CHAP. III.

1567 - 1569.

Regency of the Earl of Murray.

CONTEMPORARY PRINCES.

England.	*France.*	*Germany.*	*Spain.*	*Portugal.*	*Pope.*
Elizabeth	Charles IX.	Maximilian II.	Philip II.	Sebastian.	Pius VI.

IMMEDIATELY after his acceptance of the government, Murray invited Throkmorton to a conference. He obeyed, and found the regent and secretary Lethington sitting together, upon which he conveyed to them "in as earnest and vehement a form as he could set it forth," the queen his mistress' severe disapproval of their recent conduct. To this remonstrance, Maitland made a bold reply. He renounced for himself and his colleagues, all intention of harm to the person and honour of his royal mistress in their late proceedings. "So far from it," said he, "Mr. Ambassador, that we wish her to be queen of all the world; but now she is in the state of a person in the delirium of a fever, who refuses every thing which may do her good, and requires all that may work her harm. Be assured nothing will be more pre-

judicial to her interest, than for your mistress to precipitate matters. It may drive us to a strait, and compel us to measures we would gladly avoid. Hitherto have we been content to be charged with grievous and infamous titles, we have quietly suffered ourselves to be condemned as perjured rebels and unnatural traitors, rather than proceed to anything that might touch our sovereign's honour. But beware we beseech you, that your mistress, by her continual threats and defamations, by hostility, or by soliciting other princes to attack us, do not push us beyond endurance. Think not we will lose our lives, forfeit our lands, and be challenged as rebels throughout the world, when we have the means to justify ourselves. And if there be no remedy, but your mistress will have war, sorry though we be, far rather will we take our fortune, than put our queen to liberty in her present mood, resolved as she is to retain and defend Bothwell, to hazard the life of her son, to peril the realm, and to overthrow her nobility."[1]

"For your wars," he continued, "we know them well. You will burn our borders, and we shall burn yours; if you invade us, we do not dread it, and are sure of France; for your practices to nourish dissension amongst us, we have an eye upon them all. The Hamiltons will take your money, laugh you to scorn, and side with us. At this moment we have the offer of an agreement with them in

[1] Throkmorton to Elizabeth, Aug. 22, 1567. Keith, p. 448.

our hands. The queen, your mistress, declares she wishes not only for our sovereign's liberty, and her restoration to her dignity, but is equally zealous for the preservation of the king, the punishment of the murder, and the safety of the lords. To accomplish the first, our queen's liberty, much has been done, for the rest, absolutely nothing. Why does not her majesty fit out some ships of war, to apprehend Bothwell, and pay a thousand soldiers to reduce the forts and protect the king. When this is in hand, we shall think her sincere, but for her charge to set our sovereign forthwith at liberty, and restore her to her dignity, it is enough to reply to such strange language, that we are the subjects of another prince, and know not the queen's majesty for our sovereign."[1]

As soon as Lethington had concluded, Throkmorton turning to Murray, expressed a hope that such sentiments would at least not meet his approval. He was not "banded" with these lords, he had committed none of their excesses. But Murray was now secure, he had little to fear from Elizabeth, nothing from France, and his answer was as decided, though more laconic than the secretary's. "Truly, my lord ambassador," said he, "methinks you have had reason at the Laird of Lethington's hands. It is true, that I have not been at the past doings of these lords, yet I must commend what they have done; and seeing the

[1] Throkmorton to Elizabeth, Aug. 22, 1567, printed by Keith, p. 448, from Orig. Caligula, C. 1, fol. xxxii.

queen my sovereign and they have laid on me the charge of the regency, a burden I would gladly have avoided, I am resolved to maintain their action, and will reduce all men to obedience in the king's name, or it shall cost me my life."[1]

The ambassador had been long aware that his further stay in Scotland would be totally useless. He had earnestly solicited his recal; and Elizabeth now agreed to it, but ordered him first to make a last remonstrance in favour of the captive queen, and to request to be admitted to her presence. This, as he had looked for, was peremptorily refused by Murray. They had excluded De Lignerolles, the French ambassador, he said, who had so lately left them; and it was impossible to admit him: for the rest of his message from the queen of England, the regent, after his usual fashion, replied to it with great brevity; as to his acceptance of the government the deed was done; for calumny he cared little, and would use none other defence than a good conscience and a sincere intention; to satisfy the queen that his mistress had consented, he could only say, that he had her own word and signature; for her liberty, its being granted depended upon accidents; and as to her condition after Bothwell's apprehension, it would be idle, he said, to bargain for the bear's skin before they had him. The ambassador before he took his leave, was pressed to accept a present of plate in the name of the king. This was declined in strong terms, and

[1] Ibid. ut supra.

on the 29th of August, he left the capital for England.

Murray now addressed himself with characteristic decision and courage to the cares of government; and to use Throkmorton's expressive phrase, "went stoutly to work, resolved rather to imitate those who had led the people of Israel than any captains of that age."[1] He instantly despatched the Laird of Grange, and Murray of Tullibardin, with three armed ships in pursuit of Bothwell, who, after lurking in the north, and in vain attempting to make a party in these remote districts, had fled to Orkney and turned pirate.[2] He next employed the most vigorous measures to compel the whole kingdom to acknowledge the king's government; to secure himself against attack if Elizabeth should meditate it, and to keep up pacific relations with France, which, from the tone all along assumed by De Lignerolles, he was assured would not be difficult. The Hamiltons had made some feeble attempts to prevent the regent being proclaimed within their bounds; but they acted with no fixed plan, had no leader of ability, and gave him little anxiety.[3]

[1] Throkmorton to Cecil, Aug. 20, 1567, in Stevenson's Selections, p. 282.

[2] Throkmorton to Cecil, August 26, 1567, Stevenson's Selections, p. 294. Also MS. Letter, St. P. Off. B. C. Bedford to Cecil, Berwick, Sept. 11, 1567.

[3] Throkmorton to the Queen, Aug. 23, 1567. Stevenson's Selections, p. 291.

A large proportion of the nobles who had hitherto been hostile or neutral now sent in their adherence to his government; and Sir James Balfour, the governor of the castle of Edinburgh, delivered that fortress into his hands. This infamous man was the intimate friend of Bothwell, and a principal actor in the king's murder. It might have been expected that Murray, who had lately expressed so much horror for that deed, and so determined a resolution to avenge it, would have been the last to overlook the crime in one of the principal conspirators; but like other ambitious men, he could make his conscience give way to his interest, as the treaty in question completely proved. Its first stipulation was, that Balfour should have an ample remission as an accomplice in the murder; the next, that before he gave up the keys of the castle, five thousand pounds should be paid down; the last, that he himself should have the Priory of Pittenweem, and his son an annuity. All this was agreed to, apparently without difficulty, and only two days after his assuming the regency, Murray in person took possession of the castle.[1]

As if to cover the shame of this transaction, the regent made unusual exertions to seize some of the inferior delinquents. Previous to his arrival in Scotland, Captain Blacater had been taken and executed. He now apprehended John Hay of Tallo, a page of the king's called Durham, Black John

[1] MS. Letter, St. P. Off. Throkmorton to Cecil, Aug. 26, 1567. History of James the Sext, p. 18.

Spens, John Blacater, and James Edmonson.[1] The guilt of Tallo, as a principal agent in the murder, was completely proved, but his examination threw Murray into great perplexity, for to use Bedford's words to Cecil, he not only "opened the whole device of the murder," but declared who were the executioners of the same, and went so far as to touch a great many, not of the smallest."[2] We have already seen that Lethington, Morton, and Argile, three of the most powerful men in Scotland, were either accomplices in the assassination, or consenting to its perpetration, and there can be no doubt that they, amongst others, were implicated in Tallo's confession. But in what manner was Murray to proceed? It was these very men who had placed him in the regency, with them he now acted familiarly and confidentially, their cause could not with safety be separated from his own. He might indeed attempt to seize and punish them, but such was their strength, that it would be at the risk of being plucked down from his high office, by the same hands which had built him up. The truth, however, probably was, that Murray had been long aware of the true character of the persons by whose successful guilt he now profited, and had determined to favour the higher culprits, whilst he let loose the vengeance of the law upon the lesser de-

[1] MS. Letter, St. P. Off. B. C. Bedford to Cecil, Sept. 5, 1567. And Same to same, Sept. 11, 1567.

[2] MS. Letter, St. P. Off. B. C. Bedford to Cecil, Sep. 16, 1567.

linquents. He could not prevent the people, however, and all the more honest part of the nation from arraigning such interested conduct, but he little heeded these murmurs, and for the present Hay's examination was suppressed, and his trial indefinitely postponed. Durham, the king's page, also was kept in prison in irons.[1]

The regent now summoned the Castle of Dunbar, which was still held for Bothwell by one of his retainers. Its governor affected to resist, but Murray bombarded it in person, and in a few days the garrison capitulated. A last effort of the Hamiltons to get up a resistance was only made to be abandoned; Argile who had encouraged it, submitted, bringing with him Boyd, Livingston, and the Abbot of Kilwinning. This last person was deputed by the Archbishop of St. Andrew's, the leader of the Hamiltons, to make his peace; Huntly and Herries, much about the same time, gave in their adherence to the king's government, and the regent, on the 15th of September, informed his friend Cecil that the whole realm was quiet.[2]

In the midst of these transactions, Grange returned unsuccessful from his pursuit of Bothwell. He had boasted to Bedford, that he would either

[1] MS. Letter, St. P. Off. Sep. 17, 1567, Occurrents out of Scotland.

[2] MS. Letter, St. P. Off. B.C. Bedford to Cecil, 16th Sept. 1567. MS. Ibid. Proceedings of the Hamiltons, 17th Sept. 1567 Also MS. Letter, St. P. Off. Murray to Cecil, 15th Sept. 1567.

bring back the murderer or lose his life in the attempt; but, in giving chase, Grange's ship, one of the largest in the Scottish navy, struck upon a sand-bank, and although he boarded and brought home with him one of Bothwell's vessels, the earl himself, in a lighter craft, escaped to Norway. In one respect the expedition was important, as Hepburn of Bolton, an accomplice in the king's murder, was seized in the ship, and, by his confession, threw additional light on that dark transaction. For the present, however, his revelations were not suffered to be known.[1]

Murray now summoned a Parliament (Dec. 15), the proceedings of which evince the new regent's complete connexion and sympathy with the party of the Reformed Church, and demand especial attention. It has been asserted that it was thinly attended, but the remark can only apply to the bishops, who represented the ecclesiastical estate, of whom but four appeared, Murray, Galloway, Orkney, and Brechin. There were present, however, fourteen abbots, twelve earls, sixteen lords and masters, the name given to lords' eldest sons, and twenty-seven commissioners of burghs.[2] The discussions were opened in a speech by Lethington, of which a copy still remains in his own handwri-

[1] MS. Letter, St. P. Off. 11th Sept. 1567. Murray to Cecil. Also Melvil's Memoirs, p. 186. Also 16th Sept. MS. Letter, B.C. Bedford to Cecil.

[2] Anderson, vol. ii. pp. 228, 229, 230. Also MS. St. P. Off. Dec. 15, 1567.

ting, and it were to be wished that its truth and sincerity had been equal to its talent. He alluded to the vast importance of the crisis in which they met, and the subjects upon which they were about to legislate, any one of which would, he said, have been enough to have occupied a parliament. These were the establishing a uniform religion, the acknowledgment of the just authority of the king in consequence of the queen's free demission of the crown in his favour, the sanction to be given to the appointment of a regent chosen to act in the king's minority, the reuniting the minds of the nobility, the punishment of the cruel murder of the late king, their sovereign's father, and many other disorders requiring the grave consideration of their lordships. Upon these heads, he said, he would not dilate, but two points he must not omit, both tending to their great comfort, and calling for deep gratitude. The first was, the success which in matters of religion had followed such comparatively small beginnings. The second, their happy fortune in having in the regent a nobleman so excellently qualified to carry their ordinances into execution, whether they related to the church or the commonwealth. "As to religion," said he, "the quietness you presently enjoy, declares sufficiently the victory that God by his word has obtained among you, within the space of eight or nine years; how feeble the foundation was in the eyes of men, how unlikely it was to rise so suddenly to so large and huge a greatness, with what calmness the work has pro-

ceeded, not one of you is ignorant. Iron has not been heard within the house of the Lord, that is to say, the whole has been builded, set up, and erected to this greatness without bloodshed. Note it I pray you, as a singular testimony of God's favour, and a peculiar benefit granted only to the realm of Scotland, not as the most worthy, but chosen out by His providence from among all nations, for causes hid and unknown to us, and to foreshow His almighty power, that the true religion has obtained a free course universally throughout the whole realm, and yet not a Scotsman's blood shed in the forthsetting of the whole quarrel. With what nation in the earth has God dealt so mercifully? Consider the progress of religion from time to time in other countries, Germany, Denmark, England, France, Flanders, or where you please. You shall find the lives of many thousands spent before they could purchase the tenth part of that liberty whereunto we have attained, as it were sleeping upon down beds."[1]

When we recollect the events of the few last years—the rising of Murray against the queen's marriage, the murder of Riccio, the flight of Morton, the assassination of Darnley, the confederacy against Bothwell, and the imprisonment of the queen, all of them events more or less connected with the establishment of the Reformation in Scotland—and remember also that Lethington was

[1] MS. St. P. Off. An Oration of the Lord of Lethington, at the Parliament of Scotland, Dec. 1567.

deeply engaged in them all, it is certainly difficult which most to condemn, the gross inaccuracy of this picture, or the hardihood evinced by its coming from his lips.

But to return to the proceedings of the parliament. The committee of the Lords of the Articles having been chosen,[1] the three estates sanctioned the queen's demission of the crown, the king's coronation, and the appointment of Murray to the regency. The Pope's authority was next abolished, the Act to that effect passed in the disputed Parliament of 1560, being solemnly ratified. All laws repugnant to the word of God were annulled, and the "Confession of Faith," which had been already read and approved of in a former Parliament, was sanctioned and published. All heretics and hearers of mass were made liable to punishment, confiscation of moveables being declared the penalty for the first offence, banishment for the second, and death for the third. Such persons as opposed the Confession of Faith, or refused to receive the sacraments after the Presbyterian form, were declared to be no members of the Church of Christ. The examination and admission of ministers was de-

[1] It was composed of the Bishops of Murray, Galloway, and Orkney, the Abbots of Dumfermling, Melrose, Newbottle, Balmerino, St. Coln's Inch, Pittenweem, and Portmoak, the Earls of Huntly, Argile, Morton, Athol, Glencairn, Mar, and Caithness, the Lords Hume, Lindsay, and Sempil, with the Provosts of Edinburgh, Dundee, Montrose, Aberdeen, St. Andrew's, Cowper, Stirling, and Ayr.

clared a prerogative inherent in the Church, but to lay patrons was continued the power of presentation, with an appeal to the General Assembly, if their nomination of a qualified person was not sustained by the superintendents and ministers; and, lastly, all kings, at their coronation, or princes, or magistrates acting in their place, were bound to take the oath for the support of the true church and the extirpation of heresy.[1]

So far every thing succeeded to the wishes of the reformed clergy, but their endeavour to repossess themselves of the patrimony of the Church was not so fortunate. They pleaded a former promise to this effect, and, if we may credit Bishop Spottiswood, the regent showed an anxiety to fulfil it, but the laymen, who had violently seized the property of the Church when it was in the hands of the Roman Catholic clergy, manifested the same violence now that their own ministers proposed to resume possession, and, with difficulty, consented to restore to them a third of the benefices.[2] It was next ordered that a reformation should be made in all schools, colleges, and universities, and that no teachers were to be admitted but such as had been examined and approved by the appointed visitors and superintendents, and lastly, that, as far as concerned the preaching of the word, the reformation of man-

[1] Spottiswood, p. 214. Maitland, vol. ii. p. 1006. Black Acts, fol. 1-5, c. 1. 2.

[2] Id. ut supra, p. 1007.

ners, and the administration of the sacraments, no other ecclesiastical powers should be acknowledged than those which were now claimed by the Presbyterian Church, to which they gave the title of the Immaculate Spouse of Christ.[1]

A keen debate arose when the subject of the queen's imprisonment came before the Assembly, which was greatly divided in opinion. Many who were convinced of their sovereign's guilt, and who had adopted the views lately promulgated by the ministers in their pulpit addresses, contended that she should be brought to a public trial, and if the crime was proved, punished by the laws, like any other subject of the realm. To this it was objected that the monarch was the source of all authority, that she could not, without absurdity and contradiction, be made amenable to an inferior jurisdiction, but was accountable for her conduct to God alone. It was replied, that extraordinary crimes required extraordinary remedies; but this doctrine was not generally acceptable. The discussion concluded in a resolution that the imprisonment of the queen should be continued, and an act of Parliament passed for the exoneration of those noblemen and barons who had risen in arms for the prosecution of the murder. The terms of this act, which were nearly similar to a previous resolution of the Privy Council, require a moment's notice, as it is in it that we find the first public mention of

[1] Maitland, vol. ii., p. 1007.

those letters of Mary to Bothwell, which, it was afterwards contended, completely proved her guilt. It declared the conduct and transactions of these lords, from the 10th of February (the day of Darnley's murder), till the present time, to be lawful and loyal; that they should never be subjected to any prosecution for what they had done, because, if the queen were confined, it was solely in consequence of her own fault and demerit, seeing, that by several of her private letters, written wholly with her own hand, and sent by her to Bothwell, and by her ungodly and pretended marriage with him, it was most certain that she was cognizant, art and part, of the murder of the king her husband. This declaration of the Estates having been signed and sealed, and ordered to be printed along with the other statutes, the Parliament was dissolved.[1]

It appears, by an act of Privy Council, dated the 16th September, 1568, that the Earl of Morton had, at that time,[2] delivered to the regent the little box or coffer, with the letters and sonnets which it contained. It was to these letters that the act now quoted referred, and the partial and unjust conduct of Murray and the Parliament

[1] Goodall, vol. ii. pp. 62, 69. The words in the Black Acts. Anderson, vol. ii. p. 221, are, "divers her privie letters written halelie, (wholly) with her own hand. The words of the act of Privy Council are, "divers her privie letters, written and subscribed with her own hand."

