The

Scottish Historical Review

Vol. VI., No. 21 October 1908

Literature and History[1]

THE title I have chosen for this paper certainly leaves much to be desired in point of clearness and precision. It may suggest, for example, a difference of opinion that exists regarding the manner in which history should be written. According to one view history should have nothing whatever to do with literature. What we want from history is fact only, and all narrative and exposition, however admirable, only obscure or distort the fact which it is our primary object to ascertain and estimate. According to this conception of history, the most truthworthy form in which past events can be presented is a *catalogue raisonné*, which will present facts in their logical connections and leave the reader to draw his own conclusions. The upholders of the other view maintain that the investigator of the facts is likely to understand them better than his reader, that his reflections regarding them must have an independent value of their own, and that the merit of his narrative or exposition will depend on the skill and force with which he presents his own views, on the logical arrangement of his materials, the clearness and attractiveness of his style. In this conception history becomes literature in a true sense, for the historian, to attain his ideal, has need of aesthetic no less than of scientific qualifications for his task.

The consideration of these two views regarding the most fruitful method of presenting the facts of history might be the subject of an interesting enquiry. On the present occasion, however, it is another theme to which I would invite your

[1] An Address to the Glasgow University Historical Society.

attention. What are the relations between literature and the facts of history? What reciprocal light do they throw upon each other? How may we best study both to draw the fullest nutriment from them for our souls and minds? These questions, it is evident, may be regarded from two points of view—from the point of the writer of history and the point of view of the reader. Fortunately, the readers of history still outnumber its writers, and it may be more profitable to consider the point of view of the former class. It is from the reader's point of view, then, that the following remarks are made.

Regarded in their primary intention, history and literature may seem to be disparate and even antagonistic subjects. Taken in their essence, they make appeal to different desires and faculties of our nature. The primary aim of history is instruction, and when Bacon said that 'histories make men wise,' he implied that instruction must be the historian's main object. On the other hand, the primary aim of literature is not instruction but pleasure; its immediate appeal is not to the cognitive faculties, but to our emotions and our tastes. In point of fact, however, we cannot draw so hard and fast a line between the aim and scope of literature and history. There are histories which do afford pleasure as well as instruction, and there are purely literary productions which yield instruction as well as pleasure. Macaulay declared that he would make his history as interesting as a novel, and his publisher's cheque for £20,000 is a sufficiently cogent proof that he fulfilled his intention. Of George Eliot's novels it has been said that, as you read them, you feel as if you were in the confessional—which is surely instruction with a witness.

In one sense, and a very important sense, every production in pure literature is history, and the larger its scope, the greater its scale—the deeper and wider is its historical significance. The most trifling occasional poem is as much the product of the age to which it belongs as of the poet who wrote it. The thoughts, the emotions that inspire it are drawn from the spiritual and intellectual capital of the time, and the poet, so to speak, only draws his cheque on this funded capital which is the common property of his generation. True, his individual signature is affixed to the cheque; the poet, in so far as he is a real poet, has his own impression, his own vision of men and things. Nevertheless, the greatest and most important

portion of the materials with which he works is impersonal, and he is only an inheritor of the common stock.

If this be true of the slighter productions of literature, it is true in a larger and deeper sense of the great masterpieces of all times. For in proportion to the range of the poet's sympathy and intelligence is the extent to which he appropriates and expresses the thought and experience of the age to which he belongs. Such works as Dante's *Divine Comedy*, the Plays of Shakspeare, and *Paradise Lost*, are an epitome of the pre-occupations and speculations and aspirations of the times out of which they sprang. In Dante's great poem we have the presentation of almost every important interest that engaged the hearts and minds of his contemporaries. We find in it the official solution of human destiny in its eternal relations, and we find in it also the doubts and reserves with which that solution was accepted. In it, too, we find the clashing political and social ideals of the time, and the warring forces that imperilled the *unitas Catholica* which had been the ideal of the Medieval Church from its beginning. Above all we find in it the *spirit* of the time—a spirit which reveals itself in the intemperance of the poet's passions, equally of love and hate, and which led a certain critic, thinking of certain passages in the poem, to declare that it remains for ever a monument of human malevolence.

There can be no more instructive lesson in history than to pass from the poem of Dante to the Plays of Shakspeare. They are divided from each other by only three centuries, but what travail of thought and act and emotion had man passed through in that intervening period! Alike in form and substance the work of Dante and the work of Shakspeare belong to different worlds. The very centre of things is different for each. Dante's scheme of thought, alike in temporal and spiritual things, had the rigidity and completeness of that system which his age accepted from Ptolemy as the mechanical explanation of the universe. For Shakspeare, on the other hand, everything was an open question. His thought and fancy play over men and things with the unchartered freedom of a mind for which dogmatic assertion is a vain assumption of certainty, where certainty is impossible. Doubtless the different geniuses of the two men partly explain their different points of view. Born in the age and in the circumstances of Dante, Shakspeare by no possibility could have had Dante's vision of Hell, Purgatory,

and Paradise. But it is to history we must go for the adequate explanation of the difference in form and spirit that distinguishes their respective creations.

Between Dante's and Shakspeare's day the *unitas Catholica* had been fatally broken up; the philosophy, the science, the religious dogma of the Middle Age had ceased to dominate the mind of Christendom; and in their place had arisen those new conceptions of nature and man which were mainly due to the rediscovered world of classical antiquity. It was amid the ferment occasioned by this revolution that the genius of Shakspeare found its characteristic scope, and only by taking account of that revolution can we have any intelligent understanding of the substance of his work and of the spirit in which he regarded it.

The case of Shakspeare is the supreme illustration of Goethe's remark that he only can be said to know a poet who knows his age, but it is also an illustration of the essential relations between literature and history. We can have no adequate comprehension of the Shakspearian plays without regarding them as a product of the general mind of the age, but, on the other hand, how imperfect, how limited in depth and scope, would our conception of that general mind be if a Shakspeare had not been its exponent! Thus literature and history are the complements of each other, and the fulness of both is only realised when they are studied in their mutual relations.

The contrast between Dante and Shakspeare is hardly greater than the contrast between Shakspeare and Milton. In contrasting the work of Shakspeare and Milton we have again to take due account of their different types of genius. In no circumstances can we imagine that Shakspeare's free outlook on man and the world could have been possible to Milton. For Milton as for Dante it was an intellectual and spiritual necessity that he should have a definite system of thought embracing every subject that concerns the temporal and spiritual interests of men. This contrast between the mind of Shakspeare and the mind of Milton doubtless determined the fundamental distinction between their respective creations, but it is not an adequate explanation of the ideas that underlie them. In Milton's day, both in England and on the Continent, men were preoccupied with problems which had not taken definite shape in the age of Shakspeare. By the date when Milton had reached maturity the Protestant scholastic theology was

fully developed and in the third book of *Paradise Lost* we have its classical exposition, just as in Dante we have the classical exposition of the scholastic theology of the Middle Age. In Milton's preoccupation with those discussions which he assigns to the rebel angels in Pandemonium :

> Providence, Foreknowledge, Will and Fate,
> Fixed fate, free will, foreknowledge absolute,

he is the child of his time, and his concern with these problems is understood and properly appraised only when we have some acquaintance with the contemporary schools of Protestant thought. But, further—between Shakspeare's and Milton's day there had been development along the lines opened up by the Renaissance as well as by the Reformation. As the Renaissance found expression in Shakspeare and his contemporaries, it was the lust of life, the free play of human nature that was the predominating note. By Milton's day the influence of the revival of Classical antiquity had passed into a new phase. In literature it had now become a restraining and chastening influence as was to be signally illustrated in the great French writers of the seventeenth century—Racine, Boileau, Pascal and Bossuet. And in no great spirit is this new discipline more notably exemplified than in Milton, in whose work the new conception of classical purity and restraint of expression has its highest embodiment in English literature. Doubtless in any age Milton's genius would have tended to severity of form ; but had he lived when the Renaissance was at its flood-tide, when men's minds were intoxicated with the new wine of antiquity, such purity of form as he attained would have been impossible even to his genius. But he fell upon an age when maturer and discreeter ideas regarding the classical models prevailed, and it was these ideas working together with his own native instincts that enabled him to produce a poem which by its scope, its style, its structure is comparable to the great creations of antiquity.

It is the great poets who are the supreme interpreters of their age, for it is in their creations that the different sides of human nature find the fullest expression : in the words of Hamlet, they show us 'the very body of the time, his form and pressure.' But to receive the full impression of any age, not only its poets but its literature as a whole must be present to our minds. A book like Bacon's *Essays*, for

example, is an indispensable commentary on the age in which it was produced. The very titles of these *Essays* suggest the main interests of Bacon's contemporaries. Take such titles as these: 'Of Unitie in Religion,' 'Of Simulation and Dissimulation,' 'Of Seditions and Troubles,' 'Of Cunning,' 'Of Plantations,' 'Of the true Greatness of Kingdomes and Estates.' Bacon's choice of such themes and his manner of handling them give us a deeper insight into the time than any state documents revealing the machinations of statesmen and diplomatists. When Bacon chooses such a subject as 'Unity in Religion' on which to discourse, we are reminded of the great Protestant schism of the sixteenth century, and its determining influence on international relations and the relations of subjects to their rulers. When he writes on 'Dissimulation and Cunning,' we are reminded of the new diplomacy which was the birth of the same century, and of which Machiavelli was the arch-deviser and codifier. Thus, Bacon's book is a veritable transcript of his time—of its engrossing problems, of its ethical standards, of its conceptions of the general and individual life of man. On the other hand, the only adequate commentary on these *Essays* is the history of Europe from the day when Luther broke with Rome. Without this commentary the book loses half its meaning, for we thus miss what is all-important to know in the case of every book—how much of it is the author's own, and how much of it is the general property of his time.

Hitherto I have been mainly emphasising the importance of history as throwing light on literature; let me now say a few words on the light which literature throws on history. It is the unfortunate disability of the writer of history that he cannot jump off his own shadow. Do what he will he cannot get away from himself; his own temperament, his own sympathies and prepossessions, his own vision of life (for we all have one, whether we know it or not) create an atmosphere around him through which he sees, not the real lineaments of the past, but a spectral illusion which he mistakes for the reality. In the often-quoted words of Faust to the enquiring student Wagner, we have the final expression of the historian's impotence to divest himself of his own personality and to see a past age as it appeared to the men who made it. 'My friend,' says Faust, 'past times are for us a book with seven seals: what you call the spirit of past times is in truth but

the spirit of him who seeks to reproduce them.' Historians may, indeed, attain to varying degrees of impartiality; some may be more exact than others; may take more comprehensive views, may have a keener insight into the significance of the facts that come under their notice, but they cannot dissolve the refracting medium which is indeed the emanation of their own being.

But not only does his own personality come between the historian and the past; the age in which he lives casts its own shadow over all previous time. How differently did the eighteenth and the nineteenth centuries regard the great events and the great characters that have marked the course of man's destinies! In great things and small the judgments of the two centuries stand in equal constrast. Take one judgment by a representative mind of the eighteenth century. David Hume, in one of his literary essays, had occasion to compare Bunyan and Parnell, the author of *The Hermit*—a poem which few but specialists in English literature have now read, and his judgment on their relative merits is that Bunyan is to Parnell what a mole-hill is to a mountain. Can we imagine Hume pronouncing such a judgment had he been born in 1811 instead of in 1711? But, in point of fact, it is not only Hume that is speaking when he pronounces his opinion on the relative merits of Bunyan and Parnell, but the age of which he is the representative spokesman.

But let us take another example which illustrates with wider significance the different attitudes of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries towards the epoch-making events of the past. Like Hume, the historian Gibbon is one of the representative minds of the eighteenth century. His point of view with regard to the spiritual forces in human history is that of the movement, known as the *Aufklärung*, the Enlightenment, and in his famous chapters on the rise and spread of Christianity we have this attitude exemplified in all its implications. His account of the development of the Christian doctrines and institutions, as we know, is a masterpiece of irony—

> 'Sapping a solemn creed with solemn sneer.'

He records with all his mastery of lucid exposition the external events of the Christian movement. He expounds the policy of the Church and the policy of the empire, and seeks to show that by the concatenation of circumstances Constantine

the Great was constrained to identify himself with the new religion. The problem, as it presents itself to Gibbon, is one simply of dynamical forces—these forces being the clashing interests of sects and parties, the vanity and ambition of individuals, the superstition of the masses. By the fortuitous working of these forces it came about that Christianity emerged triumphant from its death-struggle with Paganism, and by the same fortuitous means it continued to maintain its supremacy. Of religion as an instinct in man, as a force that lay behind all doctrines and institutions, behind the policies of statesmen and ecclesiastics, Gibbon had no conception ; and if the conception had been presented to him he would have regarded it as the lingering delusion of the ages of unenlightenment.

By temperament, Gibbon was unsympathetic with enthusiasm in any form ; in no age could he have been fired with ardour for any cause. But, had he lived in the nineteenth century instead of the eighteenth, he would not have written of Christianity as he did. By the beginning of the nineteenth century the philosophy of the 'Enlightenment' no longer satisfied the minds of thinking men. They realised that religion was a constituent element of human nature and in itself one of the potent factors in the development of humanity, that it was not a figment devised by cunning priests at a given moment as a convenient means of exploiting their fellow creatures. To illustrate the different points of view of the two countries, let us take a criticism passed on Gibbon's account of the spread of Christianity by one of the most eminent critics of the nineteenth—the French critic Ste. Beuve. Personally Ste. Beuve was at the same point of view with regard to Christianity as Gibbon. He regarded it as a purely natural development, which can be adequately explained by human nature itself and the historical conditions under which the Christian faith made its way into the world. But what is his judgment on the explanation given by Gibbon in his famous chapters? Gibbon, he says, writes of religion like a mandarin. What he meant was that Gibbon dealt with religion in a purely external fashion, and that he was incapable of understanding its real nature and the modes of its working. And Ste. Beuve goes on to make a notable remark which Gibbon could never have made, though both were at one in their attitude towards historical Christianity. 'The moral innovation effected by Christianity,' says the French critic, 'was that it inculcated a keener, a more absolute senti-

ment of truth.' And it is in this keener sense of truth that he finds the explanation of that intolerance of other religions which distinguished the Christian from the Pagan. No doubt Ste. Beuve had finer critical instincts than Gibbon, but had he lived in the eighteenth instead of the nineteenth century, even his finer instincts would not have suggested such judgments as those that have been quoted.

The conclusion is that the writer of history sees past ages through a double veil—the veil of his own personality and that of the age to which he himself belongs. But is there any means by which the reader can escape from this double illusion which is thus woven round the past? The question is one which it is the business of philosophy to answer, for it is simply the old question whether mortals are capable of envisaging the ultimate reality of things. Waiving this question, therefore, let us ask another which can be more simply answered. How may the reader of history best guard himself from the inevitably personal presentment of any given period of the past by the later historians of that period, and how can he most effectually assure himself that his own illusions are at least his own? The judicious reader has, of course, one means always at his disposal. He can make his own reserves with regard to the personal element in the work of the writer who is engaging him. He will see that the historian, belonging to some particular school of thought, is apt to select facts and pass judgment on them in accordance with his own point of view. And he will make his qualifications not only with reference to the historian's opinions, but also to the mental qualities which are exhibited in his work. He will make the necessary abatements according as the historian is rhetorical or sentimental, rash or unduly cautious, optimistic or pessimistic in his outlook on human affairs. Such checks as these are in the power of every reader, but they will enable him only partially to control the general picture of a period presented by another mind. Fully to control it, he would require such an amount of knowledge as would enable him to form an independent picture of his own.

But there is another means by which the reader of history may effectually guard himself against the idiosyncrasies of individual historians. It is in the literature of any period that we have the veritable expression of its spirit, defeatured by no distorting medium. By acquainting ourselves, says Bacon, with the substance, the modes of expression of the literature of any

age, we, as it were by incantation, evoke its genius from the dead. Acquainted with this 'genius' of the age, we are enabled to see its events, its men in their true lineaments and proportions. The chief cause of misconception regarding the great characters of past times is that they are so frequently estimated out of relation to the age to which they belong. To correct such misconceptions not only knowledge is required, but the constant reminding ourselves that we must not apply present standards to their words and actions. Take, for example, one great man who has already been mentioned—the poet Milton. The contrast between Milton the poet and Milton the controversialist is so shocking to modern feeling that it is almost inconceivable that they should be one and the same man. When we think of the grace and pure beauty of such poems as *Lycidas*, *L'Allegro*, and *Comus*, of the sublimity of *Paradise Lost* and *Samson Agonistes*, we are at a loss to understand how the same hand could have written such things as the replies to Salmasius. In point of fact, however, the scurrilous and brutal language of Milton towards his adversaries had been the current coin of scholars for more than a century before his day. In their controversies with each other these scholars, humanists they called themselves, thought that in the interests of truth it was perfectly legitimate to traduce the private character of those who differed from them. Peter Ramus, the unflinching critic of the mediaeval Aristotle, was constantly reminded by his antagonists that he was the son of a charcoal-burner. Salamasius exulted that he had knocked Milton blind in the course of their repeated encounters, and Scioppius, another humanist, congratulated himself on having killed Joseph Scaliger by the exposure of his vaunted pedigree. The fact that Milton's controversial style was not peculiar to himself does not indeed make us regret the less that he indulged in it, but it reminds us that we must not judge him by modern canons of good taste and feeling.

