

NOTES AND ILLUSTRATIONS.

I.

DIURNAL OF OCCURRENTS IN SCOTLAND.¹

Authenticity of the First Part of this Work.

THE frequent references in the text to the first part of this work, as an original and valuable authority, renders it necessary for me to explain the reasons why I have been led to form a different opinion of its authenticity from that given by its learned editor. In the Prefatory Notice to the volume, there is this sentence, "to those who are at all acquainted with the minute details of Scottish history in the sixteenth century, a very slight perusal of the work will suggest, that in its different parts it is of very unequal value. From the era of the battle of Floddon, and the death of King James the Fourth, in the year 1513, at which it commences, down to the termination of the government of the Earl of Arran in 1553, its details, comparatively meagre and occasionally inaccurate, are obviously not recorded by a contemporary chronicler, but must have been derived from tradition and other imperfect sources. Yet, even in this first and least valuable portion of the work, will be found many minute facts and notices that would be vainly looked for in the ordinary histories of the reign of King James the Fifth, and the first ten years of the reign of Queen Mary."¹ In pronouncing this first portion of the *Diurnal of Occurrents* the work, not of a contemporary chronicler, but of some subsequent writer, deriving his materials from tradition, and other imperfect sources

¹ Published by the Bannatyne Club.

² Preface, p. 1.

the Editor appears to me to have fallen into an error, which could scarcely have been avoided by one who compared the Diurnal of Occurrents with our earlier historians, Lesly and Buchanan, or even with the later volumes of Maitland. It not only is contradicted by them in some important particulars, but it contains events, and these not minute, but grave and material facts, which are not to be found in either of these authors. These events, however, can be proved to have occurred by evidence, of which the authenticity is unimpeachable; and it is the discovery of their perfect truth which has induced me to consider the greater portion of the first part of the Chronicle, entitled the "Diurnal of Occurrents in Scotland," as the work of a contemporary, who wrote from his own knowledge, and not a compilation from traditionary sources. I say the greater portion, because such a character belongs not to the whole of the first part; and it appears to me, that this valuable original matter has fallen into the hands of some later and ignorant compiler, who, preserving the purer ore, has in some places mixed it up with baser and more erroneous matter of his own.

To support these conclusions, let me give some proofs; the years 1543, 1544, occurring in the Regency of Arran, form an obscure æra in our history; and did we possess no other guides than the common historians, Lesly, Buchanan, or Maitland, we should be left in a maze of confusion and contradiction. The revolutions in state affairs are so sudden and so frequent during this period; the changes in the politics and the conduct of the different factions so rapid, and so apparently contradictory, that without some more authentic guides, the task of unravelling or explaining them would be hopeless. It is upon this period that the original correspondence in the State Paper Office throws a flood of clear and useful light, introducing us to the actors in these changes, not through any second hand or suspected sources, but by supplying us with their original letters to Henry the Eighth, and his ministers. Now, to come from this observation to the work entitled the Diurnal of Occurrents. When it is found that it, and it only, contains various facts, demonstrated by these original letters to be true, and which sometimes are not mentioned, sometimes are positively contradicted by our general historians; such a circumstance will be allowed, I think, to create a strong presumption in favor of its value and authenticity; that a work, which stands this severe test, should

have been, not a contemporary, but a later production, compiled from tradition, and imperfect sources, seems to me nearly impossible.

To take an example from the period of which I have already spoken. In the year 1544, in the *Diurnal of Occurrents*, p. 33, we find this passage,—“ Upon the thrid day of Junii, thare was ane general counsall haldin at Stirling, quhairat was all the nobelles of Scotland, exceptand the Erle of Lennox and Glencairn ; quhair the governor was dischargit of his auctorite ; and maid proclamation through the realm, that nane obeyit him as governor ; and als thair thei chesit thrie erlis, thrie lords, thrie bishops, thrie abbotes to be the secreit counsale ; quhilk lastet not lang, for everie lord ded for his awin particular profit, and tuk na heid of the commonweill ; but tholet the Inglismen, and theivis to overrin this realm.” In the same chronicle, p. 34, is this sentence,—“ Upon the last day of Julii, thare was ane Parliament sould have been halden in Edinburgh ; and the governor, with his complices furneist the town, and held it, becaus he gat word the queenis grace drowarie was cummit out of Striveling to the Parliament ; becaus thai yet being in hir company was full of dissait, sho past to Stirling with meikle ordinance and swa the Parliament was stayit.” Again, in the same chronicle, p. 36, we find this passage,—“ Upon the 5th day, (1544) the governor held ane parliament in Edinburgh—Upon the 12th of November, the queen’s grace drowrier (dowager) held ane parliament in Striveling, and thereafter the parties suld have met, and stayet in hope of aggreance, and the cardinal raid betwix them, quha come to Edinburgh and tuke the governor to Stirling with him, quhair gude aggreance was made to be bund to hir grace, and twentee four Lordis counsall.” It will be at once perceived, that these passages embody the history of an important revolution, which, for nearly six months changed the whole face of affairs in Scotland. In May 1544, Arran was the unchallenged governor of the kingdom ; in June, the queen dowager arose against him, was joined by the whole body of the peers excepting Lennox and Glencairn, held a general council at Stirling, in which he was discharged from his office, made proclamation through the realm, that none should obey him, and appointed a new secret council for the management of the affairs of the state. In July, as is shown by the second extract, an attempt was made by Arran, who still claimed the name and

authority of governor to hold a parliament in Edinburgh; but the queen dowager advanced with great force to the city; the governor fortified it against her; she retreated to Stirling, and the parliament was delayed. Three months after this, in the beginning of November, Arran, the governor, assembled a parliament at Edinburgh; the queen issued writs for a reval parliament, to be held on the 12th of the same month at Stirling; and the cardinal dreading the effects of this miserable disunion, acted as a peacemaker between the two parties, and at length brought them to an agreement.

Now, of these very important events, no notice whatever was to be found in our general historians; nay, the tenor of their narratives seemed to contradict them; the question, therefore, at once came to the credibility of the Diurnal of Occurrents. In this dilemma I was delighted (the reader, who knows the satisfaction of resting in researches of this nature upon an authentic document, will pardon the warmth of the expression) to meet with the following paper in the State Paper Office, which, it will be seen, completely corroborated the assertion of the Diurnal as to the deprivation of the governor. It is dated June 1544, and entitled "Copy.—Agreement of the principal Scots nobility, to support the authority of the queen mother as regent of Scotland against the Earl of Arran, declared by this instrument to be deprived of his office." This valuable paper in its entire state, will be given in the forthcoming volume of State Papers relative to Scotland, published by government. In the mean time, the following extract will be sufficient for my purpose. After stating the fact of a convention having been held at Stirling on the 3rd of June; it proceeds thus to describe their deliberations and proceedings. "After long and mature consultacion had, in the said matiers, by the space of iii. or iv. daies contynuall, fynally (they) fand that oon great part why inobedience hath ben within this realme, sithins the king's grace's; and that other inconveniences which have happened, was, and is in my lord governor, and his counsaile, that was chosen to have ben with him for the time; and for remedye herof in times commyng; and that perfit obedience maie be to our soverain ladie's auctorite, (that) unite, concorde, and amitee maie be hadd among all our soverain ladie's lieges;

and specialle among the great men; and that they maie convent at all times to give their counsaile in all matiers concernyng the quene's grace our soverain ladye, and her realme; and that justice maie be doon and executed among the lieges therof; and that resistance maie be made to our ennymies. They all, without variaunce, consulted and deliberated, that the quene's grace, our soverain ladye's mother, shulde be Egall with him therintill; and that oon great counsaile adjoynd with my lord governor in the using of th' authoritie of government in all times comyng, shulde be chosen of xvi. persones,—xii. of them the greatest erles and temporal lords of the realme, and iv. spiritual men, as in the deliveraunce mad therupon the vi.th daie of the saide monith of Junii, is at more length conteyned. The whiche deliveraunce and counsaile, was shewen and declared to my lorde Governor, before the quene's grace and the whole lords the saide vi.th daie of Junii. And the lords, who devised the same, praied my lord governor that he wold consent therto, both for his owne weale, and for the weale of our soverain ladye the quene, and of the whole realme for divers causes and respects, particularly appointed and declared; and specially, because the quene's grace our soverain ladie's mother is a noble ladye of highe linage and bludde, of great wisdom, and haile of lief having the king of Ffrance, and the greatest nobles of that realme, and others about hyr, tendre kynsmen, and friends who will be the more readye to supporte the realme for defense of the same if hyr grace be well favoured and honored by the nobles therof, and holden in honor and dignitie; and also, because the whole nobles have their special confidence in hyr grace, and doo think them sure to convene in any place where hyr grace is present. My lord Governor tuke to be advised, while the morne at even, viz. the viiith daie of the saide monith, and then to give the answer. Attour that same daie incontinent the saide deliveraunce and consultacion, was shewen to the remanent of the lords, both prelates, erles, lords, barons, and other noble men of the realme personallie present, who, being all singularie asked of their opinion, declared ilk man for himselfe that the saide deliveraunce and consultacion was good and for the common weale of this realme. And therefore affirmed the same. The which viiith daie being bepast, And noon answer made nor sent by my lorde Governor on the premises, And aftre diverse messages sent to him of the lords

