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In August 1561, Mary Queen of Scots sailed to Scotland to assume her personal reign, following the death of her husband François II (fig. 1). She had become Scotland’s monarch within a week of her birth in December 1542, with the sudden death of her father James V.1 Amidst fears of possible kidnap by England, she was sent to France in 1548.2 There, she was brought up at the Valois court, as the betrothed of the dauphin. Treated as ‘our very own daughter’, Henri II specified that Mary should be given precedence over all of his children apart from the dauphin, in recognition of her crowned status (fig. 2).3 In 1554, it was determined that she and the dauphin should officially travel with the court during its frequent progresses,4 thus completing her courtly education for becoming future dauphiness of France. Already, her maternal uncle Cardinal Charles de Guise-Lorraine oversaw her statecraft training to serve as Stewart monarch.5 In addition, the many hours Henri II spent in conversation with the young Mary would have also shaped her education and her understanding of monarchy.

Fig. 1 Atelier of François Clouet, ‘Double Portrait of François II and Mary Stuart in Coronation Dress’, Miniature in the Hours of Catherine de Médici, N. a. lat. 82 f. 154v, 1559, watercolour on vellum, 10 x 6.8 cm.

Fig. 2 François Clouet, Portrait of Mary Stuart, 1555, drawing on paper, 31.4 x 21.4 cm, Wroclaw, National Ossoliński Institute, inv. 8695.
Mary and François were married on 24 April 1558 at Notre Dame Cathedral. Just over a year later, she became queen of France upon Henri II’s death in July 1559 (fig. 3). Yet, before the end of that year, Scottish noble magnates overthrew her regent (and mother), Marie de Guise-Lorraine, and then ran Scotland as a semi-republic. Many Scots considered that Mary was unlikely ever to return from France to govern Scotland. Styling themselves ‘the State of Scotland’, these rebels even undertook treaty negotiations with England. Then, in December 1560, François II died. Barely eighteen, Mary decided to return to Scotland and rule in her own name.

Arriving back in Scotland, Mary quickly had to gain control of her kingdom and of her subjects’ obedience and loyalty. As Queen of Scots, Mary’s title reflected the fact that the Stewarts were a \textit{primus-inter-pares} dynasty: she would have to rule her over-mighty magnates as a first-among-equals sovereign. Modern historiography is mixed in its appreciation of the success of Mary’s personal reign. Jenny Wormald deemed it a failure, though more recent works point to Mary’s successes. John Guy praises her for ‘holding together a fairly unstable kingdom’ for as long as she did and highlights the ‘theatre of power’ that she created. Overall, Michael Lynch praises her political and religious policies. He also challenges any critics to answer why a majority of the nobles, most of whom had rebelled against her regent, then fought for Mary during the civil war years following her forced abdication in 1567. In fact, as some indication of the strength of the sustained support for Mary, the civil war (1567–1573) continued for as long as had lasted her personal reign before then.
This chapter sets out how Mary employed particular aspects of Valois palace planning, furnishing and court ceremonial as possible solutions for the great challenges she faced on her return to Scotland. It will explore how she utilized ‘architecture as politics’, having Holyrood serve as an embodiment of power to herald her sovereign authority as the Queen of Scots (fig. 4). It will consider why she drew upon Holyrood’s ancient representations, as a way to establish her personal reign immediately and effectively. The chapter will also examine why she made changes to established room usage at Holyrood and look at the opportunities this afforded her: the expression of her monarchical power in Holyrood’s inner chamber and its processional route through the outer chamber. For this use of architecture as politics, the royal interior and its ceremonial spaces presented great scope for portrayal of the monarchical image and for the projection of sovereign authority. Investigating her use of interior space, this chapter will present how Mary created her Holyrood inner chamber to be the setting for the performance of ceremonial ritual. Finally, it will analyse how she fashioned this room and the particular furnishings deployed for the portrayal of her image as Stewart monarch.

