

10# 2733197

ORIGIN OF THE SCOTS

AND THE

SCOTTISH LANGUAGE.

AN INQUIRY PRELIMINARY TO THE PROPER UNDERSTANDING OF

SCOTTISH HISTORY AND LITERATURE.

BY JAMES PATERSON,

Editor of "Kay's Edinburgh Portraits;" Author of "The Contemporaries of Burns;"
"History of the County and Families of Ayr;" "Memoir of
James Fillans, Sculptor," &c. &c.

"If there is any branch [of antiquarian research] that has pretensions to interest and dignity, it is certainly that which relates to the origin and destinies of nations, the filiation of distant races, and the affinities of remote establishments."—*Edinburgh Review*, 1803.

EDINBURGH: JOHN MENZIES, 61 PRINCES STREET.

GLASGOW: THOS. MURRAY & SON, 49 BUCHANAN STREET;

J. PATERSON, 94 GLASSFORD STREET.

PAISLEY: R. STEWART, CROSS.

M D C C C L V.

DA777

P38

Digitized for Microsoft Corporation
by the Internet Archive in 2007.

From University of California Libraries.

May be used for non-commercial, personal, research,
or educational purposes, or any fair use.

May not be indexed in a commercial service.

CONTENTS.

	Page
PREFACE,	7
INTRODUCTION,	25
FIRST INHABITANTS,	29
THE PICTS,	30
THE SCOTS,	42
THE TEUTONIC ADVENT,	76
OF THE NORTHMEN,	89
ORIGIN OF THE SCOTTISH LANGUAGE,	106

P R E F A C E.

THE following pages make no pretension to novelty in matters of fact. The many learned and able disputants who from time to time have entered the lists, and brought the full array of their laborious gleanings from ancient authorities to bear upon the question at issue, preclude the hope of any additional information capable of throwing light on the subject. The Author, at the same time, is convinced that the existing diversity of opinion proceeds more from the one-sided manner in which these facts have been produced, and the pre-determination of the contending parties to support particular views, than from the contradictory or unsatisfactory nature of the facts themselves. In a matter of such remote antiquity, and in the face of so many plausible and conflicting theories, it would be presumption to affirm that he has even approached a settlement of the question; yet he is egotist enough to think that he has at least suggested

views capable of reconciling or explaining the leading data adduced by the more distinguished controversialists, and brought the whole within the grasp of the general reader, whose leisure and inclination may not have enabled him to grapple with the various authorities. He has endeavoured to do this by avoiding unnecessary detail, laying hold only of the more prominent landmarks, which in reality command all the rest, and bringing to bear upon them the weight of self-evident conclusions, or the conviction arising from the testimony of circumstances.

The Author was led into this self-imposed undertaking, not with a view to publication, but for his own satisfaction. While engaged in writing the 'History of the County and Families of Ayrshire,' some years ago, he had occasion to inquire into the origin of the inhabitants of that district; and in doing so, felt much perplexed by the opposing theories and contradictory statements put forth by the respective writers whom he found it desirable to consult. When more leisure offered, he resumed the inquiry, upon a more extended basis, and the following pages are the result of his labours. Believing it to be of essential interest historically as well as nationally, that a people should know from what division of the world or

from what branch of the human family they are derived, he has thus ventured to claim public attention, and trusts that the digest of the great antiquarian question of ages which he offers may not be without its use in at least preparing the reader for deeper study, should it fail to carry conviction to the understanding.

In reference to the origin of the Scottish language, the Author believes that a similar vagueness prevails amongst the generality of readers. That it arose somehow, they find to be an existent fact; but from whence derived, or what are its constituent parts, very few can tell, or have been at the trouble to ascertain. With the exception of Dr Jamieson's Introduction to his Scottish Dictionary, he is not aware that any formal attempt has been made to trace it to its source, however much the learned may be of one mind on the subject. Jamieson's is no doubt an able essay; but he had peculiar views to support, and a thorough and impartial elucidation of the question was scarcely to be expected from his pen. Unacquainted probably with the British and Gaelic, it was apparently his aim to derive the Scottish chiefly from the Scandinavian. For example, he passes over the very expressive and euphonious word *croon*—

‘Whiles *croonin* oure some auld Scots sonnet,’—

so intimately associated with our national lyrics, without any attempt to trace its root: which he might at once have found in the Gaelic *cronan*, a low murmuring sound, a dirge. It is indeed rather strange that, although we have numerous writers on the early ballad literature of Scotland, few of them have ventured to account for the singularly felicitous language in which they are composed.

Sir Walter Scott, in his preface to the *Romance of Sir Tristrem*, makes a vigorous dash at the root of the matter. Though differing with us in some points, as the reader will perceive on perusing the following pages, he is nevertheless right in the main facts. 'The Saxon kingdom of Bernicia,' he observes, 'was not limited by the Tweed, but extended, at least occasionally, as far northward as the Frith of Forth. The fertile plains of Berwickshire and the Lothians were inhabited by a race of Anglo-Saxons, whose language resembled that of the Belgic tribes whom they had conquered, and this blended speech contained as it were the original materials of the English tongue.* Beyond the Friths of Forth and of Tay, was the principal seat of the Picts, a Gothic tribe,

* We do not understand this passage. The Anglo-Saxons conquered the Ottadeni and Gadeni of Lothian, but they were British, not Belgic tribes.

if we can trust the best authorities, who spoke a dialect of the Teutonic differing from the Anglo-Saxon, and apparently more allied to the Belgic. This people falling under the dominion of the kings of Scots, the united forces of these nations wrenched from the Saxons, first the province of the Lothians, finally that of Berwickshire, and even part of Northumberland itself. But as the victors spoke a language similar to that of the vanquished,* it is probable that no great alteration took place in that particular, the natives of the southern border continuing to use the Anglo-Saxon, qualified by the Pictish dialect, and to bear the name of Angles.'

Sir Walter was of opinion that the *English* language, as he calls it, made greater progress in Scotland than in England. Ellis, in his specimens of early English poetry, makes a similar remark, and contends for the independence of the Scottish language.

Allan Cunningham, in his introduction to the 'Songs of Scotland,' glances at the subject in his usual poetical style:—

'The period when the Scottish language began to be heard above the barbarous discordance of the conquering and the conquered, cannot be accurately known; and it

* Part of the Pictish portion of the Scottish forces only did so.

is equally vain to seek to be informed at what time it flowed in a stream pure and plentiful enough for the uses of the muse. There must have been a large interval of years, while the Celtic language was step by step retiring to the northern hills, and the present language was secretly moulding itself on the Saxon (?), the Danish, and the Norman, in which our poetry appeared of many colours, and caught a strip and a star from every fresh infusion from the west or the south. That our earliest poets spoke a kind of Babylonish dialect, fit to confound the wisdom of many colleges, I am not prepared to say; but it is much easier to prove that the peculiar poetry of the various tribes or nations who turned Scotland and England into a prize-fighter's stage, gave a tinge or an impulse which is yet visible in the popular poetry of the land. If we can indulge in the pleasing belief that Fingal lived and that Osian sang; and if we are to judge of the aspirations of the Celtic muse by the wild, and pathetic, and chivalrous strains which were so long and so wondrously preserved for Macpherson to find, we may conclude that the Lowland muse owes less to her Celtic sister than to the wild legions of the Norwegians and Danes. The Scottish and the Scandinavian ballads or songs have a close and a vivid resemblance: the same

spirit seems to have conceived, and the same spirit executed them. They abound in the same wild and singular superstitions; the same thirst for the marvellous by sea, and the incredible by land. They present an image of a rude, a martial, and original people; might is their source of right; personal beauty and personal bravery are their only visible perfections; their ships are their homes, the field of battle their delight; plunder their reward; and the chief judge and arbitrator in all dubious matters is the sword. Blood flows, through their romantic as well as their martial strains; and if they draw images of female loveliness and beauty, it is but to throw them into the arms of the savage hero of the tale, or upon the sword-point of some fiercer rival. But, steeped as they are in superstition and in blood, they have many redeeming graces of graphic power, rude chivalry, and fervent pathos. They exhibit that sharp and fresh presentment of incident and scene which will ever be found in the songs of those who seek to see nature for themselves. They have the fire-edge of first thought strong upon them, with that minuteness and particularity which make fiction speak with the tongue of truth. In much of this energy of character, the Celtic poetry shares; but its manners are more refined, its sentiments

more generous, its superstitions more sublime, and its chivalry rivals the brightest era of European knight-hood.'

Had Cunningham attended to historical facts, he would have found that there must have been properly two eras in the formation of the Scottish language. The first during the Pictish period, prior to the middle of the ninth century; and the second after the accession of the Scottish line of kings to the Pictish throne. So far from 'the Celtic retiring step by step to the northern hills,' the Scottish dialect, mixed and confused as it may have been, and moulded not on the Saxon but on the Norwegian, was in the first instance pushed by the Gaelic from the north southwards. So long as the Picts and Danes held the north-east of Scotland, the language of the Norsemen, or mixed Pictish, must have extensively prevailed, for the Gael were strictly circumscribed to their original Dalriada, now Argyleshire. On the downfall of the Danish reguli in the north of Scotland, they so overspread the Pictish provinces that in the days of Buchanan, and at a still later period, Gaelic was the universal language even in Sutherlandshire and Caithness. The germ of the Scottish tongue, as well as the mixed race of people by whom it was spoken, and with

whom it originated, tenaciously continued to hold their place in the wide and fertile district of Moray and Aberdeenshire. The progress of the Scottish dialect in the first era was thus from north to south; during the second, from causes which must be obvious, and which we need not here repeat, the process was reversed. The alleged superior refinement of the Celtic is a fiction. When it shall have been established that Macpherson's Osian is a genuine production, then the premises may be admitted; but not till then.

Our ballad literature and melody, contrary to Cunningham's opinion, are greatly indebted to the Celtic. The plaintive, so expressively deep in its tone, may be said to be wholly derived from it. In short, the superiority of the Lowland Scots seems to consist in this, that it combines the peculiar excellencies of both the Scandinavian and the Celtic lyre.

J. P.

GLASGOW, July, 1855.

ORIGIN OF THE SCOTS.

INTRODUCTION.

No question has puzzled antiquaries more than the Origin of the Scottish People and Language. The fabulous derivations in which our early historians indulged—not even exclusive of the classic Buchanan—opened a wide field for speculation; and the few authorities, prior to the existence of indubitable national records, whose statements can at all be relied upon, have had their facts twisted into all manner of meanings, or been wholly set aside, according to the peculiar views of the respective combatants.

Without a knowledge of the origin of a people, it is clear that we can form no very distinct or accurate idea of their language. Until the appearance of Pinkerton's 'Essay on the Origin of Scottish Poetry,' published in 1786, it seemed to be a settled notion that the Scottish, or Lowland language, was simply a dialect, or corruption of the English. That writer contended for a more immediate derivation from the Gothic root, through the

medium of Scandinavia. His theory was, that the ancient Caledonians, or Picts, were Scythians from Norway, and had peopled Caledonia ages before the invasion of the Romans—hence the vernacular of the great body of the kingdom; while to the Scots, a later people, we owe the Gaelic of the Highlands. Upon a similar hypothesis, the late Dr Jamieson brought out his invaluable Scottish Dictionary, which abundantly established the close affinity of the Icelandic and Scottish tongue.

Plausible, however, as Pinkerton's system was, it wanted the necessary cohesion in certain vulnerable points; and in his 'Inquiry into the History of Scotland preceding 1056,' wherein the same theory was more elaborately produced, his arguments and authorities were thrown so meretriciously together, as to weaken rather than strengthen his position. His language, too, is invariably boldest where his proof is most deficient. His 'Inquiry,' nevertheless, made considerable impression. To it we no doubt owe the great topographical and historical work of George Chalmers, the first volume of which appeared in 1807. This is perhaps one of the most systematic and logical works of the kind on record. Though most of his propositions were suggested by previous writers, yet he so arranged and illustrated them as to make them virtually his own. His object was to show that the Caledonians and Picts were the same people, but of Celtic, not of Scandinavian origin; that

the Scots were a later colony from Ireland, also of Celtic descent; and that the Scottish dialect was derived from the Saxon by colonization from England.

Chalmers' opposition to Pinkerton, however, carried him occasionally too far; and, in not a few instances, he is not only inconsistent, but casts aside probability and even direct testimony, where these do not coincide with the general scope of his views. Pinkerton was no doubt right in his opinion that the dialect of the Lowlands is a more direct offshoot from the Gothic than the Anglo-Saxon as spoken in England; but he was as clearly wrong in the historical data by which he endeavoured to account for the fact. So also, we opine, Chalmers was in error when he attributed the introduction of the Anglo-Saxon into Scotland wholly to colonization from England. The erroneous deductions of both were the necessary consequence of a false assumption in the out-start, to reconcile and illustrate which will be the chief object of the following pages.

We may premise that both writers were fully conversant with all the Roman and other authorities on the subject; and before them lay the critical investigations of Camden, Usher, Innes, Clerk, Sibbald, the Macphersons, Whitaker, etc.; but it is remarkable how prone even the more impartial writers on disputed points of antiquity, are to a one-sided selection of authorities. It is a great pity that Chalmers did not live to finish his truly national

work. The fourth volume—which is awanting—would have brought him more directly into contact with the two grand divisions of ancient Caledonia north of the Forth, and with many of those remains of antiquity, which the ingenuity of our most laborious antiquaries have hitherto failed to explain.

Since the time of Chalmers and Pinkerton, several writers—such as Logan, Grant, Skene, etc.—have grappled with the same subject; but their views are either a reiteration of theories formerly propounded, or so fanciful and unsupported as to be unworthy of particular notice. These again have been followed by a swarm of miscellaneous writers, who, in every department of literature, throw out their ill-digested conjectures in the most arbitrary manner; so that, at this moment, the origin of the Scots and Picts, and the language in which Barbour, Wyntoun, Douglas, Dunbar, Ramsay, and Burns gave poetical expression to their sentiments, is, to the majority of readers, as great a mystery as ever.

No one can believe with Pinkerton and his followers that the original Picts were a Gothic people, who made good their footing in the Hebrides three hundred years before Christ, and on the mainland a hundred years afterwards, all evidence, historical and topographical, being against him; and as little can we agree with Chalmers in his opinion that the Scottish vernacular

was introduced by colonization from England subsequent to 1093, when we find the language of the former more refined than that of the latter, not much beyond a century subsequent to the alleged era of change. We must endeavour to find the truth between the two extremes.

FIRST INHABITANTS.

With Chalmers we can have no reasonable doubt that Great Britain and Ireland were originally peopled by one and the same race of Celts from Gaul. This is demonstrated by the stone monuments, and other remains of antiquity, which are to be found in all parts of the three kingdoms, as well as topographically by the maps of Ptolemy* and Richard,† wherein it is apparent that the names of rivers and places are similar, and, in not a few instances, of the tribes themselves. For example, the tribe of the Damnii are to be found in each of the three divisions of the kingdom. In Ireland there were,

* Ptolemy, the Egyptian geographer, lived in the second century; and with the exception of a mistake in the longitude and latitude, his maps of the British isles are considered amazingly accurate. A transcript of Ptolemy's map, with Richard's variations indicated, was published some years ago by the Society for Promoting Useful Knowledge.

† Richard of Cirencester, in England, existed in the thirteenth century. He was an excellent geographer, and seems to have had good authority for his statements. Nevertheless, doubts have been thrown upon the genuineness of the maps ascribed to him

besides, the *Voluntii*, and in Britain the *Voluntii* or *Volantii*; in Ireland the *Vennicnii*, and in Britain the *Vennicones*, etc. The nearest point of land to Ireland, in South Britain, is called *Ganganorum*, in Caernarvonshire, in the maps of Ptolemy and Richard, hence it is inferable that the tribe of the *Cangani*, in Ireland, emigrated from the Welsh coast. Of the similarity of names of places in Britain and Ireland, Chalmers furnishes numerous and convincing illustrations.

At the same time, however, there seems to be good reason for believing that the Welsh, or Cymbric branch of the Celts, were a later colony, before whom the earlier tribes gradually retired northward and westward, to Scotland and Ireland. This opinion was first suggested by Lloyd, an eminent Welsh scholar and antiquary, who found that the more ancient names of places in Wales were Erse or Gaelic, not Welsh. This hypothesis, of which Chalmers takes no notice, relieves the inquirer of one great difficulty, viz., the difference between the Welsh and Gaelic languages, if the people had been colonies of the same age and tribe.

THE PICTS.

At the era of Agricola's invasion (78), it is apparent that the three kingdoms were chiefly occupied by a Celtic people. We say *chiefly*, because, in opposition to Chal-

mers, it must not be forgotten that Julius Cæsar, who invaded South Britain a hundred and thirty-three years previously, is somewhat positive in his statement to the contrary. He says that, on landing in England, he found the inhabitants on the coast to be of Belgic descent, differing from those of the interior, whom he designates *Britanni*, both in language and institutions; nay, in three obvious particulars—*linguâ, institutis, moribus*. He farther states that the tradition among the Belgæ themselves was that they were not Celts, but Germans. Chalmers repudiates the positive statement of Julius Cæsar, on the ground that the term *Belgæ* itself is Celtic, signifying men of war, or warlike; that, taking the context, Cæsar afterwards modifies his statement by saying, ‘the Belgæ were chiefly descended from the Germans; and passing the Rhine, in *ancient times*, seized the nearest country of the Gauls;’ and that, as Germany was occupied by Celts as late as 112 years B.C., and partially by them during the next century, the Belgæ necessarily were Celtic. It is to be inferred, he also urges, from Livy and Strabo, Pliny and Lucan, that Cæsar meant *dialect* in place of language. The positive statement of Cæsar is thus somewhat neutralised. But whatever may have been the difference between the Belgæ and Britons in Cæsar’s time, Tacitus concluded, after a deliberate consideration of the origin of the various tribes of which Britain was composed in the

following century, that they were veritable Gauls.* On a general survey, 'he says it appears probable that the Gauls originally took possession of the neighbouring coast. The sacred rites and superstitions of those people are discernible among the Britons. The languages of the two nations (the Gauls and Britons) do not greatly differ.'

There is reason to believe, at the same time, that considerable trading intercourse had existed between the Britons and Continentals long prior to the era of the Romans; and Kemble, in his 'Saxons in England,' has followed up the idea of Pinkerton, by showing that there were Saxons in South Britain centuries before the landing of Hengist and Horsa in 449. The *Coritani*,† according to Welsh tradition, were Germans; and the Roman classics affirm the fact, that a legion of Alamanni, a German tribe, served under the Roman standard in

* There seems much dubiety as to the term *Gauli* in the Roman classics, whether it applied to the Celtic or German tribes; and it is probable that a considerable intermixture of races latterly ensued. This may account for the difference traced by particular authors as to the physical appearance of the inhabitants of Britain. Tacitus, in describing the battle of the Grampians, particularly mentions the *Covinarii*, a German tribe, as opposed to the Romans. But although a mixture of race, to some extent, may thus be admitted, there can be little doubt that the great mass of the Caledonian people were Celtic, and that they spoke the Celtic language. The opinion of the *Edinburgh Review* (1803), that the inhabitants of Britain, in the time of Cæsar, were German Gauls, and spoke a dialect of the Teutonic language, is absurd in the extreme.

† The *Coritani* occupied the centre of England.

Britain. Kemble, besides, quotes from the *Notitia* of the Romans—a document of the close of the fourth century—to prove that a Saxon community then existed in England. The *Comes Littoris Saxonici* of the *Notitia* was an officer whose authority over the Saxons extended from Portsmouth to Wells, in Norfolk. If the Saxons, thus specially recognised by the Romans in the fourth century, were the Belgæ of Julius Cæsar, as some have supposed, it is evident that their presence had not produced much effect in changing either the language or usages of the Britons. The latter retired westward as the tide of Saxon colonization rolled in from the east; and whether the Belgæ, if Celts, retreated with their countrymen to the mountains of Wales; or, being Saxons, amalgamated with the Teutonic flood, is likely to remain for ever a secret. At all events, it is plain that the Anglo-Saxons of history spoke the Saxon language, and maintained it in considerable purity down to the twelfth century; which could hardly have been the case had the Belgæ been a body of German settlers, mixing with the Romans and native Britons for so many ages. No intermediate language, or dialect, between the Welsh and Saxon, can be traced either in the literature or topography of ancient England. The Belgæ disappear to history after the first century; and, in the absence of all tangible recognition of them, have been converted into Scots, Picts, Irish, or Welsh, according to the arbitrary

will and pleasure of the multitudinous inquirers who have written on the subject. For example, the editor of the *Athenæum*, in reviewing Skene's 'Highlanders of Scotland,' in 1837, records his firm belief in this Belgic transmutation: 'Without condescending for a moment,' he says, 'to admit the strange hypothesis of Mr Skene, that they (the Belgæ) are the progenitors of the modern Welsh, we have a *strong opinion* that they *amalgamated with the Britons of Caledonia*, and that this junction gave rise to the name of *Picts*!' Elsewhere, as if determined to leave the Celts a very small share in our ancestral honours, the editor finds the hypothesis that the *Scots* were of 'Teutonic origin,' (thus following Pinkerton so far) 'greatly confirmed by the remarkable affinity now subsisting between the language of the Gael and that of the German (!) As we ascend the stream of time,' he continues, 'as we compare the oldest extant monuments of the Erse with those of the dialects confessedly Teutonic, we are powerfully struck with the resemblance. This fact alone, independent of all authority, we hold to be *decisive* of the question that the Scots were Germans, whether derived immediately from the country usually understood by that name, or from Scandinavia, is of no consequence!'

If writers in the position of the editor of the *Athenæum* are found giving utterance to such unsubstantiated dicta as this, we need not wonder that the popular mind

should be submerged in a flood of ignorance on the subject.*

In Scotland, at the advent of Agricola, there were twenty-one clans—the *Caledonii*,† occupying ‘the whole of the interior country, from the ridge of mountains which separates Inverness and Perth, on the south, to the range of hills that forms the forest of Balnagown, in Ross, on the north; comprehending all the middle parts of Inverness and of Ross.’‡ Fife, Perth, Aberdeenshire, etc., afterwards the chief country of the *Picts*, were inhabited by the *Horestii*, *Venricones*, *Taixali*, etc. In the map of Ptolemy, the *Picti* are not mentioned, but they occur in that of Richard, while the names of the *Horestii*, etc., disappear. The Romans seem to have used the designation in the belief that it was derived from the practice of painting their bodies; but as this

* There is an affinity, less or more, between almost all languages, to be traced in numerous radical words; but the German assuredly belongs to the Gothic, not the Celtic branch. At the same time, as Gaul was anciently inhabited by Germans and Celts, it is not wonderful that there should be words, in the language of each, common to both—a fact which has given rise to much confusion in the topographical argument of the question. We are aware that some gentlemen, who have given attention to the Celtic language and literature, are of opinion that the various Gothic languages of Europe are but so many deviations from or corruptions of the Gaelic; as, for example, the Gothic *wick* is just another mode of spelling and pronouncing the Celtic *uig*—a nook, or retired solitary hollow. It would require a great many such instances, however, to prove that the similarity arose from other than the causes already assigned.

† So called from their occupying the woody district.

‡ Chalmers' Caledonia.

custom was, and still is, general amongst rude tribes, it is not easy to see how the term could apply to any one portion of the inhabitants of Britain more than to another. Pinkerton contends that ornamenting the body in this manner was a Gothic, not a Celtic custom; and he derives the name from the Norwegian *vik* and *vikar*, a corruption, he says, of the ancient *Peukini*, as *Suitod* or *Sweden*. Chalmers seeks a more direct etymology, which he finds in the word *Peithw*,* signifying the open country, in contradistinction to *Celyddon*, the wooded district. Thus the central portion of the country, north of the Forth, appears to have been distinguished as *Celyddon*, and the open country, along the eastern coast, as *Peithw*, which terms were Latinized by the Romans as *Caledonia* and *Pictavia*, occupied in all by thirteen clans.

* '*Peithi* and *Peith-wyr*,' says Chalmers, 'are the usual terms for the Pictish people in the oldest Welsh poets. On the confines of Wales those Britons who threw off their allegiance to their native princes, and set up a *regulus* of their own, or adhered to the Saxons, were called *Peithi* or *Picti*. Thus a Welsh poet of the seventh century, celebrating "*mic (myg) Dinbich*," "*the renown of Denbigh*," says, "*addowyn gaer ysydd ar glâs Phicti*,"—a fair town stands on the confines of the Picti. In fact, the Welsh, to distinguish the northern from the southern Picti, called the Caledonian Picts by the appellation of *Gwyddyl Pichti*. The ancient Welsh, by applying the terms *Brython* and *Brythonig* to the Picts, show that they considered them as Britons. From this application of *Brython* to the Picts, we may infer that the earliest of the classic writers, in calling the Picts by the name of Britons, merely adopted the British appellation [without knowing its import.] We may here, perhaps, discover the real origin of the term *Britons*, as applied to the most ancient colonists of our island, and not from the name of the country, as often is supposed.'