of Counsaile, and nothing reoported again but vayne delaies, The lords of Counsaile upon the ixth daie of the saide moneth directed furth our soverain ladie's (letres) to require my saide lorde Governor to compare, in the said Graye ffrers place of Striveling where the said convencion is holden upon the x.th daie of the said moneth to accept and consent to the saide ordinaunce and articles, And to concurre with the quene's grace in th' administration of the governement with th' advise and counsaile of the lords, with certification that if he faileth it, the lords wolde determyn him to be suspended from th' administracion of his offices. And wolde provide howe the same shulde be used in time to com while further remeadie weare founde therto, as in the saide letres directed thereupon more fully is conteyned. At the which xth daie of Junii the lords convented in the fratre of the said graie ffreers, and there consulted upon the matiers concerning the commonwealefande and awayted upon the coming of my lord governor, and upon his answer for a x houres before noon while xii howers was stryken. And he neither compared by himself nor sent his answer to accept and consent to the said ordinaunces and statutes there. Than the lords gave their decrete decerning my lord Governor *to be suspended, and suspending him from th' administration of his offices*, while further remeadye weare funde therfor. And because of the urgent necessite of the realme, and invading of the same by our old ennymies of England, and for the furthe setting of our soverain ladie's Auctorite and perfit obedience to be had therto, unitie concord to be had among all them of this realme both great and smale without th' administration of the governement weare put in soom persones hands most convenient therfor, the saide lords, without variaunce have thought noo other persone more convenient therto nor the quene's grace our soverain ladie's mother, for the good and urgent causes before expressed. And therefore have chosen hyr grace to use and minister in the saide office of governement with th' advise of the lords of counsaile conforme to the acts and ordinaunces made thereupon of before while further remedye be made herto. And hyr grace hath accept the same in and upon hyr to be used with th' advise of the saide lords as said is. And bicause hir grace can not doo the same without she be starklic mainteyned and defended therintyll, Therefore we archbishopps, bishopps, erles, lords, barons,

abbotts, and others noble men whose names hereafter subscribed, doo bynd and oblige us and promitt by the faithes in our bodies, and have gyven our aithes herupon that we shall maintein and defende the quene's grace our soverain ladie's mother in the using and administracion of th' office of gouvernement and th' aucthorite in all things. And we shall gyve unto hyr our best counsaile in all things. And shal resist with our bodies and friends and our hole substance to all them that will impugne or comen in the contrarie therof undre the payne of perjurie and infamye. And also ilk oon of us shal tak afalde part with others, without Excus or fenzeing in this matier and defense therof. Undre the paine aforsaide.

“ Gawen of Glasgow.

Patrick Morvinen.

Willm of Dumblane.

Ro. Orchaden: Epis.

T. Commendator of driburt, De. de Cuper.

V. de Cdlros.

Archbald Erle of Anguss.

Erle Bothwile.

Willm Erle of Montross.

Willm. Lord Sanchar.

Robart Maxwell.

George Erle of huntlie.

G. Erle of Caslis.

Erle of Merschell.

John Erle of Mentieth.

Hew lord Somerwell.

George Duglass.

Erle of Murray.

Archd Erle of Argile.

George Erle of Erroll.

John lord Erskin.

Willm lord of Sanct John.

Malcum lorde chalmerlane.

Hew lord lovett.

Schir John Campbell of Cawder, Kgt.¹

¹ In the State Paper Office ; now published for the first time.

This extract settles the point as to correctness of the Diurnal in its narrative of the revolution of the 3rd of June. Next came the question regarding the rival parliaments, the meeting of the three estates at Edinburgh, by summons of the governor, on the 5th of November, and the meeting of the parliament at Stirling, by summons of the queen regent on the 12th of the same month; upon this point the correspondence in the State Paper Office was silent; but fortunately the evidence of the Acts of the Scottish parliament is conclusive as to the accuracy of the facts stated in the Diurnal of Occurrents. In the second volume of the Acts, p. 445, we find that the governor Arran held a parliament at Edinburgh on the 6th of November; and one of the acts then passed by the Three Estates is thus entitled,—“ Deliverance annulling ane Proclamation be the Queen’s Moder, and certain Lordis of ane pretendit parliament, and of certane other pretendit actis.” In turning to the act we find the whole narrative of the Diurnal thus fully corroborated. It states, that “ the queen mother (I use the modern spelling) to our sovereign lady, with a part of lords and others, our sovereign lady’s lieges, ill-advised, has caused proclaim a pretended parliament to be held at the Burgh of Stirling, the 12th day of November, instant, with continuation of days, without any sufficient authority;” after this preamble, the decision of the three estates is thus given,—“ the whole three estates of parliament, with the votes of many others, nobles, barons, and gentlemen, being present, has declared, and declares the said pretended parliament to be held at Stirling, as said is, and the pretended summons raised against my lord Governor, in their manner, to have been and to be, from the beginning, of none avail force nor effect. And such like all pretended acts maid at Stirling regarding the suspending of my lord Governor from the administration of his said office, and discharging him of his aucturity in their manner.” The evidence contained in this statute so manifestly establishes the accuracy of the Diurnal of Occurrents, that upon this point any other remark would be superfluous.

A second proof of the authenticity of the same work is to be found in the accuracy of the account there given of the intrigues of the Douglasses and their treasonable correspondence with England, at a time when our general historians know nothing of any such matters.

Here the Diurnal of Occurrents maintains its character for truth, when examined by the severest of all tests, the original correspondence of the principal actors in the events. Of this I shall give a striking example. In the Diurnal, p. 40, is an account of that abortive invasion of the governor, (August 10, 1545) in which he broke into England with an army of thirty thousand men, and again on the third day thereafter, the 13th of August, was compelled to return home. Now, on this occasion, the Diurnal ascribes the failure of the expedition and the retreat and dispersion of the army to the deceit and treachery of George Douglas and his party.¹ The dispersion of the Scottish army is thus mentioned:—"Upon the nynt (ninth) day of August, the governor with his company made their musters on Fawnrig Mure to the number of 30,000 men by (besides) the Frenchmen whilk (which) were 3000. And the same day at even they passed in England, and burnt Cornwall and Tilmouth, Edderslie, Brankston, with sendrie othere towns thereabouts, and there did no other thing to their lak and dishonour." "Upon the tenth day of August, the said Scottis was pairted (divided) in three battles, (battalia) in the vanguard the Earl of Angus, Marshall, Errol, Glencairn, and Cassillis, Lords Gray, Glammes, and Yester; in the rereward Erles Huntly, Bothwell, Lords Ruthven, Drummond, Borthwick, Fleming, Home; in the middle ward the Governor, with the body of the realme and Frenchmen, with twa wings, the ane (one) Lord Seton, the Laird of Bass, and many other gentlemen, the other the Laird of Buccleugh, with all Liddesdale and Teviotdale; and on this order they raid (rode) in England, and burnt Tweesdale, Grendonrig, the great tower, new bigging, and Dudie, with the towers thereof; and there was on the Pethrig of Englishmen 6000 (had) the Scots followed with

¹ The retreat from Coldingham is ascribed to the same cause, "On the morne (morrow) the Scots without any skaith (harm) fled misorderlie. The Englishmen persevand this, twa thousand of thame followit the chase to Cockburne quha durst not bide (stay) a strike. Of this host the Erle Angus had the wangaird (vanguard), there was with him the Erles of Cassillis, Glencairne, the Lords Somerville, Yester, the sheriff of Ayr quha (who) did but feebly; in the rear was the Earl of Bothwell quha baid (abided) stiffly quhill (until) he might no more. George Douglas had the wyte (blame) hereof, for he said the Englishmen were ten thousand men, lyin within the said town; the inventioun (artifice) was saissit on chance by the Erle of Bothwell.

speed, they had vanquished all the said Englishmen. Upon the 13th day of August, the Scottish men come hame, through the deceit of George Douglas, and the vanguard, who would not pass again through his tyisting."

Such is the history of this remarkable invasion given in the Diurnal, and upon this narrative I have to repeat the same observation already made regarding the revolution in 1544, that such an explanation of the cause of its failure is new to Scottish history and to be found in the Diurnal alone. We find no mention of any such thing in Lesly, Maitland, or Buchanan. How, then, are we to discover the truth upon this subject? Simply by going to the letters of the actors themselves, which describe these events, and are fortunately accessible. In the State Paper Office we find an original dispatch from the Earl of Hertford, and the Council of the north to Henry the Eighth, in which, after detailing the plan of his proposed invasion, he incloses a letter in cipher which he had received from George Douglas and the Earls of Angus, Cassillis, and Marshall. It may be well to give Hertford's description of the mode in which this letter was conveyed to him, as it contains a curious illustration of the extreme caution with which this secret correspondence between Henry the Eighth and the Douglasses was carried on. "After this device of the said proclamation, one Thomas Forster, who was of late, by your majestie's commandment, at the desire of the Earls of Angus and Cassillis, George Douglas and others sent to them into Scotland, came hither to me the said earl and showed me a letter sent to him from one Sym Penango, servant to George Douglas, of such effect as your majesty may perceive by the same letter here inclosed, upon the sight whereof I willed the said Thomas Forster to go and speke with the said Penango, according to his desire, with whom he hath been at the place appoynted between them, where he received of the said Penango a letter in cipher, sent him from George Douglas, which we have deciphered and send both the cipher and the decipher to your majesty herewith."¹ The letter here described not only establishes the fact of the general treasonable correspondence between Henry and the Earls of Angus, Cassillis, Marshall, George Douglas, and others, which is

¹ Orig. State Paper Office; not before published.

mentioned in the "Diurnal," but contains this remarkable passage relative to the expedition of Arran into England, on the 9th of August, and his return home on the 13th of the same month, which in the same work is ascribed to the deceit of George Douglas and the vanguard. "Further as to this last journey of ours it was advised by the queen, cardinal, and this French Capitaine Lorges Montgomery. Huntly fortified this army at his power. Notwithstanding, at short, all that they devised *was stopped by us that are the king's friends*. Their whole intent was to have besieged the king's houses, unto the time they had gotten bargain, *but all was stopt, whereof they stood nothing content.*"¹ Now looking to the passage above in the Diurnal, we find it there asserted that the expedition was ruined "thro the deceit of George Douglas and the vanguard." We know from the same work that in the vanguard were the Earls of Angus, Cassillis and Marshall, with others. The journey or invasion took place on the 10th of August, the retreat on the 13th, and here on the 25th of the same month we have a letter from George Douglas, and the Earls of Angus, Cassillis, and Marshall, in which they declare to the Earl of Hertford, that the whole expedition was stopped by them, and claim credit for it with the English king. It is this which I think we may pronounce a beautiful example of the corroboration of an ancient chronicle by the original correspondence of the times, and I am sure the learned editor of the Diurnal will readily allow that a work thus corroborated could not have been compiled from traditional and imperfect sources, but must have been the production, not only of a contemporary writer, but of one minutely and accurately informed in the history of the times. It is for this reason I have quoted it as an original authority, and have preferred any information it communicates to the vague, loose, and imaginary details of the general historians of this period. I could give various other instances of the accuracy of the first part of the Diurnal when checked by the correspondence of the times, but my limits will not permit me. That there are occasional errors in the narrative is not to be disputed, but they may be chiefly traced, I think, to the ignorance or carelessness of the transcribers of the manuscript.

