

technical. Frenchmen have shown great ability in tackling the problems involved in the expression of the new ideas and the new material introduced into art, and in values, drawing, simplicity and directness of handling, the means to the end, they have taught our painters much. And if in some cases the method has mastered the painter instead of the painter the method with disastrous or only uninteresting results, in others, where it has been tempered with a larger outlook, with study of the great art of the past, and transfigured by personal and national sentiment it has achieved splendid things. The technical debt is perhaps more obvious in the case of sculpture, but even there one feels an essential difference in the temperamental and racial characteristics expressed.

The past sixty years of British art have been fertile in ideas and artistic experiment, subjects previously unthought of, effects before unobserved, emotions and sympathies until now unexpressed have been added to the material with which art deals, and, when all the trivial, and incompetent, and inartistic work produced has sunk and is forgotten in the abyss of time, there will still remain sufficient original and powerful art to make the Victorian era brilliant in the annals of British art, and important in those of Europe.

JAMES L. CAW.

ART. II.—WYNTOUN'S ORIGINAL CHRONICLE.

THOUGH it may still be possible for the historian to turn to Wyntoun's *Chronicle* for light upon the events of Scottish history, the Prior's voluminous work is of much greater interest from a literary and linguistic point of view. The *Original Chronicle* stands beside Barbour's *Bruce*, and the nameless *Legends of the Saints*, as a valuable monument of early Scottish literature and language. It was a work that evidently enjoyed a wide popularity in its day, if we judge by the number of copies which have escaped the general destruction of old Scottish

manuscripts and printed books. While the *Legends* exist in only one copy, and the *Bruce* in two, there are at least eight of Wyntoun which have a respectable antiquity (15th and 16th centuries), besides several later transcripts. This is an almost unique supply of material for fixing the text of an old Scottish work.

It was noticed by the antiquaries and historians of last century that these copies of Wyntoun did not all agree with each other. Besides the smaller discrepancies, which are inevitable in written versions of such a work, there were larger divergences, which suggested that the *Chronicle* must have undergone some changes at the hands of its author. The first, apparently, to call attention to these differences, and to attribute them to a revision of the work by Wyntoun himself, was Father Thomas Innes in his *Critical Essay on the Ancient Inhabitants of the Northern Parts of Britain or Scotland*, published in 1729. Unfortunately, as will appear in the sequel, Father Innes took hold of the wrong end of the string, and succeeded in entangling the whole subject for himself and others. The confusion has remained unravelled to this day, for Innes misled Macpherson, Wyntoun's first editor,* and the authority of both proved too much for David Laing.† The latter's mistake is the most unpardonable of all, as even the scanty light which he gives his readers on the points at issue, might have shown him the true path.

The matter which led Innes to quote Wyntoun as an authority was the vexed question of the antiquity of the Scottish monarchy. By the joint efforts of Fordun, Boece, Buchanan, and others, a belief in this had come to be the 'lie in the soul' of every patriotic Scot. Innes, in exposing Fordun's myth of the forty-five kings who reigned between Fergus son of Ferchard and Fergus son of Erc, brought in Wyntoun to bear witness that *he* had never heard of these kings. This is very true, but Wyntoun had the same difficulty to face as Fordun, though at first he did not quite realize it. It was when the crux came clearly before

* *The Orygynale Cronykil of Scotland*, etc., now first published, etc. London, 1795.

† *The Historians of Scotland: Wyntoun*, in three volumes, 1872-79.

him that he made the alterations which attracted the notice of Father Innes.

Long before the days of either Fordun or Wyntoun, it had been contrived that the Scottish monarchy should begin some centuries before Christ, so as to out-distance the claims of England. Fordun adopted a fabulous arrival of the Scots in Scotland in the year 330 B.C., and supplied a series of forty-five kings to cover the period between this and the coming of Fergus mac Erc (about 500 A.D.), which he antedated by a whole century. There was, however, another device to which other chroniclers had had recourse. This was to take the list of Scottish kings from Fergus mac Erc to Kenneth mac Alpin, and place it in front of the long line of Pictish kings, which began with the year 200 B.C. This plan was even more successful than Fordun's, for it made the Scottish monarchy date from about 450 B.C., and so furnished an excellent weapon of controversy.

It was this account, then, that Andrew of Wyntoun found in the course of his historic researches, and at first he accepted it without suspicion. When, after weary wanderings in the realms of ancient history and fable, he has at last reached the proper date for inserting the entry (Wyntoun is strong in dates), he devotes a special chapter to the rise of the 'Scottis and Peychtis' (Book IV., chap. 8). In 450 B.C., he tells us, the Romans adopted the laws of the twelve tables, and then he proceeds:—

' As in our stories written is,
Then in Scotland the Scottis
Begouth to reign and to steer,
Twa hunder full and forty year
Five winter and moneths three,
If that all suld reckon'd be,
Ere the Peychtis in Scotland
Come, and in it was dwelland.' *

After these lines he takes up the genealogy of Simon Brek's descendants, which he had broken off at the end of Book III., having there brought it down to Fergus mac Erch. From this

* Book IV., 1101-1108. In this and the following extracts I have for the most part modernized the spelling; the exact form of the original can readily be seen in Laing's edition.