It must not be forgotten, however, that, though the etymology adopted by Chalmers may be the right one, the *Britanni* of South Britain were also occasionally 'called *Caledonii* and *Picti*; and that there was a *Sylva Caledonia* in the vicinity of the Thames.' Martial, who lived about the year 94, says, in one of his epigrams:

'Barbara de Pictis veni bascauda Britannis;
Sed me jam mavult dicere Roma sūam.'*

While, in another addressed to Q. Ovidius, going to Britain, he speaks of them as the *Picti Britanni*:

'Quincte, Caledonios Ovidi visure Britannos.'†

Florus, his contemporary, in writing of Cæsar's second invasion, says: 'cosdem rursus Britannos sequutus in Caledonias Sylvas.' While Lucan, who wrote before the island was explored by the Romans to the north of the Brigantes, calls the Southern *Britanni Caledonii*:

'Ant vaga cum Thetys, Rutupinaque littora fervent,
Unda Caledonios fallit turbata Britannos.'‡

Pinkerton does not refer to these authorities, no doubt, because they did not accord with his theory.

* M. Val. Martialis Ep. lib. xiv.; Ep. xcix, Bascauda.

† M. Val. Martialis Ep. lib. x.; Ep. xlv.

‡ M. Annaci Lucani Pharsalia, lib. vi. [From a paper in the Transactions of the Scottish Society of Antiquaries, entitled, 'An Inquiry into the Original Inhabitants of Britain,' by Sir James Foulis of Colinton, Bart., written before the works of Pinkerton or Chalmers were published.]

Tacitus, the first Roman classic who describes Scotland, speaks of the Caledonians as the only inhabitants of Scotland except the Britanni, the latter of whom were located south of the Forth and the Clyde. Dio Cassius is the first to mention the *Maetae*, a word evidently Latinized from the Gaelic *Magh*, a level field, and signifying inhabitants of the low country. The *Maetae* seem to have occupied the district afterwards given by Ptolemy to the *Horestii*, *Vennicones*, etc.

Writers subsequent to Tacitus and Ptolemy puzzle by the introduction of new names—*Picti*, *Scoti*, *Attacoti*, etc.—while those of the *Maetae*, *Horestii*, etc., wholly disappear. With regard to the Picts, most writers are agreed as to their being one and the same people with the Caledonians. Chalmers, as we have seen, considers *Picti* but another name for *Caledonii*. So does Pinkerton, but the latter brings both the Caledonians and Picts from Scandinavia, some centuries before the Christian era, while Chalmers believes them to be the aboriginal inhabitants.*

Eumenius, the orator, is the first of the Roman authors who speaks of the Picts as a people. In a panegyric on Constantius Chlorus, delivered in 296, after his victory over Allectus, Eumenius not only alludes to the Picts as

* Pinkerton adduces no proof, and the fact that no satisfactory trace of a Tentonic people is to be found in the map of Ptolemy, together with the circumstance of no movement having taken place among the Goths on the Euxine at so early a period, seem conclusive against him.

then existing, but retrospectively carries them back prior to the time of Cæsar, whose victories he depreciates in comparison with those of Constantius, because the Britons whom he attacked were then rude, and accustomed 'only to the *Picts* and Irish as enemies :'* 'Solis *Pictis* et *Hibernis* hostibus olim adsuet fuerint.' No doubt Eumenius was substantially correct, though the Picts were not then known by that appellation. In another oration, delivered in 310, the panegyrist is still more significant as to the identity of the Caledonians and Picts: 'Non dico *Caledonum*, *aliorumque Pictorum*, silvas, et paludes.' Eumenius, however, was a rhetorician, and not the best authority for historical facts. All that can be safely adduced from Eumenius is, that the Caledonians and Picts were then the leading tribes in Scotland.

Ammianus Marcellinus repeatedly mentions the Caledonians and Picts. In 360 he speaks of the invasion of the Roman provinces by those wild nations—the Scots and Picts: 'Scotorum Pictorumque, gentium ferarum;' and again of the Picti, 'Saxonesque,† et Scoti, et Attacoti,' as harassing the Britanni with incessant attacks.

* Pinkerton had some trouble in rendering this passage properly, which he only accomplished by the aid of the Nuremberg edition of the *Panegyrist* in 1779.

† If Kemble, in his 'Saxons in England,' is correct, that the Saxons were in England long before the time of Hengist and Horsa, the opinion of a writer in the *Penny Cyclopædia*, 'that the Scotti or Scottii, mentioned in these two passages, were, in all probability, not yet inhabitants of any part of Britain any more than were the Saxons,' falls to the ground.

In his annals of the year 368, where he relates the actions of the Emperor Constans (A.D. 337-350) he says he had described, as well as he could, the situation of Britain,* and that it was now only necessary to observe, that at that time the Picts were divided into two nations, the *Dicaledonæ* and *Vecturiones*: 'Illud tamen sufficiet, quod es tempore Picti in duas gentes divisi, Dicaledones et Vecturiones, itidemque Attacoti, bellicosa hominum natio, et Scoti per diversa vagantes, multa populabantur.' 'Let this suffice to be said, that at this time the Picts, divided into two nations, the *Dicaledonæ* and *Veturiones*, as also the Attacots, a warlike nation, and the Scots, *wandering diverse ways*, ravaged many parts.†

That the Picts were thus known to historians, as composed of two divisions or nations, is beyond question; and it seems equally positive, from the few glimpses of their language that remain, that they were, originally at least, Celtic, but of the British or later colony, though there may have been a considerable intermixture with the original Gael towards the interior and westerly, so

* This passage is unfortunately lost.

† The *Dicaledones* occur in no other work save that of Marcellinus. The *Veturiones*, however, are mentioned by Richard of Cirencester. The Picts were known to the Saxon chroniclers as the Northern and Southern Picts. According to Grant, in his 'Scottish Gael,' *Duchaoidhain*, in the Gaelic, signifies the real or genuine inhabitants of the woods; and *Veturiones*, pronounced *Uachtarich*, the inhabitants of the cleared country. *Druim-Uachtar* is the name of the ridge of hills from whence the country descends to the level plains. Pinkerton derives *Veturione* from *Vickverior*, the Icelandic for *Pehtar* or *Picts*.

that a shade of difference may have existed between the Dicaledones and Vecturiones from an early period, which subsequent circumstances and events may have considerably augmented. Bede, one of the earliest of our historians, brings the Picts from Scythia. His story of their arriving in Ireland first, where they found the Scots, who directed them to Scotland, is fabulous in the extreme; but there can be little doubt that Bede wrote from tradition, and however absurd tradition may be in detail, there is universally some foundation for its averments. And so in this case. If it is a correct supposition—and it is supported by topography as well as the Welsh Triads, (some of which are confessedly older than Bede's history)—that Britain and Ireland were peopled by successive tribes, all of the Cumraic race, at different intervals, it is quite possible that Bede may be right in the main fact. The Picts might belong to the second or third nation of the Cimbri who gained the British shore, or possibly to a still later. History sufficiently attests the migratory and warlike spirit of the Cimerians, and of their being gradually expelled or circumscribed by the Goths and their descendants. According to Greek authority, a greatly diminished body of the Cimbri were in the peninsula of Holstein, or *Scythia*, early in the first century of the Christian era. Hence Bede may be right. 'If the Welsh, who have always called themselves Cimbri, are the Cimbri of the ancient Cimbri

Chersonese, now Jutland, this lineage would account for the Scandinavian or northern origin assigned to the Picts by the uniform testimony of the Saxon, the Irish, and the Icelandic annalists.*

Pinkerton, in his hypothesis, brings the Picts from Scythia, or Scandinavia—from *Pitea*,† an ancient province of Sweden; but while he affirms that they were Goths, he produces no satisfactory evidence that they spoke anything else than a dialect of the Celtic. It is at the same time probable that there was amongst them a sufficient number of Scandinavian auxiliaries to justify the opinion of Tacitus that the Caledonians, from their large limbs and fair complexion, were Germans.

THE SCOTS.

Chalmers successfully demonstrates that the Scots were not a foreign colony, as asserted by our fabulous historians, and by Pinkerton, who avers that they were the Belgæ-Gothic adventurers, who lost their Teutonic language while sojourning in Ireland, but preserved their lineage from Celtic contagion!‡ He differs in opinion, however, from Chalmers, as to their *first settle-*

* *Athenæum*.

† From *Pitea* he derives *Pict* or *Peh*.

‡ The Belgæ or Firbolg, the Tuath de Danan, the Damnii—tribes of the latter of whom were to be found in all the three kingdoms—and the *Cruithne*, independent of the *Scoti*, formed the leading nations in Ireland.

ment in Scotland, agreeing with Bede, and other concurrent authorities, that the *Attacoti*—whom he believes to have been Scots*—were in Scotland about 258; and that the *second* took place in 503–4, the era assigned by Chalmers and others for the first. Though the latter is now the prevailing and almost settled opinion, yet we do not see that it is at all *conclusive* or *satisfactory*; and in a question where there are conflicting statements, and evident misconceptions, the whole circumstances, and the palpable signification of events, ought to be taken into consideration.

The Scots were not aborigines of Ireland, for they do not appear in the map of Ptolemy, though they are noticed in later times by Richard of Cirencester,† as occupying a corner of the north of Ireland. Yet Ireland, and the ‘gens Hibernorum,’ were well known to the ancient world, long before the *Scoti* appeared in history.‡ The Hibernians, properly so called, were a distinct nation from the ‘gens Scotorum’ of subsequent writers. In the year 81, immediately after the battle of the Grampians, the fleet of Agricola sailed round the

* From the British *ad*, to or near; but the derivation is somewhat fanciful.

† Richard is considered spurious by some. He at least adapts his topographical details *retrospectively* to history, and is therefore of much less authority than Ptolemy, who represented matters as they existed in his own time.

‡ Festus Avienus, about 400 years B.C., states that Britain was visited by Carthaginian voyagers, and that the Albiones occupied the larger island, and the gens *Hibernorum* the smaller.

north of Scotland, and satisfied that accomplished general that Britain was not a continent. That the Roman chief was well acquainted with Ireland and the Irish, appears from Tacitus, who, writing of his father-in-law,* says, 'Saēpe ex eo audivi, Legione una et modicis auxiliis debellari obtinerique *Hiberniam* posse; which is to this purpose, that he had heard Agricola often say, that with one single legion, and a few auxiliaries, the whole country of Ireland might be conquered and kept.' Now, as Gordon† further observes, from remains dug up in connection with the wall of Antoninus, it appears that it required not less than five or six legions, besides auxiliaries, to drive back the Caledonians from the Romanized portions of Scotland. The Scoti, who afterwards, in conjunction with the Picts, gave so much trouble to the Roman armies—sometimes defeating them—must have been a very different people from the native inhabitants of Ireland. We do not repeat the argument of Gordon here for the purpose of disparaging the national courage of the Irish, believing that the distinction drawn by the Roman general referred to their want of unity more than to any deficiency in warlike skill or prowess.

Although Tacitus had pretty authentic information regarding Britain and its affairs, considerable ignorance

* Agricola.

† Gordon's 'Itinerarium Septentrionale.'

on the subject seems to have prevailed amongst Roman writers at a later period. The historians of the campaign of Severus, undertaken in the year 200, for example, 'mistakingly suppose that the victorious ruler of the Roman world came into Britain without any previous knowledge of its domestic affairs, or its *geographical* state. They wrote like annalists who knew nothing of the commencement of the British story; either of what had certainly passed before, or what was to follow after the Emperor's exertions. They did not know that the coast of Britain had been explored by the Roman fleet under Agricola; that he had traversed the territories of the Ottadini, Gadeni, Selgovæ, Novantes, and Damnii, who, as they resided within the Friths, submitted wholly to his power: neither did the classic writers advert to the fact, that Lollius Urbicus had built the wall of Antonine seventy years before; and had carried roads and established stations from the wall to the Varas, both which remained during thirty years, the envied memorials of his skill, and the certain monuments of the Roman authority. They probably intended to raise the fame of Severus, by supposing him ignorant of what undoubtedly he must have known.* Such is the severe but just comment of Chalmers himself; and yet it is chiefly on the *geographical* intimations of these ignorant or inten-

tionally disingenuous historians, that he and others found their conviction, that Ireland was the *first* and *sole* *Scotia* of the Scots.

Eumenius, who notices the Picts in 297, mentions the Hibernii without allusion to the Scots. Porphyry, his contemporary, however, 'a scholar and a geographer,' as Chalmers observes, speaks of them as the *Scotiæ gentes*—the Scottish nation of the *Britannic* world—thus showing that the Scots were as early known as the Picts. None of the earlier writers amongst the classics say one word of the Scots. It is thus evident that they were unknown, by the name of Scoti, until the close of the third century. Indeed, 'all the old writers of Ireland, from St Patrick to the twelfth century, justify the inference that these Scots were a comparatively recent tribe. They seem to have been the dominant, because the conquering caste. The Saint himself, in his *Confessio*—a piece indisputably authentic—everywhere draws a distinction between them and the Hiberionaces, or the old inhabitants. In the *fifth* century they had not given their name to the whole island, but only to the regions in which they were settled.'* So says the Editor of the *Athenæum*; and yet this people, who had not given their name to their adopted country in the *fifth* century, are so repeatedly mentioned, in conjunction with the Picts, by

the Roman authors, from the close of the third century downwards, that it would appear as if they were one people waging war against the spoilers of their common country; while it is admitted by the most sceptic that they had finally settled in Scotland, at the latest, in 503-4!

With the Roman annalists the term *Caledonii* came to be almost wholly superseded by those of *Scoti* and *Picti*. Ammianus, in 360, speaks of them as forming one army; nay, as of one country. His words are, as given and translated by Pinkerton: '*In Britannii cum Scotorum Pictorumque, gentium ferarum, excursus, Vupta quieta, conducta loca limitibus vicina vastarent*: In Britain, when the excursions of the Scots and Picts, fierce nations, having broken the peace, ravaged the *appointed grounds*, next to the boundaries,' etc. Now, these 'appointed grounds,' as Pinkerton observes, 'were surely those of the future province of Valentia,' beyond the boundary wall of Antonine, between the Clyde and Forth; and if so, the Scots and Picts must have made their attack from the north by land, in a thoroughly united manner, as friends and allies. This is the first mention of the Scots by any Roman author, and they are spoken of as 'immediate and present'—in Britain—not retrospective, 410 years previously, as the *Hibernii* are by Eumenius. Yet Chalmers disregards the historian's implied meaning, while he leans upon the very questionable authority of

the poet Claudian, from one of whose panegyrics he quotes a few ambiguous lines in support of the theory, that Ireland, and not Scotland, was the proper home of the Scots:*

‘Totum cum Scotus Hibernem—movit;
Scotorum cumulos flevit glacialis Jerne.’

Which he renders thus:

‘When the Scots all Ireland mov’d;
O’er heaps of Scots, whom icy Ireland wept.’

Strange to say, Chalmers has been guilty of an interpolation—accidental or intentional—of the poet’s text, which perhaps conveys a more marked intimation of the locality of the Scots than he desiderated. The passage is from ‘De Quarto Consulatu Honorii Augusti Panegyris,’† and is as follows:

‘Ille Caledoniis posuit qui castra pruinis,
Qui medios Libyæ sub casside pertulit aestus,
Terribilis mauro, debellatorque Britanni
Litoris, ac pariter Boreæ vastator et Austri.
Quid rigor æternus Cæli? Quid sidera prosunt?
Ignotumque fretum? Maduerunt Saxone fuso
Orcades; incaluit Pictorum sanguine Thule:
Scotorum cumulos flevit glacialis Jerne.’

There is no such line as:

‘Totum cum Scotus Hibernem—movit.’

* In this Chalmers follows Buchanan, partially quoting the same passage.

† 26-33, Amsterdam edition, 1665.

Although it occurs in another passage, thus :

‘ ——— totum cum Scotus *Jernen*
Movit, et infesta spumavit remige Tithys.’*

The expression, ‘ When the Scots all Ireland moved,’ is evidently more significant of an intruding than a resident people. But it is probable that Claudian, who was a poet, and no geographer, had only a confused notion that such places as he mentions did exist, but where, or in what relation to one another, he was uncertain. The editor of the edition of Claudian already referred to, Heinsius, in a note to the passage, remarks that the Scots were to be found both in Scotland and Ireland, which possibly was the precise state of the matter.

Chalmers also cites Orosius, who says that ‘Igberia,

* Whitaker was the first, amongst the more recent writers on the subject, to quote these two passages. On the faith that the poet really understood his own language, Sir James Foulis of Colinton, Bart., in an article on the ‘Origin of the Name of the Scottish Nation’ (1780), in the first vol. of ‘The Transactions of the Society of the Antiquaries of Scotland,’ remarks that it is absolutely necessary to suppose that the Romans invaded Ireland, to make sense of the passage; and as this was notoriously not the case, he infers that Claudian meant the water of *Erne*, in Strath-Erne, which the Romans could meet with in the first day’s march beyond their own walls, and which it was necessary for them to pass, to enable them to carry their hostilities farther north; and which, on that account, would be strongly defended by the assembled Caledonians. In a subsequent paper, Sir James Foulis suggests the probability that the *Jerne* of Claudian may be the *Juberna* of Juvenal who possibly alludes to Agricola’s fifth campaign, when he attacked that part of Scotland opposite to Ireland, and traversed these shores northward. Be this as it may, *Jerne* could not possibly mean Ireland, as the Romans never were there.

which we call Scotland, is surrounded on every side by the ocean.' But what does Bede say? Speaking of the inroads of the Scots and Picts upon the Roman province, during the reign of Honorius, he remarks: 'After which the country groaned many years under the oppression of two *transmarine* nations, viz., the Scots from the west, and the Picts from the north. We call them, says Bede, *transmarine*, or foreign nations, not that they are seated out of Britain, but because they are separated from the south part thereof by two interjacent firths or arms of the sea, one from the eastern ocean, the other from the western, which do not meet. The firth, towards the east, has the town *Guidi** placed on the side of it, near the middle of the country; the other, towards the west, has on it the town of Alcluith, which, in the language of the country, imports the rock of Cluith, for it lies close by the river of that name.'†

If it must be admitted that Claudian really understood what he was speaking about, we should be strongly inclined to support the view adopted by Sibbald, in his 'History of Fife and Kinross.' He was of opinion that, by *Thule*, Claudian meant the country possessed by the Picts beyond the Clyde and Forth:

'The Orcaes were moist with Saxon gore,
Warm with the blood of Picts flowed Thule's shore;

* Supposed by Pinkerton to be *Inch Keith*.

† Gordon's 'Itinerarium Septentrionale.'

And whilst its head each Scotchman's tomb uprears,
Icy Juverna all dissolves in tears.'

This is the only sense in which the passage can be rendered intelligible. The Saxons or Northmen of the Orkneys, the Picts of Pictland, north of the Forth, and the Scots of Argyle, to the mountains of which the term 'Icy Juverna' might well be applied. This also is in keeping with the passage from Bede, already quoted, in which he calls the Scots and Picts a transmarine people.*

Chalmers quotes numerous passages from the researches of Camden in support of the hypothesis that Ireland was the proper country of the Scots; but it would be easy to multiply authorities, from the same source as Camden has drawn upon, in support of the opposite view. From the context of Ammianus, when he states that, in the reign of Valentinian, anno. 364, the Saxons confederated with the *northerly Britons*, committing great devastations on the southerly Britons, it is evident he meant the Scots and Picts.† His words are, 'Picti, Saxonesque, et Scoti, et Attacoti, Britannos ærumnis vexavere continuis: 'the Picts, and Saxons, and Scots, and Attacots vexed the Britons with continual harassments.'

In the passage already quoted, under the head of the

* One thing is clear from Claudian, and it is worthy of remark, viz., that when he wrote, about 360, the *Picts of Thule* were considered a *distinct* people from the *Saxons*, or Northmen, of the *Orkneys*, and therefore could not have been of *German or Scandinavian origin*, as alleged by Pinkerton.

† Gordon's 'Itinerarium.'

PICTS (p. 40), in reference to the two divisions of that nation, Ammianus clearly speaks of the Scots as if they were equally of Britain as the Picts or Attacoti: 'Itidemque Attacoti, bellicosa hominum natio, et Scoti per diversa vagantes, multa populabantur.' There is no intimation here that the Scots were *Hibernii*, or from Ireland. All the difference inferable is, that they were more erratic and predatory than the Picts and Attacoti.

Referring to the same author, Gordon, in his 'Itinerarium,' says, 'I would have them [the advocates of the first advent of the Scots from Ireland in 503-4] consider if Ammianus Marcellinus, speaking of the Scoti and Attacoti, about the year 369, really means Scots or Irish; or, if speaking of Theodosius' battles with them in Britain, and taking from them the country which is between Tine and the firth of Edinburgh, calling it Valentia; I may as well ask them if Valentia be in Ireland, or in Britain; for I think it equally absurd to assert that the inhabitants of that country were Irishmen, as that Valentia itself is Ireland. For it plainly appears from Ammianus, that Theodosius possessed himself of that country, which he took from the inhabitants thereof; and this Bede and Ado both explain and prove, by acknowledging that the Scots were the native inhabitants there as far as the wall.' As Gordon farther remarks, the Picts as well as the Scots are spoken of as transmarine, and he pertinently asks—were the Picts also Irish?

Digitized by Microsoft

The idea that the Scots were non-resident in Scotland was probably first drawn from a passage in Gildas,* which Gordon thus quotes and explains:—‘*Romanis ad suos remeantibus emergunt certatim de curucis, quibus sunt trans Scythicam vallem evecti;*’ which is in effect, that the Romans returning out of Britain, the Scots and Picts came over the Scythian valley in curraghs. . . . It seems very clear that it [the Scythian valley] could be no other than the firth of Edinburgh, for the words Scythica† and Scotica are so much alike that they have often been confounded one with another, of which several examples might be given; and the water of Forth lying so low, with respect to the coast of Fife and the Lothians, which bounded it on each side, makes their terming its channel a valley not so very absurd an image as some may imagine.’

Tacitus may also be referred to as an authority that the Scots were inhabitants of Britain at the time he wrote. Indeed, the whole chain of history, during the Roman and Caledonian wars, infer the fact that the Scots as well as the Picts were resident in Scotland. Bede

* Gildas, the first British writer, was a native of Strathclyde—born, in 520, at Dumbarton. His father, Cannus, or Navus, king of Strathclyde, was succeeded by his son, Hoel. Gildas wrote about 560. He must have had a thorough topographical knowledge of the country.

† It seems probable that the resemblance between these two words has originated the whole story of the Scots coming from Scythia. Our early writers troubled themselves little with derivations.

crowns the argument by positively stating, that the Scots were settled in Scotland before the Christian era; that the Attacoti were in Scotland in the year 258, and that they were expelled by the Picts about the year 440. Had they been so recently settled as 503, he could hardly have been ignorant of an event which occurred only one hundred and fifty years before he lived.*

It is thus apparent that there are authorities on both sides of the question; and it is worthy of remark, that it is not till after the fourth century—after their alleged expulsion from Scotland, and when they had become converted to Christianity—that the inhabitants of Ireland are called indiscriminately by certain writers *Hibernii* and *Scoti*, which Chalmers supposes they did in the belief that they were the same people. This may have been the case, in so far as a common Celtic origin is concerned; but the uniform impression conveyed by the writings of St Patrick—himself a Strathclyde Briton—is that the Scots were a superior caste to the native *Hibernii*. Chalmers himself, in another passage, seems to have some misgivings on the subject: ‘From all my inquiries,’ he says, ‘it appears to me that no permanent colonization of north Britian by the Scoto-Irish people began till the recent period of the sixth century.’ He thus qualifies the point at issue by the word *permanent*;

* Bede ceased to write about 735.

because it must have been to him a matter of doubt whether the incursions of the Scots into the Romanized territories could have been so systematically and effectively made, if the Scots were under the necessity of crossing the Irish channel in their tiny currachs on every occasion. They neither could have brought sufficient provisions to support their armies, nor carried back the spoil of the provinces, if this had been the case; and no one has yet attempted to show that the Scots were a marine nation, possessed of anything in the form of a ship larger than a piece of wicker-work covered with hides.* It is apparent also that the Scots had some common interest in the country, as well as the Picts, which prompted them in their steady endeavours to drive out the Roman invaders.

It is impossible to believe with Chalmers—on the poetical authority of Claudian—that the Scots were the ruling people in Ireland during the Roman period. They were not known at all to the Latin historians till the latter part of the third century, and between that time and their alleged first settlement in Kintyre, in 503–4, little more than 200 years had elapsed, during which period they were chiefly, if not solely, remarkable for their hostile invasions of the Romans and Romanized

* As Gordon remarks, if the Scots had not been at least *temporarily* settled in Scotland, the Romans, with a small fleet, might easily have cut off their communication.

Britons. There can be no doubt, at the same time, that the Scots had a settlement in the north of Ireland, and that they were a prominent people there in the *fifth* century, when they were converted to Christianity chiefly through the preaching of St Patrick. In Ptolemy's map of Scotland, Kintyre is occupied by the *Epidii*; but in that of Richard, the Attacoti (or hither Scots*) are found spread over a considerable portion of the western Highlands. The etymology of *Scot* has been derived from *Scuite*, or *Squit*, a Gaelic word signifying *scattered* or *wanderers*,† and Chalmers has adopted this etymology, in the belief of their singular disposition to adventure, and

* Pinkerton, amongst others, adopts this interpretation. According to Bede, the Attacoti settled or were to be found in Scotland as early as 258. Pinkerton, with a considerable array of circumstantial evidence, insists that this was the era of Fin MacCowall (or Fingal), the original hero of Ossian's Poems, and who is mentioned by Wyntoun.

