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ABSTRACT

A previous paper in these Proceedings (Murray 1995) described the castle in its final form in the 1690s and its gradual destruction over the following century. Since then a study of the Bishop of Moray’s castle of Spynie has pointed to similarities between it and Glasgow. Examination of other sources has documented two periods of building activity which have escaped previous notice. The first involves repairs and alterations carried out by the Duke and Duchess of Lennox after 1598; the second work undertaken by Archbishop Ross between 1680 and 1686. In addition further light is thrown on Robert Thomson’s role in the destruction of the castle from 1715 onwards.

THE LENNOXES AND THE CASTLE 1598–1607

For the Lennox connection with the castle, it is necessary to go back to 1570 and the forfeiture of the last Catholic Archbishop, James Beaton, who had fled to France ten years earlier. Following the forfeiture the Regent, Matthew Stewart, Earl of Lennox, appointed John Porterfield as Archbishop, allegedly on condition that he should sell the bishopric of Glasgow to him and the heirs and successors of the house of Lennox. Lennox was murdered on 4 September 1571 and Porterfield failed to retain the archbishopric. Thereafter the crown appointed three successive Archbishops, with varying success in face of opposition from the Reformed Kirk. The last of these, William Erskine, was accepted by Glasgow presbytery on the basis that he would hold the temporalities and leave ecclesiastical jurisdiction in the hands of the Kirk. However, in June 1587 the General Assembly ordered this arrangement to be annulled and in the following month he lost the temporalities by Act of Parliament.

THE ACT OF 1587 ANNEXING THE TEMPORALITIES OF RELIGIOUS HOUSES, BISHOPRICS AND OTHER BENEFICES TO THE CROWN

The Act of 1587 annexing the temporalities of religious houses, bishoprics and other benefices to the crown, was followed by grants to various persons. On 3 November 1587 Walter Stewart, commendator of Blantyre, later first Lord Blantyre, received a crown charter of the lands and barony of Glasgow, formerly belonging to the bishopric, erected into a free lordship and regality, with the Castle of Glasgow as its principal messuage.

Although Blantyre’s charter was ratified by James VI on 26 August 1591, he was soon supplanted by Ludovick Stuart, second Duke of Lennox, son of the king’s late cousin and favourite, Esmé Stuart. An Act of Parliament of 21 July 1593, giving Lennox the superiority of the archbishopric and priory of St Andrews and archbishopric of Glasgow, was followed on 30 April 1594 by a charter of the lordship of Glasgow, in similar terms to those previous granted to Blantyre. There was, however, a possible flaw in Lennox’s title. Archbishop Beaton, still alive and living in France, was held in high esteem by the king, whom he had served as ambassador. On 29 June 1598 an act of convention of estates restored him to his
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offices, lands and other possessions. Faced with the prospect of this being confirmed by Parliament the duke took counsel with his friends. They advised, ‘It is expedient that my lord deill for the possessioun of the bischoprick of Glasgow and that the auld Bischop be satisfeit ather for his lyfrent or yeirlie deutie as best can be agree’. Lennox proposed that he should pay Beaton all the revenues during his lifetime and have the archbishopric lands thereafter. Under an agreement signed on 16 February 1600 with Beaton’s agent, Alexander King, he would appoint a person to receive the revenues and pay them over to King. He was to retain half the rents of the mill of Partick and possess the Castle of Glasgow, the office of bailiary and the privilege of electing the magistrates of Glasgow until ‘the Bischoppis mynd be knawin thairanent’. On 9 March James VI promised to erect the archbishopric into a temporal lordship for Lennox after Beaton’s death. This would be written into an Act of Parliament confirming its restoration to Beaton, but by October 1600 it was known that Beaton would not agree, ‘neither, as I hear, that a heretic should succeed him, he says and he stands upon it’. Although the Act was passed on 15 November Beaton’s agent ‘flatly refused it, with these words, that the Bishop would not accept it, nor be the king’s Ambassador any more’. Expressly excluded from the restoration of the archbishopric were the castle and the right to choose the burgh magistrates.

Lennox had remarried on 3 September 1598. His second wife was Jean or Jane Campbell, sister of Sir Hugh Campbell of Loudoun and widow of Sir Robert Montgomery of Giffen, who had died in August 1596. Montgomery had been the brother of the murdered fourth Earl of Eglinton and tutor-at-law of his son, Hugh Montgomery, the fifth Earl. The marriage seems to have been arranged by James VI to ally his cousin to these two powerful Ayrshire houses. Already, in April 1598, he had brokered a marriage contract between the young earl and Gabrielle Stewart, Lennox’s sister, frustrating Robert Montgomery’s plan for the earl to marry his eldest daughter, Margaret. Robert had acquired the gift of the earl’s marriage, but later assigned it to his brother-in-law, Hugh Campbell, probably around the time he made his will. The will shows his determination that the earl should marry Margaret (born probably around the time he of Glasgow and that the auld Bischop be satisfeit ather for his lyfrent or yeirlie deutie as best can be agree’. Lennox proposed that he should pay Beaton all the revenues during his lifetime and have the archbishopric lands thereafter. Under an agreement signed on 16 February 1600 with Beaton’s agent, Alexander King, he would appoint a person to receive the revenues and pay them over to King. He was to retain half the rents of the mill of Partick and possess the Castle of Glasgow, the office of bailiary and the privilege of electing the magistrates of Glasgow until ‘the Bischoppis mynd be knawin thairanent’. On 9 March James VI promised to erect the archbishopric into a temporal lordship for Lennox after Beaton’s death. This would be written into an Act of Parliament confirming its restoration to Beaton, but by October 1600 it was known that Beaton would not agree, ‘neither, as I hear, that a heretic should succeed him, he says and he stands upon it’. Although the Act was passed on 15 November Beaton’s agent ‘flatly refused it, with these words, that the Bishop would not accept it, nor be the king’s Ambassador any more’. Expressly excluded from the restoration of the archbishopric were the castle and the right to choose the burgh magistrates.

