HISTORY

OF

SCOTLAND.

CHAP. I.

DAVID THE SECOND.

CONTEMPORARY PRINCES.

Kings of England. Edward III. Kings of France.
Philip of Valois.

Popes.
John XXII.
Benedict XII.
Clement VI.
Innocent VI.
Urban V.

On the death of Bruce, Scotland, delivered from a long war by a treaty equally honourable and advantageous, was yet placed in very perilous circumstances. The character of Edward the Third had already begun to develope those great qualities, amongst which a talent for war, and a thirst for conquest and military renown, were the most conspicuous. Compelled to observe the letter of the recent treaty of Northampton, this Prince soon showed that he meant to infringe its spirit and disregard its most solemn sanctions, by every method of private intrigue and concealed hostility. With a greater regard for the decencies of public opinion than his grandfather Edward the First, he was yet as thoroughly bent upon

the aggrandisement of his dominions. Unwilling to bring upon himself the odium and unpopularity of an open breach of so recent and sacred a treaty, cemented as it was by a marriage between King David and his sister, Edward's policy was to induce the Scots themselves to infringe the peace by the private encouragement which he gave to their enemies, and then to come down with an overwhelming force and reduce the kingdom.1 Against these designs there were many circumstances which prevented Scotland from making an effectual resistance. Randolph was indeed nominated Regent, and the talents of this great man in the arts of civil government, appear to have been as conspicuous as in war; but he was now aged, and could not reasonably look to many more years of life. Douglas, whose genius for military affairs was, perhaps, higher than even that of Randolph, was soon to leave the kingdom on his expedition to the Holy Land; and the powerful faction of the Comyns still viewed the line of Bruce with the most persevering hatred, and showed themselves ready to rise upon the first opportunity against the government of his son. Nor was this opportunity long of presenting itself. Edward, the eldest son of John Baliol, had chiefly resided in France since his father's death, but he now came to England, and with the private connivance

¹ It is unfortunate that the Rotuli Scotiæ, from which the most authentic and valuable materials for Scottish history are to be drawn, are awanting from the first year to the seventh of the reign of Edward the Third. Rotuli Scot. p. 224. From 22d January, 1327-8, to 1st April, 1333.

of Edward the Third, began to organize a scheme for the recovery of the Scottish crown. Dornagilla, the mother of Baliol, was sister-in-law to the Red Comyn, whom King Robert Bruce had stabbed at Dumfries, so that the rights of the new claimant were immediately supported by the whole weight of the Comyns; and, no longer awed by the commanding mind of Bruce, disputes and heart-burnings arose amongst the Scottish nobility, at a time when a concentration of the whole strength of the nation was imperiously required.

To return to the course of our narrative, Randolph, upon the death of Bruce, immediately assumed the office of Regent, and discharged its duties with a wise and judicious severity. He was indefatigable in his application to business, and his justice was as bold and speedy as it was impartial. An instance of it has been preserved by Bower.1 A priest was slain, and the murderer, having gone to Rome and obtained the Papal absolution, had the audacity to return openly to Scotland. He was seized and brought before Randolph, who was then holding his court at Inverness, during a progress through the country. He pleaded the absolution, but at the command of the Regent was tried, condemned, and instantly executed. The Pope, it was remarked by Randolph, might absolve him from the spiritual consequences of the sin, but it was nevertheless right that he should suffer for the crime committed against the law. Aware of

¹ Forduni Scotichron, a Goodal C. 18, book xiii, vol. ii. p. 297.

the important influence of the local magistrates and judges, he made every sheriff responsible for the thefts committed within his jurisdiction; so that, according to the simple illustrations of the chronicles of those times, the traveller might tie his horse to the inndoor, and the ploughman leave his ploughshare and harness in the field, without fear, for if carried away, the price of the stolen article came out of the pocket of the sheriff. Anxious for the continuance of peace, Randolph sent Roger of Fawside on an amicable mission to the English king, whilst he took care at the same time to strengthen the borders, to repair the fortifications of the important town of Berwick, and commanded John Crab, the experienced Flemish mercenary, whom he retained in the pay of Scotland, to remain in that city, and keep a watch upon the motions of England.1

In the meantime, as soon as the season of the year permitted, Douglas, having the heart of his beloved master under his charge, set sail from Scotland, accompanied by a splendid retinue, and anchored off Sluys in Flanders, at this time the great seaport of the Netherlands.² His object was to find out companions with whom he might travel to Jerusalem; but he declined landing, and for twelve days received all visitors on board his ship with a state almost kingly. He had with him seven noble Scottish knights, and was served at table by twenty-eight squires of the

¹ Fordun a Goodal, vol. ii. p. 297. Winton, vol. ii. p. 139. Chamberlain's Accounts, pp. 171, 227, 228. See Appendix, A.

² Rymer's Fædera, vol. iv. p. 400.

first families in the country. "He kept court," says Froissart, " in a royal manner, with the sound of trumpets and cymbals; all the vessels for his table were of gold and silver, and whatever persons of good estate went to pay their respects to him, were entertained with the richest kinds of wine and spiced bread.1 At Sluys he heard that Alonzo, the King of Leon and Castile, was carrying on war with Osmyn, the Moorish governor of Granada. The religious mission which he had embraced, and the vows he had taken before leaving Scotland, induced Douglas to consider Alonzo's cause as a holy warfare; and before proceeding to Jerusalem, he first determined to visit Spain, and to signalize his prowess against the Saracens. But his first field against the infidels proved fatal to him, who, in the long English war, had seen seventy battles.2 The circumstances of his death were striking and characteristic. In an action near Theba, on the borders of Andalusia, the Moorish cavalry were defeated; and after their camp had been taken, Douglas with his companions engaged too eagerly in the pursuit, and being separated from the main body of the Spanish army, a strong division of the Moors rallied and surrounded them. The Scottish knight endeavoured to cut his way through the infidels, and in all probability would have succeeded, had he not again turned to rescue Sir William Saint Clair of Roslin, whom he saw in extreme jeopardy. In at-

¹ Froissart, p. 117, vol. i. Ed. de Buchon.

² Fordun a Goodal, p. 302. vol. ii.

attempting this, he was inextricably involved with the enemy. Taking from his neck the casket which contained the heart of Bruce, he cast it before him, and exclaimed with a loud voice, "Now pass onward as thou wert wont, and Douglas will follow thee or die."1 The action and the sentiment were heroicand they were the last words and deed of a heroic life, for Douglas fell, overpowered by his enemies; and three of his knights, and many of his companions, were slain along with their master.2 On the succeeding day, the body and the casket were both found on the field, and by his surviving friends conveyed to Scotland. The heart of Bruce was deposited at Melrose, and the body of the "Good Sir James," the name by which he is affectionately remembered by his countrymen, was consigned to the cemetery of his fathers in the parish church of Douglas.

Douglas was the model of a noble and accomplished knight, in an age when chivalry was in its highest

¹ Barbour a Pinkerton, vol. iii. p. 171.