Fergus he now enumerates thirteen kings of the Scots, ending with the sesquipedalian name of Hecgede Monavele MakDongat Downad-brec-son. Here he stops, with the words,

' Here I suspend this genealogy,
But I will speak mair thereof sune,
When all the lave till it is dune.'

The stories of Brennus, Alexander, and Hannibal, enable Wyntoun to meander through the next 250 years, and the Scottish narrative is resumed in chap. 19, with the coming of the Picts in 200 B.C. The account of their arrival * is followed by a few remarks on the Scottish monarchy, in these terms:—

' By them was Scottis in that tyde
Reignand, and the first man
Of thae was Fergus Erc-son than . . .
Fra Fergus even by line
Till that Kyned MacAlpine
Rase as king, and was reignand
Within the kinrik of Scotland,
Few persons [were] lineal ;
Some others fell collateral
As course made and qualitie
Heiris waverand for to be . . .
But fra this Fergus even by line
Kyned descended MacAlpine.
And, as we find in our story,
Cruthne that time MacKyny
Was the first intill Scotland
Atoure the Psychtis k̄ing reignand.' †

Such is the form in which these two chapters appear in the Royal MS., from which the text of Macpherson's and Laing's editions is taken. The same version is found in two other MSS., the Wemyss and the Harleian, the latter of which is an abridged, seventeenth-century copy.

If we now turn to the remaining manuscripts, the most important of which are the Cottonian, Edinburgh (two), and St.

* Some extra lines appear at this point in the Wemyss MS., and perhaps belong to the original text, being afterwards excised by Wyntoun (see Laing's edition, Vol. III., p. 176).

† Book IV., 1794-1814.

Andrews, we find that these chapters have undergone a complete transformation. A serious difficulty had either occurred to Wyntoun himself, or had been suggested to him by some other person. The misplacing of the Scottish kings from Fergus to Alpin had not effaced the older account, by which Kenneth mac Alpin, the conqueror of the Picts in 843 A.D., was the direct continuation of this line. Between Fergus and Kenneth there were, as Wyntoun says, 'few persons lineal;' in fact, there were only ten generations. Now, if Fergus began to reign in 445 B.C. and Kenneth was king in 843 A.D. these ten generations must have been of antediluvian longevity.

The discrepancy was a sad puzzle to Wyntoun, though he had some suspicions of the real solution. He could at least see that the series of kings he had given was hopelessly at variance with the chronology he had adopted, and so he withdrew it altogether. In the MSS. of which the Cottonian is a type, these two chapters exhibit the following form.* In chap. 8, after the lines already quoted ('As in our stories' down to 'was dwelland'), the list of kings disappears, and is replaced by a statement of the difficulty.

' But I will nocht tell you their name,
 Their condition nor yet their fame,
 For, possible suppose it be,
 Difficile yet it is to me
 To tell their namis distinctly,
 Or all their grèis severally,
 That before the Peychtis rase.

For, as our story mention mays (*makes*),
 Fergus Erch-son the first man
 Was, that in our land began,
 Before the time that the Peychtis
 Our kinrik wan fra the Scottis,
 And syne thae Peychtis reignand were
 A thousand ane and sixty year.

And fra this Fergus, doun by line
 Descendand even, was MacAlpine

* The Cottonian text is printed by Laing *in locis* on the lower half of the page.

Kenyaucht, that was aucht hunder year
 And three and forty passit clear
 Efter the blest nativitie
 Ere reignand he begouth to be,
 Fra * the Peychtis was put out.

The tenth man, withouten doubt,
 Was Kenyauch MacAlpine
 Fra this Fergus even by line :
 And sa thir ten suld occupy
 (Gif all were reckon'd fullily)
 Twelve hunder winter and well ma (*more*).
*But I can nocht conceive it sa,
 But that this Fergus was reignand
 With the Peychtis in Scotland ;*
 And thae ten that reignand were
 Efter this Fergus year by year
 (As they that the cornicle wrate
 Intill number set the date)
 Amang the Peychtis was reignand
 Within the kinrik of Scotland,
 And lived in bargane and in weir
 Till Kenyauch rase with his powere.

If others of mair suffiance
 Can find better accordance,
 This book at liking they may mend ;
 But I, now shortly to make end,
 Thinkis for to set their date
 As chroniclers before me wrate
 And cast and reckon'd, year by year,
 As the Peychtis reignand were ;
 And their date sa set I will
 When the process is led there-till.'

