The
Scottish Historical Review

Vol. XIX., No. 75 April, 1922

Eighteenth Century Highland Landlords and the Poverty Problem

IN the previous part of this article[1] we discussed some of the suggestions made by contemporary writers for the improvement of the eighteenth century Highlands. We tried to show how far these suggestions had been or were being put into effect; what were the practical or psychological obstacles which prevented their progress being more rapid; and how far the suggested policy, if fully carried out, would have met the needs of the situation.

The conclusion arrived at was, that security of tenure, decent housing, and reasonable rents would have relieved the situation of some of the Highland farmers, but they could not be expected to provide a complete solution for a problem the crux of which lay in a present excess of population. They created no new demand for labour, and their benefit to the farmers depended mostly on the hope that they would be accompanied by radical improvements in Highland farming methods.

The reformers themselves, feeling the insufficiency of mere changes in tenure, urged the Highland owners to make haste in matters of farming to follow the example of improving proprietors in the Lowlands.

Before the sheep era, the typical Highland agrarian unit was the medium-sized cattle farm rented by a group of tenants, either from a superior tenant, or directly from the owner. Such

[1] See *Scottish Historical Review*, xix. p. 1.

a farm would include a small portion of arable, some meadow and heathy pasture, with probably grazing rights over a considerable tract of mountain.[1] The arable was sometimes held and worked in common, but more often it was divided on the runridge principle, each tenant having his own strips, separated from those of the other tenants by turf balks. As in the unimproved Lowlands, the cultivated land was divided into in-field and out-field; the former got practically all the manure, and was kept constantly under crop; the latter got no manure but that of the animals folded upon it, but was also kept under crop as long as it would bear.

Enclosures were very rare. Occasionally there was a *march dyke* separating one farm from another. In a hilly area this would invariably run vertically up the hill, stopping when it reached the mountain pasture common to all the farms; in such a case there would probably also be a *head-dyke* dividing the farms proper from the higher slopes. Often the only enclosure would be that separating two estates.

Rents were paid from the profits of the black cattle, which were usually sold to southern drovers. Crops were raised, not for the market, but to supply the food for the farmers' households, and to keep the animals alive during winter. Very often they failed to do either. Apart from a few favoured districts, the Highlands, except in good years, had to import grain for food, and a large proportion of the live stock perished every winter from want.

Such was the old system, a system which gave an extremely miserable living to the farmers, and left practically no margin for rents either reasonable or unreasonable.

In connection with it, we must remember that the Highland farmer laboured under several serious geographical drawbacks, the chief of which were the nature of the climate[2] and the soil,

[1] Marshall, *General View of the Agriculture of the Central Highlands*, 1794.

[2] The Rev. John Warrick of Cumnock calls attention to one source of poverty to which Samuel Johnson refers in his *Journey to the Western Isles*. 'Mull,' he says, 'had suffered like Skye by the black winter of seventy-one, in which, contrary to all experience, a continued frost detained the snow eight weeks upon the ground. Against a calamity never known no provision had been made, and the people could only pine in helpless misery. One tenant was mentioned, whose cattle perished to the value of three hundred pounds—a loss which probably more than the life of man is necessary to repair. . . . In Mull the disappointment of a harvest, or a murrain among the cattle, cuts off the regular provision; and they who have no manufactures can purchase no part of the superfluities of other coun-

and the remoteness from good town markets. The climate and soil were a serious hindrance to grain cultivation; the distance from markets practically destroyed the value of the minor produce, such as milk, eggs and butter.

It is true that none of these difficulties were insuperable. It was possible to modify both climate and soil by enclosures, by planting, and by draining the swamps. It was possible to create markets by better communication, and by the encouragement of towns and villages.[1] But as matters stood at the end of the eighteenth century these obstacles were serious.

A few writers like Macdonald [2] believed that a considerable extension of grain cultivation would have been possible and profitable, particularly in the Hebrides. This opinion was not generally shared by their contemporaries. The opposite opinion was stated with great vigour by the minister [3] of the parish of Kilmuir, Skye, who spoke with some authority, having struggled with grain crops upon his own glebe. His experience was that it was madness to try to cultivate anything there more exacting than sown grasses.

Possibly this view was somewhat exaggerated, but there was certainly nothing in Highland experience to warrant the hope that any general measure for converting the existing cattle into arable farms was likely to meet with any success. Even if such a transformation had been possible, it is doubtful if it would have done much to solve the poverty and unemployment problems of the Highlands. It remained, then, for the landlord to do what he could towards making the existing cattle farms more profitable.

The weaknesses of the existing system were sufficiently obvious.

Carelessness in selecting Breeds. This was invariable amongst the tenant class who formed the problem.[4] Even the big Highland sheep farmers generally failed in competition with Lowland stock breeders on that account, and if the men with money enough to embark on sheep-raising were indiscriminate in their selection of breeds, the small cattle farmer usually failed to grasp the fact that any choice of stock existed. If by any chance there

tries. The consequence of a bad season is here not scarcity, but emptiness; and they whose plenty was barely a supply of natural and present need, when that slender stock fails, must perish with hunger.'

[1] Knox, *Tour through the Highlands*, 1786.

[2] Macdonald, *General View of the Agriculture of the Hebrides*, 1811.

[3] *Old Statistical Account.* [4] *O.S.A.* Monivaird and Strowan, etc.

was a farmer who took the question seriously, it was practically impossible for him to do anything so long as his pastures were all unenclosed, and his beasts mixed freely with those of the other tenants.

Overstocking. This was more immediately disastrous than even the casual method of choosing stock. The situation on the average Highland farm was that, with a large extent of available summer pasture, there was relatively a very small quantity of food available for the animals over winter. But few Highland farmers were proof against the temptation offered by the summer grazing; practically all attempted to keep a number of beasts which they could not possibly provide food for during the winter. The result was inevitable. Every spring saw the herds terribly depleted by deaths from starvation, while the beasts that survived were reduced to mere skin and bone, and ruined for all purposes.[1]

In the parish of Glenorchy, 510 cattle of all ages, the property of a single person, died in one season from starvation.[2] As late as 1808, in Kildonan, Sutherlandshire, there perished from want in a single spring, 300 horses, 126 cows, 500 cattle, and this though every second calf had been killed to give the others a chance.

Obviously the difficulty of finding enough winter food for the cattle was a serious one, and it was intensified by the extraordinary number of horses supported on a Highland farm. These were partly superfluous and partly made necessary by the poorness of the farm implements and the badness of the Highland roads.

Undoubtedly one of the most pressing tasks for the Highland landowner was to persuade his tenants to make their stock correspond with the feeding capacity of their farms, either by decreasing the number of animals, or, if possible, by increasing the amount of winter food stuffs.

Poor Cultivation. At the root of the food problem was the wider question of the general backwardness of Highland cultivation. At the end of the eighteenth century there were few parts of the Highlands or Hebrides where any green crop other than potatoes was grown. Turnips and sown grasses were either unknown or unheeded by the small cattle farmer.

The grain crops were generally very poor. The in-field and out-field system left one part of the land practically barren, and

[1] Marshall, *Central Highlands.* [2] *O.S.A.* Glenorchy.

kept the other foul with weeds, while climate made the harvest late, so late that often the crop could never be lifted.

Matters were not improved by the type of implement used. The *caschrom*, the crooked Highland spade, though slow and uneconomical compared with a proper plough, was not ineffective, and was useful on some sorts of land where ploughing was hardly possible. But the ordinary Highland plough itself was extremely clumsy and unsatisfactory; the light, wooden harrows used were practically useless; while many of the most valuable implements common in the Lowlands were simply unknown. Under these circumstances, grain crops were often deplorable; in the parish of Kilbride, in Arran, it was reckoned that the best land only yielded two returns.

Want of Enclosures. Cultivation was further held back by the subdivision of the arable fields into ridges, and by the want of proper enclosures. Macdonald reckoned that in 1808, in Arran, Mull, Skye, Jura and the Long Island, there were still 800,000 acres without enclosures of any kind. The want of enclosures made it useless for individuals to experiment with green crops, and on the spongy arable land common in the Highlands good culture was impossible so long as the cattle continued each year after harvest to overrun the arable fields and destroy the surface of the soil. The difference in productive power between enclosed and unenclosed lands was so great that farms which had with difficulty yielded 2d. an acre, could readily pay three shillings an acre after enclosure.

These being the weak points of Highland farming, the line of policy for the landlord seemed clearly indicated.

An owner could restrict the disastrous practice of overstocking, though no doubt he would be regarded, in the first instance, as a brutal tyrant for doing so; he might insist, though it would not be quite so simple, on the abolition of out-field and in-field, and the adoption of a regular system of rotation of crops; he might replace the runrig holdings with compact, enclosed farms. It was also possible for him to improve conditions by draining damp lands, by making plantations that would give shelter in exposed areas. Finally, on his home farm the landlord might experiment with new crops and implements, and so give his tenants some practical illustrations of what might be done with the land.

A general policy of this kind was actively pursued on the lands administered by the Forfeited Estates Commissioners from

the time of the fifties onward. It was followed to a greater or less degree on the great estates of Argyll and Breadalbane, and after 1795 on the possessions of the Sutherland family. It was taken up by Dempster of Dunnichen on his lands at Criech. It directed the activities of the Hebridian improvers, Lord Macdonald, M'Lean of Coll, M'Leod of Raasay, the Macneills of Barra, Colonsay, and Gigha, and most zealous improver of all, Campbell of Shawfield.

On many Highland estates, however, the improvements, even when begun, never got beyond the home farm. It might be found well drained, well cultivated, properly enclosed, with a good rotation of crops, and the newest implements in use, while beside it the farms of the tenants remained in their aboriginal condition.

The backwardness of Highland farming, at a time when the Lowlands were advancing rapidly in the path of progress, led to very unfavourable comparisons being drawn between the Highland and Lowland owners. The public spirit and energy of the latter were constantly contrasted with the apathy and ignorance of the former. The comparison was sometimes just, especially as regards many small Highland proprietors who lived outside the influence of the agrarian revolution movement; some of them were indifferent, and most of them were intensely conservative. But it was not only on the estates of such proprietors that the improvements mentioned advanced slowly.

One of the things which the critics tended to forget was that the Lowland progress had been due as much to the tenants as to the owners. But if the average Highland landowner seemed dubious of the advantages of the new methods, and strangely unimpressed by the propaganda of the scientific agriculturists of his day, how much more was this the case with the tenants who possessed the same conservative temperament as the owner, quite unmodified by any contact with the non-Highland mind. Yet it was with this material that the proprietor had to carry through the elaborate programme of reforms.

Further, it must be remembered that, apart from a few families, the Highland landlords were not rich. Their estates had received no accidental increment from proximity to growing manufacturing towns, and they had no mineral wealth. Without the co-operation of the tenants, expensive improvements like enclosures were simply not financially possible.

Again, in many parts of the Highlands day labour was difficult

if not impossible to get; hence, if the farmer would not help in the actual work of building dykes and drains, the latter must remain unmade.

Undoubtedly many Highland owners laid themselves open to the charge of trying to shift too much of the initial burden of the semi-permanent improvements on to the shoulders of their tenants. In the Lowlands the expense of improvements of this kind were mostly borne by the proprietors, but it must be remembered that this outlay was in the nature of a reasonably secure investment, for they had the co-operation of tenants with respectable working capitals, who could be counted upon to make the most of the improved farms.

Above all, it must be recalled that reforms on a large scale in the Lowlands were almost invariably accompanied by the union of farms, the creation of a new class of substantial tenantry and the degradation of the small farmers to the rank of cottager. Many of the best known improvers like Sir John Sinclair thought that such a change was inevitable if any solid advance was to be made. If the Highland proprietors had universally adopted this system, undoubtedly farming would have progressed much more rapidly than it did. The Highland districts which compared most favourably with the Lowlands were those like Kintyre and Islay, where not only were geographical conditions most favourable, but where the Lowland example of big farms with substantial tenants (often of Lowland blood) had been followed most extensively.

From a purely farming point of view the results of such a policy were excellent. But such a policy universally applied in the Highlands could only have solved the problems of poverty and over-population in a manner similar to the introduction of sheep farming. Poverty would have been cured by the emigration of the existing tenants, and the substitution of a new type of farmer more fitted economically and, perhaps, temperamentally for his particular work. But it was this probable effect on his tenants which had caused many landlords to refrain deliberately from turning their estates into sheep runs; the same reasons prevented them from taking the shortest and most sensational method of improving the level of Highland farming.