² The three knights were Sir William Sinclair of Roslin, Sir Robert and Sir Walter Logan. Boece, who might have consulted Bower in his continuation of Fordun, or Barbour, prefers his own absurd inventions, which he substitutes at all times in the place of authentic history. Buchanan, B. 8. c. 58, erroneously states that Douglas went to assist the King of Arragon, and that he was slain "post aliquot prosperas pugnas." In Buchon's Notes to Froissart, vol. i. p. 118, we find "that the object of the Moors was to raise the siege of Gibraltar, then straitly invested by the Spaniards. On their approach, Alonzo raised the siege, and marched against the enemy. Hume of Godscroft, in his Hist. of Douglas and Angus, vol. i. p. 96, adopts Boece's Fable as to Douglas having been thirteen times victorious over the Saracens.

splendour. He was gentle and amiable in society, and had an open and delightful expression in his countenance, which could hardly be believed by those who had only seen him in battle. His hair was black and a little-grizzled; he was broad-shouldered, and somewhat large-boned, but his limbs were cast in the mould of fair and just proportion. He lisped a little in his speech; but this defect, far from giving the idea of effeminacy, became him well, when contrasted with his high and warlike bearing. These minute touches, descriptive of so great a man, were communicated by eye-witnesses to Barbour, the historian of Bruce.

The good Sir James was never married; but he left a natural son, William Douglas, who inherited the high military talents of his father, and with whom we shall soon meet, under the title of the Knight of Liddesdale.

Soon after this disaster, which deprived Scotland of one of its best defenders, David, then in his eighth year, and his youthful queen, were crowned with great pomp and solemnity at Scone,² on which occasion the royal boy, after having been himself knighted by Randolph the Regent, surrounded by his barons and nobles, conferred knighthood on the Earl of Angus, Thomas Earl of Moray, Randolph's eldest son, and others of his nobles. His father Robert, in consequence of his disagreement with the court of Rome, had never been anointed King;³ but in virtue of a

¹ Barbour, p. 15. ² Fordun a Goodal, vol. ii. p. 302.

³ Winton, B. 8. c. 24, p. 137, vol. ii.

special bull from the Pope, the Bishop of St Andrews poured the holy oil on the head of his successor.

Notwithstanding the wise administration of Randolph, the aspect of public affairs in Scotland began to be alarming, and the probability of a rupture with England became every day more apparent. The designs of Edward Baliol, and the dissembling conduct of Edward the Third, have been already alluded to, and it unfortunately happened that there were circumstances in the present state of Scotland which gave encouragement to these schemes of ambition. During the wars of King Robert, many English barons who had been possessed of estates in Scotland. and not a few Scottish nobles who had treacherously leagued with England, were disinherited by Bruce. and the lands seized in the hands of the crown. By the treaty of Northampton, it was expressly provided that the Scottish estates of three of those English barons, Henry Percy, Thomas Lord Wake, and Henry Beaumont, should be restored. Percy was restored accordingly, but, notwithstanding the repeated requisitions of the English King, the Scottish Regent delayed performance of the stipulations in favour of Wake and Beaumont, and there were strong reasons

¹ The coronation oath, in its full extent, is not given by any ancient historian; but in one part of it the King solemnly swore that he would not alienate the crown lands, or any of the rents of the same, and that whatever lands or revenues fell to the crown, should not be bestowed upon subjects without mature advice.—Robertson's Parl. Records of Scotland, p. 97.

both in justice and expediency for this delay.1 The first of these barons claimed the lordship of Lidel. which would have given him an entrance into Scotland by the Western Marches, while Beaumont, one of the most powerful barons in England, who, in right of his wife, claimed the lands and earldom of Buchan, might have excited disturbances, and facilitated the descent of an enemy upon the coast. These were not the only considerations which induced Randolph to suspend performance of this part of the engagement. Henry de Beaumont and the Lord Wake had violently opposed the whole treaty of Northampton, and declared themselves enemies to the peace with Scotland; they had leagued with the disinherited Scottish barons, and had instigated Baliol to an invasion of that country, and an assertion of his claim to the crown. The English King, on the other hand, although speciously declaring his intention to respect that treaty,2 extended his protection to Edward Baliol; and when he was perfectly aware that a secret conspiracy for the invasion of Scotland was fostered in his court, of which Baliol, Wake, and Beaumont, were the principal movers, he yet preposterously demanded of Randolph to restore Beaumont and Wake to their estates in that country.3

The power and opulence of Beaumont induced the whole body of the disinherited barons⁴ to combine their strength; and, aware that no effectual measures

¹ Rymer's Fædera, vol. iv. p. 461. ² Rymer, vol. iv. p. 470.

³ Rymer's Fœdera, vol. iv. pp. 445, 452, 511, and 518.

⁴ Their names and titles are given by Leland, Collect. vol. i. pp. 552, 553. The ancestors of Lord Ferrers, one of these disinherited

for suppressing their attempt would be used by Edward, they openly put themselves at the head of three hundred armed horse and a small body of infantry, and declared their design of subverting the government of Bruce, and placing Baliol on the throne. It was their first intention to invade Scotland by the marches, but to this the King of England would not consent: he allowed them, however, without any offer of opposition, to embark at Ravenshire, near the mouth of the Humber, with the design of making a descent on the coast, while, to preserve the appearance of the good faith which he had broken, he published a proclamation, enjoining his subjects strictly to observe the treaty of Northampton.2 In the meantime, Randolph the Regent, who, with his wonted activity and determination, had put himself at the head of an army to resist the hostile designs which he knew to be on foot, died suddenly, without any apparent cause,3 and not without the strongest suspicion of his having been poisoned. Winton and Barbour, both historians of high credit. and the last almost a contemporary, assert that he came by his death in this foul manner, and that the

lords, were settled in Scotland as far back as 1288. See Excerpta E. Rotulis Compot. Temp. Alex. III. p. 56. Chamberlain's Accounts.

1 Echard's Hist. England, p. 145. Rapin's Acta Regia, vol. i.

¹ Echard's Hist. England, p. 145. Rapin's Acta Regia, vol. i. p. 201. Rymer's Fædera, vol. iv. p. 590.

² Rymer, vol. iv. pp. 518, 529.

³ He died at Musselburgh, and was buried at Dunfermline. Bower's Continuat. Fordun, vol. ii. p. 300. Hailes seems to have borrowed his scepticism on Randolph's death, from Tyrrel, vol. iii. p. 372, who gives no ground for his opinion. See Remarks on this subject, Appendix, letter B.

poison was administered to him at a feast held at his palace of the Wemyss, by a friar who was suborned by the faction of Beaumont.¹ It is certain, at least, that the friar took guilt to himself, by a precipitate flight to England.

In the Earl of Moray Scotland lost the only man whose genius was equal to manage the affairs of the nation, under circumstances of peculiar peril and difficulty. In his mind we can discern the rare combination of a cool judgment with the utmost rapidity and energy of action; and his high and uncorrupted character, together with his great military abilities, kept down the discordant factions which began to show themselves among the nobility, and intimidated the conspirators who meditated the overthrow of the government. Upon his death, a parliament assembled at Perth for the election of his successor. and the spirit of civil disunion broke out with fatal violence. After great contention amongst the nobility, Donald Earl of Mar, nephew to the late king, was chosen regent.2 This nobleman was in every way unfitted for so arduous a situation. When a child, he had been carried into England by Edward the First, and on being released from captivity, had continued to reside in that country, and had even carried arms in the English army against Scotland. Although he was afterwards stored to his country, and employed by Bruce, it was in a subordinate mi-

Winton, vol. ii. p. 146. Barbour a Pinkerton, vol. iii. p. 179. Fordun a Goodal, vol. ii. p. 299.