† *Scot*, a shield, has also been assigned as the origin of the word; but it cannot be shown that the use of the shield was peculiar to the Scots. Pinkerton argues strongly for the Scythic derivation of *Scot*. But if this was the case, why were not the Picts, a purer Cythic people, called Scots? The Belgæ of Ireland, if German at all, were a mixed race of Germans and Gauls—the Celtic blood apparently predominating. Granting Pinkerton's position, that the Scots were the Firbolg, or Belgæ, this would account for the mixture of Gothic words found in the Celtic—which fact convinces the editor of the *Athenæum* that the Highlanders are Goths!—as if no interchange of language could possibly ensue from their subsequent intercourse with a Gothic people in Scotland itself! Put Pinkerton adduces no proper evidence that the Belgæ of Ireland really did come from Belgium—while the name by which they are alone known in the Irish annals, *Firbolg*, literally signifies, in Gaelic, the *ancient Irish*, or *men of the quiver*. They are never spoken of as Scots.

that they were aboriginals, appearing, like the Picts, by a new name. Richard, as quoted by Pinkerton, gives unintentionally strong support to our view of the derivation. He says, 'In Hiberniam commugrarunt ejecti a Belgis Britones ibique sedes posuerunt, ex illo tempore Scoti appellati.'

Pinkerton quoted Richard with the view of supporting his averment that the Scots were a Teutonic people; but Chalmers parried this thrust by insisting that the Belgæ were Celts as well from etymology as the language still spoken by their descendants. Richard, however, is perhaps more to be relied upon as a geographer than a historian, and his statement in this case is worthy of notice because it points to the traditional or historical fact that, whether Belgæ or not, a *body of people driven from Britain to Ireland, assumed in time the name of Scots.*

From the close proximity of the west of Scotland and the north of Ireland, it may be supposed that an early intercourse was maintained between the two coasts long before there were annalists in Ulster, or anywhere else; and it is highly probable that, on the success of the Roman arms, many fled from Scotland to Ireland. It is known from the Irish annals, that *Ulladh* or *Ulster*, the nearest land in Ireland to Scotland, was occupied by the *Cruithne*, the Gaelic or Irish name for the Picts, from which it is to be inferred that they were originally a co-

lony of Caledonians or Picts.* Indeed this may be considered a settled matter. But whether the *Cruithne*, or North Britons, had been settled in Ireland prior to the Roman invasion, may admit of question. They are not noticed, at all events, in the map of Ptolemy; consequently the inference is that they were not.

With regard to the settlement of the Scots in Argyle in 503-4, which Chalmers and others hold to have been their first, but Pinkerton and the old historians the second, the statement of the Irish annalists is to this effect: In the middle of the third century,† Cormac being the king of Ireland,‡ Cairbre-Riada, his cousin and general, conquered a district from the *Cruithne* in

* This is countenanced by the fact of the Scots of Galloway—a colony of the *Cruithne* of Ulster, who settled there in the eighth century—being frequently styled Picts by our old historians. At the battle of the Standard, in 1138, the men of Galloway claimed the right of leading the attack—in virtue probably of their ancient Pictish descent—and their war-cry was, ‘*Albanich! Albanich!*’—evidently pointing to their Caledonian origin. Richard of Hexham, and other contemporary writers, positively state that the Picts claimed the first place in the Scottish army as their prescriptive right. *Cruithne-Tuath*, as shown by Chalmers, is the old Irish name for the country of the Picts, and *Cryuthne-Tuath* signifies *North Britain*. This is borrowed from the British *Brythin*, the Irish, according to the idiom of the language, substituting the initial *c* for *b*.

† Precisely the period when the Scots first appear in history. As before stated, Bede dates the Attacoti settlement in Scotland in 258. The coincidence is worthy of remark.

‡ It may be noticed here, that Ireland was divided into numerous clanships or kingdoms, and that the sovereign of Ireland, according to Celtic custom, was elective—so that the supreme power never rested permanently in any one of the royal branches. Cormac could only be king *pro tempore*.

the north-east corner of Ireland, which was afterwards occupied by him and his followers, and called *Dalriada*, the portion of *Riada*.* Loarn, Fergus, and Angus were the three sons of Erc, the descendant of Cairbre-Riada, who led over the colony of Dalriadini, and who took possession of Kintyre about 503.† The subsequent wars between the Cruithne and the Dalriada people who remained in Ireland, under Olchu, the brother of Erc, is said to have led to much intercourse between the coasts of Ireland and Scotland; and some suppose that this was the era in which the Fingalian warriors of Ossian flourished.

The Dalriadini were not known to the Irish annalists by the name of Scots, and therefore could not in their writings give that name to the land of their adoption. On the contrary, Argyle was for ages afterwards known as *Dalriada*, the residence of the Dalriadini.‡ It is evi-

* According to another interpretation of this Gaelic word, it means the clear or *redd* field, in contradistinction to the woody or uncleared district. *Riada* may therefore have been a local name.

† It must be obvious to every one that this small body of Dalriadini never could have constituted the hordes of Scots who continued to harass the Roman provinces in conjunction with the Picts, from the close of the third century down to the departure of the Romans in the beginning of the fifth. They are not even called Scots by the Irish annalists.

‡ The kingdom of Dalriada was limited to the district now forming the modern county of Argyle. There they remained more than three hundred years, during which period, according to all the old authorities, the rest of the island north of the Firth and Clyde formed the country of the Picts, who were divided into northern and southern Picts.

dent, therefore, that they were not *the* Scottish nation so repeatedly spoken of by the Roman classics, although they may have formed a tribe or clan of the Scots, locally known as the Dalriadini. Neither could Ireland have properly been called *Scotia*, nor the Scots in Ireland the ruling people, as Chalmers asserts, otherwise it would have been designated *Scotia* still. Because neither the king or kings of Ireland, nor the bulk of the people, ever made such an exodus as to transfer the name and characteristics of the one country to the other. The great body of the people, and their royal leaders, remained in Ireland; and if ever known generally and accurately as the Scottish nation, Ireland would have been Scotland still.* Loarn, Fergus, and Angus were not leading men in Ireland. They were descendants of Riada, who was cousin and general to Cormac the Irish king, and chiefs, no doubt, of the Dalriadini, but as such were not entitled to carry with them the *nationality* of Ireland.†

* It is chiefly in the writings of ecclesiastics, and in the correspondence with the Roman See, that the confusion in the names of the respective countries occurs. Nor is this surprising. The first propagators of Christianity in this country were of the Scoto-Irish church; and it is now universally admitted that St Patrick himself was a Scotsman.

† If Ireland had been the sole *Scotia*, and the Scots the predominant people in Ireland, how comes it that the Dalriadian branch was enabled to do this—leaving, as they were, a large and fertile land, over which they held sway, to settle in a mountainous and rugged corner of a comparatively barren country? The thing is inexplicable: hence we must be cautious in admitting testimony so much opposed to common sense. The annals of Ulster, upon which the Dalriadian episode chiefly rests, is but a fragment of local

The Irish annals inform us that the Dalriadini were of the Firbolg, but throw no light on the origin of the tribe. We are therefore left to conjecture at will. But, from whatever source, it is evident they were of Celtic, not of Gothic, descent. It is possible even that they may have been of the *Cruithne*, though they were at war with their kinsfolk, a circumstance by no means uncommon among British clans. The ancient bards of Ireland expressly affirm that the Scots were of Scythian or Scandinavian origin, in contradistinction to the true Milesian race of Ireland. If we are correct in believing that the Britons were a later colony of the *Cimbri* than the original Celts from Gaul, and that the Caledonians, or Picts, were of that later stock, and that they found their way to Scotland through the medium of Scythia, then the Irish bards were justified in the origin attributed to the Scots, although it is just as likely that the idea of their Scythic origin was derived from *Scot*, and not *Scot* from *Scythia*, as we have previously hinted.

If the Scots were not a foreign colony, and we think

history, without beginning or conclusion, and written many centuries after the early occurrences which it records had happened. Scotland was usually called Albyn by the natives—Dalriadians as well as Picts—till the eleventh century. Alfred of England was the first to apply the term Scotland, about the middle of the tenth century, and it is uncertain, from the context, whether he meant Ireland or Scotland. Ireland was unknown to her own annalists by the name of Scotia or Scotland. She was only so designated by foreign writers, chiefly ecclesiastics, and by them partly in ignorance, and partly because the Scots were the main support of the Irish church.

the fact already established, from their language and other circumstances, there seems only one way of accounting for them, namely, *that they were aboriginal inhabitants of North Britain, driven from their possessions by Agricola*, who over-ran the country as far as the Grampians, and who was the first to erect a barrier, extending from the Firth of Clyde to the Forth, where the wall of Antoninus was subsequently built. It is absurd to suppose that the whole, or anything like the whole, of the low-country Britons remained under the dominion of the Romans. The idea is contrary to the known history and principles of the Celtic nations. That the north, and especially the west Highlands, and even the north of Ireland, became crowded with exiles—afterwards known in their retaliatory wars—in conjunction with their countrymen, the Picts—as the Scots, or *Scuiti*, the *dispersed**—appears to be a very rational solution of the difficulty.

The whole procedure of the Scots—as recorded in the Roman classics—coincides with this view of their origin, and with no other that has yet been proposed. They are not found in Ptolemy's maps either of Scotland or Ireland, nor indeed could they be known at that period; for, although driven out by Agricola, who was

* The *dispersed* would apply equally to their position, as inhabitants of the headlands and islands of the West Highlands, as to their having been driven from their native districts.

recalled in the year 85, it was not till the middle of next century that active operations were resumed, under Lollius Urbicus, against the Caledonian nations; nor is it to be supposed that the Scots (or the Scattered) should attract notice as a distinct body, until they had become, in some measure, organised and numerous by successive augmentations. Hence it is that they are not mentioned by the Roman historians till the middle of the third century; from which period, it is apparent, they gradually increase in importance, until, according to Chalmers' rendering of Claudian, 'they moved all Ireland.'

That the small colony under Loarn, Fergus, and Angus were the first of the Scottish nation in Scotland—those warlike and numerous people, who so often contended, and frequently with success, against the Roman arms—or that they were even of the indigenous race of those *Hibernii* whom Agricola boasted he could have conquered and held in subjection by a single legion and auxiliaries, is equally absurd and historically inconsistent. At the same time, of the fact that they became associated with the founders of the Scottish monarchy,* there seems no reason to doubt, though it may be difficult to explain satisfactorily how this occurred; but it is clear that the

* Or possibly the *restorers*, according to our old but now usually esteemed fabulous historians. Pinkerton produces good authority for the expulsion of the Scots in 440.

settlement of the Dalriadini in Argyleshire was a peaceful one—amongst a kindred people.*

Thus we hold the conclusion arrived at by Chalmers and others as to the *first* settlement of the Scots in Scotland in 503–4, to be not only questionable, but altogether erroneous:—

1. Bede, although we do not place much reliance upon

* From the history of Dalriada, as preserved by the Irish annalists, it appears that from nearly the commencement of the reign of Angus MacFergus (in 731), who was a Southern Pict, there were frequent wars between the Southern Picts and the Dalriadians. Pinkerton asserts that ‘the old Scots, or Dalriads, far from being the conquerors of the Piks in 843, had been themselves subdued by the Piks in 739, according to the annals of Tighearnac and Ulster, the most authentic Irish documents; and which certainly favour the Dalriads more than the Piks, as the former were from Ireland. That the kingdom of Dalriada, upon its conquest by the Piks in 739, vanishes from history, and dwindles into nullity; which could never have been the case had it grown into power, so as in 843 to vanquish the Piks. That Kenneth, noted in our fables as conqueror of the Piks, was real and immediate king of those very Piks, whom we dream that he conquered. That the modern name of Scots, and Scotland, unknown for the people and country of North Britain till the year 1010 or 1020 [?], did not arise at all from the Dalriads, or old British Scots of Bede; who, on the contrary, had lost the name of Scots for some centuries before, and were called *Gatheli* and *Hibernenses*, as terms of special distinction, from the modern SCOTI, a name given to the Piks by later Celtic writers, as being *Scythæ*, or *Goths*, as were also the old *Scoti* of Ireland.’ There is much truth in this, though somewhat warmly stated. It is impossible to tell, as Pinkerton says, who Kenneth’s grandfather was, and still more difficult to show that he was purely of the Dalriadian race. He is absurd, however, as to the etymology of the Scottish name. If the ‘old *Scoti* of Ireland’—of whom were the Dalriads, according to his view—were *Goths*, and ‘the modern *Scoti*,’ or *Piks*, were also *Goths*, where lies his distinction, or where his authority for the statement that *Scot* was a modern name? As already remarked, Alfred was the first, so far as known, to apply the term Scotland.

his statement in this instance, affirms that the Scots were in Scotland before the Christian era.

2. If the Attacoti were Scots, as Pinkerton and others suppose, it is certain, from Bede and other authorities, that they were settled in Argyle and Dumbarton shires, where Richard has topographically placed them, about the year 258.

3. That the Scots were not of the Belgæ, if the Belgæ were Goths—from whom Pinkerton and others derive them—because their language was Celtic and not Teutonic, and had none of the refinement and knowledge of the arts which has been attributed to that people: that the Belgæ are known only in Irish history as the *Firbolg*, which classic scholars derive from *vir-Belgici*, Belgians, but which is just as likely, if not more so, to be pure Celtic, signifying men of the quiver: that the *Menapii* occupy that part of the south of Ireland (Wexford) in the map of Ptolemy which is afterwards given to the Belgæ without any substantial reason;* and lastly, because, if the Belgæ, or *Firbolg*, were the progenitors of the Scots of Britain, the topography of the country shows that they did not speak the same dialect of the Celtic language as their descendants. In the word *inver*, in place of *aber*, Chalmers found a proof of the Scoto-Irish overlaying the British topography in Scotland. Now, it

* As Chalmers observes, the *Menapii* of Ireland were probably from South Wales, where the town of *Menapia* is placed by Richard.

happens that there are only six *invers* in all Ireland, and *five* of these are to be found in the *north* of Ireland, the land of the *Cruithne* and *Dalriadini*.^{*} If *Laogaire* (not *Leogaire*†) the first Christian king of Ireland, was a Scotsman and a Goth—according to Pinkerton—it is curious that his name was not perpetuated among the Scots in Scotland.

4. That, as already shown, the Scots are mentioned by Porphyry as early as the Picts are by Eumenius (297), in connection with the affairs of Caledonia; and from that period down to the time of Orosius, in the *fifth* century, they are repeatedly alluded to by Ammianus Marcellinus without the slightest indication that they were of or belonging to Ireland. That before and during this long period, upwards of a century, *Hibernia* and the Irish are frequently mentioned by the Roman historians; from which it is to be inferred that the Scots and the Hibernii were a distinct people.

5. That even Orosius, who was a Spanish ecclesiastic, is not the best authority in a question of geography; for Bede, who wrote only two centuries later, speaks of the

^{*} It is a curious fact, that there are few *Bals* in Scotland, compared with Ireland; and it is still more remarkable, that they are almost wholly to be found in the north-east of Scotland, and in Ayrshire and Galloway, the land of the Picts.

† Pinkerton writes it *Leogaire*, so that he might, with a greater show of reason, derive it from the German *Leofgard*, 'a keeper of love;' but it is probably from the Gaelic noun *Laoch*, signifying a champion.

Scots and Picts as a transmarine people ; but, be this as it may, Orosius is the *first authority* for associating the name of Scot, or Scotia, with Ireland. That granting Orosius to be worthy of credit, the coincidence is striking: the Scots were driven from Scotland, according to Bede and other old authors, supported by Pinkerton, early in the *fifth* century.

6. That the proofs adduced by Camden, and urged by Chalmers, identifying Ireland as the Scotia of ancient times, are from authorities *subsequent* to Orosius, and, like him, chiefly ecclesiastics, who continued to write of the *Scoticæ gentes* in Ireland long after the return of the Dalriadini, or royal branch, to Argyleshire in 503-4, and when to do so had become a solecism.

7. That, in the *Ulster annals*, Ireland is always spoken of as *Hibernia*, never as *Scotia*, even before the departure of the Dalriadians from Kintyre. Alluding to the ravages of the Northmen, in 797, the Annals, as translated from the Irish, say briefly, ‘Spoils of the see, between *Ireland* and *Scotland*, by the gentiles.’ . . 830. ‘Diarmaid came into *Ireland*, with Columcille’s reliques,’ etc.,*—thus showing that the Irish annalist was well aware of the proper distinction between the two countries as early as the eighth century, while Pinkerton and his followers aver that Ireland continued to be

* Scotland is thus distinguished by the Irish annalists even before the time of Alfred.

called Scotland from the fourth down to the eleventh century.

8. That whatever distant ecclesiastics, such as the authorities adduced by Camden, might write, in reference to the Scots and Scotia of Ireland, it is clear that the Irish, who knew better, never called themselves *Scots*, or the country *Scotia*. St Patrick, in his correspondence, always speaks of the Scots in Ireland as a different people from the native Irish; and it is well known that St Patrick had his principal residence at Armagh, in the north of Ireland, the province of the Cruithne and Dalriadini.

9. That Pinkerton—upon whose authorities miscellaneous writers of the present day chiefly rest—in his anxiety to prove that Ireland was the Scotland of the learned down to the eleventh century, has collected a curious medley of confusion and contradiction. For example, in reference to the ninth century, he quotes the monk of St Gall, who says of Clemens and Albinus, founders of the University of Paris, ‘*Contigit duos Scotas de Hibernia, cum mercatoribus Brittanisis, ad littus Gallicæ devenisse, viros et in sæ secularibus et in sacris scripturis, incomparabiliter eruditos*: It happened that two *Scots of Ireland* came to the French coast, with British merchants; these men were incomparably skilled both in secular and sacred letters.’ Here the monk of St Gall assuredly proves the contrary to what Pinkerton intended,

viz., that Ireland was known by its own proper name of *Hibernia* in the ninth century, and not by Scotland; while the phrase ‘Scots of Ireland,’ shows that there were Scots of some other country. So with Marianus Scotus, in the eleventh century, who, speaking of the year 686, says, ‘*Sanctus Kilianus Scotus de Hibernia insula*, etc.: St Kilian, a *Scot of Ireland*,’ etc. Many other examples might be pointed out; but it is needless. That Pinkerton is correct in showing that Pictland was anciently known as Albyn, before the union of the Scots and Picts; but that he flounders most absurdly in attempting to prove that the modern names of *Scots* and *Scotland* are derived from our Pictish forefathers, and not from the Scots. His chief countenance in this theory is the *Descriptio Albanicæ*, written, as is supposed, by Giraldus, in 1180, from the information of Andrew, Bishop of Caithness, who says that Albany was called *Scotia corrupte* (corruptly)—that *montes qui dividunt Sociam ab Arregaithal*—‘the mountains which divide Scotland from Argyle’—and that the inhabitants of Argyle were *Hibernenses*, or Irish. If full credence were to be given to the *Descriptio Albanicæ*, it would prove too much for Pinkerton’s purpose, by showing that the words *Scot* and *Scotland* had their origin in present Scotland, and that the designation of Ireland as *Scotia*, by distant and probably ignorant writers, was entirely a misnomer—so that *Pinkerton* virtually opposes *Pinkerton*,

and, unintentionally, affords strong support to the views of the present writer. There can be little doubt, however, that, in whatever way the name originated, it was but a continuation or application of the *Scotia* of Bede and other ancient writers; for history bears no record of any new *Scoti* from whom it could be derived—while it is certain that the Dalriadini of Argyle were called *Scoti*, and that, after their union with the Picts, the Lia-Fail, or coronation stone of the Scots, was removed from Dunstaffnage to the capital of the Picts. The statement of the Bishop of Caithness, however, is instructive, as showing that the people of Scotland in the twelfth century did not consider themselves as the descendants of Irishmen, and drew a distinction between the inhabitants of Argyleshire and the rest of the Highlands—that district being more accessible to influxion from Ireland, and more akin to it in dialect and manners than the inhabitants north and east of Drumalbin. If the Scots of Pinkerton were Picts—a Teutonic race, as he insists they were—how comes it that the Gaelic Duan, from which he quotes, was rehearsed at the coronation of Malcolm Caenmore by a Gaelic bard? and why was Gaelic the court language of a Pictish king, if Gaelic had not been the language of the leading people?

Thus there is good ground for believing, after all, that present Scotland was the original *Scotia* of the Scots, though the north of Ireland, from their temporary resi-

dence, and long-continued intercourse with their own or a congenerous people there, may have partially appropriated the name for a time. In this way, then, the statement of Bede that the Scots came from Ireland can be accounted for, as well as the fact of the Gaelic being designated the Erse or Irish language. The *Scuite*, in their sojourn in Ireland, must have acquired much of the Irish idiom of the Celtic or British tongue. Indeed, it is to be supposed that the language of the west of Scotland and of the north of Ireland, from their proximity, would necessarily have a greater affinity than that of other portions of the country. Hence Chalmers' topographic support of the Irish origin of the Scots. He finds the Irish Gaelic gradually overlaying the original strata of British etymology, from the west, east, north, and southward; but, in his eagerness to support a theory, he forgets that most of this may have been of indigenous growth, as the fact stands illustrated at the present day—there being a vast difference between the Gaelic of the north-east and west Highlands. Indeed, it is generally admitted by Celtic scholars, that the Celtic language has been maintained in its greatest purity in the central Highlands of Scotland. How could this have happened if the Scots had been of purely Irish or Gothic descent?

The fact is, that not only the national dress of the Scots, which is wholly different from that of ancient or modern Ireland, but their arms, and even their language, show

that they were not derived from the aboriginal settlers of Ireland—though, of course, of a kindred race. In corroboration of this, we have only to refer to Gordon's *Itinerarium*, wherein he describes the figures and inscriptions on a stone dug out of the ruins of one of the forts of Antoninus' wall, between the Forth and Clyde, and deposited in the University of Glasgow in 1694:—‘At the one side is a figure of a man on horseback, holding a spear in his right hand, with a shield on his left arm; behind him stands a *victory*, with a garland; and upon the ground, under his horses' feet, are two Caledonian captives sitting, with their hands tied behind their backs. At the foot of the one is a *pugio*, exactly in the form of those *whingers* or *dirks*, which the Highlanders use to this day; between these two captives is plainly to be seen the Roman vexillum, or standard; and on the right hand of the inscription is an eagle upon the back of a sea-goat, under which is another captive, having his hands likewise tied behind, and a Caledonian bonnet on his head, etc. The arms of the *maetae*,* who lived next the Roman wall, as described by Herodian, were precisely similar to the modern Highland Scot—a broadsword and target, and a whinger or dirk.’†

The sword and target were thus peculiar to the Caledonians, and equally so to the Scots, while the national

* Cultivators or occupiers of the open country, from *magh*, a field.

† This stone is still preserved in the Museum of the College.

weapons of the Irish were the bow, the javelin, and the spear.* Indeed, from the difference in this respect, some etymologists, as already stated in a note, have derived the origin of the term *Scot*; but the term applies to the Scythians generally, and therefore is not tenable as referring to the Scots in particular. In regard to dress alone, that of the Scots is very different from the Irish. The tartan, or cloth of various colours, was common, no doubt to the Gauls;† but the belted plaid is discoverable amongst no other people than the Scots Highlanders; and the dress is of unquestionable antiquity. The Scots and the Caledonians thus agree in dress and armour from the earliest times, but differ essentially from the Irish.

With regard to the language, it is not difficult to account for the greater affinity between the Irish and Scots Gaelic than between the Irish and Welsh, and

* Recent excavations in Ireland have discovered numerous interesting remains of bronze weapons—some of them swords of gigantic proportions; but nothing akin to the broadsword.

† The Gauls arrayed themselves in showy stuffs, and were fond of bright and varied colours; or else, almost naked, adorned their chests and limbs with massive gold chains:—

‘Fair golden tresses grace the comely train,
And every warrior wears a golden chain;
Embroidered vests their snowy limbs unfold,
And their rich robes are all adorned with gold.’

—*Virgil's Ænied.*

They also wore trews and striped cloaks, fastened with a buckle, and divided into numerous many-coloured squares. The ancient Irish wore pantaloons, and a cloak so fastened.

why the former are esteemed the older of the three dialects. The Irish, and no inconsiderable portion of the Highlanders of Scotland, were unquestionably of the first immigration from Gaul. Michelet, author of a recent history of France, derives the Irish, like Pinkerton, from the Belgæ, whom Julius Cæsar somewhat loosely said were Germans or Teutons, and not Celts; but Michelet himself supplies the best corroboration of the fact that they were Gauls. Gleaning from the ancient authors, he describes the Gauls as impulsive, but neither enduring nor persevering; fierce in their joys, vast in their hopes, and vain. They were, at the same time, brave and courageous in the extreme; never to give way was their point of honour. No people held their lives cheaper. There were of them who would undertake to die for a trifle of money, or a little wine; would step upon their sleeping-places, distribute the wine or money among their friends, lie down on their shield, and offer their throat to the knife. Their banquets seldom ended without a fray: the thigh of the animal on the board was the right of the bravest, and each would be he. Next to fighting, their greatest pleasure was to crowd round the stranger, seat him among them, whether he liked or not, and make him tell them tales of distant lands. They were themselves formidable talkers, highly figurative in their speech, pompous, and ludicrously grave with their guttural tones; and it was quite a business in their

assemblies to secure the speaker from interruption. The Gauls were hilarious, but they were also deceitful, and broke their word with a jest. Who does not see in this a mirror reflecting the character of the genuine Irish, even at this distance of time? Circumstances have changed, but not the nature of the Gaul, as developed in his modern representative, the Irishman.