The difficulty of attaching their proper meaning to the spoken and written words of a past age is, indeed, one of the chief obstacles in the way of understanding it. We read a letter, a sermon, a speech of a past century; we attach a definite meaning to every word, and we imagine we have taken in the full mind of the writer or speaker. But the truth is that words expressive of the deeper thoughts and feelings of men vary in suggestion with every age. Words that to one age savour of unctuous

hypocrisy once expressed honest and genuine feeling. During the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries biblical phraseology was applied in a way that the hasty modern reader is apt to set down as cant—the truth being that the English Bible was then a new book whose words came home to men's minds with a freshness and point of which familiarity has deprived them.

The later historians of a past age cannot enable us to appreciate those delicate shades of thought and feeling which distinguish it from every other. The only means of acquiring this power of appreciation is to make ourselves familiar with the literature of the period in question. But we cannot read all the literature of the time, and it is necessary to determine what portions of it may be read with most profit. Lord Bacon, in the passage already quoted, distinctly says that it is enough even for the historian himself that he should 'taste' (*degustare*) the literature of the period, whose history he undertakes to write. For the reader of history, therefore, it is sufficient that he should familiarise himself with the chief literary productions of the period he may choose for special study. As has already been said, it is in the representative poets that we find the spirit of the age in its most concentrated, most comprehensive, and most vital expression. But there is another form of literature which, if the age has produced it, is invaluable for its adequate understanding. In certain periods there have been minds with a genius for systematising the general thought and experience, and for condensing them in a great work, which remains as a perpetual memorial of the epoch that produced it. Such a work, for example, is the *Leviathan* of Thomas Hobbes—a work whose scope and intention embodies the ideals, carried no doubt to extremes, of similarly-minded Englishmen of his generation. Read from the point of view of history, Hobbes' book is a revelation of the conflicting ideals in politics and religion which underlay the great struggle between Crown and Parliament in the first half of the seventeenth century. At the close of that century we have another thinker, John Locke, whose work was in no less degree conditioned by the experience of his time, of which it remains the equally durable memorial. The value of the work of such thinkers is that it not only reveals the conflicting ideals of their own time, but it links that time with the past and future of the total experience of the race. When we lay down Hobbes and take up Locke, we become aware of the never-ceasing endeavour of

humanity to adjust itself to the changing conditions under which its life is lived. And what is history but the tale of this endeavour on the part of man since he first awoke to conscious purpose?

One of the great masters of history has said that the highest result of its study is the acquired ability to appreciate the differences between times and countries, nations and races. The full attainment of this power implies a sweep of knowledge which can be the acquisition of only a few. But to acquire a familiarity even with one other age than our own is a great intellectual gain. It saves us from the mechanical acceptance of standards which we are apt to think absolute for all time; it supplies us, so to speak, with a parallax from which we can more adequately estimate men and events in all countries and in all ages. The ability to see things in their true relations marks, in fact, the distinction between the educated and the uneducated mind. The whole process of education, we may say, is to lift men out of their immediate surroundings and to provide them with larger measures of things. And for such as have a predilection for what are called the humane studies, there could perhaps be no better discipline towards this end than the mastery of some one period of the past, which by the greatness of its events and the eminence of its actors marks an epoch in the history of humanity. The period we choose will be determined by our own personal affinities, for there are periods which appeal to our individual temperaments and modes of thought more powerfully than others. Some will be attracted by such a century as the eighteenth, with its love of measure and proportion, others to such a century as the sixteenth, when human passions had their freest play and the fountains of the great deep were broken up. The period once chosen, the method of study I have suggested can hardly fail to result in a living acquaintance with the specific characteristics that distinguish it from every other. As our study deepens, these characteristics appear with increasing clearness of definition, and the spectacle arises before us of a world, inhabited by men of like passions with our own, but whose aims, whose interests, whose modes of thought exhibit human nature under other aspects, and remind us that the preoccupations of our own day are likewise but another passing stage in the general experience of humanity.

P. Hume Brown.

Chronicle of Lanercost

STUDENTS of English and Scottish history in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries have so long been familiar with the record known as *The Chronicle of Lanercost* that an English translation may seem to be a superfluity. But, whereas the tendency of modern education is to exchange the study of the classics for a diversity of other subjects reputed to be of greater utility, it is certain that a far smaller proportion of educated persons can read Latin easily in the twentieth century than could do so in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, before that flexible language had ceased to be the common medium of scientific and literary intercourse. Now the writer of this chronicle permitted himself so many digressions from his formal narrative, betrayed such an ardent purpose of exalting his own monastic order by explaining its advantages over every other, and threw so many sidelights upon the social conditions of his time, that it seems possible that both amusement and instruction may be found in his work by many readers who, unversed in Latin, lack time for arduous historical research.

The Latin text was edited from the oldest extant MS.[1] by the late Joseph Stevenson with his usual acumen and fidelity, and printed for the Maitland and Bannatyne Clubs in 1839. 'The whole Chronicle,' wrote Stevenson in his preface, 'as it now stands has been reduced to its present form, about the latest period of which it treats, by a writer who had before him materials of a varied character and of unequal merit.' In this form it has been appended as a continuation to Roger de Hoveden's *Annals*.

In Stevenson's opinion there is no warrant for attributing the origin of this chronicle to the Priory of Lanercost. He judged from internal evidence that it was written by a Minorite Friar of Carlisle. Without venturing to differ from so perspicuous

[1] British Museum, Cottonian MSS. Claudius D vii.

a critic as Father Stevenson, I think that it is apparent from that very evidence that a resident of Lanercost is responsible for certain passages. For instance, in respect of King Edward's visit to Lanercost in September, 1280, Dr. Stevenson observes that, had the notice of an important event been written at Lanercost, the inmates of that monastery would have dwelt thereon at greater length. True; but, as Dr. Stevenson had already pointed out, the narrative is a compilation from 'materials of a varied character and of unequal merit.' On 22nd March following after King Edward's visit it is recorded that Bishop Ralph of Carlisle performed a visitation at Lanercost, 'in which we were obliged [*coacti sumus*] to accept new constitutions.' It seems clear from this that a member of the convent is writing on the spot. Probably his manuscript formed part of the 'materials' employed in compilation by a Friar of Carlisle, who may have pared away a good deal that was of purely local interest. Another indication of compilation from plural sources occurs in the occasional repetition of the same event in different words. Thus in the year 1272 the death is twice recorded of Henry IV.'s brother, once as Richard king of Germany, and once again as Earl of Cornwall. The entire work covers the period from 1201 to 1346. The translation now presented only extends over the reigns of Edward I. and II. and part of the reign of Edward III., a period of perennial interest to Scotsmen, who, however, must not be offended at the bitter partizanship of a writer living just over the Border.

HERBERT MAXWELL.

CHRONICON DE LANERCOST, 1272-1280*

AFTER the Church's three years widowhood, as it was called,[1] when all men were laughing at the College of Cardinals, the Archdeacon of Liége, who A.D. 1272. had accompanied [our] Lord Edward in his journey to the Holy Land, was elected Pope, and was named Gregory the Tenth. He sat for four years and ten days, and the seat was vacant for ten days. In the third year of his pontificate he held a solemn council at Lyons of five hundred bishops, six hundred abbots and three thousand other prelates, for the good of the Church and especially of the Holy Land, which he desired to visit at another time; at which council, among many other excellent acts, it was decreed that whensoever the name of Jesus should happen to be heard in church, every head, whether of layman or cleric, should be bowed, or, at least, every one should do adoration in thought.

The Greek official delegates were present with the Patriarch at this Council, and solemnly affirmed, by singing in their own language, the creed of the Holy Spirit proceeding both from the Father and the Son, to which [doctrine] they had not assented previously to that time. There were present also Tartar delegates, asking on behalf of their own people for teachers of the Christian faith, in token whereof they returned to their own [country] having been catechised and baptised.

In this Council the Orders both of Preachers and Minorites were approved and confirmed for the Colleges of Mendicants. But it would be a long matter to mention all the good things which were settled there.

And so in the year of the Consecration of this Pope, there arose, as is reported, a great dispute in the [Papal] Curia over the election of William Wishart[2] many of them raising so many objections that the Head of the Church himself, having examined the objections set forth in writing, vowed by Saint Peter that if a moiety of the allegations were brought

* Further instalments of this translation of the Chronicle of Lanercost will appear in future numbers of the *Scottish Historical Review*.

[1] The Papal throne was vacant for two years and nine months, 1268-71.

[2] To the see of St. Andrews in 1271.

against himself, he never would seek to be Pope. At length, by intervention of the grace and piety of Edward, he [Wishart] was consecrated under the Pope's dispensation. For the sake of example I do not hesitate to insert here what befel him later when he applied himself to his cure. Indeed, it is an evil far too common throughout the world that many persons, undertaking the correction of others, are very negligent about their own [conduct], and, while condemning the light offences of simple folk, condone the graver ones of great men.

There was a certain vicar, of a verity lewd and notorious, who, although often penalised on account of a concubine whom he kept, did not on that account desist from sinning. But when the bishop arrived on his ordinary visitation, the wretch was suspended and made subject to the prelate's mercy. Overcome with confusion, he returned home and beholding his doxy, poured forth his sorrows, attributing his mishap to the woman. Enquiring further, she learnt the cause of his agitation and became bitterly aware that she was to be cast out. 'Put away that notion,' quoth she to cheer him up, 'and I will get the better of the bishop.'

On the morrow as the bishop was hastening to his [the vicar's] church, she met him on the way laden with pudding,[1] chickens and eggs, and, on his drawing near, she saluted him reverently with bowed head. When the prelate enquired whence she came and whither she was going, she replied: 'My lord, I am the vicar's concubine, and I am hastening to the bishop's sweetheart, who was lately brought to bed, and I wish to be as much comfort to her as I can.' This pricked his conscience; straightway he resumed his progress to the church, and, meeting the vicar, desired him to prepare for celebrating. The other reminded him of his suspension, and he [the bishop] stretched out his hand and gave him absolution. The sacrament having been performed, the bishop hastened away from the place without another word.[2]

About this time there departed this life a certain prebendary of Howden church named John, a man of honourable life, passing his days modestly and without ostentation, skilled in astrology, given to hospitality and works of mercy. He began [to build] a new choir to the church at his own expense, and

[1] *Pultæ* = broth, pap or porridge, seems to have been used in the plural just as 'porridge' and 'brose' are so used in Lowland Scots at this day.

[2] *Quasi mutus.*

foretold that the rest should be finished after his death; which [saying] we [now] perceive more clearly in the light; for, having been buried in a stately tomb in the middle of the choir itself, he is revered as a saint, and we have beheld, not only in the choir, but the wide and elaborate nave of the church completed through the oblations of people resorting [thither].

In the same church there lived at that time another master, called Richard of Barneby, a true and pure man, who, putting away from himself his private means, was residing at Gisburn in return for his money.[1] He was formerly well known in the kingdom of Scotland as a cleric of the religious community of Kelso. On leaving that kingdom he commended his nephew, who is still living, to Sir Patrick Edgar, knight, for education and service. After a lapse of years, at the above-mentioned time, he ended his life in a fatal manner, when his nephew in Scotland, [feeling] his bed shaken, was putting on [his] garments or shoes. And behold, a bird of the size of a dove, but differing in appearance by its variety of colour, entered by the chimney of the house and attacked the said youth with its wings, striking him with so much noise, that the people in the kitchen wondered at the sound of blows, and the lad [thus] belaboured sat still as though stunned. This [the bird] did thrice, retiring each time to the beams of the roof. After about the space of a month had elapsed, the youth went on business to Kelso, and on drawing near, heard all the bells of the monastery sounding. Entering within the walls, he asked what was the cause of bell-ringing. 'Do you not know,' they said, 'that your uncle, our clerk, has died at Gisburn, on such and such a day and hour? The abbot received the news yesterday, and to-day is commemorating him.'

What lesson such an apparition was intended to convey, let him who readeth explain.

In the same year Richard King of Germany died.

In the same year died the Earl of Cornwall, brother of King Henry of England.[2]

[1] *Perhendebat*, a verb form from *perendinus*, the day after to-morrow.
There was a canonry at Gisburn, in Yorkshire, valued, says Matthew Paris, 'at 628 poundes yearlye.'

[2] These two entries refer to one and the same person, viz. Richard, Earl of Cornwall, brother of Henry III., elected King of the Romans by four out of seven electors in 1257; but the minority having elected Alphonso X. of Castile, Richard failed to establish his authority, and returned to England in 1260.

In the same year Friar Robert of Kilwardby, of the Order of Preachers, was consecrated Archbishop of Canterbury.

Boniface Archbishop of Canterbury died, and in his place was elected the Prior of Holy Trinity; but on coming before the Sacred College his election was quashed, and his dignity conferred by the Pope upon Robert of Kilwardby, Prior Provincial of Preaching Friars in England. This person, a man of honourable life, a doctor of divinity, devoted to the study of God's Word, ruled and corrected the clergy as firmly as the laity, as his treatise on heresy and his condemnation of Oxford show by themselves.[1]

A.D. 1273.

Also at this time King Henry of England, devout servant of God and the Church, departed from this world, on the feast day of Saint Edmund, Archbishop of Canterbury,[2] after he had ruled over England fifty-six years and four months. He was buried at Westminster, and the absence of his son [3] caused the coronation to be deferred.

In the time of this Henry a boy named Hugh was crucified in Lincoln by impious Jews, in derision of Christ and Christians, nor were they able to conceal him by any device.

Now in the beginning of King Henry's reign, Louis, son of the King of France, invaded England with Frenchmen at the instigation of some people of the country, as has been aforesaid; but afterwards intestinal war broke out at Lincoln between the English and French, where the French were beaten and Thomas Count of Perch was slain with many others. But the son of the King of France narrowly escaped in great terror, wherefore after his escape some Frenchman composed this rhyme:

> 'Enthroned in La Rochelle, our king never quails
> Before Englishmen armed, for he broke all their tails.' [4]

To which an Englishman replied thus:

> 'Lincoln can tell and the French King bewails
> How the rope bound his people to Englishmen's tails.' [5]

[1] Excellent work, no doubt; but it had been better if, when appointed Cardinal-Bishop of Porto and Santa-Rufina in 1278, he had not removed all the registers and political records of Canterbury to Italy, whence they never returned.

[2] 20th November, 1272.

[3] On the last Crusade.

[4] *Rex in Rupella regnat, et amodo bella*
Non timet Anglorum, quia caudas fregit eorum.
The taunt of *Angli caudati* is ancient and well known.

[5] *Ad nostras caudas Francos, ductos ut alaudas,*
Perstrinxit restis superest Lincolnia testis.

This King Henry in his youth, at the instigation of Peter, Count of Brittany, crossed the channel to Brittany to recover the territory owned and lost by his predecessors; but failing altogether of success in his undertaking, returned [home] luckless and empty-handed.

In truth, whereas diligence in evil seldom has a good issue, it pleases one to relate an instance rather for the sake of justice than from ill-will to an individual. Queen Margaret of Scotland, deeply distressed by her various trials, chiefly by the death of her father[1] and by anxiety about the return of her brother,[2] went forth one beautiful evening after supper from Kinclavin to take the air on the banks of the Tay, accompanied by esquires and maidens, but in particular by her confessor, who related to me what took place. There was present among others a certain pompous esquire with his page, who had been recommended to him by his brother in the presence of his superiors. And as they were sitting under the brow of the bank, he [the esquire] went down to wash his hands, which he had soiled with clay in playing. As he stood thus bending over, one of the maids, prompted by the Queen, went up secretly and pushed him into the river-bed.

'What care I?' cried he, enjoying the joke and taking it kindly, 'even were I further in, I know how to swim.'

Wading about thus in the channel, while the others applauded, he felt his body unexpectedly sucked into an eddy, and, though he shouted for help, there was none who would go to him except his little page-boy who was playing near at hand, and, hearing the clamour of the bystanders, rushed into the deep, and both were swallowed up in a moment before the eyes of all. Thus did the enemy of Simon and satellite of Satan, who declared that he had been the cause of that gallant knight's destruction, perish in sight of all; and the matron, led away unduly by affection for her parents,[3] received rebuke for her selfish love, and showed herself before all men wounded to the heart by overpowering anguish.

From the Beginning of the World 6470 years.

In beginning the eighth part of our work and, as it were, the peace of our age with a new king, I deem it meet to put this

[1] Henry III. [2] Edward I. who was on his journey home from the Crusade.

[3] Or spoilt by the undue affection of her parents [*nimis affectu parentum seducta*]. The construction of the last paragraph and the moral are alike obscure.

foremost in our desires, that, as the renewer of the old Adam, seated in the paternal throne, said—'Behold, I make all things new, so he (the king) may induce new growth of virtues [to spring] in the Church, and that new joys may be bestowed upon us through the king and in time following, whereof now we have undertaken to treat.

A.D. 1274.

Accordingly, messengers were sent to the Council assembled, as aforesaid at Lyons, whereat the heir of England attended, urging him to return to his country and restore the condition of the desolate realm. Returning accordingly to England in the same year, being thirty-five years and two months of age, he was received in most honourable manner by the whole nation, [and] was solemnly anointed and crowned on the 14th of the kalends of September[1] by the Archbishop of Canterbury, Brother Robert of Kilwardby. The nobles of the land attended the ceremony with a countless multitude, redoubling the display of their magnificence in honour of the new king. But my lord Alexander King of Scotland, who attended with his consort and a train of his nobility, exceeded all others in lavish hospitality and gifts.

Before the date of this coronation, Robert of Stichell, Bishop of Durham, died on his return journey from the Council, about two days' journey on this side of Lyons. He had besought from the Pope letters and license for his resignation, [because] he disliked to be mixed up in worldly trouble. In dying, however, he suffered the greatest remorse of conscience because he had deprived the burgesses of Durham city of liberty of pasture, and bestowed it upon those who needed nothing. Therefore in proof of penitence and in token of his desire for reconciliation with St. Cuthbert, he gave his ring to his confessor to be carried to the shrine of the saint, vowing that, should he recover health, he would annul that gift.