The position of a would-be-improving Highland landlord who felt strongly about depopulation was difficult in the extreme. He had to struggle along against the obstacles created by the conservatism and the poverty of the small tenants. He had not

much money to spend on risky investments. He had no reason for feeling confident that Lowland methods would work when applied under such difficult conditions and with such a different tenantry. As a final discouragement, he had to allow for not only the conservatism, but the active destructiveness of the small Highland farmers.

The Lovat Papers gave a description of the efforts of the Forfeited Estates Commissioners to carry out a large scheme of afforestation in the Highlands, and showed how their plans were hampered by the tenants who kept peeling off the barks of the young oaks.[1] But the following passage from Macdonald gives the best description of what the improving Hebridian owner had to contend with :

' The man who builds inclosures or constructs gates in the Hebrides must always bear in mind the nature, not only of the climate and soil and other circumstances of a similar description, but also of the people and the animals which they possess. These are more difficult to manage than those of any other portion of Scotland. The people, one would be tempted to imagine on a superficial glance, take pleasure in mischief, and find a peculiar delight in destroying everything which conduces to human comfort. They throw down stones from the battlements of bridges, they fill up wells or drains, they deface milestones, break the windows of churches, of other public buildings, they leap over hedges, dykes and ditches, cut down the banks of rivers, and alter their course for inundating the adjacent fields, and all this with the utmost *gaieté de cœur*, and without the slightest notion of its being taken ill, or the idea that any malicious construction can be put upon their amusement. . . .

Nor is this strange tendency confined to what we call (perhaps Hibernically) the *rational* animals of this country. The horses and cows and sheep are universally of a similar disposition. The same inclosure that suffices for protecting the rich meadows of Suffolk and Essex would be no more heeded by an Hebridian beast, not even by the smallest cow, than if it consisted of the mist of the mountain. . . .

The *sangfroid* with which an Hebridian pulls down a dyke for a passage to himself and his cattle (and without dreaming of rebuilding the gap) is to a stranger most ludicrously provoking. The scene is sometime acted before a gentleman's door, and he himself an indignant witness. The Hebridian is surprised at

[1] See also Marshall, *Central Highlands; O.S.A.* Rogart (Sutherland).

his rage, and tells him that he meant no harm by taking the nearest road home with his horse! He perhaps adds in the same strain, 'And as for the grass, you need not mind it, Sir, it will grow again.'' [1]

Given such a tenantry, a certain amount of caution on the landlord's part in spending money on improvements does not seem entirely unnatural.

But there is another question. Suppose that none of these obstacles had existed, and the landlords had gone on rapidly in the path of improving, draining, planting, enclosing, etc., how far would this action have done anything to relieve the situation of the Highland population?

Most of the permanent or semi-permanent improvements created some initial demand for additional labour. That indefatigable improver, Campbell of Shawfield, employed at first a hundred labourers all the year round. This might have lasted for some time, and it was possible that there might have been a certain permanent increase in the number of day labourers required to keep farms and drains in repair.

On the other hand, the new methods of cultivation generally meant that in the long run the amount of employment was decreased. Such, at least, was the Lowland experience. With enclosures the need for herds must vanish; with the new improved ploughs much of the old agricultural labour must become superfluous. This last is obvious if we consider how ploughing was done in the eighteenth century Hebrides. When a piece of grass sward was turned up, two men went first with an implement called a *ristle*, made necessary by the ineffectiveness of the Hebridian plough. They were followed by a cavalcade of four horses drawing the plough proper, and accompanied generally by three more men. In other words, it took five men and five horses to do what one man and one horse would do under the new system.

Undoubtedly anything done to improve the old cattle farms was likely to raise the standard of comfort among the farmers, but it would not provide work for the rapidly increasing population. At best, all it could do was to make necessary a certain limited number of additional day labourers, as in the case of Islay.

That in itself was all to the good. A day labourer in the Highlands, as we have said before, could often live more

[1] Macdonald, *General View of the Agriculture of the Hebrides*, 1811.

prosperously and comfortably than the tenants with minute possessions.[1] There appeared to be during this period a serious shortage of day labour both on the Hebrides and on the mainland, and when we read the demands made for it, it is difficult at first to see why a great part of the practically unemployed Highland population could not have been profitably occupied in that way, at least while the improving era lasted. Anywhere but in the Highlands, it would seem a contradiction in terms to say that a shortage of day labourers and an excess of population existed side by side, but such appeared to be the fact.

The situation is explained by the psychological phenomenon which we have mentioned before. We quote from four independent witnesses, two of whom had spent their lives in the Highlands as parish ministers, the others being close and interested observers of Highland conditions:

'The genius of the people is more inclined to martial enterprise than to the painful industry and laborious exertion requisite to carry on the art of civil life. Till of late it was even with reluctance that they would live as day labourers; and still the greater number of those employed in this way are brought from other countries.' [2]

'The people seem to be more inclined to idleness than to industry. They are extremely frugal of the little they have, but as to earning anything more, it is a melancholy fact, that a poor tenant, who rents land only to the value of twenty shillings or thirty shillings, and whose labour could well be spared from his little farm many days in the year, will rather saunter or sit idle at home than work for sixpence a day, which would be a considerable addition to his own and his family's scanty meal.' [3]

'Day labourers are unknown on the Highland farms; though about the castles of chieftains and men of fortune they are found in sufficient abundance; and, in the Lowlands, they will do the meanest of drudgery for the meanest tenants; yet, cannot brook the idea of working for their neighbors; they will rather loiter away the winter in idleness, and starve on the pittance they have saved in their summer's excursion.' [4]

'They (the subtenants) often prefer having their children about them in the most miserable state imaginable, to the hardships (or what they are pleased to call such) of driving them into

[1] See *O.S.A.* Rogart (Sutherland); Kiltearn (Ross).

[2] *O.S.A.* Kingussie and Inch, Inverness, 1795.

[3] *O.S.A.* Rogart (Sutherland). [4] Marshall, *Central Highlands.*

service, either on their own island or anywhere else. It is a common sight, on entering the cottage of one of those subtenants, to find five or six grown-up individuals, half-naked and savage looking, around a peat fire watching a pot of potatoes (their sole food for nine months of the year), without any idea or wish of changing their manner of life; and on being demanded to work for hire, asking the most extravagant wages, or determined to remain as you found them.'[1]

These quotations make the attitude of the average Highlander towards ordinary day labour sufficiently clear. No doubt this point of view was gradually being modified, especially in districts that bordered on the Lowlands, but it was undoubtedly still strong enough in 1811 to be a factor that had to be seriously considered. So long as the Highland people felt as described, it was useless for anyone to suggest that the landlords could solve the Highland problem by increasing the demand for day labourers.

However zealously the owners adopted all the suggestions regarding tenure and better farming methods, he was always liable, at last, to come up against a blank wall. By the policy proposed, he could and did raise the standard of life amongst a limited number of people, but he could not, by means of it, provide acceptable occupations for all the persons who continued to make their headquarters upon his estate. The fact had to be faced that what they wanted was not work but land.

The only conceivable solution, then, of the Highland problem which was at the same time open to the landowners and desired by the people, was to plant the unoccupied persons upon the waste lands. True, this might not be possible for the individual proprietor; he might possess none; but it might be put forward as a solution of the problem as a whole, subject to the assertion that there were a considerable number of Highlanders who thought that there was nothing to choose between migrating to another district and leaving the country altogether.

Ignoring this last complication, we can start with the fact that at the end of the eighteenth century the Highlands possessed a certain area of reclaimable land.

Macdonald estimated that in 1811 there were something like 300,000 acres of waste in the Hebrides alone; of these, 120,000 were mountain and 80,000 were pure bog, but the remaining 100,000 of mossy or heathy moor he thought were capable of becoming agricultural land if properly drained and limed.

[1] Macdonald, *The Hebrides*, 1811.

On the north and west coast of the mainland, the proportion available for improvement was not so high, for the mountains came very close to the water line, and in the interior the climatic conditions raised more serious difficulties than in the islands; still there did exist here and there straths which had not hitherto been fully utilised.

A landlord who approached the subject of reclamation from the purely economic standpoint would have several things to consider. First, was the whole thing likely to be worth while? Would the land, which had no doubt already served some purpose as rough pasture, really produce any crops likely to give a sufficient return for the labour and money spent in reclaiming it. Secondly, if the reclaiming was to be done, what was the most economical method of doing it? Conceivably it might be done by the landlord himself undertaking the work and employing the labour; it might be done by getting the tenants of any large farms which adjoined the waste to reclaim some part as one of the conditions in their leases; it might be done by allowing crofters to take up some acres and bring them into cultivation by their own labour. In the case of very wet lands the second and third methods would hardly be possible without a considerable amount of co-operation by the owner.

Whichever one of these three methods was adopted, some additional work would be given to the inhabitants. But if the main purpose of the landowner was a humanitarian rather than an economic one, he would naturally choose the third plan as the one that appealed most to the people he was trying to help. Even from a purely economic point of view some owners preferred the crofter system. Lord Kames, for example, when he set himself to consider the case of reclaiming Kincardine Moss, found that to do the work entirely by himself would involve a prohibitive expense, and would compel him to charge a rent subsequently of from twelve to fifteen pounds an acre, if the operation was to be a commercial success and repay the outlay.

The policy of reclaiming the waste was eagerly urged upon the landlords by Macdonald and other writers, on the ground that it would supply the nation with more food (a strong argument in the early years of the nineteenth century); that it would provide a satisfactory method of disposing of the surplus population, and might even allow the landlords to enlarge the existing grazing farms to a size that would lend themselves better to the sort of improvements already described. The country as a whole, the

existing tenantry and the landlords, were all to benefit by the proposed changes.

Many landlords did take up the policy of reclamations, some mainly from the idea of making the most profitable use of their estates, others with the problem of over-population specially in mind.

The earliest and most conspicuous reclamation on a large scale within the Highland area was Kincardine Moss. This Moss was situated in the Monteith district of Perthshire between the Forth and the Teith, and extended to something like 2000 acres, of which 1500 were on the Blair Drummond Estate of Lord Kames. When Lord Kames took possession of his estate in 1766, his plan was to reclaim the Moss by a huge scheme of irrigation, the moss to be floated off, revealing the good soil underneath. The expense deterred him from doing it quite as originally planned; and the ultimate reclamation was the result of the joint efforts of Kames and his irrigation works and the crofters whom he got to co-operate with him. When Kames first projected his scheme it met with no enthusiasm from the surrounding farmers, and finally nine-tenths of the crofters were brought from the parishes of Callander and Balquhidder, from which they had been displaced by the development of sheep farming. By 1790 most of the Moss was in occupation.

The agreement with the tenant was on the following lines. He was given eight acres of moss for a lease of thirty-eight years. He was allowed a share of the water power for floating off the moss. He was allowed timber sufficient to build a house; and two bolls of meal to support him while building it. In return he paid:

For the first seven years—no rent.
For the eighth year —1 mark Scots.
For the ninth year —2 marks Scots.
By the nineteenth year —19 marks Scots.

Then twelve shillings for each cleared acre, and half-a-crown for each acre unclaimed.

Once the scheme was well started there appeared plenty of Highlanders willing to carry on the reclamation on these terms.

Other estates took up the general idea and adapted it to local circumstances. Reclaiming with a view to giving employment was carried on at Strachur, in Islay, and in different parts of the Hebrides. Sheriff-Substitute Brown, who was a very cordial advocate of the crofters, described how, in the Central High-

lands, some comparatively high waste land had been brought into cultivation by means of them. As evidence of the general success of the crofting system, he stated that many owners who had turned most of their estates into sheep runs had by 1806 begun to reconsider matters, and had broken up some of the great sheep runs into small crofts.

The policy of reclamation was also taken up by various Sutherland proprietors. Dempster of Dunnichen, at all times a warm believer in small farms, was one of the pioneers upon his estate at Criech. The arrangement there was, that crofters might reclaim all the waste they could in return for an annual payment of one shilling during the crofter's life-time. When the crofter died, his heirs had the option of taking over the holding at a rent to be fixed by arbiters chosen by the landlord and the heirs. The rent so paid was to remain unchanged during the new possessor's life-time and to be similarly revised at his death. Crofters were also given enough seed corn and building materials to help them to make a start. The part of the waste that remained unoccupied could be used as common pasture by all the tenants, unless it was specially enclosed by the owner for the purpose of making plantations.

In the course of the first twenty years of the nineteenth century a similar system was in progress on the Sutherland estates of the Marquis of Stafford and Lord Reay. In these cases the development of the crofting system on the flat areas beside the shore was carried on simultaneously with the extensive development of sheep farming on the high lands in the interior. The earliest crofters were small cattle farmers who had been transferred.