The Gauls, as the first colonists of Britain, naturally penetrated to its farthest bounds. They were followed by the Cimbri, the ancestors of the modern Welsh, who spread not only over England, but the larger portion of Scotland—the Gauls retiring as they advanced; and thus was constituted the great body of the British people on the descent of the Romans.* The Belgæ, whom Cæsar found settled in Kent, are supposed to have been a third colony, whose history has become a riddle. The Cimbri, though a Celtic and kindred race with the Gauls, are said to have been a more sedate people, and more under the control of the Druids; which is so far borne out by the fact, that Druidism seems to have prevailed to a greater extent in England and Scotland than in Ireland. The Gauls professed a more natural religion than that taught by the Druids, and led a more unbridled life.

* General Wade, in his report on the Highlanders, 1725-6, mentions that a tradition existed amongst them that the Lowlands at one time belonged to their ancestors, and therefore, as they argued, they had a right to plunder it. This points backward probably to the era of the Cimbri, or of the Romans.

We have thus ample reason for the opinion, that the Irish and Scots Gaelic is of greater antiquity in the names of places in Britain than the Welsh; and the greater purity of the one than the other must be attributed to the same cause. We have thus also a key to that distinction of character which has all along existed between the Irish and Scottish Celts—the one being more purely Gaulic than the other.

THE TEUTONIC ADVENT.

According to Chalmers, there was no people of a Gothic or Teutonic origin in Britain at the departure of the Romans in 446, nor in Scotland till the Angles, under Ida, defeated the Gadeni and Ottadeni at the battle of Catraeth, in 547,* and occupied their country, now known as the *Lothians*.† After this defeat, which the poet Annuerin attributes to the inebriety of the Ottadeni and Gadeni as much as to the valour of the Saxons, the remains of these clans, with the other inhabitants of Romanized Valentia, formed themselves into a kingdom

* We have already intimated our belief that numerous Saxons were in England prior to the departure of the Romans.

† Lothian seems to have been divided from Strathclyde by a ditch and mud wall, called the *Catrail*, or *Pictwork-ditch*, which bounded the possessions of the British Cumbrians and the Saxon Northumbrians. It extended from the river Tweed, near Galashiels, Selkirkshire, towards Yarrow Kirk, Delaraine, across Borthwick water and Allan water to Maiden Paps, Roxburghshire, and Pell Fell, on the border.

called Cumbria,* or Strathclyde, and this kingdom continued to maintain its position, with varying success, in spite of its numerous enemies, till after the union of the Scots and Picts, when it became attached to the Scottish crown in 975.

To the advent of the Saxons in the fifth century, the subsequent inroads under Edgar in 828, and the policy of the Scottish kings, from Malcolm Caenmore downwards, in settling foreigners in Scotland, Chalmers entirely attributes the first introduction of the Teutonic blood into North Britain.† He is not consistent with himself, however, and the facts do not bear out the conclusion.

The Saxons of Lothian were totally defeated by the Picts at the decisive battle of Dunichen in 685, and had their kingdom limited to their possessions south of the Tweed. Bede states that the Saxon people, notwithstanding, remained in the Lothians; but this statement could only be partially correct. The Pentland, or Pictland hills, in the vicinity of Edinburgh, constitute a topographical evidence that the Picts took possession of the Lothians, and became the dominant people there.‡

* From the Cimbri, of whom, as we have shown, they were chiefly descended.

† At a later period he admits that the Northmen made settlements in Caithness and Sutherland. But he insists that the Teutons of Buchan are the descendants of Flemish settlers in the eleventh century!

‡ The very name of the district, *Lothian*, as Chalmers himself shows, is explainable only in the language of the Northmen—*Lat-ling*, *Lotting*, or *Lodding*, meaning a jurisdiction on the march.

Pinkerton, indeed, affirms that they extended their power over Cumberland, in England. Chalmers admits, on the authority of the Saxon Chronicles, that the Picts overran Lothian, even to the Tyne, where they were defeated by the Saxons in 710. It is thus conclusive that the Picts ruled over Lothian, if not Cumberland, from the defeat of the Saxons in 685 till the above year, a period of twenty-five years; and it is certain that the Saxons never regained their sway in the Lothians, although they appear to have held, temporarily, the stronghold of *Edwinsburgh* (Edinburgh) in 1020, when it was formally resigned to the Scottish king. Edgar is said to have overran Strathclyde and made settlements in it in 828, and Athelstane invaded Scotland in 934; but as the Strathclyde Britons maintained the independence of their kingdom for forty-one years afterwards, it is evident that the Saxons had made no very durable impression. In 970, Culen, king or leader of the Scots and Picts, was slain, and his army defeated, by the Strathclyde Britons, in *Lothian*, whither the latter marched to meet them—a proof, if any were wanting, that the Picts actually possessed the Lothians.* The

* Lothian seems, to some extent, to have been debatable ground. Edwinsburgh was abandoned by Osulf, the first of the Northumberland Earls, in 954, and finally acquired by Malcolm II. from Eadulf-Cadel in 1020. Still, as Athelstane overran Lothian and spoiled Edinburgh in 934, claiming the district as Northumbrian territory, it is obvious that it had previously been in the possession of the Scots and Picts, then united. Chalmers, in-

Britons were, in turn, defeated by the Scots and Picts, on 'the gory field of Vacornar, where the victor lost many a warrior;'* and in 975, immediately afterwards, Dunwallon, their heroic leader, retired to Rome, where he took the cowl. Strathclyde was now attached to the Scottish crown, and the Scots and Picts became mingled with the Strathclyde Britons.

Meanwhile a fresh infusion of Celtic blood had been thrown into the ancient district of the Novantes and Selgovæ—now Galloway—by the *Cruithne* of Ulster, who made good a settlement there towards the end of the eighth century. The *Cruithne* in Galloway were subsequently recognised by historians under their original name of *Picti*, or the 'wild Scots of Galloway,' thus evincing that the *Cruithne* of Ireland and the Scots were one people. At the battle of the Standard, their war-cry was *Albanich! Albanich!* farther attesting their descent from the old Caledonians.†

It was the design of Chalmers to show that when the

deed, shows, from the topography of the district, that the Saxons had no permanent possessions farther north than the Avon. Lothian comprehended the present Lothians, the Merse, and Roxburghshire, north of the Tweed.

* Caledonia.—Innes.

† Some crotchety inquirers argue that the Scots first descended to the Lowlands from Argyle, and that Caledonia, or Pictavia proper, remained unmixed with Scottish blood. But this is absurd. The famous stone of the Scots—now in Westminster Abbey—evinces their route. It was carried from Kintyre to Dunstaffnage, next to Iona, and from thence removed by Kenneth to Scone. That monarch died at Forteviot, the Pictish

whole of Scotland became united under the Scottish dynasty, the people were purely Celtic, and that the prevailing, if not the only languages, were the Gaelic and British. In proof of this he adduces the fact that the Gaelic *Duan* was produced in the reign of Malcolm, and that the English settlers were wholly expelled by the Scots under his successor, Donald Bane, in 1093; while even so late as the reign of William the Lion (1165–1214), the English were confined to the towns.

Thus, according to Chalmers, no Teutonic settlement took place in Scotland—save that of the Saxons in Lothian, whose supremacy was short-lived—until the eleventh century; the introduction of a Teutonic race and language being referable alone to the Anglo-Saxon colonization of Scotland, which occurred chiefly during the reign of David I. That king had long previously been Prince of Cumbria, which embraced the whole of the Strathclyde kingdom; and he married, says Chalmers, an English countess, and was followed successively

capital, in 859. The bardic inscription on the stone (translated) is as follows:—

‘Except old seers do fain,
And wizard wits be blind;
The Scots in peace must reign,
Where they this stone shall find.’

The Scottish crown never had a residence south of the Forth, with the exception of Stirling and Edinburgh, which were merely fortresses, until David became Prince of Cumbria, and resided at Cadzow Castle, near Hamilton, and occasionally at Carlisle.

by a thousand Anglo-Normans, who obtained grants of land in various quarters of the country.

No doubt the conquest of England by William the Norman in 1066, introduced a vast change in the policy of the Scottish kings. Malcolm and his successors saw the necessity of adopting or extending the feudal system* introduced into England by the Conqueror, if they hoped to preserve the independence of their crown or kingdom. Their own Celtic subjects were opposed to innovation; hence the countenance shown to those disaffected Anglo-Normans who sought protection in Scotland. Yet great as the infusion of Norman blood was at this period, we do not see that it is sufficient to account for the rapid spread of the Anglo-Saxon language. If Gaelic was universal in Scotland in 1093, when the Saxons were wholly expelled, it seems impossible that the Anglo-Saxon could have become the vernacular of the greater portion of the country in the course of next century—much less the medium of that inimitable body of lyric poetry by which Scotland is distinguished, and which undoubtedly existed to a greater or less extent about the period in question. The Normans and their followers spoke French—the degraded and enslaved Saxons alone spoke English. It was Norman, not Saxon innovations that were courted by the Scottish kings. They saw that

* Some maintain that the system existed in Scotland previously. ®

neither the Celtic nor the Saxon polity was capable of maintaining itself in the vicinity of Norman enterprise and centralization ; hence their undeviating attempts not only to extend the feudal system of the Normans, but their mode of warfare and weapons, as well as that spirit of chivalry which had recently sprung up in Europe, and which the Normans were the first to call forth in England. It is much to the credit of Malcolm Caenmore and his immediate successors, that they so early saw the necessity of supplanting the patriarchal government of the Celts by a system more in keeping with the spirit and progress of the age ; and the arduous nature of the task which they undertook may be inferred from the fact, that it was not fully completed till the clans were disbanded in 1746.

It is absurd to suppose that Scotland became Saxonized by these innovations. The colonists of whom Chalmers speaks were as a drop in the bucket. They came not as conquerors, but in many cases as fugitives, flying from the vengeance of the conqueror ; and, though kindly received, were not in a position to impose either their laws or their language on the natives. As already observed, they were chiefly Normans, or descendants of the Danes, a kindred people,* who occupied almost ex-

* The Normans were of Norwegian origin. William the Conqueror was the fifth in descent from Rollo, thane of the Orkneys, who conquered Normandy from France. One of the earliest and greatest colonisers of Scotland, according to Chalmers, was Hugh Morville, from *Burg*, in Cumberland. *Burg* is purely Norwegian.

clusively the counties of Suffolk, Norfolk, Lincoln, and York. The vernacular of the Scottish Lowlands could not originate with the Normans, however much the Anglo-Danes may have contributed to its growth. Neither could it with the Flemings, who spoke a wholly different dialect of the Teutonic. These men of trade and manufactures were invited to England as well as Scotland, and encouraged in both kingdoms for the sake of the arts which they taught; but they speedily became amalgamated with the great body of the people in speech as well as in blood.*

That Saxon customs were not introduced by our reforming monarchs in the wholesale manner inculcated by Chalmers, is apparent even from his own book. The laws, which began to assume a form and consistency in the reign of David I., if not earlier, were based on the

* The formidable array of charters by which Chalmers supports his theory of 'Saxon colonization,' looks powerful on paper, but that is all. The Celtic population were opposed to charters; hence, the acceptors of them were chiefly foreigners, as were also, as a matter of course, the parties by whom they were witnessed. Without keeping this fact in view, the student of Scottish history, in consulting the early cartularies, would be apt to imagine that the country was wholly occupied by foreigners. The native chiefs and their clans do not appear in these documents, for the reason already stated; but that they existed, and kept possession of their lands, in numerous cases, in defiance of charters, is undeniable. The chartered magnates, scattered over various districts, were at first chiefly superiors, and only succeeded, in most instances, after many generations, in assuming actual possession of the soil. Even although overlords of this description had been planted in every division or sub-division of Scotland, they could have little effect in changing either the blood or the language of the country.

Scottish common law, long previously in existence, and anglicised only in so far as the introduction of the feudal system rendered it necessary. In dividing the country into shires, which began about this time, certain terms, such as *shieriff* and *shieriffdom*, were borrowed from the Anglo-Norman law-books; 'but, as Chalmers himself observes, 'we find no such divisions as the Saxon *rapes*, *laths*, *tithings*, and *hundreds*.' It is obvious that what our monarchs aimed at was an imitation of the Anglo-Norman system, based upon the ancient immunities of the people—a proof of which exists in the fact that most of the Scottish law terms are derived from the British or Gaelic.*

That the Britons of Scotland—the ancient and original Picts—were the same as the Britons of England, if it ever were doubted, may be inferred from the great similarity between the laws of the Welsh and those of the Lowland Scots. Among the Welsh, as preserved in long adhered-to customs, the king was not hereditary, but in some measure elected. The nomination generally lay with the reigning monarch. Under the sovereign ranked the *uchelwrs*, or great men, who held their land from the crown, each presiding as an overlord over his respective domains. 'As immediate tenants of the king, they were obliged to perform certain services. Some held

their lands by the tenure of personal attendance on the king's court; but the majority retained their estates by the *gwaeth milwyr*, or military service, being bound, on summons, to attend their sovereign with a certain number of men in arms, and follow him to the wars; to aid in the repair of the royal castles; and were also assessed with certain stated rents, payable in money or in kind.' The great body of the people was composed of two classes—the *uchelwrs*, the first class, holding their lands at discretion, and possessing the power of buying and selling, etc. The other class, *caeths*, were the property of the lord, attached to the soil; but subject, like the chiefs, to military attendance in time of war, and to contributions in money and kind. Lands descended to all men equally; the youngest son divided them, and the portions were then chosen according to seniority. The king was the ultimate heir of all lands, where the owner left none. The king could alter the laws at pleasure. Julius Cæsar lends support to the existence of this system in describing the Druids: 'The Druids do not commonly engage in war, neither do they *pay taxes like the rest of the community*; they enjoy an exemption from military service, and freedom from all other public burdens.'

Who does not see in this outline of the ancient British constitution the remains of 'the customs of the *Scots* and *Brets*,' which Edward I., in 1305, ordained, in his attempt at the settlement of Scotland, should 'for the future be

prohibited?' The right of property, upon the part of the lord, or tenant of the crown, in the tenantry, is to be traced in charters down to modern times, as well as in the law of *mercheta*, which prevailed among the north as well as the south Britons.*

The customs of the Scots, or Gaels, were somewhat different from those of the Britons; and in this we find a strong evidence of the fact already adduced, that the Irish and Scots were chiefly of the original colony from Gaul, and retained the customs of a pastoral life—the patriarchal—in greater purity. The Cimbri, or second colony, on the contrary, had become more artificial, and more subject to the control of the Druids. By attending to this distinction we can account for the difference which we know did exist betwixt the Welsh and Irish, and which the ordinance of Edward I. shows still prevailed amongst the kindred people of Scotland in the thirteenth century. It is only by observing minute points of this kind that the truth of remote history is to be established. The Pictish form of monarchy was elective from amongst a royal race—the offspring of the female being preferred.

The battle of the Standard, in 1138, has been often referred to by inquirers, as affording certain landmarks

* For example, the charter granted by Robert the Bruce, in 1314, to Sir Walter, the son of Sir Gilbert Hamilton, of the barony of Cadzow, included also 'the *tenendry* of *Adelwood*,' etc.

as to the state of the Scottish kingdom in the early part of the reign of David I. Some idea of the people who occupied Scotland at the time may be formed from the various divisions of his army, which was composed as follows:—

1st Division—Gallovidians.

2d Division—Men-at-arms from Cumberland and Teviotdale.

3d Division—Lothianmen, Islanders and Lennoxmen.

4th Division—Pure Scots and Murraymen.

Under the first division not only the native warriors of Galloway proper must have been included, but those of Ayrshire and Dumfries—Galloway of old comprehending both these modern divisions. They were therefore a kindred Celtic people.

The second division was composed of Norman settlers, men-at-arms, (mailed warriors), and the spearmen of Cumberland and Teviotdale—a mixture of Normans, Danes, Scots, and Picts.

The third division comprised the men of Lothian, of Clydesdale, which then included Renfrewshire (the *Laverni*); and islanders (west Highlands), forming a body composed of the central inhabitants of the kingdom, and with whom the islanders could be best associated topographically.

The fourth division plainly points to the *pure Scots* of the Highlands, north of the Forth, and the *Murraymen*,

the men occupying the extensive plains on the north-east coast—who, it would thus appear, were not pure Scots, and of course a mixed race.

The army of David I. at this time, we thus see, was not wholly composed of Celts. The Anglo-Normans and the mixed men of Murray, with probably a slight sprinkling of Saxon blood in the Lothians, were decided exceptions.* Indeed the charters of this monarch amply show the various races over whom he held sway. Not only were Galloway and Ayrshire Celtic, but the greater part of Nithsdale was held by Donegal of Stranith; and from the names of places in the other border counties, it is apparent that they were, or had been, extensively occupied by the Scoto-Irish of Chalmers. In the words of one of David's charters, when Prince of Cumbria, there were amongst his subjects 'Francis, Angles, Scotis, Walensibus et Galwensibus,' etc., *i. e.* Normans, (who spoke French); English, (Dano-Saxons); Britons, and Galloway-men. David's pryncedom included Northumberland, Cumberland, and Westmorlaud—the seat of the

* The English historians are so contradictory in their designations of the Galwegians—'*Picti, Scoti, Galwenses, et Loenensis,*' etc.,—as to call forth a very pertinent remark from Lord Hailes:—'This strange contrariety,' says his lordship, 'ought to teach us that the English historians are no certain guides for ascertaining the denominations of the different tribes who inhabited Scotland in ancient times; an observation so very obvious has not been attended to by our antiquaries.' If the English historians, living so near at hand, are not trustworthy, how much less so ought to be those of Rome, or the ecclesiastics of Spain?

Anglo-Danes (English); the French were his new Norman subjects, the Scots, (the Scoto-Irish), the British, or Walensibus, the inhabitants of Strathclyde, and the Galwegians, or Cruithne of Galloway. The successor of David, Malcolm IV., in 1164, addressed his writ, *De Decimis Solvendis*, to the Normans, the English, the Scots, and the Welsh, living within the diocese of Glasgow. So did his successor, William the Lion.

Thus have we a pretty clear view of the various races subject to the Scottish crown in the beginning and throughout the twelfth century—from which it must be apparent that the introduction of a Gothic people and language could not have flowed, to any perceptible extent, from Saxon England.

OF THE NORTHMEN.

With the historical records of the reign of David I. before us, we shall retrace our steps, and endeavour to account for the introduction of a Gothic people and language upon a broader basis than Chalmers has done.

That the Northmen—the Scandinavians of Norway, Sweden, and Denmark, had early intercourse with this country—amicable or warlike—is unquestionable.* According to Norwegian history, the Northmen are of Scy-

* Authentic Norwegian records carry this intercourse back to the eighth century, but it must have existed much earlier.

thian origin, and supposed to have settled on the Euxine about 2000 years before the Christian era. From thence they peopled Denmark, Norway, and Sweden, which became the Scandinavia of ancient history.

‘Bede,’ says Pinkerton, ‘tells us in positive and direct terms, that the Picts were from Scythia, which every one knows means German-Scythia, or Scandinavia. Bede wrote in 731, and is as good an authority for the origin of the Picts as of the Scots or the Saxons. He also says that there were in his time five tongues in this island (Britain), English, British, Scottish, Pictish, Latin,’ (book Latin, not spoken Latin.) He was right, so far, as we have shown, in reference to the Scots; and he may not be wrong, in the same degree, in regard to the Picts. We are satisfied, as already indicated, that the Picts were originally Celtic. Indeed, Chalmers and other writers have proved that the names of their kings are chiefly significant in the British language;* and the topographical etymology of the country is confirmative of the fact; but that Bede was justified in his statement may be presumed, not only from the probability of the Picts having been a colony of the Cimbri from Jutland, but from a succession of truly Scandinavian colonists at a later period. Pinkerton settles the Picts in the Hebrides

* Jamieson, in his introduction to the Scottish Dictionary, endeavours to show that they are equally significant in the Gothic. He is not, however, very successful.

300 years before our era, and on the mainland, north of Tyne and Tay, a century later: but this is mere conjecture.

If the *Dicaledonæ* were the genuine Caledonians, in opposition to the *Vecturiones*, it would seem to imply that the latter were either originally a distinct people, or had become a mixed race by subsequent immigration. If a distinct people, they must have been still Celtic, from their language, which is known to have been similar to the Welsh. 'One Pictish word only has been expressly mentioned by any old writer. *Pænvahel*, Bede tells us, was the Pictish name of the place at which the wall of Antoninus terminated on the Forth, and which, Nenius says, was called in Welsh *Pengaaul*, and in Scotch *Caenail*. It is still, in fact, known by the name of *Kinneil*, *Cen* or *Caen* is the Irish or Gaelic word for a head, and *Cenail*, in that dialect, would mean the head of the wall; and that is also the signification of the Welsh name, with which the Welsh is evidently identical, and generally it appears that the ancient names of places in those parts formerly occupied by the Picts are Welsh, as was long ago pointed out by Camden, and has since been more fully established by Chalmers.* On the other hand, it is remarkable that the most ancient names of

* In Angus and the north-east countries, where the Picts were longest established, the popular speech is still characterised by the substitution of *f* for *w* *wh* or *gw*.

places in Wales are not Welsh, but Irish. This was stated by Humphrey Lloyd, nearly three centuries ago, and is, we believe, generally admitted by Welsh antiquaries.* This led Camden to the opinion that the Welsh were a remnant of the Picts, who had supervened upon a people speaking the same dialect as the Irish and Highlanders.

Of the Pictish language, if Teutonic, Pinkerton could give no example; but Chalmers adduces a quotation from *Merlinus Caledonius*, who was born on the north of the Clyde, and flourished about 560, which is British—arguing therefrom that the Picts were Britons. It is possible, however, that when Bede wrote, more than two hundred years afterwards, the language of the Picts had undergone a considerable change, from the admixture of northern words; and thus he may have been, to a certain extent, right in designating the Pictish as a distinct language or dialect.

To trace the influx of a people topographically, as Chalmers has done, is not always satisfactory. The names of places given by the first inhabitants are rarely changed, even by a conquering and wholly distinct race of invaders. Yet, tried by this standard, the coasts of Caithness, Sutherland, and Moray exhibit an instructive number of Teutonic names—as, for example, *Scoon*,

(Norway, *Skonland*;) *Hope*, (*Hoop*;) *Almond*, (*Almund* and *Almand*;) *Anstruther*, (*Haldum*, *Struer*;) *Weams* (*Wyn*), etc.*

There is a class of antiquities, too, which evidently point to some such people having at one time occupied the north-eastern peninsula of Scotland. These are the remains, some of them very entire, of a peculiar kind of castle, or stronghold, mostly of a conical shape, and built of stone without cement. They are to be found chiefly in the Shetland Isles, Orkneys, the counties of Sutherland, Ross, Inverness, Aberdeen, etc. A writer in the *New Statistical Account of Scotland* says he has visited the ruins of not less than 65 round towers in Sutherland alone. At Kirkwall, these Picts' houses, as they are called, measure from 50 to 100 feet in diameter. Of four of these, which anciently stood in the valley of Glenelg, Inverness-shire, Gordon in his *Itinerarium* gives the following account of the most entire :—

‘On the outside were no windows, nor were the materials of this castle any ways different from those of the other, already described, only the entry on the outside was somewhat larger; but this might be occasioned by the falling of the stones from above. The area of this makes a complete circle, and there are four doors in the inner wall, which face the four cardinal points of the

compass; the doors are each eight feet and a half high, and five feet wide, and lead from the area into the cavity between the two walls, which runs round the whole building. The perpendicular height of this fabric is exactly thirty-three feet; the thickness of both walls, including the cavity between, no more than twelve feet, and the cavity itself hardly wide enough for two men to walk abreast; the external circumference is 178 feet. The whole height of the fabric is divided into four parts or stories, separated from each other by thin floorings of flat stones, which knit the two walls together, and run quite round the building; and there have been winding-stairs of the same flat stones, ascending betwixt wall and wall up to the top. The undermost partition is somewhat below the surface of the ground, and is the widest; the others grow narrower by degrees, till the walls close at the top; over each door are some square windows, in a direct line above each other, for the admission of light, and between every row of windows are three others, in the uppermost story, rising above a cornice which projects out from within the inner wall, and runs round the fabric.' Gordon, who supposes these buildings to have been ancient places of strength, has preserved a traditional rhyme, in Gaelic, to the effect that the four castles were built by a mother for her four sons:—

‘My four sons, a fair clan,

I left on the strath of one glen;

My Malcolm, my lovely Chonel,
My Tellve, my Troddan.'

The tradition has evidently little reference to the history of the strongholds, and is valueless, unless, probably, as preserving the names of the castles.

Gordon mentions the existence of six similar towers at Glendunin, Easter-Fairn, in Ross-shire, and two or three in 'my Lord Ray's country, one of which goes by the name of *Dornadilla's Castle*.' After describing *Dun Dornadilla*, the reverend correspondent of Mr Pennant, in his letters illustrative of Antiquities in the North of Scotland, gives the following rhyme from the Gaelic regarding it:—

'Seven miles from ocean, in the cheerful dale,
Basks the large tower where Dornadilla reigns;
From thence, when war or civil feuds prevail,
The warriors pour into the Caithness plains.'

Dornadilla, according to tradition, was a chief or king.*

In Caithness, the circular buildings are not so entire as in Sutherland; but there are numerous remains of castles of a later era, such as *Aldwick*, *Guernigo*,† *Freswick*, *Boorve*, etc., all British or Scandinavian from their names.

* Dornadilla is reckoned by Buchanan to have begun his reign 260 years before Christ.

