alexander utilised the occasions. In the case of Isabella, documents produced in regards to her dowry suggest the marriage occurred prior to 14 May 1225, and that the couple were taken to Scotland following their wedding by the archbishop of York, bishop of Durham, and John Constable of Chester. The youngest sister Margery was married on St Peter ad Vincula feast day, 1 August 1235, at Berwick with Alexander presiding and nobles of both realms in attendance. The designation of the wedding on a feast day allowed for the commandeering of the preparations undertaken on this day by churches, religious houses and the people of the town; but other than emphasising Alexander’s dominant role the records offer little in regards to the ceremony.

Alexander II’s second marriage to Marie de Coucy in May 1239, following the death of Joanna in 1238, reveals Alexander looking to the continent. Marie was not the daughter of a French king or duke, but she was the daughter of an extremely wealthy and important French lord who had royal Capetian blood. Several chronicles concur that the union took place at Roxburgh on Whitsunday 1239, following her journey from France accompanied by the Scottish ambassadors, David Bernham, bishop of Glasgow and the Chancellor, and Sir Walter [Fitz] Alan, justiciar. The choice of Roxburgh in the borderlands with England for a second French marriage could have been purposefully antagonistic, but was equally likely to be linked to the wealth of the area, its proximity to merchant communities, and for the ease of attendance for foreign guests from both northern England and Europe. The castle of Roxburgh sat overlooking Kelso Abbey on the confluence of the rivers Tweed and Teviot. While Roxburgh

41 The feast day of St Peter ‘in chains’.
42 Chron. Melrose, 63.
43 The young king Louis IX of France and his wife Margaret of Province did not have their first child until 1240, so their wouldn’t have been an eligible ‘daughter of France’ for the Scottish king had such an ambitious attempt crossed Alexander’s mind.
44 Marie de Coucy’s family lineage was linked directly to the Capetian blood line through Robert of Dreux, brother of Louis VII in Early Sources of Scottish History A.D. 500 to 1286, ed. A.O. Anderson (2 vols, Edinburgh,1922), Vol. II, 417 (fn. 6), 514 (fn. 4). Oram who also discusses the fact that Enquerraund (or Ingram) de Coucy – Marie’s father – was listed as a prominent figure in one of the dauphin Louis’s campaigns into southern England in the 1216-1217. He may have met Alexander, as the latter journeyed to Dover to greet the French prince and followers: Alexander II, 156-7.
45 15 May 1239.
was an important and wealthy royal burgh, it had no abbey or cathedral, which could point to nearby Kelso Abbey providing the grand ecclesiastical setting in which the sacrament of marriage took place.\textsuperscript{47} However, Roxburgh had at least two churches and a friary, and the 2004 excavations of old Roxburgh – the only visible signs of which are ruins of the castle – uncovered substantial sarcophagi, indicative of high status burials, and detailed carved masonry within St James’s church, implying this was a sizeable church of high status.\textsuperscript{48} The other point that is emphasised by all Scottish chronicles in regards to this union was the birth of a male child on 4 September 1241,\textsuperscript{49} but following seventeen years of marriage to Joanna without a legitimate heir the focus on Marie’s child-bearing capabilities is unsurprising.

Alexander II died long before his son reached marriageable age, but evidence suggests that the marriage of this long-awaited son was foremost in Alexander’s mind from his early infancy. The first formal betrothal agreement with Henry III for Prince Alexander and his infant daughter Margaret is dated 1244 following a possible earlier agreement in 1242.\textsuperscript{50} The uncertain and unstable nature of the minority led to a ‘solemn embassy’ departing – at the insistence of the clergy – to treat with Henry III and finalise the marriage union between the young Alexander III and Princess Margaret.\textsuperscript{51} The preparations at York, undertaken from mid-1251, are illustrated in the English financial records and cover everything from the provision of beasts and wildfowl collected from across the northern counties to exquisite gifts presented throughout the ceremonial proceedings to Princess Margaret, Alexander and others.\textsuperscript{52} Henry III

\textsuperscript{47} For more on Kelso’s status see above Chapter 2, Section III, 168, fns. 402-403. See Map VII.
\textsuperscript{48} *Old Roxburgh, Floors Castle Estates, Kelso: An Archaeological Evaluation and an Assessment of their Results*, Document Reference: 52568.06 (Salisbury, Jan 2004), 16-17, figures 1 and 6.
\textsuperscript{49} *Chron. Melrose*, 67-8.
undoubtedly put on a spectacular show with feasting and entertainment, but the Archbishop and people of the surrounding area supplied large proportions of the basic ingredients to make it possible.  

The fact that no Scottish financial accounts remain extant for 1251 has the potential for creating a lopsided and biased view, particularly when the fullest description is that of Matthew of Paris, monk of St Albans. Despite this, evidence suggests the young king’s minority council intended to use the occasion to enhance his royal authority and the independent status of the realm. Prior to Alexander III’s journey to York, the minority councillors made a further attempt – as Alexander II had in 1221 – to gain papal sanction of Scottish coronation. The attempt was not successful but the timing reveals the efforts of the minority government to bolster the young king’s status, and that of the realm, at this crucial juncture when faced with another ceremony at York. In addition, Alexander III’s train was not only made up of Scottish nobles, knights and clergy but also the queen mother Marie de Coucy, who had returned from France, with a noble entourage that was described as a ‘numerous and pompous train of attendants’ by Paris.  

The first ceremonial event that followed the arrival of Alexander III and his entourage was the knighting ceremony on Christmas Eve, in which Alexander and others were knighted by Henry III:

Of Scotland our kyng [th]at ilk tyde  
Tuk in honourabyle array  
[Th]e ordo of knychtheide on [Y]oyl day.  

Between ten and twenty others were knighted alongside Alexander, with scarlet cloth purchased for ten to twelve robes for ‘stranger or foreign knights.’ During this ceremony, or prior to it, 

54 For a brief introduction to Matthew of Paris see: Richard Vaughan, ‘Introduction’ in The Illustrated Chronicles of Matthew Paris: Observations of Thirteenth-Century Life (Stroud, 1993), vii-xiii. While Paris can often add interesting information on Scottish issues, as an English monk his potential biases must be appreciated.  
55 TNA, SC7/20/11, Special Collections: Intimation to the king of England the Pope cannot grant his request regarding the King of Scots [16 April 1251]; CDS, Vol. I, no. 1798 (April 6 1251).  
56 Marie de Coucy returned to France after the inauguration of her son and the translation of the relics of St Margaret, see: CDS, Vol. I, nos, 1785-6, 1791, 1795; Watt, ‘The minority of Alexander III’, 8.  
Henry presented Alexander with a sword, a scabbard of silk and a silver pommel all ornately decorated, along with a belt and a pair of decorative silver gilt spurs. Unfortunately, other than Paris stating that all were richly dressed, there are no other direct references to Alexander’s attire during the knighting ceremony. The lack of reference to any clothing for Alexander in the English financial accounts does suggest that his clothing was from his own wardrobe, particularly as Henry purchased attire for the ‘stranger knights’. The knighting ceremony of 1251 supports the conclusion that Alexander III was not knighted prior to his inauguration, but the event put Henry firmly in the position as the bestower of honours rather than the child he knighted. Therefore, the later Scottish chroniclers may have inserted this ceremony into the inauguration to counter the suggestions of overlordship that the knighting in York raised.

There is little detail of the actual marriage ceremony that occurred on Christmas day 1251, despite the relative wealth of source materials. The financial accounts reveal that Prince Edward of Westminster and three attendees received tabards of cloth of gold or scarlet decorated with a gold leopard and lined with fur made for the wedding, and likely took part in the procession into the church before or after the bride. The prince and his attendees emblazoned with the English royal leopard and shimmering with gold were purposefully made highly visible and emphasised the relative dynastic stability of the English monarchy, particularly if Henry had worn the mantle made for him of purple samite decorated with three leopards in gold. One very brief near-contemporary manuscript account of the marriage is

59 Ibid; TNA, C54/65, m. 30-31, Close Rolls, 36 Hen III; CDS, Vol. I, no. 1824, 1828, 1831. Michael Penman (personal communication) suggested that these gifts may have been included in Alexander III’s burial regalia; however, the king was a child when presented with them making this unlikely.
60 See above Chapter 2, Section I, 105-106.
61 The date could potentially have carried much symbolic weight, dependant on who made the choice, with the consummation of a marriage on the birth day of the king of kings; however, as both Alexander and Margaret were children there would not have been an actual consummation.
63 The others are listed as Nicholas de Molis, Bartholomew Peele and Ebulu de Montibus.
64 TNA, Close Rolls, 36 Hen. III, C54/64, m. 30-31 dorso; CDS, Vol. I, nos. 1825, 1829, 1838; For further examples see: Staniland, ‘Nuptials of Alexander III’, 29-30, 32-3, 36-7. For discussions on the development of the leopard badge of English kings: C. Shenton, ‘Edward III and the Symbol of the
accompanied by a rudimentary sketch of a couple with the groom in a crown and the bride dressed in a wimple and hood being blessed by a pair of bishops, but the entry itself focuses on who had ‘custody’ of the young couple following the union. The images in the manuscript are simple and highly stylised, but the chronicle illustrator saw fit to mark Alexander out with a crown, despite its English focus and probable authorship. The wearing of a crown by Alexander – pictured thus in various seals – would have been a clear statement of his royal authority. As a boy of eleven he would perhaps have struggled carrying the papal sword and sceptre topped with the golden rose, but this does not mean they were not prominently displayed, carried by nobles or knights before the king. Henry stood to gain a distinct position of superiority through the union, particularly as Alexander made homage for his English lands. Yet, Alexander’s refusal to make homage for Scotland, and to yield to traditional demands made by the English earl Marshal for his palfrey following the ceremonies, saw distinct posturing and registering of royal independent status by the young king and the minority leaders who guided him.

The situation surrounding the wedding of 1251 offered Henry III clear political advantages, which included an infiltration of Scotland’s court with the entourage he sent with Margaret, and an opportunity to project the royal majesty of himself and his heir. However, there was reason for the English king to bolster Alexander III’s image of authority through this ceremonial. Not only was he marrying Henry’s daughter, but as a vassal-king Henry needed Alexander to be respected and formally lifted above his own nobility. The need to emphasise Alexander’s judicial powers as king was illustrated by one of Henry’s final gestures in the

---


65 BL, Cotton MS Nero, A. iv, f. 109v. The British Library have dated this manuscript (ff. 75v-111v), and the accompanying Geoffrey de Monmouth, *Propheji Merlini* (ff. 63v-75v) to first quarter of fourteenth century, although the chronicle ends in 1274. Those named as guardians of the child monarch and his bride are Robert de Ross and John de Balliol.

66 See Plate 9.


69 Margaret English entourage included Robert of Norwich, Stephen Bauzan and Matilda Cantelupe, widow of William de Cantelupe. Matilda was purchased a robe of scarlet furred with miniver, while unnamed two maids are given green gowns. Two different lords, ‘Ridellus de Briggelak’ and ‘Geoffrey de langele, justiciar of the forest’, were purchased baudekins (garments made out of rich silk, possibly embroidered) and two of Ridellus’s knights and the king’s marshals were all bought furs. TNA, C54/65, m.29; *CDS*, Vol. I, no. 1841; *Matthew of Paris’s English History*, Vol. II, 471-3.
ceremonial when the young couple were granted the royal right to pardon prisoners, and through two episodes in which they gained pardons through personal petitions to the English king for specific individuals. Yet, these acts also emphasised Henry’s desire for control over this young king’s power. Amongst the numerous gifts that Alexander and Margaret received from Henry was Margaret’s first seal as queen of Scotland, the seal was the mark of royal power and this gift to his daughter was a further example of subtler ways in which he pressed his royal authority upon the young couple.

For Alexander and the Scottish minority government, the ceremony was intended to show friendship and heal breaches, but at the same time register the Scottish royal stance without any loss of honour or independence. The occasion also provided inspiration and examples in heraldic display, lavish feasting, clothing and the scale of royal ceremony to an impressionable young monarch, both from the English display and Marie de Coucy and her entourage of French visitors. Later seals of Alexander III’s reign bear the hallmark of such influences with the elaboration of the heraldic design on the reverse, including further ‘lion rampants’ decorating the comparison of the horse, as well as the shield, and the background covered in fleur-de-lys. The influence Henry III was able to exert over his son-in-law would have been bolstered by frequent trips south of the border throughout Alexander III’s reign. These cross-border interactions often included ceremonial entries, such as Woodstock in 1256. Although the events celebrated Henry’s daughter’s return, they ultimately made Alexander III a focal point of elaborate ceremonial.

Following the birth of his own children, Alexander began to orchestrate royal weddings and looked beyond his English ties to Europe to do so. The eldest of Alexander and Margaret’s

---

70 Margaret’s petition was on behalf of for Alan, son of Thomas earl of Atholl, and Alexander’s for Philip Lovell: Ibid., 471-2; TNA, C66/63, m. 14, 16; CDS, Vol. I, nos. 1852, 1865.
71 CDS, Vol. I, nos. 1903, 1928. For other gifts to Margaret: TNA, C54/65, m. 29-30; TNA, E372/95, m. 7 dorso; TNA, C62/28, m. 14-18; CDS, Vol. I, nos. 1816, 1819, 1825-7, 1841, 1854. Alexander also received a set of ‘precious’ bed-hangings decorated with gold and coloured fabrics as a Christmas gift: TNA, C54/65, m.30; CDS, Vol. I, no. 1826.
72 See Plate 28; Birch, History of Scottish Seals, 27-30; McAndrew, Scotland’s Historical Heraldry, 24.
children, Princess Margaret, departed from Scottish shores in early August 1281 to Norway accompanied by:

[...] a noble train – with Earl Walter and the Countess of Menteith, the abbot of Bulmuriach [Balmerino], Barnard of Montealt [de Mowat], and many other knights and nobles.  

Bower and Wyntoun note that the company arrived on the Eve of the Assumption of our Lady and were received with honour. On the following day, Princess Margaret married Eric II, king of Norway, and was crowned queen by the highest bishop of the land [Archbishop of Lund].

By looking to other realms, following trade routes, and contracting a long-term peaceful alliance with Scandinavia, the daughter of Alexander III became the crowned queen of Norway.

The marriage of Alexander III’s eldest son and heir, Prince Alexander, in 1282 was not to a royal house. Nevertheless, the union between Prince Alexander and the daughter of Guy, Count of Flanders, was still a prestigious match with a continental house that broadened Scotland’s foreign connections, fostered expanding trade links and provided Alexander III with an opportunity to host a royal marriage in his own realm.

Prince Alexander’s wedding took place at Roxburgh on the Sunday after Martinmas, ‘in the presence of many Flemish knights and ladies, amid unbounded joy and compliments’. Large numbers of Scottish prelates, nobles and knights gathered at Roxburgh, or possibly Kelso, alongside these foreign guests to witness the marriage of the heir ‘solemnized in great state’. Following the nuptials the union was

---

75 Chron. Fordun, 302.  
77 Norway received papal dispensation for coronation and unction in 1247: see Bagge, From Viking Stronghold, 163.  
78 Inventaire Chronologique des documents relatifs à l’histoire d’Ecosse conservés aux Archives du royaume à Paris. Suivi d’une indication sommaire des manuscrits de la bibliothèque royale, ed. J.B.A.T. Teulet (Edinburgh, 1839), 3. Duncan discusses the fact that Edward I may have been consulted in regard to this match, as Guy of Flanders was allied with the English king against France, however, there is no evidence of this (Making of the Kingdom, pp. 591-2.)  
79 15 November 1282.  
80 Chron. Bower, Vol. V, 409-11; Chron. Fordun, 302; Chron. Wyntoun, Vol. V, 135. Wyntoun has the only variation on date stating the 12 November, the other two state the Sunday after the feast of Martinmas which would have been 15 November in 1282, and the Sunday prior to the feast of St Margaret (whose feast may have begun from Sunday Vespers).  
81 See above Chapter 3, Section I, 221-2.
celebrated with fifteen days of feasting, but again no financial accounts remain extant for the year of Prince Alexander’s wedding.\textsuperscript{82} A number of \textit{Exchequer Roll} fragments from 1264–1266 survive and offer insight into the provisioning of the royal household on a summer visit to the royal hunting lodge of Forfar. It records beef and wild boar used from the adjacent (presumably royal) forests, sheep brought from different locations, sixty stone of cheese, an array of chicken and wildfowl, and over eight hundred eels brought from Loch Cluny in nearby Perthshire. In addition, the large quantities of malt and flour would suggest plentiful supplies of beer and bread. The account also refers to the purchase of furs and cloth, imported and collected by Augustin the tailor from the fair at Dundee, as well as costs for the king’s falconer, maintenance for horses, dogs and grooms, and the wages for a gardener.\textsuperscript{83} The account is only a brief glimpse recording a quiet time with a reduced court, but this first glance offered by Scottish royal financial accounts indicates the manner in which the foodstuffs were collected from the surrounding area, as seen with Henry III. Therefore, the royal burgh of Roxburgh and its environs were likely chosen specifically for plentiful access to supplies and the burgh’s vicinity to the port of Berwick, which allowed easy access to imported goods, as well as a convenient point of arrival for the foreign entourage.

Queen Margaret had died in 1275, but it was not until the tragic deaths of all Alexander III’s children by 1283 that there was a sudden urgency to find the king a new bride. Once again the destination of the ambassadors was the continent.\textsuperscript{84} The formal envoy of knights and royal officials, including the Chancellor, returned to Scotland with the daughter of the count of Dreux. Yolande, like Marie de Coucy, was not a princess but she had Capetian royal blood and links to French royalty; moreover, she was a countess in her own right through her mother’s line.\textsuperscript{85} Following her arrival the Scottish chronicles report ‘countless throngs’ and ‘innumerable

\textsuperscript{83} \textit{ER}, Vol. I, li-lii, 7-9.
\textsuperscript{84} \textit{Gesta Annalia} lists the ambassadors – ‘to wit, his Chancellor, Thomas of Charteris, Patrick Graeme, William of St Clair and John Souls, knights ’: \textit{Chron. Fordun}, 304.
multitudes’ from both realms meeting at Jedburgh to celebrate the royal union. The border abbey was an architectural triumph – ‘one of the finest examples of Romanesque architecture in Scotland’ – and certainly befitting of a royal marriage. The likely landing place for the French party was Berwick, and this would suggest that the journey taken would have encompassed not only Jedburgh but also Coldstream, Kelso and Roxburgh. A simple look at the settings for the marriage gives an immediate impression of the image that the Scottish king intended to project, both on this occasion and for his son’s wedding. All four sites were part of a belt of contention running between England and Scotland, but more importantly were some of the richest burghs and monastic houses in Scotland, with the abbeys providing some of the grandest Scottish ecclesiastical architecture of the age. These were prime places for entertaining foreign guests.

The distance between Kelso and Jedburgh was just over ten miles, suggesting there may have been a procession through the burgh to the castle on their arrival prior to the wedding day itself. For the first time, Bower expands on the entertainments that followed on from the feasting and wedding ceremony. These took the form of a procession headed by ‘skilled musicians’ and behind them came dancers ‘splendidly performing a war-dance with intricate weaving in and out’. The rest of the description was undoubtedly added for dramatic effect building on a myth that an apparition was seen at the wedding foretelling of Alexander III’s nearing death; however, this snippet brings performance and music into the foreground briefly. The penchant for high status matches continued under the guardianship following Alexander III’s death, with plans for the marriage of the maid of Norway and Prince Edward.

---

86 Cron. Fordun, 304.
87 J.H. Lewis, G.J. Ewart et al, *Jedburgh Abbey: The Archaeology and Architecture of a Border Abbey* (Edinburgh, 1995), quote 1. This publication has a range of colour and black and white images, and detailed explanations of phases of building and highlights decoration and features from all the stages of its construction.
88 It is approximately 35 miles from Berwick to Jedburgh, and Coldstream and Kelso would provide stopping points breaking the journey into three parts (with 14 miles between Berwick and Coldstream, 10 miles between Coldstream and Kelso, and 11 miles between Kelso and Jedburgh). See Map VII.
90 Cron. Bower, Vol. V, 419. Bower’s fifteenth-century authorship must be taken into account as his own personal experience may have influenced the description; but it is pertinent to highlight that the chronicler prologues this section by claiming that he could ‘not recall having read of such a famous feast ever before in Scotland’ as a reminder that he relied on earlier material for his information.
son of Edward I. However, this match ultimately saw the Scottish independent kingdom skating on thin ice, with signs of Edward’s true intentions of absorbing the realm visible prior to the death of the young queen.

The marriage of David Bruce, the infant heir of Robert I, in 1328 must be considered primarily as a representation of royal authority of the father rather than of the son. Robert I’s own marriages, to Isabella of Mar and Elizabeth de Burgh, daughter of the earl of Ulster, and John Balliol’s marriage to Isabelle de Warenne, all occurred prior to the their husband’s accession to the throne and before any certainty of them taking the throne; therefore, these unions were noble weddings and will not be discussed here. Elizabeth de Burgh was recorded with the title of queen in chronicle accounts, but none of the records of Robert I’s accession in 1306 suggest that his wife was present during the ritual, and she was captured shortly after in the repercussions that befell Bruce’s family and adherents. Even following victories against the English, particularly Bannockburn, and the subsequent release of Elizabeth, Robert does not appear to have used his wife’s return with any ceremonial display or consort crowning. The marriage of Prince David and Joan of the Tower on the other hand, can provide an example, on a par with Robert I’s funeral the following year, of the extravagance that Robert stretched to once he had the means to do so and the way in which he manipulated ceremony in the projection of royal authority.

The first marriage of David II, aged five, to Joan, sister of Edward III, at first glance offers similarities to the Canmore unions with the English crown in the previous century, particularly to 1221. On each occasion Scotland had the upper hand while a minor sat on the throne of England surrounded by rebellious and fractious nobles, but Robert I’s ailing health and David’s young age made the situation far more fragile than that of Alexander II, who was

91 Ibid, Vol. VI, 3-5.
92 Nicholson, Later Middle Ages, 29-35; Watson, Under the hammer, 10-11.
93 Isabella of Mar died prior to Robert I taking the throne.
94 Nicholson, Later Middle Ages, 70; Oram, Kings and Queens of Scotland, 96, 101-103; Barrow, Robert Bruce and the Community of the Realm, 123-4; Beam, The Balliol Dynasty, 86-9.
95 The parody poem translated by the Marquis of Bute recording Bruce’s accession hints at Elizabeth’s absence from the coronation, as it refers to Elizabeth’s comments to Bruce ‘when he was come home’ from his inauguration, with no mention that she accompanied him: Passio Scotorum Perjutatorum, 172. See also Chapter 2, Section I, 116, fn. 119.
96 Nicholson, Later Middle Ages, 75; Barrow, Robert Bruce, 293; Brown, Wars of Scotland, 201-202.
into his twenties at the time of his marriage. For Scotland and the Bruce dynasty the marriage of 1328 was intended to mark the triumphant end of a long drawn out war, concluded by the Treaty of Edinburgh–Northampton agreed at Berwick with Queen Isabella and Mortimer on behalf of Edward III. 97 The terms meant that the English crown was forced to accept the sovereignty and independence of Robert I as King of Scotland, along with the return of the Black Rood relic. 98 This agreement was by no means a complete neat conclusion, and the opinions recorded in some of the English chronicles on the match show open hostility, such as one which records the union as the ‘abaschemente oft alle Raille Blode of Englande’. 99 Nonetheless, the Scottish position of relative control of the ceremony is what separates it most from its thirteenth-century counterparts at York. Furthermore, in the case of this marriage there are surviving Exchequer Rolls covering the final two years of Robert I’s reign. 100 These add valuable insight into the preparations and suggest a far higher cost than the proposed £1,000 price tag put on the celebrations by Penman, with the three main totals recorded adding up to over £2,300 without the individual smaller entries and additional supplies in livestock and goods. 101 Robert I’s choice of Berwick as a site for the wedding was provocative as the town had been central to Bruce’s attempts to reclaim Scotland’s former boundaries, the last town retaken, and the site from which he laid down his terms in 1327. By choosing this venue for his son’s marriage, Robert was overtly proclaiming the victories he achieved for his dynasty and, by drawing the English into Scotland for the ceremony, he readressed the balance of power. 102

98 Holy Rood of St Margaret relic is referred to in a couple of the English chronicle descriptions as being returned at this point (possibly a point at which other regalia was returned or promised along with the Stone of Destiny): BL, Harley MS 4690, ff. 74v-75r, Old Chronicle or Kalendar or Chronicle of Brute, to the sixth year of Henry V; A Chronicle of London from 1089 to 1483; written in the fifteenth-century [...], ed. E. Tyrell and Sir N.H. Nicholls (London, 1827), 52-3.
99 In particular see: BL, Harley MS 4690, ff. 74v-75r.
100 As utilised in Chapter 1, Section II.
101 There are a number of smaller individual entries and incoming livestock and goods recorded for the wedding, but the three ‘bulk’ costs from the accounts total: £2308, 11s. 4 d. ER, Vol. I, 118-19, 149, 185; Penman, David II, 18-19.
102 See Benham for more discussion on the importance of meeting places between equal and inferior/superior realms in the twelfth century: Peacemaking in the Middle Ages, 21-67.
Moreover, like his Canmore predecessors he chose this prosperous border burgh which could support the ceremonies to reflect an image of plenitude and opulence.

The expenses in the *Exchequer Rolls* show that the young David Bruce, earl of Carrick, travelled to Berwick via Lanark, Peebles, Wedall and Coldingham. The king did not accompany his son to Berwick, and Barbour’s *Bruce* records that Thomas Randolph, later guardian, and Sir James Douglas accompanied the prince in the king’s stead. Penman has proposed that the decision not to attend was a conscious one on the part of Robert in reaction to Edward III’s refusal. Yet, it seems odd that Robert would snub his own due to the young English king’s adolescent behaviour, particularly when he had laid out such great expense. The financial accounts for 1328 tellingly mix expenses for the wedding, fees for doctors, tomb expenses and even costs for funeral preparations, making Robert’s illness the most likely cause of his absence. While Edward did not attend the event, his mother Queen Isabella was present and brought with her both spiritual and temporal representatives, including the bishops of Lincoln, Ely and Norwich, earl Warenne, and Roger Mortimer accompanied by barons and a knightly entourage, who were met at Berwick by the Scottish party who assembled with their young prince:

The erle and the lord of Douglas
Come to Berwick with mekill far
And brocht young Davvy with thaim thar,
And the queyn and Mortymer
On other part cunnyn wer
With gret affer and reawté
The young lady of gret bewté
Thidder they brocht with rich affer.

Barbour and Froissart both emphasise the pomp and extravagance of the entourages of both realms, suggesting that both contributed to feasting and entertainments, which likely extended to jousting or a *mêlée*.

---

104 Penman, *David II*, 18.
106 Ibid, 747.
The details of the betrothal ceremony on 17 July 1328 itself are sparse in surviving descriptive accounts. Payments made to repair a wall around the cemetery of Saint Trinity church in Berwick imply that the crowds collected in great volume around the church to see the infant royals enter and exit the church. Further payments recorded suggest that a monetary offering was made by the young prince during the ceremony, while alms were also given to the Minorite friars of Berwick after the wedding. One of the English chronicles includes a short verse about the union which refers to psalms being sung ‘passionately’ and the luxurious nature of the feasting. The celebrations around the betrothal lasted for several days according to Barbour, and the financial material suggest that the feasting and celebrations certainly lived up to claims of luxury.

Supplies were brought in from far and wide, with basics such as grain, flour, malt and barley, oats, beef, mutton and fifty-six casks of wine being brought to Berwick from around the realm, while more expensive and exotic items were imported. Two merchants – Peter the Machinist and Thomas de Carnato – were sent on separate journeys of acquisition to specifically procure items required for the festivities and their purchases cost £941, 6d. and £400 respectively. Thomas de Carnato did not leave a full list of purchases, although there are implications that his cargo would have contained fine silks and precious metals and gems. However, for Peter the Machinist’s purchases a full itemised record remains extant covering

---

108 Everett Green refers to over three hundred and sixty lances or spears provided by Isabella for a mock spear fight in Lives of the Princesses of England, Vol. III, 105. She references Wardrobe Fragment, 2 Edward III, Queen’s Remembrancer; however, this has not been located in English royal financial material at National Archives (Kew) despite searching all expense rolls and fragments from 1327 to 1330.
109 The date is stated as the 17 July by the Scottish chronicles (Chron. Fordun, 345; Chron. Bower, Vol. VII, 43), and as the Sunday prior to the feast St Mary Magdalene (22 July, which would have equated to Sunday 17 July 1328) by the English Chronicle of Linercost, 260-61; but there are some English chronicles that set the date as the feast day of St Mary Magdalene itself (BL, Harley MS 4690, f. 75r, and Chronicle of London, 53) and Penman states 12 July (David II, 18).
110 ER, Vol. I, 218. The officiating cleric is not recorded in the accounts. Berwick was in the diocese of St Andrews, but Bishop Lamberton of St Andrews had died only months before the marriage and a replacement had not been invested; therefore, it may have been the archdeacon of Lothian, who was the second highest official in that diocese, or another prominent bishop.
111 Ibid, 217.
112 BL, Harley MS 688, ff. 316v-317r.
114 ER editor translates this name as Thomas of Charteris (see Preface, cxiii-cxv).
115 The ER records that king Robert gave an exemption to Thomas in regards to submitting an itemised list of purchases for the audit (Vol. I, pp. cxiv-cxv, 149); also see above Chapter 2, Section II, 125-6.
fabrics, materials, food stuffs and cooking equipment. The account gives a fuller understanding of the interesting flavours and exotic smells of the feast that took place, including purchases of pepper, cinnamon, honey, nutmeg, olive oil, galangal, mustard, cumin, ginger, saffron and sugar. All these products were bought in vast quantities. For example, one bale of ginger containing 1,060 lbs of the spice was purchased and over forty pounds of saffron for use in this ceremony. There are a few items in particular that standout: 4,360 lbs of almonds, forty loaves of sugar (equating to around 378 lb), 2,104 ‘confections’ and eight pounds of ‘colours for food’. The quantities of sugar, confections and almonds, particularly when ‘food colouring’ is added, suggest the possibility of some form of decorative marzipan dessert, with the colours possibly used for designs such as coats of arms. All the food at a medieval feast was put on show and, therefore, it was a perfect vehicle to demonstrate wealth and generosity by showcasing expensive foreign delicacies.

Cloth was purchased for soldiers and men-at-arms at the wedding – costing in excess of £250 – along with vast quantities of fur purchased for lining and trimming surcoats and cloaks. Although the colours are not specified, the use of the lion rampant was increasingly prominent as a symbol of Scottish royalty featuring on Alexander III’s and the Bruce’s seals, and later on David’s coinage. This symbol on the clothing of these men, in a time when livery and uniforms were rapidly developing as a key mode of elite display, would have been a potent and relatively cheap way of making a strong royal statement. The expense on their clothing suggests that these figures would have been highly visible in the ceremony, probably forming part of ceremonial procession leading the couple to and from the church and playing their part

116 NAS, E38/7, Exchequer Rolls; Ibid, cxiii-cxv, 118-19. A spot check of original was undertaken to assess accuracy of edited volume transcription and revealed only very minor of discrepancies.

117 Ibid. The almonds and loaves of sugar alone were £53, 18s. (well over a ninth of the full cost of Peter’s acquisitions), and were in addition to seventy pounds of sugar bought separately in a barrel for the kitchen/ provisions, which suggests that the loaves of sugar were for a specific purpose. See references for the soltetes at the coronation of Katherine de Valois: Chapter 2, Section III, 150.

118 Birch, History of Scottish Seals, 43-5; Stewart, Scottish Coinage, 25-31; McAndrew, Scotland’s Historic Heraldry, 24-32.

in the feasting display by carrying out the courses of food, led by the Master of the Household or other key official. The account includes large purchases of canvas, linen, napery and towelling; the former potentially used for tents and pavilions, while the rest would be used in the general housing and feeding of a multitude of guests.\textsuperscript{120} The comptroller’s account also shows a significant payment of £61, 16s. 4d. to a group of minstrels for their performances at the wedding celebrations, this was more than double the amount paid for the minstrels for the king and queen at the time of their coronation in 1331, and a group of English minstrels paid shortly after the festivities at Dunbarton received just £4.\textsuperscript{121} These comparative expenses emphasise the large number of wedding feast minstrels, as well as their employment for a significant time period, and further amplify the scale of the occasion.

Regrettably, despite the relative wealth of material for David II’s marriage ceremony provided in the accounts, they do not allow any conclusions to be drawn in regards to the attire of the royal couple themselves. The likelihood of a set of regalia for the young couple being purchased, made or reacquired – or a combination of the three – for their wedding, perhaps hidden in the missing account of Thomas de Carnato, has already been discussed in some detail.\textsuperscript{122} However, it is pertinent to briefly reiterate Barbour’s description of the crowning ceremony that he described as occurring directly after David and Joan’s return to Scotland in 1328:

\textit{...For he [Robert I] thocht he wald in his lyff
Croun his young sone and his wyff
And at that parleament sua did he...}\textsuperscript{123}

If this crowning ceremony did occur in 1328 and Joan was crowned alongside her husband in parliament, followed by a swearing of fealty of the estates, it was the first known crowning of a queen in Scotland and it occurred in parliament rather than in a church. On the one hand this could reveal Robert I’s confidence to crown the young couple without papal sanction, but it also

\textsuperscript{120} NAS, E38/7; \textit{ER}, Vol. I, cxiii-cxv, 118-19.
\textsuperscript{121} Ibid, cvi-cvii, 210, 398.
\textsuperscript{122} See Chapter 2, Section II, 126-7.
\textsuperscript{123} Barbour, \textit{Bruce}, 748-9.
draws the pleasures of the wedding ceremony into a sharp contrast with the fear of dynastic
insecurity that this infant couple’s accession would bring.