In the face of these facts, it cannot be alleged that the Highland landlords ignored the possibilities of reclaiming, though from the statements of Macdonald in 1811, it is evident that the process was still capable of being carried a good deal further so far as the Hebrides were concerned. Where the crofting system was started, it appeared to have been welcomed by the inhabitants, and to have provided a considerable additional population with the means of support. Sheriff-Substitute Brown mentioned that about 1770 there had been on the eastern side of the Long Island, a district that was mainly waste, only some ten families; at the time he was writing, that is in 1806, the same area supported a population of nine hundred souls.

Undoubtedly the crofting system of reclamation helped to solve some of the immediate Highland difficulties, but whether,

from a broad point of view, it was a success was a matter of much controversy at the time and later.

Some contemporaries were enthusiastic about the results. Brown, writing in 1806, spoke in glowing terms of the contentment and comfort amongst the crofters who had come under his observation. The following quotation from an article in the *Farmers' Magazine* on the Sutherland crofters corroborates Brown's view:

'Services and payments in kind have been abolished; in lieu of which, fixed money rents, on a moderate scale, have been substituted. To every cottage is attached a quantity of land at least sufficient for the maintenance of a cow; but in most cases, every cottager has been allotted to him from two to three Scotch acres, capable of cultivation, with a proportional quantity of hill pasture. The new settlers have adopted every improvement in agriculture which their limited means will permit. The improvements which they have commenced, and which are now in progress by bringing into cultivation considerable portions of waste land, may be said to be astonishing; and the exertions they have made since their industry has received a proper direction, and has been confined within proper limits, adapted to their respective means, give them a character totally different from that which formerly distinguished them. As they have increased in industry, so have they increased in the knowledge and the desire to possess those comforts which their circumstances can afford. Their turf hovels, after having, in the first instance, given place to cottages built of rough stones, without mortar, are, by degrees, changed into neat houses constructed of stone and lime. A greater attention to cleanliness commences to be an object; and the cow and the pig begin no longer to inhabit the same dwelling with the family.'[1]

As against such comparatively favourable descriptions, we have to put the vigorous attacks made on the crofting system from two very different quarters.

To some extent the creation of crofts of the type described went on simultaneously with the spread of sheep farming, and was intended as a provision for the displaced farmers. In such cases the crofters were given portions of waste land, generally small, and were concentrated in villages convenient for additional sources of livelihood like fishing and kelp-making. It was this aspect of crofting which attracted the attention of some writers

[1] *Farmers' Magazine*, February 1816.

and led to their vigorous denunciations. It was obviously not the work of reclaiming to which such authors[1] objected; they were men deeply and very genuinely moved by the distress of the Highland people, and by the wrongs which they believed the latter had suffered at the hands of brutal and oppressive landowners, and they were inclined to see sinister motives in any changes proposed by the proprietors. The objections they made to crofting were its association with sheep farming; the compulsory transfer of the small tenants to new homes; the insufficient quantity of land provided; the exorbitant rents charged for it; and the wretchedness often existing amongst the crofters, which they compared unfavourably with the state of comfort previously enjoyed by the small cattle farmers.

The second group of critics, of whom one might select as types Sir George Mackenzie[2] and Dr. Macculloch,[3] approached the whole subject from an entirely different point of view. They started from a much more friendly attitude toward the landowners, and their main preoccupation was how to make the best use of the land rather than how to make the situation of the majority of the local population more comfortable. Much of their criticism of crofting is purely economic, and is closely connected with the general dislike of the eighteenth-century improver for the small farm. They considered that crofting was an uneconomic method of reclaiming land, and that the results of the work of the crofters were very small in proportion to the vast expenditure of labour. Such criticisms, though they may have served to discourage some proprietors at the time, would not necessarily have detracted from the social value of the crofts. More serious was the fact that neither Macculloch nor Mackenzie thought that the system held out any hopes for the crofters themselves. Mackenzie thought that its weak spot was that, by confining a man permanently to a few acres, it offered no reasonable incentive to ambition, and gave the Highlander no chance of seriously improving his lot. Macculloch, touring

[1] *Sketches of the Character, Manners and Present State of the Highlanders*, Col. David Stewart, 1822.

A Critical Examination of Dr. Macculloch's Work on the Highlands and Western Isles of Scotland, Anon. 1826.

[2] *General View of the Agriculture of Ross and Cromarty*, Sir George Mackenzie, Bart., 1811.

[3] *A Description of the Western Highlands of Scotland*, Dr. John Macculloch, 1819.

the Hebrides in 1819, thought that the generally deplorable condition of the crofters was a sufficient commentary on the drawbacks of the system.

Both groups of critics could bring a considerable amount of evidence in support of their views. Crofting was in many cases accompanied by injustice and oppression on the part of owners, and used by some as a fresh means of extortion, but the opponents of the change overlooked certain fundamental facts.

It will be evident from all that has been said, that writers like Colonel Stewart took an impossibly sentimental view of the previous situation of the crofter. At worst he was exchanging one life of poverty and hardship for another.

Again, as regards the insufficient size of the crofts, though there was justice in the charge, the situation arose partly from a real shortage of land and partly from the difficulty of preventing the tenants from subdividing their crofts. Those landlords who refused to allow such subdivision laid themselves open to a charge of brutality, since they virtually compelled some emigration; those who allowed it were blamed for the consequent state of wretchedness existing on their estates.

At first sight it seems difficult to reconcile the roseate view of crofting taken by Sheriff-Substitute Brown and the writer on the Sutherland improvements, with that taken either by Colonel Stewart or Dr. Macculloch. Though the two latter writers disagreed on most things, they were both emphatic in asserting that the crofters mostly lived a wretched existence.

Their view has some support from other sources. In 1826 a Parliamentary Report[1] on emigration produced sensational evidence as to Highland and Hebridian conditions, including areas where crofting had been tried. In Tiree one half of the population of the island had to live on the bounty of the rest. On Benbecula one-third of the population had no land, while the owner had had to spend nine thousand pounds between 1812 and 1818 simply to keep the people alive. The situation was then relieving itself in the usual way by a fresh outburst of emigration.

The two opposing views as to the value of crofting as a solution for Highland poverty and unemployment are not absolutely impossible to reconcile. The success of crofting depended largely on the existence of favouring circumstances. In the eighteenth century it worked best in those districts where cultivation of the land was not the sole resource of the crofter. On the

[1] *Parliamentary Papers*, vol. iv. 1826-1827.

Sutherland estates, for example, the crofts planted along the shore did partly achieve their object. It is significant that during the bad years between 1812 and 1818, when most of the Highland areas suffered seriously, the Sutherland family had to distribute twelve thousand pounds to support their inland tenants who were still farming on the old system, but the crofters on the coast weathered the storm with little help. They could fall back in bad seasons on the fisheries.

Similarly, so long as kelp-making remained a profitable industry, which was the case until 1822, the crofters on the Hebrides stood a chance. But by 1822 prices of kelp, which had once ranged as high as ten pounds a ton, had fallen as low as two or three pounds, so that resource could no longer be relied upon.

Even at its best, crofting obviously had decided limits as a method of meeting the Highland difficulties. It was necessarily limited by the amount of waste land capable of intensive cultivation. It was hampered by the difficulty of preventing the Highlanders from subdividing their crofts into such small portions as could not possibly provide subsistence for a family. It is noticeable that on the Sutherland estates subdivision was forbidden. The Highlanders themselves were the chief obstacles to the crofting system being given a fair trial.

As a commentary on this whole discussion, it might be mentioned that in 1837 the Highlands again approached a sensational crisis in destitution. A report was drawn up by Mr. Robert Graham [1] and ordered to be printed by the House of Commons.

The report bore out the view that the destitution was due, not to any special oppression by the owners, either by way of rents, tenures, introduction of sheep or enlargement of farms.

'The evil consists in the want of occupation for the great mass of the population, in any way which will pay in any quarter. In many large districts the small tenants could not live as well upon their present possessions as the poorest labourers in the low country, if they were freed entirely from the burden of rent.'

Certain conclusions regarding Highland distress at this period would seem to emerge from the whole of this investigation.

First, that no manipulation of their estates by the owners could have provided employment for any length of time for all the people who wished to remain there. To maintain decently

[1] Letter from Mr. Robert Graham to Mr. Fox Maule on Highland destitution, 6th May, 1837.

even the existing population, leaving out of account the natural increase, subsidiary occupations of some sort were necessary —fisheries, kelp-making, canal building, manufactures, etc.— and the early nineteenth century saw these sources of employment diminished, not increased. The withdrawal of the fishing bounties, the abandonment of the protection to kelp, the revolution in the textile industries and their concentration in coal areas, were all aggravating factors in Highland distress.

Secondly, it must be admitted that those Highlanders who succeeded in their ambition of getting and retaining a small piece of land, were unlikely, even under a favourable system of tenure, to reach a comfortable standard of living. It is true that modern experience has shown that there are many more possibilities in the small farm than were dreamed of by the eighteenth-century improver. But where small farming in the late nineteenth and twentieth centuries has been a success it has been associated with certain conditions.

(*a*) More natural advantages than were to be found in the Highlands. (*b*) Good market facilities and some co-operative system of marketing. (*c*) Intensive cultivation. (*d*) A considerable amount of capital supplied by way of Land Banks and Credit Societies.

Of these conditions of success, not one was present in the Highlands or Hebrides.

What the eighteenth-century Highlands wanted was not a patriarchal chief, but an eighteenth-century Raiffeisen or Sir Horace Plunkett.

MARGARET I. ADAM.

Aesculapius in Fife: a Study of the Early Eighteenth Century

AMONG the many records of Scottish domestic accounts during the seventeenth century which have been published there are few which make any reference at all to expenditure on medical attendance, though, as the papers dealt with below clearly show, the doctor's bill must have formed an appreciable item in the annual budget of the family man.

The three accounts printed below, which have only recently come to light, are, probably, fair samples of the doctors' bills of the early years of the eighteenth century outside such towns as Edinburgh and Glasgow, and they throw some light on the activities and methods of the country practitioner of the time; and, though they differ in respect of the fact that one deals with the every day slight affections of a healthy and growing family, and the other two with an illness which terminated fatally, they resemble each other in the remarkable variety of drugs prescribed,—with what particular object it is impossible to say.

A word is necessary regarding the two doctors concerned, Archibald Arnott and Robert Scott.

They were certainly not 'qualified' in the modern sense of the term, but had learnt their business by an apprenticeship to a local 'chyrurgeon-potingary' who, for a fee of about £600 Scots, undertook to instruct the pupil in the 'airtes of surgery and pharmacy.' After the three years of apprenticeship the pupil, if he desired it, could appear before the Incorporation of Surgeons and Barbers in Edinburgh or the Faculty of Physicians and Surgeons (including barbers) in Glasgow, and undergo a perfunctory examination, qualifying him to call himself a Chirurgeon-Apothecary. There was apparently no obligation whatever for the would-be practitioner to undergo any examination at all, and large numbers of men were in practice who had neither obtained this diploma, nor had any regular instruction in their profession. This condition of affairs is not to be wondered at

as, even in Edinburgh, there was no University school of medicine before 1726.

Nor is it likely that these men read much current medical literature, such as it was. The popular work called after its author 'Tippermalloch's Receits,' and a large volume by Pomet, chief druggist to King Louis XIV. of France, entitled 'A compleat history of Druggs' were available; but it is evident from the details of the accounts below that these two doctors at least had abandoned the empirical remedies recommended by Tippermalloch, such as applications of snails for 'cold distemper of the brain,' ants' eggs and onion juice for deafness, 'ashes of little frogs' for baldness, the burnt and powdered bones of a man for epilepsy, or the application of a living duck or frog, or a sucking puppy to the seat of colic pains. Doctors Arnott and Scott may have been empiricists, but they were not mere charlatans, as was Tippermalloch. On the contrary Arnott shows that he had been influenced by the teaching of the English physician Dr. Sydenham, who advocated the use of emetics containing antimony in the treatment of fevers. A report on this treatment had been made at the end of the seventeenth century by one Dr. Andrew Brown of Dolphington, and the practice of prescribing what were elegantly described as 'vomiters' was well established in Fife at this time.

If they made use of frogs, snails, pigeons' blood, and the like, these worthies presumably employed them on their 'panel' patients, not on the laird and his family.

