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CHAPTER 1. INTRODUCTION

This report describes the results of historical research and archaeological desk-based assessment undertaken in June 2004 by CFA Archaeology Ltd and Dr Richard Oram as part of the Prestongrange Community Archaeology Project (PCAP). This research represents the first stage of a larger data structure report that will be produced in 2005 following the completion of all work on the PCAP.

The East Lothian Museums Service and the East Lothian Archaeology Service developed the concept of the PCAP. Lottery Funding has been secured and a prerequisite of the project is to foster local community participation. This is a long-term project, initially with three phases, which aims to arrive at a better understanding of the historic development of Prestongrange.

The first phase was implemented in 2004 and included: historical research; site walk-over; topographical survey; the collection of surface artefacts on the site of a pottery; and exploratory excavation of a glassworks, a pottery and a toll house. A web-site has been created and a series of talks was presented as part of East Lothian Archaeology Week, part of Scottish Archaeology Week. The second phase of the project (2005) will involve more detailed archaeological work on the former pottery site. Additional work will be carried out to investigate the precise location of the toll house. Following this work a final data structure report will be produced along with a final exhibition.

Objectives

The principal objectives of the 2004 phase of the Prestongrange Community Archaeological Project were:

1. to explore and investigate the pre-collery industrial heritage traditions of Prestongrange and its environs by way of a desk-based assessment;
2. to provide information which will contribute to the existing and future interpretation of the site in addition to feeding into the long-term conservation and interpretation objectives of Prestongrange Industrial Museum as a whole;
3. to offer an opportunity for interested individuals and local communities to become actively involved in a long term archaeological project with opportunities to work alongside qualified archaeologists, learn archaeological techniques and develop a more comprehensive understanding of a part of their local landscape and the objectives behind archaeology.

Fieldwork Aims

The specific aims of the fieldwork component of the project were:

1. to investigate and characterise the 16th century harbour, fort, vaults and tidal mill at Morrison’s Haven, to the immediate north of the existing Prestongrange Visitor Centre;
2. to investigate and characterise the 16th to 17th century salt panning industry in association with the harbour;
3. to investigate and characterise the 17th century glassworks at Prestongrange;
4. to investigate and characterise the 18\textsuperscript{th} century pottery at Prestongrange;

5. to investigate and characterise the 18\textsuperscript{th}/19\textsuperscript{th} century toll house at the west end of the Prestongrange site.

\textbf{Report Layout}

Chapter 2 outlines the methods used during this project, including a review of various cartographic and other documentary sources for the 19\textsuperscript{th} –20\textsuperscript{th} century. Chapter 3 provides a historical report on Prestongrange and Morrison’s Haven, concentrating primarily on 16\textsuperscript{th} – 18\textsuperscript{th} century historical sources. Chapter 4 discusses the implications arising from this desk-based study with a conclusion and recommendations for future work. Chapter 5 lists the various sources examined during this project. Appendix 1 outlines previous historical research and is bound at the rear of the report.
CHAPTER 2. METHODOLOGY & DESK-BASED ASSESSMENT RESULTS

Introduction

Work was conducted with regard to the Institute of Field Archaeologists Code of Conduct and relevant Standards. Recording of all elements was carried out following established CFA methods.

Documentary sources

Historical and documentary research has been undertaken by Dr Richard Oram and forms the subject of Chapter 3. The sources for this chapter are listed in Chapter 5. An earlier report was prepared for East Lothian Council by David Anderson (2003) which brought together the many strands of evidence on the history of industrial development of Prestongrange and constructed a series of useful timelines to indicate gaps. This report assembled and summarised events on an industry-by-industry basis (Appendix 1). A documentary and bibliographic study was made of relevant items held in the National Monuments Record of Scotland (NMRS) library to provide background and historical information. The New Statistical Account was also consulted.

National Monuments Record of Scotland

An assessment of the records held by the NMRS has been undertaken. These records consist of an on line database and various other collections. Examination of vertical and oblique aerial photographs of Prestongrange were examined in order to assess the presence of buildings now absent on the ground. Attention was paid to the layout of Morrison’s Haven and how this might differ from the cartographic sources dated to the mid-20th century. Industrial photographs of Prestongrange housed in the NMRS were also examined. The East Lothian SMR was checked and did not have any additional information other than that recorded already in the NMRS.

Scheduled Ancient Monuments and Listed Buildings

The most recent published list of Ancient Monuments in Scotland (Historic Scotland 1999) was consulted to identify any scheduled archaeological sites or monuments within the study area.

Cartographic sources

Ordnance Survey 6 inch to 1 mile scale map editions from the 1850s onwards, and other readily available early cartographic sources held at the National Library of Scotland Map Library and the National Archives of Scotland were checked. These are listed in chronological order in Table 1.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Map detail</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1654</td>
<td>Blaeu, J., 1654, Lothian and Linlithqu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1682</td>
<td>Adair, J., 1682, East Lothian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1688</td>
<td>Adair, J., 1688, Mapp of the part of the Parioch of Trannent with Port Seaton.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1736</td>
<td>Adair, J., 1736, A Map of East Lothian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1744</td>
<td>Elphinstone, J., 1744, A New and Correct Map of the Lothians from Mr Adairs Observations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1745</td>
<td>Moll, H., 1745, Lothian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1799</td>
<td>Forrest, W., 1799, Map of Haddingtonshire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1822</td>
<td>Thompson, J., 1822, Haddington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1832</td>
<td>Plan of Mr Gordon’s Property</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1854</td>
<td>James R.E., 1854, Prestonpans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1854</td>
<td>Ordnance Survey First Edition 1854 Haddingtonshire Sheet 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1894</td>
<td>Ordnance Survey Second Edition 1894 Haddingtonshire Sheet 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1907</td>
<td>Ordnance Survey Third Edition 1907</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1914</td>
<td>Ordnance Survey Third Edition 1907</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1938</td>
<td>Ordnance Survey Provisional Addition 1938 Sheet IV NE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960</td>
<td>Ordnance Survey 1960 Sheet NT 37 SE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1969</td>
<td>Ordnance Survey 1969 Sheet NT 37 SE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1973</td>
<td>Ordnance Survey 1973 Sheet NT 37 SE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1 Cartographic sources examined in chronological order.

Photographic Record

Scotland’s Cultural Resource Network (SCRAN), an online database of photographic images, was consulted.

Results of desk-based survey

Documentary sources

Examination of relevant texts concerning the Prestongrange industrial complex has been confined mainly to the work by Jill Turnbull (2001) which provided a valuable source of information on early glass manufacture at the site. Haggarty and McIntyre's (1996) rescue work at the Newbigging Pottery in Musselburgh has also provided technical information on manufacturing and kiln design.

National Monuments Record of Scotland (NMRS)

The NMRS, housed at the Royal Commission on Ancient and Historical Monuments for Scotland (RCAHMS), contains six entries associated with Prestongrange. These are listed in Table 2.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NMRS No.</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Record summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NT37 SE 12</td>
<td>Morrison’s Haven</td>
<td>Review of history, place name changes, mention of disuse and impact of erosion to seaward end of the pier.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NT37 SE 23</td>
<td>Acheson’s Haven Fort</td>
<td>Wall dimensions gleaned from historical account by Rev. J. Struthers, minister of Prestonpans, 1853. Foundations still could be seen in 1853. Fort lies under a new road.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NT37 SE 24</td>
<td>Cists</td>
<td>A short cist measuring 3ft 6ins by 1ft 8ins deep was found in the sand near Morrison’s Haven in 1887. A crouched male skeleton was found but no grave goods.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NT37 SE 78</td>
<td>Prestongrange Colliery</td>
<td>Summary notes on colliery and brick-making.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NT37 SE 79</td>
<td>Prestongrange Tileworks</td>
<td>Summary notes on ownership and the duration of works. Dimensions and details on the surviving Hoffman-type kiln.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NT37 SE 83</td>
<td>Site of Village</td>
<td>Village marked on Adair’s map of 1682 and a weekly market and yearly fair authorised in 1701. A two storey crow-stepped structure survived in 1964 and was attributed as the sole survivor of the village.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NT37 SE 255</td>
<td>Welfare Institution</td>
<td>No bibliographic details.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2  Summary of the NMRS records for Prestongrange.

**Scheduled Ancient Monuments and Listed Buildings**

Consultation of Historic Scotland’s Statutory List of listed buildings at Prestongrange shows that there are three listed buildings within the former industrial complex. The former Prestongrange Colliery Cornish engine and house built in 1874 is a Scheduled Ancient Monument (SAM No. 2813).

Situated close to the former colliery pit head is the Category A listed three-storey beam engine pump house and pump, built by Harvey and Company of Hoyle, Cornwall. The structure was erected in 1874 and is built of rusticated sandstone ashlar with a grey slate roof and cast iron rainwater goods. The north elevation is the bob-wall that houses the giant central cast-iron beam which protrudes from the third floor opening with a vertically-boarded frontage at its apex. The engine pumped water out of the pit in three stages, at 2995 litres a minute. After the closure of the Prestongrange Colliery, and after abandonment and partial clearing, it was saved and is now a central exhibit of the Prestongrange Mining Museum. The building is one of only two of its type surviving in Scotland, the other being the Devon Colliery Beam Engine House, Clackmannanshire, built by Neilson & Co. in 1865.

To the east of the Cornish pumping engine house is a Category B listed two-storey former generating house. The structure is constructed of red-brick with contrasting brickwork banding. It has a pan-tiled roof and dates to the mid-19th century. The building is now used as an exhibition hall.

To the west of the Cornish pumping house opposite the museum exhibition centre is the Category B Listed Hoffman Kiln. The kiln dates to the later 19th century and is a 12-bay, rectangular-plan, red brick structure with 24 loading chambers. The walls contain firing bays...
along each side. The kiln is all that remains of the former Prestongrange Brick and Fire Clay Works.

*Cartographic sources (pre-1850)*

The available cartographic sources make an important contribution towards our understanding of the industrial development of Prestongrange, in particular the changes in the layout of Morrison’s Haven that have occurred between the mid-18th and mid-20th century. The Ordnance Survey maps provide important information of how the harbour functioned and other sources attest to its importance as the region's main coal, brick and tile manufacturer by the mid-19th century. The earlier maps (pre-1850) tend to be more schematic in their depiction of Prestongrange, but these are nonetheless of historical interest. A list of all the cartographic sources can be found in Chapter 6. Historical and aerial photographs are an invaluable resource and have helped to identify the scale of the operations and provide other useful indirect information.

Timothy Pont’s 1630 map “*A new description of the shyres Lothian and Linlitgo*” depicts Achysons Haven as a single crescent shaped breakwater along a straight section of coastline. The same detail is also shown on Blaeu’s map of 1654. The maps produced by John Adair in 1682 and 1688 both depict New Haven. The latter map depicts a single curving pier with an anchor within its interior. The placenames Morrison’s and New Haven are depicted together on the 1736 map by John Adair, although the map shows no architectural detail of the harbour. The 1745 map by Herman Moll depicts ‘Prestongrange’ but shows no detail of the harbour.

A plan entitled “*Plan of the harbour as it stands 8 August 1753*” (RHP 41 329/1) shows a sandy channel protected by an off-shore reef running south-east to north-west, with a small terminus of stonework at the SE end. A sounding depth of 12ft is depicted on a section drawing over this point. There was a short pier running east-west on the landward side, adjacent to the northward-pointing pier of the tide-mill. The latter is depicted as a rectangular building with a flood gate mill lade and wheel at its north-west end. To the south-west was a substantial mill lagoon. Between the piers and lagoon was the site of the ‘vaults’ and this may be represented by an unnamed rectangular building. The plan has been reproduced elsewhere (Turnbull 2001, plate 43). This is the earliest large-scale plan of the harbour, providing the first evidence of a tide-mill.

The 1773 map by Andrew and Mostyn Armstrong shows that by this period, Morrison’s Haven had two breakwaters. The placename Prestongrange is shown along with a Toll house situated at the fork in the old coast road and the road to North Berwick to the west of the haven.

William Forrest’s map of 1799 shows that by this date Prestongrange was expanding as an industrial complex. His map depicts not only the haven, but also a mill and pottery. A star-shaped symbol is also depicted. Whether or not this marks the relative position of a fort is difficult to interpret. The 1822 map by Thompson depicts ‘Morrison’s Haven’ and a ‘flint mill’. Unlike the 1773 Armstrong map, only a single curving pier is shown. It may be the case that only one of the piers survived at this time. An 1832 plan of ‘Mr Gordon’s Property’ by Grant Suttie shows the position of a pottery with three kilns and part of Morrison’s Haven. Part of the ‘remains of an old fort’ is also depicted.
Cartographic sources (post-1850)

The 1854 First Edition Ordnance Survey map (Fig 3) shows the layout of Morrison’s Haven in much greater detail than the earlier historical maps. The expansion of the Prestongrange industrial complex by the mid-19th century is clearly evident. Morrison’s Haven is depicted with two piers. The northern pier is aligned E-W with a slight bend at the high water spring mark. The southern pier is much smaller and was a curving breakwater terminating opposite the end of the northern pier. A rectangular building on the south side of the haven is labelled as a ‘saw mill’. The mill may have been powered by water stored in a large tidal lagoon situated on the south side of the haven. Three other buildings to the east of the saw mill are not named. On the east side of the coastal road is a row of cottages. On the south side of the cottages is another building arrangement, one of which is depicted as a school. Immediately to the south of the school building is a brick and tile works. The works have a U-shaped plan with two square kilns and a circular structure that may have been a horse gang for milling clay. The kilns are likely to have been the traditional Scotch updraft kilns (see Douglass and Oglethorpe 1993, 16-18) of the mid-19th century. The U-shaped complex is likely to have been the timber-framed drying sheds.

A coloured mine engineering plan of 1877 shows the underground coal seams being worked at Prestongrange Colliery in that year. The plan is very useful as it depicts the brick and tile works with a set of nine beehive kilns situated round a rectangular machine shop. At the harbour the northern pier is shown along with a coal-loading pier. The southern harbour breakwater is not shown and may have been out of use at this date.