In this year Margaret, Queen of Scotland and sister of the King of England, died on the fourth of the kalends of March.[2] She was a woman of great beauty, chastity, and humility—three [qualities] seldom united in one individual. When her strength was failing many abbots as well as bishops collected to visit her, to all of whom she refused entrance to her chamber; nor from the time that she had received all the sacraments from her

[1] 19th August, 1274.

[2] Feb. 27, 1274, or, according to our reckoning 1275; but in the Calendar then prevailing in Britain the year began on 25 March.

confessor, a Minorite Friar, until her soul passed away, did she admit any other to discourse, unless perhaps her husband happened to be present. She left behind her three children—Alexander and David and a daughter Margaret, all of whom followed their mother in a short time, owing, it is believed, to the sin of their father.

Richard of Inverkeithing, Bishop of Dunkeld, departed from the world, treacherously poisoned, as is affirmed, and it is believed by many that the aforesaid Queen [perished] in the same manner. For, after the death of the aforesaid man, a certain [fellow] author of this plot,[1] drawing near to death, declared that he had sold poison in this place and that, and that a full bottle thereof still remained in Scotland. And seeing that the movables of bishops dying in that kingdom devolve upon the king, he [the Bishop of Dunkeld] only and one other named Robert de la Provender, Bishop of Dublin, whom we remember above all others, so made a virtue of necessity at the point of death by distributing their goods, that they left scarcely anything to satisfy the cupidity of royal personages.

A.D. 1275.

About the same time in England there lived in Hartlepool William Bishop of Orkney, an honourable man and a lover of letters, who related many wonderful things about the islands subject to Norway, whereof I here insert a few lest they should be forgotten. He said that in some place in Iceland the sea burns for the space of one mile, leaving behind it black and filthy ashes. In another place fire bursts from the earth at a fixed time—every seven or five years—and without warning burns towns and all their contents, and can neither be extinguished nor driven off except by holy water consecrated by the hand of a priest. And, what is still more wonderful, he said that they can hear plainly in that fire the cries of souls tormented therein.

In the same year there [fell] a general plague upon the whole stock of sheep in England.

In this year, on the seventh day of the month of October, the King of Scotland's fleet steered into the port of Ronaldsway. Straightway Lord John de Vesci and the king's chief men with their forces, landed on Saint Michael's Isle,[2] the

[1] *Hujus confectionis.*

[2] Near Castletown, Isle of Man. S. Michael, having been set to guard the gate of Eden after the expulsion of Adam, is commonly the patron of extra-mural churches and of islands, such as Mont-Saint-Michel and S. Michael's Mount.

Manxmen being arrayed for war under Godred the son of Magnus, whom shortly before they had made their king. But the nobles and chieftains of the King of Scotland sent to treat for peace with Godred and the people of Man, offering them the peace of God and of the King of Scotland, provided they would desist from their most foolish presumption and submit in future to the king and his chief men. But as Godred and certain of his perverse counsellors would not agree to the treaty of peace, on the following day before sunrise, when the shades were still upon the land and the minds of foolish men were darkened, a conflict took place and the wretched Manxmen, turning their backs, were terribly routed.

Pope Gregory died and was succeeded by Innocent the Fifth, a native of Burgundy, whose previous name was Peter of Taranto, of the Order of Preachers. He was formerly Doctor in Holy Writ, then Archbishop of Lyons, and afterwards Cardinal of Ostia. He sat but for five months and two days and the seat was vacant for eighteen days. To him succeeded Adrian the Fifth, and sat for one month and nine days. He suspended the constitution of my lord Gregory regarding the election[1] of Cardinals, intending to substitute another. After him in the same year John the Twenty-first was elected, formerly called Peter the Spaniard. He sat for eight months and one day, and the seat was vacant for twenty-eight days. Through want of attention he altogether destroyed the constitution which his predecessor had suspended. Expecting greatly to prolong his life, for he excelled in skill as a physician, he caused a new vault to be built at Viterbo, supported by a single column. In this [vault] when it fell, whether by treachery, as some say, or by accident, he alone was crushed, and, having received the sacraments, he survived for six days; and, albeit he was a physician, he did not heal himself.

A.D. 1276.

There lived in Rome about this time a certain very rich man, notoriously a usurer, who, although often admonished for his sin, died at length excommunicate. His friends having assembled, preparation was made for his sepulture, and, in accordance with the customs of his country, he was placed on an open bier adorned with all his garments, and carried to the place of the Minorite Friars in the Capitol, the Church of S. Maria in the Ara Cœli, which used to be the chamber of Octavian, to be buried there. The Rector of the Friars

[1] *De inclusione.*

there would not permit the wrong to be done of burying a vessel of Satan, a person excommunicated by the Pope, within the sacred walls; [so] his [the dead man's] insolent friends [and] poor dependents forced the priest to the altar, so that he should begin the mass by their command, [while] they opened the pavement of the church to dig a grave. And lo! an enormous parti-coloured wolf appeared at the door of the church, and, showing no fear of so great a gathering, seized the corpse in the presence of them all, and carried it out of the church without hindrance from anybody; nor is it known to this day what became of a hair of its head.[1] This was reported by one who was present in the church at the time.

Nicholas the Third, who was previously called John of Gaeta, a Roman by birth, was created Pope and sat for four years. He was so devoted to the blessed Francis that he caused to be painted above the altar in his chapel Saint Nicholas drawing him to heaven and St. Francis pushing him from behind. Also he caused the general chapter of the brethren of Assisi to be summoned to his presence in Rome by the Cardinal Legate, whereat he [the Pope] personally attended. Besides this he issued a famous bull, expounding the rule of Saint Francis —[a bull] so glorious as would [have] amazed all previous ages.[2]

A.D. 1277.

At this time Robert de Coquina[3] was created Bishop of Durham, being a monk of that house.

Also, Philip King of the French marched with a picked army against Spain, no doubt for the following reason. The eldest son of the King of Spain[4] had married the King of France's sister [Blanche], and, having had two sons by her, was carried off by an early death before his father. That father, utterly unmindful of [his] dead [son] endeavoured to supplant the sons of the defunct [prince] by putting forward the surviving brother. When the King of Aragon became

[1] *Quo vel capillus capitis devenerit:* an idiomatic phrase which I do not recognise.

[2] *Quod retroactis seculis ingerat stuporem.*

[3] History repeats itself: the present Dean of Durham is the Very Rev. G. W. Kitchin, D.D.

[4] Ferdinand, son of Alfonso X. of Castile, killed in battle with the Moors, 1275.

aware of this, he had the boys brought [to him] and took care of them in one castle, while his mother passed the time with [her brother] the King of France. Roused by this [proceeding], the King of Castile (who is the principal lord of Spain) determined to break into the castle where the boys were guarded. [The King of France] having advanced in this manner with an immense army three days march into Spain to the aid of the King of Aragon and the boys, [his people] could find nothing to sustain life, [so they] returned within their frontier.[1]

I shall insert here as a joke a certain anecdote made known to me by Sir Robert of Roberstone, one of the King of Scotland's knights, which at my request he related before many trustworthy persons. The said noble gentleman owned a town in Annandale, in the diocese of Glasgow, which he let in farm to the inhabitants thereof.

These people, waxing lewd through their wealth and giving way to wantonness, on leaving the tavern, used to violate each other's wives or seduce each other's daughters, and by such practice would frequently replenish the archdeacon's purse, and, by repeating the offence, they were almost continually upon his roll. But when the landlord required the rent of his farm, they either pled poverty or besought delay. That kindly and just man said to them—'Why should you not pay me my annual rent, any less than my other tenants? If [the land] is let to you at too dear a rent, I can reduce it; if you are unable to cultivate it, give it back to me.'

'No, my lord,' quoth a comical fellow among them with a loud laugh,' none of these things which you mention is really the cause; but our incontinence is so great, and it exhausts us so much, that it re-acts both upon us and upon you, our lord.'

Thereupon the landlord said—'I make this law among you, that any man who commits adultery shall relinquish my land forthwith.'

Taking alarm at this and deterred by the penalty, they refrained from illicit intercourse, applied themselves to labour and agriculture and began to make money unexpectedly, although day by day their names disappeared from the Archdeacon's list.[2]

[1] *Ora conclusi.*

[2] *In rotulo Officialis, i.e.* the Archdeacon in his capacity as episcopal judge in the consistorial court, the nature of which office is explained in the preface to *Liber Officialis S. Andree*, published by the Abbotsford Club in 1845.

And when he [the Archdeacon] enquired one day why he did not find the men of that village [entered] in his list, it was explained to him what the landlord had laid down as a law for them. He was indignant at this, and, meeting the knight upon the road one day, exclaimed with a haughty countenance—'Pray, Sir Robert, who has appointed you either Archdeacon or official?'

Sir Robert denied [that he was either one or other], whereupon the Archdeacon replied—'Undoubtedly you exercise that office when you coerce your tenants by penal laws.'—'I made a rule about my lands, not about offences,' said Sir Robert; 'but you absorbed the rents of my farms [in exactions] for the discharge of crimes. I perceive that so long as you can fill your purse, it does not concern you who gets the souls!'

After this the assessor of crimes and lover of transgressors held his peace.[1]

At this time began the first war in Wales by King Edward, with whom Llewellyn made peace, having paid the king 50,000 pounds of silver.

A scutage was again imposed in England.

Brother Robert [of Kilwardby] my lord Archbishop of Canterbury, having been summoned to the Curia, there to be made a cardinal, Friar John of Peckham, Provincial Minister of the Minorite Friars of England, who, after [occupying] the chair of Paris and Oxford, where he presided in the faculty of Theology de Quolibet, was summoned to the Curia and exalted the reputation of the science of divinity and of his own Order; and, after a couple of years of controversy which he sustained mostly every day against sundry heretics, dissipating their arguments and answers, he was proclaimed Archbishop of Canterbury by Pope Nicholas in a public oration on [the day of] the Conversion of Saint Paul,[2] having been previously appointed. How humbly, sincerely, and industriously he afterwards discharged that office, tongues do testify and consciences applaud.

A.D. 1278.

Also in this year Robert Wishart, Bishop of Glasgow, *effectus*;[3] he survives in health to the present time. But in October

[1] It is significant of the condition of the church at this time, that a story like this should be repeated as a joke—*causa ludi*—not by a layman, but by a cleric.

[2] 25th January, 1278-9.

[3] The meaning of *effectus* is obscure. He was made Bishop of Glasgow in 1271 and died in 1316. Either the chronicler has mistaken the year, or the word should be *affectus*, *i.e.* sick.

Robert de Chalize, Bishop of Carlisle, died; [he was] eager for the honour of God, philanthropic and ready in urbanity; the world may testify without our assurance how bountiful and liberal he was. He used often to relate, in reproach of himself, what at this day may often be repeated in rebuke of others.

'I used to be,' said he, 'physician in ordinary to the Lady Eleonora, mother of the king, and another cleric, whose affection was dear to me, served as notary. It came to pass that our noble mistress, wishing to reward [our] services, bestowed upon me a benefice of one hundred marks and upon him one of thirty marks a year. Having been promoted, impelled by conscience, he soon determined to serve God exclusively, and, having obtained license and left the court, applied himself entirely to the cure of the souls committed to him. I [however], bound down by habit, adhered to the vanity which I had undertaken. As years went by a longing stirred me for the absent one—that I might enjoy the sight and conversation of him whom I bore in my mind, and, having obtained leave, I started to go to him, and found him on the Lord's day performing the dominical office in the church. He was astonished [to see] me; I embraced him, and the affairs of God having been performed, we proceeded to his dwelling to refresh our bodies. While we rested and rejoiced, there came to us some who brought the offerings of the neighbours, and he, for my pleasure, added to the delicacy of the dishes. And as we left the table I asked this man how he was able to live upon such an income.—"Perfectly," quoth he, "and every day as you have seen to-day; I am neither embarrassed by debts, nor am I diverted from ruling [my] parish."—"Your income," said I, "is a very modest one, but mine is ample; and in the court of my mistress I am maintained in her general expenses, nor do I profit at all from the fruits of my church." To which the other replied piously, with a bland smile[1]—"Do you know that God is a faithful friend?"—"Undoubtedly," said I, "I understand [that]."—"This is the character of a faithful and true friend," he replied, "that he is all in all to him who loves him truly. Wherefore, as I think, God is with me because I give myself up to perform his service; but it is otherwise with you, so he is not with you."'

To him [Bishop Robert] succeeded Ralph, Prior of Gisburn, a shrewd and provident person, but somewhat covetous, who turned the visitation of the churches into a whirlpool of

[1] *Caste subridens et catholice respondens.*

exactions, and extorted from honest priests at their anniversaries throughout his diocese an unfair tax for building the roof of the principal church of his see.

At this time the coinage was changed ; pennies and farthings were made round, and Jews were hanged for clipping coins. In the same year Robert, Lord Bishop of Carlisle, lost the presentation to the church of Rothbury.

In the same [year], on the morrow of All Souls, the Itinerant Justiciaries sat in Carlisle—to wit, Sir John de Vallibus,[1] Sir John de Metyngham, Sir William de Seaham, and Master Thomas de Suttrington.

In the same [year], on the day of S. Lucia Virgin,[2] the canons of Carlisle elected as bishop Master William de Rothelfeld, Dean of York, who utterly declined [to take] office ; wherefore on the following day they elected as bishop my lord Ralph, Prior of Gisburne. To which the king would not give assent, being angry with the Prior and Chapter of Carlisle because they had twice elected without license ; wherefore my lord Ralph betook himself to the Roman Court.

Walter, Archbishop of York died, an elegant cleric, chaste, sociable and free handed, but fretful and feeble because of his corpulence. To him succeeded William of Wykeham,[3] who, on the contrary, was lean, harsh and niggardly, but certainly so far as could be known out of doors, just in judgment and most tender of conscience. For, as I shall set forth later,[4] according to the rules set by the holy fathers, it is held and ordained that diocesans and their monks shall be visited by the metropolitan. Concerning which matter Walter, his [Wykeham's] predecessor twice informed him who presided over that church of his coming ; but, when he was proceeding on his perambulation, the Prior of Durham cunningly inveigled him out of the city to his own lodgings, [where] he might divert him from his purpose by more sumptuous fare and by oblations. On arriving there he [Bishop Walter] did not yield to the stratagem, but performed the ordinary visitation, so that if they had anything to plead for themselves or anything upon their conscience to be lightened, they

A.D. 1279.

[1] Vaus, which, by an ancient clerical error, is now written Vans.

[2] 13th December.

[3] Not the famous founder of Winchester College, who was not born till 1324.

[4] *Ut altius ordiam.*

should not delay putting it before him. But as they responded neither in law nor prudence, but closed the windows of the church and even shut the public gates of the city [against him], he set a chair for himself in the open space before the gates, in official vestments addressed the populace with words of life, and, explaining the object of his coming and pronounced sentence of excommunication upon the rebels. This gave rise to troubles, lawsuits and expenses which are not yet settled, even in the days of his successor.

At this time there died[1] at Morebattle William Wishart, Bishop of S. Andrew's, and was buried at his see; to whom succeeded William Fraser, king's chancellor also, who still survives.

In the same year died Walter Giffard, Archbishop of York, of good memory; and in the same year Oliver was consecrated Bishop of Lincoln on S. Dunstan's day.[2]

Item—a great fire at S. Botolph's at fair time.

Item—in the aforesaid year began the second war in Wales by Llewellyn and his brother David.

At midsummer there took place the burning of Norwich Cathedral, and nearly all the convent, from the following cause.

A.D. 1280.

While we consider how poverty is the guardian of holiness, it is equally certain that affluence is the mother of insolence, and that, as Daniel prophesied of Antichrist, of all things wealth destroys most men. Accordingly the monks [of Norwich] enriched by their possessions, and puffed up in spirit, deposed their prior, a virtuous, but aged, man, and elected a haughty youth, who forthwith multiplied for himself stables and carriages, not even denying himself a lodging for his whore within the walls of the convent, after the example of infatuated Solomon. And, forasmuch as deep calleth unto deep, and sin leads on to further sinning, so this presumptuous prior infringed the liberties of the burgesses in the matter of their property and pasture. The community being roused [thereby], there followed waste of money, wrath of minds and strife of words. It grew at length to this, that they prepared to fight against each other, and, while the Prior's men in the church tower had prepared Greek fire to discharge upon the town, and those on the other side were striving to set fire to the abbey gates (strong as they were and richly wrought), those stationed

[1] *Recessit e seculo.*

[2] 21st October. This is one of the duplicate passages tending to show that the chronicle was compiled from several sources.

within assembled to defend them, when a fire broke out which, being foolishly neglected, first consumed the bell-tower, and then the entire church with all its contents; which notwithstanding they continued fighting fiercely outside and burning houses. Thus did the heedlessness of this rash Prior lead to the dishonour of the Creative Trinity, and later to the sacrifice in a horrible death of many citizens by royal justice.

At this time the King of Norway died, leaving as successor his son called Magnus; who hearing that the King of Scotland had an amiable, beautiful and attractive[1] daughter, a virgin, of suitable age for himself (being a handsome youth of about eighteen years), could not rest until a formal mission, divines as well as nobles, had been sent twice to obtain her as his spouse in marriage and consort on the throne. But before I bring to an end the narrative of this marriage, let me relate to the praise of God and his servant, what was told by one of the emissaries about his king [to show] to what height human affection may be carried.

