Now the Wars are Over: the past, present and future of Scottish battlefields

Tony Pollard and Iain Banks[1]

Suggested running head: The past, present and future of Scottish battlefields

Centre for Battlefield Archaeology

University of Glasgow

The Gregory Building

Lilybank Gardens

Glasgow G12 8QQ

United Kingdom

Tel: +44 (0)141 330 5541

Fax: +44 (0)141 330 3863

Email: t.pollard@archaeology.arts.gla.ac.uk

[1] Centre for Battlefield Archaeology, University of Glasgow, Glasgow, Scotland

Abstract

Battlefield archaeology has provided a new way of appreciating historic battlefields. This paper provides a summary of the long history of warfare and conflict in Scotland which has given rise to a large number of battlefield sites. Recent moves to highlight the archaeological importance of these sites, in the form of Historic Scotland's Battlefields Inventory are discussed, along with some of the problems associated with the preservation and management of these important cultural sites.

Keywords

Battlefields; Conflict Archaeology; Management

Introduction

Battlefield archaeology is a relatively recent development within the field of historical archaeology, which, in the UK at least, has itself not long been established within the archaeological mainstream. Within the present context it is noteworthy that Scotland has played an important role in this process, with the first international conference devoted to battlefield archaeology taking place at the University of Glasgow in 2000 (Freeman and Pollard, 2001). This association was strengthened in 2005 with the founding of *The Journal of Conflict Archaeology* by the authors of this paper and again in 2006 with the establishment of the *Centre for Battlefield Archaeology* at the University of Glasgow.

Although it is often assumed that battlefield archaeology was pioneered in the United States, most obviously through the investigation of the iconic site of the battle of Little Bighorn in the 1980s (Scott *et al.*, 1989), early tentative steps were made in the UK as early as the 1970s, notably through the work of Peter Newman at Marston Moor (Foard, 2001). There was also an early antiquarian interest in these sites. In the late eighteenth century, William Hutton carried out what could be regarded as a proto-survey of Bosworth field, even digging to relocate the well from which Richard III supposedly drank and collecting chunks of rusting metal picked from the fields (Hutton, 1999). The mid nineteenth century saw further explorations on battlefields, including the digging of graves at Naseby in 1842, which resulted in the recovery of bones and musket balls. This 'bone-rummaging' was carried out by a local man called Fitzgerald on behalf of Thomas Carlyle who was eager to learn more about the battlefield for his biography of Cromwell (Harrington, 2004). This 'excavation' has

some parallel with the trend among nineteenth-century antiquarians for ‘barrow busting’ which later gave rise to more thoughtful examination of Bronze Age sites.

Despite this time depth and the subject’s recent popularisation, largely through television series and high profile campaigns to protect battlefields under threat, the subject has yet to fully meet the challenge of making itself relevant to the wider social project of archaeology, in the same way for instance that Bronze Age studies have. This failing is partly a result of the tendency for battlefield archaeologists to adopt an empirical approach which focuses very tightly on battle sites without considering the place of warfare within the wider social framework of those involved in it (Pollard and Banks, 2006). There have been recent calls for the abandonment of the term battlefield archaeology altogether and its replacement with ‘conflict archaeology’ but there is no a guarantee that this would reflect any change in attitude.

In the UK, the upsurge of interest in the archaeology of battlefields partly coincided with the introduction of the Battlefields Register by English Heritage in 1994 – though its practice did not begin to blossom until after then. The Register included 43 of what were regarded as the most important battlefields in England, its purpose being to inform decisions relating to battlefields within the planning process. It will come as no surprise that many English battlefields, some of which cover considerable expanses of the landscape, have come under threat from various types of development including roads (e.g. Newbury and Naseby), mineral extraction (e.g. Blore Heath), industrial complexes (e.g. Adwalton Moor) and housing (e.g. Tewksbury and Stamford Bridge). While some of these threats have been blocked, including the

proposal for quarry pits at Blore Heath, others, including the Newbury bypass, have gone ahead and impacted on battle sites.

The Register has been criticised for being non-statutory (e.g. Eisele, 1997; Freeman, 2001), with a battlefield's inclusion providing no guarantee of preservation in the face of development plans. This situation in England differs with that in the United States, where an almost equivalent number of battle sites have, since the 1950s, been preserved as National Battlefield Parks, though this has by no means protected them from all forms of development nor from the activities of metal detectorists acting illegally. Furthermore, the situation is not entirely clear cut, as the sites themselves have no statutory protection; the protection comes from private property laws. The approach in the United States has been to purchase the sites, which then have the protection afforded to any landowner's land from interference by others.

The preparation of the English Heritage Battlefield's Register, which was led by military historians (the project was based at the National Army Museum) with little input from archaeologists, closely coincided with the establishment of the Battlefields Trust in 1991, initially in response to the threat of road building at Naseby.

It has taken rather longer for battlefields north of the border to be recognised as sites of cultural importance and perhaps worthy of preservation and protection like other types of archaeological site (MacSween, 2001). This time-lag has, however, allowed Historic Scotland to take on board some of the problems related to the English Register, not least of these being the lack of input from archaeologists. In 2004, The Battlefields Trust was commissioned to carry out the first phase of the Scottish Fields

of Conflict project, which included the compilation of a list of all sites of conflict, ranging from skirmishes to full scale battles. In 2006, the project entered a second phase, when work commenced on the creation of inventory entries for the most important sites – the equivalent of the English Heritage Battlefield's Register – in a collaborative effort between the Battlefields Trust and the Centre for Battlefield Archaeology at Glasgow University.

The present paper will draw both upon the experience of the Fields of Conflict project, which has yet someway to go before completion, and a number of archaeological projects in order to provide an overview of historic battlefields in Scotland. The purpose of the paper is to act as an introduction to the situation, and consequently requires a recitation of the historical and archaeological resource of Scotland.

Battlefield Scotland

For a nation so small, Scotland has played host to a surprising number of battles. The Romans did not import warfare but for present purposes they will suffice as a starting point as their arrival marks the first recorded example of a battle in Scotland (Figure 1). The battle of Mons Graupius was fought in AD 84 between the Romans under Agricola and the Caledonian tribes. The fullest account of the battle is contained within the biography of Agricola written by Tacitus, his son-in-law. There has been a debate among Romanists and military historians (e.g. Salway, 1993; Maxwell, 1990; Fraser, 2005) as to the true location of the battle, with one of the favourites being the slopes of Bennachie, close to the foot of which is the large Roman marching camp at

Durno (the account states that the Roman army formed line in front of a camp while the Caledonians attacked down a slope). As a footnote to the forgoing introduction to this paper it is perhaps pertinent to point out that until recently Romanists were by very dint of their subject matter regarded as the only archaeologists who could consider military matters without raising eyebrows among their archaeological colleagues.

Like Mons Graupius, the battle of Dunnichen or Nechtansmere, fought between the Anglian Northumbrians and the Picts on 20 May, AD 685, has become something of a holy grail among archaeologists as its location has disappeared in the mists of time. The battle, thought to be commemorated on the Pictish carved stone in Aberlemno churchyard, is generally accepted to have taken place at Dunnichen Moss, near Forfar. Unfortunately, the small lochan of Nechtansmere, from which the battle takes its alternative name, no longer exists and so, again, debate rages about the exact location (Alcock & Alcock, 1996; Fraser, 2005). The battle saw the defeat of the Northumbrian Anglians and broke their influence over the Pictish kingdoms.