Lennox had remarried on 3 September 1598. His second wife was Jean or Jane Campbell, sister of Sir Hugh Campbell of Loudoun and widow of Sir Robert Montgomery of Giffen, who had died in August 1596. Montgomery had been the brother of the murdered fourth Earl of Eglinton and tutor-at-law of his son, Hugh Montgomery, the fifth Earl. The marriage seems to have been arranged by James VI to ally his cousin to these two powerful Ayrshire houses. Already, in April 1598, he had brokered a marriage contract between the young earl and Gabrielle Stewart, Lennox’s sister, frustrating Robert Montgomery’s plan for the earl to marry his eldest daughter, Margaret. Robert had acquired the gift of the earl’s marriage, but later assigned it to his brother-in-law, Hugh Campbell, probably around the time he made his will. The will shows his determination that the earl should marry Margaret (born probably around the time he of Glasgow and that the auld Bischop be satisfeit ather for his lyfrent or yeirlie deutie as best can be agree’. Lennox proposed that he should pay Beaton all the revenues during his lifetime and have the archbishopric lands thereafter. Under an agreement signed on 16 February 1600 with Beaton’s agent, Alexander King, he would appoint a person to receive the revenues and pay them over to King. He was to retain half the rents of the mill of Partick and possess the Castle of Glasgow, the office of bailiary and the privilege of electing the magistrates of Glasgow until ‘the Bischoppis mynd be knawin thairanent’. On 9 March James VI promised to erect the archbishopric into a temporal lordship for Lennox after Beaton’s death. This would be written into an Act of Parliament confirming its restoration to Beaton, but by October 1600 it was known that Beaton would not agree, ‘neither, as I hear, that a heretic should succeed him, he says and he stands upon it’. Although the Act was passed on 15 November Beaton’s agent ‘flatly refused it, with these words, that the Bishop would not accept it, nor be the king’s Ambassador any more’. Expressly excluded from the restoration of the archbishopric were the castle and the right to choose the burgh magistrates.

Lennox had remarried on 3 September 1598. His second wife was Jean or Jane Campbell, sister of Sir Hugh Campbell of Loudoun and widow of Sir Robert Montgomery of Giffen, who had died in August 1596. Montgomery had been the brother of the murdered fourth Earl of Eglinton and tutor-at-law of his son, Hugh Montgomery, the fifth Earl. The marriage seems to have been arranged by James VI to ally his cousin to these two powerful Ayrshire houses. Already, in April 1598, he had brokered a marriage contract between the young earl and Gabrielle Stewart, Lennox’s sister, frustrating Robert Montgomery’s plan for the earl to marry his eldest daughter, Margaret. Robert had acquired the gift of the earl’s marriage, but later assigned it to his brother-in-law, Hugh Campbell, probably around the time he made his will. The will shows his determination that the earl should marry Margaret (born probably around the time he of Glasgow and that the auld Bischop be satisfeit ather for his lyfrent or yeirlie deutie as best can be agree’. Lennox proposed that he should pay Beaton all the revenues during his lifetime and have the archbishopric lands thereafter. Under an agreement signed on 16 February 1600 with Beaton’s agent, Alexander King, he would appoint a person to receive the revenues and pay them over to King. He was to retain half the rents of the mill of Partick and possess the Castle of Glasgow, the office of bailiary and the privilege of electing the magistrates of Glasgow until ‘the Bischoppis mynd be knawin thairanent’. On 9 March James VI promised to erect the archbishopric into a temporal lordship for Lennox after Beaton’s death. This would be written into an Act of Parliament confirming its restoration to Beaton, but by October 1600 it was known that Beaton would not agree, ‘neither, as I hear, that a heretic should succeed him, he says and he stands upon it’. Although the Act was passed on 15 November Beaton’s agent ‘flatly refused it, with these words, that the Bishop would not accept it, nor be the king’s Ambassador any more’. Expressly excluded from the restoration of the archbishopric were the castle and the right to choose the burgh magistrates.

Lennox had remarried on 3 September 1598. His second wife was Jean or Jane Campbell, sister of Sir Hugh Campbell of Loudoun and widow of Sir Robert Montgomery of Giffen, who had died in August 1596. Montgomery had been the brother of the murdered fourth Earl of Eglinton and tutor-at-law of his son, Hugh Montgomery, the fifth Earl. The marriage seems to have been arranged by James VI to ally his cousin to these two powerful Ayrshire houses. Already, in April 1598, he had brokered a marriage contract between the young earl and Gabrielle Stewart, Lennox’s sister, frustrating Robert Montgomery’s plan for the earl to marry his eldest daughter, Margaret. Robert had acquired the gift of the earl’s marriage, but later assigned it to his brother-in-law, Hugh Campbell, probably around the time he made his will. The will shows his determination that the earl should marry Margaret (born probably around the time he of Glasgow and that the auld Bischop be satisfeit ather for his lyfrent or yeirlie deutie as best can be agree’. Lennox proposed that he should pay Beaton all the revenues during his lifetime and have the archbishopric lands thereafter. Under an agreement signed on 16 February 1600 with Beaton’s agent, Alexander King, he would appoint a person to receive the revenues and pay them over to King. He was to retain half the rents of the mill of Partick and possess the Castle of Glasgow, the office of bailiary and the privilege of electing the magistrates of Glasgow until ‘the Bischoppis mynd be knawin thairanent’. On 9 March James VI promised to erect the archbishopric into a temporal lordship for Lennox after Beaton’s death. This would be written into an Act of Parliament confirming its restoration to Beaton, but by October 1600 it was known that Beaton would not agree, ‘neither, as I hear, that a heretic should succeed him, he says and he stands upon it’. Although the Act was passed on 15 November Beaton’s agent ‘flatly refused it, with these words, that the Bishop would not accept it, nor be the king’s Ambassador any more’. Expressly excluded from the restoration of the archbishopric were the castle and the right to choose the burgh magistrates.
ladyis chalmer dure’. A key for Lord Eglinton’s ‘cabinet dur’ could have been for an item of furniture rather than his study. Other entries refer to ‘mistress Margretis kist’, the duchess’s coffer and ‘drau burd’ (extending table), as well as the ‘hall burd’ (table in great hall), the spice kist and the ‘oyll fat’. A ‘hundreth cleikis to the tapestrie’ were probably for the ‘chalmer within the Dungeon of the Castell of Glasgow hung with tapestrie’ referred to in a later deposition, some of which may have been borrowed from the royal wardrobe. The castle’s role in the administration of justice is reflected in the supply of two ‘hingand locks’ (padlocks) for the stocks, which presumably stood in the courtyard. Items listed in this account amounted to £44 15s 8d out of a total of £117 2s 2d, indicating that the smith had supplied the greater part (£72 6s 6d) of the ironwork before August 1599. Most of the supplies appear to have been requisitioned by Robert Montgomery, one of the duchess’s servants.

