

The Scottish Historical Review

VOL. VI., No. 22

JANUARY 1909

Ballads illustrating the relations of England and Scotland during the Seventeenth Century

IN a previous paper, printed in this *Review*,¹ an attempt was made to illustrate from ballads published during 1638-40 the feeling of the English people with regard to the two campaigns of Charles I. against the Covenanters. In the present a larger task is attempted, namely, to show from the ballads and political poetry produced in England between 1603 and 1688 how the political events of the period affected for good or ill English feeling towards Scotland.

The accession of James I. in March, 1603, and the union of the two crowns of England and Scotland was the signal for an outbreak of congratulatory verse of every kind addressed to the new king. 'The very poets with their idle pamphlets promise themselves great part in his favour,' wrote Chamberlain to Carleton on April 12, 1603 (*Court and Times of James I.* i. 7.) Specimens in plenty of their productions are reprinted in volume one of Nichols's *Progresses of James I.*, and some others may be found in the second series of *Fugitive Tracts* written in verse, privately printed by Mr. W. C. Hazlitt in 1875, and in (iii. 544; x. 342) Park's edition of the *Harleian Miscellany*. But while so many of these poetical tracts survive, time has dealt hardly with the similar compositions produced by the balladmongers and printed in broadside form. The registers of the Stationers' Company give the titles of many. 'A thinge in verse called King James proclaimed (March 30,

¹ *Scottish Historical Review*, iii. 257.

1603); The Joy and ready preparacion of the nobles and states of this Land for the enterteyninge of the Kinge (June 11); A Song of Joy for the Kinge's coronacion on Sanct James Day Last (Aug. 1); A joyfull newe ditty made of our most gracious and nowe crowned King of England, Scotland, France, and Ireland (Aug. 1)'; and there are nearly half a dozen more either on the coronation itself or the entertainments which followed it. Yet of all the ballads on this event one only has survived: 'An excellent new ballad shewing the petigree of our royal King James, the first of that name in England,' which is reprinted in *Roxburghe Ballads*, viii. 758, and in *Sherburn Ballads*, p. 315.

'Eyght hundred myles his Empyre goes
in length, in spight of all his foes.
From Cornewall to past Calidon
Is knowne to be King James own.'

This is a fair specimen both of the author's verse and his reflections. More interest attaches to a small set of ballads illustrating the ill-feeling which the favour James showed to his Scottish followers caused in England. A popular rhyme on this subject is quoted in Osborne's 'Traditional Memoirs' (*Secret History of James I.* ed. Scott, 1811, i. 217). 'This nation,' says Osborne, 'was rooted up by those Caledonian bores, as these homely verses do attest, which were everywhere posted, and do containe as many stories as lines . . .'

'They beg our lands, our goods, our lives,
They switch our nobles, and lye with their wives;
They pinch our gentry, and send for our benchers,
They stab our sargeants and pistoll our fencers.'

The last half line refers to the well-known case of Lord Sanquhar's trial for hiring two ruffians to murder the fencing-master, Turner. Sanquhar was hanged on June 29, 1612, and on July 5 there was entered to William Burley 'a ballad of the Lord Sanquire,' called 'Bloodshed revenged' (*Arber, Stationers' Registers*, iii. 490). Unluckily this ballad has not survived.

Another incident, the duel between Sir James Stewart and Sir George Wharton on November 8, 1612, in which both the combatants were killed, is celebrated in a ballad reprinted in the *Roxburghe Ballads*, vii. 595, and copies of the broadside are to be found in six English collections besides the

Roxburghe. Mr. Ebsworth, in his introduction to the reprint, describes Wharton as 'a pestilent swaggerer and insufferable nuisance' who well deserved chastisement. Another version of this ballad, held by Mr. Ebsworth to have been altered and sophisticated by Hogg, is to be found in Scott's *Border Minstrelsy* (ed. 1810, ii. 296) and also in Maidment's *Scottish Ballads, Historical and Traditional*, ii. 164. A lighter side of national rivalry appears in a unique ballad called the 'Leaping of the Lords' (*Roxburghe Ballads*, viii. 135). Three Scotch lords proudly challenge the peers of England to leap against them for a bet of £7000. The contest takes place in the presence of King James and Prince Charles, the latter offering to wager £10,000 on the English champion. The Earl of Southampton, the English champion, leaps 'six yards and full two foot' easily defeating his competitor. King James, alluding to the fact that Southampton was a prisoner in the Tower for complicity in Essex's plot when he came to the throne, tells him that he leapt a far greater leap when he leapt from the Tower. Your Grace did more, interposes Lord Derby, 'you leapt a greater leap from Scotland's gates to wear our English crown.' The ballad ends amicably, and with boasts of the agility and vigour of the English peerage.

The tables are turned in the next ballad which requires mention. It is entitled 'Blew Cap for me,' and the substance of it may be gathered from the second verse:

'There lives a blithe lass in Faukeland towne,
 And shee had some suitors, I wot not how many;
 But her resolution shee had set downe
 That shee'd have a Blew-cap gif e're she had any:
 An Englishman when our good king was there
 Came often unto her, and loved her deere:
 But still she replide, "Sir, I pray let me be
 Gif ever I have a man Blew-cap for me.'

(*Roxburghe Ballads*, i. 75.)

The ballad was registered March 22, 1634, and was clearly suggested by Charles the First's visit to Scotland in 1633. Five others entered in 1633 entitled 'A princely Progress,' 'Joyful newes from Scotland,' 'News from the North,' 'News of the Coronation,' and 'His majesties returne from Scotland,' referred to the same journey, but all have perished (Arber, *Stationers' Registers*, iv. 270, 271, 273, 274, 289).

The paucity of English ballads about events in Scotland, or

Scottish matters in general, during the first forty years which followed the union of the crowns is not surprising. It illustrates the truth of what Clarendon writes when he begins his account of the disturbances about the liturgy in 1637. 'There was so little curiosity either in the Court or the country to know anything of Scotland, or what was done there, that when the whole nation was solicitous to know what passed weekly in Germany and Poland and all other parts of Europe, no man ever enquired what was doing in Scotland, nor had that kingdom a place or mention in one page of any gazette, so little the world heard or thought of that people.'¹ All this was changed in 1638, and for the next four years events in Scotland were of supreme interest to England. In the previous paper an attempt was made to illustrate the development of English opinion about these events, and to show how the common opposition of the two countries to Charles I. made the Scots and their country popular in England.² But this period of popularity was brief. The cost entailed by the Scottish occupation of the northern counties and the sums paid and promised for Scotland's 'brotherly assistance' much diminished English gratitude.³ To this period probably belongs the satirical ballad entitled 'The Bonny Scot made a Gentleman,' unless it should be assigned to the reign of James I.⁴

By 1644, when a Scottish army once more entered England, the growth of Royalist feeling had made the Scots hated by half the English nation. They were naturally welcomed by a chorus of execration from Royalist wits. John Cleveland saluted them with 'The Rebel Scot,' containing the oft-repeated taunt:

'Nature herself doth Scotchmen beasts confess
 Making their country such a wilderness. . . .
 Had Cain been Scot, God would have changed his doom,
 Not made him wander, but compelled him home.'

The barrenness of their country, ran the argument, compelled Scots to sell their swords and make a living as mercenaries. 'We would fain change our land for a better' is the confession

¹ *Rebellion*, ii. 18.

² 'Ballads on the Bishops' Wars,' *Scottish Historical Review*, April, 1906.

³ See Terry, *Life of Alexander Leslie*, pp. 144-152.

⁴ It is printed in *The North Country Chorister*, 1802, as Song vi, but when it first appeared I have not been able to discover.

another Royalist poet, Alexander Brome, puts in the mouths of Leslie's soldiers in 'The Scots Curranto,' written, as he asserts, in 1645:

'Long have we longed for the English land,
But we're hindered still by disasters;
But now's the time, when they can't withstand,
But are their own countrey's wasters.'

England's extremity, in short, was Scotland's opportunity:

'And thus when among us the kingdom is shared,
And the people are all made beggars like we;
A Scot will be as good as an English Leard;
O what an unity this will be.'¹

Another reproach flung at the Scots was that they were a nation of pedlars, based on the fact that in England in the seventeenth century numbers of 'petty chapmen,' as they were called, were Scots. This explains the first line and some of the allusions in the following ballad, which is printed from the Ashmolean MSS. in the Bodleian (vol. xxxvi. No. 266). It evidently refers to the siege of Hereford in 1645. Leven and his army invested that city on July 31, and raised the siege about September 2, on the approach of Charles I.

'Did you not see the Scotchman's wallet
Lately hanging on Beare's Court;
The Countreyes treasure pleased their pallet,
Their complayning was their sport?
Did you not see old Leshlye stout
With all his Scottish ragged rout?

(*Chorus.*) Then drinke your drinke and fill your vaine,
The Scotch shall nere come here againe.

Did you not see his pedlers standing,
Sheetes pin'd up against the wall?
'Tis three jurnimen demanding,
Come bye our wares, you here us call.
Come countrymen, and be not slack,
For with your goods wele make our pack.
Then drinke, etc.'

There are six more verses, and one of them, by mentioning the death of Major-General Laurence Crawford, helps to identify the siege referred to in the ballad.

Meanwhile the relations of the Scots with their English allies had become strained. The burden of maintaining the Scottish forces fell heavily on the northern counties. Since the

¹ Brome's Poems, p. 167.

subsidies promised by the Parliament were anything but regularly paid, the soldiers were obliged to live upon the country, which, as usual, was fatal to discipline, and led to every kind of disorder. A ballad called 'The Committee Man's Complaint and the Scots Honest Usage,' published in 1647, enlarges upon this theme. The Scots, it says, made the north country as poor as Job, and carried more out of Yorkshire than would have bought two Scotlands. (Wright, *Political Ballads of the Commonwealth*, p. 60.)¹ The agreement made in December, 1646, to pay them £400,000 in satisfaction of the debt due to them was naturally unpopular in England, as 'The Scots Arrears' sets forth:

'Four hundred thousand pounds!
A lusty bag indeed:
Was't ever known so vast a sum
Ere past the river Tweede?
Great pity 'tis, I swear,
Whole carts was thither sent,
Where hardly two in fifty knew
What forty shillings meant. . . .'

(*Ramp Songs*, p. 222; *Wit Restored*, i. 313.)

The surrender of the king to the Parliamentary Commissioners, which took place at the same time, roused the Royalist satirists once more. Cleveland followed up the 'Rebel Scot' by 'The Scots' Apostacy,' of which the first part seems to have been written in 1646 and the second early in 1647. Like Iscariot, says the poet to the Scots, you have sold your master:

'T was Judas taught you this,
How to betray your master with a kiss.'²

The English ballads, however, say little about what was subsequently called 'the sale of the king.' Before the end of 1647 it was evident that a third Scottish intervention was to be expected in England, and this time on behalf of Charles. The Royalists changed their note to wonder at this conversion:

'What strange Chimera's this, to see
Rebellion turned to loyalty!
Was't e'er in thought of any one
A Scot would fear damnation!
We know by nature clouds at night
Dissolve with Sol's approaching light,

¹ Compare *A Justification of our Brethren of Scotland*, British Museum, 669 f. 11 (77).

² *Cleveland's Poems*, ed. 1687, p. 182. Compare 'Judas Justified,' by his Brother Scot: *Thomason Tracts*, 669, f. 11 (103).

But Scottish mists we only thought
 The Stygian exhalation brought,
 And for to be too black a dye
 For even Charles to rarefy.'

(*MS. Ashmole*, xxxvi. No. 7. Compare *The Scots Constance*, British Museum, E. 383 (9).)

To the Parliamentarians, however, the conduct of the Scots in adopting the royal cause appeared the blackest treachery. Milton expressed this in his sonnet to Fairfax:

'New rebellions raise
 Their hydra heads, and the false North displays
 Her broken league to imp their serpent-wings.'

Milton's exultation in his sonnet to Cromwell over 'Darwen's stream with blood of Scots embrued' is another indication of this feeling. Hence the delight felt at Cromwell's victory at Preston, which is celebrated in a curious ballad 'Upon the routing of the Scots Army,' written in what is supposed to be the dialect of the defeated soldiers, with a chorus of

'Sing heome agen Jockey.'¹

None who suffered in the king's cause was less pitied than the Duke of Hamilton, whom both parties alike accused of treachery. A pamphlet entitled 'Digitus Dei or God's Justice upon treachery and treason exemplified in the life and death of the late James Duke of Hamilton' ends with an epitaph containing the following verses on this 'Proteus':

'He that three kingdoms made one plaine
 Blasted their beauty, burnt the frame,
 Himself now here in ashes lies
 A part of this great sacrifice. . . .
 'Twas he that first alarmed the Kirk
 To this preposterous bloody work
 Upon the king's to place Christ's throne
 A step and footstool to his own.'²

The temporary alliance between the Independent party in England and the Argyle party in Scotland, patched up after the defeat of the Hamiltonians, was not strong enough to survive the execution of the king and the abolition of monarchy. The

¹ *Rump Songs*, p. 248: from John Tatham's play 'The Scotch Figgaries,' p. 178 of Patterson's reprint of his works.

² 'Digitus Dei' was written by Marchamont Nedham, and published April 9, 1649. It is amongst the *Thomason Tracts*, E. 550 (6). A similar poem entitled 'Duke Hamilton's Ghost' is quoted by C. K. Sharpe in a note to Robert Law's *Memorials*, p. 2.

overthrow of English Presbyterianism was another grievance. A dramatic pamphlet, published in 1647, entitled 'The Scottish Politick Presbyter slain by an English Independent' had pictured prophetically an English army extirpating Presbytery root and branch, and concluded with a scene in which Directory, the Scotch Presbyter was stabbed by Anarchy, an Independent.¹ The prophecy was now to come true. In May, 1650, when Cromwell returned from Ireland, a complete breach between the two countries was imminent. Andrew Marvell, in the Horatian ode addressed to Cromwell on his return, enigmatically predicted that the fickle Scots would hesitate to provoke Cromwell's arms :

'The Pict no shelter now shall find
Within his parti-coloured mind,
But from this valour sad,
Shrink underneath the plaid.'

But the Scots showed no inclination to draw back, and in June, 1650, Charles II. landed in Scotland and submitted to accept his crown on the hard terms exacted. An English broadside, entitled, 'Old Sayings and Predictions verified and fulfilled, touching the young King of Scotland and his gued Subjects,' contains a caricature on this submission. Charles the Second's nose is held to a grindstone by a Scottish ecclesiastic, whilst 'Jockie,' a Scottish layman in a blue cap, turns the handle. At the side of the picture are verses :

'This Embleme needs no learned exposition,
The World knows well enough the sad condition
Of regall power and prerogative,
Dead and dethroned in England, now alive
In Scotland, where they seeme to love the Lad
If hee'l be more obsequious then his Dad,
And act according to Kirk principles,
More subtile then were Delphick oracles ;
For let him lye, dissemble, kill, and slay
Hee's a good Prince that will the Kirk obey.
. . . Turne Jockie turne (for gold will turne thy heart,
And make thee to renounce in Christ a part)
The grindstone to make sharp thy Levites Laws,
Or else t'abate the edge of regall Cause
And privilege. And Jockie for thy paines
Great treasures, pleasures, offices and gaynes
Shall be thy large reward when England's wonne.'²

¹ Reprinted in *Harleian Miscellany*, vii. 391, ed. Park.

² The poem is printed at length in the *Catalogue of Satirical Prints and Drawings in the British Museum*, i. 448. The caricature is copied in Wright's *History of Caricature and Grotesque*, p. 369.

Another caricature in the same collection, entitled, 'A Mad Designe: or a Description of the King of Scots marching in his Disguise after the Rout at Worcester,' contains not only a representation of the King but emblematic figures typifying his English and Scottish followers.¹ There are also two ballads on the escape of Charles II., one entitled, 'The Last News from France,' the other, 'The Royal Patient Traveller.' Both are reprinted in the *Roxburghe Ballads* (vii. 635, 639).

One might expect to find some English ballads on the battles of Dunbar and Worcester, but since the ballad writers were generally hostile to the government, the government had, so far as it could, suppressed ballads. Hence these two victories of the republic's arms were celebrated in hymns instead. John Fenwick, senior, produced a pamphlet on 'the late memorable and glorious victory at Dunbar,' dedicated in three parallel columns, to the known God, the Parliament of England and the Lord General, and closing with what he calls one of the Songs of Sion. Verse 16 will serve as a specimen:

'From North to South from East to West
All yee that now in Sion rest,
Jew, Gentile, Greek, Barbarian,
From America and Java to Japan
All prayses sing
To Sion's King.'