The marriage ceremonial of the thirteenth and early fourteenth century demonstrates the
determination to project independent authority through the ceremonial interactions central to the
weddings of royalty despite, or perhaps ultimately made stronger by, the complexities that
followed the death of Alexander III’s only heir and the turmoil of war and a new dynasty’s rise
to power. The limited sources can be frustrating, but there are elements of the ceremonial of
marriage in the broader sense outlined in the introduction being demonstrated. These include
the processional arrivals and the protocol designating precedence, with entourages of the three
estates dressed in their finest, and lavish and exotic feasting along with insights into the
entertainments provided. Alexander II and III’s own prestigious marriages to English princesses
brought the complications of monarchs marrying primarily at the expense of someone else,
which while beneficial for the treasury meant that demonstrations of personal prestige were
tempered by the surrounding situation. However, the subsequent marriages that they
orchestrated for sisters, children and themselves saw these two kings taking bold steps to further
the politically advantageous matches with continental European and English houses, and have
allowed more insight into the surrounding ceremonies and entertainment organised on their own
terms. Robert I turned to an English union for his son in a final attempt to restore peace, but in
this instance, the fact that the Scots hosted this major event, and the survival of the financial
accounts, mean that the proceedings at Berwick illustrate the sumptuousness of these kinds of
entertainments in the early fourteenth century. Yet, for all the extravagance hinted at, some of
the simplest ceremonial choices – such as control of the settings, like Berwick and the border
abbeys – could add layers of potent political meaning and symbolic depth to the merry feasting.
Section II: The First Anointed or the Inbetweeners

In the context of the ceremonial development of royal weddings the remaining years of the fourteenth century pose some distinct problems, particularly as Robert II and Robert III married native noble women prior to their coronations. In the case of Robert II and Euphemia Ross, who were married in 1355, their marriage took place long before he could have been assured he would succeed to the throne. The majority of Robert II’s children were married or betrothed prior to his accession, a factor that limited his ability to utilise marriage as a ceremony through which royal authority could be projected on the wider European stage. There was rumoured French royal interest in one of Robert II’s daughters, Lady Egidia, but she was ultimately married to Sir William Douglas. The fragmented financial material extant does illuminate the other ways in which Robert attempted to express Scottish royal authority beyond the bounds of the realm, even in the periods when his power was challenged by the ascendancy of his sons. During his reign, envoys and ambassadors travelled to and from England and France, nearly £600 was spent on the entertainment of John of Gaunt, Duke of Lancaster (1380–1381), horses were frequently used as gifts, the first reference to Lyon herald appears, and records show expenses for a tournament in 1380.

The marriage of Robert III, then John of Kyle, to Annabella Drummond in 1366 was most probably orchestrated by David II and his second wife Margaret Drummond. Much like his father’s reign, Robert III’s years in power were marred by internal conflict. Threats to his authority had an impact on the image that he could portray. For better or worse, Robert III put his son and heir, David earl of Carrick, at the centre of the reestablishment of royal power, as

126 Grant, Independence and Nationhood, 177-8; Penman, David II, 348-9; Boardman, Early Stewart Kings, 22-3.
Boardman has explored at length.\textsuperscript{127} While David’s marriage brought about further internal conflict, events arranged around his elevation illustrate how chivalry, heraldry and status were used to project the Prince’s royal authority.\textsuperscript{128} The fragmented financial records reflect a continuation of expenses lavished on ambassadors and heralds travelling to England, France, Rome and other places.\textsuperscript{129} Overall there appears to be little focus upon marriage as a means of projecting royal authority by Robert III; however, following the birth of Prince James (later James I) in 1394 a letter from Queen Annabella to Richard II of England, delivered by the Douglas herald, discussed a possible union ‘between some of your kindred blood and one of the children of the King my Lord and me’.\textsuperscript{130} Moreover, such advantageous matches were also pursued by the Guardian, Robert Duke of Albany, for his daughter to the second son of Henry IV around 1412.\textsuperscript{131} The use of marriage as a medium of display for the early Stewarts was severely hindered by the political, financial and social standing of the dynasty. However, these suggested unions hint at a shift from local brides and throughout this period there was a keen interest in the projection of the royal Stewart image abroad.

The obvious difference between James I and his father and grandfather was that James had inherited the throne long before his marriage to Joan Beaufort in 1424. Nevertheless his long captivity in the English court meant that James I was not crowned until his return to Scotland.\textsuperscript{132} Joan and James’s union was thought to be based on true affection; James likely wrote the poem \textit{Kingis Quair} for his new wife. Still, this was a political union. It was also the

\textsuperscript{127} \textit{Ibid}, 194-254.
\textsuperscript{128} \textit{Ibid}. The main events included David’s well-funded separate household, the North Inch of Perth pitched battle, his elevation to the dukedom of Rothesay and subsequent granting of the Rothesay herald, and tournaments organised by Queen Annabella in his honour. See: \textit{ER}, Vol. III, lxxx, 418, 435-5, 526, 596; \textit{Chron. Bower}, Vol. VII, 7-13; Boece, \textit{Chronicle}, 354-5; \textit{Pluscarden}, 253-4. The author intends to will investigate these events more closely in future work.
\textsuperscript{129} A variety of examples can be located: \textit{ER}, Vol. III, 238, 248, 274-5, 285, 290, 292, 340, 399, 410, 534, 560, 567, 594, 646.
\textsuperscript{131} NAS, SP6/10, State Papers, Treaties with England: Letter from Henry IV to Robert Duke of Albany acknowledging the Duke’s envoys [...] with Duke’s letter of 8 Nov, re: ransom for Murdoch, and proposed marriage between King’s son John and Duke of Albany’s daughter Elizabeth [...].
\textsuperscript{132} See Chapter 2, Section III, 147-56.
first completed Scottish marriage into a European house since David II and Joan in 1328.\textsuperscript{133} Despite the high profile status of his English noble bride, who was grand-daughter of John of Gaunt, daughter of John Beaufort, earl of Somerset, and the niece of Henry Beaufort, bishop of Winchester and the Chancellor of England (later Cardinal), their wedding is only briefly mentioned in the chronicles. It is recorded that the nuptials took place at the recently rebuilt St Mary Overy church, part of Augustinian Southwark Priory,\textsuperscript{134} presumably presided over by the bride’s uncle who also provided the wedding feast at his London residence of Winchester House.\textsuperscript{135}

It is, therefore, the crowning ceremonies of the queens of this period – from Joan of the Tower to Joan Beaufort – that provide the most insight into the ceremonial development that can be witnessed in regards to consorts in the fourteenth century. Downie rightly highlights the secondary nature of the queen even in her own ceremony which ultimately emphasised the king’s superior status. However, Downie’s conclusions gloss over key themes and leave some details unexplored.\textsuperscript{136} Downie does not raise the implied post-marriage crowning of Prince David and Joan. In fact, she asserts that no crowning of queens was known before 1331, even though Barbour’s account clearly challenges this statement.\textsuperscript{137} The joint coronations of David II and Joan, Robert III and Annabella,\textsuperscript{138} and James I and Joan Beaufort, mean that much of the ground has been covered in the previous chapter, but the remainder of this section will briefly


\textsuperscript{134} Now Southwark Cathedral.


\textsuperscript{136} Downie, She is But a Woman, 87-91.

\textsuperscript{137} Ibid, 87; Barbour, Bruce, 748-9.

\textsuperscript{138} Annabella’s coronation took place the day after her husband’s in the middle of a three day ceremony.
analyse those elements specific to the queens involved and draw Margaret Logie née Drummond and Euphemia into the discussion.

While crowns and crowning are mentioned in regards to all five queens, there are no references to their anointing, not even for Joan of the Tower in Bower’s account of 1331, where he specifically emphasises the anointing of David II.139 This could indicate that the rite of unction was not extended to queens at this stage, but the act of anointing was not always specifically mentioned for the kings either; the descriptions of James I and Joan Beaufort, for instance, just state that in 1424 both were solemnly crowned.140 The only item of regalia that was definitely used in these consort coronations was the crown or diadem, with none of the chronicle accounts referring to detail of any other regalia for the queens. However, as brought to the fore in the previous chapter, the Exchequer Rolls indicate that a small sceptre was made in the preparations for 1331, and this could have been made for Joan rather than David.141 For all but two of these queens the officiating bishop of the ceremony is referred to in chronicle accounts.142 In the case of Joan Beaufort at Scone in May 1424, and possibly for Joan of the Tower in 1331,143 the bishop of St Andrews crowned both the king and queen in what appears to be a double ceremony.144 The brief comments on the joint ceremony for James I and Joan give little indication of how the ceremony proceeded other than it included a crowning ceremony in which a bishop crowned them both, and it is not known whether this was quite literally side by side or in distinctly separate parts of a whole ceremony. This was followed by the king alone being enthroned by the earl of Fife (duke of Albany); therefore, the series of

140 Ibid, Vol. VIII, 221; Plascaden, 278-9; Boece, Chronicle, 382.
142 There is no specific bishop referred for either Joan of the Tower (see below fn. 145) or Margaret Logie. The reports of Margaret Logie’s crowning imply that it was David II who ‘raised’ her to the throne and no officiating bishops are listed; however, the list of who may have been in attendance includes William Landellis, bishop of St Andrews, along with the bishop of Brechin, either of whom may have acted as officiator. Chron. Fordun, 370; Chron. Bower, Vol. VII, 323-33; Penman, David II, 292-4.
143 Bower’s account that refers to Joan of the Tower’s crowning in a joint ceremony alongside David does not record whether the same bishop undertook her crowning: VII, 71-3.
144 Ibid, VIII, 221; Plascaden, 278-9; Boece, Chronicle, 382. The latter is the only one not to state that James Ben, bishop of St Andrews, crowned the couple; the confusion around the role of Murdach, duke of Albany, is discussed above in Chapter 2, Section III, 154-5.
events in 1424 may well be considered a condensed version of the three day coronation ceremony of Robert III and Annabella.

Unlike Joan Beaufort, the two previous Stewart queen consorts were not crowned by the same officiating bishop as their husbands. Euphemia was crowned in 1372 at Scone by the Gilbert de Greenlaw, bishop of Aberdeen, and Annabella was crowned on the day after her husband on 15 August 1390, also at Scone, by the Bishop of Dunkeld. Following the coronation in the latter ceremony, Wyntoun records that the Bishop of Dunkeld gave a sermon which ‘accordande weil’ with the feast of the Assumption of the Virgin on which the ceremony occurred. This supports the proposition made in the previous chapter that this prominent Marian feast day had been specifically chosen. It forged a connection to the Virgin feast days favoured in the coronations of former Scottish kings, and allowed for the use of Marian imagery in what would essentially be an advice-to-queens sermon taking place after her crowning.

The exact date of Euphemia’s coronation is unknown but, in contrast with the other queen consorts married prior to coronation, it was separated by at least a year from that of Robert II on 25 March 1371. Downie has proposed that this delay was caused by discussions regarding the order of succession that looked to honour the sons of Robert’s first marriage to Elizabeth Mure, before those of his second marriage to Euphemia. Euphemia’s power and influence were ambiguous given this ongoing inheritance dispute. Although still a child, Euphelia’s eldest son David, had been created earl of Strathearn by 1371, and following his

---

147 For example, Robert I and Robert II were both inaugurated on 25 March, Annunciation of the Blessed Virgin.
148 Chron. Bower, Vol. VII, 375, 508. Downie suggests that the coronation took place between Dec 1372 and March 1373: Downie, She is But a Woman, 89-90.
149 Ibid. Robert II had four adult sons by his first wife Elizabeth Mure (as well as a number of daughters) and in 1371 two sons, both children, to his second wife, Euphemia.
father’s coronation received a grant of the barony and castle of Urquhart,\footnote{150} which Boardman posits was due to the queen’s influence.\footnote{151} Euphemia’s powerful brother, William, earl of Ross, may have also been exerting pressure on behalf of his nephews’ claims until his death in 1372.\footnote{152} However, the acts of succession dictating the line through Elizabeth’s children first were still agreed on 4 April 1373 in a parliament begun in March at Scone.\footnote{153} Euphemia’s coronation receives minimal attention in the chronicles, but both place this event in Scone and in the same year as the death of Bridget of Sweden (1373).\footnote{154} When taking into consideration Bruce and early Stewart favouritism towards Marian feast days for prominent ceremonial, it could be proposed that her coronation took place on 25 March or the feast of the Annunciation of Our Lady in 1373. In purely practical terms, placing the coronation within a parliament meant that large numbers of the three estates could have easily attended both events, boosting attendance. Moreover, by placing the ceremony thus, her coronation reflected that of her husband’s (which had occurred exactly two years earlier) and allowed for Marian symbology to imbue it. Furthermore, through its proximity to the parliament in which the succession was formally decided, Robert made a clear statement of his royal authority and the subordinate authority of his queen.

The coronation of Margaret Logie, David II’s second queen, followed soon after their marriage at Inchmurdoch in Fife in May 1363. This was the only consort coronations in this period that did not occur at Scone.\footnote{155} Given the unpopularity of David’s native choice of bride, the new queen was not of the noble class, but was a commoner.\footnote{156} Whether this decision was due to insufficient candidates from the nobility or the usual emphasis the Bruce and Stewart kings placed on royal power is debatable.\footnote{157} Regardless, the coronation highlights the need for legitimization through the established religious ceremony and the importance of the presence of the three estates, as well as the queen herself.

\footnote{150} This grant was made at the expense of Robert II’s third son by Elizabeth Mure, Alexander of Badenoch (or the Wolf of Badenoch), who was later made earl of Caithness.

\footnote{151} Boardman, \textit{Early Stewart Kings}, 74-89.

\footnote{152} Ibid, 75.

\footnote{153} \textit{RPS}, 1373/1, Legislation: statute, ordinance and declaration entailing the Crown on the sons of Robert II (Scone, Parliament, March–April 1373).


\footnote{155} It is not clear where exactly the marriage occurred, there is a nineteenth-century chapel (now Boarhills Church, previously Chesterhill Chapel) in the vicinity of the Inchmurdoch at which nineteenth-century excavations located foundations of an early religious building possibly dating back to the ninth or tenth century. For further information see: ‘Chesterhill Chapel’, \textit{Scottish Church Heritage Research} (2013), \url{http://www.scottishchurches.org.uk/sites/site/id/10596/name/Chesterhill+Chapel+St+Andrews+and+St+Leonards+Fife}. Accessed 15 Sept 2013.
amplified in the commentary from Bower,\(^\text{156}\) the choice of such a quiet location suggests that David’s second marriage was less public and extravagant than his first. Yet, the event must be placed in the context of surrounding events to better understand David II’s use of ceremony. In 1363 there was a failed, but nevertheless dangerous, threat of rebellion from the Steward, later Robert II, and other magnates – notably the earls of Douglas and March. The Steward’s public submission was combined with the king’s wedding to Margaret Logie and her coronation. As Penman has proposed the combination of the capitulation through the public giving of an oath for the Steward, who was next in line for the throne should the Bruce line end with David, and the king’s marriage to his mistress Margaret, who had successfully produced a son for her first husband, was used to very publicly ‘legitimise his [David’s] domestic and dynastic plans’.\(^\text{157}\) In addition, Bower’s account of the submission of the Steward also supplies a list of those present to witness the oath and therefore indicates those present for the nuptials and the queen’s coronation. This included William Landellis, bishop of St Andrews to whom the manor of Inchmurdoch belonged, and the bishop of Brechin.\(^\text{158}\) Margaret Logie’s marriage and crowning was not linked directly to a parliament but it was utilised in a highly politicised way in front of a select but sizeable representation of the estates.

The ceremony of coronation for both king and queen in Scotland were relatively new. During this period, new elements of the ceremony were drawn into older traditions. An officiating bishop was clearly central to the crowning of a Scottish queen, whether she was anointed or not. The queen was crowned at the same site as her husband at Scone in four out of five cases, as is found in comparable English *ordines* and in the fourteenth-century *Charles V’s Coronation Book*.\(^\text{159}\) Where the couple were crowned in adjoining ceremonies, the king’s outdoor enthroning was clearly separated, but the political community was still very involved in

\(^{156}\) *Chron. Bower*, Vol. VII, 332-55; Downie, *She is But a Woman*, 82-5.


\(^{159}\) The coronation of Charles V and Jeanne of Bourbonne illustrated in the *Coronation Book* (See Chapter 2, Section II, 133-4, and Plates 13-14) was the last joint French coronation ritual and it became the custom in France for the queen to be crowned separately in St Denis. See McCartney, ‘Ceremonies and Privileges of Office: Queenship in Late Medieval France’, 182-3.
the ceremonial surrounding the consort. There is too little detail to confirm whether an oath was taken by the queen, as in the king’s ceremony, although it does not appear to have been prescribed elsewhere in Europe at the time.\textsuperscript{160} However, the events following Joan’s coronation in 1424, when James I formally emphasised her role as second person of the realm, saw the giving of oaths to the queen decided in parliament. This would suggest that return oaths of the estates had not been given during the coronation, even if the queen herself had made an oath.\textsuperscript{161}

Of the kings discussed here, none was in a particularly strong position (in regards to actual political power and stability) at the point of their joint or consort’s coronation. They therefore had to use these occasions to bolster their own royal status as much as that of their queen as Downie has suggested.\textsuperscript{162} Yet, the overt presence of the three estates in four of these occasions, and the likelihood of the estate’s attendance at Euphemia’s coronation, suggest that their involvement was important in the sanctification of a consort’s coronation, just as it was for a king. But rather than pointing to any independent political power of queens in this era, this thesis argues that a powerful political community expected to be involved in the elevation of both their ruling monarch and that monarch’s consort.

\textsuperscript{160} Parsons, ‘Ritual and Symbol in the English Medieval Queenship to 1500’, 62; Downie, \textit{She is But a Woman}, 88. Laynesmith highlights that no oath between queen and people (as found in the king’s ceremony) occurred, and that the only oath that the queen made was with God: \textit{Last Medieval Queens}, 103.

\textsuperscript{161} For more on the raising of Joan to second person of the realm, see: Chapter 1, Section IV, 59-60.

\textsuperscript{162} Downie, \textit{She is But A Woman}, 87-90.
Section III: Returning to the European Stage: Fifteenth-Century Royal Marriages

The marriage of James II and Mary of Guelders in 1449 was achieved after more than two decades of convoluted foreign policy and alliances, accelerated by the marriage of James II’s eldest sister Margaret to the dauphin of France in 1436. In the wake of this prestigious match orchestrated by James I and amidst a web of French, Burgundian and English power play, three further sisters were married into continental houses – Isabella or Elizabeth to the Duke of Brittany in 1442, Mary to the son of the Lord of Veere in 1444, and Eleanor to the Duke of Austria-Tyrol in 1448 – and a fourth, Annabella, was betrothed to the heir of Savoy for over ten years during which time she was resident at the Savoyan court. These marriages of James I’s daughters have been discussed at length by various historians regarding Franco-Burgundian intervention in Scottish foreign policy and Scotland’s reintegration into European power networks, the expansion of foreign policy and complex domestic policies driven by a Douglas-heavy minority government; as well as those uncovering a little more about the individual princesses as wives to their foreign husbands. Yet, the value of these nuptials – particularly that of Margaret where the sources are plentiful – as ceremonial occasions have not been specifically addressed, despite the fact that they had the potential to act as influential shapers of future Scottish ceremony and the manner in which these princesses were sent to their various destinations presented an opportunity for projecting the Scottish royal image on a European stage.

In contrast to her younger sisters, Princess Margaret’s marriage to the Dauphin of France was the only one to occur within James I’s lifetime and can therefore be accurately analysed as the royal display of an independent adult monarch in a way his own nuptials could not. The union was under discussion by 1428 when a high-powered ‘splendid escort’ from France headed by Reginald of Chartres, archbishop of Rheims, Alain Chartier, chancellor of

---

church of Bayeaux, and John Stewart, constable of the Scots in France, arrived in Scotland to renew old alliances and treat for the hand of the infant Margaret for the Dauphin Louis, eldest son of the Most Christian king of France, Charles VII. From the limited extant financial material it is apparent that these French ambassadors stayed at least one night at Linlithgow Palace. This palace would have been a work in progress – with around £632 being spent on the fabric of the building in the account of the following year – but it was James I’s principal building project. The previous royal residence had been devastated by a fire. But as Dunbar notes, the frequency with which James and his queen visited and entertained royal guests suggests that significant accommodation remained from which to view the unfolding grandeur of the new palace, including its monumental armorial lintel emblazoned with the royal arms supported by angels, posited by Scott as an emphasis of the divine nature of James’s kingship. Recognising the honour of the French king’s proposal, symbolically emphasised through his choice of high status ambassadors, James I sent a return embassy headed by the Henry Lichton, bishop of Aberdeen, who was by 1428 a well-travelled royal ambassador, Edward de Lauder, and Sir Patrick Ogilvy. The latter ultimately acted as proxy for Margaret in a betrothal ceremony in France in December 1428. There followed seven years of diplomatic exchange affected by changes of circumstance, allegiances and the balance of power between Scotland, England and France. The drawn out negotiations were concluded from 1434 to 1436.

164 The Exchequer Rolls that remain extant for James I’s reign are limited, only two chamberlain’s account survive (1427 and 1435) and other accounts are patchy, in addition James’s reign saw the introduction of the royal treasurer but there are no Treasurer’s Accounts surviving from this period. ER, Vol. IV, ci-cii, 484-5.
165 Ibid, cxxvii-cxxviii, 512-13; Dunbar, Scottish Royal Palaces, 5-9; Scott, The Court and Household of James I, 156-8, 251. The lintel has been dated c. 1430, so may not have been complete at this stage. See Plate 29.
167 NAS, SP7/7-9, State Papers, Treaties with France; Inventaire Chronologique, 39-41 (Originals can be found Paris Archive Nationales, J678/21-25); Chron. Bower, Vol. VIII, 247-9; Pluscarden, 281-2; Downie, She is But a Woman, 36-9.
168 NAS, SP7/10-12; Inventaire Chronologique, 42-4 (Originals, Paris AN, J409/57-59); L. Barbé, Margaret of Scotland and the Dauphin Louis (London, Glasgow and Bombay, 1917), 13-75; Downie, She is But a Woman, 39-49.
These final negotiations were undertaken by a French embassy led by Regnault Girard, seigneur de Bazoges, who recorded his journey to Scotland in great detail. The French embassy included seasoned traveller Hugh Kennedy who, on arrival in early 1434/5, revealed a keen understanding of the importance of a fine welcome. Feasting was provided by the Campbells, as well as Kennedy himself, and a thanksgiving pilgrimage to St Martin of Tours at Whithorn organised. Following this a suitably large entourage was arranged to accompany the French ambassadors to meet the king. The party of roughly sixty knights and followers travelled to Linlithgow, once again prominent in the proceedings, and were met by dignitaries including the bishop of Brechin. On the approach to Edinburgh the Franco-Scottish convoy were greeted by a party from the city, headed by the Chamberlain, the Keeper of the Privy Seal, the Master of the King’s Household and numerous prelates. The meeting with the king did not occur in Edinburgh Castle but at the Grey Friar’s Priory. Here the king, surrounded by nobles and prelates, welcomed his guests. Following discussions with the French, James sought the council of his queen allowing the opportunity for the French party to travel to Perth to meet the queen and Princess Margaret. No doubt this exercise was partly designed to showcase James I’s other major building project, the Carthusian Charterhouse, although unfortunately Girard does not indicate where exactly he was graciously received by the queen and princess. The treaty documents were drawn up and carried by a pursuivant, accompanied by Hugh Kennedy and others, back to France. As Stevenson has shown the late fourteenth and early fifteenth centuries saw a rapid expansion of heraldic messengers across Europe, a trend that can be

169 Anon, *Regnault Gerard, seigneur de Bazoges, and other tales and verses* (Glasgow, 1897), 1-27; J.J. Jusserand, *English Essays from a French Pen* (New York, 1895), 24-61; Barbé, *Margaret of Scotland*, 50-82. The original work of Regnault Girard is found in manuscript form in the Paris BN, MS Français, the number given by secondary works using the manuscript suggest MS 17330 but this does not correlate with modern catalogue (or the old numbering) and the hunt for it continues. The discussion here is based on the three cited works, unless otherwise referenced.

170 It would be January 1435 on modern calendar.

171 This is possibly the meeting on which the fanciful Siena fresco of James I holding court was based: Pinturicchi, *Aeneas Sylvius Piccolomini meeting James I;* see cover of Tanner, *Late Medieval Scottish Parliament*.

172 This visit to Perth has one of the few specific references to expenses for the French ambassador in the patchy Scottish financial records, but does not give further detail: *ER*, Vol. IV, 633.

173 Girard was required to stay behind in Scotland and await the reply, and would ultimately spend well over a year in the realm.

witnessed in the reigns of Robert II and III, and this pursuivant would have been symbolic of proxy royal authority. Girard does not name the pursuivant but his status was obviously clear to the French ambassador, suggesting the official wore a tabard with the royal arms. The ‘Dragance’ pursuivant\textsuperscript{175} received £10 in addition to his annual fee in 1435 for expenses incurred on ‘certain negotiations on the command of the king’ making him a likely candidate for this role.\textsuperscript{176}

Girard noted that the expenses of the French envoys throughout their stay had been footed by the Scottish royal treasury, making the incomplete financial records ever more frustrating. Nevertheless, an idea of how James portrayed himself is illuminated in the extensive purchases of luxury goods by John Ducheman and John Turyne,\textsuperscript{177} for which he was criticised and subsequently punished by parliament who withheld future taxes.\textsuperscript{178} One full account of Turyne has survived recording everything from decorative ostrich feathers to Flemish purple velvet and black silk, from costumes for stage-players (and even the stage-players themselves) to collars encrusted with jewels and tapestries of the king’s arms;\textsuperscript{179} the latter particularly illustrating the development of symbols of power decorating royal space. The general expenses of the king and queen’s household, where they remain, refer to an abundance of meat and seafood, including one reference in the custumar’s account for Inverkeithing submitted in 1435 that appears to suggest the royal household consumed 45,100 oysters.\textsuperscript{180} The specifics spent on the French envoy’s entertainment and provisions may not be known, but the extant material suggests a veritable feast of rich display was provided.

As the royal party collected at Dumbarton in spring of 1436 for the princess’s departure a further ship from France arrived with provisions and gifts: a mule for the king, perhaps the first in Scotland, and wine and barrels of fruit for the queen.\textsuperscript{181} The entourage which

\begin{footnotes}
\item[175] The Dragance pursuivant is an infrequently used title/office, the origin of which is uncertain.
\item[176] \textit{ER}, Vol. IV, 620. Annual fee for ‘Dragance pursuivant’ referred to previously in 1429 (507) and 1434 (575).
\item[177] \textit{Ibid}, cxlvi-cxlvii.
\item[178] Tanner, \textit{Late Medieval Scottish Parliament}, 53-6.
\item[179] \textit{ER}, Vol. IV, cxlvi-cxli, 676-85.
\item[180] \textit{Ibid}, 617-18.
\item[181] \textit{Regnault Gerard, seigneur de Bazoges}, 17; Barbé, \textit{Margaret of Scotland}, 78.
\end{footnotes}
accompanied the young princess were a venerable array of important figures from across the three estates headed by William Sinclair, earl of Orkney and Admiral of Scotland, and John Crannock, bishop of Brechin, accompanied by a host of nobles, lairds, knights and clerics.\textsuperscript{182} The Scottish crown, sponsor of the convoy, supplied matching elegant livery for 140 squires or youths, presumably emblazoned with the royal arms, and between 1,000 and 3,000 men-at-arms accompanied them to provide a visual projection of the Scottish monarchical prowess to this foreign audience.\textsuperscript{183}

Margaret and her convoy were met by a great French embassy, led by the Archbishop of Rheims, and made numerous royal entries along the route to Tours in which the Scottish entourage of Princess Margaret was highly visible. At La Rochelle her Scottish retinue ‘made a great impression on the crowds’ and she was met by a group of wives of nobles and prominent townsmen dressed according to their status.\textsuperscript{184} She arrived at Tours on a ‘richly comparisoned palfrey’ and was once again welcomed by joyous townsfolk.\textsuperscript{185} The French accounts emphasise that she was accompanied by the ‘dames and damsels’ of Scotland, who presumably accompanied the princess, and were recorded by Boece to be 140 in number perhaps to compliment the 140 liveried squires.\textsuperscript{186} She was led to the royal palace with the French lord of Vendôme on one side and the Scottish earl of Orkney on the other to meet the French queen and the Dauphin. For her wedding\textsuperscript{187} Margaret wore a dress of velvet and cloth of gold, and a circlet of gold on her head. Her young husband was dressed in velvet decorated with gold embroidery and carrying a sword gifted to him by the King of Scots, which was reported to have the Virgin Mary and St Michael fashioned on its pommel, evoking both the French royal order of chivalry,

\textsuperscript{182} One of the clerics that accompanied the party may in fact be the author of the anonymous \textit{Book of Pluscarden}; Master Maurice de Buchanan was the dauphiness’s treasurer who accompanied her on the trip and remained in France with her and there are indications in the text of the chronicle, highlighted by the chronicle’s editor Skene, that the author was this man: Skene, ‘Introduction’, xxv.
\textsuperscript{183} The different accounts have figures ranging between these totals: \textit{Chron. Bower}, Vol. VIII, 249; \textit{Pluscarden}, 282-3; Barbé, \textit{Margaret of Scotland}, 81.
\textsuperscript{184} \textit{Ibid}, 87-8.
\textsuperscript{186} \textit{Regnauld Gerard, seigneur de Bazoges}, 8, 21; Boece, \textit{Chronicle}, 397-8; Barbé, \textit{Margaret of Scotland}, 89-90.
\textsuperscript{187} The wedding took place on 25 June, the day after her arrival on St John Baptist’s feast day (24 June).
whose patron saint featured in many of James I’s dedications, and the coronations of James’s predecessors which focused on Virgin feast days. The conspicuous Scottish presence at the event, even if many of the attendees were rather rapidly sent home, meant that various key figures along with a multitude of courtiers, ladies, knights and clerics had taken part in and witnessed the elaborate French entertainments.

The French marriage of Margaret rebuilt strong foundations for the minority government of James II to pursue outward-looking foreign policy. Although records are poor for the other sisters, evidence such as taxes raised by the burgh of Aberdeen and expenses for ambassadors for the marriage of Isabella to the duke of Brittany indicate the manner of interactions. In the case of Eleanor’s union to the duke of Austria-Tyrol, James II’s own involvement is revealed as his permission for the princess’s departure appears to have been actively sought. James II’s own marriage to Mary of Guelders in 1449 heralded the conclusion of a treaty that firmly allied Scotland not only to Guelders, but also to Brittany and more importantly Burgundy. One of the most interesting events in regards to Scottish representations of authority in the build up to this marriage was the tournament held at Stirling on Shrove Tuesday, 25 February 1449, between Burgundian knights and Scottish knights led by Sir James Douglas. The chivalric prowess and European renown of the Douglas family as

---

188 Ibid, 97-8. Barbé suggests that the sword was that of Robert Bruce, or at least believed to be by the French, but this seems unlikely and its design suggests a purposeful chosen design for the gift. See also Nicola Scott’s discussions regarding the raised profile of St Michael in symbolism and dedications by James I: ‘The Court and Household of James I’, 156-8, 174, 244, 251-6.


190 Although officially a minor until 1449, there are a number of letters raised by Downie that indicate James II’s involvement with Charles VII, as well as the Dukes of Burgundy, Brittany and Guelders, in regards to his sisters and his own marriage; such as in NAS, SP9/2, State Papers: Treaties with the Low Countries, Letter of Elizabeth, Duchess of Burgundy, requesting King James II allow his sister, Eleanor to proceed to France [...] (20 April 1445); Letters and Papers Illustrative of the Wars of the English in France during the Reign of Henry VI, King of England, ed. J. Stevenson (2 vols, London, 1861–1864), Vol. I, 194-8, 221-3; Downie, She is But A Woman, 50-80.

showcased in this event have been discussed by Katie Stevenson,¹⁹² and in many ways this was a ‘Douglas’ affair. Yet, the accounts by continental contemporaries Jacques de Lelain and Mathieu D’Escouchy¹⁹³ register the centrality of the young king as the enthroned mediator, and illuminate the fact that the king entertained these foreign guests both before and after the event:¹⁹⁴

The trial of arms over, each returned to his lodgings. And some days after the king feasted them very grandly, and gave them honourable gifts for which they thanked him.¹⁹⁵

By February 1449, James II was eighteen years old and various events – such as the retaking of oaths in the parliament of 1445 – had been consciously designed to raise his public profile.¹⁹⁶ James was very much aware of the political landscape in which he and his nobility functioned both in a national and European context; therefore, the previously made conclusions regarding this event certainly leave some lingering questions. For example, Stevenson raises the chivalric value of Stirling and its Arthurian links suggesting that the ‘setting was clearly contrived by the Douglasses’.¹⁹⁷ Yet, Stirling was a royal castle, even if its ‘captain’ was a Livingstone and therefore a firm Douglas adherent,¹⁹⁸ and Lelain states that it was the king of Scotland who ‘appointed time and place, and had the lists made ready at Stirling’.¹⁹⁹ The only specific reference to the earl of Douglas was his entrance to the field with a large entourage following the three Scottish combatants and, though a vivid visual demonstration of Douglas might, the attention of the foreign commentators lingers upon the combat and the young king who presided as judge. James also took advantage of the occasion to bestow knighthoods on the three competing Douglas adherents, publicly tying their loyalty to the crown.²⁰⁰ There can be no

¹⁹² Stevenson, ‘Contesting Chivalry’, 203-09.
¹⁹³ The former was Burgundian and the latter from Picardy.
¹⁹⁴ While the Exchequer Rolls do not shed light on expenses used specifically for the event and there are no extant Treasurer’s Accounts to expand upon the former, Lelain’s account reports that the expenses and feasting costs for the foreign guests were undertaken by the king, rather than Douglas.
¹⁹⁵ ‘Histoire du... Jacques de Lalain’, 38; Chron. D’Escouchy 150.
¹⁹⁶ See above Chapter 2, Section III, 166-8.
¹⁹⁷ Stevenson, ‘Contesting Chivalry’, 207.
¹⁹⁹ ‘Histoire du... Jacques de Lalain’, 33.
²⁰⁰ Ibid, 33-4; Mathieu D’Escouchy, 150.
denial of the dominance of the Douglas faction in the minority governance of James II’s Scotland, but this event took place in the centre of marital negotiations in which James had played an active role from 1448, if not earlier. It seems odd to suggest that James would have passed up such a fortuitous occasion to enhance his own European status in the presence of representatives of the Burgundian duke who had played the role of international matchmaker.