¹ Orig. State Paper Office; not before published.

II.

CONSPIRACY OF LADY GLAMMIS. p. 265

That a noble matron, in the prime of life, and of great beauty, should be tried, condemned, and burnt, for an attempt to compass the king's death by poison, and should also have the crime of witchcraft imputed to her by most of our historians, is an appalling event, by which my friend Mr. Pitcairn, in his notes upon the trial of Lady Glamis, has naturally felt all his sympathy awakened. In the absence of direct proof, he has adopted the story told by Buchanan, Book xiv. c. 54, and repeated by all following writers, with the exception of Pinkerton; he pronounces her innocent of the crimes laid to her charge, and a victim of James's implacable hatred to the House of Douglas. The examination of the curious evidence which he has published, has led me to form a different opinion. As to her being justly found guilty of treason, in assisting the Earl of Angus and George Douglas, in their attempts to "invade" the king's person, and re-establish their authority in Scotland, there seems to be no question. It was natural she should support her brothers; and had her offences been confined to this, although the act was undoubtedly treason, it is probable the sentence of death would have been exchanged for banishment or imprisonment. But a little investigation will convince us, I think, that the lady was not exactly the injured and innocent woman she has been represented. Let us look a little into her life.

She married, probably about the year 1521, John, sixth Lord Glamis. He died on the 8th of August, 1528, in his thirty-seventh year, and about four months after his death (Dec. 1, 1528), Lady Glamis was summoned, with Patrick Hume, of Blackwater, Hugh Kennedy, of Girvanmanys, and Patrick Charteris, to answer before Parliament for having given assistance to the Earl of Angus, in convocating the king's lieges for the invasion of his Majesty's person.¹ These men were all bold and active partizans of the Douglases. On September 20, 1529, we find that Lady Glamis and Patrick Charteris, of Cuthelgurdy, a person who, in the interval, had been indicted to stand his trial for fire-raising and cow lift-

¹ Pitcairn, vol. i. p. 188.

ing¹; obtained a letter of license to pass to parts beyond sea, on their pilgrimage, and other lawful business.² Whether Patrick and the lady had gone upon their pilgrimage, does not appear, but she did not interrupt her political intrigues, and seems to have been again not only summoned, but found guilty of treason; for on July 1, 1531, we find, that Gavin Hamilton got a gift from the crown of the escheat of all the goods heritable and moveable, of Janet Lady Glamis, which had been forfeited on account of her intercommuning with our sovereign lord's rebels, or for any other crimes.³

At thistime she appears to have fled from justice, and we lose sight of her for some time; but, on 31st January, 1532, a far darker crime than caballing with rebels, or associating with fire-raisers, was laid to her charge. She was summoned to stand her trial at the Justice Ayr of Forfar, for the poisoning her husband Lord Glamis. The crimes of poisoning and witchcraft were then very commonly associated, as may be seen from many interesting trials in Mr. Pitcairn's Collections; the great dealers in poisons were witches, and the potency of their drugs was thought to be increased by the charms and incantations with which they were concocted. Hence probably the mala fama against Lady Glamis, as a witch or sorceress; but however this may be, it is certain, that on February 2, and February 26, 1532, Lord Ruthven, Lord Oliphant, with the Lairds of Ardoch, Moncrieff, Tullibardine, and a great many other barons, to the number of twenty-eight, were fined for not appearing to pass upon the Lady Glamis jury:⁴ and the imperfect and mutilated state of the criminal records of this period, unfortunately, leaves us in the dark as to the future proceedings upon this trial. The probability seems to be, that she was either acquitted, or the charge dropt from want of evidence. If innocent, she was certainly most unfortunate; for, on the 17th of July, 1537, she was, for the fourth time, brought to trial, found guilty of having been art and part in the conspiring the death of the king by poison, and also for her having treasonably assisted Archibald Earl of Angus and George Douglas, his brother, who were traitors and rebels. For this crime she was condemned

¹ Pitcairn's Trials, vol. i. p. 141.

² Ibid. vol. i. p. 244.

³ Ibid. vol. i. p. 246.

⁴ Ibid. vol. 1. p. 158.

to be burnt at the stake, the common mode of death, as Mr. Pitcairn informs us, for all females of rank in cases of treason and murder, and from which he plausibly conjectures, that the vulgar opinion of her having been burnt for a witch may have partly arisen. Her son, Lord Glamis, then only sixteen years old, her husband, Archibald Campbell, a priest, and a barber named John Lyon, were tried along with her. The witnesses, as was usual in this barbarous age, being examined under the rack, or *pynebaukis*. Lord Glamis, on his own confession, was found guilty of concealing the conspiracy, and imprisoned till the death of James the Fifth, when he was restored to his estates and honors, upon the ground, that in the fear of his life, and having the rack before his eyes, he had made a false confession.¹ The long extracts given by Mr. Pitcairn, from the histories of Scot, Lesly, Hume of Godscroft, and the Genealogy of the House of Drummond, seem to me scarcely worthy of the place he has assigned them, and cannot be quoted as authentic evidence. Scott's story is a mere *rifacciamento* of Buchanan's, with some ludicrous additions of his own—as, where he tells us, Archibald Campbell, the husband of Lady Glamis, commanded the third regiment in the king's army. Lesly falls into blunders which Mr. Pitcairn has detected; Sir James Balfour repeats them; and as for David Hume of Godscroft, none acquainted with his history will trust him, when he stands unsupported by other evidence. The only authentic, and, as I believe, contemporary account of the trials of the Master of Forbes and Lady Glamis, is to be found in the following passage from the *Diurnal of Occurrents*, p. 22. “In this menetye, the Master of Forbes was accusit of tressone be the Laird of Lenturk, and was put in ward in the castell of Edinburgh; in the said moneth of Julii, the Lady Glamis, sister to Archibald Earl of Angus, was accusit for tressonne; her husband, Archibald Campbell, of Skepnische; her son, the Lord Glamis, of sixteen yeares of age; ane barbour John Lyon, and ane priest, all accusit in the tolbooth of Edinburgh; the said lady was condannit to be brynt quhell deid, scho deet and her husband, sone and the rest ordanyt to remain in prisone in the castell of Edinburgh forsaid.³—Upon the

¹ Pitcairn's Trials, vol. i. p. 327.

² Ibid vol. i. p. 244.

³ We may infer, I think, from the omission of any notice of the horrid fate

13th day of July, the Master of Forbes was convicted for tressonne, and drawin, hangit, and heidit."

That there is any ground on which we may conclude, that unprincipled witnesses were brought forward to give false testimony, upon which the jury were compelled to convict her, I cannot admit; still less do I perceive the proceedings to have been characterised by any savage traces of unmanly revenge upon the part of the king. On the other hand, it appears clear, that at this time the Douglasses, whose last hope of restoration had been destroyed, began to embrace desperate designs. "The letters of Penman, their secret agent," says Pinkerton (vol. ii. p. 350), "to Sir George Douglas, his employer, betray a malice, and designs the most horrid." "The king is crazed, and ill spoken of by his people." "He has beggared all Scotland." "All are weary of him."—"James shall do the commandment of the Douglasses, God willing"—"All hate him" and say he must go down—"His glass will soon run out." These diabolical expressions against a prince in the vigor of early life, what can they insinuate but poison or the dagger? Could they be addressed to a person who did not seal them with approbation? And could a more fit or secret agent than a sister be employed to promote the interests of her family at any risk." If the reader will turn to Pitcairn's Criminal Trials, p. 190, and read the names of the jurymen who gave the verdict against her, he will scarcely admit the idea of her being innocent, and it is worthy of notice, that instead of having the least appearance of its being a packed jury, some of the leading men amongst them were friends and near connections of the Douglasses. John Earl of Athole, one of the jury, married Janet, a sister of that Master of Forbes, who suffered for treason about the same time as Lady Glammiss, and who was a supporter of the Douglasses.—(Douglas Peerage, p. 141, vol. i.) Robert Lord Maxwell, another of the jury, it is well known, was intimately connected with the Dou-

of the husband of Lady Glammiss, who, some time after his imprisonment, was dashed to pieces on the rocks in attempting to escape from the castle of Edinburgh, that the Diurnal was written at the very time of his trial. It is hardly possible, if it had been a subsequent compilation, that this circumstance, which appears in all our historians, would have been omitted. That the author was a Catholic, appears from a passage in p. 19.

glases. He married a daughter of Douglas of Drumlanrig (Douglas, vol. ii. p. 317), and his daughter, Margaret Maxwell, was afterwards married to Archibald Earl of Angus, brother to Lady Glamis. William, Master of Glencairn, a third juryman, was also nearly related to the Douglasses, and constantly of their party. His mother was Marjory, a daughter of Archibald, fifth Earl of Angus, a sister of Gawin Douglas, the famous translator of Virgil, and a grand-aunt of the Earl of Angus, and of Lady Glamis. Gilbert, Earl of Cassillis, another of the jurymen, and the pupil of Buchanan, was also a firm partizan of the Douglasses. Are we to believe that these men violated their oaths, and found guilty upon false evidence an innocent and noble lady, in whose favor they must have felt a strong bias.