As Anglian incursions from the south had encouraged the Picts and Scots to join forces, so Viking incursions and then later colonisation (of the islands to the north and west) from the eighth to twelfth centuries, encouraged the Scots to coalesce into a proto-nation. In 1263, King Hakon of Norway sent a great fleet against the Scots under Alexander III and, although many of the Norse chiefs in the west chose to remain neutral, an alliance with Magnus, king of Man, created a serious threat to the young Scottish nation. The campaign did not favour the Norse and after being constantly hampered by bad weather they came to grief at Largs, where on 2 October

1263, an attempt to recover beached longships prompted a successful attack by the Scots. The battle of Largs was to have a long-term impact somewhat out of proportion with its small scale, with probably no more than 800 Norse and a thousand or so Scots involved. Hakon died on Orkney on his return home, and in 1266 his son signed the Treaty of Perth, in which all of the Norse lands in the Western Isles were surrendered to Scotland, though they retained a hold in Orkney and Shetland.

Medieval warfare

Some of the best known battles in Scotland were fought during the Medieval period (Figure 2), and it cannot be denied that the profile of the major engagements of the Wars of Independence, including Falkirk and Bannockburn, has been enhanced through what could perhaps be called the 'Braveheart effect', with both battles featuring in a Hollywood movie which despite its historical dubiety was to have a quite profound impact on some elements of the Scottish psyche (Pollard, in press).

The power vacuum created by the death of Alexander III without issue in 1286 precipitated a long period of conflict between Scotland and her southern neighbour. But it was internal strife that was really to draw Scotland into war; much of it ignited by personal ambition among the guardians allocated the task of seeing Alexander's granddaughter and heir, the three-year-old Margaret 'Maid of Norway' (her title a reflection of the new-found peace with the Norse), through her minority. The two major protagonists were John Balliol and Robert the Bruce, and their rivalry was only spurred on by the death of Margaret while on her way to Scotland. In an effort to quell the growing crisis the English king, Edward I, was called in to arbitrate. Edward

saw the invitation as an opportunity to exercise what he saw as his inherent right to the lands north of his present border.

Edward, recalling the precedent set when Malcolm III swore fealty to William the Conqueror, favoured the cause of John Balliol on condition that he swore an oath of allegiance. Over the next three years, Scotland became increasingly divided between those who had sworn fealty to Edward and those loyal to Balliol, and things reached breaking point when, at the insistence of his Lords, Balliol withdrew his own fealty to Edward. In response, the English capture of Berwick in 1296 was to mark the beginning of twenty years of conflict in Scotland, during which time Edward I was to earn the *nom de guerre* of 'Hammer of the Scots', and his son, the rather less martially spirited Edward II, was to see English hegemony over Scotland come to a bloody end at the battle of Bannockburn in 1314.

With Balliol first a prisoner of the English, then an exile in France, it fell to William Wallace, the son of a minor noble, to be the first to raise a hand against the 'auld enemy'. His career as a national hero began with the killing of the sheriff of Lanark, after which he went on with Sir William Douglas and Andrew Murray to raise an army and face the English at Stirling Bridge on 11 September 1297. Attacking the English cavalry as they crossed over the bridge the Scots won a notable victory, though at the cost of Murray who was mortally wounded in the fight. Although the wooden bridge was later to be demolished and replaced by a stone structure, piers which mounted the supports of a wooden bridge were identified in the bed of the river by divers from [illegible]ling University in 1997. Some archaeological evidence for the battle may await recovery in an area of open ground close to the river, though much

of the battlefield will have been swallowed up by the town of Stirling, which today extends out from the castle to an extent which would have been impossible to imagine in the thirteenth century.

The English hit back at Falkirk a year later, when their archers broke up the tight formations, or schiltrons, of Scots spearmen. Wallace fled the field, which today probably lies somewhere beneath the town, and went into hiding, leaving Edward to subjugate the rest of the country, in the first instance by bringing an impressive array of siege machines against Stirling Castle. The opposition meanwhile saw a change at its head, with Robert the Bruce, grandson of Bruce 'the Contender' (against Balliol) and John Comyn of Badenoch serving as guardians of the Scottish crown in Balliol's continued absence. There followed an uneasy truce between the two nations, heralded by more oaths of fealty, though Wallace was not to share in the peace and was executed in London in 1305.

With Balliol still in exile, the crown of Scotland was still for the taking and Bruce left no doubt as to his ambition when in February 1306 he killed his only real rival, John Comyn, in Greyfriar's Kirk in Dumfries. A lightning campaign of castle taking followed and he was crowned King Robert I of Scotland by the archbishop of Glasgow at Scone in March 1306. Edward sent north Aylmer of Valence, Earl of Pembroke, who won an early victory over the Scots at Methven after which Bruce left the scene for a while, perhaps taking refuge on  hlin island. Bruce returned a year later to display himself a master at ambush, first routing an English mounted force at Glen Trool. However, it was at Loudon Hill in May 1307 that the Scottish king really demonstrated the importance of levelling the playing field. Having accepted a

challenge from Aymer de Valence to fight at Loudon Hill on 10 May, Bruce arrived early and prepared the ground to his advantage. The road through the glen was fringed on both sides by a marsh but this wet ground was still a bow shot either side of the road. In order to shorten the gap and produce a bottleneck Bruce ordered his men to dig trenches leading from the wet ground toward the road. Such entrenchments are rare on Scottish battlefields and although it is possible that the archaeological remains of these features have been eaten away by quarrying the search for them would obviously figure in any attempt to relocate the battle in the modern landscape.

Edward I died in July 1307 while on his way north to take personal control of the situation. In addition to the English garrisons in Scotland, which found themselves under increased pressure and suffering from a lack of interest on the part of Edward II, Bruce sought to quell his domestic foes, the Comyns, against whom he won a convincing victory at the battle of Barra on 23 May, 1308. The battlefield sits between the small towns of Inverurie and Oldmeldrum in Aberdeenshire and, despite modern roads and the threat of expansion from light industrial units on the fringes of Oldmeldrum, appears to be relatively well preserved. The landscape, which is dominated by the Iron Age hillfort on Barra Hill rising above the river plain, may share some similarity to the likely site of Bannockburn before more drastic urbanisation took its toll on the latter site (see below).

By the end of 1313 the Comyns had long been in exile in England and most of the English garrisons in Scotland had fallen. One of the last to hold out was Stirling castle, which had been put under siege by Bruce's only surviving brother, Edward, the

other three having been killed by the English. According to the Medieval rules of siege warfare, the castle would fall to the Scots if a relieving army failed to get within a mile of its walls within a year of the siege's commencement. Edward II duly marched north with what was probably the largest English army ever to cross the border (c. 20,000) and the two sides met at Bannockburn, within sight of the castle, in July 1314. After heavy skirmishing on 23 July, the main battle took place on 24 July, with the outnumbered Scots using massed spearmen deployed in schiltrons, eventually routing the English. Edward himself narrowly missed capture.

Thus came to an end the first war of independence but the search for the site of this conflict's most famous battle continues. A recent report on Bannockburn produced by historians Watson and Anderson for Stirling Council (2001) noted five possible sites, while the more recent Fields of Conflict survey by the Battlefields Trust numbers no less than eight. The traditional view is that the main battle was fought on the Carse lands of the river Forth, and the present authors feel that this location provides the best fit for what is known of the battle. Metal detector survey (Pollard and Oliver, 2002) has, however, failed to locate any irrefutable evidence for the battle in this and several other locations, including the higher terrace known as the Dryfield favoured by both Watson and Anderson and the Battlefields Trust.