It would be out of place here to enter into a critical examination of the accounts with a view to discovering the particular diseases from which the patients were suffering—it might, indeed, fail to produce any conclusion at all. The practitioner of that day was as ignorant of the causes of disease as he was of the action of his drugs on the diseased part; he worked by rule of thumb, and what he lacked in knowledge he made up for by energy of treatment, and a versatility in prescribing which could scarcely be surpassed now. It is quite clear, however, from the nature of the remedies, that the Lady Raith was suffering from a fatal complaint accompanied, as the rapidly increasing doses of laudanum show, by pain; while the family of Sir John Wemyss were principally victims of errors of diet.

Dr. Archibald Arnott's treatment was always thorough, and he believed in a whole-hearted assistance of Natura Medicatrix; he commenced with bleeding and followed that up with a

' vomiter,' which must have added markedly to the discomfort and weakness resulting from loss of blood. As his charge for a vomiter was thirty shillings, the fact that the operation of bleeding was performed gratuitously—in which he differed from Dr. Scott—must have tempered the wind of adversity to the Laird, whose finances, we know from other sources, were heavily embarrassed.

Among the drugs prescribed by name were some which are still in use, such as ' Cenna ' (Senna), Turpentine, Laudanum, Syrup of Poppies and various essential oils—even the now fashionable Cinnamon was then in use. But, generally, Arnott preferred to conceal the identity of his drug and to leave his patient in ignorance of the remedy he was prescribing, by merely entering in his account such terms as ' A gargarisme ' (gargle), ' the purging materials,' ' a vomiter,' and so forth. Incidentally he was not above prescribing for the Laird's stock, as in one account we find ' The Burgundie pitch for the horses ' ; in another account there is ' Rats bane for the house of Raith,' and ' Arisnick ' (Arsenic), which was presumably used for the same purpose. Sometimes special reference is made to the fact that the drug was supplied in a ' glass ' or ' paper.'

The financial aspect of the Wemyss account is not without interest. The Laird, who was actively engaged in developing his coal measures, was generally acutely embarrassed, and was in the habit of allowing his bills to remain unpaid. The opening entry in his account is for arrears of £784 Scots, which, at the rate for the period from September, 1714, to May, 1716, must have represented some six or seven years' attendance. During the twenty months covered by the account Dr. Arnott attended the family nearly a hundred times, so he must have been a familiar feature at Bogie. He had to come in some five miles from Kirkcaldy ; and, in the absence of any road suitable for wheeled conveyances, he no doubt rode a horse to visit his patients. For this attendance his total charge amounted to £204 Scots. At first sight this appears a large amount, but a scrutiny of the drugs employed shows that in nearly all cases they were imported from England or abroad, and had to be paid for in the depreciated currency of the time. The most remarkable feature of the accounts, however, is that no charge was made for the attendance apart from the profit made on the medicaments supplied. It is regrettable to find from other documents that Dr. Arnott's bill was not paid for years after the Laird's death.

The second account dated 1710/11, shows that Dr. Robert Scott was more a believer in drug treatment than Dr. Arnott; but he was less addicted to bleeding and the administration of vomiters. Variety was his strong point, and he changed his line of treatment, perhaps at the urgent request of his patient, nearly every time he was called in. He made use of what might almost be regarded as proprietary remedies, such as 'Jesuit's powder,' 'Melilot plaster,' and 'Mathe's pills,' evidently accepting them at their face value. But he also employed well known drugs, such as 'Ippoocacoan' (Ipecacuanha), Nitre, and Sal Ammoniac. Cosmetics were within his province, as is evidenced by his supply of 'ane large pott with Pomate'; here he manifested the ancient confusion between the functions of the barber and the surgeon.

His fee for bleeding was twelve shillings; on the other hand a 'vomiter' of a simple type was the same price, and it was only when 'Ippoocacoan' was an ingredient that he charged as much as Dr. Arnott. The bill for over two years was only £57 odd, but it was not paid until after her Ladyship's decease.

During the last three years of her life, the Lady Raith was under the care of Dr. Arnott, and to the layman it is evident that the increasing dosage of Laudanum betokened increase in pain suffered by the patient. This drug indeed was the principal one prescribed until January, 1719, when it was abandoned and cordials substituted.

The closing entries show that the duties of a medical man were not as strictly defined as they are now, and that, besides being professionally associated with the ancient art of the barber, he was also required to be an embalmer, and to perform certain of the functions of the undertaker. He provided not only the 'powders and oylls' necessary for embalming, but also the 'cear cloath' for 'wrapping the bodie.' Embalming, in varying degrees, according to the social position of the subject was a recognised duty of the apothecary, and full details of the methods to be employed are given in 'The compleat history of druggs' above referred to.

The account in this case, excluding the 'undertaking' items—which stand at £90 13s.—was about £260 Scots for a period of three years.

Bruce Seton.

My Lady Raith's account with Robt Scott.

		lbs	s	d
	Rests of ane former account	27	14	6
Oct. 2 1710	Imp. one drop Oil of Cloves	00	04	00
6	It. Three drops of the oil of cloves	00	12	00
March 10 1711	It. Pott Venice turpentine	00	17	00
	It. ane large liniment with chyminal oils	02	12	00
23	It. ane dose Mathe's pils	00	12	00
	It. ane glass with Sweet Spirit Niter	01	18	00
	It. Volatile salt ammoniack gl(*ass*)	00	13	00
April 8	It. Oil of maros by expression	00	12	00
	It. Ane vomiter	00	12	00
August 1	It. two ounces of the white ointment	00	08	00
Oct. 4	It. 36 of Matheu's pils	01	16	00
	It. Spirit of Niter. gl	01	14	00
Nov. 6	It. four drops Spirit of Harthorn gl[*ass*]	00	14	00
	It. Spirit Sal Ammoniack gl.	00	13	00
8	It. Volatile Salt Harthorn 2 drops	00	13	00
12	It. 3 ounces of the white ointment	00	12	00
	It. ane vomiter gl	00	12	00
	It. ane Liniament pott	00	17	00
15	It. Jesuit's powder	00	18	00
	It. 2 drops volatile salt of harthorn	00	12	00
Jan. 5th	It. Ane vomiter gl	00	13	00
1712	It. Ane Defensive plaster	00	10	00
	It. Spirit Sal Ammoniack	00	12	00
Feb. 24th	It. ane Vomiter Ippoocacoan gl.	00	18	00
April 29	It. 3 dozes of Arisnick	00	17	00
	It. Seven ounces of white ointment	01	08	00
June 3	It. ane ounce and ane half of Senna	01	01	00
17	It. Vomiter of Ippoocacoan	00	18	00
24	It. ane vomiter gl.	00	12	00
Sept 1st	It. bleeding Mrs. Lindsay	00	12	00
Oct. 1st	It. ane Mixture gl.	01	10	00
	It. ane Vomiter gl. Butler	00	12	00
	It. bleeding another woman	00	12	00
	It. ane sudorifick mixture	00	18	00

		lbs	s	d
Nov. 20	It. ane mutchkin Pennyroyal water	00	08	00
	It. 3 ounces white ointment	00	12	00
Dec. 20	It. bitter materials	00	12	00
	It. ane large pott with Pomate	00	16	00
Jan. 20th	It. Pomate as before	00	16	00
1713	It. ane bleeding plaister Cook	00	12	00
	It. ane Red Lead Plaister	00	17	00
March 10	It. Bleeding the chambermaid	00	12	00
	It. purging materials	02	14	00
13th	It. ane plaister	00	09	00
24th	It. Arsenick 3 doses	01	10	00
26	It. Ane blistering plaister	00	09	00
	It. Ane Melilot Plaster	00	03	00
28	It. Ane vesicatory plaster	00	07	00
August 25	It. Ane ounce of Liquorish	00	03	00
	It. Ane purging powder for 2 dozes	01	04	00
Sept. 17	It. 3 ounces white ointment	00	12	00
	It. ane red lead plaster	00	12	00
Nov. 16	It. Spirit of harthorn	00	12	00
	It. half an ounce of Empl. Oxycrot	00	06	00
	It. powder of Mastick half ane ounce	00	05	00
Dec. 7th	It. Venice turpentine pott	00	05	00
	It. ane large defensive plaster her woman	01	02	00
	It. ane large red plaster	00	17	00
	It. glasses and pots	01	15	00
	Servants particular accounts given in.			
	All	82	12	06

Recd from My Ladie Bogie the soume of Eighty two pounds Scotts money and that in full payment and satisfaction for ane accompt for medicaments by my Lady Raith to me, and discharges her La:shipe and all concerned for now and ever, as witness my hand att Coatts the twenty day of May one thousand seven hundred and nineteen years, by me

Robert Scott.

ACCOUNT FOR THE MUCH HONOURED SIR JOHN WEMYSS OF BOGIE TO ARCHIBALD ARNOTT. 1715.

		lib	sh	d
Jan 16 1715	A vomiter to Miss Ann	00	14	00
	A purging potion	01	10	00
17	The potion with adition	01	14	00
19th	Materials for white wine	02	18	00
Feb 4th	A fomentation to My Ladie	02	09	00
20th	A vomiter	01	10	00
	The tincture to you	02	09	00
	A plaister to Miss Marie	00	02	00
March 5th	A purging potion	01	17	00
7th	The potion	01	16	00
8th	The potion	01	16	00
10th	Letting your blood			
11th	A purging potion	01	17	00
13th	The potion	01	16	00
15th	The potion	01	16	00
19th	The potion	01	16	00
21st	The potion	01	16	00
29th	The plaister and liniment to your Ladie	00	18	00
April 4th	The plaister	00	10	00
7th	The purging potion	01	16	00
15th	The potion	01	16	00
May 3rd	The potion	01	16	00
Julie 4th	To letting Miss Babie's blood			
	A vomiter	00	18	00
	Two supositors to Miss Ann	00	08	00
	A clyster pipe mounted	00	14	00
7th	Letting your blood			
	The purging infusion for both	03	00	00
8th	The spirit of hartshorn	00	17	00
11th	A vomiter to Miss Ann	00	18	00
	The syrup Viollots	01	05	00
12th	A vomiter	00	18	00
Aug 16th	Letting my Ladie's blood			
	A plaister	00	06	00
	The spirit hartshorn	00	17	00
	The cinnamon water	00	13	00
20th	The Laudanum	01	05	00

		lib	sh	d
Aug 20th	The alkarine (? alkaline)	01	06	00
27th	A vomiter	01	10	00
Sept. 8th	The cinnamon water to Miss Ann	00	13	00
9th	The cinnamon water and purging materials	03	13	00
	Letting her blood.			
10th	The cinnamon water	00	13	00
11th	The cinnamon water	00	13	00
12th	The cinnamon water and seeds for emulsion	00	13	00
	The syrup white popies	00	17	00
14th	The syrup	00	17	00
	A julep	01	19	00
19th	The syrup and spirit hartshorn and seeds	01	18	00
20th	A liniment in a pott	00	19	00
26th	A liniment	00	19	00
30th	Letting Miss Babie's blood			
	The seeds for emulsion	00	12	00
Oct 3rd	A gargarisme for Miss Ann	00	19	00
	Three powders	01	09	00
	Two drop cafron	01	04	
5th	The purging materials	03	00	00
	A julep to Miss Babie	01	19	00
7th	Letting Miss Marie's blood			
	A vomiter	00	18	00
8th	A julep to Miss Babie	01	19	00
	The seeds for emulsion	00	12	00
11th	Three drops cafron	01	04	
	The purging materials	03	00	00
12th	The powders to her and Miss Ann	02	08	00
19th	The cinnamon water	00	13	00
	The laudanum	01	05	00
	The chamomile flowers	00	02	00
	The liniment for her boills and wounds	01	06	00
20th	The pills for Miss Babie	00	16	00
	A purgative potion for Miss Marie	00	19	00
27th	A julep for Thomas	01	19	00
	The Syrup of white poppies	00	17	00
28th	The blistering and drawing plaisters	00	18	00

		lib	sh	d
Nov. 8th	A purging potion to you	01	17	00
10th	A vomiter	01	10	00
16th	A purging ptizan to the children	01	14	00
23rd	The turpentine	00	03	00
Dec 13th	A drawing and blistering plaister to Thomas	01	02	00

Receaved full payment of the Above and all other Accts preceding this eighth of June 1716 years

ARCHIBALD ARNOTT.

The following is an extract from Dr. Arnott's account

ACCT. THE RIGHT HONBLE MY LADY RAITH
TO ARCHIBALD ARNOTT.

		lib	s	d
March 21 1716	Imp. The Laudanum to your Lãship	00	07	00

Note : This entry is repeated at intervals of three or four days until November, 1718. The amount supplied increased steadily ; at first the quantity was 2½ drachms, in the later weeks it had risen to 10 drachms.