² Winton, vol. ii. p. 147. Fordun a Hearne, p. 1018.

litary command. The king appears to have considered his talent for war as of a very inferior order, and the result showed how well Bruce had judged.1 In the meantime, on the very day that the reins of the state fell into this feeble hand, word was brought that the fleet of Edward Baliol, and the disinherited barons, had appeared in the Forth. They landed soon after with their army at Kinghorn, where the ground was so singularly unfavourable for the disembarking of cavalry, that a very small force, led by any of the old captains of Bruce, would have destroyed the daring enterprise in its commencement. But Mar, who was at the head of a Scottish army more than ten times the strength of the English, lingered at a distance and lost the opportunity, whilst Alexander Seton threw himself, with a handful of soldiers, upon the English, and was instantly overpowered and cut to pieces.2 Baliol immediately advanced to Dunfermline, where he found a seasonable supply for his small army in five hundred excellent spears, and a quantity of provisions, laid up there by the orders of Randolph, then newly dead.3 When he first effected a landing, he had with him only four hundred men; but by this time he had collected a force of about two thousand foot soldiers,4 and feel-

Barbour, p. 387. Rotul. Scot. 13 Ed. II. m. 3.

² Fordun a Hearne, vol. iv. pp. 1018, 1019.

³ Leland's Collect. i. p. 553. Randolph had died twelve days before. Knighton, p. 2560.

⁴ Knighton, p. 2560. Leland, vol. i. p. 553. Walsingham, p. 131. Fordun a Goodal, vol. ii. p. 307, says, "six hundred was the original number."

ing more confident, he commanded his fleet to sail round the coast and anchor in the mouth of the Tay, while he himself pushed on to Perth, and encamped near Forteviot, with his front defended by the river Earn. On the opposite bank of the river lay the extensive tract called Dupplin Moor, upon which the Earl of Mar drew up his army, consisting of thirty thousand men, excellently equipped, and commanded by the principal nobility of Scotland. Eight miles to the west of Forteviot, at Auchterarder, was the Earl of March, at the head of an army nearly as numerous, with which he had advanced through the Lothians and Stirlingshire, and threatened to attack the English in flank.

Nothing could be imagined more perilous than the situation of Baliol; but he had friends in the Scottish camps.¹ Some of the nobility whose relatives had suffered in the Black Parliament, were decided enemies to the line of Bruce, and secretly favoured the faction of the disinherited barons; so that, by means of the information which they afforded him, he was enabled, with a force not exceeding three thousand men, to overwhelm the army of Mar at the moment that his own destruction appeared inevitable.²

It is asserted by an English historian, on the authority of an ancient MS. chronicle, that the newly

¹ Fordun a Goodal, vol. ii. p. 304.

² Bower's Continuat. Fordun, vol. ii. p. 301. "Annon audivisti de internecione nobilium in Nigro Parliamento? Generatio eorum tibi adstabit." Winton, vol. ii. p. 151. The place where the disinherited lords encamped, was called "Miller's Acre."

elected regent had entered into a secret correspondence with Baliol; but the conduct of that ill-fated nobleman appears to have been rather that of a weak and presumptuous madman, than of one dealing with the enemy.1 Aware of the near presence of the enemy, he kept no watch, and permitted his soldiers to abandon themselves to riot and intemperance. Andrew Murray of Tullibardine, a Scottish baron, who served in the army of March, treacherously conducted the English to a ford in the river, which he had marked by a large stake driven into its channel.2 Setting off silently at midnight, the English passed the river, and marching by Gask and Dupplin, suddenly broke in upon the outposts of the Scottish camp, and commenced a pitiless slaughter of their enemies, whom they mostly found drunken and heavy with sleep.3 The surprise, although unfortunate, was not at first completely fatal. Young Randolph Earl of Murray, Murdoch Earl of Menteth, Robert Bruce, a natural son of King Robert, and Alexander Fraser, hastily collected three hundred troops, and with the desperate courage of men who felt that all hung upon gaining a few moments, checked the first onset, and drove back the English soldiers. This gave time for the main body of the Scots to arm, and as the morning had now broke, the small numbers of the English army became apparent. But the military incapacity of the regent destroyed the advantage which might have been improved, to the total discomfiture

¹ Barne's Hist. of Ed. III. p. 60.

³ Fordun a Goodal, vol. ii. p. 307.

³ Ibid, p. 305.

of Baliol. Rushing down at the head of his army, without order or discipline, the immense mass of soldiers became huddled and pressed together; spearmen, bowmen, horses, and infantry, were confounded in a heap, which bore down headlong upon the English, and in an instant overwhelmed Randolph and his little phalanx. The confusion soon became inextricable: multitudes of the Scottish soldiers were suffocated and trodden down by their own men, and the English, preserving their discipline, and under brave and experienced leaders, made a pitiless slaughter.

1332.

The route now became total, and the carnage, for it could not be called a battle, continued from early dawn till nine in the morning, by which time the whole of the Scottish army was slain, dispersed, or taken prisoners. So rapid and easy had been the victory, that the English ascribed it to a miraculous interference for their preservation, and the Scots to a sudden infliction of divine vengeance. But the military incapacity of Mar, and the treachery of Murray, sufficiently account for the disaster.

On examining the field, it was found that multitudes had perished without wound or stroke of weapon, over-ridden by their own cavalry, suffocated by the pressure and weight of their armour, or trod under foot by the fury with which the rear ranks had pressed upon the front.² On one part of the ground the dead bodies lay so thick, that the mass of the

¹ Winton, vol. ii. pp. 152, 153.

² Fordun a Goodal, vol. ii. p. 305.

slain was a spear's length in depth.1 It is difficult to estimate the number of those who fell; but amongst them were some of the best and bravest of the Scottish nobility. The young Randolph Earl of Moray, whose conduct that day had been worthy of his great father, Robert Earl of Carrick, a natural son of King Edward Bruce, Alexander Fraser, Chamberlain of Scotland, who had married the sister of the late king, Murdoch Earl of Menteth, Robert Bruce, a natural son of King Robert, and the Regent Mar himself, were amongst the slain. In addition to these, there fell many Scottish knights, and men-at-arms, and probably not less than thirteen thousand infantry and camp followers.2 Duncan Earl of Fife was made prisoner, after a brave resistance, in which three hundred and sixty men-at-arms, who fought under his banner, were slain. Of the English the loss was inconsiderable: besides those of less note, it included only two knights and thirty-three esquires, a disparity in the numbers, which, although very great, is not without parallel in history.3 There does not occur in our Scottish annals a greater or more calamitous defeat than the route at Dupplin, even when stript of all the absurd and incredible additions of English historians.4 It was disgraceful, too, as its cause is to be found in the military incapacity of Mar the leader, and in the acknowledged treachery of one,

¹ Winton, vol. ii. p. 155.