The father of this king being deeply attached to the religion of S. Francis, encouraged the [Franciscan] brethren above all others, and interested himself diligently in their schools of sacred theology, where, also, he set up for himself a mausoleum. It happened that the Queen brought forth her first-born on the said saint's day,[2] to the shame rather than to the joy, of the realm, [for it] resembled more the offspring of a bear than a man, as it were a formless lump of flesh. When this was announced to the king, strong in faith, he said, 'Wrap it in clean linen and place it on the altar of S. Francis at the time of the celebration.'

Which having been fulfilled, when they came at the end of the service to take away what they had placed there, they found a lovely boy crying, and joyfully returned thanks to God and to the saint. This [child] having grown up, sought the damsel in marriage, as aforesaid; and, although the union was very distasteful to the maiden, as also to her relations and friends (seeing that she might wed elsewhere much more easily and honourably), yet it was at the sole instance of her father, the king, that the bargain was made that he should give her a dowry 17,000 merks, primarily for the contract of marriage, but secondarily for the redemption of the right to the Isles.

[1] *Morigerosam*, cf. Lucretius, iv. 1277.

[2] 16th July.

On the morrow of S. Laurence[1] she embarked at . . .[2] with much pomp and many servants, and after imminent peril to life which they ran on the night of the Assumption of the Holy Virgin,[3] at daybreak on the said festival they lowered their sails at Bergen. Shortly afterwards she was solemnly crowned and proclaimed before all men by a distinguished company of kinsmen. She comported herself so graciously towards the king and his people that she altered their manners for the better, taught them the French and English languages, and set the fashion of more seemly dress and food. He only had one daughter by her, who survived her mother but a short time.

On the day before the nones of October[4] [occurred] the translation of the blessed Hugh Bishop of Lincoln, which translation Master Thomas de Bek was the means of obtaining and liberally discharged all expenses. On the same day he was consecrated Bishop of S. David's by Friar John of Peckham, of the Order of Minorites, Archbishop of Canterbury, in the presence of Edward King of England and his Queen.

From the beginning of the world 6080 years, to wit, in the year of our Lord 1280, on S. Mark the Evangelist's day,[5] it was decided in the court of Irthington that an attachment upon the elemosynary land of the prior and convent of Lanercost was null and void.

Item—My lord Ralph came to England about Ascension Day,[6] consecrated as Bishop of Carlisle by the Roman Court. In the same year, on Thursday the ninth of the calends of November,[7] a convocation was held by my lord Bishop Ralph in the principal church of Carlisle, and there was granted to him by the clergy a tithe of the churches for two years according to their actual value, to be paid in the new money within a year, wherefore we paid him in all twenty-four pounds. Wherefore H[8] said as follows about that transaction :

'Poor sheep; bereft of ghostly father;
Should not be shorn; but pampered rather.
Poor sheep! with cares already worn,
You should be comforted; not shorn.

[1] 11th August. [2] Blank in MS. [3] 15th August. [4] 6th October.
[5] 25th April. [6] 30th May. [7] 24th October.

[8] Perhaps the chronicler himself. Dr. James Wilson identifies this Brother H. with Henry de Burgo, who became Prior of Lanercost in 1310. Verses cease to appear in the chronicle after 1315, the year of Prior Henry's death.

But if the shepherd must have wool,
He should be tender, just and cool.'[1]

In the same year my lord . . .[2] received the canonical dress, on the day of St. Agapitus Martyr.[3]

In the same year, on the third of the Ides of September[4] my lord Edward King of England and Queen Eleanor came to Lanercost, and the prior and convent met them at the gate in their capes.[5] Item, the king presented a silken robe, and the king in his hunting took, as was said, two hundred stags and hinds in Inglewood.

At that time some box of a certain page was broken [into], whereat H. said as follows:

'A pilfered chest yields shameful booty,
The thief, when caught, must learn his duty;
Ill-gotten gains return no profit,
Who steals his wealth makes nothing of it.'[6]

About the same time a certain young fellow was killed, about whom H. said:

'William, poor fellow, has proved by his fate,
He is wanting in prudence who stays out too late.'[7]

In the same year, on Sunday, the eleventh of the Kalends of April,[8] Ralph, Lord Bishop of Carlisle, first came to Lanercost on a visitation, and the monks met him in the manner described above for the king, and afterwards he gave [them] benediction, and received all the brethren to the kiss of peace, and after his hand had first been kissed, he gave them a kiss on the lips; and having himself entered the chapter house, he preached, saying—'Behold I myself shall require.' The preaching being finished, he proceeded with his visitation, in which we were compelled to accept new constitutions.

[1] *Grex desolatus, pastore diu viduatus,*
Sic cito tondere, non indiget, immo foveri;
Grex desolatus, nimis hactenus extenuatus,
Jam comfortairi debet, non excoriari.
Sed si pastor oves habeat tendere necesse,
Debet ei pietas, modus et moderamem inesse.

[2] Blank in MS. [3] 18th August. [4] 11th September. [5] *In Cappis.*

[6] *Res, cista fracta, surrepta fuit male nacta;*
Juste surreptus fuerat male census adeptus;
Finitur foeda prave saepissime praeda;
Raro dives erit thesaurum qui male quaerit.

[7] *Garcifer occisus Willelmus testificatur*
Quod non est sapiens nimium qui nocte vagatur.

[8] 22nd March.

Scottish Trade with the Plantations before 1707

SCOTLAND, unlike the other countries in Western Europe, was very little influenced by the exploring and colonising impulses of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, and there are few traces of any Scottish communication with America before the Restoration. One attempt was made to plant a Scottish settlement in America: that of Sir William Alexander, afterwards Earl of Stirling, to whom was granted a charter for colonising in America in 1621. The land was called Nova Scotia, and a number of Nova Scotia baronets were created; but no settlement seems to have been made, although the claims of the Alexander family on the country are a subject of controversy later in the century.

A few Scottish ships sailed to Greenland for the whale fishing, but there they came into collision with some ships of the English Greenland Company, who resented the Scottish attempt to share their trade. One Scottish merchant, John Burnett, of Aberdeen, 'being the sole merchant of our Kingdom of Scotland that hath supplyed the plantacon of that our colony of Virginia,'[1] received permission in 1634 to trade with that settlement, and to transport tobacco and any other merchandise.

The trade of the west of Scotland with America had scarcely begun before 1660; for in 1656 Tucker, in his 'Report on the Customs and Excise,' says of Glasgow: 'Here hath likewise been some who have ventured as far as Barbadoes, but the losses they have sustained by reason of their going out and coming home late every year, have made them discontinue going thither any more.'[2] During the Commonwealth about 2000 Scots were forced to settle in America, transported by the Government to Virginia, New England, Bermuda, Barbadoes, and Jamaica. In New England, and doubtless elsewhere, they seemed to have settled peaceably. John Cotton, writing from New England to Cromwell, says: 'He that brought most of

[1] *S.P. Col.* ix. 118. [2] *Report*, p. 38.

them buildeth houses for them and layeth some acres of ground thereto which he giveth them as their own . . . and promiseth that . . . he will set them at liberty.'[1]

There was very little cause for English jealousy in the slight connection of Scotland with the Plantations; and Scotland might have reasonably hoped to continue at the Restoration her privileges of equal trading rights with English merchants and ships—privileges which had been hers since the union of 1603, unaffected by Cromwell's Navigation Act of 1651. But by the Navigation Act of 1660[2] she was excluded from all share in the English Plantation trade. This Act declared that no goods should be exported from any of His Majesty's Dominions in Asia, Africa or America except in ships belonging to England, Ireland, Wales, Berwick-upon-Tweed or the Plantations, of which the master and three-fourths of the crew were to be English. No goods of the growth or manufacture of Africa, Asia, or America were to be imported into England, etc., except in English or Colonial ships. No foreign goods were to be brought into England except in English ships or ships belonging to the country where the goods were produced. Aliens were to be excluded from the English coasting trade. Certain plantation commodities, sugar, tobacco, etc., were not to be shipped to any place except England or the English Plantations. By an 'Act for the Encouragement of Trade,'[3] 1663, it was enacted that no goods were to be taken to the Plantations unless in English ships and shipped in England. Scottish servants and victual were excepted, and might be shipped in Scotland, but in English ships. Penalties for infringement of the acts were made more severe. The aims of the Navigation Acts were set forth in the preamble: 'And in regard His Majesties Plantations beyond the seas are inhabited and peopled by His subjects of this his kingdome of England, For the maintaining a greater correspondence and kindnesse betweene them and keepinge them in a firmer dependance upon it, and rendering them yet more beneficial and advantageous unto it in the further employment and encrease of English shipping and seamen, Vent of English Woollen and other manufactures and commodities . . . and making this Kingdome a staple not only of the Commodities of those

[1] *Hutchinson Papers* (Prince Society), ii. p. 264.

[2] 12 Car. II. c. 18.

[3] 15 Car. II. c. 7.

Plantations but alsoe of the Commodities of other Countreyes and Places for the supplying of them. . . .'

In 1677, in a letter from the Treasury to the Governors of the Plantations, this preamble is recited with the addition: 'and for the further and more peculiar appropriating the trade of these plantations to the Kingdom of England exclusive from all other His Majesty's dominions':[1] significant words, showing clearly that the Plantations were not intended to be 'beneficial and advantageous' to His Majesty's dominion of Scotland. Various reasons were given for the change of policy involved in treating the Scots as aliens after they had enjoyed nearly sixty years of free trade with England. One reason probably was that Scotland was independent of the control of the English Parliament, which had no desire to see her accumulate wealth in the disposal of which they could have no voice. Scotland also had had no share in the losses and hardships incurred in settling the Colonies, and therefore, according to seventeenth century ideas, had no claim to share the benefits which might arise from them. It was also feared that her admission to the trade might do actual damage to English interests. 'They in one word overthrew the very essence and designe of the Act of Navigation.' 'It will very much discourage the Building of English shipps when strangers shall enjoy the same Libtyes upon the English land.'[2]

The jealousy of the powerful East India Company had been aroused by rumours that the West Indian Islands were going to endeavour to produce the commodities of the East Indies, and the fear that Scotland, which had some trade with Barbadoes, might become a market for them. 'The first difficulty . . . is in the poynt of plantatione exceedinglie stood upon in respect of the great tread at present with the Barbadoes, and hopes of dryving a richer tread heirefter with all the Illandis, they intending to plant synomon, nutmegis, cleues and peper, for they have sent to the East Indies for all thes plantis and they conceauve that if wee sall have any tread we willbe able to tak the tread from thame . . . and furnish many places of Europe with the commodities of these Plantations.'[3] There

[1] *Treasury Outletters, Customs*, i. p. 51.

[2] *Report of the Commissioners of the Customs concerning Navigation*, 1663. *S.P. Dom.* C. II. xliv. 12.

[3] *Records of the Convention of the Royal Burghs of Scotland*, vol. iii. p. 565.

seemed to be some fear that Scotland might be a staple for all Plantation commodities. 'They may carry by this admittance all the Growth of these Plantacons into forreigne Parts which must lessen his Majesties duties. . . . They may serve all forreigne Parts as Germany and Holland with the fruits of our Labours and make Scotland the Magazine and leave us to our home consumption.' But perhaps the most important point in the case against Scotland, at the time when the first Acts were passed, was the dread that Scotland's ancient commercial allies, the Dutch, might, under cover of the Scots, intrude into England's plantation trade. 'When the Scotch shall trade at large with mixture of other Nacons especially the Dutch to whome they are most contiguous and who no doubt will worke into them as well in shipping as Mariners, against which the Act principally aymes at.'[1] The Scots were not long in realising the disadvantages and losses which the passing of the Navigation Act brought upon them; and their remonstrances were voiced by the Convention of the Burghs and the Privy Council, also by a petition from the Earls of Glencairne and Rothes, Chancellor and President of the Council in Scotland. They declared the Act to be 'totallie destructive to the tread and navigatione of this Kingdome.' They also asserted that their poverty, and the fact that 'the whole schippis now belonging to Scotland ar of ane verie inconsiderable value and number,' would prevent them from having any great share in the trade in any case; while 'a great pairt of our stockis which wee most send abroad . . . consistis of Inglisch manufactures which we most buy for our money.'[2]

The Scots threatened retaliation if they were not excepted from the Act, and accordingly passed in June, 1661, an 'Act for encourageing of Shiping and Navigation';[3] which forbade the import of any goods into Scotland, except from the country of their production, and in ships belonging to that country or in Scotch ships. This was not to be enforced for English or Irish merchants, if the like exception were made there in favour of Scotsmen. In August, 1663, in return for an English Act laying heavy duties on Scots cattle and salt, prohibitive duties were laid on English merchandise, especially on cloth and tobacco.[4] This proved disastrous to many English mer-

[1] *S.P. Dom.* C. II. xliv. 12. [2] *Royal Burghs*, vol. iii. p. 555.

[3] *Acts of Parliament of Scotland*, vol. vii. p. 257.

[4] *Acts, Scotland*, vol. vii. p. 465.

chants, who petitioned that the Scots should be admitted to some share in English trade. English imports to Scotland had far exceeded those of Scotland to England, and, instead of this profitable trade, 'thousands of families who got a comfortable subsistence in ye management of that trade are now exposed to want and beggary.' Great prejudice was done to the kingdom of England, 'in the decay of English manufactures which in great quantities were yearly carried out besides what goods came from your Majesties Plantations abroad, the lessening of your Majesties Revenue and the giving up that Trade wholly into the hands of the Dutch and French.'[1]

What Scottish trade there was to the Plantations had been chiefly to Barbadoes, to which cargoes of servants had been taken. Many remonstrances and petitions came in from the Governor and planters there, begging that the hindrance to the supply of servants might be removed. The Scots were highly valued both as settlers and as soldiers. 'Heretofore the Colonyis were plentifully supplyed with . . . Christian servants . . . the most of which they had from Scotland who being excellent Planters and Soldjers and considerable numbers of them coming every year to the Plantations kept the Colonists in soe formidable a position that they neither feared the Insurrection of their negroes nor any invasion of a foreigne enemy, but are now by the Act of Navigation forbidden to have trade with Scotland whereby they can have no servants from thence.[2] The remonstrances of Scottish, English, and West Indian merchants were of no avail, and, though during the negotiations for union of 1667-1670 the question was discussed again, no agreement could be made. The Scots, therefore, continued to be excluded from all lawful share in the English Plantation trade, and, consequently, from all trade with North America. Scotland, prohibited from trading with the English Colonies, had forthwith put prohibitive duties on English manufactures and Colonial products imported from England.[3] But there was a considerable amount of tobacco consumed in Scotland, and sugar was also required for the 'sugyaries,' which were set up in 1667, 1669, 1696, 1700,

[1] *East India Entry Book*, i. p. 79, 1664.

[2] *An Account of the English Sugar Plantations*, Brit. Mus. *Egerton MSS.* 2395, 629.

[3] *Acts, Scotland*, vol. vii. p. 465.

and for the works for distilling strong waters and molasses from sugar. There was also some trade in furs. In 1683 an Edinburgh merchant, who, 'having a considerable trade to some of the plantations in America he doeth export severall quantities of the native product of this Kingdome. The returns whereof are Beavers and Racoone skins,' asked and received permission from the Privy Council to set up a hat manufactory.

There was, therefore, a demand in Scotland for plantation products, and, though a few special licenses were given by the King to Scotsmen for trade with America, they were by no means sufficient to supply the demand; so from about 1675 onwards, a lively illicit trade seems to have been carried on both by Scottish and Colonial ships. The loss of the English supply of manufactured goods seems to have given an impulse to Scotch manufactures. An Act for encouraging manufactures was passed in 1661,[1] and in the following years a good many were set up for making sugar, cloth, linen, glass, etc. England, therefore, suffered by her efforts to exclude the Scots from the Plantation trade. She did not supply Scotland as largely as before with manufactured goods, the deficit being made up by imports of Dutch manufactures and by the development of Scottish industries. These, instead of English goods, were sent out to supply the Plantations when Scotland succeeded in forcing herself into an illegal share in the trade with America.

The goods which were exported were principally coarse cloth and linen, stockings, hats, salted meat and fish, Dutch manufactures, etc. Mr. George Muschamp, Collector of duties in Carolina, writes in 1687, that the Scotch 'are evidently able to undersell ye English, their Goods being either much coarser or slighter, which will serve for servants weare and will be sure to go off, they being cheap so that an Englishman must go away unfreighted or sell to vast Disadvantage.'[2]

One commodity was very plentiful in Scotland and could easily be had for exportation: 'notorious vagabonds.' For over twenty years the Privy Council continued to grant licenses to masters of ships sailing to Virginia, Barbadoes, New York, or New England, to transport 'idle and sturdie beggars and loose and masterless men and women who have no visible way of livelihood bot by stouth and robbery to the great

[1] *Acts, Scotland*, vol. vii. p. 255. [2] *Colonial Entry Book*, 100, p. 1.

oppression and trouble of the country.'[1] It was hoped that it might 'much contribut to the peace and quyet yrof and the good of those persons themselves if they were sent to work for their livelihood abroad.' It was said that 'severall other persones so sent away . . . have become very active and virtuous persones, their idleness and poverty having formerly corrupted them.'[2] During the 'Killing Times' numbers of 'obstinat phanaticks' and 'absenters from the Church' were transported, along with the vagabonds, not, one would think, particularly congenial fellow-travellers. Many of these persons received their freedom in a few years and settled down as merchants and factors. Altogether quite a number of Scots settled in the Plantations during the last quarter of the seventeenth and first few years of the eighteenth centuries. Settlements were made in East New Jersey and Carolina, the former becoming a prosperous Colony and a centre for trade with Scotland. There were also Scottish merchants in Maryland: 'They send tobacco to Scotland (having many Scotchmen living and trading among them)':[3] in New Hampshire 'There are several Scotsmen that inhabit here and are great interlopers and bring in quantities of goods underhand':[4] and also in Pennsylvania, New York, and in other parts of New England. There was far more illicit trade in the northern than in the southern Colonies, as they had more difficulty in finding a market for their products in England, and so were forced into trading with other countries.[5] Scottish trade took some time to recover from the exhaustion caused by the Civil Wars, and for several years after the Restoration there seems to have been little connection with America. The first mention of Scotsmen trading illegally does not occur till 1676, in a paper sent by Mr. Edward Randolph (appointed in 1675 Collector, Surveyor, and Searcher for all New England) about the state of New England. Here, he says, 'the trade and navigation is carried on by a general traffick to most parts of Europe, as England, Scotland, Ireland, France. . . .'[6] In 1678 the

[1] *Scottish Privy Council Register*, 31 July, 1673.