[2] Anderson, vol. ii. p. 257.

need hardly be pointed out. Such documents might or might not be originals, but by every principle of justice, the queen ought not to have been condemned, nor should these letters have been received as evidence of the justice of that condemnation, until she had enjoyed in person, or by her counsel, an opportunity of examining the proofs produced against her. This injustice, however, was little in comparison with another proceeding of Murray's, who, having now tasted the sweets of absolute power, and being determined, at all hazard, to retain it, became little scrupulous of the means which he employed. Sir James Balfour, as we have seen, had been the confidant of Bothwell, and was the depository of the Bond or Contract which was drawn up for the murder of the king. It had been seen by one of the accomplices in the murder, named Ormiston, who affirmed that Bothwell pointed out certain signatures, which he declared to be those of Argile, Huntly, Lethington, and Balfour himself.[1] This profligate adherent of Bothwell's kept the bond along with the queen's jewels and other property of value in the Castle of Edinburgh, which fortress the duke had committed to his charge, but he betrayed the place, as we have seen, to Murray, and, on its delivery, the regent, now all-powerful, might have stipulated for the delivery of all the evidence which threw light upon so foul a plot. In estimating his moral character, which has been highly ex-

[1] Supra, p. 30.

tolled by some writers, it is instructive to mark in what way he appears to have proceeded. The letters alleged to be written by the queen, were preserved, exhibited to the Council, and quoted to the Parliament as proofs of her guilt. Her jewels and other apparel were delivered up by Balfour[1] to Murray, but the "Bond" which connected his friends with the murder, was appropriated by Lethington, committed to the flames, and destroyed for ever. We learn this important fact, which is new in the controversy, from a letter addressed by Drury to Cecil, on the 28th of November, a short time before the meeting of the Parliament. "The writings," said he, "which did comprehend the names and consents of the chief for the murdering of the king, is turned into ashes, the same not unknown to the queen, and the same that concerns her part kept to be shown, which offends her." It is true, there is here no assertion that the regent himself threw the bond into the fire, and it was Lethington's and Balfour's interest, as it criminated themselves, to have it destroyed; but that Murray consented to its destruction, whilst he preserved the evidence against the queen, the whole circumstances appear to me to demonstrate. Drury, in the same letter to Cecil, observed, "that Murray made fair weather with Mary, and was dealing

[1] MS. Letter, St. P. Off. B.C. Bedford to Cecil, Berwick, 5th Sept. 1567. Ibid. Same to same, 11th Sept. 1567. Melvil's Memoirs, p. 11. Also MS. Letter, St. P. Off. Randolph to Cecil, Oct. 15, 1570, and MS. St. P. Off. Drury to Cecil, Nov. 28, 1567.

very soundly and uprightly." Sir William's ideas as to upright conduct, unless the expression was used solely with reference to the safety assured by the regent to his own associates, must have been peculiar.

Of this partial dealing, he now gave another signal instance in the trial of those delinquents who were in custody for the king's murder. Their names were Hay of Tallo, John Hepburn of Bolton, George Dalgleish, a page or chamberlain, and William Powrie a servant of Bothwell. It was well known at the time of his being apprehended, that Hay, the confident of Bothwell, had not only given a full detail of the murder, but had accused some of the highest nobility of being accomplices in it.[1] It was equally notorious, that Captain Cullen who had been employed in his most secret concerns by the chief murderer, had revealed the whole circumstances,[2] and that the lords and the regent must have been in possession of his confession. So general was the expectation of these disclosures being made public, that Sir William Drury, in writing to Cecil upon the subject, informed him that Tallo's life had been spared for a little only, until some of the great persons who were acquainted

[1] Bedford to Cecil. MS. Letter, St. P. Off. B. C. Sept. 16, 1567. Also Drury to Cecil, MS. Letter, St. P. Off. B. C. Sept. 30, 1567.

[2] MS. Letter, St. P. Off. B. C. Drury to Cecil, June 14, 1567. Berwick. Scrope to Cecil, June 16, 1567, Carlisle. MS. Letter, St. P. Off. B. C.

with the cruel deed were apprehended. All therefore looked with intense anxiety to the trial of these men, and it was confidently demanded, that as so much pains had been taken in the recent parliament to criminate the queen, the same care should be employed to discover who else were guilty, that by the publication of the confessions of Cullen, Tallo, and Hepburn, the regent would at length reveal the names of those great accomplices who had hitherto escaped. But Murray had neither the power, nor the will, to make this exposure. The trials were shamefully hurried over. The culprits were arraigned, convicted, and executed in one day (Jan. 3). Although Hepburn of Bolton, in his speech on the scaffold, directly asserted that Argile, Huntly, and Lethington had subscribed to the bond for the murder, no arrest of these persons followed, the judicial confessions which were made by him and his accomplices were suppressed at the time, and when subsequently brought forward to be exhibited in England, it was found that they had been manifestly tampered with, and contained evidence against no one but themselves and Bothwell.[1]

These proceedings told strongly against the regent, and making every allowance for the miserable state of the law in these times, it is impossible to exculpate him from the charge of having lent him-

[1] MS. Letter, St. P. Off. B.C. Drury to Cecil, Jan. 4, 1567-8. MS. Letter, St. P. Off. B.C. Drury to Cecil, Jan. 7, 1567-8. Ibid. Forster to Cecil, Alnwick, 11 Jan. 1567-8. Ibid. Drury to Cecil, Berwick, 21st Jan. 1567.

self to a plan for the defeat of justice. Nor does it need any great discernment to discover both the means by which the truth was suppressed, and the motive for such base conduct. Argile was Lord Justice General, the head and fountain of the criminal jurisprudence of the country. By his deputy, the trials were conducted, and Argile was a principal accomplice in the king's murder. The confessions were made before the lords of the privy council, and amongst these lords were Morton, Huntly, Lethington, and Sir James Balfour, all of them parties to the murder. Lastly, Murray was regent of the realm, but he had been placed in the high office by these very men, and his tenure was still so insecure, that a new coalition might have unseated him.

Such conduct, although politic so far as his own greatness was concerned, disappointed the people, and was loudly condemned. Handbills and satirical poems, which upbraided his partiality, were fixed to the doors of the privy council and of his own house. Of these one was in the following pithy terms:—

Quæritur.

Why John Hepburn, and John Hay of Tallo, are not compelled openly to declare the manner of the king's slaughter, and who consented thereunto?[1]

Another was a pasquinade of which the truth was more striking than the poetry. It bore the title of a letter sent by Maddé unto my lord regent,

[1] MS. St. P. Off. Questions to be absolved by the Lords of the Articles. 4th January, 1567-8.

and the whole estates, and strongly insinuated that Hay and Hepburn were about to be hurried out of life and their confessions suppressed, lest they should discover the principal subscribers of the bond for the king's death.[1]

By his partial conduct, Murray not only estranged the people, but it was soon apparent that notwithstanding all his efforts, he could not long keep his party together. Even in the parliament, his legislation on the subject of religion had been condemned by Athol, Caithness, and the Bishop of Murray, and the provision for the ministers of the church was an unpopular measure with a majority of the lords. He had endeavoured indeed, to secure the support of the chief nobility and barons by rewards and favours. Lethington had received the sheriffship of Lothian, Hume that of Lauderdale, Morton the promise of the Lord High Admiral's place, vacant by the forfeiture of Bothwell, Kirkaldy of Grange had been made governor of Edinburgh Castle, and Huntly and Argile were courted by the prospect held out to

[1] MS. St. P. Off. A letter sent by Maddé to My Lord Regent and the haill estates :—

My lordes all, the king is slain,—
Revenge his cause in hand,
Or else your doing is all but vain,
For all your general Band.

If ye shall punish but *simple* men,
And let the *principal* pass,
Then God and man shall you misken,
And make you therefore base.

them of a matrimonial alliance with the regent's daughter and sister-in-law.[1] But even these prizes and promises sometimes failed in their effect, every one being ready to magnify his own merit, and to anticipate a higher distinction than was bestowed. Nor did it escape observation, that his conduct since his elevation had become haughty and distant to those proud nobles who had so recently been his equals, whilst he was open to flattery, and suffered inferior men to gain his confidence. Even the vigour with which he punished the riot and lawlessness of the border district failed to increase his popularity, the kingdom having been so long accustomed to a more relaxed rule, that justice was construed into tyranny.

Owing to such causes, it was apparent that Murray's government, soon after the dissolution of Parliament, was in a precarious state. The Hamiltons hated him; to Lethington intrigue and change seemed to be the only elements in which he could live. Herries and the Melvils were strongly suspected. Balfour, who knew many secrets, and was capable of any treachery, had left court in disgust. Athol was beginning to be lukewarm;[2]

[1] MS. Letter, St. P. Off. B. C. Berwick. Drury to Cecil, Jan. 4, 1567-8. Huntly's son was to marry his daughter, Argile's brother, his sister-in-law.

[2] MS. Letter, St. P. Off. B. C. Drury to Cecil, Berwick, Jan. 4, 1567-8. Also MS. Letter, St. P. Off. B. C. Drury to Cecil, Berwick, Jan. 21, 1567-8. Ibid. Same to same, Berwick, Feb. 2, 1567-8. Also Ibid. Same to same, Berwick April 2, 1568.

the friends of the Romish religion resented his late conduct, and the people, never long in one mind, began to pity the protracted and rigorous imprisonment of the queen.[1] All these circumstances were against him; but they were trivial to the blow which now fell upon him, for it was at this very crisis, that Mary effected her escape in a manner that almost partakes of romance.

Since her interview with Murray, the captive queen had exerted all the powers of fascination which she so remarkably possessed, to gain upon her keepers. The severe temper of the regent's mother, the lady of the castle, had yielded to their influence,[2] and her son George Douglas, the younger brother of Lochleven, smitten by her beauty, and flattered by her caresses, enthusiastically devoted himself to her interest. It was even asserted that he had aspired to her hand, that his mother talked of a divorce from Bothwell, and that Mary, never insensible to admiration and solicitous to secure his services, did not check his hopes.[3] However this may be, Douglas for some time had bent his whole mind to the enterprise, and on one occasion, a little before this, had nearly succeeded; but the queen, who had assumed the dress of a laundress, was detected by the extraordinary whiteness of her

[1] MS. Letter, St. P. Off. B.C. Drury to Cecil. 2d April, 1568.

[2] MS. Letter, St. P. Off. B. C. Drury to Cecil, Berwick, Sept. 30, 1567. Melvil's Memoirs, p. 199.

[3] MS. Letter, St. P. Off. B. C. Drury to Cecil, April 2, 1568. Also MS. Letter, St. P. Off. —— to Cecil, May 9, 1568.

hands, and carried back in the boat which she had entered to her prison.[1]

This discovery had nearly ruined all, for Douglas was dismissed from the castle, and Mary more strictly watched; but nothing could discourage her own enterprize, or the zeal of her servant. He communicated with Lord Seaton and the Hamiltons, he carried on a secret correspondence with the queen; he secured the services of a page who waited on his mother, called Little Douglas, and by his assistance at length effected his purpose. On the evening of the 2nd of May, this youth, in placing a plate before the castellan, contrived to drop his napkin over the key of the gate of the castle, and carried it off unperceived: he hastened to the queen, and hurrying down to the outer gate, they threw themselves into the little boat which lay there for the service of the garrison. At that moment Lord Seaton and some of her friends were intently observing the castle from their concealment on a neighbouring hill; a party waited in the village below, while nearer still, a man lay watching on the brink of the lake.[2] They could see a female figure with two attendants glide swiftly from the outer gate. It was Mary herself, who breathless with delight and anxiety, sprung into the boat, holding a little girl, one of her maidens, by the hand, while the page, by locking the gate behind

[1] Keith, 470.

[2] Proofs and Illustrations—No. 5, from the MSS. of Prince Labanoff, and Letter of Kirkaldy to Lochleven Morton, MSS.

them, prevented immediate pursuit. In a moment, her white veil with its broad red fringe (the concerted signal of success) was seen glancing in the sun, the sign was recognised and communicated, the little boat, rowed by the page and the queen herself, touched the shore, and Mary, springing out with the lightness of recovered freedom, was received first by George Douglas, and almost instantly after by Lord Seaton and his friends. Throwing herself on horseback, she rode at full speed to the Ferry, crossed the firth, and galloped to Niddry, having been met on the road by Lord Claud Hamilton with fifty horse. Here she took a few hours rest, wrote a hurried despatch to France, dispatched Hepburn of Riccarton to Dunbar, with the hope that the castle would be delivered to her, and commanded him to proceed afterwards to Denmark, and carry to his master, Bothwell, the news of her deliverance.[1] Then again taking horse, she galloped to Hamilton, where she deemed herself in safety.

The news of her escape flew rapidly through the kingdom, and was received with joy by a large portion of her nobility, who crowded round her with devoted offers of homage and support. The Earls of Argile, Cassillis, Eglinton, and Rothes,

[1] Proofs and Illustrations, No. 5. MS. Letter, St. P. Off. B. C. Drury to Cecil, April 2, 1568. Also MS. Letter, Copy, St. P. Off. —— to Cecil, May 9, 1568. MS. Letter, St. P. Off. B. C. Drury to Cecil, May 26, 1568. Also Memoir towards Riccartoun, MS. St. P. Off. Also MS. Letter, St. P. Off. Willok to Cecil, May 31, 1568.

the Lords Somerville, Yester, Livingston, Herries, Fleming, Ross, Borthwick, and many other barons of power and note crowded to Hamilton. Orders were sent by them to put their vassals and followers in instant motion, and Mary soon saw herself at the head of six thousand men.

She now assembled her council, declared to them that her demission of the government, and consent to the coronation of her son, had been extorted by the imminent fear of death, and appealed for the truth of the statement to Robert Melvil, who stood beside her and solemnly confirmed it. An act of council was then passed, declaring all the late proceedings by which Murray had become regent treasonable and of none effect, and a bond drawn up by the nobility for the defence of their sovereign, and her restitution to her crown and kingdom, which in the enthusiasm of the moment, was signed by eight earls, nine bishops, eighteen lords, twelve abbots and priors, and nearly one hundred barons. But the queen, though encouraged by this burst of loyalty, felt a desire to avoid the misery of a civil contest, and in this spirit sent a message to Murray with offers of reconciliation and forgiveness.[1]

The regent was in Glasgow, a city not eight miles from Mary's camp at Hamilton, engaged in public

[1] Keith, p. 475. Also MS. Letter, St. P. Off. 8 May, 1568. Endorsed in Cecil's hand, "Band of 9 Earls, 9 Bishops, 18 Lords, and others for defence of the Queen of Scots," Melvil's Memoirs, p. 200. Also Drury to Cecil, May 7, 1568. Keith, p. 474,

business and attended only by the officers of the law and his personal suite, when almost at the same instant he received news of the queen's escape and her overtures for a negotiation. It was a trying crisis—one of those moments in the life of a public man which test his judgment and his courage. Already the intelligence, though but a few hours old, had produced an unfavourable effect upon his party. Some openly deserted, and sought the queen's camp, others silently stole away, many wavered, and not a few, whilst they preserved the show of fidelity, secretly made preparations for joining the enemy.

Under these difficult circumstances Murray exhibited that rapid decision and clearness of judgment which mark a great man. When counselled to retire, he instantly rejected the advice. "Retreat," said he, "must not for a moment be contemplated. It is certain ruin—it will be construed into flight, and every hour's delay will strengthen the queen and discourage our adherents. Our only chance is in an instantaneous attack before Huntly, Ogilvy, and the northern men have joined the royal force." Pretending, however, to deliberate upon the offers of negotiation, he gained a brief respite: this he used to publish a proclamation, in which he declared his determination to support the king's government, and sending information to the Merse, Lothian, and Stirlingshire, was rapidly joined by a considerable body of his friends. Morton, Glencairn, Lennox, and Semple lost no

time, but marshalled their strength and advanced by forced marches to Glasgow.[1] Mar dispatched reinforcements and cannon from Stirling; Grange, whose veteran experience in military affairs was of infinite value at such a moment, took the command of the horse, and Murray had the good sense to entrust to him the general arrangements for the approaching battle. Hume, also a skilful soldier, not only foiled Hepburn of Riccarton in his attempt to seize Dunbar for the queen,[2] but kept the Mersemen from declaring for her, and soon joined the regent with six hundred men, whilst Edinburgh beat up for recruits and sent a small force of hackbutters. The effects which so invariably follow decision and confidence were soon apparent, and in ten days Murray commanded an army of four thousand men.[3]

Amid these preparations Mary sent her servant, John Beaton to England and the French court, soliciting support. In return, the English Queen resolved to dispatch Dr. Leighton into Scotland with her warm congratulations, and an assurance that if her sister would submit the decision of her affairs to his royal mistress and abstain from

[1] Drury to Cecil, May 7, 1568. Keith, p. 474. MS. Letter, St. P. Off. B. C. Drury to Cecil. Berwick, May 10, 1568. Proclamation of the King of Scots, May 7, 1568, broadside, St. P. Off. Printed by Lekprevick. Also Ibid. MS. Proclamation of the Regent for the gathering of the country, May 3, 1568.

[2] Drury to Cecil, May 6, 1568. Keith, p. 474.

[3] MS. St. P. Off. Advertisements of the Conflict in Scotland, May 16, 1568.

calling in any foreign aid, she would speedily either persuade or compel her subjects to acknowledge her authority.[1] It happened, too, that shortly previous to her escape, Monsieur de Beaumont, an ambassador from Henry, had arrived from France to solicit, as he affirmed, an interview with the captive princess, which had been positively refused. Some suspected that he came to urge the expediency of a divorce from Bothwell, and a marriage between Mary and the lord of Arbroath, second son of the Duke of Chastelherault. Others affirmed, that like De Lignerolles, his secret instructions were more favourable to the regent than the queen; but, however this may be, he now resorted to the camp at Hamilton, and apparently exerted himself to procure a reconciliation between the two factions.[2]

We have already seen, that this was agreeable to Mary's own wishes. Her inclination from the first had been to avoid a battle, to retire to Dumbarton, a fortress which had been all along kept for her by Lord Fleming, and to regain by degrees her influence over her nobility and her people. In this wise and humane policy she was opposed by the ambition and fierce impatience of the Hamiltons, who, seeing themselves the strongest party, deemed the moment favourable to crush Murray for ever, and

[1] MS. St. P. Off. wholly in Cecil's hand, "Instructions for Mr. Thomas Leighton sent into Scotland."