An 1891 annotated sketch of the harbour by an unknown artist (Fig. 2) shows the northern and southern pier, the latter is depicted as a broken wall. To the east of this feature is a north trending jetty with a railway line. A similar rail route is shown along the road to Prestonpans on the south side of the harbour, and is described as road and railway. The lagoon is shown as stagnant sluice pond and its sluice gate is also depicted. Interestingly the northern pier has been annotated with rocks on the seaward side. This could imply either that the pier rested on a natural outcrop of rock, or it was defended by boulders dumped to minimise wave impact from north-easterly gales.

The 1894 Second Edition Ordnance Survey map (Fig. 4) shows that Prestongrange had undergone dramatic industrial expansion since 1854. The old brick and tiles works had been cleared to be replaced by a larger brick and tile company operating under the title of the Prestongrange Brick and Fire Clay Works. Situated around a large rectangular building are thirteen circular beehive kilns and a large brick kiln and chimney. Prestongrange Colliery is depicted for the first time to the east of the brickworks. The main shaft and pit-head buildings are shown along with several other unnamed buildings. A large rectangular railway shed was present on the south side of the pit-head. A railway ran southwards towards Morrison's haven Junction which provided a direct link to a loading pier at Morrison’s Haven, where coal was loaded directly onto boats for export. All of the colliery waste was being dumped to the east of Morrison’s Haven. The map clearly shows a railway line on top of a tip, two earlier tip and lines are shown adjacent.

The northern pier of Morrison’s Haven is shown as well as the smaller curving south pier. A linear wall connects the curving south pier to the main coal-loading pier. A sluice is shown near the coal pier. This effectively allowed tidal water to fill the reservoir on the south side of the sluice. For navigation purposes a beacon was positioned near the Big Ox rocks in order to mark these dangerous shoals.
Immediately on the south side of the coal-loading pier is the position of a fort that marked by a cross. This feature is discussed above (see page 20-21). Two other buildings are located to the south of the fort position with another one situated further to the east, all unnamed. A miner’s row is depicted with six individual cottages. To the east of the cottages is a larger rectangular building with two compartments. This feature survives today (see below) and is known locally as the Old Customs House.

The 1907 Third Edition map (Fig 5) shows that Prestongrange had expanded again with the most significant development since 1894 being that of mineral transportation. The railway system leading to Morrison’s Haven had been developed significantly with a hauling tramway leading directly from the brick and tile works to the haven. Several new branch lines and sidings had been built along with new lines to the tips, both near the colliery and east of the haven. Here the configuration of the shoreline was significantly altered by the amount of colliery waste that had been dumped in the intervening period between when the two map surveys. This expansion in the works also led to the requirement for workers housing. Two miners' rows were built at the north-east end of the colliery boundary. These appear to have been two-storey dwellings with accommodation for up to 22 families. The upper floors were entered by a back stair on the south side of the buildings.

The 1914 Revised Edition map (Fig 6) shows that Prestongrange Colliery continued to expand. This is exemplified not only by its railway network, but also by the reclaimed land that was being gained as a result of dumping colliery waste along the foreshore.

An undated surface layout plan of Prestongrange Colliery names all the buildings making up the complex. The plan shows that the harbour had gone out of use, as colliery waste had been dumped into its interior. This event is also depicted on the 1960 Ordnance Survey map. Several features are shown that have been recorded during the recent topographical survey carried out in May 2004. These will be discussed in a forthcoming interim report (Cressey in prep 2005).

A 1972 plan entitled “Prestongrange Industrial Heritage Site” shows the disused Prestongrange Colliery with named buildings. The two-storey miners cottages were depicted as derelict buildings. The railway lines had gone and several of the mine buildings had been demolished. The beehive kilns appear either to have been demolished or were in a derelict state at this time.

Photographic record

Aerial photographs were consulted at the NMRS. The surveys date from between 1946 and 1988. The 1946 aerial photograph shows Prestongrange Colliery, Morrison’s Haven and lagoon. The 1953 aerial photograph shows that the lagoon has been partly infilled. The 1958 photograph shows that the harbour had been completely infilled. The 1971 plate shows that the miner’s rows were all standing but according to the 1974 photograph two of the rows had been demolished. The 1988 plate shows that Prestongrange had been landscaped and was much the same as it is today.

On-line data bases

The SCRAN (www.scran.ac.uk) database contains 158 image-based entries relating to Prestongrange. The photographs include images and descriptions of the colliery and the brickworks (Plates 5-6). Morrison’s Haven is well represented by 19th century images as well as more recent aerial views of the former industrial complex (Plates 1-4). The database also includes a wide range of photographs of ceramic wares produced by the pottery industry.
The Peak District Mines Historical Society database (http://www.tidza.demon.co.uk/page26.html) on Haddington’s Mining Industry 1896, lists Prestongrange Colliery under the ownership of Summerlee and Mossend Iron and Steel Company of Glasgow. The colliery manager in that year was Mr George Goodwin. There were 236 underground workers and 21 workers working at the surface.
CHAPTER 3. HISTORICAL RESEARCH: PRESTONGRANGE AND MORRISON’S HAVEN
Richard Oram

Introduction

This chapter should be read in conjunction with that undertaken in April 2003 by David Anderson (Appendix 1) as part of the preparatory work for the Prestongrange Community Archaeology Project. This chapter concentrates primarily upon the pre-1800 period, where the evidence survives in a much more fragmented and dispersed state, and provides only a summary of nineteenth- and twentieth-century developments.

The primary aim of this investigation was to undertake a series of reconnaissance samples of the surviving materials relating to Prestongrange and Morrison’s Haven, with a view to supplementing work already undertaken, examining several of the issues raised by these previous exercises, and assessing the value of the data available. An exhaustive collation, examination and analysis of all available materials relating to Prestongrange, however, is an exercise that would require several months of work, even when building upon the substantial database already assembled in preparation for the establishment of the Community initiative. Such a detailed research programme was considered to be unfeasible at this stage in the project and that a targeted sampling strategy would offer the best means of providing an assessment of the quality, quantity and content of the surviving documentary record. The main thrust of the sampling was intended to pursue four principal lines:

- a. sample the main pre-1560 sources to provide an overview of medieval activity on the site;
- b. sample the principal post-Reformation family papers to identify records relating to i. the coal-workings, ii. the saltpans, iii. the mills, iv. the harbour, v. the glass-and pottery/tile-works, vi. Prestongrange House and estate buildings, vii. the toll-house;
- c. evaluate the map and plan collections;
- d. sample the Coal Board records relating to the colliery.

Inevitably, the sampling quickly revealed significant skewing of the surviving data but also produced a series of unexpected results which have led to greater emphasis being given to certain areas in the exercise than was originally intended. For example, it was rapidly determined that there was little by way of true medieval record to illustrate the early development of the sites, although there is a significant documentary archive from which a general picture of the development and operation of the Newbattle Abbey estate of Prestongrange could be obtained. Only material directly related to the ‘grange of Preston’ was analysed and is presented below, but there is a wider body of material from which a generalised discussion of the medieval economy and society of Prestongrange/Salt Preston/Prestonpans could be constructed.

Substantial materials relating to Prestongrange and its satellite facilities, survive in number only from 1526 onwards, and more especially from the 1540s onwards. With these, it was again determined at an early stage that there were two clear groups of material: that relating to the wider estate of Prestongrange and the components of the barony (which were scattered throughout the western half of the medieval parish of Prestonpans), and that specific to the complex of industrial developments clustered at and in the immediate hinterland of the haven. This present study has focused principally on the latter, as the material was considered of more immediate relevance to the programme of archaeological work than, say, records of grain production on the Prestongrange demesne. It
needs to be stressed, however, that there are substantial numbers of documents from which it would be possible to construct a detailed picture of the wider economy and social structure of the barony from the mid-sixteenth to the early nineteenth centuries.

In the sampling of the post-Reformation material, any records relating to the house of Prestongrange, to the brick and tile works, and to the toll house which were found were noted but not examined in depth. The volume of Coal Board materials is such that examination of even a representative sample would have taken longer than the time allowed for this present project.

**Historical Background**

Prestongrange comprised roughly the western half of the medieval parish of Preston (later called Prestonpans), an ancient ecclesiastical unit that fell under the jurisdiction of the bishops of Dunkeld. Contrary to statements in previous reports, at no time in the Middle Ages did Preston/Prestonpans parish form part of the parish of Tranent, and it has a continuous history as a small but distinct ecclesiastical unit from the twelfth century until the mid sixteenth century. For some sixty years after the burning of the parish church of Preston in 1544 by the English army under the earl of Hertford, the parishioners did attend the neighbouring parish church of Tranent, but there was no formal unification of the two parishes. In 1595, a new parish church was at last provided for Prestonpans by the Hamiltons of Preston and a formal re-separation of the parishes was granted by Act of Parliament in 1606.

Possession of the parish church by the bishops of Dunkeld, one of several properties in Lothian which they controlled as part of their deanery south of Forth, points to pre-twelfth century origins for the parish. Preston was possibly a property which had been granted to the monastery founded at Dunkeld in the ninth century, and may have come into its possession in the late tenth or early eleventh century following the absorption of Lothian into the kingdom of the Scots. As successor to the pre-twelfth-century heads of that monastery, the bishops received the parsonage teinds of the parish as part of their ‘mensal’ revenues, but the vicarage remained unappropriated until after c.1300. It was, however, almost certainly a very much older estate which was already functioning as a distinct economic unit at the time of the Scottish takeover. In common with many of the parishes and lordships of south-east Scotland, Preston probably originated as a secular landed estate in the 7th to 9th centuries, when Lothian formed part of the Anglian kingdom of Northumbria, and could have even early roots as a lordly property in the Brittonic kingdom in Lothian which was conquered by the Angles in the early 600s.

By the middle of the twelfth century the lands of Prestongrange formed the western end of a large block of property on the southern shore of the Firth of Forth east of the Esk and centred on Tranent which belonged to the family of de Quincy, members of the Anglo-Norman colonial elite who began to settle in numbers in southern Scotland in the 1100s. The de Quincys rose rapidly in royal service and as a result of a series of good marriages, and were to acquire properties scattered throughout eastern Scotland from Aberdeenshire to Lothian, as well as major lands in Galloway and in England, where in the early 1200s they received the title Earl of Winchester. From 1235, the de Quincys also held the title of Constable of Scotland, but in 1263/4 the male line of the family became extinct and their properties were broken up between the husbands of Roger de Quincy’s three daughters. Already for nearly a century by that date, however, Prestongrange had been detached from the de Quincy estates and given into the hands of the Church. While the eastern portion of the estate passed through the hands of a succession of secular owners and was itself also detached from the lordship of Tranent to form, eventually, the Hamilton lordship of Preston, Prestongrange
remained for the duration of the pre-Reformation period in the hands of a religious corporation, the Cistercian abbey of St Mary of Newbattle.

Substantial amounts of documentation survive relating to the development of Prestonpans in the period c.1200 to c.1500, relevant to both the Hamilton lordship of Preston and the Newbattle estate. These would be well worth exploring in more detail, as they would provide a firm context within which to view the development of Prestongrange and its component properties. Such a wide perspective would offer the potential to understand better the economic mechanisms which drove the post-medieval developments at Prestongrange specifically, while also providing a more nuanced picture of the socio-economic structures of East Lothian.

The Grange of Preston

In 1170, Robert de Quincy leased all of his land in Preston, which formed a portion of his lordship of Tranent, to the Cistercian abbey of Newbattle near Dalkeith for a period of twenty years. In return, the abbey was to settle Robert’s debts of £80 owed to a Jewish moneylender named Abraham. Between 1179 and 1189, probably nearer to 1189 when the original term was due to expire, Robert converted that lease into an outright grant in what is referred to as free alms (where in return for a grant of property by a lay landholder to an ecclesiastical recipient, the only service due from the recipient was the saying of masses and prayers in perpetuity for the salvation of the soul of the donor). Robert had clearly amassed further debts and appears to have entered into similar leasing arrangements with Melrose and Holyrood abbeys to provide for their settlement. Robert’s original lease survives (not included in the published Newbattle documents) but his subsequent charter granting outright possession does not, but it is probable that the grant in free alms was a device to cover what was in effect the sale of the land to the monks. The earliest surviving record of this transaction is a charter of King William the Lion confirming the grant to Newbattle Abbey made by Robert de Quincy and confirmed by Saher de Quincy, his son, of Prestongrange (grangia de Preston) in East Lothian, which was issued by the king at Haddington, 1179 x 1189. This charter provides important information relating to the nature of what was granted, for it refers to ‘grangie de Preston’.

While Newbattle developed extensive sheep and cattle runs on its moorland properties on the northern slopes of the Pentland and Lammermuir hills, and Robert de Quincy’s grant gave them grazing for a further 700 sheep on the common grazing of his property in Tranent, the use of ‘grange’ (meaning a granary) at Preston at this date suggests involvement in arable cultivation rather than pastoral activity. As later evidence shows, this was primarily grain producing country and Newbattle was a noted speculator on the grain market in Lothian down into the later medieval period. This primarily arable function is emphasised by a second charter of William the Lion, which confirmed a grant made to the canons of Holyrood in Edinburgh by Robert de Quincy of a ploughgate and ten acres in Tranent in exchange for the ploughgate in Preston claimed by the canons from Robert and the monks of Newbattle, issued by the king at Haddington, 19 August 1195 x 1203, perhaps 1198. Holyrood evidently considered that it had a prior claim to the Preston property, probably arising from their later agreement to pay off his debts, and that its claim was not without foundation is made clear by Robert’s award to them of a suitable equivalent piece of land in his neighbouring lordship of Tranent. Both grants are made in terms of ploughgates, a measure equal to what an ox-team harnessed to a plough could work in a day, normally set at 104 acres. It is a term linked almost exclusively with measurement of cultivated ground. The grant of a share in the common grazing for 700 sheep should not be confused with the outright possession of property granted in respect of the ploughgate.
Newbattle ran this outlying component of its estate as a grange. A grange was, in effect, a self-contained economic centre from which the organisation of a block of monastic property could be managed, where produce could be gathered or manufactured, and from where it could be transported back to the monastery or disposed of at market. Under the Cistercians’ system, the grange could in theory not be located further from the home monastery than workers could travel to and from in a day. In practice, most Cistercian granges were outpost communities, where groups of lay-brothers (men who had not taken full monastic vows but who lived a monastic existence) provided the labour force under the supervision of one or more of the fully professed brethren. At Prestongrange, therefore, the late twelfth- and thirteenth-century grange would have comprised a complex of buildings where the supervising monk and the lay-brethren would have been housed, plus storage for the harvested produce and equipment, stables and byres for draft animals and plough teams, perhaps an oratory, and various other ancillary buildings. Under papal legislation, monasteries which broke land into cultivation from ‘waste’ by a process of assarting were exempt from payment of ‘novalia’, the teind payable on land newly taken into production. For the Cistercians, this was a major incentive to develop their estates and it is likely that Newbattle considerably expanded the scale of the cultivation on its property in Preston.