The unnamed person rendering the second account may have been Montgomery, as some payments are said to have been ‘at my ladeis command’. They were defrayed from her ‘silver’, including money due to her from Partick Mill. The entries are undated, but one referring to corn and straw for ‘my lorde horse quhen the king ves in Glesgow’ can be dated to August 1600, when James VI visited the city in the aftermath of the Gowrie conspiracy. Whether or not this was Montgomery, the person concerned seems to have been in overall charge of the work and to have agreed prices with tradesmen and suppliers. When the wright would not agree a fixed price, he allowed a daily rate but kept a close eye on him to ensure that he was ‘not aydell’. The work involved even larger quantities of nails, as well as numerous ‘glass bands’, and is more specific as to where they were used. The first purchase was 180 deals (planks) which were evidently brought in by river and carted from the Broomielaw to the castle. There they were hoisted up through an upper window of the great tower and laid on the rafters to dry, after which they were lowered into the hall. Meanwhile a large quantity of rubbish had to be removed from the tower, ‘for hale (hall) and chalmeres and all’ were full of it.

The deals were partly destined for flooring a loft, which involved altering the existing joists and raggling the wall to take the ends of the floorboards. This can be identified with the ‘garle lacht’ mentioned elsewhere in the account as having at its end a ‘lang’ window. The ‘garle’ seems to be the gallery, probably in a wing to one side of the great tower. It appears to have had a paved floor, with three steps up to it. There is a later reference to a room under the gallery. Payment for ‘hewing of ane dore’ and purchasing a lintel for it suggests that access to new loft may have involved breaking through a wall. That the wardrobe also lay in a wing is implied by payment for repairing a hole that a stone had fallen through ‘af the house heid’. New locks were supplied for the wardrobe door and that of the ‘dungeone hoil’ (prison cell) beneath it.

Work on the great tower included alterations to a chimney carried out by a Paisley tradesman, Andrew Boyd, for which a wright erected scaffolding and made room ‘to gang about the chymlaye’. A new sneck was furnished for the door of the high chamber. Work on the great hall involved reglazing the north window and three little windows and renovating two ‘auld dores’. One hall door opened onto to the turnpike, which had a window on the same level. The highest window in the turnpike was reglazed, but its ‘laigh’ window was replaced by a new ‘bose’ (bow) window. As the masons carrying this out broke a length of slating on the ‘auld hose’ (presumably an offshoot), the new window must have been at an upper level. The privy door ‘behind the turnpeck yet’ probably opened off the turnpike at ground level. The whole of the turnpike was replastered, using a chalder of lime.

There is reference to the highest door in the ‘jame’ (projecting wing). New doors were constructed for Lord Eglinton’s chamber and
other unspecified chambers and ‘caettes’ (small rooms or walk-in cupboards), which could have been either in a wing or the great tower itself. Part of the timber was used for making new free-standing beds, one of which, for the high chamber, must have been an imposing four-poster. Not only was it ‘cled at heid and feite and coverit abone’, at its head was a ‘rowme maid for ane scheild’ (privy) with a door. Total expenditure of £2287 3s 6d included an additional sum on account to the glaswright ‘because the daye is past that I promeset him payment’. This suggests that more glazing work had been carried out than was detailed in the main account.

Items unrelated to the castle include some referring to a child at the duke’s mansion at Inchinnan. Two doctors were sent twice from Glasgow to see him, followed by a third with his ‘man’. Meanwhile boys were dispatched to Edinburgh with letters to the duke, the second conveying the reassurance that the ‘grownd of the bairnes sieknes ves bot teithe breiding’. Whichever doctor diagnosed teething trouble could not have been more wrong. Next to go Inchinnan was a wright with his ‘man’, carrying the child’s coffin. There can be little doubt that the unnamed child was the Lennoxes’ only son, who died in infancy. They had one other child, a daughter, Elizabeth, who survived infancy but died young. The duke’s illegitimate son, John Stewart, seems to have stayed with the duchess until February 1601, when he was sent to school in Ayrshire.

By then work on the castle must have been virtually complete. No further accounts have survived, apart from a receipt dated 3 July 1602 by James Leishman, a smith, to the duchess’s factor, for part payment for ‘the wark to be wrocht be him to the castell of Glasgow’. The small sum involved, £6, suggests that this was of a minor nature. The extensive works carried out in 1599–1600 may have obliged the ducal household to reside elsewhere. Its actual or prospective return is indicated by an agreement dated 8 January 1601 whereby William Heriot, baxter burgess of Glasgow, undertook to bake ‘to his grace hous in the castell of Glasgow’. The duchess was probably in residence on 26 March 1601, when her factor attended to account for her revenues from the lordship of Methven. On 5 September 1601 another Glasgow burgess, Robert Watson, flesher, undertook to supply her household with meat. In September 1602 the duke is reported to have attended the king very diligently and ‘feasted and lodged him at Glasgow’, presumably in the castle. James VI’s visit may be reflected by two payments in the duchess’s accounts, one ‘for making the yallow taftatie bandis quhairof three was tomore glazing work had been carried out than was detailed in the main account.