[2] MS. Letter, St. P. Off. B. C. Forster to Cecil, Alnwick, April 30, 1568. Also MS. St. P. Off. Advertisements of the Conflict in Scotland, Keith, p. 478.

to obtain an ascendancy over the queen and the government.[1]

So far, however, Mary's influence prevailed, that they consented to march from Hamilton to Dumbarton, and Murray congratulating himself upon their resolution, immediately drew out his little army on the moor beside Glasgow, resolved to watch their movements, and if possible bring them to an engagement. For this purpose Grange had previously examined the ground, and the moment he became aware that the queen's army kept the south side of the river, the regent's camp being on the opposite bank, he mounted a hackbutter behind each of his horsemen, rapidly forded the Clyde and placed them advantageously amongst some cottages, hedges, and little yards or gardens which skirted each side of a narrow lane through which the queen's troops must defile.[2]

Whilst this manœuvre was successfully performing, Murray, who led the main battle, and Morton, who commanded the vanguard or advance, crossed the river by a neighbouring bridge and drew up their men, a movement which was scarcely completed when the queen's vanguard, two thousand strong, and commanded by Lord Claud Hamilton, attempting to carry the lane, was received by a close and deadly fire from the hackbutters in the hedges and cottage gardens. This killed many, drove them back, and threw

[1] Memoirs of James the Sext, p. 25. Melvil's Memoirs, p. 200.
[2] Melvil's Memoirs, pp. 200, 201.

their ranks into confusion; but, confident in their numbers, they pressed forward up the steep of the hill, so that the men were already exhausted when they suddenly found themselves encountered by Murray's advance, which was well breathed, and in firm order. It was composed of the flower of the border pikemen. Morton, who led it, with Hume, Ker of Cessford, and the barons of the Merse, all fought on foot, and when the first charge took place, Grange's clear voice was heard above the din of battle, calling to them to keep their pikes shouldered till the enemy had levelled theirs, and then to push on.[1] They obeyed him, and a severe conflict took place. It was here only that there was hard fighting, and Sir James Melvil, who was present, describes the long pikes as so closely crossed and interlaced, that when the soldiers behind discharged their pistols and threw them or the staves of their shattered weapons in the faces of their enemies, they never reached the ground but remained lying on the spears.[2]

For some time the conflict was doubtful, till Grange perceiving the right wing of the regent's advance (consisting of the Renfrewshire barons) beginning to give way, galloped to the main battle and brought Lindsay, Lochleven, Sir James Balfour, and their followers, to reinforce the weak point. This they did effectually, and their attack was so

[1] Melvil's Memoirs, p. 201. MS. St. P. Off. Advertisements of the Conflict in Scotland, May 16, 1568.

[2] Melvil's Memoirs, p. 201.

furious that it broke the queen's ranks and threw all into confusion. Murray, who had hitherto stood on the defensive, contenting himself with repulsing the enemy's cavalry, which was far superior in numbers and equipment to his own, now seized the moment to charge with the main battle, and the flight became universal.[1] At this instant, too, the chief of the Macfarlanes and two hundred of his highlanders broke in upon the scattered fragments of the army with the leaps and yells peculiar to their mode of fighting,[2] and the pursuit would have been sanguinary but for the generous exertions of the regent, who called out to save the fugitives and employed his cavalry, with Grange who commanded them, not as instruments of slaughter but of mercy. This decisive battle lasted only three quarters of an hour. On the queen's side there were but three hundred slain—some accounts say only half that number.[3] On the regent's only a single soldier fell. Ten pieces of brass cannon were taken and many prisoners of note. Amongst the rest, the Lords Seaton and Ross, the masters, or eldest sons of the Earls of Eglinton and Cassillis, the sheriffs of Ayr, the sheriff of Linlithgow, a Hamilton who bore their standard in the vanguard, the lairds of Pres-

[1] Ibid. Also History of James the Sext, p. 26. Also Calderwood's Account in Keith, p. 480.

[2] MS. St. P. Off. May 16, 1568. Advertisements of the Conflict in Scotland.

[3] M.S. Orig. St. P. Off. Advertisement of the Conflict in Scotland, May 16, 1568. Also Melvil's Memoirs, p. 202.

ton, Innerwick, Pitmilly, Balvearie, Boyne, and Trabrown, Robert Melvil and Andrew Melvil, two sons of the Bishop of St. Andrew's, and a son of the Abbot of Kilwinning. It was reported that Argile was made prisoner, but purposely suffered to escape. On the regent's side Hume, Ochiltree, and Andrew Car of Faudonside, were severely wounded.[1] Previous to the conflict Mary had taken her station upon an eminence half-a-mile distant, which commanded a view of the field. She was surrounded by a small suite, and watched the vicissitudes of the fight with breathless eagerness and hope. At last when the charge of Murray took place, witnessing the total dispersion of her army, she fled in great terror and at full speed in the direction of Dumfries, nor did she venture to draw bridle till she found herself in the abbey of Dundrennan, sixty miles from the field.[2]

On arriving at this place, which was on the confines of England, the queen declared her intention of retreating into that country and throwing herself upon the protection of Elizabeth. It was a hasty and fatal resolution, adopted against the advice of those faithful servants who had followed her in her flight, and must have been dictated more by the terror of her own subjects than by any well grounded confidence in the character of Elizabeth. Lord Herries, who accompanied her, had taken

[1] MS. St. P. Off. Advertisements of the Conflict in Scotland, 16 May, 1568.

[2] Ibid.

the precaution of writing to Lowther, the deputy-governor of Carlisle, desiring to know whether his royal mistress might come safely to that city, but such was her impatience, that before any answer could be returned she had taken a boat and passed over in her riding dress and soiled with travel, to Workington, in Cumberland. Here she was recognized by the gentlemen of the country, who conveyed her to Cockermouth, from which Lowther conducted her with all respect and honour to Carlisle.[1] Amongst her attendants were the Lords Herries, Fleming, and Livingston.

While still at Workington, the queen of Scots had written to Elizabeth describing the wrongs she had endured from her rebellious subjects, alluding to the recent defeat at Langsyde, and expressing her confident hope that the queen would protect and assist her against her enemies. She concluded with these pathetic words, "It is my earnest request that your majesty will send for me as soon as possible, for my condition is pitiable, not to say for a queen, but even for a simple gentlewoman. I have no other dress than that in which I escaped from the field; my first day's ride was sixty miles across the country, and I have not since dared to travel except by night."[2]

[1] MS. Letter, St. P. Off. Papers of Mary Queen of Scots. Lowther to Cecil, 1568, 18th May; also MS. St. P. Off. Advertisements out of Scotland, 18 May, 1568.

[2] Anderson, vol. iv. p. 33. The original letter is in French, Calig. C. I. fol. 68.

On receiving this letter, Elizabeth felt that Mary was at last in her power, and she did not hesitate to avail herself of the fatal error which had been committed. Her first orders to the sheriffs on the 19th of May, sufficiently show this. She commanded them to treat the Scottish Queen and her suite with honour and respect, but to keep a strict watch, and prevent all escape.[1] At the same time Lady Scrope, sister to the Duke of Norfolk, was sent to wait upon her, and Sir Francis Knollys, arrived with letters of condolence;[2] but impatient under these formalities, and anxious for a personal interview, Mary addressed a second letter to Elizabeth, in which she entreated, that as her affairs were urgent, she might be permitted instantly to see the queen, to vindicate herself from the false aspersions which had been cast upon her by her ungrateful subjects, and to dispel the doubts which she understood were entertained. She had sent up Lord Herries, she said, to communicate with her sister, and Lord Fleming to carry a message to France, but she entreated if any resolution had been formed against assisting her (a decision which must surely come from others, not from Elizabeth's own heart), leave might be given her as freely to depart from her dominions, as she had freely entered them. Nothing could so much injure her

[1] Copy, St. P. Off. By the Queen, to the Sheriffs, Justices of Peace, &c., of Cumberland.

[2] Anderson, vol. iv., P. i., pp. 52, 53. Lord Scrope and Knollys to the Queen, Carlisle, 29 May, 1568.

cause as delay, and already had she been detained in the state of a prisoner for fifteen days, a proceeding, which, to speak frankly, she found somewhat hard and strange. In conclusion, she reminded Elizabeth of some circumstances connected with the ring, which she now sent her. It bore the emblem of a heart, and had probably been a gift of the English Queen. "Remember," said she, "I have kept my promise. I have sent you my heart in the ring, and now I have brought to you both heart and body, to knit more firmly the tie that binds us together."[1]

The offer in this letter to vindicate herself in person before Elizabeth, was earnestly pressed by Mary in her first interview with Scrope and Knollys. Her engaging manner, and the spirit and eloquence with which she defended herself, made a deep impression on both. She openly declared, that Morton and Lethington were cognizant of the king her husband's murder, and Knollys confessed, that although he began by accusing her of that dreadful crime, the sight of her tears soon transformed him into a comforter.[2]

Meanwhile Murray lost no time in following up the advantage which he had gained, and after the retreat of the queen, having made an expedition northward, at the head of a large force, and for the moment put down opposition, he returned to

[1] Ibid. pp. 48, 49, 50. History of James the Sext, pp. 27, 28.

[2] Id. Anderson, vol. iv. pp. 58, 59. Knollys to Elizabeth, Carlisle, 30 May, 1568.

the capital, to let loose the vengeance of the laws against those who had resisted his government. Notwithstanding the accusations of his enemies, no instance of cruelty or revenge can be proved against him: whether it was that his nature was really an enemy to blood, or that he found fines and forfeitures a more effectual way of destroying his opponents and enriching his friends.[1] These occupations at home, however, did not prevent his cares for his safety on the side of England. As soon as he heard of Mary's retreat to Carlisle, and her offer to vindicate herself before Elizabeth, he sent up his secretary or confidential servant Wood, to express his readiness instantly to appear in person with the Earl of Morton, to answer any charges brought against him, to produce evidence to justify his conduct and that of his companions, and as Drury expresses it, to enter himself prisoner in the Tower of London, if he did not prove her guilty in the death of the king her husband.[2]

This proposal of both parties to vindicate themselves before the Queen of England, and to make her the arbiter of their mutual wrongs, came very opportunely to Elizabeth, as she was at that moment engaged with her council in a deliberation on the proper course to be pursued, in consequence of the flight of the Scottish Queen. Knollys had

[1] MS. Letter, St. P. Off. B. C. Drury to Cecil, May 26, 1568.

[2] MS. Letter, St. P. Off. B. C. Drury to Cecil, May 22, 1568. Also MS. Letter, St. P. Off. B. C. Drury to Cecil, June 17, 1568.

already warned her of the impression made upon the Roman Catholics in the North by her arrival, and had urged the necessity either of granting her assistance, or, if that was held too much, restoring her to liberty. Rumours and speeches, so he wrote, were already blown about the country, exposing in strong language, the ungratefulness of her detention, and indeed so manifest a wrong was committed by her imprisonment, it involved so flagrant a breach of the common principles of law and justice, that Knollys, an honourable nobleman, felt impatient that he should be made a "Jailor," so he expressed it, in such a cause.[1]

Of all this, Elizabeth and her ministers were well aware; but in that unscrupulous and accommodating school of politics for which the times were conspicuous, when principle and expediency were found at variance, there was seldom much hesitation which should give way, and it was resolved that, in this instance, honour and justice should be sacrificed to necessity. And here, although I must strongly condemn the conduct of the English Queen, it is impossible not to see the difficulties by which she was surrounded. The party which it was her interest to support, was that of Murray and the Protestants. She looked with dread on France, and the resumption of French influence in Scotland. Within her own realm, the Roman Catholics were unquiet and dis-

[1] Knollys to Cecil, Carlisle, 2 June, 1568. Anderson, iv. Part i, p. 61.

contented, and in Ireland constantly on the eve of rebellion—if such a word can be used to the resistance of a system too grinding to be tamely borne. All these impatient spirits looked to Mary as a point of union and strength. Had she been broken by her late reverses, had she manifested a sense of the imprudence by which she had been lately guided, or evinced any desire to reform her conduct, or forgive her subjects who had risen against the murderer of her husband more than against herself, the queen might have been inclined to a more favourable course. But the very contrary was the case. Her first step after her escape had been to resume her correspondence with Bothwell.[1] His creatures Hepburn of Riccarton, and the two Ormistons, blotted as accomplices in his crime, had frequent access to her. In her conversations with Knollys and Scrope, she could not repress her anticipations of victory and purposes of vengeance, if once again a free princess. She declared, that rather than have peace with Murray, she would submit to any extremity, and call help from Turkey before she gave up the contest, and she lamented bitterly that the delays of Elizabeth emboldened the traitors who had risen against her.[2] Was the queen of England at such a crisis, and

[1] MS. Letter, St. P. Off. B.C. Drury to Cecil, Berwick 26 May, 1568; also MS. Letter, St. P. Off. Mr. John Willok to Cecil, Edinburgh, 31 May, 1568.

[2] Anderson, vol. iv., Part i., p. 71. Knollys to Cecil, 11 June, 1568; also Ibid. p. 74. Bishop of Durham to Cecil, 27 June, 1568. MS. St. P. Off. B. C.

having such a rival in her power, to dismiss her at her first request, and permit her to overwhelm her friends and allies, to re-establish the Roman Catholic party, and possibly the Roman Catholic religion in Scotland? After such conduct, could it be deemed either unlooked for, or extraordinary, should she fall from the proud position she now held, as the head of the Protestant party in Europe? So argued the far-sighted Cecil, and the queen his mistress followed, or it is probable in this instance anticipated, his counsel. It was determined to detain Mary a prisoner, to refuse her a personal meeting, to support Murray in the regency, and to induce him to make public the proofs which he possessed of the guilt of his sovereign the Queen of Scots.

With this view, Elizabeth wrote to the regent, and soon after dispatched Mr. Middlemore with a message both to him and to the Scottish Queen. She informed him in her letter, that he was accused by his sovereign of the highest crimes which a subject could commit against his prince, rebellion, imprisonment of her person, and her expulsion from her dominions by open battle. She admonished him to forbear from all hostility, and as her royal sister, who would observe the same abstinence, was content to commit to her the hearing and ordering of her cause, she required him to bring forward his defences against the crimes of which he was accused.[1]

[1] Elizabeth to Murray, June 8, 1568. Anderson, vol. iv. Part i., pp. 68, 69.

Before repairing to Murray in Scotland, Middlemore was admitted to an interview with Mary, at Carlisle. He informed her, that his mistress disclaimed all idea of keeping her a prisoner, her present detention at Carlisle having no other object than to save her from her enemies. As to a personal interview that was at present impossible. She was accused of being an accomplice in a foul and horrible crime, the murder of her husband. She had made choice of the queen of England to be the only judge of her cause, and care must be taken not to prejudice her defence, and give a handle to her enemies by admitting her to her presence, before trial had been made of her innocency.

At these words *judge* and *trial*, which escaped Middlemore, Mary's spirit rose, and she at once detected and exposed the artful diplomacy of which she was about to be made the victim. It was God, she exclaimed, who could alone be her judge, as a queen she was amenable to no human tribunal. Of her own free will, indeed, she had offered to make Elizabeth the confidant of her wrongs, to defend herself against the falsehoods brought against her, and to utter to her such matters as had never yet been disclosed to any living being, but none could compel her to accuse herself, and as to Murray, and those rebels who had joined him, her sister was partial. She was contented, it appeared, that they should come to her presence to arraign her, whilst she, their sovereign, was debarred from

that indulgence in making her defence. Who ever heard that subjects and traitors should be permitted to plead against their prince? And yet, said she, if they must needs come, bid the queen, my sister, call up Morton and Lethington, who are said to know most against me—confront me with them—let me hear their accusations, and then listen to my reply.—But, she added significantly,—I suspect that Lethington would be loath of such an errand.[1]

It had been Mary's idea from some expressions used by Scrope and Knollys in their first interview,[2] that the English Queen would be induced to restore her without enquiry, or at least by an enquiry so regulated as to criminate her subjects without permitting them to reply; but the mission of Middlemore dispelled this notion. She found that not only was she to be refused an interview with the English Queen, but that Murray had been already called upon to repair to England, and to justify his conduct by bringing forward his proofs against his sovereign. Against this she loudly protested, and at once declared, that she would endure imprisonment, and even death, sooner than submit to such indignity.[3] Such conduct was, no doubt, completely consonant to her feelings and her rights as

[1] Anderson, vol. iv., Part i., p. 90. Middlemore to Cecil, 14 June, 1568.

[2] Ibid. Id. p. 55. Scrope and Knollys to Elizabeth, 29 May, 1568.

[2] Mary to Elizabeth, 13 June, 1568. Anderson, vol. iv. p. 97, Part i.

a free princess, and may have been quite consistent with her complete guiltlessness of the charges brought against her, but it seems to me, that complete innocence would have been impatient to have embraced even the opportunity of an imperfect defence, rather than endure the atrocious aspersions with which she was now loaded.

Murray in the mean time acted with his accustomed calmness and decision. Having received Middlemore's message at Dumfries, hostilities against Mary's partisans were suspended at the request of the English Queen, and he professed his readiness to repair to England in person, accompanied by Morton, rather than that the truth should not be fully investigated;[1] but previous to this, there was one point upon which he desired to be satisfied. It was evident, he said, that in a cause involving such grave results, nothing could be more ruinous for him than to accuse the queen, the mother of his sovereign, and afterwards, as he expressed it, "to enter into qualification with her."[2] Again, if the accusation should proceed, and he was able to prove his allegations, he was solicitous to know what was likely to follow. As to such letters of the queen of Scots as were in his possession, he had already sent translations of them by his servant, Wood, and he would gladly understand whether in the event of the originals agreeing with these translations, their

[1] MS. Letter, St. P. Off. B.C. Drury to Cecil, 17 June, 1568.

[2] MS. St. P. Off. Murray to Cecil, with enclosure, 22 June, 1568.

contents would be judged sufficient to establish her accession to the murder.[1]

This preliminary enquiry, so artful in its object, for it is evident it enabled the regent to arrange or amend his proofs according to the instructions which he might receive from England, was entrusted to Middlemore, who on his return to the English court, reported it to Elizabeth, and at the same time informed her of Mary's resolution to decline the intended investigation. Cecil's answer was framed with the evident view of being communicated by Lord Herries, who was then at the English court, to his sovereign. It informed the regent that Elizabeth neither meant to promote any accusation of the Scottish Queen, nor to proceed to any condemnation, that her single purpose was to settle all disputes, to allow of no faults in her sister, to bring the controversy to a happy conclusion with surety to all parties, and to esteem no proofs sufficient till both parties were heard.[2]

Such a declaration must have startled Murray, and had he believed it, it is evident from the cautious tone of his previous enquiries that no accusation of the queen of Scots was to be looked for from him. But Elizabeth at this moment exerted all the powers of that state craft in which she was so great an adept, to blind

[1] Goodall, vol. ii. p. 75. Murray's answer to Middlemore, 22 June, 1568.

[2] Goodall, vol. ii. p. 89. Answer by Cecil to the Earl of Murray's proposals, 31 June, 1568.

both Murray and Mary. It was her object to persuade the regent, that whatever might be her assurances to Mary, she really intended to try the cause, and if he could prove her guilty, to keep her, where she was, in prison; it was her purpose on the other hand, to convince Mary that she would never permit Murray to bring forward any accusation, but quashing all odious criminations, promote a reconciliation with her subjects, and restore her to her dignity. The negotiations were conducted on the part of the Scottish Queen by Lord Herries, who was then at the English court, and by Cecil's directions, such only of this nobleman's proposals as it was deemed expedient Murray should know were communicated to the regent,[1] whilst from Mary we may believe the same concealment was made of Murray's entire messages.