The second War of Independence began after the death of Robert the Bruce in 1329 and involved fighting on both sides of the border. His heir, David II, was only five years old, which allowed a renewal of the power struggle that preceded Bruce's reign. Edward III supported the claims of Edward Balliol, the son of John, to the Scottish throne. Balliol was also supported by the sons and grandsons of men who had lost

through Bruce's victory, known as the Dispossessed. As before, the Scottish nobles were too concerned with their own ambitions to provide a united front to this new threat, with the result that there was a string of defeats for the Scots – Dupplin Moor (1332), Halidon Hill (1333) and the Battle of Neville's Cross (1346). The last of these three battles saw the capture of David II, who was imprisoned for 11 years and required an enormous ransom to be paid for his release. Central to English success in this campaign was the introduction of massed longbow tactics, which would go on to be used to such great effect against the French in the Hundred Years War; these battles were the laboratory in which the victories of Agincourt and Crécy were prepared. The English had also learned well the lessons of Bannockburn and so fought with their cavalry dismounted.

Renaissance warfare

Despite these wars, Scotland retained her independence and with England's new found taste for war against the French the nation entered a period of relative calm. By the early 1500s, however, England's continued antipathy to France had come to be seen as a window of opportunity by the Scots. In 1513, while Henry VIII was busy fighting the French, James IV led a Scottish army into the north of England and captured several important castles close to the border. But success was not to last, and in September 1513 the English army under the aged Earl of Surrey confronted the Scots at Flodden (Figure 3). Although it sits south of the Scotland/England border, the authors cannot resist pointing out that their work on the site resulted in the identification of an earthwork on Flodden Hill thought to be a Scottish gun emplacement and the recovery of evidence for the battle, including an English cannon

ball on nearby Branxton Hill (Pollard and Oliver, 2002; Pollard, Banks and Oliver, forthcoming).

The battle was a disaster for the Scots, who abandoned well-defended positions to advance with their ill-suited Swiss-style pikes down the slope of Branxton Hill onto the more efficient bills of the waiting English. James, who led from the front, was killed along with a long list of Scotland's elite and around 5-10,000 Scottish soldiers.

The loss of the king once again threw Scotland into chaos, and a wall was built around Edinburgh to protect it from the expected English invasion (which didn't appear). Not for the first time, the minority of the royal heir, the young James V, provided a climate in which the rivalries and ambitions of the guardians flourished. James became the pawn in a power game played out between his self-appointed guardian, Archibald Douglas, who kept him a virtual prisoner, and his mother, the dowager queen Margaret, who made several attempts to release him. The most dramatic of these resulted in the battle of Linlithgow Bridge on September 4, 1526 (Cooper 2006). The queen's force of around 10,000 men, led by the Earl of Lennox, marched on Edinburgh. The advance was stalled at Linlithgow Bridge by a force of just 2,500 men led by the Earl of Arran, many of them followers of the local Hamilton family. In the ensuing action, the larger force, having crossed the River Avon somewhere near the Manuel Convent (one wall of which still stands), got jammed in a bottleneck between the river, some marshy ground and the high ground upon which Arran's men were arrayed. The arrival of pro-Douglas reinforcements from Edinburgh sealed the fate of Lennox's army and upwards of 3,000 men died in the

ensuing slaughter. Lennox himself was captured and then murdered by James Hamilton of Finnart.

James soon began to exert his own authority and after a brief marriage to Madelaine, eldest daughter of the king of France, ended by her death, he married Mary of Guise in June 1538. This tying of the knot with France was seen as provocation by Henry, and after James failed to turn up at a meeting in York to discuss the matter, he reverted to military action. The first foray north, under Sir Robert Bowes, came to grief at Hadden Rig near Berwick, where the English were chased from the field by the Scots under the Earl of Huntly. A second expedition, under the Duke of Norfolk prompted a counter-invasion that led to Scottish defeat in the battle of Solway Moss on 24 November 1542.

The defeat was compounded by the death of James just weeks after the battle, not long after the birth of his daughter Mary – later to be Mary, Queen of Scots. Not surprisingly, Mary's minority saw the return of uncertainty and internecine struggle. Henry took advantage and saw to it that his son Edward was soon after married to Mary, thus cementing a relationship that would put an end to the alliance between the Scots and the French. The Scots, however, had other ideas and when they refused to ratify the treaty, he sent north another army.

The inevitable clash came at Pinkie, not far to the east of Edinburgh on 10 September 1547. A Scots army numbering around 20,000 men left a well defended position on the west of the river Esk and crossed the river to engage 18,000 English troops in the open fields to the south east of Inveresk. In one of the largest battles fought on

Scottish soil, the Scottish forces effectively exploited wet ground, turf walls and tilled ground to assist their tight, well-ordered pike formations in neutralising the English cavalry advantage, holding off the first attack by the heavy horse. But when the English deployed some 800 troops with firearms just across the mire, supported by thousands of archers and an intense artillery bombardment, the Scottish army began to reel. Unable to respond with equivalent firepower the Scottish battle formation disintegrated before the English infantry and cavalry could advance to hand-to-hand combat.

In the subsequent pursuit, which stretched towards Edinburgh, Leith and Dalkeith, the Scottish army suffered as badly as it had at Flodden. However, the English chose not to exploit their victory, withdrawing after achieving little more than the establishment of a few border garrisons. In response, the Scots sealed another alliance with France, through the marriage of Queen Mary to the Dauphin, and soon French troops were landing in Scotland, which was by now heavily divided on religious grounds. The Protestants found a vociferous mouthpiece in John Knox, while the Catholics closed around the queen and her French allies. In 1560, the walled town of Leith, garrisoned by the French, was put under siege by the Protestant Scots, who were later aided by the English. Evidence of these siege works have been exposed in Pilrig Park, where open ground still remains within the modern urban environment (Banks, Pollard and Poller, 2006; Pollard, 2009). The death of Mary of Guise in June 1560 accelerated the negotiation of a treaty, and the Treaty of Edinburgh saw the departure of all French troops and the strengthening of the Protestant power base.

Mary Queen of Scots, having arrived from France not long after the fall of Leith in 1560, took up the Catholic cause, her campaign climaxing in 1568, with the battle of Langside. On 13 May, Mary's army of 6,000 was marching from Hamilton to Dumbarton Castle, only to find their line of march blocked at Langside to the south of Glasgow by a Protestant force under James Stuart, Earl of Moray, Regent of Scotland and also her half-brother. Despite having superior numbers, Mary's army was defeated after they launched an abortive cavalry attack and were then routed in the push of pike. Following the defeat, she fled to England to seek the aid of her cousin Queen Elizabeth I, but became her prisoner and was finally executed in 1587. In 1568 Langside was a small village outside Glasgow but is now part of the south side of the city. Elements of the battlefield may survive in Queen's Park but as yet no attempt has been made to verify this, though rumours abound of weapons being recovered from the bottom of the boating lake.

The Civil Wars

The religious schisms of the sixteenth century were to take on a new twist in the mid-seventeenth century when Protestantism divided between Episcopalians and Presbyterians. Supporters of the latter group were to become known as Covenanters after their signing of the Covenant, which among other things called for the abolition of bishops, who had been re-imposed on the Presbyterians by Charles I. His refusal to accept the covenant on the one hand, and the refusal of the Presbyterians to accept bishops and the Anglican *Book of Common Prayer* on the other, was reason enough for war. The so-called 'Bishop's War' broke out in 1639 and was to escalate into full-blown civil war.