The Burgundian matchmaking exercise was concluded with the Treaty of Brussels on 1 April 1449, and the ensuing ceremonial provided James II with the opportunity to project his image of authority in an event that centred on his own person and the dynastic security his new bride offered, rather than the chivalric prowess of prominent nobles. The preeminent source for this union is the account of contemporary chronicler Mathieu d’Escouchy, and when combined with other extant source material this rare descriptive account of a fifteenth-century Scottish wedding and consort coronation can add pertinent details in the search for understanding the development of Scottish consort ceremonial. Following a tournament in their honour, Mary and her large entourage including Henry van Borsele, lord of Veere, Sir Anthony Rochebaron [sic] and Isabel, the daughter of the infamous Jacques de Lalain, departed the duke’s court for Scotland. After a brief spiritual sojourn at the Isle of May shrines of the Blessed Virgin and St Adrian, they arrived in thirteen ‘gret schippis and ane craik’ at Leith on

---

201 See McGladdery, James II, 14-47; Brown, The Black Douglases, 246-82; Stevenson, ‘Contesting Chivalry’, 203-09.
202 Downie, She is But a Woman, 66-74.
204 Dunlop, Life and Times of James Kennedy, 100-101.
206 Chron. D’Escouchy, 175-83; Downie has utilised some parts from his commentary in a short description of the ceremony to conclude her chapter on the political interaction that had brought about the union, but the discussion of the ceremony itself is brief and relies predominantly on this one text: She is But a Woman, 78-80; Dunlop, Life and Times of James Kennedy, 102-103.
207 Ibid, 100-101; Baxter, ‘The Marriage of James II’, 71-2; Downie, She is But a Woman, 78.
208 Father of Wolfaert van Borsele who married Mary Stewart, one of James II’s sisters.
209 Chron. D’Escouchy, 176-7. John Leslie’s later sixteenth-century history includes the Count of Nassau and the bishop of ‘Leadge’ or Liége (Historie, Vol. II, 68); however, his sources for this information are not clear.
210 Ibid, 177-8; Downie, She is But a Woman, 78-9. The excavations undertaken in the late 1990s on the island have uncovered a great deal about the religious settlements history and some of the monks and
18 June, where they were reverently welcomed by the people who had congregated at the port. The crowd was headed by prominent figures including John Ralston, bishop of Dunkeld, and William Crichton, the Chancellor, accompanied by numerous ‘men in harness,’ likely liveried men-at-arms on horseback, and perhaps a host of Highland men considering D’Escouchy’s comment on the ‘gens sauvaige’ in the crowd. Throughout the process of Mary arriving and travelling from Leith to Holyrood, James II appears to have been entirely absent, a factor reflected through D’Escouchy’s account although never stated. The ten thousand strong company who paraded ‘in rather beautiful order according to the estates of the country,’ and the choice of wording in the financial account that refers to the expenses for the ‘...adventus domine regine infra regnum...’ are both suggestive of an elaborate royal welcome by the estates that focused upon the queen herself. While D’Escouchy reported the portside greeting as an unusual custom, it does not sound far removed from that of Princess Margaret arriving in France and these portside greetings can be equated to the people of burghs exiting the city gates to welcome a new arriving consort, king or prince who arrived on horseback by land.

Mary was lodged at Holyrood Abbey in the Cannongate of Edinburgh – which had received royal funds for work done ‘ad fabricam’ in the months prior to the event – until the formal ratification of the marriage treaty was undertaken by James II in Stirling. She was led into her first meeting with James II by Chancellor Crichton and John Ralston, bishop of Dunkeld, who had been ambassadors in the earlier negotiations and appear to have continued

211 Chron. Auchinleck, 171; Chron. D’Escouchy, 178.
213 ER, Vol. V, 381-2. [Translation: ‘...the lady queen’s entry into the realm...’]
214 Chron. D’Escouchy, 178.
215 See also Dean, ‘Enter the Alien’.
216 ER, Vol. V, 346-7. While Holyrood would become synonymous with Scottish royalty and particularly important to James II, and did have royal lodgings, its upkeep until well into the late fifteenth century was left to the Augustinian brethren who resided there: Dunbar, Scottish Royal Palaces, 55-6.
217 NAS, SP7/14, Confirmation under the Great Seal of Scotland of marriage contract between King James II and Marie de Gueldres (Stirling, 25 June 1449).
their role as ambassadorial escorts by leading the queen physically to her husband.218 The staged meeting was undertaken with apparent choreographed formality: the queen knelt before James II, who raised her up to standing, and only once the king had welcomed his queen were the Burgundian and Scottish nobles permitted to greet each other.219 This staged meeting marked the commencement of ceremonial lasting several days, with the welcoming of the young queen by prominent ladies of the realm, including the countess of Orkney, Lady of March and a countess who was aunt of the king, occurring on the second day.220

A number of days later the marriage and coronation of Mary of Guelders took place in one combined ceremonial event at Holyrood, in a manner not encountered previously in the ceremonies discussed. On the day after the Feast of the Visitation of the Blessed Virgin,221 placing the ceremony in the octave of that feast, Mary was led into the abbey church of Holyrood – where James had been baptised and crowned – by two members of her embassy. Henry the Lord Veere and another lord222 acted essentially as ‘father of the bride’ figures, and were followed by all the Burgundian gentlewomen and ladies who had accompanied them as well as the countesses and grand ladies of Scotland.223 The king arrived at the church after Mary on horseback with an entourage of knights, presumably carrying royal banners. Once

218 Chron. Auchinleck, 234; Dunlop, Life and Times of John Kennedy, 96; Chron. D’Escouchy, 179.
219 Ibid.
220 While a secondary point, the identities of these women seem to be the cause of some confusion; for example, the countess of Orkney at this time was Elizabeth Sinclair (St Clair) née Douglas, daughter of fourth earl of Douglas, but she is misnamed as Marguerite by D’Escouchy’s editor. Moreover, the one listed as the king’s aunt could have been either of James I’s surviving sisters, Lady Mary (mother of Bishop Kennedy) and dowager countess of Angus, or Margaret (married to the earl of Douglas). D’Escouchy’s editor has been criticised by Dunlop for presuming that it was the latter as she would have been known as the duchess of Tourraine; however, her husband’s death in battle after his elevation to dukedom meant that the title was lost, despite successors attempting to regain it, and it is therefore unlikely that a French/ Picardian would recognise her under this title over twenty years after her husband’s death. Dunlop, Life and Times of James Kennedy, 102, fn. 3; Chron. D’Escouchy, 179-80.
221 The marriage was on 3 July 1449 and the annual Visitation feast was 2 July.
222 D’Escouchy states ‘Lord Rarresy’ as the second ambassador, but the previously named ambassador was Rochebaron and this second figure seems not to have been named before: Chron. D’Escouchy, 180.
223 At this stage the attire of the queen is not described in D’Escouchy, 180. Downie suggests that the gown was gifted to her by the Duchess of Burgundy; however, the extant Exchequer Rolls records that large quantities of cloth including silks and furs, as well as gold items, were purchased for the queen around this time. There are also records of wages for cloth-cutters and tailors in the same account and there was certainly time following her arrival (on 18 June, more than two full weeks before her wedding and coronation) for clothes to be made for her: ER, Vol. V, 385; Downie, She is But a Woman, 79.
dismounted, James II entered the church bearing his sword and wearing a long fur-lined grey and white robe, but ostensibly without a crown or any other regalia.

The entire nuptial ceremony clearly took place within the church before an altar. The ordering of events with James II arriving after Mary had entered the church did not allow for an exchanging of vows at the door of the abbey church, as highlighted in comparable European surviving descriptions. This may seem like stating the obvious but there is no such confirmation prior to this. The 1449 ceremony also illustrates that ‘letters’ regarding the surety of her dowry and dower lands were read out before the wedding proceeded. Once married, the king took the queen by the hand and led her to the altar where they knelt through the entire Mass, one would presume on plenty of rich velvet cushions. The identity of the officiating bishop of this ceremony is not recorded. Dunlop has highlighted the absence of James Kennedy, bishop of St Andrews, from signatures on the ratification, but there are two bishops recorded as signatories: William Turnbull, bishop of Glasgow whose role in the king’s coronation was outlined in the papal bull, and John Ralston, the bishop of Dunkeld. The latter had been actively involved in the earlier ambassadorial proceedings and his crowning of a queen would not lack precedence as Annabella was crowned by John Peebles, bishop of Dunkeld in 1390, and it may be that both bishops were involved in the ceremony.

Following the Mass, Mary was led into a side chapel where she was redressed in a robe of royal purple, the colour of which was commented on as unusual by D’Escouchy, and her hair was arranged loose over her shoulders prior to returning to the altar to be crowned before the host alongside the king. At this stage the king is recorded as being dressed similarly to the queen, as he entered the abbey in a long grey and white fur-lined robe this suggests that he too

---

224 All further references to the church ceremony that are not individually referenced are from: Chron. D’Escouchy, 180-81.
225 Ward, Women in Medieval Europe, 1200–1500, 26-44, particularly 30-32.
226 There were definitely crowds around the church at Berwick for the wedding of David and Joan in 1328, but it is not clear whether the actual nuptials took place at the door. See above Chapter 3, Section I, 233.
had been redressed in his royal robe of purple, perhaps designed to signify the unity of the royal couple.\textsuperscript{228} The \textit{Exchequer Rolls} refer to a payment for cloth purchased ‘ad robam regalem’ at the time of the marriage. However, the small cost of the cloth suggests a repair rather than a new item and supports the idea of the royal purple robe being an essential item of regalia passed down from king to king as an eminent statement of dynastic lineage.\textsuperscript{229} The one line on the actual act of coronation gives away very little, stating quite simply that she was crowned before the great host, with no indication of where the king stood, who crowned her, whether she was anointed\textsuperscript{230} or whether she was invested with any other items of regalia.

In the ensuing celebrations the king and queen were seated at separate tables in the hall in Holyrood Abbey, with William Crichton and other lords serving the queen, while further tables arranged around the hall housed great lords and ladies from the realms involved, clerics and knights, and were most likely ordered according to rank.\textsuperscript{231} The use of food in display was something that has been constant throughout the ceremonies discussed, but in this case there are actual descriptions of two main decorative dishes that demonstrate an understanding of the use of heraldic and royal symbols of display that were rising in prominence and elaboration across Europe.\textsuperscript{232} The first was a painted stuffed boar’s head surrounded by banners of the arms of the king and key nobles, the stuffing of which was set alight ‘to the joy of all observers’. The second was an exquisitely crafted ship with silver cords, which was carried in by the Admiral of the Scottish fleet, William Sinclair [St Clair] earl of Orkney, and four knights. Considering the treaty signed at Brussels was one of mutual military support and trade alliances, this display would have made a pointed statement about the union. Each course was brought out by thirty to forty people and projects a rigid formal etiquette in which the official servers were described

\textsuperscript{228} Downie, \textit{She is But A Woman}, 79.
\textsuperscript{229} \textit{ER}, Vol. V, 387. See Chapter 2, \textit{passim}, for discussions on the purple ‘rob ryall’.
\textsuperscript{230} If she was anointed this should surely have occurred between the marriage and the following Mass, and when she was re-robed; however, there is no indication that this occurred.
\textsuperscript{231} \textit{Chron. D’Escouchy}, 181-2. The account of the feast section of events by D’Escouchy is translated by Richard Vaughan, but he offers no real discussion of the occasion: Vaughan, \textit{Philip the Good}, 112.
\textsuperscript{232} For the soltetes of Queen Katherine in 1420, see: Chapter 2, Section III, 150. This kind of symbology can be found epitomised and taken to extremes in the Feast of the Pheasant, organised at Lille by Duke Philip of Burgundy in 1454. The account of Olivier de la Marche of the event is translated and discussed in A. Brown and G. Small, \textit{Court and Civic Society in the Burgundian Low Countries, c. 1420–1530} (Manchester, 2007), 36-53.
kneeling before the person they served until they began eating. In contrast to the crown controlled servers, five prelates and a number of knights were described as drinking liberally from an enormous wooden goblet, alongside comments about wine being as common as seawater, illustrating the etiquette of officials was not necessarily followed by the clerics and knights in the manner they celebrated.\(^{233}\) D’Escouchy’s description both praises and scorns through comparisons to his own experience, revealing the kind of contradictions that are often illuminated in regards to Scottish ceremonial and court-life, particularly in the observations of foreign guests.\(^{234}\)

After a number of courses dancing ensued which D’Escouchy implied seemed strange to his French tastes, but he gives no any indication of how or why.\(^{235}\) Leslie’s sixteenth-century commentary refers to a famous banquet ‘quhair any kind of music was nother want nor skant’.\(^{236}\) References to specific provision of music for the wedding are lacking, but expenses can be found for the making of the king’s own ‘gittar’ or ‘gythorn’ in 1448.\(^{237}\) There are also expenses for players at Christmas in 1446 and 1447 at Stirling, and an annual payment to three players/jesters of the king.\(^{238}\) ‘Mimis et histrionibus’\(^{239}\) were provided at least twice at Perth, presumably at the Carthusian Charterhouse royal lodgings, and in 1450 this provision coincided with the general council held there in May of that year.\(^{240}\) These references may not furnish a clear idea of the scale of entertainments and music provided for the wedding, but they at least shed some light on the king’s tastes and the likely nature of the entertainments.

\(^{233}\) Chron. D’Escouchy, 182.
\(^{234}\) Dunlop posits that D’Escouchy emphasises ‘vivid contrast’ between ambition and reality of the Scottish court, but this statement must be tempered by an understanding of the cultural differences that would have flavoured his opinions and observations. See Dunlop, Life and Times of Bishop Kennedy, 102-103.
\(^{235}\) Ibid.
\(^{236}\) Leslie, Historie, 68.
\(^{237}\) ER, Vol. V, 311. [Gittar/ gythorn: Instrument similar to a guitar.]
\(^{238}\) Ibid, 263, 302, 339.
\(^{239}\) Mimes and plays.
\(^{240}\) Ibid, 263, 377-8. As well as the players at Perth at the time of the council, the account refers to payments to the friars of the Charterhouse of the Vale of Virtue received for preparing to receive the king; while charters produced in the May council of 1450 reveal grants of land given to the same religious house, and a further charter stating that it occurred in the friar preacher’s church: RPS, 1450/5/5-6, Charters and Letters (abstracts), Perth, General Council, 12 May 1450.
When Fradenburg briefly raised the wedding ceremony of James II and Mary to emphasise the ceremonial leap that had been taken by the 1507 tournament of the Black Lady, she stated that ‘no solemn joust’ took place for the wedding of 1449. However, following the tournament of February 1449 and Stevenson’s conclusions regarding James II’s determination to prove his independence through dominance of those areas deemed royal, such as chivalry and tournaments, not to mention the spectacular tournament at Bruges provided in the run up to Mary’s departure, it seems unlikely that in the five or six days feasting and celebrating did not include tournaments. It is strange that D’Escouchy does not record a tournament event if one did occur, but his account becomes somewhat vague following the feast. The Exchequer Rolls illuminate expenses for items such as coloured cloth, armour and lances purchased for John Liddale in preparation for a tournament, while a further entry refers to pieces of armour ordered for the king himself, implying his personal involvement. The evidence is by no means infallible proof of a tournament and expense may have proven inhibitive, but the complete absence of any martial display seems highly unlikely in the context of surrounding events particularly as part of the new queen of Scotland’s dowry came in the form of access to weaponry from Burgundy.

The ten thousand strong procession ‘in order of the estates of the realm’ as described by D’Escouchy leading the queen from Leith to Edinburgh shows a ceremonial involvement of the three estates. More curiously, the sixteenth-century chronicler Pitscottie explicitly links the occurrence of a parliament with the wedding, as found frequently following monarch coronations:

The mariege being solemnizet thair was ane parlieament haldin at Edinburgh.
The first parliament, or rather general council, held after the wedding in 1449 was in January 1450 at Perth and was the first of James II’s full majority marking the start of a new relationship between the king and parliament. At this council the charter ‘setting out the earldoms, lordships and other possessions to be provided in payment of the queen’s dowry’ was confirmed by the whole council of the estates. A further charter, regarding the testament of the bishops, draws the new queen consort physically into the functioning of the government in a public act of intercession on behalf of the bishops. Downie has posited that this was stage-managed and predetermined by the king to make a public demonstration of her weaker subordinate status to placate a twitchy political community in the wake of the Livingstone hangings. By default then, this was a prime opportunity for James II to project his importance as the sole giver of pardons and justice, emphasising his new adult royal authority in this his first parliament. However, it also drew the queen into an active relationship with the estates and the king at this crucial turning point. Mary’s presence in the parliament on 25 January to plead on behalf of the bishops does not confirm her attendance on 22 January when the charter of her dower lands was presented, but this would have provided the optimum arena for a public exchange of oaths between queen and estates. The king may have pressed to have the power of the crown placed by proxy in the person of the queen should his life be cut short prematurely, particularly following the murder of his own father and the political eclipse of his mother, by demanding oaths of loyalty to his queen. The retaking of the king’s oaths in parliament in 1445 demonstrated the importance of the recognition of power in a public political space. Thus, fears arising following James I’s elevation of Joan Beaufort may have seen demands for a reciprocal oath from the consort by the estates in response to such a request.

247 The sixteenth-century Pitscottie’s timing of a parliament suggests it was held directly after the marriage, but his chronicle handles time badly on many occasions, grouping together prominent events when nothing of consequence occurs between.
248 RPS, 1450/1/32, Charter: under the great seal (Edinburgh, Parliament, 22 Jan 1450).
249 RPS, 1450/1/34, Charter: under the great seal relating to the right of testament of bishops (Edinburgh, Parliament, 25 Jan 1450).
250 Downie, She is But A Woman, 94-5.
251 See above Chapter 1, Section IV, 59-60; Chapter 2, Section III, 165-7.
This discussion leads rather neatly into one of the most intriguing reference in relation to the ceremonial surrounding Margaret of Denmark’s arrival to Scotland in 1469 to marry James III, which is found in the sixteenth-century Historie of Leslie, Bishop of Ross:

The neist Novembeir is haldne a general Parleame, heir the Quene is crouned: Then the king and Quene with, amaist, al the Nobilitie honorable conuoyet, tuik thair recreatioun through the North of Scotland, with gret gratulatioun, mirrines and Joy of the haile peple […]

The first comment recounts an actual crowning of the queen consort in a general parliament witnessed by the gathered three estates. Other chronicle accounts record that the wedding of James III and Margaret took place at Holyrood; therefore, the implication would be that this was a separate ceremony to the church-bound coronation. Only partial records for the November meeting of parliament in 1469 remain extant, with no evidence remaining to give further details of this the queen’s attendance at parliament. However, Leslie’s proposal that the consort should have received her crown amongst the three estates, at some date after her official ecclesiastical ceremony, suggests that perhaps as with Mary there was the reading of a charter confirming her dower, possibly accompanied by an oath. With only Leslie’s word that Margaret appeared in parliament, such a proposal stands on rather shaky ground. Yet, the fact that the sixteenth-century commentator links a display of the queen in parliament separate from her coronation, combined with the knowledge that Mary certainly appeared in parliament in a staged event, suggests a developing pattern of parliamentary intervention in royal power and a parallel use of the political theatre as an arena for displays of royal authority.

252 In the original Latin the chronicle uses ‘obiverunt’ or ‘made a progress’.
253 Leslie, Historie, 89.
254 BL, Royal MS 17 D XX, f. 307r, Heir is assignyt þe cause quhy oure natioun vas callyt fyrst þe Scottis: a short prose chronicle to 1482, appended to Andrew of Wyntoun, Original Chronicle of Scotland, in verse, with other tracts; Pitscottie, Historie, Vol. I, 161.
255 RPS, 1469/ 1-36, A1649/1-2, Various records (Edinburgh, Parliament, 20–29 November, 1469). The actual confirmation of the charter regarding Margaret’s dowry and the entitlements she has to Scottish lands is not actually made until 13 May 1471 in parliament, again there is unfortunately no indication in the records for this parliament that the queen herself was present at this parliament. RPS, A1471/5/1, Charter: Confirmation [...] of the dowry of Queen Margaret of Denmark (Edinburgh, Parliament, 13 May 1471).
One major hurdle in tracking the further ceremonial elements of the marriage and consort coronation of 1469, as has been apparent for the mid-fifteenth century in each chapter, is the patchy survival of contemporary documentation. Margaret was described as arriving in Scotland with a large and splendid entourage in July, with the increasingly favoured Holyrood Abbey as the location; but there are various suggestions for the date ranging from 10 to 20 July. The official documents regarding the marriage which have survived in Danish archives are fairly standard examples of marriage treaty documents of the era, including a formal diplomatic confirmation from James specifically relating to the dower lands of his queen Margaret, dated 24 July 1469. The reading of letters of the surety of the dower occurred prior to the performance of the nuptials of Mary and James II in 1449. If the same ceremonial declaration was made in Margaret and James III’s wedding ceremony, this official version may have been read at the ceremony before being delivered to the King of Denmark by the bishops of Glasgow and Orkney, the earl of Arran and Lord Avandale, the Chancellor. The fifteenth-century consort regalia is rarely brought to light, except for a ‘grete round ball [...] of silver overgilt’ was recorded amongst the inventory of treasure recovered in 1488, recorded in lists specifically relating to the queen, which may have been an orb used in the ceremony. A covering of purple cloth embroidered with unicorn and thistle decorations, with a roof and pendicles, was also recorded and suggests a canopy for either a throne or bed of state. In addition, the inventory lists the ‘surples of the rob royall’ or the white linen vestments that the queen would have worn during her anointing. This simple item is the first firm reference to a

256 See above Introduction, 13-20; and Dean, ‘Enter the Alien,’ where the same issues are faced in regards to discussions regarding royal entry of Margaret of Denmark.
257 BL, Royal MS 17 D XX, f. 307r; Leslie, Historie, 89; Pitscottie, Historie, Vol. I, 161. The MS dates the wedding to 13 July, Leslie states 10 July, and Pitscottie dates Margaret’s arrival and marriage as 20 July (1473). The MS was one a number of ‘other’ tracts accompanying a version of Wyntoun’s chronicle dated to the late fifteenth century due to its last dated entry. The chroniclers were written in sixteenth century and Pitscottie is often confused when it comes to dating in the reigns of James III and IV; however, these are the only chronicle accounts to record the event with any additional detail.
259 Pendicles: cloth in the manner of a valance.
261 Ibid.
Scottish queen being anointed in her coronation, and if Margaret of Denmark was the first it is reasonable to posit that her status as the daughter of a king determined this decision.262

In preparation for the match, the parliament of January 1468 recorded that a tax of approximately £3,000 was to be levied equally from the three estates to send an ambassador to Denmark to treat for the union.263 The embassy was made up of high powered figures such as the bishops of Glasgow and Orkney, the earl of Arran, Lord Avandale, Martin Wan the king’s secretary, Gilbert the archdeacon of Glasgow and David Crichton, sheriff of Edinburgh.264 Although the records do not provide a breakdown of the expenses for 1467/8, the extant Treasurer’s Accounts surviving for sixteen months from 1473 to 1474 reveal details of the manner in which royal authority was projected through ambassadorial interaction in this period. Despite Stevenson’s conclusions regarding James III’s apparent personal lack of interest in martial sports and chivalric activity,265 the heraldic developments of previous reigns continued and heralds are frequently mentioned in these financial accounts in this short period travelling both within the realm and beyond it.266 These heralds and other ‘front-of-house’ officials, such as henchmen and trumpeters, were well supplied with symbols of status. For example, the Snowdon herald was gifted a damask gown and paid a significant fee for his journey to meet the Holy Roman Emperor on behalf of the Scottish king. There does not seem to be a specific set of royal household livery colours at this point, but groups are matched in similar coloured items and purchases were made of gold leaf to decorate the coats of arms of heralds and the banners

262 While no crown is listed in the inventory, it is probable that the young queen, who died in July 1486 (two years before the treasure was found and recorded in 1488) was buried with her crown.
263 APS, Vol. II, 90; RPS, 1468/1/2-3, Legislation (Stirling, Parliament, 12 January 1468). The act recorded actually refers to ‘ane ambassador’ in 1467. The known total of money raised for Princess Isabella in 1440s was £130, £50 from the Exchequer to an ambassador and an additional £80 raised from Aberdeen, even if other burghs had donated sums this total less than 30 years later suggests a significant ambassadorial entourage: ACA, CA/1/1/5 (2), ff. 666, 689-90; Extracts Aberdeen, Vol. I, 7-10. The value of coinage fluctuated between 1440s and 1470s but not substantially, see above Note on Money, xii-xiv.
264 SAC, a-1, 1468 9 8; b-1, 1468 7 28; b-3, 1469 7 24, Konghuset Christian I., Princesse Margarethe: Pergamentsbreve 1468–1469. (a-1 is a Danish copy of the final treaty with seals and lists bishops of Glasgow and Orkney, Arran and Avandale, Martin Wan [the king’s confessor?], Gilbertus de Rerik archdeacon of Glasgow, David Creichton of Cranstoun, and John Schaw); ER, Vol. VIII, xl.
265 Stevenson, Chivalry and Knighthood, 82-5.
for trumpeters. Both the Lyon herald and the Unicorn pursuivant appear more frequently in this reign, as did the heraldic symbols they would have borne. The lion rampant had become synonymous with the Scottish crown and the Lyon herald the main advocate. The Lyon herald who travelled to London in 1474 likely bore a variation on the commonly recognised heraldic arms. An act of 1472 demanded the removal of the fleur-de-lys that framed the top of the arms ‘indicating in clear iconographical terms the statement that there was no power higher in Scotland than the Scottish crown.’ The Unicorn pursuivant first appeared in the reign of James I, and the gorged unicorn image – representative of the ability of the crown to tame the proud mythical beast – quickly became an important and prominent symbol of Scottish royal authority in the reign of James III. Heraldic badges and livery was increasingly common, and evermore politically fuelled, as the fifteenth century progressed; therefore, there was an ever great need to glorify the symbolic emblems of royal power with rich dressings of gold to reestablish the monarchical supremacy that they expressed.

The marriage contract forged between Cecilia, second daughter of Edward IV, and Prince James, son and heir of James III offers further insights into this king’s forays into marriage diplomacy and display. James III selected an impressive embassy – including Thomas Spens, bishop of Aberdeen, John Colquhoun of Luss (the Chamberlain), James Shaw of Sauchie and the Lyon King of Arms – to journey south to treat with the English in August

267 Ibid, lvi, pp. 50, 55-63. Such as white and blue items purchased for trumpeters, henchman purchased blue gowns specifically for parliament, while the officers of the queen’s chamber sport russet, tanny and green clothing.

268 Contrary to popular belief, Stevenson has highlighted that the Lyon herald had not always been the principal herald as during the early fifteenth century the Rothesay herald was recorded as the King of Arms: ‘Jurisdiction, Authority and Professionalisation’, pp. 45-6.


270 Stevenson, ‘The Unicorn, St Andrew and the Thistle’, 12; McAndrew, Scotland’s Historic Heraldry, 275-6. The first Scottish coinage to illustrate the collared and chained unicorn occurred later in the reign of James III (c. 1484/5): see Stewart, Scottish Coinage, 62, 141. See Plate 31.

271 Adrian Ailes discusses the prominence and pervasion of heraldic badges and livery in England in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, commenting on the increased political value of such symbols in times of war and contested accession (such as the wars of the roses): ‘Heraldry in Medieval England’, 85-104.

272 Prince James (later James IV) was born in the summer 1473, a couple of month prior to the start of the extant Treasurer’s Account, Vol. I.
The union was decided with relative speed and a proxy marriage took place in Edinburgh ‘in the low chamber of the Friars Preachers’ on 26 October 1474 with David Lindesay, earl of Crawford, acting as the proxy for the baby prince and John Lord Scrope as proxy for the infant Cecilia. Thomas Yare, the King’s Steward, received various payments for expenses accrued during the English embassy’s visit, as did the Dominicans of Edinburgh, who housed the ambassadors at Blackfriars. As during his father’s reign, there was an increased focus on Edinburgh for ceremonial events, adding weight to the centring of attention upon the burgh as an administrative capital posited for James III’s reign.

During the interactions surrounding the betrothal of 1474, a gown of cloth of gold lined with white satin is recorded, amongst other things, as being gifted to the English herald. Gift giving was also prominent in the relations with Denmark. The inventory of jewels of 1488 records an Order of the Elephant jewel – the symbol of the chivalric order of the Danish king – which it has been suggested was given to James III as part of the ceremonies celebrating the union. Following the wedding the Danish envoy present at James’s court at Yule in 1474 received a collar from the king, which may have been one of the first chains of thistles. Despite a lack of material, what remains suggests that visual symbols of wealth and expressions of royal grandeur were understood and exploited in high profile ambassadorial interactions by the adult James III. Such use of visual magnificence was nothing new for the Scots, but the most recent historiography considering James III’s reign argues that such gestures of opulence

---

273 CDS, Vol. IV, no. 1414; it also lists the English ambassadors licensed by Edward to treat with the Scots: Lawrence, bishop of Durham; Edward, bishop of Carlisle; Sir John Scrope and John Dudley (knights); and Master John Russell, archdeacon of Berkshire and Keeper of the Privy Seal. See Macdougall for more on James III foreign policy: James III, particularly 110-25.

274 NAS, SP6/23, Indenture between English and Scottish commissioners prolonging the truce to 1519 [...] and to include the treaty of marriage between James, son and heir of James III, and Cecilia, daughter of King Edward IV, Edinburgh (26 Oct 1474); CDS, Vol. IV, no. 1417; there are also further ratifications and obligations recorded in the calendar of documents, nos. 1418-25 and NAS, SP6/24, Obligation by King Edward IV for payment of sum of 20,000 merks in name of dowry on the marriage of Cecilia to James, son and heir of James III, Westminster (26 Nov 1474).


276 Fradenburg, City, Marriage, Tournament, 20-34; Macdougall, James III.


278 Ibid, 81; A collection of inventories, 6; Macdougall, James III, 82.


280 The thistle rapidly became a further prominent symbol of Scottish royal authority and was found on coinage from c.1470: Stewart, Scottish Coinage, 60-61; McAndrew, Scotland’s Historical Heraldry, 275. See Plate 32.
had solid ideological foundation. The European Renaissance, underpinned by humanist ideologies and a revival of classical antiquity, was well underway by the fifteenth century and this movement in Scotland had strong foundations dating back at least to James I.\textsuperscript{281}

In 1469 James III was still a young monarch, aged seventeen, and he was undoubtedly heavily influenced and guided by councillors around him. These men included advocates of the ideological and cultural movements inspired by the continent, such as Archibald Whitelaw and William Scheves,\textsuperscript{282} who would leave their mark on the king perhaps most notably in regards to imperialist notions of greatness. The marriage marked a monumental moment on Scottish history: not only did it mark the end of James’s minority through a prestigious foreign match in the context of Edward IV’s secret marriage to the widow of an English squire, but it also provided the final jigsaw piece in the consolidation of the realm as Orkney was granted to Scotland in place of the promised monetary dowry.\textsuperscript{283} This would have lent a significant symbolic weight to the northern progress which followed and to the act of parliament of 1469 that stated that the king had a ‘fre impire within his realm’.\textsuperscript{284} Such ideals would have been brought vividly to life through ceremonial display with such advisers as were involved in 1469.


\textsuperscript{282} Archibald Whitelaw, archdeacon of Lothian and sub-dean of Glasgow, educated at St Andrews and Cologne, was royal secretary from 1462 to 1493 and undertook the role of tutor to James III. His surviving library reveals the extent of interest in classical humanist learning and his long service at the heart of the Scottish court has been proposed as one of the key factors in the entrenching of humanist rhetoric in the Scottish chancery. See particularly: Mason, ‘Laiisation and the Law,’ 14-17. Mason provides numerous references for both bibliographical information on Whitelaw, as well as works discussing his library (See 14-15, fn.58-9). William Scheves was later Archbishop of St Andrews, trusted councillor and a follower of the Albertist school of theology, as was Whitelaw, supporting realist ideas of hierarchical political structure rather than nominalist ideas of conciliarism. See also Tanner, ‘James III (1460 – 1488)’, 215-19.

\textsuperscript{283} Laynesmith, \textit{Last Medieval Queens}, 35-47.

\textsuperscript{284} RPS, 1469/20, Legislation (Parliament, Edinburgh, 20 Nov 1469); \textit{ER}, Vol. VIII, 80-6, 131; Leslie, \textit{Historie}, Vol. II, 89. See also: Dean, ‘Enter the Alien’.
James III struggled to master such tools of representation in later life and failed to gain support for his foreign policy, particularly in relation to England, but he laid the foundations for the marriage of his son whose handling of public display saw the ideologies of these Renaissance men brought to fruition with spectacular results.

On St Paul’s Day, 25 January 1502, at Henry VII’s royal manor of Richmond, the earl of Bothwell – on behalf of James IV – and the young Margaret Tudor exchanged wedding vows in a proxy ceremony that sealed the Treaty of Perpetual Peace between Scotland and England. The following December James IV ‘swore on the sacrament to observe the treaties of peace and marriage’ in the cathedral of Glasgow in the presence of Robert, archbishop of Glasgow, Andrew, bishop of Moray, Robert abbot of Paisley, and six other witnesses, and ratified the treaty.  

The ceremonial events that ensued from January 1502 until the wedding and coronation in August 1503 are recorded across a range of sources, and the intricately detailed account of the Somerset Herald, John Young, has formed the backbone to studies from a variety of disciplines considering various aspects of this union. James IV was the first adult Scottish king to marry within his own realm since David II’s marriage to Margaret Logie in 1363. By 1503 the symbols of Scottish royal authority were well developed and the Stewart dynasty had reigned for over 130 years. In comparison, Henry VII’s Tudor dynasty was a fledgling one,

---

285 NAS, SP6/29, Indenture on treaty of perpetual peace (24 Jan 1501-2); NAS, SP6/31, Ratification by Henry VII of indenture of treaty of Perpetual Peace (31 Oct 1502) [Accessed as a ‘virtual volume’ at NAS]; TNA, E39/92/12, Treaty of perpetual peace (24 January 1502); TNA, E39/92/18, Treaty of marriage between the King of Scots and the Princess Margaret. (24 Jan 1501-2); TNA, E39/79, Confirmation by James, King of Scots, of the dowry of Queen Margaret (6 June 1503); TNA, E39/81, Similar ratification (17 Dec 1502); TNA, E39/2/28, Notarial attestation of the exchange of ratifications (20 December 1502); CDS, Vol. IV, nos. 1690-7. [Documents NAS, SP6/31 and TNA, E39/81 are both beautiful examples of highly ornate treaty ratification documents; the ratification of James IV held at TNA though worn by age has an ornate letter ‘J’ in red with gold leaf and is adorned with flowers, crown and the Scottish coat-of-arms. See Plate 34.  