Briefly stated, the latter portion of this means that Wyntoun felt the necessity of giving up the idea that Fergus lived before the time of the Picts, especially as he found that some chroniclers placed his reign within the Pictish era. This is still more clearly stated in the revised version of chapter 19. Here the lines already quoted ('By them was Scottis,' etc.) are removed in favour of the following :—

* *i.e.*, from the time when.

'Sa, in our cornicles as we read,
 The Scots were reignand mony year
 Before the Peychtis comen were
 Within Scotland. I can nocht ken
 What they were called that reignit then ;
 But Fergus Erch-son i-wis
 The first of Scots he reckon'd is,
 That reignit, as the cornicles says,
 King before the Peychtis days :
 And, wha that redly see can,
 He was but the tenth man
 (For to reckon even by line)
 Before Kenyauch MacAlpine.

Others seir that we of read
 Between thae twa as they succeed,
 Some fell collaterale
 And reignand oure the Scottis hale,
 As course made and qualitie
 Heiris variand to be. . . .

But fra this Fergus even by line
 Kenyauch descended MacAlpine,
 And was but in the tenth gré
 And yet nearer, gif ye will see.
 Reckon what the tenth lived here,
 And how lang time they reignand were,
 And they all shall nocht exceed
 Three hunder year, withouten dread,
 Where in the Cornicle written is
 Twelve hunder and far mair i-wis,
 Fra first the Scottis were reignand
 Ere Kenyauch MacAlpine wan the land.

*But by other authors sere
 The Scots, I find, begouth to stere
 When that the Peychtis were reignand.
 To that I am accordand,
 And their date sa set I will
 When the process is led there-till.*

In-till this time by our story
 Cruthne,' etc.

A careful comparison of these two chapters in their double form cannot leave us in doubt for a moment as to which is the earlier, and which the later, version. The order in which I have

presented them above is the only possible way of understanding their relation to each other. Wyntoun was at first deceived by the old Chronicle, of which a copy existed in the Register of St. Andrews, and so placed the Scottish kings (from Fergus to Alpine) as reigning from 445 to 200 B.C. The date of Kenneth MacAlpine then 'gave him pause,' and he found it more in accordance with chronology and common sense to believe that the Picts were already reigning in Scotland before Fergus appeared on the scene. This is the natural explanation of the changes made in these chapters, and is one that does credit to Wyntoun's judgment. Father Innes, however, being carried away by the excellence of the Royal MS. in other respects, hastily assumed that it was 'the last review and edition (if I may speak so) that Wyntoun made of his chronicle, containing several corrections, additions, and alterations made in it upon better information.'

The confusion caused by this misapprehension is so well reflected in Innes's subsequent remarks, that it will be better to quote the briefer and clearer statement of his disciple, Macpherson, in which the absurdity is at once patent.

'Before Wyntoun's time the history of the Scots had been plunged into confusion almost inextricable by an insatiable and ignorant rage for antiquity, which placed the reign of Fergus 1200 years before that of Kenneth Mac Alpin, whom they made only the tenth in descent from him, thus involving themselves in the monstrous absurdity of allowing 120 years to each generation. Wyntoun saw and felt the dilemma, but not having sufficiently informed himself from ancient records, he could see no way of getting rid of it and fairly gave it up to "òthir of mare sufficians."

'Having afterwards obtained better information, he found it expedient to give a second improved copy of the Chronicle with the important correction, which by enumerating the years of Fergus and his successors reduces his æra pretty near to the truth, being even a little below it; though at the same time he could not drop the notion that the Scots were in Scotland 245 years before the Picts.'*

It is remarkable that both Innes and Macpherson could have missed seeing their mistake. If Wyntoun originally 'saw and felt the dilemma,' wherein lay the 'better information' and 'im-

* Macpherson's Preface, Laing's ed., Vol. I., p. xxxv.

portant correction'? In giving the list of kings from 445 B.C., and still asserting that Kenneth was not far distant from Fergus, he would simply have been ignoring the difficulty and repeating the traditional blunder. One can perhaps only charge Innes and Macpherson with a desperate confusion of thought, but David Laing had the means of discovering their error, and yet failed to correct it. This, however, is only in harmony with his general treatment of the manuscripts.

Laing, in fact, adds nothing to the discussion of the question, although he promises to do so. In a note to the eighth chapter of Book IV. (Vol. III., p. 215), he mentions the point, and adds, 'This will more particularly be described in the preliminary portion of this volume.' One turns to 'the preliminary portion,' but this is all that can be found there:—

'Though Wyntoun in the course of time, while compiling his Chronicle, made frequent corrections and additions, these were not to such an extent as materially to alter the work itself. The most important alterations (as already noticed in the preface) occur in chapters viii. and xix. of Book IV. in reference to the first advent and the succession of the Pictish * kings. The MSS. containing the corrected text are reckoned to be the last revised and completed text.'