Along with cultivation, however, the monks were also quick to exploit the wider economic potential of their new property. Amongst the requirements of a supposedly self-sufficient Cistercian monastery was salt, necessary both as a preservative for bulk stores of meat and fish and also as part of the preparation process for white leather. Around the time of the foundation of Newbattle in 1140, David I granted the monks a saltpan at the lost ‘Blankelande’, which was probably in the upper reaches of the Forth estuary, and shortly afterwards added a second pan at ‘Kalentyr’ (Callendar – the lands stretching down to the Forth at Grangemouth, north and east of Falkirk). Whilst these two pans no doubt provided a vital supply to the monastery, the difficulties and costs of transporting significant quantities of salt from the vicinity of Falkirk to Dalkeith no doubt prompted the monks to seek a supply significantly closer to the monastery. It is likely, therefore, that they almost immediately began the development of pans on their stretch of the coast at Preston, if pans did not in fact already exist there. In tandem with that, we should probably expect the development of coal extraction to have occurred quickly under the monks’ direction, as it had probably done soon after 1140 in their other lands around Tranent. The pans, then, would have become a significant part of the processes undertaken on the Prestongrange property, with the work being either overseen or, possibly, undertaken by, the lay brothers of the abbey. It should be stressed here, however, that there is no evidence that the abbey ran or leased out any pans at any period during the monastic possession of Prestongrange at the Morrison’s Haven site. The abbey’s pans appear to have lain at either Prestonpans itself (including Cuttle), or at West Pans.

Towards the end of the thirteenth century the numbers of lay-brothers being recruited into Cistercian monasteries had declined catastrophically and they disappear as a class by the middle of the 1300s. By that date, the removal of the privilege on novalia and significant shifts in the economic structures of western European society generally, after the shocks of the agrarian crises of the early 1300s, the Great European Famine of 1315-22 and the Great Mortality of 1347-51, had seen many monasteries shift towards the leasing of their outlying properties as well as an increased emphasis on hired labour. Granges, as compact blocks of property, were easily disposed of at lease, with only those closest to the home monasteries, from which the immediate household requirements of the convent could be met, being retained in the hands of the monks. At Prestongrange, Newbattle seems to have followed this general trend and the property appears to have been leased to lay tenants throughout the later Middle Ages. It was in lay hands that the commercial potential of the estate was developed.
Potential for a wider examination of the monastic grange is clearly to be seen in the surviving documents. Records relating to the Newbattle lands of Prestongrange survive in far greater quantities than are preserved in the Registrum Sancte Marie de Neubotive, although the majority are late documents concerned primarily with the feuing of the abbey’s properties. There is a substantial group of late writs, feu-charters and tacks in the Grant-Suttie collection, much of it very detailed and which provides a significant record of the development of several of the families who dominated the land-holding pattern of Prestongrange and Prestonpans in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. Taken in conjunction with the material in the Registrum, these unpublished documents would enable a detailed picture of the progressive alienation of the old monastic estate into the hands of lay tenants to be constructed and, again, provide a richly textured record of the wider context within which the Prestongrange properties developed.

The Barony of Prestongrange

Although the grange had been disposed of to lay tenants, Newbattle retained the superior lordship of the lands and had reversionary rights to it, i.e. should the lay occupier die without heirs, the property would return to the monastery’s direct control. Thus, in all the general confirmations of the monastery’s properties through the pre-Reformation period, and in ratifications down to the erection of the abbey into the temporal lordship of Newbattle for its commendator, Mark Ker, in 1587, the Prestongrange lands were listed as a component of the estate. When this act was ratified in 1591, Prestongrange was instituted as a component barony of Ker’s lordship, and confirmed as such in 1606 when Mark Ker was created 1st earl of Lothian. Although there is record of a John Morison buying the property in 1609, Prestongrange was still firmly in Ker hands in that year and was confirmed as a portion of the Newbattle lordship in a royal charter. It was only later in the 1610s when the Ker family was encountering significant financial problems that the lands were firstfeued then sold to help ease the burden of debt.

The barony of Prestongrange passed through several hands in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. In 1617, Robert Ker, 2nd earl of Lothian, son of Mark Ker II, Lord Newbattle and 1st earl of Lothian, had a charter of his in favour of Thomas Hope, advocate, ratified by the crown. This charter settled the barony of Prestongrange and its component properties on Hope, for an annual rent of 10 merks. Hope was a very controversial character who was involved in defending opponents of James VI religious policies, who rose to become Lord Advocate and a baronet under Charles I, but who still undermined the king’s position in the crisis of the 1630s. He was also a noted acquirer of properties around the Firth of Forth most notably from debt-burdened estates, developing interests in both Fife and Lothian, of which Prestongrange was clearly one. Hope relinquished his lease by 1622, when the property passed to another of his legal colleagues, Alexander Morrison. On 11 July 1622, the earl of Lothian’s charter confirming the sale of the barony of Prestongrange to Morrison was ratified by the crown, and on 29 August the king erected Morrison’s holding into a free barony. There is little evidence for the elder Alexander Morrison’s possession of the estate and he appears most often in the context of an Edinburgh lawyer with landed interests in Banffshire and Fife rather than East Lothian.

More information relating to the barony and lands begins to become available from the 1630s onwards. Alexander Morrison senior died in late 1631 and on 3 January 1632, Alexander Morison of Prestoungrange was retoured as heir of Master Alexander Morison, Senator of the College of Justice, his father, in the lands and barony of Prestongrange. The barony as detailed in that document comprised an extensive spread of landed property and other rights that had formerly formed part of the lordship of Newbattle. Amongst the lands were properties in Salt-Preston, comprising half of the toun and its arable fields, the mill of
Prestoungrange, the port of Acheson’s Haven, the adjacent grain mills known as the Seamills, and the land that had formed the abbey’s rabbit-warren. Exactly the same components are listed in the retour of Alexander’s son, dated 31 December 1684, which should alert us to the formulaic repetition of these legal documents. It is entirely possible that significant developments that had occurred on the property between the 1630s and 1680s have been masked by the formulaic format of the retour.

Alexander Morison jnr died in late 1684 and the estate devolved upon his son, William. Under William’s management, the Morisons of Prestongrange experienced both the apogee and extinction of their personal fortunes, with William at first enjoying a very successful political career as a lawyer, Member of the Scottish Parliament for East Lothian, Privy Councillor, Commissioner in the Union negotiations, then MP for Peeblesshire and Sutherland. Exploiting his political connections to the full, he instituted a radical programme of economic development on his Prestongrange estate, improving the harbour and existing coal- and salt-workings and establishing a glass manufactory and, possibly, a pottery. A key indication of his personal prominence in Scottish elite society was the marriage secured in October 1704 for his eldest daughter, Katherine, to William, Lord Strathnaver, the heir to the earldom of Sutherland. The marriage occurred at the peak of William’s career, which spanned the first decade of the 1700s. Thereafter, involvement in a number of rather questionable legal actions, bad financial investments – including £1000 invested in the Company of Scotland’s Darien venture - and saddled with a son who was described as ‘useless and continually drinking’ and ‘capable of no business’, Prestongrange’s fortunes slid progressively towards failure. Amongst the burdens on his estate were the tochers paid to husbands of his daughters. In 1707, Morison offered a tocher of 60,000 merks for the marriage of his third daughter to John Boyle, 2nd earl of Glasgow, but in 1711, there was a dispute with the Arbuthnott family over the tocher arrangements for the marriage of his second daughter, Jean, to John, 5th viscount Arbuthnott. Morison offered 40,000 merks, but Arbuthnott wanted 50,000. Morison eventually agreed to 50,000 but with 10,000 to be returned to Morison by Arbuthnott when he reached the age of 21. In 1716, Arbuthnott succeeded in getting this agreement overturned at law in a Court of Session suit which described the deal as ‘contra fidem tabularum nuptualis’ (against the spirit of the marriage contract). The ranks of the husbands found for his daughters – two earls and a viscount – plus the tochers paid, provide a very clear indication of the perceived wealth and prominence of the Morison family despite their lack of a title. As the anxiety over Jean’s tocher in 1711 shows, however, Morrison’s finances were far from able to bear the weight of such generosity. The dissolution of the estate followed William Morrison’s death in 1739 and the succession of his useless son. Even support from the Sutherlands was inadequate to preserve the family fortunes. The Morisons retained possession of the estate until 1746, when it was sold as part of a process of bankruptcy to the Lord Advocate, William Grant.

William Grant of Prestongrange, the second son of Francis Grant, Lord Cullen, was a member of another Scottish legal dynasty, was one of the pillars of the Hanoverian Establishment in Scotland and a key figure in the Government’s anti-Jacobite policies in the 1740s. His career was primarily spent in law and politics and his interest in the industrial aspects of the barony’s economy was apparently minimal. Indeed, it appears that he closed down what remained of the loss-making ventures of his predecessors, including the colliery. Grant died in 1764, leaving no son. The estate passed instead through his daughter, Janet, into the hands of the Lanarkshire-based Carmichaels of Carmichael, yet another legal dynasty. Janet’s husband, John Carmichael, succeeded to the family estates as 4th earl of Hyndford in 1767. Their Prestongrange properties were peripheral to their main interests, but appear to have been managed effectively under a series of bailies and factors, who leased substantial portions of the estate to commercial developers. Widowed in 1787, Janet, countess of Hyndford, took little direct interest in her properties other than as a source of income. On her death in 1818,
Prestongrange passed to her nephew, Sir James Suttie of Balgone, who changed his family name to Grant-Suttie thereafter. It was under the Grant-Sutties of Balgone that the main development of the coal mines and brick and tileworks occurred through the nineteenth century.xxviii

The overview of the barony undertaken for the project concentrated primarily on the possession of the estate by the Morison and Grant families. In constructing that overview, the focus was fixed chiefly on the activities which related most directly to the key sites subject to archaeological examination and it needs to be stressed that there is a large quantity of material available that would illustrate the wider activities of those families in the Scottish historical record, the wider development of their landed, mercantile and industrial interests, and the management of the barony in their hands. Again, the volume of material increases significantly post-1800, or rather post-1818 with the inheritance of the barony by the Grant-Sutties, and an examination of this material would have required considerably more time than was available for the current phase of research.

The Haven: Gilbert’s Draught, Milnhaven, Newhaven of Preston, Acheson’s Haven, and Morrison’s Haven

According to the Rev. John Trotter’s 1793 submission to the Statistical Account, Morrison’s Haven, as it was by then called, was the only harbour in the parish of Prestonpans.xxix He described it as lying a little to the west of Prestonpans proper, having 10 feet of water at full tide, and that it was commonly reckoned one of the safest harbours on the Firth of Forth. The importance of the harbour is indicated by the presence here of a custom-house whose district stretched from the Figgat Burn on the west to the mouth of the Tyne north of Dunbar on the east. Within that district the only customs port was Morrison’s Haven and its nearest creeks were Musselburgh to the west and Port Seton to the east.xxx Clearly, this was the most significant harbour along the whole south shore of the Firth between Leith and Dunbar.

The origins of the harbour date from 1526, when on 22 April James V authorised Edward Schewill, abbot of Newbattle, the superior lord of the property, ‘special licence for building a port in the place known as Gilbertis-draucht’.xxxi The grant, according to the Great Seal charter permitting the construction of the harbour, had arisen from an appeal from the abbot, who had claimed that:

the fishermen upon the sea-shore within the lands of Prestoun-grange… have sustained loss, and several of them have been drowned in the sea by tempests of the air for want of a good port…

The 1526 award also granted the abbots of Newbattle the rights to receive and collect ‘port moneys, customs and duties from persons, boats and ships mooring in the said port’, under the same arrangements as applied at Leith. A 1541 confirmation of this act provides considerably more information in respect of the construction and management of the new harbour, rehearsing within it a feu-charter of 23 April 1526 which was not enrolled in the Great Seal Register at the time if James V’s original award.xxxii

The 23 April charter records the demission in feu-ferme by Abbot Edward and his convent to ‘their servant’ Alexander Atkinsoun, described as ‘commoranti’ or residing in Salt-Prestoun, of the coastal properties of Preston-grange. Later documents suggest that Alexander’s surname may have been Achesoun rather than Atkinsoun.xxxiii What was feued to him comprised:
The landing-stage (Latin, *ripa*, a hithe, wharf, landing-stage) commonly called Gilbert-draught situated within the tide-way (Latin, *fluxum maris*), to the effect of building a harbour, extending to half an acre of open lands (Latin, *terrarum campestrium*), for entry and shelter of ships and vessels, and half an acre from their grass (Latin, *viridarius*, literally meaning a green place or a green), *lie grene*, adjacent to the said harbour on the landward side of the tide-way, for the construction of houses and other necessary works for the construction of ships and vessels chancing to be built there...

Clearly, Gilberts-draught was not in any sense a formal harbour with built facilities and may, indeed, have been little more than an open mooring-place, possibly at a break in the shelving reefs which run parallel to the shore along this stretch of the coast. Whilst there was maritime activity going on here before 1526, this act set in motion the commercial development of the haven.