Another by Mr. John Goodwin, on Worcester, is reprinted by James Maidment. It begins:

'The mighty God hath once again
Appear'd from Heaven high
His people to deliver from
The House of Slavery.'²

Maidment thinks 'this strange spiritual ballad indicative of no very Christian feeling' on the part of Mr. Goodwin and his congregation, but it represents with absolute fidelity the results which English Independents expected from a victory on the part of the Royalists, and the causes to which they attributed the success of their own. The feeling of the average Englishman, who was not pious, and was very much

¹ *Catalogue of Satirical Prints*, p. 451; Wright, p. 370.

² See Three Hymns composed by Mr. John Goodwin, etc., 1650: *Thomason Tracts*, E. 1300 (3). Two Hymns sung in Mr. John Goodwin's Congregation, 24 Oct. 1651, E. 1300 (4). Also Maidment, *Scottish Ballads and Songs, Historical and Traditionary*, ii. 274.

embittered against 'the old enemy of Scotland,' and not without reason, for it was the fourth Scottish invasion of England within ten years. The fact that on each occasion the Scots had been called in by some English party did not make them less odious, but rather more. Hence the subjugation of Scotland after Charles the Second's unlucky expedition to England was not only a cause of satisfaction, but seemed a guarantee of security in time to come. In England one of the most popular ballads of the period was one entitled, 'Jockie's Lamentation,' which contained a verse-chronicle of all these wars put into the mouth of a Scottish soldier. It begins by recounting the successes of their arms 'when first the Scottish wars began' and the riches they got from the plunder of English towns:

'Jockey he was wondrous fine
And Jenny in her silks did shine.'

Now all is changed:

'The Lowlands all, and Highland's too,
And bonnet blue, I'se yield to you
To be your own;
For red-coats they with gun and sword,
Makes every Lord with one accord,
To cry "Ohone";
Our lives and our wives, our goods and lands
Are in the limits of your own hands;
For Jockey must a servant be,
And Jenny must live as poor as he.'

The moral set forth in the last verse is:

'See what covetousness doth bring
We have lost our Kirk and everything.'¹

To the same period belong 'A Medley of the Nations,' and 'A Medley,' in both of which representatives of various nations, including the Scots, are introduced lamenting the victories of the English arms.²

In spite of racial feeling and the burdens the military occupation of Scotland imposed, the English soldiers do not appear to have been unpopular in the Scottish towns. Marriages

¹The best version of this ballad is that printed in the *Bagford Ballads*, i. 331. It appears also in *Rump Songs*, 1662, i. 228; and in *Merry Drollery*, ed. 1670, p. 93; and in *Loyal Songs*, 1731, i. 58.

²*Rump Songs*, i. 254, 258.

between the soldiers of the garrisons of Leith and Edinburgh and Scottish women were sufficiently frequent to be regarded as a danger, and were prohibited by the military authorities in consequence.¹ One English ballad represents the lament of a Scottish girl when the English troops were withdrawn from Scotland:

‘I never fancied laddy till I saw mine enemy,
 Me thought he was the blithest mon
 That ever I set eyes upon :
 Well might have fooled a wiser one,
 As he did me.’²

The restoration of Charles II. naturally prepared the way for a reconciliation between the two nations. For once they thought alike on political questions. This is well put in a ballad entitled ‘A Pair of Prodigals Returned, or England and Scotland agreed.’³ It is a discussion between an Englishman and a Scot, which begins with mutual reproaches. ‘You sold your lord,’ says one, ‘You murdered your king,’ answers the other. They conclude by resolving not to rip up old sores any more.

‘We have both been trait’rous rebels to our prince,
 Drencht our hands in his innocent blood,
 Let’s expiate our crimes by obedience, since
 ’Tis never too late to be good.’

Henceforth the hostility between the two nations steadily diminished, for it had its root in political rather than in natural causes.

There are indications of this in poems, ballads and songs, side by side with occasional exhibitions of the old animosity. One reason for the growth of a better feeling was association in arms against common enemies. A ballad called ‘The Granadeers Rant’ with the chorus ‘Hey the brave Scottish boys’ celebrates the courage of a detachment of Dumbarton’s regiment during the defence of Tangiers against the Moors (reprinted in *Roxburghe Ballads*, vii. 532). But the most remarkable example of this feeling is Andrew Marvell’s poem commemorating the death of Captain Andrew Douglas in June, 1667, when the Dutch burnt the English ships in the Medway.

¹ *Scotland and the Commonwealth*, p. 324; *Cromwell’s Army*, p. 301.

² ‘The Scottish Girl’s Complaint for an Englishman’s going away when my Lord Monck came to London,’ *Roxburghe Ballads*, IX. xxxii.

³ British Museum, 669, f. 25. (50).

Douglas was burnt with the Royal Oak, having refused to quit his ship without orders. Marvell calls his poem 'The Loyal Scot,'¹ and puts it in the mouth of Cleveland, as an answer to that poet's 'Rebel Scot,'

'My former satire for this verse forget
My fault against my recantation set'

Cleveland is represented as saying.

So noble a death, argues the poet, ought to heal the old breaches between the two nations. What separates them is no natural feud or incompatibility, but the malignant influence of the clergy, in particular of the bishops.

'Though kingdoms join yet church will kirk oppose,
The mitre still divides, the crown does close—
The friendly loadstone has not more combined
Than bishops cramped the commerce of mankind.
Had it not been for such a bias strong
Two nations ne'er had missed the mark so long.'

In his animosity to bishops, Marvell went so far as to applaud Mitchell's attempt to assassinate Archbishop Sharp, and wrote Latin verses in praise of *Scaevola Scoto-Britannus*.² Lauderdale he attacked with equal vigour, not only as the champion of the English hierarchy in Scotland, but as a danger to England:

'This haughty monster with his ugly claws,
First tempered power to destroy our laws;
Declares the councils edicts are beyond
The most authentic statutes of the land;
Sets up in Scotland a la mode France,
Taxes, excise, and armies does advance.
This Saracen his country's freedom broke
To bring upon their necks the heavier yoke.
Of all the miscreants e'er went to hell
This villain rampant bears away the bell.'³

A dialogue between Duke Lauderdale and the Lord Danby, written about 1680, refers to the rumour that an army was to be levied in Scotland to support Charles II. against the Exclusionists and the English Parliament. Lauderdale says to Danby:

'You know I had ten thousand men at call
To join with you to work these nations' fall.'⁴

¹ *Marvell's Poems*, ed. Aitken, i. 126.

² *Ib.* ii. 114. The verses were written in 1678, about the time of Mitchell's trial. For an English poem on the same subject, see *Roxburghe Ballads*, iv. 147, and Kirkton's *History of the Church of Scotland*, ed. C. K. Sharpe, p. 388.

³ *Ib.* i. 74, 96.

⁴ *Roxburghe Ballads*, iv. 91.

Marvell was an exception. English feeling, so far as it expresses itself in ballads, was on the side of the king's government in Scotland, for the poets and ballad writers were mostly Tories. An elegy published in London about May, 1679, on the murder of Archbishop Sharp, compares it to the assassination of Sir Edmondbury Godfrey, and describes it as an attempt of 'grim Lucifer' to outdo the Pope (*Roxburghe Ballads*, iv. 150). Edmund Waller wrote a poem on the Duke of Monmouth's expedition into Scotland¹ in which he thus described

'His fame, his conduct, and his martial look
The guilty Scotch with such a terror strook,
That to his courage they resign the field,
Who to his bounty had refused to yield.
Glad that so little loyal blood it cost,
He grieves so many Britons should be lost;
Taking more pains, when he beheld them yield,
To save the fliers than to win the field;
And at the Court his interest did employ,
That none who 'scaped his fatal sword should die.'

The traditional ballad on Bothwell Brig, printed by Maidment,² dwells in the same way on Monmouth's mercifulness, contrasting it with the alleged cruelty of Claverhouse. There was also printed at London 'A New Scotch Ballad called Bothwell Bridge or Hamilton's Hero,' which Mr. Ebsworth rightly terms 'a wretched piece of doggerel,' and regards as an insult directed against Claverhouse. But it is far more likely to be an attack on Sir Thomas Armstrong, a swaggering ruffian who accompanied Monmouth to Scotland.³ A second English ballad on Bothwell Bridge is 'Jockey's Downfall,' written by the author of 'The Satire against Hypocrites,' *i.e.* John Phillips, Milton's nephew.

'How now, Jockie, what again? Does the Covenant ride thee still?' asks the poet. As it was forty years ago, so now, he asserts, Mess John and Mess Andrew for their own profit had incited the mistaken throng of countrymen and artisans to rebellion, and the poor men had lost their lives for the sake of these canting Levites.⁴ Stimulated both by this insurrection and by the contemporary struggle over the Exclusion Bill the feeling

¹ *Waller's Poems*, ed. Drury, p. 212; cf. *Roxburghe Ballads*, iv. 534.

² Maidment, *Scottish Ballads, Historical and Traditional*, ii. 300. See Terry, *Life of Dundee*, p. 81.

³ *Roxburghe Ballads*, iv. 537.

⁴ *Roxburghe Ballads*, iv. 541.

against Presbyterianism once more rose high in England. Dryden expresses it in *Absalom and Achitophel*¹ where Scotland is typified by Hebron, in which banished David ruled before he was recalled to reign in Jerusalem, and where two 'false Hebronites,' Robert Ferguson and James Forbes, are personally satirised. He again attacked Presbyterianism in general in the *Hind and the Panther*, where it appears as the wolf. 'Never was so deformed a beast of grace': its native kennel was Geneva, but colonies of these monsters had been established in Holland and Scotland.²

Occasionally Dryden seems to echo some of Cleveland's lines, but times had changed since 1644, and in spite of the animosity expressed to Presbyterianism there is little sign of the bitterness against the Scots as a race which had risen so high between 1644 and 1651. One reason is obvious; the rebellion of 1679 had been a partial and local movement; Scotland as a whole had remained quiet; there had been no new attempt to intervene across the border. Poets and ballad writers even contrasted the conduct of the Scots with that of the English Whigs, much to the advantage of the former. One song, called 'The Loyal Scot,' paints the surprise of a Scot on arriving in England in the midst of the Exclusion Bill agitation and finding the English Whigs, under the mask of reform, scheming to establish Presbyterianism and a Commonwealth. He decides to go back to Scotland since 'a loyal lad's in danger here.'³ A poem called 'The Convert Scot and Apostate English' sets forth still more clearly that the two nations had changed parts. Cleveland's ashes, it begins, will surely rise, for now the Scots are become proselytes and the English rebels.

'Twas our fanatic Presbyter,
The Devil's factors, made the plot;
By them misled the Scots did err
When them thou call'dst "Apostate Scot."

But now, the author continues, the northern air blows sweetly, dispelling mists, and there are no clouds there. The heir-apparent to the throne finds a refuge in Scotland from his enemies in England:

'Brave Scots go on, a braver man
Ne'er wanted yet protection

¹ *Absalom and Achitophel*, part i. l. 59; part ii. ll. 320-349.

² *Hind and Panther*, part i. ll. 153-234. Published in April, 1687.

³ 'A Choice Collection of 180 Loyal Songs,' printed by N. T., 1685, p. 189.

Than our great Duke of York; what can
 But this merit oblivion?
 All that is past of guilty fact
 Lies buried here, in this one act.'

Henceforth they will be called 'the Convert Scots,' not Rebels or Apostates. Only let them stand by the Duke and the friends of monarchy in England:

'A glorious occasion now
 Courts yet with opportunity:
 Let after-ages say if you
 When all men failed us, you stood by.

Your king, your country, all their friends
 Now need your duty and your love,
 Bravely appear, and make amends;
 Let's hand in hand together move.

Down with your kirk-roost, curb them so
 They cannot hurt; take sword in hand,
 Defend your king from in-bred foe,
 And York conduct you in command.'¹

If Charles II. had been obliged to appeal to force it is probable that he would have attempted to employ Scottish arms as the poet suggested. But the contest over the Exclusion Bill in England ended without fighting. The strength of the king's government in Scotland was shown by the facility with which it suppressed Argyle's rebellion in 1685. His defeat is the theme of an English ballad entitled 'The King and Parliament or the Destruction of Argyle,' his capture, of another called 'The Rebel Captive.'² In both these productions the feeling is anti-Whig rather than anti-Scotch; they are expressive of political rather than national prejudices; in one the parliament of Scotland is praised as loyal and brave; in the other Argyle is denounced and derided as a traitor, not as a Scot.

The ballad literature of the period supplies some other indications of the subsidence of national animosities, which, small in themselves, are yet worth noting. According to Mr. Chappell, English ballads began to be circulated in Scotland about 1679: he supposes that their circulation was permitted by the Duke of York in order to gain popularity.³ It is more certain that

¹ 'A collection of 86 Loyal Poems,' collected by N. T., 1685, p. 45.

² *Roxburghe Ballads*, v. 611, 621. Both are also to be found in 'A Collection of 180 Loyal Songs,' pp. 358, 365.

³ *Roxburghe Ballads*, iii. 674.

Scottish traditional ballads began to be printed by English ballad publishers during the latter part of the seventeenth century and attained some popularity in England. 'The gallant Grahams,' 'Johnnie Armstrong's Last Good-Night,' and 'A delectable new ballad, intituled Leader-Haugh and Yarrow' appear with some others in the Roxburghe collection. 'The Life and Death of Sir Hugh of the Grime' is another example of the adaptation of a border ballad.¹

Scottish amatory ballads became still more popular south of the Border. One, commencing 'Wilt thou be wilful still?' was transcribed in the manuscript note-book found on Monmouth when he was captured after Sedgmoor.²

A large number of Scottish songs—or what were meant to represent Scottish songs—were in circulation in England during the reign of Charles II. Some are possibly adaptations of genuine songs; most are imitations, written in a fictitious dialect by English poetasters. Mr. Ebsworth, who reprints a large number of them, terms them the 'Anglo-Scotch indecorous absurdities wherein Londoners delighted.'³

Examples are, 'An excellent new Play-House Song called The Bonny Grey-eyed Morn, or Jockey roused with Love,' which was sung in 1676 in Tom Durfey's play, 'The Plotting Sisters.' Another example is 'Pretty Kate of Edinburgh,' being a new Scotch song sung to the King at Windsor by the same author.⁴ A third is 'The Bonny Scot, or the Yielding Lass,' also by Durfey, which was included later in Allan Ramsay's and Herd's collections. These songs, written by Durfey and his imitators, are interesting not on account of their intrinsic merit but as indications of popular feeling. As John Selden observes, 'more solid things do not show the complexion of the times so well as ballads and libels.'⁵ Some of the extracts quoted before show that a ballad and a libel were often the same thing. It was a step towards union when ballads of a different type came into vogue, and when the popular literature of one nation, or something resembling it, began to interest the other.

C. H. FIRTH.

¹ See *Roxburghe Ballads*, vi. 575-608.

² *Ib.* iv. 544.

³ *Ib.* vi. 618.

⁴ *Ib.* vii. 302, 304; *Bagford Ballads*, i. 16.

⁵ *Selden's Table Talk*, ed. Reynolds, p. 105.

A New View of the War of Independence

THE part played by the North of Scotland in the War of Independence has been consistently ignored by Scottish historians. They have always taken it for granted that the War of Independence was won by the Lowlands of Scotland, though they have not explained how and whence Bruce obtained the adherents who made his early successes, and consequently his ultimate success, possible. Professor Hume Brown, in his history, does not discuss the point. Mr. Andrew Lang observes: 'But we still ask, how did he achieve any success? The nation as a whole was not yet with him (that his later forfeitures of his enemies proves); patriotism, properly speaking, was as yet rudimentary. The Commons had fallen away after Wallace's death; of the nobles some were indifferent, many were bitterly hostile, holding Bruce in deadly feud. Rome, since 1304 no ally, was now an embittered foe, because of Bruce's sacrilege, and he lay under excommunication—then, and much later, a terrible position. Who composed Bruce's forces while he wandered in Galloway? A few knights, probably, with some hundreds of broken men from Kyle, Annandale, Carrick, and the Isles.'¹ Sir Herbert Maxwell, writing of Bruce's campaign against the Earl of Buchan, says: 'For several months after this² we hear no more of either Bruce or Buchan. It is quite likely that Buchan's inactivity was the result of the growing popularity of Bruce and the idea of independence. Failing some such reason, it seems amazing that such a favourable chance of capturing or crushing the King of the Scots was allowed to slip.'³ It seems clear, therefore, that these writers are unable

¹ *Hist. of Scotland*, i. 212.