286 Fyancells MS, ff.75-115v; Fyancells Coll., 258-300. The printed version (Fyancells Coll.) has some discrepancies from the original manuscript, but on the whole these are minor. A full discussion of this document must be reserved for elsewhere; however, where the differences are relevant they are noted. Secondary studies: Everett Green, Lives of the Princesses of England, Vol. IV, 54-110; Fradenburg, City, Marriage, Tournament, particularly 67-152; Gray, ‘The Royal Entry in Sixteenth-Century Scotland’, 16-22; Barrow, ‘the Kyngse sent to the Qwene, by a Gentylman, a grett tame Hart’, 65-84; Carpenter, ‘Thexaltacyon of Noblesse’, 104-120; Dean, ‘Enter the Alien’.  

287 While the other fifteenth-century kings entered their majority at the point of their marriage, they were still some years off their official majority (at which point they could revoke actions undertaken during their minorities); whereas, James IV was thirty when he married.
following victory at Bosworth in 1488 less than two decades earlier. Moreover, the match itself – roughly pursuing the revamped policy of James III – was considered to be of a ‘brittle nature’. All these factors combined demanded that this Scottish ceremonial display surpassed all that had come before to truly demonstrate the longevity and majesty of the Stewart dynasty to compete with the wealthier, yet comparatively adolescent Tudor dynasty.

The Scottish ambassadors arrived in London around the time of the wedding between Prince Arthur and Katherine of Aragon in November 1501, one of the most glorious ceremonial projections of dynastic stability undertaken by Henry VII. The ambassadors, led by Robert Blackadder, Archbishop of Glasgow, and Earl Bothwell, were received by generous hosts, while London celebrated the proxy marriage by lighting great fires around the city and providing a hogshead of wine at each fire. The proxy ceremony – attended by nobles, lords, prelates and ladies of the court, as well as ambassadors from Rome, Spain, Venice and France – was followed by feasting and the exchanging of gifts, possibly including a portrait of James IV as Henry VII sent portraits of himself, his family and Margaret in September 1502. The earl Bothwell’s wedding robe was gifted to the English officers of arms, echoing James III’s gift of a gown of cloth of gold to an English herald in 1474, and Henry VII provided extravagant gifts of gold and silver plate to the Archbishop of Glasgow and the earl. And so the competition began.

---


292 *TA*, Vol. II, xxix, 341, 405. The last payment in December of 1503 suggests the painter remained in Scotland over a year, and was possibly employed in the court. It is unknown whether the portraits that were exchanged survive. Of five known surviving portraits of James IV, at least two are later copies from earlier paintings, but the portrait of James holding a falcon (found on the cover of Macdougall’s *James IV*) has been dated c. 1500. See J.L. Caw, ‘Portraits of the First Five Jameses’, *SHR*, Vol. VII, no. 26 (January 1910), 113-18; D. MacMillan, *Scottish Art, 1460–1990* (Edinburgh, 1990), 29-30.

293 *Fyancells Coll.*, 258-264; *Fyancells MS* (held in the College of Arms and consulted by author) does not include the proxy ceremony. The MS version that Hearne’s account derives from was that owned by ‘John Anstis, Garter King of Arms, and now Houghton Library, Harvard, MS English 1095’. See P. Bawcutt, ‘A Note on the Term of “Morality”’, *Medieval English Theatre*, Vol. 28 (2006), 171-2.
The ceremonial display of 1503 can be split into four parts: Margaret’s journey northwards to Scotland, orchestrated by her father Henry VII; the meetings and interactions of the Scottish and English parties at Dalkeith; the royal entry to Edinburgh; and the wedding and coronation combined ceremony on 8 August 1503, with the latter forming the core of the discussion here. Carpenter highlights that the northward journey was organised by Henry VII to provide ‘appropriate spectacle that would demonstrate royal magnificence wherever she passed.’ Margaret’s entourage was quite literally a walking statement of Tudor royal authority; for example, items made for two footmen of the Queen in May 1503 included two jackets of green cloth of gold and white – the Tudor colours – decorated ‘with crowned portcullises’ – a Tudor emblem.

After a final royal entry at Berwick on 30 July, the first Scottish return show of power and wealth was created by the large welcoming party sent to meet Margaret at the church of St Lambert in Lamermure, not unlike the gathering orchestrated at harbours of Leith for Mary of Guelders and probably Margaret of Denmark. This party was led by the archbishop of Glasgow, who advanced to the sound of trumpets from pavilions erected and likely adorned with royal arms, with the gathered lords, knights, gentlemen and squires, some of whom supported coats of arms on their velvet, damask and silken attire, to kneel before their new queen as a sign of reverence. These coats of arms were presumably royal but could equally have included various noble arms as a show of solidarity and support. The combined entourage went via Haddington to Dalkeith where the queen was housed with Lord and Lady Morton at

294 Carpenter, ‘Thexaltacyon of Noblesse’, 107; Fyancells MS, ff. 76v-91r; Fyancells Coll., 266-78. The entourage went to all the following towns between Richmond and Berwick: Collewesont [sic], Grantham, Newart, Sirowsby [sic], Doncaster, Pontefrac, Tadcaster, York, Newbrough, Allerton [Northallerton?], Hexham, Darnton, Durham, Newcastle, Morpeth, Alnwick and Berwick.

295 TNA, E101/415/7, f. 122, King’s Remembrancer: Wardrobe and Household: Documents subsidiary to accounts of the great wardrobe (22 Aug 1501–21 Aug 1503); Fyancells MS, f. 78r and Fyancells Coll., 267. The warrants give a great deal of information on the expenses and preparation; see TNA, E101/415/7, ff. 91-2, 95-9, 104-5, 107-22, 138, 141, some of these can also be found printed in CDS, Vol. IV, nos. 1715-7, 1720-7. Many of these warrants can be cross referenced with the account of Fyancells MS, ff. 76v-78v; Fyancells Coll., 266-8. NB. Carpenter has highlighted how the musicians accompanying the entourage can be located in the warrants, ‘Thexaltacyon of Noblesse’, 107-8, fn. 12.

296 Dean, ‘Enter the Alien’; Fyancells MS, ff. 90r-91v; Fyancells Coll., 278-9.

Dunbarton. Here the king himself made his first appearance accompanied by sixty horse, including his brother the Archbishop of St Andrews and the earls of Argyll, Lennox and Huntly:

\[...\] the Kynge cam arayd of a Jakette of Cramfyn Velvet bordered with cloth of Gold \[...\]^298

The manner in which Young describes the clothing, Carpenter proposes, ‘goes well beyond a naïve interest in the glamour of luxury and high fashion’ to reveal a contemporary’s understanding of the self-display and performance that were central facets of the ‘noblesse’ of society in the early sixteenth century.299

The interactions at Dalkeith between the king and the queen centred around music and performance with both king and queen taking part in the informal performances, both together and more often as performances for each other. There are various comments about the informality of the Scottish king and his court in comparison to English manners. Acts such as James IV jumping onto his horse without putting his foot in his stirrup were perhaps viewed as impetuous. Yet, his actions reflected an urgent desire for this royal lady’s approval emphasising his role as ardent lover rather than sovereign king, like his frequent reverential actions putting her honour above that of his own.300 Prior to the formal entry to Edinburgh a prologue of scenes take place outside the city that build upon this image of James IV and the chivalric themes of valour and love. The pre-entry pageantry further utilised cross-court shared interests and symbolism, including a joust settled by the king to emphasise his role as overseer of justice and a hart that was chased toward the city by the king, queen and earl of Surrey. The couple entered the city of Edinburgh on one horse – the queen’s ‘palfray’ – in a further act to emphasise their

^298 Fyancells MS, ff. 95r; Fyancells Coll., 283; TA, Vol. II, 210. The comparisons between Young’s account and TA records has proven a fruitful method of confirming the details of the former; a method, it has been discovered since undertaking these comparisons, also used to a lesser extent by Carpenter, ‘Thexaltacyon of Noblesse’, 108-9.

^299 Ibid, 104-20, quote 106.

^300 Fradenburg, City, Marriage, Tournament, 102-5; Carpenter, ‘Thexaltacyon of Noblesse’, 111-15; Barrow, ‘the Kynge sent to the Owene’, 74. This incident, along with more detailed discussions regarding James’s ‘performance’ throughout the occasion are found in all these works; however, in the latter – by Barrow – there is a complete contrast in the understanding of the action in which James leaps on his horse without the aid of his stirrup. Fradenburg and Carpenter highlight how this emphasises his role as the chivalrous lover by his undertaking a hurried action that was not usually attempted, but Barrow states that this was an act expected of any knight.
union. All the interaction and emphasis on the couple found in 1503 flags up a key difference between the adult James IV and the minor James II, as there is no evidence to suggest that the latter was involved in the initial entry prior to his first official meeting with his queen at Holyrood. The entry to Edinburgh itself included innovations, such as Scotland’s first triumphal arches and classical pageants; however, there was a marked prominence of reverence to relics and religious symbology within the entry pageantry and procession.

The royal entry came to a spectacular climax on 8 August at Holyrood Abbey in a ceremony that combined the wedding and the coronation of Margaret as found for Mary of Guelders fifty years earlier. Young’s account of the wedding day opens by immediately emphasising the high female presence with richly dressed ladies gathered to ‘hold company to the said Quene’. The English ambassadors and gentlemen of the estates of Scotland gathered in the king’s chamber where he sat in a crimson velvet chair with a blue cloth of estate figured with gold, most likely sporting the developed arms design – with the chained unicorns supporting the imperially-crowned armoured helmet and shield of the lion rampant surrounded by the collar of thistles with a St Andrew pendant – found in the Book of Hours c. 1503/4. Before this veritable feast of heraldic symbology stating Stewart royal authority ‘every Man dyd reverence to the king’. However, the king appears to have been uncrowned throughout this procedure. The queen was given a gold crown decorated with pearls which was worn upon a long rich ‘coyfe’ over her loose hair. As with her predecessor, Mary of Guelders, Margaret was led into the church by ambassadors of her own realm, the archbishop of York and earl of Surrey. The countess of Surrey carried the train of her white gown flowered with gold and bordered with crimson velvet, followed by noble ladies in groups of four, with two Scottish and

301 *Fyancells MS*, ff. 95r-101v; *Fyancells Coll.*, 283-8; Fradenburg, 102-105; Gray, ‘The Royal Entry’, 16-7; Carpenter, 111-16; Barrow, 74-8.


303 Österreichische Nationalbibliothek, Cod.1897; see Plate 22 (on the altar cloth in the image of ‘James at Prayer’ and Plate 35 (full plate of arms).

304 *Fyancells MS*, ff. 106r; *Fyancells Coll.*, 292.
two English side by side.\textsuperscript{305} The Scottish prelates led by the archbishop of Glasgow preceded the king, who entered accompanied by his brother, archbishop of St Andrews, and the royal Stewards, Chamberlain, Constable and Marischal all carrying the staffs of office in a potent ecclesiastical and royal display. As with James II half a century earlier, the only part of the king’s regalia mentioned was the sword of honour, which had received new purple velvet to wrap the handle and a new sheath, embroidered with pearls and gold silk thread, and was carried down by Lord Hamilton in front of the king.\textsuperscript{306} In addition to the multitude of items purchased for the couple themselves, the king spent huge amounts on clothing for attending nobles, courtiers, household officials and servants, including musicians, henchmen, and heralds. The latter received red taffeta and gold coats of arms for the ceremonies further amplifying the symbols and colours of royal authority that permeated every inch of the church.\textsuperscript{307}

Trumpets sounded in joy to conclude the marriage ceremony followed immediately by the coronation,\textsuperscript{308} as in 1449. The king, now bare-headed, led his wife to the high altar where they knelt on cushions of cloth of gold to hear the opening ‘oraysons’ and litany sung by the archbishop of Glasgow. The king and queen sat on chairs placed at either side of the altar to hear the Mass, and made offerings during the gospel, an act traceable back to David II and probably present much earlier.\textsuperscript{309} There was no suggestion that the king was placed physically higher in this seating arrangement as related for the English ceremony.\textsuperscript{310} It was after this that the queen was anointed. While Young does not provide details about where the oil was placed

\textsuperscript{306} Fyancells MS, f. 107r; Fyancells Coll., 293; TA, Vol. II, 206-7. While the crown was not worn by the king in the ceremony, there was work undertaken on it around this time.
\textsuperscript{307} Ibid, 306-13, 341; ACA, CA/1/1/8, f. 239, Council, Baillie and Guild Court Book, Vol. VIII. The accounts also indicate – particularly the burgh records from Aberdeen – that anyone who had received orders to attend had also received instructions to be dressed in their best.
\textsuperscript{308} There was no reference from Young regarding the exchange of rings, and the order of events meant that there would not have been any exchange of vows or rings at the door; however, after the wedding Margaret is given a number of gold items including a hart (reflecting the pre-entry chase) and three ‘litill ringis of gold’.
\textsuperscript{309} Ibid, Vol. II, 385; Fyancells MS, ff. 107v-108r; Fyancells Coll., 294.
\textsuperscript{310} Parsons, ‘Ritual and Queenship in the English Medieval Queenship to 1500’, 63-4; Laynesmith, Last Medieval Queens, 103.
upon her or the prayers said, for the first time the consort’s anointing is explicitly referred to. Moreover the investiture of the queen with a sceptre occurs.\footnote{Parsons and Laynesmith both discuss that a sceptre was given to English queens from at least the fourteenth century, but she was presented with this item by the celebrant. See also for Marian symbology of floriated sceptre linking it to intercession and other symbolic meanings, although it must be pointed out that floriated sceptres were also used by kings: Parsons, ‘Ritual and Queenship in the English Medieval Queenship to 1500’, 64-5; Laynesmith, \textit{Last Medieval Queens}, 104-107.} The action of presenting the queen with this symbol of royal power, particularly connected to justice and fair rule, was undertaken by the king rather than a prelate. This practice, not found elsewhere,\footnote{Leslie, \textit{History}, 73. This statement cannot be located in the 1888 two volume version of Leslie, nor in the Latin version \textit{De Origine Moribus, et Rebus Gestis Scotorum Libri Decem} (Rome, 1578) from which it was translated. Cody (editor of 1888 volumes) highlights that the one volume version, in which the statement is found, was based on the earliest known manuscripts of Leslie’s \textit{History}, once in the possession of the Earl of Leven and Melville, thought to have been completed in 1569. See E.G. Cody’s introduction to Leslie, \textit{Historie}, xviii-xxii. This has been taken as fact in some cases: Everett Green, \textit{Lives of the Princesses}, Vol. IV, 19; Barrow, ‘the Kynge sent to the Qwene’, 72, fn. 25.} made a visual confirmation of her role in assisting the king in matters of justice and the proxy powers she gained through him that was sought in the oaths proposed in the case of Mary of Guelders and Margaret of Denmark. Two prelates then held ‘the Cloth upon them’ and the \textit{Te Deum} was sung by ‘syngars of the kingis chapell’.\footnote{Fyancells \textit{MS}, f. 108r. This reference does not appears in the printed version.} There is no evidence to suggest that the young queen was re-robed into a ‘rob ryall’ as found in Mary’s ceremony prior to her coronation, although in Margaret Tudor’s case such a redressing would presumably take place after her anointing.

The church ceremony does not appear to have involved any kind of oath, although the point of anointing would have been apposite. However, John Leslie’s \textit{History of Scotland} states the following:

Sone eftir the mariage of the Kinge wes compleit, he caused convene the three estatis of the realme, and held a parliament, in the quhilk the Quene his wiffe was crowned [...]\footnote{Fyancells \textit{MS}, f. 108r. This reference does not appears in the printed version.}

The fact that there is no corroborating evidence from Young for this statement would suggest it should be overlooked; however, the first parliament following the union in March 1504 saw the production of charters and other documents regarding the fulfilment of Margaret’s marriage...
dower and confirmation of her morning gift. 315 Parliamentary records do not confirm Margaret’s attendance explicitly, but the king’s royal robe and crown underwent work in preparation for the event and the queen was made a ‘gret goun’ of white and gold damask.316 In the context of the other queens discussed, this would appear to be a recurring theme and further emphasises the role of parliament in the ratification of royal power.

Returning to the events of 8 August 1503, the evening entertainments began with a feast in the royal chambers. The king and queen ate not only at separate tables but in separate richly decorated chambers, with each chamber filled to the brim with guests seated in order of rank. The descriptions and financial accounts record the rich furnishings in royal colours of the queen’s chamber, with huge quantities of blue, red and purple velvet along with £400 worth of cloth of gold used for the queen’s chamber and bed of state, which stood prominent in the room. 317 Margaret sat beneath a gold cloth of state presumably showing the English and Scottish arms impaled. The king too had a cloth of estate made but refused to sit under it out of reverence for his queen, who was also served before him at every course,318 revealing determined gestures made by James in honour of his new wife amidst the barrage of Scottish royal symbolism. The officers of arms – again sporting the lion rampant if not a more complex version of the royal arms – entered before the food and the queen was served by the English lords. Young comments gushingly on the honourable order and large numbers of Scottish officers that made the event a ‘fayre thing to se’. Such uniformed officials were crucial to the smooth running of the event, and this seamless order was as important as more elaborate forms of display for it demonstrated authority at a more rudimentary but essential level.319 The dinner included three courses, the first included a wild boar’s head as the centrepiece reminiscent of 1449, after the second course the ‘Pryncypal Herald’ cried ‘Largesse’ to the queen’s name, and

317 Ibid, 213-14; Fyancells MS, f. 108v, and Fyancells Coll., 295.
318 The two cloths of estate cost £438, 18s. TA, Vol. II, 213.
319 Fyancells MS, ff. 111v-112r. This reference was only found in the original manuscript, not in printed version.
the last course – according to the *London Chronicle* – included jellies with the arms of Scotland, the arms of England and others with their joint arms which may have been painted on with gold leaf and ‘colours for food’. The music for subsequent dancing was provided by both English and Scots minstrels and trumpeters, further demonstrating the visual and now aural harmony of the union. After Evensong and supper the king changed out of his wedding attire and gifted his wedding gown to the English herald, as the Earl of Bothwell had done during the proxy ceremony, echoing James III’s gift to the English herald thirty years earlier.

The day following the wedding provided a lull in the entertainments with the king and his entourage attending Mass without the queen. Although the entourage and viewers of this ritual would have been significantly smaller, the king was recorded wearing one of his most outrageously expensive outfits. The robe of cloth of gold lined with black furs cost in excess of £650, more than three times the wedding attire for the couple combined. In addition he wore a crimson doublet, black and gold hose, and a jewel of St George and the dragon (the former being gold and the latter ruby); therefore, overtly displaying a symbol synonymous with English royalty rather than Scottish. After letting his new queen have the initial limelight, James IV appears to have taken this opportunity to reveal a whole new scale of opulence with a day of display that focused solely on him. The following days until 13 August witnessed further daily attendance at Mass, the dubbing of forty-one knights, the belting of three earls, jousting...

---

320 *Great Chronicle of London*, 323-5. The ‘colours for food’ reference relates back to David II marriage to Joan, see: above Chapter 3, Section I, 234.
321 The minstrels may have included the Italian troupe of minstrels discussed by Helena Shire (present at the court c. 1502–c. 1548): H.M. Shire, ‘Music for the ‘Goddis Glore and the Kingis’’, in Williams (ed.), *Stewart Style*, 119-121.
323 *Fyancells MS*, ff. 110v-111r; *Fyancells Coll.*, 297.
325 James IV’s mother Margaret of Denmark is depicted in the Trinity Altar piece alongside a saint who has been identified as St George, due to the red and white cross he holds, although the national patron saint of Denmark is Cnut. Thompson and Campbell note that the use of St George may be linked to the fact that the Trinity Altar piece was destined for the Trinity College dedicated to St George rather than any specific connection to St George through Margaret’s Danish heritage: Thompson and Campbell, *Hugo Van der Goes*, 11-13. For more on St George in Scotland and popular devotions from aristocracy and burgesses, see: Boardman, ‘The Cult of St George in Scotland’, in Boardman, J.R. Davies and E. Williamson (eds), *Saints’ Cults in the Celtic World* (Woodbridge, 2009), 146-59.
326 For the king the attendance is daily and often for both a morning and evening service; however, the queen’s attendance is less, she seems to attend only two of the five days.
tournaments, and indoor entertainments including music, dancing, feasting and at least one
morality play.\footnote{Fyancells MS, f. 112r-115v, Fyancells Coll., 297-300. For the play in particular see: f. 115r and 300; Mill, Medieval Plays, 14-15. Mill has also highlights the possible link between the musical of ‘thre gysaris’ and the play revealed in the TA, Vol. II, 387; Fradenburg, City, Marriage, Tournament, 175. Fradenburg discusses these tournaments and their development from earlier events at great length: City, Marriage, Tournament, 173-264. Fyancells MS, f. 112v-114v; Fyancells Coll., 298-9. Referred to in regards to the layout of the palace during James IV’s reconstructions prior to the wedding in: Dunbar, Scottish Royal Palaces, 59. See plate 35 (more detail on caption).} The chivalric nature of the opening events was mirrored and expanded upon in the post-wedding entertainments, as were the generosity and religiosity of the hosting king.

The descriptions of these martial displays do not indicate that they were of the complex
‘stage-managed’ type that would be found in the Wild Knight and Black Lady tournaments of 1507/8.\footnote{For example: £953, 10s. 8d. was spent on the English entourage of the queen, and housing and feeding the English and Scots lords in Haddington, Dalkeith, Newbattle and Edinburgh. ER, Vol. XII, 181-2} While these later complex displays were a development rather than a repeat of 1503, many aspects of Margaret’s arrival and the marriage were tightly ‘stage-managed’ and the viewing of these tournaments reveals an understanding of how the interactions between indoor and outdoor spaces could be manipulated. The jousts were held before the palace and the royal couple watched separately from the windows of their great chambers. Some of the guests watched from alongside either the king or queen, or from a scaffold that appears to have been built below the windows, while others – such as officers and trumpeters – observed from alongside the action.\footnote{TA, Vol. II, 384-91; ACA, CA/1/1/8, f. 241.} The arrangements suggest that the structures provided viewing platforms tiered by status or level of access to the monarchs.

Over the entire duration of the events the costs were staggering, including: £1,142, 10s. 6d. spent on spices and chandlery; £2,278, 2 shillings spent on wine; and near £1,000 spent on housing the English guests.\footnote{} The scale of the entertainments was equally vast with the equipment for jousts and other martial sports, including over 200 jousting spears; gifts purchased for English attendees; and payments for a wide variety of musicians – from English minstrels and Scottish trumpeters to the Aberdeen pipers and minstrels paid to travel to ‘our soverane lords marriage, at commaunde of his hienes and to the plesour of his maieste’.\footnote{}}
fact that James IV did not want to be interpreted as the lesser part in this union was visibly expressed through the effort and expense put into the arrival and ceremonial for his queen.

The evidence for 1503 is far more complete than for James IV’s father and grandfather, but similar concerns were certainly found for all three and James I in the entertainment of French ambassadors. There was a constant underlying tension between aspiration to foreign standards of extravagant glory and monarchical elevation, the ability to finance such extravagances, and the retaining of the Scottish aspects. The marriages of Scottish royals in the fifteenth century were prime opportunities for display on a European stage. The dual wedding and coronation ceremony occurred for three successive foreign consorts, and it is clear that Scottish queens were married and crowned indoors from at least 1449, with Holyrood Abbey favoured as the ceremonial setting. The act of anointing a Scottish consort was not recorded explicitly until 1503, but the white vestments for Margaret of Denmark imply it occurred in 1469, and that the royal status of these two women dictated the inclusion of this ceremonial element, if it had not previously occurred. The king it would appear – at least in the case of James II and James IV – did not wear a crown or carry any regalia other than the sword of honour during the ceremonies for consorts. Nevertheless, there was certainly a growing emphasis, epitomized by James IV investing Margaret Tudor with the sceptre, on consort regalia that accentuated her regal status and duties to act alongside the king in matters of justice and peace, or even in his stead when necessary, particularly on behalf of an heir. A second crowning in parliament, in the context of an increasing role of the estates in monarchical power and ceremony more broadly, would suggest a determined reaction of the wider polity to these assertions of mature adult kingship which accompanied the marriage ceremonies. The expansion of Scottish horizons in regards to matrimonial partners caused a veritable explosion of ambassadorial interaction, which truthfully deserves its own dedicated study. This was accompanied by an escalation in the scale and grandeur of visible symbols of royal authority, including continued and rapid development in heraldic display that encompassed everything from food to heralds to decorations, and a variety of ‘performance’ from martial sports to

informal musical interludes. Moreover, while foreign commentary suggests a lack of formality to the Scottish court, these ceremonies demonstrate that the order of rank in processions, feasts and the serving of food, stage-managed meetings, and even observing jousts was an essential component of the overall spectacle. Many of the developments were firmly rooted in older traditions, but the ceremonial that was produced carved out statements of the increasing confidence, even arrogance, of the Stewart dynasty in spite of the very real challenges it faced. The expansion of Scottish horizons in regards to matrimonial partners caused a veritable explosion of ambassadorial interaction, which truthfully deserves its own dedicated study. This was accompanied by an escalation in the scale and grandeur of visible symbols of royal authority, including continued and rapid development in heraldic display that encompassed everything from food to heralds to decorations, and a variety of ‘performance’ from martial sports to informal musical interludes. Moreover, while foreign commentary suggests a lack of formality to the Scottish court, these ceremonies demonstrate that the order of rank in processions, feasts and the serving of food, stage-managed meetings, and even observing jousts was an essential component of the overall spectacle. Many of the developments were firmly rooted in older traditions, but the ceremonial that was produced carved out statements of the increasing confidence, even arrogance, of the Stewart dynasty in spite of the very real challenges it faced.
Section IV: The Apogee of the French Connection? James V and his French Brides

In the two decades preceding James V’s French marriage to Madeleine of Valois in 1536, eight different realms offered seventeen different potential brides. Thomas has stated that it was fortuitous for James that his first major royal ceremony ‘was held in France and paid for by the French king’. However, this statement underestimates James V’s own efforts and huge financial contribution to his flamboyant trip to France. The French king footed many large expenses, including the marriage ceremony itself, but James’s eight month trip entailed many additional costs beyond the marriage ceremony. A valuable set of sources for this discussion, which curiously go unexplored in Thomas’s work on James’s pageantry and display, are the ‘French accounts’ appended to volumes six and seven of the Treasurer’s Accounts – one compiled by Kirkcaldy of the Grange, and the other two by Cardinal Beaton. Essentially the primary income for the recorded expenditures was accrued from France, the largest portion of which was acquired through the dowries of his two French wives Madeleine of France and later Marie de Guise. However, this income was James’s own and had to be conserved where possible to allow for some financial buoyancy upon his return. These accounts detail James’s attempts to project his image of authority and royal dignity in person on French soil, at the court of one of the most pre-eminent Renaissance kings in Europe.

James V departed from Scotland in September 1536 with a high-powered entourage, including the earls of Argyll, Arran and Rothes, Cardinal Beaton, Lord Fleming, and James

333 NAS, GD149/264, ff. 3v-4v, 8r-v, 17r-22v, 48v-49r, 59r-63v, 71r-74r, Caprington MS, Royal Letter Book, 1524/5 – 1548/9; NAS, GD249/2/2/1, ff. 19r-22r, 30r-32v, 45v-46r, 47r-48v, 57v-61r, 65v-66v, 70r, Tyningham MS, Royal Letter Book, 1529 – 1627; E. Bapst, Les Mariages de Jacques V (Paris, 1889), 7-281; Letters of James V, 170-2, 181, 199-201, 212-3, 215-6, 237, 245-6, 255-8, 277, 280-3, 289, 294-5, 297-9, 302-7. The calendar of letters and MS references are in some cases referring to the same letters but all originals listed have been consulted in the hope of finding further information. Cameron, James V, 60-1, 132-3 (list of all proposed matches, 153, fn. 15); Thomas, Princelie Majestie, 183-4.

334 Ibid, 183.

335 A total of 14,615 livres 10d. (roughly £7,500 in Scots, see above Note on Money, xii-xiv) is recorded as being accrued by the French king for the expenses of James V, Madeleine and her sister Marguerite between October 1536 and April 1537: Inventaire Chronologique des documents relatifs à l’histoire d’Ecosse, 84; Papiers d’état, pieces et documents inedits ou peu connus relatifs a l’histoire de l’Ecosse au XVieme siecle, ed. A. Teulet, (3 vols, Edinburgh, 1852-60), Vol. I, 125.

Gordon of Lochinver. 337 Their six ships were prepared and crewed at crown cost. 338 This would suggest that the ships were decked out in royal colours and banners of royal arms, although this is not specified in the accounts. The ships were supplied with guns – a show of might rather than aggression – and one ship was provisioned with fireworks. 339 Pitscottie records that James received a royal welcome from the Duke of Vendôme, whose daughter had been his intended bride, with entertainments and feasts laid on, and apartments prepared for him:

[...] a paill of gould sett witht pratius stouns sett abone the kingis heid quhene he sat at meit and the hallis and challmeris was all perfumit witht suet odouris quhilc was werie costlie and delictabill to the sense of men. 340

James V would ultimately marry Madeleine, the eldest surviving daughter of the king of France. After settling the marriage treaty at Blois on 26 November, the honours offered to the king of Scots by his father-in-law placed him in the ranks of a son of the French king himself. 341 This included an entry to Paris and the temporary transferral of the recently deceased dauphin’s household to serve him. Thomas comments that the entry ‘was a triumph of international significance’ for Scottish king and his realm alike, and discontented local grumblings reflected the unusual nature of François’s demands on his capital. 342 Despite their initial reluctance, Paris welcomed James on 31 December 1536 with officials dressed in traditional red robes, welcome

---

337 RSS, Vol. II, nos. 2108, 2152, 2155, 2166, 2167, 2173. The chroniclers do not agree with each other: Pitscottie states that the earls of Arran, Argyll, Huntly, Atholl, Cassilis Marischal, Moray and Rothes, Lords Maxwell, Fleming, Livingston, Ruthven and ‘Saltoun’, plus Master Erskine and others were present (Historie, Vol. I, 357-8); whereas Leslie states that the earls of Argyll and Arran, Lords Fleming and Boyd, with many others accompanied James, while the earls of Lennox and Cassilis, Lord Erskine and Cardinal Beaton awaited him in France (Historie, Vol. II, 234). Also see Cameron, James V, 131.

338 TA, Vol. VI, 449-66. The totals spent on the Mary Willoughby throughout the trip rests at near 3,500 francs or livre (the two appear to be interchangeable), and this is just the total for one of four named ships, with two other unnamed ones mentioned. The accounts show an exchange rate of between 9 s. and 10 s. 6 d. to a franc; therefore, this would equate to approximately £1750 Scots. The exchange rate from the TA is used by Gilbert: ‘The Usual Money of Scotland’, 144; also see above Note on Money, xii-xiv.

339 Ibid, Vol. VI, 454. Depending on which account is consulted the size of James’s fleet may have led to the retreat of the imperial army threatening to wage further war on France: Pitscottie, Historie, Vol. I, 357-9; Bapst, Mariages de Jacques V, 288; Thomas, Princelie Majestie, 184-5.

340 Pitscottie, Historie, Vol. I, 358-9; Leslie, Historie, Vol. II, 234. Pitscottie states that the departure from the Duke’s household was excused as James wished to seek permission from the French king before discussing the marriage further, and that high value gifts were exchanged: (Vol. I, 360).


342 Ibid, 185.
orations and a paill of cloth of gold carried over the Scottish king who was accompanied by the Dauphin and the king of Navarre amongst a host of other nobles. The arms of Scotland and France hung from the buildings along the processional route. Given the rise of print during the sixteenth century, the Scottish arms would have been familiar to the wider educated Parisian population: Parisian printers produced and sold first editions of prominent Scottish works, including Hector Boece’s *Scotorum historiae* (1527), which was dedicated to James V and displayed the royal arms. François also permitted James the royal privilege of granting pardons to prisoners on the entry into a foreign city. Notably this had been granted in August 1536 while James’s intended bride was Marie de Bourbon, suggesting that the honour would have been extended had he wed Marie.

The wedding ceremony on 1 January 1537, described in some detail by Thomas, saw the couple led across a raised walkway from the Bishop’s Palace to Notre Dame. They were married outside the church in the doorway – in the manner dictated by the Lateran Council of 1215 – with the cries of largesse and distributions of coins following, before all headed into the cathedral for Mass. James spent well over 1000 crowns on a diamond ‘spousing ring’ for his young queen which was presumably exchanged at the doorway of the church. This exchange of rings has appeared absent from earlier Scottish ceremonies; however, contemporary Vigne asserts that the ring-giving ritual of the royal wedding in sixteenth-century France was centrally important to the affirmation of the queen’s shared power with her husband through their union.

---

343 Mann, *The Scottish Book Trade 1500–1720*, fig. 6, 126. Mann gives the coat of arms printed in the Scottish publication of c. 1540 but notes that the early Parisian publication printed by Jodocus Badius had a smaller printed coat of arms.

344 NAS, SP7/31, Grant by King Francis I conferring on the King of Scots when in France the privilege, on entering a town, of liberating prisoners and pardoning crimes. Signed by the king, 17 Aug 1536; *Cronique du Roy Francoys*, 201-2; *Papiers d’etat*, Vol. I, 123-4; *Diurnal*, 21. Thomas refers to Lindsay’s poem ‘The Deploratioun of the Deith of Quene Magdalene’ which describes Paris like Rome when it welcomed the king with triumphal arches. She also relates the entry to that of Emperor Charles V (1540), for which there are better sources, and proposes that James’s royal entry may have set a precedence for such occurrences in France: Lindsay, *Selected Poems*, 103-104; Thomas, *Princelie Majestie*, 185-6.

345 This was an honour found being extended to Alexander III and his new bride at York by Henry III. See above, Chapter 3, Section I, 225-6.

346 *Cronique du Roy Francoys*, 202-4; Thomas, *Princelie Majestie*, 187-8. Mary Queen of Scots’ wedding ceremony in 1558 was very similar and is described in more detail by contemporaries, see below Chapter 3, Section V, 294-5.