The award also granted Alexander the teind of the fishing within Salt-Prestoun and the right of free harbour. The property was to be held by Alexander and his heirs male of tail, and would revert to the monastery should these fail. In return, Alexander would pay 40 shillings fore payment and an ‘augmentation’ of 5 merks annually, with a doubling of the ferme at entry of heirs. Also, since the rabbit warren (*cunicularium*) of the abbey was situated near the port and would most likely be lost on account of the house construction, Alexander would satisfy the monks by giving them annually 12 brace of rabbits between All Souls (1 November) and the Feast of the PVM (Purification of the Virgin Mary – 2 February), or three shillings for each pair. In return, Alexander was given faculty to intromit with the profits of the warren. The conclusion of the 23 April agreement gives an indication of the ambitions which were held for the new harbour, for the convent stipulated that:

> when sale of grain, fish etc should occur at the said port, the said abbot and convent should be forewarned and be satisfied for their supply needs before all others…

This was not intended to be simply a fishing-haven, but a fully fledged trading port dealing in bulk commodities.

That the port was already a going concern before the 23 April 1541 feu charter is established by the entry in the Exchequer Rolls for 1542 of the accounts of the custumar of ‘Newhavin de Prestoun’, which covered the period 1 April 1541 to 4 July 1542. Unsurprisingly, the custumar was Alexander Aitkinsoun, and his accounts were rendered at Edinburgh by his son, John, who was to play a key role later in the 1540s in developing the port facilities. The customs collected amount to £5 4s charged on 52 chalders of salt, with no other customable goods being reported. From this sum, Alexander drew 21d as his fee and charged 24s for ‘the making and sculpting of a seal of the office of custumar of the said port’, leaving a return of £3.18s.3d to the Exchequer. The making of the custumar’s seal provides some circumstantial evidence that it was only in this year that trade through the port either commenced or reached a level to make a separate custumar for it necessary.

The second custumar’s account shows considerable expansion of trade in customable goods through the ‘Newhavin’. Again submitted by John Aitkinsoun in the name of his father, these cover the period from 4 July 1542 to 23 March 1544. The account detailed 28s custom on 2 lasts 4 barrels of unspecified fish; £8.8s for 3 lasts 6 dares of hides; 48s for 4 lasts of tar; £5.4s for 50 chalders of salt; and 4s for an unspecified quantity of lead. This produced a total of £17.9s. Allowance, however, was made for £12.5s of custom on the bulk of this trade in respect of losses made on one trading voyage when John and his ship had been seized by
Flemings, plundered, impounded and detained by them for the space of five months. The implication from this allowance is that trade through this port was handled almost exclusively by Achesoun younger and carried in a vessel owned by his family.

There is a break in the submitted accounts for the port from 1544 until 1554, when ‘John Achesoune, son and heir apparent of Alexander Achesoune, dwelling in Preston, custumar of Newhavin of Prestoun’ presented his compt through his agent, John Murdoch.xxxvi For the period 23 March 1544 to 10 April 1554, he accounted for only £27 of custom. He secured an allowance of £15 against this sum for the first five years of the period since, he claimed, ‘no goods had been customed at the said port for the said time, because the port had been laid waste by invasion of our old enemies of England at Haddington…’. Certainly, the English garrisons in places such as Haddington, Broughty Castle at the mouth of the Tay, and Hume Castle in the Merse, undertook actions targeted at the economic resources of the Scots in their neighbourhoods and inflicted significant damage on trade through Dundee, for example. The English government was certainly aware of the significance of the new haven, instructions to the English military commanders in Scotland dated 27 June 1548 reporting that ‘Preston haven’ offered an obvious revictualling point for the army as it advanced towards Edinburgh.xxxvii The value of the harbour as both a supply point for an army moving by land up the east coast from Berwick and also as a landing place for a sea-borne assault was clearly recognised. This brief mention appears to be the only reference to the haven in English accounts relating to the ‘Rough Wooing’ period, but, coupled with Achesoun’s later statement concerning the wasting of the port, it is probable that significant damage to facilities and to trade was caused. It was perhaps the experience of the late 1540s that prompted the Achesouns to consider measures for the more effective defence of their investment.

Alexander and John Achesoun may have had grandiose plans for their port. Such ambitions were not uncommon in this period, with the Frasers of Philorth commencing their development of what became Fraserburgh and the Earls Marischal beginning the enlargement of Peterhead. Both of those families, however, had access to far more significant economic resources and political connections to underpin their commercial enterprises, but the Achesouns were not without additional means of support and certainly not without dreams of creating a major commercial centre. In a letter of the French king Henri II to Marie de Guise, regent of Scotland, sent in 1553, reference is made to considerable works undertaken by ‘Jehan Acheson’ at ‘ung havre nomme le port du Moulin pres le petit Lict’ (a haven named the port of the Mill near the little ‘Lict’ [Leith?]).xxxviii King Henri described Achesoun as an archer in the Garde Ecossais, the elite bodyguard of the French monarchs, and towards the conclusion of his letter notes that 100 Scottish horsemen had just come overseas to him and that he had given command of them and the rank of captain to Achesoun.xxxix Achesoun had clearly briefed the king well, for Henri described how the harbour had been built ‘to receive ships in all winds and seas’ and that the work had been started by John’s father, who ‘at the beginning employed a good sum of money on the hope that the promise which my said good brother [James V of Scotland] made to him of procuring some benefice for one of his sons’ would come to fruition. It had not, yet the Achesouns had not only built but had begun to strengthen the harbour, although the works remained incomplete at the date of writing.xl Henri was writing in an effort to persuade Marie to share the cost of the work because of the advantages that it could bring her, and urging her to secure Achesoun the promised benefice or pension – valued at the princely sum of 1000 livres. What is being referred to here was a military fortification rather than simply a reinforcement of the harbour walls, the ‘deux entrees et deux boullevoirs’ of King Henri’s letters apparently referring to a double bastioned arrangement, but it is remarkable that no further notice of the defences occurs in any sixteenth-century source.xli Clearly, work was undertaken there, for reference to repairs being carried out on a fort there in 1727 appears to confirm its existence.xlii What is clear, however, is that Achesoun was pushing the idea that his all-weather harbour was a key installation on
the otherwise harbourless south shore of the Forth estuary between Leith and Dunbar, and that he merited a reward both for his foresight in underwriting this work and also to secure his future loyalty.

Achesoun’s development of the harbour and Henri II’s recognition of its strategic significance gave the haven added importance in the Wars of the Congregation at the end of Marie de Guise’s regency, the collapse of the French-led Catholic regime in Scotland, and the establishment of a Protestant government. With the main port on the Forth estuary, Leith, fortified and in French hands, Acheson’s Haven was the only port in the region at which a sea-borne force could land safely in harbour rather than having to be ferried ashore in small – and vulnerable – boats. It became, therefore, a key facility to be controlled in the struggle to overthrow the French ascendency but, interestingly, there is no evidence that the fortifications were considered a threat. In February 1560, the Lords of the Congregation of Christ, leaders of the protestant opposition to the Regent, wrote to the English authorities and offered to assemble 5000 men under arms at Acheson’s Haven by 25 March, where they would link up with an English expeditionary force before marching to lay siege to Leith. The Lords also offered to supply draught horses necessary to draw artillery and wagons from the landing-place to the siege. There is, however, no clear evidence that the haven was used as the entry point for the invasion force.

The significance of the new harbour is again made apparent by a charter confirmed under the Privy Seal on 22 September 1569, whereby the Comptroller (the controller of the royal revenues), Sir William Murray of Tullibardine, consented to the gift to Archibald Stewart, younger brother of Sir James Stewart of Doune, and his wife, Helen Achesoun, of the right to uplift the customs and duties of ‘Newhaven of Prestoun’ for a period of nineteen years at a tack of £3. Helen Achesoun was the daughter of Alexander Achesoun, laird of Gosford, and the terms of the gift specified that should they die without direct heirs, the right would pass to her brother, Alexander Achesoun jnr. It appears to have been by this route that a controlling interest in the harbour was retained by the Achesoun family, whereby their name was given to the ‘Newhaven of Prestoun’. Evidently, trade through the port had grown substantially since 1526 and the customs offered a lucrative source of income to be milked by speculators. There are indications that either the earlier Achesoons had been understating the custom revenue received or that trade had grown massively in the 1570s under the administration of Archibald Stewart, for his account for 1 January 1573 to 16 February 1575 yielded £194 on 810 chalders of salt, more than an eight fold increase on the previous reported levels of customable goods through the harbour. The Exchequer account gives only salt as the customable export, but in February 1574 a case had been brought before the Exchequer by Robert Watson, custumar of Edinburgh, against Lucas Wilson, burgess of Edinburgh and Archibald Stewart, also burgess of Edinburgh but also custumar at Acheson’s Haven. Watson was claiming £36 custom owed by Wilson on ‘hydis, woll and skynnis’ that had been shipped from Acheson’s Haven to Leith, who claimed that he had paid custom on these items to Stewart and that he was now being double customed. Stewart, in his turn, denied having received the custom payment and the court eventually found against Wilson. The £36 figure indicates that this was a significant amount of goods being shipped and helps to underscore the development of the port as an important outlet for the produce of the agricultural hinterland of East Lothian.

It is in this context as a trading port that the harbour appears in June 1575, by which date it was already being referred to as ‘Achesoun’s Haven’, possibly after the feu-fermer named in 1526, but more likely after Helen Achesoun and her family, who were prominent in the parishes of Prestonpans, Tranent and Aberlady. The port occurs in the record of litigation brought by two English merchants against John Aytoun of Haddington for breach of contract. They had been coasting up the Firth to Leith with a cargo of malt and wheat when Aytoun
had boarded them and made an acceptable offer which he subsequently failed to honour. On 5 June the Privy Council ordered Aytoun and his partners to buy half the cargo at the agreed price and permitted the balance to be shipped ‘fra Achesonis Havin to any uther part of this realme’. The implication from this is that a substantial trade in produce was already being conducted through the harbour as the established customs port for the western district of East Lothian, involving merchants and dealers from Haddington such as Aytoun and his colleagues, and again reinforcing the point that by the mid 16th century ‘Acheson’s Haven’ was a conduit for trade. The high volume of exports recorded in 1573-1575 was, however, not repeated. Archibald Stewart’s second custumar’s return to the Exchequer in 1582 yielded only £42 for the period 16 February 1575 to 2 February 1582. Unfortunately, this account does not specify the nature of the goods exported on which custom was levied.

Although Archibald Stewart had a nineteen-year tack of the customs of Newhaven of Preston, and the agreement had been confirmed in a charter under the Privy Seal in 1569, in 1581-1582, Stewart’s rights were challenged in the Exchequer. On 25 January 1582, the Lords Auditors of the Exchequer agreed to receive a composition of £42 for seven years’ custom due by Stewart, instructing him to pay the following day. They went on to instruct that he was in future to make account of his ‘haill intromission’ with the said custom, ‘nocht respectand his pretendit tak’. Despite his enrolled charter granting the tack, the Lords Auditors decided that he had no right to uplift the custom of the port. Despite this ruling, Stewart appears to have retained his position as custumar until shortly before the due date for the expiry of his tack.

In June 1587, an action for recovery of duty on salt exported from the harbour was begun against the new custumar, Mark Achesoun of Achesonisheavin, who had possibly acquired the tack of the customs from Helen Achesoun. Mark’s relationship to Helen is unclear, but he may have been a younger brother or cousin. In 1590, Mark submitted accounts to the Exchequer which show that he was paying a tack of £30. Sadly, although we can surmise that with a tack charge ten times greater than that paid by Archibald Stewart the volume of trade through the port was considered more than adequate to give Achesoun a good return on his gamble, we have no details as to what was being exported.

The scale of the development at Acheson’s Haven by this date emerges from a general charter of confirmation of the lands and rights of the monastery of Newbattle made to Mark Ker II, the commendator, when the abbey was erected into the temporal lordship of Newbattle on 28 July 1587. Included in the grant were:

the lands of Salt-Prestoun formerly pertaining to the said monastery, with half of the toune of Salt-Prestoun, houses and gardens, with the arable acres adjacent to the said toune with the mill and mill-lands near Prestoun-grange, with the port of Achesonis-hevin, with two grain mills adjacent to it, known as lie Seymilnis, with the Links of the sea adjacent...

In a ratification of the 1587 grant, dated 15 October 1591, mention is also made of the ‘manor-house’ and toune of Prestoungrange, coal pits, stone quarries, saltworks, lie girnelhousis or stores, and the rabbit warren mentioned in 1526. The harbour, therefore, appears to have comprised a complex of structures ranging from ‘houses’, which could be workshops and stores as well as residential buildings, yards for boat-building, two sea mills (discussed below) and their attendant buildings, at least two girnals (probably at West Pans rather than the haven itself) and an economically exploited rabbit warren. It was clearly a significant commercial venture and its fermor was a man of some economic stature.
Mark Acheson was clearly one of the key figures in the parish of Prestonpans and carried significant political and economic influence. He first comes to notice on 2 April 1586 when he stood caution to the sum of 500 merks each for four of his kinsmen and neighbours (James Johnstoun of Elphinstone, Alexander Achesoun of Gosford, John Achesoun of the Canongate, and John Johnstoun, brother of James), that none of the four would pursue Janet Heriot, widow of Captain John Achesoun, her tenants and servants, for the recovery of debts due from her late husband’s estate. Mark Achesoun’s exposure to losing up to 2000 merks indicates that he was a man of substance and it appears that he had probably acquired much of that wealth through trading speculation. Interestingly, he appears to have been another of Captain John Achesoun’s creditors, for on 7 April 1586 the head of the Achesoun family, Alexander Achesoun of Gosford, for whom Mark had stood caution only five days earlier, reciprocated by standing caution for 500 merks ‘that Jonnett Hereott, relict of Captain Johnne Achesoun, her bairnis, tenants and servants, shall be skaithless of the said Mark Achesoun’. Janet Heriot, however, was patently not a harassed or victimised widow, having her own past history of financial sleight-of-hand. In September 1571, the Edinburgh notary Gilbert Grote recorded a testimonial by Johnne Patersoun, Snawdoun Herald (one of the chief officers of the Lyon Court), setting two charges against Janet. The first of these narrated that an action had been raised before the Lords of Council between William Craik, former provost of Edinburgh, the bailies, council and community of the burgh, and Johnne Achesoun, described as ‘of the Mylnhavin, called Gilbertis Drawcht, beside Prestounpannis’, and Jonete Hereot his spouse, regarding an alleged wrong committed by her against Craik during the lifetime of Marie de Guise, Regent of Scotland (Marie was regent from 1554 until her death in 1560). The second point was that in June 1557, Patersoun had gone to Mylnhavin on the Regent’s business and, in Janet’s dwelling-house there, saw her receive the sum of £7 12 shillings Scots from William Craik for the great customs owed on a consignment of his fish, and 48 shillings for the small customs of 12 lasts of fish. Janet, it appears, was receiving and pocketing the customs money. This type of fraud, however, appears to have been a problem common in Scotland’s ports and Janet was not to be the last receiver of customs at Prestongrange to stand accused of this crime.