In December, 1718, other drugs begin to appear, but laudanum in still larger doses was still prescribed until a short time before the patient's death. These entries are omitted here for want of space.

Dec 2nd	Oills for your Lãships foot	01	11	00
	Materialls for Sock [1]	02	08	00
17th	Spirit salt ammoniack	00	09	00
23rd	Spirit harthorn	00	09	00
31st	The Senna	00	09	00
1718. Jan 6th	The Syrup of violots	01	13	00
10th	A vomiter [2]	01	10	00
	The spermacetie	00	16	00

Note : This drug was frequently prescribed in this case.

13th	The salt harthorn	00	13	00
16th	3 papers materials for ptizan	02	19	00

[1] The word 'sock' is quite clear in the script, but its meaning is obscure. It is repeated several times.

[2] Dr. Arnott spared this patient in his prescribing vomiters.

		lib	s	d
Feb 28th	The oylls for her Lãps side	01	17	00
	A plaister for her ankle	00	18	00
Sept 14	The manna and powder	01	04	00
19	The stomachick decoction	01	05	00
Dec. 19	For Rats bane to the house of Raith	00	16	00
	The lotion for her Lãships mouth	01	05	00
1719 Jan 8th	The Cordial	02	09	00
Feb 2	A cordial julep	02	09	00
	¼ mutchkin Cinnamon water	00	10	00
12th	The oyll of Maros	01	05	00
	The oyntmenti	00	05	00
	The plaster	00	12	00
	The julep	01	04	00
	½ mutchkin The cinnamon water	00	18	00
24th	Item : To wrapping the bodie in cear cloth	66	13	4
	Powders and oylls for the bodie & cofin	24	00	00
	ye soume of ye whole is	352	07	02

Letters from Queen Anne to Godolphin

THE following letters form the sole contents of Add. MS. 28070 in the British Museum. They are all written to Godolphin by Queen Anne, the first before her accession to the throne. Three of the letters illustrate the opinion of the Queen of the characters of the Scottish statesmen who were mainly responsible for the Union of 1707. The last apparently reveals the Queen's anxiety about the naval measures to be taken to avert the expedition of the Pretender to Scotland in 1708. The letters are not fully dated, but an attempt has been made to supply as exact dates as the internal evidence permits.

G. DAVIES.

I.

WINDSOR, Tuesday night. [?23rd September, 1701.][1]

I can not let your servant go back without returning my thanks for your letter he brought me, & assuring you it is a very great satisfaction to me to find you agree with Mrs. Morley concerning the ill natured cruel proceedings of Mr. Caliban, which vexes me more than you can imagine, & I am out of all patience when I think I must do so monstrous a thing as not to put my lodgings in mourning for my father. I hope if you can get a copy of the will Lord Manchester says he will send over you will be so kind as to let me see it, & ever believe me your faithful servant.

For the Lord Godolphin.

[1] James II. died $\frac{5}{16}$ September, 1701. Manchester (the English representative at Paris) mentions that he hopes to send a copy of James's will to England in a letter dated $\frac{17}{28}$ Sept. (Tindal, *History of England*, iii. 494-5). Under Thursday, 18th Sept., Luttrell, *Brief Historical Relation*, v. 91, mentions a rumour that William III. had given orders to forbid the court going into mourning.

'Mr. Caliban' is William III., and 'Mrs. Morley' Princess Anne herself.

II.

WINDSOR June the 6th. [1705.][1]

I give you many thanks for your letter & for the answer you have given the D. of Queensberry, for indeed it would be very uneasy to me to have any thing said to him which might look like a command to go down into Scotland, being sure if upon that, he and his friends behaves themselves well in the Parliament he will expect to be taken into my service wch. is a thing I can never consent to, his last tricking behaviour having made him more odious to me than ever. I have enquired of the Prince about what you mention of Sr. G. Rook & he told me presently he was afraid his name was in the commission for when it was brought to him to sign Mr. Clark told him it was the same as the old one, only with the name of Mr. Walpol instead of Mr. Bridges which the Prince says he did not then reflect upon, always looking upon Sr. G. Rook to be entirely out of service but remembering since he signed the commission what Mr. Clark had said, he intended if I had not spoke to him to have enquired into the matter & order a new commission to be drawn leaving out Sr. G. Rook. You will easily imagine that these things that reflect upon the Prince are very uneasy to me, & consequently that I will use my utmost endeavour to get him to part with him that is the occasion of them. Pardon this strange scrawl & believe me with all trust your humble servant.

III.

WINDSOR June the 14th. [1705.][2]

Tho you tell me you intend to be here either tomorrow night or Saturday morning, I can not help venting my thoughts upon the Scotch affairs, & in the first place I think those people use me very hardly in opposing Lord Forfar's being of the Treasury & I should be very glad to know your opinion whether upon this refusal I might not write to the Commissioner to let him know if he does not think it for the service that Lord Forfar should

[1] The date of this letter is 1705, because Sir Robert Walpole was appointed one of the Council of Prince George of Denmark on 28th June (*Dict. Nat. Biog.*). Also Queensberry was in London at this time. His 'tricking behaviour' took place in 1704, when he allied himself with the Jacobites (Hume Brown, *The Union*, p. 96).

[2] It is clear from the first sentence of this letter that it was written on a Thursday. 14th June was a Thursday in 1705.

have that post I recommended him to, I would have let him have some other that may be equivalent to it and that I do expect he should comply with this one desire of mine in return for all the compliances I have made to him. This may displease his grace's touchy temper, but I can't see it can do any prejudice to my service and in my poor opinion such usage should be resented. As to the Duke of Queensberry, tho he is none of my choice, I own it goes mightily against me, it grates my soul to take a man into my service that has not only betrayed me, but tricked me several times, one that has been obnoxious to his own countrymen these many years and one that I can never be convinced can be of any use, but after all this since my friends may be censured & that it may be said if I had not been obstinate every-thing would have gone well, I will do myself the violence these unreasonable Scots men desire & indeed it is an unexpressable one. The draught of the letter and instructions as you propose, will certainly be much better than those that are come out of Scotland, but I am entirely of your opinion that no method will succeed. My heart was so full that it was impossible for me to forbear easing it a little, & therefore I hope you will excuse this trouble.

IV.

WINDSOR July the 11th. [1705.][1]

Your telling me yesterday that when you were at London you would consider to whom it would be proper to give the great seal, is the occasion of my giving you this trouble at this time, for I think it is always best to tell one's thoughts freely before one takes a final resolution in a thing of this nature, & therefore I can not help saying I wish very much that there may be a moderate Tory found for this employment, for I must own to you I dread the falling into the hands of either party and the Whigs have had so many favours showed them of late, that I fear a very few more will put me insensibly into their power which is what I'm sure you would not have happen no more than I. I know my dear unkind friend has so good an opinion of all that party, that to be sure she will use all her endeavour to get you to prevail with me to put one of them into this great post & I can not help being

[1] The date is fixed by the mention of the lord keepership, a position in which the Whig Cowper succeeded the Tory Wright in October, 1705.

The 'dear unkind friend' was the Duchess of Marlborough, whose zeal for the Whigs is well known.

apprehensive that not only she but others may be desirous to have one of the heads of them in possession of the seal, but I hope in God you will never think that reasonable, for that would be an unexpressible uneasiness and mortification for me. There is nobody I can rely upon but your self to bring me out of all my difficulties and I do put an entire confidence in you not doubting but you will do all you can to keep me out of the power of the merciless men of both parties, and to that end make desire of one for Ld. Keeper that will be the likeliest to prevent that danger.

V.

WINDSOR, Wednesday evening. [?26th Sept. 1705.][1]

I could not resolve with myself to send any answer to the flying packet which is come from Scotland without asking your opinion what is proper to be done in the business concerning Lord Annandel which the Commissioner & some of the other servants are so very pressing in. I can't but say the reasons they give seem very reasonable as to Scotland, but I believe it will not be thought so here as to England, however what you think is best to be done I shall very readily agree to. I find some are against the Chancellor's coming hither, & very desirous the D[uke] of Q[ueensberry] should be sent for, may be his being here may be of use, but then I think the chan[cellor] should be sent for too, or else he will have reason to think himself neglected & in my poor opinion he should be called up whoever is, for besides that he is the best tempered man amongst them & that he has behaved himself the most faithfully of all my Scots servants I really believe he will give the purest and impartialist accounts of things and people & his stay need be but a very little time here. I do not send you the Commissioner['s] letter to me there being nothing in it but what you will have a fuller account of in Sir David Nairn's letters & for that I shall trouble you no more at this time on that subject.

I desire if you can conveniently that you would give your self the trouble before you come from Newmarket to go and look

[1] The business concerning Annandale is probably his dismissal from the secretaryship of state, which took place on 29th Sept. 1705 (*Dict. Nat. Biog.*). Anne was at Windsor at this time (Luttrell, *Brief Historical Relation*, v. 594). The reference can scarcely apply to the contents of Annandale's letter of 3rd July (Hume Brown, *The Union*, pp. 190-1), because Seafield and Queensberry would not have been sent for during the parliamentary session at Edinburgh.

upon my house. I am in such haste that I fear I have writ nonsense.

VI.

WINDSOR June the 4th. [? 1706.][1]

I thank you for your letters which I received this morning as soon as I was awake & did intend if I had not heard from you to have troubled you with a letter about a thing I have forgot a long time to speak of & that is concerning what the States & I are to give Prince Charles of Denmark in recompense of his loss of the bishopric of Lubeck. I find the Prince thinks it will be expected that the States should give two thousand pound a year & I four, Mr. Secretary Harley telling me yesterday you had some thoughts of proposing to the Prince to give some estate that he has in Denmark to his nephew for my four thousand pound, I should be glad to know if you continue of the same opinion that I may try how the Prince is inclined to this change, knowing he thinks the States are very slow, & is very desirous this business should come to a conclusion. I desire you would let me know what answer you think will be proper for me to give to the enclosed, not that I have any objection against the thing, for now that we have God be thanked so hopeful a prospect of a peace there can not be those inconveniences in making promotions of this kind as there was two years ago, but because I am not sure what Mr. Secretary Hedges has said to Coll. Stanhope on this subject.

VII.

WINDSOR. Wednesday evening. [?February, 1708.][2]

Seeing Lord Dursley here today when there ought to be two flags with the fleet besides Sr. G. Bing, to go with the two intended expeditions makes both the Prince and me very uneasy,

[1] As Harley was appointed secretary of state in May, 1704, and Hedges was dismissed from that office in December, 1706, this letter must belong to one of the years 1704-6. The last is the most probable year, because there were indirect peace negotiations then, and because Harley had been interested in the question of the bishopric of Lubeck earlier in that year (Hist. MSS. Com., *Portland MSS.* iv.). 'Coll. Stanhope' is James Stanhope, created brigadier-general 25th August, 1704 (Dalton, *Army Lists*, v. 17)—roughly two years before June, 1706.

[2] The clues to the time this letter was written are slight, but point to about the end of January or the beginning of February, 1708, since the Queen seems to be referring to the preparations for sending out a fleet to stop the intended

& the more because Lord Dursley desires to stay two or three days longer in town. He has asked the Prince's leave to stay twice since he came hither which the Prince has denied him as often, but not knowing what resolution his Lordship may take, I can't help giving you this trouble to desire you would speak with him when he comes to town and endeavour to prevail with him to return to his duty, for else if Sir John Jennings must have leave to go to the bath, there will be no flag to attend Sir G. B[yng] in his expedition nor to go with the ships that are ordered to Ireland which in my poor opinion would be very shameful, & is all I have to say at present but that I am sincerely your humble servant.

expedition of the 'Old Pretender' to Scotland. On 26th January, 1708, Byng was gazetted as admiral to command the fleet, Sir John Jennings was made vice-admiral of the red, and James Berkeley, by courtesy Viscount Dursley (he had been called to the upper house as Baron Berkeley in March, 1705. *House of Lords MSS.* 1704-6. The date given in *Dict. Nat. Biog.* is incorrect) was made vice-admiral of the blue. These were the two flags who were to accompany Byng and finally did (Luttrell, vi. 269, 272; Burchett's *Complete History*, p. 742 *seq.*; Charnock's *Biographia Navalis* and *Dict. Nat. Biog. sub.* Byng, Berkeley and Jennings).

