

The Scottish Historical Review

VOL. V., No. 17

OCTOBER 1907

The Casket Letters

IN 1905 Mr. T. F. Henderson published his book, *Mary Queen of Scots*. It fell to my lot to criticise the book, and, in a signed review,¹ I promised to return to Mr. Henderson's Appendix A.² This Appendix is devoted to pulverising some hypotheses of mine concerning the Casket Letters, published in my *Mystery of Mary Stuart*,³ and as I said that I would, when I had leisure, consider Mr. Henderson's arguments, and publish the interesting circumstances of my conversion to his opinions, if he converted me, I now 'keep tryst.' If Mr. Henderson and I had met, over our respective books and the Lennox MSS. in the Cambridge University Library, I think we might have converted one or the other of us to the constant belief that we are both poor fallible mortals; poor but honest, even in our errors. As this conference was proposed by neither party, I did what seemed best and fittest. I carefully examined Mr. Henderson's long and intricate argument; and, taking point by point, I solemnly wrote a reply, which contained about 6500 words. Then I tore up my reply: *Mr. Henaerson had not converted me.*

It is needless to go into all details minutely. In pp. 617-621, Mr. Henderson examined the penman's toil, the mechanical possibilities of a forger of the Casket Letters, deciding that the task was too hard; too hard it would be if the judges were to be modern experts, with leisure and microscopes. But the judges were the members of the conference at Hampton Court, meeting on the shortest day of the year. That day was occupied with much other business, and work stopped when night drew

¹ In the *Morning Post*,

² pp. 617-652.

³ Fourth Edition, 1904.

on. No result of the *comparatio literarum* is given in Cecil's report of the proceedings. Many members of the conference presently advocated the marriage of Mary with the Duke of Norfolk. In these circumstances the *comparatio literarum*, usually a very weak form of evidence, is, as any barrister will admit, entirely worthless.

As to the 'convincing character' of the other evidence, say for the famous Letter II., Mr. Henderson remarks that, when he wrote, I was 'unable to make up my mind.'¹ That is perfectly true. My book expressed, tediously, the waverings of my judgment, my balancing of probabilities. But Mr. Henderson represents these as, if I may say so, 'dodges'; *he* says, in one case, '*an ingenious manœuvre* that I hope may baffle and bewilder the enemy.' He asks 'what is the present position of Mr. Lang's belief in regard to the genuineness of the Casket Letters? This—*apparently from strategical reasons*—he leaves us to discover.' Yet,² he had discovered it! 'Mr. Lang is unable to make up his mind. . . .' Quite true! My word on the matter was this: 'While unable to reject the testimony of all the circumstances to Mary's guilty foreknowledge of, and acquiescence in, the crime of her husband's murder, I cannot entertain any certain opinion as to the entire or partial authenticity of the Casket Letters.'³

That was my position. Yet Mr. Henderson says that, 'apparently for strategical reasons,' I 'leave us to discover' what my position is. I find that, in *The Mystery of Mary Stuart*,⁴ I said that my opinion 'is now more adverse to the complete authenticity of the Casket Letters than it was, for a variety of reasons which appear in the text.' I had, in 1904, an additional shade of doubt. Mr. Henderson⁵ asks 'how much my adverse-ness amounts to?' with two other equally sagacious queries.

What questions! How can I make the quantitative estimate of a shade? Perhaps I may put it thus: In 1901 I would have laid seven to five; in 1904, I would have laid seven to four, against the complete authenticity. Later,⁶ Mr. Henderson, in his omniscience, explains *why*—he knows my motives—I 'so readily' (readily!) 'undertook to show the possibility of overcoming the supposed chronological difficulties of Letter II.' Well, I laboured sorely at that task. I took the trouble of copying out Letter II., till I discovered that the difficulties of

¹ p. 621. ² *Ibid.* ³ *History of Scotland*, vol. iii. p. 569, 1902.

⁴ Fourth Edition, 1904.

⁵ p. 622.

⁶ p. 636.

the internal chronology 'may be easily explained, if we suppose Mary, on the second night, to have written by accident on the clean side of a piece of paper, whereof the verso contained some lines written on the previous night, but left standing by the translators.'¹

I was not glad to make this discovery, and I am not aware that it had previously been made. My honest work Mr. Henderson explains as part of my cunning. My motive for my labour is exposed. I 'really could not afford to dispense with Letter II.,' for 'strategical reasons,' known to Mr. Henderson.

On this question of my honesty as an historical critic I shall say no more. We are all fallible, but I sincerely believe that we are all honest, doing our best to find out the truth.

Mr. Henderson says that, in my treatment of the subject of the Casket Letters, I 'have blundered all along the line.' Not quite that, I think, though I am happy to be corrected as to the pace of George Douglas's ride from Edinburgh to London, starting on June 21, 1567, and as to the absence of Robert Melville from that city, where Lethington expected him to be. But it would weary the reader if I attempted to clear myself from the charge of 'blundering all along the line.'

There are, I think, but two essential points on which Mr. Henderson and I were at odds.

(1) I thought, and he does not, that there are traces of an early forged letter.

(2) I inclined to think that Letter II. had been interpolated with a large passage, really derived from Crawford's declaration of December 9, 1568. Mr. Henderson is of the opposite opinion.

(1) The supposed early forged letter was noted by Mr. Hosack. What he knew of it was derived from a statement, by the Spanish Ambassador, de Silva, of a report made to him by Moray, in July 1567, of a letter which had been read by 'a man' known to him; probably John Wood. That man had a bad memory, or he *had read a forged letter*. Mr. Hosack easily showed, as against Mr. Froude, that this letter did not tally with Letter II., but was much more explicit and poisonous. On the essential points this is true. Mr. Henderson labours to prove a negative.² I leave his arguments to his readers. They are, as far as I can judge, unconvincing.

¹ *History of Scotland*, vol. iii. p. 567.

² pp. 639, 640.

Again, a thing unknown to Mr. Hosack, there is a Lennox document, printed by Mr. Henderson as *THE BILL OF SUPPLICATION*, in his Appendix II., and used by me (he cites it as 'Cambridge University Library, MSS. Oo. 7. 47'), which contains a set of charges against Mary by Lennox.

I dated, and still date this document in July-August, or even September, 1568. In the paper Lennox very closely follows Moray's version, not Letter II. But, on June 11, Lennox had been working with John Wood. This is perfectly certain, for on June 11 he wrote, or dictated, several letters to Scotland, and they are on the same paper, and in the same hand, as letters sent by Wood, on June 12, from Greenwich to Moray and Lethington.¹ Moreover Lennox, in one of his letters, refers to Wood's knowledge, through the Laird of Minto, of a confession betrayed by a priest (later hanged, I am glad to say), and asks for information on this head. Now Wood had with him copies of the Scots versions of the Casket Letters, and Mr. Henderson 'believes it to be indisputable' that Wood showed the letters to Lennox.² In his *Casket Letters*³ Mr. Henderson says, 'the probability is that they were not shown to any one.' If they were shown to Lennox, why did Lennox, if he wrote the charges against Mary in the Cambridge MS. Oo. 7. 47. f. 17. b after June 11 (I prove that he did), follow Moray's version of a letter, instead of following Letter II., as he did in an indictment prepared for, but not read to, the inchoate Commission of Inquiry at York, in October, 1568? Of this indictment we have a draft (Oo. 47. fol. 27), and the 'Brief Discourse,' put in at Westminster (Dd. 111. 66).

My hypothesis was that, in June, 1568, the Scots versions included a forged, or partially forged, and never produced, letter corresponding to the version of Moray, and of Lennox. Mr. Henderson (p. 644) upsets this reasoning in a way of his own. He says, *à la* Sir John Coleridge at the Tichburne trial, 'Would Mr. Lang be surprised to learn that on May 28 (1568), the Earl and Countess of Lennox presented to Elizabeth a Bill of Supplication against Mary, which Bill they no doubt proceeded to prepare as soon as they learned of Mary's arrival in England.' (May 16: her arrival might be known to Lennox by May 19.) Mr. Henderson proves the presentation of this Bill from Chalmers,⁴ and from a letter of Lennox to Cecil, of August 18.⁵

¹ *Maitland Miscellany*, vol. iv. pp. 118, 120. ² p. 643. ³ p. 29, 1890.

⁴ *Mary Queen of Scots*, ii. 289.

⁵ 'Appendix B.' Mr. Henderson misquotes himself, he means Appendix E.

Though I was unaware of this presentation of a Bill, nothing could surprise me less, or be of less consequence to my argument. Mr. Henderson maintains that this Bill of May 28 is the Lennox paper Oo. 7. 47. (f. 17. b), in which Lennox follows Moray's version, not Letter II. Consequently it was done a fortnight before Lennox and Wood are proved to have met (June 11), and therefore Lennox could not follow the Scots versions if they were shown to him, later, by Wood, but rested on a version which, in 1567, he may readily have acquired from Moray in London. Mr. Henderson is so sure of all this that he heads¹ his text of Oo. 7. 47. f. 17. b THE BILL OF SUPPLICATION.

On seeing this heading I was staggered; Mr. Henderson, I thought, has found this heading of the document in the Lennox MSS. at Cambridge. Who would not have shared this first impression? But, in fact, Mr. Henderson writes²: 'What I venture to submit is, that the so-called "first indictment" is a draft of *The Bill of Supplication prepared in May, 1568.*'

Thus his bold heading of Oo. 7. 47. f. 17. b as BILL OF SUPPLICATION is a mere piece of playfulness, not intended to convince a reader, or to alarm myself—though it had that effect. The document Oo. 7. 47. (f. 17. b) is alone, in these papers, in lacking a head-title or an endorsement. Mr. Henderson might fairly have used the heading 'Bill of Supplication (?).' It is not headed THE BILL OF SUPPLICATION. It is *not* a Bill of Supplication; there is no such document in the Lennox MSS. It opens, 'first to nott after the queens of Schotes arryvall,' and it is a bungling, self-contradictory, and perhaps mutilated, history of the relations between Mary and Darnley. It is so stupidly executed that, though Lennox must have known the confessions of Powrie, Tala, and Bowton (June-December, 1567), he cleaves to the contradictory account of Darnley's murder given in Moray's version of a letter (July, 1567). Moray sat at Bowton's examination, on December 8, 1567, but it was earlier, in July, 1567, that he told de Silva that Mary, in her letter, said that she would put Darnley 'in the house where the explosion was arranged for the night upon which one of her servants was to be married.'³ Lennox must have known the

¹p. 653.

²p. 646.

³Mr. Henderson thinks that de Silva meant the house, known to all, where the explosion was later arranged. This is possible, but not thus did Lennox understand the meaning.

confessions, yet he makes the murderers approach Kirk o' Field by 'the secret way,' obviously the legendary subterranean passage from Holyrood (p. 659). He knew the confessions, yet he says that Kirk o' Field 'was already prepared with under mines and trains of powder' (p. 661).

There is no limit to the crass self-contradictory averments of that crew!

The paper Oo. 7. 47. f. 17. b was not, and could not be, written between May 16 (when Mary arrived in Elizabeth's power) and May 28, when the Bill of Supplication was delivered. The proof is, as I showed, that, on June 11, Lennox wrote to Scotland asking for 'the sayings and reports' of Mary's 'servants.' If he asked for them on June 11 it was because he had not got them. Any one but Mr. Henderson can see this fact. He *can* see a similar fact. In his book *The Casket Letters* (1890, p. xxvi.) he writes: 'It is . . . absurd to suppose that Lennox, on June 11, 1568, should have written to Crawford *for notes which he had already in his own possession.*' Lennox did not do that: it is an error of Mr. Henderson's, but it is equally absurd to suppose that, on June 11, Lennox wrote for the reports of servants which he already possessed, and used, according to Mr. Henderson, on May 28, 1568. Mr. Henderson's so-called 'Bill of Supplication' is rich in reports and sayings derived from Mary's servants.¹ We even² possess a document from Scotland containing some answers to Lennox's request for servants' reports. They give private taunts of Mary to Darnley at Stirling (December, 1566), and words of Mary's spoken at Hermitage Castle when she visited the wounded Bothwell. These are curious: 'If Bothwell died, she would not give a *liard* for the face of any man in Scotland, but his only, and if she lost him she lost her right arm.'

The paper ends, 'further your Honour shall have advertisement of as I can find, but it is good that this matter' (the indictment-making), 'be not ended, till your Honour receive the copy of the Letter' (Letter II. ?) 'which I shall have at your Honour' (send to you Honour) 'as soon as I may have a trusty bearer.' The condition of the paper proves that it has been sent as a letter. It is one of, no doubt, several replies to Lennox's demands for servants' reports and other information. If he had them on June 11, why did he then ask for them? He had them not. So Oo. 7. 47. f. 17. b is subsequent to June 11, when he asked for the reports.

¹ See them in pp. 658, 659.

² MS. Oo. 7. 47. fol. 7.

He could not send for and receive these reports, and make his so-called 'Bill of Supplication,' between May 19, when he may have learned that Mary was now in Elizabeth's power, and May 28, when he put in the Bill of Supplication. On June 11 he was asking for these sayings and reports; Mr. Henderson states that he had to write again to Scotland. Indeed his letters of June 11 were apparently intercepted. They were later in the muniment room of his deadly foes, the Hamiltons.