† This castle is supposed to derive its name from the Carnabii or Carnavii, a tribe who inhabited a portion of Caithness, in the time of Ptolemy. A similar tribe occupied Cornwall at the same era, which circumstance is held as furnishing additional evidence that the Picts were chiefly British originally.

If these ancient and peculiar fabrics were the construction of the Northmen—and it is evident that they were not built by the Celtic nations, for nothing of the kind is to be found in any other part of the country peculiar to the Britons or Scots—it is rather a singular coincidence that the Picts are invariably represented by tradition as the builders of all the ancient edifices in the country. If the Picts were the builders of these castles, it is evident that, however the Pictish nation arose, their numbers had been largely augmented by Scandinavian colonists, with whom they became blended.*

Of the first intercourse between the Caledonians and the Northmen, we have no record. Richard of Cirencester mentions the arrival of a colony of Picts from the Orkneys in the reign of Hadrian; and Claudian, in the passage formerly referred to, speaks of the Orkneys as inhabited by the Saxons, and Thule by the Picts:—

———— ‘*Maduerunt Saxone fuso
Orcades; incaluit Pictorum sanguine Thule.*’

By the Saxons of Orkney, Claudian, if he is to be held at all worthy of credit, must have meant the Northmen, who certainly were a kindred people. If so, they were in possession of Orkney about 370, the period alluded to by the poet. The earliest recorded expedition of the

* Similar remains of stone buildings are found in Norway.®

Northmen to the Scottish islands appears to have been undertaken in consequence of some prior connection; and Chalmers himself, quoting from Adomnan's *Life of St Patrick*, proves that the Orkneys were settled by Scandinavians in the days of Columba, who found one of their chiefs at the residence of Bridii, the Pictish king.*

If the Pictish language was originally similar to the ancient British or Welsh, a dialect of the Celtic—and we see no reason to doubt the fact—it must have become unintelligible to the Scoto-Irish, and possibly so through the infusion of the Norwegian tongue. This is proved by the circumstance that Columba, who was an Irish Scot, and spoke Gaelic, was obliged to employ an interpreter when he addressed the Picts. Although Mr Skene, in his '*Highlanders of Scotland*,' attempts to conceal or deny this fact—the more effectively to support his theory that the Highlanders are the descendants of the ancient Picts—yet the statement of Adomnan is so clear on the point, in more than one passage, that it cannot be set aside. For example:—'*Per interpretatorem sancto predicante viro*,'—the holy man *preached by the aid of an interpreter*. There was, then, a marked dis-

* We agree with Pinkerton and Jamieson in opinion, that the Orkneys were originally occupied by the Scandinavians. The stone monuments that remain are not so obviously Celtic as Chalmers would have us to suppose, and the topography of the islands is wholly against him.

inction between the language of the Scots and Picts. 'The language which St Columba used is still extant both in MSS. and printed books: the language used in the Highlands to this day, and for some generations back, is nearly identical with it. What then *can* we infer, but that the modern Highlanders are the descendants, *not* of the Picts, but of the Scots.*

At the same time, as remarked by Dr Geddes, the difference was perhaps merely provincial—not greater than that 'between the Erse of Arran and that of Uist;' in illustration of which he says:—'The Aberdeen breviary commemorates, on the 24th of August, a saint Erchad, born at Kincardine, in Mearns, (confessedly a part of the Pictish kingdom), who, going to Rome, was consecrated Bishop of the Scottish nation; and on his return passed through the provinces of the *Britons* and *Scots*, preaching the word of God, until he came to the place of his nativity. That is, as I conceive it, he preached to all the Celtic inhabitants in his mother-tongue; but not to the *Saxons*, whose language he did not understand.' This is probably drawing the inference in too one-sided a sense. Because he did not pass through the provinces of the Saxons, it does not follow that he understood not the Saxon tongue; while his having been born a Pict, and in communication with the Scots, may

have enabled him to understand the Scottish Celtic, though Columba, an Irish Scot, may not have been equally acquainted with the Pictish.*

Odin, 'the Mars as well as the Mohammed of Scandinavia,' is supposed by Torfaeus, as well as Storne Sturlesen, the historians of Norway, to have existed about the middle of the century before Christianity; so that the Northmen were in ample time to have effected a partial settlement in Scotland before the Roman invasion. Tacitus, it is well known, describes the Caledonians as of German origin, from their fair complexion and largeness of stature:—'*Namque rutilæ Caledoniam habitantium comæ, magni artus, Germanicam originem adseverant.*'†

The Danes first appear in history, as the ravagers of the three kingdoms, in the eighth century. In 787 they plundered Lindisfarne, and conquered Northumberland in 793; and, as is well known, became the supreme race for a time in England. A great portion of the country, termed the Dane Law, was permanently settled and held by them. 'The known coasts of the Irish sea,' says

* As remarked by Dr Geddes, there are about one hundred saints in the Scottish calendar, three only of whom are Saxon, and these three posterior to the ninth century.

† Bede was inclined to believe that the Picts were not the original inhabitants. The Catini, one of the tribes mentioned by Ptolemy as inhabiting part of Caithness, and from whom the district is named, have a tradition amongst them to this day that they came from Germany. The inference is, that they were of the same Gothic stock as the Northmen.

Chalmers, 'and the obvious shores of the Clyde, were overran, in 870 A.D., by the Danish Viker, who roved in the ocean, and sought for plunder in every clime. The same adventurers, sallying out from Northumberland in 875 A.D., wasted Galloway and overran Strathclyde, a kindred country. The Northumbrian Saxons [Anglo-Danes] having thus invaded the peninsula, [formed by the Irish Sea, the Solway, and the Clyde,] retained the ascendancy, which their superiority of character, for enterprise and union, more than their greatness of numbers, had given them during the two subsequent centuries.'*

Tradition universally affirms that the Picts were driven out of the country by the overspreading Scots, but tradition is scouted in this particular by modern inquirers. It must be recollected, at the same time, that the Forth and Clyde were the southern *limits of Scotland proper* prior to 975.† The reguli of the Scots gradually

* This fact is unsubstantiated, and not borne out by circumstances. The kingdom of Strathclyde remained unsubdued till 975, and therefore could not have been under the ascendancy of the Northumbrians from 875; while, according to Chalmers' own showing, the Saxons were wholly expelled the kingdom by Donald Bane in 1093. But Chalmers is not always consistent in his statements and deductions. Had he lived to complete and revise his valuable work, the case, we daresay, would have been otherwise.

† This explains the passage in the Saxon Chronicle, quoted as inexplicable by Lord Hailes, to the effect that Malcolm III., (1091,) 'advanced with his forces out of Scotland, into *Lothene in England*, and there remained.' Lord Hailes was much puzzled by this statement, and in vain sought for a Lothian in present England, by which to unriddle the mystery. The fact plainly is,

extended from Dunstaffnage to Scone, and southwards to Dunfermline, where Malcolm Caenmore is understood chiefly to have held his court. It is perfectly probable, therefore, that the Southern Picts—for it is a historical fact, that the Northern Picts were in League with the Scots—may have been to some extent expelled from proper Scotland, and driven into Strathclyde or the adjacent islands. It is said by the Norwegian historians that many of the Picts took refuge in Scandinavia, and by their representations, induced their countrymen to renewed invasions of Scotland.

The supremacy of the Scots was consummated in 843. In 850, according to Torfaeus, a Norwegian squadron was fitted out under the command of Sigurdus, son to Ronald, and destined for the re-establishment of the Picts; and in 894, Sigurd, Earl of Orkney, and Thorstein the Red, who claimed the sovereignty of the Western Isles, made a descent on the main land of Scotland. Overrunning Caithness, Sutherland, Ross and Moray, they established there a principality, which was given to Thorstein, who held it, with the title of King of the half of Scotland, till he was defeated and slain by the Scots in 900.

that Malcolm crossed the Forth, the boundary of ancient Scotland, and remained in Lothian awaiting the army of his opponent, William the Conqueror. The writer of the Saxon Chronicle probably did not acknowledge the comparatively recent relinquishment of his country's long-cherished claims to Lothian, which they accounted as belonging to England.

Harold Haarfager, who died in 934, reduced the Shetlands, Orkneys, Hebrides, and the whole of Scotland north of the Grampians. The Isle of Man, where a Norwegian dynasty had long been established, and part of Ireland, including Dublin, were added to his dominions.* This implies that these were merely re-conquests, the whole having at some previous period belonged to the Danes. The Northmen, however, were signally defeated by the Scots at Cullen in 961.

According to old chroniclers, the *second* founder of the Scottish monarchy received aid from them in recovering his dominions, and was descended maternally from the Skioldonys, the father of Fergus II., having married Ulvilda, daughter of Frode III. He had been driven into exile at the Danish court by the Romans.

Caithness was reconquered by Thorfinn, Earl of Orkney, about the middle of the tenth century. A long succession of wars followed, which resulted, in 1034, in the complete subjugation of Scotland, as far south as the Frith of Tay, by Thorfinn, grandson of the original conqueror. This Norwegian kingdom lasted for thirty years, during which period Macbeth had overcome Duncan,

* In the early records of Ireland, the sea-rovers are called Lochlanach, and the country whence they came Lochlin; the King of which, according to the Annals of Ulster, came to Erin 852. The Scandinavians held a great portion of Ireland down to the period of Henry II. The era of Osian is therefore considered, by some, to have been the ninth century. No mention is made of the Northmen in the Irish annals till 795.

and assumed the Scottish crown. Macbeth in the south, and Thorfinn in the north, reigned undisturbed till 1045, when the adherents of the exiled family rose against Macbeth. This attempt to unseat the usurper was crushed, however, and Macbeth enjoyed other nine years of tranquillity. In 1034 Macbeth was expelled from Lothian, and Malcolm Caenmore established in his stead; so that there were in Scotland three dynasties at that time. In 1058, Thorfinn headed an expedition against England, which roused Edward's ire, and an English force, in connection with the army of Malcolm, marched to Lamphanan, Aberdeenshire, where Macbeth was overtaken and slain.

Thorfinn, however, held his own till his death, in 1064; and even then the people of the north refused to submit to Malcolm, but attempted to set up a king of their own, Donald MacMalcolm, who is styled, as were Malcolm II. and Macbeth, Maarmor of Moray, and was probably of the same family with them. Malcolm dying in 1093, the northern people asserted the right of Malcolm's brother, Donald Bane, whom they placed on the throne. On the accession of Edgar, in 1098, those lands which had formed Thorfinn's kingdom appear to have reverted to their original owners, native chiefs; but the rest of the country which the Scots had gained from the Piets, and which had fallen to the royal house founded by Duncan, in addition to the whole of the country south of the Frith,

became the absolute property of the king. By this means he was enabled widely to extend the feudal system, and in a short time, as historians say, the greater part of Scotland became the counterpart of England. The udal system,* which still prevails in Orkney and the

* If you turn up some of our more recent works of reference, you will probably find 'Udal—Udaller' explained as signifying a 'freehold, a freeholder' in the Shetland Isles; but as to the derivation of the terms, or why they should be peculiar to Shetland, the chance is you will have to go somewhere else for information. Mr Lang, in his 'Residence in Norway,' (1851,) an excellent little work, illustrative of the political and social condition of that country, supposes the term *udal*, or *adel*, to be derived from the German '*adel*, signifying noble;' and he sees 'an equivalent meaning in all its applications.' He goes on to explain that 'udal land is *noble* land, not held from or under any superior, not even from the king, consequently without charter, and is subject to none of the burdens and casualties affecting land held by feudal tenure direct from the sovereign, or from his superior vassal.' This derivation, however, is not satisfactory. There are no titles—no feudalism—in Norway. Why, then, should the land, or any portion of it, be esteemed *noble*, when no such title as *noble* exists even amongst the people? Mr Lang might have found the origin of the word nearer home—in the Icelandic, the original language of Norway. In that language the word *od*, or *oed*, signifies *possession*; and this is the pure and unambiguous meaning of the term *udal*. *Udal* is possession, and *udaller* the possessor. From *oed* also proceeds the law-Latin *allodium*, independent possession.

When nearly all Europe was brought under the yoke of feudalism, Norway remained free; hence the right of property was constituted by possession, and hence her freedom from feudal burdens. In the language of Mr Lang, she 'is subject neither to fines on the entry of new heirs or successors, nor to escheat, nor forfeiture, nor personal suit and service, nor wardship, nor astrictions to baronial courts or other local judicatories, nor to baronial mills or other feudal servitudes, nor to any of the ten thousand burdens and vexatious exactions which, in the middle ages, and even in some degree to the present day, have affected all property held under the feudal tenure.' Orkney and the Shetland Isles were long under the Norwegian rule—hence the prevalence of *udalism* in Shetland.

Shetland Isles, owes its existence to the circumstance that the lands which formed the Norwegian province in Scotland reverted to their former proprietors, and were not claimed as the property of the crown.

Magnus of Norway, who died in 1103, again subdued the Scottish Isles, whose jarls had thrown off their dependence on the mother country. He is said, while in Scotland, to have adopted the dress of the Highlanders, and hence acquired the cognomen of Magnus Barfoed, or Barefoot—a proof of the antiquity of the Highland dress, which Pinkerton contended was modern. The isles were finally conceded to Scotland in 1468.

ORIGIN

OF THE

SCOTTISH LANGUAGE.

IF we are right in the historical facts thus thrown together, and in our deductions where no facts can be adduced, it follows—

1. That Britain was at first peopled by the Gauls, the earliest of the Celtic colonists.

2. That the Gauls penetrated to the farthest boundaries of the mainland, and peopled Ireland.

3. That the Gauls were succeeded by the Cimbri, another Celtic colony, more under the control of the Druids, who overspread England, and the greater part of Scotland.*

4. That by this means the original settlers, the Gauls, were gradually pressed northward and westward—Ireland and the western Highlands of Scotland becoming their chief abodes.†

* From the Cimbri we have, in considerable purity, the modern Welsh and their language.

† From the Irish and Scots Highlanders we have the Gaelic, which, in topography, is shown to have preceded the Welsh.

5. That the Picts, or inhabitants of the open country, north-east of Drum-Albin, were originally Celtic, of the Cimbric race, but early mixed by Norwegian settlers; to such an extent, amongst the southern Picts especially, as not only to influence their language materially, but, in some measure, to appropriate the very name of Pict.*

6. That, on the acquisition of the Pictish crown by the Scots, the Picts were, to some extent, scattered; many of them repairing to the isles and the Lowlands, though the great body continued in their possessions, as is demonstrated by their descendants at the present time.

7. That 'the men of Moray' were not pure Scots in the eleventh century, before any grants by the Scottish crown had been made in the north of Scotland to Anglo-Saxon settlers, is shown by the roll of the battle of the Standard; consequently they must have been a mixed race of Picts, Norwegians, and probably Scots; the Teutonic blood prevailing, as is demonstrated by the popular dialect of the inhabitants in our own day.

8. That from this mixed race, mingling with a similar amalgamation of Britons, Scots, and Anglo-Normans in the Lowlands, has sprung the great body of the Scottish people—the Highlanders alone, and that only to a par-

* Bellenden, in his description of the Western Isles, says that Orkney was 'of old called *the realm of the Picts*;' and he styles the Pentland frith *the Picts' sea*.

tial extent,* retaining any claim to purity of Gaulic blood.

With the map of Scotland before us, we may easily trace, in outline, the Teutonic progress of which we have been speaking.† To the north we find the Shetland and Orkney isles in possession of the Northmen from the earliest times; and to suppose that such a restless and enterprising people had not made settlements on the mainland before the ninth century, the era when authentic Northern history commences, is to give them less credit than their well-known character deserves. That the Pictish language had, in the eighth century, become so far changed from the Cimbrian Celtic as to be esteemed a separate language, is amply attested by Bede, who, writing about 731, distinctly states that there were then four languages spoken in Britain, the English, Scottish, *Pictish*, and *British*. The Pictish was, therefore, in 731, a dialect or language different from the British, which, it is understood, the inhabitants of the Lowlands chiefly made use of; for, although the Romans overran and held this division of Scotland for a consi-

* It must not be forgotten, if we are right in our hypothesis as to the origin of the Scoto-Irish, that they were a mixed race of Gaulic and Cimbrian Celts, or original Picts. Many of the clans are of Teutonic descent; for example, the clans MacIntosh, M'Kay, MacPherson, Davidsons, M'Leod, Gunn, Gillander, M'Heamish, Robson, Henderson, Wilson, etc., are all of Norwegian origin.

† From Cornwall to the Orkneys, a line might almost be drawn separating the Celtic race westward from the mixed Teutonic race eastward.

derable time, yet their occupancy was frequently interrupted and their power so precarious that it is not supposed that their language or customs made any serious impression on the people. There is not the slightest evidence for believing that they did so. If the Teutonic speech of Scotland thus originated with the Picts, from an admixture of Norwegian blood, it is easy to see that it would meet with a kindred stream, and extend itself, when, after the battle of Dunichen, in 685, the Picts took possession of the Saxon kingdom of *Lothian*, which they retained down to the final settlement of the Scottish dynasty. Their lineage and their language thus prevailed from the Shetland isles along the whole of the east coast of Scotland, including the extensive district of Buchan,* to the counties of Cumberland and Northumberland in England, where they amalgamated with a kindred race of Anglo-Saxons and Danes. The near proximity of Picts and Anglo-Danes, though frequently at war with each other, must have produced an effect on the language of the Strathclyde people, which no doubt approximated in its British phase to that of the Pictish.

In this way we maintain that the Scottish dialect, which is, in many respects, distinct from the old English or Saxon, had its origin in Pictavia, north of the

* Nowhere in Scotland is the vernacular spoken more broadly or purely than in Buchan, the original seat of the Picts.

Forth, and not in the Anglo-Saxon colonization of the south of Scotland by David I. and his successors, though that colonization by a kindred people may have helped to spread and perpetuate it. The conquest of the Isle of Man by the Norwegians, and their repeated descents, in conjunction with the Danes of England, on the southern shores of Scotland, must also have had an effect in circumscribing the original Celtic of the inhabitants; while the subsequent dominion of Thorfinn in the north, as already stated, would tend to strengthen the footing it had there obtained. It is not likely that Malcolm Caenmore, or his immediate successors, would attempt to change the language of an entire country, by means of the Court, and the introduction of strangers who even did not speak the Anglo-Saxon. William the Conqueror, with his whole army, who lorded it supreme over England, entirely failed in subverting the English tongue. How impotent, then, must have been the attempt of the Scottish kings to supplant the Gaelic with such inferior power!

The Scottish vernacular had thus a much wider range of origin than is generally conceived, and which Chalmers would not admit, simply because he could not trace its progress topographically, at least to such a copious extent as he considered satisfactory. But this was not to be expected from a language, not of a conquering people—which arose imperceptibly, as it were, amongst

the mixed races of inhabitants. In such a case, they would naturally retain the names of places as they found them, as in our own day, chiefly because it was convenient. Although it is a historical fact that the Gaelic formed the language of the Court in the time of Malcolm Caenmore, and a Gaelic priesthood officiated at the altars, it does not militate against our hypothesis that the language of the Picts had been gradually approximating to what is now designated the Scottish dialect, no more than that the Anglo-Saxon was not the vernacular of England, because the Normans introduced Norman-French as the royal and legal tongue, and filled the benefices with their retainers. As little are we to believe that, in banishing the recent settlers from England in 1093, the whole Scandinavian race in Scotland were included. The facts we have stated preclude the possibility of such a thing.

Of the Saxon language in England, there are written remains as early as the seventh century—and of the Erse or Gaelic, MSS. exist of the age of Columba; but we have no specimen of the Pictish in ancient times, save the single word *Pænvahel*, formerly alluded to, preserved by Bede; and the poetry of *Merlinus Caledonius*, transmitted downwards through the medium of the Welsh. The quatrain produced by Chalmers from the *Avallenau* of Merlinus, can scarcely be considered, therefore, as a pure specimen of the Pictish in the sixth century:—

‘Ni neuav ; ni chyscaf ; ergrynaf fy nragon,
 Fy arglwydd Gwenddolau, am browy frodorion !
 Gwedi porthi heint, a hoed, amgylch *Celyddon*,
 Bwyf was gwynfydig gan Wledig Gorchorddion !’

‘I sigh not; I do not sleep; I am agitated for my chief,
 My Lord Gwenddolau, and my genial countrymen !
 After bearing of affliction, and mourning about Caledonia,
 I pray to be a blessed servant with the supreme of supernal
 circles !’

The Saxon scholar will perhaps perceive, in such words as *heint* and *hoed*, that even this specimen of British is not entirely free of a Gothic mixture.

From this period we have literally no specimen whatever of the Pictish or Scottish dialect till after the demise of Alexander III., when we find the following often-quoted lines preserved by *Wyntoun* in his *Chronicles* :—

‘Quhen Alysandyr, oure kyng, wes dede,
 That Scotland led in luive and le,
 Away wes sons of ale and brede,
 Of wyne and wax, of gamyn and gle :
 Oure gold wes changyd into lede—
 Cryst, borne into virgynte,
 Succour Scotland, and remede,
 That stad is in perplexyte.’

This fragment, belonging to the latter end of the thirteenth century, exhibits, in contrast with the Saxon

or English of the same period, evident marks of superior cultivation.*

If Motherwell is right in his conjecture—and we think there can be no doubt of it—that ‘the grand old ballad of Sir Patrick Spens’ refers to the ‘disastrous shipwreck which awaited the return of a number of those noblemen who formed the retinue of Margaret, when she was married to Erick of Norway’ (A.D. 1281), it is probable that the ballad is as old as the event itself, and may therefore be classed as of the same age with the lines preserved by

* Chalmers, in his account of the parish of Cumbernauld, quotes the following quatrain, said to have been inscribed on the ceiling of an old house; and he esteems it an interesting specimen of the Scottish language in the days of ‘Wight Wallace’ :—

‘ He that sittis down to ye bord for to eite,
Forzetting to gyf God thankis for his meite;
Syne rises upe, and his grace oure pass,
Sittis down lyk ane oxe, and rysis upe lyk ane ass.’

Doubts are entertained of its claims to such antiquity. Genuine or not, however, Chalmers was indebted for this relic to Ure’s History of Renfrewshire. On making repairs at *the Farme* (Lanarkshire), May, 1792, the workmen (says the writer) had occasion to take down the stucco ceiling of one of the principal apartments. Underneath was another ceiling of wood, upon the sides of the beams of which they discovered several lines of writing in old Saxon characters. The letters were black, upon a white ground. Some of the lines were obliterated, but the above were easily made out. If this statement can be relied upon, they are certainly a great curiosity. The transcriber does not seem to have known that the *z* in ‘forgetting’ (second line) was not a *z*, but the Saxon sign for a soft *g*. Neither was it meant that *ye* should be pronounced *ye*, but in the common way—the *y* being merely a sign for *th*. By ignorance of these facts, great confusion has crept into our old literature

Wyntoun; but having come down to modern times by recitation, it has no doubt undergone various alterations, and cannot therefore be quoted as illustrative of the Scottish language at any particular period. It bears all the marks of antiquity in poetic sentiment and construction.

‘The most ancient English specimen extant,’ says Bosworth, copying from Ritson, ‘is a vulgar song in praise of the cuckoo, which is quoted from a fine old Harlein MS. by Sir J. Hawkins and Dr Burney, who refer that MS. to the middle of the 15th century, though it is now known to be nearly two hundred years older, having been written about the end of the reign of Henry III.’ The song is therefore of a contemporaneous period with the Scottish specimen above quoted. It is as follows:—

‘Sumer is icumen in;
Lhude sing cuccu;
Groweth sed, and bloweth med,
And springeth the wde nu.
Sing cuccu,’ etc. *

Awe bleteth after lamb,
Lhouth after calve cu;
‘Bulluc sterteth, bucke verteth,
Murie sing cuccu.

* Modern English:—

‘Summer is come in;
Loud sings the cuckoo:
Now the seed grows, and the mead blows,
And the wood springs.
The cuckoo sings,’ etc.

Cuccu, cuccu, well singes thu, cuccu,
Ne swik thu naver nu.
Sing, cuccu, nu, sing, cuccu,
Sing cuccu, sing, cuccu nu.

But we shall quote a portion of another more unquestionably of the same age. It was written on the siege of Berwick, (30th March, 1296,) and has been preserved by Brunne, the translator of Langtoft's Rhyming Chronicle :—

‘ The Scottis had no grace, to spede in ther space, for to mend
ther nisse,
Thei filed ther face, that died in that place, the Inglis rymed
this.
Oure fote folk put tham in the polk, and nakned ther nages,
Bi no way herd I never say of prester pages,
Purses to pike, robis to rike, and in dike tham schonne,
Thou wiffin Scotte of Abrethin, kotte is thi honne.’

There is no comparison between the two specimens, that of the Scots belonging to a people much farther advanced in the language and harmony of poetry. Nor is this, perhaps, to be wondered at. During the long and prosperous reign of Alexander III., as well as those of his predecessors—from Alexander I. downwards, including David I. and William the Lion—the country had flourished to a surprising degree; and while war was not neglected, the arts of peace enjoyed ample protection. England, or rather the Saxons of England, from whom

Univ. Coll. - Digitized by Microsoft®

the English language flowed, on the contrary, had not recovered from the blow inflicted by the conqueror, and the Saxon language was repudiated by the great and influential, while a civil, or rather agrarian war, continued to prevail between the Saxon serf and his feudal lord.