In England, the supporters of Parliament went to war against the Royalists, with the first major battle fought at Edgehill, in Warwickshire, in October 1642 (Banks & Pollard, forthcoming). In Scotland, James Graham, 1st Marquis of Montrose, who had been one of the first signatories of the Covenant but was also a Royalist, came out in favour of the king in 1643 and was to prove one of his most talented generals.

By 1645 Montrose's campaign against the Covenanters, under the command of Archibald Campbell, the Marquis of Argyle (sic), had come to an unsatisfactory end, despite initial resounding victories at Tippermuir and Aberdeen (Figure 4); while its rural location has probably preserved the former pretty well the only potential for any remnant of the latter lies in the city's parks. After Montrose's small force managed to escape destruction at the hands of a much stronger enemy at Fyvie in October 1644, things were looking bleak for the Royalists, who were by now essentially on the run.

Things began to look up for Montrose in late 1644, when MacColla, his equally charismatic Highland comrade, met him at Blair Atholl with 1,000 clansmen newly recruited from the west. The result was a winter spent harrying the Campbell lands in Argyllshire, which climaxed with the sacking of Inverary, the seat of the Campbells. At this point, however, Montrose was, not for the first or last time, to suffer from the irregular character of his army as many Highlanders returned to their homes laden with loot. With no more than 2,000 men left, he moved onto to Kilcumin at the head of the Great Glen, at the other end of which lay the enemy stronghold of Inverness. Montrose set off down the Glen, perhaps with the aim of engaging the town, but by the end of January was to find Argyle behind him having deployed his army around

the castle at Inverlochy. After an audacious march over the mountains, Montrose launched a Highland charge against the Covenanters and quickly routed them in the battle of Inverlochy.

With Argyle firmly put in his place, Montrose was able to concentrate his campaign in the east, picking up more recruits and plundering Aberdeen, Brechin and Dundee. More victories were to come his way at Auldearn in May and then Alford in July, with his campaign climaxing at Kilsyth in August 1645. Once again, however, his largely irregular army suffered from desertions and in September 1645, Montrose's Royalists were to suffer their most serious defeat at Philiphaugh, at the hands of the Covenanter general David Leslie. Montrose was forced to escape overseas. Today, remnants of the battle of Philiphaugh may be preserved on the narrow river terrace which accommodated much of the fighting, with modern field boundaries running along much older ditches that perhaps represent the remains of the earthworks and enclosures put to use by Montrose's outnumbered men.

The surrender and later execution of Charles I did not bring an end to the conflict and, in early 1650, Montrose landed in Orkney, supported by a small force of Danes. He was now in the service of Charles II, who had been proclaimed as king by the previously anti-monarchist Scottish government in reaction to the execution of his father. Things did not go well for the veteran general and on 27 April 1650 his small army was surprised and routed at Carbisdale, near the Kyle of Sutherland. Montrose escaped but was eventually captured and, with his former enemies now the confidants of the king, was executed in Edinburgh on 21 May 1650. Although some of the battlefield has suffered from house building the main impact on Carbisdale, as with

many other battlefields in the Highlands, has been the planting of commercial forestry.

In September 1650 Charles, now supported by the Covenanters, had occasion to regret the loss of one of the Stuart's most able commanders when Oliver Cromwell, in what is thought to be his finest victory, defeated the Royalist Scots at Dunbar; ironically, the Scots were led by Montrose's nemesis David Leslie, who was now fighting for Charles II. Here, a large quarry has scoured out a good portion of the battlefield along the eastern flanks of the parliamentarian position with further elements of the field lost to landfill created by the creation of the quarry. The battlefield suffered more denudation in the early 2000s during the building of the A1 road, which represented a major upgrade of one of the main arterial routes into Scotland from the south. Despite a major archaeological evaluation in advance of the roadwork, which gave way to the excavation of major prehistoric sites (Lelong & MacGregor, 2008), there was no attempt to assess the impact on the battlefield which the road dissected – unfortunate as this situation is, it would be safe to say that just a few years later such bias would not be demonstrated. In spite of these incursions onto the site the landscape of battle is still recognisable when compared with a contemporary drawing of the battle and overall still has very high archaeological potential.

The Covenanters

Although the battle of Dunbar effectively brought the Civil War in Scotland to an end in 1650, the religious strife continued. A brutal campaign was carried out against the Covenanters – who had come out on the losing side in the Civil War – at the hands of

the new Monarchy, with Charles II returning from exile in 1660. Despite paying lip service to the Scottish Covenanters in his attempt to win back the crown at the tail end of the Civil War, Charles was determined to extract revenge from the Presbyterians in England and the Covenanters in Scotland – who through most of the war had been virulent anti-Royalists. This began with the public burning of the Covenant and the reintroduction of the Book of Common Prayer. In Scotland, ministers were evicted from their manses and a military campaign carried out against supporters of the cause, involving evictions, imprisonment and summary execution.

The first action was a skirmish at Rullion Green, fought outside Edinburgh on 28 November 1666, but larger engagements were to take place at Drumclog, where Covenanters successfully routed dragoons under the command of John Graham of Claverhouse (later to be more famous as 'Bonnie Dundee'), killing 36 of them in the fight (Figure 5). The only major battle of the campaign was, however, a victory for the government forces, when on 1 June 1679 Claverhouse, with support from troops under the Duke of Monmouth (destined to be the loser at the battle of Sedgemoor in 1685 in his abortive attempt to seize the English crown), defeated a Covenanter force at Bothwell Brig on 22 June 1679. Verified through finds of musket balls by a recent unpublished metal detector survey, one of the last surviving remnants of the Bothwell battle has recently come under serious threat from a proposed housing development, which like other such cases will undoubtedly result in a national outcry, but whether this will result in a reprieve for the site remains to be seen.

This purge against the Covenanters continued with the accession of Charles' brother James in 1685, but it was his exile in 1688 as a result of the Glorious Revolution,

which was to initiate the last period of warfare in Scotland, and one that was to continue, sporadically, for over fifty years.

The Jacobite Uprisings/Rebellions

Following the 'Glorious Revolution' in 1688 the Jacobites (from the Latin for James) pressed for the return of the Catholic King James VII and II from exile in France. Among their ranks were not only Catholics but also Episcopalians and set against them were Presbyterians who supported the new regime, under the Protestant William of Orange. So it was that the commander of the Scottish Jacobites during the first Jacobite uprising of 1689 was John Graham of Claverhouse, known to his Presbyterian detractors as 'Bloody Clavers' and by his supporters as 'Bonnie Dundee'.

While James VII fought in Ireland and neglected the struggle in Scotland, Dundee carried out a highly mobile campaign in Scotland, initially involving the pursuit of the Jacobite army by the government force under Major-General Hugh MacKay. The two sides met just outside the Pass of Killiecrankie, near Blair Atholl, on 6 July 1689 (Figure 6). Although outnumbered almost two to one, around two and a half thousand Jacobites put the government army to flight within minutes of charging down the side of the glen into their lines. Unfortunately for the Jacobites, Dundee was killed during the battle, leading the charge of the Jacobite horse. MacKay and about half his force managed to escape while the Jacobites plundered the baggage train and pursued stragglers.

Even though the A9 road was built across the middle of the battlefield in the 1970s, Killiecrankie has retained much of its character, largely thanks to the dramatic nature of the terrain in which it was fought. Metal detector survey has revealed evidence for the heavy fire delivered into the path of the Jacobite charge, down the hillside long since portioned by hedges and field walls. Excavation of a supposed war grave revealed no sign of human remains and it has been suggested that the monument was constructed around just a few remains encountered by workmen in the late eighteenth century (Pollard and Oliver, 2002).