Thus, certainly, Oo. 7. 47. f. 17. b was written long after June 11, and is not work done in May 19-28. Mr. Henderson argues against this on the ground of a confusion of my own. I still seem to remember a yet earlier indictment than that of Oo. 7. 47. f. 17. b; but, as it is not in the transcripts of Father Pollen (which he has again kindly lent to me), I conceive that I got 'a little mixed' (as Mr. Henderson says of de Silva) among the papers.

Mr. Henderson writes that 'in the so-called first indictment there is not the slightest evidence that Lennox received replies to his letters.' There is only the evidence of the presence in the indictment of the 'sayings and reports of her servants,' for which, in his letters, Lennox asked. That is all. Thus in Oo. 7. 47. f. 17. b Lennox, *after*—according to Mr. Henderson—he saw the Scots letters, prefers to follow Moray's version of Mary's letter. That version would therefore seem to have been in the Scots copies of the letters.

In a later indictment¹ Lennox alludes to Moray as 'here present' with lords and gentlemen. Reference is also made to Crawford's presence and evidence, which were useless, except as corroboration of Letter II. Finally (D. 111. 66), Letter II. is cited in 'A Brief Discourse' which opens with an address to 'your Grace and Honours,' namely the Commissioners with Norfolk at York.

It is thus certain that, in July-August, or even later, Lennox prepared an indictment² which shows knowledge of Moray's version of an impossible letter, and that we have no proof of his knowledge of Letter II. till he addresses the Commission at York in October. Thus room is left for the hypothesis that Letter II. is made up by the addition of the reports of Crawford, the greater part of which he swore (Dec. 9, 1568) he had written down from Darnley's instant account of his interviews with Mary, 'as near as he could carry it away,' and given to Lennox.

¹Oo. 7. 47. fol. 27.

²Oo. 7. 47. f. 17. b.

Mr. Henderson¹ urges that Lennox had 'lost' these notes. But he does not say why, if so, Lennox, when asking Crawford (June 11) for his reminiscences of his own talk with Mary, did not also ask for reminiscences of the 'lost' notes of the Darnley-Mary talks which Crawford had written out, at the moment (January 21, 22, 1566-1567), and given to him. I asked that question; Mr. Henderson omits notice of it, a process rather easy than convincing.

Mr. Henderson erects² 'a towering pyramid of impossibilities' as regards the theory of interpolation of Letter II. In my draft for this article I replied to all of this, showing that Mr. Henderson's historical perspective was wrong, and that Mary's accusers accumulated what, to us, seem 'impossibilities' in their management of a charge brought by them—accomplices and perjured men—against their Queen. As to Crawford's declaration of December 9, 1568, and as to its rendering into English, 'The Lords retained,' I say, 'Crawford's original autograph text (in Scots doubtless) "written by his own hand,"' for which I cite Goodall, Vol. II. p. 88. Unluckily we have not his autograph declaration in Scots. Mr. Henderson prints the Lennox Draft,³ I print the copy in the State Papers.

The two copies prove to me now, whatever I said before, that Crawford's Scots deposition was carefully made into English for the English nobles and others. The two versions vary in points. The Lennox Draft opens with the conversations between Mary and Darnley, and ends with the earlier talk between Mary and Crawford. The State Papers version, more logically, reverses the positions. The Draft has erasions, interlineations, and, where the State Papers has 'moreover,' has 'thys' erased, and 'ferther' substituted, while the State Papers version, in place of 'ferther' (which is Scots) has 'moreover.' As far as I understand the position, the State Papers version is a corrected copy of the Lennox Draft.

At this point my long written examination of and reply to Mr. Henderson's criticism closed. I was unconverted to his views. But it occurred to me to make what I had not made so carefully before, a close comparison between our copies of Crawford's declaration and the Scots version of Letter II. The first thing obvious is that Crawford's account of his own conversation with Mary, when she entered Glasgow, differs greatly from the account in Letter II. It is longer; gives two reasons

¹ pp. 651. 652.

² pp. 648-650.

³ pp. 664-668.

why Lennox cannot come to meet her, while Letter II. only gives one; and contains self-defence and compliments which are not in Letter II. Moreover, Letter II. represents Lennox as desiring an inquiry into certain matters wherein Mary suspected him. Crawford has not this.

To Mary's remark 'there is no receipt against fear,' Crawford makes himself answer with spirit; and again he reports himself as saying that Lennox only wished that the secrets of every creature were legible in their faces. Letter II. makes Lennox, or Crawford, represent that she 'answered but rudely to the doubts that were in his letters.' Crawford makes no reference to any letters. Letter II. says that Crawford spoke beyond his commission; about an inquiry desired by Lennox. Crawford makes Mary ask him if he has any further commission.

These two accounts of the matter differ as much as any two independent accounts of a conversation are likely to do. What were the doubts in letters of Lennox's to which, in Letter II., Mary 'answered but rudely'? Probably they were passages in letters of Lennox to Darnley, 'at Stirling,' says Crawford, not so Letter II. Cunningham communicated Lennox's doubts to Mary, we surmise, and it was then (Letter II.) that Mary 'spoke rude words to Cunningham.'

Certainly, in this passage, Crawford does not borrow from Letter II., and who can believe that a forger, working on Crawford's version, could produce that of Letter II., and introduce the reference to Lennox's letters? If this was done, Lennox must have 'coached' the forger. The forger would ask, 'What was the affair of Cunningham?' Lennox would answer, 'Oh, he repeated to the Queen some doubts from letters written to my son by me: my son and she were quarrelling like wild cats at Stirling.' Then the forger, as a 'blind,' and to vary from Crawford's declaration, inserts the allusion to the letters, and the other variations!

This hypothesis any one may hold who pleases, but I cannot hold it. I believe Crawford's and Letter II. to be, here, independent and unborrowed versions. There follow in Letter II. two long paragraphs (3 and 4 in my text). Close as is the correspondence of the two versions of the conversations, *Crawford has some original points*. Thus (paragraph 6 in my text), the Scots Letter II. has 'Gif I may obtene pardoun, I protest I shall never mak fault agane.' Crawford has 'Yf I have made anye fayle, that ye but think a fayle,

howe so ever it be, I crave your pardone, and protest that I shall never fayle againe. . . .’ I believe that here Crawford writes from his original notes, dictated by Darnley.

Again, Scots Letter II. has ‘not being familiar with zow.’ Crawford has ‘ye and I not beinge as husband and wife ought to be,’ a much better expression. In both versions Darnley says that necessity compels or constrains him to keep his wrongs in his breast, when (Scots Letter II.) ‘yat causes me to tyne my wit for very anger.’ But Crawford has ‘that bringeth me in such melancholy as ye see I am.’ In paragraph (7) Mary writes, ‘I answerit ay unto him, *but that would be ovir lang to write at length.*’ Crawford has, ‘She answered yt semed hym she was anoyed with hys sickness, and she would find a remedye so soon as she might.’ I think he had this from Darnley.

Again, Scots Letter II. has ‘I askit him why he wald pas away in the Inglis schip. He denyis it, and sweirs thair unto; but he grantis that he spak with the men’—that, and no more. Crawford, after his form of this, adds ‘he had spoken with the Englishman but not of mynde to go awaye with him, *and if he had, it had not bin without cause in respect of the maner how he was used, for he had neather to sustaine himsell nor his ser-vauntes, and needed not to make farder discourse thereof, for she knew yt as well as he.*’ On reflection, I think this addition is *part of Darnley’s speech*, not an *obiter dictum* by Crawford himself. That I am right can be demonstrated, though I have never seen the point taken. Mary, in paragraph 7 of Letter II., makes no reference to these brave words of Darnley’s, which Crawford quotes; Darnley’s reproaches about his ill treatment. But, on her *second* day of writing (paragraph 19 in my text),¹ she returns to the matter of the English ship. ‘He spak very braiffly, at ye beginning, as this beirer will schaw you, upon the purposis of the Inglisman, and of his departing. But in ye end he returnit agane to his humilitie.’ No man can believe that a forger, with Crawford’s declaration before him, took Darnley’s brave words given by Crawford as spoken ‘in the beginning,’ and made Mary first omit them, and, later, casually allude to them, ‘he spoke very bravely. . . .’ If no man can believe this, then Crawford’s declaration and Letter II. have independent sources. Letter II. is Mary’s own, the declaration is based by Crawford on his ‘lost’ notes or on memory.

There are many points in Letter II. which could not be

¹ *Mystery of Mary Stuart*, p. 407.

derived from Crawford's declaration, for Crawford says nothing about them. Here is one, in English spelling. 'He' (Darnley) 'showed, among other talk, that he knew well enough that my brother had shown me the thing which he' (Darnley) 'spoke in Stirling. Half of it' (of his words) 'he denies, and above all that he' (who?) 'ever came into his' (whose?) 'chamber.' Is the brother of Mary, here, the Earl of Moray or Lord Robert of Holyrood, who was rather friendly to Darnley? What did Darnley say at Stirling that a brother of Mary reported to her? Nobody knows: Crawford says nothing. A forger had nothing to gain by adding a paragraph which perhaps only Mary's brother understood. There are other such examples. *Enfin*, as far as my judgment is concerned, my scepticism is broken down—Mary wrote Letter II., the whole of it. I had long believed parts of it to be almost beyond doubt genuine.

In my book I said that parts of Letter II. seemed almost 'beyond the genius of forgery.' An example is the presence of a set of memoranda; one of them runs 'Of Monsieur de Levingstoun.' Immediately under this Mary writes: 'I had almost forgotten that Monsieur de Levingstoun' said something. If this be by a forger, I wrote, 'his craft seems superhuman.' But his craft is even more beyond belief when, after the passage about Minto and Highgate, he makes Mary write (to the entire confusion of the internal chronology) that *not till the day after her arrival* did Darnley confess his knowledge of the Highgate affair. Why forge this?

In my opinion, then, after a minute comparative study of Letter II. in Scots, and of Crawford's declaration, *the differences, not the verbal resemblances, between Crawford and Letter II. are the important point.* He is not merely using Letter II. as a source; and Letter II. is not based on his Declaration. The two versions differ more and more as they advance. The verbal identities may, in some cases, be the result of Crawford's transcribing on the instant Darnley's fresh memory of his conversations with Mary. Crawford based his Declaration mainly, I think, on these notes of the moment, which Lennox possessed; Mr. Henderson's belief that he had lost them is purely subjective. I do not know on what evidence he holds this opinion.

In short, the comparison of Scots Letter II. with the English translation of Crawford's Declaration convinces me that my hypothesis—Letter II. partly based on Crawford—is impossible. Mary wrote the whole letter!

Then why, I may be asked, did Lennox not quote Letter II. in the Lennox Charges? Perhaps because, as Mr. Henderson used to believe, Wood did not, in June, 1568, show him the Letters (though he must have told Lennox that they proved Mary's guilt). The secret was perhaps not entrusted to Lennox in full detail at that time, or, at least, he had not a written 'copy of the letter.' He had only Moray's absurd version. Later, his Scottish correspondent (in MS. Oo. 7. 47. fol. 7.) may have sent the promised 'copy of the letter' (Letter II.?). That may even be the copy of Letter II. in the Lennox MSS. at Cambridge.

But I cannot imitate Mr. Henderson's certainty of opinion. It may even be that Lennox in Oo. 7. 47. f. 17. b quotes from Moray's version, out of sheer stupidity. The document (Mr. Henderson's *Bill of Supplication* of May 28, 1568) is rife with equally absurd self-contradictions. Lennox probably had a written copy of Murray's version; he may have thought 'it will do well enough.'

However this point may be settled, by reason of the differences between Letter II. and Crawford I have converted myself; I have attained, on this point, to that certainty in which Mr. Henderson abounds. But it is due to him to say that, in a passage which I did not remark till this paper was type-written, he gave me the clue to the labyrinth. He wrote (p. 633) that Letter II. 'contains information independent of Crawford's Declaration and other Lennox sources: this, and the convincing nature of other evidence, external and internal, renders it impossible to doubt its genuineness.'

I believe these remarks to be true. If Mr. Henderson had worked out his suggestion in detail, as I have done, —then the glory of my conversion would have been, under Providence, his own.

Indirectly it is his own. But for his Appendix A, I might never have looked into the problem of the Casket Letters again. I did so with that 'open-mindedness' which, he charitably says, might possibly be better termed 'wide-awakeness.'¹ In the same not unsportsmanlike spirit I report the result of my fresh examination of the problem. My arguments for the authenticity of Letter II. may be overthrown: I shall then withdraw them. But now, in my opinion, it is 'Lombard Street to a China orange' in favour of the genuineness of Letter II.

A. LANG.

¹p. 622.

The Templars in Scotland in the Thirteenth Century

THE Knights-Templars are surrounded by the halo of romance and the glamour of chivalry. Their rapid rise from a small and insignificant beginning to great wealth and power, their brilliant military career with its heroic deeds of daring, and their fall at last amid persecution into dishonoured oblivion—such a tragedy, enacted on the stage of the Christian world in the Middle Ages, rivets attention, and calls forth sympathy. It possesses all the fascination of the enigmatical and mysterious. For, when all has been said, the fall of the Templars retains elements of doubt and difficulty, which make the solution of the problem presented by it perplexing in no ordinary degree.