² That is after Christmas Eve, 1307—Sir Herbert here proceeding on the assumption that the Battle of Inverurie was fought on 22nd May, 1308, instead of on Christmas Eve, 1307, which can, I think, be proved to be the correct date. See below, page 134, for Bruce's movements in the spring and summer of 1308.

³ *Robert the Bruce*, p. 177.

to explain who formed the armies which Bruce led to victory. Mr. Andrew Lang, however, goes a step further. In an appendix to the first volume of his history, headed 'The Celts in the War of Independence,' he says: 'The War of Independence was won by the Lowland Scots (in origin mainly of English descent) fighting under the standards of leaders more or less Norman by blood.'¹ There is not, I think, historical evidence to support so emphatic a statement.

Bruce's ultimate success was made possible—indeed was secured—not by the support which he obtained from the Lowland Scots or in the Lowlands, but by the support he obtained in the north and in the other parts of Celtic Scotland. At the first glance this may seem a rash statement, and I do not wish to be understood to imply that Bruce obtained no support in the Lowlands. But it seems to me that the centre of his strength was in the north and not in the south—in Celtic and not in Lowland Scotland.

It is remarkable that no fortress of importance in the Lowlands of Scotland was captured by Bruce or his adherents until 1312. In that year Buittle, Dalswinton, Caerlaverock, and Lochmaben were captured; Perth, Dumfries, and Linlithgow fell in the following year, and Roxburgh and Edinburgh about the same time. Dundee was certainly in English hands as late as 1312, while Stirling and Bothwell did not surrender until after Bannockburn. On the other hand, by the middle of 1309 Scotland north of the Tay, with the exception of Perth and Dundee, was entirely in Bruce's hands, while the Celtic part of Scotland south of the Tay was held by Douglas and Edward Bruce, and formed the base from which the Scots carried the war into the enemy's country.

When Bruce was crowned at Scone in March 1306, he had no more devoted adherent than David de Moravia, Bishop of Moray. The bishop was a member of the powerful and patriotic house of Moray, the only noble house which had stood by Wallace after the surrender of the Scottish nobility on 9th July, 1297. Immediately Bruce was crowned King, the Bishop of Moray preached a Holy War throughout the length and breadth of his diocese with such effect that the men of Moray flew to Bruce's standard.² After Methven the bishop had to flee for

¹ *Hist. of Scotland*, i. 495.

² Palgrave's *Documents illustrating the History of Scotland*, 346.

his life, and Edward issued peremptory orders to his Generals in Scotland to make every effort to effect his capture.¹ The bishop, however, succeeded in reaching Orkney, and there, as I shall endeavour to show, he almost certainly met Bruce in the winter of 1306-1307. The old Scottish historians have it that Bruce spent that winter in the island of Ráchrin, though the English chroniclers state that he went to Norway, and that Ráchrin itself was the property of a close ally of the English King. The English fleet, too, was scouring the western seas, leaving no nook or cranny unexplored in its efforts to find him. The English version of his flight to Norway is, therefore, the more likely to be true; but it did not find much acceptance in Scotland until the recent discovery of documents, which show that Bruce's sister was married to the Norwegian king. That discovery at least confirms the English statement that Bruce did spend the winter of 1306-07 in Norway.²

In the spring of 1307 Bruce landed in Arran, whence he made his famous raid on the south-west of Scotland, which culminated in the victory of Loudon Hill. Now there is in existence a letter written from Forfar on the 15th of May of that year, in which the writer says: 'Sir Robert Bruce never had the goodwill of his own followers, or of the people at large, or even half of them, so much with him as now. . . . And they firmly believe, by the encouragement of the false preachers who come from the host, that Sir Robert de Bruce will now have his will. . . . If Sir Robert de Brus can escape any way or towards the parts of Ross he will find them all ready at his will more entirely than ever.'³ Now what does that mean? It can only mean that there was a movement on Bruce's behalf in the north and north-east of Scotland prior to the Battle of Loudon Hill, and that the preachers were at their old work of stirring up the people to support his cause. In the previous year we have it on Edward's own authority that the Bishop of Moray had roused 'the flock of his bishopric' by preaching a Holy War. The bishop had fled to Orkney. Bruce had sought an asylum in Norway. And as soon as the winter is over, we find Bruce trying to rally his own men of Carrick to his support, and 'preachers' rousing the north. The obvious conclusion, therefore, is that Bruce's descent on the south-west of Scotland was

¹ Bain's *Calendar of Documents relating to Scotland*, ii. p. 488.

² Bain, ii. xlix. and note.

³ Bain, ii. p. 513.

no mere accident, no forlorn hope, but was part of a plan arranged in Orkney or Norway with the Bishop of Moray, that plan being that Bruce was to raise his own earldom of Carrick, while the bishop raised the province of Moray. Bruce's exploits and successes are a matter of history; but that these formed only a part of a well-laid plan has never hitherto been suggested. If confirmation of the existence of such a plan is needed, we find it in another well-known fact—Bruce's expedition to the north in the autumn of 1307. Previous writers have dealt with that expedition, but have failed to explain it. Mr. Lang says: 'Bruce moved to the north, where, as the Forfar letter shows, he had hopes of finding partisans;'¹ while Sir Herbert Maxwell observes: 'He moved northwards in order to raise the people in the national cause.'² But why northwards? Why not to the east or to the midlands, where he would have been in touch with his victorious friends in the south-west? And what hopes of finding partisans had he? Why in the north were the people showing signs of rising in his favour prior to the Battle of Loudon Hill? Because he was a hunted fugitive in the south-west? There is only one possible answer. The north held out no indefinite hopes. The north was ready; his friends had done their work. Bruce's presence alone was required to fan the flame they had kindled into a fierce blaze. Then, as for centuries before and for centuries later, the north was the home of desperate causes. So Bruce answered the call, hastened north with a few trusty followers, and, by so doing, won the independence of Scotland.

It was in September or October 1307 that Bruce crossed the Grampians. Barbour makes him meet there Sir Alexander and Simon Fraser, 'with all the folk thai with thaim had,' and immediately proceed to Inverurie. At Inverurie Bruce fell ill, and lay for several weeks in danger of his life. His force was not yet large, Inverurie was not well protected, and the Earl of Buchan and Sir David de Brechin were at hand with a large following. So Edward Bruce deemed it advisable to remove the sick King to the greater security—and the greater hardships—of the hill country of Strathbogie. Buchan and de Brechin followed; the latter attacked Bruce's outposts, and Bruce, rising from his sick-bed at the news of the brush, led his men against his foes, where they lay in fancied security near Inverurie on Christmas Eve, 1307, not on 22nd May, 1308, as later historians

¹ *Hist. of Scotland*, i. 213.

² *Robert the Bruce*, 174.

have averred. For, as we shall presently see, Bruce was in the Earl of Ross's territories on the latter date. The victory of Inverurie was followed by the 'Hership of Buchan,' by the capture of Aberdeen, and by the winning of the whole of the modern counties of Aberdeen and Kincardine to the cause of Independence. By the end of July Bruce's lieutenants had completed the work so well begun, and in all Scotland north of the Tay only Dundee Castle and Perth were held for England.

Now, two questions immediately arise. Why did Bruce strike first for Aberdeenshire? And how did he attain such success with a force which Barbour—whose numbers are usually to be trusted—places at 700 men? The answer to the second question is to be found in the answer to the first. Aberdeenshire had always been friendly to Bruce and to the cause of Independence. Bruce himself as King, as well as by descent from the Earl of Huntingdon, was feudal superior of the Earldom of the Garioch, while he was at the same time the natural guardian of his nephew, the youthful Earl of Mar, then, and for several years afterwards, a prisoner at the English court. For Bruce's sister Christian had married Gartney, Earl of Mar, who died in 1306, leaving her a widow with two young children, while Bruce himself had married in 1295 Gartney's sister Isabel. The Earls of Mar and the Bruces had for many years been closely connected; and, indeed, when the elder Bruce was a competitor for the Crown, the Earl of Mar, Earl Gartney's father, was his chief supporter.¹ So it was natural that Bruce should expect to find adherents in Mar and the Garioch. Mar, too, was one of the ancient Celtic earldoms, and as it lay close to the Province of Moray, it had in all probability received the attention of the Bishop of Moray and his fellow 'preachers.' For in the Forfar letter, above quoted, the writer states, on the authority of 'Sir Reginald de Chen, Sir Duncan de Ferendrauth, and Sir Gilbert de Glenkerni, and others who watch the peace both beyond and on this side of the mountains,' that the people are ready to support Bruce.

Immediately after the Hership of Buchan, Bruce advanced into the Province of Moray. Here the influence of the Bishop was at once apparent. The whole country rallied to Bruce's side, the castles held for England were captured or gladly surrendered, and the very officials whom Edward I. had appointed in September 1305 to govern the north in his name came over to Bruce. Inverness Castle, the principal fortress north of the

¹ *Scots Peerage* (Balfour Paul), v. 577.

Spey, was taken by surprise, probably before Bruce's actual arrival, as the whole district was strongly in his favour, and had a brave and capable leader in the person of Alexander Pilche, the colleague and chief lieutenant of Andrew de Moray in 1297. This Alexander Pilche was a burgher of Inverness, and a man of great influence in Moray. He remained constant to the cause of Independence until its seemingly final overthrow in 1303, when, like many other Scotsmen, he was compelled to accept the inevitable. With him Edward followed his usual practice of endeavouring to conquer his greatest opponents by trusting them, and we find him Governor of Inverness Castle for England in midsummer, 1304, though by the following year he seems for some reason to have been out of favour.¹ In him Bruce found a staunch supporter, and it was probably owing to his influence and skill that the Castle of Inverness fell so easily. For the rest of his life Alexander Pilche was high in Bruce's favour, and he subsequently died Sheriff of Inverness. Bruce found the Castle of Inverness a place of great strength, and ordered it to be levelled with the ground in order that no rallying-place might be left to the English faction in the north.² For the Earl of Ross was still Edward's man.

From Inverness Bruce marched at the head of nearly three thousand men against the man who, little more than a year before, had given signal proof of his loyalty to England by violating the Sanctuary of St. Duthac in Tain, and surrendering Bruce's Queen to Edward—the Earl of Ross. Him Bruce speedily brought to terms. During April and May he marched through Ross, Sutherland, and Caithness, and when the Earl showed signs of resistance, a threat to lay waste his territories proved effectual. With the example of Buchan before him, the Earl agreed to a truce till 1st June, 1308. These things we know from a letter³ still in existence from the Earl himself to Edward II. But if the Earl looked for help from England he looked in vain, and at last he made a formal and complete surrender to Bruce at Auldearn, near Nairn, on the 31st October, 1308.⁴ Bruce treated him generously, gave him a new grant of all his lands, and granted him, in addition, the lands of Dingwall and

¹ Bain, ii. 438.

² For full account of Alexander Pilche and the war in the north, see my *Inverness in the Middle Ages*, pp. 51 to 68.

³ *The Sutherland Book* (Sir Wm. Fraser), iii. 10.

⁴ *Acts of Parl.* i. 477.

Ferncrosky. From that time onwards the Earl of Ross was one of Bruce's staunchest friends and supporters.

The surrender at Auldearn marks the conclusion of Bruce's campaign in the north. It had been a wonderfully short and a wonderfully successful campaign. Indeed, so strongly was the north on his side, that it had been, at least north of the Spey, a practically bloodless campaign. A few English garrisons driven out, and perhaps one or two slight skirmishes with the Earl of Ross's men prior to the truce in April or May, provided the only fighting worthy the name. The witnesses to the Earl's surrender perhaps show best the extent to which Bruce had the north behind him. The first witness is the patriotic Bishop of Moray, and the second, Thomas Bishop of Ross, whose appointment to the see Edward I. had himself approved in 1297. Then follow, among others, no less than three of the Sheriffs whom Edward I. had appointed for Scotland north of Aberdeen in September 1305,¹ viz.: Sir John de Stirling, Sheriff of Inverness, Sir William Wiseman, Sheriff of Elgin, and Sir Walter Berkeley, Sheriff of Banff. Sir John de Stirling was a landholder in Moray, but, it is interesting to observe, he had in 1291 leased from Sir Robert Bruce, lord of Annandale, all Bruce's land in the Barony of Inverbervyn.² Sir William de Haya, who was Edward's sheriff at Inverness in 1295-96,³ is also a witness, as are also Sir David de Berkeley, and Sir John de Fenton. Sir David de Berkeley was, of course, an adherent of Bruce from the very first, while Sir John de Fenton appears to have been of the family of Sir William de Fenton, who married Cecilia Byset, one of the co-heiresses of the last Byset of Lovat. The document is also witnessed by Walter Heroc, Dean of Moray, William de Crewsel, precentor of Moray, and 'by many other nobles, clerics, and laity, assembled at same time and place.' These signatures prove that the north of Scotland, noble, cleric, lay, and official, was strongly on the side of Bruce and independence. Thus by the close of 1308 all the Highlands proper—the most Celtic part of Scotland—had once again thrown off the English yoke. Barely three years before Edward I. had made what he deemed a final settlement of the Highlands, yet at the first opportunity the church, the nobility, and the people declared for Bruce, the very sheriffs who governed for England abandoned her cause, and the greatest magnate in the Highlands, who was bound by the closest ties of interest and policy to

¹ Bain, ii. p. 458.

² Bain, ii. p. 121.

³ Bain, ii. p. 264.

England, who had wronged Bruce more deeply than any other man in Scotland, was compelled, whether he liked it or not, almost as soon as Bruce appeared in the Highlands, to sue for pardon. These facts speak for themselves, but it may be pointed out as a further indication of the real attitude of the north, that from 1297 to 1303 Scotland north of the Spey had been absolutely independent. In the latter year Edward in person crushed all resistance in the north, but the very men he had appointed to govern in his name had, most of them, been prominent on the patriotic side down to 1303. Like the vast majority of Scotsmen elsewhere, they had no choice but to become Edward's men when in 1303-1304 Scottish Independence seemed at last to be finally crushed. But the English conquest took no firm hold of the north, for the people were not 'Lowland Scots in origin mainly of English descent,' and they had all the old Celtic preference for a king of their own race. Bruce was in their eyes the rightful King of Scotland. He claimed the throne by virtue of his descent from the old Celtic kings; his mother was a Celtic princess in her own right, and his own earldom of Carrick was a Celtic earldom. And to crown all, only three years had elapsed since the north had last met England in battle. Then the north had been beaten but not subdued. And, as we have seen, there were not wanting patriotic spirits to keep the fire smouldering.

The results of the adherence to Bruce of Scotland from Caithness to the Tay were far-reaching. With the north behind him Bruce was able to proceed with the task of wresting the Lowlands and Argyle from English hands. Between November 1308 and March 1309 he subdued the latter, while his brother Edward secured Galloway. Affairs proceeded so favourably that on 16th March he was able to hold his first Parliament, that Parliament which met at St. Andrews, and drew up the letter to the King of France declaring that Bruce was now King of Scotland. The record of that Parliament is exceedingly interesting.¹ Three of the great Celtic Earls were present in person, the Earls of Ross, Lennox, and Sutherland, while the other Celtic earldoms of Fife, Menteith, Mar, and Buchan, and the earldom of Caithness, whose heirs, the record states, were in ward, were represented. Bruce's tried and trusted friends, his brother Edward, James the Steward, Donald of Isla, Gilbert de Haya, Robert de Keith, Thomas Randolph, Sir James Douglas, Alexander de Lindsay,

¹ *Acts of Parl.* i. 459.

William Wiseman, David de Berkeley, and Robert Boyde, are also specifically mentioned, while the names of Alexander of Argyle, Hugh, son and heir of the Earl of . . . (Ross?), and John de Menteith, 'and the Barons of the whole of Argyle and Innisgall and the inhabitants of the whole Kingdom of Scotland,' complete the record. Thus, of the twenty-four names mentioned specifically in the document, no less than fourteen are representative of the ancient Celtic Kingdom of Scotland, while several of the others are more or less connected with the north. Some doubts have been expressed as to the trustworthiness of the record, but the names it gives are confirmed in a striking manner by the events I have narrated. The Earls of Ross and Sutherland, Hugh, son and heir of the Earl of Ross, William Wiseman, and David de Berkeley, are all mentioned in the contemporary documents from which I have compiled my narrative, as having been, by 31st October, 1308, of Bruce's party, while of the remaining names that of Alexander of Argyle is the only one doubtful.