Bellenden's Translation of the History of Hector Boece

IN October, 1919, the present writers published in the *Scottish Historical Review* (xvii. 12) an article dealing with some features of the *Translation of the History of Hector Boece*, by John Bellenden, Canon of Ross, and called attention to an important Manuscript of Bellenden, the Auchinleck Manuscript, now in the Library of University College, London. In particular, attention was directed to the important and significant differences between the Auchinleck text and the printed text of *c.* 1540, reprinted in 1821-22.

One result of the former article was an invitation from the Scottish Text Society to the present writers to prepare an edition of Bellenden for that Society. The invitation was accepted, as it appeared highly desirable that a new and more accurate edition of Bellenden's *Chronicle* should be attempted, in the hope that it might be a not altogether unfitting sequel to Professor Craigie's admirable edition of Bellenden's *Livy* for that Society. The new edition is now in course of preparation; but as some time must elapse before the first volume can appear, it may be of interest to students of Scottish history to have now some additional information which has come to light.

The further result of the article was to bring from various sources valuable information as to other Manuscripts of Bellenden which were unknown to Thomas Maitland, the editor of the printed edition of 1821-22. Altogether nine Manuscripts of Bellenden's *Chronicle* are now known to exist.

1. Pierpont Morgan. The finest, most accurate, and probably most primitive MS. of Bellenden at present known is in the wonderful private collection of Mr. J. Pierpont Morgan of New York. It was prepared for King James V. of Scotland and has a beautifully illuminated title-page, containing the arms of King James V. impaled with those of his Queen, Madeline. It is a large folio of 312 leaves, many with fine borders or

capitals. It is complete in every respect. It was formerly in the possession of the Earl of Lauderdale and has an autograph inscription by him on the first page.

The text has been compared with that of the other Manuscripts and with the printed text: also with the original Latin version of Boece. Its general superiority is so marked that the editors have decided—with Mr. Morgan's permission—to make this Manuscript the basis of the definitive text, adding, of course, notes on collation with other MSS. For brevity this MS. will be referred to below as M.

At this point reference may appropriately be made to the great courtesy and generosity of Mr. Pierpont Morgan, who has sent the MS. to London and deposited it in the British Museum on loan for the editors' use; and further, has contributed to the funds of the Scottish Text Society, to pay for the cost of transcription, the cost of rotographing the whole Manuscript (in itself, a most important point, so that in future years there will be a complete record of this interesting document in this country, when the original has returned to America), and the cost of reproducing two of the best pages in colour and eight in collotype.

2. Auchinleck. In the Library of University College, London. This was described to some extent in our former article. One point may, however, be added. Mr. James F. Kellar Johnstone of Aberdeen, who has examined the binding, believes that this MS., before it passed into the Boswell collection, must have belonged to one of the Maitland family, either to John Maitland, 1st Viscount Lauderdale, or Richard Maitland, the antiquary and biographer. It is possible that Viscount Lauderdale, if it was his, got it from his father-in-law, Alexander Seton, 1st Lord Fyvie and 1st Earl of Dunfermline, the Chancellor of Scotland. It will be called A.

3. Register House, Edinburgh. A sixteenth century MS. of 173 leaves. Defective—it begins in the middle of Book I., Chapter ii., and breaks off in the middle of Book XVI., Chapter ii. It will be called R.

4. Trinity College, Cambridge. 1193. Marked G 25. No. 310. Folio, early sixteenth century. Defective in the table of contents at the beginning: also at the end, where it breaks off in the middle of Book XVII., Chapter v. At the end of the *Ballate* it contains a note: *Liber cronicarum Regum et gestorum Scotorum pro domino Johanne Roull, Priore de Pettinweym, alias maizo* (?).

It will be called C. It has not yet been examined in detail by the editors.

5. BATH. A fine folio in the Library of the Marquis of Bath at Longleat. It appears to be perfect and complete : it is on 246 leaves. Its previous history is explained by the following note : 'Found in Edinburgh at the wyninge and burninge thareof the 7th of May being Wednesday the xxxvith yeir of the Reyn of our Soverayn Lord King Henry the eight per John Thynne.'

It has been placed on loan at the British Museum, for the use of the editors, by the courtesy of the Marquis of Bath. It will be called B.

6. UNIVERSITY LIBRARY, EDINBURGH. The Catalogue of the Laing MSS. contains the following entry :

p. 16, 205. Translation of Boetius *Chronicles of Scotland*, by Mr. John Bellentyne, Canon of Ross. Sixteenth century. Arms of Gordon of Earlston inside of cover.

This MS. also has not yet been examined by the editors. It will be called L.

7. ADVOCATES' LIBRARY, EDINBURGH. This Library possesses a seventeenth century Manuscript, which appears to be closely similar to the printed text. It will be called E.

8 and 9. Manuscripts rather similar to E and, as far as can be judged from a somewhat cursory examination, possessing much the same characteristics as the printed text, are in the possession of Dr. George Neilson and Dr. J. T. T. Brown, of Glasgow, who were good enough to show them to one of the editors. These will be called respectively N and Br.

Probably other Manuscripts of Bellenden will come to light before the proposed edition is ready.

Summarizing then to this point, the investigation has resulted in locating eight more MSS., besides Auchinleck—the starting point. Of these four, viz. M, A, B, and probably L, are complete : two, viz. R and C, are incomplete : three, viz. E, N and Br, are too late to be of much importance.

The present article is only an interim statement, and the editors are not in a position to offer an exact and accurate genealogical tree of the MSS., showing their interrelation. They can only at this stage suggest some general principles.

In the *Scottish Historical Review* (xvii. 12) attention was called to the striking differences between the text of A and the printed text ; and to the fact that Bellenden, having in October,

1531, received £30 for his 'translating of the Croniclis,' received in July, 1533, £12 for 'ane new Cronikle.'

The work already done in examining and comparing the various MS. texts and the printed text serves to demonstrate that while the differences between one MS. and another are numerous and sometimes important, they are few compared to the differences between the MSS. generally and the printed text. It would be no exaggeration to say that the printed text is a version in which almost every sentence has been rewritten. It would be difficult to find a single line of the printed text which agreed absolutely with the corresponding passage of any of the MSS., except of course, E, N, and Br. We have in the printed text essentially 'ane new Cronikle.'

The more interesting, as naturally the more difficult, problem, is the interrelation of the more important MSS. In our previous article some characteristic passages were given, illustrating the differences between A and the first printed text of *c.* 1540. It is proposed to give the passages in M, B, and R corresponding to some of these. Points of comparison are italicized.

Book XIV. cap. 5 [See *S.H.R.*, xvii. 12].

M.	B.	R.
Robert Bruse quhilk *was* yis tyme with ye Army of Ingland, thynkand nocht eneuch to invaid ye Scottis with batall *bot als* to eik his iniure with mair tresoune come on ye bakkis of Scottis. . . .	*was* [A. reads *wes*]	*was*
	bot [A. omits]	omits *bot als*
For you sall nocht faill ane *myschevous end* be punicioun of God, quhen you belevis lest, for ye frequent iniuris done sa oft-tymes aganis yi native cuntre. *I compte* na payne *nor deth* in defence of my countre, and sall cess nothir nychtis nor dayis for defence yairof.	*mishevus dede* [A. *mischevis deia*]	*miserable deid*
	certifying ye yat before *I compte* [A. also] *nor displessour* [A. *displeseir*]	*certifying ye yat* before *I compte nor displeseir*

Book XIV. cap. 5.

M.	B.	R.
It is sayid yat Robert Bruse *was* ye causs of *ye* discomfitoure of yis last feild at Dunbar, for in ye begynnyng of ye bataill he pro-	*was* [A. *wes*]	*wes*
	yis [A. *ye*]	*ye*

M.	B.	R.
mittit to king Edward to cum *fra Ballioll* with all his freyndis and kynnismen quhilkis wald assist to him . . . yai tynt curage and war slayne lyke *schepe* but ony defence. Eftir yis discomfitoure Robert Bruse come to king Edward desyring ye rewarde of his tresoun, quhilk (as he belevit) sulde haif bene ye realme of *Scotland.*	*fra Ballioll* [A. *fra king Ballioll*]	*fra Ballioll*
	miserabil creaturis [A. ditto]	*miserable creaturis*
	Scottis [A. ditto]	*Scottis*

Admittedly these are only small verbal variants, but they have some significance in determining relationship. The words ' lyke schepe ' above are a translation of Boece's *veluti pecora*, wrongly spelled ' peiora ' in the Latin text of 1526. M is thus slightly nearer to the Latin original than the other MSS.

Book XIV. cap. 7.

Attention was called in 1919 to A's mistake about the meeting of Bruce with his brother. Boece's Latin text says Bruce met *Fratrem Dauidem cum Roberto Flemein.* A gives this as ' Dauid Bruse and Dauid Flemyn ' : while M, B, and R all give ' Dauid Bruse and Robert Flemyng.' All three are thus more accurate than A, or rather more faithful to their original, for as a matter of historical fact Boece and all the Bellenden MSS. are wrong, since Bruce's brother was Edward, not David.

Book XIII. cap. 15.

Reference was also made in 1919 to the comments on S. Gilbert, as showing the growing tendency towards advanced ideas in religion. B is interesting in one detail. M and R agree with A in admitting that miracles were being wrought by his body ' *to our dais* ' : but the scribe of B, either intentionally or accidentally omits the words ' *to our dais*,' possibly being in some doubt whether the miracles were still being wrought. B is in this point a half-way house towards the rationalistic printed text, which has omitted the whole sentence about the miracles.

From these and a good many other variants which have been studied, the editors have come to the following provisional opinions :

(1) That M is the best text and the one nearest to the Latin original.

(2) That M is at present in a class by itself, possessing certain quite characteristic features.

(3) That B, R, and A are closely allied—more closely than any one of them is to M.

(4) That the printed text represents a fresh recension, probably based upon the common ancestor of B, R, and A.

R. W. Chambers.
Walter Seton.

Rent-Rolls of the Knights of St. John of Jerusalem in Scotland

IN the years 1828-29-30 the late James Maidment, Advocate, Edinburgh, published in very limited editions copies of certain papers which had come into his hands relating to the history, privileges and possessions of the Knights-Templars in Scotland and their successors the Knights of St. John of Jerusalem. These pamphlets, five in number issued in paper covers, are now rare. To one of them entitled *Abstract of the Charters and other papers recorded in the Chartulary of Torphichen from* 1581 *to* 1596 is prefixed an introductory notice wherein the loss, or supposed loss, of the greater part of the Chartulary is deplored.

It is, however, clear that Manuscript Rentals of the varied possessions of the Knights Hospitallers in Scotland were made with some care in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, and that more than one copy has come down to us. Not only the yearly tack and feu duties payable, but especially the dues exigible on the entry of heirs and singular successors made these rent-rolls necessary for the ingathering of the revenues of the preceptory by the officials appointed for this purpose by the Lord of St. John's.

In the General Register House are preserved in manuscript certain ' Minutes of evidents of Temple lands ' which belong to the late sixteenth and early seventeenth century. These contain matter of some historical and genealogical value, and the present writer transcribed certain portions, but they have not been published as yet.

The late Mr. John Smart, W.S., Edinburgh, had made a copy executed with great care of a Rent-roll which had come into his possession. He was much interested in the history of the Order of Hospitallers in Scotland and contemplated publishing a volume upon the subject. Some excerpts from Mr. Smart's copy are appended to this note in the belief that their quaint

interest will stimulate a desire to see in print the entire rent-roll with its asides indicating the trials of a landowner in Scotland upwards of three hundred years ago. JOHN EDWARDS.

EXCERPTS FROM TRANSCRIPT OF THE HOSPITAL (TEMPLE) RENTAL PRODUCED IN HILL *v* LOCKHART, 1852

[folio 13]

Terre et Baronia de Denny iacentes infra vicecomitatum de Striueling

Memorandum, ze barony of Denny at this tym pais be zeir . . . xxiiij. [s] War ze Miathill[1] weill set it war bettir, quhilk ze Kincadis haldis on [*blank*] quhill God send remeid.

Item, ilk fywe[2] zeris, ze landis of Denny, ilk mark land pais xxs. of gersum.

Item, ze haill landis pais zerlie ix dussan of pultre.

Item, ze myln of Denny wes wont & suld pay zeirlie of meile . . . iij chalder bot now I get nocht sa mekyll. The lard of Artht[3] haldis ze meile of ze Garwald, and ze Kincadis haldis ze meile of ze Miathill, bot & God will, zar wil be remeid gottin. Zai haue gottin discharge of naine to zis tym bot al ma be.