These artful transactions occupied nearly a month, and were interrupted, not only by the suspicions and delays of both parties, but by the state of Scotland. In that country Murray's unpopularity was now excessive, whilst the queen's friends were daily rising into confidence and strength. The severity of the regent, and the terrors of an approaching parliament, in which the dismal scenes of forfeiture and confiscation were expected to be renewed, had so estranged his supporters and united his enemies, that he began to be alarmed not only for his government, but for his

[1] MS. Letter, St. P. Off. Murray to Cecil, June 22, 1568, with enclosure.

life. A conspiracy for his assassination was discovered, at the head of which were the comptroller Murray of Tullibardin and his brother, the same persons who had acted so bold a part in arraigning Bothwell.[1] The regent was taunted, and not unjustly, with his former activity in prosecuting the king's murder, and his present lukewarmness; and people pointed ironically to his associate, Sir James Balfour, a man universally detested, by his own confession one of the murderers, and now employed by Murray in the most confidential affairs of the government.[2]

To such a height had these discontents arisen, that Argile, Huntly, and the Hamiltons, uniting their strength in favour of the queen, held a convention at Largs (July 28) in which they resolved to let loose the borderers upon England, and wrote to the Duke of Alva requesting his assistance in the most earnest terms.[3] Notwithstanding the delays produced by this miserable state of things, Mary and the regent at last agreed to have their disputes settled by the English Queen, and Lord Herries having arrived at Bolton Castle, to which place the Scottish Queen had been removed, informed his mistress, in the presence of Scrope

[1] MS. Letter, St. P. Off. B. C. July 20, 1568, Drury to Cecil. Also Id. Ibid. Same to same, July 31, 1568. Also Id. Ibid. Same to same, 3d Aug. 1568.

[2] MS. Letter, St. P. Off. B. C. Drury to Cecil, July 10, 1568.

[3] MS. Letter, St. P. Off. B. C. Drury to Cecil, 3d Aug. 1568. MS. St. P. Off. Lords of Scotland to Duke of Alva.

and Knollys, of Elizabeth's proposals, and received her formal acquiescence. As some controversy has arisen upon this point, it is right to give his very words. He told Mary, that Elizabeth had commanded him to say unto her, "that if she would commit her cause to be heard by her highness order, but not to make her highness judge over her, but rather as to her dear cousin and friend to commit herself to her advice and counsel, that if she would thus do, her highness would surely set her again in her seat of regiment, and dignity regal, in this form and order. First, her highness would send for the noblemen of Scotland, that be her adversaries, to ask account of them, before such noblemen as this queen herself should like of, to know their answer, why they have deposed their queen and sovereign from her regiment, and that if in their answers they could allege some reason for them in their so doing, (which her highness thinks they cannot do) that her highness would set this queen in her seat regal *conditionally*, that those her lords and subjects should continue in their honours, estates, and dignities to them appertaining. But if they should not be able to allege any reason of their doings, that then her highness would *absolutely* set her in her seat regal, and that by force of hostility, if they should resist." To this promise, which is quite clear and explicit, Elizabeth annexed as conditions, that Mary should renounce all claim to the crown of England, during the life of the queen, or her issue, that she

should forsake the league with France, and abandoning the mass, receive the Common Prayer after the form of England.[1] This last stipulation was added with a view of encouraging some symptoms of a disposition to be converted to the Church of England, which had recently appeared in Mary—who had received an English chaplain, and "had grown to a good liking of the Common Prayer."[2]

These proposals the queen of Scots embraced after some hesitation, and commissioners would have been immediately appointed for the trial of this great cause, but for the melancholy state of Scotland. In this country Huntly and Argile kept the field at the head of a large force, and having completely reduced under the queen's power the northern and western parts of the kingdom, were rapidly advancing to the south. Their object was, to crush Murray before he could hold the parliament in which they expected the vengeance of the laws to be let loose against themselves, but their march was arrested by letters from their sovereign, who commanded her friends to desist from hostilities, informing them, that Elizabeth would compel the regent to the same course.[3] This order, on Mary's side, was obeyed; on Murray's, if indeed ever sent by the English Queen, it was openly violated; for scarce were his rivals dispersed, than the parliament met, (18 August) and had it not been for

[1] Anderson, vol. iv. P. i. pp. 109, 110.

[2] Knollys to Cecil, 28 July. Anderson, vol. iv. P. i. p. 113.

[3] Id. vol. iv. P. i. pp. 125, 126.

the remonstrances of Lethington, not a baron who had espoused the cause of the queen would have been left unproscribed. As it was, all his efforts could not save the Archbishop of St. Andrew's, Lord Claud Hamilton, the Bishop of Ross, and many others, who were declared traitors, and forfeited.[1] It was in vain that the lords of Mary's party complained of this cruel and unjust conduct, and prepared for revenge. Murray forgetful of his promises, anticipated their attack, hastily levied a force, overran Annandale and Galloway, and would have reduced all opposition by fire and sword, had not his progress been interrupted by a peremptory message from Elizabeth, who commanded him instantly to lay down his arms, and send commissioners to York to answer for his conduct to his sovereign. If this was delayed or resisted, she declared her resolution instantly to set Mary at liberty, and assist her against her enemies, adding, that his refusal would convince her of his mistress's innocence and his own guilt.[2]

This mandate Murray did not dare to disobey, whatever may have been his wishes and regrets. He distrusted Elizabeth, he dreaded increasing his unpopularity with the nobles, by openly bringing forward so odious an accusation against his sovereign; he saw that success was doubtful, failure absolute ruin, and when he proposed to select commissioners, all shrunk from so invidious an

[1] Anderson, vol. iv. P. i. pp. 125 126.

[2] Camden, apud Kennet, p. 412.

office. But he had advanced too far to retract, and digesting, as he best could, the mortification of being arrested in the course of his victories, he determined to appear personally at York, and appointed four commissioners to accompany him. These were the Earl of Morton, the Bishop of Orkney, Lord Lindsay, and the Commendator of Dumfermling. To them he added some assistants, the most noted of whom were Lethington, the secretary, whom he had begun to suspect of a leaning to the queen's cause, and dreaded to leave behind him, the celebrated Buchanan and Mr. James Makgill. Elizabeth now directed the Duke of Norfolk, the Earl of Sussex, and Sir Ralph Saddler, to appear upon her part, and nothing remained but for Mary to appoint her commissioners.[1]

Previous to this, she desired to have a consultation with Lesly the Bishop of Ross, and, on his repair to Bolton, this able and attached servant expressed his sorrow that she had agreed to any conference wherein her subjects should be accused, as Murray and his friends, he said, would undoubtedly utter all they could for their defence, although it were to her dishonour, and that of the whole realm; it was vain, he added, to expect that they would openly acknowledge themselves to be ill subjects, and she a good princess, and it would, in his opinion, be far better to endeavour

[1] Goodall, vol. ii. p. 109.

to bring about an amicable arrangement without any accusation on either side. To this, Mary's answer, as reported by Lesly himself, was remarkable. She declared that there was no such danger to be apprehended as he supposed, since the judges would be favourable to her, and she was already assured of the good will of the Duke of Norfolk, who had sent her a message to Bolton, expressive of his attachment to her interests.[1]

At this moment Robert Melvil arrived at Bolton with important dispatches from Lethington to Mary. He stated that Murray was determined to utter every thing he could against her, and had carried with him to York the "letters which he had to produce in proof of the murder; he sent her, by the same messenger, copies of these letters which he had clandestinely procured; he assured her, that nothing but a desire to do her service had induced him to come into England, and begged her to send word by Melvil to York, what she thought it best for him to do. Mary, after having carefully examined these letters, which were only the translations from the original French into the Scottish language, sent her answer to Lethington. It is worthy of note, that it contained no assertion as to the forgery or interpolation of these letters, now, as it appears, communicated to her for the first time. It simply requested him to use his efforts to stay the rigorous accusations of Murray,

[1] Examination of the Bishop of Ross at the Tower. Murdin, p. 52.

to labour with the Duke of Norfolk in her favour, and to give full credit to the Bishop of Ross.[1]

Having concluded her consultation with Lesly and Melvil, she chose her commissioners. They were the Bishop of Ross, Lords Herries, Boyd, and Livingston, the Abbot of Kilwinning, Sir John Gordon of Lochinvar, and Sir James Cockburn of Skirling.[2] These persons having received their instructions, proceeded to York, where they met the regent, the Duke of Norfolk, and the rest of the judges.

So far Elizabeth had been successful, and the position in which she had placed herself was certainly most solemn and imposing. Before her pleaded the Queen of Scots, so late her rival and her opponent, now her prisoner awaiting her award, and acknowledging, that if restored to her dignity, she would owe all to her interference. On the other hand, stood the Regent, the representative of the majesty of his sovereign, and the governor of a kingdom, but now receiving the law from her lips whose superior power he did not dare to resist. To hear the cause were assembled the noblest and the wisest in both countries; and besides this, the misfortunes of Mary had created so great and universal a sensation that it is no exaggeration when we say, the eyes not only of England and Scotland, but of Europe, were fixed upon the conferences now opening at York.

[1] Murdin, pp. 52, 53. [2] Goodall, vol. ii. p. 109. 31 Sep. 1568.

The commissioners accordingly having assembled, the proceedings began, but, on the very threshold, a sharp dispute arose, when Norfolk observed that the regent, having consented to plead before Elizabeth, must first do homage to the English crown. The proposition was received as an insult, and Murray, red with anger, was hesitating how to answer it, when the cooler Lethington took up the word, and sarcastically remarked, that when the Scottish monarchs received back again the counties of Northumberland and Cumberland, with the manor of Huntingdon, it would be time to talk of homage; but, as to the crown and kingdom of Scotland, both were more free than their own England had recently been when she paid Peter's pence to Rome.[1] The mention of the point, however, rendered some notice of it necessary, and after the oaths had been administered, mutual protestations were taken.[2] The commissioners of the Scottish Queen then gave in their complaint. It stated, in clear and energetic language, the history of the rebellion against Mary, her deposition and imprisonment, the usurpation of the regency by Murray, her escape, defeat, and flight into England, and her confident hope, that by the mediation of Elizabeth, she might be restored to the peaceable enjoyment of her kingdom.[1]

[1] Melvil's Memoirs, p. 206. Lesly's Negociations, Anderson iii. p. 15. Also Norfolk to Cecil, Oct. 9th, 1568. Anderson iv. 42.

[2] Anderson, vol. iv. P. ii. pp. 49, 50.

All now looked with eagerness for Murray's reply, confidently expecting that he would bring forward, as his defence, the accusation of his sovereign, and the promised proofs of her accession to the murder of the king; but, to the surprise and disappointment of Elizabeth, he was seized with a repetition of his former fears, and, instead of proceeding to any accusation requested a preliminary conference with the English commissioners. Being admitted to it, he desired to know whether they would grant him an assurance that their mistress would pronounce the queen of Scots guilty or not guilty, according to the proofs which he laid before them, and in the event of the conviction of the murder, whether the queen of England would sanction his proceedings, maintain the government of the king, and support him in his office of regent.[2] These questions being remitted by the commissioners to Elizabeth, he gave in his defence, which produced new astonishment. It rested solely on Mary's marriage with Bothwell, and detailed the shameful circumstances by which it was accompanied, with the necessity of rising in arms to defend the prince, and of subjecting the queen to a temporary imprisonment, during which she voluntarily resigned the crown. It added not a syllable, directly or indirectly, accusing Mary of being an accomplice in the murder,

[1] Goodall, vol. ii. pp. 123, 126.

[2] Goodall, vol. ii. p. 130, 131. Oct. 9th, 126, 127.

and did not even contain a hint or an allusion, from which it could be gathered that the regent ever entertained such a suspicion (Oct. 10).[1]

It was difficult to account for this sudden and unexpected moderation upon the part of Murray. A few weeks only had elapsed since he had been loud in his accusations, and testified the utmost eagerness to bring forward his proofs. He was now silent on the subject—his defence was general, almost to feebleness, and when, after a few days' interval, it was replied to by Mary's commissioners, who urged, forcibly and triumphantly, the coalition between Bothwell and the lords, his trial and acquittal, and their subsequent recommendation of him as a husband to the queen, he sat down apparently dispirited and confuted, and declined saying another word upon the subject.

A secret intrigue, of which we have already had some slight intimation from Mary's conversation with the Bishop of Ross, furnishes us with a key to all this mystery. It originated in the ambition of the Duke of Norfolk, a nobleman then perhaps the most powerful subject in England, and who had long been a favourer of Mary's title to the crown. There seems, too, to be little doubt that for some time Norfolk had entertained the idea of a marriage with the Scottish Queen, and that he deprecated the present proceedings

[1] Goodall, vol. ii. p. 144 and 139; and Dépêches de la Motte Fenelon, published by Mr. P. Cooper, vol. i. pp. 17, 18, a very valuable work.

against her in the strongest manner, although he dared not refuse the task imposed upon him by Elizabeth. These feelings, which he had secretly imparted to the Scottish Queen through his sister Lady Scrope, who waited on her, she had, as we have seen, communicated to Lethington and the Bishop of Ross; and Lethington on his arrival at York procured a secret interview with Norfolk.[1]

On this occasion the Duke expressed his astonishment that he and Murray should so far forget their honour as to accuse their sovereign before Elizabeth —as if they thought that England was entitled to be a judge or a superior over the kingdom of Scotland. Lethington warmly deprecated the idea, blamed the weakness of the regent, whose own feelings were against the accusation, declared for his own part that he was there, as Murray well knew, rather as the friend than the enemy of his sovereign, and professed his readiness to exert every effort to quash the accusation.[2] Norfolk then asked, whether he thought in this matter Murray could be trusted, and the secretary affirming that he might, the Duke took the regent aside and remonstrated with him on the folly and impolicy of his present conduct. "The English Queen, his mistress," he said, "was resolved during her life to evade the question of the succession; careless what blood might be shed, or what confusion might arise upon the point—as to the true title, none doubted that it lay in the queen

[1] Examination of the Bishop of Ross. Murdin, p. 53.

[2] Melvil's Memoirs, p. 206.

of Scots and her son, and much he marvelled that the regent, whom he had always reputed a wise and honourable man, should come hither to blacken his mistress, and, as far as he could, destroy the prospect of her and her son's succession.[1] Besides," added he, "you are grievously deceived if you imagine the queen of England will ever pronounce sentence in this cause. We are sent here, no doubt, as commissioners, but we are debarred from coming to a decision, and Elizabeth has fully resolved to arrive at none herself. Do you not see that no answers have been returned to the questions which upon this point were addressed by you to us, and forwarded to the queen? Nay, you can easily put the matter to a more certain proof. Request an assurance under the queen's hand, that when you accuse your sovereign and bring forward your proofs, she will pronounce sentence. If you get it, act as you please—if it is not given, rest assured my information is correct, and all that will come of your accusation will be repentance for your own folly."[2]

This conversation made a deep impression on Murray, already sufficiently alive to the dangerous part he was playing; and when he imparted it in confidence to Lethington and Sir James Melvil both of

[1] Melvil's Memoirs, pp. 206, 207.

[2] Melvil's Memoirs, p. p. 207, 208, 4to. Edit. Melvil's authority here is unquestionable, as he was not only present at York, but the regent made him privy to this secret interview. Also Dépêches de la Motte Fenelon, vol. i., p, 17,

them strongly confirmed him in the views stated by Norfolk.[1] From his brother commissioners, Morton and Makgill, and his secretary Wood, who had drawn up the proofs against the Scottish Queen, the regent carefully concealed what had happened, but he determined to follow Norfolk's advice, and bring forward no public accusation till he was assured of the course to be followed by Elizabeth. Such is the secret history of Murray's sudden change, and the present moderation of his conduct towards the queen his sovereign.

But whilst a regard for his own interest prevented him from assuming the character of a public accuser, the regent *privately* exhibited to Norfolk, Sussex, and Sadler the alleged proofs of Mary's guilt, consisting of various bonds or contracts and other papers, besides some letters and love sonnets addressed by her to Bothwell, with a contract of marriage in the handwriting of the Earl of Huntly. These letters had been found, as the Scottish commissioners affirmed, in a little silver casket or coffer; it had been given by the queen to Bothwell, and was afterwards with its contents seized by Morton, and they offered to swear that the letters were written in Mary's own hand. Having carefully inspected them, and drawn up a summary of their contents, Norfolk transmitted it in a letter to Elizabeth, requesting her judgment whether she considered them sufficient to convict the queen of the murder of her husband. He added, at the same time, his own

[1] Melvil's Memoirs, 208.

opinion and that of his brother commissioners, that the proof was conclusive against her, if the letters were really written with her own hand.[1]

This, however, was confidential, and unknown to the world, so that if matters had terminated here the result of the enquiry must have been considered highly favourable to Mary. She had triumphantly confuted Murray, and, after his boastful speeches, he had shrunk from any open accusation. But Elizabeth was not to be so easily defeated. She had resolved that Murray should publicly accuse his sovereign of the murder, she was convinced that such an event would be of the greatest service to England whether the Scottish Queen was to be restored to her dignity or detained a prisoner; and with this view she suddenly removed the conferences to Westminster, affirming that York was too distant to allow of a speedy settlement of the controversy, and taking particular care that neither Mary nor her commissioners should suspect any sinister intention upon her part.[2] How artfully this was managed appears by the original draft of the English Queen's letter, still preserved, and partly in Cecil's handwriting. In it Norfolk and his companions were instructed to be especially careful that the queen of Scots' commissioners should gather no suspicion of the ill success of her cause, but imagine that this new measure was solely intended to accelerate their mistress's re-

[1] The Commissioners to Elizabeth, 11 October, 1568. Anderson, vol. iv. P. ii. pp, 58, 63.

[2] La Motte Fenelon, vol. iv. p. 18.

storation to her dignity on safe and honourable terms, both for herself and her subjects.[1]

It happened that at this moment Murray had made a secret overture to Mary, which rendered this queen less likely to dread any disadvantage to her cause from the removal of the conferences to London. He had sent Robert Melvil to Bolton, to propose a scheme, by which all necessity for accusing his sovereign should be removed, and an amicable compromise take place. The Scottish Queen was to ratify her demission of the crown, which had been made in Lochleven, the regent was to be confirmed in his government, and Mary was to tarry in England, under the protection of Elizabeth, and with a revenue suitable to her royal dignity. On these conditions Murray was contented to be silent; and although at first the captive princess professed much unwillingness to agree to such terms, she was at length convinced by the arguments of Melvil, that such a settlement of the controversy was the best for her interest and honour. She therefore dispatched Melvil to carry her consent to Murray;[2] she wrote to the English Queen, expressing her entire satisfaction that her cause and her honour were now placed in her hands, where she most wished them to be,[3] and she dis-

[1] Orig. draft. St. P. Off. October 16, 1568, Elizabeth to her commissioners.

[2] MS. Declaration of Robert Melvil, Hopetoun MS.; also MS. Letter, St. P. Off. Knollys to Cecil, 25 October, 1568.