The events I have just narrated, and the names I have given, prove, I think, that Celtic Scotland had declared itself for Bruce at the crisis of his fate, and three years before he made any headway in the Anglicized Lowlands. He could only have made the headway he did in Celtic Scotland in so short a period by the support of the people of the country. It follows that the people who won the War of Independence were not, as Mr. Lang says, 'Lowland Scots (in origin mainly of English descent) fighting under standards of leaders, more or less Norman by blood,' but the inhabitants of the Celtic part of Scotland fighting under leaders, many of them Celtic, and under a king whose mother was a Celtic countess, and who claimed the crown by virtue of his descent from a Celtic king. And I do not think it can be disputed that, if Bruce had not secured the support of the north in 1308, the independence of Scotland would not have been won. From the north he obtained men and staunch support when he needed both most. From Celtic Scotland in the west his armies raided England. From Celtic Scotland in the north and west he captured one by one the strongholds of the Scottish Lowlands. For it cannot be denied that it was not until he had Celtic Scotland behind him that the strongholds of the south fell. Lanark was held for England as late as October 1310, while in 1312 the whole of the Lothians and a large part of Scotland south of the Forth were in English

hands. There were English garrisons in Berwick, Roxburgh, Edinburgh, Stirling, Bothwell, Linlithgow, Dunbar, Yester, Luffenok, Dirleton, Kirkintilloch, Selkirk, Jedburgh, Livingston, Lochmaben, Buittle, Dalswinton, Dumfries, Caerlaverock, and Cavres, as well as in Perth and Dundee, and English sheriffs still ruled in Berwick, Roxburgh, Edinburgh, Haddington, Linlithgow, Stirling, and Perth.¹

It is interesting to observe that the narrative as I have told it is borne out by Barbour, in a passage often quoted, but always with the comment that nothing is known of events in the north. The passage is as follows (the poet has just described the Hershship of Buchan):

‘The King than till his pess has tane
The north cuntreys, that humbly
Obseysyt till his senyowry.
Swa that be north the month war nane.
Then thai his men war euirilkane.
His Lordschip wox ay mar and mar.
Toward Anguss syne gan he far;
And thought sone to mak all fre
That wes on the north half the Scottis Se.’

An interesting sidelight on the views I have advanced is that the only two parliaments which Bruce held prior to Bannockburn met in the old kingdom of Celtic Scotland, the one at St. Andrews in 1309 and the other at Inverness in 1312.² The latter was an exceedingly important parliament, and one which would in ordinary circumstances have been held in the capital of the kingdom. It was the parliament at which Bruce in person met the envoys of the King of Norway and ratified with great solemnity the treaty made between the Kings of Norway and Scotland in 1266. As befitted the occasion, Bruce was attended by a great retinue, the most important members of which were witnesses to the treaty. They were the Bishops of Aberdeen, Moray, Ross, and Caithness, and the Earls of Ross, Athol, and Moray. Though the Earl of Moray was Thomas Randolph, the witnesses unmistakably are all representative of Celtic Scotland.

I do not desire to exaggerate the part played by the north of Scotland in the War of Independence, nor to lay myself open to the charge of holding a special brief for the Celts. But

¹ See Bain, vol. iii., for various entries relating to these places.

² *Acts of Parl.* i. 459 and 461.

the facts I have stated show how important was the part played by Celtic Scotland in the War of Independence, and that it was the old kingdom of Celtic Scotland which really maintained and ultimately won that struggle. For I think I have shown that there is sound historical evidence for the view that in the north of Scotland, Bruce found his earliest and staunchest supporters; that the north declared for and stood by Bruce while the Lowlands were as yet lukewarm or hostile; and that, therefore, to the north was his ultimate success due.

EVAN M. BARRON.

An Edinburgh Account-Book of Two Hundred Years Ago

ON or about May 12th, 1699, while William of Orange was still on the throne—five years before Blenheim and eight before the Union—there died in her house in Blackfriars Wynd, Edinburgh, Anna Broun,¹ widow of John Wilson, merchant there, daughter of Robert Broun, stationer, and half-sister of Charles Broun of Gleghornie.² This was a small estate near North Berwick, famous as the birthplace of John Major or Mair, scholar, historian, and philosopher, who had among his pupils John Knox and George Buchanan.

As nearest relative Charles now took charge, and issued the following invitation to the funeral: 'Sir, the favour of your presence to accompany the corps of my sister Anna relict of Ja. Wilson mert. in Edr from her dwelling house in Blackfrier Wynd to her buriall place in the Greyfrier Church yeard on Munday ye 15 instant at seven o'clock at night is earnestly intreated. Coaches shall attend you.' With some slight alterations, such as the substitution of 'remains' for 'corps,' and change of the appointed hour, the invitation might have been issued yesterday.³

It will be noticed that the hour appointed for the funeral was

¹The intrusions of the curator on this estate are contained in a number of sheets, amongst the Colstoun papers now in my possession. J. G. A. B.

²The said Charles afterwards married a distant cousin, Jean Broun, who succeeded to the estate of Colstoun on the death of her father and two brothers by drowning, as told elsewhere.—*Blackwood's Magazine*, July 1907.

³The word 'relict' still survives in Scottish obituary notices, and perhaps in legal documents, though there is no apparent reason for its continued existence. It was in use in the sixteenth century, but cannot compare in point of antiquity with 'widow,' nor indeed in any other way. 'Widow' arouses sympathy and respect, not so 'relict,' which seems to denote something of no importance, a mere appanage of the husband, not worth taking with him. The word no doubt came to Scotland from France, as did many others to which no objection can be taken.

'seven o'clock at night,' and it may be presumed that this was about the usual time. Apart from any question of its appropriateness for the ceremony, being near sunset, it was no doubt the most convenient time of day for those invited to attend, for there were no trains arriving or departing; the day's work, of whatever kind, would be over or nearly so, and friends and neighbours would be at liberty.

But there was another reason, and that was the 'dragie,' or dirgie, as this curious word was more usually and more correctly spelt. 'Dirige,' the first word of the antiphon at Matins in the Office of the Dead, was used as a name for that service but acquired another meaning, and was more commonly used to signify the drinking of the company after the interment, as Jamieson puts it. Obviously, therefore, the evening was the most suitable, and probably in some cases the most decent, time for that essential part of the obsequies, and admitted of a more prolonged session for busy people. And there is no doubt of the meaning of 'dragie' on this occasion, for a servant had ten shillings for attending thereat and giving out tickets for wine. The wine and ale provided cost £44 and the plumcake and biscuits £30—a more respectable proportion than the half-penny worth of bread to two gallons of sack, which provoked a famous remonstrance. Moreover the account is in Scots money, and as the pound Scots was worth then about one shilling and eightpence, the amount of liquor provided could not have been great, unless it was unusually cheap, so that the dragie seems to have been quite a moderate one. There is, however, a previous item in the account which is difficult to explain. 'To Mrs McRae for 8 bottles sack ye night ye said Anna died.' No light is thrown on the subject by any other entry. One bottle for a posset or other prescribed drink would not be remarkable, but eight are somewhat difficult to account for in that way, and yet surely the drinking customs of the time did not include such an immediate memorial service of wine.

The account includes also payments to the gravemaker, bellman, town officer, and Kirk Thesaurer, the latter of whom received 5 rexdollars or £14 10s. Scots. The mortcloth, no doubt hired for the occasion, according to use and wont, cost £8, the 'dead-linnens' or shroud £26, and the coffin, for which flowers were provided—oh for a list of those flowers—£30. Nor were the poor or the 'blewgouns' forgotten, for they were supplied with meat, and thirty-nine shillings were distributed among them.

The funeral over, Charles Broun proceeded without delay to wind up his late sister's affairs, and the first step was the taking of the 'Inventar' of her goods and gear. She lived in a hired house, for which she paid £70 a year. There were a parlour and dining-room, which were furnished with sets of chairs, one of cane, and the other of gilt wood, each set including one arm-chair, besides tables, mirrors, and chests of drawers. Of beds there are specially mentioned a throne bedstead, and a 'langsadle' or longsettle. There was good store of bedding, including blankets spranged (*i.e.* striped) and unspranged, linen sheets, and sheets of strakin—linen made from coarse flax. The kitchen utensils consisted of a large pan and a small one, a couple of frying-pans, a brander or gridiron, dripping-pan and strainer, girdle, and pestle and mortar. The table equipage, which included porringers, dishes, trenches, sugar-dish, and 'saltfoot' or salt-cellar, was of pewter, as were two flagons, and a stand of stoups, pint, chopin, mutchkin, half-mutchkin, and gill. The crockery comprised a posset dish, trencher, and two plates of earthenware—a very modest amount. There was besides a small quantity of silver—a server, a dish, two jugs, and a cathel or caudle pot.

The taking of the inventory was speedily followed by the roup, which was completed by May 23rd, while the board, intimating that the house was to let, was in position before the 17th, so that little time was lost. At the roup Deacon Inglis, the silversmith, bought the silver server, dish, and cathel pot for £127 10s. The silver spoons fetched £3 4s. the ounce, and the pewter was sold at 12s. the pound. An iron frying-pan brought 10s., which seems a high price, but it was in Scots money. The roup realised altogether about £800, and with the cash which his sister left, Charles Broun had £872 to account for, to begin with.

For Anna left something more important than goods and gear, to wit, a daughter Margaret by name, to whom uncle Charles became curator and guardian. His intromissions with her property, or at any rate the account of what he spent on her behalf, whether out of her funds or his own, for the next ten years comprise about five hundred entries, from which something may be gathered of a child's upbringing in Edinburgh two centuries ago. One of the earliest items in the account is 'an extract of ye sd Margaret her age,' for which 14s. 6d. were paid. The age is not given, but as she

was at school in 1700, and went to a masquerade in 1708, she was probably nine or ten years old at the time of her mother's death. Margaret was boarded out, at first with a Mrs. Foulis, and afterwards with Anna Edgar, for £36 a quarter. She remained with the latter until November, 1706, when she went to Colstoun; returned to her in October, 1708, and was with her when the account came to an abrupt conclusion in February, 1709. Whether these ladies provided education, as well as board, is uncertain, but as no payments are mentioned for teaching, except in special subjects, it seems probable that they did. The special subjects were: music, which included playing on the virginals or spinet, singing, arithmetic, and pastry, which probably included all the operations of the still-room. Margaret was, on the whole, blessed with good health, but had occasional colds, for which she was treated with syrups of sugar and oranges, sugar and poppies, sack and prunes, and conserve of roses. Here is a recipe for the last-named remedy should anyone care to try it. 'Take your roses before they be full-blown, pull the leaves, and clip off their white ends, then beat them very well in a mortar, then take two times their weight in sugar, and beat them together till they be well mixed, then put in a gallipot for use.' How the conserve was to be used, whether externally or internally, is not quite clear. Besides the above remedies there were also provided 'jessamie and oyl' three mutchkins of wine to steep herbs in, five of white wine for a diet drink, and hungary water at 12s. the bottle. During her stay at Colstoun, however, there was evidently a more serious complaint, and Dr. Stirling was called in and paid a guinea for his advice; the result of which was that Margaret was bled by Provost Edgar, of Haddington, who was a chirurgeon by profession, at a charge of £3 for the operation.¹

While Margaret's health was attended to, her religious upbringing was not neglected. Her extremely scanty library was, so far as can be gathered from the accounts, confined entirely to religious books. In September, 1700, she was furnished with a proof catechism, and in February, 1703, with a *Confession of Faith*, which being lost, or worn out—the former, most likely—was replaced by another copy in 1706.

¹This Dr. Stirling was probably the surgeon in Edinburgh, and Member of Parliament for the city, whose daughter married Alexander, fourth Lord Elibank.

The *Confession* was evidently considered an essential possession for a child in those days, when the dogmas of Westminster were accepted without demur or reservation. In 1707 Margaret received a pocket Bible and *Dolittle on ye Sacrament*.¹

Poor Margaret; her mind was certainly not distracted from more serious reading by light literature, unless Anna Edgar supplied her charge with something of the kind, which was indeed at that time not very easy to do. For recreation she learnt jappanning and practised that art upon sconces, prints, snuff-boxes, and picture-frames; for which purpose the following materials were provided: vermilion, dragon's blood, silver leaf, ivory black, lamp black and flake white, with varnish, oils, and turpentine. Another entry in the same connection is 'a quarter ounce rushes.' This material was difficult to identify, but 'rushes' was no doubt the trade name of the juice of a tree of the sumach tribe named *Rhus vernicifera*, which is used for lacquering by the Japanese. For the sconces there was supplied prince's metal, an alloy said to have been first prepared by Prince Rupert, who seems to have been an inventive genius as well as a dashing soldier—is he not the reputed father of mezzotint engraving? Anything else in the way of amusement must have been paid for out of Margaret's pocket money, which beginning at £1 9s. was subsequently raised to £2 18s. a quarter. Besides this subvention, she was furnished with hansel money for presents, and tips for various persons, such as the doctor and under-doctor of her school, who received £2 and £1 respectively.

Information concerning her wardrobe is somewhat scanty, because the tradesmen's bills are entered in sums total, and details are not given; but stuffs were purchased in lengths for making up. An early entry is 'for 2½ ells bustine to be a waistcoat to her, and making £1 12.' This material is described as a cotton fabric of foreign make, or a species of fustian, and is mentioned in Allan Ramsay's *Gentle Shepherd*, where Patie describes his sweetheart Peggy, saying 'Neat, neat she was in

¹ Dolittle was a clergyman of the Church of England, and becoming a non-conformist, was ejected from his charge of St. Alphage, London Wall. He was an eminent preacher, and kept an academy at Wimbledon for some time; had many troubles, some of which were caused by the Plague, and Fire of London; belied his name by publishing twenty books on Divinity, and died in 1707.

bustine waistcoat clean.' Other materials which were, as a rule, of an inexpensive kind, comprised twill, worsted for petticoats, alamode and lutestring—two silken fabrics—cambric, calico, Scots muslin and temming, which was a kind of woollen cloth. The highwater mark of extravagance was reached in 1705 when £136 12s. 6d. was paid for a silk gown, etc. There are also mentioned a dust-gown of camlet lined with crape, and a 'Marseils' petticoat. The latter stuff appears to have been either a stiff cotton fabric, or quilting. For headgear she was provided with commodes, which were wire frameworks—foundations for a superstructure, linen mitches, and headsuits. The latter term does not convey any definite idea of what is meant, but the headsuit was composed of various materials, including lace, which was, no doubt, its highest form. Margaret used powder, which was purchased by the pound, and for ornament she got a cheap necklace now and then: in 1709 24s. were paid for a 'necklass and anchor.' She was also supplied with a fan at 20s. Besides ordinary shoes and pattens, she had others of marikine or morocco, and capron or goat-skin of some kind. Gloves of washing material may complete the list of Margaret's usual outfit, but there was one article which deserves notice. This was a 'Strae bone grace' at 13s. According to the *New Oxford Dictionary* a 'bonegrace' was 'a shade or curtain formerly worn on the front of women's bonnets or caps to protect the complexion from the sun.' Scott, describing the appearance of Meg Merrilies in the third chapter of *Guy Mannering*, calls it 'an old fashioned bonnet,' and Jamieson merely a 'straw bonnet'; so that by a process of evolution, not without parallel, the part came to denote the whole. The bonegrace is still worn by field workers in the Border counties, but the name has departed along with many another of French origin to the limbo of glossaries and dialect dictionaries.

With this note the analysis of Charles Broun's accounts on behalf of his niece comes to an end. Of her subsequent life and adventures there is no record, though, perhaps, diligent search might reveal something; were it worth while. And so exit Margaret Wilson, and enter Thomas Broun, nephew of the aforesaid Charles, who became his curator in December, 1702, and kept an account of all outgoings, for ten years at least. In that year Thomas succeeded to the lands of Eastfield, near Ratho in Midlothian, and some property at Gogar-

stone in the same county; being heir of entail to his uncle James, son of Thomas Broun, stationer, and bailie in Edinburgh, who purchased the estate of Eastfield in 1696. His exact age is not discernible, but as he was still at school in 1712, and in a state of tutelage in other respects, it is evident that he was quite a little boy when he came into his kingdom. Nevertheless one of the earliest entries in the account is for 'a wig to sd Thomas' at £3 5s., which seems a strange accoutrement for a boy of tender years, but as no more wigs are mentioned, it is probable that he had lost his hair somehow, and a wig became a necessity. Shortly afterwards three ells of tartan were purchased to make him a nightgown or evening frock, which in combination with the wig must have made a queer little figure of him.