The closing sentence seems worthy of Dogberry: 'Masters, it is proved already that you are little better than false knaves, and it will go near to be thought so shortly.' Laing, however, may mean that there was no edition later than the 'corrected text.' The way in which all discussion of the point at issue is avoided, makes one suspect that Laing had got into a dilemma as well as Wyntoun, without seeing his way out of it. He had in his own hands the materials for disproving the hasty assumption of Father Innes, but apparently never made the necessary inference from it. These materials are supplied by the Wemyss MS., which Laing has the credit of discovering. He even recognised its importance as 'enabling us to ascertain the actual extent of the Chronicle as it appears to have come from the author's hands, before the work was enlarged and sub-divided into Nine Books.'

* This should, of course, be 'Scottish.' Wyntoun has no doubts about the line of Pictish kings.

The clue thus indicated is not followed up, although some extracts from the MS., printed on pages 147-178 of Vol. III., are exactly what is needed for our purpose.

The Wemyss MS.,* as Laing perceived, represents an earlier edition of the Chronicle than either the Royal or Cottonian. We should expect, therefore, if the Royal were the *latest* edition (on the Innes-Macpherson-Laing assumption), to find the Wemyss and the Cottonian agreeing in the chapters on the Scottish kings. But they do not: it is the Wemyss and the Royal that present the same text, and the Harleian † goes with them because it belongs to the Wemyss type. ‡

ROYAL, COTTONIAN, ETC.

When Alexander our king was dede,
That Scotland led in luv and lé,
Away was sonce of ale and brede,
Of wine and wax, of gamyn and glé ;
Our gold was changèd into lede ;
Christ, born into Virginité,
Succour Scotland and remede,
That stad is in perplexité.

WEMYSS, HARLEIAN.

Sen Alexander our king was deid,
Away was sonce of ale and breid,
That Scotland left in luf and lé,
Of wine and wax, of gamyn and glé.
The gold was changit all in leid,
The frute failyeit on everilk tré.
Jhesu succour and send remeid
That stad is in perplexité.

That the Wemyss text is earlier than the Royal is an easy matter to establish on several grounds. While the prologue of the Chronicle is substantially the same in both editions, the chapter which follows it shows an important difference. In the Wemyss MS. it opens thus:—

‘ The Second Chapter tells how this
In Seven Books divided is.

* I am greatly indebted to the courtesy of Randolph Erskine Wemyss, Esq. of Wemyss, for access to this manuscript, which has enabled me to confirm several of the conclusions arrived at here.

† Macpherson, in a note to the passage quoted above, says:—‘ The transcripts from this corrected copy of Wyntoun are much scarcer than those from the first one. Innes, who had examined many, never saw any but the one in the Royal Library. The Harleian manuscript is another.’ It will be clear now that copies of this edition are scarce just because it is *not* the corrected one.

‡ This may safely be inferred from its version of the song on the death of Alexander III. (Wyntoun, Book VII., *fin.*), which agrees with the Wemyss text. The contrast with that of the other MSS. is very striking.

By the Eldis * I will devise
 In Seven Bukis this treatise,
 But I will nocht ay there mak end
 Where stories makes the Eldis kend.

The First Buke fra the beginning
 Sall treat till that Ninus King,' etc.

Then the contents of the seven books are successively detailed, ending with—

' The seventh sal mak conclusioun
 Of the noble generatioun,
 And of the blessit gude linage
 That came of the marriage
 Of Malcolm, King of Scotland,
 And Margaret, heir till England.'

On turning to the Royal text, we find that Wyntoun has made an entirely new division of his work, which he thus introduces :—

' *The divisions of all this book
 Into this next chapter ye look.*

In honour of the Orders nine
 Of haly Angels, the whilk divine
 Scripture lovis, on like wise
 I will depart now this Treatise
 In Nine Bukis, and nocht mae (*not more*).

And the First Buke of thae
 Sal treat fra the beginning
 Of the Warld, till Ninus king,' etc.

The two versions then agree for 14 lines, after which the accounts of Books IV., V., and VI. are re-written, and the chapter ends with—

' The Seventh, till Alexander our king,
 The third, of his days made ending.

The Auchtand, till the other Robert
 Our king was crowned efterwert.

The Ninth sal continued be
 In him and his posteritie.'

* *i.e.*, the Ages of the World : the MS. has 'eldest.'

There could in any case be little doubt that the Wemyss division into seven books was prior to that of the Royal into nine. But there is further evidence to establish this point. The Wemyss text is considerably shorter than the other. In spite of its division into books, the chapters are numbered straight on, and the second last one (chap. 197) is entitled—

‘ Of Robert our king’s ending,
And of his eldest son’s crowning.’

This corresponds to chapter 10 of Book IX. in the Royal MS., which then adds another 16 chapters, bringing the Chronicle down from 1390 to 1408 A.D. That Wyntoun originally stopped at 1390 is plain from the final rubric of the Wemyss M.S.