² Walsingham p. 131. Fordun a Hearne, vol. iv. p. 1019.

³ At Cressy, the English lost only three knights and one esquire.

⁴ Echard, p. 145. Tyrrel, vol. iii. p. 372.

and probably of more than one, of the Scottish barons. The principal of these, Murray of Tullibardin, was speedily overtaken by the punishment which he deserved: he was made prisoner at Perth, tried, condemned, and executed.¹

After the battle of Dupplin, Baliol instantly pressed forward and took possession of Perth, which he fortified by palisades, with the intention of abiding there the assault of the enemy, for the Earl of March was still at the head of a powerful army of thirty thousand men. March was a baron of great landed power, but lightly esteemed by all parties;2 timid, and intent upon his own interest, unwilling to peril his great estates by an adherence to the losing side, and possessed of no military talents. Upon hearing the account of the defeat at Dupplin, he passed with his army over the field of battle, which presented a ghastly confirmation of the tale; and on reaching Lammerkin Wood, commanded the soldiers to cut faggots and branches to be used in filling up the fosse, should they assault Perth, against which town he now advanced. The near approach of so great an army, alarmed the citizens, who began to barricade the streets and the approach to their houses. But on reaching the high ground immediately above the town, March commanded his men to halt. mont, who intently watched his operations, observing this, called out "to take courage, for he knew they

¹ Fordun a Hearne, vol. iv. p. 1020. Fordun a Goodal, vol. ii. p. 307.

² Scala. Chron. as quoted in Hailes, vol. ii. p. 319.

VOL. II.

had friends in that army, and need fear no assault."1 It is probable, that in the halt made by March, Beaumont recognised a sign of his friendly intentions, which had been previously agreed on. It is certain at least, that this powerful baron had engaged in a treasonable correspondence with Baliol; as the intended assault was delayed, and the protracted measure of a blockade preferred; a change, which, in the mutual situation of the two parties, can be accounted for on no ground but that of a friendly feeling to Baliol. At this moment, Crab, the Flemish mercenary, appeared with his fleet in the Tay, and attacked the English ships. He was at first successful, and made a prize of the Beaumondscogge, Henry de Beaumont's vessel; but the rest of the fleet defended themselves with such resolution, that in the end, Crab was defeated, and compelled to fly to Berwick.2 This disaster gave March a plausible pretext for deserting. The blockade was changed into a retrograde movement, which soon after ended in the total dispersion of the Scottish army, and, after a decent interval, in the accession of the Earl of March to the English interest.3

¹ Winton, vol. ii. p. 156. Fordun a Goodal, vol. ii. p. 306.

² Walsingham, p. 130. The Cogga de Benmond, or Beamondscogge, was purchased by the state in 1337. It had become the property of Reginald More, Chamberlain of Scotland, who sold it to the king for two hundred pounds. Chamberlain's Accounts, p. 256.

³ Hailes' Ann. vol. ii. p. 155, in a note, attempts to exculpate March, and soften his accession to the English lords. He tries to show that March raised the leaguer of Perth, not from treachery but necessity. It is evident that much of the question, as to March's

Baliol, secure from all opposition for the present, now repaired to Scone; and in the presence of many of the gentry from Fife, Gowry, and Stratherne, was crowned King of Scotland.¹ Duncan Earl of Fife, who had joined the English party, and Sinclair, Bishop of Dunkeld, officiated at the solemnity.

The chief causes which led to this remarkable revolution, destined for a short time to overthrow the dynasty of Bruce, are not difficult of discovery. The concluding part of the late king's reign, owing to the severity with which he punished the conspiracy of Brechin, had been unpopular, and part of the dis-

treachery, and that of the "noble persons" who acted along with him, hangs on Beaumont's speech. Now, the annalist is guilty of a little piece of suppression in curtailing this speech. Beaumont really said, "Take courage, for that army, as I conjecture, will not hurt us, because I perceive, without doubt, our friends and well-wishers amongst them." Hailes makes him say, "Take courage, these men will not hurt us;" and he then observes, "Whet er he said this merely to animate the English, or whether he formed his conjecture from the disordered motions of the enemy, or whether he indeed discerned the banners of some noble persons, who secretly favoured Baliol, is uncertain." And yet after all, for these conjectures and this alleged uncertainty so plausibly brought in here, there was no ground whatever. Beaumont, in the part of the passage which Hailes has suppressed, expressly affirmed that he perceived friends in March's army. Had he consulted Winton, he would have found that this old and authentic chronicler, vol. ii. p. 156, makes Beaumont say,

"Look that ye be
Merry and glad, and have no doubt,
For we have friends in yon route."
What was the object in all this it is not easy to say,

1 Winton, vol. ii. p. 157.

contented nobility were not slow in turning their eyes from the line of Bruce, which his great energy and military talents had compelled them to respect, to the claims of Baliol, weak in personal power, but, as they imagined, better supported in right and justice. A party of English barons, headed by Henry Beaumont, one of the most powerful subjects in England, having been dispossessed by Bruce of their estates in Scotland, determined to recover them by the sword, and united themselves with Baliol, concealing their private ambition under the cloak of re-establishing the rightful heir upon the throne. They were mostly men of great power and vassalage, and were all of them more or less connected with the numerous sept of the Comyns, the inveterate enemies of Bruce. They received private encouragement and support from the king of England, and they began their enterprise when the civil government in Scotland, and the leading of its armies, was in the hands of Mar and March: the first a person of no talents or energy, and suspected of being inclined to betray his trust; the second undoubtedly a favourer of the English party.

There was nothing, therefore, very extraordinary in the temporary recovery of the crown by Baliol; but a very short time showed him how little dependence was to be placed on such a possession. The friends of the line of Bruce were still numerous in the country: amongst them were the oldest and most experienced soldiers in Scotland; and the feelings of the nation were entirely on their side.

Perth had been fortified by the disinherited lords; after which Baliol made a progress to the southern parts of Scotland, and committed the custody of the town to the Earl of Fife. It was soon after attacked and stormed by Sir Simon Fraser and Sir Robert Keith, who destroyed the fortifications, and took the constable Fife and his daughter prisoners. Upon this first gleam of success, Sir Andrew Moray of Bothwell, who had married Christian, the sister of the late king, was chosen regent; and his first care was to send the king, then only nine years old, along with his youthful queen, to France, where they were honourably and kindly received. Meanwhile Baliol, with ready pusillanimity, hastened to surrender to Edward the liberties of Scotland; and the English king moved on to the borders with the declared purpose of attending to the safety of that divided country. The transactions which followed at Roxburgh throw a strong light upon the characters of both sovereigns.

After many hypocritical declarations as to the solemn and conscientious observation of the treaty of Northampton, the English king now dropt the mask, and declared, that the successes of Baliol, in Scotland, were procured by the assistance of his good subjects, and with his express permission or sufferance.² In return for this assistance, Baliol acknowledged Edward as his feudal lord, and promised that he would

Fordun a Goodal, vol. ii. p. 307. Winton, vol. ii. p. 160.