The first business to be attended to at Thomas's succession was the letting of his property, and accordingly Robert Taylor was sent to Kirkliston, Ratho, Currie and Corstorphine, 'to intimat at the Kirkdoors that Gogarstain was to Sett.' This not producing the desired effect, six months later the bellman of these villages and of Collingtoun and Libertoun besides, was paid 5s. for intimating that it was 'to be sett by way of roup,' which intimation was also made by a Sheriff's officer at the Cross of Edinburgh. The roup proved successful in so far as getting a tenant was concerned, and the tacks were signed a week later. Eastfield, however, was not let till the beginning of 1705, when Sir Robert Murray became tenant, but to account for the delay, there was a good deal of repairing to do. For this purpose trees and deals were supplied by John Henderson, wright, for the house and stables; and six hundred flooring nails and a quarter hundred double floorings, as well as door nails and ironwork, were purchased. So it is evident that the woodwork of the house was in a bad state. However, there was no further outlay during the period covered by the account, and the only expense was the cess, and a small sum occasionally for the repair of Cramond Bridge. After the properties were let, and sundry legal matters settled, the accounts are chiefly concerned with the boy's clothing and education, which seems to have begun in 1705. The only entries for his clothing are for shoes and stoquens—an unusual but picturesque spelling—hats and gloves, muslin for 'gravates,' linen for shirts, and nightcaps, and 'corderins' or corduroys. All else is hidden away in tradesmen's accounts entered in sums

total. The schoolmaster was paid £2 18s. a quarter, and the doctor half that amount; but the former received in addition a present from the pupils at Candlemas, which was called bleize money or candle-money, the amount of which varied—on one occasion it was 14s. 6d., on another £2 14s. 6d. Another master received £2 a quarter for teaching Thomas to write.

An interesting entry occurs in 1706, when a cock was purchased for him for 6s., and 4s. were paid for setting it down and taking it up. It does not recur in 1707, but in the three following years the same sums were paid and the same services rendered; on one occasion, at any rate, by the doctor, the boy providing the bird, but otherwise taking no part in the performance. The doctor was evidently what would now be termed an expert in cock fighting. The fights took place about the same time in each year, the middle of February—the usual day was Shrove Tuesday. It was a strange custom and an old one, which survived into the nineteenth century. In *My Schools and Schoolmasters* Hugh Miller writes, 'The School like almost all the other grammar schools of the period in Scotland had its yearly cock fight.' The period was about 1812. Every boy had to pay the dominie twopence for leave to bring his birds to the pit; but in Hugh Miller's time, though the fees were exacted, it was no longer necessary to bring the birds, of which circumstance he took advantage. These fees were recognised as part of the income of the schoolmaster, which in 1790 was formally stated, in the case of Applecross, to be composed of salary, fees, and cock-fight dues. The books supplied to Thomas, which give some idea of the character of his education, form the most interesting element in the accounts. His earliest acquisition was a New Testament in 1705, which was followed by a 'pair of rudimenis,' that is, a set of rudiments,—what was included in the set?—and by a gilded Psalm Book in Turkey. In 1706 he was furnished with Kirkwood's grammar.

This James Kirkwood was a scholar and notable character in his day. He was born near Dunbar, date unknown, and in 1674 became master of the school in Linlithgow at a salary of 400 merks—say £22 sterling—and served in that post for fifteen years. He then quarrelled with the magistrates, who were his superiors, and was dismissed, being moreover forcibly ejected from his dwelling along with his Dutch wife; while

his books and furniture were flung into the street. For these injuries, moral and material, he got damages to the amount of 4000 merks after much litigation. While at Linlithgow he had the honour of boarding and educating the second Earl of Stair, of Dettingen fame, who was a good scholar as well as a good soldier. He subsequently started a school in Edinburgh, and finally became schoolmaster of Kelso, where he died some time before 1720. Kirkwood published a Latin grammar in 1674 and, after the Revolution, at the instance of Lord President Stair, was consulted by the Parliamentary Commissioners for Colleges as to the best Latin grammar for schools. The Lord President asked him what he thought of Despauter's grammar. He replied, 'a very unfit grammar, but by some pains it might be made a good one.' Being desired to be more plain, he said, 'My Lord President, if its superfluities were rescinded, the defects supplied, the intricacies cleared, the errors rectified, and the method amended; it might pass for an excellent grammar.' He was accordingly appointed to reform Despauter, and in 1695 published a revised edition, which was used in schools until superseded by Ruddiman's *Rudiments*. Despauter was a Fleming, and his Latin grammar was used in the schools of France, whence, no doubt, it was introduced into Scotland. 'Too long,' says a French writer, 'it caused the despair of youth, who shed many tears over its obscurities.' Despauter died in 1526.

In addition to Kirkwood's grammar, Thomas received in 1706 two copies of *Rudiments*, and a *Child's Guide*. In 1707 the year began with *Phaedri Fabulae*, and closed with *Majora Colloquia Erasmi*, a *Confession of Faith* coming between. The next January added Ovid's *Epistles* to the list of Classics, and Coles' *Dictionary* was also purchased. This *Dictionary* was published in 1677 by one Elisha Coles, a schoolmaster, who compiled two, whereof one was English and the other Latin, but which of the two was purchased on this occasion is not specified. In January, 1709, Thomas began to read *Cornelius Nepos*, and in May he got Gustius' *History*, which was probably the History of the World from the Assyrian Monarchy down to the time of Augustus Caesar, by Justinus, a Roman historian. This book was in the original Latin, which was 'made English' by T. Brown three years later—too late for poor Thomas. In the same year he got Ovid's *Metamorphoses*, and,—just in time for the Christmas holidays—Buchanan's *Psalms with ecphrasis*.

The next year began badly for him with *Exercises to the Accidents*, which was followed by Smetius' *Prosodia*—Smetius or Smet being a Belgian poet, who has long ceased from troubling. An improvement, however, took place in April, when *Virgil cum Notis Minelii* was purchased, followed in October by Caesar's *Commentaries*, and, early next year, by *Horace with Minelius' notes*. From this rapid succession of classical authors it would seem that Thomas had scarcely time to make the acquaintance of one, before being introduced to another. The only other book purchased in this year, 1711, and indeed the last one mentioned in the accounts, was another copy of Buchanan's *Psalms with ecphrasis*—no escape from that branch of learning. In September, 1711, the boy went on horseback to Haddington, where he was put to school with one Watt for a quarterly payment of £3—surely sterling money—and was boarded with Margaret Wilkie, relict of Thomas Warrander, painter. He was at Haddington in September, 1712, when the accounts close abruptly. His life cannot have been a long one, as his uncle Charles succeeded to the estate of Eastfield.

J. G. A. BAIRD.

Letters of Cardinal Beaton 1537-1541

THE following letters are perhaps of more linguistic than historical interest. They show us how a gentleman of Scotland wrote in the middle of the sixteenth century. But his Eminence, like Sir George (Bluidy) Mackenzie, omitted the year-date in his correspondence, and thereby nearly drove me out of my five poor wits.

Whoever reads the text of this holy man will perceive that the letters are of date August 22-October 25. In Letter II. (Mascon, September 13) is a reference to the bad health of 'Casso the fule,' a Court jester. In Letter V. ('of Dongeoune,' October 25) the statement of September 13, as to Casso, is repeated. The correspondence, so far, appears to be of August-October, but in what year? We know (*Treasury Accounts*, vol. vii. p. 497) that Beaton left Scotland in July, 1541, with the 'Unicorn,' and (*Hamilton Papers*, vol. i. 83) that he sailed in the 'Mary Willoughby.' The same papers (vol. i. 148-149) show that he came home by August 14, 1542. But, in Letter V., he is 'of Dongeoune' (which I took for Dungeness), on his way home, on October 25, 1541. Letters II. III. refer to James's meeting, never held, with Henry VIII. at York, of which the date is September, 1541. The letters are of September 13 and 14. Letter IV. (October 22) on the other hand is all about James's negotiations for marrying Mary of Guise, a match arranged in 1537!

Nearly reduced to the condition of a gibbering idiot by this mixture of 1537 with 1541, and by 'Casso the fule' permeating the correspondence, I consulted Mr. Hume Brown. He rescued my sanity by pointing out that Letters I. II. III. V. are of 1541, while Letter IV. is an interloper from the autumn of 1537. That would have been my own verdict, but for 'Casso the fule,' who appears in Letter II. (Mascon, September 13) and in Letter V. ('of Dongeoune,' October 25). Dongeoune cannot be Dungeness, for Beaton will later come to Paris, he says.

For the rest, the student may pick out of the letters such matters as interest him, whether he care for hawks, boars, 'cocks of Ind,' or old diplomacies. It is not my business to masticate the *kava*, in Fijian fashion, into a refreshing beverage for the student. Here is the *kava, au naturel*. The papers were copied for me by Miss E. M. Thompson.

A. LANG.

I.

Add. MS. 19401. f. 34.

Sire; pleise 30^r grace to onderstand quhow I come heir to Douure y^e xxii day of august and passis ower to Bouloigne to morne god willinge and yairefter sall do ye best diligence I may to pass fur^twardes to ye kingis grace 30^r fader quhome I beleif to find in fontainebleau I have gottin seur worde y^t he is bly^t and mery of ane gentill man y^t departit fra him w^tin yir five or sax dayis. I onderstand be 30^r graces writting send to me be Alex^r Gordonis seruand y^t 30^r grace suld be informyt y^t ye tailzo^r suld haif put awaye ane greite part of ye geir q^{lk} he had in charge quharof I merweile mekle for I wait na man my^t do mayr to knaw ye verite yan I did for I geve na credence to him bot to ye Inuentaies maid yairapoune and als to Madame montreul and sundry oyer of ye gentill wemen beseiking 30^r grace y^t diligence may be maid y^t ye verite may be knawin quhidder ye report maid to 30^r grace be trew or no^t and I sall no^t fail to Inquire ye verite quhar I pass in ye best sorte I can.

Sire I am in seur beleif to bring ye materis at 30^r grace directit me apoune to gud and haisty effect I sall no^t tyne day nor heure in my defalt will god quhill I ken ye vterest and yaireftir 30^r grace salbe aduertist w^t all diligens possible the King of Ingland was nathing contentit at 30^r grace schew zow sa affectit to ye king 30^r graces fader quhowbeit I ken perfityly y^t ba^t he and his counsale sall haif zow in greter estimatioun quhill yai leif—and I wait ye king of france will think y^t 30^r grace hes done 30^r part Mons^r. de Lymoges quho is heir in cumpanye w^t me commendis his humble seruice to 30^r grace and desirit me to writt to 30^r grace in fauo^r of yis berar q^{lk} wes lang in dunbar to ye effect y^t he may be helpit in sum sorte.

Sir efter ye maist humble recommendatioune of my seruice to 30^r grace I pray ye creato^r preserue ye samyn eternellie. Of Douure ye xxij day of august.

30^r grace avne maist humble
seruito^r ARBROHT.

[Holograph.]

Addressed: To the Kingis grace.

II.

Add. MS. 19401. ff. 35-36.

Schir It will please your grace to understand that I have euer differit to writ to your grace sene my cummyne to yis court quhilk wes ye¹ day of August last bypast, because ye king your graces fader wes euer removand and I culd neuir gett him and his counsal togiddir quharthrou I my^t haue resoluition of sic thingis I tho^t was necessar to aduertise yo^r grace. I schew ye king your graces fader at gret lenth diuerse tymes your gud and constant mynd towart him quhilk he findis and knawis veray weill, and I assure yo^r grace als fer affectit towart your grace, as he schewis planelie as he is to ony of his sons and thankis your grace mekle that your grace wald no^t condissent to na metinge w^t ye king of ingland quhilk he thinkis culd never be to your graces surte nor hono^r. And gif ye king of ingland ware of that mynd to Invaid your grace or realme he is determit to declare him his enemy incontinent and to vse all his forsis aganis him, and to gif your grace ye succurris and supple that ze may or that ze will desire of him, and said to me that he wes als diligent as he my^t be to knaw be his ambassadeur, beand in ingland ye maner and occasioun of ye kingis passing in ye nor^t partis, and gif he my^t haue knawin that it wes to invaid your grace or realme he suld no^t haue taryt quhill he had bene aduertist and requirit be your grace to do ye thing that ye fader is haldin to do for ye sone, bot suld haue send you ye supple that he my^t. I schew at gret lenth baith to ye kinge and his counsal ye gret preparationis that ye king of ingland hes maid on his bordo^r and how he hes fortifit all his towns and strenthis in sic sort that other your grace mon do siclik or ellis it my^t be grete hurt to your grace and your realme quhilk wes occasioun to put your grace to grete coist and expensis and besot his grace to haue consideratioun yarof and of ye King of inglandis grete riches and substaunce and it was difficile for your grace to fortife your bordo^r nor provid you of munitionis wy^tout help to resist his pissance. And gif ye king heire dred ony besines or cummer to cum haistelie betuix him and ingland, that he wald provid in tyme and help your grace that ze my^t be meit to resist him and no^t to differe quhill ye better houre quhilk were na tyme to provid for yo^r graces suretie and weill, quhilk ye king and his counsal fand ry^t resonable and said that he wald glaidlie help you in all behalfis and that he wald persauie haistely quhat ware able to be betuix him and ye emprio^r and als ye king of ingland. I spak yis mater to him because I fand yame disparit of ingland in cause ye empero^r and ye king your graces fader fall out, and beleif surlie that you sall consider to giddir in his contra, yair is na traist betuix ye king and ye emprio^r and grete apperence of truble and weire betwene yame. Howbeit I traist yair salbe na grete thing ado yis zeir w^t ye help of god salang as I am heire I sall no^t be necligent bot as ye tyme occurris sall handill yire materis ye best I may to your graces hono^r and proffit eftir

¹ Blank in the original.

ye wit and knowlege yat god hes gevin me. The king 3our gravis fader schew me laitlie how ye king of ingland had proponit mariage to his ambassado^r being w^t him betuix his dochter and mons^r de orlance and his grace haldis ye samin bot dissimulatioun no^t ye less he interteins him no^t gevand traist nor credence to him. I can no^t weill schaw 3our grace be writ ye grete fauo^r and luf yat ye king 3our gravis fader schewis to haue to 3o^r grace and siclik mons^r Doulphin quhay is cummyne ane wyise vertuose prince and beris grete fauo^r and luf to 3our grace and sua dois mons^r De orlance and all ye laif of yis cumpany. My lord constable is clane out of credit heir and ay ye langer ye mair and as I beleif surlie he salbe put at scharplie the kinge gevis him all ye wytt of ye empryo^rs cummyne throu fraunce quhilk hes bene occasioun of grete hurt to ye kingis effaris. Howbeit 3our grace want ye constable heire 3our grace may beleif weill yat yair is na thing 3our grace hes ado bot ye king 3our gravis fader will cause it be done. As for ye pension his grace hes commaundit to pay it incontinent howbeit yai haue mekle ado wy^t siluer and praxis to haue ane litill patience and it salbe weill pait yair wilbe na falt yair untill. And als his grace commandit incontinent to discharge ye impositioun made apoun ye merchandis howbeit ye counsall makis grete difficulte yar untill because it is tane of all ye kingis awin subiectis and thinkis strange to mak strangearis freare nor his awin subiectis no^tyeless I beleif haistelie to gett it done be ye kingis speciall command in fauouris of 3our grace.

I am seurlie informit yat mons^r de guise wes of purpose and yire trublis had no^t happinnit betuix ye king and ye emprio^r to haue cummyne throu ingland bepost to Scotland bot I traist yair salbe oyer thinge ado or ye nixt 3eir, and sa lang as I am heire I sall tak tent and do conforme to 3our gravis directioun gevin to me in yat behalf. 3our grace hes ben euil done to throu report and reherse of sum fellus yat is cummyne in yis cuntre yat hes maid mony and diverse lesingis quhilk is cummyne to ye king 3our gravis faderis eris and all ye laif of yis cumpany quhilk I haue gart him and yame all onderstand ye contray it were lange to writ to 3our grace of yai purposis bot I sall schaw 3our grace all wy^t tyme will god, bot I dare weill assure 3our grace yat it is no^t in ye power of na levand man to gare ye king 3our gravis fader to trow ony thing of 3ou bot gud and hono^r. Schir I have written to ye pape and hes commoint at lenth w^t his ambassadeur being heire anentis ye contributioun and because maister George Hay as I onderstand hes commission to know 3our gravis mynd gif 3oure grace will yat ane seruand of ye papis cum in scotland to 3oure grace I traist quhill ye pape be aduertist of 3oure gravis mynd yaruntill yair salbe na resolutioun nor answer gottin in yai materis. Beseikand 3our grace yat I be aduertist of 3our gravis mynd and plalur in yat behalf and all oyeris and I sall do yareftir. And in ye meyntyne I sall do ye best I may and sall remembere on ¹3ouris memoriall in all behalfis will god. 3our gravis

¹ '3our' omitted.

harnes is at ye making. As for ye gyire falconis zour grace wrait for yair is nane cummyne heire as zit bot how sone ony cummis I sall do diligence to recover twa of yame and sall send yame to zour grace incontinent yai will cum heire wy^tin ane moneth. As for casso ye fule he is cummyne ane sely seikly body and is no^t wor^t to be spokin for nor may no^t travel. The cardinall of turno and ye admirall is gretast now w^t ye kinge in absence of mons^r Hannebo quhay is now in turinge and wilbe heire sone. Schir I mon aduertise zour grace how effectuouslie mons^r la¹ Doulphin and Madame la Doulphines hes spokin to me to writ to zour grace for ye help of madame Dalbany to sum gud partie in scotland quhilk were grete hono^r to zour grace to do ye samin and gret plesur to yame. Scho giddis hirself mervellouse weill, and ye house and persone yat scho hes maist Ee to is ye maister of grahame. And quhay euir gettis hire will get xij^M frankis of gud payment w^t oyer profittis yat yai will gett heire w^t ye tyme and scho to haue ane zeirlie pensioun of madame La Doulphines. I beseik zour grace to aduertise me quhat I sall schaw to yame yis behalf. As to it wes said betuix hire and ye schiref of air yair is na thing yar of. It will please zo^r grace to resaue w^t yir presentis ane writinge of ye kinge zo^r faderis w^t oyer writtingis fra ye quene of nauerne to ye quene and fra oyeris hir seruandis. And I pray god preserue zour grace eternally. Writtin off Mascon ye xiii day of septembre.