The proposed marriage of Lennox’s sister to the Earl of Eglinton having fallen through, in August 1604 Margaret Montgomery fulfilled her father’s wishes by marrying the earl, but their marriage was not destined to last. When she left him in June 1608 he blamed her other child, a daughter, Elizabeth, who survived infancy but died young. When she left him in June 1608 he blamed her other child, a daughter, Elizabeth, who survived infancy but died young.

When she left him in June 1608 he blamed her other child, a daughter, Elizabeth, who survived infancy but died young. When she left him in June 1608 he blamed her other child, a daughter, Elizabeth, who survived infancy but died young.

The Lennoxes’ marriage had broken down even more acrimoniously. They were living apart, he mainly in England, she presumably at Glasgow in the castle which he had granted to her for life. By April 1605 Lennox was protesting that no power on earth could make him use her as a wife. Though he would do nothing unlawful, ‘ther is no earthei thing I wiche more then lawfully to be queit of hir If lawful means failed, he would be patient and leave it to God. Meanwhile, ‘till God some way mak me quet of hir I shall ever thinke hir as a cross’. Given his attitude she may well
have had reason to suspect his motives when in August 1607 he demanded that she should fulfill her wife's duty by coming to live in his house at Inchinnan, following this up with an action of adherence in the commissary court of Edinburgh. Though professing willingness to accompany him to England, she declined to go to Inchinnan on the grounds that he intended to incarcerate her there. On his giving assurances that she would be free to come and go, the court gave decree in his favor. Meanwhile in September 1607 the duke brought an action before the Privy Council for custody of their daughter, Elizabeth, who had reached an age when she was 'capable of instruction and learning'.

On 15 October the duchess agreed to hand her over 'in the place of Cardonald'. Its proximity to Glasgow suggests that she was still living in the castle.

Perhaps the prospect of losing her child brought Jean to submit, at some point thereafter she and her daughters were living at Inchinnan. Though apparently not under restraint, she was not treated with respect. According to her brother, 'Albeit scho had many freyndis in prosperitie, yit I trow scho thocht thay war very few, yea drawin to the archiepiscopal palace (castle) into a tolerable condition of repair.'

There may have been some uncertainty about the castle's ownership. According to Sir William Brereton, who visited it in 1635, 'It is said to be the inheritance of the Duke of Lennox, but the archbishops successively made use of it.' It certainly reverted to Lennox ownership following the first abolition of episcopacy. On 6 September 1641 at Holyroodhouse Charles I granted a charter to the fourth Duke of all the lands formerly belonging to the Archbishops of Glasgow, including the castle.

Apart from expenditure of £651 for unspecified repairs in 1674–5, there is little further
information about the castle until 1680. Arthur Ross or Rose was translated from the bishopric of Galloway to the archbishopric of Glasgow in October 1679. Earlier that year the castle had suffered damage during the Western Rebellion, apart from which it seems to have been in a poor state of repair. On 11 September 1680 Charles II instructed the Scottish Privy Council to authorize Ross to uplift £300 sterling (£3600 scots) from vacant stipends in his diocese for repairing his ‘house or manse’, which was ‘very much out of repair and unfit to serve as a convenient lodging for the Archbishop thereof and his family’. The Privy Council complied on 5 October 1680, giving him priority over other claims upon the fund. A similar grant had been made to the Bishop of Dunkeld earlier in the year. Vacant stipends, the funds arising from stipends due to parish ministers during vacancies, were granted for deserving causes, including the repair of manses. Thus in December 1676 the Dean of Glasgow had received a grant for his manse, which was ruinous and uninhabitable, he having asserted that ‘a deans manse ought to be somewhat better then the ordinarie manse of ane minister.’ Some two years later Ross reported to the Privy Council that the repairs had been ‘brought to a great length’ and asked for his accounts to be considered. The matter was remitted to a committee which reported on 13 February 1683 that he had received a total of £3744 scots and expended £3933. Despite this expenditure the ‘old tower’ was ‘very ruinous and the battlements therof by which the rain descends and spoils the whole roumes of the tower and endangers the other rooms next thereto’. They recommended that the tower should be kept up and that the ‘barmekinwall, which is near falling’, be also kept up. No doubt with the events of 1679 in mind they further recommended that the garden wall should be ‘a little heightened with two little flankers upon each corner, as being the only place lfit for the security of the forces in case any insurrection should happen to be in that corner of the country’. On 29 March 1683 the council authorized Ross to draw another £150 sterling (£1800 scots) in addition to the balance due to him. Though the work was probably unfinished when Ross was translated to St Andrews in October 1684, he remained responsible for it. On 17 June 1686 the Privy Council appointed a committee to receive his accounts. Their report, approved by the council on 21 June, found that the repairs had been finished at an additional cost of £1962, of which he had received only £1500. This brought the total expenditure to £5955 (£496 sterling), leaving a balance of £651 9s 2d due to Ross. This was to be repaid to him by Glasgow University, to whom he was to assign the vacant stipends of Hutton and Row in Berwickshire.

Neither report gives details of works carried out, although the second lists payments to four persons, presumably tradesmen. Three can be identified tentatively with contemporary Glasgow burgesses. Thus James Boyd, who received £678, could be either of two masons, Alan Marshall (£628 14s) a wright, Walter Corbet (£157 8s 8d) a hammerman. Alexander Thomson who received two payments (£120 7s 4d and £377 19s 2d) was not a burgess. Presumably the works had included the repairs recommended in 1683 to the roof of the great tower and the walls enclosing the castle and its garden. Those carried out before 1683 may have included some new building. The ‘new dining room’, described in 1693 as linking the great hall to the gatehouse tower does not appear in Slezer’s depiction of the castle in the 1670s, here seen in Professor Charles McKean’s reconstruction view (illus 1). The exterior stair from the courtyard to the great hall was also built not long before 1686. In a dispute involving the principal and regents of the university it was alleged that some £1000 scots had been spent on ‘railing the great staire’ in the college, whereas the stair in the entry to the castle ‘that is not much less’ had been ‘perfected’ for £120 or less. This not only suggests that the castle’s ‘great
balustraded stair’ was similar to the university’s surviving ‘Lion and Unicorn stair’, but also that the latter may have been erected a few years earlier than the accepted date of 1690.61