² Rymer's Fædera, vol. iv. p. 538. The deed is dated Roxburgh, 23d November, 1332.

be true and loyal to the English king and to his heirs, the rightful sovereigns of the kingdom of Scotland, and the isles pertaining thereto. In addition to this, he became bound to put Edward in possession of the town, castle, and territory of Berwick, and of other lands in fit and convenient places upon the marches, extending to the value of two thousand pounds; and affecting to consider the Princess Joanna of England as only betrothed to King David Bruce, he proposed himself as a more convenient match, and offered to provide for David Bruce in whatever way Edward should think fit. He lastly became bound to assist the English king, in all his wars, with two hundred men-at-arms, raised and maintained at his own charges; and he engaged that his successors should furnish a hundred men-at-arms for the same service. The penalty affixed to the breach of this agreement, was a fatal part of the treaty. If Baliol, or his successors, neglected to appear in the field, they became obliged to pay to England the enormous sum of two hundred thousand pounds sterling; and if this money could not be raised, it was agreed that Edward should take possession of the "remainder of Scotland and the isles." This last obligation, which was to be perpetually in force, evidently gave Edward the power of draining Scotland of its best soldiers, and in the event of resistance, of at once seizing and appropriating the kingdom.1

Thus, in a moment of mean and sordid selfishness,

¹ Fœdera, vol. iv. pp. 536 and 548.

were the chains, which had cost Robert Bruce thirty years' war to break, again attempted to be fixed upon a free country, and this by the degenerate hands of one of her own children. But Baliol's hour of prosperity was exceeding brief. Strong, as he imagined, in the protection of the king of England, and encouraged in his security by the readiness with which many of the Scottish barons had consented to recognise his title,1 the new king lay carelessly encamped at Annan, not aware of the approach of a body of armed horse, under the command of the Earl of Moray, the second son of the great Randolph, along with Sir Simon Fraser and Archibald Douglas, brother to Bruce's old companion in arms, the Good Sir James. These barons, informed of Baliol's remissness in his discipline, made a sudden and rapid march from Moffat, in the twilight of a December evening, and broke in upon him at midnight. Taken completely by surprise, the nobles who were with him, and their vassals and retainers, were put to the sword without mercy. Henry Baliol, his brother, after a gallant resistance, was slain; and Walter Comyn, Sir John de Moubray, and Sir Richard Kirby, met their deaths along with him. The Earl of Carrick was made prisoner; and Baliol, in fear of his life, and almost naked, threw himself upon a horse, and with difficulty escaped into England.2 Carrick, the natural son of King Edward Bruce, would have been executed as a traitor, but young Randolph in-

¹ Fordun a Hearne, p. 1020, 1021. Winton, vol. ii. p. 159.

² Winton, vol. ii. p. 161.

terfered and saved his life. With the assistance of strangers and mercenary troops, it had cost Baliol only seven weeks to gain a crown. In less than three months it was torn from his brow, he himself chased from Scotland, and cast once more a fugitive and an exile upon the charity of England.

Encouraged by this success, and justly incensed at the assistance given by Edward to Baliol and the disinherited lords, the Scottish leaders began to retaliate by breaking in upon the English borders. It is a singular instance of diplomatic effrontery, that the English king, on hearing of this invasion, accused the Scots of having violated the treaty of Northampton; in his correspondence with the king of France and the court of Rome, he does not hesitate to cast upon that nation the whole blame of the recommencement of the war; and as if this was not enough, the English historians accuse them, in broad terms, of having attacked Baliol at Annan during the existence of a truce. Both the one and the other assertion appear to be unfounded.

¹ He landed 31st July, and was crowned 24th Sept. He was surprised and chased into England on 16th December.

² Rymer's Fædera, vol. iv. p. 552.

³ During the whole period of his intrigues and alliance with Baliol, both before and after his successes in Scotland, Edward had taken especial care, in his correspondence with Rome, to keep the Pope entirely ignorant of the real state of Scottish affairs; and the cause of this sedulous concealment was the dread of being subjected in the payment of two thousand pounds, the stipulated fine in case he infringed the treaty.—Knighton, p. 2560.

⁴ Lingard's Hist. of England, vol. iv. p. 23. The passage in Wal-

Hostilities having again broke out between the two nations, the border inroads recommenced with their accustomed fury, but at first were attended with circumstances disastrous for Scotland. It happened that Baliol, after his flight from Annan, had experienced the Christmas hospitality of Lord Dacres; in return for which kindness, Archibald Douglas, at the head of a small army of three thousand men, broke in upon Gillesland, and wasted the country belonging to Dacres with fire and sword, spreading desolation for a distance of thirty miles, and carrying off much booty. To revenge this, Sir Anthony Lucy of Cockermouth, and William of Lochmaben, with eight hundred men, penetrated into Scotland; but on their return were encountered by Sir William Douglas, commonly called the Knight of Liddesdale, and at that time keeper of Lochmaben Castle. After a sore conflict, in which Lucy was grievously wounded, Douglas was totally defeated. Of the Scotch, a hundred and sixty men-at-arms, including Sir Humphrey Jardine, Sir Humphrey Boys, and William Carlisle, were left on the field, and the best of the chivalry of Annandale were either slain or made captive. Amongst the prisoners were Douglas himself, Sir William Baird, and a hundred other knights and gentlemen.

So pleased was Edward with the prize he had won

singham, p. 132, will not prove anything, for neither March nor Douglas were at the head of affairs, but Sir Andrew Moray.

¹ Walsingham, p. 132.

in the knight of Liddesdale, who was a natural son of the Good Sir James, and inherited his father's remarkable talents for war, that he issued special orders for his strict confinement in iron fetters; and Baliol, who, a short time before this success, had again entered Scotland, and established himself, after some partial successes, in the castle of Roxburgh, endeavoured to confirm his authority in Annandale, by bestowing the lands of the knights who were slain upon his English followers.

Another disaster followed hard upon the defeat of Douglas at Lochmaben. The Regent Sir Andrew Moray, with a strong body of soldiers, attacked and attempted to storm the castle of Roxburgh, where Baliol then lay. A severe conflict took place on the bridge, and in the onset, Ralph Golding, a brave esquire in the regent's service, pushing on far before the rest, was overpowered by the English. Moray, in the ardour of the moment, more mindful of his duty as a knight than a leader, attempted singly to rescue him, and instantly shared his fate.3 Disdaining to surrender to any inferior knight, he demanded to be led to the king of England, and being brought to Edward, was thrown into prison, where he remained for two vears. The Scots, who had now lost in Douglas and Moray two of their best soldiers, at a time when they so much needed them, endeavoured to supply their place by conferring the office of regent upon Archi-

¹ Rymer's Fædera, vol. iv. p. 552.

² Rotuli Scotiæ, 8. Ed. III. 18 Nov. vol. i. p. 294.