Pinkerton too rashly pronounces the cases of the Master of Forbes and of Lady Glamis to have had no connection with each other. There is, I think, a strong presumption to the contrary. The similarity in the charges against them, the circumstance that both were apprehended, tried, and executed within two days of each other—the Master of Forbes on Saturday, the 14th of July, and Lady Glamis, on Tuesday the 17th; and the fact that the object of both appears to have been to procure the restoration of the Douglasses by compassing the death of the king, are striking circumstances, and look as if both plots had been coined in the same mint. The revealer of the conspiracy of Forbes was, as we learn from the extract from the Diurnal of Occurrents, the Laird of Lenturk; and this gentleman, we find from Pitcairn, vol. i. p. 200, was Thomas Strachan. His son John Strachan, was accused as being a participator in the Master of Forbes's treason, and it is worthy of notice that, David Strachan, probably of the same family, was one of those apprehended at the same time that Lord Glamis, the son, and Home of Wedderburn, the brother-in-law of Lady Glamis, were imprisoned.¹ David Strachan, whose piteous petition for liberation has been given by Pitcairn, p. 206, vol. i. is nowhere mentioned as having been concerned in the treason of the Lord Forbes. The presumption seems to be, that he was imprisoned for his participation in Lady Glamis's plot, and this seems in some degree to connect the

¹ Sir Thomas Clifford's Letter, quoted by Pitcairn, vol. i. p. 198.

two conspiracies. But all this is conjectural.¹ It was not till the 22nd of August, about five weeks after Lady Glamis had suffered, that John Lyon, her accomplice, was tried and found guilty of imagining and conspiring the king's death by poison; and of using the same poison for the destruction of the Earl of Rothes; whilst on the same day, Alexander Makke, who had sold the poison, knowing from Lyon for what purpose it was bought, was also tried and convicted. Lyon was beheaded: and Makke had his ears cut off and was banished by a singular sentence from all parts of Scotland, except the burgh of Aberdeen.² Mr. Pitcairn has drawn an inference for the innocence of Lady Glamis, from the fact that a number of Lords and inferior barons suffered themselves to be fined rather than act as Jurymen against her. This, however, one of his most noted cases, shows to be no proof. The master of Forbes confessed on the scaffold that he was guilty of the murder of Seton of Meldrum; yet when tried on the 27th of August 1530, Gordon of Achindown, Lyon of Colmelegy, and fifteen other barons and landed gentlemen, were fined for not appearing to pass on his assize. A refusal of this kind was in fact a proof of the power, not of the innocence, of the party accused. In concluding this note, I may mention that Lord Glamis, it seems, had made himself obnoxious to the Douglasses, and may therefore have incurred the resentment of his high-spirited and determined consort, by refusing to join them with his vassals on the noted occasion, when they proceeded against the border thieves, taking the young king along with them—(Pitcairn, vol. i. p. 136). It was on this occasion that Scott of Buccleugh unsuccessfully attempted to rescue his sovereign from the captivity in which he was held.

¹ Pitcairn, vol. 1. p. 202-203.

² John Strachan and Donald Mackay, were accomplices with the Master of Forbes, in the murder of Seton of Meldrum. Pitcairn, Crim. Trials, vol. i. pp. 150-175. Alexander Makke (Makay) and David Strachan were accomplices with Lady Glamis in her attempt to poison the king.

BATTLE OF FLODDEN.

It is difficult, from the conflicting accounts of historians, to arrive at the numbers of each army in the battle of Flodden; and even more difficult to estimate the loss on both sides. That nearly a hundred thousand souls mustered on the Borough-muir is extremely probable; but, it is to be recollected, that of these a great many were waggoners, suttlers, servants, and camp-followers; that the presence of the king and the whole body of the nobles inferred the attendance of more than the usual number of servants; and that, owing to the delay in active operations, and the scarcity of provisions, the army was diminished by desertion previous to the battle. When this is considered, the estimate of thirty-five or forty thousand men, the latter number is that of Dr. Lingard, is probably pretty near the truth. On the side of the English, it is certain from the English contemporary account of the battle, that Surrey's army was, at the lowest computation, twenty-six thousand strong; and it is by no means improbable that this was rather a low estimate.¹ The battle began between four and five in the afternoon of the 5th of September, and continued, according to an² authentic contemporary chronicle, "within night," that is some time after nightfall; all accounts agreeing that the combatants were only separated by darkness. It is a mistake in Lingard, therefore, to tell us it was decided in something more than an hour. From half-past four on the 5th of September, till after nightfall, will give a continuance to the combat of at least three hours. As to the loss sustained, the common estimate of ten thousand Scots is probably under the truth. After giving the names of the nobles and chiefs who were slain, the ancient chronicle already quoted observes that over and above the said

¹ The rare contemporary tract, reprinted by my friend Mr. Pitcairn, and entitled, "Batayle of Floddon-felde, called Brainston Moore," thus commences:—"The maner of th' advauncyng of my lord of Surrey, tresourier and marshall of Englande, and levetenente generall of the north, parties of the same, with xxvi M. towards the kynge of Scott and his armye, vewed and nombred to an hundrede thousande men at the leest."

² Ibid. p. 12.

persons, eleven or twelve thousand of the Scots who were slain were viewed by My Lord Dacre,¹ and on the inscription on Surrey's monument at Thetford, the number is seventeen thousand.² But whilst this last, which may perhaps be considered an eulogistic estimate, is probably not far from the truth, it is evident that there is an endeavour on the part of the English historians to conceal their own loss, when they state it at fifteen hundred men. Holinshed, who gives this, admits that the "victory was dearly bought on the side of the English," and when it is considered that it was a fair stand up fight, which lasted with the utmost obstinacy for three hours—that no pursuit took place till next day—and that no quarter was given on either side, the assertion that only fifteen hundred English were slain, cannot be believed. In noticing the very few Scottish prisoners taken, the ancient English account of the battle observes, "many other Scottish prisoners could and might have been taken, but they were so vengeable and cruel in their fighting, that when Englishmen had the better of them, they would not save them, though it were that diverse Scottes offered great sumes of money for their lives."³ Lord Thomas Howard, indeed, in his message to the king, had declared, that as he expected no quarter himself, he would give none; and this fierce resolution of the English admiral was probably rendered more intense in its operation by the silence of the Scottish king, who replied with courtesy to the cartel of Surrey, but did not condescend to send Howard an answer. With the exception of the Highlanders and Islesmen, the Scots preserved good discipline. Their army when first seen by Howard was drawn up in five divisions; some in the form of squares, others in that of wedges, and they descended the hill on foot in good order, after the manner of the Germans in perfect silence.⁴ Every man for the most part, was armed with a keen and

¹ Batayle of Brainston Moore, p. 11.

² Ridpath's Border History, p. 491.

³ Batayle of Brainston Moore, p. 12.

⁴ Original Gazette of the Battle of Flodden, MS. in Herald's office, printed by Pinkerton. — Appendix to 2nd vol. No. X. — La bataille dud: Roy D'Escosse Estoit divisee En cinq: batailles, Et chacun bataille loing l'un de l'autre environ un trait d'arc * * partie d'Eulx Estorent En quadrans Et autres En maniere de pointe.

sharp spear, five yards in length, and a target which he held before him. When their spears failed, they fought with great sharp swords, making little or no noise. The old account of the battle expressly states that few were slain by arrows, as the rain had damaged the English bows, but that most fell by the bills of the Englishmen, and yet the armorial device given as an augmentation to his arms to Surrey in commemoration of his victory—a demi-lion gules, transfixèd with an arrow, seems to contradict this; whilst the impatience of the Highlanders, under Huntly and Lennox, has always been ascribed to the deadly discharge of the English bowmen. The English artillery were well served, and did considerable execution; whilst the Scottish guns, injudiciously placed, and ill-directed, fired over the heads of the enemy; a blunder probably to be ascribed to the obstinacy of the king, who would not suffer them to play upon the English columns when they were passing the river. James thus lost the great advantage which might have been derived from the acknowledged excellence in the make and calibre of the Scottish ordnance.

As the battle of Flodden is of much importance in tracing the military history of the country, I may notice an inaccuracy of Hume, which to the general student might seem of little importance, but to the military reader it will not appear so. This historian informs us¹ that Surrey, finding that the river Till prevented his attack, made a feint by marching to Berwick, as if he meant to enter Scotland; upon which James descended from his encampment, having fired his huts. "On this Surrey" says he, "took advantage of the smoke, and passed the river with his army, rendering a battle inevitable, for which both sides prepared with tranquillity and order." This, any one who will study the battle as it is given in this history, from contemporary records will discover to be a misapprehension of the fact.

¹ Hume's History, p. 292.

HISTORICAL REMARKS

ON

THE ASSASSINATION OF CARDINAL BEATON.

THE assassination of Cardinal Beaton is an event which has been viewed under very different aspects by different parties. The exultation and unseasonable pleasantry with which Knox relates the murder are partly to be ascribed to the savage times in which he was bred, and to the natural temper of this singular man, which was strongly tinged with a love of the ridiculous. That he considered the deed as not only justifiable but almost praiseworthy, is evident from the whole tone of his narrative. This mode of writing naturally roused to the highest pitch the indignation of the Roman Catholic party, it was received with equal reprobation by the more moderate Protestants, whilst the covenanters, driven by the harsh persecution of the government to acts similar in their manner of perpetration, although dictated by higher and less selfish motives, eagerly defended a proceeding, which seemed to justify their own. The consequence of this has been that much idle vituperation and inconclusive argument were elicited, nor have these angry indications completely subsided in the present day. Such feelings are particularly unpropitious to the investigation of historical truth, and setting them aside entirely, I proceed more fully than was permitted me in the text, to investigate this subject and to present my readers with some extracts from those original papers and letters which throw new light upon it, and have hitherto remained unknown.