The loss of Dundee's leadership was fatal for the uprising and following a disastrous encounter with a much smaller force of Cameronians in the streets of Dunkeld, it came to a sorry end with the rout of the remnants of the Jacobite army when surprised in their camp at Cromdale at the end of April 1690. Not long after, James's campaign in Ireland suffered a severe set back at the Battle of the Boyne on 1 July, and was brought to an end with defeat at Aughrim on 12 July.

Another attempt to restore a Stuart to the throne followed the 1707 Union of the Parliaments of Scotland and England, when a French fleet came close to landing troops at Burntisland in Fife. On board were 5,000 French troops and the son of James, James Francis Edward Stuart, who became known as the 'Old Pretender.' Before they could disembark, however, the Royal Navy, under Byng, arrived in the Forth and prompted the French to abandon the attempt.

In the only Scottish battle of the 1715 rebellion, the Jacobites under the Earl of [illegible], numbering just over 7,000 men, approached Sheriffmuir, just north-east of Stirling,

from their original position on Kinbuck Moor, over two kilometres to the northwest. The government force under the Duke of Argyll, consisting of just over 3,000 men, advanced onto the moor from Dunblane in the southwest. Possibly because of poor lines of sight, both armies outflanked one another on their right flank, a factor that was to heavily influence the outcome of the battle.

The Jacobite flanks met with mixed fortunes. On the right, a charge went in after a heavy delivery of musket fire, threw back the government left wing as it was taken in the flank, with the Jacobites pursuing their fleeing foe for a considerable distance off the field to the south. On the left, the opposite occurred, and a charge by government dragoons pushed the Jacobites back. With a running fight stringing out to both north and south, the field was essentially abandoned. The retreating Jacobites fought their way back as far as the river known as the Allan Water, the government pursuit ceasing only once the crossing was made. By the time Argyll and Mar returned from their forays, the day was drawing on and, with a general unwillingness to re-engage, the battle drew to an inconclusive close.

Sheriffmuir is the most recent Scottish battlefield to be subject to archaeological investigation, in a project motivated by plans to construct a new overhead power cable with super-sized pylons across the site. Prior to the survey the exact location of the battle was uncertain, with at least three locations suggested by historians (MacKay, 1898; Smurthwaite, 1995; Reid, 2004). Metal detector survey (Pollard, 2006) recovered evidence for the route of the government left, in the form of musket balls, buttons and horseshoes, while evidence for the fighting which prompted the retreat of the Jacobite left was found in the vicinity of the Sheriffmuir Inn (built after the battle).

Unfortunately, it seems that the position of the initial encounter has largely been lost beneath tree plantations established in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries.

The 1719 Jacobite Rising differed from earlier and later attempts to place a Stuart back on the throne because it came about as a the result of collaboration with Spain rather than France – a result of the outbreak of war between Spain and Britain. Any pressure brought to bear in the north of Britain would benefit the Spanish, who for the first time since the Armada were seriously contemplating an invasion of England.

Accordingly, in March 1719 a force of 7,000 men under the Irish Jacobite Duke of Ormonde sailed from Cadiz with the intention of invading England, while sometime later a smaller force of 300 Spanish troops led by James Keith, the Earl of Marischal, departed Corunna and landed on the shores of Loch Alsh on the north-western coast of Scotland, where they set up their headquarters in Eilean Donan Castle. Although a small force, it was hoped that the promise of invasion from the south would prompt a general rising in Scotland. Unfortunately for the Jacobites, the main invasion fleet, like its more famous earlier counterpart, was wrecked in a storm, leaving the Scottish contingent to go it alone.

News of the wrecking of Ormonde's fleet did nothing to tempt the clans to the cause, though Lord George Murray, Rob Roy MacGregor, Cameron of Locheil and Lord Seaforth brought with them a combined force of around 1,000 men. Things did not improve when Royal Navy warships arrived in Loch Alsh and bombarded the castle. A government force from Inverness led by General Wightman was also on the march.

In an effort to stop Wightman's advance, barricades were erected along the road through Glenshiel and across the steep slopes overlooking it. On 10 June 1719 Wightman's force, which included Highlanders and roughly matched the enemy in numbers, began the assault against the Jacobite positions. After a brief fire fight, which included a bombardment delivered by government mortars and a difficult up-hill assault, the Jacobite positions fell, with the Spaniards being among the last to leave the field.

The battle of Glenshiel took place within one of the most dramatic landscapes in the British Isles and it takes little imagination for the visitor to picture the difficulties of fighting in such steep terrain, especially if one should choose to climb the very steep hills to inspect the locations occupied by Jacobite troops. Despite the presence of tree plantations on the northern slopes, the battlefield is very well preserved – it seems possible that the fighting on the Jacobite left wing took place above the tree line. Glenshiel is also one of the very few British battlefields to have field defences still intact: the stone barricades erected by the Spanish on Spanish Hill. Despite part of the site being protected as a scheduled ancient monument (see below), it is not immune to threat and the southern slopes, which were occupied by a Jacobite outpost stormed by the government left wing, have recently been planted with coniferous saplings.

The best known of the Jacobite rebellions began with the landing on the west coast of Scotland of Bonnie Prince Charlie or the 'Young Pretender' in August 1745. Charles was grandson of the exiled James VII and II, who died in 1701, and son of James VIII and III (though never officially crowned as such and known as the 'Old Pretender'). Bringing only a handful of men with him he succeeded in rallying a number of

Highland clans to his support and on 21 September 1745 delivered a resounding victory against General Cope's government army at Prestonpans to the east of Edinburgh. An interesting aspect of this battle is that it was fought within an industrial landscape, with coal mining an important aspect of the local economy until the latter part of the twentieth century, and the Jacobite army crossed a coal tramway in their manoeuvrings prior to the battle.

The landscape retains its industrial character today, with a coal-fired power station being the most obvious landmark. A slag heap resulting from coal extraction, which looks rather like a modern day pyramid, serves as viewing point for the battlefield, which still retains some pockets of open ground among the roads, railways, industrial units and housing developments that impinge on the fringes of this iconic event. It is still possible to make sense of the battle through the presence of landmarks which appeared on contemporary maps of the fight, with the churchyard on the outskirts of Tranent, in which Jacobite piquets suffered bombardment by government artillery, still retaining its period character. Further toward Edinburgh, Bankton House still stands; in 1745 this was the home of Colonel Gardiner who died in the battle fighting for the government and is buried in the back garden. The building was some time ago converted into flats after almost falling into dereliction.

After Prestonpans the victorious Jacobites began their march into England, getting as far as Derby where, with two government armies on their trail, they decided to return north rather than march on to London. The next major encounter took place at Falkirk in January 1746, with the government forces this time under General Hawley. Although heavily impinged upon by the expansion of Falkirk's suburbs, elements of

the battlefield still survive as agricultural land, and the gorge which played a role in the battle can also be seen in woods once related to a Victorian mansion which is now demolished.

On the field, Falkirk was a Jacobite victory, with many government regiments routed, but in the ensuing chaos and in the face of escalating desertions they failed to follow through with the destruction of the enemy. Abandoning their siege of Stirling Castle, the Jacobites withdrew north once again, this time to Inverness. Hot on their heels was a government army some 12,000 strong under the command of the Duke of Cumberland.