³ Fordun a Goodal, vol. ii. pp. 309, 310.

bald Douglas, Lord of Galloway, the brother of the Good Sir James.¹

In consequence of these advantages, Edward determined to carry on the war with renewed spirit. He assembled a powerful army, besought the prayers of the church for his success, and wrote to the Earl of Flanders, and to the magistrates of Bruges, Ghent, and Ypres, requesting them to abstain from rendering assistance to the Scots.2 He informed the king of France, who had interposed his good offices in behalf of his ancient allies, that, as the Scots had repeatedly broken the peace, by invading and despoiling his country, he was necessitated to repel these outrages by force of arms;3 and having taken these preliminary steps, he put himself at the head of his army, and sat down before Berwick. The Scots, on their side, were not unprepared to receive him. Although Crab's disaster, in the former year, had weakened their strength by sea, they still possessed a fleet of ships of war, which committed great havoc on the English coasts, and plundered their sea-ports;4 and Douglas the regent exerted himself to raise an army equal to the emergency. The defence of the castle of Berwick was committed to the Earl of March, whose conduct, after the battle of Dupplin, had evinced already the strongest leaning to the English interest; the command of the town was intrusted to Sir Alex-

¹ Fordun a Goodal, vol. ii. pp. 310.

² Rotuli Scotiæ, 7 Ed. III. pp. 233, 234. Fædera, vol. iv. p. 556.

³ Fædera, vol. iv. p. 557.

⁴ Rotuli Scotiæ, vol. i. pp. 233, 249, and 252.

ander Seton.1 The garrison appears neither to have been numerous nor well supplied; but for some time they made a gallant defence, and succeeded in sinking and destroying by fire a great part of the English fleet. Edward at first attempted to fill up the ditch with hurdles, and to carry the town by assault; but having been repulsed, he converted the attack into a blockade, and as the strength and extent of his lines enabled him to cut off all supplies, it became apparent, that if not relieved in a short time, Berwick must fall. After the blockade had continued for some time, a negotiation took place, by which the besieged agreed to capitulate by a certain day, unless succours were thrown into the town before that time; and for the strict performance of the stipulations, the Scots delivered hostages to Edward, amongst whom was a son of Seton the governor.2 The period had nearly expired, when, one morning at the break of day, the citizens, to their great joy, saw the army of Scotland, led by the regent in person, approach the Tweed, and cross the river at the Yare ford. They approached Berwick on the south side of the river, and although the English endeavoured to defend every passage, Sir William Keith, Sir William Prendergest, and Sir Alexander Gray, with a body of Scottish soldiers, succeeded in throwing themselves into the town. The main body of the Scots, after having remained drawn up in order of battle, and in

¹ Scala Chron. quoted in Hailes, vol. ii. p. 317, and Rotuli Scotiæ, vol. i. p. 272, Compot. Camerarii Scotiæ, p. 255.

sight of the English army for a day and a half, struck their tents at noon of the second day, and, with the hope of producing a diversion, entered Northumberland, and wasted the country with fire and sword. But although they menaced Bamburgh castle, where Edward had placed his young queen, that monarch, intent upon his object, continued before Berwick; and on the departure of the Scottish &rmy, peremptorily required the town to be given up, as the term stipulated for their being succoured had now expired. This demand the besieged refused to comply with; they asserted that they had received succours, both of men and of provisions; the knights, they said, who had led these succours, were now with them; out of their number they had chosen new governors, of whom Sir William Keith was one; and they declared their intention of defending the city to the last extremity.1 Edward upbraided the citizens, accused them of duplicity, and requested the advice of his council with regard to the treatment of the hostages. It was their opinion that the Scots had broken the stipulations of the treaty, and that the lives of the hostages were forfeited. The king then commanded the son of the late governor to prepare for death, expecting that the threatened severity of the example, and the rank and influence of his father, would induce the townsmen to surren-But he was disappointed; and Thomas Seton, a comely and noble-looking youth, was hanged before the gate of the town,2 and, it is said, so near, that the

¹ Scala Chron. apud Hailes, vol. ii. p. 316.

² Fordun a Hearne, vol. iv. p. 1022.

unhappy father could witness the execution from the walls. Immediately after this, the citizens became alarmed for the lives of the rest of the hostages, and from affection for their children, renewed the negotiations for surrender, unless succoured before a certain day. To this resolution Keith their governor encouraged them, by holding out the sure hope of the siege being raised by the Scottish army, which he represented as superior to that of England.2 Unhappily they embraced his advice. It was stipulated, in a solemn instrument yet preserved, and with a minuteness which should leave no room for a second misunderstanding, that Berwick was to be given up to the English, unless the Scots, before or on the 19th of July, should succeed in throwing two hundred men-at-arms into the town by dry land, or should overcome the English army in a pitched field.3

Keith, the governor of the town, was permitted, by the treaty of capitulation, to have an interview with the regent, Archibald Douglas. He represented the desperate situation of the citizens; magnified the im-

¹ See Appendix, letter C.

² Scala Chron. in Hailes, vol. ii. p. 319. Ad Murinath, p. 80. Hailes says, and quotes Fordun, B. 13. c. 27. as his authority, that during a general assault, the town was set on fire, and in a great measure consumed; and that the inhabitants, dreading a storm, implored Sir William Keith and the Earl of March to seek terms of capitulation. Neither Fordun, nor his continuator Bower, nor Winton, say any thing of the town having been set on fire. The English historians, Walsingham and Hemingford, indeed assert it; but it is not to be found in the narrative of the Scala Chronicle, which appears to be the most authentic; I have therefore omitted it.

³ Fædera, vol. iv. pp. 566, 567.

portance of the town, which must be lost, he said, unless immediately relieved; and persuaded the regent to risk a battle. The resolution was the most imprudent that could have been adopted. It was contrary to the dying injunctions of Bruce, who had recommended his captains never to hazard a battle if they could protract the war, and lay waste the country; and especially so at this moment, as desertion and mutiny now began to show themselves in the English army, which all the endeavours of Edward had not been able to suppress.1 Notice, too, had reached the camp, of illegal meetings and confederations having taken place in London during the king's absence, and the people of the northern shires had peremptorily refused to join the army; so that there was every probability that it must soon have been disbanded.2 In expectation of this result, Seton, the former governor, had determined to hold out the town to the last extremity, and sternly refused to capitulate, although the life of his son hung upon the issue. But his resolution was counteracted by the ignorant rashness of Keith, the new governor of the town, as well as by the excusable affection of the citizens for their sons, who were hostages. The regent suffered himself to be overruled, and on the day before the festival of the Virgin, being the 18th of July, the Scottish army crossed the Tweed, and encamped at a place called Dunsepark. Upon this, Ed-

¹ Rotuli Scot. 7 Ed. III. m. 26, dorso, vol. i. p. 235.