The 1683 report had proposed incorporating the garden to the north of the castle within the defensive perimeter by raising its walls and adding two small flankers (corner turrets). If this was done it proved useless, as there were no troops to provide a garrison when troubled times came in 1688–9. The small Scottish army, summoned south by James VII, was disbanded when resistance to William of Orange collapsed. Archbishop Paterson, having prepared to defend his castle, abandoned it without a struggle and with the abolition of episcopacy it became crown property.62

ROBERT THOMSON AND THE DESTRUCTION OF THE CASTLE 1715–44

As the history of the castle after 1688 has been discussed elsewhere,63 it is sketched briefly here to put new information into context. By 1693 it was suffering vandalism in the form of broken windows, stolen door furniture and damage to the exterior stair, as well as longer-term structural problems with leaking roofs and unsafe chimneys. These appear to have been remedied before or soon after 1696 when Lord Cathcart and his family were given leave to occupy the castle. It is not clear whether their occupation ended with Cathcart’s death in 1709, but by 1715 the effects of neglect and vandalism were again apparent.

Robert Thomson, then postmaster of Glasgow, first comes on the scene in a letter to the first Duke of Montrose from his factor, Mungo Graham of Gorthie, in 1715. The duke’s long-standing family connection with Glasgow had been strengthened in 1704 by his acquisition of the Duke of Richmond and Lennox’s Scottish estates and in 1714 by his appointment as bailie of the barony and regality formerly belonging to the archbishopric. He had a mansion in the city, where he had lived as a boy with his widowed mother and to
which he himself made considerable additions. Writing from Glasgow on 20 May 1715, Gorthie mentioned that ‘Mr Thomson the postmaster’ had approached him concerning the ‘Bishops house here’ which was ‘daily going to ruin for want of repairation; and besides the towns people are stealing everything, as iron, stone and timber’. Should the duke obtain a grant of the property from the crown, Thomson would pay him 1000 merks (about £56 sterling) for the ‘house and ground right’. Gorthie saw two material objections to the proposal, firstly that the grant might not be made and secondly that the duke might not wish to take it, ‘so I should say nothing of the matter, but its a pity that it should be left a prey to all the pilferers in the town’.  

Thomson may have been contemplating the opportunities he was to exploit later on, but nothing came of his initial approach. Though the duke did not apply for a crown grant, he seems to have had an undefined interest in the castle, with Gorthie holding some of the keys. On 7 January 1726 John Graham of Dougalston, one of the duke’s commissioners, wrote to Gorthie, passing on information from the Provost of Glasgow. The major of a regiment quartered in Glasgow had applied to the magistrates for a place in the town where their chaplain could say prayers. Though the magistrates did not feel obliged to provide one, if the major and chaplain found a place they could give them protection, presumably from local presbyterians outraged by the Anglican liturgy. Having been told they intended to write to the Duke’s commissioners ‘for a place in the castle’, Graham sought Gorthie’s opinion, ‘for if they speake to me, I shall tell them I shall write to the rest of the commissioners about it’.  

By this date, if not earlier Thomson was living near the castle. He petitioned the Barons of the Scottish Exchequer drawing their attention to the ruinous condition of the castle resulting from the depredations of ‘some bad men’. In July 1726 he was appointed the building’s overseer until further order. On 24 July 1727, following a report on the fabric by William Adam, the Barons formalized Thomson’s position, empowering him to take charge of the castle, receive the keys and employ the rents of the garden to keeping the building in order. On 8 November 1727 he wrote to Gorthie about problems he had encountered. Wishing to get the keys ‘in a manerly way’, he had gone to wait on Gorthie at Buchanan Castle. Then he went to Cardonald to enquire about problems he had encountered. Wishing to get the keys ‘in a manerly way’, he had gone to wait on Gorthie at Buchanan Castle. Then he went to Cardonald to enquire for Lady Blantyre. Her son did not know where she was; he had nothing to do with the keys but believed ‘my Lady would not trouble herself abowt them’. Thomson then went to Ross Hall and Edinburgh ‘but could not hear of her Ladyship’. Before he left for Edinburgh David Mein, ‘to whom I had sett ane convinice for broowing’ in the castle, got an order from the provost to William Mathie to deliver the key of the cellar to him, ‘which I wold a had him delay till I cam hom and wrotte to yow but he wold not’. He added, ‘Sir, I howp grant, he seems to have had an unde fi ned interest in the castle, with Gorthie holding yow mind that I sundrie tims told yow that if I thowght my miedling with the Castell wold give any office to His Grace, yowr self or any of the Famle I wold not do it (and I howp it hes given non)’. On 24 November he wrote again asking Gorthie to order Mr Graham (probably Dougalston) to give him the key of ‘a high rowm upon which I have the workmen’ which he was going to glaze. This was probably an upper room in the great tower. In all he expended £8 13s 6d up to February 1728, when the Barons ordered that he be reimbursed and invited Adam to return to Glasgow to inspect stones and other material Thomson was seeking permission to sell. It appears that control of the castle was split between various parties, who may or may not have had some sort of legal rights in it: Montrose and his factor, Lady Blantyre and the magistrates of Glasgow. Thomson could claim to be acting under the authority of the Barons of Exchequer, as representing the king, who was the rightful owner. But the Barons were in Edinburgh and in no position to keep an eye on what was happening in Glasgow.
Their first intimation that Thomson was treating the castle as an architectural salvage yard came in an anonymous letter laid before them in February 1730. It appears that Thomson had sold the iron yett and some window grills from the great tower, as well as oak timber and stones from the outer wall. Although the Barons instructed William Bowles, the Deputy King’s Remembrancer, to ask the Lord Provost of Glasgow to make enquiries and consider possible uses for the castle, nothing seems to have been done for another four years. On 29 July 1734, after two more letters complaining that Thomson’s wife was committing ‘great waste and destruction’, the Barons ordered Robert Molleson, a local excise official, to enquire and report ‘and a power is to be drawn to revoke Thomson’s commission and turn his wife out of possession’. Having received Molleson’s report they ordered Bowles to write to the magistrates of Glasgow on 5 December 1734, asking them to consider and some way for preserving the castle, nothing seems to have been done for another four years. On 29 July 1734, after two more letters complaining that Thomson’s wife was committing ‘great waste and destruction’, the Barons ordered Robert Molleson, a local excise official, to enquire and report ‘and a power is to be drawn to revoke Thomson’s commission and turn his wife out of possession’. Having received Molleson’s report they ordered Bowles to write to the magistrates of Glasgow on 5 December 1734, asking them to consider and some way for preserving the castle, nothing seems to have been done for another four years. On 29 July 1734, after two more letters complaining that Thomson’s wife was committing ‘great waste and destruction’, the Barons ordered Robert Molleson, a local excise official, to enquire and report ‘and a power is to be drawn to revoke Thomson’s commission and turn his wife out of possession’. Having received Molleson’s report they ordered Bowles to write to the magistrates of Glasgow on 5 December 1734, asking them to consider and some way for preserving the castle, nothing seems to have been done for another four years. On 29 July 1734, after two more letters complaining that Thomson’s wife was committing ‘great waste and destruction’, the Barons ordered Robert Molleson, a local excise official, to enquire and report ‘and a power is to be drawn to revoke Thomson’s commission and turn his wife out of possession’. Having received Molleson’s report they ordered Bowles to write to the magistrates of Glasgow on 5 December 1734, asking them to consider and some way for preserving the castle, nothing seems to have been done for another four years. On 29 July 1734, after two more letters complaining that Thomson’s wife was committing ‘great waste and destruction’, the Barons ordered Robert Molleson, a local excise official, to enquire and report ‘and a power is to be drawn to revoke Thomson’s commission and turn his wife out of possession’. Having received Molleson’s report they ordered Bowles to write to the magistrates of Glasgow on 5 December 1734, asking them to consider and some way for preserving the castle, nothing seems to have been done for another four years. On 29 July 1734, after two more letters complaining that Thomson’s wife was committing ‘great waste and destruction’, the Barons ordered Robert Molleson, a local excise official, to enquire and report ‘and a power is to be drawn to revoke Thomson’s commission and turn his wife out of possession'.

