

PROCEEDINGS

of the
Society of Antiquaries
of Scotland



Our full archive of freely accessible articles covering Scottish
archaeology and history is available at
<http://archaeologydataservice.ac.uk/archives/view/psas/volumes.cfm>

Society of Antiquaries
of **Scotland**

National Museums Scotland
Chambers Street, Edinburgh

www.socantscot.org
Charity No SC 010440

NOTES.

1. AN ADDENDUM TO BROOK'S ACCOUNT OF SCOTTISH MACES.

In his paper to the Society in 1892, Alexander J. S. Brook, F.S.A.Scot., described the "Lord President's or Old Exchequer Mace."¹ Now, among the *Treasury Warrants* in H.M. General Register House there is the following bill and receipt:—

"May 29: 1668

Bought of John Wendouer goldsmith one guilt mace,	£.	s.	d.
weight, 230 ozs. at 10s. p. oz.	115	00	00
One leather case lin'd with bayes to putt the mace in	001	05	00
	<u>116</u>	<u>05</u>	<u>00</u>

"June 9th 1668. Received then of Mr. John Kirkwood the sum of one hundred sixteene pound five shillings by order of the Right Honble. the Earle of Louderdale in full of this bill, I say received by me £116 05s.

Jo: Wendouer.

[*Endorsed*] Bill and Receipt of the mace £116 5s. sterl."

This document, which was not accessible to Brook in 1892, when his article was written, reveals certain new evidence on the subject. The mace paid for in 1668 corresponds approximately in weight with the mace which he describes as the "Lord President's or Old Exchequer Mace," presently in use in the First Division of the Court of Session. It weighs 232 ozs. 8 dwt. and bears the London hallmark for 1667. The maker's initials, however, are said (by Brook) to be "T. H.," but if it is identical with the mace specified in the above receipt the initials should be "J. W." for John Wendouer who was the goldsmith. "T. H." may be a misreading. The hallmark is now so much defaced that a positive pronouncement as to the initials is almost impossible. With some diffidence "J." might be read in preference to "T."

Brook comes to the conclusion that the "Lord President's or Old Exchequer Mace" belonged to a high official, probably the Lord Treasurer. Probably it did: he and the Lord Chancellor were the only two officials at that time who bore such elaborate state maces, and it could not belong to the Lord Chancellor, for his mace differed in certain particulars. These are clearly shown in three engravings of contemporary portraits of the chancellors, 1685-1704 (*op. cit.*, 504), in which the official mace is displayed. There the

¹ *Proc. Soc. Ant. Scot.*, vol. xxvi. p. 502.

orb and cross are supported on four arches, and the initials of the sovereign under whom the respective chancellors held office are engraved on the head. The first bears the initials I. R., the second W. R., and the third A. R. The "Lord President's or Old Exchequer Mace", however, has eight arches and the royal initials on the head are C. R. By a strange misconception Brook mistook the subjects of the portraits for those holding the office of Lord Treasurer (although their official title is plainly indicated on the engravings), and regarded the mace there reproduced as belonging to that official. He explains away the difference as to the initials by stating that "such an alteration as this might naturally be expected from the artists" and not of much importance. That may be, but it is remarkable that different artists (for the engravings were not all by the same hand) should be so consistent in their licence. There is no explanation, however, of the difference in the number of arches. Indeed, Brook's own illustration of the "Lord President's or Old Exchequer Mace" (*op. cit.*, pl. xi, fig. 1) shows, as in fact there are, eight arches, although in his description of it he fails to notice this and states that there are "four arches bearing the orb and cross."

This confusion would surely have been avoided had Brook realised that before the Union of 1707 these two officials, the Chancellor and the Treasurer, each had a mace similar in size and style except for the differences to which attention has been drawn. Further proof that each official had his own mace is found in another Treasury warrant (which was also apparently not available to Brook). It is dated 20th March 1701, and authorises payment of an account, 23rd December 1699, to Collin Mackenzie, goldsmith, for "mending of My Lord Chansler's Mace," partly in silver and iron, and for "mending of the Theasurie Mace being aded to it a bar for the Coronet with a plate of silver for the suporting of the Glob." Various other references to the Chancellor's mace are found, *e.g.* in the "Method and Manner of Ryding the Scottish Parliament" (*Maitland Club Misc.*, iii, 123, 135), but the Chancellor's mace is entirely ignored by Brook; even when he refers to missing maces (*op. cit.*, 513) he fails to mention it.

The question which naturally arises, therefore, is—if the mace now in use as the President's mace in the Court of Session was the Treasurer's mace (as appears likely), what has become of the Chancellor's mace? Some light on this question is shed by a very pointed entry in item 18 of an inventory of the "Exchequer Rooms and other Offices," dated 1714, printed in our *Proceedings*, vol. lxii. p. 191, thus "The Chancellours Great Mace is att present in his own possession." The Earl of Seafield was the Chancellor at the time of the Union and apparently he retained the mace then and still had it in 1714. Recently a search among the Seafield possessions and records, very kindly undertaken by the Seafield Trustees, failed to reveal any further trace of the mace; and further investigations at Westminster, where it may have been lodged, likewise proved negative. May be it perished

there in the fire of 1834. If by good fortune this important and venerable relic of our Scottish Parliament is ever recovered perhaps it may find its way back home to Parliament House and the Court of Session. There it would be a fitting neighbour to the Treasurer's mace and a more historically appropriate and correct symbol of authority in the hands of the Lord President, for whereas the Treasurer's precedence was confined to the Exchequer court, the Chancellor was not only the presiding official of parliament but his precedence extended to all other courts, including the Court of Session (*Acts Parl. Scot.*, 1696, x. 6b).

C. T. MCINNES.