Fig. 4 James Gordon Rothiemay, ‘West front of Holyrood Palace’ from La Galérie Agréable du Monde, 1729.
Holyrood Palace as a ‘Stewart Dynastic Emblem’

James IV chose the site of the Augustinian abbey, with its important twelfth-century origins, to build his new palace for Edinburgh as capital (fig. 5). Work began at the time of preparations for the Treaty of Perpetual Peace between Scotland and England, the terms of which arranged the marriage of James IV with Henry VII’s elder daughter Margaret. Built as the Stewart dynastic emblem, the palace thus came to symbolize this wedding’s union of the recently created Tudor dynasty with the more ancient house of Stewart. Founded in 1371, the Stewarts were Europe’s second oldest dynasty. However, Holyrood Palace was only built at the beginning of the sixteenth century.

Fig. 5 Georg Braun & Franz Hogenberg, 1582, Edenburgum, Scotiae Metropolis, EMS.s.653.

Having the contemporary name of ‘the palice beside the Abbay of the Holy Croce’, Holyrood Palace served to link the Stewart dynasty even further back to the eleventh-century origins of the Canmore dynasty, from whom it directly descended. The palace’s contemporary name underscored its link to the Augustinian abbey, established in 1128 by David I (fig. 6). The Canmore dynasty had been founded by his parents, Malcolm III and St. Margaret of Wessex. Thus, tradition connected the Stewarts to the pre-Conquest Anglo-Saxon kings, since Margaret was the great-
niece of Edward the Confessor (d.1066). Thereby the ancestry of the house of Stewart pre-dated both England’s Plantagenet line and the 1066 Norman Conquest.

Fig. 6 James Gordon Rothiemay, Bird’s Eye View of Holyrood Palace from the South, c.1647.

The royal lodgings that James IV created for his new Holyrood Palace followed the traditional Stewart arrangement, which comprised three principal rooms. This sequence of rooms consisted of the king’s hall, the great chamber (or presence chamber) and the bedchamber, which was the innermost room within the public suite of the palace. Previously, in 1364, when commissioning new royal accommodation at the Old Louvre upon his succession, Charles V created what was then a new type of royal lodgings for monarch and consort. Charles designed these new lodgings to facilitate ceremonial and to project the majesty and power of Valois monarchs. Charles V’s configuration of three principal rooms was also followed by other European dynasties such as the Tudors and Habsburgs. There is some evidence to suggest that the Stewarts may also have followed Charles V’s prototype of three principal rooms from the early decades after the foundation of the Stewart dynasty.

By the late fifteenth century, the number of rooms in royal lodgings for many dynasties began to increase from this original configuration of three principal rooms and continued to in-
crease even further over the course of the sixteenth century. They included adaptations for spatiality and ceremonial.\textsuperscript{17} However, the Stewarts built and re-fashioned their palaces in this same three-room configuration during the sixteenth century.\textsuperscript{18} There is evidence for such continuation in James V’s building programme at Linlithgow Palace that was carried out in the mid-1530s. Construction began in 1539 for James’s new palace at Stirling Castle, which continued this traditional Stewart three-room configuration. James V’s Stirling Palace would be the last royal building work for the sixteenth century, apart from James VI’s Chapel Royal, which was built at Stirling in 1594.\textsuperscript{19}

**Mary’s Reinstatement of Holyrood as the Stewart Dynastic Emblem**

When Mary returned to Scotland on 19 August 1561, that date marked the first time that Holyrood housed the Stewart monarch in two decades. Though becoming Scotland’s monarch within a week of her birth in December 1542, Mary instead resided at her birthplace, Linlithgow Palace. On becoming Regent of Scotland in January 1543, the Earl of Arran took up residence at Holyrood.\textsuperscript{20} Later that year, fearing threat of English kidnap, Mary and her mother moved to the greater safety of Stirling Castle.\textsuperscript{21} In an attempt to annex Scotland by repeated invasions in the decade following James V’s death, English armed forces inflicted considerable damage in May 1544 to Holyrood’s palace, abbey and to the Stewart mausoleum (fig. 7).\textsuperscript{22}

Fig. 7 Richard Lee, *Edinburgh as Depicted in the So-called Spy Map*, c.1544, Cotton Augustus I.ii, f. 56.
After that time, contemporary sources make no further mention of James V’s state rooms of the west wing; neither do they attest to the extent of damage to the palace that resulted from the conflagration of the attack. The thick stonewalls of the palace’s great tower might have withstood better the substantial damage by fire, particularly on the upper floors. Therefore, after seizing the regency from Arran in 1554, Marie de Guise-Lorraine then returned to reside on the tower’s second floor in the lodgings she had previously occupied as queen consort.