[2] *Privy Council*, 10 August, 1680.

[3] *S.P. Col.: America and West Indies*, 556. 18, 1695.

[4] *S.P. Col.: Col. Papers*, 50, 3, 1683.

[5] *Commercial Policy of England towards the Am. Colonies*, G. L. Beer, p. 135.

[6] *Hutchinson Papers*, ii. p. 231.

Commissioners of the Customs in London, writing to Randolph, commission him to take measures for preventing ships laden with enumerated plantation produce from sailing to Scotland or Ireland.[1] There were many methods of evading the Customs authorities. Robert Holden, Collector of the Customs in Carolina, said that the tobacco grown there was collected in a certain place where the Collector of Customs was in the interest of the merchants, and thence carried to Boston, where it was shipped, without examination or payment of dues, to Ireland, Scotland, Holland, etc., 'under the notion of fish and such-like goods.'[2] Tobacco from Maryland was also taken over from the east shore to the Delaware River, where there were numbers of creeks and inlets into which ships could enter unnoticed, unload their goods, and get a return cargo of tobacco. 'The inhabitants of the Eastern shore of Virginia, Maryland, and Delaware River, Scotchmen and others have great stocks lying by them, to purchase tobacco and to prepare a loading ready to be put on board upon the Arrivall of any Vessell from New England etc., who assist with boats and sloops and get the goods ashoar befor the Vessell is entered, which they dispose of amongst their goods in the Store, the Vessell lying in some obscure creek 40 or 50 miles distante from the Collectors office and in a short time loaded and sailes out of the Capes undiscovered.'[3]

With such a long coast-line it would of course have been almost impossible to prevent smuggling entirely, even if the officials had been more numerous, and incorruptible, which they were not. 'This province' (Pennsylvania) 'having many very large and navigable Rivers in it, and at great distance from one another many ships goe out singly and many false Traders from Scotland and Holland . . . escape unpunished.'[4] 'Which illegal Trade so carryed on . . . is connived at and encouraged by divers of their Majesties Collectors of ye Customs in Virginia etc. who are (Underhand) interested and Concerned therein.'[5] But besides the vessels which engaged in the regular smuggling trade, entering and departing unobserved; there were many ships which, under pretext of trading in a lawful manner, went to

[1] *Massachusetts Hist. Soc. Collections*, 3rd Series, vols. vii. and viii. p. 129.

[2] *S.P. Col.: Records of North Carolina*, i. p. 245, 1679.

[3] *S.P. Col.: Entry Book*, 100, p. 359, 1694.

[4] *Maryland Archives*, viii. p. 358, 1692. [5] *Treasury Papers*, xxvi. 53, 1694.

Scotland without giving bond, or landed their goods there when they had given bond to go to England. A great deal of this trade was carried on under cover of trade with Newfoundland. Under pretext that it was a plantation, tobacco was loaded for transportation thence, without giving bond, when the ship's real destination was Scotland. The island was also a magazine for all sorts of European goods brought from different countries, and then taken on to New England without paying duty. Colonial vessels coming from Scotland seem to have adopted one of two methods of evading the authorities. One is described by Holden. 'The Scotch Trade by the like legerdemain jugles is driven. A ship at Newcastle, Berwick Poole etc. toucheth, taketh in coals or some other slight goods, goes for Scotland and there receives great quantities of linen and other Scotch goods . . . and coming here by her English clearings at the Ports etc abovesaid passeth for current without further inquisition.'[1]

Another method, and one that was generally adopted by Scotch ships, was that of using a false certificate. 'Which illegal trade so Carryed on by severall Merchants in Scotland is Connived at and encouraged by divers of their Majesties Collectors of ye Customs in Virginia etc. who . . . Receive their goods by false Cocketts which they know to be made in Glascow and the seales of their Majesties Commissioners for ye Customs of London and those of several of the outports of England Counterfeited and affixed thereto—Particularly those of Newcastle, Berwick, Bristoll, Bewmorrice, Beddeford, Whitehaven, Liverpoole and Plimouth.'[2] Although the Customs officials were very often interested in the illicit trade, and although it was impossible to watch so long a coast-line, yet seizures were occasionally made, generally by the special officers, Randolph and Quary. (Colonel Quary was appointed Surveyor General of the Customs in the Plantations in 1703.) But the case had still to be brought to Court and tried before a jury, and it was almost impossible to find men who would condemn the traders, for most of the inhabitants were sufficiently in sympathy with the Scottish interest to dismiss the case, whatever the evidence might be. Nicholson, Governor of Maryland, writing to the Committee of Trade and Plantations in 1695, says: 'I have found by

[1] *Col. Records of North Carolina*, i. 245, 1690.

[2] 'Proposals for Discovery of ye severall frauds in their Majesties Customs . . . by persons trading directly to these places from Scotland.' . . . *Treasury Papers*, xxvi. 53, 1694.

experience that it is a difficult thing to get Judges and Jurys to try and condemn illegal traders.'[1]

Other difficulties arose from some of the Colonies declaring that the Acts of Navigation could not bind them, and that the English Customs Commissioners had no authority in the Colonies. Randolph wrote from New England in 1690 that he was: 'alwaies opposed in open Court by the Magistrates and my seizures and prosecutions (tho made upon very plain evidence) were ended ineffectual, for the Juries found for the Defendant against His Majesty all agreeing that the Power of the Commissioners of the Customs in matters of trade did not extend to their Colony.'[2] On one occasion when he did succeed in obtaining several convictions he said: 'This highly aggravated the Traders and Masters of Ships against me. . . . I was seized upon and hurried to the Common Goale . . . whence I hardly escaped with my life.' The settlers in Carolina declared that as their Charter was granted them after the passing of the Acts they were not bound by them, and therefore the Courts refused to grant any convictions.[3] The Government in England of course asserted that the Acts were binding in America, but although this came to be generally recognised, the amount of illicit trade did not seem to decrease. Various suggestions were made for the stricter enforcement of the Acts: that greater care should be taken in examining the certificates and cocquets and in taking bond for observing the Acts; and, perhaps most important of all, that the present collectors and officers should be removed, and 'men of integrity' substituted. It was also suggested that several small boats should be chartered, to cruise about and discover those ship which unloaded and loaded in secluded bays and creeks. In accordance with this advice one or two small boats were sent out. One of these was put in command of a certain Thomas Much, referred to in 1692 as 'an old offender,' but in February, 1694, found 'humbly acknowledging the unhappy part himself had been unwarily seduced to act in these misdemeanours,' and 'faithfully discovering divers fraudulent and illegal practices of Severall Scotch merchants.'[4] Fortunately 'notices were given and the Alarm taken on ye Scotch coast,' but even so the turncoat Much

[1] *Board of Trade, Maryland*, 2. 114, 1695.

[2] *S.P. Col.: Entry Book*, 100, p. 1, 1687.

[3] *S.P. Col.: Colonial Entry Book*, 100, p. 1.

[4] *Treasury Papers*, xxvi. 53, 1694.

succeeded in taking two ships. A year later he managed to catch a fellow 'old offender,' whose story is typical of many others. Morris Trent had lodged false certificates for '5000 ells of Scotch cloth and Ticken and 30 dozen of Scotch Hose'; and had on board 'about 30 Tun of Sea Coales,' for which he had no certificates. The year before he had landed his tobacco in Scotland 'under pretence of ye Vessell being disabled which upon strict examination of ye men I find to be false and a trick put upon . . . ye Commissioners.' The vessel was seized and brought to New Jersey. The Governor, Hamilton, who was a Scotchman, told Much that it was not in his power to seize there and 'Cleared ye seizure from Mee and ordered her to be seized by one of his Creatures there, and then not being brought to Tryall according to Law was Cleared under collour of giving bond.'[1]

Besides complaints from Government officials of Scottish interlopers in the Plantations, there were also petitions from English merchants whose trade was interfered with. In 1692 the Custom House officials at Liverpool wrote to the Commissioners of the Customs at Bermuda, saying that they had various accounts from merchants and masters of ships in that port, who 'lawfully trade to the said Plantacons,' that they are 'much discouraged and almost ruined by reason their Majesties officers in the Plantations do . . . Corruptly or Unfairly comply with Persons tradeing to Scotland not capable by Law to Trade there.'[2] The merchants of London also complained: 'That their Trade is in a great measure destroyed and ruined by many ships trading directly from Scotland and Ireland to Virginia, Maryland and Pennsylvania without paying their Majesties' duties to the undervaluing of Trade.'[3] The Commissioners of the Customs 'concurr with the said merchants herein and do humbly move . . . that some effectual remedy be taken by writing to the Government of Scotland or otherwise as to His Majesty shall seem fitt for preventing this great evill.' In 1694 the merchants and traders of Bristol also sent in a petition against unfair traders from Scotland and Ireland, who did not pay custom in England.

The Privy Council in Scotland did not attempt to put a stop to this illegal trade. On the contrary they granted licenses to

[1] *Treasury Papers*, xxvi. 53, 1694. [2] *Board of Trade, Bermuda*, 28, pp. 41-45.

[3] *Board of Trade, Virginia*, 5, 46, i. 1694.

Scottish merchants sailing to the Plantations to transport servants thither. After the Revolution, when the Scottish Parliament and Government became more independent, and the ill-feeling between Scotland and England increased, English ships of war and privateers began to cruise about in Scottish waters, in order to arrest ships coming from the Plantations or from France. The first complaint sent in to the Council was in 1690. 'Anent a petition given in . . . be George Lockhart merchant in Glasgow . . . shewing That qr the petitioners . . . did Import ane ship Loadned with Tobacco from Virginia to the port of Glenwark in the river of Clyde and reported the said Loadning of Tobacco to the Custome Office . . . and payed the ordnar dutie, yet notwithstanding on Potingar Captaine of the Dartmouth ffrigot hes . . . most unwarrantably against all Law and reasone Seased the said Vessell . . . threatening to cary her away for Ingland . . . to dispose upon her as ane prize purchased by him.'[1] Several complaints followed, and in 1694 the Council wrote to the King 'anent seizing Scotts shippes in our owne ports.' They complained that 'both in our East and West seas and in the ports and harbours therof our merchant ships have been seized. . . . And furder we are informed that severall other merchant English shipps have taken out Commissions of Mart from the Admiralty against unlawful traders which we see they mostly make use of against our ships coming from the plantations. . . . Albeit be certaine that before this late warr none of our ships could be attacqued or mollested on that account at sea But only in the ports and harbours of America. . . . Our merchants are so much discouraged and prejudget by these attempts that many of them already hes given over trade.'[2] The frequency of the complaints against the trade of Scotland with the Plantations show that it must have been considerable. There are also some lists of ships trading between the countries, and of Scottish merchants whose interests were involved in the trade. In October, 1689, there were three ships from Boston in Scotland and two more on their way from Glasgow back to Boston. In 1692 Randolph wrote that 'within eight months over 20 Scotch, Irish and New England vessels have sailed out of the Capes with tobacco for Scotland and Holland.'[3] In 1693 and 1694 thirteen ships trading

[1] *Privy Council Register*, 14 August, 1690.

[2] *Privy Council Register*, 29 June, 1694.

[3] *S.P. Col.: America and West Indies*, 637, 110.

illegally, all belonging to Scottish merchants, loaded tobacco in Virginia and Maryland, of which nine went direct to Scotland.[1] Much, in 1695, drew up a list of Glasgow merchants trading to the Plantations contrary to Acts of Parliament. He gives the names of fourteen, and says there are others whose names he does not remember.[2] Between April 13, 1695, and December 29, 1696, twenty-seven vessels left Scotland for the Plantations, of which twenty seem to have been Scottish, nearly all from the Clyde ports.[3]

During William's wars with France illegal trade with America seems to have increased. Chalmers, in his *History of the Revolt of the American Colonies*, says that English commerce and shipping decayed during this period; and quotes from Davenant a complaint that 'during this war, the colonists have presumed . . . to set up for themselves, and to load their effects on ships belonging to foreigners, and to trade directly with other nations, sending them their commodities and receiving from thence manufactures not of our growth to the great damage of this kingdom.'[4] There are several letters from various Colonial authorities complaining of the want of ships to carry on the Colonial trade. Nicholson, Governor of Virginia, wrote in 1695: 'I most humbly propose that a good number of ships be permitted to come to these ports for when few come then goods are very dear and tobacco very cheap. If too few ships come they will stop growing large quantities of tobacco and will begin manufacturing clothing for themselves.'[5] Scottish ships doubtless took advantage of the opportunity given by English difficulties and Colonial necessities, and their trade seems to have increased after the Revolution. The goods which the Scots merchants took out, chiefly coarse cloth and linen, were not such good quality as English manufactures, but were cheaper, and therefore very acceptable.

Scottish merchants and ships were also employed in the active trade carried on between the English Plantations and the Dutch possessions of Surinam and Curaçao. 'Several Scotch merchants in Pennsilvania . . . carry the Tobacco of Maryland to Surenham and Carressoe in bread Casks covered with flower

[1] *Board of Trade, Virginia*, 5, 56. [2] *Board of Trade, Maryland*, 3, 2.

[3] *Hist. MSS. Commission Report: House of Lords MSS.*, p. 464.

[4] Chalmers's *History of the Revolt of the American Colonies*, vol. i. p. 269.

[5] *Board of Trade, Maryland*, 2, 114.

at each end.'[1] Colonel Quary, writing to the Commissioners of Customs about New Jersey and Pennsylvania, says: 'There is Four times ye quantity of Tobacco made in this Countrey this last year than ever was made in anyone year before All which is Engrossed by the Scotch . . . they give such Extravagent rates that . . . no person who designs to trade fairly can give. . . . They carry on a constant trade from Curesan hither, about a month ago came in a vessel from thence belonging to Scotch merchants which brought in abundance of Linen and other Dry Goods of the manufacture of Holland.'[2] These Dutch goods thus imported were sold as 'cheap in Pennsylvania as they can be bought in England.'[3] Scotland also had some advantages as a market for Colonial produce, especially for tobacco. The merchants were said to be induced to follow illegal trade 'by ye Great Incouragement which a Scotch Act of Parliament gives to ye Importation of tobacco thither directly from Virginia, in which case ye Importers are Obliged to pay but three pence per pound, and do ordinarily obtaine leave to Compound for thre halfe pence, whereas if ye ship first make her Entry in England then for such Tobacco afterwards brought into Scotland the Importer is obleiged to pay sixpence per pound.'[4]

Before the Act of 1696, which endeavoured to remedy the abuses in the Plantation trade, was passed, another cause of complaint had arisen, which made the feeling against Scotland and Scottish interlopers still more strong. This was the Scottish Act of 1695 constituting the 'Company of Scotland, Trading to Africa and the West Indies.'[5] The original design seems to have been to start a rival to the East India Company, but the officials in America regarded it as an attempt to legalise and extend that illicit trade with Scotland which they had been endeavouring to suppress. Randolph, writing to the Commissioners in England about the Scottish Act, says: 'In which Act under pretence of erecting an East India Company in yt Kingdome they do engage themselves with Great sums of money in an American Trade; a Trade which has for several years been carried on by Scotchmen.'[6] The Commissioners of

[1] *Board of Trade, Maryland*, 8, p. 188, 1695.
[2] *Treasury Papers*, xlxiii. 43, 1701.
[3] *Board of Trade, Maryland*, 2, 115, 1694.
[4] *Treasury Papers*, xxvi. 53, 1693.
[5] *Acts, Scotland*, vol. ix. p. 377.
[6] *S.P. Col.: Col. Entry Book*, 100, p. 352.

the Customs then made a presentment to the Commissioners of the Treasury in which they declared themselves: 'Humbly apprehensive of this growing mischief, for ye Trade between Scotland and the Plantations is now about to be more openly carried on under colour of a Law lately past in Scotland.'[1] They desired the matter to be laid before His Majesty in Council 'in order to some effectual remedy for suppressing such a Trade from Scotland to the Plantations tending so apparently to the ruine of this Principale Branch of the Revenue.' It was feared that the Scots would settle at some point on the Delaware shores which had not been specified in Penn's grant; or in some island near the Continent, where they might in a short time make a staple for European and enumerated Plantation commodities. It was therefore recommended that all unappropriated tracts of land should be immediately annexed to the nearest province, and put under some regular government. The House of Lords were also alarmed about the Plantation trade. In their address to the King on the subject of the Scottish East India Company they declare that: 'When once that Nation shall have settled themselves in Plantations in America, our Commerce in Tobacco, sugar, Cotton, Wool, Skins, Masts etc, will be utterly lost . . . and the English Plantations and the Traffick thereof lost to us, and the exportation of our own manufactures yearly decreased.'[2]

As a result of the various petitions and remonstrances concerning the Plantation trade the 'Act for preventing Frauds and regulating Abuses in the Plantation Trade'[3] was passed in 1696. This Act recited all the provisions of Charles II.'s statutes relating to Colonial trade, asserted their validity in all the Plantations, ordered the governors and officers to take oaths for the proper performance of their duties, and generally made the administration of the Acts far more stringent. With evident reference to the Scottish East India Company it was enacted that persons who claimed right or property in America, or in the islands, were not to sell any land except to natural born subjects of England, Ireland, Wales, or Berwick-upon-Tweed. Special provisions dealt with the Scotch trade. 'And whereas great Frauds and Abuses have beene committed by Scotchmen and others in the Plantation Trade by obtruding false and

[1] *S.P. Col.: Col. Entry Book*, 100, p. 350.