[3] Mary to Elizabeth, 22 Oct., 1568. Anderson, iv. P. ii. p. 95.

patched four of her commissioners, Boyd, Herries, the Bishop of Ross, and the Abbot of Kilwinning, to London.

On their arrival Elizabeth admitted them to an audience, assured them that she had carefully weighed all that had been done at York, that the enemies of the queen of Scots appeared to her to have entirely failed in their defence, as far as they had yet pleaded, and that their only course was to acknowledge their offences, return to their allegiance, and intercede for pardon, which she would labour to procure them. For this purpose she had removed the conferences to London, and to make the settlement more solemn had joined some other commissioners to those already named. Nothing now remained but to proceed with the business, first ascertaining whether Murray had any thing further to say in his defence.[1]

When the regent repaired along with Lethington and Makgill to London, it was with a determination not to accuse Mary, but to remain true to his agreement to Norfolk, and if any thing should occur to render its execution difficult or impossible, to fall back upon his scheme for Mary's demission of the crown, which he had so lately proposed, and to which she had consented. But an interview with Elizabeth alarmed and perplexed him; he found, to his dismay, that she was perfectly aware of his intrigues with Norfolk. The whole transactions

[1] Anderson, vol. iv. P. ii, p. 95. Lesly's Negociations. Anderson, vol. iii. pp. 25, 26.

had been betrayed by a confidant of Mary to Morton; he had indignantly revealed it to Cecil, and from him it reached the queen. Nor were his difficulties lessened by a message from Mary herself, who informed him that the Duke of Norfolk had forbid her to resign the crown; and without his consent she could not abide by her agreement.[1] Nothing could be more embarrassing than his situation. On the one hand Elizabeth did not conceal her anxiety, that he should accuse the Scottish Queen and bring forward his proofs of the murder. She had every thing in her power; she already hinted, that in case of his refusal it might be found necessary to bring forward the Duke of Chastelherault, whose claim to the regency was superior to his own; and it is scarcely matter of wonder that Murray faltered in his resolution. Yet, should he consent to the wishes of the queen of England, he must bear the disgrace of betraying Norfolk. On the other hand, if he remained true to this nobleman, his fellow commissioners were ready to arraign him of treachery to them and to the cause of his sovereign. Under these embarrassments he adopted a middle course, and resolved to prepare the accusation, but not to make it public until he had a positive assurance that the queen of England would pronounce judgment.

Meanwhile Mary became alarmed at some private intelligence which she received from Hepburn

[1] Melvil's Declaration. Hopetoun, MS.

of Riccarton, a follower of Bothwell's, who was now in London, and who assured her that so far from being favourable, Elizabeth was decidedly hostile to her, and would probably succeed in compelling Murray to desert Norfolk and accuse his sovereign.[1] To meet such an emergency she sent additional instructions to her commissioners, by which their powers were limited to the single act of extending her clemency to her disobedient subjects. She added, that if they found any encouragement given to her adversaries to accuse her, they were instantly to demand her personal admission to the presence of Elizabeth, and if this was refused to break up the negociation.[2]

The conferences were now opened in the chamber, called the *Camera depicta* at Westminster, the commissioners of the Scottish Queen having declined to meet in any place where a judicial sentence had been pronounced. They protested against any thing which was now done being interpreted against the rights of their mistress, who, as a free princess, acknowledged no judge or superior on earth; and they required, that as Murray had been admitted to the presence of Elizabeth, and had calumniated his sovereign, the English Queen should grant the same privilege to the queen of Scots, and listen to her defence from her own lips. To this Elizabeth replied, that it was far from her intention to assume the character of a judge, or in

[1] MS. Letter, St. P. Off. Knollys to Cecil, 21 November, 1568.

[2] Goodall, vol. ii. pp. 185, 186, 187.

any thing to touch their sovereign's honour; but, that to admit her into her presence was impossible till the cause was decided.[1]

With this answer they were compelled to be content; and having retired, Murray and his friends were called in, when being informed that the defences recently made by them at York, were considered inconclusive, they were required to say whether they could urge any thing further in their behalf. To encourage them to speak openly Sir Nicholas Bacon, the lord keeper, assured the regent in reply to the demands made at York, that if the queen of Scots should be proved guilty of the murder of her husband, she should either be delivered into his hands, her life being sufficiently secured, or be kept in England; and he added, that if found guilty, Murray should be continued in the regency, till it was shown that another had a superior right.[2]

By this declaration Murray was somewhat reassured. He had prepared his accusation, and the paper which contained it was at that moment in the possession of John Wood, his secretary, who sat beside him at the table, and for greater security kept it in his bosom. The regent now rose and declared how unwilling he and his friends had ever been to touch the honour of their sovereign, or to publish to strangers what might eternally defame her; how readily, had it been possible, they would

[1] Goodall, vol. ii. p. 188, 189, November 23, 1568.

[2] Ibid. vol. ii. p. 201, 202, November 26, 1568.

have secured her reputation and preserved their prince, even at the price of their own exile; and he solemnly protested, that if at last they were compelled to pursue a different course, the blame was not to be imputed to them but rested with their enemies, who constrained them to adopt it in their own defence, and dragged into light the proofs which they had hitherto concealed.[1] Having delivered this protest in writing, Murray prepared to give in his accusation, but before he took this last and fatal step, he required an assurance under the English Queen's hand, that she would pronounce a judgment. To this Cecil replied, that he had ample assurance already; and it ill became him to suspect or doubt the word of their royal mistress. Where, added he, is your accusation. It is here, said Wood, plucking it from his bosom, and here it must remain till we see the queen's handwrit; but as he spoke the paper was snatched from him by Bothwell, the Bishop of Orkney, who sprung to the table pursued by Wood, and mid the ill-suppressed laughter of the English commissioners laid it before them. The scene, as it is described by Melvil, must have been an extraordinary one. The regent was deeply mortified, and Cecil, smiling triumphantly, enjoyed his confusion; Lord William Howard, a rough seaman, shouted aloud, and commended the activity of Bishop Turpy, a nickname of Orkney; and Leth-

[1] Anderson, vol. iv. Part ii. pp. 115, 118.

ington, who was the saddest of the company, whispered in Murray's ear, that he had ruined his cause for ever.[1]

The die, however, was cast, and the charge which had been so long withheld, was now preferred in the broadest terms. The regent stated, that as Bothwell was the chief executor of the horrible murder of their late sovereign, so he and his friends affirmed that the queen his wife had persuaded him to commit it, that she was not only in the foreknowledge of the same, but a maintainer of the assassins, as she had shown by thwarting the course of justice, and by marrying the chief author of that foul crime.[2] To give additional force and solemnity to this proceeding, the Earl of Lennox, father to the murdered king, at this moment presented himself before the commissioners, and having bewailed in pathetic terms the miserable fate of his son, delivered to them a paper in which he accused Mary in direct terms of conspiring his death.[3]

When informed of this proceeding, the deputies of this princess expressed the utmost indignation; they declared that nothing could be more false and calumnious than such a statement, that some of those persons, who, now with shameless ingratitude, sought to blacken their sovereign, were themselves deeply implicated in the murder, and they required

[1] Melvil's Memoirs, pp. 210, 211.
[2] Anderson, vol. iv. P. ii. p. 119.
[3] Ibid. p. 122.

an immediate audience of Elizabeth.[1] When admitted to her presence, they complained in strong terms of the manner in which she had conducted the proceedings; they reminded her, how carefully it had been provided, that in the absence of their royal mistress, nothing should be done which might affect her honour and royal estate; this they declared had been directly infringed; she had admitted her subjects into her presence; they had been encouraged to load her with the most atrocious imputations; it was now, therefore, their duty, as custodiars of their mistress's honour, to demand, that in common justice she should also be heard in person; and to beseech her to arrest the authors of such slanderous practices, till they should answer the charges which should be brought against them.[2]

This demand perplexed Elizabeth. It was a just and spirited assertion on the part of the Scottish commissioners of their mistress's undoubted right; but the English Queen had not the slightest intention of acquiescing in it. She had now gained her first point, Murray having at last publicly arraigned Mary of the murder; but another and greater object remained: she was desirous of getting possession of the proofs of her guilt, of exhibiting them to her council; and either publishing them to the world, or employing them in intimidating her unhappy prisoner into an acceptance of

[1] Goodall, Appendix, vol. ii. pp. 209-213, inclusive.

[2] Goodall, Ibid. pp. 213-219. La Motte Fenelon, vol. i. pp. 38-51.

any terms she dictated. Her mode of accomplishing this was artful and politic. It was no doubt quite reasonable, she said, addressing the commissioners of the queen, that their mistress should appear to defend herself against so heinous an imputation as the murder of her husband, a crime of which she never had believed her guilty. As for a personal interview, the only reason why she had refused this was, on account of the common slander against her; and now, since the accusation had been publicly made, it would be inconsistent alike with her honour and that of their mistress, to consent to any compromise or agreement, until the regent and his friends had been called upon to prove their allegations. She therefore had resolved to send for them and demand their proofs, after which she would willingly hear their mistress.[1]

The commissioners remonstrated against the manifest partiality and injustice of such a proceeding; they observed, that her majesty must of course act as she pleased; but, for their part, they would never consent that their sovereign's rebellious subjects should be further heard, till she herself were admitted to declare her innocence; and they ended, by solemnly protesting that nothing done hereafter should in any way affect or prejudge her rights.[2] So far every thing on their part was consistent and agreeable to the indignant feelings of a person unjustly accused; but their next step

[1] Goodall, vol. ii. p. 221, December 4.

[2] Goodall, vol. ii. p. 223.

is perplexing, and seems not so easily reconcileable with Mary's perfect innocence, for on the same day, they made a final proposal for a compromise, by which Murray, notwithstanding his accusation, might still once more be admitted to the favour of his sovereign, and the disputes between her and her subjects be settled.[1] They added that this scheme seemed to them most consonant to the first intentions of both the queens. It was rejected, however, by Elizabeth—any compromise she said would now affect Mary's honour; better far would it be to summon her accusers, to reprimand and chastise them, for the defamation of their sovereign. She would not call for proofs; but if they persisted in their charge it would be proper to hear what they could allege in their defence.[2]

Such a proposal for a compromise would certainly tell strongly against the innocence of the Scottish Queen, had it proceeded from herself, after the accusation brought forward by Murray, but this was not the case. It came from her commissioners alone, and, as they afterwards asserted, without any communication with their mistress. When at last, they found it declined, and perceived that Elizabeth had formed a resolution to hear from Murray the alleged proofs of their sovereign's guilt, before she was suffered to open her lips in her defence, they resolved to be equally peremptory: As soon there-

[1] See Anderson, vol. iv. P. ii. pp. 135, 137, for the particulars of this last proposal.

[2] Id. Ibid. pp. 139, 140.

fore as the regent was summoned before the English commissioners, the Bishop of Ross, and his associates, demanded admission, and coming forward, at once dissolved the conference. They declared that since the queen of England was determined to receive from the regent the proofs of his injurious allegations against their sovereign, before she was heard in her presence, they were compelled to break off all proceedings, and they delivered a written protest, that nothing done hereafter should prejudice the honour or estate of their royal mistress. Cecil and the commissioners declined to receive this paper, affirming, that it misrepresented the answer of the English Queen, but the Scottish deputies withdrew, repeating that they would neither treat nor appear again.[1]

From this moment the conferences were truly at an end, but Elizabeth's object was still to be attained—Murray therefore was charged with having defamed his sovereign by an unfounded accusation, and required to defend himself. He did so by the production of those celebrated letters and sonnets which Elizabeth had already secretly examined, and of which he now produced both the originals and the copies. Of these the originals have long since disappeared, and the garbled state of the copies which now exist, and which appear to have been tampered with, certainly, renders their evidence of a suspicious nature. At this time, however, both originals

[1] Anderson, vol. iv. Part ii. pp. 145, 146. Dec. 6, 1568.

and copies were laid before the commissioners, after which the depositions of some servants of the late king, and the confessions of Powrie and others, executed for the murder, were produced.

Having proceeded thus far, and the English commissioners being in possession of the whole proofs against the Scottish Queen, it might have been expected that some opinion would have been pronounced by them. Nothing of the kind, however, took place, neither did Elizabeth herself think it then expedient to say a word upon the subject, but after a short season of delay, she resolved to bring the cause before a more numerous tribunal. With this view the chief of her nobility were summoned to attend a meeting of the Privy Council. There came accordingly the Earls of Northumberland, Westmoreland, Shrewsbury, Worcester, Warwick, and Huntingdon, and from some expressions dropt by Cecil, in a letter to Norris,[1] it may be gathered, that it was intended with their advice to come at last to some important and final decision. Yet this third solemn preparation ended like the rest, in nothing. After the lords had been sworn to secrecy, the whole evidence against the queen of Scots was laid before them, and instead of a judgment upon the authenticity of the proofs, and the alleged guilt of the accused, these noble persons contented themselves with a vague allusion to the "foul matters they had seen," and a general approval of the course

[1] Cabala, p. 155.

adopted by their sovereign. Elizabeth next sent for the Scottish commissioners, and in reply to their demand so recently made for the admission of their royal mistress to defend herself in her presence informed them that, from the turn matters had taken, it had become now more impossible than ever to listen to such a request. It was easy, she said, for Mary either to send some confidential person to court with her defence, or to permit the English Queen to dispatch some noblemen to receive it, or to authorize her deputies to reply to the English commissioners. If she still refused to adopt any one of these methods to vindicate herself, she must not be surprised if so obstinate a silence should be interpreted into an admission of guilt.[1]

These specious offers and arguments did not impose upon the Bishop of Ross and his colleagues. They remonstrated loudly against the injustice with which their royal mistress had been treated, they insisted that since she was denied the common privilege of a personal defence, she should be permitted to return as a free princess to her own kingdom, or if she preferred it, to retire to France, and at the same time, as their services were no longer necessary, they requested their dismissal from court.[2] The queen replied, they might go to Bolton and consult with their mistress, but should not leave England till the conference was at an end. She then addressed to Mary a letter, of which the

[1] Goodall, vol. ii. pp. 257, 260, 263, 264.

[2] Goodall, vol. ii. p. 267, 268.

object seemed to be, to intimidate her into a defence; but so perplexed and capricious was Elizabeth's mind at this moment, that on the next day she changed her measures, and in a private communication to Knollys, the vice chamberlain, who then had charge of the Scottish Queen, declared her anxiety to proceed no farther in her cause. It appeared to her, she said, a far better method to endeavour to persuade Mary to resign the government into the hands of Murray, whilst the prince her son, for his safety, should be brought into England. She herself, too, it was added, might continue in that country, and this whole cause of hers, wherewith she had been charged, be committed to perpetual silence.[1]

Knollys was directed to manage matters so that this proposal might proceed from herself: but whilst Elizabeth was thus tossed about by so many intricate and contradictory schemes, Mary had transmitted directions to her commissioners which defeated this last artifice. She informed them, that although she still insisted on her right to be heard in person, and adhered to her protestation, it was not her intention to pass over in silence the atrocious calumnies with which she had been assailed; that Murray and his accomplices in accusing her had been guilty of a traitorous falsehood, and had imputed to her a crime of which they were guilty themselves. She then enjoined them to demand inspection both of the copies and the originals of

[1] Goodall, vol. ii., p. 279, Dec. 22, 1568.

the letters which had been produced against her, and she engaged to give such an answer as should triumphantly establish her innocence.

This spirited appeal, which was made by the Scottish commissioners in peremptory terms,[1] threw Elizabeth into new perplexity, and it required all the skill of Cecil to evade and parry it. Recourse was had to delay, but it produced no change, and on the 7th January, the Bishop of Ross required an audience, in which he repeated the demand in still stronger language. His royal mistress, he said, was ready to answer her calumniators, and once more required in common justice to see the letters, or at least the copies of the letters which had been produced by her enemies, that she might prove them to be themselves the principal authors of the murder, and expose them to all christian princes as liars and traitors.[2] This fair and moderate request Elizabeth evaded. It appeared to her better, she said, that Mary should resign the crown in favour of her son, that, on the ground of being weary of the government, she should remain privately in England, and make a compromise with her enemies.[3] It was instantly answered by Ross, that he had his mistress's command to declare that to such a condition she would never agree—if the letters were produced, and she was permitted to see the evidence against her, she was prepared to defend

[1] Goodall, vol. ii. pp. 288, 289.
[2] Id. Ibid. p. 297, 299.
[3] Goodall, vol. ii. p. 300.

herself. She was ready also to entertain any honourable proposal by which a pardon might be extended to her disobedient subjects, notwithstanding the greatness of their offences, but to resign her crown would be to condemn herself—it would be said, she was afraid of a public accusation, and shrunk from enquiry.—This, therefore, she would sooner die than consent to, and the last words she uttered should be those of a queen of Scotland.[1]

Elizabeth struggled violently against this determination, and was unwilling to receive it. She intreated Ross again to write to his mistress, but this he steadily refused. She required him and his colleagues to confer with her council. They did so, but it was only to re-iterate Mary's final resolution.[2]

It was now become absolutely necessary that the Queen of England should either grant this last request, or refuse it, and pronounce a final judgment. Murray earnestly urged the necessity of a return to his government. From Mary no change of mind was to be expected. The regent was accordingly summoned before the Privy Council, and Cecil delivered to him and his associates the definitive sentence of Elizabeth. Its terms were most extraordinary. He stated, on one hand, that as Murray and his adherents had come into England, at the desire of the queen's majesty, to answer to

[1] Goodall, vol. ii. p. 301.

[2] Id. Ibid. pp. 304. January 9, 1568-9.

an accusation preferred by their sovereign, she was of opinion that nothing had as yet been brought forward against them which impaired their honour or allegiance. He declared, on the other hand, with regard to Mary, that nothing had been produced or shown by them against the queen their sovereign, which should induce the Queen of England, for any thing yet seen, to conceive an ill opinion of her good sister, and he concluded by informing Murray, that he should immediately receive permission to return to his government.[1] From this judgment, which was virtually an acquittal of Mary, it seems an inevitable inference, that the English Queen, after having had the most ample opportunities of examining the letters which had been produced, either considered them to be forgeries by the other party, or found that they had been so interpolated, garbled, and tampered with as to be unworthy of credit—for no one can deny, that if the letters were genuine, the Queen of Scots was guilty of the murder.

But if Mary was acquitted, Murray also was found guiltless, and these two conclusions, so utterly inconsistent with each other, Elizabeth had the hardihood to maintain. When we consider the solemnity of the cause, the length of the conferences, the direct accusation of Murray and his associates, the recrimination of the queen, the evidence produced, and the impossibility that both parties could be innocent, the sentence of Eliza-

[1] Goodall, vol. ii. p. 305, Jan. 10, 1568-9.

beth is perhaps the most absurd judicial opinion ever left upon record.