By March 1560, Queen Marie fled from Holyrood, having been overthrown as Regent of Scotland by rebel magnates in October 1559. No longer a royal residence, Holyrood’s status as the Stewart dynastic emblem was further diluted since, at times, Arran would occupy Holyrood Palace, claiming his rights as second person of the realm through his distant Stewart descent. Indeed, if Arran coveted the crown for himself, his residence at Holyrood may have advantageously highlighted his Stewart blood. One of his earliest occupations was in April 1560 during the rebels’ siege of Leith, the seaport town outside Edinburgh. In a further subversion of the former status of Stewart sovereignty, the English spy Thomas Randolph also moved into Holyrood during that time. Writing dispatches from Holyrood to Elizabeth I’s chief minister William Cecil, Randolph reported on the rebels’ progress against the overthrown Stewart Regent, Marie de Guise-Lorraine.

Though built by James IV as the Stewart dynastic emblem, in less than forty years Holyrood had lost all its crowned residents. Moreover, the west wing’s disappearance from contemporary accounts strongly suggests that the English army’s 1544 torching put an end to James V’s state rooms. By 1560, Holyrood would become the headquarters for rebel activity and for English intelligence. Accommodated at Holyrood, rebels would behave as rulers over a quasi-republic, when they entered into treaty negotiations with England as ‘the State of Scotland’.

On her 19 August 1561 arrival in Scotland, Mary had to seize control without delay and attain the obedience and loyalty of these rebel magnates. She immediately established Holyrood to serve as her personal residence and the seat of her court and government. Significantly, she filled her first days back in Scotland with a programme that underscored her strategic reinstatement of Holyrood in its governmental role and as the Stewart dynastic emblem. Within her first week, Mary conducted audiences on state matters at Holyrood. There, she gave audience to Thomas Randolph, in his new role as Elizabeth I’s ambassador, and even to the Calvinist religious reformer, John Knox, whom Mary sharply rebuked about his radical views that subjects had no need to obey a female monarch. By the first week of September, she also had formed her Privy Council, deliberately choosing those same Privy Council members who had overthrown her mother and had run Scotland as a semi-republic. To symbolize her right to rule, Mary used the monumentality and memoriae of Holyrood as the embodiment of her power as the Stewart monarch (fig. 8).
Mary’s Holyrood: Room Planning and Ceremonial Space

Contemporary sources help with the modern day re-construction of the planning and room use in Mary’s Holyrood lodgings. Scrutiny of dispatches by Thomas Randolph provides an interpretation of Mary’s actual room usage at Holyrood. In his diplomatic writings to Elizabeth I’s chief minister, William Cecil, occasional snippets act as clues for the particular roles Mary had each of these Holyrood rooms perform. Randolph mentioned several meetings taking place in Mary’s bedchamber during which he was present. His dispatches show that she used this room both as an audience chamber and as the room in which she held her conseils with chief advisors, thereby confirming that she introduced such Valois practice in Scotland. When writing about the December 1562 audience granted him at Holyrood, John Knox also stated that this audience took place in Mary’s bedchamber. In the early modern period, physical proximity to the monarch was much sought after and, therefore, Mary’s invitation to this innermost room bestowed the greatest honour on the person received therein.

Mary understood the Valois’ ceremonial use of the monarch’s bedchamber. When she had arrived in France in 1548, Henri II arranged for her to live at the palace of St. Germain-en-Laye. In recognition of her crowned status, Henri allowed Mary to occupy the apartment directly above his own lodgings that were situated on the west wing’s second floor. Her St. Germain rooms were laid out identically, if marginally smaller, to those of the king immediately below. As a
result, Mary would have observed at first hand the important role performed by the Valois monarch’s bedchamber. The close reading of Randolph’s dispatches thus allows for the comparison of Mary’s Holyrood lodgings with those she had occupied at the Valois court up to the time of her marriage to the dauphin. Indeed, the room distribution of her St. Germain lodgings was also similar to her Holyrood lodgings (fig. 9).34

The monarch’s bedchamber symbolized his daily life, with the room’s bed of estate representing his daily arising and retiring.35 Of all the rooms in royal palaces, this room constituted the greatest physical representation of the monarch’s power and the palace’s innermost sanctum. Mary chose this room to serve as her audience chamber and as the setting for the ritual of counsel when privy councillors came for consultation. Simon Thurley emphasizes that an important function of this room was to house the monarch’s bed of estate and, as Hugh Murray Bailey underscores, the monarch’s bed of estate equated to a throne in this period.36 Accordingly, by moving the location of her Holyrood audience chamber, Mary incorporated these important monarchical forms of representation into her audience chamber as the embodiment of her power and right to rule.