[2] *Journals of House of Lords*, vol. xv. 611.

[3] 7 and 8 Gul. III. c. 22.

counterfeit Certificates upon the Governour and Officers in the Plantations . . . of having given security in this Kingdome to bring the ladings of Plantation Goods to England, Wales or Berwick-upon-Tweed, as also Certificates of having discharged their lading of Plantation Goods in this kingdome pursuant to securities taken in the Plantations, and also Cocketts . . . of having taken in their ladings of European goods in England etc, whereof they may carry the Goods of Scotland and other Places of Europe without shipping or lading the same in England . . . to His Majesty's Plantations, and also carry the Goods of the Plantations directly to Scotland, or to any Market in Europe without bringing the same to England,' greater care is to be taken in accepting certificates. To guard against the influence exerted by Scots settlers on behalf of their fellow-countrymen, the Act declared that, in actions concerning forfeiture of goods because of unlawful exportations or importations, 'there shall not be any Jury but of such onely as are Natives of England or Ireland or are borne in His Majesties said Plantations.'

In the same year a new Board of Trade and Plantations was erected, which was to examine into and regulate all foreign trade and all Colonial affairs. Notwithstanding the provisions of the new Act for the more stringent enforcement of the laws concerning the Plantation trade, and also the fact that a great deal of the capital of the Scottish nation was engaged in the ill-fated Darien scheme, the trade of Scotland with the English Colonies seems to have continued to flourish. In 1699 Governor Basse of New Jersey writes that he is discouraged and deserted because of his 'discountenancing the Scoch and pirates in their illegal trades.' The former, he says, 'are growne to a very great height,' from the prospect of a Scot being made governor of the province, and also because of the 'success that their Countrymen meet withall in their settlement of . . . Golden Island.' 'I cannot but see that the English Interest and trade must of necessity fall if some speedy course be not taken for their stoping of their Growth . . . the principall traders in East New Jersey and Pennsylvania are Scotch.'[1]

A few years later Colonel Quary declares that in Pennsylvania and the Jersies the quantity of tobacco grown has very much increased, and that it is all engrossed by the Scotch 'as almost all other Trade here is.'[2] All attempts to exclude them from the trade seemed to be made in vain. As Quary said: 'There

[1] *New Jersey Colonial Documents*, ii. 288. [2] *Treasury Papers*, lxxiii. 43, 1701.

are so many Conveniences for the running of Goods that tis impossible to prevent it Lett the government make what Laws they can.' It seems probable, therefore, that the feeling that as the Scots were evidently going to have a large share of the Plantation trade, they should therefore be brought under the control of the English Parliament, was in some degree responsible for the union of 1707.

THEODORA KEITH.

The Relations of the Earl of Murray with Mary Stuart

IDENTIFIED from the outset of his career with the triumph of the Scottish Reformation, Murray is indebted for his place in history more to circumstances than to statesmanship. Happy in the hour of his birth, he had throughout life what would be described, in modern phraseology, as the 'flowing tide,' conducting him to eminence almost in his own despite. Calvinism, as Mr. T. L. Henderson observes, 'fitted him like a glove,' and temperamentally he was an absolute expression of the tendencies that were then riveting that theology upon the minds of the Scottish nation.

So far as Murray's relations with his sister are concerned, they may be described without exaggeration as a tissue of treachery from beginning to end. To hold him entirely blameworthy for this history of betrayal would be scant justice, as all Mary's instincts were in immediate antagonism to his own; but none the less it would puzzle even the most ingenious of apologists to whitewash many phases of Murray's conduct to his sovereign and sister. After making every allowance for a divided duty, he stands condemned at the bar of history as perfidious and disloyal when his attitude to the most luckless of Queens alone is subjected to examination.

A singularly colourless and unromantic personality, it seems almost a caprice of heredity that Murray should have been the scion of a dynasty so steeped in sentiment and abandoned to reaction as that of Stuart. Alike for good and evil, he was devoid of all the characteristics that distinguish the race to which, by virtue of a curious irony of circumstance, he belonged. Endowed with all the solidity, solemnity, and energy of Puritanism, he held graces, scholarship, and accomplishments in but slight esteem. A burgher rather than an aristocrat by temperament, it was, in some degree, by means of what many would

have regarded as his defects that he earned the confidence of a party who distrusted nothing more than the meretricious.

Born about the year 1531, the illegitimate son of James V. and Margaret Erskine was at the age of seven made Commendator of St. Andrews. A spoiler of the Amalakites even from childhood, he did not disdain throughout the earlier part of his career to draw large revenues from the properties of the Church which he was ultimately destined to be so instrumental in overthrowing. Unaffected by any consideration for the hierarchy of which he was ostensibly a member, Lord James Stuart instinctively flung in his lot with the new Evangel, and as a youth of nineteen took an active part in the deliberations of the Calvinistic leaders.

Whatever weight may be attached to the charges levelled against Murray by the school of writers to whom Hosack and Skelton belong, none at least can question the genuineness and consistency of his Protestantism. That he entertained no scruples against bowing down in the house of Rimmon is rendered abundantly evident by the nature of his dealings with Catherine de Medici, but nothing in reality was more remote from his intentions than the lending of a hand to further the recovery of French ascendancy in Scotland. It says but little for the astuteness of the Parisian diplomatists that they ever imagined that such a personality as Murray would become a tool in their hands; and, as might have been anticipated from the outset, he merely feathered his nest at their expense, and finally betrayed them to his compatriots.

Down to the year 1560 no room existed for any relations between Murray and his sister save those of a purely formal and official description. In that year, however, with the despatch of the Puritan leader to France for the purpose, as Maitland expressed it with characteristic vividness, of 'groping the Queen's mind,' they assume a perfectly definite shape. How far his psychological investigations justified the confidence reposed in him has never been fully disclosed, but he undoubtedly succeeded in winning the Queen over to his views, and rendered abortive the projects of the Scotch Catholic Lords who had sent across Lesly the historian to essay the task of persuading her into attempting a landing at Aberdeen and the crushing of Protestantism before that Titanic undertaking had become an impossibility.

It has been contended that in communicating the results of

his negotiations with his sister to Throgmorton, the English ambassador, Murray must be held as blameless by virtue of the understanding which subsisted between the Lords of the Congregation and Queen Elizabeth; but in view of the fact that Mary never for a moment contemplated the possibility of such a revelation, it is difficult to entirely acquit him of double-dealing in the matter. Murray's position had now become one of extreme delicacy, but none the less he was actively engaged in playing the English game so far as circumstances permitted him to do so. Upon the one hand his heart was with Elizabeth, but, on the other, it was manifest that Mary's position at the French Court had been rendered intolerable by the domination of Catherine de Medici, and that her return to Scotland had become inevitable. Only deposition could have averted what, in Murray's eyes, was a political calamity, and yet for such a proposal he knew well that his countrymen were wholly unprepared.

Adopting the only course left open to him, which was that of persuading his sister that her true interests lay in the acceptance of Presbyterianism and the English alliance, Murray steered his way with no small measure of adroitness. To obtain the confidence of Mary and preserve that of Elizabeth was a task demanding wariness at every turn; but until the appearance upon the scene of Darnley he contrived to perform it without a stumble.

For the time being, however, both Mary and her brother were pursuing almost identical aims. From the period covered by the disembarkment of the former at Leith down till the arrival of Lennox and his son, their relations, so far as can be discovered, were perfectly harmonious. The fact that she was heir presumptive to Elizabeth had become almost an obsession in Mary's mind, and rendered her indifferent to all other considerations. Under Maitland's guidance, Murray had become convinced that the union of the two kingdoms was a political necessity, and that no price was too high to pay for such a consummation. The obstacles to anything in the shape of a permanent alliance between temperaments so remote from one another were, none the less, insuperable, and to this underlying antagonism Murray himself, in all probability, was fully alive. Little exception, however, can be taken to his conduct, from a fraternal standpoint, throughout the duration of the Protestant phase, and had not the underhand hostility of Elizabeth driven

Mary into the championing of the Catholicism she had virtually abandoned, it is perfectly possible that he might have continued to serve her loyally enough, provided only that full scope was left for the gratification of his private ambitions.

With the internal administration of the country practically entrusted to his care, the future Regent lost little time before sweeping from his path the rivals whose power impeded the establishment of his ascendancy. The incapacity and French connections of Châtelherault had long ago rendered him a negligible factor in Scotch politics. Bothwell, Murray disposed of by the trumping-up of a charge of conspiracy, which, being backed up by the presence in Edinburgh of 5000 of his followers, caused the for once unjustly accused Hepburn to flee the country. The destruction of Huntly was an undertaking of vastly more difficulty, and one which but for the active participation of the Queen herself could never have been accomplished.

To Murray the demolition of Huntly was a matter of paramount importance, not merely on public, but on private grounds. The Lord James (as he was then still termed) had obtained a grant under the Privy Seal of the Earldom, by the title of which he was to be known to history, and subsequently, as a stepping-stone, managed, in 1561, to get himself invested with that of Mar. The latter he openly assumed, but deemed it prudent to conceal the existence of the prior grant, as the Earldom of Murray was held infeft of the Crown by Huntly, and the Cock o' the North was too formidable a personage upon whom to prematurely declare war.

The exact nature of the understanding that subsisted between Mary and Murray in regard to the uprooting of the house of Gordon, is one of the problems of Scotch history which has remained unsolved. Bringing down as it did the tottering fabric of Roman Catholicism in Scotland, the ruining of Huntly can only be described, from the point of view of a Marian partizan, as a political blunder of the first magnitude. The ardour, however, with which the Queen flung herself into the campaign against her co-religionists does not suggest any form of coercion, and there is no evidence to show that she required persuading in the matter. As to Murray, who, according to Bishop Lesly, was the 'sole favourite and disposer of everything' at this period, his gain was immeasurable. Not only did he render secure his long coveted earldom, get quit of a dangerous adversary, and deal

a staggering blow to Catholicism, but a favourable impression was made upon the mind of Elizabeth, and for the time being the English alliance was placed upon a footing of greater stability.

The advent of Lennox, and subsequently that of Darnley, however, affected a transformation in the whole aspect of Scottish affairs, and one under which Murray's fortunes reached their lowest ebb. Opposed from the outset to a matrimonial alliance which threatened Protestantism and brought into the field a rival claimant for a portion of his own estates, he retired in disgust from the court upon finding that all the wiles of diplomacy were powerless to avert it.

It must be acknowledged by even the warmest admirers of Murray, that he cut but a sorry figure throughout the struggle which ensued upon his abandonment of office. Failing in an attempt to kidnap Mary and Darnley when the royal couple were on their way from Perth to Queensferry, he took up arms with Châtelherault, Argyle, and Glencairn as confederates, but only to be chased from pillar to post by the Queen's troops. The end of the rising found him a fugitive across the English border. Led on to the ice by Elizabeth, he was finally left there in the most callous of fashions. In a prearranged but clumsily executed scene, he was dismissed the royal presence as an 'unworthy traitor,' and left for the nonce with no better occupation than to meditate upon the treachery of princes.

The inflexibility of Elizabeth in regard to the right of succession to the English throne and the contumacy of Murray, had left Mary with no option but that of gathering around her the Catholic nobility whom she had originally forfeited and slighted. Bothwell, Huntly, Athole, and Sutherland were now installed as her advisers, and Rizzio to all intents and purposes was foreign minister for Scotland.

For the moment the cause of the Reformation was in the gravest jeopardy, and only desperate remedies could have averted the danger that menaced its prospects. It must be confessed, however, that the means adopted which took the shape of the murder of Rizzio, was one that in its atrocity equalled anything recorded in the history of the Borgias. Its objective was less the cutting-off of a Piedmontese upstart than the destruction of the infant life, whose advent would bar Darnley's claim to the Crown of Scotland. Murray and his fellow exiles were undoubtedly fully privy to the conspiracy in all the rigour of its intentions, and even after making all deductions for the sake

of the issues which were involved, their complicity is one of a species that renders exoneration impossible.

Less than two days after the perpetration of what Knox describes as 'that just act, and most worthy of all praise and approbation,' Murray arrived at Holyrood, and was effusively received by the Queen. Though Mary must have been aware of the part played by her brother in regard to the assassination of Rizzio, he appears from this point to be fully re-established in her confidence and esteem. A readiness to forgive injuries was ever one of the Queen's most characteristic traits, and in temperamental fluctuations rather than in any deliberate scheme of policy is the key to her actions generally discoverable. Although after the flight to Dunbar, it was entirely due to Bothwell, Huntly, and Athole, that the reins of power were once more placed in her hands, their influence was practically neutralised by the introduction of Murray, Argyle, and Glencairn into the privy council, and the participators in the Holyrood shambles were thus rewarded for their concurrence in a diabolical outrage. When the Queen's confinement was rapidly approaching, the only nobleman permitted to reside with her in Edinburgh Castle was Murray, and had anything untoward occurred all power would undoubtedly have passed into his hands.

In no phase of his career does Murray's wariness exhibit itself in so extreme a form as in his attitude to the murder of Darnley. At the Craigmillar conference, it was memorably summed-up by Maitland in the assurance 'that he will look through his fingers, beholding our doings and saying nothing to them.' To this course of masterly inactivity, Murray steadily adhered, though accessory at the same time to all that was taking place. He does not appear to have entertained any objections to murders being done, but merely disliked the doing of them.

Two days before the disposal of Darnley, Murray discreetly retired to St. Andrews and remained in Fife 'looking through his fingers' for a period extending to over six weeks. As Mr. Lang remarks, 'he was always ready with his alibi.' For no apparent reason, he shortly afterwards took his departure upon a pilgrimage to France, but before doing so he made a will appointing the Queen to be the guardian of his only child—a provision which hardly seems compatible with the Messalina theory of Mary's character maintained by Buchanan and other writers of the school to which he belongs, in the employment of her brother and his confederates. Whether or not the checking

of the Queen's infatuation for Bothwell was a possible or an impossible undertaking, it was certainly one never attempted by Murray. Throughout, he preserved an attitude of aloofness, and witnessed the spectacle of his sister descending the slopes of Avernus with indifference, if not complacency.

After a period of absence exceeding six months, Murray journeyed homewards with a French pension in his pocket—which, to do him justice, he did nothing to earn. That his interests had been in no way neglected during the course of his peregrinations was at once shown by the conferring upon him of the crowning dignity of Regent of Scotland. Mary by this time had been immured by the Confederate Lords in the island prison of Lochleven Castle, and her position was one which lent itself admirably to the development of her brother's designs. Adroitly availing himself of it, he succeeded in obtaining not merely the confirmation of his office, but also the custody of the royal jewels, which he then promptly sold to Elizabeth at a miserably inadequate figure.

The rout of the royal forces at Langside was in no small degree attributable to the military skill of the Regent, whilst the clemency which he displayed in dealing with enemies whose rancour towards him in many instances surpassed all bounds, exhibited a magnanimity most unusual in a period when vindictiveness ranked almost among the virtues.

In the subsequent conferences, however, which took place at York and Westminster, with the object of determining the position of Mary when a captive in England, Murray appeared in the character of the plaintiff, and exhibited an unscrupulousness which no casuistry can extenuate. Accompanied by Morton and Lethington, he had the effrontery to accuse Mary of the Darnley murder—a crime with which he himself was indirectly, and his two associates directly, connected. Whatever view may be taken as to the genuineness or spuriousness of the *Casket Letters*, it is at least certain that they were only produced at Westminster by Murray and his confederates as a *dernier ressort*, and, after secret communications with the English ministers, most hostile to Mary.

After the conclusion of the inquiry, which ended in a refusal to condemn either accuser or accused, Murray took his departure northwards with the sum of £5,000 in his pocket bestowed upon him from the English treasury as a reward for blackening, though failing to destroy, the character of his sister.

Resuming his duties as Regent, Murray enforced law and order throughout Scotland with an unsparing hand, but in his treatment of his adversaries he exhibited in an ever-growing degree the duplicity which had always been one of his most marked characteristics. Inveigling Châtelherault to Edinburgh by counterfeited inducements, he then consigned him to prison, and about the same time betrayed the matrimonial overtures, sanctioned by himself, which Norfolk had made to his sister, and thus brought down upon the head of that nobleman the unrelenting wrath of Elizabeth.

It is highly probable that Murray's dramatic death at the hands of Hamilton, of Bothwellhaugh, preserved his memory from a depth of obloquy which would otherwise have awaited it. At the time of his assassination he was actively engaged through the medium of Elphinstone, one of his emissaries, in negotiations for the transference of his sister to Scotland, and had Elizabeth consented to such a surrender, there can exist little doubt that it would have been equivalent to the signing of her death-warrant. The English Queen would thus have been spared a weight of odium which, shifted to the shoulders of Murray, could not have failed to greatly modify the verdicts of history. The good Regent might then have been stripped of the sanctity in which he has been clothed by his ultra-Protestant adulators and rendered a target for the sneers of the ungodly.