It was followed by a scene no less remarkable. A Privy Council was called at Hampton Court, on the eve of Murray's departure. It included the Duke of Norfolk, the Earls of Pembroke, Derby, Bedford, and Leicester, with Sir William Cecil, and Sir Walter Mildmay. Before it were summoned the Bishop of Ross and Lord Herries, on the one side. On the other came Murray, Morton, Lethington, Makgill, Orkney, Balnevis, and Buchanan; and when they were met, Cecil, rising up, delivered a message from the queen his mistress. She had determined, he said, to give the Earl of Murray and his adherents permission to depart for Scotland; but a rumour having arisen that they were concerned in the murder of the king, Murray had desired to be confronted with the deputies of the queen of Scots, and he now came there to know whether they would accuse him or his adherents, in their mistress's name or in their own.[1]

To this challenge the queen of Scots' commissioners immediately answered, that in their own name they had affirmed, and would affirm, nothing, but, with respect to the queen their mistress, they had received her written instructions to accuse the Earl of Murray and his adherents as the principal authors, and some of them the actual perpetrators of the murder. They had communicated, they

[1] Goodall, vol. ii. p. 307.

said, their sovereign's letters on this point to the queen of England—they had publicly preferred their accusation, they had constantly adhered to it—they had offered to defend the innocence of their mistress, they had demanded in vain an inspection of the letters produced against her, and even now, if exact copies were furnished, they would undertake her defence, and demonstrate, by convincing proofs, what persons were indeed guilty of the murder of the king.[1] Murray strongly asserted his innocence, and offered to go to Bolton and abide in person the arraignment of his sovereign. It was answered, that such a step was wholly unnecessary, as her written accusation had been produced to the queen of England. Both parties then left the Council, and next day the regent received permission to return to Scotland, (Jan. 12.)[2]

It remained to dismiss their antagonists with an appearance of liberality, and being once more called before the Privy Council, Cecil intimated to them his mistress's consent, that the queen of Scots should have copies of the letters (the originals having been re-delivered to Murray), but he first required them to procure a declaration, under her seal and signature, that she would reply to the charges which they contained. It was answered, that Elizabeth had already two writings of the precise tenor required, under the queen's hand; to

[1] Id. vol. ii. p. 308.

[2] Id. Ibid. p. 309.

seek for more was only a vexatious delay. The whole proceedings, from first to last, had been partial and unjust. If the regent and his adherents were permitted to depart, why was their royal mistress, why were they themselves debarred from the same privilege? If the queen of England were really solicitous that she should enter upon her defence, let her adversaries be detained until it was concluded. To this spirited remonstrance, it was coldly and briefly replied, that Murray had promised to return when called for, as for the Scottish commissioners, they also would probably be allowed to depart, but for many reasons the queen of Scotland could not be suffered to leave England. Against this iniquitous sentence, no redress was to be hoped for; the deputies could only protest that nothing done by her in captivity should prejudge her honour, estate, or person, and having taken this final precaution, they left the council.[1]

It is difficult from the conferences at York and Westminster, to draw any certain conclusion as to the probability of Mary's guilt or innocence. Both Elizabeth and the queen of Scots acted with great art, and throughout the discussions neither the professions of the one or of the other were sincere. Thus the English Queen, whilst she affected an extreme anxiety to promote a reconciliation between Mary and her subjects, was really desirous that the breach should be made irreconcilable, by the accusation of Murray, and the

[1] Goodall, vol. ii., pp. 310, 313.

production of the letters. Nor does there seem to be any doubt that Norfolk's assertion was correct, when he assured Lethington she had no intention of pronouncing a decision. On the other hand, it is clear that during the first part of the conferences, both Mary and her advisers, Ross, Herries, and Lethington, were, from whatever motive, anxious to suppress Murray's charge, that they deprecated the production of his evidence, and were only induced to go into the investigation from the hope which Elizabeth held out that she would not permit an accusation, but exert herself, under all circumstances, to promote a reconciliation between the Scottish Queen and her subjects, and restore her to the throne. It must have struck the reader, that whenever by means of the private letters which have been preserved, we get behind the scenes and are admitted to Mary's secret consultations with her commissioners, or to their own opinion on the conduct of the cause, we meet with no assertion of the forgery of the letters; and it seems to me difficult to reconcile her agreement to resign the crown, and suppress all enquiry, a measure only prevented by the interference of Norfolk, with her absolute innocence. On the other hand, there are some circumstances, especially occurring during the latter part of the conferences, which tell strongly in her favour. The urgency with which from first to last she solicited a personal interview with Elizabeth, and promised if it were granted to go into her

defence; the public and oft-repeated assertion of the forgery of the letters, and the offer to prove this if copies were furnished to her commissioners; Elizabeth's evasion of this request; her entire suppression of these suspicious documents; their subsequent disappearance; and the schemes of Norfolk for a marriage with Mary; these are all circumstances which seem to me exceedingly irreconcileable with her being directly guilty of the murder of her husband. Upon the whole, it appears to me, that in the present state of the controversy, we are really not in possession of evidence sufficient to enable any impartial enquirer to come to an absolute decision. I have already pointed out, as the circumstances occurred, such moral evidence against the queen as arose out of her conduct both before and after her marriage with Bothwell. The discussions at York and Westminster do not materially affect this evidence, either one way or the other, and, so far as we judge of these conferences by themselves, they leave the mind under the unsatisfying and painful impression that the conduct of the Scottish Queen throughout the whole investigation, was that of a person neither directly guilty, nor yet wholly innocent.

But, whilst animadverting on the proceedings of Elizabeth and Mary in these celebrated conferences, the conduct of the regent must not be forgotten. He was then perfectly aware of the accession of both Lethington and Morton to the murder of the king: this both prior and subsequent events proved; yet

did he not scruple to bring these two accomplices to England, and employ Morton as his assistant in the accusation of his sovereign. Such a course, which could be dictated only by the ambition of retaining the whole power of the government in his hands, seems unworthy of the man who was the leader of the Reformation in Scotland, and professed an extraordinary regard for religion. It was cruel, selfish, and unprincipled—nor is this all. Making every allowance for the defective justice of the times, it is impossible to defend Murray's management of the evidence against Mary. There can be little doubt, I think, that some letters addressed by this unfortunate princess to Bothwell did really fall into the hands of her enemies, but the regent's refusal to produce the originals to the accused, and the state in which the copies have descended to our times, evidently garbled, altered, and interpolated, throws on him the utmost suspicion, and renders it impossible for any sincere enquirer after the truth to receive such evidence. If the only proofs of Mary's guilt had been these letters produced at Westminster, the task of her defenders would have been comparatively an easy one.[1] It is the moral

[1] I have purposely abstained from quoting or entering into the arguments of the writers in the controversy which has arisen on the subject of these letters, and of Mary's guilt or innocence. My object has been to attempt from original and unquestionable evidence to give the facts; not to overload the narrative with argument or controversy. The reader who may wish to pursue the points farther, will find ample room for study in the volumes of Goodall, of Tytler, my venerated grandfather, of Laing, Whitaker,

evidence arising out of her own conduct, which weighs heaviest against her. But to return.

Upon the conclusion of the conferences, the Scottish Queen exerted herself to rouse her partizans in Scotland and animate them to a vindication of their independence against the practices of Elizabeth. Acting by the advice of Cecil her chief minister, the Queen of England had formed a scheme by which, under the nominal regency of Murray, she would herself have managed the whole affairs of the country. The project drawn up in the handwriting of its astute author still exists; the young prince was to be delivered up by Murray, and educated in England under the eye of Elizabeth, the regent was to be continued in his office, receiving, of course, his instructions from the queen of England, on whom he was to be wholly dependant; and the queen of Scots was to be persuaded to remain where she was by arguments which Cecil minutely detailed.[1] These insidious proposals were discovered by Mary, and being communicated to her friends, exaggerated by her fears and indignation, raised the utmost alarm in Scotland. The regent, it was

and Chalmers. Upon the whole, my grandfather's "Historical and Critical Enquiry," as it appears in the 4th Edition, London, 1790, may still I think be appealed to, not only as the best defence of Mary, but, in a controversy which has been deformed by much coarse and bitter invective, as the most pleasing and elegant work which has appeared on the subject. It is throughout, the production of a scholar and a gentleman.

[1] MS. Brit. Mus. Caligula, C. 1, fol. 273, 22nd Dec., 1568.

said, had sold the country, he was ready to deliver up the principal fortresses, he had agreed to acknowledge the superiority of England, he looked himself to the throne, and was about to procure a deed of legitimation, by which he should be capable of succeeding if the young prince died without issue. Such reports flew from one end of the country to the other, and as he was not on the spot to contradict them, and cope with his adversaries, their effects were highly favourable to the captive queen.

In the mean time, although he had received permission to return to his Government, Murray, found himself very unpleasantly situated. He was deeply in debt, and although he had lent himself an easy tool in the hands of the queen of England, she refused to assist him. If, indeed, we may believe Sir James Melvil, who had an intimate personal acquaintance with the history of these times, she really despised him for his subserviency, and enjoyed his distresses. This was not all—the Duke of Norfolk was enraged at his late conduct. He had broken all the promises made to this nobleman, and as Norfolk commanded the whole strength of the northern counties, through which lay Murray's route homeward, he dreaded being way-laid before he crossed the border. Nor was such an apprehension without good foundation, as a plot for his assassination, of which it is said both Norfolk and Mary were cognizant, was actually organized, and the execution of it committed to the Earl of Westmore-

land.[1] Under these difficulties Murray had recourse to dissimulation. With much address he procured a reconciliation with Norfolk, expressed deep contrition for the part he had been compelled to act against his sovereign, and declared, that his feelings upon the subject of the marriage between her and the Duke remained unaltered: it was still his conviction, he said, that such a union would be eminently beneficial to both kingdoms, and he was ready to promote it by every means in his power. To prove his sincerity he opened the matter to the Bishop of Ross, he sent Robert Melvil to propose it to Mary herself, he promised to use his influence for its furtherance with the Scottish nobles, and in the end he so completely re-assured the Duke, that this nobleman procured the regent a loan of five thousand pounds from Elizabeth, and sent the strictest injunctions to his adherents not to molest him in any way upon his return.[2]

With Mary herself, his artifices did not stand him in less stead. Her friends in Scotland were at this time mustering in great strength. She had appointed the Duke of Chastelherault and the Earls of Argile and Huntly her lieutenants. The two earls commanded the north. The duke was ready to rise with the whole strength of the Hamiltons; Lord Boyd and other powerful nobles were preparing for action, and had these combined forces been brought into the field, Murray must

[1] Murdin's State Papers, p. 51.

[2] Lesly's Negociations in Anderson vol. iii. p. 40.

have been overwhelmed. But at this crisis the queen and Norfolk were deceived by his professions of repentance, and Mary, trusting to his expressions of devotion to her interest, commanded her adherents to abstain from all hostilities. They reluctantly obeyed, and the regent, congratulating himself on his own address and the credulity of his opponents, returned secure and unmolested to his government.

On his arrival in Scotland Murray dropped the mask, and exerted himself with energy against his opponents. He held a convention of the nobility, clergy, and commissaries of the burghs at Stirling, he procured an approbation of his conduct, and a ratification of his proceedings in England,[1] and lastly he gave orders for a general muster of the force of the kingdom.[1]

On the other hand, the Duke, Cassillis, and Lord Herries, as soon as they came home assumed a bold tone, issued a proclamation, in which the regent was branded as an usurper, mustered their strength, fortified their houses, and showed a determination to put all to the arbitrement of the sword. But the rapidity with which Murray assembled his army disconcerted them. It was evident, that although willing to enter into terms, he was better prepared than his opponents to act upon the offensive; and

[1] MS. Letter, St. P. Off. Murray to Cecil, 8th February, 1568-9. Ibid. Same to same. 17th February, 1568-9. Ibid. Same to same, 25th February, 1568-9. Ibid. Murray to Sir John Forster, 15th March, 1568-9.

after a personal conference with the regent at Glasgow (March 13) they concluded a treaty of peace.[1] It was agreed, that a convention of the nobility should be held upon the 10th of April for the settlement of the affairs of the country, and that in the mean season there should be a suspension of hostilities. Murray simply insisted that Chastelherault and his adherents should acknowledge the authority of the king. The Duke agreed to this, on condition that all who had been forfeited for their obedience to the queen, should be restored, that such measures should be taken for the maintenance of her honour and welfare as were consistent with the sovereignty of the king, and that a committee selected from the nobles on both sides should meet at Edinburgh to deliberate upon a general pacification. It embraced the regent himself, the Duke and the Earls of Huntly, Argile, Morton, Mar, Athol, Glencairn, and Lord Herries. For his part, Murray stipulated that these noblemen should repair to Edinburgh and return to their estates in security, whilst they agreed to disband their forces and surrender themselves or their eldest sons as a security for the performance of the treaty.[2]

[1] Diurnal of Occurrents, p. 141. MS. Letter, St. P. Off. 13th March, 1568. Heads of the communing between the Earl of Murray on the one part, and the Earls of Cassilis and others on the other part.

[2] MS. Letter, St. P. Off. 15 March, 1568. Murray to Sir J. Forster.

A temporary tranquillity being thus restored, the leaders of both parties repaired to Stirling, where the Archbishop of St. Andrew's the Earl of Cassillis and Lord Herries placed themselves in Murray's hands as hostages, and the regent in return released the prisoners taken at the battle of Langside. It was expected that he would next disband his force, but seizing this moment of leisure, he led them against the border marauders, who, from the long interruption of justice in these districts, were become formidable to both kingdoms. His expedition was successful, and it was a politic stroke, for it afforded him a good excuse for keeping up his forces, and it taught them confidence in themselves and their leader. When he returned to the capital, it was with spirits animated by victory, and with a secret determination never to lay down his arms till he had compelled his enemies to submit to such terms as he was pleased to dictate.

The 10th of April, being the day for the convention of the nobles, now arrived, and according to agreement, the Duke, Cassillis, Herries, and other nobles who composed the committee, (Huntly and Argile excepted), met at Edinburgh. Two points of much difficulty, and almost irreconcileable with each other, were to be settled—the continuance of the king's government, and the restoration and return of the captive queen; but Murray had no serious intention of entering into discussion upon either. When, therefore, the counsellors were assembled, he rose, and haughtily

handing a paper to the Duke of Chastelherault, desired him and his associates, before proceeding farther, to sign an acknowledgment of the king's authority. The duke remonstrated: the demand he said was unjust and premature, as the regent well knew. The object of this conference, was to deliberate on the measures to be adopted towards their captive sovereign, let him propose such measures himself, or listen to him and his friends when they brought them forward. If both parties were agreed upon them, he and his adherents were ready to subscribe to the king's authority—they had observed every article of the late treaty, they had trusted themselves in the regent's power; their hostages were in his hands, their lives and their lands at his disposal; but they had relied upon his honour most solemnly pledged, and signed, nor could they believe that he would disgrace himself by an act of fraud and tyranny. To this spirited remonstrance Murray did not vouchsafe an answer, but ordered his guards instantly to apprehend the Duke and Lord Herries. The last nobleman being the most formidable, was hurried a prisoner to the castle of Edinburgh without a moment's delay; the duke next morning shared the same fate.[1]

This outrage was beheld with deep indignation by the country, and estranged from the regent some of his best friends, but it intimidated his opponents, and rendered Argile and Huntly more inclined to

[1] Melvil's Memoirs, p. 219. History of James the Sext. MS. Letter, St. P. Off. Herries to Elizabeth, 5 July, 1569, pp. 39, 40.

an accommodation. These noblemen wielded the whole power of the northern districts, and had refused to sign the pacification at Glasgow. So deep was their enmity to Murray, that they had accused him in a public paper, presented during the conferences at Westminster, of being accessory to the murder of the king, and since that time they had left nothing undone to support the interests of their sovereign, and destroy the authority of the regent. But the late scenes in the capital had alarmed them; they saw him supported by England; at the head of a large force; his opponents in prison; the southern part of the kingdom reduced to obedience; and they deemed it prudent to enter into an accommodation. Argile consented to acknowledge the king's authority, and was immediately received into favour. With Huntly, who had acted more independently for the queen, and granted commissions in her name, the arrangement was more difficult. But at last all was settled in a meeting at St. Andrew's, and the northern lord subscribed his adherence to the government, surrendered his artillery, and delivered hostages for his peaceable behaviour (10th May).[1] To secure his advantage, the regent immediately led his army into the North, reduced the country, levied heavy fines on all who had risen in favour of the queen, compelled the clans to swear allegiance, and returned enriched and confident, to hold a great

[1] MS. Letter, St. P. Off. Lord Hunsdon to Cecil, May 19, 1569, and Spottiswood, p. 229.

convention of the nobility, which he had appointed to meet at Perth on the 25th of July.[1]

To explain the object of this assembly, we must look back for a moment, and recal to mind the intrigues which had taken place between Murray, Lethington, and the Duke of Norfolk, to bring about a marriage between this nobleman and the Scottish Queen. The project had originated in the busy and politic brain of Lethington, it had been encouraged and furthered by the regent, and its success was ardently anticipated by the duke, who carried on a correspondence with Murray upon the subject, and trusted in the end to procure the consent of his own sovereign. A secret of this kind, however, is difficult to keep in a court; and something coming to Elizabeth's ears, she broke forth with much passion, and attacked the duke, who saved himself by his address. He would admit, he said, that proposals had been made to him on the subject by some noblemen. These he could not have prevented, but he had never seriously entertained them, and indeed, he was not likely to do so, as he loved to sleep upon a safe pillow.[2] His earnestness re-assured Elizabeth, and Norfolk believing that he had lulled all her suspicions, had the rashness and folly to continue his correspondence with Mary.

After some time, the scheme assumed a definite

[1] MS. Letter, St. P. Off. Murray to Cecil, Aberdeen, July 8, 1569.

[2] Trial of the Duke of Norfolk, Jardine, vol. i., p. 162.

form, and was secretly supported by a large party of the nobility in both countries. Leicester earnestly promoted it, the Earls of Arundel, Pembroke, Bedford, Shrewsbury, Northumberland, and Westmoreland, gave it their full concurrence. Sir Nicholas Throkmorton laboured warmly in the cause; even the cautious Cecil, to whom it was early communicated, contributed his advice.[1]

In Scotland the plan was managed by Lethington, the regent, and his secretary Wood, whilst the Bishop of Ross, and the Lord Boyd, communicated with Mary, who corresponded with the duke, and professed her readiness to be divorced from Bothwell. Nothing in short was wanting, but the consent of Elizabeth, and the concurrence of the Scottish nobility. To conciliate and convince the English Queen, Leicester proposed that Lethington should repair to England. To ensure the second, it was resolved that the matter should be brought before that convention of the whole nobility, which was to meet at Perth on Murray's return from the North.