The traditional location of the Stewart audience chamber had been the room immediately preceding the monarch’s bedchamber (fig. 10).37 This change of location for her audience chamber provided Mary with further opportunities to present the embodiment of her monarchical power. Within her Holyrood bedchamber, she was able to create a special ceremonial space, which became the most sacred spot within the monarch’s innermost sanctum. Contemporary
source material shows that Mary imitated the Valois’ power-enhancing arrangement of furniture of estate in her Holyrood bedchamber. Accordingly, she brought together the important symbols of power, i.e. fireplace, bed of estate and chair of estate, to create an appropriate composition as backdrop for her audience (fig. 11). With the help of cloth-of-gold segments placed on the floor around her bed, she designated this sacrosanct area within her bedchamber.  

Fig. 10  Plan of James V’s State Apartments on the First Floor of the Palace Block at Holyrood, 2016 [1663].
Mary’s Holyrood bedchamber constituted the culmination of the processional route within the palace. By changing her Holyrood room usage, Mary also altered the processional route that led to her audience chamber, thereby providing further opportunities to present the physical reminders of her monarchical power. Monique Chatenet identifies markers along such a processional route and emphasizes that, not merely being an architectural or furnishing element, each of these markers constituted a representation of monarchical authority.39 By increasing the bedchamber’s role and extending the processional route, Mary further heightened the honour for those being received in this sacrosanct room at Holyrood. Along the processional route, Mary’s honoured guest would mount the ‘great turngreis’ stairs up to the second floor and then pass through the doorway leading to her royal lodgings, before entering the outer chamber or salle. The processional route through this outer chamber was punctuated with further architectural and furnishing markers. Positioned at the room’s far end, the fireplace symbolized the monarch’s authority. Overhanging the fireplace was Mary’s cloth of state; as an additional symbol of authority, her chair of estate was placed in front of the fireplace.40

This outer chamber served as the setting for Mary’s daily dining in public and her frequent courtly evenings of dancing, dice and cards at which large numbers of courtiers would be present (fig. 12).41 Mary’s Holyrood changes allowed this room to perform an additional important role: her outer chamber also served as her Stewart portrait gallery, further embodying her dynastic

Fig. 11 After George M. Greig, Queen Mary’s Bedchamber, 1862–63, lithograph.
credentials on this important processional route. Portrayed on the ceiling was the Stewart dynasty’s unbroken and undisputed line of succession. Panels depicted the monograms of James I through to James V and their respective consorts, with each monogram surmounted by the closed imperial Stewart crown. Shortly before Mary’s marriage to the future François II, ceiling panels had been added to display the monograms and arms of Henri II and of the dauphin, along with a central lozenge with the arms of the house of Guise-Lorraine, Mary’s maternal line.

This magnificent ceiling crowned the room, both literally and figuratively. On the ceiling, the imperial crown surmounting each Stewart monarch reiterated Mary’s own status as the anointed Stewart monarch. On their processional way to her bedchamber for audience, those honoured guests must first pass under this ceiling, thus performing yet another figurative genuflection to the Stewart monarch in acknowledgement of her right to rule. While the guest received great honour by the invitation into her Holyrood bedchamber, he in return had to offer respect to the Queen of Scots and to acknowledge her monarchical status, at repeated intervals, as he traversed this processional route. Under the Stewart portrait gallery in Holyrood’s outer chamber, he was obliged to acknowledge the Stewart monarch’s ancient and unbroken dynastic lineage as a further sign of her power. By embodying power in space, iconography and furnishing, Mary deliberately created a setting in which ceremonial and protocol allowed her, as a female *primus-inter-pares* monarch, to receive counsel and to honour chosen subjects or diplomats without compromising

---

**Fig. 12** *Mary Queen of Scots*, sixteenth century, after an engraving by Franz Huys, NPG D13137.
her authority. In such surroundings, she could flatter courtiers and make herself accessible while maintaining a regal dignity.