² Rotuli Scotiæ, vol. i. pp. 234, 244.

ward Baliol and the King of England drew up their forces on the eminence of Halidon Hill, situated to the west of the town of Berwick. Nothing could be more advantageous than the position of the English. They were drawn up in four great battalia, each of which was flanked by choice bodies of archers. A marsh divided the hill on which they stood from the opposite eminence, and on this rising ground the Scottish commanders halted and arranged their order of battle.1 It consisted also of four battalia, led respectively by the regent Douglas; the Stewart of Scotland, then a youth of seventeen, under the direction of his uncle Sir James Stewart; the Earl of Moray, son of the great Randolph, assisted by two veteran leaders of approved valour, James and Simon Fraser, and the Earl of Ross. The nature of the ground rendered it impossible for the English position to be attacked by cavalry. The Scottish army accordingly fought on foot, and the leaders and heavyarmed knights having dismounted, delivered their horses to be kept by the sutlers and camp boys in Before reaching their enemy, it was necessary for them to march through the soft and unequal ground of the marsh; an enterprise which required much time, and was full of danger, as it ine-

¹ I take this from an interesting and curious manuscript preserved in the British Museum, Bib. Harleiana, No. 4690, of which I find a transcript by Macpherson, the editor of Winton, and a most accurate investigator into Scottish history, in his MS. Notes on Lord Hailes' Annals. As it has never been printed, I have given it in the appendix, letter D. Winton, vol. ii. p. 169.

vitably exposed the whole mass of the army to the discharge of the English archers, the fatal effects of which they had experienced in many a bloody field. Yet, contrary to the advice of the elder officers, who had been trained under Bruce and Randolph, this desperate attempt was made, and the Scots, with their characteristic national impetuosity, eagerly advanced through the marsh. The consequence was what might have been expected: their ranks, crowded together, soon fell into confusion; their advance was retarded; and the English archers, who had time for a steady aim, plied their bows with such deadly effect, that numbers of the Scots were every instant slain or disabled. An ancient manuscript says, that the arrows flew as thick as motes in the sunbeam, and that the Scots fell to the ground by thousands.1 It could not indeed be otherwise; for from the nature of the ground, it was impossible to come to close fighting, and having no archers, they were slaughtered without resistance; the English remaining in the meantime uninjured, with their trumpets and nakers sounding amid the groans of their dying enemies, while their king was fighting on foot in the front of the battle. Upon this dreadful carnage many of the Scots began to fly; but the better part of the army. led on by the nobility, at last extricated themselves from the marsh, and, pressing up the hill, attacked the enemy with great fury. It was difficult, however,

¹ MS. Harleian, Appendix, letter D. Ad Murimuth, p. 80, VOL, II. C

for men, breathless by climbing the acclivity, and disspirited by the loss sustained in the marsh, to contend against fresh troops admirably posted, and under excellent discipline; so that, although the Scots for a little time fiercely sustained the battle, their efforts being unconnected, the day, in spite of all their exertions, ultimately went against them.

The Earl of Ross, in leading the reserve to attack the wing where Baliol commanded, was driven back and slain. Soon after, the regent Douglas was mortally wounded and made prisoner. The Earls of Lennox, Athole, Carrick, and Sutherland, along with James and Simon Fraser, were struck down and killed, while the English, advancing in firm array with their long spears, entirely broke and drove off the field the remains of the Scottish army. In the pursuit which succeeded, the carnage was very great. Besides the nobles and barons already mentioned, John Stewart, uncle of the Steward of Scotland, was killed, and James Stewart, another of his uncles, was mortally wounded and made prisoner. Malise, Earl of Strathern, John de Graham, Alexander de Lindesay, and other barons of high rank, were also slain; and with them fell, on the lowest calculation, fourteen thousand men. Such was the disastrous defeat of the Scots at Halidon Hill. The battle was fought on the twentieth day of July, and the English monarch immediately addressed letters to the archbishops and

Winton, vol. ii. p. 170. Fordun a Hearne, vol. iv. p. 1021. Fordun a Goodal, vol. ii. p. 311.

bishops of his dominions, directing them to return thanks to God for so signal a victory.¹

In the conflicting accounts of the various annalists, the exact number of the two armies, and the extent of the loss on either side, cannot be easily ascertained. It seems probable, that nearly the whole of the men-at-arms in the Scottish ranks were put to the sword either in the battle or in the pursuit; and that of the confused multitude which escaped, the greater part were pages, sutlers, and camp followers. So great was the slaughter of the nobility, that, after the battle, it was currently said amongst the English, that the Scottish wars were at last ended, since not a man was left of that nation who had either skill, power, or inclination, to assemble an army or direct its operations.²

The consequences of the battle of Halidon were the instantaneous delivery of the town and castle of Berwick into the hands of the English, and the sub-

¹ Winton, vol. ii. p. 166, says the Scots had an army full sixty thousand strong. It is observed by Edward, in his letters ordaining a public thanksgiving, that the victory was obtained without great loss upon his side; an expression proving the absurdity of the assertion of the English historians, that of their army only thirteen foot soldiers, with one knight and one esquire, were slain. Nor is it unworthy of remark, that the king makes no allusion to any inferiority of force upon the English side; which, had such been the case, he could scarcely have failed to do, if we consider the subject of his letter. When the English historians inform us that the Scots were five times more numerous than their opponents, we must consider it as a gross exaggeration, and totally incredible.

² Murimuth, p. 81.

sequent submission of almost the whole kingdom to Baliol, who traversed it with an army which found no enemy to oppose it.1 Five strong castles, however, still remained in possession of the adherents of David, and these eventually served as so many rallying points to the friends of liberty. The fortresses in question were Dumbarton, which was held by Malcolm Fleming; Urquhart, in Inverness-shire, commanded by Thomas Lauder; Lochleven, by Alan de Vipont; Kildrummie, by Christian Bruce, the sister of Robert the First; and Lochmaben, by Patrick de Chartres.² A strong-hold in Lochdown, on the borders of Carrick, was also retained for David Bruce by John Thomson, a brave soldier of fortune, and probably the same person, who, after the fatal battle of Dundalk, led home from Ireland the broken remains of the army of King Edward Bruce.3

Patrick, Earl of March, who had long been suspected of a secret leaning to the English, now made his peace with them, and swore fealty to Edward; and along with him many persons of rank and authority were compelled to pay a temporary homage: but the measures which Edward adopted, on making himself master of Berwick, were little calculated to conciliate the minds of those whom he somewhat prematurely considered as a conquered people. He seized and forfeited the estates of all the barons in

¹ Fordun a Goodal, vol. ii. p. 311.

² Rotuli Scotiæ, 8 Ed. III. vol. i. p. 274.

³ Fordun a Goodal, vol. ii. p. 311.

the county of Berwick, who held their property by charter from King Robert; in giving leases of houses within the town, or of lands within the shire, he prohibited his tenants and vassals from subleasing them to any except Englishmen; he directed the warden of the town to collect together all the Scottish monks whom he suspected of instilling rebellious principles into their countrymen, and to transport them to England, to be there dispersed amongst the monasteries of their respective orders on the south side of the Trent; and he commanded the chiefs of the different monastic orders in England to depute to Scotland some of their most talented brethren, who were capable of preaching pacific and salutary doctrines to the people, and of turning their hostility into friendship. Orders were also transmitted to the magistrates of London, and other principal towns in the kingdom, directing them to invite merchants and traders to settle in Berwick, under promise of ample privileges and immunities; and, in the anticipation that these pacific measures might still be inadequate to keep down the spirit of resistance, he emptied the prisons throughout England of several thousands of criminals condemned for murder and other heinous offences, and presented them with a free pardon, on the condition of their serving him in his Scottish wars.2

Baliol having thus possessed himself of the crown by foreign assistance, seemed determined to complete

¹ Rotuli Scotiæ, 8 Ed. III. vol. i. pp. 272, 275.