Dr. Mackenzie in his lives of Scottish writers (vol. iii. p. 23) early observed that the assassination of Beaton had been planned in England, and to corroborate his opinion published from a document which he affirmed he had seen in the Library of the Faculty of Advocates, an extract from the letter of the Earl of Hertford, dated 17th April, 1544, and quoted in my text. When Keith published his history (in 1734) this letter could not be found, and, although he gives it from Mackenzie's work, he declines pronouncing any opinion, aware of that author's great inaccuracy. When Robertson, in 1759, published his History of Scotland, he considered the subject so obscure that he satisfied himself with expressing a suspicion that there existed a correspondence between the murderers of Cardinal Beaton and Henry the Eighth, and many years after, when Dr. Cook gave to the world his History of the Reformation, he got rid of the difficulties attending the question in a very summary manner, by doubting whether such a letter was ever written, or such a person as Wishart, mentioned as the agent of the conspiracy, ever came to the Earl of Hertford, or was sent by him to Henry the Eighth. "The letter, says he, "is entitled to no credit. It was not found by one of our most accurate enquirers into points of history, where the writer who quotes it asserts it may be seen, and what is completely decisive, it was said to have been written two years before the cardinal's death, and could therefore, have no relation to a conspiracy, which it is apparent was not in existence, till within a very short time of its being carried into execution." In a short historical disquisition appended to an early work (Life of Sir Thomas Craig, published in 1823), I pointed out the errors contained in this passage and established the authenticity of the letter quoted by Mackenzie, by referring to a direct answer to it which occurred in the collection published by Haynes, vol. i. p. 34. The fact of the existence of a conspiracy for the assassination of Beaton which was fostered in England, and carried on by Brunston and Wishart was thus fixed beyond question. To crown the whole it turned out that after an interval of many years Dr. Robertson had discovered in the MS. collection of the Duke of Hamilton, and published in the latest edition of his history, the original of the letter quoted by Mackenzie. Thus far had the truth been ascertained, when I was last year permitted by

Lord Melbourne to have a full examination of the Scottish correspondence in the State Paper Office, an event which, at the risk of exciting a smile in some of my readers, I must consider as one of the most pleasurable in my literary life. This examination is at present only in progress, but the documents I have there found have already enabled me to trace my way through some of the most obscure portions of our national history; and one of these relates to the English conspiracies for the assassination of Cardinal Beaton. I proceed now to point out the singular letters which illustrate the progress of the conspiracy.

It may first, however, be proper to remark that Henry's antipathy to Beaton was early excited, and soon assumed a violent form. On hearing that the cardinal had procured his removal from Lord Seton's house, where he was kept in custody, to St. Andrew's, the king (not aware that the crafty prelate had by this step completely recovered his liberty) proposed to Sir George Douglas through Sadler his ambassador, that he should be brought to England and there kept in sure custody. This was on the 30th March, 1543. (Sadler's State Papers, vol. i. pp. 101, 106.) A similar proposal for the apprehension of the cardinal was made on the 21st June, 1543. (Sadler, vol. i. p. 221.), which was reiterated in strong terms to Arran the governor by the English monarch on the 4th of August (Sadler, vol. i. p. 249), and it appears that Beaton had received warning of these hostile intentions, for on the 28th of August, 1543, he refused to leave his castle of St. Andrew's for the purpose of meeting with Arran the governor, alleging that he was afraid of his life. (Sadler, vol. i. p. 278.) On the 5th of October, the lords of Henry's party expressed an earnest wish that the cardinal were in the king's majesty's hands so that he might never more trouble the realm of Scotland, (Sadler, vol. i. p. 312). This rooted enmity to the cardinal, in the mind of Henry, was well known to Crichton, the Laird of Brunston, a man in whose character we recognise the ferocity and familiarity with blood which marks the feudal times in which he lived, the cunning and duplicity which is the growth of a more civilized æra, and this united to the most revolting feature of all, a deep religious hypocrisy. Busy, unscrupulous, and active, this pliant intriguer insinuated himself into the confidence of all parties,

and seems to have been willing at various times to desert all, till the money of England fixed him by the powerful chain of self-interest in the service of Henry the Eighth. We first meet with him as a familiar and confidential servant of Cardinal Beaton, entrusted with secret letters from that dignitary to Rome (10th December 1539. Sadler, vol. i. p. 25) which were intercepted by Henry the Eighth. He next attached himself to Arran the governor, who thought him worthy to be trusted in diplomatic missions to France and England. (Sadler, vol. i. pp. 186, 280), and it would seem that on the 28th of August, 1543, Sadler had not much intimacy with him, as he denominates him "a gentleman called the Laird of Brunston." In a few months, however, Brunston had deserted Arran, and so completely gained the confidence both of Sadler and his royal master, that we find him furnishing secret intelligence to the ambassador, and honoured by a letter from the king. (Sadler, vol. i. pp. 332, 338, 339, 342.) On the 16th of November, 1543, Brunston thus writes in a letter to Sadler * * "I pray your lordship that I may be excused to the king's majesty, and to thank his highness on my behalf of his gentle letter, which it hath pleased his highness to send to me, the contents whereof I shall not fail to fulfil, so far as God will give me grace."

Nearly five months after this, on the 17th of April, 1544, the Laird of Brunston engaged in that secret correspondence with Henry the Eighth, in which, on certain conditions, he offered to procure the assassination of Beaton.¹ As the purport of both letters has been

¹ This Letter having never been correctly printed, I here subjoin it, his grace the duke of Hamilton, having many years ago, politely permitted me to copy the original in his possession.—"Please it your highness to understand, that this daye arryved here with me, the Erll of Hertford, a Scotchman called Wyshert, and brought me a letter from the Larde of Brunstone, which I sende your highness herewith; and according to his request, have taken order for the repayre of the said Wysshert to your majestie by poste, bothe for the delyvire of suche letters as he hathe to your majestie from the said Brunstone, and also for the declaracion of his credence, which, as I can perceyve by him, consisteth in two poyntes; one is that the Larde of Graunge, late thresaurer of Scotlande, the mr of Rothes, th' Erl of Rothis eldest son, and John Charters, wolde attempt eyther t' apprehend or slee the cardynall at some tyme when he shall passe thouroughe the Fyf lande, as he doth sundrye times to Sanct Andrewes; and in case they can so appre-

fully stated in the text, I shall not recapitulate it, but merely observe

hende hym, will delyver him unto your majestie, which attemptat, he saythe, they wolde enterpryse if they knew your majestie's pleasure therein, and what supportacion and mayntenance your majestie wolde minister unto them efter th' execution of the same, in cace they suld be persewed afterwards be any of their enemyes; the other is, that in cace your maj. wolde grant unto them a convenient enterteynement for to kepe 15 or 16 men in wages for a moneth or two, they, joyning with the power of th' Erl Marshall, the said Erl of Rothes, the Larde of Calder, and others of the Lords Grey's friends, will tak upon them at such tyme as your maj. armye sall be in Scotlande, to destroy the abbey and town of Arbroyth, being the cardynal's and all th' other bishops and Abbots houses and countreys on that syde the water thereabout, and apprehend all those whiche they saye be the principall impugnators of the amyte between England and Scotland, for the whiche they suld have a good opportunitye, as they saye, when the power of the said bishops and Abbote shall resort toward Edinburgh to resist your majesty's armye. And for th' execution of these thinges, the said Wyshert saith that the sayde Erl Marshall, and others above named, will capitulate with your majestie in wryting under their handes and seales afore they shall desyre any suplye of money at your majes. handes. This is the effect of his credence with other sundrie advertisements of the great contencion and division that is at this present within the realme of Scotlande, which we doubt not he will declare unto your majestie at good length.

"Also, I, the said Erl of Hertford, have receyed this daye, certain letters from the Lorde Wharton, and Sir Robert Bowes, with the copies of suche letters as were wryten by the Erl of Glencairne's sone, and Bishop, the Erl of Lennox's secretary, to be sent into Scotland to the same erlles, which copies the said Lord Wharton and Bowes atteyned by such meynes as sall appear unto your majestie by the said letters, whiche, with the said copies, we send also to your highnes here inclosed; together with certain other letters, whiche arryved here also this day from the Lord ———, conteyning certain employtes done in Scotlande.

"Fynally—the Lorde Wm. Howard being at Tynemont, sent a letter to me, the said Erl of Hertford, whereby it appeareth that certain of the shippis victuallers are arrivid, and some of them report that yesterday morning they sawe My Lord Admyrall, west of the fleete on See Borde hull, makyng hitherwarde, so that the wind contynuing as it is, they will be at Teynemouth this night or to-morrowe with the grace of God, who preserve your royall majestie in your most prynceley estat, most felycitously to endure unto your highnes.—Newcastel, the xvii of April.

"Your Majestie's humble subjects, and most bounden servants,

"E. HERTFORD, *Cuth. Duresme.*

"ROBERT LANDAFFE, RAY SADLEYR."

that, in the plot devised by Brunston, and proposed to be executed by Kircaldy of Grange, and the Master of Rothes, the conspirators, do not appear to have acted from religious, or I should rather say fanatical motives. No allusion to such is to be found in the correspondence. Their views seem to have been purely selfish and mercenary. The "feat," however, against the cardinal, for some cause not easily discoverable, was not at this time carried into execution, and the conspiracy slept for nearly a year, when it was again revived by the earl of Cassillis, the pupil of Buchanan, the convert of Cranmer, and a nobleman, who, in their ignorance of his true character, has been highly lauded by some of our historians. This baron, who proved himself one of Henry's most active instruments, was employed by this monarch in April, 1545, in a negotiation regarding the marriage and the peace, of which an account has been given in the text. Previous to this diplomatic mission, he repaired to the English court from Scotland, and having received his instructions from Henry in person, returned to manage the business in the Scottish parliament. In the State Paper Office there is an original letter, dated April 2nd, 1545, entirely in cipher with a contemporary deciphered copy, from the Earl of Cassillis to the king, in which he states that he had a conference with the governor and the cardinal on the subject of his mission, but they would come to no conclusion till the arrival of the queen and the Earls of Argyle and Huntly; and adds that a convention had been summoned for the 15th to determine on his offers. On the 20th of April, Cassillis again addressed a letter in cipher to the king, in which he informed him of the total failure of his negotiation, the triumph of the party of the cardinal and the governor, and the rejection of peace with England. On the 18th of May, 1545, Sir R. Sadler, and the Council of the North, wrote to the king, transmitting a letter in cipher which the Earl of Cassillis had addressed to Sadler. That the reader may understand the purport of Sadler's letter, I give an extract from it.—"Please your royal Majesty to receive herewith, such letters as we have received from the Lord Wharton, with others in cipher addressed unto us with the same from the Earl of Cassillis; whereof one of them is a letter to the same Erle from the Erle Marshall as your Majesty shall perceyve, which we have deciphered, and sende herewith, unto your Majesty,

both the cipher, and the same deciphered accordingly. And when it may appear unto your highness by the said Earle of Cassillis lettres, amongst other things, that he intendeth to procure one to be sent to me, Sir Rafe Sadleyr, as sone as is possible, for him to speke with th' Erle of Anguisse and George Douglas, for such purposes as your highness has appoynted with the saide Earl of Cassillis. I, the said Sir Rafe Sadleyr, shall not faile as soon as I shall heare of the comyng of such a one as they will sende, to repayre to Alnewyke, there to commune with him according to such instructions as I lately received from the lords of his majesty's council in that behalf, and touching such matter as the said Erle of Cassillis now hath written of to your Highness, wherein he seemeth desirous to know your Majesty's pleasure by me, I shall be ready to say and do as it shall please your Highness to command me in that part or anie other, according to my most bounden dutie." The rest of this letter is unimportant. From the above extract it is, however, evident, that the king had communicated certain purposes to Cassillis; that Cassillis, having first consulted with the Earl of Angus and Sir George Douglas, was to send a secret messenger to Alnwick, to commune with Sir Rafe Sadler touching such purposes, that Sir Rafe had already received from the privy council instructions regarding this intended communication; that Cassillis had moreover written to the king upon another private matter, in which he wished to know the royal pleasure through Sir Rafe; and that this statesman only waited to hear his Majesty's opinion, that he might communicate it to the Scottish earl. The importance of this minute analysis will immediately appear.