**Fashioning Mary’s Holyrood Bedchamber**

When Mary sailed from France, her flotilla to Scotland included more than a dozen cargo vessels laden with Valois furnishings. A dowry settlement made shortly before her 1558 marriage to the dauphin provided that, if he should pre-decease her, Mary would be entitled to furnishings befitting a Queen of France (fig. 13). At that time, it would seem almost unimaginable that the future François II would die less than three years later in December 1560, aged only sixteen.

When the cargo of Mary’s Valois dowry furnishings was unpacked at Holyrood in November 1561, an inventory was taken that listed almost 200 items, with many of these having multiple sets. Significantly, this November inventory shows that her selection reflected the monarchical policy she would set for her personal reign. Fourteen beds of estate and dozens upon dozens of tapestries with classical themes were packed alongside costumes for masques that were decorated with more than fifty metres of gold fringe. In addition, this inventory listed great quantities of luxurious fabric, fringes and other ornamentation that were brought to Scotland, providing a well-stocked haberdashery for Holyrood’s workrooms. To carry out her many decorative campaigns, Mary also brought Valois artisans as part of her household to Scotland. These Valois resources provided the necessary foundation for the manifestation of her embodiment of power.

![Fig. 13 François Clouet, Portrait of Mary Queen of Scots, 1558, miniature on vellum, 8.3 x 5.7 cm.](image-url)
Sixteenth-century Stewart inventories were not arranged by room unfortunately, but instead by furnishing category. However, a comparative study of the Scottish treasurer’s accounts provides essential information including details of the specific pieces of furniture placed in Mary’s Holyrood bedchamber. It also reveals that, throughout her personal reign, the colour palette used for decorative furnishings was always restricted to one of four particular colours. Whenever a buffet of estate’s ornamental cover (‘burdclaith’ or ‘tapis de buffet’) and chair of estate were made, a set of complementary seating furniture was also produced. All these pieces were made in the same colour, either in crimson, purple, black or green velvet. The specific colour chosen related to a particular bed of estate, with the colour of velvet echoing the principal colour in the bed’s hangings. Such consistency, both for specific furniture and for the colour of velvet, indicates a methodical system for Mary’s numerous decorative projects that were carried out over the course of her personal reign.

Having multiple sets of furniture in velvet of the same colour scheme allowed Mary to have furniture remain in situ at principal Stewart palaces. Even during the later years of the sixteenth century, furniture and tapestries would be constantly moved from palace to palace in reflection of a court’s peripatetic nature. However, Mary seems not to have followed this European practice. A study of the itinerary during her personal reign shows that visits by queen and court to the other principal Stewart palaces followed a restricted travel schedule, in comparison to those set out for other sixteenth-century Stewart monarchs.

The large number of her crimson velvet beds of estate strongly suggests that it was Mary’s intention to have some furniture of estate and other furnishings remain permanently at principal palaces. Several marginal notes to the November 1561 inventory further confirm such a plan, such as the ‘In Striueling’ notation for ‘crammosie veluot of heich cullour pafmendt [sic] with gold’ bed of estate and its accompanying bright crimson velvet furnishings with gold lace and fringe.

Convenience and savings in transport costs were not the only reason for such a practice. A comparison with a 1542 inventory of Valois furnishings held permanently at the Louvre, can shed further light on the motives behind Mary’s decorative projects. Sophie Schneebalg-Perelman stresses that particular furnishings listed on this 1542 inventory were meant to remain at the Louvre and she also points out that François I and the court were no longer in constant movement by that time (‘le roi […] jusqu’ici nomade’). She further highlights that the furnishings listed in this inventory were created in deluxe fabrics with lavish embroidery and, most importantly, they were designed in a single colour and type of ornamentation. As in the case of Mary’s sets of furnishings created in a single colour, the 1542 inventory shows groups of furniture of estate which maintained the same unity of colour and ornamentation, such as the entry for ‘la chambre de veloux verd’.