At present, we are concerned only with the later years of the Templars' history, and as to those years, one only requires to get, so to speak, into intimate relations with the Knights, in order to discover that their right to be regarded with veneration and respect is questionable. Overbearing carriage and want of tact¹ had caused the contemporary judgment of their conduct to be unfavourable, and this even in an age which was certainly not unduly sensitive. Pride, as is well known, was attributed to them by King Richard in the twelfth century, and at the end of the thirteenth an additional hundred years of wealth and warfare had not weakened their besetting sin. After the fall of Acre there was no military outlet for their energies, which were, thereafter, used in doubtful, and often mischievous directions. 'He must needs go that the devil drives,' and

¹The Templar of Tyre gives details of the complete want of tact shown by Jacques de Molay in dealing with his debtor, the King of France. It was a blunder to throw a Papal letter into the fire, especially in the presence of the bearer, who happened to be also one of the aggrieved parties. Jacques de Molay is reported to have done this. Vide *Gestes des Chiprois* (*Société de l'Orient Latin*), pp. 329-30.

the pace is seldom regulated by prudence. The Templars hurried towards their doom, their powers of resistance to their enemies weakened by internal dissensions, and their fame darkened by deeds of violence and greed. Avarice, and disregard of truth and justice, where the aggrandisement of their Order was concerned, were features of the history of their latter years.

It is, however, becoming increasingly clear that heresy was not one of their sins. Their faults really lay in the region of conduct, not of belief.¹ They were not theologians, but warriors. They made enemies not only by reason of their deeds of violence and injustice, but also through blunders in policy and bearing, displaying gross want of wisdom.

This estimate receives remarkable corroboration from a minute narrative of certain doings in Midlothian at the end of the thirteenth century, preserved in a Charter of date 1354. The deed containing this record was first mentioned by Dr. John Stewart in his Report to the Historical Manuscripts Commission on the writs of Mr. Dundas of Arniston. It is now preserved in the General Register House, Edinburgh.² Although referred to on more than one occasion, it has not hitherto been printed in full.³ It is so extraordinary as to raise doubts at first sight as to its being a faithful narrative, but consideration of all the details leaves little room for hesitancy in accepting the substantial accuracy of the facts set forth.

The first part of the story is largely concerned with events in Scotland shortly before, and at the time of, the battle of Falkirk, and it is to be noted that in King Edward's host there was a large body of Welsh mercenaries⁴—a subject which does not appear to have received from Scottish historians the attention it deserves. The difficulty the King had in raising troops for his wars in Flanders and Scotland—both in the

¹Dr. Gmelin points out that no single Templar really confessed to any heresy as his firm conviction. There is entire absence of that dogged adherence to opinion which is characteristic of heretics in all ages (Gmelin, *Schuld oder Unschuld des Templerordens*, p. 507).

²*Calendar of Charters*, vol. i. No. 122.

³The late Mr. Robert Aitken in an article which appeared in *The Scottish Review* for July, 1898, on *The Knights Templars in Scotland*, quoted considerable portions of this Charter.

⁴Mr. Gough has printed documents proving that King Edward had issued writs to raise 11,300 foot from Wales, and the neighbouring shires of Salop, Stafford, and Chester. *Scotland in 1298*, p. 63.

same year—is well known. He would not have trusted to these Cymric clansmen, we may be sure, could he have done otherwise. He had no alternative, however, as the usual feudal sources were exhausted.

According to the Chronicler the Welsh failed him :

‘The Walsch folk that tide did nouthur ille no gode,
Thei held tham all biside, upon a hille thei stode.
Ther thei stode that while, tille the bataile was don ;
Was never withouten gile Walsh man no Breton.
For thei ever in weir, men so of tham told,
Whilk was best banere, with that side for to hold.
Saynt Bede sais it for lore, and I say it in ryme,
Walsh man salte never more luf Inglis man no tyme.’¹

By the testimony of other contemporary writers, they did worse than stand aloof at the critical moment. Walter of Hemingburgh, who goes into details, states that two hundred casks of wine were brought by the King’s provision ships and distributed throughout the army. Of these, two were assigned to the Welsh—not many, certainly, for so large a number of men. He says that the intention was thereby to impart Dutch courage to these doubtful auxiliaries!² They naturally wanted additional liquor, and as the ecclesiastics in the Army were thought by them to have got more than their share, in the fight which ensued, eighteen priests, we are told, were slain, and many others wounded. Thereupon the cavalry turned out, and before order was restored, eighty Welshmen had been slain, and the rest of the rioters put to flight. The Welsh were evidently undisciplined troops, and probably a source of great anxiety to the King and his officers. A description by an eye-witness (Louis Van Velthem) who saw them in Flanders that same year may be quoted, he says : ‘One saw the curious manners of the Welsh. In mid-winter, they were in the habit of running about with bare legs, wearing a red tunic. They could not be warm. The money which they received from the [English] King was spent on milk and butter. They used to eat and drink on every occasion no matter where they were. I never saw them wear any armour. I examined them repeatedly and carefully, going among them in order to ascertain what defensive weapons they made use of in the field.

¹ Langtoft, *Chronicle* (Hearne), vol. ii. p. 306.

² *Ad refocillandas eorum animas, eo quod valde defecerant et moriebantur glomeratim.* Walter of Hemingburgh (English Historical Society), vol. ii. p. 176.

They carried as arms, bows, arrows, and swords; they had also javelins, and wore linen garments. They were great drinkers (*grands buveurs*). They were encamped at the village of St. Pierre [lez Gand]. They did great injury to the Flemings.¹ Their pay was too small, and it was their custom to make it up by laying hands on what did not belong to them.²

So much for the character of King Edward's Welsh troops.

Another point may be shortly referred to. The Charter is granted by 'Brother Thomas de Lindesay, Master of the Hospital of St. John of Jerusalem within the Realm of Scotland.' He is the eighth Scottish Master of the Hospitallers whose name is known to us.

Brother Thomas de Lindesay was sent into Scotland in 1351 by the Prior of England, Philip de Thame, 'to take charge of the possessions and goods of the Hospital and of the Temple there.' It will be noticed that the place of granting is not Torphichen, but Balantradach.³ He appears to have been resident there at this time, and from the indications of the deed itself the conclusion may be formed that he had a difficult rôle to play. Since the battle of Durham, or Neville's Cross (1346), David II. had been a prisoner. His nephew, the Steward, had been re-elected Guardian, but the Scottish Government was weak, while King Edward III. was

¹ The Chronicler probably means that they did this injury by their example of want of discipline.

² Spiegel Historiaal, livre iv. chap. ii. pp. 215-16, quoted by F. Funck-Brentano, *Annales Gandenses*, p. 7. The English, as well as the Welsh troops, were unpopular in the Low Countries. The Minorite friar, author of the *Annales Gandenses*, speaks in bitter terms of their conduct, and of the two days' riot between them and the Flemings of Ghent resulting from it. He declares that 'the English—most ungrateful of men, consuetam trahentes caudam—tailed as usual, were eager to pillage the town, and to put all opponents to death. They set fire to it, therefore, at four different points, so that the inhabitants, in their efforts to extinguish the flames at these four separate corners, might be taken unawares, and spoiled of their goods with comparative ease' (*Annales Gandenses*, sub anno 1298).

³ Balantradach, now the modern parish of Temple in Midlothian. Dr. George Henderson, in a letter to the writer, gives its composition as *Baile*, stead, hamlet, townland; *an* the article; and *trod*, quarrel, *trodach*, quarrelsome. Its situation, to the south-west of the Pentland (Pictland) Hills, in the debateable land in early times between Celt and Saxon, renders 'Battlestead' a thoroughly appropriate name. The principal preceptory of the Knights Templars in the peaceful valley of the South Esk with the old parish church—an interesting pre-reformation building now roofless—is now far removed from all associations of strife, but this was not its early character.

a strong and strenuous ruler, swift to seize upon every opportunity for intervening, and thus strengthening his hold upon the smaller kingdom. Hence Brother Thomas shows an anxious desire to avoid everything savouring of injustice and high-handed dealing, which might give ground for appeals against his Order. He wishes manifestly to establish a character for equity and fairness between man and man, so that, come what might, he and they would be safe.

TRANSLATION OF CHARTER BY BROTHER THOMAS DE LINDE-
SAY MASTER OF THE HOSPITAL OF ST. JOHN OF JERUSALEM
TO ROBERT, SON OF ALEXANDER SYMPLE OF HAUKERSTOUN.

1354.

Translation. To All the sons of the Holy Mother Church to whom these presents shall come Brother Thomas de Lindsay Master of the Hospital of St. John of Jerusalem within the Realm of Scotland [Wisheth] Everlasting Salvation in the Lord Whereas Robert Symple son of Alexander Symple of Haukerstoun in our Courts holden at 'Blantro-dokis' and other public places frequently in the most earnest way possible besought us to grant him justice, and to give him an Assize of faithful men regarding a certain land or tenement lying within the territory of Esperstoun which belonged to the foresaid Alexander his father, declaring always before witnesses that if we refused to grant him full justice in our Court, he would in that case obtain redress by means of letters from the King's Chancery. Accordingly we being desirous to do justice and also fearing lest the King¹ or his Minister on our refusal, should take the matter in hand, which might result in great prejudice to our privileges, took counsel with our Brethren and legal experts first of all, and by common assent and consent of our Chapter held in our principal Court at 'Blantro-dokis' on Wednesday the 30th day of the month of April A.D. 1354, the said Robert Symple having personally appeared in our presence seeking justice as formerly touching his petition, granted to him an Assize; to which Assize we did choose by ourselves and our brethren of the Chapter the soothfast and honourable men, as well free tenants as others underwritten, from the best and most reverend of our whole lordship through whom the truth of the matter might be better known, and for this purpose they touched the holy Gospels and took the greater oath, namely William Slyeth² of Temple, Laurence son of Peter, Thómas de Megeth, John de Elewoldschawe, Richard de Yorkistoun, Adam Hoy, Richard de Esthouse, William Broun, Richard Doune, Richard de Croshauhope, William son of Mariota, Hugh de Haukyrstoun, and Patrick son of David Sutor of Arnaldistoun: Who being sworn and accorded, narrating the whole progress [of title] of the said land or holding from the beginning unto the end, in what manner it came into the hands of the Templars and by what means

¹ Edward III.

² Bailiff of the Hospitallers at Balantro-dach.

it had been recovered from them, in virtue of their oath duly given say that there was a certain man, by name Robert the Scot, who was true lord and just possessor of the said land and died lawfully vest and seized in the same; that he had a daughter who succeeded him as heiress, by name Christiana, whom William son of Galfrid of Haukirstoun¹ married, and by whom the said William had three sons, vizt. Richard Coque, William called William son of Christiana, and Brounin his younger brother; that the said William son of Galfrid, more given to ease than to labour, during his life, conveyed the said land—the patrimony of his said wife, for his lifetime, to the Templars in return for his maintenance, seeing that he could not make a more ample alienation of the said land; whereby he moved it away from his wife and not away from himself. The said William accordingly lived in the house of the Temple and the said Christiana his wife dwelt in a certain residence on the said property assigned to her though barely sufficient for the support of herself and her boys, until the death of the said William her husband. On his death, there came to the home of the said Christiana the Master of the House of the Temple with his followers at Esperstoun. Wishing to drive her forth from her home and property, he said that he had bought the said land from her deceased husband; but this the said Christiana controverted and expressly denied, declaring to him that her husband neither sold to him the said land nor could in any manner do so, as that land was her property and not her husband's. But the foresaid Master, in no wise desisting on account of her declarations, ordered his followers to drag her forth from her house, and she, resisting this with all her might, closed the doors of the house by which the brethren—followers of the said Master—had entered, and they dragged her to the door, and when she had reached the house-door, she put her arms in the vault of the door and thus twining them she held on firmly so that they could not pull her forth. Seeing this one of the followers of the Master drew out his knife and cut off one of Christiana's fingers, and they thus forcibly and wrongfully expelled her, wounded by the amputation of her finger, sobbing and shrieking, from her home and heritage, and the Master foresaid in this manner intruded himself by main force '*de facto*,' seeing that he could not do so '*de jure*.' The said Christiana, thus illegally expelled, maltreated and foully injured, approached the Royal Court and was at length conducted into the King's presence at Newbotill,² and she then declared the whole facts and the injury done to her by the mutilation of her member. The King having heard these things was greatly moved and ordered inquiry to be made in the premises by Writ in Chancery by which the truth was known and the said Christiana was forthwith again infeft in her said land and lawfully and honourably restored to the same, and thereafter remained in peaceable possession

¹ Galfrid le Simple appears more than once as a messenger in the English Wardrobe Accounts of 1299-1300 (*Liber Quot. Gard.*, pp. 297-8).