347 TA, Vol. VII, 14. The accounts give some of the figures in crowns worked out into francs/ livre (see TA, Vol. VII, 51 for an example), therefore, possible to calculate a rough exchange rate for the crowns of £1,6s. per crown. This would make this approx. £1,300 Scots for the ring. See above 279, fn. 338.
of marriage. Although James’s attire during the event was not described specifically, his abundant purchases of clothes and jewels allow insight into the display. To give just a few examples, 1,000 francs were spent on one entry for furs for the king in Paris, 31 ells of grey velvet were purchased on 27 December; over 3,000 crowns were spent on cloth of gold; and more than 600 foot (212 ells) of red and black velvet were purchased for in excess of 2,800 francs. Moreover payments to the French king’s embroiderer and the purchasing of accessories, including a total of 39,860 gold buttons and 119 gold, azure and emerald buttons for a riding jacket, suggest items being made in situ. Alongside the entry for Madeleine’s ring it lists over forty small diamonds being set in gold to attach to a bonnet for the king and another decorated with thirty-four gold thistles, a symbol that was synonymous with Scottish royalty by the 1530s. There is no suggestion that James was crowned for his wedding or royal entry, but as with his father, portraits of James V portray him bonneted rather than crowned, often with a collar of thistles. Six earls, six lords, six bishops and twenty barons of Scotland were called upon to attend the marriage, according to Pitscottie, suggesting a large Scottish entourage. The purchase of six white, green and red velvet ‘comparisons’ and ‘journayis,’ along with other matching liveries, one of which was sent to the chevalier of France, illustrates a mounted demonstration of royal power took place, presumably in the royal entry. The liveried entourage was further expanded as pages and lackeys were purchased liveries in yellow and red, which were increasingly dominant as the colours of Scottish royal household attendees in the sixteenth century.
The wedding was followed by two weeks of tournaments, jousts, feasting and spectacle with a ‘théâtre fort sumpteux’, or sumptuous mock fort theatre, around which the tournaments took place.\textsuperscript{356} This structure was decorated with the arms of all the nobles, princes and knights, and had painted figures of knights. Of all the attending nobles and princes, the chronicler refers to the king of Scots and the dauphin as the most wonderfully mounted and equipped throughout all the days of jousting.\textsuperscript{357} The horse attire purchased by James V for the ‘tournay’ is abundant and included harnesses overgilt with gold, a comparison of red velvet trimmed with gold fringes, gold trappings and velvet footmantles decorated with silk, jousting saddles, reins, rests for jousting spears, over 470 spears, 15 and half ells of green damask for a pavilion/tent and various other items all decorated with gold, silk, and embroidery.\textsuperscript{358} There are also twelve sets of ornamental horse armour paid for,\textsuperscript{359} with a further set gilded with gold specifically for the king making him conspicuous amongst his entourage.\textsuperscript{360}

The trip was punctuated with extensive gift giving exercises through which James V demonstrated the kingly qualities of beneficence and generosity. These ranged from the expensive and opulent New Year and parting gifts for the extended royal family and officials,\textsuperscript{361} to smaller signs of munificence that emphasised a quite different but equally important facet of kingship. The latter included twenty crowns being given for alms, a habit bought for a friar, candles provided at Easter and a lining for an altar cloth all donated at Rouen.\textsuperscript{362} Prior to his departure both kings made one final elaborate show of gift-giving, with James and Madeleine receiving horses, jewels, and cloths of gold and other rich fabrics. In return James made gifts to the French king and queen and the ‘master of France’ of great gold cups valued at over 7,500

\textsuperscript{356} Pitiscottie mentions these events were crammed into one day so that so much solemnity and wonder had not been ‘sen then sen the tyne of King Chairlis the Maine.’ In the French account, however, they are spread out over several days: Pitiscottie, \textit{Historie}, Vol. I, 364-7; \textit{Cromique du Roy Francyoys}, 204-5.

\textsuperscript{357} \textit{Ibid}, 205.

\textsuperscript{358} TA, Vol. VII, 8-9, 29-30.

\textsuperscript{359} ‘Bardis’: an ornamental armour for the chest and flanks of a horse.

\textsuperscript{360} \textit{Ibid}, 51. The king’s ‘bardis’ or horse armour cost 270 francs on its own, while 324 francs paid for the other twelve.

\textsuperscript{361} The dauphin, king of Navarre and monsieur d’Orleans received ‘quhynzears’ (short swords) decorated with gold, silk, and pearls worth in excess of 800 crowns in total. Madame de Dauphine received two ornamental bracelets of gold decorated with eighteen rubies and the queen of Navarre a ‘coffir’ worth 360 crowns. Monetary gifts were also given to members of the French household. TA, Vol. VII, 7, 14-15.

\textsuperscript{362} \textit{Ibid}, 5-6, 11-12, 21.
francs, and on his return to Scotland a silver cup overgilt with gold was gifted to the French ambassador.\textsuperscript{363} The king’s extended visit to France and his triumphant marriage to Madeleine of France allowed him an opportunity to flaunt his multi-faceted royal image through martial skill, generous gift giving and pious munificence, rich clothing and a finely attired entourage decorated in Scottish royal emblems and colours. Moreover, the newly acquired wealth that came with his new bride allowed James the freedom and luxury to present himself as the European debonair prince in a manner he would otherwise have struggled to achieve.

The preparations for Madeleine’s arrival were underway to greet the queen at Leith and Lindsay’s poem describes extensive preparation for Madeleine’s arrival and welcome.\textsuperscript{364} The remaining Treasurer’s Accounts partially support this, with messengers sent to a huge number of members of all three estates, as well as purchases such as banners for trumpeters and coats of arms for heralds.\textsuperscript{365} However, his young queen’s frail health meant that the return gestures of royal welcome and coronation would not be performed, and the accounts have few references between her arrival and death to indicate that preparations for such celebrations continued.

\begin{quote}
All thare greit solace and solemponentis
Thow turnit in till dulefull dirigeis.\textsuperscript{366}
\end{quote}

The death and funeral of his queen, some seven weeks after her arrival, meant James V’s dynastic security was once again a matter for concern and this had the potential to rapidly undermine the confident Scottish royal statement that had been made in France.

He looked to his father-in-law François I to secure a second dynastic union sending ambassadors that included the recently created Cardinal, David Beaton, bishop of Mirepoix.\textsuperscript{367} The offered bride was Marie de Guise, the recently widowed duchess de Longueville, who was

\textsuperscript{363} Ibid, 25, 31; Pitscottie, Historie, Vol. I, 367-8. As yet the author has not been able to locate any reference to the survival of any of the gifts. These gifts would have been worth around £3,750 Scots.

\textsuperscript{364} Ibid, 369; Leslie, Historie, Vol. II, 238; Lindsay, Selected Poems, 101-108.

\textsuperscript{365} TA, Vol. VI, 298-300, 303, 305, 310-13. These entries relate to the queen’s entry and coronation, the return of the king and preparations at Leith; the following account from June 1537 has no references to these ceremonies and swiftly moves to funeral arrangements; see also, Thomas, ‘Crown Imperial’, 56.

\textsuperscript{366} Lindsay, Selected Poems, 105.

still in her early twenties and had two sons, proving her capabilities to continue the Stewart dynastic line. In May 1538 an embassy headed by Robert Lord Maxwell, the Lord High Admiral, set out for France to complete the contract and perform a proxy wedding ceremony. Although James did not travel to France on this occasion, a host of two thousand made up of lords, barons and lairds, with ships prepared by the crown and admiral would have made a significant statement of Scottish royal authority. In addition, liveries of red and yellow were purchased for four trumpeters, four drummers, three pipe/flute players and six other named individuals; plus clothing was purchased four others including a woman, Lady Cragy’s servant Janet Campbell. Leslie and Bapst both record that the ceremony took place in Paris; however, Beaton’s financial account records that forty crowns were paid to officials and minstrels ‘the day if the Quenis mariage in Chateau Dun’. In addition to the minstrels and officials, who were presumably accompanied by the newly liveried trumpeters and musicians sent by James, the account also lists ‘ane ring witht ane diamand to be the quenis grace spousing ring’; therefore, an exchange of rings took place amidst the great joy and triumph of the ceremony.

While the financial negotiations and proxy ceremony took place in France the preparations for Marie de Guise’s arrival in Scotland at St Andrews on 16 June 1538 were in full swing. These ranged from refurbishments of royal palaces and mending an abbey window, to the provision of new jousting gear for James and the building of lists. The arrival at St

370 Ibid, 399-402. Over £300 was spent, with £76, 2s. 6d. of this for trumpeters and other musicians. The rest was distributed by rank indicating the status range of people on board. For example, ‘McBrocht and Wat Jakkis boyis’ items total under £20, whereas Patrick Weymss, Duncan Omay and Alexander Sinclair received over £50 worth of clothing each, with the latter costing nearly £65. It is not clear from the entries whether Lady Cragy and other ladies of the court also made the journey to accompany Marie back to Scotland, or whether her servant took on this role for the new queen.
371 Chateau Dun was one of Marie de Guise’s former husband’s properties, about 20 miles from Chartres on the Loire.
372 TA, Vol. VII, 56; Leslie, Historie, Vol. II, 240; Bapst, Mariages de Jacques V, 326. Bapst suggests that the ceremony took place in the presence of François I and his court. It seems unlikely that the French king and full court went to Chateau Dun for the event, although since the chateau was not too far from Paris and the other royal palaces outside the capital, this was not impossible.
Andrews saw a distinct move away from Leith, which had hosted the arrivals of both Mary of Guelders and Margaret of Denmark. This choice may have been driven by the influential ambassadorial figure, Beaton, who had recently received the honour of the bishopric of Mirepoix from François I and whose ambitions saw him become a cardinal and archbishop of St Andrews in rapid succession. As the seat of Scotland’s premier archbishop, and home to the oldest university and one of Scotland’s most eminent cathedrals, St Andrews was likely selected both to impress the foreign observers and to draw attention away from the site of Madeleine’s arrival. Large numbers of people were present to receive Marie in a welcome that focused primarily on the consort alone. This included mechanised pageantry scripted by the herald David Lindsay and the use of a ‘paill’ carried over her. The latter may have been another element introduced through French influence as it has not been observed in earlier Scottish ceremonies.

The details of the ceremony confirming the proxy marriage on the following day are a little vague, but here James V took up a central role alongside his new bride. The archbishop of Glasgow was noted as the presiding prelate and the church was said to be filled with both music and people. The king was made a gown and doublet of white Venetian satin decorated with cloth of gold, gold sewing silk and pasmentis. Although not described specifically as a wedding outfit, this would seem appropriate for the occasion and reminiscent of that of James IV. In addition a decorative scabbard of black, white, red and blue/violet velvet was fashioned for his rapier and John Mosman the goldsmith was paid for bejewelling a bonnet for him. The following year the coinage portrait was changed to show him not crowned, but capped in a bonnet, a subtle but mass-produced suggestion of the increasing self-confidence of the monarch.

gives the date as 16 June, the Diurnal of Occurrents (22) states that it is Trinity Sunday (Easter dated 21 April 1538), while Pitscottie states she arrived in Scotland on 8 June (at Craill, see Leslie) prior to making her way to St Andrews. See also: Thomas, Princelie Majestie, 191-2.

374 For more on Beaton, as royal servant and ambassador see: M. Sanderson, Cardinal of Scotland: David Beaton, 1494–1546 (Edinburgh, 2001), particularly 45-71.

375 Sir David Lindsay is recorded at various intervals as herald and often travelled on behalf of James V on envoys, including accompanying James to Paris. He would later be officially made Lyon Herald; however, at this stage he may still have been acting Lyon Herald rather than formally promoted.

376 Thomas, Princelie Majestie, 191-2; also see Dean, ‘Enter the Alien’; Pitscottie, Historie, Vol. I, 380.

377 Ibid, Diurnal, 22.


379 Ibid, 398, 408.
through the removal of the crown and his representation as an all-round Renaissance man in the manner of contemporary kings.\textsuperscript{380} The following day, Marie de Guise and her entourage were taken on a guided tour of all the ‘kirkis and colledgis and unversitie’ undoubtedly to build upon the projection of a king and realm of advanced Renaissance culture and learning. The party remained at St Andrews for a number of weeks amidst feasting, dancing, plays and jousting.\textsuperscript{381} Later, Marie was welcomed at a number of palaces and burghs on her route to Edinburgh\textsuperscript{382} where she made her formal entry on 20 July 1538. The entry ceremonies for Marie did not end at Edinburgh, as she was welcomed to both Dundee and Perth in August 1538.\textsuperscript{383} The continuation of Marie’s royal entry ceremonies was not out of the ordinary,\textsuperscript{384} but what was unusual was the immediacy of her departure from Edinburgh to continue on this progress without a coronation to conclude the marriage.

In fact, over eighteen months would pass between Marie’s arrival and her coronation on Sunday 8 February 1540.\textsuperscript{385} There was no indication that a coronation was being planned until October 1539 when John Mosman was paid £45 for making the queen’s crown from thirty-five ounces of gold and various precious stones.\textsuperscript{386} The preparations for Madeleine’s arrival and

\textsuperscript{380}Stewart, Scottish Coinage, 78. See Plate 38.
\textsuperscript{381}Pitscottie, Historie, Vol. I, 380-1; NAS, E31/7, ff. 70r-77r. The household accounts give a breakdown of bread, wine and other supplies utilised by the royal household in St Andrews; on 16 June it lists 6,622 loaves of bread prepared/used which really adds a sense of scale to the proceedings.
\textsuperscript{382}NAS, E31/7, ff. 77r-80r. The location of the royal household was recorded in the margins each day the account was transcribed (undertaken almost daily), which gives a clear indication of the route taken, places visited and duration of their stay. Additionally it verifies Pitscottie’s descriptions of the queen’s journey (Historie, Vol. I, 380-1). The queen’s pre-entry stay at Corstophine is recorded in the TA, Vol. VI, 431-2. The Diurnal’s reference to St Margaret’s day must refer to St. Margaret of Antioch, whose saint’s day is 20 July, as the Scottish St Margaret’s feast day was 16 November: Diurnal, 22.
\textsuperscript{383}Pitscottie, Historie, Vol. I, 380-381. The entry to Dundee was combined with the wedding of the earl of Errol to the sister of the earl of Lennox presided over by the archbishop of Glasgow and the king. Financial records do not indicate that the king was financially involved; however, the continuation of his own marriage celebrations through the nuptials of others is an interesting in itself. There is evidence of James V and Marie de Guise supporting others in marriage. For example, they gave a substantial dowry of £323, along with 12 ½ ells of red velvet to make wedding gown costing £108, to one of Marie’s attendants, Joanna Gresmoir, when she married Robert Beaton of Creich: TA, Vol. VII, xxxix, 166, 328.\textsuperscript{384}One definitely occurred for Margaret of Denmark, and Margaret Tudor unquestionably made progresses much later in her reign as consort, including an entry to Aberdeen in 1511.
\textsuperscript{385}The coronation was not on a specific feast day with any obvious connection to James V, Scotland or Marie de Guise; however, it was the Sunday nestled between two feasts of the Virgin Mary, the Presentation of the Lord, and Our Lady of Lourdes. See below for more discussion of the dating.
\textsuperscript{386}TA, Vol. VII, 254.
welcome in 1537 did not include the fashioning of a crown. Following the death of his first bride so soon after her arrival, James’ decision may have been based on the practicality of being sure that his wife would survive to produce children. This implies that Marie’s authority and legitimacy as queen hinged on her ability to produce children, perhaps more so than her predecessors. In further contrast to her predecessors, the queen mother Margaret Tudor was still alive, and this may have diminished any urgency to crown either of James V’s queens, and was certainly the reason for a new crown being required. It was not unusual in France for queens to remain uncrowned throughout their reign; as Layne-Smith has noted, although coronation was important it was the ‘wedding which made them queens’. Whilst James was not setting a precedent in the wider European context, he was in Scotland. Since the advent of the consort coronation in Scotland, the only confirmed gaps between marriage and consort coronation are found when the union occurred prior to the king himself ascending to the throne.

Marie de Guise was pregnant by October 1539. James V quickly provided a ceremony that would both emphasise the status of his wife as mother of his unborn child and help him further project his own regal authority. It is not possible to fully reconstruct the coronation ceremony, but some aspects can be revealed. The ladies of the realm were summoned to the coronation at Holyrood, which echoes the marked focus on the female involvement found in both Margaret Tudor and Mary of Guelders’ coronations. This general summons does not list specific individuals, but purchases made at the time for James V’s illegitimate daughter indicate she may have been involved. Payments were made for nineteen loads of timber ‘buirdis and sparris’ for the coronation. The size of the loads is not recorded. However, it seems likely that these materials were for a raised platform; since c. 1437, platforms had been erected near the

387 Ibid, Vol. VI, 313. One reference specifically requests the barons attended her coronation, but there is little to suggest that the preparations had gone very far.
389 See McCartney, ‘Ceremonies and Privileges of Office: Queenship in Late Medieval France’, particularly 182; Laynesmith, Last Medieval Queens, 75.
390 TA, Vol. VII, 302; Thomas, Princelie Majestie, 197. At both the time of the coronation and Marie de Guise’s arrival, new gowns were purchased for James’s illegitimate daughter ‘Lady Jane’ (one of purple velvet and a highly decorative jewelled affair respectively); however, no suggestion is made regarding her age at this point: The Scots Peerage, Vol. I, 25; TA, Vol. VI, 405-6; Ibid. Vol. VII, 266.
391 Ibid, 487.
altar for the performance of the crowning ritual in Scottish monarch’s coronation ceremonies.\footnote{See Chapter 2, Section III, 164.}

Thomas has suggested ‘tiered stands’ were erected for the congregation, but contemporary ideas that circulated at the time regarding the elevated status of kingship more readily support a stage or platform that would raise the monarch above the people rather than vice versa.\footnote{There does not seem to be any precedence for the tiered stands for the congregation of a Scottish coronation (Thomas, Princelie Majestie, 197), but tiered seating used from at least the seventeenth-century post-Reformation coronations of Charles II and James II in Westminster to accommodate the volume of onlookers. There were viewing platforms constructed outside Holyrood Palace in 1503 for watching the outdoor tournaments and events, but no suggestion of tiered stands within the abbey itself. TA, Vol. VII, 284-5.} Two chairs were revamped with purple velvet, silk ribbons and fringes specifically for the queen in February 1540. This, and the fact that Marie was six months pregnant, suggests that the king and queen were seated rather than kneeling during the ceremonial Mass, and for the investment of the regalia as in 1503.\footnote{See Plate 39.} While the exact decorations are not described, a number of sixteenth-century sources portray the couple’s royal arms, such as those in the Lindesay Armorial or sketched in a contemporary household book,\footnote{MacAndrew, Scotland’s Historic Heraldry, 277.} with the complex armorial of Guise impaled with the Scottish lion rampant noted by MacAndrew as bringing ‘a heady European dimension to Scottish heraldry.’\footnote{Archbishop of St Andrews from 1539.}

The Diurnal recorded that Cardinal Beaton, Archbishop of St Andrews,\footnote{The Diurnal oddly uses Beaton’s title of abbot of Arbroath here, even though he was both Cardinal and Archbishop of St Andrews by this point, 23.} was the leader of the Mass, which indicates that he carried out the act of crowning and unction.\footnote{Woods Preece, ‘Our awin Scottis Use’, 106-25, 163-4. One of Carver’s Masses may have been used in 1513, see above Chapter 2, Section IV, 184-5.} There were payments made for eleven additional chaplains from the king’s Chapel Royal at Stirling, and new clothing purchased on 7 February for one specific chaplain. The chaplains of the king’s Chapel Royal were ‘highly-trained’ choristers at the forefront of Scottish religious musical performance and during the 1540s they would almost certainly have counted Robert Carver amongst their number. Isobel Woods Preece has emphasised Carver’s involvement with the Chapel Royal and Stirling, while his choir book has datable pieces in 1513 and 1546.\footnote{See Chapter 2, Section III, 164.} Thomas’s proposal that these men were just there to boost the number of clerics and to assist
with the ceremonial therefore misses a key facet of the inclusion of these particular men.\footnote{Thomas, \textit{Princelie Majestie}, 197-8.} Their presence in Holyrood in February 1540 can illustrate the aural extravagance that would have accompanied the visual splendour of the ceremony. Moreover, the Mass almost certainly had a Marian theme, given that it celebrated a queen called Marie who was with child, and that the date chosen for the ceremony was a Sunday between Virgin Mary feasts on 2 and 11 February.

Restoration and remodelling work on the king’s regalia began in 1532. The crown was definitely fashioned with imperial arches presenting a tangible visual symbol of James V’s status.\footnote{Thomas, \textit{Princelie Majestie}, 194-8; Thomas, ‘Crown Imperial’, 55-67. Other works on the regalia also consider the remodelling: Brook, ‘Technical Description of the Regalia’, 94-104; C.J. Burnett and C.J. Tabraham, \textit{The Honours of Scotland: the History of the Scottish Crown Jewels} (Edinburgh, 1993).} However, both James II and James IV attended the coronations of their wives bareheaded. This potentially made James V’s crowned head at his wife’s ceremony an innovation that drew attention to him while subordinating his consort. Yet, the visual prominence of the crown could equally have been designed to emphasise the Catholic rite of coronation to quell French and papal fears of James V’s defection to his uncle Henry VIII’s split from Rome. The queen, in addition to her crown, received a gold belt decorated with sapphires, a sumptuous thirty foot purple velvet ‘rob royall’ (which matched the king’s, echoing the matching attire of consort and monarch found in both 1449 and 1503),\footnote{The king’s robe was significantly larger at approximately 50 foot; \textit{TA}, Vol. VII, 277-8.} and a newly fashioned sceptre.\footnote{\textit{A collection of inventories}, 76; Thomas, ‘Crown Imperial’, 64.} The sceptre was topped with a white hand, similar to the \textit{main de justice} found in the French regalia.\footnote{Pitscottie, \textit{Historie}, Vol. I, p. 380} By ordering the queen’s sceptre fashioned in this manner, James did more than illuminate his admiration for French design. In the speech composed for her arrival at St Andrews, Marie was reportedly advised about her duties to her new husband; this advice stressed that she would help to uphold justice and preserve the peace.\footnote{The first parliament of the reign following Marie’s coronation occurred in December 1540 and no reference suggests she was present. There were parliaments between her arrival and coronation; however, the records are patchy. See RPS, reign of James V from 1538–1542.} There are no explicit references to Marie taking an oath at her coronation.\footnote{There are no explicit references to Marie taking an oath at her coronation.} However, in the context of the
fifteenth-century consort coronations, her investiture with the sceptre demonstrated the proxy power bestowed upon her, particularly if it was presented to her by the king, as James IV had done for Margaret Tudor in 1503.

James V’s physical presence in France in 1536–7 gave him unprecedented exposure in a foreign royal arena and the opportunity to project a confident image of triumphant Scottish majesty, which was spurred on by his apparent position of power. Yet, following Madeleine’s death the king’s expression of complete adult authority and the continuation of his dynastic line would remain under threat until a new bride was found. Marie’s welcome at St Andrews, her comprehensive progress around the major lowland towns, and royal entry to Edinburgh, all provided the space and opportunity for the realm to interact with their new consort through speech, music and intricately designed pageantry. The completion of her queenly status through coronation was delayed until a pregnancy occurred; however, her visible pregnancy made a tangible statement about the shared responsibility for the heir and proxy royal power placed in her by the king.407 Many of the methods of projecting the Scottish royal image were the same through these years as they had been previously, but there was an ever greater need to make the symbols of the crown more elaborate and ornate, particularly while James was in France. In 1540, the king’s regalia became a prominent feature of the consort coronation ceremony for the first time. It was perhaps this desire to continually enhance and amplify the monarchical portfolio that brought about this change.

Section V: Marrying the Queen of Scotland

407 A role which Marie clung to determinedly throughout her daughter’s minority, see Ritchie, Mary of Guise; above Chapter 2, Section IV, 191-8; forthcoming Dean: ‘Scottish Queen or Catholic Princess’.
The marriages of Mary Queen of Scots straddle the Reformation of 1560. Yet, the unique complexities arising from the marriage of a queen regnant to a king consort make it useful to examine these two ceremonies together, starting with her marriage to the French Dauphin in 1558, and then her provision of celebrations for the unions of key nobles following her return to Scotland in 1561 and her marriage to Darnley in 1565. Mary’s first marriage to the Dauphin François threatened Scottish royal authority and autonomy as essentially she was to become the French consort, as well as a queen of Scotland in her own right, and the wedding ceremonies were almost entirely controlled by Henri II and her powerful Guise relatives. Mary was brought up in the French court and her marriage to François, though debated with varying degrees of vigour throughout Mary’s youth, was not a surprise. To assess whether this marriage ceremony can really be seen in any way as a projection of Mary’s royal authority as queen or as a projection of Scottish royal authority in Europe, this section discusses the French ceremonies with an emphasis on the Scottish involvement and the portrayals of Mary and François within the ceremonial before turning to the celebrations held in Scotland in the summer following to mark the event.

The final impetus for the union ultimately came from Scotland, but Scottish reassertions in 1557 led war-weary Henri II to send urgent message to Marie de Guise requesting that commissioners be sent to France to conclude the marriage contract.

---

408 Mary’s final marriage to Bothwell, shortly before her forced abdication, was the act that provided the final political ammunition to attack her queenship and right to rule, and has therefore excited much interest for its political value; however, it has made little impact upon the sources in regards to the ceremony that occurred other than the fact that it was performed as a Protestant rite. For discussions on Mary’s reign and this final union there are a multitude of books and articles available, just a few of these include: A. Fraser, *Mary Queen of Scots* (London, 1970); G. Donaldson, *All the Queen’s Men*; Lynch, ‘Introduction: Mary Queen of Scots Vol. IV’, 1-29; White, ‘Queen Mary’s Northern Province’, 53-70; J. Wormald, *Mary Queen of Scots: A Study in Failure* (London, 1988); A. Weir, *Mary Queen of Scots and the Murder of Lord Darnley* (London, 2003); J. Guy, *The Life of Mary Queen of Scots: My Heart is My Own* (London, 2004); R.K. Marshall, *Mary Queen of Scots: Truth or Lies* (Edinburgh, 2010).


Parliament selected commissioners from each of the three estates, including James Beaton, archbishop of Glasgow, Robert Reid, bishop of Orkney, George Leslie, earl of Rothes, Gilbert Kennedy, earl of Cassilis, James Stewart, prior of St Andrews, Lord Fleming, Lord Seton and John Erskine of Dun, provost of Montrose.412 After a stormy journey, in which a ship containing the bridal ‘furniture’ was purportedly lost, the Scottish commissioners were honourably received by the King of France in Paris.413 However, the Scottish commissioners are noticeably absent in the two detailed contemporary French accounts of the wedding ceremonies on 24 April 1558.414 Even the fragmentary Scottish account, thought to be by an eyewitness, gives little information on these Scottish attendees.415 The wedding procession included members of the French court and clergy, Swiss liveried guard, musicians, ministers of the French Parlement, town council members and the extended French royal family all dressed in their finest array. These attendees made their way across a raised platform walkway, which was covered in rich Turkish carpets framed by a vine-covered arch and stretched from the bishop’s palace to the cathedral of Notre Dame.416 But none of these contemporary accounts hint at the presence of the Scots.

Patrick Anderson, physician to Charles I (c. 1642); RPS, A1557/12/3, Additional Source: Legislation (Edinburgh, Parliament, 14 December 1557).

412 Lord Seton was also the provost of Edinburgh. These commissioners are listed in various parliamentary records including: RPS, 1558/11/6-7, Procedure: discharge of commissions concerning treaty of marriage between Mary Queen of Scots and the Dauphin François Valois (Edinburgh, Parliament, 29 November 1558); Leslie, Historie, Vol. II, 378; NLS, Adv. MS 35.5.3, Vol. II, f. 190r; and with some minor variations from the accurate lists in: NLS, Adv. MS 35.4.2, Vol. I, 331r, Johnston’s History of Scotland; Pitscottie, Historie, Vol. II, 120-1.


414 This date was two weeks after Easter in 1558, although not a particularly prominent festal holiday it would have been a Sunday in Eastertide which enjoyed reflectively austere and elaborate liturgy.


416 The city/town officials’ account is particularly detailed in regards to the dress of all the participants, although it unsurprisinglylavishes the most detail on the town councillors’ garments: ‘Cérémonies de Mariage de Monseigneur le Dauphin’, 292-7.
The Scottish fragment admittedly begins part way through the event and the later suggestion that the wedding party ‘returned in the same ordir’ from the cathedral implies that the author had already described it. Pitscottie’s account, probably based on the printed Scottish fragment,\(^{417}\) records that the queen of Scotland was accompanied by French ladies, and the ‘scottis lordis and the scottis company’.\(^{418}\) He also alludes to the Scottish lords and earls receiving the Order of St Michael:

> [...] quhar war maid knichtis thairof instantlie afoir the ordour of the mariaige and that be the King of France and gret rewardis givin vnto thame and propynes be the king of France conforme to the ordour of the cockill.\(^{419}\)

While the French accounts make no reference to this, the same honour was not without precedent as it had been bestowed upon the earl of Moray and James V during wedding negotiations some twenty years earlier.\(^{420}\) The two French accounts report that Mary wore a white gown richly embroidered with a long train carried by two French ladies. The French town account also states that the queen-dauphine wore a crown estimated to be worth 500,000 Ecu,\(^{421}\) while the other records that the king’s ‘Chevalier of the Chamber’ held her royal crown during dinner.\(^{422}\) There is no description of François wearing a crown, which may have been due to his bride’s status as a queen in her own right while François remained a king-in-waiting, but there is significant lack of any description of the groom so conclusions are hard to draw.

The marriage ceremony itself occurred at the doorway of Notre Dame in full view of the crowds, as had been the case for James V and Madeleine, and it was performed by the Cardinal de Bourbon using a ring that the French king took from his own finger. The couple

\(^{417}\) Hamer, ‘A Scottish Printed Fragment’, 424; Carpenter and Runnalls, ‘The Entertainments at the Marriage of Mary Queen of Scots’, 151. Hamer suggests that the Scottish observer was a Scottish student in Paris and Runnalls proposes that it was one of the commissioners who returned in the summer after the event. The account was produced in Scotland with relative speed – definitely before the Edinburgh celebrations of early July 1558 – and it is likely that Pitscottie used it.


\(^{419}\) Ibid.

\(^{420}\) Thomas, *Princelie Majestie*, 205-207.

\(^{421}\) *Cérémonies de Mariage de Monseigneur le Dauphin*, 298.

\(^{422}\) *Ceremonial at the Marriage of Mary*, 6-7; *The Marriage of Mary*, 15. Confusingly in the marriage ceremony itself these accounts describe the crown and a choker decorated with precious stones of inestimable value as being worn by a man. Yet, the description falls between that of Mary’s train being carried and the royal women who followed her in the procession and the crown is later linked to Mary.
stood under a canopy decorated with fleur de lys of gold and decorated with the arms of the ‘Roy et de la Royne d’Ecosse’. The design of these arms, found on a medallion produced to commemorate the union, shows the couple’s arms impaled, crowned with the imperial crown and flanked by crowned single initials. The anonymous French Discours – posited as a quasi-royal publication – treats Mary as a French princess ‘a tribute, not to Scotland, but to France’. Although Mary’s claims to the Scottish and English thrones, and by default François’s claims, would be flaunted openly following Mary Tudor’s death, the lack of reference to Scottish attendees and her titling as dauphine in this publication suggests a conscious decision to downplay Mary’s prominence in her own right. Yet, the town account emphasised her independent royal status. Both the reference to the arms of the king and queen of Scotland and the fact that she was referred to as the ‘queen of Scotland’ rather than the ‘dauphine’, suggest her Scottish royal status was emphasised and, simultaneously, the same royal authority was conferred upon the new king-consort of Scots. The different treatment of Mary in the two French accounts underscores the complexities inherent in representing Mary’s royal authority in this union.

Following a wedding Mass performed by the Bishop of Paris and cries of largesse along with distributions of coins to the crowds, feasting took place, first at the bishop’s palace and then the royal palace. Pitscottie recorded that throughout the day two of the Scottish commissioners, the earls of Rothes and Cassilis, acted as carver and cupbearer to Mary during meals. The Scottish fragment, which picks up after the dinner in the bishop’s palace, refers to the food being brought in at the royal palace by two Scottish and two French heralds walking

---

423 Ceremonial at the Marriage of Mary, 6; The Marriage of Mary, 15; ‘Cérémonies de Mariage de Monseigneur le Dauphin,’ 297.
424 François arms as dauphin were quartered fleur-de-lys and dolphins, and Mary’s was the lion rampant within the double treasure flory counterflory. See Plates 40a and 40b.
426 Ibid.
427 ‘Cérémonies de Mariage de Monseigneur le Dauphin,’ 292-303.
428 This event, and the general confusion it caused as the crowds rushed to gather the thrown coinage, was described by all the contemporary accounts. However, it was most interestingly described in the Scottish account, which mentioned pushing and shoving in a manner that suggests the author was amongst the general crowds at this point in the ceremony; ‘A Scottish Fragment’, 425; ‘Cérémonies de Mariage de Monseigneur le Dauphin,’ 297; Ceremonial at the Marriage of Mary, 9; The Marriage of Mary, 16.
side-by-side – their respective tabards with coats of arms emblazoned emphasising the union – in front of the duke of Guise who was the Master of Ceremonies. Later in the proceedings the heralds of both nations cried largesse simultaneously prior to the [Scottish] herald receiving a gift of a pot of gold from the French king’s royal cupboard. The entertainments that followed included seven planets, large ‘mechanical’ horses and unicorns, chariots drawn by white palfreys, the nine worthies, ships with silver sails that appeared to rock as if on the water, and many other delights. None of the individuals described by name as taking part in the performances in the royal palace were Scottish except for the queen herself; however, where colours of dress are described, subtle links can be made. For example, the dresses of the nine muses were red, green, and white, reminiscent of the livery used by James V in France during his wedding ceremonial.

Carpenter and Runnalls reason that one of the most interesting aspects of the performances celebrating Mary’s wedding was the ‘response’ that occurred in Edinburgh on 3 July 1558. These ceremonies were largely funded by the town, but the driving force behind them was Marie de Guise, who sent a torrent of messages demanding that processions were prepared and bonfires lit in honour of her daughter’s wedding in twenty-three different burghs across the realm, not including Edinburgh itself. The sources are predominantly extant for Edinburgh, but other burghs responded to the queen’s request. This included Aberdeen where the town minutes record that John Chalmer was put in charge of the play to conform to the

431 Ceremonial at the Marriage of Mary, 11-14; The Marriage of Mary, 18-20; Cérémonies de Mariage de Monseigneur le Dauphin,’ 299-303; ‘A Scottish Fragment’, 428; Carpenter and Runnalls, ‘The Entertainments at the Marriage of Mary Queen of Scots’, 147-51. In regards to coverage of the entertainments, the town record gives the most detail. The official account does not attempt to provide a full record and key facets such as the seven planets, which form a central pillar to Carpenter and Runnalls comparison with the Edinburgh pageantry, are omitted. The Scottish fragment is cut off just after it begins to describe the first entertainment, but it follows the ‘official’ account rather than the town account, supporting the proposition that the Scottish fragment would have been at least partly reliant on the printed account for what the author did not witness personally.
432 ‘Cérémonies de Mariage de Monseigneur le Dauphin,’ 302. See above Chapter 3, Section IV, 281.
433 Carpenter and Runnalls, ‘The Entertainments at the Marriage of Mary Queen of Scots’, 145-6, 151-7. This event will also be addressed by the author in a forthcoming chapter: Dean, ‘Scottish Queen or Catholic Princess’.
‘sovereign ladyis lettre’.\textsuperscript{435} The \textit{Treasurer’s Accounts} indicate that Marie de Guise supplied velvet, satin and taffety for the ‘solemnization of the mariage of our Soveraine Ladie to be counterfute in Edinburgh’ and accounts of the Dean of the Guild reveal other preparations for this ceremony.\textsuperscript{436} It appears that the city’s processions and plays revolved around a proxy marriage or recreation ceremony organised by Marie de Guise during the octave of the Feast of the Visitation of the Blessed Virgin. This drew a comparison between the young queen and her namesake, the Virgin, as had occurred for her mother in 1540. It could also have been read as a strong royal Catholic statement in the face of increasing Protestant rumblings in Scotland.