‘ Of the Chronicles thus ends the book
That hecht the Original, wha will look.’

Unfortunately, the last pages of the MS. are lost, and the rubric (which is preserved in the prefixed table of contents) may be rather a colophon than the title of a chapter.* Even in the Royal text, however, there are clear indications that what follows after this point is an addition to the original work. Lines 1153-1190 contain two statements: (1) that the preceding portion of the Chronicle (from Book VIII., chap. 20) was not Wyntoun’s own composition but that of some unknown author; (2) that he will not stop here, but go on to tell the more remarkable things which he had seen in his own time. This distinct break in the continuity of the work is entirely wanting in the Cottonian MS.,† which also, by several other omissions at this point, avoids making double mention of the coronation of Robert III. and his Queen. This is easily understood if it is recognized that the Cottonian is a later edition than the Royal.

It can be shown, moreover, that the Royal MS. was copied from one in which the new division into nine books had not been

* This point might be settled by the Harleian MS., which I have had no opportunity of examining.

† See the ‘Various Readings’ in Laing’s edition, Vol. III., p. 135. The St. Andrews MS. agrees with the Cottonian, the Second Edinburgh differs slightly (retaining more of the Royal text), while the First Edinburgh has suffered the loss of a number of leaves just at this point.

completed. It has no prologue, and no table of contents, to Book VIII., whereas both of these appear in the Cottonian. The archetype of R., therefore, ran straight on with Book VII., as does the Wemyss. Further, although R. does contain the prologue and contents of Book IX., these cannot have come from the same original as the rest of the text, the orthography being of quite a different character.

A curious survival of the original division into seven books is to be found (apparently in all the MSS.) in Book VIII., chap. 19. It comes at the point where Wyntoun introduces the matter not composed by himself:—

‘ Here Wyntoun pointis in this dyte
 What he gert of this treatise write,
 That tited is Originale,
 By his studious and thra* travail
 Sett it be simple as ye may see.
 In this Seven Bukis treated he,’ etc.

‘In this *Seven Books*,’ although we are close upon 3000 lines deep in Book VIII.; neither Wyntoun nor his copyists had ever noticed that the passage required to be altered.

Of the various points in which the Wemyss and Royal MSS. disagree, the following may be noticed. Laing quotes the Wemyss version of Book I., chap. 15, and Book III., chap. 10. These two passages have this feature in common, that the Royal MS., gives a number of links in the genealogies necessary to connect Malcolm Canmore with Adam, whereas the Wemyss omits the names, and simply says, in the first passage—

‘ And syne by line even discendand
 That to rehearse were tarryand.’

In the second passage it uses other words to the same effect. This discrepancy may be due to the scribe of W., and not to Wyntoun himself, especially as both MSS. agree in the passage in Book VI., line 2311 ff., where Wyntoun declares that he has omitted no person whose name he could find in the genealogical tree. Again, the last three chapters of Book VIII. in the Royal MS. containing about 500 lines, are represented by only one

* Persistent.

† Although.

chapter of 130 lines in the Wemyss, and here the Royal text has probably been expanded in the revision. On the other hand, chapter 43 of this book (= 180 in W.) belongs to the first recension, and was dropped in the later editions. Its occurrence in two other MSS. besides W. will be explained later. The reason for dropping it is obvious enough: the chronicler himself admits that it does not bear on the matter in hand. Exactly the same thing was done with a chapter in Book IX. (c. 196 in W.), which told of a great tournament held by three knights of Picardy, and of which the same confession is made by the author. The Wemyss MS. breaks off in the middle of this chapter, but the full text is preserved in the Second Edinburgh. Laing gives no hint of its existence, so that a whole chapter of the *Chronicle* still remains unprinted, the result of neglecting to make a careful collation of all the manuscripts.

There remains yet another remarkable feature which distinguishes the text of the Wemyss MS. from that of the Royal and Cottonian. This is found in the Rubrics, or rhyming couplets by which each new chapter is introduced and its contents indicated. Here again Laing points the way, without following it up to the end, or discovering where it led to. On p. 147 of Vol. III. he remarks, 'The Rubrics or Titles of the several chapters likewise vary in the different Manuscripts. The Wemyss MS. being wholly unlike the printed text, it was deemed advisable to give the entire series of Rubrics in a substantive form, etc.' Accordingly, these rubrics are printed, at length on pp. 149-164, and there Laing leaves the matter. It is a most surprising fact that he gives no hint of another MS. which contains the very same set. This is none other than the Second Edinburgh, which he describes on pp. xxiii. and xxiv. of the same volume, even remarking on the list of Rubrics which is prefixed to the MS. This specimen of editorial neglect is hardly what we should have expected from one with Laing's reputation for thoroughness. Macpherson is scarcely to blame for not having noticed the fact, for he only knew the Edinburgh MSS. through 'the very obliging communications of Alexander Fraser Tytler, Esq.'