² Edward I. of England. He was at Newbotle on Tuesday, 5th June, 1296, and left for Holyrood next day. Gough, *Itinerary*, ii. p. 280.

thereof for a lengthened period. But afterwards war having broken out and increasing between the Kingdoms, the gates of justice were closed and the foresaid Master of the Temple a second time took forcible possession of the said land, the said Christiana being illegally driven forth as formerly; and having thus taken possession he retained it contrary to justice, for some time, namely, up to the date of the Battle of Falkirk¹ in which battle the said Master whose name was Brian de Jaia took part and led from England with him a large body of Welshmen and came to 'Blantrodokis' four days before the said battle and there dwelt. Thereupon Richard Cook the above mentioned eldest son of the said Christiana heard of the arrival of the foresaid Master and appeared in his presence and sought of him his land, which the Master himself retained having illegally expelled his mother. But the Master deceitfully requested him on the morrow to come and guide the said Welshmen to Listoun, promising to do him justice regarding his land there; but the said Master meanwhile arranged with the Captain of the said force to slay the said Richard, which was done; for on the morrow as the said Richard came to guide the said Welshmen from 'Balintrodokis' to Listoun they murdered the said Richard in the Wood of Clerkyntoun² and left his body there after they had rifled it. And thus the said land was illegally retained in the hands of the said Templars, where it remained for some time afterwards, namely up to the time of their destruction³ which took place in the reign of the most serene prince King Robert the Illustrious, in whose time William son of the said Christiana and at that time heir to her and to his brother the said murdered Richard obtained formal letters from the King's Chancery directed to the Sheriff and Bailies of Edinburgh regarding his right in and to the said land which had belonged to his said mother; whereupon a faithful Inquisition being made with diligence by the said Sheriff in the premises by means of the elder and more trustworthy men of the whole neighbourhood⁴ it was clearly ascertained that the said land or holding was the property of the said Christiana the mother of the said William in which she was vest and seized; which land the said Christiana never gave nor sold nor alienated in any way in favour of anyone. And although William the son of Galfrid her husband before-mentioned placed the said land in the hands of the Templars by a certain agreement for his lifetime, it was rendered null by law, since this agreement had and could have no force after his death, seeing that the said land was the estate of his wife, and consequently the foresaid Templars could have no right by virtue of such an agreement or alienation made by her said husband in and to the said land on his death, nor was their claim of any validity after his death: Moreover it was ascertained that William son of the said Christiana was son and nearest heir

¹ 1298.

² Now Rosebery.

³ In Scotland, November, 1309. See *Processus contra Templarios in Scotia* (*Spottiswoode Miscellany*, vol. ii. p. 7).

⁴ *Patria*. This term is used in a restricted sense, signifying the vicinity outside the walls of the Religious house. *Vide* Raine, *North Durham*, p. 124.

of his said mother and of lawful age: And the truth of the matter having been thus faithfully ascertained and declared in due order of law, the said William son of Christiana obtained heritable seizin of the said land or tenement with its pertinents which belonged to his foresaid mother, justly and legally, and thus brought into true and peaceful possession of the same, and freely and peacefully vest and seized, he enjoyed for many years the said land with all its pertinents: And the said jurors say unanimously that these things are true: And they say further that the said William son of the foresaid Christiana afterwards in the greatest and most urgent necessity, gave, granted, and heritably in all time coming disposed his said land or holding with all its pertinents to his dear kinsman Alexander Symple before-named and his heirs for a certain sum of money which the said Alexander gave and fully paid: Of which land or holding with its pertinents the foresaid Alexander obtained from the Superior who at that time held the lordship of 'Blantrodokis'¹ heritable seizin in due form, and being lawfully put into corporal possession of the same, remained vest and seized of the said land or tenement with its pertinents for many years in peaceful possession: And they say that the said Robert Symple is the son and heir of the said Alexander his father and of lawful age: These things say the said jurors with one accord in all the premises in virtue of their oath taken by them: Therefore We having God before our eyes and wishing to do justice to everyone do grant to the said Robert as son and heir of the foresaid Alexander Symple the full infestment lawfully due to him in the said land or tenement with all and singular the pertinents thereof in God's name, and do deliver to him heritable seizin with our own hands by common consent of our Brethren at Haukyrstoun² upon Monday on the Feast of St. Dunstan Archbishop³ in the year above mentioned, before these Witnesses William Sleeth of Temple, Laurence son of Peter, William Tod, John son of Roger, Laurence Squire and many others: Nevertheless we ordain by these our letters patent Adam called Morcell our Serjeant of 'Blantrodokis' to put the said Robert Symple upon the ground of the said land or holding into corporal possession of the same with its pertinents saving the rights of every one: Which Adam Morcell, having cited the worthy men by virtue of our precept, upon the ground of the said land or holding gave corporal heritable seizin of the same with all its pertinents to the said Robert Symple upon Tuesday on the morrow of the said feast of St. Dunstan in the year before written in the presence of the good men witnesses to the said seizin, vizt.: William Slieth foresaid at that time our Bailiff at 'Blantrodokis,' Laurence son of Peter, Adam de Hermistoun, Thomas de Megeth, Alan de Yorkystoun, Adam de Wedale, at that time our Forester at 'Blantrodocis,' John de Catkoyn, John Tod, Alan de Wedale,

¹ Probably Reginald More, who had a grant from Brother Ralph de Lindesay [1309-1333].

² *Halkerstoun, prebenda in collegio de Creichtoun (Reg. Mag. Sig. I. Jac. iv. No. 1784).*

³ 19th May.

William son of Mariota, Richard de Yorkystoun, William Tod, William Brown, John de Camera, Alan son of Symon de Herioth, Thomas son of Hugh de Middletoun, Robert Morcell, Oliver Fuller, Patrick Sutor, Patrick Morcell, John Bell de Locworward, the said Adam Morcell our Serjeant and many others: And that all these premises may be kept in memory, that the truth of the matter may be known in future time we have caused these our Letters patent to be sealed with our Common Seal: Given at 'Blantrodocis' on the day and year above said.

After reading this Charter one naturally asks if the Templars were charged with instigating the murder of Richard. Strange to say they were not, when in 1309 they were tried in Scotland. Forty-eight witnesses, including the accused themselves, were examined; not one of them says a definite word about the murder. There is a monk from Newbotle—the eighth witness—and we turn to his evidence with expectation, for it was at Newbotle that Christiana told her story to King Edward thirteen years before, and subsequent developments would surely be known to such near neighbours. But Adam of Wedale confines himself entirely to general statements. After concurring in the evidence of previous witnesses regarding the secrecy observed at the meetings of the Chapters of the Templars, he adds: 'The Order is defamed in manifold ways by unjust acquisitions, for it seeks to appropriate the goods and property of its neighbours justly and unjustly with equal indifference, and does not cultivate hospitality except towards the rich and powerful, for fear of dispersing its possessions in alms.'¹ He evidently knows more than comes out, but is either afraid to speak frankly and freely, or considers that in a trial for heresy evidence of cruel oppression and homicide would not count for much, as compared with proof of falling away from the orthodox faith. We must remember that heresy was looked upon as far more heinous than moral depravity. 'Suspected heretics had practically no legal rights, and their capture was the highest duty of all secular officials.'²

The Templars paid dearly for their possessions and moral delinquencies. Their pride, avarice, and cruelty brought upon them a heavy retribution, though they were innocent of the charges of heresy brought against them. These latter were supported by evidence of the most flimsy kind. In fact, the case and its issue may be very fairly summed up in the words of

¹ *Processus factus contra Templarios in Scotia* (Spottiswoode Miscellany, vol. ii. p. 14).

² H. C. Lea, *English Historical Review*, iii. p. 152.

Dr. Gmelin: 'So ist, wollen wir alles zusammenfassen, zu sagen, dass die Unterdrückung des Templerordens ist und bleibt ein schmachvolles, in keiner Weise zu rechtfertigendes, Unrecht.¹

Turning to the Hospitallers in Scotland in the fourteenth century, what light does the procedure detailed in the Charter shed upon their position? It discloses one or two points. For instance, we see that they were in effective possession at this date (1354) of Balanrodach, the Templars' principal preceptory. They were administering the Barony by their own officers—William Slyeth, Bailiff, Adam Morcell, Serjeant, and Adam de Wedale, Forester, are all mentioned. Their own tenants, to the number of thirteen, form the jury who try the question of heritable right. It is thus clear that, however uncertain their future undisturbed enjoyment of the property may have seemed, actual possession had been ceded to them.

As to their own preceptory at Torphichen we get no information. Brother Thomas de Lindsay, as we have seen, is not resident there at the date of the Charter, and the Chapter is mentioned as being held at 'our principal court at Balanrodach.' One might argue from this that the War of Independence had compelled the Order to vacate Torphichen, and that a Warden having been put in by Bruce they had not recovered possession. The reference to the times of 'the most serene prince King Robert the Illustrious' (the only King mentioned by name in the deed) is very courtly, and there seems to be a politic attempt to point out that the suppression of the Templars in Scotland, having taken place in his reign, responsibility for it lay upon him; the inference being that the patriotic party were thus bound to see that the Hospitallers, who had been solemnly declared their heirs, were put into possession of all Temple lands throughout the realm.

JOHN EDWARDS.

¹Gmelin, *Schuld oder Unschuld des Templerordens*, p. 510. This work is an exhaustive critical examination of the case from beginning to end. The twenty carefully prepared Tables forming the appendix give an elaborate analysis of the testimony of the so-called witnesses.

TEXT OF CHARTER BY BROTHER THOMAS DE LINESAY
 MASTER OF THE HOSPITAL OF ST. JOHN OF JERUSALEM
 TO ROBERT, SON OF ALEXANDER SYMPLE OF HAWKERSTOUN.

1354.

Universis sancte matris ecclesie filii ad quos presentes littere pervenerint frater Thomas de Lindsay Magister hospitalitatis sancti Johannis de Jerusalem infra Regnum Scocie Salutem in Domino sempiternam Cum Robertus Symple filius Alexandri Symple de Hawkerstoun sepe in curiis nostris tentis apud Blantrodkis et aliis locis publicis nos petebat instanter instancius et instantissime sibi iusticiam facere ac assisam fidelem sibi dare super quadam terra seu tenemento infra territorium de Esperstoun jacente que fuit prefati Alexandri patris sui protestans semper coram testibus quod si iuris complementum sibi concedere noluimus in curia nostra in defectu nostro litteras Capelle Regie pro iusticia habenda impetraret Nos vero iusticie inclinati necnon timentes si Rex aut Minister eius taliter defectu nostro se intromitterent quod potuerit redundare in preiudicium libertatum nostrarum non modicum concilio prius cum fratribus nostris ac iure peritis habito ex communi consensu et assensu capituli nostri in Curia nostra Capitali tenta apud Blantrodkis die Mercurii ultimo die mensis Aprilis Anno Domini Millesimo trecentesimo quinquagesimo quarto prefato Roberto Symple in presencia nostra personaliter constituto iusticiam petenti ut prius super petitione sua assisam sibi concessimus ad quam assisam per nos et fratres nostros Capituli eligere fecimus viros fidedignos et insuspectos tam liberos tenentes quam alios subscriptos de melioribus et antiquioribus tocuis domini nostri per quos Rei veritas melius sciri poterat et ad hoc tactis sacrosanctis evangelii maiore sacramento jurato videlicet Willelmum Slyeth de Templo Laurencium filium Petri Thomam de Megeth Iohannem de Elewoldschawe Ricardum de Yorkistoun Adam Hoy Ricardum de Esthous Willelmum Broun Ricardum Donne Ricardum de Croshauhope Willelmum filium Mariote Hugonem de Haukystoun et Patricium filium David Sutoris de Arnaldistoun Qui iurati et concordati totum processum dicte terre seu tenementi recitantes a principio usque ad finem quomodo fuit in manibus templariorum et qualiter recuperata erat ab eisdem in virtute sacramenti sui prestiti dicunt quod fuit vir quidam Robertus nomine Scotus qui fuit verus dominus et iustus possessor eiusdem terre et iuste vestitus et saysitus obiit de eadem qui habuit filiam heredem sibi succedentem nomine Cristianam quam quidem Cristianam Willelmus filius Galfridi de Haukirstoun desponsavit et tres filios ex ea genuit scilicet Ricardum Coqum Willelmum qui dicebatur Willelmus filius Cristiane et Brouninum fratrem eius juniorem Dictum vero Willelmus filius Galfridi maius ocio deditus dum vixit quam labori dictam terram hereditatem uxoris sue predicte in manibus templariorum posuit pro sustentatione sue ad tempus vite sue cum amplio alienationem de dicta terra facere non potuit Ex quo ex parte uxoris sue movebat et non ex parte sui ipso quoque Willelmo in domo templi sic existente dicta Cristiana uxor eius morabatur in mansione dicte terre portione quadam eiusdem terre sibi assignata licet modica pro sustentatione sua et puerorum suorum usque ad mortem dicti Willelmi viri sui. Eo vero mortuo venit magister domus templi cum clientibus suis apud Esperstoun ad domum dicte Cristiane volens eam expellere de domo et hereditate sua dixit se emisse dictam terram a marito suo iam defuncto; prefata vero Cristiana contradixit et hoc expresse negavit ostendens ei quod maritus eius nunquam dictam terram sic vendidit nec vendere potuit quomodo cum illa terra fuit hereditas sua et non mariti sui; Magister vero