In the meantime whilst these secret transactions were carefully concealed, the Bishop of Ross, who remained in England, carried on an open negociation for his mistress's restoration. To this Elizabeth, with the desire of keeping a check over Murray, affected to listen, and Lord Boyd was despatched with some proposals on this subject, to

[1] Lesly's Negociations, Anderson, vol. iii., pp. 51, 61, 62. Camden's Elizabeth, Kennet, vol. ii. p. 420.

be communicated first to Mary herself, and afterwards when she had given her consent, to be broken to the Scottish nobility. These articles, Camden affirms, were drawn up by Leicester.[1] They stipulated that the Scottish Queen, on condition of being reinstated in the government of her kingdom, should enter into a perpetual league with England, establish the Protestant religion, receive to favour her rebellious subjects, and give assurance to Elizabeth that neither she nor her issue should be molested by any claims upon the English throne. Another article was added on the marriage with Norfolk, but was carefully concealed from the English Queen. It recommended this union, as the only measure which was likely to restore tranquillity to both kingdoms, and to enforce it more effectually, Leicester and his friends despatched a special messenger, Mr. Candish, who accompanied Lord Boyd to Tutbury, and carried letters and costly presents to Mary.[2] To some of the conditions she immediately consented, on others she demurred and requested time to consult her foreign allies, as to the projected marriage; her sorrowful experience, she said, inclined her to prefer a solitary life, yet if the remaining conditions were settled to her satisfaction, she was not indisposed to Norfolk, provided Elizabeth were consulted and her consent obtained.[3]

[1] Camden's Elizabeth. Kennet, vol. ii. pp. 419-420.
[2] Lesly's Negociation. Anderson, vol. iii. pp. 51, 52.
[3] Lesly's Negociations, p. 53, 54.

On receiving this favourable reply, Norfolk became impatient to complete his ambitious project. He courted popularity, kept open house, strengthened himself by every possible means, and communicated his design to the French and Spanish ambassadors, who after consulting their courts, gave him their encouragement and support. Nor did he neglect the Scottish Regent, with whom he kept up a close correspondence, and who assured him of his continued fidelity and devotion to his service. It may seem strange that Norfolk should have so long delayed to sound Elizabeth upon his great design, but Leicester, in whom he chiefly confided, strongly dissuaded him from any premature disclosure, and the deeper he and his confederates were engaged in their secret intrigues, the more they shrunk from the dreaded task of revealing them to a princess whose violence and severity held them in constant awe.

Meanwhile, though kept in the dark as to the marriage, the English Queen was urged to conclude an agreement for the restoration of Mary on the ground of those articles which had been submitted to her by the Bishop of Ross, and after a conference with her privy council, Lord Boyd was dispatched upon this business into Scotland.[1] This nobleman carried with him letters to the regent from Elizabeth, Mary, the Duke of Norfolk, and Sir Nicholas Throkmorton, and meeting Murray at Elgin,

[1] Lesly's Negociations, Anderson, vol. iii. p. 54, 55.

on his return from his northern expedition, he immediately laid before him his dispatches and instructions.[1] The letters of Elizabeth contained three propositions in Mary's behalf, and she intimated her desire that one or the other of them should be adopted. She might be restored, she said, fully and absolutely to her royal estate—or, secondly, she might be united in the government with her son, and retain the title of queen, whilst the administration continued in the regent till the prince had attained the age of seventeen—or lastly, she might return to Scotland, as a private person, and be honourably maintained in quiet and retirement. In Mary's own letter, which was brought by Lord Boyd, she briefly intimated her desire that judges should be appointed to decide upon the lawfulness of her marriage with Bothwell, and should it be pronounced illegal, her request was, that sentence of nullity should be pronounced, so that she might be free to marry where she pleased. This request evidently pointed to the projected union with Norfolk, and the subject was insisted on in the letters of the duke himself and Sir N. Throkmorton. Norfolk, in addressing the regent, contented himself with warm professions of friendship, and assured him that as to his marriage with the queen his sister, he never meant to recede from his promise, having proceeded so far that he could not go back without dishonour. He referred him to Lord Boyd, who was fully instructed by Mary and

[1] Lesly's Negociations, Anderson, vol. iii. p. 70.

himself to reply to any doubts which he might entertain, and begged him to believe that he felt for him the affection not only of a faithful friend, but a natural brother.[1]

Throkmorton's letters were addressed both to Murray and to Lethington. To the regent he observed, that the time was come when he must give up all his conscientious scruples and objections. The match was now supported by a party too powerful and too numerous to be resisted. If he opposed it, his overthrow was inevitable. If he promoted it, no man's friendship would be so highly prized, no man's estimation be greater or more popular. In his letter to Lethington, Throkmorton urged the necessity of his hastening to court for the purpose of breaking the affair to Elizabeth. Of her consent, he said, he need have no doubt. She was too wise a princess to risk the tranquillity of her government, her own security, and the happiness of her people for the gratification of her own fancy, or the passions of any inconsiderate individual, and he concluded by assuring him, that the wisest, noblest, and mightiest persons in England were all engaged upon their side.

On receiving these letters, the regent, as we have seen, summoned a convention of the nobility at Perth, on the 25th of July; an assembly of the church was held at the same time in the capital, and commissioners deputed from it to the meeting of the nobles. It was impossible, so acute a person as

[1] Haynes, p. 520.

Murray should fail to perceive that the queen's restoration and the proposed marriage, if carried into effect, must be a death blow to his power, and whilst he affected to fulfil his engagements to the duke with scrupulous fidelity, he secretly persuaded his partizans to oppose the match with their utmost influence.[1]

When Boyd delivered his letters at the convention, containing Elizabeth's three proposals, the effect of this disingenuous dealing was perceived: Mary's full restoration to her dignity was refused, her association with the young king in the government was also declared dangerous and impossible, but the third scheme for her restoration to liberty, and being reduced to a private condition within her dominions, appeared to them more likely to succeed. The assembly, however, arrived at no definite resolution, and when the queen's letter regarding a divorce from Bothwell was laid before them, a violent debate arose between Lethington and his friends, who secretly supported the intended marriage with Norfolk, and Makgill, the clerk register, with the leaders of the Presbyterian party. It was argued by the secretary, between whom and Murray there had recently been great coldness, that the divorce might be concluded without injury or disrespect either to the king or the church. To this Makgill answered, that Mary's own letters confuted him, and insulted

[1] Lesly's Negociations, Anderson, vol. iii. p. 71. MS. St. P. Off. Names of the noblemen, &c., assembled at Perth, 28 July, 1569.

their sovereign. The king was their only head and master, yet she still addressed them as her subjects, and subscribed herself their queen. The Bishop of St. Andrew's was a heretic, a member cut off from the true vine, an obstinate rebel and papist, yet she wrote to him as the head of the church. To vouchsafe an answer to such an application, would be, in some measure, to admit its justice—to grant it, nothing less than treason and blasphemy. It was in vain that Lethington attempted a reply, and sarcastically insinuated that they who were so recently anxious for the queen's separation from Bothwell, had now altered their tone with unaccountable versatility. He was interrupted by Richardson, the treasurer, who started from his seat, calling the assembly to witness that the secretary had argued against the king's authority, and protested that any who dared to support him should be accounted traitors and dealt with accordingly. This appeal finished the controversy, and Mary's proposal for a divorce was indignantly rejected.[1] The assembly then broke up, with mutual expressions of contempt and defiance, the queen's deliverance appearing still more distant than before.

But if the affairs of this unfortunate princess were thus unsuccessful in her own dominions, an event which now happened in England overwhelmed her with fresh affliction. The renewed

[1] MS. Letter, St. P. Off. Lord Hunsdon to Cecil. Berwick, 5th Aug. 1569. James the Sext, p. 41.

intrigues of the Duke of Norfolk were discovered, and Elizabeth's suspicions being once awakened, she never rested till, by the assistance of Cecil, her indefatigable and vigilant minister, the whole plot was unravelled.[1] These discoveries were made when the duke scarcely suspected it, till he was awakened from his security by some dark speeches of the queen, who taunted him with his high hopes, and bade him beware on what pillow he leant his head.[2] But this moderate tone of reprehension was short-lived, for on ascertaining the extent to which the plot had been carried under her own eye, by her principal nobility, and without a pretence of soliciting her consent, Elizabeth's fury was ungovernable. Leicester and his associates hastened to propitiate her resentment by a full discovery, and basely purchased their own security with the betrayal of Norfolk. His example was followed by Murray, who with equal meanness, on the first challenge of the English Queen, delivered up the whole of his secret correspondence with Norfolk, and excused himself by declaring that a fear of assassination had compelled him to join a conspiracy, of which he secretly disapproved.[3] He pleaded also, and with some reason, that Elizabeth's own conduct was enough to mitigate her

[1] Maitland, vol. ii. p. 1090.

[2] Spottiswood, p. 231.

[3] MS. Letter, St. P. Off. Murray to Cecil. Hawick, 22 Oct. 1569, Trial of the Duke of Norfolk, in Jardine, vol. i. p. 157-160.

resentment. If she had adopted a decided part against Mary, they would have known how to receive Norfolk's proposals—but her vaccillating policy, and the favour with which the captive queen was treated, created, he said, an equal uncertainty in his mind, and that of his supporters.[1]

As for the unfortunate Duke himself, he appears to have acted with that indecision which in matters of this kind, and with such an adversary as Elizabeth, is commonly fatal. His friends admonished him to throw off the mask and take the field at once, and had he followed their advice his popularity was so great that the consequences might have been serious; but he rejected their advice, and in an apology addressed to the queen, assured her that it had been his fixed resolution throughout the whole course of the negotiations never to marry the queen of Scots without the consent of his sovereign. His guilt lay in the delay, but his allegiance was untainted, and his devotion to her service as entire as it had always been. This letter was sent from Kenninghall, his seat in Norfolk, to which he had precipitately retired on his first suspicion of a discovery. Elizabeth's reply was an immediate summons to the court. The Duke did not venture to obey without first consulting Cecil. The secretary assured him that he was safe. He complied, and was instantly arrested and lodged in the Tower.[2]

[1] MS. Letter, St. P. Off. Murray to Cecil, Dumfries, 29 Oct. 1569.

[2] Haynes, pp. 528, 533.

The discovery was followed by a more rigorous confinement of the Scottish Queen, who was now removed from Winkfield to Tutbury, her repositories were ransacked for letters, and she was committed to the custody of the Earl of Huntingdon, a nobleman particularly obnoxious to her, who was associated in this charge with Shrewsbury her former keeper.[1] Her most trusty domestics were dismissed, the number of her attendants diminished, her letters intercepted and conveyed to the queen of England, and all her actions so rigorously watched, that it became impossible for her to communicate even in the most common affairs with her friends.[2]

Nothing can more strongly mark the sudden and extraordinary changes of these times than an event which soon after occurred in Scotland—the arraignment of Lethington. The regent, since the discovery of his intrigues with Norfolk, had fallen into suspicion with Elizabeth. His secretary Wood, also, who had been entrusted with his negotiations at the English court, by his duplicity and false dealing had incurred her resentment; and although Murray hastened to appease her, by a delivery of the letters which convicted the Duke, she was aware that Lethington still intrigued upon the subject, and suspected that the regent, from their long habits of intimacy, might be induced to favour his designs. Her fears, indeed, on this point, proved

[1] Haynes, pp. 526-527.

[2] Lesly's Negociations. Anderson, vol. iii. p. 78.

to be unfounded, for Murray, as we learn from Melvil, had recently forsaken his old friends and suffered himself to be surrounded by a circle of base and needy parasites. But of this estrangement Elizabeth was ignorant. She therefore directed Cecil to keep a vigilant eye upon the operations of the regent; Lord Hunsdon, the governor of Berwick, received the same instructions; the proceedings of the convention at Perth and the subsequent conduct of the Scottish governor were severely criticised, and he found to his mortification that whilst he had incurred extreme odium by the betrayal of Norfolk, he was himself an object of suspicion.

Whilst Elizabeth, however, only suspected Murray, she was incensed to the highest degree against Lethington, whom she now discovered to be the originator of the marriage plot and the greatest partizan of Norfolk. This restless and indefatigable politician, since his unsuccessful efforts in the convention at Perth, had sought security in Athol, where he was surrounded by his friends, and continued to incite them to renew their exertions in favour of the Scottish Queen; and Murray, who like other victims of ambition, had become sufficiently unscrupulous in the means which he adopted to consolidate his power, resolved to recommend himself to Elizabeth by the ruin of his former associate.

Under the pretence of requiring his immediate assistance at Stirling, in the business of the government, he requested the secretary to leave his retreat in Athol and return to court. Suspi-

cious of some intrigue, he obeyed with reluctance, and scarce had he taken his seat at Council, which was attended by Murray, Mar, Morton, Athol, and Semple, when word was brought that Crawford, a gentleman from the Earl of Lennox, requested audience on business of moment He was admitted, and falling down on his knees, demanded justice to be done on William Maitland, of Lethington, and Sir James Balfour, as the murderers of their sovereign.[1] Amongst the councillors, the only one who heard this sudden accusation unmoved was the secretary himself. With a smile of calm contempt he observed, that his long continued services might have exempted him from so foul and false a charge, preferred, too, by so mean a person, but he was ready to find surety to stand his trial on any day which was appointed and he had no fears for the verdict. Crawford, however, still kneeling, warmly remonstrated against his being left at large. He, a gentleman, and a servant of the late king,[2] had publicly arraigned that guilty man of treason, he was ready to prosecute and adduce his proofs, and under such circumstances he appealed to the council whether bail could possibly be accepted. After a violent debate it was determined, that the secretary should be committed, and Murray, who secretly congratulated himself on the issue of his intrigue, carried him to the capital and confined him in the

[1] MS. Letter, St. P. Off. B. C. Lord Hunsdon to Cecil. Newcastle, Sept. 7th, 1569. Diurnal of Occurrents, p. 147, 148.

[2] Supra, p. 79.

house of Forrester one of his own dependants. At the same time a party of horse were dispatched to Fife, who surrounded Balfour's residence at Monymeil, and brought him and his brother George prisoners to Edinburgh.[1]

The arrest of Lethington increased the unpopularity of the regent; but his victim had scarcely fallen into his hands ere he was again torn from him; for the secretary's old associate Grange, dreading some new treachery of Murray and Morton, now closely leagued together, attacked the house in which he was confined, and, by a mixture of stratagem and courage,[2] carried him off in triumph to the castle. This rescue deeply mortified Murray, who believed that in securing Lethington he was not only performing an acceptable service to Elizabeth, but removing the most formidable opponent of his own government. He dissembled his indignation, however, and as the secretary still declared his readiness to answer the accusation, contented himself with appointing the 22nd of Nov. as the day of trial.

Meanwhile England became disturbed by a rebellion in the northern counties, which at first assumed a formidable appearance. Its leaders were

[1] MS. Letter, St. P. Off. Murray to Cecil, Stirling, Sept. 5th, 1569. Also Lord Hunsdon to Cecil, Alnwick Sept. 8th, 1569, Diurnal of Occurrents, pp. 147-8.

[2] Melvil's Memoirs, p. 218. It is stated by Robert Melvil, that Grange, to forward his purpose, forged an order under the handwriting of the regent. MS. Declaration of Robert Melvil in the Hopetoun Papers.

the Earls of Northumberland and Westmoreland, its object no less than the restoration of the Roman Catholic faith, the destruction of the Protestant constitution of that country, and the delivery of the Scottish Queen. So imminent did the danger at first appear, that Elizabeth issued an order under the great seal for Mary's execution, which seems only to have been arrested by the sudden and total failure of the insurrection.[1] It arose from the intrigues of the Duke of Norfolk and the hopes excited amongst the English Romanists by the anticipated restoration of Mary. Amongst Norfolk's most powerful friends were the Earls of Northumberland and Westmoreland, two peers of ancient family, great alliance, and steady attachment to the Romish church. They commanded the strength of the northern counties, and, had Norfolk chosen to have bid defiance to Elizabeth, they were ready to have risen in arms in his defence. His submission and imprisonment broke, but did not put an end to, their intrigues, and irritated at his desertion they sought the support of the King of Spain, and secured the services of the Duke of Alva and the Bishop of Ross.

This prelate, a man of great talents and restless intrigue, was the ambassador and confidential minister of the Scottish Queen, and by his secret negotiations his mistress, who in her first imprisonment at Bolton had kept up a correspondence with Northumberland,[2] became involved in these new

[1] See Proofs and Illustrations, No. 3. Letter of Leicester to Cecil, communicated by Mr. Bruce.

[2] Haynes, p. 594-595.

commotions. Alva promised to assist the two Earls with a large body of men, and sent over the Marquis Vitelli, one of his best officers, under the pretence of a mission to Elizabeth, but really to forward the rebellion. Before, however, these preparations were completed, Elizabeth obtained a knowledge of the plot, and instantly summoned both to court. Whilst they hesitated, intelligence arrived that Sussex, the queen's lieutenant in the north, had received orders to arrest them, and scarce was this message delivered when Northumberland's castle was beset by a body of horse. He escaped with difficulty, joined the Earl of Westmoreland, and, as the only chance now left them, they dropped the mask and broke into rebellion. An enterprise thus prematurely forced on, could scarcely be successful. In their proclamation the two earls professed a devoted attachment to the queen's person, and declared their only object to be the restoration of the faith of their fathers, the dismissal of false councillors, and the liberation of Norfolk. They had confidently looked to being joined by the large body of the English Roman Catholics all over the country, but their utmost strength never amounted to six thousand men, and these soon melted away into a more insignificant force. Sir John Forster, the Warden of the Middle Marches, made himself master of Northumberland's castles of Alnwick and Warkworth, and by taking possession of the principal passes, effectually cut off all communication between the earl and his vassals

in those parts. Thence marching to Newcastle, and being joined by Sir Henry Percy, Northumberland's brother, he speedily reduced the rebels in the northern parts of Durham, so that when Sussex took the field with seven thousand men, the rebellion was already expiring.[1]

The two rebel earls, with a force which diminished every hour, retired first upon Hexham, and afterwards fell back upon Naworth Castle, in Cumberland. Here they suddenly dispersed their little army, and fled with a handful of horse into Scotland. Westmoreland took refuge with the lairds of Buccleugh and Farnyhirst, two of the most powerful chiefs in those parts, whilst Northumberland, in company with black Ormiston, a traitor who was present at the king's murder, the Laird's Jock, and other border banditti, threw himself into the Harlaw, a stronghold of the Armstrongs.[2] These events passed with so much rapidity, that Murray, who, on the first intelligence of the insurrection, had professed his readiness to assist Elizabeth with the whole forces of the realm, was scarcely able to muster his strength before he heard that assistance was unnecessary.

From such commotions in England, so intimately connected with the fortunes of the captive queen,

[1] Lingard, vol. viii. pp. 52, 58. Camden, in Kennett, vol. ii. pp. 421, 422.