To judge Murray solely in the light of his relations with Mary, would, however, be an act of manifest injustice. They represent indubitably his character under its most unfavourable aspect, but none the less it is difficult for those among whom the spirit of theological partizanship is entirely lacking, to find much material for admiration in a personality so reticent and elusive. Lord Guthrie has deplored the absence of any adequate biography of Murray, and undoubtedly an unfilled niche in Marian history is created by this void. All that at present exists is a subsidiary memoir by Chalmers attached to his *Life of Mary*, which merely takes the shape of a virulent indictment.

Tytler, in his *History of Scotland*, appears more than inclined to question the genuineness of the humanity with which the Regent stands generally accredited, and dryly remarks that 'he found fines and forfeiture a more effectual way of destroying his opponents and enriching his friends.' M. Philippson takes a similar view; but, on the other hand, Murray has been canonised

by Froude, who discovers him to be 'a man of stainless honour and free from any taint of self.'

Apart, however, from any conclusions favourable or unfavourable arrived at by different historical writers who have been largely guided by bias in their varying estimates, it is at least abundantly evident that Murray possessed fundamental principles in a period when the bulk of his contemporaries were content to be led by their own ever-changing impulses and interests. Fidelity to Elizabeth and the union of the two kingdoms of England and Scotland were the two aims which animated his career, and in nothing did he ever deviate from them. In his *Memoirs*, Sir James Melville maintains that Elizabeth despised Murray for his subserviency, but however this may have been his standpoint remained unaltered.

Morally it seems hardly possible to leave the Regent uncondemned. A scribe and a pharisee, the standards of the day can hardly be taken as applying to him. His house, it was said, 'was more like a church than a court,' and this being so, it is hard to see by what process of apologetics the owner can be weighed up in the same scales as a Bothwell or a Huntly. Over his grave like that of the great 'daughter of debate,' his sister, controversialists are still content to wrangle, but whatever issue their ingenuity may raise it can scarcely be that of the life-long perfidy practised by Murray towards one whom it was his duty to succour and protect from calamity. The pensioning of Bothwellhaugh by the hands of Mary may have seemed to many a matter for regret, but to none can it appear in the light of a subject for astonishment.

THOMAS DALRYMPLE DUNCAN.

The Romance of Sir Tristrem

THE famous *Romance of Sir Tristrem* has been fortunate in its editors; it has successively attracted the attention of Sir Walter Scott, Professor Kölbing and Mr. George M'Neill. The last of these edited it for the Scottish Text Society in 1885-6, and this may be taken as the standard edition.

But it is now nearly twenty years old; and so much has been done during this swiftly advancing period that it may not be out of place to suggest some explanations of passages that once seemed hopeless.

A few preliminary remarks may also fittingly find a place here. The MS. has been exactly reproduced; but I do not observe that two of its peculiarities have received special mention, though they are likely to mystify a reader.

The first is, that the indefinite article is frequently united with its substantive; it will therefore be found, for example, that *ares* is only a way of writing *a res*, *i.e.* a 'race, rush, swift attack'; and the word is only given in the glossary under *res*. Examples are rather numerous.

The second is that, on the contrary, compound words are often written as *two* words. Hence *y wis* really means *ywis*, adv. 'certainly'; and is duly entered as *ywis*. So also *for lorn*, *for thi*, and several more.

There is but one MS. copy; so we must be thankful for what we have. But it is a very careless and inaccurate copy; and many of its errors are duly corrected in the notes. I take occasion to point out others that have not been observed.

The word *auntours*, *i.e.* 'adventures,' as in *The Anters* (or *Auntours*) *of Arthur*, is dissyllabic; but is ill spelt *auentours*. I need not supply the references except where the Glossary fails us. *Maked* should be *mad*, *i.e.* 'made,' not only in l. 2965 (Glossary), but in l. 144. In the note to l. 189, for 'the following line' read 'l. 194.' In l. 56, for *went* read *wend*. In l. 323, for *endred* read *entred*; in 327, for *has* read *as*; in 707, for *Wit* read *With*; in 711, for *Whasche* read *Wasche*; so in l. 1580; in l. 1917, read *loge*; in l. 1980, for *kinsseman* read *kinnesman*; in l. 2012, read *seyth*; in l. 2150, for *his* read *is*; in l. 2247, for *schip* read *schippes*; in l. 2399, for *welp* read *whelp*; etc. In several places the scribe miswrites a word so as to ruin the rhyme; I may instance *redde* (miswritten *radde*), 155; *yspred* (written *ysprad*), 442; *led* (written *lad*), 444; *hy* (written *heye*), 786, 2150; *thinke* (written *thenke*), 1112; *arive* (written *a ride*, corrected in the note), 1173; *dint* (written *dent*), 1450; *brent* (written *brend*, but see 1478), 1472; read *bald* for *glad*, 2014; *fille*, 2172; *me think*, 2262;

thriste, 2391 ; *diste*, 2393 ; *say* (miswritten *sain*), 2621. These are, I fear, uninteresting details ; but they may serve to put us on our guard. There is a misprint in l. 521, where *þ* means *th*.

It will be of more interest to discuss some passages that do not seem to be explained in this edition. I usually quote two lines in one, to save space.

28. His men he slough among, And *reped* him mani a res.

Reped is given up ; for, indeed, the right form is *raped*. *Raped him* means 'he hastened him,' or 'hastened on for himself'; and the phrase means 'quickly performed or sped many a swift attack.' See the *New English Dictionary*, *s.v. Rape*, reflexive verb, where there are two good illustrative quotations. Compare :—'Rape the to ride,' *P. Plowman*, B. iv. 7 ; 'Rape the to shrifte,' *id.* v. 399 ; 'Rape yow to worche,' *id.* vi. 120 ; 'He wolle rape hym on a resse . . . to the holy londe,' *Le Morte Arthur*, 2665, which is a parallel passage.

In l. 44, we have mention of 'rouland rise'; so also 'rouland riis,' 49, 94, 122, 189, 200 ; but also simply 'rouland,' 179, 194. The note is :—'it may be connected with the German *riese*, a giant, or with the German *reis*, a sprout or scion. Neither explanation is wholly satisfactory.' But it is obviously the Welsh name *Rhys*, which has been Englished both as *Reece* and *Rice*, and whose sons are with us still as Preeces and Prices. It is an excellent example for convincing such as are open to conviction (they are far too few) that the modern English long *i* was once pronounced like the *ee* in *deep*.

229. King Markes may rewe, the ring, than he it se,
And *moun*.

Here the word *moun* rhymes with *sone*, 'son,' so that the *ou* really represents the short *u*, which comes out in modern English as the *u* in *sun*. It is explained by 'moan, sorrow.' This is impossible, because *oa* comes from an A.S. *ā*. Just as *son* is from A.S. *sunu*, so *moun* is from the A.S. *munan*, to remember ; a vast improvement of the sense. 'King Mark may feel pity, when he happens to see the ring, and remember me.' See the whole context, in which the dying lady leaves her ring to her son.

289. He taught him ich a lede Of ich maner of glewe.

Lede is explained by 'song'; and is compared with the German *lied*.

This is not very satisfactory, because the A.S. form for 'song' was *lēoth*, Mid. Eng. *lēth* ; a word not much used. It hardly gives the right sense. I greatly prefer the explanation given under *Leed* in the *N.E.D.*, which makes it a docked form of *leden*, 'language,' and explains it by 'phraseology.' This is the very point : 'he taught him every phrase relating to every kind of sport.' In olden times, only the ploughboy spoke about the 'feathers' of a hawk ; every one who had pretensions to gentility called them 'plumes.' In the same way I would explain the apparently otiose term 'in lede,' in l. 64 and elsewhere, by 'in correct terms,' or 'in gentle language'; it is expressly said, in the same sentence, that the knights were *hende*, *i.e.* 'courteous.'

293. On hunting oft he yede, To swich a lawe he drewe,
Al thus ;
More he couthe of veneri Than couthe Manerious.

It is obvious that *veneri* does not rhyme with *drewe*, as it should. No doubt the line ought to run thus :—'More of venery he knew.'

But the great puzzle is the wonderful name *Manerious*, which no one (says the note) can explain. However, I explained it once somewhere, some years ago. It should rather be Manerius ; and it is nothing but the Old Norman and Middle English word *Manére*, touched up with a Latin suffix to imitate its original. For what is its original? It is merely a French translation, meaning 'manner,' of the Latin name *Modus*. But what is meant by Modus? It is to be feared that its fame has departed ; yet it was at that time one of the most famous of all works, as well known as the *Roman de la Rose*, or as the name of Newton is now to the students of science. *Le Livre du Roi Modus et de la Reine Reson* (*The Book of King Manner and of Queen Reason*) was the chief authority on this very subject of 'venery' or hunting, containing all the precious terms of the chase and all the directions for the cutting up of the deer which, as the *Romance* informs us, Sir Tristrem knew so well. If he really knew more of hunting terms than even King Manner, he had great reason to be proud.

327. He yaf as he gan winne, In raf.

Raf is explained as 'plunder' ; from the A.S. *rēaf* ; which could only give such a form as *reef*. And 'plunder' is repugnant to the context. *Raff* means 'abundance, plenty, profusion,' and is still in use. See *N.E.D.* and the *English Dialect Dictionary*. We now get the true sense. It is said of Tristram that he gave away, even as he won, in great abundance. He won much by his skill, and he gave largely, like a gentleman.

353. *Fand* does not exactly mean 'found,' but 'provided' for him. See the *Dialect Dictionary*.

480. *Ther nest* is explained in the Notes to mean 'after that.' The literal sense is 'there next,' *i.e.* next to that. *Nest* is not in the Glossary.

485. The spande was the first brede, The erber dight he yare ;
To the stifles he yede, And euen a-to hem schare.

I think it clear that the right word is *spaude*, as Scott suggested. The objection made, that 'to derive *spande* from *spalla* (shoulder) is philologically incorrect' is no objection at all, since it begs the question as to the correctness of the printed form. The *Eng. Dial. Dict.* gives *spald*, a shoulder, with the variants *spauld*, *spall*, *spade*, *spaud* ; so that there is no doubt about the matter. *Brede* means 'roast' or 'roasted piece,' as Kölbing has already said ; see my note to Chaucer's *House of Fame*, 1222. In Hazlitt's *Popular Poetry*, vol. i. p. 21, we have :—

'The kyng of venyson hath non nede,
Yit myght me hape to haue a *brede*
To glad me and my gest.'

'The erber, etc.,' is explained by 'He quickly took out the bowels' ; an explanation which I cannot well follow. *Erber* is not explained in the Glossary, but it is the same as *arber*, fully explained in the *N.E.D.* Cotgrave explains the Old French *herbiere* as 'the throat-bole, throat-pipe, or gullet of a beast' ; and it was sometimes extended to mean the whole

'pluck' of an animal. To *dight* is to prepare or arrange; and 'to dight the erber' is the same as 'to make the erber,' *i.e.* to take out the pluck, the first stage in disembowelling.

Stifles is explained by 'knee-caps'; but this is apt to mislead. The 'knee' suggests the knee of the fore-leg; but the *stifle* (says Webster) is 'the joint next above the hock, and near the flank, in the *hind* leg of the horse and other animals; the joint corresponding to the knee in man.'

1273. That al games of grewe On grounde.

Here *That* refers to Tristrem. The Note says—'Out of whom all games grew from the ground, *i.e.* who thoroughly understood every game.' But *On* cannot mean 'from'; the sense is rather—'Out of whom grew all the games on earth.'

1356. A maiden of swiche reles.

The Glossary has: 'Reles, kind, description.' I know of no authority for this. I have shown, in my *Notes on Etymology*, that *reles* is the modern 'relish.' It here means 'sweetness.' The *N.E.D.* says:—'sensation or impression left behind by anything; taste, after-taste, relish; odour, scent.'

2393. Ouer the bregge he deste.

The Glossary has: '*deste*, dashed.' This gives the sense, but *deste* is not the past tense of *dash*. It is an error for *diste*, just as *threste* is an error for *thriste*; the rhyming words are *miste*, he missed, *wiste*, knew, and *kiste*, kissed. The *N.E.D.* gives *deste* twice. S.v. *deste*, we are wrongly referred to *dash*; but under *dust*, verb, we have it well explained. *Diste* is, in fact, the past tense of an A.S. verb **dystan*, answering to a non-recorded Teutonic **dustjan*, not otherwise known excepting as it appears in the Mid. Eng. *disten* and *dusten*. Transitively, it means 'to fling violently'; and intransitively, as here, 'to fling oneself violently'; so that 'dashed' gives a sufficiently good sense.

2801. Tristrem knewe him fre; Beliagog in hight,
Nought lain, An halle to maken him bright.

The note says: 'Tristrem acknowledged him as a free man, *i.e.* accorded him his freedom.' This is a very harsh construction of *knewe*. I take *fre* in its usual sense of 'liberal' or 'bounteous.' Further, I alter the semi-colon after *fre* to a comma, and place another comma after *Beliagog*. The sense is: 'Tristrem knew him, Beliagog, (to be) liberal in his promise, (namely), if I am to conceal nothing, that he would make a bright hall for him.' Here is nothing forced or obscure. For *hight*, a promise, see the *Cursor Mundi*, l. 785. The semi-colon after *fre* deprives the rest of the passage of its verb.

2500. He fond a wele ful gode, Al white it was, the grete.

Grete is not explained. I take it to mean: 'he found a well that was very good; all white it was, viz. the gravel below.' See *grit* in the *New E. Dict.*; *grete*, meaning 'gravel,' is common enough. Compare l. 121 of *Le Roman de la Rose*, quoted in my Chaucer, vol. i. p. 98, where

it is said of the well: 'Le fons de l'iaue de gravele'; the bottom of the water was of gravel.

> 2955. Tristrem tho gan him calle, On astilt he com tho,
> Ful swithe.

Astilt is not explained. It is an error for *als tit* or *as titt*, a common phrase meaning 'as fast as possible,' and parallel to *ful swithe.* The sense is: 'then did Tristrem call him; then he came on as fast as possible, very soon.' See *tid* in Stratmann; and *astite* and *alstite* in the *N.E.D.* The phrase occurs again, in l. 248, where the scansion shows that *al so tite* ought to be *as tite*, in two syllables, not three.

3054. *Fayt* does not mean 'to slander,' but 'to pretend'; see *P. Plowman*, B. vii. 94.

3129. For *that* read *thaim*, 'them'; and all difficulty vanishes.

> 3274. Thai token the heighe held.

Held does not mean 'a hill,' but 'a slope'; see *hield* in the *N.E.D.*

> 3167. This lond nis worth anay.

Anay is not noticed, either under *anay*, or *nay*, or *ay.* It stands for *a nay*, which is merely another form of *an ay*, *i.e.* 'an egg.' This is noted by Stratmann, s.v. *ei.* In l. 3288, for *halle* read *hille.*

With reference to the miswriting of *n* for *u*, as in *spande* for *spaude*, it is worth noting that this is by no means the sole instance. The word *blihand* should certainly be *blihaud*; *Rohand* should (I think) be *Rohaud*, cf. Ital. Roaldo; and I suspect that *Ganhardin* should be *Gauhardin.* As to *Ysonde*, it seems a sad perversion of *Ysoude*, as the French form was *Ysoude* or *Yseulte*; cf. Ital. *Isolta.* It is remarkable that the name never occurs at the end of a line, except in the modern continuation by Sir Walter Scott.

There is a curious fault in the rhythm at l. 1068. It is due to mere misarrangement.

> 'Moraunt of yrland smot
> Tristrem in the scheld,
> That half fel fram his hond
> Ther adoun in the feld.'

Rearrange the first two lines thus:

> 'Moraunt of yrlond (*as in* l. 969)
> Smot Tristrem in the scheld'; &c.

It is *yrlond*, not *smot*, that rhymes with *hond.*

WALTER W. SKEAT.

Claverhouse's Last Letter

I GLADLY take advantage of the Editor's courteous invitation to reply to Mr. Barrington's interesting article, *S.H.R.* v. 505. I admit that the allegation of forgery in regard to the alleged letter written by Dundee after his victory is supported by no positive evidence, and for that reason a verdict of 'Not proven' is, as Mr. Barrington demands, the proper one. But a verdict of 'Not proven' by no means precludes a belief that a charge is true though incapable of proof. In the absence of direct disproof of the genuineness of the alleged letter, Dundee's authorship of it must be judged in relation to (1) the circumstances in which it was written, and (2) the authority of the documents which attribute it to him.

In regard to the first test, the letter must be denounced as a forgery if the manner of Dundee's death was such as to make the writing of the letter by him an impossibility. Naturally, therefore, Mr. Barrington is sceptical of the evidence which I adduced as to Dundee having been shot in the eye. Such a wound, he supposes, would mean instant death. Probably it would; though I am told that an oblique shot might shatter the eye-socket and not be immediately fatal. Mr. Lang (*History of Scotland*, vol. iv. p. 20) doubts whether a man could receive such a wound and retain consciousness. He points out pertinently that such a wound, and Dundee's conversation with 'a Mr. Johnstone,' are difficult to reconcile. I agree. But I must point out that the statement of Mackay's officers, who saw Dundee's dead body and noticed the eye-wound, is not less authoritative and credible than the statement of Johnstone, of whom we know nothing, and who may even have had discreditable motives for identifying himself with the last moments of Dundee. This point also is worth noticing: the statement of the manner of Dundee's death by Mackay and his officers, who saw the body at Blair, is not only nearest in point of time to the event, but is also the only definite evidence we have from persons who actually saw Dundee's dead body. In the *Military History of Perthshire*, recently edited by the Marchioness of Tullibardine, and in a most interesting and detailed chapter therein written by herself (p. 272), Lady Tullibardine criticizes the statement of Mackay's officers on the ground that it is improbable that 'an army of victorious Highlanders would leave its General unburied.' But apart from the fact that the statement of Mackay's officers is confirmed by Sir Duncan Campbell of Auchinbreck, who also saw the body of Dundee coffined but unburied

in Blair Church, it appears eminently natural that it should have been deposited but not interred at Blair, in view of an ultimate and possibly imminent transference to its natural resting-place among the dead man's forebears; particularly seeing that Dundee's army was victorious and in possession of the field. Lady Tullibardine also objects, though she does not push the objection, that credible statements assert that Dundee's body was 'buried' within a few days of the battle. But, as Lady Tullibardine admits, 'the interment might merely have consisted in laying the coffin in the vault of the church.'