prefatus non propter allegationes suas dimittens precepit clientibus suis extrahere eam de domo sua que pro viribus suis resistens hostia domus clausit quibus fratris clientes dicti magistri domum intraverunt et illam usque ad hostium trahebant ; Cumque ipsa ad hostium domus provenisse utraque brachia in arcu hostii ponebat Et ita ea plectendo fortiter tenebat quod illam extrahere non potuerunt ; Videntes hoc unus ex clientibus magistri evaginavit cultellum suum et abcidit unum digitum ipsius Cristiane et sic eam vulneratam digito suo amputato clamantem et ululantem de domo et hereditate sua per vim iniuste extraxerunt, magistro predicto sic se intrudente per potentiam suam de facto cum de iure non potuit ; Prefata vero Cristiana sic iniuste expulsa vexata ac enormiter lesa Curiam Regiam est executi ; ac in presencia Regis tandem deducta apud Neubotill totum factum ac iniuriam sibi latam cum mutilacione membri sui ostendit Quibus auditis Rex mirabiliter stupefactus fecit inquirere super premissis per litteras in forma Capelle sue, unde cognita veritate dicta Cristiana fuit statim in dictam terram suam resaysita ac iuste et honorifice restituta ad eandem ; Et post in pacifica possessione eiusdem per magnum tempus stetit ; Postea vero guerra mota et crescente inter regna ianuis iusticie clausis, predictus magister templi iterato in dictam terram, Cristiana prefata iniuste per vim expulsa, de facto se intrusit ut prius et sic intrusus per aliquod tempus contra iusticiam eam detinuit videlicet videlicet (*sic*) usque ad tempus belli varie capelle ; ad quod bellum dictus magister nomine Brianus de Jaia se disposuit et adduxit de Anglia secum magnam comitiam de gente Cambrensi et venit apud Blantrodokis per quatuor dies ante dictum bellum et ibi pernoctavit ; Audiens autem Ricardus Coqus supramemoratus filius Cristiane antedictae primogenitus adventum magistri prenominati, constitutus in presencia eius petebat ab eo terram suam quam matre sua iniuste expulsa, ipse magister detenuit (*sic*) ; Magister vero dissimulans precepit illi ut in crastino veniret ad conducendum dictas gentes Cambrenses apud Listoun ; promittens sibi gratiam ibi facere de terra sua : Magister vero predictus interim convenit cum capitaneo dicte gentis ut dictum Ricardum interficeret quod ita factum est Crastino vero veniens idem Ricardus ut dictas gentes Cambrenses conduceret de Balintrodokis versus Listoun ipsum Ricardum in Nemore de Clerkyntoun interfecerunt, Et ibi mortuum et spoliatum relinquerunt ; Et sic dicta terra in manibus dictorum templariorum iniuste detenta adhuc remansit per aliquod tempus post, videlicet usque ad tempus destructionis illorum quod fuit in tempore Serenissimi principis Regis Roberti illustris ; Tempore cuius Willelmus filius Cristiane prenominate filius et heres tunc eiusdem ac fratris dicti Ricardi interfecti litteras Regis in forma Capelle sue prout juris ordo expostulaverat vicecomiti et ballivis suis de Edinburgh directas super iure suo quantum ad predictam terram que fuit matris sue prefate impetravit ; Unde inquisitione fideli cum diligencia facta per vicecomitem predictum super premissis per antiquiores homines fidedigniores tocius patrie et insuspectos plane compertum fuit quod predicta terra seu tenementum fuit hereditas dicte Cristiane matris dicti Willelmi de qua fuit vestita et saysita quam quidem terram dicta Cristiana nunquam dedit nec vendidit nec alicui quoquomodo alienavit ; et licet Willelmus filius Galfridi maritus suus supramemoratus dictam terram in manibus templariorum per aliquam conventionem posuit pro tempore vite sue Discussum fuit de iure, quod hec conventio post mortem suam nullam vim habuit nec habere potuit, ex quo terra predicta fuit hereditas uxoris sue, et per consequens templarii antedicti nullum ius causa talis conventionis seu alienacionis per dictum maritum suum factum in dictam terram eo mortuo habere potuerunt nec clamen illorum alicuius vigoris erat post decessum eius Preterea compertum fuit quod Willelmus filius Cristiane predictae fuit filius et propinquior heres eiusdem Cristiane matris sue et legitime etatis, Et

sic rei veritate fideliter inquisita et expressata ordine iuris in omnibus servato Idem Willelmus filius Cristiane saysinam hereditariam de dicta terra seu tenemento quod fuit matris sue predictae cum pertinenciis iuste et legitime optinuit et in vera ac pacifica possessione eiusdem deductus per plures annos dictam terram cum omnibus pertinenciis suis libere et pacifice vestitus et saysitus gaudebat, Predicti vero Iurati dicunt unanimiter ista esse vera, dicunt et ulterius quod dictus Willelmus filius Cristiane predictae postea urgente maxima necessitate predictam terram suam seu tenementum cum omnibus suis pertinenciis de se et heredibus suis dilecto consanguineo suo Alexandro Symple prenominate et heredibus suis dedit concessit ac hereditarie in perpetuum tradidit pro quadam summa pecunie quam dictus Alexander eidem Willelmo filio Cristiane in sua magna necessitate dedit et integraliter persolvit De qua terra seu tenemento cum pertinenciis predictus Alexander per superiorem qui dominium de Blantrokokis pro tunc habebat in forma qua decet saysinam hereditarie optinuit, ac in corporalem possessionem eiusdem iuste deductus in dicta terra seu tenemento cum pertinenciis per annos non paucos in pacifica possessione extitit vestitus et saysitus de eadem; Dicunt etiam quod dictus Robertus Symple est filius et heres dicti Alexandri patris sui et legitime etatis Ista dicunt predicti iurati concordati in omnibus in virtute sacramenti sui prestiti; Nos igitur Deum pro oculis habentes ac volentes iusticiam facere cuilibet predicto Roberto filio et heredi Alexandri Symple prefati plenum statum sibi de iure debitum de dicta terra seu tenemento cum omnibus et singulis suis pertinenciis in Dei nomine concessimus ac sibi hereditarie saysinam manibus nostris propriis per commune assensum fratrum nostrorum tradidimus apud Haukystoun die Lune in festo Sancti Dunstani archiepiscopo anno supradicto Hiis testibus Willielmo Sleeth de Templo Laurencio filio Petri Willielmo Tod Iohanne filio Roger Laurencio armigero et aliis pluribus; Nichillominus precipiendo mandavimus per literas nostras patentes Ade dicto Morcell seriando nostro de Blantrokokis quod ipse dictum Robertum Symple super territorium dicte terre seu tenementi in corporalem possessionem eiusdem cum pertinenciis inponeret cuiuslibet iure salvo; Qui quidem Adam Morcell citatis fidedignis precepto nostro mediante eidem Roberto Symple de dicta terra seu tenemento cum omnibus suis pertinenciis super territorio eiusdem Saysinam hereditarie tradidit corporalem die Martis in Crastino dicti festi sancti Dunstani anno prescripto in presencia bonorum virorum dictam saysinam attestancium videlicet Willielmi Slieth predicti tunc temporis ballivi nostri de Blantrokokis Laurencii filii Petri Ade de Hermistoun Thome de Megeth Alani de Yorkystoun Ade de Wedale forestar nostri tunc temporis de Blantrokokis Iohannis de Catkoyne Iohannis Tod, Alani de Wedale Willielmi filii Mariote Ricardi de Yorkystoun, Willielmi Tod, Willielmi Broun, Iohannis de Camera, Alani filii Symonis de Herioth Thome filii Hugonis de Middiltoun Roberti Morcell Oliveri Fullonis Patricii Sutor Patricii Morcell Iohannis Bell de Locworward Ade Morcell Seriam nostri predicti et aliorum multorum; Et ut hec omnia premissa ad memoriam possint reduci pro rei veritate cognoscenda in posterum presentes literas sigillo nostro signatas communi fieri fecimus patentes; Datum apud Blantrokokis die et anno supradictis.

[Seal gone.]

The 'Scalacronica' of Sir Thomas Gray

The Reign of Edward III., as recorded in 1356 by Sir Thomas Gray in the 'Scalacronica,' and now translated by the Right Hon. Sir Herbert Maxwell, Bart., continued.

At Christmastide preceding an English knight, James de Pipe, was surprised in the tower of Epernon which he had won from the French. He was so confident in the strength and height of the keep that he did not set a proper watch; and, having caused a low window to be built up, the fortress was lost through the said window, by the wile of a French mason who built it up dishonestly. The said James was taken in his bed, and also the knight Thomas de Beaumont, who had come to lodge the night with him as he was travelling from one district to another on safe conduct. Both of these, and their property, were under safe conduct of the Regent, the king's son. Now the said James had not discharged his ransom for the other time that he was captured in season before, having been taken near *Graunsoures*, as he and the English knight Otis de Holland were travelling from the King of Navarre at Evreux, when the said Otis was wounded and died thereof. From which former captivity the said James was rescued from the hands of the enemy by his well-wishers the English, who were in garrison throughout the country. Having espied that, at a certain hour of the day, he was accustomed to go and ease himself outside the castle of *Auneuyle* where he was detained, they concealed themselves near at hand, found him at the place, took him away, and declared that he was rescued. Those who had captured him and in whose keeping he was a prisoner maintained that this was not a proper rescue, but contrary to his parole, inasmuch as he had assured

them he would observe ward loyally without deceit, collusion or evil design. They blamed him for this and charged him with it openly, telling him that the said English had arranged this ambush against the laws of loyal chivalry [acting upon] his instigation, information, procurement, command and design. In consequence whereof they afterwards agreed upon a sum of ransom, of which he had provided and laid by much with him in the said tower.

In the same season about the feast of the Purification, an English knight, Robert Herle, who was Guardian of Brittany for the King of England, was in the field against the Welsh Bretons¹ near *Dowle*, where there was a river between him and his enemy; and when the English were descending, thinking that they might find a bridge (but this was broken for there was a great flood in the river), an English knight, Robert de Knollys, coming on the other side [of the river] out of Brittany [leaving] his fortress on the command of the said Guardian, descried his friends, and with seven of his comrades, spurred forward rashly without the rest of his people being aware of it, judging by the descent which he saw the English making that the said Guardian had crossed the river, and so he was unhorsed and captured by the enemy. But without delay he was rescued by his people when they came up, who were furious when they perceived the mishap of their leader. They attacked with the remainder of the force, defeated the enemy and rescued their master.

This chronicle does not record all the military adventures which befel the English everywhere during this war, because of the [great] variety of them; but [it records] only the more notable ones. To relate everything would be too lengthy a business.

Be it known that, in Passion week of the same season, the said King of England marched through Beauce, where the monasteries were almost all fortified and stocked with the provender of the country, some of which were taken by assault, others were surrendered so soon as the siege-engines were in position, whereby the whole army was greatly refreshed with victual.

¹ *Bretouns Gallois*, a term applied to the Welsh or Cymric people of Brittany to distinguish them from the French Bretons. It occurs in Froissart. 'Si chevaucha le Connestable premierement Bretagne bretonnant, pourtant qu'il la sentoit toujours plus encline au Duc Jehan de Montfort que Bretagne gallot.' L. i. folio 438.

At this time the Captal de Buch¹ went by permission of the said King of England to Normandy with 22 English and Gascon lances, to interview the King of Navarre to whom he was well-disposed. Near Dreux he fell in suddenly with four and twenty French men-at-arms, knights and esquires, who were lying in ambush for other English garrisons. Both sides dismounted and engaged smartly; the French were defeated, and Bêque de Villaines their leader was taken with four of his knights, the others being taken or killed.

MS.
fo. 233 The said King of England took up his quarters before Paris on Wednesday in Easter week in the year of grace 1360, [namely] in the villages adjacent to the suburb of Saint-Cloud, across the Seine above Paris. He remained there five days, and in departing displayed himself in order of battle before the King of France's son, who was Regent of the country and was in the city with a strong armed force. The Prince of Wales, eldest son of the said King of England, who commanded the advanced guard, and the Duke of Lancaster with another column, marched close under the faubourgs from sunrise till midday and set them on fire. The king's other columns kept a little further off. A French knight, Pelerin de Vadencourt, was captured at the city barriers, where his horse, being wounded by an arrow, had thrown him. [Certain] knights of the Prince's retinue, newly dubbed that day, concealed themselves among the suburbs when the said columns marched off, and remained there till some [knights] came out of the city, then spurred forth and charged them. Richard de Baskerville the younger, an English knight, was thrown to the ground, and, springing to his feet, wounded the horses of the Frenchmen with his sword, and defended himself gallantly till he was rescued, with his horse, by his other comrades, who speedily drove back into their fortress the Frenchmen who had come out.²

Then the Comte de Tankerville came out of the city demanding to treat with the Council of the said King of England, to whom reply was made that their said lord would entertain any reasonable proposal at any time.

The said king marched off, spreading fire everywhere along his route, and took up quarters near Montereau with his

¹ *Dusch* in original.

² Froissart gives the names of the French knights in this encounter, and admits that they were defeated, and that ten knights were made prisoners. [Book i. cap. ccxi.]

army round him. On Sunday the 13th of April it became necessary to make a very long march toward Beauce, by reason of want of fodder for the horses. The weather was desperately bad with rain, hail and snow, and so cold that many weakly men and horses perished in the field. They abandoned many vehicles and much baggage on account of the cold, the wind and the wet, which happened to be worse this season than any old memory could recall.

About this time the people of Monsire James d'Audley [namely] the garrisons of Ferté and Nogent-en-Brie, escaladed the castle of *Huchi* in Valois, near Sissonne, after sunrise, when the sentries had been reduced. This [place] was very well ^{MS.} fo. 233^b provisioned and full of gentle ladies and some¹ men-at-arms, knights and esquires.²

And eight Welsh Archers of Lord Spencer's retinue had a pretty encounter in Beauce when the said king's army was billeted in the villages. These archers, having charge of the millers in a corn mill outside the lines near Bonneval, were espied by the French garrisons in the neighbourhood, who came to attack them with 26 lances and 12 French Breton archers. Both sides dismounted and engaged smartly; the French were defeated, three of their men-at-arms being killed and nine made prisoners, every man on both sides being wounded nearly to death. Some of the said English had surrendered on parole to the said enemy during the mellay, but were rescued by the said Welshmen, who behaved very gallantly there.