[Signed]: z^r gracis awne maist
 humill seruite^r off Sanctandr^r.

Addressed: To the Kingis grace.

III.

Add. MS. 19401. ff. 37-38.

Schir eftir ye writtinge of my last writtingis ye king zour gracis fader send for me and schew me how he wes aduertist be his ambassadeur being in ingland how ye king of ingland wes in zork bidand on zour graces cummyne yaire, and yat ye Duk of nor^tfolk said to him yat zour grace wald no^t faille to be yaire quhilk he tho^t strange. I assurit his grace in ye contrare and yat yaire wes na thing yarof and it wes no^t in ye powere of na leiffand man to cause zour grace do ony thing in yat or ony oyer cause by him. And how I had writtingis of zour grace writin wy^t zoure awin hand laitlie yat zoure grace wald na way meit wy^t him howbeit yair wes grete wayis soucht be ye king of ingland to yat effect. And yat ze wald be als constant towart him as ony sone he had, quharof he wes mervellouse bly^t and thinkis he may no^t quyt zour grace of zour gud part kepit to him at all tymes. Als he schew me how mons^r de Hannebo had written to him how ye erle bothuil wes cummyne to turing and lovit him mekle to ye king his maister and desirit ye kingis grace to resaue

¹ Sic 'la.'

him in seruice allegeand yat he wes ane able man to do seruice and yat he my^t haue had seruice of ye emprio^r and refusit ye samin. He is now passit to wenis bidand answer of mons^r de Hannebo and is furnist as I am aduertist be ane gentilwoman quhilk come w^t him fra birgis in flanderis and kepis ane tryne of xx horse and may. I schew ye kinge at lenth ye gret offence and falt he maid to zoure grace and how graciouse zour grace wes agane to him. And fra tyme he herd ye verite he said he wald haue na ado w^t him nor na oyer yat zour grace wes no^t content wy^t. And I pray god preserue zour grace eternallie written of mascon ye xiiii day of septembere.

[Signed]: z^r gracis awne maist
humile seruite^r off Sanctandr^r.

[Postscript written in margin]: Sr madame la Doulphines writis presentlie to z^or grace quha is als affectit to z^or grace as ony frend z^or grace hes in erd.

[Addressed]: To the Kingis grace.

IV.

Add. MS. 14901. ff. 39-40.

Schir pleise zour grace to onderstand yat yis berer and his companzeoins come heire to leonis ye vij day of yis instant moneth wy^t five falconis and ye sext deit be ye way. And or yaire cummyne ye Dolphin and ye grete maister wy^t him was redde to depart our ye hillis to ye veris sua I tho^t no^t expedient to present na halkis to ye grete maister at that tyme bot deliuit twa of ye saidis halkis to ye cardinal of Veneur (?) quhay wes mervellouse glad of ye samin and ye toyer thre halkis to ye cardinal of tourney quhay is and hes bene euir zour gracis gud seruand and frend. And at yis houre is in als grete credit wy^t his maister as ony man in yis cuntre. I traist zour grace variit neuir halkis bettir nor yai ar.

Schir as to zour affaris heire I haue pretermillit na tyme bot hes bene doand ye best I culd conforme to zoure gracis directioun and resolucioun tane at my departing and w^tin ane moneth eftir ye departing of Johane charteris and thomas crage I presentit zour gracis vther writtingis to ye king zour gracis fader and schew him how zoure grace thankit him hartly of his gud counsel gevin to zour grace quharby ze persauit euir maire and maire his gud and hertly mynd toward zour grace quharthrou ze wald euir continew and perseucire his hertly luffit sone, and howbeit zour grace had na mynd nor haiste desire of mariage considering ye recent deceise of zoure quene no^tyeless zoure grace wald euir conforme zou to his gud counsal and mynd and to yat effect zour grace had send me writingis how zour grace had condiscendit to madame de Longueveil and how ze had send me power and commissioun to end throuch conforme to his mynd and counsel, quharof ye king schew him mervellouse well contentit & said yat he wald accept hir as his dochtir and gif hire for ye samin to z^or grace wy^t mony gud wordis of hire wisdome and gidding. And

als ye cardinal said yat he and yaire house wes perpetually oblist to remane zour guid seruandis and yat zoure grace suld fynd yame als reddy as ony subiect zoure grace had in ye warld. And yaireftir ye king directit incontinent ye samin day ane gentilman of his chalmer for mon^s de guise quhay wes in champanze to cum heire ye post for ye ending and concluding of yire materis quhay come to Leonis yis xxi. day of october, quhome apoun I haue tariit. Heire sene ye kingis departing, quhilk wes ye x day of ye samin moneth I haue spokin at lenth wy^t ye said mon^s de guise quhome I find mervellouss desirouse of ye expeditioun and haiste end of ye mater, the cause yat he come na soner wes, yat he hes done diligence and send ye post baith to ye Duke of loraine and to his dochter and hes gottin yaire mynd and beneuolence to ye fulfilling and ending of ye said mater. And now yis day he departis of yis toun ye post toward ye king quhay is in grenenoble quhilk is viii legis fra yis. And I sall follow him fast will god. I beleiff surly wyⁱⁿ veray short tyme to haue ane final end in yis mater and how sone resolutioun and end beis maid I sall send w^t all extreme diligence aduertising of all to zour grace, war no^t ye grete besines yat is heire ado and ye kingis passing vp in yire partis yire erandis had bene done or now for I find ye king cardinal and mon^s de guise als desirouse of ye end yarof as is possible and elikwise all oyeris noblemen In yir partis. And euery man thinkis zour grace ane noble wise and constant prince yat bydis sa ferme at ye king zour fader quhay schawis planely to euery man that he hes na less fauo^r na will do na less for zou thane ze ware his awin carnal sone. Schir sene all yire materis gais sa weill and na apperand difficulte bot all sall cum sone and weill to gud effect, for ye luf of god and weill of zour gracis successioun realme and subiectis haue pacience for ane litill tyme for in gud faith ye tyme is langsummer to me nor to ony vther levand man quhill I se zoure grace, and I traist in god to do sua yat ye wyntir sall no^t stop us bot we sall haistely cum hame sua yat gud sett wedder may be had. loving to god scho is stark and weill complexionit and may indure travel. scho is presently wy^t her moder in champanze bydand on ye resolutioun yat is takin heire. I dare assure yat yaire wes neuir greter diligence done in ane mater nor is done in yis considering ye tyme and cummaris yat are heire ado, for ye king tuk his voyage of fontaneblew ye morne eftir my cummyne to his grace and sene syne hes continually travellit and na thing heire ado bot assambleing of men of weire. bai^t suesis almannis etalianis and frenchemen sua yat he is at yis houre vtouch XL^M fute men j^M men of armes and xij^o leicht horse. The principall occasioun and cause of ye sending of ye Dolphin o^f ye hillis is for ye victalling of turing pynzerol and other strenthis wⁱⁿ pemond. quhilk beand done I traist ye army sall skaill for yis wynter. ye Inemys ar no^t stark aneuch to resist yame sua I traist yai sall have done yat yai haue ado wⁱⁿ ane fiftene dais ar yarby. The Turk is reterit and past away and hes done bot sobire skaith apoune cristin men lovinge to god, quhilk is liker to be be mirakle nor vyer way considering yat he had na forse nor party to

resist aganis him he wes mekle persecutit be turment of evil wedder. As for peire weiff yaire can na thing be had of him for he allegis yat ye quene quhome god assolze wes awand him maire nor ye hail soume yat he hes resauit no^{ye} less or I depart I sall do yarto yat is to me possible. As for ye money of zour counte of gyane it wilbe gottin and I sall waire ye samin vpoun wyne and sic vyer necessaire thingis as I sall think for zour grace, and as it plesis zour grace to aduertise, beseikand the samin to aduertise me of zour gracis mynd and plesur in all behalfis and I sall no^t fail to fulfill ye samin at ye vtermaist of my power. And yes eftir maist humile commendatioun of my maist lawle seruice to zour grace I beseik ye trinite to preserue ye samin eternally. Of Leonis yis xxij day of october be zour gracis

Maist humile & maist obedient

servito^r ARBROHT.

[Addressed]: To the Kingis grace.

V.

Add. MS. 19401. ff. 41-42.

Schir I resauit zour gracis writting fra James Skrymgeo^r ye xiiii day of yis instant moneth [of octo]ber ye gidder w^e ye xiiij falconis quahrof I presentit xii to ye kingis grace and ye toyer to lorge montgumry quha is w³^t ye king in gud credit and is zour gracis gud seruand. ye king zour gracis fader wes ry^t bly^t of ye saidis halkis and thankit zour grace gretumlie yarof and estemit yame mekle, and send to me twa dais yarefter viii faire gzire falconis quhilkis salbe at zour grace ye sonest yat is possible as yai may be cariit ye gidder w^t ane falconare yat can mak and handill yame. As for casso ye fule I wrait to zour grace of befor how he is ane sely seikly body and may na way travel. And as to ye sangelers and cokis of ynd I sall provid for ye samin w^t diligence bot I dreid ye tyme of zeire be no^t conuenient to cary yame now I sall pretermitt na thing in yat behalf nor oyeris yat may be done will god. Schir pleise zour grace to onderstand yat yair is intelligence and labouris makand betuix ye king and ye king of ingland tuichinge ye mariage of mons^r de orleance and ye kinge of inglandis dochter as I wrait of befor to zour grace, and sum thing hes bene in heid yar ane meting suld be betuix yame in ye sprynge of ye zeire, and ye king zoure gracis fader schew me gif ony sic thing were he wald aduertise zou in tyme to be at ye samyn bot now w^tin yir twa dais quhene I spak last w^t him I fand him of ane oyer purpose and and to send sum ambassatouris to ingland and to comone on yat and oyer materis. And yat he tho^t necessar yat zour gracis ambassatouris were yaire elikwise yat his ambassatouris and zouris my^t concur togidder and na thing to be done yaire by zoure gracis advise. And said yat he suld aduertis zoure grace in dew tyme or he send ambassatouris to ye effect yat zour grace my^t send siclik. quhat followis of yire purposis I sall no^t fail to aduertise zoure grace heireftir. As to ye payment of ye queenis pensioun it is redy in to paris and wilbe deliuit how sone ye king cummis

to fontaineblew quhilk be wⁱⁿ x or xii dais. He commandit him self to pay it thankfully, yair is na thing done in sic materis at yis tyme by his awin speciall command. As to ye impositioun rasis agane ye merchandis of zoure grasis realme ye samin is expsed be his grasis awin speciall command and commission directit to his officiaris to consider quhat priulegis yai haue broukit in tymes bypast and yat the samin be kept to yame in tyme cummyne. I sall do gud will to gett it maire ample nor it wes of befor. I assure zoure grace yis mater hes bene cummersum and wer no^t ye kingis self wald haue it done in fauo^r of zour grace it had no^t bene gottin for na thing nor yaire is nane of his awin subiectis nor oyeris yat hes gottin sic fauo^r. Ye kinge zoure grasis fader schewis him euir weill my[ndit tow]art¹ zoure grace sa lang as I am heire I salbe doand ye best I can to handill all thingis to zoure grasis hono^r and proffit as I sall answer to God and zoure grace and sall neur tyire to do zoure grace good seruice as ye tyme and experience sall schew w^t ye grace of god. I haue writtin to my lord secretarie presentlie tuiching sic writingis as I haue gottin fra maister James Salmond fur^t of rome anentis ye prouisioun of Melrose as to zoure grasis oyir materis yair, tuiching ye contributioun I haue spokin diuerse tymes to ye papis ambassatour heire and hes writtin to ye pape yairupoun bot hes gottin litill answer as yit and differris to do forthere in yai behalfis quhill I gett ansuer fra zoure grace of ye writtingis I send w^t retray and quhat zour grace commandis me to do in yat and all oyir behalfis I sall no^t fail to do my diligence w^t ye grace of god. As to ye money of zour grasis counte of gyan I haue send up to rome V^M frankis or yarby for ye expeditioun of Melrose and hes resaut my self iiiⁱⁱ^M frankis quhilk ye merchandis suld refund agane to zoure grace ye laif yat is awand salbe gottin and gud compt maid yairof w^t ye help of god I sall deliuer ye money of ye pensioun to Johne of Bartoun as zour grace commandit at my departing. Schir as for nouellis heire, ye difference betuix ye empriour and ye king continewis ay and na apperence bot of evill among yame. The empriour departit ane moneth syne wy^t ane gret army be sey eftere yat he had spokin wy^t ye pape in lowk and It wes belevit yane yat he wes passit to ergeire and now it is suspectit heire yat he suld tak ye woyage to constantineople quhilk is ane grete mater and no^t w^tout intelligence w^t ye soffe and suabe. The Turk is zit in Hungarie and reteris him for yis wintir bot he levis ane grete army yaire and in almanze. At my cummyne to Paris I sall send hame zour grasis harnes w^t sic oyir thing zoure grace gaif me in memorial. I thank zoure grace ry^t humilie of zoure gud and graciouse writing send to me. I can do na forthere for recompance bot I sall waire ye body and gudis yat god hes gevin me in zoure grasis seruice w^t trew hert. And sanct andro preserue zoure grace eternally. of Dongeoun ye xxv day of october.

[Signed]: ʒ^r grasis awne maist
 humill seruite^r off Sanct And^r.

[Addressed]: To the Kingis grace.

¹The surface of the paper is worn away here.

Sir Thomas More in his English Works

THE passing of four centuries has not sufficed to remove the career and memory of Sir Thomas More from the region of heated discussion. Everything that concerns him, the fame attaching to his literary ventures and friendships, the part played by him in great events, the religious passions which stormed round his latter days, the very martyrdom itself, adds to the controversy, and makes it easier to attain picturesque effects than to give a complete portrait of the man, correct in its every detail. To attempt a rectification of so exciting a calculation in controversial psychology from the actual records of the fray, and to weave from the many pages of More's English writings an accurate conception of More's mind, may savour of paradox. But the experiment is worth trial. More had a capacity for putting himself into all he wrote, and the fourteen hundred pages printed for William Rastell, in 1557, include work, from his first youthful sallies, down to the last tragic lines written in charcoal from the Tower to his daughter Margaret. It is true that almost the whole volume is devoted to theological debate; but, in theology laymen have a way of revealing more than their theological opinions, and Thomas More was peculiarly free from the strict methods of the divinity schools. Even the casual references and asides of the book have significance for the study of its author. Indeed, in any final portrait of the man, the English works must claim their place along with Erasmus's letters, Holbein's portraits, the *Utopia*, and Roper's *Life* as essential data; and as such, they demand careful, unprejudiced, imaginative study. Yet appreciators of *Utopia* have failed to temper their eulogies of emancipated intellect by even a partial study of these pages; and apologists have inclined to draw from them rather food for argument than a knowledge of the truth.

'When this towardly youth,' says Cresacre More, 'was come to the age of eighteen years, he began to show to the world his ripeness of wit; for he wrote many witty and goodly epigrams,

which are to be seen in the beginning of his English works.'¹ It is hardly fair to remember against More the sins of his youth, but the earlier pages of Rastell's great volume may at least remind us of the brilliant young man of Henry VII.'s reign, concerning whose marvellous future Cardinal Morton had spoken so confidently. Apart from the jesting or sententious poems, the volume reveals More, even before *Utopia* had set him among the Renaissance leaders, as the fervent admirer of another Renaissance youth, 'that singular layman, John Picus, Earl of Mirandula'; and, in the fragment on Richard III., as an historian of quite unusual promise. Although the bulk of the English writings is of a date fully ten years later than the period of *Utopia*, these preliminary fragments and essays supplement the earlier record, and throw light on More's Renaissance and literary fervours.