In addition, Schneebalg-Perelman underscores that many of the sets of furniture of estate included in this 1542 inventory had been made for special dynastic events. They might then be brought out again, for future state occasions of great dynastic importance. Following a similar
pattern, Mary had decorative works carried out in Holyrood’s workrooms in readiness for her marriage to her cousin, Lord Darnley, in July 1565. Of great dynastic significance, Darnley was a grandson of Margaret Tudor, as well as being a Lennox Stewart through his descent from James II’s eldest daughter Mary. This marriage thus created double Stewart-Tudor lines for Mary’s children and their descendants. Following the June 1566 birth of Prince James, Mary undertook a substantial decorative campaign ahead of the prince’s December 1566 baptism celebrations, taking full advantage of the opportunity to make a dynastic statement.

Conclusion

Mary drew upon Valois practice to find solutions for some of the enormous difficulties she faced on her return to rule over Scotland. Importantly, she deployed the resources of her Valois dowry furnishings and French court artisans to fashion her surroundings so that they embodied her power, reinforced her status as monarch and impressed upon advisors, diplomats and favoured courtiers how gracious the queen was to grant them an intimate audience in the innermost sanctuary of her residence.

The great number of beds of estate Mary selected from Valois wardrobes was a clear indication of plans already underway, even before leaving France, to create a power centre in her Holyrood bedchamber. On her arrival in Scotland, she immediately set about rearranging Holyrood’s room usage. She moved the audience chamber to the bedchamber and, thereby, changed the traditional Stewart location. The arrangement of this room and the Valois beds of estate created a powerful backdrop for her Holyrood bedchamber, visually asserting her right to rule. The power centre of Mary’s bedchamber was essential in gaining the involvement of rebel magnates to serve in her government and, thus, in gaining their obedience as loyal Crown servants. Rather than meeting solely in the council chamber on the first floor, advisors and other Privy Council members would come upstairs to consult in the monarch’s bedchamber. In addition, as part of her monarchical policy to achieve amity with England, Mary included the English ambassador Thomas Randolph in her bedchamber conseils on a regular basis. All these aims were achieved by the creation of her new Valois style audience chamber. Mary successfully reinstated Holyrood as the Stewart dynastic emblem, having it immediately serve as her official residence and as the seat of her government and court. The substantial support Mary received from former rebels during the civil war years is some indication that her strategy to employ Valois elements and ceremonial practice in Scotland met with success, despite those former rebels’ resentment of all things French.
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1 James V died on 14 December 1542. The September 1543 coronation of Mary Queen of Scots took place in the Stewart Chapel Royal at Stirling Castle.
2 For this period of increased English efforts to resurrect its old claims of overlordship over Scotland, see Merriman 2000, pp. 39–48.
3 For an early example, see Teulet 1852, I, p. 234.
4 For instance, see the appropriate letters from the Balcarres papers published in Wood 1923–25, II, pp. 137–38.
5 Teulet 1852, I, p. 234. For an assessment of the quality of her political tutelage under the Cardinal de Guise-Lorraine, see also Loughlin 1991, 100, n. 214.
6 Knox, 1735, edited by Keith 1844, II, p. 35.
9 For an assessment of Mary’s personal reign, see Lynch 1991, pp. 210–18.
10 Lynch 1988, pp. 7–8.
11 Though the Treasurer’s Accounts (TA) indicate a desire for work to begin as early as October 1501, it did not begin until the following autumn. See Dunbar 1998, pp. 56–57.
12 ‘Rood’ or ‘rude’ was the Scottish term to denote the crucifixion cross of Christ, especially in the mediaeval period. See TA documents published in Dickson 1877, II, p. 498.
13 For Malcolm III and the Canmore dynasty, see Barrow 2004, XXXVI, pp. 279–81.
14 Drawing upon the account of the 1503 wedding celebrations at Holyrood written by the English herald, John Dunbar concludes that James IV built Holyrood in a courtyard configuration with three contiguous rooms; see Leland 1770, IV, in particular pp. 292–95, and Dunbar 1999, p. 142.

15 For the planning of Charles V’s new lodgings, see Whiteley 1994, pp. 47–63 and Whiteley 2014, p. 11. Prior to the later sixteenth century, ‘lodgings’ (‘logis’) was the term used rather than ‘state apartments’.

16 Dunbar’s study of extant resources about palace planning shows some example of this three-room configuration, even at early Stewart palaces; see Dunbar 1999, in particular pp. 7–8, 83–87. In fact, a fair amount of political and cultural exchange with France took place at the time of the Stewart dynasty’s 1371 founding: for example, a Scottish delegation was sent to France to renew the 1295 ‘Auld Alliance’ with France. This renewed treaty was then signed by Charles V in June 1371; see Bonner 2002, pp. 13–14.