‘The last expiring efforts of the Saxon language,’ says Bosworth, ‘seem to have been made in 1258–9, in a writ of Henry III. to his subjects in Huntingdonshire and all other parts of the kingdom, in support of the Oxford provisions of that reign.’ What is now called the English language superseded the Saxon, and dates its rise from the thirteenth century, specimens of which, in both countries, we have already furnished at this interesting period.

Before proceeding farther, it may be necessary to revert for a moment to the Saxon as written at various periods prior to the Norman invasion:—Bosworth at once supplies us with what we want, and the simplest way, perhaps, of conveying an idea of the changes to which the Saxon was subject, will be to quote the example of the Lord’s Prayer. We must first premise, however, that the southern and northern Saxon of England were considerably different—the latter being confined to the Danish descendants of the north of England, and called Dano-Saxon.

1.—PURE ANGLO-SAXON, WRITTEN ABOUT 890.

Fæder ure thu the on heofnum.

Si thin nama gehalgod.

To-becume thin rice.

Gewurthe thin willa on eorþan swa swa on heofenum.

Urne dæghwamlican hlaf syle us to dæg.

And forgyf us ure gyltas swa swa we forgifath urum gyltendum.

And ne gelædde thu us on costnunge.

Ac alys us of yfele.

Sothlice.*

2.—DANO-SAXON, ABOUT 930.

Fæder ure thu the in heofenum earth.

Beo gehalgud thin noma.

Cume to thine rice.

Weorthe thin willa swa swa on heofune swile on eorthe.

Hlaf userne dæghwamlicu sel us to dæg.

And forlete us ure scylde, swa swa we ec forleten thæm the
scyldigat with us.

And ne gelaet us geleade in costnungæ.

Ah gelese us of yfele.

Though these extracts are copied from Saxon ritual books, and of course are the composition of ecclesiastics—with a slight tint of the Latin to which the learned

* Present orthography :—

Father our thou who art in heaven,

Be thy name hallowed.

Come thy kingdom.

Be done thy will in earth, so as in heaven.

Our daily loaf sell us to-day.

And forgive us our guilt, so as we forgive to our guiltyings (debtors).

And not lead thou us into costning (temptation),

But release us from evil.

Soothly (truly, Amen.)

were addicted—they at the same time afford a good idea of the language at the time. It will be seen that the difference between the Saxon and Dano-Saxon is considerable; and at this moment the vernacular of the north of England, almost pure Scots, is very different from that of the south.

Of Saxon poetry in 937, we have a specimen in the ‘Ode on Athelstan’s Victory,’ of which the following is the first stanza :—

‘ Her Aethelstan cyning,
Eorla drighten,
Beorna beah-gyfa
And his brothor eac.’

LITERAL RENDERING.

Here Athelstan King,
Of Earls the Lord
Of Barons the bold chief,
And his brother eke.

Layamon’s translation of the *Brut d’Angleterre*, about 1180, affords another good specimen :—

‘ Tha¹ the masse wes isungen²
Of chireccken heo thrungen.³
The king mid his folke
To his mete *verde*,⁴
And mucle his dugethe :⁵

¹ When.

² Was sung.

³ Out of church they thronged.

⁴ Went, fared.

⁵ Many of his nobility.

Drem wes on hirede,¹
 Tha quene, an other halve,²
 Hire hereberwe isohte ;³
 Heo⁴ hafle of wif-monne⁵
 Wunder ane moni en.⁶

Unfortunately we have not the means of tracing the progress of the Scottish in its 'fermentation' from the Norse—the Icelandic—which is the elder branch of the Teutonic, and, of course, the senior of the Anglo-Saxon. The Pictish, as spoken by the mixed race of Scandinavians and Picts, or Britons,* prior to the thirteenth century, as already shown, is unrecorded. We can only adduce a few specimens of the old Danish,† as spoken by the Northmen in their native regions.

DANISH BEFORE 645.

Thann hefi ek manna
 Mennskra fundit
 Hring heyjanda
 Hrammastan at afli.

¹ Joy was in the household.

² On the other half, side.

³ Her lodging sought.

⁴ *She*, sometimes *they*.

⁵ Women.

⁶ Wonder a many ane.

She had wonderfully many women with her.

* Pinkerton, who strongly contended for the pure Seandinavian origin of the Picts, is obliged to admit, on the authority of Richard of Cirencester, that the *Cantae* and *Carnabii* tribes, north of the Forth, were from South Britain—in other words, *Brets* or Britons.

† Old Danish, Norwegian, and Icelandic were the same—Swedish nearly so.

LITERAL TRANSLATION.

Him have I among men
 Of the human race, *
 Among warriors, found
 The strongest of body.

OLD DANISH—LODBROK'S SONG—862-867.

Hjuggu vèr meth hjörvi !
 Hörth kom rith a skjoldu,
 När fèll nithr til jarthar
 A Northumbralandi ;
 Varat um eina ottu
 Öldum thörf at frýja
 Hildar leik, thar er hvassir
 Hjálm-stofn bitu skjomar ;
 Böthmana sa ek bresta,
 Bra thlvī fíra lífi.

LITERAL ENGLISH.

We hewed with swords !
 Hard came the storm on our shields,
 Dead they fell down on the earth,
 In Northumberland.
 None, on that morning,
 Needed men to incite.
 For Bellona's sharp sport,
 The glittering sword split the steel-capt skull,
 The moon-round shield saw I broken,
 And thus men's lives were lost.

SWEDISH, 1354.

Wi Magnus, med guds nadh sverikis konung, norghis oc skane,
 wiliom at that scal allom mannom witerlikt wara, at wi aff wara

serdelis nadh hafwm vnt bergxmanno-men a noreberge thænnæ ræt oc stadhga, som hær æfter følger; fforst hafwm wi stat oc skipat, at tolf skulu wara the som fore bergheno sculu standa oc thera rææt wæria oc fulfölgia i allom lutom, etc.

ENGLISH.

We, Magnus, by the grace of God, King of Sweden, Norway, and Scania, will that it shall be known to all men that we, by our peculiar grace, have conceded to Bergxman (miner) of Noreberge, the right and power as hereafter follows: first have we constituted and ordained, that twelve shall be the sum, etc.

MODERN SWEDISH.

DEN SÖRJANDE MODREN.

Ser ni, nära cyrkogårdens mur, denna quinnos-kapnad, sittande paa en sten,* och oröliksom denna?
 Vaardelöst falla lockar af gränade haar ned öfver heunes axlar, vinden leker med hennes sonderrifna kläder.
 Hon är gammal och stelnad, men ej blott af aar.
 Gaa ej kallt förbi—gif henne en skärf; länge skall hon ej besvära er.

LITERAL TRANSLATION.

THE SORROWING MOTHER.

See you, near the churchyard wall, this female form, sitting on a stone, and motionless as it?
 Neglected fall curls of grey hair down over her shoulder, the wind sports with her tattered garments.
 She is old and stiff, but not alone front age.
 Go not coldly past—give her a farthing; long shall she not trouble you.

The above we quote from 'Notes and Queries,' † and

* In Aberdeenshire *sten* is the pronunciation of stone at this moment.

† The passage is from Bremer's writings.

agree with the contributor that it affords most satisfactory evidence that the grammatical construction of the English is precisely that of the Swedish. Indeed, travellers tell us that at this day Scotsmen, if they speak broad Scots, have little difficulty in making themselves understood in Sweden.

As formerly observed, the modern language of Scandinavia has undergone a considerable change. It is, therefore, to the more pure Icelandic that we are to look for what of Gothic is to be found in the Scottish dialect. The following is the Lord's Prayer, as given in Icelandic, by Pinkerton :—

'Fader uor som est i Himlum. 2. Halgad warde thitt nama. 3. Tilkomme thitt Rikie. 4. Ski thin vilie so som i Himmalam, so och po Jordannè. 5. Wort dachlichea brodli gif as i dagh. 6. Och forlat os uora skuldas, so som agh vi for late them os skildighe are. 7. Agh inled os ikkie i frestalsan. 8. Utan frels as ifra endo. Amen.'

In old Scots :—

'Uor fader quhilk beest i Hevin. 2. Hallowit weird thyne nam. 3. Come thyne kingrik. 4. Be dune thyne wull as is i hevin, swa po yerd. 5. Uor dailie breid gif us thilk day. 6. And forleit us uor skaths, as we forleit tham quha skath us. 7. And leed us na intil *temptation*.* 8. But an fre us fra evil. Amen.'

The reader will observe that there is a very close affinity between the two languages, the orthography and pronunciation constituting the chief difference. A still

* Pinkerton confesses that he knew no Scots word for temptation.

more satisfactory example of this, perhaps, is to be found in the Icelandic account of the battle of Largs (1262), rendered into Scots by the late Andrew Crawford, Lochwinnoch:—

THE BATTIL O THE LARGS.

ISLANDIC.

Kakon Konongr la med herinom ollom i Herloveri. Var that allmikit lit ok fritt. Morg hafdi Konongr stor skip ok vel buin.——

Hakon Konongr hafdi a odru hundradi skipa, ok flest stor, ok oll vel-skipat baedi at monnom ok vapnom.——

Efter thetta sigldi Hakon Konongr sudr fyrer Satirismula vid ollom herinom, ok lagdi at vid Hereyarsund.†—

Sidan sigldi Hakon Konongr inn under Kumreyiar ollom herinom.——

Tha sendi Hako Konongr fioratigi Skipa inn i Skipa-Fiord. Var thar

SCOTS.

King Hako lay with his haill airmie at Herlover. It was a very meikil leit,* an a braw. The king had mony big schips an weil boun.

King Hako had ower a hunder schips, an maistly big, an aw weil plenishit baith wi men an wapins.

Efter this king Hako sailit sonth afore the Mull o Kintyre, with aw his fleit, and lay a quhyle in Arran Sound.

Syne King Hako sailit in yont the Cumbras with aw his forces.‡

Then King Hako sent forty schips in Loch Long.§ The commandars o

* This is rather extending the application of the word *leit*; though it seems very allowable, for the army appears to have been a well *selected* one.

† *Herey* is probably a name which was imposed upon Arran by the Norwegians themselves. In their language *ey* signifies an island; and the first part of the name was perhaps adopted from their having repeatedly sheltered their fleet under Arran, for *her* is used for a host generally, whether military or naval.

‡ An account is here given of a negotiation between Hako and the King of Scotland. The islands in the Firth of Clyde were the subject of dispute. The King of Norway claimed a right to these islands; but as Alexander refused to acknowledge that right, the negotiation broke off, and Hako determined to invade Scotland.

§ *Loch Long* in Gaelic signifies the loch of ships. The Icelandic *Skipa-Fiord* is an exact translation of it.

ISLANDIC.

fyrrer Magnús Konungur or Maun ok Dugall Konungur, Aleinn brodir hans, Engus, Myrgadr, Vigleikr Prestson, ok Ivar Holmr. Ok er their komo i fiordin, toko their bata sina ok drogo npp til vatnz eins mikils er heiter Loko-Lofni. Um vatnit utan la eins Jarls riki or Lofnach heitir. Thar er ok mikill fiolthi eyia i thvi vatni, ok vel bygdar. Thessar eyiar eiddo Nordmenn vid elldi. Their brendo ok alla bygdina um-hverfis vatnit, ok gerdo thar it mesta hervirki†

Aleinn brother Dugals Konongs geck miog um thvert Skotland ok drap mangan man. Hann tok morg hundra drot nauta, ok gerdi mikit hervirki.‡

Sidan foro Nordmenn til skips sinna. Their Fengo storm mikin sva at braut nockor skip tio i Skipa firde. Tha tok Ivarr Holmr bratha sott, tha er han leiddi til bana.

Hakon Konungur la i Sudreyiom§

SCOTS.

tham war Magnus king o Man, an king Dugall, Allan his brither, Angus, Margad, Wiglick Preistson, and Ivar Howm. An quhan they cam in the loch, thay tuk thair boats and druggit thaim up till a meikil loch, hat Loch Lomond. Roun that loch on the far syde, lay ane yerlrik,* hat Lennox. Thier war meikil walth of ylands in the loch, an they war weil biggit.† Thae ylands the Norsemen wastit with eldin. An they brent aw the biggins about the loch and garrit grit herschip.

Allan the brither o king Dugall gade far in athort Scotland, an killit mony men. He tuk mony hunder nowt, and garrit meikil herriment.

Syne the Norsemen fure till thair schips. They met wi sae meikil a storm, that it brak to pieces ten schips in Loch Long. Then Ivar Howm tuk a braith illness, quhilk led him till his deid.

King Hako lay in the Hebrides, as

* It is certainly an allowable license to use this as a Scots word, for *rik*, signifying power or dominion, is used both by itself and in the composition of analogous words: thus, *rik*, a kingdom; *kingrik*, the same; *bischoprik*, a bishop's see or dominion.

† It is not probable that the islands in Loch Lomond were well inhabited in ordinary times; but in times of danger the inhabitants of the neighbouring country would resort to them for safety.

‡ The word signifies strictly *sogeoors' wark*; *her* being Islandic for an army, and plunder being anciently considered the appropriate object of military expeditions.

§ *Sudr-eyiar* is the Norwegian name of the Hebrides, compounded of *sudr* southern, and *ey* an island. They were so called to distinguish them from the *Nordr-eyiar* or *Orkneys*, the northern division of the Scottish isles.

ISLANDIC.

sem fyrr var ritat. Michials messa var a laugardag, enn mana-dags nottina efter kom a stormr mikill med elum ok hreggi. Kaulludn their tha er streingvaurd helldo a Konongs skipi ok sogdo at kugg einn rak framman at festom. Lupo tha menn upp; enn stugin a kugginom festi a hofdi Konong-skipsins ok tok af nasarnar. Sidan rak kuggin aftr med bordi, til thes er ackerit tok vid ok festi i strenginom toko tha ackerin at kraka. Konongrinn bad tha hoggva ackeris strengin a kugginom, ok sva gerdo their, rak hann tha ut a eyina: enn Konongs skipit hellz, ok lago tialdlausir til dags. Enn um morgynin er flæddi, flant kuggrinn ok rak inn a Skotland ok langskip eitt. Vindrin tok at vaxr at eins, neytto menn tha grunnfæra thiersa er hofdo, tha var felt it fimta ackeri a Konongs skipi. Enn Konongrinn, for i bat ok reyri ut til eyiarinnar, ok let syngia ser messo. Enn skipin rak inn a sund, ok um dagin æsti stormin, sva at sumir hioggo trein eun suma rak.

SCOTS.

afore was written. Michelmess fell on a Setterday, and on the Monday nicht after ther cam a meikil storm, wi hail and hevvy rain. Thay quha held the stringwart* o the king's schip, callit out that a cog was rackand sicker agane thair fastinin.† The men lap up on deck;—but the taikil o the cog festinit till the king's schip, and tuk aff its nose.‡ Syne the cog rackit away, till the anchor tuk fast be the strings|| o the schip, an harlit the ankers crackand. The king bauld hag awa the anchor-string o the cog; an quhan they had done sae, it rackit out till the sie; but the king's schip held steive, and lay wi the tyals low-sit§ till day. But in the mornin quhan the tyde flowit, the cog floatit, and rackit in upo Scotland, an a lang-schip¶ too. As the wind waxit sturer and sturer, sum o the men gat mae cabils; an a fyft anker was fellit frae the king's schip. But the king fure to the boat, an rowit out to the ylands, an luit sing the mess. The schippin rackit up the sound; and throu the

* The forecastle; called the *streingvaurd* evidently from its being the part of the ship where the cable lies.

† Cable.

‡ Beak.

|| Cables.

§ This is explained *uncovered*, or *without an awning*; it being the *tyals* of the awning which are here meant, as being *lowsit*.

¶ A galley. In this and a few other instances, I employ words which the Scots have perhaps not been accustomed to use for exactly the same purpose. But my object is to render the Icelandic literally, where it can be done; and from the common meaning of the words, the reason of their application will be obvious.

ISLANDIC.

Konongs skipit rak ok inn a sundit, ok voro fyrer tha siau ackeri med thvi er their hofdo a kugginom. Ok hit atta apal ackeri, ok rak egi thvi sidr; litlo sidarr festi ackerin. Nockor fim skip rak in at landi. Sva var thessi stormr mikill, at menn sogdo gerninga valida; ok hofdo menn thar hit mesta vas.

Tha er Skotar su at skipin rak at landi, somnndo their saman ok foro ofan at Nordmonnom ok skuto a tha. Enn their vordoz vel ok leto Kuggin gæta sin; Skotar sotto at stundom, enn iafman fra, fello thar fair menn, enn margir vrdo sarir. Tha sendi Hakon Konongr inn lid a batom nockorom at hialpa theim. Thviat tha lægdi helldr vethrit.

Sidan for Konongr ut a skuto med Thorlaugi Bosa. Thegar sem Konongs menn komo a land, flydo Skotar, enn Nordmenn voro a landi um nottina. Um nottina, for Skotar til skipsins, ok toko burto fe sem their mattó. Um morgynin efter, kom Hakon Konongr a land ok mart folk med honom,

SCOTS.

day the storm flistit sae, that sum veschels haggit thair treein, an sum ran agrun. The king's schip too rackit up the sound, tho they had usit seven ankers, wi that quhilk they gat frae the cog. They drappit an aucht, quhilk was the scheit anker, and still the schip rackit; but a littil efter, the ankers festinit. Fyve schips rackit in upo the land. Sae meikil was this storm, that men said it was raisit be the waldin of warlockrie.

Quhan the Scots saw that the schipping had rackit on the land, thay gatherit thegither, and fur aff to the Norsemen, an attackit thaim. But they wardit weil, and luit the cogs beild thaim. The Scots ettilit at ane attack at tymes; but they fellit few men, tho mony grippit sairs. Then King Hako sent in sum boats wi men, to help thaim; because the wathir was now something lownit.

Syne the king fure out in a skout, alang wi Thorlaug Bosa. As sune as the king's men cam neir the land, the Scots fled; an the Norsemen steyit on land throu the nicht. Wi the cloud o nicht the Scots fure out till the schip, and tuk as meikil spuilie as thay mat. On the morning efter, king Hako cam on land,* and a rein-

* It is worthy of remark, that in the Norwegian narrative, the place where Hako landed, and where the battle was fought, is never named. It is probable that the Largs received its name in consequence of the battle; for the word in Gaelic signifies *fields*, and it was natural to give such a name, by way of eminence, to the place where so memorable a battle was fought: the

ISLANDIC.

let hann tha rydia Kuggin ok flytia
ut til skipa.

Little sidarr sa their her Skota ok hugdo their thar mundi vera Skota Konongr sialfr; thviat herinn var mikill. Ogmundr Krækidanz var a haugi nockorom ok sveit manna vid honom Sotto Skotar at thiem thier sem fyrster foro; enn er megin herinn nalgadiz, bado Nordmenn Hakon Konong fara ut til skipa, ok senda theim lid, ok villdo han egi sva hafa i hættu. Enn hann baudo at vera a landi; enn their villdo thiat egi, ok for hann i bat ut under eyina til lidz sins. Thessir voro lendirmenn a landi, Herra Andres Nicholas son. Ogmundr Krækidanz, Erlingr Alfson, Andres Pottr, Erlendr Raudr, Rognvalldr Urka, Thorlaugr Bosi Pall Sur, Andres Plytr. Thar voro allz manna a land atta hundred eda nio. Voro trau hundrot manna uppi a

SCOTS.

forcement o fowk with him; and then he bauld red the cog, and flit it out till the schips.

A little syder, thay saw the Scots airmie; an thay thocht that the Scots king maun be thair himsell,* because the airmie was meikil. Ogmund Kraekidans was on a certane hicht, an his sute o men with him. The Scots that cam first forat skirmishit wi thaim: but thair main airmie cumand on, the Norsemen bauld King Hako that he wad fare out till the schips, an send thaim help; an thay wissit him to have himsell aback frae wan-chance. But he bauld to stey on land; howsumevir thay wadna heir that; and he fure out in a boat till his pepil, under the ylands. Thae landmen† war on schore; Lord Andro Nickolson, Ogmund Kraekidans, Erling Alfson, Andro Pott, Erland Rand, Ronald Urka, Thorlaug Bosa, Paul Sur, and Andro Plyte. Aw the men

definite article being always joined to the name, is a confirmation of this etymology. The name indeed appears to have been imposed while the remembrance of the event was still fresh; for it occurs in a charter by which Walter the High Steward of Scotland gives the kirk of the Largs to the monks of Paisley, in the year 1328, only 55 years after the battle.

* The Scots historians seem not quite certain whether King Alexander was present or not. The common account is that the army consisted of three divisions; the king himself commanding the men of Perth, Angus, Mearns, and the north; Alexander the High Steward those of Athole, Argyle, Lennox, and Galloway; and Patrick Earl of Dunbar those of Lothian, Fyfe, Stirling, Berwick, and the Merse.

† Barons, or nobles, who held lands of the sovereign.

ISLANDIC.

hauginom hia Augmundi; enn annat lithit stod nidri a maullinni.

Tha droz at Skota her, voro nær fimtan hundrot ridarar. Hestar thierra voro allir bryniadir, ok morg hofdo their Sponsk ess oll fordykt. Skotar hofdo mikin her fotgangandi manna vel buna at vapnom. Mest hofdo their boga ok spaurdor.

Nordmenn their sem a hauginom voro, dreifdoz ofan at sianom, ok villdo egi at Skotar kringdi um tha. Andres Nikolas son kom tha upp a haugin ok bad tha Ogmund leita nid til fiorunnar, ok flaukta egi sem flot-tamann. Skotar sotto at fast med skotum ok grioti. Var tha mikill vappa burdr at Nordmonnom, enn their foro undan a hæli, ok hlifdo ser. Eun er their koino ofan a melin, foro their hardara enn their villdo, hugdo their tha sem i fiorunni voro at hinir villdo flyia. Hliopo their sumir til batanna ok komoz med thvi fra lande, sumir lupu i kuggin. Hinir kaullodo at thier skyldi aftr snua; snero pa aftr nockorir menn ok tho fair. Andres Pottr hliop yfer tva batana ok i hinn thrithia, ok for sva fra landi. Margir batar snkko nidr, ok tyndo nockorir menn. Sumir Nordmenn oko undan a hæli ofan at sianom.

SCOTS.

on land war about aucht or nyne hunder. Twa hunder men war up on the hicht with Ogmund; but the lave stude nethermair on the schore.

The Scots armie now advancit, an ther war neir fyftein hunder rydars. Thair horse war aw breistplatit; an mony had Spenish steids full graithit wi geir. The Scots had a mekil armie o futgangand men weil boun wi wapins. The maist o thaim had bows an speirs.

The Norsemen that war on the hicht drave aff to the sie; for thay wissit na that the Scots soud inring thaim. Andro Nickolson then cam up on the hicht, an baud Ogmund leid neth till the schore, an to flee, but no lyke fleyit men. The Scots assawtit thaim fast wi derts an stans. Ther fell a mekil schour of wapins on the Norsemen; but thay lowpit abeich, and fure awa frae the onding. But quhan thay cam towart the schore, ae quhein fure harder nor anither wad hae thaim; an they that war on the schore thocht thay ahin mintit to flee. Sum lowpit till the boats, an cam aff wi thaim frae land, an sum lap in the cog. They ahin callit efter thaim that war skailand to retour; and sum retourit, tho few. Andro Pott lap ower twa boats, and in the third, and sae fure frae the land. Mony boats sank neth, and some men were tint. Sum Norsemen at last quheilid about an aff to the sie.

ISLANDIC.

Thar fell hirdmadr* Hakonar Konongs Hakon af Steini. Tha hrucko Nordmenn sudr fra Kugginom. Thesir voro thar fyrer, Andres Nicholas son, Ogmundr Krækidanz, Thor-kangr Bosi, Pall Sur. Var thar hardr bardagi† ok tho miog oiaf nigr, thvitat Skotar voro um einn Nordmann. Einn ungr riddari af Skotom er Fergus het ok riki. Hann hafði hialm allan gullroðin, ok settan dyrom steinom; thar efter var aunor harneskia. Hann reid diarfliga at Nordmonnom enn engi annara. Hann reid ok i gegnom fylking Nordmanna ok oft til sinna mann. The var kominn i fylking Skota Andres Nicholas son. Hann mætti theim hinom agiæta ridara ok hio til hans med sverdi a lærit sva at i sundr tok bryniona ok nam i saudlinom stadar. Toko Nordmenn thar af honom agætt balltenum. Tha var hinn hardasti bardagi. Margir fello af hvarom tveggjom, ok tho fleiri af Skotum.

Medan bardaginn var, tha var sva mikill stormr at Hakon Kongr sa egi efni a at koma herinom a land. Enn Raugnvalldr ok Eilifr or Naustadal reyri a bati inn til bardagans ok for alldiarfliga, ok their Nordmenn er a batana hofdo gengit. Rognvalldr

SCOTS.

Heir fell Hako o Steinie, ane o king Hako's househand. Then the Norsemen war drivin south frae the cog. Thae war thair commandars, Andro Nickolson, Ogmund Kraekidans, Thorlang Bosa, and Paul Sur. Ther now happenit a hard faecht, tho very unevinly, because ten Scots war agane ae Norseman. Ther was a jung rydar o the Scots, hat Ferash,‡ an pourfon baith be his nobilitie an his rik. He had a helmet platit wi gowd, an set wi deir stanes; an the lave o his harnassin was siclyke. He rade derfly up to the Norsemen, but nae ither with him. He rade aftin up to the raw o the Norsemen, an back till his ain men. Andro Nickolson had now cum up to the Scots raw. He matchit himsell wi this gentil rydar, an hewit at him wi his sward, on the thie sae, that he sinderit throu the graith, an left a sted in the sadil. The Norsemen tuk his braw belt aff him. Then was the hardest o the battil. Mony fell on baith sydes, tho mae o the Scots.