Memorandum, ilk xxs. of land of Denny suld pay zeirlie of meile clerlie [*blank*] and millar suld pay four boll meile.

Item, ze uast[4] medow suld pay zeirlie v rukkis of hay.

. . . . . .

The Garwald.

The Lard of Artht hes this . . . iiij mkis xxd.

The Miathill.

This toun ane Kincaid hes it aganis my veill,[5] & pais bot iij markis & a half.

[folio 29]

Heir followis the schiris of al zis realme and to quhom ilk part is set at zis present tym & for quhat proffit. Imprimis, the schyraiffdom of Berwy, set to Thom Brovn, & takkis for ze awellis zarfor as he plesis to gyf at zis tym.

Item, ze schyraiffdom of Tawedaile[6] is output to proffit, & Sande Weddale is band to help, as he may, to put it to order.

Item, the schyraiffdom of Tueddaile is set to William Dudingstoun.

Item, Estlothian fra Colburnispetht to near Mussilburcht-schir with Ouer-lothian set to Andro Lyndesay, payand zarfor yeirlie xii markis.

Item, Wost lothian & Lynlythcu schiris, set to William Polwort for v markis, quhilk he hes in his fye.

[1] Mutehill, Motehill. [2] Five. [3] Airth.
[4] West. [5] Will. [6] Teviotdale.

Item, Stirling schir, set to Alexr. Lewingstoun of ze Benzardis.

Item, Cliddisdaile set to Thom Hammiltoun in ze Wodhale bayth ouerward & neythir by ze barony of Renfrow, Payand zeirlie . . . xis.

[folio 57]

STRAGRIF.

Barnran - - - -	ij s.
Hirskin [*Erskine*] - -	iij s. iiij d.
Hinchinan :	
Stephanus de Colgare -	xiiij s.
Regni filius Spothan - -	vij s.
Ioannes de Lessaw - -	vij s.
Terra de ponte - -	xij [s.]

RENFREW.

Henricus Eufemie - -	iij s.
De terra Leidis soulre - -	xviij d.
Terra Johannis Coci - -	iij s.
Crokestoun - - - -	ij s.
Pollokis - - - -	ij s.
Heglinham - - - -	ij s.
Newton in lie Mernis - -	xiiij s.
Casteltoun - - - -	ij s.
Belliis Croft & Pennyshill, possesit be James Widraw.	

GLASGW.

Terra Oliver - - -	xij d.
Terra Nicholaii de Permetar -	xij d.
Terra Richardi Belle - -	xij d.
Terra Willielmi de Madwell,	xij d.

RUGLEN.

Terra de Flede - - -	xij d.
Terra Henrici Brady - -	xiij d.
Terra Willielmi Colt - -	xij d.
Terra Willielmi Osualde -	iij s.
Terra Willielmi Clerici -	iij s.

The Professional Pricker and his Test for Witchcraft

NOTWITHSTANDING the strenuous advocacy of James I., in his *Daemonologie*, the cold-water ordeal, or, to borrow the royal phraseology, 'fleeting on the water,' never became popular in Scotland, as a test for witches. In England it was different. This ordeal was the favourite *modus operandi* of Matthew Hopkins, the infamous Witch-Finder of Manningtree; and long after witchcraft, as a crime punishable by death, had disappeared from the statute-book, 'swimming the witch' was indulged in as a serious pastime in many a rural district.

That there may have been sporadic instances of its employment in Scotland is possible; certain place-names that still survive would seem to suggest this. There is, for example, at St. Andrews a Witch Lake, into which, according to local tradition, suspected witches were cast, to sink or swim. Dalyell, however, may be more correct when he says that 'The Witch Lake, a rocky bay of the sea at St. Andrews, is said to be so denominated from the ashes of the victims having been thrown into it.'[1] In the *Statistical Account of Scotland*,[2] from the description of the parish of Kirriemuir, comes the sentence: 'A circular pond, commonly called 'the Witch-pool,' was lately converted into a reservoir for the mills on the Gairie; a much better use than, if we may judge from the name, the superstition of our ancestors led them to apply it.' The statement is non-committal on the particular way in which the superstition manifested itself. The scattering of the ashes was regarded as imperative, in order that they might not be employed for further malefices by the surviving sorceresses. Increase Mather,[3] throws light upon this. 'It is noted in the Germanic Ephemeris for the year 1675, that a man troubled with a fistula, which the physitians by all their art could not relieve, a person that was esteemed a wizard undertook

[1] *The Darker Superstitions of Scotland*, Edinburgh, 1834, p. 636.

[2] 1791-9, xii. 197. [3] *Remarkable Providences*, 1890, p. 192.

to cure; and applying a powder to the wound, within a few dayes the sick party recovered. The powder was some of the ashes of a certain woman who had been burnt to death for a witch.'

The pricker sprang into existence owing to the Devil marking his own. Some of the witch marks were visible, others invisible. The invisible marks could only be recognised as such by their anaesthesia; logically, therefore, pricking was the only sure test. At first, this process would be entrusted to enthusiastic amateurs, such as the parish ministers interested in the various cases. Catherine Oswald was found guilty of witchcraft in 1630; 'the advocate for the instruction of the assyze producing the declaration of two witnesses, that being in the tolbuith, saw Mr. John Aird, minister, put a prin in the pannell's shoulder, (where she carries the devill's mark) up to the heid, and no bluid followed theiron, nor she shrinking thereat: which was againe done in the justice-depute his own presence.'[1] Rev. John Bell, minister of the Gospel at Gladsmuir, discoursing on the 'stigma' says: 'I need not insist much in describing this mark, which is sometimes like a blewish spot; and I myself have seen it in the body of a confessing witch, like a little powder-mark of a blea colour, somewhat hard, and withall insensible, so as it did not bleed when I pricked it.'[2] Soon, however, pricking would be taken out of the hands of the clergy to be given over to a set of specialists, who would make it their profession, and a lucrative one.

Such an adept gave trouble to the Privy Council in 1632. This was 'John Balfour in Corshouse,' who practised 'by remarking the devil's mark upon some part of their persons, and thristing of preens in the same.' 'Upon the presumption of this knowledge,' say the Privy Council, 'he goes athort the country abusing simple and ignorant people for his private gain and commoditie.' In 1643 'James Scobie, indueller in Mussilburgh, being sent for, and brocht in before Jonet Barker, as he that had knawledge in finding out, and trying the devillis mark, he fand out the said mark betuix her schoulderis, in the quhilk he did thrust ane lang preane, the quhilk preane abaid stiking thrie quarteris of ane hour; and yet the said preane was nawayis felt sensible be the said Jonet.' On the 22nd November, 1649,

[1] C. K. Sharpe, *A Historical Account of the Belief in Witchcraft in Scotland*, 1884, pp. 104-5.

[2] C. K. Sharpe, *op. cit.* pp. 208-9.

the Presbytery of Lanark instructed one of the ministers 'to write for George Cathie the pricker for helping to discover the mark.' At their next meeting (6th December, 1649) 'Mr. Robert Birnie doeth report that he had writen for George Cathie, the pricker, who hath skill to find out the marke in witches; and that, upon the last day in November last bypast, in the tolbooth of Lanark, before famous witnesses, to wit, Gideon Jacke and Patrick Craig, baillies of Lanarke, James Conynghame of Bonytoun, James Coninghame of Coblehaugh, Mr. James Vetch, Mr. Robert Birnie himselfe also being present, and by consent of the forenamed suspected women of witchcraft, (eleven women sent by the Marquis of Douglas out of the parish of Crawford Douglas,) the said George did prik pinnes in everie one of them, and in diverse of them without paine the pinne was put in, as the witnesses can testifie.' [1]

Sinclair, in Relation XV. of his *Satan's Invisible World Discovered*, mentions by name an Ayrshire pricker. Bessie Graham, of Kilwinning, was suspect of witchcraft, and 'at this nick of time one Alexander Bogs skilled in searching the Mark, came, being often sent for, and finds the Mark upon her ridge-Back, wherein he thrust a great Brass Pin, of which she was not sensible: neither did any blood follow, when the Pin was drawn out.' In this year the name of John Kincaid, of Tranent, occurs, for among the expenses in connection with the execution of Margaret Denham is an item: 'To Johne Kinked for brodding of her, VI lib. Scotts.' [2] Kincaid's name recurs with distressing frequency in the annals from this date on. The magistrate and minister of Dalkeith caused 'John Kincaid in Tranent, the comon pricker, to prick Jonet Paiston, and found two marks upon hir, which he called the devill his marks—which appeared indeid to be so, for shoe did nather find the prein when it was put into any of the said marks, nor did they blood when they were taken out again: and quhen shoe was asked quhair shoe thocht the preins were put in, shoe pointed at a pairt of hir body, distant from the place quhair the preins were put in, they being lang preins of thrie inches, or thairabout, in lenth,—quhilk John Kinkaid declares wpon his oath, and verifies by his subscription to the same.' [3]

Another woman, Jonet Cock, was implicated by Jonet Paiston, and next day the same minister and magistrate 'charged the

[1] *Extracts from the Records of the Royal Burgh of Lanark*, Glasgow, 1893, p. 143.

[2] Pitcairn, *Criminal Trials*, iii. 599.

[3] Dalyell, *op. cit.* p. 640.

said Johne, vpon his great oath, to goe about his office faithfullie, and to do nothing theirin but what sould be of trueth—and the said Jennet being tryed, their was tuo marks found vpone hir, and pricked without any sense or feilling thereof, or any of the leist appearance of any blood: the preins being taken out, the holles remained vnclosed, as if the samine had bein put into whytt peaper.'[1] In the same year, 1661, John paid a professional visit to Forfar. There he was so successful in the performance of his duties that he received the freedom of the burgh, just ten days after the same honour had been bestowed on Keith, sheriff-depute of the county, and of the noble family of Keith Marischal. But the next year finds him in sore trouble. The Privy Council had received complaints of his inhumanity, and they ordered him to be put in prison. At the end of nine weeks' durance he petitioned for his liberty, representing that, being an old man, the confinement was telling upon his health, and if he were confined much longer his life would probably flicker out. The Council, in a merciful mood, acceded to his request. He was set free on condition that he would prick no more without warrant from them.

A contemporary of his, named John Dick, flourished in the North. One, John Hay, a messenger in Tain, who had reached the age of sixty without a shadow on his character, was denounced by a distracted woman as a wizard. He fell into the hands of Dick, who without any authority, pricked him all over his body, first shaving his head to see that there were no marks upon it. Hay was brought from Tain to Edinburgh, and imprisoned in the Tolbooth. The Privy Council ordered his liberation, likewise that of two women who had lain six weeks in gaol, subjected to 'a great deal of torture by one who takes upon him the trial of witches by pricking.' Yet another appeared at Inverness, as we learn from the Wardlaw Manuscript, under the date, 1st March, 1662. 'There came to Inverness one Mr. Paterson, who had run over the kingdom for triall of witches and was ordinarily called the Pricker, because his way of triall was with a long brasse pin. Stripping them naked, he alledged that the spell spot was seen and discovered. After rubbing over the whole body with his palms, he slipt in the pin, and it seems with shame and feare being dasht they felt it not, but he left it in the flesh deep to the head and desired them to find and take it out. It is sure some witches were discovered, but many honest men

[1] Dalyell, *op. cit.* pp. 640-1.

and women were blotted and broak by this trick. In Elgin there were two killed: in Forres two, and one, Margaret Duff, a rank witch, burned in Inverness. This Paterson came up to the Church of Wardlaw, and within the church pricked 14 women and one man. . . . Several of these dyed in prison never brought to confession. This villain gained a great deal of money, having two servants: at last was discovered to be a woman disguised in man's cloathes.' This instance of a female pricker is probably unique.

The next witch-storm broke out in the year 1677. Again we find the prickers active. In Stirling Tolbooth several unfortunates suspected of having caused the death by drowning of two sons of Douglas of Barloch, had to undergo the usual ordeal. 'Their bodies being searched by the ordinar pricker, there were witch-marks found upon each of them, and Janet M'Nair confessed that she got these marks from the grip of a grim black man, and had a great pain for a time thereafter.'[1] In the same year Fountainhall saw a man being examined at Haddington. 'I did see the man's body searched and pricked in two sundry places, one at the ribs, and the other at his shoulder. He seemed to find pain but no blood followed.' At this period the prosperity of the prickers began to wane. Catherine Liddil laid a complaint before the Privy Council against one Cowan of Tranent, who had been a pupil under Kincaid, for subjecting her to the painful process of pricking on the suspicion of her being a witch. Cowan was committed to prison during the Council's pleasure.