It is unfortunate that the letter in cipher from Lord Cassillis to the king mentioned in the above dispatch, is not to be found in the State Paper Office; but on the 21st of May, 1545, there is a letter from the Council of the North to the king, informing his majesty that the Scottish barons, Angus, Cassillis, Glencairn, Marshall, and Sir George Douglas, had declined, as they at first intended, sending an agent to Alnwick, to confer with Sir Ralph Sadler; and thought it better that a confidential messenger should be sent into Scotland to deliberate with them. This letter from the Council of the North to the king, is autograph of Sir Ralph Sadler. It contains this passage—"And whereas I, the said Sir Rafe, was adver-

tised from the lords of your majestie's council, that your highness pleasure was I should repayre to Alnwick, to meet there with a gentleman that should be sent from the Erles of Anguisse, Cassillis, Glencairn, Marshall, and George Douglas, and others, for such purposes as I was also then advertised from my said lords of his majestie's council, for the whiche journey I have been in a readiness, according to your most gracious pleasure, it shall now appear to your highness, by the said Erle of Cassillis lettres, that they have chaunged that purpose, and would have me send a gentleman to them with such instructions, and in such sorte as your majestie shall perceve by the said Erle of Cassillis lettres." This letter from the Earl of Cassillis to Sir Ralph Sadler, alluded to above as having been transmitted to the king, is not to be found in the State Paper Office, but its purport clearly appears from a letter of the English privy council, dated May 30th, 1545. The importance of this document induces me to give a long extract. It shows, I think, that although they contain no direct mention of it, the former letters of the 18th and 21st of May, related to the designs against Beaton's life, and it reveals for the first time a plot that has remained hidden for nearly three centuries. The dispatch is in the hand-writing of Mr. Secretary Paget, except the last sentence, which is autograph of Wriothesley, then chancellor. It is addressed to the Earl of Hertford. "After our most hartly commendations unto your good lordship. It may like the same to understand that the king's majesty, having of late seen certain lettres sent from th' Erle of Cassillis unto Mr. Saddleyr, *the same containing an offer for the kylling of the cardinal if his majesty wold have it done, and wold promise, when it were done, a reward*; the other excusing the change of their purpose for sending of one from them, to meet with Mr. Saddleyr upon the borders, and requiring John Forster (who, they say, being prisonir, may come well without suspition) should be sent to commune with them, and to as well signify unto them the king's majestie's pleasure towards them, as to hear again what they would do for their parts—to the first point his majestie hath willed us to signify unto your lordschip, that his highness reputing the fact not mete to *be set forward expressly by his majesty, will not seem to have to do in it, and yet not misliking the offer*, thinketh good that Mr. Saddleyr, to whom that letter was addressed, should write to th'

Erle of the receipt of his letter, conteyning such an offer which he thinketh not convenient to be communicated to the king's majesty ; marry, to write to him what he thinketh of the matter, he shall say, that if he were in th' Erle of Cassillis place, and were as able to do his majesty good service there as he knoweth him to be, and thinketh a right good will in him to do it, he would surely do what he could for th' execution of it, believing verily to do thereby not only an acceptable service to the king's majesty, but also a special benefit to the realme of Scotland, and would trust verily the king's majesty would consider his service in the same ; as you doubt not of his accustomed goodness to them which serve him, but he would do the same to him."¹ The remaining portion of this letter, which is an original, and signed by seven privy councillors, relates to the sending Foster into Scotland, and to other matters, not important to be noticed.

To go on with the unravelling of these dark designs, it next appears, by a letter from the Council of the North to the king, dated June 3, 1545, that Foster had been sent for to be dispatched forthwith into Scotland, and, upon his arrival, Sadler informs his majesty, "that he will write to the Earl of Cassillis, according to the directions contained in the last letter from the Privy Council. Hitherto the conspiracy of the Earl of Cassillis for the assassination of Beaton does not seem to be connected in any way with the former plot of Brunston, Wishart, Kirkaldy of Grange, and Norman Lesly ; but the above letter contains a sentence from which a strong presumption arises, that the conspiracy of Cassillis was merely a revival of that of Brunston. "Also, here arrived presentlie a lettre in cipher from the Laird of Brunstone, which we have caused to be deciphered herewith to your majesty." Here the dispatch of the Privy Council, which was sent, concludes with the usual prayer for the royal health ; but in the scroll of that dispatch, which is autograph of Sir Ralph Saddler, after the words "your majestie," the following sentence succeeds: "And this day Sir Thomas Holcroft showed us a cipher, which was devised betwix him and the said Brunston, when Brunston departed last from the court, upon the perusing of which cipher we fynd it to be the very same that is betwix your majesty and th' Erle of Cassillis, as your majestie shall

¹ Orig. State Paper Office. Never before published.

perceive upon the sight of it which we send here inclosed, so that it appeareth to us that both th' Erle of Cassillis and Brunston,"—here this additional sentence, which is scored through, breaks off abruptly; but it is evident, I think, the Privy Council intended to observe, that it appeared to them that Brunston and Cassillis were in close communication with each other upon the point touching the murder of the cardinal, and, when we weigh all the circumstances, it is difficult to resist the same conclusion. Brunston formerly had submitted to Henry a plot for the assassination of Beaton—Brunston was an intimate friend and supporter of the party with whom Cassillis acted—Brunston had lately been at court, and had arranged a cipher for a secret correspondence with Sir Thomas Holcroft. At the moment when Cassillis again proposes to Henry the assassination of the prelate, a letter in cipher is sent from Brunston to the Council of the North, and instantly transmitted to the king, and lastly, Brunston and Cassillis are found using the same cipher. Every circumstance shows a unity of schemes, and an intimacy of communication, from which we may infer, I think, that the second conspiracy of Cassillis was merely a revival or continuation of the first by Brunston. The king, however, as we have seen, did not choose to give direct encouragement to the proposal of Cassillis. That noble person was informed by Sadler, that he had not communicated his design to the monarch (which was false), and Cassillis, although willing to commit murder upon a written order from the king, did not chuse to peril himself in any such business upon the bare recommendation of Sir Ralf Sadler. He did not even venture to reply to Sadler's letter upon this delicate point; and in the succeeding interview, which took place between him and Foster, the English agent, at Douglas, in June, he appears carefully to have avoided any allusion to the subject. The proposal of Sir George Douglas to this envoy, that Henry "if he would have the cardinal dead should promise a good reward for the doing thereof," has been noticed in the body of this history, but Forster (July 4, 1545) returned without having had any communication with Cassillis upon the subject.

The Laird of Brunston, however, was resolved that the proposal for removing their great enemy should not so easily drop; and on the 12th of July we find, by the following extract from a letter of the Council of the North to the Privy Council, that this busy intriguer

had renewed to the king and to his council the atrocious proposal :—
 “ After our most hartie commendations, yesterday arrived here lettres in cypher to the king’s majestie from the Larde of Brunston, and also to me, Sir Rafe Sadleyr, which we have deciphered and sende herewith, both the cipher and the same deciphered, unto you, which we praye you to declare and showe unto the king’s majestie. And forasmuch as the said Brunston doth partly in his said letters (touch) the matter which concerneth the kylling of the cardinal, because, as we perceyve by such letters, as I, th’ Erll of Hertford, have receyved from the Lordes you and others of the counsaill, his majestie will not seeme to have to do in that matter, but referreth the same to the handeling of me Sir Rafe Sadleyr, I therefore have taken occasion upon the said Brunston’s letters to write my mind to him in that matter, in such sorte as you shall perceyve by the copie of my lettre to the saide Brunston, which you¹ shall receyve herewith.”¹

Sadler goes on to state, that he had written before this upon the same matter of the killing of the cardinal to the Earl of Cassillis, but since then had received no answer. The rest of his letter is of little interest; but the enclosure, entitled the “ Copie of Sir Rafe Sadleyr’s Lettres to the Larde of Brunston,” which is wholly in Sir Ralph’s own hand, is too important and curious to be omitted. It commences thus, “ After my right hartie commendations, I have recieved your lettres by Robert Lyster, this bearar, with also your lettres addressed to the king’s majestie, which shall be depesched hens to his highness with such spede as appertayneth. In one parte of your said lettres, I note chiefflie, that certayn gentlemen being your friends, have offred *for a small soume of money*, to take hym oute of the waye, that hath been the hole impediment, and lett to all good purposes there, so that they might be sure to have the King’s majestie their good lorde; and that his majestie wolde rewarde them for the same. Of this I judge that you mean the cardinall, whome I knowe to be so much blynded to his own affection to France, that, to please the same he seeth not, but utterlie contempnyth all thinges tending to the weale, and benefite of his owne cuntry; and, indede, hitherto, he hath been the onelie cause and worker of all your myschief; and will, if he continewe, be undoubtedlie the utter ruyne and confusion of the same. Wherefore I am

¹ Orig. State Paper Office, never before published.