Quhyle the battil lastit, ther was sae meikle a storm, that king Hako sawna how the armie cond cum on land. But Ronald and Eilif o Naus-tadale, rowit in a boat, in till the battil, and behavit full derfly; an sae did the Norsemen quha had gane in

* *Hirdmadr*, i.e., a man of the *hird*, or *hirsell*.

† Perhaps our word *bardy*, rude and petulant, is allied to this.

‡ Perhaps his name was *Fergus*.

ISLANDIC.

rauck ut aftr till skipsins; enn Eilifr for all kappsamliga. Tok Nordmonnom at safnaz lidet; ok letto Skotar tha undan, uppa haugin. Var tha glettu at soku um hrig med skotom ok grioti; enn er a leid dagin, veitti Nordmenn Skotom at-gaungo uppa haugin diarfuga.

Skotar flydo tha af hauginom hverr sem matti i brot i fioll. Foro Nordmonn tha i batana, ok reyro ut til lidzins, ok komoz naudugliga fyrer stormi. Enn um myrgynia foro their a land efter likom theirra manna sem fallit hofdo. Thessir fello thar Hakon af Steini, Thorgisl Gloppa, hirdmenn Hakonar Konongs. Thar fell godr bondi or Thrandheim, er Karlshofut her, ok annar bondi or Fiordom er Hallkell het. Thar lettost thrir kerti-sveinar, Thorstein Batr, Jon Ballhofut, Hallwardr Buniadr. Ugerla matto Nordmenn vita hvat fell af Skotum thviat their toko hvern er fell ok flutto til Skogar. Hakon Konongr let flytia lik sinna manna till Kirkio.

SCOTS.

thair boats. Ronald was efterwart dryvin out till the schips; but Eiliff behavit full mansumly. The Norsemen tuk to gatherin thair forces, a the Scots gat up on the hicht. Ther was then ydent bickering wi derts an stanes; but quhan the day grew late, the Norsemen facht derfly wi the Scots that had gane up on the hill.

The Scots then fled aff the hicht, to the gate to the fell quha micht. The Norsemen then fure to their boats, an rowit out till thair fleit; an cam luckily afore the storm. The neist mornin thay fure to the land, an gatherit the likes o the men that had fawin. Thae fell thair; Hako o Steinie, an Thorgyle Gloppa, membirs o king Hako's houshaud. Ther fell too a guid vassal frae Drontheim, hat Harls-hoft; an anither vassal frae the Fuir, hat Hawkell. Ther fell also three candil-servands,* Thorstein Batt, John Ballhofut, an Harwart Runyard. Onpossibly mat the Norsemen wit quhat fell o the Scots; because they tuk them that fell, an flittit thaim till the skugs. King Hako luit flit the likes of his men till a kirk.†

* Officers whose charge it was to superintend the lighting of the king's palace.

† The tradition of the battle is still preserved, among the people at the Largs; and the field is still pointed out, a little to the south of the village. There were several cairns upon it; and an upright stone of unbewn granite, ten feet in height; but they have been removed. An immense cairn at the Hailley was found to enclose five stone coffins, containing urns and human bones. There are several local names in the neighbourhood, that are supposed to bear some reference to the battle, such as Camphill, Killincraig, Keppinburn, etc.

ISLANDIC.

Fimta dagin let Konongr taka up ackerin ok flytia skip sitt ut under Kumbrey. Thann dag kom sa her til hans er inn hafdi farit i Skipasford. Enn fostudagin efter var vedr gott, sendi Konongr tha gesti at brenna skip thau er upp hofdo rekit: ok thann sama dag littlo sidarr sigldi Konongr undan Kumrey ut til Melanze-
yar ok la thar neckorar nætor.

Tha let Hakon Konongr flytia lik Ivars Holms inn til Botar ok var hann thar iardadr.

Efter that sigldi Konongr under Melanze, ok la um nott under Hersey; ok thadæ under Sandey, ok sva til Satirismula.

SCOTS.

In fyve days the king luit tak up the ankers, and flit the schips to sit out under Cumbra. That day he saw cumand till him, the fleit qubilk had farit in Loch Long. But the fast day efter the wathir was gude, and then the king sent gests* to bren the schips that had rackit agrun: and that samin day, a littil syder, the king sailit yont Cumbra out till Melansey, an lay thair sum nichts.

Then king Hako luit flit the lik of Ivar Howm in till Bute, and he was thar yirdit.†

Efter that the king sailit frae Melansey, and lay some nichts neir Arran; then he gade by Sandy, an sac till the Mull o Kintyre.

We have quoted enough, we think, to satisfy the most sceptic of the true parentage of the Scottish dialect. The transmutation of Icelandic into Scots, we see, could not have been a difficult process; and of the fact the language bears philological proof. The southern and northern dialects of England, as already remarked, were always different; the latter approaching more to the Norse, as is shown in the conjugation of the verb:—

* Retainers, or persons belonging to his household.

† Several stone coffins, covered with cairns, have been found along the coast of Bute, opposite to Meikil Cumbra, namely, at Mountstewart, Kerry-lamont, and Bruchag. These coffins contained ornamented urns and human bones; and the tradition is, that they were the graves of Norwegians, who fell at the Battle of the Largs.

	South.		North.		Swedish.
Pres.	Ich	hop-e.	I	hop-es.	jag hopp-as.
"	thu	hop-est.	thu	hop-es.	du hopp-as.
"	he	hop-eth.	he	hop-es.	han hopp-as.
"	we	hop-eth.	we	hop-es.	vi hopp-as.
"	ye	hop-eth.	ye	hop-es.	I hopp-as.
"	they	hop-eth.	they	hop-es.	de hopp-as.
Perf.	thu	hoped-est.	thu	hoped-es.	du hoppad-es.
Imp.		hopeth ye.		hop-es ye.	
Infin.	to	hop-en.	to	hop-e.	att hopp-as.

The northern dialect is otherwise more akin to the language of northern Europe in the use of such words as end in *er*, as *wulfer*, a wolf; *hunker*, a haunch; *teamer*, a team; *heather*, heath, etc. The southern dialect assimilates more nearly to the Netherlandish or Low Dutch.

Grammarians say that the Anglo and Dano-Saxon, like the Latin and Greek, often distinguished the cases of its noun, and the conjugations, numbers, and persons of its verb, by a change in the vowel of the final syllable; in the dialect which succeeded, and which has been called the Old English, all these vowels were confounded, and in our modern dialect they have, for the most part, been lost. This change in the termination caused the introduction of auxiliary verbs, as well as other radical changes. This, to a certain extent, may have been true; but from the extract from Bremner it would appear that the Swedish, if ever it had a different inflection, must have undergone a similar change to the English.

Pinkerton is of opinion that the Pictish was not a

written language; but if Anewrin and *Merlinus Cale-*
donius were Picts, and whose writings are accessible to
all acquainted with Welsh Archæology, it was a written
language in early times. Indeed it is difficult to believe
that a nation so superior as to be the only people in the
country acquainted with building in stone—who had,
unquestionably from their Norwegian ancestors, a know-
ledge of Runic characters, were otherwise intelligent,
and had, from both races of their progenitors, bards and
skalds to sing and record their transactions—were alto-
gether without literature. The Pictish, after it had *fer-*
mented into what is now the Scottish vernacular, no
doubt prevailed amongst the people, and was the common
medium of expression for their joys and sorrows, their
songs and lamentations; but, like the Saxon after the
Norman conquest, it was excluded alike from the court
and the church by the Gaelic of the Scots, until the ad-
vent of Edgar to the crown in 1098, when Norman-
French (not the Saxon) was substituted for the Gaelic.
The same cause which retarded Saxon or English litera-
ture in England, may also have had an influence, though
of less effect, on that of Scotland. ‘In 1067,’ says Pin-
kerton, ‘the Normans conquered England; but the
Saxon language remained almost pure till the reign of
Stephen, when the Saxon Chronicle was written, about
1150. Nay, a charter of Henry I., about 1130, seems
pure Saxon. The *Ormulum*, which I take to have been

written in the reign of John, about the year 1200, is Saxon fermenting into English; and the very first English piece seems *The Geste of King Horn*, written perhaps about 1250. Robert of Gloucester wrote in or near the year 1278, as appears from his work. Robert of Brunne finished his Chronicle in 1338, as is evident from a MS. colophon given by Hearne; and it is surprising what a difference of language there is between him and Robert of Gloucester, though only sixty years intervened. . . . Brunne being born at Malton, in Yorkshire, his language is also very northern. It is proper to observe that this deduction might have been more complete, had not the chief of English poets written solely in French from the Conquest (1067), till Chaucer began to write his best pieces, or about 1366, being three centuries.' In Scotland, as in England, French was for an equal period the language of the polite, and Latin of the learned. The coin in the reign of William the Lion bears a French inscription; and Alexander III., in 1249, as Pinkerton observes, took his coronation oath in Latin and French. Hence 'the poor bards who entertained the mob might recite ballads and short romances in the vulgar tongue; but the minstrels who appeared in the king's or in the baron's hall, would use French only, as in England.'*

* Sir Walter Scott entertained the opinion that the Saxon was the language of the Scottish Court from and after the reign of Malcolm Caenmore; and Chalmers, quoting Verstegan to show that the Gaelic was the prevailing

Notwithstanding this drawback, the vulgar tongue and the bardic literature of the people must have made considerable progress, seeing that the few specimens already quoted of the thirteenth century are so superior. We quite agree with Pinkerton in thinking, that 'the music of these Pictish and Scoto-Pictish songs and ballads, perhaps presented early specimens of that exquisite expression and simple melody now so deservedly admired in Scottish music. The ancient Scandinavian music remains, I believe, very obscure;* so of the Pictish nothing can be said; nor, indeed, of that of the Scoto-Pictish era of our language, which extends from the ninth to the thirteenth century.' We agree also with Pinkerton in thinking that the Scandinavian poetry bequeathed to the Scottish a peculiar wildness, which, in the ballad form, is so productive of effect.

That the Scottish dialect and literature, however, is not wholly indebted to the Gothic, may be inferred from the fact of the great body of the people, ancient Picts and Britons, being Celtic. Even Pinkerton unwittingly

language down to that period, adds something like a corroboration of the fact. Verstegan's statement, however, in reference to the Saxon must be taken with caution. In so far as it was the language of the Queen, it might temporarily prevail; but there can be little doubt that on the subsequent influx of Norman adventurers, who were warmly received by the successors of Malcolm, Norman-French became the fashionable speech both of the court and nobility.

* The Scandinavian scale and the Scottish are very similar. The music peculiar to Cumberland was unknown throughout the rest of England.

admits this. Speaking of king Arthur, he says:—‘Certain it is that the south parts of Scotland were full of Arthur’s fame, nor is he better known to the bards of Wales or of Bretagne. Almost the whole old English metrical romances are written in the north of England or south of Scotland, and in the northern dialect. They unanimously place Arthur’s court at Carlisle, which seems to have been the fact, for no French romances put Charlemagne’s court but at Paris. Froisart, in speaking of Carlisle, always adds in *Wales*. Perhaps the Britons in Arthur’s time were under one sovereign; after him we find kings of many divisions of the Britons. It shall only be added on this head, that the very first important piece of Scottish poetry we hear of, namely, the Romance of *Sir Tristrem*, by the celebrated Thomas Lermont, the rhymers of Ercildoun, was founded on *British poetry*; Tristrem being one of Arthur’s knights. This poem, so highly celebrated at the time, was written about 1270, but seems now to be unfortunately lost.* However, innumerable passages of early Scottish poetry yet remaining, are *strongly tinged with British tradition*.†

* An edition of *Sir Tristrem* was edited by Sir Walter Scott from the Auchinleck ms., in 1804. He surmises that the poem was composed about 1250. As Thomas of Ercildoun was in the zenith of his reputation at the death of Alexander III., in 1286, it has been supposed that he was the author of the lines on the death of that monarch, already quoted.

† Motherwell, in his ‘*Minstrelsy: Ancient and Modern*,’ says—‘Indeed, the most of our old ballads appear to have been equally well known on the south as on the north of the Tweed; but in the Scottish ballads there never

This is precisely what we contend for, (but elsewhere virulently opposed by Pinkerton,) that the Picts were *originally British*, but became greatly mixed by successive arrivals of Northmen—hence the blending of both characteristics in the poetry, music, and language, in the Scots.

The north of England was peopled chiefly by Danes, and, as suggested by the learned editor of the *Romance of Sir Tristrem*, the southern province of Scotland and the northern of England, which were long under the Scottish Crown, may be regarded as the common source from whence emanated much of the romance of the middle ages.*

occurs any mention of "Harpers of the North Countrie," which silence, taken in conjunction with the admission of the English ballads, may be twisted into something like proof that Scotland was looked on as the accredited source of minstrel song. We know her poets did not scruple to acknowledge their obligations to Chaucer, as "flour of rethoris al," and even "Dan Lydgate" came in for a share of their approbation, along with "moral Gower;" and had her minstrels owed anything to their brethren of the south, that debt, no doubt, would also have been gratefully remembered.'

Robert de Brunne testifies the fact, that the northern romances were written in *English*, the southern in French, and that the minstrels marred them so much in the reciting that the plebeian audiences could not comprehend them. He says—

‘I made noght for no disours,
Ne for no seggours, no harpours,
But for the luf of symple men,
That strange Englis cannot ken.’

The northern English was thus *different* from the southern.

* Mr Jamieson, in his Northern Ballads, observes, 'There may be remarked in all the Scottish and Danish traditionary ballads, a frequent and almost

In thus bringing our deductions down to the close of the thirteenth century, we have only to remark that, during the golden age of Scotland, which ceased with the reign of Alexander III., music, and, of course, poetry and song, were highly cultivated. Aelred, who died in 1166, shows this, though he speaks in derisive terms of the musical extravagance—both instrumental and vocal—of the times. Simon Taylor, a Scottish Dominican friar, became the leader of the science, in the following century, (about 1210,) and, according to Newton, brought Scottish church music to vie with that of Rome itself.*

The war of independence, and the civil broils which followed the death of Robert the Bruce, tended greatly to retard the progress of literature, as well as of everything else; yet the few productions traceable to the fourteenth century are quite equal, if not superior, to anything of the same era producible on the southern side of the border. Take the following verse from a ballad against the Scots, written upon the execution of Sir Simon Fraser, 1306:—

unvaried recurrence of certain terms, epithets, metaphors, and phrases, which have obtained general currency, and seem peculiarly dedicated to this kind of composition. The same ideas, actions, and circumstances are almost uniformly expressed in the same form of words; and whole lines, and even stanzas, are so hackneyed among the reciters of popular ditties, that it is impossible to give them their due approbation, and to say to which they belonged.

* Pinkerton.

‘Lystneth, lordynges ; a newe song ichulle bigynne,
 Of the traytours of Scotland, that take beth wyth gynne :
 Mon that loveth falsenesse, and nule never blynne.*
 Sore may him drede the lyf that he is ynne,

Ich understonde :

Selde wes he glad

That nevir nes asad

Of nyth ant of vnde.†

To warny alle the gentilmen that bueth in Scotlonde,
 The Waleis wes to drawe, seththe he wes an honge,
 Al quic beheveded, ys bowels ybrend,
 The heved to Londone-brugge wes send,
 To abyde.

After Simond Frysel,

That wes traytour ant fykel,

Ant yeud ful wyde.’

This is a genuine specimen of the Saxon *fermenting* into English.

The following is a fragment of a Scottish song written on the battle of Bannockburn, 1314 :—

‘Madinis of England soir may ye murne
 Foir your lemmons ye haif lost at Bannockburn
 With Hevaloch !
 What ! weind the kyng of England
 So sone to haif wone all Scotlande ?
 With Rummiloch !

There is much less of the Saxon idiom in this, and more poetry, though only a few years later. In short, there seems every reason to believe that the Scottish

* Cease.

† Malice and fury.

vernacular had made greater progress towards purity of style and poetic elegance than its sister dialect of England prior to, or even including the age of Chaucer, who is universally admitted to be the father of the English language. From the scraps of Scottish song alluded to by Barbour, James I., and Gawin Douglas, such as—

‘ There sall be mirth at our meeting yit.’

‘ The schip salis over the salt fame
Will bring their merchands, and my leman hame.’

And—

‘ I will be blyith and licht ;
My hart is lent apoun sa gudly wicht.’

It is evident that poetry had been cultivated in the Scottish dialect for ages previously, and that the language had a source wholly irrespective of the intercourse with England ; otherwise all improvement in it, in fact all our early Gothic literature, must have flowed from the south. Wyntoun records one of the earliest adventures of Sir William Wallace, which still lives as a ballad, commencing—

‘ Wallace in the high highlans,
Neither meat nor drink got he,
Said fa’ me life, or fa’ me death,
Now to some town I maun be,’ etc.

And he adds—

‘Of his gud dedis, and manheid
Gret gestis, I heard say, ar made;
But sa mony, I trow nowcht,
As he until hys dayis wroucht.’

Motherwell supposes that ‘the industry of Henry the minstrel has absorbed the greater number of these *gestis* of the patriot, in the same way that Barbour has appropriated those of Bruce.

In ‘The Complaynt of Scotland,’ published, it is believed, in 1549, mention is made, amongst numerous particular ‘tayills,’ of the ‘sweet melodious sangis of natural music of the antiquitie,’ thus showing that even then there existed a lyrical literature of unknown origin. Hutcheon of the Awle Royal was probably contemporary with Thomas of Ercildoun; and ‘besides Sir Tristrem,’ as Sir Walter Scott remarks, ‘there still exist at least two Scottish romances, which, in all probability, were composed long before the conclusion of the thirteenth century. These are entitled *Gawan and Gologras*, and *Galoran of Galoway*.’ They contain many allusions to the British tribes in Scotland, a proof of their antiquity. As Sir Walter farther remarks, to this list might be added the *History of Sir Edgar and Sir Grime*. Only a modernized copy of this tale exists, yet the language is unquestionably Scottish, and the scene is laid in Carrick, in Ayrshire. As Pinkerton remarks, ‘Thomas of Ercil-

doun * (1250) composed before Chaucer; and even Barbour, who wrote in 1375, knew nothing of him—Chaucer's works not becoming popular in Scotland till the following century: and where shall we find, of the same age, either more beautiful language or better poetry than the historian of Bruce has bequeathed us in the lines to Freedom, so often quoted:—

‘ O how Freedom is a nobil thyng !
 For it maks men to haif lyking.
 Freedom all solace to men givis :
 He lives at eis that frelie livis.
 A nobil hart may haf na eis,
 Nor nocht als that may it pleis,
 If Freedom fale. For fre lyving,
 Is yarnit abone uther thyng.
 O he quha hes ay livit fre
 May nocht knaw weil the properte,
 The aungir, nor the wretchit dome,
 That is couplit to thirldom !
 Bot gif he had assayit it,
 Then all perqueir he micht it wit ;
 And suld think Freedom mair to pryse
 That al the gold men culd devyse.’

‘ When Barbour wrote,’ says Motherwell, ‘ ballads relative to this period appear to have been common; for the poet, in speaking of certain ‘Thre worthi poyntis of wer,’ omits the particulars of the ‘Thrid which fell into

* As the language in which the Romance of Sir Tristrem has come down to us may have undergone considerable change in the transcription, and otherwise, we cannot with propriety quote from it as illustrative of our subject at any particular period.

Esdaill,' being a victory gained by 'Schyr Johne the Soullis' over 'Schyr Andrew Hardclay,' for this reason,

'I will nocht rehers the maner,
For wha sa likes thai may her,
Young women quhan thai will play,
Syng it amang thaim ilk day.'

Barbour was followed by Andro Wyntoun, about 1410, and by James I. in 1420, whose 'Chrystis Kirk on the Grene,' 'Peblis to the Play,' etc., are certainly equal to anything written by Chaucer.

It would be easy to multiply examples of the difference in language and style between the early literature of England and Scotland—a distinction which, to a considerable extent, disappears at a later period, at least amongst the more learned of our poets. Though Dunbar* and Kennedy wrote with a fine sprinkling of the vernacular in their more humorous pieces, yet they display a greater approach to a standard common to the learned of both countries. To such an extent was the introduction of new phrases carried, that honest Gawin Douglas, as early as 1496, seriously entered his protest against the new-fangled system, and declared his inten-

* Dunbar, who had travelled and sojourned in England, showed great veneration for Chaucer:

'O reverend Chaucer, rose of rethoris al,
As in oure tongue ane flour imperial
That raise in Brittane evir,' etc.

tion to use the pure Scottish idiom, in so far as his knowledge of it would enable him. In the preface to the translation of Virgil, he says—

‘ I set my besy pane
(As that I couth) to mak it brade and plane,
Kepand no *Sodroun*, but *oure ain langage*,’ etc.

A recent writer in the *Times*, alluding to this subject, twits the ‘patriotic dignitary of Dunkeld’ with his want of success in ‘kepand no Sodroun;’ but he forgets the apology of the poet in reference to his short-coming in this respect:—

‘ Not that our tounge is in the seluin skapt,
But for that I the fourth of language want.’

Douglas had himself been brought up at Court, where French so long prevailed, and where the English of Chaucer—greatly mixed with Norman French—had become fashionable. He was, therefore, from his education, deficient in his command of the mother tongue. It is evidently to this circumstance he alludes in admitting that he lacks ‘the fourth of language.’

This protest of Douglas is worthy of remark, as showing that in his day the difference between the dialects of England and Scotland was of a very decided character, a difference which gradually became less as education*

* Many of the learned Scotsmen of the fifteenth century were educated at the English Universities.

and intercourse between the learned of both countries increased. Yet it would appear from the records of Ayr, and the fact has not been sufficiently noticed, that the *Scots* language was taught in the schools down to the period of the Union. 'In 1695, it was enacted by the magistrates that "all persons shall be prohibited from keeping a common school—reading, writing, and arithmetic—except George Adamson, teacher of the *Scots* school."'* For the preservation of the vernacular as a medium of national literature much is attributed to our minstrels; but if they deserve the credit generally accorded to them, they must have been of a very different race from those of England. As Ritson observes, there is no evidence that ever such an order of men existed in England as the minstrels described by Percy, 'who united the arts of poetry and music, and sung verses to the harp of their own composing.' The minstrels of the middle ages were chiefly Norman troubadours, who chaunted their ballads in French. The minstrels mentioned in English Acts of Parliament, and other documents, appear to have been simply musicians, trumpeters, fiddlers, etc. Motherwell claims a higher standing for the minstrels of Scotland, and he refers to the sumptuary laws in the time of James III. (A.D. 1471), to show that 'they were classed along with "knychtis and heraldis," and with such as could spend "a hun-

* Hist. of Ayrshire, vol. i., p. 195.

dretht pounds wortht of landis rent.”’ But the statute is not very clear, and it may be questioned whether minstrel and herald were not synonymous terms: ‘Item, it is statut and ordanit in present parlyament, that considering the gret powerte of the Realme, the gret expensses and cost mad apoun the brynging of silkis in the Realme, that thar for na man sal weir silkis in tyme cummyng, in gown, doublate, and clokis, except knyghtis, *menstrallis*, and *herraldis*, without that the werar of the samyn may spend a hundreht pundis wortht of landis rent, under the payn of amerciament to the king of x lib. als oft as thai ar fundyn, and eschetin of the samyn, to be gevyn to the *herraldis* or *menstrallis*, except the clathis that ar mad befor this parlyament,’ etc. The term ‘*herraldis or menstrallis*,’ here used, would seem to imply that, if not identical, they were at least similar in profession. Nor is he more successful in his reference to ‘the time of James the Sixth, in which a number of sapient acts are passed, and amongst the fierce enactments against the whole class of maisterfull and ydill beggaris, sornaris, fulis, bairdis, etc., there is an express provision in favour of the minstrels of great lords and the minstrels of towns.’ The words of the act are—‘all *menstralis*, *sangstaris*, and *taill tellaris* not avowit in special service be sum of the lordis of parliament or greit barronis, or be the heid burrowis and cities, for thair common *menstralis*.’ These minstrels of great lords

and of towns were simply musicians. In 1586, for example, the Town Council of Ayr enact 'that the common minstrels of the town, pyper and drummer, gang dayly ilk day through the toun, evening and morning, and gif they failzie, they to ressav na meit that day they gang not; sua being that they be not starved be the intemperateness of the weddir.*

Motherwell himself admits that Blind Harry is the only one who can be referred to as coming up to the notion we are led to form of the ancient minstrel. 'He chaunted his heroic strains before the princes and the nobles of the land.' But this statement rests alone on the authority of Major. At the same time, there cannot be a doubt that minstrels—whether they chaunted their own compositions or not is of little consequence—did exist. This is proved by the Romance of Sir Tristrem itself, as well as by Robert de Brunne, who declares that he made his translations neither for 'seggours no *harpours*,' but for the love of simple men.

The French minstrels of the middle ages, who frequented the courts and halls of the barons, were therefore of little advantage to English or Scottish literature, unless through the medium of translation; and it is well known that Chaucer translated many of these romances for the use of the English ballad-singer, who seems to have held a similar rank with our *sangstaris* in later

* Hist. of Ayrshire, vol. i., p. 190.

times. Amongst the Celts, the bard was a person of considerable importance; but in the Lowlands of Scotland he seems to have lost caste at a pretty early period. It is nevertheless to these bards that we owe the popular taste for ballad literature.