There is an interesting parallel with the Duke of Montrose’s Glasgow house, which stood in Drygate near the castle and incorporated two pre-Reformation manses of the cathedral prebendaries. This substantial mansion with 147 windows, ceased to be a ducal residence about the same time. Even before that it suffered from vandalism. In 1732 Gorthie was informed that all but three of the windows in ‘that new building upon the east side’ had been broken by ‘idle boys’. In April 1741 he was urged to have some broken windows repaired rather than boarded up, ‘for how dismal it will look on the High Street where strangers are coming and going every minut of the day and asks whose house is that, it’s such a persons, and with amazement will say some harsh thing to see a new house going to pott’. Though redundant, the duke’s house was still partly occupied in June 1744:

However there’s nobody in it now but William Mathew and his family who looks after it. Were it not for them I make no doubt it would [have] been by this time much like the Bishop’s house, which is called the Castle, rummished to the very foundation; that is, nothing standing but a few old walls, and now when the timber and iron work is gone, they are selling the very stones.

Despite this gloomy scenario substantial portions of the castle remained until they were finally removed in the 1790s to make way for the new Royal Infirmary. A contemporary painting, here reproduced from a later print (illus 2) shows three walls of the great tower standing to roof level and a lower wing whose lancet window may have belonged to the chapel.

In 1745 the second Duke, who had succeeded his father in 1742, put the Glasgow house up for sale. John Graham of Dougalston, whose company proposed turning it into a woollen manufactory, offered £500 for the house and 5000 merks (£289) for the yard (garden), but referred to the property in scathing terms. The main house built by the duke’s
father was of little use except for the stones and timber, the forework built by his grandfather had a defective roof, and the new building was unfinished. Though his offer, later increased to £800, was not accepted, the house was sold in 1751. It survived until the mid-19th century before finally sharing the fate of the castle and nearly all other relics of medieval Glasgow.
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APPENDIX: ACCOUNTS RELATING TO BUILDING WORK 1599–1600

Original spelling has been retained but contracted words have been extended and use of capital letters
standardized. The punctuation of account 2 follows that of the original.

1 Smith’s Account 1599–[1600] (NAS, GD220/2004/3)

[p1] The compt of Patrick Malynnie smyth of his labours in the Castell of Glasgow maid be him sen the last compt quhilk was wpon the xvij day of August last wes in anno 1599.

In the first anucht glas bandis veand half ane stane wecht at xxvj s viij d

Item at Robert Montgumrereis comand thre sowlis and sax stapillis to the brassin lampis xij s iij d

Item at his command ane hundreth half gwrane nailis at xl s

Item at the said Robertis command tua hundreth planchour nailis xx s

Item ane hundreth small nailis to the courtingingis at vs

Item ane hundreth cleikis to the tapestre xx s

Item resavit be John Dunlope wrycht at Robert Moncumryis command ane hundreth half gwrroun nailis to the kechinge at xl s

Item xij claiiks at Robert Montgumris command to Andro Broun to hinge thair martis on at xij s iij d

Item mair be him four hundreth & ane half of planschour nailis at xlv s

Item ane hundreth and ane half of half guroun nailis to the kechin at iij lib

Item vj greit claiikis to hinge the martis on at xxv s

Item sax strouppis to ryn the wyne at xij iij d

Item ane hundreth and ane half dur nailis at Robertis command at xxiiij s iij d

Item at Robertis command iij’ small nailis at xv s

Item thre lokis to the dungeown to the yeard dur and to the kitchen at xl s

Item ane slot with tua stapillis at vs

Item ane stapill to the bowat with ane slot at vs

Item to George Elphinstoun at Robertis command four gles bandis four pund wecht at xiij s iij d

Item ane staple to the axe ane bocht at iij s iij d

Item to the lampe tua stapillis and twa swollis at vj s viij d

Item tua stapillis to the dur of the foirwork at iij s.