17 For the substantial increase in room numbers at Tudor lodgings during Henry VIII’s reign, see Thurley 1993, p. 136. Baillie 1967 covers the pre-Baroque period, despite the article’s title.

18 For James V’s new work at Stirling, Wormald 2000, pp. 43–48 stated: ‘[W]hat was innovative […] was its layout of rooms. The entrance led directly into the guard, presence, bedchamber. […] James V designed his palace not for ease of access to the king but inaccessibility’ [emphasis added]. Spangler 2009, pp. 49–62 based much of his article on Wormald and repeated the list and sequence of three rooms, further noting that this planning was ‘innovative’ and constituted a ‘more controlled layout’ and ‘changed ceremonial’; […] ‘James’s new palace block design shifted away from the “easy-access” palace layout of his father’s and grandfather’s building.’ John Dunbar’s lifelong work on Stewart palaces culminated in his substantial 1999 publication. Unfortunately, Wormald’s assessment did not include any mention of Dunbar’s work; this omission was then repeated in Spangler’s article. Though stating that design of James V’s Stirling ‘shifted away from the “easy-access” layout’ of palaces of James IV and earlier Stewarts, this assessment overlooks the long Stewart tradition of this three-room configuration of the king’s hall, great chamber, inner chamber (or bedchamber). See Wormald, 2000, pp. 43–48; Spangler 2009, pp. 49–62.

19 For these three rooms, the Accounts of the Masters of Works for Building and Repairing Royal Palaces and Castles (MWA) regularly used this terminology: outer, mid and inner chamber; see Paton etc. 1967–1982, I, pp. 115–131, 227–228; II, p. 84 and pp. 239, 256, 259–274 and Dunbar 1999, pp. 13 and 51.

20 The respective documents from the Acts of the Parliaments of Scotland (APS), pp. 411–12.

21 Under the 1543 Greenwich treaties, Henry VIII’s son Edward would marry Mary. However, the Scots feared that she would be quickly removed to England, despite treaty provisions guaranteeing that she be allowed to remain in Scotland until 1554. Mary and her mother moved to Stirling Castle in July 1543: TA, published in Dickson 1877, VIII, p. xlii.

22 See the respective Letters and Papers from the reign of Henry VIII (LP) published in Brewer, 1920: May 1544, pp. 6–19, 296–310. For a political assessment of this period of ‘rough wooing’ and English attempts to claim suzerainty over Scotland (dating from the Scottish Wars of Independence and reignited during Edward I’s reign), see Merriman 2000.

23 The provision of a new door and lock for the tower in July 1544 is the only mention of any work at Holyrood for this period in the treasurer’s accounts published in Dickson 1877, VIII, p. 305. No other repairs at Holyrood Palace are listed in the MWA records (published in Paton etc. 1967–1982), which are not completely preserved for the period 1543–1590.
Payments were made in 1554 to purchase lead for the tower’s new roof, since its previous lead cover had been stripped off by the English during earlier invasions. Beginning in 1554, minor works were carried out to enable use of the Abbey and of the Chapel Royal within the palace, some at Marie de Guise’s personal expense. Expenditure mentioned for Holyrood in early 1558 could refer to the outer chamber’s ceiling and to the depiction of the arms of Henri II and the dauphin, along with those of Marie de Guise Lorraine. See TA published in Dickson 1877, X, pp. 409–10.

TA published in Dickson 1877, XI, p. 5.

CSP Scot published in Bain etc. 1898–1969, I, pp. 354–57. At that time, Randolph used the code name ‘Barnabie’ for his intelligence work.

In Randolph’s role as English resident ambassador to Scotland, Mary sometimes invited him to be present at her audiences with visiting foreign ambassadors, in addition to the frequent audiences she granted him concerning English matters. At times, she would also invite him to be present during consultative meetings with some of her Privy Council advisors. See also Adams 2002, p. 38.

Knox 1949, II, p. 43. By tradition, the outer chamber of Mary’s Holyrood lodgings has been designated as her audience chamber in guidebooks and visitors’ accounts since the nineteenth century.
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