The Second Edinburgh MS., however, is a member of the Cottonian group. The result of this is, that while in the

Wemyss MS. the rubrics are in harmony with the text, in EE. they are not. The scribe has taken his text from a copy of the latest edition of the *Chronicle*; he has got his rubrics from a MS. of the first edition.* The result is decidedly confusing in certain places. It would seem that he began to write from his copy of the first edition, for in ch. 2 he begins by stating that the work is divided into *seven* books (see the extract from W. above). After writing four lines of this, he discovered his mistake, and turned at once to the other copy, linking the two versions by the unmetrical line—

‘The first sal treit fra the beginning.’

Then he gives the contents of the *nine* books as in the Royal and other MSS., and apparently avoids confusing his copies thenceforward, though adhering throughout to the rubrics of the first edition.

Still more curious is the procedure of the scribe who wrote the St. Andrews MS., about which Laing makes many marvellous statements. ‘The rubrics,’ he says, ‘are much the same as in the printed text, but are numbered straight on, although actually divided into Books, with the Prologues not reckoned.’ The first and last of these assertions are not even half-true, for the prologues of Books II., III., V., VI., VII., *are* reckoned as chapters, and more than half of the rubrics are *totally different* from the printed text. These are strange blunders for an editor of Laing’s experience to make, and as he worked at the MS. in person, they must be supposed to be his own.

The fact is that our scribe, like the writer of the Second Edinburgh MS., had two copies to work from, but he began with only one of them, a MS. of the Cottonian type. This he continued to use by itself until he had reached the sixth chapter of Book V. At the end of this chapter in Laing’s edition (Vol. I., p. 314), there are 18 lines enclosed within square brackets; these are taken from the St. Andrews MS., though Laing nowhere says so. They do not occur in either of the Edinburgh MSS., and so are no doubt wanting in the Cottonian. They must have

* Of course this may really apply to the archetype instead of the MS. itself.

come from the new MS. which the scribe had got hold of, and this happened to be a copy of the first edition of the *Chronicle*.* The result of his new acquisition is remarkable; he now deserts the rubrics of his original MS., and adopts those of the other one. That is, from this point onwards to chap. 10 of Book IX., the rubrics of the St. Andrews MS. are the same as those of the Wemyss and Second Edinburgh. When this set ended at chap. 197, he was forced to return to the other series, and continues with it to the closing chapter of Book IX. The different portions may be tabulated thus:—

Chaps. 1-78 (Book I. 1, to V. 6)=Royal and Cottonian set.

„ 79-197 (Book V. 7, to IX. 10)=Wemyss (and Second Edinb.).

„ (unnumbered) (Book IX. 12 to 27)=Royal and Cottonian.

Laing's assertion, that the rubrics 'are much the same as in the printed text,' is therefore marvellous enough in itself, but it becomes more so when we find that in his *Additional Various Readings* he actually prints 28 rubrics from Books V., VII., and VIII. Yet he never sees that they form part of a series, and that this series is the same as the Wemyss one. After this, one is scarcely surprised at the statement made regarding chap. 43 of Book VIII., which Laing assures us is only found in the St. Andrews and Second Edinburgh MSS. It is also in the Wemyss MS., as already stated, and Laing even prints the rubric of it from that source. The scribes of St. A. and EE. thus got it from their copies of the first recension. The former, indeed, has produced great confusion in the closing chapters of Book VIII. by attempting to combine the text of both his copies, but into this it is not necessary to enter. Some irregularities in the numbering of the chapters are also to be explained by a desire to keep the numerals the same as in the Wemyss set.

That the St. Andrews MS. is a combination of two copies is clearly shown by another peculiarity of its rubrics. Although the scribe preferred the Wemyss set, he found that his other MS. sometimes inserted the heading at a different place in the text. This gave him the chance of using *both* rubrics, and he accordingly took over seven from the later set and put them in

* This is proved by the occurrence of these lines in the Wemyss MS.

their proper places, without numbering them as chapters. The result is well illustrated by the following instances in Book VIII. :—

ROYAL MS.	ST. ANDREWS.
c. iv. How the Council of France wrote Their deliverance of that de- bate.	c. 138. How Kyng Edwarde gaif fals sentence Agane the Broysse but con- science.
c. v. How Edward the King gave sentence Contrare till all gude con- science.	— How Edward the King gaif sentence Contrare till all gude con- science.
c. vi. Now followys a computatioune Of Lordis generatioune.	— Heir followis a computatioune Of Lordis generatioune.
c. vi. line 1063.	c. 139. How fyrst Cunynis com in Scotland, And how thai grew to stait beand.*

The existence of this double set of Rubrics is a very remarkable phenomenon in the different editions of the *Chronicle*. To change a whole series of metrical headings, nearly 200 in number, is a task which we can hardly attribute to any mere copyist, and the alteration is no doubt due to Wyntoun himself. The reason for it is not very obvious, as the earlier set (the Wemyss) is, if anything, the livelier of the two. The later series is marked at the outset by a greater regularity of form, the words 'This chapter' occurring in the great majority of cases throughout the first three books, while in the later ones the rubric very often begins with 'when.'