Item ane lok and ane pair of bandis at Robertis command at xx s xvij d

Item ane lok and ane pair of coverit bandis to the spyce kist at xx s

Item for ane lok and gratthing of mistres Margretis kist at x s

Item to my ladyis chalmer dure tua snexis with thre gret nailis at viij s

Item at Robertis comand tua bar nailis at iij s

Item to the hall burd thre gret naillis xij d

Item to Mcilvane ten cast of planscheour naillis at xxx d

Item to my lord Eglingtonis cabinet dur ane key at xxx d

Item of iron work to my lord Eglintonis stokis veit befor Robert Mungumry and vj dur lox four score fuye pundis thre unce wecht at xvij merkis iij s

Item xxx gurroun nailis to set the oyll fat xx s

[p2] Item mair at Robertis command viij vyce naillis and v schawis [reading doubtful, MS torn] to my ladyis drau burd at iij li

Item to my lady ane new key to hir co and tua bandis to ane uther coffir and graything of all togidder at xij s iij d

Item tua greit hingand lokis to the stokis at iij lib

Summa of the haiell compt is xliij li xv s viij d

Summa totalis is j’xvij li iij s iij d [added in a different hand, presumably as the total of both smith’s accounts]

2 Expenditure on the Castle [1600] (NAS, GD220/6/2009/9)

[Endorsed] The compt of that thing that I hawe gevin out of my ladeis silver partle be preceptes at your l[ordships] command and partle to vork men for your l[ordships] vork in the castell.

[p1] The compt that I have ressavat of the silver of the mylne of Partik sen my lord departing out of Glasgow and sume fra Hew Neisbit as eftir fallowes.

Item in the first because I could not get baiithe my ladeis preceptes ansuerit and Andro Boyndes halfe payment payet and the rest of the vorkmen payet according to your l[ordships] directioune and saxt score pundes for nyne score of dales I behuvet to
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tak part of silver fra James Lichtbody and Robert Cors to mak all clare the sowme of viij lib and viij s
Item becaus the lard of Pollok and syndrie utheris vald giwe Robert Mathow na silver witout my discharge I tuik silver fra thame my selfe and gawe it owt agane my selfe fra the lard of Pollok vix and ix merkis Item fra Hew Neisbet and his sone xlvij lib viij d Item fra Jhone Steuart xxxij lib Item ressavit fra Robert Mathow xv lib xl d Item fra the lard of Blair xxj lib v s
Summa iiij viij lib viij s and iiij d savand juster calculationine
[p2] Item gevyn to voorkmen and thinges necesser and preceptes at my lades command as eftir followes Item imprimis for nyne score of dales vj score lib. Item for horse corne and straye to my lordes horse quhen the king ves in Glesgow xij lib viij s viij d
Item for carteres to bring up the dales fra the Brumie law xv s
Item to four men to draw thame up vithe cordes to ane heiche vindo in the dungeon and to laye thame on the geistes to dry xxxiij s iiiij d Item for the rid bringing out of the dungeon for hale and chalmeres and all ves full viij lib.
Item for ane thousand double plenschour nales to the loft v lib x s
Item because the vricht ves serviable I lent him to ane guid compt vj lib xij s iiiij d
Item for the lating doune of the dales to the hale quhen thai ver dry v s
Item for mending ane hole in the yardrop that ane stane fel throw af the house heid v s
Item for leid to sume erne bottes xx s
Item for making of tua dores to my lord of Eglintounes chalmer xx s
Item for fitching of the geistes to gar thame serve the turne and lavaning of thame and regaling of the vall to laye the end of the lafting burdes upone xlvij s viij d
Item for pargowning of the turnepeck vj lib
Item for ane double skace to the vindo of the turnepeck befor the hale dore xx s and for the making of it xx s

Item for sawing of alevin dales to be beddes licht dores to chalmeres and caettes xxxvj s
Item for ane hundrethe and quarter of hundrethe dore nales ij s iiij d
Item for ane hundrethe and halfe ane hundrethe single plenschour s
Item for fywe hundrethe double plenschour nales ma to the lofting lv s
Item for bandes to the vindo of the turnepeck, vith ringses, snekkes and tua uther bandes vithe ane snek to the heiche chalmer dore xx s
Item for ane chalder of lyme to pargoune the turnepeck and leiding of it liij s iiij d
Item for making of ane stand bed and upsetting of it cled at heid and feite and coverit abone vithe ane rowme maid for ane scheild at the heid of it and ane dore maide and hung to the same chalmer, vith ane new dore maid and hung to the scheild iiij d.

Summa primi lateris ix score j lib x s viij d [p3] Item to James Leichman for erne stanchoures and glasbandes as it comes to fourtie schilling the stane vecht x lib xvij s viij d Item for Piter Vallace clothes xv lib and x d Item for tua horse to doctor Law and doctor Hammiltoun to ryid to Inchynand the secund tyme because Robert Craufurd payet for thame the firstyme xxxij s
Item to ane lad to gang to Edinbrucht vithe ane letir of Mr Piteris xx s
Item for sixteine lades of sand xxvj s viij d
Item for tua horse to doctor Law and doctor Hammiltoun the thrid tyme to ryid to Inchynand upone xxxij s
Item for tua horse to doctor Merteine and his man xxvj s viij d for I had agreit vithe him to gang thair, or Sandirs Cleland come and James Stewart and Jhone Wallace to gang vithe him
Item for the kist to the barne, the making, picking, nales, and making blak and for the vrichtes ganging to Inchynanand and his man to beir it xls
Item for ane boye to gang to Edinbrucht the secund tyme vithe Mr Piteres lettir quhair he vreit that the grownd of the barnes seiknes ves bot teithe breiding xxs
Item to ane boye to gang to Paslay to Andro Boyd about the agreing vithe him annent the biggin of the tual of the chymlaye in to the dungeoune v s
Item to Leichman for ane bone vindo to the lache vindo of the turnepeck as it comes to fourtie shilling the stane vecht xj lib xj s iij d
Item for led to the said bone vindo, tua stane and ane halfe togethiter vithe thrie uther stanchoures inputting and leiding xij s iij d
Item for the inputting of the bone vindo and uther thrie gret stancheres viij s iij d
Item for puontinge of the hale loft rownd aboute and pargowning of thrie caetes xlv j s viij d
Item mair to the loft and dores tua hundrethe dore nales x s
Item fyve hundrethe mercate plenschour nales xxvj s viij d
Item for halfe ane hundrethre v s vj d
Item tua throuche lokes to the dungeon hoil and the vdrop abone it xvj s
Item mair for ane dowsand lades of sand xx s
Item for sixt bandes to the grete chalmer dore to the grete vardop dore and the hiest dore in the jame, qhilik veis xxvj pundes iij lib viij s vj d
Item for four dores and hinging of thame, and skafaling to the chymlaye, and uther vork that I could not agrie vithe the vricht in task bot gart him vork dayle vages and vytet upone him and he ver not aydell fywe dayses him selfe and his man ten schilings in the daye him selfe, and fywe his man
Summa iij lib xv s
Item for tua bandes to the privie dore behind the turnepeck yet at thrie pund vecht viij s vj d
Summa lateris iij score iij lib x s viij d