On 16 April 1746, following an aborted night march executed in an attempt to surprise Cumberland's army while in camp at Nairn, the Jacobite army under Charles took up position between two stone enclosures. The battle of Culloden opened with an exchange of artillery fire, during which the government guns quickly took the upper hand. After suffering this galling fire for some time the Jacobite infantry in the centre surged forward The right wing was a little slower off the mark, and this staggering of the advance created a diagonal movement, with boggy ground, a road running across the moor, gently sloping topography and heavy fire further directing the advance toward the left flank of the government line.

In the face of heavy cannon fire and volleys of musketry the Jacobites made contact with the government, hacking their way through the front line; the Jacobites were trapped between the muskets and bayonets of the front and second lines.

Meanwhile, government dragoons moved behind the Jacobite right, after passing through breaches made in the enclosure walls to the south of the field. All was lost and under the protection of a covering action by the Jacobite horse and the infantry detachments of the second line, the broken army streamed from the field. The government line advanced in close order, dispatching the wounded and those too slow to escape and the cruel aftermath of the battle has entered into the popular imagination. Culloden marked the bloody end of more than fifty years of Jacobite struggle and the beginning of a profound shift in the trajectory of British history, which in the first instance saw the defeat of the French in Canada, with many Jacobite veterans serving with the British army.

Today, the battlefield of Culloden is one of the most visited tourist attractions in the Highlands of Scotland, with the battlefield core in the ownership of the National Trust for Scotland (NTS). The graves of the fallen Jacobites were heavily memorialised in the mid-to-late 1800s, with stone makers bearing clan names placed on the grave mounds and a large cairn raised to the memory of the 'gallant Highlanders' who fell in the name of the Jacobite cause. Once again though, the battlefield suffered tree plantations in the nineteenth century; but some of the forest was cleared by the NTS in the 1980s while a road which passed through the clan cemetery was moved some 100m further to the north – this now seems a little ironic as analysis of the maps (Pollard, 2005) has demonstrated that the graves were originally dug either side of a road which passed over the moor in 1746 and was later widened (once in the 1830s) to become the route which in the twentieth century caused enough offence to ensure its obliteration from the landscape. The site is the only battlefield in Scotland to be accompanied not just by a visitor centre (Bannockburn also has one), but also by

marked footpaths that guide the visitor to the various positions of the troops on both sides.

Although the first investigation of Culloden was carried out under the auspices of the BBC television series 'Two Men in a Trench' in 2000 it has been continued under the umbrella of the Culloden Battlefield Memorial Project. The motivation for this project was the construction of a new visitor centre, which opened on the site in 2007. An important aspiration of the project has been to reinterpret the battle on the basis of its archaeology rather than relying entirely on historical accounts, as is the case at most battlefield interpretation centres (following the commencement of the Culloden project a similar programme of investigation was initiated at Bosworth, in England, though there the archaeologists have a much more daunting task ahead of them as the precise site of the battle is unknown).

The fieldwork at Culloden has revealed a large assemblage of metal artefacts, including musket balls, cannon shot, mortar shells, musket fragments, a bayonet, buckles, buttons, coins and personal possessions, all of which have added to our understanding and have allowed for the very precise location of certain elements of the battle, not least the point at which the Jacobite right hit the government left. Geophysical survey has also revealed the buried remains of buildings standing at the time of the battle and very possibly the site of the presently unmarked graves of the government dead (Pollard, 2005; Pollard,  hcoming).

Other engagements

Several references have been made to the clans and their part in the Jacobite rebellions. Those unfamiliar with this period tend to regard the clans as Jacobite in sympathy almost by default. This was not the case and a number of clans were staunchly pro-government throughout some or all of the rebellions while others refused to be drawn into the conflict – the Jacobite wars were in essence civil wars. The clan system was built on obligatory allegiances based on kinship and territoriality in which clan chiefs could operate with almost monarchical like power. It was also prone to conflict between clans, and at times cattle raiding and low intensity warfare was almost a way of life. This type of warfare is unique to the Highlands and was governed by an entirely different set of rules to that which defined warfare elsewhere – and which gave rise to a martial spirit that was eventually to be incorporated into the British army via the Highland regiments. There are numerous sites associated with clan battles scattered throughout the Highlands and, although many of these may have been little more than skirmishes in scale, the impact they had on the society of the time should not be overlooked. Some of these engagements, such as the so-called Battle of the Clans, which took place in Perth in 1396, had a ritualistic gladiatorial element to them.

Conflict was also rife on the borders of Scotland, where up until the late seventeenth century cattle raiding among the Reivers really was a way of life (MacDonald Fraser, 1971; Durham, 1995). Farmhouses were fortified and family feuds would run for generations. Once again, many of these 'battles' may have been more akin to skirmishes but there are numerous sites associated with raiding and fighting.

Battlefield Archaeology in Scotland – a nascent discipline

The initial study of Scotland's Historic Fields of Conflict carried out by the Battlefields Trust on behalf of Historic Scotland (Foard and Pardita, 2005) includes a provisional list of 343 sites of conflict, including 270 full scale battles (defined by Foard and Pardita as an action involving armies of battalion or greater strength - around at least 1,000 men – deployed in formal battle array) and 73 smaller skirmishes (it does not include siege sites such as Leith). This list has been revised to create an Inventory of what are thought to be the most important sites in Scotland, on the basis of historical importance, level of preservation and archaeological potential. This process, especially with regard to the latter of these considerations, benefits in a way that the development of the English Battlefield's Register did not because battlefield archaeology is now an established field of study in the UK. The compilation of the English Heritage Battlefields Register would most certainly have benefited from archaeological input – as has been demonstrated by the survey at Towton which took place post-1994. There, the results suggest that some of the historical information used to define the boundaries of the battle site for the register was flawed (Sutherland, 2002).

The practice of battlefield archaeology in Scotland can be traced back to 2000 when the first archaeological survey of Culloden battlefield was carried out as part of the BBC television series 'Two Men in A Trench'. Some geophysical survey had previously been carried out in order to try and locate traces of the no longer visible Leanach enclosure, prior to its reconstruction by the National Trust for Scotland, but failed to find any trace. The Culloden project saw the first use of metal detectors on a

Scottish battlefield under the auspices of an archaeological project (Pollard and Oliver, 2002).

Many claims have been put forward with regard to the ability of archaeology to provide new information on battles, which in some cases it undoubtedly can, and techniques such as metal detector survey are very good at locating battle sites. The most recent example of this is at Sheriffmuir, which, as previously noted, was thought to exist in one of at least three locations – albeit all of them very close to one another. survey, which integrated metal detector survey and topographic analysis with historical research, which included a study of both maps and documentary accounts, has succeeded in tying down the location of the initial encounter on the field (Pollard, 2006). In addition to locating battle sites, archaeological survey can also pin-point various elements within a battle. At Culloden, for instance, the point at which the Jacobite charge hit the left flank of the government army has been identified through metal detector survey.

Although by no means wishing to negate the potential of techniques such as metal detector survey to locate medieval battles, as work at the Wars of the Roses site of Towton in Yorkshire has clearly demonstrated, Medieval and earlier sites are clearly more problematic than the later sites. Archaeological survey at Bannockburn, fought in 1314, has failed to locate any artefacts that can be definitely ibuted to the battle (Pollard and Oliver, 2003). The Bosworth project is encountering similar difficulties on that 1485 battle site in England (G. Foard, pers. comm.). These issues may of course be related to doubts about the actual location of the battle, perhaps leading to the searches being carried out in the wrong places, but equally the age of these battles

may also have played a role, with many of the artefacts – particularly those of iron – having decayed almost entirely away over the centuries.