² Rotuli Scotiæ, 7 Ed. III. vol. i. pp. 254. 258,

the humiliation of his country. An assembly of his party was held at Edinburgh on the 10th of February. Lord Geoffrey Scrope, High Justiciar of England, attended as Commissioner from Edward, along with Sir Edward Bohun, Lord William Montague, Sir Henry Percy, and Ralph Neville, seneschal of England. As was to be expected, every thing was managed by English influence. Lord Henry Beaumont, the Earl of Athole, and Lord Richard Talbot, were rewarded with the extensive possessions of the Comyns in Buchan and Badenoch. The vale of Annandale and Moffatdale, with the fortress of Lochmaben, were bestowed upon Lord Henry Percy; and the Earl of Surrey, Ralph Lord Neville of Raby, Lord John Mowbray, and Sir Edward Bohun, were remunerated for their labours in the Scottish war by grants of the estates of those who had fallen at Halidon, or who were forfeited for their adherence to David Bruce. To his royal patron, more extensive sacrifices were due. Not only was the town, castle, and extensive county of Berwick surrendered to the King of England, but the forests of Jedburgh, Selkirk, and Ettrick, the wealthy counties of Roxburgh, Peebles, Dumfries, and Edinburgh, the constabularies of Linlithgow and Haddington, with the towns and castles situated within these extensive districts, were, by a solemn instrument, annexed for ever to the kingdom of England.1

¹ Rymer, Fædera, vol. iv. pp. 614. 616. Rotuli Scotiæ, vol. i. p. 261.

To complete the dismemberment of the kingdom. there was only wanting a surrender of the national liberties. Accordingly this mean-spirited baron appeared before Edward at Newcastle, acknowledged him for his liege lord, and swore fealty for the whole kingdom of Scotland, and the Isles adjacent. Edward, thus rendered master of the fairest and most populous part of Scotland, hastened to send English governors to his new dominions; while the friends of the young king once more retired into the mountains and fastnesses of their country, and waited for a favourable opportunity of rising against their oppress-Nor was it long ere an occasion presented itself. Dissensions broke out amongst those English barons to whose valour Baliol owed his restoration: and a petty family quarrel gave rise to an important counter-revolution.

The brother of Alexander de Mowbray died, leaving daughters, but no male heirs; upon which Mowbray claimed the estate of his brother, in exclusion of the heirs-female, and, by a decision of Baliol, was put in possession; —an award, which was the more extraordinary, as it went to destroy his own title to the crown. The cause of the disinherited daughters was warmly espoused by Henry de Beaumont, Richard Talbot, and the Earl of Athole, all of them connected by marriage with the powerful family of the Comyns; and, upon the denial of their suit by Baliol, these fierce barons retired in disgust from

¹ Rotuli Scotiæ, p. 263.

² Fordun a Goodal, vol. ii. p. 312. Winton, vol. ii. p. 175.

court. Beaumont, taking the law into his own hands, retired to his strong castle of Dundarg in Buchan, and seized a large portion of the disputed lands which lay in that earldom. Athole removed to his strongholds in the country of Athole; and Talbot, who had married the daughter of the Red Comyn slain by Bruce, collected his vassals, and prepared for war. Encouraged by the disunion amongst their enemies, the old friends of the dynasty of Bruce began again to reappear from their concealment; and, at this favourable conjuncture, Sir Andrew Moray of Bothwell2 was released from his captivity, and returned to Scotland. At the same time, the Scottish ships of war, assisted by a fleet of their allies, richly laden with provisions and arms, and well manned with soldiers, hovered on the coast, and threatened to intercept the English vessels which had been sent by Edward with supplies for his adherents in Scotland.3 Baliol in the meantime, irresolute and alarmed, retreated to Berwick, and reversed his decision in favour of Mowbray. But this step came too late to conciliate Beaumont, and it entirely alienated Mowbray, who, eager to embrace any method of humbling his rivals, went over with his friends and vassals to the party of David Bruce, and cordially cooperated with Moray, the late Regent.

And now the kingdom which Edward so lately be-

¹ M'Pherson's Notes on Winton, vol. ii. p. 506, 509.

Erroneously called by Maitland, vol. i. p. 520, the Earl of Bothwell.

³ Rotuli Scot. vol. i. p. 279. 20th Sept. 1334.

lieved his own, on the first gleam of returning hope, was up in arms, and ready again to become the theatre of mortal debate and contention. Talbot, in an attempt to pass with a body of men-at-arms into England, was attacked and taken prisoner by Sir William Keith of Galston; six of the knights who accompanied him, and many of his armed vassals, being put to the sword. He was instantly shut up in the strong fortress of Dumbarton; and one of their most powerful opponents being disposed of, Moray and Mowbray hastened to besiege Lord Henry Beaumont in the castle of Dundarg. This, however, was no easy enterprise. Situated on a precipitous rock overhanging the Murray Firth, the strong retreat which Beaumont had chosen was connected with the mainland by a neck of land so narrow, that a few resolute men could defend it against a multitude. To attempt to storm it would have been certain defeat; and Moray chose rather, by a strict blockade, to compel Beaumont to surrender. unexpected circumstance accelerated his success. Having discovered the situation of the pipes which supplied the garrison with water, he mined the ground, cut them through, and reduced the English baron to extremity. Beaumont capitulated; and, upon payment of a high ransom, was permitted to retire into England.2

¹ Walsingham, p. 134. Leland, Collect. vol. i. p. 554. Fordun a Goodal, vol. ii. p. 325.

² Fordun a Goodal, vol. ii. p. 312. Stat. Acct. of Scotland, vol. xii. p. 578.

42

Amongst the numerous confiscations which followed his brief possession of power, Baliol conferred the extensive possessions of Robert, the Steward of Scotland, upon the Earl of Athole; while this young baron himself, ever since the calamitous battle of Halidon, had lain concealed in Bute, and escaped the search of his enemies. With a prudence and determination superior to his years, he now organised a plan for escaping to the castle of Dumbarton, in which he happily succeeded. Two old vassals of the family, named Gibson and Heriot, brought a boat to Rothesay late in the evening, and the Steward, accompanied only by a chamber-boy and two servants, threw himself into it, and rowed that night to Overtunnock, from which they crossed to Dumbarton, where they were joyfully welcomed by Malcolm Fleming the governor.1 Here he did not long remain inactive; but assembling his scattered vassals, with the assistance of Colin Campbell of Lochnow, he attacked and stormed the castle of Dunoon in Cowal.

The news of this success soon flew to Bute; and there the hereditary vassals of the young patriot instantly rose upon the English governor, Alan de Lyle, put him to death, and proceeded, carrying his head in savage triumph along with them, to join their master. The Castle of Bute soon after fell into the hands of the insurgents.²

¹ Winton, vol. ii. p. 178. Fordun a Goodal, vol. ii. p. 313.

² Winton calls the vassals of the young Steward " The Brandanys of Bute;" and in describing the battle in which Lyle was slain, tells us, they overwhelmed him with showers of stones, hence