In addition to the head-wound there are statements, to which Mr. Barrington refers, to the effect that Dundee was also shot in the body. In my book I quoted Balhaldy's statement—he is not a contemporary witness—to the effect that Dundee was shot 'about two hand's-breadth within his armour, on the lower part of his left side.' Balcarres, on the other hand, places the wound in Dundee's 'right side, immediately below his armour.' Mr. Barrington advances some reason to doubt whether the latter statement carries the weight of Balcarres' authority; but let it stand. I added that the breastplate of Dundee at Blair shows no trace of a shot-hole and therefore, if genuine, refutes both statements. Mr. Barrington says that neither of these alleged wounds 'affect the question of a hole in the breastplate.' As to Balhaldy, does Mr. Barrington weigh sufficiently the words 'within his armour'? If these words mean anything, they imply that the shot wounded Dundee in a spot protected by his armour. Lady Tullibardine thinks that the shot may have penetrated the back-piece (which is not extant), and that 'in the left side' could refer as well to the back of the armour as to the front. But Balhaldy describes the wound as being 'about two hand's-breadth within his armour, on the lower part of his left side,' and a wound at such a distance from the junction of the breast- and back-pieces would certainly be described as a wound in the back if the shot penetrated the back-piece, as Lady Tullibardine suggests it may have done. However that may be, it is clear, as against Mr. Barrington's contention, that the condition of the breastplate, if genuine, is exceedingly relevant to the credibility of Balhaldy's statement. And in regard to Balcarres? Mr. Barrington does not take Balcarres' statement by itself, but makes a compound statement of Balhaldy *plus* Balcarres to the effect that 'if the fatal wound was below his armour in the lower part of his side, the breastplate would naturally remain untouched.' But Balcarres does not say a word about 'the lower part.' He says that the wound was 'in his right side immediately below his armour.' Now 'below' may obviously refer either to the top or bottom of the armour. Mr. Barrington takes it in the latter sense. But a wound below the bottom of the armour would certainly not be called a wound in the side, as is clear from the portrait of Dundee in armour at page 89 of my *Life of Claverhouse*. A wound below the neck-rim of the breastplate, on the other hand, would certainly come within the category of a side wound.

But the question of a body wound is almost irrelevant, except in so far that if Dundee was shot in the body as well as in the head the improbability of his having written the alleged letter is increased. James Malcolm's sworn evidence as to Dundee's 'wounds,' if it has any significance (which I doubt, since we usually say of a soldier that he died of his 'wounds' rather than 'wound'), is as relevant to one wound in the head and another in the body as to two wounds in the body.

The second test of the genuineness of the alleged letter is the authority of the documents which attach its authorship to Dundee. I cannot here repeat the evidence on which I was led to the conclusion that the MS. in the Bodleian was a copy of the broadside. I still hold to that view, and unless the whole thing was a hoax, or an example of enterprising journalism, the reason which I suggested to account for the appearance of the broadside is the most reasonable one. There could be no possible motive for publication of the broadside if it were not closely contemporary with Dundee's victory and death. The broadside itself, which Mr. Mawdesley allowed me to see, is obviously of the period both in type and paper. Given the circumstances, a victory, a wounded General, the construction of such a letter should not have been beyond the ability of a generation that knew Titus Oates. Mr. Barrington defends Dundee's alleged statement that he was in command of an army three times its actual strength on the date above which the letter was printed. If the Bodleian MS. is a fair copy of the letter from Dundee to James written on July 28, Dundee's statement was a lie, and to lie was not his wont. If the broadside was after all a reprint of an actual letter from Dundee to James, its publication must have been at such an interval after the event as to make the interpolation of so misleading and inaccurate a detail wholly unnecessary. Finally, the alleged letter stands or falls with the alleged speech of Dundee to his army, which accompanies it both on the broadside and on the MS. in the Bodleian. The speech is conventional to a degree, and prejudices the authenticity of any other utterance found in its company.

I conclude therefore, that the most authentic account of the manner in which Dundee met his death throws the gravest doubt on the supposition that he was enabled after his wound or wounds to write or dictate the letter attributed to him. I maintain further that there are no circumstances in connection with the publication or character of Dundee's alleged letter which weaken the conclusion that his fate in the battle made the writing or dictating of it in the last degree improbable.

C. SANFORD TERRY.

MR. BARRINGTON'S view, expressed in his recent contribution to the *Scottish Historical Review* (*S.H.R.* v. 505), seems to be that as Dundee was possibly alive on the 28th July, he may have written the letter to King James, and that therefore the latter is to be accepted as genuine. At least he thinks a verdict of 'not proven'

should be entered as to the allegation that it is a forgery. But there are two questions which present themselves to one not committed to either side: (1) *Was* Dundee alive on the 28th, or is the presumption that he was then dead irresistible? and (2) Is the point raised by Mr. Barrington worthy of so much attention, or the letter itself worthy of its alleged writer?

First, as to Dundee's death. Mr. Barrington argues that he was not killed outright, but was wounded, on the testimony of a witness who refers to his 'wounds.' Mr. Barrington then quotes the testimony of Johnston, a soldier who caught the wounded General in his arms after the shot, and who reported a conversation with him on the field. Lastly Mr. Barrington argues that the letter in dispute, being dated 28th July, proves that Dundee had been alive on that day. It may be suggested that here Mr. Barrington is assuming that to be true which is not proved; but let that pass, and let us accept these as witnesses on his behalf, although Johnston's testimony is weakened by its being given at second hand.

On the other side we have many testimonies. I do not, however, call Balhaldy as a witness, nor do I deal with the scene at Blair when the body was seen. There are other and nearer witnesses to the event itself. The first testimony, not in date, perhaps, but in importance, is that of Major General Mackay, who writing about the time, and calmly reviewing the memories of the battle, states that the fire of his own troops was at first 'continued and brisk,' whereby Dundee and others 'were killed' while charging down the hill. The phrase 'were killed' cannot be construed into any other than its usual meaning, implying that Dundee died on the spot or was fatally wounded and his death was speedy, so that in colloquial phrase he 'was killed.' Another witness whom Mr. Barrington himself quotes 'as worth calling,' the well-known Ian Lom, says of Dundee, 'O heroic leader, thou didst fall in the fight, and dreadful was thy arm till thy hour came. . . . Neath the folds of thy clothing the bullet pierced thee.' Thus the poet, who no doubt looked on at the fray, says that one bullet pierced the hero, who fell in the fight. No hint of the journey to Blair here, though it would not have detracted from the heroism. The next witness, whom Mr. Barrington does not name, was a certain James Osburne from Cupar-Fife, who fought on Dundee's side. He stated in evidence to a Parliamentary Committee[1] that he saw the Viscount Dundee during the fight at Killiecrankie, and that he 'saw a dead body which was said to be the Viscount's body, wrapped up in a pair of Highland plaids after the said fight.' This perhaps is not direct testimony, but it is strong evidence of the belief that Dundee lay dead on the field of battle on the night of the 27th, and the witness Malcolm, already referred to, corroborates Osburne by saying that he saw the Viscount 'lyeing dead of the wounds he receaved that day in the feight.'[2]

Another form of testimony is that of letters, contemporary and fortunately dated. The first is one written from Tullimet, about ten miles from Blair, to John, Lord Murray, afterwards Earl of Tullibardine and Duke of Atholl, from his brother, Lord James Murray, who says that

[1] *Acta Parl. Scot.* ix. App. 57. [2] *Ibid.* p. 58.

he (who was then a supporter of Dundee) had written to Dundee about his father's [the Marquis of Atholl's] papers, when he heard of Dundee being killed.[1] This letter is dated 28th July, 1689, *the very day of the alleged letter to King James*, and this fact largely discounts the probability of Dundee's being alive that day. Another letter, which Mr. Barrington refers to, written on 29th July, also from Tullimet, gives a note of those killed on Dundee's side. It names his successor, Cannon, and states that none were killed of Dundee's party save Dundee himself, two brothers of Glengarry, a second son of Sir Donald Macdonald, one Robert Ramsay, and Pitcur was deadly wounded. 'My Lord Dundie was shot dead on the head [at the head] of his horse' or cavalry.[2] The distinction in this letter between the killing of Dundee and others and the deadly wounding of Haliburton of Pitcur is important—as the latter afterwards died of his wounds, but Dundee is classed among those slain. Mr. Barrington, in dealing with this letter, charges Sir William Fraser with assuming that Dundee died instantaneously, but the *Report* quoted expresses no such opinion; it only indicates that the letters now cited tend to disprove the statement that Dundee was carried alive to Blair Castle.[3] On similar grounds it might be argued, from one passage in his article (*S.H.R.* v. 506), that Mr. Barrington himself favoured the view of instantaneous death for Dundee.

To sum up, Mr. Barrington puts forward, as I have said, three witnesses, and I really cannot discern more in his article, in favour of his view, and their united testimony does not amount to proof, while one of them is a 'suspect witness.' On the other side we have no fewer than six witnesses, four who were present at the battle and two contemporary letter writers, who from differing points of view, and in simple assurance of the fact, all repeat the same thing, that Dundee 'was killed,' that he was 'shot dead,' that he was 'lying dead' on the night of the battle, that is, the 27th July. Their unanimity is remarkable, and while their testimony does not exclude the view that Dundee may have lingered for a time, it certainly implies that that time was brief, and that he died on the field. Few will doubt that the balance of evidence is against Mr. Barrington, and the natural conclusion is that Dundee could not have written the letter on the 28th, which is the chief point in Mr. Barrington's contention. A verdict of 'not proven' seems to be insufficient.

But admitting a possibility that the dying Dundee might have dictated *something* which was afterwards expanded into a letter, is the present version his or is it a production which he never saw, and therefore a forgery so far as he was concerned. The raising of the question at this late date, when the controversy has slumbered so long, seems unnecessarily futile, and an examination of the letter suggests that it were better for Dundee's reputation that it were proved a forgery. The late Dr. John

[1] *Hist. MSS. Comm. Report*, xii. App. viii. p. 41.

[2] *Ibid.* This letter is printed in full in the *Scottish Antiquary*, vii. pp. 105, 106.

[3] *Ibid.* p. 6.

Hill Burton held that opinion, chiefly on the ground that it was too well expressed to be written by Dundee;[1] Macaulay also, but his verdict was too sweeping. Mr. Barrington accepts the letter because he thinks it bears so strong a resemblance to the hero's other letters that it would have seemed a fitting close to his career. And it was also his way, says Mr. Barrington, 'whilst disowning all rhetorical aid, to convey his meaning most surely and effectively.' But such a characteristic would be the more easy for a forger to imitate, and those interested could thus more easily produce a likeness to Dundee's style. Mr. Barrington thinks that if they were clever enough to do this, they ought to have 'realised the folly of attempting to postpone a discovery of the real state of affairs by so feeble and necessarily shortlived a stratagem.' But it would not seem so then. Mr. Barrington is writing in 1908, but in 1689 the spread of news was comparatively slow, and it was doubtless of the greatest importance to the Jacobite cause to conceal their great loss even for a short time, an idea emphasised by the rush of Highlanders to join the standard after the battle. Hence a valid motive for such a manifesto, especially if intended for foreign consumption. The attempt did fail, but rather from King James's supineness than from the truth as to Dundee's death.

But before discussing the letter itself, what about the alleged speech to the troops on the same MS. and print? Mr. Barrington ignores this effusion, yet it is important. The speech and the letter, coupled as they are, are evidently intended to be accepted together as from Dundee. Yet though the subject is not directly before us, who can believe that a man like Claverhouse would address his troops in the form given in the MS. or broadside.[2] Major-General Mackay, indeed, made an appeal to his men before the battle, but most of these were raw levies and needed encouragement. Dundee's men were very different. They needed no 'speech' to stimulate them; rather, they were like hounds on their leash straining and eager to get at their quarry. It is difficult to believe that Dundee ever wasted time on a speech at all, especially such as is attributed to him, which is of the feeblest to such an audience. We now turn to the letter. Mr. Barrington accepts it as it stands, yet he himself administers a shrewd blow to its authenticity. Professor Terry pointed out that in the broadside, which he believes to be the original rather than the MS., Dundee estimates his force at Killiecrankie at '6000 men,' whereas he had only a third of that number, really about 2500. Mr. Barrington adopts the MS. version, which omits the '6000 men,' and suggests that 'as the Highland army swelled to some 6000 men within a few days after the battle, this may account for the interpolation in the broadside.' But why interpolation at all? The letter purports to be a letter to King James, and ought therefore to have been printed exactly as the MS. has it, or as it was written. To admit interpolation in any form, means that there *was* a manipulation of the original, and can any one tell how far we have the correct version?

[1] *History of Scotland* (1689-1748), i. pp. 133, 134 *n.*

[2] See print in *John Graham of Claverhouse*, by C. S. Terry, pp. 358, 359 *n.*

Mr. Barrington himself thus gives a wide loophole for doubt. Professor Terry gives good reasons, which will be appreciated by those familiar with old writings, for believing that the MS. was copied from the broadside, and not *vice versa*. If this was the case and the MS. a rough note made for transmission to Sir D. Nairn, among whose papers it was found, the words '6000 men' would naturally be omitted as not true. Mr. Barrington says it may be conjectured that those interested 'on hearing, early in August, that the Highland army then consisted of considerably over 5000 men, took it for granted that all these men fought at Killiecrankie, and consequently interpolated the impressive figures.' But the figures are *not* impressive, for their insertion makes Dundee to be in his death, what he was not in life, a braggart and a foolish one. He is made to boast that he defeated an army of 5000 (really 4000) with a force of 6000. It was not like Dundee to claim credit for such a result, and surely no great glory, with such troops, to gain a victory over a much inferior force; and though the MS. version omits the words, it was the broadside that was published as his letter. Further, if we admit 'interpolation' on one point, why not in all?

We may pass over certain items in the letter as to disposal of the fruits of victory, items which might have been written by any officer commanding, and take another sentence which occurs in *both* versions. The letter reports that Dundee's men behaved with gallantry, equal 'to whatever I saw in the hottest battles fought abroad by disciplined armies, and this Mackay's old soldiers felt on this occasion.' Was Dundee likely to put the matter so? It was a mere commonplace that his men, chiefly Highlanders, should behave bravely, and to compare them with disciplined soldiers seems unnecessary. Also, though he had served abroad, there is no clear certainty that he had personally witnessed any very great battle, except perhaps Seneffe. The reference to Mackay's old soldiers and their feelings seems to come oddly from one who, if he did live till 28th July, must have been too weak to consider such a point, and who does not appear to have ascertained the feelings of the enemy. Such an idea, however, might come from some one who had later opportunities.

Another and important point in the letter is the signature, which in both versions is 'Dundee.' Yet Claverhouse never spelt his title so, but always 'Dundie,' and it seems strange that in writing to his King he should depart from his usual practice. But the form 'Dundee' would come naturally to one who did not know the Viscount's own spelling; and here is a point which raises another difficulty. Dundee may have dictated the letter; he certainly did not *write* it as it stands. So far as he is concerned, the letter must either be a revised copy or a forgery, though it is said to be a letter from him to his King and therefore sacred from alteration. This writer has seen many original letters of John Grahame of Claverhouse, some written in times of comparative ease,[1] and others written in the hurry of his military cam-

[1] Cf. *Red Book of Menteith*, by William Fraser, ii. per Index.

paigns,[1] and not one of them was free from misspelt words, some letters containing a great many. This was not at that period a style peculiar to Claverhouse, but it is *so marked in his letters* that the want of it cannot be ignored. Yet in this letter the words and spelling are in a very correct style. It must therefore have been *written* or *edited* by someone else, and this may have been done after Dundee's death. The editor probably appended his own spelling of the Viscount's name; or if the Viscount did sign the letter, the spelling has been changed, and the probability of revision still remains.

If the above criticisms do not invalidate the letter they will suggest that there is much room for doubt. And when to this is added the strong testimony as to Dundee's death *on the field of battle*, there is very good ground indeed for believing that Dundee neither saw nor wrote the letter as it is known to us either in the MS. or the print. Surely, however, it were better to let the matter rest until we get that 'further light' which Mr. Barrington hopes for, and others, as well as he, seek for.

JOHN ANDERSON.

Register House, Edinburgh.

[1] *Historical MSS. Report*, xv. App. viii. 264-294. No one, reading these, can fail to note the difference between them and the one in dispute. Even those printed by Professor Terry in his book and referred to by Mr. Barrington have the same peculiarity, which he has not, apparently, taken into account.

The Editor has received from Mr. Michael Barrington a second contribution (see *S.H.R.* v. 505) on this subject. In this he further maintains his position, to which he strongly adheres, that 'as there is no adequate motive for forgery, and as the letter is in the very spirit and manner of Dundee, and as the evidence of his death upon the battlefield is not convincing, the letter deserves a more respectful treatment than it has received since 1826, when Mr. Smythe, of Methven, first cast doubts upon its authenticity.' His opinion is not altered after reading the above papers by Professor Sanford Terry and the Rev. John Anderson, of which he has seen proofs.

The Editor regrets, however, that he has not space for further discussion of this subject.