In addition, differences in military technology also influence the chances of relocating a battle site through the recovery of artefacts. The bow was one of the major weapons deployed in medieval battles and, once the fighting was over, used arrows would commonly be collected from a battle site in order to be re-used. Arrowheads were recovered from Towton, but many of them appear to have fallen from bodies after the battle and then exhumed and reburied elsewhere (T. Sutherland, pers. comm.). This situation changes once muskets are introduced (becoming more common in the mid sixteenth century) – with those lead balls which did not find their targets highly unlikely, due to their small size, to be collected up. They are also more likely to survive relatively well in most soils – unlike iron.

A growing body of fieldwork has been directed toward battle sites but the majority of those included within the Historic Scotland Inventory have yet to benefit from any form of archaeological survey that could be used to define areas of major importance and the boundaries of action. It is however hoped that this initiative will provide the motivation for a later programme of the evaluation of a representative number of Scottish battle sites in order to assess the accuracy of the Inventory.

Protection, Planning and the Geography of Scottish conflict

It will be apparent from the foregoing that Scottish battlefields face a series of threats to their survival as historic landscapes. Despite the loss of sites under forestry in the

nineteenth and twentieth centuries the most devastating impact in recent years has come from urban development. This should really come as no surprise, as the factors that influenced the location of historic battles also influence developers and their projects. Battles were very often fought near major settlements, as the town or city represented an important strategic location. Perhaps the clearest example in Scotland is Bannockburn, where the Scots faced up to the English army just outside Stirling to prevent them from relieving the siege of the castle. Today, land on the outskirts of towns is vulnerable to outward expansion, most obviously due to the need for further housing. Additionally, the terrain on which medieval armies fought was quite often flat and open and as such represents an ideal location for housing schemes or industrial facilities.

Other common locations for battles were valleys or coastal plains through and across which important roads passed. These areas were an obvious focus for armies on the march and where two opposing armies meet, battle is quite often the result. The Forth valley and the southeast coast of Scotland have been important thoroughfares for thousands of years. It is largely because of this factor that these areas include the highest density of important battlefields in the country (e.g. Bannockburn, Stirling Bridge, Falkirk, Prestonpans, Pinkie and Dunbar – the latter three, with Prestonpans at their centre, representing the highest concentration of post-medieval battlefields in the UK). The same is also true of several of the passes further north, which give access to the Highlands, with the battles of Killiecrankie (1689) and Glenshiel (1715) being prime examples. The continued importance of these locations in communication networks, and the need to widen and expand them in order to meet the needs of modern traffic, as has recently been the case with the upgrade of the A1 in south-

eastern Scotland, is therefore another example of how historic battlefield locations and modern development needs can clash.

There are mechanisms in place in Scotland to preserve archaeological sites and historic buildings and monuments; however, many of these are not applicable to battlefields. Important monuments can be protected as scheduled ancient monuments, a designation that makes it an offence to damage or disturb the monument without prior permission (as in the case of an archaeological excavation). Scheduling is most appropriate in the case of limited areas and discrete and often upstanding monuments, and these rarely feature on battlefield sites, rare exceptions being the Jacobite graves at Culloden, the grave of the officers at Killiecrankie and the field defences at Glenshiel, all of which have been scheduled.

Only small parts of battlefields may have been deliberately scheduled due to related monuments but a battle site can sometimes benefit from having unrelated scheduled monuments on it. Prestonpans is a case in point, where the area occupied by two large prehistoric enclosures at Setons West Mains (identified as cropmarks from aerial photographs) has accordingly been scheduled. It just so happens that this area sits within the battlefield as described on contemporary maps of the action.

Another form of protection known as ‘listing’ applies to buildings, although these again have only rarely played a role in Scottish battles, as opposed to sieges which by their very nature are centred on buildings. Rare examples are to be found at Prestonpans and Culloden. At the former, Bankton House saw some small action on the eve of the battle, when an outpost of government troops stationed there opened

fire on a body of Jacobites (Duffy, 2003, 16), while Leanach Cottage at Culloden is a small stone and turf dwelling, which along with several other long since disappeared buildings, formed Leanach farmstead and was standing at the time of the battle (though see Pollard, 2005).

As battlefields cover large tracts of landscape, which in most cases will have changed since the time of the battle, scheduling obviously is not an appropriate means of protection. In the United States, a number of American Civil War battlefields are preserved as National Parks. Perhaps the nearest equivalent in Scotland is Culloden, where a sizable portion of the battlefield is owned by the National Trust for Scotland. However, important parts of the battlefield are outside the boundary of Trust ownership and may therefore, at some future date, be the subject of planning applications for new housing or other developments. Should this occur, it is hoped that the local planning department would take into account the importance of the site and act accordingly.

The issue with battlefields is not merely one of archaeological presence or absence – for large tracts of a battlefield may have no artefactual material or other archaeology upon or within them. In these cases, it is important to take into account the setting of the site – how its appreciation and understanding can best be facilitated by preventing further developments upon it. This has in the past been an issue at Culloden, where new housing located off the battlefield proper has served to reduce the overall visual amenity of the site within the wider landscape. In these instances, it is beholden on the local planning authority to act in the site's best interest without making

unreasonable restrictions on the area's economic and social well being, which in many cases will be easier said than done.

While it is hoped that the Historic Scotland Inventory of Battlefields will assist in these difficult decision-making processes and provide a resource which best serves the nation's battlefield heritage, the question of legal protection for these sites still remains. Like its English Heritage counterpart, the Scottish Inventory will be non-statutory, and in the absence of new heritage laws is likely to remain so. Once again, however, there may be something to learn from the English experience, where the introduction of new government proposals on the historic environment has seen battlefields treated in a similar fashion to features such as historic gardens and in this way afforded some degree of legal protection (this new framework has been a long time in the making, being the end result of a process which began with the publication of the DCMS (Department of Culture, Media and Sport) consultation paper – *Protecting our historic environment: Making the system work better* in 2003). The review of legislation in Scotland relating to heritage has brought battlefields explicitly into the sphere of material considerations for development, and while the process is ongoing in 2009, it does appear that battlefields will be much less likely to be overlooked in development control.

An issue not previously considered here is that posed by amateur metal detectorists, which, in some cases (e.g. mass detector rallies), presents a serious threat to the archaeological resource – since the archaeological component of most battlefields takes the form of metal objects within the topsoil. The unregulated use of metal detectors on battlefields can destroy a site without it having been recorded. It would

not seem too great a challenge to ban non-sanctioned metal detecting from the core areas defined within the battlefield Inventory, but once again we must await future developments here. It must also be noted that this is an archaeological topic that can bring archaeologists and metal detectorists together in research programmes. Indeed, the 'Two Men in a Trench' television programme relied heavily on the involvement of metal detector groups. The important point is that both sides recognise the importance of contextual details being adequately recorded.

An important factor in the preservation and conservation of historic battlefields is community interest, of which there appears to be a great deal. The latest manifestation of this desire to identify with a battle site comes in the form of the campaign by the residents of Prestonpans to have a visitor centre devoted to 'their' battlefield, which has been largely successful and will see newly commissioned archaeological research in 2009. Battlefields have great potential as tourist attractions (Pollard, 2003), as Culloden has clearly demonstrated, and it is likely that the future will see an increasing number of these facilities; it should be hoped that the economic benefit of protecting battlefields from development should be enough to ensure a future for at least some of these important sites.