But students of More are less interested in elaborating the details of his Renaissance fancies, than in reconciling, if it be possible, the scholar in him with the saint, and in connecting the mood which produced *Utopia*, with these later serious and argumentative pages. The problem lies in a supposed intellectual cataclysm in More's life; the end to be sought, some self-consistent reconstruction of the man's mental life. The difficulty hinges on the *Utopia* and inferences drawn from it. The book seems admirably fitted to stand as the gospel of a new intellectual faith, with its gleams of wonder caught from the discoveries of that day, its instinctive love of things literary, and its wilfully un-Saxon capacity for intellectual conceptions. The ingenious mind finds in the *Utopia* proof after proof of what must be labelled Renaissance wares; and its publication assuredly established More's reputation in Europe, as the most elegant English writer of the day, and the prophet of a new advance in culture. Scholars spoke of the honour More had done to England, and desired either introductions to him, or descriptions of his person and life. Erasmus himself, after its publication, lamented that More had not set himself to head the intellectual world, and, even at his death, learned Europe lamented the loss of intellectual as much as of moral force. Here, then, is a book most distinctively progressive and ideal in its doctrines; and here, too, a definite impression made through it on Europe, that its author had a vital connection with that radical intellectual change,

¹*The Life of Sir Thomas More*, by his great-grandson, Cresacre More, p. 24. Edited by the Rev. Joseph Hunter. (London, 1828.)

which had swept Italy clear of old beliefs, if not of old practices. Did the book correspond to a serious mood of enlightenment, dismissed later in a panic of orthodoxy? or, was it a 'sport' of the intellect; or, after all, something not so different from the rest of his life, when viewed in true perspective?

A very casual reading of More's *English Works* must force even the most orthodox of his apologists to own at least two 'Utopian' characteristics: an extraordinary sense of humour, and an equally extraordinary capacity for seeing and stating both sides of a question. Of his ironic humour, there is of course sufficient external evidence, from the time when, as a boy, he furnished wit at Morton's table, till the last jest was spoken to the headsman on the scaffold. But More's humour was never more apparent than when he girt himself for the theological fray. 'Myself,' his shade, Antony, in 'Comfort against Tribulation' confesses, 'am of nature even half a giggler and more.'¹ The messenger in the 'Dialogue' accuses him—'Ye use to look so sadly when ye mean merrily, that many times men doubt whether ye speak in sport when ye mean good earnest';² and he was Master Mocker to the heretics, for not even in the heat of conflict did he spare his jests. Quips and flouts, and the most charmingly informal illustrations and proverbs bring a suggestion of humanity into the arid regions of discussion. Being distinctly personal in his references, he evolves, through these many pages, quaintly ironic portraits, unnamed, of himself, and his wife, and men, like Wolsey, whom he had known and could parody. Cavendish's conscientious panegyric of the great Cardinal may receive humorous corrections from More's anecdotes, and there are so many unmistakable hints of the admirable, shrewd, faithful, commonplace woman who was his second wife, that one is forced to quote, by way of illustration. It is in a discussion concerning those who 'bear a rule, command and control other men, and live uncommanded and uncontrolled themselves.'

'I never was ware,' says More's representative, 'it (this habit) was so great, till a good friend of ours merrily told me once that his wife once in a great anger taught it him. For when her husband had no list to grow greatly upward in the world, . . . she fell on hand with him (he told me) and all to-rated him, and asked him, "What will you do, that you list not to put forth yourself as other folk do? Will you sit still by the fire, and make goselings in the ashes with a stick, as children do?"

¹ *English Works*, p. 1171.

² *Ibid.* p. 127.

Would God I were a man! and look what I would do." "Why, wife," quoth her husband, "what would you do?" "What, by God, go forward with the best. For my mother was wont to say, God have mercy on her soul, it is ever more better to rule than to be ruled. And therefore, by God, I would not, I warrant you, be so foolish to be ruled where I might rule." "By my truth, wife," quoth her husband, "in this I dare say, you say truth. For I never found you willing to be ruled yet."¹ We do not hear that Lady More read her husband's works.

Now humour, like imagination, is a dangerous gift in controversy. It tends to make the controversialist face inconvenient facts, and to emphasise both sides of a question; for the humorist, being an artist, is at the mercy of his inspiration. So, throughout these pages of apologetic, More constantly connects himself with the great school of Reformation satirists, of which Erasmus, Rabelais, Lindsay and Skelton are notable disciples. Conventional panegyrists must find room in their estimates of More, not merely for his constant sallies of Aristophanic humour, but for most disconcerting hits at clerical weaknesses. If natural and unrestrained humour be a disqualification for saintship, Thomas More's vices in this region have been overlooked.

As a more serious aspect of this quality, those who long for some conventionally saintly figure, must also force themselves to acknowledge the splendid honesty and capacity for self-criticism, which form perhaps the most distinctive note of More's polemics. The disciple of Colet, the plain critic of Henry and Wolsey, the comrade in Erasmus's most daring clerical criticisms, did not forget his craft when, even after 1528, he turned to defend his Church against the Lutheran attack. It is doubtful whether there exists anywhere in controversy so powerful a statement of the positions to be demolished, as More puts into the mouth of the 'messenger' in his 'Dialogue.' Ecclesiastical miracles, tricks of saints' relics, the whole minor paraphernalia of sixteenth century shrine worship, have their weaknesses stated with an adverse power, which even Erasmus might have envied, and stated, be it remembered, preliminary to refutation. Well might Tyndale accuse More of 'faintly defending the things whereof he wrote.' Nor was More unconscious of this feature in his work. When Tyndale taunted him with being otherwise minded, in the days when Erasmus drew inspiration for his *Praise of Folly* from the talk at Chelsea, More confessed:

¹ *English Works*, p. 1224.

'That book of Moria doth indeed but jest upon the abuses of such things, after the manner of the disour's part in a play; and yet not so far neither by a great deal, as the messenger doth in my dialogue.'¹ From first to last, in spite of vehement abuse of his opponents, and manifold quibbling, Thomas More contrived not only to give the other side fair hearing and honest quotation, but even to imagine their positions with a skill, not always possessed by their occasionally lumbering intellects. Admirers of the 'Utopian' More, may find, then, traces of the mood they love, even in heated orthodox controversy, and lovers of sacred calm and irreproachable deportment, must not let the halo blind them to a twinkle in the eye of the saint, and to his persistent habit of blending piety with ironic intelligence.

But the *English Works* enable us to see, as the *Utopia* never could, the limits to the activities of this intellectual and artistic More. The disillusionment with which More's later career afflicts the lovers of his Renaissance mood, proceeds simply from a miscalculation of the importance due to that mood, even in his earlier years. The famous letter to Peter Giles might have prevented the mistake: 'While I do daily bestow my time about law matters; some to plead, some to hear, and some as an arbitrator with mine award to determine, some as an umpire or a judge with my sentence finally to discuss; while I spend almost all the day abroad among others, and the residue at home among mine own; I leave to myself, I mean to my book, no time.' The truth is that More never considered himself a literary man, or professed illuminist like his friend Erasmus. Erasmus was, if not the artist, at least the scholar of the day, and gladly paid the tithes of practical efficiency, and even moral power, which is the ordinary levy made on all who enter, as professionals, the scholarly or the aesthetic life. But Thomas More was too busy living, to acquiesce in the sacrifices of the higher intellectual life. *Magis amare potest studia quam colere*, was Erasmus' verdict. He was the chief lawyer of the day; his connection with government first dragged him into domestic affairs, then made him one of Wolsey's most trusted diplomatic agents, and finally gave him the most responsible office in the kingdom. Possibly he was reluctant to enter the Royal service, but the record of his labours forbids the idea that he performed them perfunctorily. When one adds to all this, the absorbing interest which his children and the family

¹ *English Works*, p. 422.

life had for him, it must become apparent that the Utopian fancies formed no dominating intellectual gospel, but were the pleasant leisure dreams of a busy man. The life of ordinary happiness and business, unstimulated by the headier kinds of pleasure, was his calm choice, and by that choice he set himself in opposition to ideals which, on one side, made Erasmus in manhood more a monk than he had been in youth, and on another, took from Italian scholars the taste for ordinary existence, and created the dazzling but unproductive civilisation of early sixteenth century Italy.

Now, in this fact, of More's sheer practicality, lies part of the solution to the seeming contradiction in his character; and here the *English Works* help to a completer understanding. More writes everywhere like a responsible practical statesman. Fancies he had, and ideals, but like all members of the administrative class to which he belonged, he had a natural conservatism, and an impatience of theoretic criticism, or of light-hearted Radical programmes. His idle imagination seems really to have welcomed the communistic basis of Utopian society, but these private fancies fail to represent his firm public opinion. It is a striking comment on the neglect of More's *English Works*, that no prominence has been given to More's own explicit criticism on the position assumed in his famous republic 'where nothing is private.' 'The rich man's substance,' he declares, with a note of modern capitalistic pleading in his voice, 'is the well-spring of the poor man's living'; and further, 'For this I think in my mind a very sure conclusion, that if all the money that is in this country were, to-morrow next, brought together out of every man's hand, and laid all upon one heap, and then divided out unto every man alike, it would be on the morrow after, worse than it was on the day before.'¹ This is the voice of fundamental British conservatism, and half of what critics call reactionary panic in More, is simply the statesman's love of order, of compromise, of deeds as opposed to words, expressing itself naturally. More furnishes a most admirable example of this administrative conservatism in the argument of his 'Debellacion of Salem and Bizance,'² a treatise, discussing with the coolest and ablest of all his opponents, legal procedure in the case of heretics. The main point at issue concerned the process

¹ 'Comfort against Tribulation', *English Works*, pp. 1207-8.

² *English Works*, pp. 929-1034.

ex officio by which, contrary to English tradition, legal procedure was used entirely to the disadvantage of the accused. More's opponent, with a fine humanity and moderation, 'minded to show that, in heresy, the suit of office might be left, and that, by the leaving, there should none harm follow to the Catholic faith, because heretics might as well come to correction by the way of open accusers, as by that manner suit.'¹ Nowhere is More less ingenuous, nowhere does he carp and quibble more brazenly, for he shuts his eyes to the plainest facts, and gives just a hint of the timid bureaucrat, as he defends non-popular tribunals and secret methods of accusation. But the truth is that the Whig in him, the efficient administrator, all for government and not at all for criticism, rises in judgment against the rash radical who opposes him. Men must be judged by the standards of the careers they choose. The author, the scholar, the irresponsible social enthusiast, may cherish comfortably his unacted schemes of social progress, the revelations of his artistic New Jerusalems, without fear of stiffening into orthodoxy; but when More, before ever he created *Utopia*, chose a life of affairs, he chose also this possible development, not simply characteristic of his calling, but the chief virtue of it. Those who admire the initial choice must accept all its consequences.

So far, the picture afforded by the *English Works* has been of no unusual type. The author is most obviously a man in authority, with a keenly trained and practical mind; on the side of government and order, by every instinct and acquired characteristic; a cleanly conservative, more than a little contemptuous of the noisy brawling heresies, which seemed to him to be tainting society with moral and social excesses. Equally obviously, he is one whose sense of honour is too exalted to condescend to misrepresentation. And everywhere a quaint genial humanity breaks through the rigour of his argument, with gleams of strong imagination, and hints of a most lovable irony. To this man, the *Utopia* must have been the most natural employment for leisurely and less serious moments—a *jeu d'esprit*, rather than fervent breathings of a troubled social conscience.

There is, however, one region, and that the most important in More's life, wherein the *Utopia* affords hardly any true indication of the man; yet where the *English Works* must be used with some discretion—I mean religion. In *Utopia*² they

¹ *English Works*, p. 182.

² *Utopia*, Bk. ii. 'Of the religions in Utopia.'

defined virtue as life according to nature, and the end of moral action for them was strictly utilitarian. In the spirit of their philosophy, they denounced all forms of asceticism, fasts, tortures, self-denials, the practices recommended by More's own church, holding them very mad, except where some greater public end was thereby attained. Corresponding to this naturalism in ethics, the Utopian religion may be presented as a simple rational theism, for even Christianity recommended itself to them, not through its supernaturalism, but because early Christian communism agreed with ordinary Utopian practice. Apart from its large dim churches, and ritual, solemn, if simple, the religion of Utopia has none of the notes peculiar to the Roman practice. Based on pleasure or utility, it condemns, not merely fasting, but such conventions as set a great body of clerks apart to form an *otiosa turba*, and, although a few holy ascetics are permitted, and even revered, it is in spite of reason. Its church services are without the usual aids to devotion—images or invocations, or any details of supernaturalism. Its God is nearer the *Être Suprême* than the mediaeval Trinity, and he is worshipped in solemn prayers, which need not have caused offence to French Encyclopaedists. Above all, it refuses to propagate or defend itself by violence; for, and historically it is the most striking fact, this utilitarian philosophy and rational belief trusts to reason alone, and, save in criminal and political cases, refuses to assist truth by anything more forcible than argument. What exactly More meant by all these details, it is not always easy to say; but nothing could be more incorrect, than to assume that their creator intended them for a statement of his ideal creed and ritual. Whatever the influence of Erasmus may have been, and however freely Thomas More may have speculated, his *English Works*, both by main argument and casual reference, forbid a suggestion of free-thought. In view of theories on either side, it seems eminently desirable to state the plain facts.

External evidence of More's constitutional piety exists, of course, in superabundance. However much his earliest biographers may have over-emphasised this aspect, the truth they colour is, after all, self-evident. Allowing for Cresacre More's exaggerations, his picture is indeed notable for a sixteenth century layman: one who 'at eighteen or twenty had begun to wear a sharp shirt of hair next his skin';¹ 'who had an earnest mind to be a Franciscan friar, that he might serve God in a state of

¹*The Life of Cresacre More*, p. 24.

perfection';¹ who modelled himself on the loftiest example of Renaissance piety, Pico;² 'who never undertook any business of importance but he prepared himself first by confession and receiving the blessed sacrament devoutly';³ finally, 'who was singular wise to deceive the world with mortifications, only contenting himself with the knowledge which God had of his actions.'⁴ We have absolutely no evidence that More ever ceased to be this unusual creature, a layman peculiarly fitted for the honorable worldly life and consciously living it; while, all the time, he had powerful emotions and ambitions working in direct opposition. But even when this point has been established, a real difficulty still remains, the adjustment of More's varying religious moods into a psychological unity. If the imaginary portrait of a tolerant scholar, drawing in his later days to spiritual panic, and the cruelty consequent on such a panic, have no real basis in fact, one must not too completely acquiesce in that of the pious layman, defending vigorously, but without any keen imaginative outlook, the ancient ways of orthodoxy. On this ground the *English Works* are final, for they give the opinions of More's maturest years, from 1525 to 1534; yet it is very possible, even with the honestest of intentions, to misuse them in the interests of the faith.

That More ever questioned, as Erasmus must have done, any of the greater verities, may at once be denied. Granting every suspicion of Theism, or loose spiritual theorising, which may be gleaned from the *Utopia*, they have still nothing to do with the fabric of More's real opinions. Everywhere, in such a book as his *Dialogue*, he proceeds on the assumption that there is a truth of revelation, something uniquely given to men from God, through that special process which we call inspiration. Everywhere, too, he has implicit trust in the scriptural promise that this truth will be continuously and progressively revealed, and given in trust to some authority. Challenged by his opponents, he defines repeatedly not merely what he means by truth, but the channels through which truth must come, and the superintendents of its distribution. One of his ablest and most philosophic chapters,⁵ to quote his own heading, 'declareth the pre-eminence, necessity, and profit of holy scripture, shewing nevertheless that many things have been taught by God without writing; and many great things so remain yet unwritten, of truths necessary to

¹ *The Life of Gasacre More*, p. 25.

² *Ibid.* p. 27.

³ *Ibid.* p. 193. ⁴ *C.M.* p. 294.