The Town Treasurer’s accounts mention decorations for scaffolds, painting a cart, and clothing purchased for players. The costumes provided included seven planets in a number of colours, cupid, and two friars; the choice of the latter likely held a political message in the fractious years prior to 1560.\textsuperscript{437} Three hundred and seventy-two bells were bought to decorate the red and white costumes of six dancers. This suggests a quasi-royal livery since Mary would later adopt these colours for her royal livery.\textsuperscript{438} One of the playwrights paid by the burgh was William Lauder, whose known work included, as Carpenter has noted, ‘a poem of advice to rulers’.\textsuperscript{439} Though no speeches or descriptions of the event remain, the likelihood of the plays being aimed at good rulership in times of need is high despite the absence of the royal couple to whom they were directed.\textsuperscript{440} Further costs for wine ‘till be run upone the Croce’ and Johnne Weir making ‘pypis to the out passage of the wyne’ indicate that wine flowed from the fountain

\textsuperscript{435} \textit{Extracts Aberdeen}, Vol. I, 307-8. No further details could be found in a search through the extant burgh minutes for Aberdeen, and there are no extant records for the town accounts, guildry accounts, or town correspondence from 1558 due to gaps in the records. Thanks must be given to the staff at the Aberdeen Archives for double checking the original minutes for further reference to this event.


\textsuperscript{437} \textit{Ibid}, 155-6.


\textsuperscript{439} \textit{Ibid}, 154-5.

\textsuperscript{440} William Lauder was one of two playwrights involved. He was paid the larger amount for making and writing the play, while William Adamsoun is also listed for ‘ane part’ that he wrote and also for his part in the play; confirming Carpenter’s suggestion [see fn. 70] that the former was perhaps orchestrator and the latter assistant. ECA, Bailies and Treasurer’s, f. 259; \textit{City of Edinburgh Old Accounts, Vol. I}, 269; Mill, \textit{Medieval Plays}, 183.
at the Cross. This recalled the inclusion of Bacchus in royal entry ceremonies, a particularly potent image for weddings alluding to anticipated bounty and plenty. There are also implications of small pyrotechnics and artillery being used, such as ‘canves, bruntstone, salt peter, lumbard paper, to the fyre balls’ and four men being paid for ‘inputting of xix pece of artailzerie within the flesche market eftir thai wer schot in the tyme of nycht’. The expenses indicate a relatively small scheme of entertainments, but this does not account for any reuse of old props and costumes from 1538. In hard times, it seems likely that such items were recycled. There is no disagreement here with Carpenter’s proposition that elements of this ceremony may have been deliberately designed to reflect the entertainments in Paris; however, the relationship these performances had to previous royal entries in Scotland, particularly Marie de Guise’s own arrival some twenty years, has perhaps been overlooked.

Around the same time as the entertainments in Edinburgh, letters arrived from Mary requesting that the commissioners take the crown matrimonial of Scotland and other regalia to France for a consort coronation. The parliamentary records state that the regent and the three estates consented to the crown being taken to France by the earl of Argyll and James Stewart, prior of St Andrews, for such a ceremony to take place, despite official protestations from James Hamilton, duke of Châtellerault. However, the crown never made it to France for the coronation of the Dauphin as king-consort of Scotland. Ultimately, neither of Mary’s consorts would be crowned, despite her apparent desire for this ceremony to occur for François.

Like the majority of single royals, the subject of Mary’s second marriage was much discussed upon her return to Scotland in 1561 following the death of François. Elizabeth I and

442 In 1590 one of the globes utilised in Anne’s entry was brought from Dundee and mended: NAS, E21/67, ff. 202r, Treasurer’s Accounts, 1 May 1588–1 Nov 1590. Also see Dean, ‘Enter the Alien’.
443 Leslie, Historie, Vol. II, 391-5. Leslie’s account includes a transcription of the letter sent by Mary. Many Scottish histories compiled and written in the following century note that this desire for the crown for Francis was first raised with the Scottish commissioners shortly after the wedding ceremonials in the French Parlement, with the commissioners stating they did not have instructions in regards to this matter. NLS, Adv. MS 35.5.3, f. 190v; NLS, Adv. MS 35.4.2, Vol. I, f. 331r; Pitscottie, Historie, Vol. II, 125-7.
Mary’s de Guise relatives continued to put pressure on her at various junctures, but there were other interested parties, including the King of Sweden who had proposed his son for a union with Mary as early as February 1561 (when Mary still resided in France). Mary’s choice of Lord Darnley, a Scottish noble, was an anomaly when compared to her predecessor’s unions since the turn of the fifteenth century and most of the thirteenth. Yet, as a female monarch of Scotland, Mary herself was also an anomaly. In ceremonial terms, her second husband did not arrive from abroad or across the border from England, and no royal entry appears to have occurred. The mounting hostility recorded in the communications of Randolph and other English ambassadors towards the match may have been why Mary did not want a large public display. On 11 May 1565 Randolph reported to William Cecil that:

> It pleases her [Mary] to advance him [Darnley] to the highest degree she can call to him; as on Monday [14 May] to create him Lord of Armenacke, upon Tuesday Earl of Ross and Duke of Rosaye [Rothesay], which are the three chief honours of her patrimony... To this solemnity are assembled the chief estates of this realm to have their full consents as well to the marriage as these three grants.

The queen may have intended for this ceremony to be the public acclamation of Darnley’s status.

The Treasurer’s Accounts highlight a flood of messengers sent out between 6 and 8 May to a variety of noble, lords and officials presumably demanding their attendance, providing relatively short notice. Nicholas Throckmorton, an English ambassador, was refused access

---

447 For example: CSP Scot, Vol. II, nos. 163, 166, 170-1, 175-6, 186-208. The details of the controversy surrounding Mary’s choice is not relevant here, but can be found in the following works: Donaldson, James V–James VI, 114-18; Ibid, All the Queen’s Men, 70-76; Lynch, ‘Introduction: Mary Queen of Scots Volume IV’, 1-29; Wormald, Mary Queen of Scots, 129-51; C. Bingham, Darnley: A Life of Henry Stuart Lord Darnley Consort of Mary Queen of Scots (London, 1997). 
448 Although Randolph and Pitscottie (Historie, Vol. II, p. 183) both state that the queen intended to make Lord Darnley the duke of Rothesay, the Diurnal (79-80) and Throckmorton (CSP Scot, Vol. II, no. 183) relay the correct honour of duke of Albany. 
449 Ibid, no. 176. 
451 Nicholas Throckmorton was sent to Scotland by Elizabeth around this time to put an end to the marriage plans with Darnley and bring about one of the other proposed matches for Mary. But since his arrival is dated at approximately the same time as the aforementioned information was sent by Randolph, his task was a difficult if not impossible one. See: CSP Scot, Vol. II, nos. 170, 173, 178. The first two are
to the knighting ceremony in the castle; but he comments with some surprise on the large numbers of nobles gathered at Stirling. Along with Darnley, the queen also bestowed knighthoods on fourteen other men of Scotland at Stirling on 15 May, which was a tried and tested loyalty building exercise. White velvet, sixty ‘hankis’ of sewing gold costing £68, and white, red and black silks and satins were purchased for the queen, and black velvet was purchased for one of the queen’s saddles on 14 May, suggestive of personal display. The Lyon Herald, heralds and pursuivants were paid ‘for thair expensis and chargis remanand in Striviling upoun hir graces effaris’ at this time, suggesting a display of royal symbolism embodied in these figures and possibly a public announcement outside the castle walls. However, an important difference between this knighting ceremony and a royal entry was the lack of wider public involvement. Mary had invited members of the estates and many attended, but previous royal entries were predominantly orchestrated by the burgh for the consort to provide an open and public display of welcome, and this was a closed event with select attendance.

The details of the actual marriage ceremony in Edinburgh are sketchy at best. Proclamations were made on 22 July at Saint Giles, Holyrood and the Chapel Royal that Henry, earl of Ross, was ‘to be marijt with Marie’. These were followed by a ceremony at Holyrood raising him to the position of Duke of Albany. The wedding took place on 29 July in the chapel at Holyrood palace. The ceremony was presided over by the Dean of Restalrig and performed as a Catholic rite, despite Darnley’s professed Protestantism, ‘with greit magnificence, accompaniit with haill nobilitie of this realme’. While there is no need to doubt that this Catholic ceremony was magnificent, Pitscottie’s account tempers the second half of the statement by naming four key nobles who were absent from the event: the duke of Châtelherault

‘Instructions to Throckmorton’, and the third a letter from Throckmorton to Leicester and Cecil announcing his arrival in Scotland, where he was welcomed and entertained by the earl Marischal and Lord Lethington, dated 11 May.

Ibid, no. 182.

Ibid, nos.181-2. No. 181 includes a list of all those men who were made knights.

TA, Vol. XI, 362-3. Note that the Lyon King of Arms at this time was Sir Robert Forman – author of the Forman Rolls, part of which is illustrated in the R.R. Stodart, Scottish Arms, 1370–1678 (Edinburgh, 1881), v, plates 12-21.

Diurnal, 79-80.

A number of reports state 28 July; however, on the whole the editors of these sources correct this date to 29 July.

and earls of Argyll, Moray and Rothes. All these men were leading Protestants and it is likely that many others abstained from attending for religious reasons. The announcement of the union was responded to ‘with loud shouts of God save our sovereigns’, while the gunners at Edinburgh Castle were paid to fire cannons ‘at the solemnite of the marriage of their hienesses’. The ceremony was concluded with attendance to Mass, and for this ritual even the queen’s new husband was conspicuous in his absence.

Many details of these controversial nuptials remain unknown. However, there is one piece of information which Mary herself provides. In the inventory of household goods and jewels collated during Mary’s pregnancy the following year, the queen noted to whom each of the inventoried items should be bequeathed. Amongst the items to be given to her husband was a diamond ring enamelled with red, next to which the queen recorded:

\[
Cest celui de quay ie espouse. Au Roy qui la me donne.
It was with this that I was married; I leave it to the King who gave it me.
\]

This implies that the ring was Mary’s wedding ring, and that it was used within the ceremony, confirming an exchange of rings within this ceremony. There are no detailed accounts – descriptive or financial – of the celebrations that followed, although Knox complained that the frivolities continued for three to four days. Utilising poems by George Buchanan composed for the occasion, Carpenter has outlined two of the pageantry displays: one featuring classic gods and goddesses and a second displaying offers of allegiance from ‘exotic’

---

458 Pitscottie, Historie, Vol. II, 183
462 In the TA around the time of the wedding payment of £76, 16 s. made for the goldsmith ‘Ginone Loysclener’ but there is no indication of what exactly he was providing, perhaps this was the ring given to the king in the wedding ceremony. TA, Vol. XI, 373.
463 Such an exchange of rings is described (although it is not footnoted) in Guy, My Heart is My Own, 215. In her discussions regarding Mary’s gifting of a diamond ring and a verse to Elizabeth, Morna Fleming notes that diamond rings were popular love tokens in sixteenth-century Scotland: ‘An Unequal Correspondence: Epistolary and Poetic Exchanges between Mary Queen of Scots and Elizabeth of England’, in S.M. Dunnigan, C.M. Harker and E.S. Newlyn (eds), Woman and the Feminine in Medieval and Early Modern Scottish Writing (Basingstoke, 2004), 104-119.
figures including Pallas, Cupid, and knights of Virtue. Both are ripe with classical illusions, steering clear of religious connotations, therefore designed for a wider court audience than the nuptials themselves. In many ways the themes of the performances – such as the promise of a fertile marriage to continue her line – were standard for wedding celebrations. Yet, placed within the context of the political climate, particularly the tensions between Mary and Elizabeth and the question of the English succession, Carpenter proposes that these ‘commonplace wedding sentiments may well have carried a sharper edge’.

Prior to Mary’s own wedding ceremonies in 1565 weddings featured prominently in the court ceremonial calendar. Mary sponsored elements of three of these weddings; the marriage of John fifth Lord Fleming in 1562, at which Mary entertained the Swedish ambassador; then that of her bastard half-brother, Sir James Stewart, to Agnus Keith in February 1562; and the first of Mary’s ‘four Mariés’ was married to John, Lord Sempill in early 1565. For the latter the queen provided a dowry, a silver wedding gown, gifts of mattresses and ‘palţeas’, and painted masks for the ‘Fastronis evin to Marie Levingstonis mariaq’. The marriage of her half-brother included similar ceremonial gestures of patrimony as those bestowed on Darnley three years later, with the belting of James Stewart as earl of Mar. The ceremony was followed by feasting, outdoor displays with horses and pyrotechnics, and a large troupe of entertainers in red and white livery including maskers, musicians and trumpeters with royal banners emphasising the queen’s sponsorship of the event. All of which suitably impressed

466 Ibid, 216.
467 Ibid, 195-225. Carpenter provides a detailed discussion of these court revels along with others orchestrated by Mary during her short personal reign.
469 CSP Scot, Vol. II, nos. 132-3, 153. The four Mariës were Mary Livingstone, Mary Seton, Mary Fleming and Mary Beaton.
470 TA, Vol. XI, xxv, 347. This ceremony took place on Shrove Tuesday (Fastronis Eve).
471 Diurnal, 70-71.
472 Ibid; TA, Vol. XI, 109, 112; Pitscottie, Historie, Vol. II, 173. The expenses also include payments for work done to a pair of organs ‘recoverit’ by the Master of Works to be used in the ceremony; many of these instruments had been removed at the onset of the Reformation.
473 TA, Vol. XI, 103, 108-109; Carpenter, ‘Performing Diplomacies’, 201-202. While Carpenter has highlighted the masking costumes, she does not refer to the others who made up this royal troupe.
Mary’s French uncle, the marquis d’Elbeuf, who was in Scotland.\textsuperscript{474} She also provided clothing, accessories and expenses for the younger brother of the groom, Robert Stewart, who may have acted as ‘groom’s man’,\textsuperscript{475} and Mary herself had a ‘croce of gold, sett witht dyamandis and rubes’ worth £1,000, made or purchased that she may have worn for the celebrations.\textsuperscript{476} In 1562 the queen lavishly entertained the Swedish ambassador, who was in Scotland to treat for Mary’s hand in marriage. This included the celebrations for the marriage of one of Mary’s subjects, John fifth Lord Fleming:\textsuperscript{477}

‘...great triumph was maid be reasone of the ambassadour of Suadin’ who is then ‘honourabille ressawit’ at Holyrood.\textsuperscript{478}

The queen gave wedding gifts of pasmentis of gold, white taffety and other materials to Fleming’s bride to adorn her wedding dress.\textsuperscript{479} A truly spectacular event was arranged, with ships in a loch in the palace park set against the wild, rugged backdrop of Arthur’s Seat.\textsuperscript{480} A mock castle was also constructed for the event, heralded by pyrotechnic displays and the thunder of artillery in a recreation of the ‘seige of Lytht’ in 1560.\textsuperscript{481} Carpenter discusses this projection of ‘danger averted and controlled’ and proposes that, rather than just a fantastical display, the pageantry had significant political value in the context of its audience.\textsuperscript{482} Although the Swedish proposals were ultimately turned down by Mary,\textsuperscript{483} the ambassador left having been entertained royally and after exchanging various gifts. All the gifts could easily have been

\textsuperscript{474} Pitscottie, \textit{Historie}, Vol. II, 173.
\textsuperscript{475} She paid his expenses in Edinburgh from late January until mid-February, and purchased an outfit of black satin and velvet decorated with silver that was worth nearly £200, as well as accessories such as a rapier overgilt with gold. \textit{TA}, Vol. XI, 107-110.
\textsuperscript{476} \textit{Ibid}, 108.
\textsuperscript{478} \textit{Ibid}, 176. In regards to the date: Randolph informed William Cecil that the ceremony was to take place on 10 May: \textit{CSP Scot}, Vol. I, no. 1097; the \textit{Diurnal} states 17 May (72-3); Pitscottie states that the queen entered Edinburgh 14 May and the ceremonies were on 20 (\textit{Historie}, Vol. II, 176); the \textit{TA} entry is dated 20 May.
\textsuperscript{479} \textit{TA}, Vol. XI, xxxv-xxxvi, 162.
\textsuperscript{480} Aerial views and old maps reveal that there are at least three lochs situated around the park (for an example see Plate 41): St Margaret’s Loch was the closest to the palace; Duddingston Loch was the largest, and Dunsapie Loch, which is noted by Carpenter. The source of Carpenter’s assertion is not clear: ‘Performing Diplomacies’, 203. For further exploration of the landscapes and space utilised within ceremony: Dean, ‘Making the most of what they had’.
\textsuperscript{481} Pitscottie, \textit{Historie}, Vol. II, 176.
\textsuperscript{482} Carpenter, ‘Performing Diplomacies’, 202-203.
\textsuperscript{483} \textit{CSP Scot}, Vol. I, no. 1115.
decorated with Scottish royal emblems; such as a chain (perhaps of thistles) worth 1,000 crowns, two cups, two basins and jugs, and two ‘standinge pecces of silver.’\textsuperscript{484} The entertainment and feasting elements of the marriage ceremonies orchestrated by Mary Queen of Scots following her return from Scotland show a matured understanding of the ‘vocabulary of performance’ and its value to the representations of royal authority.\textsuperscript{485}

The years between 1561 and 1565 saw Mary court foreign ambassadors and master the arts of gift-giving; however, her competent understanding and use of ceremonial display was not always a mirror image of her handling of diplomacy. Despite a clear attempt to sanctify and promote her choice through ceremonial projections, Mary’s own marriage in 1565 was missing some important elements highlighted previously for her predecessors’ consorts. Darnley made no consort entry to the capital or any other city and, although proclaimed King following their wedding,\textsuperscript{486} he did not receive the crown, a coronation or make an oath. The crown matrimonial and accompanying ceremony raised complications for Mary as a queen regnant in both her marriage to Darnley and to the Dauphin. For Mary a husband, particularly an increasingly unpopular husband, could not provide the completion to her adult queenship in the manner that a female consort could for a king.\textsuperscript{487} Although he offered the same hope of children and securing the succession, a consideration advertised by Mary’s wedding pageantry, he posed more of an overt threat to her sole authority and power as a monarch.\textsuperscript{488} By denying Darnley the coronation and oath that the queen consorts of the fifteenth century underwent, Mary made a

\textsuperscript{484} Pitscottie, \textit{Historie}, 176; \textit{CSP Scot}, Vol. I, no. 1111. Mary was gifted a portrait of the Swedish king in return, which may also have featured royal arms.
\textsuperscript{485} Carpenter, ‘Performing Diplomacies’, 194-226, quote 196.
\textsuperscript{487} For examples of queen regnants across Europe: E. Woodacre, ‘The Queen’s Marriage; Matrimonial Politics in Pre-Modern Europe’ in J. Murray (ed.), \textit{Marriage in Pre-Modern Europe: Italy and Beyond} (Toronto, 2012), 29-46. Other works considering queen regnants and marriage in sixteenth-century in particular: A. Whitelock, ‘A Woman in a Man’s World: Mary I and political intimacy’ in \textit{Women’s History Review}, Vol. 16, no. 3 (June 2007), 323-334; \textit{Ibid}, \textit{Mary Tudor: England’s First Queen} (London, 2009), particularly 177-302; A. Weir, \textit{Elizabeth: The Queen} (London, reprint 2009); A. Samson, ‘Power Sharing: The Co-Monarchy of Philip and Mary’ in A. Hunt and A. Whitelock (eds), \textit{Tudor Queenship: The Reigns of Mary and Elizabeth} (New York, 2010). Thanks also Mariana Brockmann (PhD Research Student, University of Royal Holloway) for discussions on her work on Mary Tudor and Mary Queen of Scots after the following paper: ‘The Stranger Within: Mary Tudor’s and Mary, Queen of Scots’ approach to marriage’ presented at \textit{Representations of Royal Authority to 1707: Scotland and her Nearest Neighbours} (Stirling, August 2012).
\textsuperscript{488} For further discussions see: Dean, ‘Scottish Queen or Catholic Princess’.
dramatic split from the marriages of her Stewart ancestors and, by removing these ceremonial public projections of Darnley’s authority as consort, she effectively reduced his status and any hope of proxy royal power in her absence.

Section VI: Scotland’s Last Consort Coronation and Royal Wedding, James VI and Anne

In 1589 James VI married Anne of Denmark amidst ceremonies that extended well into 1590, including the king’s extended visit to Norway and Denmark. Given the impressive number of surviving sources covering the wedding and surrounding ceremonial interactions, a number of scholars have written about these events.489 This chapter therefore places the evidence from this

post-Reformation marriage and consort coronation in the context of the Scottish royal marriage ceremonial since the thirteenth century to provide the end point of the discussion and an overture to the conclusion.

From 1583, when legislation was passed for a tax of £20,000 ‘for making such charges as will be required toward the preparation for his marriage’, the marriage of James VI was the concern of many.490 The early stages of the negotiations for the Danish match were marred by a number of ceremonial faux pas, including when the Danish ambassadors were ‘mishandled, ruffeled, triffelit, drifted and delayed’ on a visit in 1585.491 Yet, despite Stevenson’s comments regarding James’ apathy to the marriage, when the king turned twenty-one and achieved his full majority in 1587, legislation was passed for a further tax of £100,000 for the wedding to be raised by the three estates.492 This followed a number of interactions between the royal pair, including an exchange of portraits instigated by James in an effort to build bridges.493 While the rather serious and dignified young man in the portrait did not portray the swaggering confidence of royal portraiture for the likes of Henry VIII and his grandfather James V, the evidence suggests that this richly dressed prince understood the value of his marriage ceremony and the display that accompanied it. Moreover, the language of the parliamentary records emphasised that the performance of James VI’s wedding was not only crucial for the king’s honour but also for the realm itself.494

---

490 RPS, A1583/4/2, Additional Source: Legislation (Holyrood, Convention, 19 April 1583).
491 Melville, Memoirs, 337; Stevenson, Scotland’s Last Royal Wedding, 4-6.
492 RPS, A1588/4/2, A1588/4/4, Legislation: Taxation of £100,000, and Act concerning the dividing and setting of taxation (Holyrood, Convention, 4 April 1588); Extracts Aberdeen, Vol. II, ER, Vol. XXII, xl-xl, 102, 108, 161. The parliamentary legislation indicates that the tax should have been collected by Martinmas [11 November] 1590; however, James Colville of Strathrodie, one of the marriage tax collectors, submitted a payment of £9930, 17s. in the period ending May 1591 and other payments were also slow in arriving. It must also be noted that the value of Scottish currency plummeted in the late 1580s and early 1590s to approximately 7-10 pound Scots to sterling, see above Note on Money, xii-xiv.
493 Stevenson, Scotland’s Last Royal Wedding, 6. As Stevenson notes, the portrait by Adrian Vanson was found in 1996 and rehoused at Edinburgh castle. It does not show a coat of arms or other symbols of Scottish royal authority. However, the original frame does not survive and may have been used in this manner, perhaps decorated with lions, thistles or other such designs. See Plate 42.
494 RPS, 1587/7/20, Procedure: Commission for the taxation to... treat and conclude upon his marriage (Edinburgh, Parliament, 29 July 1587).
The high-powered embassy that departed for Denmark, made up of George Keith, earl Marischal, Andrew Keith Lord Dingwall, James Scrymgeour, the constable of Dundee, John Skene and George Young, was welcomed with honour on their arrival for the final negotiations, which were concluded in August 1589. The proxy marriage took place in Kronenborg on 20 August, where the Scottish ambassadors undertook a formal signing and oath-taking ceremony. The earl Marischal acted as James VI’s representative and had to deliver a German address prior to a symbolic bedding ceremony accompanied by torchlight, with twelve nobles from each realm carrying different coloured torches. Although the colours are not indicated, it is probable that they were in the royal colours of the respective realms and perhaps decorated with royal arms to provide visual symbols of each part of this royal union. Stevenson suggests that this ceremonial would also have incorporated gift giving, music, and feasting.

Preparations for Anne’s arrival began in earnest in August and September 1589, but were put on hold when it became clear that the princess was not going to arrive in Scotland before the following spring due to storms. Stevenson has proposed that James VI’s decision to sail to ‘save’ his bride and the events which occurred on this journey ‘represented a political coming of age.’ The declaration he left in his wake emphasised idealistic chivalric values of rescuing Anne from the perils of the storms, and that the decision had been made for the good

---

495 BL, Add MS 22958, f. 5v, Audit of the accounts of Sir John [Maitland] of Thirlestane, Lord Chancellor of Scotland, of money expended in 1589, 1590, on the visit of James VI to Norway and Denmark, in the occasion of his marriage, date 1 March 1593[4]. These accounts of the Scottish Chancellor Thirlestane reveal that George Keith received £10,000 ‘as principall ambassado[r]’ and that £4500 was paid to the captain of the ship and his company for several months.

496 Danish Account, 79-85; NAS, SP8/4-6, State Papers: Treaties with Norway, Denmark and Sweden; Stevenson, Scotland’s Last Royal Wedding, 17-23.

497 The earliest English example of a bedding ceremony for royalty occurs at the marriage of Katherine de Valois and Henry V, which took place in France in 1420, and the bedding ceremony persisted and became more elaborate as the centuries progressed (particularly in France): L. Wright, Warm and Snug: A History of the Bed (Stroud, 2004), 82-4, 93-5; A. Weir, ‘Princely marriage: Royal weddings from 1066–1714’ in Weir, K. Williams, S. Gristwood and T. Borman (eds), The Ring and the Crown: A History of Royal Weddings, 1066–2011 (London, 2011), 28-30. Pluscarden records the ceremonially consummation of the marriage between Princess Margaret and Dauphin Louis in a bedding ceremony once both parties were of age two years after their wedding in 1436 (Pluscarden, 283), and this is the only mention of a bedding ceremony in all discussed here. However, there is evidence of the bedding ritual found in Scottish custom as late as the nineteenth century in the north east: Margaret Bennett, Scottish Customs: From the Cradle to the Grave (Edinburgh, 2011), 147, 175.

498 Danish Account, 85-6.

499 Stevenson, Scotland’s Last Royal Wedding, 22-3.


501 For more on the king’s journey to and within Scandinavia, see Stevenson, Scotland’s Last Royal Wedding, 24-56.
of the realm and to restore faith in his ability to continue the ancient line of Scottish kings. However, James’ uninvited arrival in Norway meant that he had broken standard royal diplomatic etiquette before even stepping off his ship. His arrival had to command a sufficient scale and show genuine concern for his new bride to make up for any insult he may have caused, and this had to be achieved while some of his wealthiest nobles were already absent in Denmark. The ambassadors who accompanied the king included: Maitland of Thirlestane; Sir Lewis Bellenden, justice clerk and governor of Linlithgow palace; Robert Douglass, the provost of Lincluden, Sir Peter Vaus of Barnbarroch; Sir John Carmichael and Sir William Keith, the Master of the Wardrobe; Mr A[lexander] Lindsay; Lord Spynie; and John Skeene. In addition, Calderwood states that the total number of lords and barons in attendance totalled around three hundred. Over £650 was paid to ‘S[ir] patrik Vaus of barne Garroch’ for fitting out a ship to accompany the king to Denmark, and Robert Jamesone, a burgess of Ayr, received a £2,000 fee to provide a ship for two months. Thirlestane’s account records that along with the crew and provisions for Jamesone’s ship, the fee covered the decoration of the ship with silk and flags, and £124 for the clothing, wage, and trumpet of the king’s trumpeter. In early October the king made a declaration to sixteen individual burghs requesting for ships to be sent at their own expense. Edinburgh responded with a sixty ton ship that was ‘appoyntet for hamebering the queyne’ and provided twenty men of Leith and Edinburgh with suitable arms.

---

502 Papers relative to the marriage of King James the Sixth of Scotland, with the Princess Anne of Denmark; A.D. MDLXXXXIX. And the Forme and Manner of Her Majesty’s Coronation at Holyroodhouse. A.D. MDXC, ed. J.T. Gibson Craig (Edinburgh, 1828), 3-11; Stevenson, Scotland’s Last Royal Wedding, 30-32. Stevenson points out that James VI’s declaration may have been a direct response to rumours of his impotency or his lack of interest in female company. 503 Ibid, p. 33. 504 Thirlestane was the Chancellor, and he put forward much of his personal wealth into the endeavour as his accounts reveal: BL, Audit of the accounts of Sir John [Maitland] of Thirlestane, Add MS 22958. 505 RPC, Vol. IV, 421; Papers relative to the marriage of King James, 33. 506 D. Calderwood, The History of the Kirk of Scotland, ed. T. Thomson (8 vols, Edinburgh, 1842–1849), Vol. V, 25-7. David Calderwood (c. 1575–1650) was a historian and Church of Scotland minister who was ultimately banished from the kingdom (1619–1625) following various grievances with the king. His history was written after his return to Scotland and the death of James VI in 1625; however, the documents he used in the writing of the history – made up of histories, diaries, acts of parliament and other official records – had been collected over his life time. See Vaughan T. Wells, ‘Calderwood, David (c. 1575–1650), Church of Scotland Minister and historian’, ODNB (2004–2013), http://www.oxforddnb.com.ezproxy.stir.ac.uk/view/article/4374 . Accessed 17 March 2013. 507 Sir Peter Vaus of Barnbarrach. 508 NAS, E21/67, f. 167r. 509 BL, Add MS 22958, ff. 6r-7v. 510 Papers relative to the marriage of King James, 3-6.
and attire to accompany with the ship and its crew. The fleet that set sail with its flags and painted decoration – which presumably sported royal arms – was a floating statement of Scottish royal authority.

Ultimately, however, James VI’s unannounced arrival meant few saw the fleet and the wedding at the Old Bishop’s Palace in Oslo was a low a key affair. However, the Danish royal family went on to entertain James for several months. This included a royal entry into Elsinore by boat, visits to a number of major cities and universities, and his visit was brought to a triumphant close at the marriage of Anne’s sister Princess Elizabeth to Henry, duke of Brunswick, which was attended by a broad spectrum of European royalty. By the time he was preparing for his departure, James must have grasped the effort required to suitably impress the Danish entourage who were to accompany the young royal couple back to Scotland.

James VI’s personal representations of royal authority in Norway and Denmark were of course limited by the fact that he was the guest rather than the host. One of the keys aspects over which James had control was the giving of gifts. As Stevenson has noted ‘his honour and that of Scotland required lavish giving.’ Thirlestane’s account lists an impressive array of rich gifts, which ranged from magnificent diamonds and rubies for Queen Sophie (dowager) and the young king of Denmark to small payments to trumpeters, bell ringers, an organist, fools and the men who ‘made the fireworks’ at the wedding of Princess Elizabeth and the duke of Brunswick. James’s generosity at the Danish court rivalled that of his grandfather in France. Beyond the court he made donations to the hospitals in Copenhagen and Elsinore,
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512 *Danish Account*, 90-94; D. Moysie, *Memoirs of the Affairs of Scotland, MDLXXVII–MDCIII, from Early Manuscripts*, ed. J. Dennistoun (Edinburgh, 1830), 80-81; Stevenson notes that specific instructions have been found regarding keeping the celebrations to a small scale due to the fact that the ceremony should have occurred in Scotland at James VI’s expense: *Scotland’s Last Royal Wedding*, 35-6.
514 *Scotland’s Last Royal Wedding*, 54.
515 Some of these details are raised by Stevenson: *Ibid*, 48-55.
516 BL, Add MS 22958, ff. 12r, 13r, 14v-15r, 16r-18r, 19v-20r, 24v-25r.
517 The wider gift-giving amongst the nobility saw jewels and gold chains distributed amongst key figures, including Henry Goldstein, Captain of Balhous, and his wife, the Chancellor of Denmark, the princes of Brunswick, the Admiral of Denmark, one of the Danish ambassadors; and 5,000 ‘daleris’ was
offerings in chapels, and he donated seven large books and a gilt cup to the college at Copenhagen. While any decoration of the gifts remains unknown, it is noted that James left an epitaph in a book for the astronomer Tyge Brahe, stating:

The lion’s wrath is noble
Spare the conquered and overthrow the haughty.

The epitaph clearly conjures the symbolic creature of his royal arms and the ideal of his kingship that it demonstrated, and the presence of the Scottish royal lion rampant – along with other emblems such as the thistle and the unicorn – upon other gifts was likely. The young king’s multi-faceted gift-giving was a key way in which he was able to represent his royal authority and project an image of a generous and beneficent European prince.

Anne’s arrival to Scotland and subsequent ceremonial was the prime opportunity for James VI to project his image of independent royal authority, now amplified by the prospect of the continuation of his dynasty through his marriage to a foreign princess. The ceremonial events can be split into four distinct sections: Anne’s arrival at Leith and Scottish preparations; the first arrival at Edinburgh and the Danish envoys’ tours of Anne’s estates; the coronation; and her official royal entry to Edinburgh. The first and third of these shall be the main focus of the remaining discussion. Preparations for Anne’s arrival had begun in September 1589, before James’s departure, when a number of pleas were sent out to his nobles and Elizabeth I for assistance. Although both Stevenson and Meikle emphasise James VI’s financial

spent on chains to be distributed amongst the nobles and gentlemen of the Danish court: BL, Add MS 22958, ff. 10v, 12r, 13r, 19v, 20r.

These books have not survived and were paid for in Danish currency, suggesting that they were bought in Denmark rather than printed in Scotland.

Ibid, ff. 12r, 13r, 14v-15r, 16r, 17r-19r. Stevenson goes into a great deal of detail regarding the king’s visits to the universities, activities that are recorded by the Danish account: see Danish Account, 99; Stevenson, Scotland’s Last Royal Wedding, 48-51.