of your opinion, and as you wryte thinke it to be acceptable service to God to take him oute of the waye, whiche, in suche sorte dothe not onelie as much as in him is to obscure the glorie of God, but also to confound the commonweale of his owne countrey. And albeit, the king's majestie, whose gracious nature and goodnes I knowe, *wool not, I am sure, have to do ne meddle with this matier touching your said cardynall*, for soundrie considerations; yet, if you could so worke the matier with these gentlemen your freends, which have made that offer, that it maye take effect, you shall undoubtedly doo therein good service, both to God and his majestie, and a singular benefit to your countrey. Wherefore, lyke as if I were in your place, it shulde be the first thing I wolde earnestlie attempt, thinking therby for the respect aforesaide chieffie to please God, and to do good to my countrey." Sadler goes on to state, that if Brunston and his friends put the matter in execution, he knows so well the king's goodness and liberality, that they may assure themselves of a reward; and he adds this remarkable sentence, "And if the execution of this matier doo rest onelie upon the rewarde of the king's majestie to such as shall be the executors of the same, I praye you advertyse me what rewarde they do requyre, and if it be not unreasonable, because I have been in your countrey, for the Christen zeal, that I have to the commonweale of the same, I will undertake it shall be payed immediatlie upon the act executed, though I doo myselve beare the charge of the same, whiche I wolde thinke well employed. * * * * Thus I write to you mine owne phantasie and mynde in this matier, as one that wolde be glad to give you such advise, as wherby you shulde doo that service to God, the kinge's majestie, and your owne natyve countrey, as might also be to your owne profett, and good fame."¹

The Laird of Brunston, however, and the friends with whom he acted, although willing for a small reward to slay the cardinal, proved as cautious and crafty as the Earl of Cassillis, and did not chuse to undertake the murder without a direct communication with the king's majesty; they had determined to have the royal warrant and writ, for their reward and their security; and on hearing that Sadler had not imparted their offer to the king,

¹ Orig. State Paper Office, never before published.

but only encouraged them out of his Christian zeal, and of his own phantasie, they, for the present, dropt their atrocious project. This letter of Sadler's was dated 4th of July, 1545; and for nearly three months, we can trace nothing of the plot against the cardinal, How the interval was occupied, is shown in this history. The invasion of Hertford, and the many miserable scenes which it brought in its train, gave ample employment to all parties in Scotland. Beaton, however, was still able to thwart the schemes of Henry; and that monarch evinced the continuance of his mortal enmity against the prelate, by recommending the Earl of Hertford to advise the French deserters to show their desire to be of service. *by trapping or killing the cardinal, Lorges, or the governor.* This was on the 9th of September, 1545, and on the 6th of October, about a month after, we find pretty strong evidence, that the plot for the assassination of Beaton had been resumed by Brunston:—at this time, the following letter in cipher was sent by that busy intriguer to Henry the Eighth.

“ My deuty usit to your most excellent majeste; it will plesse your highnes, yat at yis last convention the Earl of Lennox is forfaltit, his brother, the bischoip, and the Larde of Tulibarn, continewit to the nixt meeting betuyx yis and Chrismes. As to other gret actis ya haif none. Yai haif providit one thowsand horsmen to ly on the Bordouris, five hundreth of the Mers, and other five hundreth of Tevidail such as hes no other thing to leif by.

“ Morovir, yt wil lyk your majeste, yat I am suirly advertesed by one yat knowith yt, wich ys one suir frend of myn, yat the cardinal passis to France with the French king's leutenant, who, as I beleif taryis for nothing but for his shippis, the which are sent for alrady. The said cardinal entendis (yf his devising tak effect) to bring us gret support in the foir yere; but I hoip to God his *jornay shall be shortit to his displecur.* He ys laborand to haif the yong queen to remane in his castel of Sanctandros, and causis the governor to beleif yat yt is for his effect to keip hir to his sone; and the queen mother makis hir angrye withal, but I belieif she dissembles. Thair is no other thingis for the present worthye your majeste's knowledge; and as otheris occuris, your majeste shal be advertest wyth such diligence as I may; always assuring your highnes yat *yair wes nevir mo gentil men desyrous to serve your*

majeste to the avansing of your majestes godlye entent, nor yair is now." This letter is dated at Ormistoun yis saxt day of October, be him yat is desirous to do your highnes service at the uttermost of his power Bronstoun.¹

After this letter, dated the 6th of October, there is no further correspondence between Brunstoun and the English government, till the 20th of the same month. We then, however, find the following letter addressed by that person to Sir Ralph Sadler.—“This present shall be to let you to wit, that sins the writting of my last letres, I talked at length with Sir George Douglas, who hath shewed me aunswer to the last letre that I send to your L. ‘that the hole lords hath agreed to the marriage of the young quene to the governors sonne with their seales and hand writtis,’ and that he as yet hath stopped the Earl of Anguisse, with the rest of his friends, notwithstanding the diligent pursuit of the governor and his friends; which they seke both with great and fayer promises, and other wayes, thretheninges of the hole authoritye to cum in their contrary, which may not be resisted by them; nevertheless, I am suir that Sir George Douglas will stave th’ Erle of Anguisse and all others his freindes unto such tyme as he maye knowe the king’s majesties pleasur; and if the king’s majestie will mak them such support that they may mak their party good in the contrary of the governour and authoritye, to the avauncing of the king’s majesties affayres, they will—themselves and their friendes, and weir all their lyves or every thing promised to the king’s majestie be not kept; and in lik manner I shall cause all the gentlemen that your L. knoweth my friends to be readye as it shall please the king’s majesty to command them * * to assist to such as ar moost to the avauncing of his majesties affaires, as they have at all tymes been hitherto, *but his majestie must be plain with them, both what his majesty would have them to do, and in like manner what they shall lippen to of his majesty*, which matier, with maney other matiers, I would gladly your L. knewe for the avauncing of his majesties affayres

¹ Orig. State Paper Office, not before published. The Earl of Hertford in his letter transmits the cipher as from the Laird of Ormeston; on deciphering, it appears to be from Brounston. I am indebted for the deciphering this and other letters as well as for frequent assistance in the course of my researches, to my friend Mr. Robert Lemon, jun., of the State Paper Office, a gentleman of great skill and learning in the knowledge of ancient manuscripts.

which wer to long to writ. Wherefore I have written as your L. may see to the king's majesty desyryng to speke with one of his majesties counsaill, but in special with yr L. for the declaring of such things as I think gretely to the avauncyng of his majesties affaires at the castle of Berwyk, wher be suche daye as shall be appoynted me, God willing, I shall meet your L. *in secret manner*, geving me advertisement thre or four before the tyme of meeting, which I pray your L. *in the most secret manner, for it standeth me beth in life and heretage if it be knownen*; at the whiche meeting I shall bring Sir G. Douglas mind, with the rest of my friends, remitting all other things unto the tyme I have knowledge from your lordshipp, which I would were the soonest it was possible, as your L. loveth the welfare of the king's maj. affayres. This twenty of Octr. at Calder."¹

The remainder of the letter is unimportant, but from its contents, and judging by the following extract from Brounston's letter to the king, we may presume that the business in which he and the gentlemen, his friends, offered their services to Henry, was of the most treasonable description.

"My duty used to your most princelie maj. it may pleis yr maj. that consydering the present estait of my cuntrey, and knowing the minds of one great part of the baronnis and noblemen thereof, the desyer to do your M. service in all that lyeth in my power, as I am moch bounden, and so moch the more that your majeste intendeth nothing but the wealth and benefit of my cuntrey, and that your majesty shall know I have not forgotten the gret liberalite and gentlenes that both I and divers of the gentlemen, my friends, through me hath found with yr M. (who shall all be any as I am one redy to serve yr M. at our powers,) moveth me for the declaracion of such things as I think gretly to th' avauncing of your majesties affayres, to be desyrous to speke with one of your majesties counsayl, and rather with Mr. Sadleyr, nor with any other, becaus he is both neir to these parts, and best knoweth my cuntrey; who if it pleis your M. to sende to the castel of Berwyk, becaus it is unable to me to cum furth within the cuntrey unknowin, and at such day as shal be appoynted me, I shall (God willing) not fayle to mete him at the said town or castle, *which I would were as*

¹ Orig. State Paper Office, not before published.

secret as were possible, for if it were cum to knowledge, it is the losing to me both of life and heritage; albeit I never knew one that lost for the servyng of yr majestie, which as knoweth God, I am willing to do, being suir your majesty will both acknowledge me and others my friends, such as I have had grit relief of in the servyng of your majestie with the nombre of yr majesties servands and friends. All such things as I both knowe and may lerne with the myndes of such as I tak to be yr majesties friends, I shall show at length to Mr. Sadleyr, at such tyme as it shall pleas yr majy. that I meet him. Ther is non other thing for the present worthy your majesties knowledge. Pray the eternal God to have your M. in his most blessed keeping. At Calder, this twenty of Octr. by your majesties assured humble servitor."

"BROUNSTON."