It is, however, unlikely that either of these principles would have induced Wyntoun to undertake the task of altering all his original rubrics. The explanation may rather be this. Wyn-

* Missed at first by the scribe, and added on the margin, where it has been mutilated in rebinding. The extra rubrics occur in Book VIII., chaps. 3, 5, 6, 12, 45, and Book IX., chap. 8. Other four or five might have been inserted in the same way. In one instance (c. 99=V. 13) the scribe has taken the rubric from the wrong set.

toun composed his chronicle, as he tells us, at the instance of Sir John of Wemyss. No doubt the first completed copy of the work would be sent to that knight, as the author's patron.* It is quite possible that Wyntoun may have had a fair copy made for that purpose by one of his subordinates, and that he then composed the headings for the different chapters. Neglecting to enter these in his own scroll, he would find himself compelled to make a fresh set for any subsequent copy, and in this way the double series would be formed. The other alternative is that one (or both) of the sets is not by Wyntoun at all.

In accordance with the different points established above, the more important manuscripts of the *Original Chronicle* may be arranged in three groups, each of which represents a separate edition by Wyntoun himself. How far each of these manuscripts ought to be considered in fixing our author's text, is a question into which I am not at present prepared to enter. Any answer to it would require to be based on a careful collation of all the MSS., the apparatus supplied by Macpherson and Laing being quite inadequate for the purpose. The groups, however, stand as follows:—

First Edition.	Original Rubrics and Text.	Wemyss [and Harleian].
Second ,,	New Rubrics, extended Text.	Royal.
Third ,,	Do., altered Text.	Cotton. First Edinburgh.

To these copies of the third edition may be added the Second Edinburgh and the St. Andrews, which have adopted the original rubrics, and in some places show a composite text. It is interesting to compare the above result with Laing's division of the MSS. (Vol. III., p. xvii.)

* The manuscripts, I imagine, may be referred to two classes, the *original* and the *amended* forms. In the first the Cronykil was divided into *seven books*, and the chapters run consecutively from Chapter I. to Chapter CXCIV.† Such are the MSS. Wemyss and Second Edinburgh.‡ In the

* The existing Wemyss MS. is not to be identified with this. It is a pretty late copy, and seems originally to have belonged to the Abbey of Cambuskenneth.

† Why 195? The Wemyss has 198 chapters, and the Second Edinburgh 212!

‡ The Second Edinburgh has *nine* books: see the account of the scribe's blunder above.

second class the Cronykil was divided into *Nine Books*, and the chapters of each book numbered separately. Of these are the Royal, St. Andrews,* First Edinburgh, and Cotton MSS. Perhaps there might be a third class, in which the later additions, contained chiefly in Book IX., may have been substituted and added to the older text.†

Another point upon which this investigation casts some light is the date at which the *Chronicle* was compiled. Here again a misconception has arisen from not distinguishing between the different parts of the work. It is evident enough that chap. 26 of Book IX. was composed later than the death of the Duke of Albany in 1420, but we have already seen that the whole of this part of Book IX. is an addition to the *Chronicle*, and cannot establish any date for the first draft of it. For one section of the work, however, there is a pretty plain indication which has hitherto been overlooked.

Upwards of 5000 lines of the *Chronicle* are not of Wyntoun's own composition: these extend from Book VIII., chap. 20, to Book IX., chap. 10, where the *Chronicle* originally ended with the death of Robert II. At this point (IX., 1117) the unknown author has these lines, according to the Royal MS. :—

' The third Robert thus crownèd was ;
 God of sweet will give him grace
 To govern and uphold his land
 In na war state than he it fand.'

It is evident that the prayer here made would have no meaning unless it were composed during the reign of Robert III., and probably not long after the commencement of that reign. Robert III. became king in 1390, so that we can hardly be wrong in dating this portion of the *Chronicle* as earlier than 1400; perhaps 1395 might not be far from the true date.

At what date had Wyntoun brought his own work down to the point where he incorporated that of his unknown predecessor? This is more difficult to determine. When he wrote the general prologue, found in the earliest as well as in the latest edition, he was already prior of St. Serf's Inch in Lochleven. It is uncertain in what year he attained to that dignity, but the Register

* The St. Andrews does *not* number the chapters of each book separately.