Mark Acheson’s designation as ‘of Achesoun Heavin’ points to the source of his wealth and provides us with an indication of the significance of the port which he controlled. Its chief value appears to have arisen from its role as the major outlet for the salt produced in nearby Prestonpans, which lacked a proper harbour of its own. The salt was a customable commodity and Mark managed the collection of the duty owed as ‘customary’ (collector of customs) of the port. In June 1587 the finger of accusation was pointed at Mark, who was charged with the fraudulent diversion of some of the moneys collected into his own pockets. On 24 June, Alexander Acheson of Gosford again stood caution for Mark, this time for an open ended sum, undertaking to ‘account for and pay to George Cheisholme comptroller of the ordnance, such sums of money as shall be found to have been intromitted with as for “the dewtie of every chalder of salt” exported by him since his entry into the office of customary of Achesonisheavin, and that he shall not uplift any such duty in time coming’. Already under a cloud from this affair, in July 1592 Mark Achesoun fell under suspicion of involvement with the ultra-Protestant leader, Francis Stewart, earl of Bothwell, who had been denounced as a traitor by the king. On 13 July, having failed to appear in court on a charge of association with Bothwell and his followers, Achesoun was denounced as a rebel. Achesoun survived this action only for him to be the subject on 4 July 1594 of a second cautionary bond paid by Gosford, this time for £1000, as surety that Achesoun would within six days place himself in ward at an unspecified place south of Haddington and remain there at the king’s pleasure, as a result of his continuing association with Bothwell and his part.
The seventeenth century provides a series of further details regarding the development of the harbour and changes in ownership or tenancy. In April 1602, the Privy Council ratified an act for the due payment of customs on goods passing through Scottish ports. Part of this act was a limitation on export through particular harbours and several ports around the Forth, including ‘Newhaven besyd Prestoun, callit Achesonis haven’, were prohibited from the import or export of any goods other than salt or coal. There appears by this date to have been several vessels using the port as their base, and operating a regular trade up and down the east coast of Britain. In April 1603, for example, the Privy Council ordered Alexander Hamilton and Robert Murdo to sail with their barque called the ‘Apiltrie’ to Scarborough or Bridlington, while Patrick Watson and Ninian Reid of the barque ‘Grace of God’ were to sail to ‘a port in England’. In 1607, another vessel, the ‘Margaret’ of Leith, appears also to have been active out of Acheson’s Haven. On 9 April 1607, her skipper, Thomas Melville, and business partners, William Leyis and John Affleck of Edinburgh, were summoned before the Privy Council on a charge brought by Mark, Earl of Lothian, ‘for damage done to him in the demolishing of his bulwark of Acheson’s Haven, alias Milhevin, by the said ship on 1st instant’. The reference to the bulwark indicates that the harbour took the form of either a long breakwater positioned someway offshore which sheltered a stretch of the shoreline behind, perhaps where an existing stream-mouth haven could be developed, or that it consisted of long piers which largely performed a similar function.

Details relating to the tenancy of the port are very sketchy for the early seventeenth century. On 7 August 1610, the retours were entered for the sisters Isabella and Elizabeth Barroun, heirs-portioners of the estate of James Barroun, merchant in Edinburgh, and wives of John Fairlie and James M’Morane, both merchants. Barroun’s estate comprised residential property in Saltpreston and portions of agricultural land in the adjacent rural hinterland, but also included ‘the rock and port known as Gilberts Draught, now Achesones heaven otherwise Milnhaven, with a half acre of grass lie Green of the same harbour adjoining, in the toun of Preston-pannis…’. There is no indication of when James Barroun took possession of the haven or under what circumstances, but he may have been infeft in the property by Lord Newbattle shortly after Mark Achesoun’s resignation in July 1602.

By the late 1600s the name change from Acheson’s Haven to Morrison’s Haven had established itself, and the harbour still commanded significance as one of only four all weather and relatively deep water facilities on the whole of the coast from Dunbar to Leith. One anonymous and apparently late seventeenth or very early eighteenth century account commented that ‘There are sea Harbours one at Dunbar, one at North-berwick, one at Cockeny and one at Morisons Haven. Sundry other creeks there are for Barks in summer time as Tynighame Aberlady, and Thorntonloch, and Sketraw’. One point that does emerge during this period is the elasticity of names and the very imprecise use attached to them. It appears that through the late 16th and 17th centuries, references to ships etc at Prestonpans are actually referring to the haven, as Prestonpans proper lacked any kind of harbour facility where vessels bigger than fishing-boats could be brought in. This point is demonstrated in a Privy Council decree of 16 August 1625 which referred to ‘ane ship of Præstoun, laitlie come from Lundone, laidinit with diverse soirtis of merchandice, and wherein thair is a grite number of passingeris…’ The ship had arrived at ‘the roade of Prestoun’ and, being suspected of carrying plague, should have waited in the roads until she had been declared free of contagion. Instead, her skipper had ‘thrust the said ship in the harborie callit Atchiesonis Haven, where they intend to sett there passingeris a land and to loasse and unloadin thair ship’. Prestonpans may have been able to handle vessels that sat offshore and to and from which passengers and goods could be ferried, but it was only at the Haven that there were true harbour facilities.
How far those facilities had developed beyond those built by the Achesouns between 1526 and the 1540s is unknown, but some significant repairs were probably necessary after the damage caused to the bulwark in 1607. It can be assumed that the operation was a significant business concern by the early decades of the seventeenth century, for the rental of the barony for 1630 shows that the harbour and mill contributed 600 merks annually to the estate income. This was a basis upon which to build. William Morison clearly intended to develop the harbour facilities in tandem with his attempts to establish an industrial complex on his Prestongrange estate. In 1700, he petitioned Parliament for an ‘imposition’ to allow for the moneys to be raised towards the costs of harbourworks, and claimed that the facilities had been damaged by a storm in 1655. He certainly had ambitions to develop his port into more than just an isolated harbour facility catering for the local needs of an agricultural hinterland, and may have planned to establish a more substantial community there. His ambitions must have been encouraged by the rapid expansion of the traffic through the haven in late 1680s and early 1690s, when the custom precinct of Prestonpans saw cargoes of coal, salt, skins, tallow and wool exported to ports in England, France, Holland, Norway, Denmark and Sweden, and the major entrepôts of London and Danzig. The rapid expansion at Prestonpans – the bulk of which would have been through Morrison’s Haven – was perhaps a consequence of lower harbour charges than were demanded at Leith and, possibly, the opportunities offered by a quicker turnaround time than the congested Edinburgh could offer. Imports were from an equally wide range of countries, plus occasional cargoes from as far afield as Greenland and Spain. In the last decades of the seventeenth century, therefore, it appears that trade through Morrison’s Haven and the lesser creeks of the Prestonpans precinct was expanding and it was probably this growth that stimulated further commercial speculation on Morrison’s part. Although there is no evidence that he sought to secure burgh status for the community at the harbour, to rival that of his neighbours the Hamiltons of Preston at Prestonpans, in 1701 he did secure an Act permitting him to establish an annual fair (on the last Tuesday in September) and a weekly Friday market at Morrison’s Haven.

Although Angus Graham suggested tentatively that some probably eighteenth-century work still visible in the remains of the pier in the early 1960s dated from William Morrison’s repairs immediately after 1700, the main work probably dates from the subsequent works undertaken in the 1710s and 1720s. The repairs were evidently completed by 1724-5, and a memorandum of 11 October 1727 recording arrangements for the coronation celebrations for George II (1727-60), noted that three pillars had been erected ‘upon the peer at Morisons haven’ three years earlier, probably around the time of its completion. The pillars may have been intended as navigation aids rather than simply as decoration. The same account notes the presence at the ceremony of William Morison and the ‘Commissioners appointed by Act of parliament for repairing Morisons haven the fort and lighthouse’, and ‘the Gentillmen that had contributed for the repairing the new peer’. Provision of a lighthouse is an interesting and early development, but no further references to it have been found in the documents consulted.

While Morrison was claiming in 1700 that the harbour was storm-damaged and in dire need of repair, the customs port of Prestonpans in 1707 (the only harbour of which was Morrison’s Haven) occupied eighth place in the ranking of Scottish ports by tonnage of registered vessels, with 6 vessels and 725 tons. Although it had slipped to tenth place by 1712, the number of vessels had increased to 26 and the tonnage to 2082. Of this total, 20 vessels were based in the head port and only 6 in the creeks associated with it, e.g. Port Seton and Aberlady. At twenty vessels, it was a fifth the size of Leith, but carried a quarter of the tonnage, and was still ranked seventh on that basis in the ranking of east coast ports. Two ships alone, however, accounted for over a quarter of the tonnage operating out of the Haven – the 250-tonners Marion and Margaret – which were ninth-equal in the table of Scottish
merchantmen in the early 1700s.\textsuperscript{\textnormal{lxxxi}} That Morrison’s Haven could accommodate such vessels suggests that the 1700-1707 repairs were more than adequate, while the post-1707 works were probably a reflection of the continued aspirations of the harbour’s owners for the mercantile success of their project.

Morrison’s hopes appear to have been sadly deluded, for the port of Prestonpans went into protracted decline in the period from 1712 to 1759. From a high of 2082 tons of registered vessels in 1712, the port dropped to only 393 tons in 1759, representing a mere 19\% of its former share.\textsuperscript{\textnormal{lxxxii}} About 20\% of Prestonpan’s tonnage may have been lost to Dunbar, which was the only Forth port to expand in the period, but overall the tonnage registered at the ports around the Firth of Forth contracted by 33\% over the four decades. In part, the decline was probably a consequence of post-Union adjustment in the nature and flow of trade, with traditional Scottish exports such as salt and coal suffering from the competition it was now exposed to from cheaper English supplies. Nevertheless, in the late eighteenth century the port was still the most significant harbour on the coast between Leith and Dunbar\textsuperscript{\textnormal{lx\text{xxxiii}}} and was home to a small but thriving import and export trade, the latter by this period mainly in fish and shellfish for the English market.\textsuperscript{\textnormal{lx\text{xxxiv}}} For the most part, the later eighteenth and early nineteenth century imports appear to have been bulk raw materials used in the stoneware manufacture in the parish, plus grain and other agricultural produce for local consumption. This employed fine clays imported from suppliers in Devon, flint from Kent and red and white lead from London, Hull and Newcastle, for use in the glazing of the pots.\textsuperscript{\textnormal{lxxxv}} Although the bulk of the pottery appears to have been intended for the domestic market, there was also a significant export trade in the stone- and earthenwares produced to European ports, the West Indies and North America.

Angus Graham has provided a detailed examination of evidence relating to the eighteenth- and nineteenth-century phases of the harbour’s life,\textsuperscript{\textnormal{lxxxvi}} and David Anderson has assembled further material of value.\textsuperscript{\textnormal{lxxxvii}} Taken together, the assembled material can provide a very detailed picture of the evolution, apogee and decline of the Haven and its place in the wider life of the local community. There is a very important story to be told here of a port which may have started out with the aim of challenging Leith’s local dominance of the Lothian shore of the Firth of Forth and which did emerge for a while as a harbour of national and, indeed, international significance. There is a substantial volume of additional material to be examined in greater detail than was possible at this stage, in particular the customs records for the Precinct of Prestonpans, which would permit a far more nuanced record of the commodities imported and exported through the Haven to be produced. It should also be possible to recover more detailed records of the various parliamentary commissions set up in the eighteenth century to undertake the repair or expansion of the facilities. Further potential lines for inquiry would be Board of Ordnance records which might contain materials relating to harbour defences and the fort (see below) and the Records of Trinity House of Leith.\textsuperscript{\textnormal{lxxxviii}} Perhaps the most valuable material, however, would be the Papers of the Thomson Family of Morrison’s haven (GD1/1015), in particular the two pilot books of William Thomson, junior, which date from January 1906 through to 1937.\textsuperscript{\textnormal{lxxxix}} These books give times of the arrival and departure of vessels, the names of the captains, ports of origin and destination, sometimes giving the drafts of the vessels, and cargoes. There are notes on imports and exports, and numbers of vessels entering the harbour during 1894-1905. The later pilot book also lists the boats laid up in the harbour from 1914 until 1937. Taken together, this collection contains the most detailed record of the twilight years of the harbour’s functioning life.

The Fort

The first indication of the existence of fortifications at the Haven dates from the letter of Henri II of France to Marie de Guise, regent of Scotland, written in 1554.\textsuperscript{\textnormal{xc}} It announced that
John Acheson of Milnhaven, who at that date was a member of the Guard Ecossais, had commenced construction of a defence for the harbour which, Henri commented, was of great significance to the security of the country. The fortification, for which John wanted to secure some financial reward, does not appear to have been very substantial, with Henri’s letter describing it as comprising ‘deux entrees et deux boullevoirs’. The ‘boullevoirs’ or bastions, in fortifications of this date were usually constructed in trios, to provide all-round defence, although arrangements would be altered to suit the lie of the land. At Eyemouth, David Caldwell’s excavations revealed that the near contemporary English-built fortifications had only a single bastion placed at the mid-point of a rampart thrown across the narrow neck of the headland occupied by the fort. This bastion could provide fire along the face of the rampart in both directions. How much of this defence was ever built, however, is entirely open to question.