The said King of England remained in Beauce, near Orleans, fifteen days, for a treaty of peace which the Council of France proposed to him, the Abbé of Cluny and Monsire Hugh de Genève, envoy of the Pope, being the negociators.³ The English of the said king's army had encounters, some with loss and others with gain. Certain knights in the following of the Duke of Lancaster, disguising themselves as brigands or pillaging soldiers, without lances, rode in pretended disarray in order to give the enemy spirit and courage to tackle them, as several of their foragers had been taken during the preceding days. Some of whom, the knights Edmund Pierpoint and Baldwyn Malet, overdid the said counterfeit to such an extent

¹ *Undz*, misprinted *yndz* in *Maitland Club MS.*

² The *Maitland Club Edition* gives a comma here, which makes nonsense of the passage.

³ The head of this mission was Montagu, cardinal bishop of Thérrouenne.

in running risks from the French that it could not be otherwise than that they should come to grief; thus they were taken and put on parole.

Sir Brian de Stapleton and other knights of the Prince's army and the Earl of Salisbury's retinue, while protecting foragers, had an affair with the French near Janville, and defeated them, taking some [prisoners].

In reprisal for the raid which the French made upon Winchelsea, the admirals of the Cinque Ports and the English northern squadron landed in the isle of *Dans*, attacked and took the town of *Lure* and burnt it, and would have done more had they not been stopped by command of their lord the king on account of the truce.

MS. fo. 234 People ought to know that, on the 7th day of May in the aforesaid year, a treaty of peace was made near Chartres and agreed to by the said King of England and his Council around him on the one part, and by the aforesaid Regent and Council of France and the commons on the other part, to the following effect. All actions, claims and disputes to be extinguished and relinquished; the aforesaid covenants to be carried out, to wit, that the aforesaid King of England should have the whole Duchy of Guienne within its ancient limits, and the province of Rouerge, the countships of Ponthieu, of Guines with its appurtenances, Calais with the lordship adjacent, utterly, without hindrance, conditions, appeals, evasions, demands or any subjection to the crown of France, freely with all the crown royalties for all time; and that he should receive three millions of gold as ransom for the King of France; and that the aforesaid kings should be sworn under pain of excommunication as allies by common assent against all nations; and that the action and dispute for Brittany between Montfort and Charles de Blois should be adjudged by the discretion of the said kings; and should this not be agreeable to the said parties, [then] neither these kings nor their heirs should take any part by aid or countenance. The King of France was utterly to give up the alliance with the people of Scotland, and the King of England was to remove his hand from the people of Flanders, and the two kings were to be absolved by the Pope from their oaths under the said alliance; for the fulfilment of which covenants it was agreed that the eldest sons of the two kings—the Prince of Wales on one part and the Duke of Normandy on the other—should be sworn by the souls of their

fathers and on the body of God. And the King of Navarre and twenty other personages of France, and the Duke of Lancaster and twenty others of England, were to be sworn also.

The two eldest sons of the said kings by their oaths upon the body of our Blessed Saviour confirmed the treaty which had been agreed to, drawn up and engrossed. The Duke of Normandy and Regent of France, being laid up with an imposthume, swore to it in Paris in the presence of valiant English knights sent thither for the purpose, by whom the said Regent transmitted to the said Prince of Wales exceedingly precious relics of the most holy cross, of the crown of thorns with which God was crowned upon the cross, with other precious jewels, signifying that our Lord, when on the cross with the said crown upon His head, had brought peace, salvation and lasting tranquillity to the human race.

The said Prince of Wales took this oath in the great minster of Louviers on the 15th day of May, in the aforesaid year, in presence of noble French knights sent thither for that purpose. The King of Navarre would not take the oath, but came to speak with the King of England near *Nemburgh*, whence the said King of England took his way towards Honfleur, where he embarked for England, his sons and many lords being with him, leaving the Earl of Warwick¹ in Normandy as guardian of the truce.

ms.
fo. 234^b

The Duke of Lancaster and the Earl of Stafford, with the rest of the English army crossed the Seine at Pont de l'Arche on the way to Calais. They were partly recovered from the grievous labours of this campaign, which had lasted nine months, in which they had traversed as much of France as they were able, courting combat to maintain the right of their lord, finding nowhere encouragement in this task, but subsisting all the time upon [the resources of] the country, sometimes in plenty, at other times according to what they could find in a country wasted and raided before their coming by the above-mentioned English. So that they had carried on the war to admiration on their own account.

And thus the three English armies marched away² in good

¹The original has *duk de Warwyk*, *duk* being partly erased and 'count' written on margin in a different hand.

²*Departiz*, omitted in *Maitland Club Edition*.

hopes of peace, truce having been settled to last for one year from the following Michaelmas, during which time the *pourparlers* might be confirmed, and so the war be stopped on the day and in the year aforesaid, which war had lasted four and twenty years.

In the same season of the year of grace 1360, about the feast of St. John,¹ Katharine de Mortimer, a young lady of London, had become so intimate with Monsieur David de Brus, who was called King by the Scots,² through the friendship he had contracted with her while he was a prisoner, that, in the absence of his wife, the King of England's sister, who at that time was residing with her brother, he could not dispense with her [Katharine's] presence. He rode continually with her, which display of favour was displeasing to some of the Scottish lords. A Scottish youth,³ named Richard of Hull, at the instigation of certain great men of Scotland, pretended to speak with the said Katharine upon the King's affairs as they were riding from Melrose near Soutra, and struck her in the body with a dagger, killing her and throwing her from her horse to the ground. Richard, being well mounted, escaped. The deed having been done in this manner, the said king, who was [riding] in front along the road, returned on hearing the outcry, and made great lamentation for the cruel loss he had sustained in his mistress. He caused her to be taken to Newbottle, where he afterwards caused her to be honourably interred.

About this time the King of Spain,⁴ who was son of the good King Alfonso, was ruled by the Jews. He did not love his wife, but loved a Jewess *par amours*, for love of whom he made Jews knights and companions of the Bend, which order his father had instituted to give encouragement to chivalry; for in his day none carried the Bend who had not proved himself a [good] knight against the Saracens. Wherefore certain Christian knights of the said order took offence that the Jews should thus be favoured on an equality with Christians, deeming that this was contrary to their ancestral custom. They therefore told the said king that

MS.
fo. 235 it was an unworthy thing that such dogs as these should be companions of such a fair, honourable and dignified order.

¹ 24th June.

³ *Vn vadlet Escotois.*

² *Qe des Escotois fu dit roy.*

⁴ Pedro 'the Cruel.'

The king answered them in wrath, saying that they were as much men as others, and not dogs, but were their equals. 'Very well,' replied the knights, 'we are ready to test that by our bodies at once.' 'By God!' exclaimed the king, 'and so let it be. We shall see to it that you do so.'

The Christians were thirty, the Jews sixty-two [in number]; with the said king's consent and in his presence they engaged upon a plain with good swords, but without armour. The Christians cut down all the Jews to death, at which the king was most furious. He gave himself up entirely to youthful excess, wherefore many of his people attached themselves to his bastard brother with whom he was at war, for he had caused his other bastard brothers to be slain.

The said King of Spain had been at war with the King of Aragon,¹ but this was composed between them by a treaty of peace, and the King of Spain went off to his own country and lived in a dissolute manner, so that without his knowledge the war with Aragon was suddenly renewed more fiercely than before.

Wherefore, albeit peace in itself is the earthly possession most to be coveted by all reasonable natures as the sovereign blessing of the age and the thing to be encouraged by a ruler, yet the manner thereof gives much cause for reflection. When the basis and motive of peace are derived honestly from virtue and [a desire] to please God, without being inspired, strengthened or constrained by any [other] influence, especially by no wish for ease nor carnal desire, but virtuously and righteously for the common weal, such peace cannot but be profitable and good. But when there is a double motive and the matter is undertaken in opposition to the said virtues, there is not so much value in it, but the result of the affair is greatly to be suspected; as when one is conscious of his right and yet fails to maintain it through indolence and a desire to avoid discomfort, wishing and hoping to find more pleasure in another direction; or as when one abandons [his right] through want of means, or through the weariness of people's hearts in persevering, or through growing old—this [manner of] putting an end to a war is not often profitable in the outcome; for many people intending only to warm themselves set themselves on fire; and the chances of time

¹The war was between Pedro 'the Cruel,' of Castile, and Pedro IV. 'the Ceremonious,' of Aragon.

are so uncertain that, in thinking to avoid one trouble, one involves himself in a greater one. And if it is not apparent that war can be avoided by means of wealth, should not kings despair of sufficiency of treasure? and, unless virtue dissuade him [from war, what assurance has he that], failing to obtain aid from one, he may not find others to aid him? That is to say—want of prudence, of hardihood and of [means for] liberality. Want of prudence—as when one does not inquire whether God will show him grace in advancing his cause and does not press the same in reasonable measure through the willing accord of his people, and with such hardihood as shall not be daunted at a crisis by fear of disaster or of damage to property during war; endurance of which things in a bold way, [brings] honour, profit and cheerfulness, so that the hand shall be liberal in rewarding those who deserve it, for the encouragement of others to do the like—the one thing in the world most helpful in waging war. Let him who seeks to stop a war otherwise than it pleases God consider that the dice may turn against him just when he expects to reap advantage. And if it were possible that God would not allow that man should enjoy his blessings, except on account of heinous sin, just as he prevented Moses entering upon the Promised Land, because out of vain-glory he received worship from the people of Israel,¹ who assigning to his own power the miracles which God showed them at his hands, in which he glorified himself, wherefore he forfeited [the privilege of] the said entry [into the Promised Land], the thing which, above all others, he desired.

Wherefore would kings do well to attribute their benefits to God and to the good behaviour of their people, in whose welfare consists their treasure; for God holds kings in due governance as the executive government of their people. For the people often suffer for the sins of kings; wherefore they [kings] ought to take good heed lest their actions bring about general and widespread disaster, as has been often seen; so that their [high] estate should be regulated towards God by virtue and towards the people by morality.

People ought to know that about Michaelmas in this same year of the Incarnation 1360, the said King John of

¹ *Il prist longa du poeple de Israel.* This strange word *longa*, printed *longa* in the *Maitland Club Ed.*, appears to be a form of *louange*.

France was released from his captivity by the King of England at Calais upon conditions afore mentioned. Which king having remained a prisoner in England for three years—at London, at Windsor and at Somerton, payed on leaving one million in gold, and left honourable hostages for the fulfilment of the remaining articles in the covenant, namely, his two sons, the Comtes d'Anjou and de Poitiers; his brother the Duc d'Orleans; his kinsman the Duc de Bourbon; the Comtes de Blois, d'Alençon, de Saint-Pol, de Harcourt, de Porcien, de Valentinois, de Brienne, de Wadmond, de Fores, and the Viscomte de Beaumont; the Lords de Coucy, de Fiennes, de Preux, de Saint-Venant, de Garençières, de Montmorency, de *Hauget*, and the Dauphin *d'Aineryne*; Messieurs Piers d'Alençon, William de Chinon, Louis de Harcourt and John de Ligny. And in addition it was agreed that if the sixteen prisoners taken at Poitiers with the said King of France would remain as hostages for the said occasion, that they should be released without ransom under the said treaty; and if not, that they should remain to be ransomed, other suitable [hostages] taking their places; the names of which prisoners are Philip, Comte de Berry, son of the said king; the Comtes de Longueville, de Tankerville, de Joigny, de Porcien, de *Saucer*, de Dammartin, de *Ventatour*, de Salebris, d'Auxerre, de Vendôme; the Lords de *Cynoun*, d'*Ervalle*, the Maréchal de Oudenam and the Lord d'Aubigny. Also it was agreed that two of the leading burgesses of each of the best cities of France should remain as hostages to the King of England until the said treaty was fulfilled, that is to say, of Paris, of Amiens, of Saint Omar, of Arras, of Tournay, of Lille, of Douai, of Beauvois, of Rennes, of Chalons, of Troyes, of Chartres, of Orleans, of Toulouse, of Lyons, of Tours, of Rouen, of Caen and of Compiègne. These articles, conditions and form of peace having been settled in due form, were agreed to and confirmed by general assent of the nobles of both realms, proclaimed in parliament and ratified by the oaths of the two kings; for the execution and fulfilment of which treaty the knight John de Chandos was sent on the part of the King of England, fully empowered to deliver up the castles and strongholds which had been taken in various parts of the realm of France, which he did faithfully as he was instructed by the King

MS.
fo. 236.

of England, according to the conditions agreed on. The English who had continued this war with France on their own account, joined forces with [men of] divers nations and were called The Great Company. They left France by command of the King of England, took the town of Pont Saint-Esprit, and raised war in Provence, living wondrous well by rapine.

Duke Henry of Lancaster died in March in the year of grace 1361, and was buried at Leicester. This Henry was sage, illustrious and valiant, and in his youth was enterprising in honour and arms, becoming a right good Christian before his death. He had two daughters as heirs; the Duke of Bavaria, Count of Hainault, Zeeland and Holland, who became insane, married the first; John Earl of Richmond, son of the said King of England, married the second.

In this same year the said King of England caused a castle to be rebuilt¹ in the Isle of Sheppey at the mouth of the Thames.

In the same year aforesaid the King of Lithuania was taken by the lords of Prussia² who surprised him by stratagem on the departure of the Christian army from his country after Easter, when he was pursuing them impetuously.

In this year there was a widespread mortality of people in England, lasting in one place and another more than a year, the second fatal pestilence which befel the people in the reign of this Edward the Third.