† The manuscript which comes nearest to this type is the Royal itself.

of the Priory of St. Andrews shows that he held the office in 1395, when he was present at a perambulation of the lands of Kirkness and Lochor. Taking this in connection with the date assumed above, we must fix the period of Wyntoun's literary activity as later than 1395. From the fact that the Royal MS. retains the phrase 'God . . . *give* him grace' in the passage quoted above, it might be argued that Wyntoun must have finished his own work, and added that of the unknown writer, at some date previous to 1406, the year in which Robert III. died. This, however, is not a safe conclusion: we have seen above how Wyntoun and his scribes mechanically retained the mention of 'seven books' after the work had been divided into nine. In the Second Edinburgh MS. the tense of the verb is altered, the line reading—

'God of his will *gave* him grace,'

but it would be rash to assume that the change is due to Wyntoun himself, unless it is an intermediate stage towards the complete recasting of the passage, which we find in the Cottonian and St. Andrews MSS.

Some years would naturally elapse before the work of his predecessor could fall into Wyntoun's hands as an anonymous production. Now we learn, from an entry in the existing Register of St. Andrews Priory, that in the year 1410 Wyntoun brought the Great Register (now lost) into court to prove certain privileges of his house. It was apparently from this very Register that Wyntoun derived his lists of the Scottish and Pictish kings. It is therefore a very natural supposition that his historical studies had led him to peruse the volume in question, and that in doing so he had stumbled upon the documents to which he appealed in the court of the official. On this hypothesis the approximate date of the first edition of the *Chronicle* would be 1410-1415, a date which would harmonize extremely well with what has been advanced above.

Wyntoun tells us (Book IX., 1165-1172) with what delight he added his predecessor's work to his own, 'for to mak me sum respyte.' It is quite probable that he then bestowed no more labour on it for some time, although several copies of it may

have been taken during that period. When he extended it, and made the new division into nine books, he was already an old man, as plainly appears from the Prologue to Book IX.*

In laying his hand afresh to his old work, Wyntoun decided to break up the long seventh book, and did so at the death of Alexander III., because the 'lineal succession' then gave way to the 'collateral' (VIII., Prol., 10 ff.). He then began Book IX. with the reign of Robert II., and resolved to bring down the narrative to a later date by adding various events which had taken place in his own time (IX., Prol., 17 ff.). The date of these alterations was probably after 1420, as there are indications that Wyntoun thought of closing his work with chapter 26, written after the Duke of Albany's death, and ending with the long alliterative lines:—

' Thy proper prole him pacify fra plicht and fra pyne,
Thou virtuous, inviolate, and verray Virgyne.†

Yet he set to work again, and went on for another five hundred lines, which tell of the exploits of the Earl of Mar, and end abruptly with that nobleman's return to Scotland. At some period after beginning to this revision and extension of his work Wyntoun must have altered the chapters relating to the Scottish

* Macpherson's inverted view of the various editions makes him declare that Wyntoun 'complains of the infirmities of old age when engaged in the *first* copy of his Chronicle.' It is evident from the similar expressions which occur in the 8th and 9th prologues, and in lines 1173-1190 of Book IX., that these were all written at the same time, the time of this later revision.

' Of this treatise the last end,
Till better than I am, I commend ;
For, as I stable mine intent,
Oft I find impediment
With sudden and fierce maladies
That me cumbers mony wise :
And eld me masters with her breves,
Ilka day me sair aggrieves,' etc.

† In the Second Edinburgh MS. these lines are thus reduced to Wyntoun's ordinary metre:—

' Thow keip and sauff him fra all pyne,
The quhilk is sueit and pure Vergyne. Amen.

kings, and probably inserted the whole of the new series of rubrics. If we suppose that the first set was composed several years before, and that he had kept no copy of them, it is not surprising that he remembered none of them and was forced to do the work over again.

If the conclusions arrived at above are sound, the current view of the Royal MS. of Wyntoun's Chronicle must be considerably modified. It is not, as its editors believed, the last completed and revised copy of the work, but can only rank as a second and enlarged edition. This, however, does not imply that its value as a text has been over-estimated. There is every probability that it comes closer to Wyntoun's autograph than any other manuscript now existing. It seems to present an older stage in the writing of the Scottish dialect * than any of those, which are in the normal spelling of the 15th and 16th centuries. Yet it is possible that some of its distinctive features may be peculiarities of Wyntoun's own orthography, or of the scribe's. The use of *-yd*, *-id*, instead of *-yt*, *it*, to form the past tense of weak verbs, is a usage not otherwise common in Scottish MSS., and is not uniform even in the Royal. It disappears after chapter 13 of Book IX., where a new scribe or a new manuscript must have come into operation.

On these and other points relating to the text it is impossible to speak at present, but they are questions which any future editor of Wyntoun will have to settle before deciding upon the manuscript he is to follow. As the Royal MS. is already printed in full, perhaps the best procedure would be to adopt the Cottonian as the basis of the text, and supply a close comparison with all the other copies, the early as well as the late editions. This would also give fuller material for investigating the language of the *Chronicle*, an enquiry which could not fail to be of great value for the study of Early Scottish.

W. A. CRAIGIE.

* Wyntoun, like other authors of his own and subsequent times, calls his language English (Book I., Prol. 30).