Afterword – why historic battlefields are important

The title of this paper obviously refers to the fact that the last battle fought in Scotland took place in 1746, but it is also ironic, because as it is being written there are a number of apparently intractable wars being fought elsewhere in the world, most obviously in Afghanistan and Iraq, involving Scottish troops. Some might say that

the old adage about learning from the mistakes of the past generally goes unheeded. This is of course nonsense, as armies do learn from the mistakes of the past, though these mistakes are those which impact on military campaigns and not those which draw the human race into warfare in the first place.  ish officers at Sandhurst, who benefit from instruction from a cadre of military historians, are well aware that the majority of British campaigns fought in Afghanistan have ended in failure, but this has not stopped today's army entering the country and engaging with an adversary who are the direct descendants of those who fought in the days of the British empire. However, armies have no choice in the matter, for they do the bidding of their respective governments, which in a democracy presumably act on the instruction from the constituents who vote them into power (though on the basis of events over recent years this presumption would seem at best a little naive). Nonetheless, the point is that the soldiers may have learnt from bitter experience, but their political masters have either failed to learn the lessons or have ignored them. It is the soldiers that pay the price, unfortunately. It is perhaps here that battlefields as heritage sites and the practice of battlefield archaeology serve their most basic and perhaps most important function. The former reminds that warfare has consequences, the most obvious being the loss of human life, while the latter allows an almost direct contact with the people who for an hour or more inhabited that landscape and perhaps breathed their last within it.

Acknowledgements

The authors would like to thank Glenn Foard, their colleague on the Historic Scotland Inventory Project, for his input into numerous discussions about the subject.

References Cited

Alcock, L. and Alcock, E.A., (1996). Reconnaissance excavations on Early Historic fortifications and other royal sites in Scotland, 1974-84; 5: Excavations & other fieldwork at Forteviot, Perthshire, 1981; B, Excavations at Urquhart Castle, Inverness-shire, 1983; C, Excavations at Dunnottar, Kincardineshire, 1984. *Proceedings of the Society of Antiquaries of Scotland* **122**: pp. 215-87.

Banks, I. and Pollard, T., forthcoming. The archaeology of the Battle of Edgehill, 1642. *Journal of Conflict Archaeology* **5**.

Banks, I., Pollard, T., and Poller, T., (2006). *Leith Open Spaces Project (Leith siege works) Geophysics*, GUARD report 2200, Glasgow.

Cooper, J., (2006). *The Heart and the Rose: The Battle of Linlithgow Bridge 1526.* Partizan Press, Essex.

Duffy, C., (2003). *The '45: Bonnie Prince Charlie and the Untold Story of the Jacobite Rising*, Cassell, London.

Durham, K., (1995). *The Border Reivers*, Osprey Men-At-Arms, London.

Eisele, J., (1997). *Third Battle of Newbury*, unpublished paper delivered at Archaeologists & Development Conference, 14 June 1997, Salisbury Museum <http://www.britarch.ac.uk/info/archdev.html>

Foard, G., (2001). The archaeology of attack: battles and sieges of the English Civil War. In Freeman, P. W. M., and Pollard, T. (eds.), pp. 87-104.

Foard, G., and Pardita, T., (2005). *Scotland's Historic Fields of Conflict: an Assessment for Historic Scotland,* The Battlefields Trust, Norwich.

Fraser, J., (2005). *The Roman Conquest of Scotland: the Battle of Mons Graupius, AD 84*, Tempus, Stroud.

Freeman, P.W.M., (2001). Issues concerning the archaeology of battlefields. In Freeman, P. W. M., and Pollard, T. (eds.), pp. 1-10.

Freeman, P.W.M., and Pollard, A. (T.), (eds.) (2001). *Fields of Conflict: Progress and Prospect in Battlefield Archaeology*, British Archaeological Reports (International Series 958), Oxford.

Harrington, P., (2004). *English Civil War Archaeology*, English Heritage/B. T. Batsford, London.

Hutton, W., (1999[1813]). *The Battle of Bosworth Field* (reprint of 2nd edition; first published 1788), Tempus, Stroud.

Lelong, O., and MacGregor, G., (2008). *The Lands of Ancient Lothian*. Society of Antiquaries of Scotland Monographs, Edinburgh.

MacDonald Fraser, G., (1971). *The Steel Bonnets: The Story of the Border Reivers*, Barrie and Jenkins, London.

MacKay, E., (1898). *The Battle of Sheriffmuir Related from Original Sources*, Stirling.

MacSween, A., (2001). Preserving Scotland's battlefields: powers, practices and possibilities. In Freeman, P.W.M., and Pollard, T. (eds.), pp. 291-96.

Maxwell, G. S., (1990). *A Battle Lost: Romans and Caledonians at Mons Graupius*, Edinburgh University Press, Edinburgh.

Pollard, T., (2003). The value of enmity: re-making and re-visiting historic battlefields in the United States and Britain. *Landscapes* **4(2)**: pp. 25-34.

Pollard, T., (2005). *Culloden Battlefield: Report on Archaeological Investigation*, GUARD report 1981, Glasgow.

Pollard, T., (2006). *Sheriffmuir Battlefield: Data Structure Report*, GUARD report 2214, Glasgow.

Pollard, T., (2009). The archaeology of the Siege of Leith, 1560. *Journal of Conflict Archaeology* **4**: pp. 159-88.

Pollard, T., (in press). Burying the hatchet? The post-conflict appropriation of battlefields. In Purbrick, L. (ed.), *Contested Spaces: Representation and the Histories of Conflict*, Pergamon Press, London.

Pollard, T., and Banks, I., (2006). Introduction. In Pollard, T., and Banks, I. (eds.), *Past Tense: Studies in the Archaeology of Conflict*, Brill Academic Publishers, Leiden, pp. vii-xi.

Pollard, T., and Oliver, N., (2002). *Two Men in a Trench: Battlefield Archaeology, the key to unlocking the past*, Penguin/Michael Joseph, London.

Pollard, T., and Oliver, N., (2003). *Two Men in a Trench II: Uncovering the secrets of British battlefields*, Penguin/Michael Joseph, London.

Reid, S.. (2004). *Battles of the Scottish Lowland, Battlefield Britain*, Pen and Sword, Barnsley.

Salway, P.. (1993). *A History of Roman Britain*, Oxford University Press, Oxford.

Scott, D.D., Fox, R.A., Connor, M.A., and Harmon, D.. (1989). *Archaeological Perspectives on the Battle of the Little Bighorn*, University of Oklahoma Press, Oklahoma.

Smurthwaite, D.. (1995). *The Complete Guide to the Battlefields of Britain*, Michael Joseph, London.

Sutherland, T.. (2002). *The Towton Battlefield Archaeological Survey Web Site* <http//:mysite.freeserve.com/Towtonbattlefield>

Watson, F., and Anderson, A.. (2001). *The Battle of Bannockburn*, Report for Stirling Council (unpublished).

Figure Captions

Figure 1 – Roman and Early Historic battles in Scotland.

Figure 2 – The Medieval period: the Wars of Independence and other Medieval battles.

Figure 3 – Renaissance warfare: battles of the sixteenth century.

Figure 4 – Battles of the Civil Wars (1644-1650).

Figure 5 – After the Civil Wars: Covenanting battles (1660s and 1670s).

Figure 6 – The Jacobite uprisings/rebellions (1689-1746).

This is a good paper – needs some tidying up, a couple of references where indicated. Tony Pollard's TV series is mentioned three times, and I'm not sure all the mentions are necessary! The paper provides a nice, practical balance to the earlier theoretical papers, and I think that the rather detailed historical introduction is necessary, though I was uncertain about it at first. There are one or two places where clarification of names is needed for an international audience, but the history section is a fine summary of the complex conflicts of the later Middle Ages and Early Modern periods.