[2] Copy of the time. St. P. Off. Instructions for Mr. Cary. Signed by Sussex, Hunsdon, and Saddler. 22nd Dec. 1569. Also MS. Letter, St. P. Off. Copy of the time. Murray to Sussex. Peebles, 22nd December, 1569.

we must turn to the condition of her partizans in her own country. Of these the great leaders were Lethington and Grange. Grange was in possession of the Castle of Edinburgh, within which now lay his friend Lethington, Lord Herries, the Archbishop of St. Andrew's, and others who supported the cause of Mary, professing, at the same time, their attachment to their prince, and an earnest desire for the pacification of the country.

Opposed to them was the Regent, supported by England and the party of the Kirk, who kept up a constant correspondence with Cecil, Elizabeth's minister, and whose measures were entirely dictated and overruled by English influence.

Since his accession to the chief power in the state, but more especially since the termination of the conferences at Westminster, Murray's popularity had been on the decline. Men blamed his conduct to his sovereign, his treachery to his associates, his haughtiness to his own countrymen, his humility and subserviency to a foreign power, as England was then considered. They accused him of being surrounded by troops of low and needy flatterers, who prospered upon the ruin of the ancient nobility, and persuaded him to betray his former friends, by whose efforts he had been placed in the regency. They declared, and with some truth, that having once sold himself to England, he had become insensible to every suggestion of honour and good faith. Hence his betrayal of Norfolk, his imprisonment of Herries and the

Duke of Chastelherault, his treacherous accusation of Lethington, his threatened severity to Northumberland—all this weighed strongly against him, and those who had been most willing to anticipate the happiest results from his administration, were now ready to acknowledge their mortification and disappointment.[1] Yet, although thus fallen in public estimation, and surrounded by enemies, Murray, naturally daring and intrepid, showed no symptoms of decreasing energy; and as the time approached when Lethington was to stand his trial for the murder of the king, he appeared fully determined to insist on the prosecution.

When the day arrived, however, a scene presented itself very different from the pacific solemnities of public justice; Lord Home, at an early hour, occupied the city with a large body of horse. He was speedily followed by multitudes of the secretary's friends, all armed and surrounded by their retainers; and as every hour was increasing the concourse, Morton, a principal accuser of Lethington, refused to risk his person within the city. Amidst this warlike concourse, Clement Little, an able advocate of the time, entered where the Council had assembled, and protested, that, as his client, the secretary, was ready to stand his trial, and no prosecutor had appeared, he was entitled to a verdict of acquittal. Murray, however, who had taken care to be strongly guarded, rose up, and declared, that as long as

[1] Melvil's Memoirs, p. 220.

the town was occupied by armed troops, no trial should take place, and no verdict be pronounced. He had been placed, he said, by their unsolicited suffrages, in the first office in the state; he had given his solemn oath to administer justice; they had promised to obey the king, and assist him in maintaining the law. What, then, meant this armed assembly? Was it thus they fulfilled their promise? or did they think to intimidate him into their opinion. That, at least, he should show them was a vain expectation, and therefore he now prorogued the trial till quiet was restored, and they were prepared, having laid aside their arms, to resume the demeanour of peaceable subjects. Such was Murray's speech, as reported by himself in a letter written next day to Cecil; but we learn, from the same source, that the regent was daily expecting a communication from Elizabeth, containing her instructions how to conduct himself in Lethington's case, and that he delayed the trial to give time for their arrival—an additional proof of his entire subserviency to England.[1]

He concluded the same letter by an allusion to the recent rebellion in the north:—"I have offered," said he, "already to Mr. Marshall, of Berwick, (he meant Sir William Drury) to take such part in her highness' cause and quarrel with the whole power of this realm, that will do for me, as he shall advertise

[1] MS. Letter, St. P. Off. Murray to Cecil, Edinburgh, 22nd November, 1569, indorsed in Cecil's hand, "Earl of Murray to me concerning the day of law for Lydington."

me * * * and since the matter not only touches her highness obedience, but that we may see our own destruction compassed, who are professors of the Gospel, let not time drive, but with speed let us understand her Majesty's mind."[1]

Murray followed up this offer by summoning the whole force of the kingdom to meet him in arms at Peebles on the 20th December, for the defence of their native country, the preservation of their wives and children, and the liberty of the true religion.[2] He had received early intelligence from Sussex of the flight of the rebel earls into Scotland, and immediately dispatched messengers to the seaports to keep a strict look-out, lest any should take shipping and escape; but his chief reliance lay in his own activity, and marching rapidly towards Hawick, he beset the Harlaw, a tower in which Northumberland had found shelter from Hecky, or Hector Armstrong, a border thief. This villain, bribed by the regent's gold, sold the English earl to Murray, who carried him to Edinburgh, and soon after imprisoned him in Lochleven.[3]

Although this new act of severity and corruption increased the regent's unpopularity in Scotland, it

[1] MS. Letter, St. P. Off. Murray to Cecil, Edin. 22nd November, 1569.

[2] MS. St. P. Off. Copy. The Regent's Proclamation, Edinb. 18th December, 1569.

[3] Diurnal of Occurrents, p. 154. Lesly's Negociations, p. 83. Anderson, vol. iii. Hence a border proverb, "To take Hecky's cloak," to betray a friend. Percy's Reliques, vol. i. p. 3. song iv.

being suspected that he meant to give up his captive to Elizabeth, his zeal and activity completely restored him to the good opinion of this princess, and he had the satisfaction to learn, that she had warmly commended him to his ambassador the Abbot of Dumfermling. This emboldened him to make a proposal on which he had long meditated, and for which the English Queen was by no means prepared. It was no less than that she should surrender Mary into his hands to be kept safely in Scotland, a solemn promise being given by him, "that she should live her natural life, without any sinister means taken to shorten the same."[1] It was added that a maintenance suitable to her high rank should be provided for her, and the arguments addressed to Elizabeth upon the subject, in a paper entrusted to Nicholas Elphinston, who was sent with the request to the English court, were drawn up with no little art and ability. After an enumeration of the late miseries and commotions in England, it stated, that "as Mary was notoriously the ground and fountain from whom all these tumults, practices, and daily dangers did flow," and as her remaining within the realm of England undoubtedly

[1] Copy of the "Instrument." MS. St. P. Off., but without date. On the back are these names in Cecil's hand,

Er: Murray,
Morton,
Mar,
Glencairn,
Montrose, M.
Er: Marshall, M.
Lr: Lyndsay,
Ruthven,
Semple.

gave her every opportunity to continue them, there was no more certain means to provide a remedy, and bring quiet to both countries, than to bring her back into Scotland, thus removing her to a greater distance from foreign realms, and daily intelligence with their princes or their ambassadors."[1]

In this petition Murray was joined by Morton, Mar, Glencairn, Lords Lindsay, Ruthven, and Semple, with the Masters of Marshall and Montrose. At the same time Knox addressed a letter to Cecil. He described himself as writing with one foot in the grave, alluded to the late rebellion, and recommended him to strike at the root, meaning Mary, if he would prevent the branches from budding again. It appears to me that the expressions of this great reformer, whose stern spirit was little softened by age, go as far as to urge the absolute necessity of putting Mary to death, but his words are somewhat dark and enigmatical. The letter, which is wholly in his own hand, is too remarkable to be omitted.

"Benefits of God's hands received, crave that men be thankful, and danger known would be avoided. If ye strike not at the root, the branches that appear to be broken will bud again, and that more quickly than men can believe, with greater force than we would wish. Turn your een[2] unto your God. Forget yourself and yours, when consultation is to be had in matters of such weight, as presently ly upon you. Albeit I have been fre-

[1] MS. Copy, ibid. ut supra. [2] Eyes.

medly[1] handled, yet was I never enemy to the quietness of England. God grant you wisdom. In haste, of[2] Edinburgh, the 2d of Janur. Yours to command in God,

"John Knox, with his one foot in the grave.[3]

"Mo[4] days than one would not suffice to express what I think."

Murray dispatched Elphinston on the 2d of January, and as Knox's letter was dated on the same day, and related to the same subject, it is probable he carried it with him.[5] The envoy, who was in great confidence with the regent, and a man of talent, received full instructions for his secret mission, which fortunately have been preserved. He was directed to impress upon Elizabeth in the strongest manner, the difficulties with which Murray was surrounded, the daily increasing power of his and her enemies, who supported the cause of the captive queen both in England and Scotland, the perpetual tumults and intrigues of the Roman Catholics in both realms, their intercourse with Philip of Spain and the Pope, who were animating them at that very moment to new exertions, the succours hourly looked for from France, and the utter impossibility of the regent keeping up the

[1] Strangely.

[2] At.

[3] MS. Letter, St. P. Off. John Knox to Cecil. Edinburgh, 2d January, 1569-70. Endorsed by Cecil's Clerk, "Mr. Knox to my Mr."

[4] More.

[5] MS. Letter, St. P. Off. Murray to Cecil, Jan. 2, 1569-70.

struggle against his opponents, if Mary was permitted to remain in England, and Elizabeth did not come forward with more prompt and effectual assistance.

It was necessary, he said, to prevent the ruin of the cause, that the queen of England and his master should distinctly understand each other. She had lately urged him to deliver up her rebel the Earl of Northumberland, to pay the penalty of a traitor. It was a hard request, and against every feeling of honour and humanity, to surrender a banished man to slaughter, but he was ready to consent, if in exchange the queen of Scots were committed into his hands, and if at the same time, Elizabeth would support the cause of his young sovereign, and the interests of true religion, by an immediate advance of money, and a seasonable present of arms and ammunition.[1] If this were agreed to, then he was ready to continue his efforts for the maintenance of the Government in Scotland against the machinations of their enemies; he would not only preserve her amity, but "would serve her majesty in England, as they are accustomed to do their native princes in Scotland, and out of England, upon reasonable wages." If she would not consent to this, then he must forbear any longer to venture his life as he had done, and it would be well for her to consider what dangers might ensue to both the realms, by the in-

[1] MS. St. P. Off. A Note of the principal matters in Nicholas Elphinston's Instructions. Wholly in Cecil's hand, Jan. 19, 1569.

crease of the factions which favoured papistry and the queen of Scots' title. Above all he entreated her to remember (alluding as it appears to me, to the subject of Knox's letter), that the heads of all these troubles were at her commandment, that this late rebellion was not now ended, but had more dangerous branches, for which, if she did not provide a remedy, the fault must lie upon herself.[1]

These secret negotiations were detected by the vigilance of the Bishop of Ross, and he instantly presented a protest to the queen of England against a proposition, which, if agreed to was, he said, equivalent to signing Mary's death warrant. He solicited also the ambassadors of France and Spain to remonstrate against it, and La Motte Fenelon addressed an earnest letter to the Queen mother upon the subject.[2] Some little time, too, was gained by the refusal of the Scottish nobles to deliver up Northumberland, and Elizabeth had dispatched Sir Henry Gates and the Marshal of Berwick with a message to the regent, when an appalling event suddenly interrupted the treaty. This was the murder of Murray himself in the town of Linlithgow, by James Hamilton of Bothwellhaugh.

The assassination is to be chiefly traced to the influence of private revenge; but there is no doubt also, that the author of the deed was the tool of a

[1] MS. St. P. Off. A note of the principal matters in Nicholas Elphinston's Instructions, January 19, 1569.

[2] Lesly's Negociations, p. 84. Anderson, vol. iii. Also Dépêches de la Motte Fenelon, vol. ii., pp. 389, 390,

faction which had long determined on Murray's destruction. He was a gentleman of good family, had been made prisoner at Langside, and with others was condemned to death, but the regent had spared his life, and been satisfied with the forfeiture of his estate.

His wife was heiress of Woodhouselee, a small property on the river Esk, to which she had retreated, under the mistaken idea that it would be exempted from the sentence of outlawry, which affected her husband's estate of Bothwellhaugh. But Bellenden, the justice clerk, a favourite of Murray's, who had obtained a grant of the escheat,[1] violently occupied the house and barbarously turned its mistress, during a bitterly cold night, and almost in a state of nakedness, into the woods, where she was found in the morning furiously mad, and insensible to the injury which had been inflicted on her. If ever revenge could meet with sympathy it would be in so atrocious a case as this; and from that moment Bothwellhaugh resolved upon Murray's death, accusing him as the chief author of the calamity. It is affirmed by Calderwood, that he had twice failed in his sanguinary purpose, when the Hamiltons, who had long hated the regent, encouraged him to make a third attempt, which proved successful.[2]

Nothing could be more deliberate than the man-

[1] The forfeited property.

[2] MS. Calderwood, Ayscough, 4735, pp. 746, 747.

ner in which he proceeded. Murray, who was at Stirling, intended to pass through Linlithgow, on his way to Edinburgh. In this town, and in the High Street, through which the cavalcade generally passed, was a house belonging to the archbishop, his uncle. Here he took his station in a small room or wooden gallery, which commanded a full view of the street. To prevent his heavy footsteps being heard, for he was booted and spurred, he placed a featherbed on the floor; to secure against any chance observation of his shadow, which, had the sun broke out, might have caught the eye, he hung up a black cloth on the opposite wall, and, having barricaded the door in the front, he had a swift horse ready saddled in the stable at the back. Even here his preparations did not stop, for, observing that the gate in the wall which enclosed the garden was too low to admit a man on horseback, he removed the lintel stone, and returning to his chamber cut in the wooden panel, immediately below the lattice window where he watched, a hole just sufficient to admit the barrel of his caliver.[1] Having taken these precautions he loaded the piece with four bullets and calmly awaited his victim.

The regent had received repeated warnings of his danger; and on the morning of the murder, John Hume, an attached follower, implored him not to ride through the principal street, but pass round by the back of the town, promising to bring him to the very spot where they might seize the

[1] History of King James the Sext, p. 46.

villain who lay in wait for him.[1] He agreed to take his advice, but the crowd of the common people was so great that it became impossible for him to alter his course. The same cause compelled him to ride at a slow pace, so that the assassin had time to take a deliberate aim; and as he passed the fatal house, he shot him right through the lower part of the body; the bullet entering above the belt of his doublet, came out near the hucklebone, and killed the horse of Arthur Douglas, who rode close beside him.[2] The very suddenness and success of this atrocious action produced a horror and confusion which favoured the murderer's escape; and mounting his horse with the weapon of his revenge still warm in his grasp, he was already many miles from the spot, whilst the people, infuriated at the sight of their bleeding governor, were in vain attempting to break open the door of the lodging from which the shot proceeded. A few, however, caught a sight of him as he fled, and giving chace observed that he took the road to Hamilton.[3] Here he was received in triumph by the Bishop of St. Andrew's, the Lord Arbroath, of whom Bothwellhaugh was a retainer, and the whole

[1] MS. Letter, St. P. Off. B. C. Hunsdon to Cecil, Berwick, 26 January, 1569-70.

[2] MS. Letter, St. P. Off. B. C. Hunsdon to Cecil, Berwick, 24 January, 1569-70. Also Id. Same to same, 26 January, 1569-70.

[3] MS. Letter, St. P. Off. B.C. Copy endorsed by Hunsdon himself. Hunsdon to Elizabeth, Berwick, 30 January, 1569-70.

faction of the Hamiltons. They instantly assembled in arms, declared Scotland once more free from the thraldom of an ambitious tyrant, who had been cut off at the very moment when he was plotting against the life of his sovereign; and resolved instantly to proceed to Edinburgh to join with Grange, liberate their chief, the Duke of Chastelherault, and follow up the advantage they had won.[1]

All these events took place with a startling rapidity, of which the slow progress of written description can convey but a faint idea: in the meantime the unhappy regent, though bleeding profusely, had strength enough to walk to the palace, where at first the surgeons gave hopes of his recovery. Mortal symptoms, however, soon appeared, and when made acquainted with them he received the information with his usual calm demeanour. When his friends bitterly lamented his fate, remarking that he might long since have taken the miscreant's life, and observing that his clemency had been his ruin, Murray mildly answered, that they would never make him repent of any good he had done in his life; and after faintly but affectionately commending the charge of the young prince to such of the nobility as were present, he died tranquilly a little before midnight.[2]

[1] MS. St. P. Off. Information anent the punishment of the Regent's murder.

[2] Spottiswood, p. 233.

I will not attempt any laboured character of this extraordinary man, who, coming into the possession of almost uncontrolled power, as the leader of the Reformed party, when he was little more than a youth, was cut off in the midst of his greatness before he was forty years old.[1] Living in those wretched times, when the country was torn by two parties which mortally hated each other, he has come down to us so disfigured by the prejudices of his contemporaries that it is difficult to discern his true features. As to his personal intrepidity, his talents for state affairs, his military capacity, and the general purity of his private life, in a corrupt age and court, there can be no difference of opinion. It has been recorded of him, that he ordered himself and his family in such sort, that it did more resemble a church than a court;[2] and it is but fair to conclude that this proceeded from his deep feelings of religion, and a steady attachment to a reformation, which he believed to be founded on the word of God. But, on the other hand, there are some facts, especially such as occurred during the latter part of his career, which throw suspicion upon his motives, and weigh heavily against him. He consented to the murder of Riccio; to compass his own return to power, he unscrupulously leagued himself with men whom he knew to be the murderers of the king; used their evidence to convict his sovereign; and refused to turn against them

[1] He was born in 1530, and slain in 1569-70.

[2] Spottiswood, p. 233.

till they began to threaten his power, and declined to act as the tools of his ambition. If we regard private faith and honour, how can we defend his betrayal of Norfolk, and his consent to deliver up Northumberland; if we look to love of country, a principle now perhaps too lightly esteemed, but inseparable from all true greatness, what are we to think of his last ignominious offers to Elizabeth? if we go higher still, and seek for that love which is the only test of religious truth, how difficult is it to think that it could have a place in his heart, whose last transaction went to aggravate the imprisonment, if not to recommend the death, of a miserable princess, his own sister and his sovereign.

All are agreed that he was a noble looking personage, of grave and commanding manners. His funeral, which was a solemn spectacle, took place on the 14th of February, in the High Church of St. Giles, at Edinburgh, where he was buried in St. Anthony's Aisle. The body had been taken from Linlithgow to Stirling, and thence was transported by water to Leith, and carried to the palace of Holyrood. In the public procession to the church it was accompanied by the magistrates and citizens of Edinburgh, who greatly lamented him. They were followed by the gentlemen of the country, and these by the nobility. The Earls of Morton, Mar, Glencairn, and Cassillis, with the Lords Glammis, Lindsay, Ochiltree, and Ruthven, carried the body; before it came the Lairds of Grange, and Colvil of Cleish; Grange

bearing his banner, with the royal arms, and Cleish his coat armour. The servants of his household followed, making great lamentation, as Randolph, an eye witness, wrote to Cecil. On entering the church the bier was placed before the pulpit, and Knox preached the sermon, taking for his text, "Blessed are the dead that die in the Lord."[1]

[1] MS. Letter, St. P. Off. Randolph to Cecil, Edinburgh, 22 Feb. 1569. Diurnal of Occurrents, p. 158.