On Saint Bartholemew's day, in August of the same season, the King of Cyprus took by storm the town of Satalie, in MS. fo. 236^b Turkey, and garrisoned it with Christians.

Lionel, Earl of Ulster, in right of his wife and son of the King of England, went to Ireland in this same season to suppress the Irish, who were doing serious injury to the English of the country after their manner.

In this season the King of Denmark fought hard at sea with the Easterlings, who had retaken *Scon*³ and much of Sweden from the King of Norway.

¹ Or 'caused a new castle to be built'—*fist edifier de nouvel un chastel*.

² The Letts or Lithuanians, a people of Indo-European race, were Pagans in the 14th century. They remain the only European people, except the Goidelic Celt, in whose language, as in Sanskrit, there are words beginning with *sr*.

³ ? Schoonen.

In this same year Edward, eldest son of the King of England, and at that time Prince of Wales, took to wife, under dispensation, the daughter of the Earl of Kent, his father's uncle. She had been married before,¹ and was a right charming woman, and the wealthy heiress of her father and of her uncle the Lord of Wake.

In the middle of January of this same year of grace 1361, there came a storm of wind in several counties around London which threw down churches and bell-towers, and trees in the woods and gardens, stripping houses in an extraordinary manner. The comet star appeared in this season.

In the same season the aforesaid King of Lithuania escaped from prison by mining, with the collusion of a renegade Lett who had been reared with the said lords of Prussia; to remedy which escape the said lords in the following season made a great naval expedition to Lithuania, besieged the castle of Kovno on the Niemen, and took it by assault with pretty feats of arms.

In the same season a band of the Great Company, which had its origin during the King of England's war, defeated the power of France in Auvergne, most of the lords being retaken who had formerly been prisoners of the King of England. Jacques de Bourbon was killed, also the Comte de *Salbrog*, and many others in this affair.

In Lent of the same season, a band of Bretons, belonging to the Great Company, were defeated at *La Garet* in Limousin by William de Felton, an English Knight, at that time seneschal of the district for the King of England.

In the following season, the year of grace 1362, a band of Gascons belonging to the Great Company which had been scattered in search of means to sustain themselves, were defeated in Auvergne by the Bastard of Spain. The Governor of Blois defeated in Berry another band of Gascons of the same Company. A band of Englishmen under Robert Dyar were defeated in the same season near *Ho* in Normandy by Bertrand du Guesclin, a Breton.

About this time the duchy of Burgundy, with the countship [thereof], came to John, King of France, through inheritance from his mother, who was sister to the duke, the offspring of her brother being dead.

¹First to William Montacute, Earl of Salisbury, and second to Thomas, Lord Holland, Earl of Kent.

The said King of France made terms with the Great Company, which had disturbed his realm since the King of England's war had been concluded, that they should quit his ^{MS.} realm on receiving a large sum of money; which they did, ^{fo. 237} betaking themselves into different countries where they found wars; many of them joining the King of Aragon against the King of Spain, who were waging war against each other.

In this season the said King of England granted the duchy of Guienne to his son Edward, Prince of Wales, to be held by him by high seigniory, homage, jurisdiction and royal appeals.

About Michaelmas in the same year of grace, 1362, Pope Innocent died at Avignon; after whose death arose great dissension in the College of Cardinals about the election of a Pope. For a long time they could come to no agreement through jealousy [of each other], none being willing that any of the others should become Pope. At last they chose a black monk, a poor abbot of Saint Victor near Marseille, who was so much astonished that he thought that the messengers who brought him the news were making fun of him. He was consecrated and named Urban: he made a rule that no benefice of Holy Church should exceed one hundred pounds in amount, except for those who had taken a degree in the schools, and for these [the limit was] two hundred pounds; and doctors of civil law, of decretals and of divinity should not exceed three hundred pounds.

Joan, Queen of Scotland, and sister of the King of England, wife of David de Brus, died in this same season, and was buried beside her mother in the Minorities of London.¹

After this same Martinmas, the said King of England held a general parliament in London, where it was ordained by statute that the law pleas of his realm should be conducted in English, having hitherto been so in French since the time of William the Conqueror.

At the same Parliament the said King created his two sons dukes—Lionel, Earl of Ulster, who was then in Ireland, being made Duke of Clarence; the other, John, Duke of Lancaster, [with remainder] to their heirs male. His third son, Edmund, he made Earl of Cambridge.² He fixed the wool

¹ She had left King David because of his infidelity, receiving Hertford Castle from King Edward as a residence.

² Edmund was the fifth son, and was afterwards Duke of York.

staple at Calais, where, on the same day of Saint Brice¹ in the sixtieth year of his age,² he remitted of his grace to his subjects all debts and arrears appertaining to his regality which they owed him, abandoning all process on account of party, treason or homicide. This [was done] in token of temporal grace, just as every fiftieth year from the Incarnation is the year of spiritual grace.

Before Christmastide in the same season a great battle took place in Gascony between the Comte de Foys and the Comte d'Armagnac. The Comte de Foys obtained the victory by the help of many English, a band of the great Company. The Comte d'Armagnac and the Sire de la Bret were taken, and many of d'Armagnac's side were killed and taken.

David, King of Scotland, in this same season besieged the castle of Kindrummie in Mar, because of the extortions which the Earl of Mar and his people had wrought upon the people of the district, as was alleged against him by the king. This castle was surrendered to him [the king] and then was restored to the said Earl with the earldom for one thousand pounds, to be paid to the said king at the end of five years on pain of losing them. Which affair arose chiefly from an appeal to [trial by] battle which William de Keith delivered to the said earl in the said king's court; whereupon they appeared armed in the lists at Edinburgh, the quarrel being settled there under the king's hand,³ who seemed more favourable to the said William than to the said earl, albeit he [the earl] was his near kinsman.

Soon after that, in the same season, there arose disagreement between the said David, King of Scotland, and William, Earl of Douglas, who had the sister of the Earl of Mar to wife, because of divers matters wherein it appeared to the said earl that the said king had not shown him such fair lordship as he would have liked. So he [Douglas] made a conspiracy, collected a large following, seized and garrisoned the castle of Dirlton, which castle was under ward of the king.

The said earl, with the concurrence of the Steward of Scotland and the Earl of March, who affixed their seals to a petition laid before the said king, complained that

¹ 13th November.

² It should be 'fiftieth.'

³ *La querel illoques pr...n mayn du roi.* The word pr...n is blotted and illegible in the original. It was part of the law of trial by battle that the king might take the quarrel into his own hand, and stop the fight.

the said king had forced them to break¹ the conditions, to which they had sworn on the body of God before the King of England, about paying the ransom of the said king their lord, which [ransom] had been levied by an impost on the commonalty and squandered by evil counsel, wherefore they demanded reparation and wiser government. For this reason the king marched against the said earl, and when the king was in one district the earl rode into another against those who were of the king's party, imprisoning the king's people wheresoever he could take them. He marched to Inverkeithing by night and captured the Sheriff of Angus with a company of armed men on their way to join the king, and sent them to prison in various places.

The said king marched by night from Edinburgh, and very nearly surprised the said Earl of Douglas at Lanark, where he had lain at night, but he escaped with difficulty, some of his people being taken.

The Steward of Scotland, without the knowledge or consent of his allies, made his peace with his lord the king; the Earl of Douglas did so also by himself, and the Earl of March did likewise.

And this rising having been thus put down for the time, the said David took to wife Margaret de Logie, a lady who had been married already, and who had lived with him for some time.

This marriage was made solely on account of love, which conquers all things.

¹ *Rountre* : printed *vouutre* in *Maitland Club Ed.*

(*Concluded.*)

The Teaching of Scottish History in Schools¹

THOUGH some may regard it as a rash assumption, we may perhaps venture to take it for granted that history is a legitimate and desirable subject in a school curriculum. If, indeed, there is a human instinct for any kind of knowledge, it is surely the desire to know the history of our fellow-mortals. If in the case of primitive races curiosity is first directed to the superhuman forces that condition life, their next intellectual interest is in the traditions of their own origin and history. At the camp fire of the savage the deeds of his ancestors are an unflinching theme of interest, and there is striking testimony to the exactitude with which one generation of tribesmen hands on its tradition to the next. Instinctively, it would appear, the rudimentary society realizes that its continuous existence is dependent on the tenacity with which it clings to its own particular past. 'We are what you were; we shall be what you are,' ran the patriotic hymn of the Spartans, and the words express at once the essence of patriotism and the essential idea of history.

Like other subjects, history may be studied from purely intellectual curiosity, but the primary justification of our interest in it is the original instinct that impels us to realize the past through which we have become what we are. Except in the case of the few for whom history is only a department of knowledge, it is still this original instinct that prompts to its study, and it is to this original instinct we must appeal in the teaching of history to the young. In the child as in the savage, there is this natural desire to know how he came to be what he is. 'Children love to listen to stories about their elders,' says Charles Lamb, and it is observable that the more remote the past, the more it impresses their imagination and excites their interest. Children love large measures equally in space and time, and it

¹ A Lecture delivered to the Glasgow Branch of the Educational Institute of Scotland and to the Eastern Branch of the Secondary Teachers' Association of Scotland.

quickens rather than diminishes their attention, to be told of an event that it happened a thousand and not a hundred years ago. In teaching them history, therefore, we are ministering to a natural desire, and in satisfying that desire we are working along with nature in the organic development of their minds. It can be said of history, indeed, what cannot be said of every subject in the school curriculum,—that it expands the individual by impressing him with the sense at once of his own insignificance and of his own importance as the ‘ heir of all the ages.’ You will remember the reply of the Carthusian monk to the question how he had contrived to pass his life: *Cogitavi dies antiquos et annos aeternos in mente habui.* Consciously or unconsciously we are the products of the past, and the individual cannot attain to his full stature till to the extent of his capacities he takes cognizance of the contributory streams that are the sources of his intellectual and moral being.

In teaching history to the young, then, we are satisfying an instinct which, if wisely cultivated, seems intended by nature to become one of the chief formative influences of intellect and character. But it is one of the disadvantages of civilization that it is apt to deaden or distort the wholesome instincts which were meant for the secure guidance of life. With the growing complexity of human aims and endeavours natural promptings are smothered, or, what is equally disastrous, they are diverted from the channels in which they were intended to flow. In the case of the teaching of history we easily see how misdirection is apt to arise. For primitive societies the past is a comparatively simple affair. A few outstanding individualities, a few prominent events comprise their whole tradition, and, apprehended by simple intuition, directly evoke the emotion and imagination which create the collective consciousness of the community. In the case of highly organized societies it is far otherwise. In the tangled and many-coloured web of their past it is difficult to find the central strands which yet give unity and cohesion to its texture. We are bewildered by the apparent conflict of opposing tendencies and of warring national leaders, and we lose sight of the fact that all alike go to evolve the net product which we call a people. Yet, if the study of history is to have its true spiritual and intellectual profit, it is precisely from the realization of this fact that profit must be won.

It will be seen, therefore, that in the teaching of history there are difficulties to be faced which other subjects do not present

in the same degree. In the case of a language or a science we have a precise body of facts to be communicated, and the only problem in teaching them is how these facts may be most expeditiously conveyed to other minds. In the case of history, on the other hand, we have first to settle the much-debated question as to what are the significant facts to be selected so that it may work its full effect on the mind that receives them. As we are aware, the problem is one which has long engaged writers on education in every country, and the manifold types of existing historical text-books show how variously the problem is answered. This is a difficulty which every country has to face in the teaching of its national history, but, as we know, in our own case another difficulty exists which we owe to the peculiar position in which Providence has been pleased to place us.

Two centuries ago the destinies of Scotland were linked with those of another country greater in extent and resources than itself, and, we may admit, more conspicuous in the world's eye than its remoter and less favoured yoke-fellow. At first, as we know, the marriage was not a happy one, and one of the partners, at least, was long convinced, and not without good reason, that the bond had been a mistake from the beginning. But both the ill-assorted parties were pre-eminently endowed with common sense, and above all with the desire to have their full share of the good things to be found in this world, and in their own interests they gradually settled down to a tolerable understanding regarding their mutual duties and responsibilities. In time, comparatively friendly intercourse was established between them, but all along there were advantages on one side which naturally gave umbrage to the other.

On the part of Scotland the gravest objection to the Union was the dread of her individuality being merged in that of her more powerful neighbour, and from the day that the great transaction was completed she has never ceased to be haunted with this apprehension. Quite recently we have seen important representative bodies raising their protest against what they regard as a serious menace to Scotland's continued existence as a nation. The school-boards of her two chief cities, and that most venerable of her corporate bodies—the Convention of Royal Burghs—have directed attention to the insidious process through which, they believe, this calamity is threatened. Scotland, name and thing, they report, is menaced with obliteration

from the records of mankind. As the result of a special enquiry, the Convention of Burghs has testified that Scottish history does not receive its rightful measure of attention in the national schools and that its place is unduly usurped by the history of the sister country. What in their opinion is still more to be reprobated, in the current school books Scottish history is not infrequently treated from a purely English standpoint. The history of Scotland, even before the Union, is represented as that of an outlying province of England with no independent self-subsistence of its own. In connection with the period subsequent to the Union they find still graver ground of offence. In direct disregard of the express terms of the Treaty of Union the terms 'English' and 'England' are substituted for 'British' and 'Britain,' and Scotland is thus insulted in her national sentiment and defrauded of her due in the building-up of the British Empire. The achievements of Scottish statesmen, soldiers, men of science and men of letters are put down to the account of England, with the result that in the eyes of the world England has all the glory which in justice should be fairly proportioned between the allied peoples. As a matter of fact, at least, we have recently had a weighty testimony regarding the neglect of Scottish history in our schools. In his school report for 1905 Mr. Struthers has the following significant remarks: 'It was disappointing to note a widespread ignorance of Scottish history even among more picked pupils who may be supposed to represent the outcome of the most advanced teaching. A large percentage of the Honours candidates who wrote on Montrose confused him with Claverhouse, while one candidate, an Edinburgh candidate, too, went so far as to ascribe to Jeannie Deans the exploit of Jenny Geddes.'