So famous had the Scottish prickers become in the detection of witchcraft that their services were requisitioned by their neighbours across the Border. Increase Mather, in his *Cases of Conscience*,[2] relates: 'I have heard of an Inchanted Pin, that has caused the Condemnation and Death of many scores of innocent Persons. There was a notorious Witch-finder in Scotland, that undertook by a Pin, to make an infallible Discovery of suspected Persons, whether they were Witches or not, if when the Pin was run an Inch or two into the Body of the accused Party no Blood appeared, nor any sense of Pain, then he declared them to be Witches: by means hereof my Author tells me no less than 300 persons were Condemned for Witches in that Kingdom. This Bloody Jugler after he had done enough in Scotland, came to the Town of Berwick upon Tweed: an

[1] Chambers, *Domestic Annals*, vol. ii. 380. [2] 1862, pp. 248-9.

honest man now living in New-England assureth me, that he saw the Man thrust a great Brass Pin two Inches into the Body of one, that some would in that way try whether there was Witchcraft in the Case or no: the accused Party was not in the least sensible of what was done, and therefore in danger of receiving the Punishment justly due for Witchcraft: only it so happened, that Collonel Fenwick (that worthy Gentleman, who many years since lived in New-England) was then the Military Governour in that Town: he sent for the Mayor and Magistrates advising them to be careful and cautious in their proceedings: for he told them, it might be an Inchanted Pin, which the Witchfinder made use of: whereupon the Magistrates of the place ordered that he should make his Experiment with some other Pin as they should appoint: But that he would by no means be induced unto, which was a sufficient Discovery of the Knavery and Witchery of the Witchfinder.'

From Newcastle comes a much fuller account of a pricker's performances in the North of England, which appeared to have had, like Scotland, no dealings with the ordeal by water. It is contained in Ralph Gardiner's *England's Grievance discovered in Relation to the Coal Trade*,[1] 'Ioh. Wheeler, of London, upon his oath, said, that in, or about the years 1649, and 1650, being at Newcastle, heard that the magistrates had sent two of their sergeants, namely, Thomas Shevel, and Cuthbert Nicholson, into Scotland, to agree with a scotch-man, who pretended knowledge to finde witches, by pricking them with pins, to come to Newcastle, where he should try such who should be brought to him, and to have twenty-shillings a peece, for all he could condemn as witches, and free passage thither and back again. When the sergeants had brought the said witch-finder on horseback, to town, the magistrates sent their bell-man through the town, ringing his bell, and crying, all people that would in any complaint against any woman for a witch they should be sent for, and tryed by the person appointed. Thirty women were brought into the town-hall, and stript, and then openly had pins thrust into their bodies, and most of them was found guilty, and near twenty seven of them by him, and set aside. The said reputed witch-finder acquainted lieut. colonel Hobson, that he knew women, whether they were witches or no, by their looks, and when the said person was serching of a personable, and good-like woman, the said colonel replyed, and said, surely this woman

[1] London, 1655.

is none, and need not be tryed, but the scotch-man said she was, and therefore he would try her; and presently in sight of all the people, laid her body naked to the waste, with her cloaths over her head, by which fright and shame, all her blood contracted into one part of her body, and then he ran a pin into her thigh, and then suddenly let her coats fall, and then demanded whether she had nothing of his in her body, but did not bleed, but she being amazed, replied little, then he put his hand up her coats, and pulled out the pin, and set her aside as a guilty person, and child of the devil, and fell to try others whom he made guilty. Lieutenant colonel Hobson, perceiving the alteration of the foresaid woman, by her blood settling in her right parts, caused that woman to be brought again, and her cloaths pulled up to her thigh, and required the scot to run the pin into the same place, and then it gushed out of blood, and the said scot cleared her, and said, she was not a child of the devil. So soon as he had done, and received his wages, he went into Northumberland, to try women there, where he got of some, three pound a peece, but Henry Ogle, esq. a late member of parliament, laid hold on him, to answer the sessions, but he got away for Scotland, and it was conceived, if he had staid, he would have made most of the women in the north, witches, for money. The said witch-finder was laid hold on in Scotland, cast into prison, indicted, arraigned, and condemned for such like villanie, exercised in Scotland; and upon the gallows, he confessed he had been the death of above two hundred and twenty women in England, and Scotland, for the gain of twenty shillings a peece, and beseeched forgiveness, and was executed.' It is good to hear of one, at least, of these ghouls hoist with his own petard. Gardiner's narrative is, in the Newcastle reprint of 1796, illustrated by a cut, in which the smirking pricker is, Judas-like, receiving his blood-money, while four of his victims swing from the gallows over his head, and three more miserable wretches await in tears the descent of the hangman from his ladder.

The fact that two of the gentlemen in the North of England at the time of the witch-finder's visit, were suspicious of his pretended science finds its parallel in Scotland. Sir George Mackenzie, in his *Laws and Customs, etc.*, is conversant with the fraud of it: 'This mark is discovered among us by a pricker, whose trade it is, and who learns it as other trades: but this is a horrid cheat, for they alledge that if the place bleed not, or if the person be not sensible, he or she is infallibly a witch. But,

as Delrio confesses, it is very hard to know any such mark, '*à nevo, clavo, vel impertigine naturali.*'—From a mark or a natural insensibility,—and there are many pieces of dead flesh which are insensible even in living bodies: and a villain who used this trade with us, being in the year 1666 apprehended for other villanies, did confess all this trade to be a mere cheat.' Fountainhall is equally emphatic: 'I remained very dissatisfied with this way of trial, as most fallacious: and the fellow could give me no account of the principles of his art, but seemed to be a drunken foolish rogue.' It was evidently amid the common people and the clergy that the pricker was accepted on his own valuation. At one time the Synod of Glasgow deliberated upon the necessity of having 'those in readinesse at the Justiciar Court, that hes skill to try the insensible mark.' Nowadays that is the province of the police-surgeon.

The dogma of the 'devil's mark' called the pricker into existence, just as that mark, taking the form of a teat in England, necessitated the existence of imps that would derive their sustenance therefrom. In Scotland the mark was just a mark, and the imps are absent, except, perhaps, in the case of Isobel Gowdie of Auldearn. One cannot help thinking that the credulous Jesuit, Delrio, had a great deal to do with the prevalence of the devil and his devotees in Scotland. His great volume on magic was a *sine qua non* with every lawyer, who might have to plead in a case of witchcraft at any moment. Perhaps every presbytery clerk had also his copy, for the questions put to those suspect of witchcraft are practically those recommended by Delrio. He has already been quoted with regard to the difficulty of fixing upon the correct 'stigma,' and for the purpose of identification he also recommends the use of a needle or a small poignard, *acu vel pugiunculo*. The cases which he gives as illustrations of the success accruing from this method of investigation on the Continent are just the Scottish ones *nominibus mutatis*, though the appointment of an official pricker is not recorded.

Pricking was a profession, although an ignoble one. Doubtless a substantial bribe to the operator would, in many cases, secure immunity from the fatal charge of witchcraft, and there must have been hundreds who saved their lives in this way, the pricker finding no fault in them. In such a case the operation may have been performed, as Sir Walter Scott suggests, by using 'a pin the point or lower part of which was, on being pressed down, sheathed in the upper, which was hollow for the purpose,

and that which appeared to enter the body did not pierce it at all.' That may have been why the pricker at Berwick on Tweed was unwilling to experiment with the pin offered him by the magistrates.

But the great majority of the witches would have nothing to offer as a bribe, for witches were notoriously poor, notwithstanding diabolic promises. In their case the absence of blood when the instrument was withdrawn, and the lack of sensibility to its presence, must have been due to other causes, which modern medicine can possibly define. The pricker must have had some slight knowledge of anatomy, for a sharp instrument, three or four inches long, in the hands of an inexperienced lout, would have meant murder in every case. It is this acquaintance with the anatomy of the human frame which entitles the pricker to be regarded as a professional man. His place is in the ranks of those quacks and charlatans who have followed in the wake of the profession of medicine.

W. N. Neill.

A Franco-Scottish Conspiracy in Sweden

THE madness of Eric XIV of Sweden led to his deposition on January 25th, 1569, and the accession of his brother as John III. During the next seven years three rebellions with the object of reinstating the ex-king agitated the country. His place of residence was changed many times, and he spent three years of rigorous confinement in the Castle of Gripsholm on Lake Mälar before being finally removed to his prison at Örbyhus, where he died apparently of poison. Before this event took place desperate efforts were made for the release of Eric, and the Mornay Conspiracy resembles in several of its details the Babington Plot.

The principal actors in the drama were Charles de Mornay, a Frenchman, and Archibald Ruthven and Gilbert Balfour, who cannot be regarded in any sense as typical Scottish settlers. Their antecedents show that they were likely to prove apt pupils in the art of dissimulation then so common. Ruthven was the son of that brutal lord who instigated the murder of Riccio, and rose from a sick bed to perpetrate the deed. He was recommended to King John by the Regent Mar in 1572, attaining the rank of Swedish General, so that there can be no doubt of his treachery. Gilbert Balfour had no scruples in deserting one political party for another. He was like his discreditable brother, Sir James Balfour, who was a fellow-prisoner with John Knox in the French galleys and afterwards abandoned the Reformers, taking good care to purchase his own safety at the fall of Queen Mary by surrendering the Casket Letters and the Castle of Edinburgh to the Confederate Lords.

The arch-conspirator was Mornay, who signed himself in contemporary documents as Baron of Varennes. He came to Sweden in 1557, and rose to high rank in the favour of Eric, being employed by him in his unfortunate matrimonial missions to the English and Scottish Courts when the king in turn solicited the hands of Queen Elizabeth and Mary, Queen of Scots.

Unsuccessful as a diplomatist and as a soldier in the Danish War, Mornay began indulging his passion for intrigue. Doubtless he was bound to Eric by ties of gratitude; but, while scheming on his behalf, he did not hesitate to win his way into King John's favour and to accept daily proofs of his friendship.

In June 1573 certain Scottish levies arrived in Sweden, and Mornay approached Ruthven and Balfour with a view of trading on their cupidity. His plan was to represent the king as a bad paymaster, who, whilst availing himself of their services, intended to banish them and their troops to a distant place where they would die of cold and hunger. When he saw that he had made some impression, he unfolded his plans in detail. The king was to be slain at the Royal Palace during the performance of a sword dance—a novelty at the Swedish Court—and Eric was to be liberated. The reward was to be 100,000 thaler each and three months' pay for their men. The sword dance was actually performed at a brilliant banquet given by King John in the palace; but, like many similar attempts, the plot failed owing to the presence of a traitor in the camp, one Hugh Cahun, who disclosed the secret designs of Mornay and the Scottish officers. Either the signal was not given at the right moment or the conspirators realised that the attempt would be hopeless, as the king was strongly guarded.

Then followed a hue and cry after the persons implicated. Mornay, in order to throw dust in the eyes of the Court and to screen himself and the others, boldly accused Cahun of having long borne a grudge against Ruthven. He demanded his seizure, and so powerful was the Frenchman's influence that the unfortunate man was executed, the weak king assenting to this. The tables were soon turned on the plotters, for the Scottish regiments were ordered to Reval with Ruthven. He wrote to the king and tried to exculpate himself by casting the blame on Balfour, who after an attempt to escape by sea was captured. Before long Ruthven was also put under arrest, and the two Scots were sent under a strong escort to Stockholm. Meanwhile Mornay, to avoid a similar fate, fled to the king's brother, Duke Charles.

But the toils were fast closing round the three conspirators. Mornay was soon surrendered for trial, found guilty and executed on the Market Place of Stockholm, his last words being: 'To-day Carolus shall die, he by whose leniency King John lives,' a strange admission of his share in the plot. Balfour was

condemned ' to the loss of life, goods and honour,' being kept in prison while the trial of Ruthven proceeded. The Scottish Government then took up the cause of the prisoners, and Morton in the name of James VI. wrote to the Swedish king, even sending over a special envoy to plead on their behalf. Fresh plots broke out, and after several postponements Balfour was executed in August 1576. He seems to have admitted his complicacy in the conspiracy, but stated that after having satisfied himself as to the payment of his soldiers he took no further part in Mornay's treasonable plans.

Ruthven's life was spared and he was imprisoned in the Castle of Vesterås for nearly four years, being given a certain amount of freedom as he was allowed to walk about the town. He did not long survive, and died in February 1578. He continually complained of want of proper food and clothing, and at his funeral there was not even enough money left to pay the sexton for tolling the bell.

GEORGE A. SINCLAIR.