Tyghe Brahe, also spelt Tycho.

For the entries and tours of Anne’s estates see: Ibid, 57-62; Meikle, ‘Anna of Denmark’s Coronation and Entry’, 280-84; Dean, ‘Enter the Alien’.

‘King James VI to the Laird of Arbuthnot’ from ‘The Arbuthnot Papers’ in J. Stuart (ed.), Miscellany of the Spalding Club (Edinburgh, 1842), Vol. II, 114; CSP Scot, Vol. X, nos. 169, 182, 201, 218, 226. For example no. 218 from Lord Scrope referring to a brace of ‘fatt stagges redy baked’ delivered for the king’s wedding by Earl of Derby, and no. 226 lists over £2,000 worth of gold and silver plate gifted to James VI by Queen Elizabeth in September 1589.
struggles, this thesis has shown how the Scottish monarchy faced such challenges in the orchestration of royal ceremony throughout the centuries, and the involvement of burghs and nobles in their organisation has ample precedent. Under James’s special command in October 1589 £2,302 was spent on eight sumptuously decorated saddles for his bride and her ladies. Royal liveries of red and yellow taffety and velvet were ordered for two pages and two lackey of his ‘hienes darrest bedfellow’ cost near £400, including gold buttons, ribbons and gold sewing silk to decorate them. These purchases continue the trend observed in previous centuries for increasingly expensive and lavish material goods to promote royal grandeur.

The Edinburgh burgh officials gave 5,000 merks to the king’s wedding preparations and undertook further expense in preparing the city for the queen’s entry. These included repairs to walls, gates, crosses, the Tron and the Kirk of St Giles, the making a ‘payl of velvott’ to be carried above the queen, decorating the West Port with the king and queen’s gilt coat of arms, making scaffolds and stages, and providing props (including two globes and a unicorn) to be used at stations on the entry route. Moreover, orders were laid down for street cleaning, removing beggars, suitably attired prominent townsmen to ‘salut hir [the Queen] at hir landing’, and allotting the task of carrying the ‘paill’ at various stages of the queen’s entry. The records imply that the entry had specific set components, with a marked focus on royal symbols
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525 Stevenson, Scotland’s Last Royal Wedding, 20, 27-8; Meikle, ‘Anna of Denmark’s Coronation and Entry’, 278.
526 The velve t alone for these cost over £1,000 and large quantities of gold, silver and black silk and satin pasmentis were purchased to decorate them: NAS, E21/67, ff. 165r-v.
527 Ibid, ff. 165r-166v.
528 5,000 merks would be around £3,300 Scots, see above Note on Money, xii-xiv.
529 This task was assigned to William Fairlie and his account listing the details of making the paill remains extant: ECA, ‘William Fairlie’s account for the Entry of Anne of Denmark’, in Edinburgh Burgh Accounts: Bailies Accounts, Extents and Unlaws, 1564–1644, 285-7 (Although the originals of these have been consulted, thanks must be given to Michael Pearce for his kind offering of his working transcriptions of this account and discussion about the design of the ‘paill’ in the context of his own work); Danish Account, 109, 114 (The Danish account records a ‘liver-coloured’ canopy carried over the carriage by six ‘worthy citizens.’ From the carriage to St Giles the canopy is recorded as red and carried by four councillors. This further develops the idea of shared honour; however the latter is harder to corroborate in other sources); Mill, Medieval Plays, 195-201.
530 ECA, SL1/1/9, ff. 3v-6r, 8v; ECA, Town Treasurer’s Accounts from 1581 to 1596 (rebound 1924), ff. 530-48; Extracts Edinburgh (2), Vol. I, 3-5, 327-8; Mill, Medieval Plays, 194-7.
such as the unicorn and the royal arms, and emphasise a sense of duty amongst the town inhabitants in regards to welcoming the queen.\textsuperscript{531}

A hiatus occurred during James’s visit to Scandinavia, but preparations were resumed following the return of William Shaw, the Master of Works, with orders set down by James in February 1590. These instructions made demands for the preparations of ships in the harbour, the firing of cannons from ships and castles, the resumption of building work,\textsuperscript{532} housing for guests to be suitably fitted out, and more specific demands about who should be present at Leith for the landing.\textsuperscript{533} In March 1590, letters were sent to the various east coast burghs regarding raising ships to be sent to meet the king’s convoy.\textsuperscript{534} Burgh records confirm that Edinburgh set up a commission to find a ship and ‘[…] weill furneist with maryners and pylots and dekkit with stremes, flags […]’,\textsuperscript{535} and that Montrose, Aberdeen and Banff also provided a ship, along with the provision of two cannons named ‘the Falcon’ and ‘the Nicholas’.\textsuperscript{536} Therefore, Anne’s arrival at Leith on 1 May 1590 was met by a floating statement of royal authority, similar to that which James had prepared for his arrival in Norway, and heralded by the rumble of cannon fire.

Crowds of nobles, ladies, burgh officials, and townspeople gathered on the docks to welcome the queen with the greeting crowd on the dock steps split with one side for women and one for men.\textsuperscript{537}

The plan devised in September 1589 planned for the queen’s official royal entry to Edinburgh and coronation to smoothly follow her arrival at Leith; however, Anne would not

\textsuperscript{531} See Dean, ‘Enter the Alien’.
\textsuperscript{532} Main building works were at Holyrood – with £1,000 of the £5,000 granted by the town of Edinburgh ‘for the entertainment of strangers’ going to William Shaw, the Master of Works, for this palace and abbey – and St Giles in Edinburgh: ECA, SL1/1/9, ff. 38r-42v; ECA, SL144/4/3, ff. 384-95, Dean of the Guild Accounts 1568–1601 and 1603–1626 (Rebound 1925), \textit{Extracts Aberdeen}, Vol. I, 17-19, 329-30.
\textsuperscript{533} ‘The directioun brocht hame be Williame Shae, Mr of Works, xix Februarij’ in Papers relative to the marriage of King James, 29-34.
\textsuperscript{534} NAS, E21/67, f. 188v.
\textsuperscript{535} ECA, SL1/1/9, ff. 36r-37r; ECA, Town Treasurer’s Accounts from 1581 to 1596, f.568; \textit{Extracts Edinburgh} (2), Vol. I, 16-17, 330. The preparations included painting the ship, mending the ordinance, and payments for the ship’s owner, gunner and Nicoll ‘the trumpeter, that saillit with the schip’ costing nearly £1,000.
\textsuperscript{536} ECA, SL30/1/1/2, ff. 183-4r, Convention of Royal Burghs Minutes, Vol. II, 3 April 1552–1 July 1595; \textit{Extracts Aberdeen}, Vol. II, 67.
\textsuperscript{537} ECA, SL1/1/9, f. 6; \textit{Extracts Edinburgh} (2), Vol. I, 4; NLS, Adv. MS 35.4.2, Vol. II, f. 597r; Calderwood, \textit{History of the Kirk}, Vol. V, 60-62, 94; \textit{Danish Account}, 100; Meikle, ‘Anna of Denmark’s Coronation and Entry’, 278-9; Dean, ‘Enter the Alien’.
make her formal entry until nearly three weeks after her arrival. Conflicts with the ministers, including objections to the royal entry’s frivolities occurring on the Sabbath, and Anne’s possible anointment as queen consort, as well as finalising documentation regarding dower lands and the completion of work at Holyrood, were at the roots of the delays. The Protestant government of 1567 had faced issues with the inclusion of some aspects of James VI’s coronation as an infant, with the result that they ended up carrying out a relatively traditional ceremony. However, there had been major changes since 1567. The Protestant government was firmly entrenched and did not have to justify the forcible removal of a monarch as in 1567. On the other hand, they were no longer dealing with an infant monarch, and James had clear ideas about the manner in which his consort would be crowned and the image of authority he intended to project. The coronation, including unction, was set to take place on Sunday 17 May, while the entry would take place the following Tuesday. James succeeded in ensuring that the coronation was conducted as he wished. However, the date set for the coronation meant that the Danish entourage had to be suitably occupied, including a preliminary entry to Edinburgh and indulging their demands to scrutinise Anne’s new lands and properties with a tour of her estates.

The coronation of Anne of Denmark at Holyrood on Sunday 17 May is recorded in varying detail by a number of contemporary accounts and the Treasurer’s Accounts underscore the splendour of the occasion. The Danish account records the only known extant oath of a queen of Scots, including perhaps most interestingly a return oath given by the estates, as well

538 Calderwood, History of the Kirk, Vol. V, 60-62. One of the main causes of contention for his Protestant ministers was James’s determination to hold his wife’s royal entry and coronation on a Sunday. However, this study illuminates that very few Scottish consorts were crowned on a Sunday and there is little consistency regarding a specific day or time of year for this event, and therefore James’s reasoning – often assumed to have been recalling tradition – may have been more overtly confrontational.
539 See above Chapter 2, Section IV, 198-207; Lynch, ‘Scotland’s First Protestant Coronation’, 177-207.
540 CSP Scot, Vol. X, nos. 398, 403; Danish Account, 100; Calderwood, History of the Kirk, Vol. V, 95-6; Papers relative to the marriage of King James, 49.
541 Ibid, 38-9; Danish Account, 100-103; NLS, Adv. MS 35.4.2, Vol. II, f. 597v; CSP Scot, Vol. X, no. 403; Stevenson, Scotland’s Last Royal Wedding, 58; Meikle, ‘Anna of Denmark’s Coronation and Entry’, 281-3. See Meikle and Stevenson re: tour of the estates gifted to Anne, including the handing over of earth and stones by the Danish entourage, accompanied by the giving of an oath.
542 Some details are also discussed by Meikle, ‘Anna of Denmark’s Coronation and Entry’, 285-7.
as offering liturgical aspects such as psalms and the manner in which the queen was anointed.\textsuperscript{543}

There are clear comparisons to be drawn between this ceremony and those in the \textit{Forme} and Balfour’s text of the monarch coronation,\textsuperscript{544} as well as the consort ceremonies discussed above. For example, a scaffold was erected at the front of the church as found from 1437 for the monarch, and as posited in regards to Marie de Guise in 1540 in order to physically raise the royal ceremony above the crowds.\textsuperscript{545} Much like his predecessors (most notably James IV and V), James VI went to great expense making sure all the attendees looked their best, spending nearly £2,950 on clothing for various ministers and other individuals.\textsuperscript{546} The church and palace of Holyrood were decked with scarlet and green cloth hangings, chairs and stools were covered with red, green and white velvet decorated with gold,\textsuperscript{547} providing a vivid backdrop in the royal colours.

The hierarchical order to the entrance of the church saw a central focus on the royal regalia of the king, carried in by nobles, and a departure from the tradition of the fifteenth century as James VI entered first accompanied by knights, nobles and heralds wearing a royal robe of purple carried by five earls. The fact that five earls were required to carry the robe and that it does not appear in the financial accounts suggests that this was the royal robe made for his grandfather in 1540.\textsuperscript{548} New clothing was purchased at great expense for the royal pages, four lackeys and four trumpeters; the latter were provided with banners decorated with the king’s arms to adorn their trumpets.\textsuperscript{549} James was surrounded by the colours and symbols of his royal authority.

\textsuperscript{543} NAS, E31/67, ff. 199r-208r; \textit{Danish Account}, 104-107; \textit{Papers relative to the marriage of King James}, 49-56; NLS, Adv. MS 35.4.2, Vol. II, f. 597v-8r; Calderwood, \textit{History of the Kirk}, Vol. V, 95-6; Moysie, \textit{Memoirs}, 83. The order of the events is different in Calderwood and Johnston than in the two former accounts, but Calderwood and Johnstone wrote retrospectively in the seventeenth century while the others were contemporary.

\textsuperscript{544} Lindsay, ‘Forme of the coronatioun’, \textit{RPC}, Vol. II, 393-95; NLS, Adv. MS. 33.2.26, ff. 30r-31r. See above Chapter 2, \textit{passim}.

\textsuperscript{545} \textit{Danish Account}, 104.

\textsuperscript{546} NAS, E21/67, ff. 202v-203v; \textit{Papers relative to the marriage of King James}, Appendix II, 16-17. Many received between £100 and £200 each.

\textsuperscript{547} Ibid, Appendix II, 14, 19; NAS, E21/67, ff. 199v, 213r.


\textsuperscript{549} For example, for the six royal pages over £900 was spent on six cloaks, doublets and breaches with a further £235 on pasmentis of gold along with the additional costs for making the garments and
Anne also wore an elaborate royal robe made of thirty ells of purple velvet lined with white taffety and bordered with pasmentis of gold, decoratively embroidered with purple, white and yellow sewing silk, costing near £900. Whilst James VI appears to have used the royal robe of his predecessor, the same is not true of Anne. Anne was only a teenager in comparison to Marie de Guise, who was in her twenties by 1540 and it might be presumed that a new smaller robe was fashioned to accommodate her. However, Anne’s robe was made from 8 ells more material than that of Marie. A purple velvet bonnet lined with red satin was added to the queen’s crown, suggesting the crown itself was that used by Marie de Guise. This was carried before her by Thirlestane, the Chancellor, who had been elevated to a lordship in a knighting ceremony preceding the coronation. The English ambassador, Sir Robert Bowes, and the Danish Admiral, Peter Monk – sporting a magnificent diamond studded chain gifted to him by the king – led Anne to the altar. The role of ambassadors as those who gave the consort up for marriage or coronation is one that can be traced back in the earlier ceremonies, as can the large train of noble ladies from both realms, including the wife of the English envoy, who followed her into the church.

The actual coronation ceremony began with the singing of two psalms, numbers forty and forty-eight, the contents of which emphasised the role of the queen in assisting her husband in upholding the true word of God, looking to God for help and defending the faith. After a sermon preached in Latin, French and English, Minister Robert Bruce made an oration designed to detach the ceremony of anointing from its Catholic roots and superstitions before...
undertaking the action.\textsuperscript{557} Much like Mary of Guelders’ ceremony, Anne was then re-robed before her investiture with the regalia, made up of crown and sceptre. Although the latter is not described, its absence from the financial accounts connotes that it belonged to her predecessor Marie de Guise. In contrast to Margaret Tudor, James VI did not personally hand Anne the sceptre, but it came from him via the minister. So, James handed her royal power through the medium of a religious figure, thereby emphasising that her power came from both the king and God. With this part complete, Bruce offered duty and obedience on the part of the three estates and asked for it in return; this was repeated in French for her understanding, before she took her oath with her hand placed on the bible. There is a certain irony to the focus on the defence of the Protestant faith in the oath, as Anne later turned to Catholicism;\textsuperscript{558} however, the oath also promoted her role as assistant to the king in matters of justice and peace, the role that the Marie de Guise’s ‘main de justice’ exemplified. Once her oath was complete, she was led to a higher platform where a second seat was provided\textsuperscript{559} for her to sit through theologian Andrew Melville’s two hundred line congratulatory piece.\textsuperscript{560}

The queen remained in this elevated position for what must have been the most interesting part of the ceremony given this chapter’s previous discussions about the consort’s relationship with the estates and how this was translated ceremonially. From this raised seat Queen Anne received the return oaths of the people. The men who took this oath were selected as representatives of the three estates with two temporal nobles, two ministers and two provosts who knelt before her ‘and with raised hands gave their oath on behalf of the common Scottish people’ to be ‘loyal, faithful and obedient’. The return oath addressed her as ‘our most gracious queen and the true and dear wife of our most gracious lord and king’, therefore, accentuating that her power emanated from her marriage to James VI. Yet, the rest of the oath, and the very fact that a return oath was made, illuminated the coronation as marking the start of the public

\textsuperscript{558} Meikle, ‘Anna of Denmark’s Coronation and Entry’, 286.
\textsuperscript{559} This could provide another explanation for why two purple velvet covered decorative chairs were provided for Marie de Guise at the time of her coronation: See above Chapter 3, Section IV, 288.
\textsuperscript{560} The Danish Account, 105-106. Some of these details are referred to in Johnston and Calderwood also; however, it is the Danish Account that provides the most detail.
relationship between the estates and the queen. There is no suggestion in the wake of Anne’s coronation and the subsequent entry that she was involved in a convention of the estates to undertake an oath in a parliamentary setting. However, the manner in which the oath was undertaken in Holyrood in 1590 – with two representatives from each of the estates – indicates that two distinctly separate ceremonies had been combined, with the oath lifted out of its previous parliamentary setting and placed within the church-bound coronation. The reciprocal oath recorded in Anne’s ceremony may have been the product of foreign influence, but there are few comparative realms where the consort oath took place, let alone a reciprocal one from three estates. The consistent connections between the Scottish consort coronation and parliament suggest that such a tradition developed from Scottish roots.

Chapter 3: Conclusion

The fourteenth century presents distinct anomalies in regards to foreign unions, with Balliol, Robert Bruce, Robert II and III all coming to the throne already married, but it is within this period that the consort coronation rose to prominence following the grant of unction in 1329 and from this point the coronations of queens are linked to parliament. Layne-Smith stated in
regards to fifteenth-century English queens that the coronation was concerned with the queen’s role in the king’s public life. Following the contentions arising from James I’s promotion of Joan within the political sphere, and the resolute attempts of parliament to control the oath-taking of the king following 1445, the inclusion of a formal oath exchange in parliament for the consort outlining her role and responsibilities would fit with both the determination of this political body of parliament to retain a level of control in the functioning of royal power following a minority (or sustained absence), and a tacit acceptance by both the king and the estates of their mutual dependency in regards to the bestowal of royal authority. Anne’s oath was placed into the coronation ceremony at Holyrood in 1590 rather than being separately undertaken in parliament; however, those chosen to kneel before her and give the return oath are distinctly representative of the three estates. This implies a symbolic connection to the proposed oaths of queens taken in parliaments of the fifteenth century, and points to a reciprocal oath having substantial roots in previous ceremonies.

The oath taken by Anne is the first text remaining extant. This creates some difficulties in making direct comparisons of its contents with earlier evidence, considering the sweeping aside of Catholicism in 1560 marking a significant break with the consorts who preceded her. Yet, the queen’s key roles that were projected through oath and ceremonial of 1590 had been emphasised clearly in previous ceremonies. Wyntoun noted that the Bishop of Dunkeld, officiator at Annabella’s coronation on 15 August 1390, chose to speak on the subject of the assumption of the Virgin. In part this was undoubtedly due to the ceremony occurring on that specific feast day, but it also allows a window into the kind of focus that such ceremonies would have had. The Virgin was a common figure to evoke in the ceremonial of queenship, due to her role as mediator between God and man, and the fact that she epitomised the truly good woman and mother. The bishop of Dunkeld’s sermon in 1390 doubtlessly focused on three key factors: the duty of the queen to uphold Christian virtue in her life, the expectation that she would provide and raise royal heirs, and her role as mediator between her king and his people in the pursuit of justice.

Layne-Smith, Last Medieval Queens, 95.
By 1503 the investiture with the sceptre by James IV visually accentuated the consort’s responsibilities in regards to justice while underscoring the roots of the queen’s power in the body of the king. If an oath occurred from the mid-fifteenth century, it was almost certainly linked to this idea of the queen’s power and the persistent desire of monarchs following James I to place proxy power over royal children in the hands of the queen. The psalms sung at the coronation of Anne of Denmark and the oath she took emphasised these same roles, only through a method that avoided any comparison to the Marian themes utilised in the fourteenth century. Perhaps the clearest break from the traditional emphasis upon the queen receiving her power from the king came in 1590, when James VI presented the regalia to Anne through a religious intermediary. As marriage was a sacrament religious men had always had a part to play in the marriage union and consort crowning; but this action was subtly different, visually demonstrating that the queen’s power came through the king – God’s representative on earth – but also as a gift from God. This difference could well have been rooted in James VI’s own developing understandings of the divine right of monarchy as recorded in the *True Law of Free Monarchies* and the *Basilikon Doron*, and subsequently this ritual action can be understood as a physical manifestation of James’s theories regarding his monarchical authority.562

For the Scottish monarchs across the period royal marriages presented the principal outlet for displays of royal majesty through a host of ceremonial elements that fed into the ultimate goal of securing dynastic union and the prospect of producing a legitimate heir. Ambassadorial interaction deserves, as suggested in the introduction, to become a central subject for a focused study of Scots abroad and foreigners in Scotland. However, in the context of this chapter its importance as a core element of marriage ceremonial from the thirteenth century onwards is clear. During the process of marrying his children, and his own second marriage, Alexander III employed prominent members of the nobility and clergy as well as knights and officials in ambassadorial duties to the continent, as would be witnessed through the course of the following centuries. These embassies were the front line of royal
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representation abroad and as such they had to present a magnificent statement. Large taxes were raised for the funding of foreign ambassadorial trips from at least the marriages of James I’s daughters, while ships and supplies were often sourced through the burghs and prominent wealthy citizens. From the fifteenth century particularly the prominence of the heraldic official who accompanied, and even made solo journeys, to foreign courts in the pursuit of settling marriage alliances was in line with general European trends. Through the increased use of heraldic officials Scottish kings were able to project their royal authority through representatives sporting the increasingly complex royal arms and array of symbols that became with synonymous with Scottish monarchs.

The European language of gift giving was another aspect of both ambassadorial interaction and marriage ceremony that can be located right back into the thirteenth century. Unfortunately, the lack of extant Scottish financial material from the earlier ceremonies, and the survival of the English equivalent, means that the evidence of gift giving that remains reveals primarily what Scottish monarchs received rather than what they gave. It is with the surviving Treasurer’s Accounts and other subsidiary accounts, such as the French accounts for James V and Thirlestane’s account for James VI, that an understanding of the fabulous lengths Scottish kings went in suitably impressing their foreign counterparts can be fully realised. The gifting of the wedding robes or robes of cloth of gold to English heralds by the Scottish kings can be observed in the wedding ceremonial of James IV and Margaret Tudor, but also in the initial ceremonial between James III and Edward IV in regards to the union of their infant children. Descriptions of other gifts are minimal, but in the context of the developments in seal, coin and heraldic design across the time period it would be surprising if the gifts of Scottish monarchs – particularly in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries – were not emblazoned with symbols indicative of the giver of the gift to emphasise and expand the reach of the projection of royal authority.
From the arrival of Mary of Guelders in 1449 through to Anne of Denmark it has been possible to observe the manner of welcoming foreign queens, with the large crowds gathering on the shoreline, or in the case of Margaret Tudor in the borderlands. The various stages of welcome were provided by a full cross section of Scottish society, with a prominence of women within the entourages marked out from an early stage, and significant members of the nobility, church and government playing active roles in such welcomes. In 1434-6, the French ambassadors in Scotland arranging the marriage of Princess Margaret were treated in a similar manner with a gradually increasing entourage being summoned to join them at various stages as they approach Edinburgh, where burgh officials were principal among the welcoming party. This harks back further to Alexander II’s demands for his arrival at York to marry Joanna of England in 1221, where figures of local and national importance met him at various stages of his arrival. Rank and precedence remained a central imperative. Ambassadors were frequently found at the core of ceremonial, in the case of Mary of Guelders, the Scottish ambassadors led her to her first official meeting with James II, while members of foreign embassies are found leading the queen into the church across the sixteenth century. Those who made up the processions of both monarchs were clearly ordered to represent such concerns, and when Thirlestane was given the honour of carrying Anne’s crown before her, his status was raised to that of lord instinctively to avoid any challenge to his suitability for such a role.

The wedding ceremonies pose numerous complications in regards to assessing continuity and changes. In part this is due to the marriages occurring outside Scotland at either end of the timescale involved, as well as the issues around the marriage of a queen regnant to a king consort in 1558 and 1565, but primarily because the actual actions of the nuptials themselves are rarely commented upon. However, where descriptions and financial accounts remain extant to relay evidence of the settings of these ceremonies, they are found embellished with a resplendent array of royal symbology. Colours, liveries, architecture (both permanent and temporary), coats of arms, banners, heralds, pursuivants, musicians, clothing, food and
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563 See: Dean, ‘Enter the Alien’ for further discussions and conclusions regarding consort entries from 1449.
regalia were compounded to create vivid displays of royal power and magnificence. Moreover, the attendees of the marriage ceremony, beyond the couple and royal officials, were increasingly purchased fine clothing, or instructed to dress in their best, to further expand the image of opulence.

The increasing focus upon Edinburgh and Holyrood in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, despite much expense on other palaces and estates, suggests that the centralisation of government and its increasing prominence as the ‘capital’ impacted upon the choice. Another more practical reason undoubtedly dictated such decisions regarding wedding setting. The reliance upon the surrounding area, burghs, officials and prominent local figures to supply the required goods to entertain can be found in the thirteenth and fourteenth century marriages taking place in the rich and abundant border burghs and abbeys. By the fifteenth century the rich border port of Berwick had returned to English hands permanently and the northern ports of the Forth grew to counter this. On the other hand, the choice of place could have more potent underlying meaning as found in the case of Berwick for the wedding of David Bruce in 1328. James I chose his key building projects as prominent places for the entertainment of ambassadors in the 1430s emphasising the use of works-in-progress could be turned to as readily as completed settings.

Throughout the ceremonies discussed feasting, music and dancing have been central to the entertainment of guests and demonstrations of royal authority. The feasting was a show of wealth that runs consistently through all the ceremonies and this vehicle for display was developed to incorporate emblems of Scottish kingship not only on the liveries of those who carried the food but in the design and decoration of the food from an early stage. Foreign commentators are on occasion critical of Scottish customs or manners; however, this can prove useful. For example, D'Escouchy suggests that the dancing included in the 1449 wedding ceremony was not like that found on the continent and in so doing illuminates that the dancing was conducted in a traditional Scottish manner that differed from European counterparts. The inclusion of outdoor entertainments such as jousting, tournaments, and hunting can be found from at least the wedding of David and Joan at Berwick, and were definitely still a prominent
part of the display for James V. The comments of Bower in regards to the 1286 marriage of Yolande and Alexander III purports of a ‘war dance’ that indicates an underlying martial nature of this display to music in the thirteenth century, while the 1560s waterborne entertainments orchestrated by Mary emphasise this was consistent through until the late sixteenth century.

From the thirteenth century, when attempts to gain unction by Alexander II and the minority government of Alexander III went hand-in-hand with the matrimonial preparations, the Scottish monarchy were fighting for a level playing field on which to project their image of royal authority. Yet, as Alexander II’s demands regarding his arrival and welcome imply, this did not hinder a defiant attitude of royal pomp and ceremony at the heart of their display. The Scottish monarchs were part of a larger web of European interaction and policy, and while individual kings had a bolder hand to play in these complex games, there was often an undercurrent of the little fish playing in dangerous waters. Nonetheless, this relatively small realm frequently earned a prominent place on the European stage and their performances on it demonstrated their capability to master an arsenal of representational tools in the display of regal magnificence. The nature of the marriage ceremonies, and the interactions of the consorts’ family and court, meant that these events were the truly public face of the Scottish monarchy beyond the realm. The pressure to perform and project a royal image that adhered to European expectation meant that these ceremonies were the most open to the influence of foreign culture and, therefore, perhaps where the potential for loss of tradition was highest. However, as with the two other life-stage ceremonies considered here, there are numerous aspects of the ceremonial that retained traditional elements, emphasised national identity, and functioned within the developing constructs of Scottish governance.
Conclusion

To be accepted as king, one had to behave like a king.¹

This thesis has demonstrated the developments of three Scottish royal ceremonies and how they were used in the projection of royal authority. By way of drawing these themes together, it is pertinent to extract the overarching elements that made Scottish ceremonial representations of authority unique, address key factors that affect the results of this study, and highlight further avenues of research.

The placing of these ceremonies against the Scottish political backdrop is critical to understanding the reasons for the subsequent shape and forms of projections of royal authority. In four hundred years, nine out of fifteen monarchs came to the throne as minors, three changes of dynasty occurred including one usurpation,² there were seven guardianships which included five periods of absentee kingship,³ the accession of a queen regnant, and a Reformation led by the lords. The political context in which Scottish ceremonial developed across the centuries was marked by the recurrent need to legitimise and re-establish royal power both at home and abroad. Thirteenth-century Scottish monarchs were still consolidating accession through primogeniture, and English claims of supremacy and overlordship were a real threat to be forcefully combated well into the fourteenth century. The accession of Robert I, though an adult, was highly contentious, and the ceremonies of his later life – the marriage of his infant and his funeral – were elaborate and expensive public statements emphasising the Brucian dynastic success, made all the more important by the young age of his heir. The Stewart accession in 1371, though less contested, still presented multifarious problems for both Robert II and III who rose from the ranks of nobility to the throne, particularly with challenges to

² There were four dynasty changes if the Balliols are included, and three usurpations if Edward Balliol and James IV are added to Robert I.
power occurring respectively from sons and brothers. The enforced absenteeism of both David II and James I led to similarly complex situations, this time due to the return of a monarch determined to re-establish royal power drawing on influences from periods in foreign royal courts. The fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, in the wake of six minorities, saw increased importance placed upon marriage as a coming of age ceremony in which the monarch was projecting a far more independent image of royal authority. These circumstances had a direct impact upon the orchestration of ceremony, not least upon the monarch’s own ability to control the ceremonies that promoted royal power.

The relative poverty of the Scottish monarchy was a further factor which affected the projection of image and is reflected in an economy of scale employed across the range of ceremonies. The full exploration of this theory would require additional analysis into a range of annual festivals, royal progresses for justice ayres, hunting expeditions and other less ‘one off’ ceremonial displays. But from the three ceremonies considered it is possible to observe varying degrees of selective expenditure. Many of the highest expenditures occurred in the ceremonies where foreign audiences were likely to attend. However, this would be to oversimplify as there were many illustrations of a more complex understanding of the use of ceremony. It is true that some of the most spectacular and overt shows of majesty and splendour occurred with a target foreign audience, found most prominently in foreign royal marriages across the centuries – including David and Joan Plantagenet, James IV and Margaret Tudor, James V and Madeleine, and James VI and Anne of Denmark – or other high profile events such as James IV’s Wild Knight and Black Lady tournaments in 1507/8 and the baptism of James VI in 1566. Yet in 1329, with no invited foreign audience, the scale and expense recorded in the preparation and execution of Robert I’s funeral appeared truly remarkable. The extended processions and ceremony of 1214, following the death of William I, and of 1390, following the death of Robert II, suggest that these adult monarchs were highly involved in the preparations for their passing. The dearth of financial material for these two funerals make it extremely difficult to simply

4 For the tournaments see: Fradenburg, *City, Marriage, Tournament*, 172-274; Stevenson, ‘Chivalry, British sovereignty and dynastic politics’, particularly 13-14. For the baptism see: Lynch, ‘Queen Mary’s Triumph’, 1-29. See also Dean, ‘Royal Births and Baptisms in Scotland’.
state that the expense and elaboration of 1329 was ‘remarkable’ in the context of comparative
funerals of the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries. Such elaborations around death and burial
may have been more of the norm when emphasis was laid more heavily on securing dynastic
succession and ceremonies that passed the crown, and conferred royal authority, down the
generations.

There was one thing that these relatively ‘native’ ceremonies and the aforementioned
‘foreign audience events’ had in common, and this was the control of an adult monarch. The
final preparations for Robert I’s funeral were not undertaken by the king, but the expenditure
that spanned over a year prior to the event clearly demonstrates Bruce’s involvement in the
ceremony which would commemorate his death and illuminate his overt efforts to compete with
his English counterparts. With the complexities of minorities and contested accessions
providing the context for the majority of Scottish inaugurations and coronations in this period,
marriage and its interrelated ceremonial often provided one of the first occasions for Scottish
monarchs to have sole control. There was a necessity to demonstrate their independent royal
authority, and it was these ceremonies that saw the raising of taxes – whether in goods, ships, or
money – specifically for ceremony. This economy of scale was often enforced by situation.
Lynch compares the costs of the baptism of James VI orchestrated by Mary Queen of Scots in
1566 to James VI’s coronation organised by the Protestant government the following year to
emphasise the low cost of the latter. However, this comparison should be tempered by the
knowledge that Mary Queen of Scots was an adult monarch, with an income as a French royal
widow, keen to restate her position of power following the birth of her son and heir at an event
attended by a range of European dignitaries, while James VI’s coronation took place with a
country and political community divided following the forced abdication of Mary and the
Reformation when the king was less than eighteen months old. While ceremonial development
certainly occurred in such periods with no adult monarch directing the projection of royal
image, there were very real obstacles for those who undertook the ceremonial displays on
behalf of the monarch.

In all cases, however, there are underlying trends defining the frugality of the Scottish crown. There are clear demonstrations of wealth, particularly in the sixteenth century, that reveal staggering expenditure on ceremony and gift giving which reached a zenith in the marriages of James IV, V and VI. Yet, across these three forms of ceremony in Scotland there were core elements – all of which were relatively inexpensive – used to project royal authority. These included music, players and dancers, and the use of livery, royal symbols and coats of arms, which could and were enhanced with gold and rich fabrics when necessity dictated. Moreover, by both figures of power in minorities and adult kings, there was an insightful exploitation of existing attributes around which to focus ceremony. This included the amalgamation of ceremony with prominent saints cults and relics, and the employment of an array of castles, palaces, churches and abbeys, and ‘works in progress’, such as Linlithgow Palace in the entertainment of French ambassadors in the 1430s, which were equally suited to reflect the status and wealth of the crown.

The survival of Scottish material – or lack thereof – is also a unique factor in assessing this subject. There is a distinct lack of consistent detailed financial accounts, such as the Treasurer’s Accounts and household accounts, prior to the sixteenth century, with a veritable dearth of financial material for thirteenth century. Furthermore, there is a scarcity of fifteenth-century chronicles, and a shortage of detailed eyewitness accounts, or even second hand material, for all but a select few of the ceremonies discussed across the period. A contemporary order of ceremony, prior to seventeenth-century copies of possibly fifteenth-century originals, is also lacking for coronation and funeral. In addition, physical remains of demonstrations of royal authority are also in short supply with the majority of tombs, burial sites and other liturgical settings, art work, gifts, jewels, clothing, decoration, music and liturgical writings lost. The issues of source survival result in a very different approach to ceremony for Scottish historians than those of England or France where far more material survives. However, as Burden and
others have argued, reliance on prescriptive material in the study of these realms has occurred at the cost of providing a synesthetic understanding of individual ceremonies set within the context of a specific time and place. The methodology forced upon this study has meant introducing a multitude of source materials from a wide selection of source types. In not relying on prescriptive texts, the individuals and the situations that surround them are unconsciously brought to the foreground giving a far more rounded interpretation. Yet, if new finds were made, these could greatly change our understanding of ceremony as laid out here. For example, if financial accounts were discovered for the thirteenth century a full comparative exercise between English and Scottish display in the York weddings could be undertaken. Moreover, if burgh accounts existed more consistently, the entries and arrivals of kings and queens prior to the sixteenth century could be more readily analysed. Our picture of Scottish royal ceremony, therefore, is dictated by the source material that remains extant, but there are conclusions to be drawn as to how the unique set of circumstances impacted upon ceremonial development.