[p4] Item for fywe and thretie smal glesbandis to the jamb and the turnepeck and ane lang band to the northe vindo of the hale and ane hundrethe and ane halfe taketees vithe ten cast of vindok nale lix s viij d
Item for making tua auld rowstie bandes new to serve for ane melir dore xl d
Item mair lent to Archibald Rid xl s
Item for four gret bandes to tua double dores xxvj s viij d
Item to the vricht for sclating and rewling of the dungeoune to mak rowme to gang about the chymlaye and for making of skaffaling to the tual thairof and for making of tua ald dores meat for tua dores within the dungeone hale and for sklaying of ane el of sklatting to the auld hose that the masouemes brak doune quhen thai pat up the laiche bone vindo in the turnepeck and for saxteine shilling vorthc of new sklates xlvj s iij d
Item for hewing of ane dore and bying of ane lintale into the toune for the dore and for hewing of four stanes to the chymlayes and for hewing and pething of the garle pavement and thrie steppes to it and for ane snek to the privie dore behind the toure yet vj lib
Item for lytil glasbandes to thrie lytil vidois in the hale and the lang vindo at the end of the garle lache and the heichest vindo in the turnepake the tua parte thairof biggit vithe stanes, and the thirt part glase and for the said glasbandes x s xlvj s viij d
Summa of this syid is xv lib. viij s. and iij d
Summa totalis savand juster calculatioune is xij score vj lib. viij s. and vj d
Item mair to the glasin vricht becaus the daye is past that I promeset him payment and man paye him as his count vil bear at maire lenthe the soume of xxxvij merk viij s iij d
Summa totalis is xiiiij score vij lib iij s vj d, mair xlvj s to Jhon Vallace
Sua restis xxxvij lib xxx d less
It vil pleas your l[ordship] to uit that I have ressavit vork dayle vages and vytet upone him and he ver not aydell fywe dayses him selfe and his man ten schilings in the daye him selfe, and fywe his man.
Item for fyve and thretie smal glesbandis to Quhen my ressait and debursing is considderit the jamb and the turnepeck and ane lang band to the quhait evir restes I sal paye it to your l[ordship] my northe vindo of the hale and ane hundrethe and ane selfe. halfe taketteis vithe ten cast of vindok nale lix s viij d

GLOSSARY
Definitions are based on those in W Craigie et al (eds) Dictionary of the Older Scottish Tongue (13 vols, Oxford 1937–2002), and G L Pryde, Dictionary of Scottish Building (Edinburgh 1996) but relate only to the context in which the words appear in the above accounts.

*Band* Horizontal part of a hinge attached to a door.
Bar nail Perhaps for fixing wooden battens.
Bose window Bow or bay window.
Bott Bolt or iron batten or bar.
Bowat Lantern.
Caette Probably small room or cupboard in recess in wall, cf Cahute, a separate room or space (Pryde, 21).
Cast A particular quantity of a commodity.
Cleck Metal hook.
Dale Deal, plank.
Draw bard Extending table.
Dungeon Great tower of castle.
Erne Iron.
Fitching Fixing or fastening, or possibly adzing, from fit, to hack or adze (Pryde, 34, 39).
Foirwork Structure round entrance of building.
Garle probable misspelling of Galre Gallery.
Geist Joist.
Glasband, glesband Metal strip for securing glass in window pane.
Garoun nail Large nails for use with garrons (short beams).
Hale Hall.
Hingand lok Padlock.
Hoil Prison cell.
Jame Projecting wing of building.
Kist Chest, coffin.
Lafting burdes, lofting Boards or planks forming the ceiling of a room and floor of room above.
Lacht Probably loft.
Lavanning Probably smoothing or levelling.
Licht dore Probably door of light construction, one thickness of planks fastened by cross pieces.
Melir dor Possibly mullerit door, ie furnished with moulding or ornamental framing.
Mercate dales/nales Possibly deals/nails purchased through a merchant, rather than direct from supplier.
Oyll fat Cask or tub containing oil.
Pargowning Plastering, pargetting.
Pething Paving.
Picking Covering with pitch.
Plenschour (plenscore) nailes Flooring nails.
Regaling Raggling, cutting groove in a wall to take ends of boards etc.
Rewling Adjusting.
Rid Rubbish.
Scheild Privy.
Skace Case, window frame.
Skafaling Scaffolding
Slot Bar or window frame.
Snexis Latches.
Sowl Base.
Stand bed Bedstead, especially four-poster.
Stapill Fastening.
Stenshours Stanchion, iron bar for window.
Stok Wooden stand or support, framework of bed.
Stokis Wooden framework for confining an offender.
Stroup Spout.
Swoll Swivel.
Taket Small nail
Through lock Lock with keyhole passing through door.
Tual of chimlaye Possibly portion of base of chimney standing proud of wall.
Turnpeck Turnpike stair.
Vindo, vindok Window.
Vyce nail Screw nail.
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