King Henri’s description, which appears to be based on discussions with Acheson himself, demonstrates that what was planned for the harbour was a fortification, not a residence. It is highly unlikely that Acheson occupied any part of such a fortification, which was clearly intended to be an artillery emplacement, as a house. As suggested by David Anderson, however, Acheson did possess a house at the haven, where John Paterson, Snawdoun Herald visited Janet Preston, John’s wife, in 1557. Paterson’s account, however, tells us simply that the house was at the haven and gives no further clue as to its location within the complex. Given Acheson’s status, it is likely to have been a substantial, stone-built property and, since Acheson was active himself as a merchant, likely also to have possessed cellars and storerooms. Such structures are possible candidates for identification with the ‘vaults’ recorded to the south of the harbour in 1853-70.

No evidence for the fort’s continued existence has been found between 1554 and 1727, although there is a persistent tradition that the defences were destroyed by the Cromwellian army as it re-advanced towards Edinburgh after defeating the Scots at Dunbar on 3 September 1650. Either that event, or long neglect, required the refurbishment of the fort during the reign of George I (1714-27), possibly to counter what was regarded as the considerable risk of a French invasion force arriving in the Firth of Forth in support of a Jacobite attempt. In October 1727, amongst the guests at the coronation celebrations for George II at the harbour were the commissioners who had been appointed with William Morison to supervise the refurbishment of the defences. As part of the festivities, guns were fired, possibly from the fort.

Given that the fort was repaired only shortly before 1727, it is remarkable that the 1753 harbour plan does not identify its site positively and it cannot be simply assumed that the ‘vaults’ it records mark the remains of the sixteenth-century defences. While the probability is strong that substantial stone-built remains are likely to be the vestiges of the fortifications, it has to be borne in mind that ‘girnehousis’ are also mentioned in the sixteenth century, and, if these were anything like the surviving examples around the Moray Firth, their ground floor would have been substantially vaulted to support the dead weight of the dry goods stored on the upper level.

There is no unequivocal evidence for the location of what was believed to be the fort until 1853, when the OS surveyors visited the site. Foundations visible to the south of the harbour, between a circular pond and the inner basin of the later eighteenth-century works, were identified for them by the then minister of Prestongrange as the last vestiges of the fortification. In 1902, however, a published account of Prestonpans parish referred to the discovery on the western side of the harbour entrance during deepening operations in 1870 of ‘an old fort’, described as ‘a three cornered building with gun holes in it’. This three cornered arrangement carries echoes of King Henri’s ‘boullevoirs’ or three-cornered bastions,
and raises the possibility that it was the harbour structure itself that was fortified rather than the fort sitting behind it on the mainland. This interpretation raises intriguing possibilities, not least that the ‘bulwark’ which Mark Ker complained had been ‘destroyed’ by a ship colliding with it in 1607 could have formed one side of the harbour-mouth defences. Sadly, McNeill recorded that the remains of the structure were removed to permit the widening of the entrance.

The scanty evidence relating to the fort hardly permits of any categorical assertions, but it seems unlikely that the ‘vaults’ recorded south of the harbour’s inner basin in the second half of the nineteenth century were remains of the defences. Siting behind the harbour makes little obvious defensive sense, particularly if there were vessels in the harbour which would have obscured the sighting of any artillery in the fort. It seems more likely that the vaults are remains of either the house occupied by the Achesons in the mid-sixteenth century, or of undercroft of the girmels recorded around the same period.

This structure remains the most enigmatic and elusive component of the Morrison’s Haven complex. Despite a careful search of the surviving Morrison records, only one post-1550s reference to the fortifications was found. The records overall are decidedly ambiguous and, although the new material identified leaves no question of the fort’s existence, there is still no clarity on either the form of the structure or its precise location. The sixteenth-century material could be describing a fortified harbour rather than a land-based fort behind the harbour, and the site ascribed traditionally for it at ‘the vaults’ may instead be that of the Achesons’ house or other non-military structure. The reference to repairs undertaken shortly before 1727 should have more substantial records to back it up, and a search of the records of the UK parliament for 1707 to 1727 should reveal the commissions and possibly reports on works undertaken. It is possible that there may be material in Board of Ordnance records, possibly in relation, too, to Government Barracks maintained down to the end of the eighteenth century. The significance of this fortification in the defences of the Firth of Forth has not been recognised in terms of either the French-inspired or built artillery works of the mid-sixteenth century or the Queen Anne and early Hanoverian fortifications developed to counter the threat of a French-backed Jacobite invasion after 1707.

Colliery

David Anderson’s report on the colliery provides a detailed account of the nineteenth- and twentieth-century history of coal-working at Prestongrange. He highlights several areas where more research is required, but provides a comprehensive overview of the main trends and developments. This present discussion, therefore, focuses on the pre-1800 operations.

Although coal was being extracted from the ground in the Tranent/Prestonpans area from the second half of the twelfth century at least, significant coal-workings on the Prestongrange estate appear to have been mainly 17th-century in date rather than having medieval origins. Coal was being produced in the eastern half of the parish at an earlier date, probably originally to supply the salt-masters of Prestonpans, and there was certainly early awareness of the existence of exploitable coal in Prestongrange. ‘Coal-works’ (carbonarii) are mentioned in Mark Kerr’s charter of the lordship of Newbattle from his father in 1591, and in Thomas Hope’s charter from Robert, earl of Lothian, in 1617, but these do not seem to have been exploited to any significant extent other, perhaps, than to supply immediate estate needs. Nevertheless, the inclusion of Acheson’s Haven in the list of unfree ports around the Forth estuary whose trade was restricted by Privy Council order in 1602 to only salt and coal suggests that there may have been shipment from the harbour (although this restriction may have been part of a general statement of principle rather than recognition of fact). Given the problems of transporting coal long distances by land at this date, it is unlikely that it was
being brought from significantly far away from the haven, which offers some circumstantial evidence for production for more than just estate requirements by the early 1600s. Their larger scale development was probably begun by Sir Alexander Morison, for by 1624 the burgesses of Kinghorn in Fife were complaining that coal exports through ports such as Acheson’s Haven were affecting their coal trade. The main expansion, however, appears to have been mainly driven by William Morison, whose efforts as a business entrepreneur in the 1690s and early 1700s deserve much wider recognition.

There is no certain date for when the production from the mines was expanded, but the mine adit mill at the east of the site appears to have been in operation from the early seventeenth century. Readily available fuel supplies may have been another factor in the decision to develop the glassworks here in the early seventeenth century and, while coal exports certainly continued, it is probable that William Morison intended to use his own coal to supply the glass-works at the Haven in the late 1690s. In the 1720s it is evident that his surviving salt-panns were also being supplied with fuel from his own pits (see below). At first, Morison appears to have seen tremendous potential in developing his coal extraction interests, and as late as January 1726/7, despite his already deep financial problems, was acquiring mines in Co Durham. He had clearly invested heavily in developing his collieries and had installed ‘engines’ in his Prestongrange pits at what appears to have been considerable – and unnecessary – expense. Sadly, we do not have any indication as to the nature of these mechanisms but their purpose appears primarily to have been extraction of water (‘there is no okeson for fayer ingens nor no other ingen for teken a we the water…’). As Morrison’s financial crisis grew in the later 1720s, he evidently looked at any means to reduce his burden of debt and liability. By 1727, he was looking either to lease the coal-workings on his land and details of the colliery and its productivity were made available to speculators who were seeking to build up holdings in what was a rapidly expanding industrial sector, or to develop the works for his own direct profit. Morison had called in a mining engineer from the English coalfields to assess the quality of the mines and advise on potential developments. The engineer, John Moore, commented on 9 October 1727 in a letter to Morrison’s bailie:

I was doun in al his collworks and I never sied the liek befor/ and I see that ther is no okeson nother for fayer ingens nor no other ingen for teken a we the water/ for if he will gief me my wille of the collwork I wille mek him a Coren gon work for mene a eare and he shall be at no gret cer ges of land/ I will hiv fourer simes goen both the 5 fut Coll and the Splente Coll and the Rough Coll and the Dofer Coll which will be 4 simes in all and I haf [unreadable] him in a we to kiep his salts pans gon and for a litoll bite of a miend to drafe he will mak a gon coll for mene a eare/ god gon I upon the hied of the Som I wad not sink it much to mek good gon coll as efor was thar befor/ prestongreng simes to tek my advise and no otherbodes/ I do not kno if he will stand by it/ he simes to haf me ther all together and I wis to god it war sun/ I wad be content to haf al my busines to do him serefes [unreadable] if promises to send me word as sun as that Coll pit is dun…

Moore clearly saw potential in the colliery to produce a good supply of quality coals – including splint, which burns with a high intensity of heat - from four separate seams. Some of this was clearly intended to be used for the requirements of Morrison’s own salt-panns at Saltpreston/Prestonpans, but there was also a wider commercial motive on the laird’s part. Moore, however, appears to have understood Morrison’s financial status at the time and recognised that although he had appeared to listen to and accept everything that the engineer had said, that in itself was no guarantee that the advice would be listened to. The concern
resurfaces in a letter written a fortnight later, when no reply had been received from either Morison or from Fearne to his first report:

I am very much surprised att you in not writing to me or att lest to send me the answer off the last letter yt I have send you ffor I wrote to you particulary how Prestongrainge and I have greed/ I was doun at all the Coal works for the 5th foot coal that they are working just now and the splint coal/ I see that its very possiable to make them going coals for severall years for small charges the rock coal and Dover coal/ there was a pile marked one the Dover coal to serve the salt pans befor I left you/ [Unreadable] strange mightily that Prestongrainge has not write to me or to let me know how that pile is prov’d for.  His 5th foot coal and the splint coal.  If he’d give me my will of them, as he promised Ile make you going coals for severall years for very small charges.  Yowll speak to Prestongrainge and tell him to send me answers to the last letter that I send him and likewise yowll ffavoure me with the answer of this by the first opportunity.cix

There is no indication that Moore ever got his reply.  Morison was still operating his colliery in March 1735 when his grandson, the Earl of Sutherland, requested that he send him ten of his colliers for the mines which he was seeking to develop on his northern estates.cx

The colliery’s functioning life was intermittent through the mid 18th century.  There is a detailed body of material relating to both saltworks and colliery dating from the 1740s and 1750s but this tails off in the 1760s.cxi  On 24 November 1763, Thomas Lumsden, a collier living at Loanhead, gave an obligation to Sir James Clerk of Pennicuik binding himself to work in Clerk’s colliery at Loanhead, but with the proviso that he would be freed from this bond were William Grant to restart his mining operations at Prestongrange.cxii  The inference is that mining had ceased only recently at Grant’s pit, but that there was a prospect of a resumption in the comparatively near future, or so the collier believed.  Lumsden was to be quite mistaken, for in 1793 it was reported that although there was an abundance of coal in the parish and ‘particularly on the estate of Preston-grange’, none was worked at that date and had not been mined for over thirty years.cxiii  Instead, the parish’s fuel requirements, both for its household consumption and the needs of the saltpans, potteries and brick and tile works, were met by the output from collieries in the adjacent parishes, especially Tranent.

Anderson’s analysis of the materials relating to the coal-workings in the post-1800 period are well detailed but concentrate primarily on the physical development of the colliery, the sinking of shafts, pumping technology and, of course, the vicissitudes of the mining companies operating the venture.  There is a great volume of material in the NCB archive in NAS (some of it still closed to public access under the thirty year rule) which can supplement his observations.  The main area where further research is needed is on the eighteenth-century material, particularly in the early years of William Grant’s ownership of the estate, when the coal and salt operations were still heavily interdependent.  This material offers scope for a detailed study to be made of the conditions of mining at that time on the estate, but has far greater potential as a source of information on a major sector in the social character of the local community.  As with the salt industry (discussed below), this material would provide an insight into the lifestyle of a significant element within the population, providing a human dimension to what is otherwise a very de-humanised study.

Saltpans

Study of salt-production at Prestonpans is an immense subject and merits detailed analysis in its own right.  Chris Whatley’s study of the post-medieval salt industry in Scotland is of
tremendous value, but it does not even begin to address the development of the industry in the
Middle Ages.\textsuperscript{cxiv} There are substantial records for the development of the ‘Saltpreston’ pans
run by the major monasteries between the mid twelfth and mid sixteenth centuries, and for the
lay operators who controlled them, to be gleaned from the monastic records in particular but
also from the later fifteenth- to early seventeenth-century feus and tacks, and the wealth of
notarial instruments of the same period. Prestonpans offers the possibility for a project of
similar scope and scale to that at St Monans in Fife,\textsuperscript{cxv} but with the added value of both a
deeper chronological range to its documentary record and clearer evidence for the integrated
nature of the local industries – salt being dependent on the colliery, representing one of the
chief exports through the Haven, and also supplying raw materials for the glass and ceramic
industries at Prestongrange.

Early in the research it became apparent that there were no pans located at Morrison’s Haven
itself, and the reference to ‘Mott’s pan’ is a red herring.\textsuperscript{cxvi} The principal concentration of
salt-production was at Prestonpans proper, where the shoreline topography was better suited
for the construction at first of rock-cut pans, then later of pan buildings,\textsuperscript{cxvii} and it was there
that Mott had his works. A second, smaller operation was located just west of Morrison’s
Haven at West Pans. From medieval and post-medieval charters, tacks and feus, it is clear
that the Newbattle and subsequent Prestongrange barony saltpans were for the most part
located in Prestonpans.\textsuperscript{cxviii} Salt was certainly exported in quantity from Morrison’s haven in
the pre-Union period, with particular peaks of trade in the later sixteenth and seventeenth
centuries, but it was not produced there. Similarly, post-1707 salt continued to be produced
by William Morrison’s pans, fuelled by coals from his colliery, but this saltworks was a
development of his properties in Prestonpans.

Like the Scottish salt manufacture generally, the development of saltpans at Prestonpans was
an earlier medieval phenomenon. Production around the Firth of Forth was established before
the 1120s, when David I granted a number of former crown-owned pans to his new
monasteries. Dunfermline Abbey, for example, had received a saltpan near Stirling from the
king by \textit{c.}1139, Newbattle at ‘Blankelande’ before 1152, Holyrood at Airth between 1128 and
1141, and Kelso in the Carse of Stirling by 1141.\textsuperscript{cxix} Given the nature of the local topography,
the demands of the population and the availability of necessary fuel supplies, it is likely that
production was underway early in the twelfth century at what became Prestonpans,
considerably before Newbattle began to develop its interest in the neighbourhood.