As already remarked, a close amalgamation of the Scottish and English dialects began amongst the learned, who were chiefly educated at the same seminaries, as early as the time of Dunbar, which continued to increase as the intercourse of the two countries became more intimate, till the union of the Crowns, and latterly of the Parliaments, rendered the amalgamation closer, and the adoption of one standard unavoidable. But, notwithstanding this apparent sameness in the written language of the two kingdoms during the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, there was nevertheless a broad and deep under current of a distinct vernacular, which maintained its ground in numerous lyrics and rhymes amongst the people, and which has been revived with unexampled pathos and effect by Ramsay, Fergusson, and Burns. Nothing can illustrate the peculiar character of the Scottish language more than the writings of the three poets just mentioned. Had the Scottish not been, not only a living, but a well-understood language, both by peer and peasant, in Scotland, and a highly poetic language to boot, their works would never have reached the high and indestructible reputation to which they have attained.

From the historical facts and specimens of early literature produced, it is apparent that the Scottish language has its source chiefly in the Norwegian branch of the Teutonic. It is especially Swedish in its construction—from which the Anglo-Saxon is also evidently borrowed. But it differs from the English, even of Chaucer, in so far that it is more Northern, as well as more Celtic, in its radical words. Much of the ancient British, or Pictish, is mixed with it—that people and that language upon which the Norwegian was superinduced, and which unquestionably existed both north and south long after the fall of the Pictish and Strathclyde kingdoms. Even the English language, as it now prevails, has been calculated to contain about an equal number of Saxon and Celtic words, with an infusion of French, Latin, Greek, Italian, etc.; and Chalmers instances numerous words in the vernacular of Scotland as decidedly British—such as *cummér*, a godmother, from the British *commaer*; *claver*, from *clebar*; *kebar*, from *ceber*; *mammy*, from *mam*, etc. There are also a vast number from the Gaelic. Our lexicographers, such as Johnson in English, and Jamieson in Scottish, have not done justice either to the ancient British or to the Gaelic, chiefly, we believe, from a want of knowledge of these languages. Besides, Jamieson had a theory to support, viz., that the Picts were *wholly* Scandinavian; and of course he felt anxious to trace the primary words to a Teutonic-Norwegian root. There

can be no doubt, however, that he might have found the etymology of numerous words, which he has either left unexplained, or traced, by a strained effort, to the Gothic, at hand in the British or Gaelic. Take, for example, a few illustrations in the letter *g*:—*Girran*, a small boil or pimple, is from the Gaelic, *guirean*, signifying the same thing; *gabber*, a talker, from *gabair*;* *gad*, a goad, from *gad*, a withe; *gair*, keen, covetous, from *gair*, nearness; *girnall*, a large chest, from *gairneal*; *galnes*, satisfaction for slaughter, from *galmas* or *galnas*, etc. In short, any one, by comparing a few pages of a Gaelic and a Scottish dictionary, may convince himself of the fact we have stated, that the Scottish dialect is replete with radical Celtic words, and is, in short, a compound of the Celtic and Teutonic—the latter predominating, chiefly in consequence of the intercourse with England, and the general use of the English language.

In the first volume of 'The Transactions of the Society of Antiquaries of Scotland,' there is a 'Dissertation on the Scoto-Saxon Dialect,' by the learned Dr Geddes, in which its peculiar qualities are illustrated in a philosophical manner. Although differing with the writer in some respects as to the origin of the language, we entirely agree with him in his estimate of its character. Alluding to the modification of the Greek and Latin

* This word was in use amongst the Gauls.

tongues, by the use of *diminutives* and *augmentatives*, he says:—

‘Hence it is that the Italians, not without reason, boast of their language as being the most copious and expressive of modern tongues, and are wont to give as an instance the word *capello*; from which they have the diminutives *capelletto*, *capellino*, *capelluccio*, of which the last two express *prettiness* likewise, and the augmentatives *capellone*, *capellaccio*, of which the last brings also the idea of *ugliness*.

But the Scots seems to be richer, at least in diminutives, than the Italian, and to equal the Greek itself. For the word equivalent to *capello* may be diminutively modified after all the following manners:—*Hat*, *hatty*, *hattik*, *hattiky*, *hattikin*;* nor are these used indiscriminately, any more than *capelletto* and *capellino*.

Nor were the Scots entirely without augmentatives. These were formed by adding *um* to adjectives and *o* to substantives; as *greatum*, *goodum*, *heado*, *mano*. It is true they are both become obsolete; yet it is not many years ago since I heard a farmer’s wife laughing heartily at her neighbour for calling a horse of a middle size a *horsie*! ‘He is more like a *horso*,’ said she.

‘It has been remarked by grammarians, that the Latins, in order to make their common diminutives still

* So corresponding to the Greek examples—*Man*, *manny*, *mannik*, *maniky*, and *mannikin*; *lass*, *lassy*, *lassik*, *lassiky*, and *lassikin*.

more diminutive, sometimes prefixed the words *parvus*, *minutus*, etc., as *parva*, *munuscula*, *minutae interrogatunculae*. So the Scots, a *little manikin*, a *wee wifkin*, and a *wee-wee babiky*, etc.

‘With regard to the variety of compounds, both English and Scots are greatly defective, compared with some other languages; but the former, I think, is more so than the latter. When I speak of compounds, I mean not here such as we have adopted from the Greek and Latin, as *philosophy*, *mathematics*, *consecration*, *concurrence*, etc.; but such as are made up of two or more Saxon terms, whether separable or inseparable, as *man servant*, *maid servant*, *stone-cutter*, *heedless*, *childish*, *untoward*, *godlike*, *unjustly*, *loathsome*, etc. In all these and similar combinations, the Scots is equally rich with the English, and has in some of them a variety of forms unknown to the English. Thus we use either *ty* or *tith*, as *poverty* and *poortith*, *rarety* and *raretith*; *dom* or *rik*, as *kingdom* and *kingrik*; *ly* or *sum*, as *ugly* or *ugsum*; *un* or *wan*, as *unlucky*, *wanchancy*, *unhappy*, *wanwierdy*. And this last mentioned particle is used not only with adjectives, but also with substantives; as *wan-rest*, *wan-hope*, *wanworth*, *wan-thrift*, *wan-heil*, *wan-thank*,* etc.

‘Of inflexion there is nearly the same (that is very little) variety in both Scots and English. Here we

* We have still some vestiges of this sort of combination in English; as *untruth*, *unrest*.

equally feel our wants; and the more so, as there is little hope of their ever being supplied. How our forefathers could abandon the principles of Saxon grammar to adopt those of one so inferior to it, is certainly matter of astonishment; but so it is. I am inclined to believe that the authority of Chaucer contributed not a little towards completing this revolution in English literature; for in Wiclef, who preceded him but a few years, we find many traces of pure Saxonism. Some of these the first Scottish writers retained; and many more of them, not half a century ago, were employed in common speech. On the whole, the inflexions of Scottish grammar were more varied and less anomalous than those of English grammar, as any one may convince himself by reading Douglas's Virgil, or the admirable Catechism of Archbishop Hamilton.

‘The superior ENERGY of a language (independent of peculiarity of style) seems to consist in this, that it can express the same sentiments in fewer words and with fewer symbols than any other; and this, I apprehend, is the just boast of the English. Our numerous monosyllables, rough, rigid, and inflexible as our oaks, are capable of supporting any burthen; whilst the polysyllables of our southern neighbours, ~~stall~~ tall, smooth, and slender, like the Lombardy poplar, bend under the smallest weight. From this, no doubt, arises the confessed superiority of our poetry; especially of the higher kinds, the *epic* and

tragic. This also gives a peculiar strength to our apophthems, and to every sort of composition where strength is a chief ingredient.

‘It would be ridiculous to attempt a general comparison between the Scottish and English poetry : it would be comparing a small grove to an immense forest : yet in those kinds of poetry which the bards of Scotland chiefly cultivated, the historical, allegorical, and satirical *tale*, and the tragic and comic *ballad*, I would engage to pick out of the few of their compositions that remain, several pieces in every respect equal, in energy far superior, to any contemporary English production. Nay, I know not if, in any language whatever, a more energetic composition can be produced than the well-known ballad of Hardyknute. It consists almost entirely of radical words. In 776 lines there are not above ten trisyllables, and four of these are proper names.*

‘Although *harmony* and *energy* be not altogether incompatible, it is certain that they are never found in the same proportion in the same language. Muscular strength and lovely symmetry are rarely conjoined : Adonis is not a Hercules, nor Venus a Thalestris. The languages allowed to be the most harmonious are the Greek and Italian ; and the nearer any other approaches

* I am well aware that Hardyknute is a modern production ; but it is so perfect an imitation of the best Scottish composition, that it may fairly serve as an example of their excellence.

to their genius, the more harmonious it is accounted. In this scale of estimation, the English, like all other northern dialects, is far from being high. Its hissing sounds, its clusters of uncoalescing consonants, the little variety of its inflexions, and the paucity of its polysyllables, are all against its harmony; and it requires much art and labour in the arrangement of words and sentences to make it in any degree melodious.

‘If it now be asked whether of the two dialects, the Scoto-Saxon or the Anglo-Saxon, I think the least unharmonious, I readily give my suffrage, such as it is, in favour of the former.’

The reasons for this opinion Dr Geddes gives at some length. Suffice it to say, he finds fewer hissing sounds, less harsh combinations, while ‘even the vowel sounds that predominate in the Scottish dialect, are of themselves more harmonious than those which are the most prevalent in English.’

The only drawback to this general commendation is to be found in the guttural *ch*, which, as Dr Geddes remarks, ‘must be highly disagreeable to an English, French, or Italian ear:’ yet it prevails in all the other Teutonic languages, and is considered by the Germans, Swedes, Danes, and Dutch, as having nothing harsh in it. It may even ‘become a beauty in the hand of a skilful orator.’

Thus it would appear from philological demonstration,

Univ Calif - Digitized by Microsoft®

that the Scottish language is not deficient in any of those requisites which constitute, as Dr Geddes says, perfection in a language—*richness, energy, and harmony*. If we had ever entertained any doubts upon the subject, it would have been in reference to the *energy* of the Scottish. The example cited, however, by Dr Geddes (Hardyknute) is a satisfactory evidence of the force of the language.

The Doctor himself has supplied one or two imitations of ancient Scottish, in which, by a studied and scholar-like attention to the peculiar sound of the letters and the idiom of the language, he has succeeded in demonstrating how nearly it approaches to the original Icelandic, from which it is derived.* The extract is somewhat lengthy, but it cannot fail to prove interesting to the reader:—

THE FIRST EKLOG OF VIRGIL.

TRANSLATIT INTO SKOTTIS VERSE.

Melebèus.

HUYL wè fre nâti' fèlds an' dèrest hèm
 Ar fors't to flè, in forran klyms to rèm ;
 Thù raxt at èz, aniou the shâdan bûs
 O that brâd bèch, meist wù the silvan mùs
 An' tèch the wu'ds, responsif to thy leis
 To ekho bak fâr Amarillis' preis.

* The Doctor, at the same time, indulged in the belief that it was derived from the Anglo-Saxon.

Titirus.

A God he was, my frènd!—At lèst to mè
 The god-lyk mán a god sál ivir bè,
 Hua gâ' this invy'd blis: héns aft, as dû,
 My fáttist lám's his áltar sál imbû.
 He bàd my bèvs, as huylom frè to fèd;
 Mè as Y list, to tûn my rustik rèd.

Melebèus.

Thy lot and luk, in thir unlukki deis,
 Myn admìrâshon, not myn invy reis:
 Sith ál árùn' huárè'r Y turn myn é
 Nokht but distrubil in the lând Y sè.
 Lo! hèr; thir gòts wì mikil pyn Y dryv;
 And en, that en, Y drèkhli drág alyv!
 Shè, mang the bizils, kidan' on a rok,
 Ther léft hir tuins, the hòp of à' my flok.
 Ah! gin sum glàmor had ne blèr't ùr èn,
 Láng syn this ìvil mokht wè hà' forsèn,
 Hù áft the blástit ák an' bòdan krà
 Tald us, misfortun was ne fár awà.
 But Tit'rus! sei, gif it bè fár to spèr,
 Huat fáv'ran' God hè is, hua kèps thè hèr.

Titirus.

O Melebèus! 'or y ged to Rèm,
 Y thokht that cèti lyk ùr ân at hèm;
 To huilk, nû sivr't fre their blètan' dâms,
 Wè shephirds dryv, on márkat-deis ùr lams.
 Huat fûl was Y? For Rèm as fár exèds
 All uther tûns, as firs our-táp the rèds.

Melebèus.

But, sei, to Rèm huat motif mād thè hy?

Titirus.

The bést of motifs, frènd ! Fâr liberty ;
 Huilk, tho' but short-sin-syn shè on mè dàn'd
 And ne till èld had with his hòri hand
 Bespren't my témpils an' my chin wi' grei ;
 Yit dàn'd at lást, an' ápin't into dei :
 Sin (Gálátèa bânis't fre my brest)
 Suèt Amárillis à' my sàl posses't.
 For Y confés, to ny it wér in vein,
 Huy! Gálátèa held mè in hir trhein,
 Y nouthèr lûk't for liberti ; nor kâr't
 Hù wi' mysel' or wi' my floks it fâr't.
 Tho' fùth of fátlin's áften wér sént dùn,
 An' wâl o' kebbaks to th' ungrâtfu' tùn ;
 Th' ungrâtfu' tùn but ill repeid my kâr ;
 My pùrs kám rârli lâdin fre the fâr.

Melebèus.

Y wundir't huat mād Amàrillis kry
 To à the gods that wun abùn the sky :
 Huy on the très unpù'd hir âpils háng,
 And huy shè ne mer ply'd the mirri sáng.
 Tít'rus was ábsint—Ilike shrub an' trè
 An' brük an' funtin, Tít'rus ! murn't for thè.

Titirus.

Huat su'd Y dù ? Nen uthèr mèn Y sà
 To kèp drèd thráldom's hivi curs awà.
 Nor ku'd Y hòp in oni uthir huèr
 To mèt wi' gods se bontiful as thèr.
 Thèr Melebèus ! thèr my lánган' èn
 First sà the Ghùth, belén't us frem abèn,
 To huam tuél tims ùr áltars ilken ghèr
 Wi' grâtfu' viktims rèkan' sál apèr.
 'Twas fre his lips Y hèr'd thir wurds divyn :
 'Suáins ! fèd ghùr floks (hè sád) as àld-lang-syn.'

Melebeüs.

Háppi ald mán! An' se thy fêlds remân
 Thyn á'n poséshon? ilke thing thyn á'n!
 Enûkh, Y wát, for thy conténtit mynd:
 For tho' but bår an' bárran, in its kynd;
 Tho' stêns invád the hikhts, an' ségs the plân,
 Yet still, ò plèsant thokht! 'tis à' thyn á'n.
 Thy prègnant ious ne frémit girs sál rot,
 Ne murrin tânt thém fre a frémit kot.
 Háppi ald mán! lièr, mid thy nâti' burns
 An' funtins bublan fre thér sákred urns,
 Anion the shâd of òdor-brethan' trës
 Thù sitst an' kàtchist the refréshan' brèz:
 Huyl, áft ghon òsier'hédj (whà's árli flùrs
 The human' bè with égernis devùrs)
 Sál with its gentil suzurâshons stèp
 Thy klosand èn in blist an' bàmi slèp:
 On t'uthir syd, the prùnirs rustick sáng
 The bàmi slèp sál plèsantli proláng:
 Nor sál the turtíl or the kushi-dù,
 (Ghùr kâr) refûs their lù-lorn nòts to ghù.

Tìtirus.

An' thèrèfor, sùner sál the bunsan' dèr
 Fèd in the ár, an' fish on land appèr;
 Sùner sál Párthians o' the Arár drink
 An' Gérman Goths inhábit Tìgris' brink;
 (Beth wullan' éxyls fre the spot thei luv't)
 'Or fre my brest his ìmaj bè remuv't.

Melebeüs.

Bat wè mun pas thro' tráks unkent befòr,
 To Scytia's frézand, Afrik's burnan' shor;
 To huèr Oáxis rous his rápid tyd;
 An' Brìtan klist fre à' the wárl'd besyd.

Ah! sál Y nivir, in the kùrs o' tym,
 Ens mèr revìsit this my náti' klym?
 Ens mèr wi' joiful an' wi' wundran' èn
 Behàd my humbil kot beturft wi' grèn.
 An' reinstatit in myn àld domân,
 Be lãrd of à' the tenement agân.
 Or sál sum sòjer or sum sòjer's boi,
 My wèl-fakht rigs for ivir-mèr injoi?
 A vyl bárbarian rep my goudin fèlds?
 Sè! cìizens, huát cìvil discord ghèlds!
 Gáng, nù, an' plánt, inòkulat an' gráff,
 An' prùn ghùr vyns, that frémit fouk mei quáff!
 Awà! my gòts! short-syn en háppi flok,
 Ne mèr (huy! péndan' fre the tuftit rok
 Ghe kráp the téndir àromátick flùr)
 Sàl Y, reklynand in sum shádoi bùr,
 Be hàd ghù brûzan'—ne mèr, huy! ghe brûz,
 Attùn my pyp to the inspìran' Mûs.

Titirus.

Yit hèr, at lèst this nikht, unháppi suân!
 In this wèl-shádit bùr wi' mè remân.
 A rùth o' nù-pù't àpils ryp an' râr,
 Tchèsnuts, an' krùds, an' krèm sál bè ghùr fâr.
 Lo! kurls o' rèk fre nùb'ran kots ascénd,
 An' lágir shádos fre the hils proténd!

It is perhaps because our poetical literature is chiefly of the amatory, pathetic, or humorous cast, with but little of the didactic, heroic, or dramatic, that we have been led to consider it less capable of high sentiment and passion. Had there been a Shakspeare in Scottish as there is in English, the case would have been very different.

Whoever has witnessed the representation of Macklin's 'Man of the World,' must be convinced of this. *Sir Archy MacSarcasm* is of course a satire on the national character; nevertheless it is well drawn, and the language, in the mouth of one acquainted with its peculiar idiom and expression, is full of energy and power. In the scene between father and son, when the old man's policy and plans of family aggrandisement are not only thwarted but logically impugned by the latter, the exclamation—'Hand yir jabber, man!'—which he makes in a tornado of disappointment and passion, conveys to the Scottish ear a sense of much stronger feeling and expression than could possibly be done by the synonymous words in English, 'Hold your tongue, Sir!'

The comparative strength of the two languages may, however, be open to question; but in pathos, arch or broad humour, the Scottish, we hold, cannot be excelled. We might fill a volume with illustrations; but shall content us with two well-known modern specimens—the one by Burns, and the other by Allan Cunningham. The subjects of both belong to the fair sex. The one desires to sketch off, in a few sweeping lines, a most ill-favoured and *unloesome* daughter of Eve, and his command of Scottish at once enables him to do so in the most graphic manner:—

Willie Wastle dwalt on Tweed,
The spot they ca'd it Linkum-doddie;

Willie was a wabster guid,
Cou'd stown a clue wi' ony bodie :
He had a wife was dowr and din,
O tinkler Maidgie was her mither ;
Sic a wife as Willie had,
I wadnae gie a button for her.

She has an e'e—she has but ane,
The cat has twa the very colour ;
Five rusty teeth, forbye a stump,
A clapper-tongue wad deave a miller ;
A whiskin' beard about her mou,'
Her nose and chin they threaten ither—
Sic a wife as Willie had,
I wadnae gie a button for her.

She's bow-hough'd, she's hem-shinn'd,
Ae limpin' leg a hand-breed shorter ;
She's twisted right, she's twisted left,
To balance fair in ilka quarter :
She has a hump upon her breast,
The twin o' that upon her shouther—
Sic a wife as Willie had,
I wadnae gie a button for her.

Auld baudrans by the ingle sits,
An' wi' her loof her face a-washin' ;
But Willie's wife is nae sae trig,
She dights her grunzie wi' a hushion ;
Her walie nieves, like midden-creels,
Her face wad fyle the Logan-Water—
Sic a wife as Willie had,
I wadnae gie a button for her.

There is a picture, so broad, so marked, that no other language could paint !

Allan Cunningham sings of one of the loveliest of human beings—an angel in woman's form. How silvery, how heavenly are the words, supplied from the same fount whence Burns drew the very opposite!—

There's kames o' hinney 'tween my luv's lips,
And gowd amang her hair,
Her breasts are lapt in a halie veil,
Nae mortal een keek there.
What lips daur kiss, or what han' daur touch,
Or what arm of love daur span
The hinney lips, the creamy loof,
Or the waist o' Ladie Ann.

She kisses the lips o' her bonnie red rose,
Wat wi' the blabs o' dew ;
But nae gentle lip, nor semple lip
Maun touch her ladie mou'.
But a broider'd belt wi' a buckle o' gowd,
Her jimpy waist maun span ;
O she's an armfu' fit for heaven,
My bonnie Ladie Ann.

Her bower casement is lattic'd wi' flowers,
Tied up wi' silver thread ;
And comely sits she in the midst,
Men's langing een to feed.
She waves her ringlets frae her cheek,
Wi' her milky, milky han' ;
And her cheeks seem touch'd wi' the finger o' God,
My bonnie Ladie Ann !

The morning cloud is tassel'd wi' gowd,
Like my luv's broider'd cap,
And on the mantle which my luv wears,
Are mony a gowden drap.

Her bonnie e'ebree's a halie arch,
 Cast by nae earthlie han',
 And the breath o' God's atween the lips
 O my bonnie Ladie Ann!

* * * * *

Which of all the poets, in any or all of the dialects of Saxon England, could produce a ballad equal to Lady Ann? The Scottish is thus, as we have shown, from the earliest down to the most recent specimens, not a mere dialect of the English, as some would have it, but a distinct branch of the great Teutonic family. It seems doubtful, however, that the vernacular of Scotland can long maintain its ground in the face of so many opposing circumstances. The thorough identity of interests existing between the inhabitants on both sides of the Tweed—the amalgamation of government offices—the continual intercourse going on between all parts of the empire by commerce, by written communications and printed intelligences; and above all, through the medium of the schools, where the *English* language, as it has been somewhat anomalously called, is the universal standard. It can hardly be expected that oral, or fireside education, can prove a match for the well-organised and aggressive system of the public instructor; and yet it is surprising how tenaciously the *mother* tongue of a people clings to existence. It may be impossible to check the onward and natural progress of events, yet we see no reason why

any undue means should be taken to hasten the extinction—if extinguished it must be—of the Scottish language. It is not inferior, as we have shown, to that of the schools, in any or all of the elements of speech,* and it is the medium of a body of literature, in many respects inimitable, and which must have originated more than a thousand years ago.

It is said that the Latin was the language of the learned amongst the Romans, but not the vernacular of the people, and that the Italian, by which the Latin has been superseded, even in ancient Romana, is the true descendant of what was then considered the vulgar tongue. If this be correct, there is still a hope that the vernacular of the British people may co-exist with the present artificial language of the learned in Britain, though, from the universal extension of schools, as well as of the press, it has not the same chance with that of the Romans. It is pleasant, however, to observe that numerous words, both Saxon and Scots, long ago considered obsolete by the literary world, are now finding a well-deserved place in our best modern dictionaries, and rapidly coming into use amongst first-class orators and writers. Since the English language, from the time of Chaucer downwards, has gradually ceased to be the

* We have often listened with delight to the Scottish language, when spoken by some octogenarian of the higher and better educated classes.

speech of any section of the original people, we do not see how the more expressive or beautiful words peculiar to any of the old dialects should be thrown aside. Wherever they appear they give harmony and strength to the sentence.

GLASGOW :

PRINTED BY S. AND T. DUNN,

102 UNION STREET.

Just Published, in One Volume, post 8vo, price 5s,

ORIGIN OF THE SCOTS

AND THE

SCOTTISH LANGUAGE.

AN INQUIRY PRELIMINARY TO THE PROPER UNDERSTANDING
OF SCOTTISH HISTORY AND LITERATURE.

BY JAMES PATERSON,

Editor of "Kay's Edinburgh Portraits;" Author of "The Contemporaries of Burns;"
"History of the County and Families of Ayr;" "Memoir of
James Fillans, Sculptor," &c. &c.

EDINBURGH: JOHN MENZIES, 61 PRINCES STREET.

GLASGOW: THOS. MURRAY & SON, 49 BUCHANAN STREET;

J. PATERSON, 94 GLASSFORD STREET.

PAISLEY: R. STEWART, CROSS.

BY THE SAME AUTHOR,

And to be had at 94 Glassford Street,

2. History of the County and Families of Ayr, 2 vols., super-royal 8vo.
3. The Contemporaries of Burns, demy 8vo.
4. Ballads and Songs of Ayrshire, 2 vols., demy 8vo.
5. The Scottish Journal of Topography, Antiquities, Traditions, &c., 2 vols., super-royal 8vo.
6. The Poems of the Sempills of Beltrees, now first collected, with Notes and Biographical Notices of their Lives, post 8vo.
7. The Poems and Songs of William Hamilton of Bangour, collated with the MS. vol. of his Poems, and containing several Pieces hitherto unpublished; with Illustrative Notes, and an Account of the Life of the Author; demy 12mo.
8. Memoir of James Fillans, Sculptor, W.S.A., E.S., and S.A., London, with numerous Engravings; royal and demy 4to.

Univ Calif - Digitized by Microsoft®

UC SOUTHERN REGIONAL LIBRARY FACILITY



A 000 661 331 9