A fussy patriotism is certainly a thing to be reprobated. It compromises the dignity of a nation, and invites the taunt that the nation can hardly be of much account that requires to flaunt its existence in the eyes of the world. But that can scarcely be called a fussy patriotism which only demands an exact use of historical terms, and maintains that the rising generation should have full and accurate instruction in the history of their native country. Moreover, if we analyse the feeling that prompts these demands, we cannot but see that it rests on rational grounds which are its fullest justification. If the history of the past has any educational value, it is from the history of our own people that the richest gain is to be derived—and this for the

simple reason that it is only the history of our own people that we can adequately understand. It was the maxim of the greatest of French critics that no one can speak with perfect security of any literature but his own; what he meant being that each literature is the expression of national idiosyncrasies which in their totality can never be fully apprehended even by the most gifted of aliens.

And what is true of literature, which is only one expression of the spirit of a people, must be doubly true in the case of a collective national life. In the citizen of every nation there is an inheritance of sentiment and emotion and type of thought of which he cannot divest himself, and which makes him Scot or Frenchman or German, as his destiny has ordained. It is two hundred years since the Union, and still to-day England is a very different place from Scotland and an Englishman a very different being from a Scot. Between a Scotsman wholly educated in Scotland and an Englishman wholly educated in England there is an intellectual estrangement which it requires an effort on the part of both to overcome. Their differences of accent and pronunciation are but the outward signs of an inward diversity of mental habit and tendency. If they come to discuss a subject of any complexity, they speedily discover that they start from different premises, apply different logical processes, and see the governing facts in incompatible relations. In the case of fundamental questions, such as those that bear on human life and destiny, the opposition of the two types is illustrated at once by history and by present experience. The average Englishman frankly admits that his mind is unequal to take in our theological distinctions, and the average Scot is equally perplexed by an Englishman's concern about ritual, which seems to him a mere question of millinery and upholstery. And the countries they inhabit bear on the face of them the marks of the different national experience which they have inherited. Apart from their different national aspects and apart from the appearance of greater national resources in the one than in the other, the two countries immediately suggest that two distinct peoples have made them what they respectively are. As Hugh Miller and Robert Louis Stevenson have vividly shown, an adult Scot who for the first time visits England feels that he is virtually in a foreign country. As he looks around him, he realizes that a process of reflection is necessary before he can take in what he sees and relate it intelligibly to his previous experience.

But all this goes to illustrate what has just been said—that it is only our own national history that we can adequately realize and understand in all its significance, and from which we can derive the stimulus and instruction which the knowledge of the past is fitted to give. We may have the most exact acquaintance with the facts of other national histories, but they will always be something external to us; something eludes us which is yet of their very essence, and we are all the while unconscious that we have missed it. We have but to read the best histories of our own country by foreigners to realize how impossible it is for them to avoid misapprehensions which excite our wrath or our ridicule, as the case may be. The historian Taine made a special study of England, yet, as is well known, he gravely notes it as a proof of the respect of English boys for their parents, that they speak of their father as ‘the governor.’ It was quite a natural blunder for a foreigner to make, but it is a blunder which illustrates the fact that only a native can tread securely outside the bare facts of his national history. It is only the members of the household who understand the varying expressions and gestures of each other which mean so much to them, but are imperceptible even to the most intimate friend. The inference is that the history of any people cannot be learned from books alone. Facts may be acquired with perfect fulness and accuracy, the chain of cause and effect in the national development may be grasped with absolute clearness and precision, yet the insight which can only come from natural sympathies and affinities, and which alone is truly formative, can be acquired by no amount of study even by the most gifted minds. It is, indeed, no paradox to say that half and perhaps the better half of our knowledge of our national history is unconsciously learnt, and that it is by this unconscious knowledge we interpret what we deliberately acquire.

But, as was already said, children in Scotland are in a peculiar position with regard to the study of their national history. They are born into the inheritance of their own country and nation, but as incorporate with England and the British Empire they are thus the inheritors of a triple tradition, which to forfeit and ignore would be disastrous to them as individuals and disastrous to that great community to whose building-up their fathers have contributed no little part. To restrict the study of history in our schools to Scottish history alone, therefore, would be at once an individual and a corporate injury; and this,

it may be said, for a double reason. As a future citizen of the British Empire, the pupil in our schools is conditioned by its past, has a stake in its future, and he must one day share the responsibility for the policy that shall guide and direct it. Ignorant of its history, he at once misses a great inheritance, and is a maimed member of that collective community in whose destinies his own are involved—whether he will or not.

But there is another reason why the study of history in our schools should not be restricted to that of Scotland alone. In point of fact, the history of no one country can be understood when isolated from that of every other. The founder of the University Chair with which I am personally associated defined its aim to be—the teaching of the history of Scotland and that of other countries so far as they illustrate the history of Scotland. Whether, indeed, we take the history of Scotland before or after the Union of the Parliaments, it cannot be fully intelligible without reference to the histories of England and of continental countries. At one time or other previous to the Union every class in the Scottish nation was affected by the corresponding classes among other peoples. Our kings learned lessons from the kings of France and England, our nobles from their own class in the same countries, and our burghs from similar communities in England and on the Continent. And the Union of 1707 itself is seen in its true historical perspective only when we realize the fact that it was the natural result of political and economical forces that were determining the development of all the countries of Western Europe.

There can be no question, therefore, that the teaching of Scottish history in our schools must be supplemented by the teaching of the histories of other countries, and specifically by the history of England and of the British Empire. But it is from the knowledge of our own national history as a basis that we can most adequately interpret the histories of other countries, and this for the reason that has already been suggested,—that, in point of fact, it is only the history of our own people which we can ever really understand. Even to the adult, study the histories of other countries as diligently as he may, those histories will always be something external, and he acquires his knowledge of them by a purely intellectual process. But if this be true of the adult it is doubly so in the case of the school-boy. His soul, his emotions cannot be so deeply engaged by the history of any other people as by the history of his own. What are

Simon de Montfort, the Kingmaker, Pym, or Hampden to him compared with Wallace and Bruce, the Good Sir James Douglas, Montrose and Dundee? These are to him bone of his bone, and flesh of his flesh; he has a personal interest in their fortunes, and he admires or hates them according to his own predilections and his family traditions. But it is only when the mind is thus alive to any subject that something can be gained from it beyond merely strengthening the memory and storing it with matters of fact.

And what is this something which is to be gained from an early acquaintance with our national history? It is the enlargement of mind and emotion and imagination which comes of the vivid realization of a world wider than the petty one which must be the immediate and main concern of each of us. And it is to be noted that it is only in youth that the mind possesses the elasticity which makes this enlargement possible. Then only are impressions so vivid that they pass into our being and cast the mould of our after thinking and feeling. And once gained, this acquisition is at once a possession and a faculty. It is a possession because this enlarged life we have once experienced gives its tone and colour to all subsequent experience, and it is a faculty because we are thus enabled to apply a larger and more genial measure equally to men and things.

According to Wordsworth, who, as we know, had pondered deeply on the growth of the individual mind, it should be the prime concern in education to

Nourish imagination in her growth,
And give the mind that apprehensive power,
Whereby she is made quick to recognise
The moral properties and scope of things.

Of all the subjects that can be taught either in secondary or elementary schools, there is none so specifically fitted to foster imagination and apprehensive power as the study of national history. Science opens up a world that excites curiosity and wonder, but it cannot touch the inmost being in the same degree as the record of the actions of our fellow-creatures. The study of languages has its own value in the development of faculty, but it does little for those powers which Wordsworth considered indispensable for the richest growth of our common nature.

Literature, indeed, works in the direction towards which Wordsworth points us, but the full effect of literature is unattainable by the average pupil either in the primary or

the secondary school. The kind of literature which is capable of evoking the highest powers of mind and soul demands a maturity of thought and experience which belongs to a later period of development and which only time can bring. You will remember the laudable attempt of Matthew Arnold to introduce literature as a power into elementary schools. The pupil in higher schools, he conceived, experienced this power in reading the master-pieces of Greek and Roman literature—which in the case of the average school-boy is open to question. In the case of elementary schools he thought that no access to this power existed, and for the reason that the best English literature was so overlaid with classical traditions that the pupil ignorant of Latin and Greek was not in a position to take it in with intelligence. To remedy this defect he edited his Bible-reading for Schools, consisting of the second part of the prophecy of Isaiah—his contention being that every British child was familiar with Bible ideas and Bible language and would thus readily transport himself into a world other than his own, and a world admirably fitted to impress him with ‘the moral properties and scope of things.’ It is difficult not to feel, however, that Arnold misjudged the capacity of the average school-child whom he had directly in his view. The scope of the prophet’s ideas, the exaltation of his style, the lack of a continuous narrative to sustain the attention, demand an experience both in life and literature for their comprehension which we cannot look for in a pupil in an elementary school. The educational benefit which Arnold expected from the study of his Bible-reading was that the scholar, by taking in a great literary whole which engaged his soul as well as his mind, ‘gained access to a new life,’ ‘was lifted out of the present,’ and schooled ‘to live with the life of the race.’ But for the attainment of these high ends, surely desirable for every responsible human being, the study of the history of one’s own people seems a simpler and more effective means than that which he proposed. The subject is one which interests the youngest child, and it can be adapted to every stage of his development. Moreover, if the grasp of a great whole has the educative value which Arnold attaches to it, the history of his own country is perhaps the only great whole which the pupil is capable of apprehending. That he can apprehend it is, I believe, a fact of experience. His apprehension is doubtless immature, vague, coloured by childish fancies; but once acquired, the conception will grow with his

own growth in fulness and precision; it will be a possession for life, making him conscious of the roots of his own being—of the heritage he owes to the race from which he has sprung.

Nor will his absorption of the history of his own people blind him to the virtues of others. Prejudice against foreign countries is mainly due to ignorance of the history of our own. When we know the history of our own people from the beginning, we realize that at one time or other in the course of its development it has manifested all the elemental impulses of human nature which are found in the history of other peoples. It has had its periods of frenzy, of magnanimity, of cruelty, of volatility, of sober and steadfast enthusiasm. We think the French a fickle and restless nation, but such impressions arise from restricting our regard to certain periods of a nation's history. Before its great Revolution the French could justly boast that they had been less prone to novelties in state and religion than any people in Europe. In the seventeenth century the French regarded the English as the most restless and fickle of peoples, and the history of England during that century naturally gave rise to the impression. To correct such hasty judgments, to school us to that enlightened patriotism which, while treasuring its own national tradition as a precious possession, does generous justice to the traditions of other races—the true and effective means is to know our own history as a whole. By restricting our attention to special periods this discipline is, in great measure lost, and for the reason that in one particular period we see only the exaggerated manifestation of one aspect of the national character. The period of the Reformation in Scotland is doubtless the most momentous in our annals, but by exclusively fixing our eyes on that period we are apt not only to misread the national character, but to defeat the end which should be the ultimate object of the profitable study of history. We identify ourselves with its contentions, take sides with its leaders, and lose sight of the all-important fact that the sixteenth century, like every other, was only one stage in the evolution of the Scottish people. Only by the large survey of every stage of a nation's history can we understand its own distinctive characteristics, and learn to distinguish that special note which it has contributed to what has been called 'the great chorus of humanity.'

From what has been said it will be seen that I am advocating the study of our national history in schools not so much with

the view of producing patriots as of producing fully developed men and women. If it could be shown that the study of the history of other countries were better fitted to effect this result, surely every good patriot would say—by all means, then, let him do so. But if the reasoning I have submitted to you be sound, it is in the nature of things that the youthful mind should derive its largest profit from acquaintance with the history to which it alone possesses the key, which it can understand and assimilate as it can do no other. From such an acquaintance it acquires something far more than a multiplicity of facts; it has entered into the life of at least one segment of the universal mind, and has gained that permanent faculty of imaginative sympathy which beyond every other lightens the burden of daily experience.

The time has gone by when we can advocate any study on petty and parochial grounds. Each nation now lives in the full current of the universal life, and if it is to be an adequate partaker of that life, its people must possess the discipline and the aptitudes requisite to receive it. It is, therefore, on the grounds, not of a narrow patriotism, but on the grounds of reason and enlightened self-interest that I have tried to emphasize the importance of the study of our national history in schools. At present, it is a matter of regret among Scotsmen of all shades of opinion that it does not receive the amount of attention it deserves. The regret is felt mainly because national sentiment is thus impaired, and with it the native vigour which springs from the consciousness of an inspiring past. But this, as I believe, is only part, and not even the greater part, of our loss. By neglecting to communicate to our youth a full, an accurate, and a living knowledge of their nation's history we are depriving them of a nutriment at once for soul and mind, which in the nature of things no other secular subject can in equal measure supply.

P. HUME BROWN.