Prior to the introduction of unction for Scottish kings there had been an ecclesiastical presence prominent in all three ceremonies considered. The very places in which the ceremonies of the Scottish monarchy were performed were often imbued with religious significance. For example, the burial sites of Scottish monarchs included personal foundations and the resting places of national saints demonstrating the underlying importance of pious devotions. The use of relics in the processions and ceremonies of Scottish monarchs is one which has been touched on, with the possibility of the holy oil of unction in some way being connected to Saint Margaret and Dunfermline. Robert I’s veneration and thanks giving of St Fillan influenced both the Duke of Albany and James IV, with the latter’s coronation procession between Scone and Perth on the anniversary of Bannockburn utilising the local relic of St Fillan’s bell. The entry of James IV’s queen to Edinburgh in 1503 was also interspersed with presentations and veneration of holy relics. The question of whether royal oaths were taken over

---

holy relics cannot be answered conclusively at present, but there is scope for an in-depth study into the monarchical use of relics and saints cults in ceremonial more broadly across the whole time period, to add to the increasing literature on saints in Scotland.7

A further distinct connection between the veneration of saints and the ceremonies of kingship can be outlined with more confidence when considering the dates on which events were held. One of the clearest examples of this were Bruce and early Stewart connections to the feasts of the Blessed Virgin, following the ‘coronation’ of Robert Bruce in 1306 on 25 March or the Annunciation of the Virgin, which were re-forged by Marie de Guise in the coronation of Mary Queen of Scots on 9 September 1543.8 Across the centuries, prior to 1560, there was no consistent dating pattern for such ceremonies for the very simple and practical reason that, where death and succession were concerned, the time window for arranging such ceremonies was relatively brief. However, there were numerous ceremonies that combined a royal occasion with a religious festival, from Alexander III’s wedding on Christmas day 1251 to James I’s royal entry on Palm Sunday 1424 and James V’s coronation on St Matthew’s day 1513. The modern mind perhaps struggles to fully comprehend the significance of this, but the symbolic value of such date choices, particularly those linking the king and Christ, would not have been lost on a population who lives rotated around a religious calendar.

The vigil over William I’s body in 1214, while his son was taken to Scone to be enthroned, was undertaken by a predominantly religious group supporting the queen. Across the four centuries the importance of prayers, offerings and illuminations in funerary arrangements remained central even when secular heraldic elements encroached upon the displays made. Furthermore, individual churchmen had the ability and desire to affect the course of ceremonial and ideological development. This has been witnessed here through figures including the abbot of Dunfermline in the thirteenth century; Robert Wishart, bishop of Glasgow, in the fourteenth century; the canons of Holyrood in the fifteenth century; and the influential churchmen in the

7 See works by the likes of Penman, Boardman and Turpie, passim.
8 Robert I (25 March 1306/ Annunciation of the Virgin); Robert II (25 March 1371); [Euphemia Ross (25 March 1372 – 1373)]; Robert III and Annabella Drummond (14-15 August 1390, Assumption of the Virgin); James II (25 March 1437); Mary Queen of Scots (9 September 1543, Octave of Feast of the Birth of the Virgin [8 September]). Chapter 2, Section I-IV.
minorities of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries (including Whitelaw, Kennedy and Elphinstone). Yet, the increasing ‘liturgification’ of Scottish ceremonies advanced by

churchmen and kings, particularly inauguration and coronation, was tempered by the Gaelic

and Celtic roots of the Scottish people, along with other inherent secular aspects, such as acts of

homage and fealty, knighting, and prominent secular actors including earls and heraldic

officials. The unique interplay of these aspects led to the ceremonies evolving in a manner

distinctive not only from French and English counterparts, but also from the Celtic ceremonies

of Ireland.

The importance of date and place, while often layered with religious meaning, can be

equally linked to the secular. On numerous occasions ceremonies are placed specifically to

emphasise dynastic glory or royal victory, including the anniversary of Bannockburn for the

coronation of James IV in 1488 and most probably for Robert I’s funeral in 1329, the

procession of which certainly passed the site of the battle. In the thirteenth and fourteenth-

century funerals of Scottish monarchs, the routes travelled by the sombre processions from

place of death to place of burial, while necessary, saw the body of the king paraded through

central heartlands of the realm and areas linked with familial ties reflecting the inherently

itinerant nature of Scottish kingship. Across the four centuries no one ceremonial site can claim

universal prominence, but the very variety of settings which the monarchs and others adapted to

provide performative space for royal ceremony was unique. The use of place was often

intrinsically linked to demonstrations of secular royal power and the importance of dynasty; for

example, the combining of ceremony and active politics by Robert II and III and James I in

Scone and Perth. Other elements of Scottish kingship and government are also found both

influencing and being mirrored by the ceremonial that surrounded it, such as relatively open


9 Duncan, The Kingship of the Scots, 150.

10 See forthcoming by Dean, ‘Making the most of what they had’. This piece has provided a platform for

future work with two further conference papers in preparation: ‘Where to make the king (or queen): the

importance of place in Scottish inaugurations and coronations from the thirteenth to late sixteenth

century’, Royal Scone: A Scottish Medieval Royal Centre in Europe Conference (Scone, March 2014);

‘The Use of Landscape and Architecture as Backdrops/Scenery for Performative Spaces in Fifteenth and

Sixteenth-Century Scotland’, Society for Renaissance Studies 6th Biennial Conference (University of

Southampton, July 2014).
access to the king and the importance of secular public acclamations of power that dictated the prominence of outdoor events and processions. Perhaps most prominently indicative of the specifically Scottish situation was the involvement of the three estates and secular officials.

Age, forced absenteeism, early death (often violent or in battle), and periods of guardianship all determined the involvement of others in the orchestration of royal ceremony. However, despite extended time without a competent adult monarch, the ceremonies that defined monarchical status continued to grow. This strongly opposes claims that such periods had a stunting effect on the evolution of ceremony.\(^{11}\) The underlying need to sustain the projection of royal authority was often at its greatest when the monarchs could not wield such power themselves. The fact that the majority of Scottish coronations and funerals occurred within this environment saw increased involvement and influence from foreign and domestic consorts, guardians, lieutenants, regents, and churchmen, with ceremonial display a core element of minority power play.

Evidence for the roles of Marie de Coucy and Yolande of Dreux in ceremonies following the deaths of their husbands is slight. Marie made a rapid departure to France after Alexander II’s death in 1249, but she did return eighteen months later for her son’s wedding with a French entourage suitably grand to be commented upon in reports and thus assisted the Scottish representation at York confronting the confident swagger of Henry III. In the fourteenth century, however, a more active role for a consort in ceremonial projections of power occurs with Annabella Drummond’s promotion of her sons, David and James (later James I).\(^{12}\) This increasing role of the consort was further compounded through James I’s unpopular but influential raising of Joan Beaufort to the position of ‘second person of the realm.’ In her brief months of power she appears to have been prominent in James I’s funerary arrangements and her son’s coronation. The flow of foreign brides for Scottish monarchs in the fifteenth and sixteenth may have seen an oath delineating their role and power inserted into either the

---

\(^{11}\) Shaw, ‘Scotland’s Place in Britain’s coronation tradition’, 47.

\(^{12}\) See Chapter 3, Section II. The role of Annabella as consort more broadly is part of ongoing research by Amy Hayes (University of Aberdeen) and I am grateful to her for discussions on the wives of the early Stewart kings.
coronation or a subsequent parliamentary sphere in reaction to James I’s promotion of Joan. However, when she outlived her husband, particularly in the cases of Joan, Mary of Guelders and Marie de Guise, the queen consort was actively influential in orchestrating ceremonies marking the final farewell to her husband and in the inaugural rites of her children.  

Consorts’ roles in ceremonial varied greatly and were often supported or contested by promotions of royal authority emanating from the estates and male counterparts at the forefront of minority government. From the beginning of the time period the first and second estate’s involvement in the making and promoting of kings was an ever changing but inherently present force in the shaping of royal image. The decades following the death of Alexander III certainly challenged Scottish royal and independent authority. However, this period of guardianship has been discussed in terms of the relative cohesion of early projections of united political authority, and witnessed a parallel emergence of the parliament and its composite estates as an increasingly powerful force that became woven into the fabric of kingship. The subsequent periods of guardianship and absentee kingship from the death of Robert I, and the centralising of governance and ceremonial from Robert II through to James I, saw an ever more complex relationship entwining the political community and secular acclamations of kingship. Furthermore, the string of minorities following the uneasy relationship between James I and the estates saw the physical stamp of orchestrated parliamentary intervention with the remoulding and retaking of the royal oath by the young James II in 1445, and the possible subsequent introduction of a reciprocal oath for the queen consort. These fifteenth-century developments in oath-taking are illustrative of the mutual dependence that existed between the estates and the monarch in regards to the functioning and bestowal of royal power, a relationship that was firmly rooted in the complexities of Scotland’s distinctive past.

13 Margaret Tudor’s role is clear in the ceremonies for James IV and James V following Flodden; however, a lack in material following Flodden is as likely cause for the dearth of understanding than any other. In the case of Marie de Guise, the activity on the part of the queen mother is perhaps the most prolific and long-lived in regards to the continued representations of royal authority of the crown during Mary’s extended absence in France. See forthcoming by author: ‘Scottish Queen or Catholic Princess’.
14 MacQueen, ‘Parliament, the Guardians and John Balliol’, 29-49.
In the funeral of William I and the inauguration of Alexander II in 1214, the role of the realm’s premier earls was central to the projection of royal power and mirrored the status they held. The ceremonial roles of the nobility, particularly the earl of Fife, remained prominent until the destruction of the Albany Stewarts and the crown assumption of the forfeited earldom. This left a ceremonial void. Another noble could potentially have filled the role but rather than selecting another, the herald and other royal officials increased in prominence. This was not the first involvement of ‘lower rank’ officials in a ceremonial capacity. The overseer of Robert Bruce’s funeral – Sir David de Barclay – was a member of the royal household but was neither an earl nor lord. Moreover, it was prior to their elevation to earldoms that the Marischal and Constable are recorded in an active ceremonial roles and each had probably acted in such a capacity long before it was explicitly recorded. The prominence of the herald in the proclaiming of royal power and as messengers of the king to foreign parts certainly existed in the fourteenth century, in the former task the herald likely superseded the poet of the thirteenth century. However, the placing of the Lyon herald at the very heart of the coronation ceremony seems to have originated from the loss of the earl of Fife (or a representative) as the figure who enthroned the king. Furthermore, the unusual inclusion of the Lyon herald’s coronation within the royal coronation ceremony may have been the result of the need to break up the ceremony for the child king James II and allow a brief respite where someone else took the limelight.

The evidence for the inclusion of the Lyon king’s crowning in subsequent coronations is not strong, but when placed in the context of the ceremonies discussed herein it certainly fits the pattern of ceremonial and wider cultural developments of 1448–9. Although the introduction of the heraldic funeral cannot be pinpointed exactly for Scotland, there were certainly elements witnessed at the Bruce funeral of 1329 that reflected an increasingly heraldic culture. However, the evidence for James II’s funeral, particularly the armour and escutcheons, combined with the increased Burgundian and French influences compounded by James II’s marriage to Mary of Guelders, support the fullest fruition occurring in this era. Moreover, the increasing use of heraldic messengers emblazoned with the Scottish royal arms had been witnessed increasingly through the late fourteenth century before undergoing a veritable
explosion in the fifteenth century. There was also a corresponding increase in the use of livery and distinctive official clothing, embellished and elaborated with the extensive use of rich fabrics, colours and cloth of gold across the later fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, which all added to the overall impact of the Scottish image of royal authority particularly in projections to foreign audiences.

While the role of the herald in the orchestration of royal ceremony and the symbols of royal authority he carried were continually enhanced through the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, the dominant role of the Lyon herald in the coronation of the king was less secure. Underlying the ceremonial developments of this later era were cultural movements amongst the elites and lower laity, particularly lairds and wealthier merchant classes, discussed at length by Mason, radiating from the acculturation of humanist and renaissance ideals. Education in rhetoric, law, history and philosophy spread forcefully beyond the clerical estate during these centuries and created a class of lay men with the skills for royal office. Furthermore, the predominantly lower status of these men meant that they were far more reliant upon the crown for their position, thus making them, on the whole, more loyal in royal service than their counterparts of higher nobility. The ideals that led to the emergence of a noblesse de robe in Scotland were equally found acting upon the great nobles, in part as a reaction to the increasing prominence of these men in court service but also through their own intellectual development. In royal ceremony, particularly in the sixteenth century, there was a markedly increasing focus upon the rank and order of processions, such as the vicinity to the monarch and the symbols of royal authority, as an awareness of office, civic duty and honour grew. Such developments have already been discussed in regards to parliamentary processions in the sixteenth century and later by Mann, and this desire for precedence can be found affecting the actors in other royal ceremonies. The ceremonial role of Scottish nobles and officials in the households of fifteenth and sixteenth century Scotland has only been partially explored, although this is an area of

expanding study. There was a definite increase in superior ranking nobles partaking in ceremonial roles in the high profile ceremonies, particularly those related to the king and with closest right to the succession, during the precarious accessions of ever younger minors. These great nobles were most commonly linked to carrying and even bestowing of the regalia. Following a period when the royal official had been accelerated into the forefront of ceremony, there was a reactionary reclaiming of deeply traditional rights of the Scottish earls by the higher nobility which focused on proximity to the monarch and these symbols of gravitas and royal power within royal ceremony.

The one ceremony where the regalia is noticeably absent in the available source material, until that of James V in 1542 where mock regalia was painted for an effigy, is the funeral. The demonstrations of royal grandeur and pomp undertaken for the funeral of Robert I, and subsequent funerals, would imply that these status symbols were utilised in some way. However, the absence of any costs for regalia or descriptions of their usage where records remain would suggest that the coronation regalia was displayed nearby, perhaps atop a coffin or other prominent place, but that regalia was not buried with the king apart from possibly individually owned items that did not make their way into the permanent honours collection. The removal of the regalia in 1296 by Edward I may ultimately have imbued those items Wishart managed to retain with an inflated national importance. It certainly appears that, until James V’s fifty foot robe made for Marie de Guise’s coronation in 1540, the same purple ‘rob ryall’ was repaired and reused by each monarch across a range of ceremonial occasions. The value of the regalia in representations of royal authority was understood by kings and minority guardians alike. Its prominence in the displays of minor monarchs, whether in parliament or processions through major cities, reflected a commonly held belief in the value of these items in the acclamations of royal power. Yet, it is telling that the most intensive work on the production and elaboration of the regalia occurred in conjunction with international marriages. The known

---

17 See: Thomas, *Princelie Majestie*, 16-54; Nicki Scott, ‘The Court and Household of James I’. In addition there is work being undertaken currently by William Hepburn (PhD, Glasgow) on James IV’s household; and by Amy Hayes (PhD, Aberdeen) on queenship in late fourteenth and fifteenth century including a section on household.
undertakings on the regalia by James IV took place in preparation for his wedding, and the extensive work by James V took place in the build up to his French marriages. The former possibly included the first addition of imperial arches, taking the lead from his father’s use of such symbology on coinage and Elphinstone’s imperially crowned King’s College at Aberdeen, as well as in contest with Henry VII. It also appears likely that Robert Bruce built upon the surviving regalia in the later years of his life for the marriage of his son, with the diamonds on the crown which survive to the present day plausibly dating from the early fourteenth century.

This conclusion is in many ways an open-ended one. However, there are some solid statements to make regarding the representations of Scottish royal authority and how these developed in a distinctive manner. The economy of scale found in the various ceremonial projections of image, although a theory to be explored in more depth, reflected both the financial constraints upon the Scots at various points across the time period, and a keen understanding of when the most prominent and elaborate displays were to be made. The marriages of Scottish monarchs, particularly those who had come to the throne as minors, were pivotal ceremonial moments on which great expense and effort was lavished to present personal displays of adult regal magnificence and power. While the ceremonies of death and succession were of extreme national importance, the political context of Scotland’s ceremonial development frequently saw these projections of royal authority made by others. Both secular and ecclesiastic forces had much influence on the development of ceremony. Perhaps that which separates Scotland most from its comparators was the involvement of the three estates, regents and guardians (in all their guises) in the demonstrations and legitimation of Scottish kingship and royal power. The Scottish ceremonies across this time period reveal a remarkable level of adaptability and fluidity in their development through a multitude of challenges and influences; nevertheless, equally they demonstrate the resilience of Scottish traditional aspects. Finally, these are just three of a large number of ceremonies through which Scottish monarchs would have projected royal authority. Hopefully this study, by dispelling myths regarding the peripheral nature, backwardness, and immaturity of ceremony, and by exploring beyond the late
sixteenth-century bias of current literature, has provided a platform for continuation of research in this field.

...to make an end is to make a beginning. The end is where we start from.

(T.S. Eliot)\textsuperscript{18}

\textsuperscript{18} T.S. Eliot, ‘Quartet Four: Little Giddings’, \textit{Four Quartets}, verse v.
APPENDIX A

NLS, Adv. MS 31.5.2 – John Scrymgeour’s heraldic collection. Material copied in the first half of the 16th century by John Scrymgeour of Myres, presumably for his own use, possibly from Adam Loutfut’s heraldic manuscript (BL Harleian MS. 6149)\textsuperscript{1692}

Part (i) A treatise on tournaments [ff. 1-18]. Transcription from ff. 15r-16r.

\textit{[f. 15r]} ‘The Maner hou herrauldis and purľeſvantis fould knau of obſequis\textsuperscript{1693}’


\textsuperscript{1692} Signature on the document is: ‘Ex libris petri thomsoune ylay heraldi’ on f. 2v. The transcription has retained long ‘s’ and original spellings; contractions have been elongated in square brackets where possible. Some obscure words and queries marked in footnote form. Thanks to Dr Alasdair Ross and Ulrike Hogg (NLS) for assistance with palaeography queries, and Dr Ralph Moffat and David Sellar (Lord Lyon) for heraldic word queries.

\textsuperscript{1693} Title in red. Obsequis or obsequies: funeral rite or ceremony.

\textsuperscript{1694} Apparelling: making ready/ fitting up

\textsuperscript{1695} Luminar: source of light, lamp, celestial light.

\textsuperscript{1696} Ciergis: Large candle (also spelt ‘serge’ or sierge)

\textsuperscript{1697} Rowk in old Scots, is the verb ‘to stack’ so it could be that this term was used to indicate the stacks of timber used to construct the bier. In Middle English ‘Rok’ or ‘Rowk’ means ‘oak’. In the context of the source, it could be that ‘four rowkis’ means ‘four branches’ (as in branches of a family).

\textsuperscript{1698} Escutcheons.

\textsuperscript{1699} This section describes four escutcheons that are placed with a candle around the bier. The first certainly shows the arms of the mother of the deceased, but the following three arms are less clear. The meaning of this word ‘losle’ is not clear, the closest heraldic term is ‘lozenge’. However, considering the previous content and that Scrymgeour may have copied his information from Loutfut, who is known to use French sources for his manuscript collections, it may come from the Middle French ‘l’aiel’ meaning grandfather.


1700 Bezele, also spelt bezel or bevill, could be from Middle English ‘bisaille’ or Middle French ‘bessaile’ meaning great grandfather; or otherwise from French biseau, ‘sloping edge’, or bijou, ‘jewel’.
1701 Fuzelle or fuselle or fusil is a heraldic word meaning either a heraldic elongated lozenge, or ‘firesteel’. The latter was a symbol used on the arms of the Burgundian dukes.
1702 Levand: living or alive or existing.
1703 Heallme: Helmet.
1704 Swerd: Sword.
1705 Pennon: Small flag or streamer.
1706 Unknown word.
Item the fyft offrand siclyck of ane horβ coverit w[i]t[h] his loveray and a man aboue quhilk salbe led [and] offerit be the tua mait gracios [and] mait wardly amang[st] ladyis [and] damoy - fellis w[i]t[h]out reproche of all the obsequis

Item in sum places the offerand[is] ar double the half for the were half for the tournay of thing[is] befeir said And in mony en[n]treis no[ch]t

Item in sum places quhair the offerand[is] ar the half maid the blak cled offer[is] no[ch]t bot he theat hes the e scheild bot in places quhair theai gang to the offerand theai fould be led and convoyit be the e gretist of the obsequis theer hes no[ch]t offerit the thingis befoir said.

Item the said[is] offerand[is] fould be offerit [and] borne to the lord[is] be the king[is] of armes or herauld[is] layand to theame gif it pleis theame till excuβ theame to do theis for it is faua ordanit.

And theai quhom to theai ar presentit fould ans[yr] thai have lakit evill about theame to present in fic honour for it is no[ch]t aucht to me befour the[ir]is in theis cumpany bot of theer charge of theame that hes maid the ordinance I will do it [and] no[ch]t of my will.

Th[e] quhilk[is] ordinances or s[er]vices ar left in this present tyme for thre thing[is] Ane is for mony theat fchawis theame felf[is] folk[is] of grit eſstait can nocht armoyer the cierg[is] of fo[ur] lignes

[Folio 16r] becaus theai ar no[ch]t cu[m]in of fic nobilnes. The secund is for the Invyes that war of offerand[is]. The thrid for the gritcost maid theair vpon bot theai war thing[is] quhair throw the eftat of [per]lane my[ch]t be knawin and quhair be men fould knaw quhat hono[ur] fould be done to theame And it wes th[r] prin – cipall caus qharfor th[e] herauld[is] tuk mair tent to the offerand[is] th[an] ony v[th]ir thing[is] [per]tein[in]g to the s[yr]juice th[e] quhilk[is] may be knawin be demanding or be veriteis or be v[th]er[is] buk[is] of theis mater.

[The account has another copy in Adv. MS. 31.3.20 – Sir David Lindsay Heraldic Collection]

1707 The first letter of this word is not clear.
Appendix B: Maps

Map I: Proposed route of the funeral procession of William I, 1214.
Map II: Proposed routes for the funeral of Alexander II, 1214

Funeral Party (Journey Option 1)
Alexander II died on Kerrara on 8 July 1249
Ayr: possible landing point of ship carrying body
Alexander II was buried at Melrose July 1249

Funeral Party (Journey Option 2)
Alexander II died on Kerrara on 8 July 1249
Dumbarton: possible landing point of ship if came up the Clyde
Alexander II was buried at Melrose July 1249

Funeral Party members who attended Alexander III inauguration
Alexander II died on Kerrara on 8 July 1249
Alexander III inaugurated at Scone on 13 July 1249
Dunfermline: possible stopping point for heart burial
Alexander II was buried at Melrose July 1249
Map III: Proposed route of the funeral procession of Robert Bruce, 1329

1: Cardross - Robert died at Cardross on 7 June 1329/
   Vigil held at St Serf Parish Church
2: Dunipace - Known stopping point/ overnight vigil
3: Cambuskenneth Abbey - Known stopping point/
   overnight vigil
4: Culross Abbey - Proposed stopping point/
   overnight vigil
5: Dunfermline - Burial of Robert I (possibly 24 June)

Map IV: Proposed funeral processions of Robert II, 1390, and Robert II, 1406

1: Robert II dies at Dundonald castle
   20 April 1390
2: Possible stopping point/
   Stewart family mausoleum
3: Masses for king’s soul/
   possible stopping point
4: Possible stopping point
5: Possible stopping point
6: Possible stopping point
7: Robert II buried at Scone Abbey

*Robert III may have died at Rothesay or at the castle of Dundonald and was buried at Paisley.
Map V: Proposed route of the funeral procession of James II, 1460

1: Site of James III coronation 10 Aug 1460 (near Roxburgh where James II died)
2: Possibly stopping point
3: Possibly stopping point
4: Site of Mary of Guelders Trinity College, built after James II’s death, possibly entry point to the city
5: Burial site of James II Aug 1460

*Site of the siege of Roxburgh, James II died here 3 Aug 1460

Map VI: Proposed route of the funeral procession of James V, 1543

1: Falkland Palace - James V died here, 16 Dec 1542
2: Dunfermline - Possible stopping point
3: North Queensferry - Crossing point for ferry over Forth
4: South Queensferry - Landing point for ferry over Forth
5: Trinity College - Possible overnight vigil prior to entering city
6: Holyrood Abbey - Burial site of James V, 9 January 1543
Map VII: Berwick, Borders and England:
Alexander II and III, 1221 and 1251, at York. Second marriages of
Alexander II (1239) and Alexander III (1286). Prince Alexander (1282) and
David II and Joan at Berwick (1328)

Berwick: Wedding of David II and Joan in 1328
Jedburgh Abbey: Wedding of Alexander III and Yolande of Dreux 1284
Roxburgh: Wedding of Alexander II and Marie de Coucy (1237) and his son
in 1282
Kelso Abbey: Possible site of ceremonies of 1237 and 1282
Coldstream Priory: Site on route from Berwick to Jedburgh
(particularly 1284)
Durham: Site on route from Berwick to York (1221 and 1251)
Easingwold: Site where Alexander II awaited Henry III’s arrival at York, 1221
York: Wedding of Alexander II to Joan (1221)
and Alexander III to Margaret (1251)
APPENDIX C: PLATES

Plate 1: ‘The Base Slabs of St Margaret’s Tomb’, photographed by the author at Dunfermline Abbey, October 2011.

Image permission for hard copy only, please consult in University of Stirling library.

Plate 2: ‘The Funeral of Alexander III’ in Scotichronicon, CCC MS 171, fo.225v, used with kind permission of the Parker Library, Corpus Christi College, Cambridge. (Also found published in Chron. Bower, Vol. IX, p. 175)
Plate 3: ‘Dirge of the King of Scots’ from, Das Gebetbuch Jakobs IV. von Schottland (Book of Hours of James IV of Scotland), Cod.1897, f. 141v [online p. 290] Used with the kind permission of the Österreichische Nationalbibliothek.

(Also found reproduced in Leslie MacFarlane, ‘The Book of Hours of James IV and Margaret Tudor’ in IR, Vol. IX (1960), Plate VII, between 16-17.)
Plate 4: ‘View from Stirling Castle great hall over Stirling to Cambuskenneth’, photographed by Katherine Buchanan, Aug 2013; used with kind permission of photographer.

Plate 5: ‘Marginalia’ from Liber Emptorum (Household Books), NAS, E31/6, f. 97r. Photographed by author and used with kind permission of the National Archives of Scotland.

Image permission for hard copy only, please consult in University of Stirling library.
Plate 6: King David of Scotland with his successor, Malcolm IV from a charter in Anderson’s *Diplomata*. © Hutton Getty Images. Licensee Scran
See [www.scran.ac.uk](http://www.scran.ac.uk)

Plate 7a: Seal impression (cast), of William I (William the Lion) © NMS. Licensee Scran
See [www.scran.ac.uk](http://www.scran.ac.uk)

Plate 7b: Seal impression (cast), of Alexander II © NMS. Licensee Scran
See [www.scran.ac.uk](http://www.scran.ac.uk)

Plate 7b: Coin (obverse) penny, from reign of William I (the Lion) © NMS. Licensee Scran
See [www.scran.ac.uk](http://www.scran.ac.uk)
Plate 8: Inauguration of Alexander III from Bower in *Scotichronicon*, CCC MS 171, f. 206r, used with kind permission of the Parker Library, Corpus Christi College, Cambridge.
(Also found published in *Chron. Bower*, Vol. IX, p. 173)
Plate 9: Sulphur cast made of seal impression of Scone Abbey, near Perth (© National Museum of Scotland. Licensee Scran) See www.scran.ac.uk

Plate 10: Seal impression (cast) of John I (Balliol) (© National Museum of Scotland. Licensee Scran) See www.scran.ac.uk


Plate 11b: Seal impression (cast) of Robert I [second seal] (© NMS. Licensee Scran) See www.scran.ac.uk
Plate 12: Seal of King David II
(© Hutton Gettys Images. Licensee: Scran)

Plate 13: ‘The reception of the king by
the archbishop of Rheims’ from
The coronation book of Charles V. of
France, ed. E.S. Dewick (1899), Plate I.

Plate 14: ‘The Bishops of Laon and Beauvais fetching the King from his chamber’
from The coronation book of Charles V. of France, ed. E.S. Dewick (1899), Plate II.
Plate 15: Seal impression (cast)
Robert II (© NMS. Licensee: Scran)
See www.scran.ac.uk

Plate 16: Sulphur cast made of seal impression of Robert III
(© NMS. Licensee: Scran)
See www.scran.ac.uk

Plate 17: Robert Stewart, Duke of Albany,
Governor of Scotland,

Plate 18: Seal impression (cast) of James I.
(© NMS. Licensee: Scran)
See www.scran.ac.uk
Plate 19a: James II seal appended to a truce signed between England and Scotland at Durham, 15 Nov 1449. (TNA, E39/92/22) Photographed by author, used with kind permission from National Archives, Kew.


Plate 20: ‘James III’ Hugo van der Goes, *The Trinity Altar Piece* (© National Galleries of Scotland, used with kind permission)

Plate 21: Coin (obverse), groat, of James III (© NMS. Licensee Scran) See [www.scran.ac.uk](http://www.scran.ac.uk)
Plate 22: ‘King James IV at Prayer’ from, Das Gebetbuch Jakobs IV. von Schottland (Book of Hours of James IV of Scotland), Cod.1897, f. 24v, used with kind permission of the Österreichische Nationalbibliothek.

(Also found reproduced in MacFarlane, ‘The Book of Hours of James IV and Margaret Tudor’, Plate II, opp. 5.)
Plate 23a: James V, King of Scots
(second seal)

Image permission for hard copy only, please consult in University of Stirling library.

Plate 23b: Coin (obverse), groat, from reign of James V (c.1526)
(© NMS. Licensee Scran.)
See [www.scran.ac.uk](http://www.scran.ac.uk)

Plate 24a: Sulphur cast made from the obverse of a seal impression of Mary Queen of Scots (first seal, c. 1542)
(© NMS. Licensee Scran.)
See [www.scran.ac.uk](http://www.scran.ac.uk)

Plate 24b: Sulphur cast made from the reverse of a seal impression of Mary Queen of Scots (first seal, c. 1542)
(© NMS. Licensee Scran.)
See [www.scran.ac.uk](http://www.scran.ac.uk)
Plate 25: The Scottish Regalia, or Royal Honours.
Image from Historic Scotland Image Library, used with kind permission from the same.

Plate 26: Coin (obverse), 10 shilling piece, from reign of James VI (c. 1582)
(© NMS. Licensee Scran) See www.scran.ac.uk
Plate 27: Seal impression (cast), Alexander II (c. 1249)
(© NMS. Licensee Scran)
See www.scran.ac.uk

Plate 28: Alexander III, king of Scots (second seal)
Birch, Scottish Seals, Vol. I (1904)

Plate 29: Linlithgow Lintel (East entrance)
Image from Historic Scotland Image Library,
used with kind permission from the same.
Plate 30: ‘Margaret entering Tours’, BNF, Département des manuscrit, Français 2691, ff. 103r, La Cronicque du temps de tres chrestien roy Charle, septisme […] roy de France […] par Jehan Chartier (15th century).
Used with kind permission from the Bibliothèque nationale de France.

Plate 31: Coin (obverse), unicorn, from reign of James III (c. 1484) (© NMS. Licensee Scran)
See www.scran.ac.uk

Plate 32: Coin (obverse), groat, from reign of James III (c. 1470-1488) (© NMS. Licensee Scran)
See www.scran.ac.uk
Plate 34: Ratification of the Treaty of Perpetual Peace (Dec 1502)
TNA E39/81. Image used with the kind permission of the National Archives, Kew.
Plate 35: ‘Scottish Royal Arms’ from Das Gebetbuch Jakobs IV. von Schottland (Book of Hours of James IV of Scotland), Cod.1897, f. 14v, used with kind permission of the Österreichische Nationalbibliothek.
(Also found reproduced in MacFarlane, ‘The Book of Hours of James IV and Margaret Tudor’, Plate I, opp. 4.)
(© Edinburgh City Libraries. Licensee Scran) See www.scran.ac.uk

Sketched before a fire (1650) which destroyed much of the sixteenth-century palace, this gives a good idea of the palace. At the time of James IV and Margaret’s wedding the tower was not built (as it was an addition by James V); however, Dunbar suggests there may have been a gallery built out at right-angles in its place. His plans of the palace during James IV’s reign indicate that the king’s apartments would run from the tower end as far as the entrance, and the queen’s apartments included the last three windows and tower, as well as several rooms running up the side of the palace (and a further tentative suggestion that a further gallery for the queen was planned, if not built, projecting away from the queen’s apartments providing further viewing of the courtyard in front for outdoor activities and display.
[See Dunbar, *Scottish Royal Palaces*, 56-61.]

Plate 37: Portrait of James V and Marie de Guise, Unknown artist, 16th Century.
James wears an ornate collar of thistles here, something he is frequently painted wearing.
(© Blair Castle Collection. Licensee Scran) See www.scran.ac.uk
Plate 38: Coin (obverse), two-thirds ducat, or bonnet piece, from reign of James V (c. 1540) (© NMS. Licensee Scran) See www.scran.ac.uk

Plate 39: Sketch of coats of arms of James V and Marie de Guise from NAS, E32/8, f. 3r, Exchequer Records: Libri Emptorum James V and Regent Arran, August 1542–August 1543. Photographed by the author, used with kind permission of the National Archives of Scotland.
Plate 40a and 40b: Medal (copy) (obverse and reverse) commemorating the marriage of Mary, Queen of Scots and François, the Dauphin of France (original c. 1558)  
(© NMS. Licensee Scran) See www.scran.ac.uk

Plate 41: The Sanctuary of Holyrood, City of Edinburgh (c. 1860)  
(© Royal Commission on the Ancient and Historical Monuments of Scotland. Licensee Scran)  
See www.scran.ac.uk

Although 200 years later than the time of Mary’s entertainments in the park, the sketch indicates at least three locks surviving in the park into the nineteenth century, with St Margaret’s Loch at the top nearest the palace, and the largest loch, Dunnington, positioned around the other side of Arthur’s seat.
Plate 42: Portrait of James VI of Scotland, unknown date (now in Edinburgh Castle)
Image from Historic Scotland Image Library, used with kind permission from the same.
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