"Hast the aunswer of these agayn to Coldingham."¹

These last letters from the Laird of Brunston to Sadler and the king must be considered in connection with what has already been proved against him. We have found him offering, on 17th April, 1544, through Wishart, and by the assistance of his friends Kirkaldy of Grange and the master of Rothes, to apprehend or slay the cardinal. We find him, on the 2nd April, 1545, connected in the most intimate manner with the Earl of Cassillis at the moment this nobleman renewed in his own person the proposal for the assassination of the cardinal. We find him again, on the 12th July, 1545, sending a letter in cipher to the king, in which he renews the offer that certain gentlemen, his friends, were willing for a small sum of money to take the cardinal out of the way; and now, when in these letters we find him, on October 6th, darkly alluding to his hopes that the cardinal's meditated journey to France will be cut short to his displeasure, and on the 26th of the same month, arranging a secret interview with Sadler at Berwick, which were it discovered might affect his life, and at the same moment declaring that the gentlemen his friends were ready to obey his majesty's commands; but that the king must be plain with them, as to what he wishes them to do, and also how far they are to depend on his majesty's support, it is difficult I think to resist the conclusion that this last correspondence, as well as the former, regarded a fourth

¹ Orig. State Paper Office, not before published.

offer for the assassination of the prelate, and that the anxiety of Brunston and the gentlemen his friends to know Henry's wishes, and what support they were to expect from him arose out of the indirect and crafty manner in which this monarch, whilst he covertly encouraged the plot, insisted on making Sadler the ostensible agent in the nefarious transaction. At this critical moment, when Brunston, in his letter of the 20th of October, pressing the king to be plain, the letters in the State Paper Office relative to the intrigues of this busy baron suddenly break off. Between the 20th of October and the 31st, 1545, occur a few unimportant letters, and from that date to 27th March, 1546, a period of nearly five months, there is a tantalizing hiatus. If I may be allowed a conjecture, I would account for it in this way: Henry the Eighth was, as we see, very anxious not to appear directly in the matter, but the conspirators, Brunston's friends, would not act unless he dealt plainly with them; they would not take the indirect encouragement to commit the murder which Sadler gave as coming solely from himself; they wished to have the king's hand and writ to plead in their defence, and produce as their warrant for protection and remuneration, after the deed was perpetrated. I imagine the king was driven to give this, but the correspondence for this reason was destroyed; hence this hiatus at this most critical moment. There are no letters to be found from March 27th to May 29th, which throw the slightest light upon the conspiracy against Beaton, and on the morning of that last mentioned day the unfortunate man was murdered; the principal assassins being Kirkaldy of Grange, and Norman Lesly, the master of Rothes—the very men who two years before had offered, through the medium of Brunston, to apprehend or slay him as he passed through Fife. One thing to be regretted in the disappearance of all letters relative to the murder after the 20th of October is the want of evidence to show any recent communication between Brunston and the assassins of the cardinal; but the inference I think is scarcely to be resisted, that this daring and unscrupulous intriguer was as intimately implicated in the first as in the last conspiracy.

At the moment of their committing the murder, Grange, Lesly, and others of the principal conspirators were in the receipt of pensions from Henry the Eighth, and were described by that monarch as his friends and supporters;¹ and it is not unimportant to observe

¹ Chalmers' Life of Mary, vol. iii, p. 340.

that soon after the assassination, the Laird of Brunston was indicted on a charge of treason, although the process against him was afterwards withdrawn.

I shall conclude these historical remarks with the following interesting extract from the letter of a Scottish spy of Lord Wharton's, named James Lindsay, sending to that nobleman the first intelligence of the murder. It is one of three letters, all on the same subject, sent by Lord Wharton to the Privy Council of England.

“Syr, to advertise zou, this satterday betwix v hours and vi in the mornyng the cardynal is slane in the Castle of St. Andrewe's, be Normond Leslie, in yis maner. At the cumyng in of ye masonis and warkmen in ye place to the wark, Normond Leslie and thre wyth him, enteret and after hym James Melwin and thre men with him and fenzit themselves to have spokin with the cardinal, and after yame came the zoung laird of Grange, and viii men with hym all in geir quhilk the porter stoppit to lat in quhill ane of them strak him with ane knyiff and kest him in the hous. Incontynent they shot furth all the warkmen and closet the zet, syne sought the chalmer and shot furth all ye howsald men as thai gat thame mastrit. Ye cardinale herand ye dyn in his chalmer come furth was passand to the blockehous head to heir quhat it was; Normond Leslie and his cumpanye met him in the torn pyk (off) and slew him; and after ya have depossesst the place of all therein till excep ye governors sone his priest and servand and ye cardinals chalmer child, ye common bell of ye toun rang, ye provest and town gadert to ye noumer of thre or four hundreth men, and come to ye castell, quhill Normond Leslie and his cumpanye come to ye wall heid and sperit quhat they desyrit to se ane deid man. Incontynent ya brot ye cardinal deid to the wall heid in ane payr of shetis, and hang hym our ye wall be the tane arm and the tane fute so bad ye pepill se yer thar God. This Johne of Douglas of Edinburt, Hew Douglas, Ayr Shaw, me, and master Johne Douglas quhilk was in Sanct Andrews and saw ye sam wyt yar ene. * *

“Wryten this Satterday at midnyt, zour servand,

“JAMES LYND SAY.”¹

¹ Orig. State Paper Office, not before published.

ADDITIONAL ILLUSTRATIONS
FROM THE HAMILTON MANUSCRIPTS.

V.

SINCE this volume passed through the press, I have seen, by the politeness of Mr. James Chalmers, a Catalogue of the Hamilton papers which belonged to his late uncle, the learned and indefatigable author of *Caledonia*. These papers are in the possession of his Grace the Duke of Hamilton. The catalogue is a voluminous one, and contains occasional extracts from the letters and documents which it describes. Of these the most valuable relate to the regency of the Earl of Arran and the minority of Mary; and it was gratifying to find that they not only confirmed, but greatly strengthened the views which I have given of that important period. Thus, with regard to the scheme of Henry for the entire subjection of Scotland under his dominion, and the mercenary manner in which the Scottish prisoners entered into his views, we have ample information in the following description of the contents of volume iv. of the Hamilton Papers.

Volume iv. commences with December, 1542, and ends with January and February, 1542-3. It contains, amongst other occurrences, Henry's instructions to Sir Richard Southwell for conferring with the Earls of Bothwell and Angus, and also with the Scots prisoners, in order to engage them in his designs of subduing Scotland, to himself, by possessing him of the government for the present, assuring the succession to him in case of the young queen's death, and granting him the tutelage of her person in the mean time, with the capital fortresses, and places of strength which he sought to have delivered into his power, together with the cardinal and another i. e. the Lord Regent, whom he looked on as his most dangerous opponents. In a minute addressed to Lord Viscount Lisle, January 8, 1542-3, Henry writes, "We have already given

you advertisement how we have dismissed from hence the noblemen and others of Scotland our prisoners, and what the same have promised unto us." In what manner these promises were made appears from this extract from the catalogue. Henry's articles with the Earl of Angus, then an exile in England, for promoting the enterprise—his *open* articles, as he calls them,—subscribed by the Scottish prisoners and Earl Bothwell, and his *secret* articles, subscribed by ten of these prisoners, the fittest, as he thought, to be trusted; namely, the Earls of Cassillis and Glencairn, the Lords Maxwell, Fleming, Somerville, and Gray; and by Robert Erskine, Oliver Sinclair, the Laird of Kerse, and John Ross, of Craigy. Again, in Henry's instructions to Sir Ralph Sadler, in vol. v. of the Hamilton Papers, the English monarch states that Sir George Douglas had undertaken not only by promise, but by *oath and bond* to perform greater services than any of the rest. The treasonable extent of the engagements of the Earl of Angus and Sir George Douglas to Henry appear from a minute of the king to the Duke of Suffolk, dated November 12, 1543, in which that nobleman is directed to expostulate with Sir George Douglas regarding a fresh demand for money from England. "They have not stiked," says the English monarch, "to take upon them *to set the crown of Scotland upon our head*. Where has now become all their force and courage * * what meant they to take upon so great maistry and to be able to perform in deed so little." Under the date of December, 1543, we find a minute of a letter from the Duke of Suffolk to Henry's pensioners in Scotland with an account of the sums of money which had been distributed to them:—viz.

	STERLING.
To the Earl of Angus	200 £.
of Glencairn	200 marks
of Cassillis	200 marks
To the Master of Maxwell	100 £.
To the Sheriff of Air	100 £.
To the Laird of Drumlauryk	100 £.
To the Earl of Marshall, John Charters, the Lord Gray's friends in the North	300 marks
To Sir George Douglas and his friends in Lothian and Merse	200 £.

In the midst of so much venality and desertion on the part of the Scottish barons, it is pleasing to find an exception in the Earl of Argyle, who resisted more splendid offers than were made to any of the rest. This is shown by a minute of the Privy Council of England to the Duke of Suffolk, preserved amongst the Hamilton Papers, by which it appears that the Laird of Drumlaurick, and the Sheriff of Ayr (Campbell of London), had laboured to promote king Henry's designs, at some charge to themselves; and that, in satisfaction of that charge, they had received for the present five hundred crowns each, with the promise of a pension, when the good fruits of their service should deserve it, particularly when they should accomplish the treaty which they had begun with the Earl of Argyle, *to make him a convert to Henry*. To induce his compliance, they were to make him a promise of one thousand crowns in hand, and a yearly pension of one thousand more; but if he would not comply, they were to "threaten him with the wild Irish, whom Henry was to hound, and to ruin both him and his country." It is shown in this history, that Argyle resisted the overtures of Henry, and that the wild Irish and men of the Isles were accordingly "hounded" upon him.

VI.

CRUELTY AND IMPOLICY OF HENRY THE EIGHTH TOWARDS SCOTLAND.

The savage temper of Henry the Eighth no where more strongly appears than in the directions, which, on the 10th of April, 1543-4, he transmitted through a dispatch of the Privy Council to the Earl of Hertford. After observing that the grand attempt on Scotland was delayed for a season, they command him, in the mean time, to make an inroad into Scotland, "there to put all to fire and sword, to burn Edinburgh town, and to raze and deface it, when you have sacked it, and gotten what you can out of it, as that it may remain for ever a perpetual memory of the vengeance of God lighted upon it, for their falsehood and disloyalty. Do what you can," continue they, "out of hand, and, without long tarrying, to beat down and

overthrow the castle, sack Holyrood-house, and as many towns and villages about Edinburgh as ye conveniently can; sack Leith, and burn and subvert it, and all the rest, *putting man, woman, and child, to fire and sword*, without exception, when any resistance shall be made against you; and this done, pass over to the Fife land, and extend like extremities and destructions in all towns and villages whereunto ye may reach conveniently, not forgetting, amongst all the rest, so to spoil and turn upside down the cardinal's town of St. Andrew's, *as the upper stone may be the nether*, and not one stick stand by another, *sparing no creature alive* within the same, specially such as either in friendship or blood be allied to the cardinal." "This journey," the dispatch goes on to state, "shall succeed most to his majesty's honour."*

* From the MS. Catalogue of the Hamilton Papers, pp. 44, 45.—It is earnestly to be wished that his Grace, the Duke of Hamilton, who is a member of the Bannatyne Club, would publish a selection from the rich manuscript stores in his possession.

END OF VOLUME V.