Saltpans formed one of the components of the barony as sold to Alexander Morison in 1622
but, significantly, they are named separately in the list from Acheson’s Haven.\textsuperscript{cxx} There is no
evidence, indeed, that there was a pan at any time at the haven itself, although there may have
been storehouses for storage of the salt before it was shipped out. The main production area
was further east along the shore at Prestonpans proper, and there were also pans to the west of
the haven.

Amongst the points listed by William Morison in the extended girm of November 1714 that is
his petition for redress for his sacrifices and sufferings in the name of the Union and the
Protestant Succession, he claimed that he had helped carry through the Union Treaty in 1707
despite the knowledge that it would lead to his exposure to a tax of £1300 annually ‘as a
considerable saltmaster’, but had accepted that as the worthwhile price of securing the
Protestant Succession.\textsuperscript{cxxi} Such high principles, however, were evidently only for public
display, for Morison was as guilty as most of his fellow saltmasters of salt embezzlement,
illicit sale of salt to avoid payment of duty (especially after the imposition of salt duty in
1713), and between 1719 and 1721 he was found guilty twice of such frauds and fined.\textsuperscript{cxxii}
The fines amounted to £430 Scots, a pretty trifling amount in comparison to the value of the
saltworks to the Prestongrange estate overall. In 1716-1717, for example, the proceeds from
salt sales accounted for nearly 63% of Morrison’s income from the non-agricultural produce of his estate, vastly in excess of his income from the glassworks, colliery and other commodities. The account book, however, offers little precise information on the location of the pans at which this income was generated.

Whatley has discussed at length the close relationship between the coal and salt industries, with the latter originally benefiting from the abundant fuel source provide by the waste and ‘small’ coal from the mines. In the later sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, however, the cheapness of the production costs of Scottish salt rendered demand for it heavy and the value of the salt trade rapidly outstripped the value of the coal operations from which it had developed as a spin off. At Prestongrange, however, the colliery appears to have been secondary to the development of the saltpans, which were in existence before the sinking of the mine. Early eighteenth-century correspondence, however, highlights the close relationship between colliery and pans at that date. John Moore’s correspondence with David Fearn, Morrison’s bailie, makes reference to production ‘to kiep his Salt pans gon’ and to ‘a pile marked Dover coal to serve the Salt pans’. Three months before Moore’s visit to the colliery, however, Morison had advertised his works for lease, the notice recording that there were eleven pans available, but only three were not in a ruinous condition. It seems evident that the impact of the salt duty imposed after the Union had been severe on Morrison’s property, as he had claimed.

Evidence relating to the saltworks on the Prestongrange becomes significantly more abundant from the middle of the eighteenth century, when the industry began to experience a boom that would last for several decades. The principal sources in respect of this are ‘Inventory of Prestongrange saltworks and colliery, 27 July 1745’ and ‘Journal of the Management of the Coal and Salt Works of Prestongrange beginning the 2nd of April 1748’ preserved in the National Library of Scotland. These are major sources and would merit a detailed study, but their value lies more in the social information which they contain than in the details of the economics of the estate. The ‘Journal’ provides highly illustrative information on the social and economic conditions of the workforce and Whatley has highlighted its value in exploring the lives of the saltworkers. This body of material is amongst the first that allows a human dimension to be offered for Prestongrange that penetrates deeper than the lives of the saltmasters and estate owners.

Analysis of the material relating to the saltpans was confined largely to the pre-1750 period, but there is a significant volume of data for the century following that and, indeed, for the lingering remnants of the industry into the second half of the twentieth century. It is a picture of progressive decline from the later eighteenth century onwards: in 1793, there were 10 saltpans in the parish, but only 6 were at that date in production, already a fraction of the mid-eighteenth-century level, and by the 1820s that had dropped to only 3 working pans. Archaeological evidence for the pans on the Prestongrange property may be potentially ‘minimal’ but the historical record is vast.

Glassworks

There is a great amount of material to be found relating to the development of the glassworks at Morrison’s Haven in the seventeenth century. Jill Turnbull’s recent research monograph on the subject represents the best summary and analysis of the surviving records and should be regarded as the primary reference for any discussion. She suggests that the works mentioned in 1625 may have been the location of James Ord’s vessel-making furnace, the first established in Scotland after 1610 under Sir George Hay’s monopoly. Either Hay or, more likely, Ord himself as Sir George’s assignee, would have required to lease a suitable site for the works and Turnbull comments that the proximity of Acheson’s/Morrison’s Haven to
salt-production sites would parallel the position in contemporary England, where all works excepting those in London were located adjacent to saltworks.\textsuperscript{cxxxii} Turnbull suggests that salt was possibly used as a flux in the bottle-maker’s batch. Ord introduced mainly Italian specialist craftsmen to his business, which produced a significant output of glass vessels (mainly drinking glasses) after c.1623.\textsuperscript{cxxviii} The presence of Italian workers would correspond with Alexander Acheson’s commission by the Privy Council in 1625 to seek out Jesuits who were known to frequent the neighbourhood and who had been reported to say mass for the workers in the glass manufactory.\textsuperscript{cxxxiv} If the quantity of drinking-glasses available in Scotland after 1623 is any indication of the market demand for the product of the early works at Morrison’s Haven, then it seems that the business was a comparative success. In 1627, however, Hay sold his patent to Sir Robert Mansell, who agreed to close down all the works that were producing green glass but retain those making finer white glass.\textsuperscript{cxxxv}

Morrison’s Haven appears to have been producing white glass in the 1620s, but it appears to have been one of the works shut down by Mansell following his taking over of Hay’s patent. Nevertheless, there are indications that some of the Italian glass-makers remained at Morrison’s Haven until c.1646, and one subsequently advised Sir John Hope of Craighall (son of Sir Thomas Hope, who briefly possessed a feu of Prestongrange in the period 1617-22) on the setting up of a glassworks.\textsuperscript{cxxxvi} Sixty years after Mansell closed the original works, possibly marking a redevelopment on the earlier site, a second attempt was made at establishing a glass production centre by Alexander Morrison’s grandson.

Amongst William Morison of Prestongrange’s many business speculations was his entry into the rapidly expanding Scottish glass-making industry in the 1690s.\textsuperscript{cxxxvii} In 1696, he used his political influence in Parliament to start a process to secure an Act that would give him a monopoly over certain areas of glass production, and in the interim, on 27 April 1697 he secured an act in his favour from the Privy Council.\textsuperscript{cxxxviii} This Act was ratified and expanded in 1698 by a full Parliamentary Act which secured him a nine-year monopoly and carefully demarcated the limits between his glasswork’s production and that established by David Weymss, Lord Elcho, at Weymss in Fife in the same year.\textsuperscript{cxxxix} The 1698 Act speaks in terms of ‘the better Improvement of the Manufactory of the Glass Work first set up by William Morisone of Prestoungrange within his own bounds at Atchesons haven alias Morisons haven and now carried on by him and his partners’, which implies that work had commenced probably in 1696 or 1697 in advance of the securing of the Privy Council or Parliamentary acts, and refers specifically to ‘ane glass house and furnaces’ already having been built by 1698 and the bringing from abroad of expert craftsmen to undertake the work. To justify the protection of the glassworks afforded by the 1698 legislation, the Morrison’s Haven, Weymss, and the third major operation at Leith, were directed to specialise in particular areas of production. At Morrison’s Haven, the main production was directed towards bottles, which appear to have become its mainstay during its functioning life, the Act charging Morison and his partners to ensure that ‘the Country about is … furnished with bottles which are sold at very moderat and easie rates’. In addition, however, the works was also to produce ‘severall other sorts and species of glasses which were never heretofore manufactured within this Kingdome such as mirror or looking glass plates coach glasses moulded glasses and window glasses’. To assist in securing the new business, the Act granted it the monopoly on production of these items for a period of nine years, unless, strangely, a competitor should set up a works within two years of the ratification of Morrison’s Act. Further assistance was derived from a prohibition on imports of these glass items made nine months after the Act came into effect, with the goods being classed as contraband and subject to confiscation. Half of the confiscated materials would be applied ‘for the use of the said Manufactory’ and the balance would be given to the discoverer. Given the specialist niche into which the Morrison’s Haven glassworks was set, these protections appeared to offer it a secure financial future. Proximity to Leith, where the main imports of wine into Scotland were transferred from barrels to bottles, and the aristocratic market for window glass and mirrors, suggested
that this should have been a strongly founded business venture. Instead, it appears to have struggled to make an impact from the outset.

Even before 1707, when Morrison’s monopoly in his specialist areas was to expire, it was clear that the Morrison’s Haven works was in financial difficulties and the imminent Union with England and the opening up of the Scottish domestic market to English industrial output threatened ruin to the plant. In 1714, Morison petitioned Parliament for recognition of his many efforts on behalf of the Protestant Succession and in securing the Union Treaty, stating that amongst his sacrifices had been the success of his glassworks. He claimed to have gone to ‘vast charges in erecting the same’, and had made considerable profits down to 1707, but Union rendered his protections under the 1698 Act useless although under the 1707 Union Treaty, ‘every mans private right is preserved’. The glassworks was still functioning shortly before 1718, when in a very gossipy letter from one James Blake to Mr Andrew Hutchinson, it was mentioned that Morison had mentioned that he had agreed ‘to let his works to 5 valuable men’, with the profits and liabilities split six ways between him and them. The business struggled on into the 1720s, but the Rev. John Trotter, in his 1793 submission to the Statistical Account, could only report that a ‘glass-house for bottles’ was established in the late seventeenth century at Morrison’s Haven, and glass manufacture was ‘carried on for some years, but did not succeed’.

Given the comparatively short interlude between the failure of the original glassworks between 1627 and 1646 and the opening of William Morrison’s new works in 1696-1698, it is likely that the later manufactory occupied the site of, and possibly used some of the buildings erected for, the earlier seventeenth century works. In respect of both works, however, we have no firmer evidence for location than the tack arrangements cited by Anderson and the details in the 1715 tack.

**Potteries**

The ceramic works at Prestonpans have been the least visible of the operations within the materials consulted for this stage of the project. Apart from casual references to the potteries, there have been no substantial papers consulted that provide any more information than that which is already available in David Anderson’s report. The 1793 Statistical Account entry identified three potteries and two brick and tile-works in the parish. The biggest, run by the Cadell family and which appears to have specialised in stonewares, was located just to the west of the church in Prestonpans. It employed a workforce of around 70 (40 men and ‘upwards of 30 boys’), using fine clay imported from Devon, flint from Kent, and white and red lead (for the glazes) imported from London, Hull and Newcastle. In the 1760s, cobalt for blue glazes was also imported to Prestonpans from Charles Erskine’s mines at Alva in Clackmannanshire. All of these commodities were imported through Morrison’s Haven, where the tidal mill (and that at nearby Cuttle) had been converted to grind the flints for the potteries and, presumably, the glassworks. The second pottery, also specializing in stonewares but also producing brownwares (or earthenwares), was located at Morrison’s Haven. Established in the late 17th century, this works was apparently half the size of the Prestonpans operation but had the advantage in being able to obtain the coarser clay suitable for the brownwares immediately adjacent to its site. A third pottery, at Cuttle, also producing stone- and earthenwares, had ceased to operate by c.1790, but it was reported that production was about to resume. According to John Trotter, the parish minister who compiled the Statistical Account entry, the value of the pottery production exceeded £5000 per annum, with exports going to most northern European sea-ports, the West Indies and North America, as well as supplying the domestic market.
The main brick and tile works in 1793 was located adjacent to the old kirkyard at Prestonpans. It employed only six men but had thirteen kilns fired that year, each capable of holding 10,000 tiles. The smaller works, which was by the shore nearby, employed only three men and had nine slightly smaller kilns fired that year which contained only 9000 tiles each. Both works used the local fireclay, which according to Trotter was ‘found in great plenty in the neighbourhood’.

**Tide Mills**

David Anderson is correct to highlight the significance of the tide mills at Prestongrange. Mills of this type are a comparatively under-represented form of water-powered mechanism in Scotland, where the abundance of flowing fresh water in most of the country (and the prevalence of hand-mills in large areas of the Highlands into the late nineteenth century) reduced dependence on other sources of energy. Although the number of identified sites has increased since John Shaw undertook the research for his major study of Water Power in Scotland, such mills are still very rare. While surveys have been undertaken of some sites, e.g. at Fife Ness (the final results of which are unpublished in detail as part of the Fife Coastal Survey in the early 1980s, archaeological investigation otherwise has been limited.

Mills of this kind used the ebb and flow of the tide to power them, being driven by sea-water flowing through a channel into a shoreward pond or lagoon as the tide rises, then using the release of the same water through the channel at low tide. It is Shaw’s observation that such mills usually occur in pairs (with two drive wheels, two mechanisms and four mill stones) – as is the case at Morrison’s Haven – but the Fife Ness example appears to have only a single mill seat as does that at Rubha an Dunain in Skye. The pond at Morrison’s Haven in which the sea-water was retained at high tide was a prominent feature of the site into the twentieth century, lying to the west of the inner basin of the harbour. Angus Graham noted in the 1960s that the pond was supplied with water from the colliery and suggested that the primary function of collecting this water was to flush silt from the harbour. The harbour mill at Fraserburgh, for example, had just that secondary function, the water from its lade scouring the basin of the burgh’s seventeenth- and eighteenth-century harbour. Given that the colliery at Prestongrange was developed after the establishment of the haven and the construction of the mills, it is unlikely that the water drained from the mine provided a power-source from the establishment of the tide mills in the mid sixteenth century. Indeed, it is likely that the drainage from the mine into the pond was a much later development, possibly post-dating the end of the mills’ use for grinding grain at some point in the eighteenth century, although reference to ‘ingens’ in the colliery in 1727 could be linked to drainage works.

While there would almost certainly have been mills at Prestongrange since at least the later twelfth century, the tide mills at Morrison’s Haven are on certain record from only 1587. They do not appear in either of the two feu-charters issued to Acheson in 1526, although the expanded version dated 23 April 1526 obliges him to give the monks first refusal of the purchase of grain that is brought to the haven. There is also no explicit mention of tide mills in the 1541 charter within which the 1526 feu is embedded, but it ends with the grant to the monks and to Alexander Acheson of the right to mill ‘within the tidal range of the sea’ within the bounds of the haven. The implication is that the right to have a mill had recently been sought but that none yet existed. In 1553, however, the port is referred to as ‘ung havre nomme le port du Moulin pres le petit Lict’ (a haven named the port of the Mill – Milnhaven - near the little ‘Lict’ [Leith?]). Clearly, the mills were by then an established feature of the site, indeed, sufficiently prominent for them to give the haven a widely recognised name which displaced its official designation as ‘Newhaven of Preston’ in common usage. Again, in 1557, the port was referred to as Mylnhavin in a Scottish record. All that can be said
with confidence is that the mills came into existence between late April 1541 and 1553, and by 1587 they were established as a functioning economic component of the property.

The tide mills were originally intended for the milling of grain^{clxii} and it can be assumed that Newbattle secured the right to the thirlage of its tenants to the mills on its property. Thirlage was the obligation placed on tenants to have their grain ground at their landlord’s mill, for which service they would pay the proprietor or lessee of the mill a proportion of the flour ground, known as multure. The tenants of Prestongrange, however, are more likely to have been thrilled to the mill at Prestongrange itself. The ‘mill and mill-lands at Prestongrange’ are mentioned in the 1617 feu charter to Thomas Hope^{clxiii} but it is likely that monks possessed a mill there in the Middle Ages. As the 1526 feu charter demonstrates, however, grain was envisaged to be one of the chief commodities moved through the haven and the sixteenth-century custom records and the Privy Council court case involving the disputed cargo of English wheat, discussed above, certainly indicate that a significant volume of cereals was both imported and exported at Morrison’s Haven. What is unclear is if the development of the mills was linked specifically to that trade, with grain being milled before re-sale to the local residents or shipped on to the Lothian burghs. There was certainly a strong local demand for meal and flour, and as late as the early decades of the nineteenth century vast quantities of those commodities were being carted up the turnpike road from western Berwickshire to Edinburgh, Musselburgh, Dalketh and Prestonpans.^{clxiv} Acheson may simply have been responding to an earlier manifestation of this demand for cereal products from the inhabitants of the non-agricultural communities at the salt-production centres.

By 1793, there were only two mills surviving in the parish, one at Cuttle driven by water from the mine adit, and one of the two tidal mills recorded at Morrison’s Haven.^{clxv} The conversion to flint crushing has been linked generally to William Cadell and Samuel Garbet’s pottery, established at Prestonpans in 1751, but it is likely – as Anderson suggests^{clxvi} - that one of the mills had been supplying crushed flint for the glassworks since the seventeenth century. The later eighteenth-century earthenware manufactory of Hamilton Watson at Prestonpans used flint crushed at the Earl of Weymss’s mill east of Prestonpans, which is probably to be identified with Sea Mill on the shore below Seton House.^{clxvii} Despite the reference offered in Anderson, there is no evidence to suggest that either of the tide mills was converted into a saw mill at any point.^{clxviii}

The possibility of archaeological investigation of a tidal mill site is of immense significance, none in Scotland having been excavated to date. There is added value in investigating the Morrison’s Haven site as it can be tied into a small but significant documentary record which charts progressive development from grain milling to flint crushing operations. There is potential for a wider exploration of the milling arrangements for Prestongrange in the pre-1541 period, in particular focussing on what appears to have been the demesne mill at Prestongrange itself. Provision of mills represents one of the chief economic powers of the landlord and provides an important insight into the socio-economic bonds within the local community. There is scope for a detailed examination of the feu-charters of the Achesons and Morisons, which contain a significant volume of material relating to the feuing of the economic resources of the barony in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries.^{clxix}

**Conclusions and Proposals**

This research project set out to tackle a series of specific questions. Some of them it was able to answer; others remain unresolved; and a number of new questions have emerged. The current work has identified the process of development of the haven from the 1520s to the 1720s, focussing in particular on ownership and activities at the port. What has emerged from this work very clearly is that this was no backwater but, from the outset, was intended to be a
significant commercial venture that could challenge the local dominance of Leith. There is a very powerful story to be told here. The existence of fortifications at the haven has also been confirmed and a basic chronology offered, but there is no clearer evidence yet identified as to the location or scale of the defensive works. It seems likely, however, that the so-called ‘vaults’ to the south of the outer basin have no connection with any fort, which may rather have been part of the harbour-works itself. It is the industrial complex, however, which provides the most compelling set of stories at the site, for here is the location of what was one of the earliest such developments in Scotland, clearly comparable to the Bruce investments at Culross and the Weymss works around Weymss and Methil in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. It offers a currently unique opportunity to explore the development of such an entity arising from investment by what was essentially a traditional landed proprietor. It has the added interest of clear medieval origins, information relating to which survives in abundance, which would enable a firm narrative for the sites’ functioning lives to be traced from twelfth to twentieth centuries.

One aspect that has come through particularly strongly in the records consulted for this work is the strength of the human dimension. While most documentary research can provide detail about the social and economic elites who financed, developed and grew rich on such operations, normally the lower end of the socio-economic spectrum who laboured in them are invisible. At Prestongrange and Morrison’s Haven, there is a clear opportunity to maintain a strongly human angle within the work and to explore the lives of the ordinary coal- and salt-workers, the fishermen and sea-men working there between the sixteenth and twentieth centuries. It is rare for such record material to survive and the opportunity to make this data available to a wider public should not be missed.

In the preparation of this report, it was evident that there is a very substantial documentary record relating not only to the concentration of sites around Morrison’s Haven which are the focus for the current project but also for the barony of Prestongrange in general. All work to date, including this current report, do little more than scratch the surface and draw attention to a series of key themes. What is also very evident is the interconnectedness of the material, with the salt, coal, glass and pottery works all being closely interdependent, and the mills and harbour itself being inseparable from the wider industrial picture. Past studies which have focused on one dimension of the industrial operations in the district inevitably draw down barriers which artificially separate the mutually supportive activities. Prestongrange offers the opportunity to explore an early seventeenth- and eighteenth-century example of the kind of ‘integrated’ industry more familiar in the nineteenth-century ‘2nd’ Industrial Revolution in the west of Scotland.

The scale of the resource available for research is such that this present project has focused on specific fields and time periods to try to preserve some integrity and avoid unnecessary replication of the work undertaken previously. As a result, several areas have, sadly, been neglected, in particular the ceramics operations and the later eighteenth-century brewing, distilling and chemical manufacturing operations. One exercise that could usefully be undertaken as a next stage would be the full integration of researched materials to date. This should be done before any further archival research is undertaken. That integration would allow any further research to be targeted specifically at areas identified as demanding attention in past work. For example, the 1750-1800 coal-working records would merit a detailed investigation, as would the late sixteenth-century writs relating to the Acheson’s. Individual researchers are likely, however, to have personal preferences and it is strongly to be recommended that any future historical research work be undertaken in very close and direct relationship with the archaeological investigation. The key to understanding this site is interdisciplinary.
CHAPTER 4. DISCUSSION, CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Discussion

The historical research undertaken by Richard Oram has confirmed the sheer wealth of industrially related documentation relating to Prestongrange. Until the work carried out by David Anderson (Appendix 1), and by Jill Turnbull on the exploration of early Scottish glass making (Turnbull 2001) the history of Prestongrange has largely remained unexplored. It is clear that the 18th century industrial development of glass and pottery manufacture was totally dependent on the presence of a harbour. The need for a ready supply of raw materials, such as sand, quartz, flint and potash for glass manufacture is evident. For the pottery industry, china clay was brought from Devon and flint (used for glaze) from the Home Counties of England. The presence of cheap coal allowed the glass and pottery industry to expand. The coal industry of the estate of Prestongrange was revitalised by the sinking of a new deep shaft close to the site of the pottery in 1829 (Anderson 2003). The surviving Cornish beam engine stands testimony to the wealth invested in these early operations. Alongside the expanding coal industry the by-products, namely fire-clay removed from the pit, provided the necessary material for the refractory industry to expand, a complex that developed with small scotch updraught kilns, through to the more efficient beehive and hoffman kilns.

Against this back-drop of industrial expansion, Morrison’s Haven eventually developed into a mechanised working harbour, and throughout its working life it was subjected to alterations, repairs and improvements until its eventual abandonment in the early 20th century. Its demise was helped by the rapid development of deep berths at the Port of Leith and the mechanised coal-handling facilities such as that at Granton harbour where thousands of tons of Scottish coal was exported each year up until the mid-20th century (Hannay-Thompson 1937).

Conclusion

This desk-based assessment has brought to light the wealth of historical information on the development and demise of the Prestongrange industrial complex. The site was historically important in terms of the emergence of early Scottish glass manufacture. The importance of Morrison’s Haven cannot be understated. It was considered to be a challenger to Leith’s local dominance of the Lothian shore of the Firth of Forth and which did emerge for a while as a harbour of national and probably international importance (Oram op cit p.16). The scale of later industrial development is exemplified not only in the historical documentation but also in the cartographic record. However there are gaps in the record, such as the precise location of the fort and the position of the glass-works kilns. Some maps show the relative position of the later pottery kilns and these will be helpful during the fieldwork stages. Importantly we are able to draw on the earlier work carried out previously by other researchers. We are very fortunate that previous excavations that have examined the local pottery industry of East Lothian have generated a wealth of comparative material which will lend support to any finds made by the PCAP. Haggarty and McIntyre (1996) have conducted rescue excavations at the former Newbiggin Pottery site in Musselburgh. Their results provide us with the types of archaeological evidence likely to be recovered from the PCAP’s own work during the forthcoming fieldwork.

Recommendations

Richard Oram has identified specific avenues where more in-depth historical research might perhaps yield important information on certain aspects of the industrial development of Prestongrange. The following should be examined:
• documentation relating to the development of Prestongrange between 1200-1500 with specific emphasis on both the Lord Hamilton of Preston and the Newbattle Estates;
• writs and charters held in the Grant-Suttie collection;
• Morrison and Grant family papers;
• Custom records for the precinct of Prestonpans;
• Pilot books of the harbour master, William Thomson;
• the NCB archive, in particular the early years of William Grant in the 18th century;
• the inventory of the Prestongrange saltworks and colliery 1745;
• the Journal of the Management of the Coal and Saltworks of Prestongrange 1748;
• feu charters of the Acheson’s and Morrison families;
• integration of most recently acquired historical imagery of Morrison’s Haven.

Linking the historical and archaeological record

Other important strands of evidence arising from historical research are likely to generate a better understanding of the location of various structures that may be brought to light if conditions are suitable. This will include a possible search for any archaeological remains associated with the fort (although its location may now be under the modern road), and the buildings associated with Morrison’s Haven including its tide-mill and store houses. However, recent fieldwork carried out by the PCAP suggests that any archaeological remains associated with these sites may be buried under several metres of colliery waste therefore making future investigation difficult.

An integration of the available cartographic sources in a digitised format onto the forthcoming PCAP web-site would be beneficial. This will generate a useful animated database that can be interrogated at various broad timescales to depict how the various industries developed and declined.

Trading routes of both imports and exports from Morrison’s Haven should be identified and plotted onto an interactive distribution map. Individual ports could be interrogated to show the names of ships, their tonnage and cargo at a given period. The success of this would depend on the success of the historical search of the aforementioned custom and pilot records.

At Prestongrange and Morrison’s Haven, there is a clear opportunity to maintain a strongly human angle within the work and to explore the lives of the ordinary coal- and salt-workers, the fishermen and seamen working there between the sixteenth and twentieth centuries. It is rare for such record material to survive and the opportunity to make this data available to a wider public should not be missed.
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Girnals were storehouses used normally for the receipt of grain paid as rent to the landlord. They were usually located near to the coast, for ease of shipping the bulk produce out to more distant markets. The girnals at Prestongrange, however, may have been related to the local salt production, for amongst the privileges of the laird mentioned in the 1591 ratification was receipt of ‘lie kane-salt’, a payment in kind of a proportion of the annual yield as part of the rent. Like grain, this requires dry storage and would have been gathered in bulk before selling on.
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Fig. 1 - The site of Gordon's Pottery and part of Morrison's Haven. (after Turnbull 2001)

Fig. 2 - A sketch of Morrison's Haven dated to 1891. The haven appears to be in a state of disrepair. Note the annotation "Broken Wall" on the southern pier. (NAS)
Fig. 3 - 1854 First Edition Ordnance Survey map showing Morrison's Haven Brick and Tile Works. Various buildings are depicted close to the Haven.
Fig. 4 - 1894 Second Edition Ordnance Survey map showing the industrial development of Prestongrange.
Fig. 5 - 1907 Third Edition Ordnance Survey map. Note the expansion of rail networks leading from Prestongrange.
Fig. 6 - 1914 Ordnance Survey map. This map shows the reclaimed land along the shore which has altered as a result of tipping colliery waste.
Fig. 7 - Undated plan of Morrisons’ Haven taken from a large colliery plan.
Plate 1 - Morrison's Haven in the late 19th century showing sailing boats alongside a coal jetty.

Plate 2 - This is a photograph of a harbour taken from a spur of rock on the seaward side. The main feature is a protruding pier reinforced with timber baulks. On the right a circular, concrete plinth carries a central light. Parts of vessels are behind.
Plate 3 - Prestongrange seen from Morison's Haven. The harbour was backed by a storage lagoon in which can be seen the reflection of the buildings of the harbourside and colliery.

Plate 4 - This view of Morison's Haven looks east, past a group of miner's cottages associated with the nearby pit at Prestongrange. The harbour basin is being used to berth a fishing boat (the Topaz) and several small sailing boats.
Plate 5 - This photograph shows the headgear over two of the shafts, the vertical winding-engine house (left) and the 200-foot high boiler house chimney (centre). Two of the 11 beehive kilns for the colliery's brickworks are in the foreground.

Plate 6 - The beehive kilns fired the Prestongrange bricks at a temperature of 1,450 degrees C. The colliery supplied coal for the kilns and fireclay and blaes for the brickworks. The tubular metal structures are waste heat ducts.