⁵ *The Dialogue*, Bk. i. c. 25.

be believed. And that the new law of Christ is the law, so written in the heart, that it shall never out of his church. And that the law there written by God, is a right rule to interpret the words written in his holy scripture ; which rule, with reason, and the old interpreters, the author sheweth to be the very sure way to wade with, in the great stream of Holy Scripture.' Add to this the complementary sentence, that 'the church (in which Christ is assistant and his Holy Spirit) cannot, to God's displeasure and their damnation, fall in any false belief in any substantial point of the faith,'¹ and we have More's authority. Of the earthly head of the church, More to the last spoke without perfect confidence. 'I was myself,' he wrote to Cromwell in 1533, 'sometime not of the mind that the primacy of the see should be begun by the institution of God, until that I read in the matter those things that the king's highness had written, in his most famous book against the heresies of Martin Luther.'² Convinced apparently by Henry's argument, he still could say, 'never thought I the Pope above the general council, nor never have, in any book of mine put forth among the king's subjects in our vulgar tongue, advanced greatly the Pope's authority.'³ His ultimate authority was a general council, and for him a denial of the truth of God, vested in his visible church, expressed and discovered through its countless offices, and summed up before men in an oecumenical council, was a medley of ignorance and revolutionary crime. That such was the consistent reasoned conviction of More, even in his sprightliest days, is beyond question. It is elaborated in successive arguments, with an ability and candour which have had no superior since his death. Nevertheless, lovers of the man, who cannot share all his convictions, but who still appreciate the brilliance of his church apologetic, turn in sorrow from certain detailed consequences of his main beliefs. His Utopia had been a land where thought developed free in reading and discussion ; where the forms of religion were reduced to a splendid and awful generality ; where, in the most famous sentence in the book, it was a decree 'that it should be lawful for every man to favour and follow what religion he would, and that he might do the best he could to bring other to his opinion ; so that he did it peaceably, gently, quietly and soberly, without hasty and contentious rebuking and invehing against others.'⁴ But in these *English Works*, More seems

¹ *E.W.* p. 160.

² *E.W.* p. 1426-7.

³ *E.W.* p. 1427.

⁴ *Utopia*, Bk. ii. c. 9.

wantonly to turn his back on the progressive methods of Utopia, and affects his readers with an impression of reaction.

The most curious, although not the most important of these minor matters, concerns prayers to saints, worshipping of images and going on pilgrimages. More's friends and teachers all came of a school little inclined to favour these matters. What Erasmus thought on these subjects, his *Colloquies* bear eloquent testimony, and the most veracious of these, the 'Peregrinatio,' involves More's father confessor and the noblest christian of the Tudor church, John Colet, in the author's disbelief. More himself seems often to be on the verge of a declaration in criticism. Nowhere in his *Dialogue* does the messenger reach a more convincing power, than in the chapters criticising prayers to saints, the worshipping of images, and going on pilgrimages—indeed, it is hard to believe that More really answers the points he raises; and there is one outburst of critical eloquence¹ so serious and vehement, that one almost believes the author's heart to be in alliance with his head as he writes. And yet, however badly he may manage his argument for the church, he leaves no doubt as to his final conviction; 'that those things, images I mean, and pilgrimages, and praying to saints are things good, and to be had in honour in Christ's church, *sith the church believeth so.*'² For More, the real importance lay in the last words. I cannot think that the natural man in him could always check wandering, mocking thoughts—how could Colet's pupil and Erasmus's friend be other than sensitive to ritualistic absurdities; and, of course, his church had always regulated with slack hand a certain kind of profanely humorous criticism. But the church of Luther's day never relinquished the use of these things; for More, the church was the one alternative, utter darkness the other, and since the church stood firm, More could not but acquiesce. There was a definite movement, retrogressive if you will, in More from earlier to later opinions, but it corresponded to no ossification of his mind. Times had changed, the church had stiffened her discipline, and More, the practical politician, recognised that circumstances govern the world. He has explained his position in one of his weightiest sentences: 'I say therefore' (it is in reference to his connection with the *Encomium Moriae*) 'in these days in which men by their own default misconstrue and take harm of the very scripture of God, until men better amend, if any

¹ *E.W.* p. 140.

² *E.W.* p. 176.

man would now translate *Moria* into English, or some works either that I have myself written ere this, albeit there be none harm therein, folk yet being (as they be) given to take harm of that that is good, I would not only my darling's (Erasmus) books, but mine also, help to burn them both with mine own hands, rather than folk should (though through their own fault) take any harm of them.'¹

This reference to the people and their turmoils raises a second, but really minor difficulty in reconstructing More's intellectual personality, his attitude towards a free use of literature, and more especially of the English scriptures. But space forbids any detailed examination of the point, and in any case the principles which control his conduct elsewhere apply here also. No such elimination however is possible when we arrive at the final testing point in the history of More's opinions—his theory of toleration and persecution. More stands forth in history as a persecutor—that is the rock of offence to all earnest protestants from Tyndale to Mr. Froude; and supporters of the vaguer gospel of culture reproach him further with turning his back on an earlier belief in toleration. Now, whatever the Utopian sentences may mean, the cold fact of More's actual opinion is indubitable, as the most casual reading of his *English Works* will prove. But the fact is one thing, its significance for More's character quite another.

Before giving More's position in detail, it may be well to suggest the world in which he held it. This spiritual and intellectual patrician had been watching, for ten years, the growth of heresy and its ally, democracy. Now piety is aristocratic; the church, which is the reservoir of piety, is the elaboration of aristocracy, and tradition, the foundation of the church, despises both the crowd and the future, that playground of the crowd. The good plain home-spun lollardy of the people, the sturdy ignorant appeal to an English or a German Bible, the rough and ready argumentative tests of truth proposed by the new faith, the very stress which Luther laid on the individual religious experience, became not merely hateful to More, but a cause of terror. With the prescience of a great politician he warned his son-in-law of the future: 'I pray God that some of us, as high as we seem to sit upon the mountains treading heretics under our feet like ants, live not the day that we gladly would wish to be at league and composition with them, to let them have their churches quietly to themselves, so that they would be contented

¹ *E.W.* 422-3.

to let us have ours quietly to ourselves.’¹ But these words must not be interpreted to suggest toleration. Broadly and plainly, Thomas More believed in persecution because, socially, political stability seemed to be threatened by heresy; and because, religiously, no other view was possible to him. In spite of the famous Utopian scheme, More never could have believed in the practicability of moderation, and in the sphere of politics, to doubt the practicability of an idea is to recognise its falsehood. Belief then was actual on both sides, a matter of something deeper than life and death. It expressed itself in very concrete phrases; it connected itself with great punishments and rewards; it had not yet learned to turn hysterical appreciations of pain, into arguments against the existence of evil or the pursuit of righteous repression. Besides all this, which amounted to the sinfulness and awful consequences of intellectual error, the church represented social stability, and Lutheranism might justifiably present itself to conservatives as a kind of anarchy, bringing war and bloodshed in its train.

It is customary to apologise for More in this field, when the truth is that, on his own hypotheses, in religion and politics, his conduct was the only perfectly righteous course. He made no attempt at disguise. Persecution he was forced to practice; the only questions were those of degree and method. In the *Dialogue* his very chapter title is clear and bold: ‘The author sheweth his opinion concerning the burning of heretics, and that it is lawful, necessary and well done, and sheweth also that the clergy doth not procure it, but only the good and politic provision of the temporality.’² Under the circumstances, when Germany was on fire with popular discontent, More tended rather to the civil, than to the spiritual argument for repression. Even in England, he held, the heretics had opened the attack; they had begun with violence, and when the messenger attempted a Utopian defence, pleading for a rule whereby ‘no man were constrained to believe but as he could be by grace, wisdom, and good works induced,’³ it was ‘the great peril and jeopardy of the realm’ which More gave as an answer to his wishes. Believing then in the essential rightness, for More, of his theories, we must be prepared to find him hold them to the end. In the epitaph, which he wrote for himself in the summer after he resigned the

¹ Roper's *Life of More*.

² *The Dialogue*, Bk. iv. c. 13.

³ *E.W.* p. 275.

chancellorship, among the qualities of which he was not ashamed, he recorded that he had been 'furibus, homicidis, haereticisque molestus,'¹ and lest it be taken for one more ironic jest of this constant humorist, we have a letter to Erasmus with a declaration perfectly explicit: 'I have purposely stated in my epitaph that I molested the heretics, for I so hate that folk, that unless they repent, I would rather incur their animosity, so mischievous are they to the world.' The truth is that we moderns can be tolerant, only because we have lost the possibility of clear belief. Conviction, with its corollary repression, is, like patriotism, one of the dying virtues, and historians find it easier to evade the question than to reconstruct an austere hero like More in full light of the facts. We may consistently praise some retired thinker for his philosophic basing of toleration, or some rash poetic dream for its anticipations of the future. But Thomas More was a man, as we have seen, immersed in living, founding that public conduct which we eulogise, on theories essentially at one with those which drove him to intolerance, and professing a most exalted piety, whose temper stood the final test, because it had been prepared to risk lives, both its own and others', for the faith.

There is a peculiar fitness in the fact that Rastell's volume closes with the letters to More's beloved daughter Margaret. The chief service rendered to More's memory by the *English Works* is that they shatter partial estimates of him, as literary man or social idealist. But it is no fierce theologian of the older school whom they substitute for the lighter figure, only a noble Englishman, of whom these letters are the most inspired expression. In mere detail of literary power they leave the *Utopia* as far behind as life does day-dreams, looking for rivals only to the simpler and less theatrical moments of Shakespeare's genius. But their highest value lies in their revelation of More's character. Not every martyr can believe so utterly as More, and not every martyr can find the creed for which he dies adorned, as More did his, with memories and great traditions like some old cathedral. But the unique thing in these personal records of his trial is the urbanity and humour they reveal. Martyrs may die like Christians, but it is not always easy to play the gentleman to the bitter end. Yet in prison, and to the very scaffold, we may watch More keep the perfect good-nature which won him friends through Europe; his wit and repartees levelled at jailors,

¹ *E.W.* p. 1420.

executioner, child and wife, would have made the reputation of a dozen courtiers; the piety which raised him above even the venerable bishop of Rochester, who suffered with him, continued still to be tempered with sanity and shrewdness; and the father's love which had already caught the imagination of Europe, met its reward in one heroic scene. 'I never liked your manner toward me (it is his last letter to his daughter) better than when you kissed me last: for I love when daughterly love and dear charity hath no leisure to look to worldly courtesy.' He has lived and will live, not through any literary grace, or intellectual progressiveness, but because, like few others, he combined perfect sanity with the deepest piety; could, even in death, hit an admirable compromise between laughter and tears; and because he sacrificed the most brilliant intellectual gifts for a practical effectiveness, which, although worldly, had never a stain of baseness in it.

J. L. MORISON.

Chronicle of Lanercost¹

MA RTIN the Fourth, a native of Touraine, succeeded to Pope Nicholas, and sat for four years. In his time, Peter, King of Aragon, took Sicily, having expelled Charles, and held it against all the power of the Pope and of A.D. 1281. the King of France, a crusade made against him taking little effect.

This [Pope] was named Simon, and was sent as special legate to France, but particularly to Paris, to allay discord among the scholars; for Satan had sown among them something of a schism, and every nation was striving for the highest place in the university. The legate having arrived and hearkened to the controversy, promulgated the law that the English had priority in that university; for, said he, Baeda went to Rome, and, coming to Paris, held classes before anybody else, founding sacred theology upon the gospel of S. John, and, by first teaching regularly, opened the way to all other sciences after him.²

He [the Pope], being under vows to S. Francis, on the feast of Pentecost, without any suggestion (unless it were that of the Holy Ghost), decreed and bestowed upon [the Franciscans] by his plenary power the privilege of preaching the word of God, and hearing the confessions of all and sundry, not without [exciting] the wonder of many and the indignation of great persons. For at that time the friars in various provinces had been prohibited by twenty-one bishops from the exercise of the aforesaid [offices]. When he was dying he directed that he should be buried at the feet of S. Francis; nevertheless, contrary to his wishes, he was interred at Viterbo.

At this time the King of England, intending to hunt in parts of Westmorland, prepared to set out for Gascony [provisioned] with all kinds of game, because Gaston de Biern, once loyal,

¹ See *Scottish Historical Review*, vi. 13.

² The Legate's ruling may have been right, but his argument was wrong, for Bede himself tells us that he never was out of England.

but now a rebel, drawing back from his allegiance. In a short time he forced them [to desist] from their rash purpose, and returned home.¹

It happened in the same year that two Minorite Friars of the convent of Dumfries were travelling the country of Annandale to preach at the holy Nativity of the Lord.² Howbeit, there was near where they passed the steward of a certain church and overseer of the rector's glebe, who, being oppressed with infirmity, felt obliged to make confession, but, intending not to do so honestly, concealed twenty gold pieces³ which he had embezzled from his master. Having received from his master the rector instructions to prepare the house for his coming, the sick man quitted the hall wherein he had lain until that time, and moved into a wattled barn, where a single girl ministered to the needs of his ailment. But one of these nights when these [two] were resting apart, there came some satellites of Satan, who entered the house about cock-crow, lit a fire, placed upon it a cauldron, and poured in water to heat it. A little afterwards two of these devils were sent to the bed of the sick man, lifted him out, soused him in the boiling water,⁴ and then bound him dripping to the cross-beam of the house, tearing him with their nails, and jeering at him with—'Take that for the twenty pieces of gold.' This was done three times in succession, the woman all the time witnessing the punishment and listening to the accusation. Having perpetrated the cruelty which God permitted, his tormentors carried the wretched man back to bed. Then one of them exclaimed—'What shall be done to that woman lying there?' To whom the leader replied, 'That water is not suitable for her. She is the priest's whore, and hotter water will suit her better.'⁵

When he said this, they all departed; and the woman went to the sick man, and asked with trembling how he was, who answered her—'You beheld my torments; need you ask how I

¹ This passage must have been misplaced by the compiler. King Edward did not go to Gascony in 1281, and the reference is probably to his expedition in 1286-89, though the facts are very inaccurately stated.

² Christmas.

³ *Solidos*. The term in late Roman coinage denoted a gold piece, the older *aureus*; but in this place it may have signified 'shillings.'

⁴ *Lixa aqua*.

⁵ The meaning seems to be that devils are afraid of hot water, as explained by one of them in an episode described in the *Chronicle*, ad ann. 1257.

am? but, for the fear of God, let a priest come to me, and seek safety for yourself.'

Therefore when it was light she went a distance of five miles to Annan, where, having confessed herself, she found plenty of hot water.

In this year Sir John of Newcastle took the monk's dress at Holcultram, upon which H. observed :

'With altered habit, habits too must alter,
Much need that John with sin no more should palter.
Unless to mend his ways he doth not fail,
White gown and snowy cowl will nought avail.'¹

In the same year Sir Nicholas of Carlisle was sent to reside at Gisburn, and became a monk there.

The Friars of the Cross who inhabit the land of Robert de Chartersborough, and raise pleasant buildings there, A.D. 1282. having carried architectural work² through the middle of the church, were preparing for themselves a lower choir, where lies the body of that just man, leaving the lower part to pilgrims, [who come] thither in order to perform vigils and burn candles. The spirit of the just man resented this and a tremendous flood, such as no man there remembers, carried the waters of the Nidd into the upper part and the middle of the church, destroying the vaulted work in the night, and [the spirit of the just man, Robert] allowed [the friars] to stand together, not as his masters but as his comrades, on the pavement which was raised only a little [above the flood].³

About the same time the rector of the church of Bothans⁴ in Lothian caused the woodwork of his choir to be carved during Lent, to the honour of S. Cuthbert, whose church it is and for the credit of the place. But when the work was finished, on the vigil of the Saint,⁵ while the rector was worrying himself about how the scaffolding, made of huge, rough beams, which

¹ *Mutatis pannis mutetur vita Johannis
Ut melioretur et ei constantia detur.
Si tibi sit pulla capa, forte, vel alba cuculla
Et virtus nulla, merces tibi non datur ulla.*

² *Arvali opere* in Dr. Stevenson's edition, which Mr. Neilson reasonably suggests is a misreading of *arcuali*.

³ This passage is very obscure : but Mr. Neilson has elucidated it by revising the punctuation, and showing that *aqua de Nith* is not the Scottish Nith but the Yorkshire Nidd.

⁴ Abbey S. Bathans.

⁵ 19th March.

the workmen had erected on the ground, could be removed so that it should be no impediment to the celebration, one of the workmen went up and loosed the upper lashings so that the supports threatened to fall down. And while the artizan was at a loss how to get down, suddenly the whole scaffolding collapsed, carrying him with it. A great shout arose, for the men supposed that he was crushed [to death], seeing that he had fallen upon a stone pavement; [but], on removing the beams they found the man not a bit the worse, even making fun of it with his rescuers. Thus did the Saint renew his ancient miracles [performed] at the time of his translation in the scaffolding of vaulted building.

About this time, in Easter week, the parish priest of Inverkeithing, named John, revived the profane rites of Priapus, collecting young girls from the villages, and compelling them to dance in circles to [the honour of] Father Bacchus. When he had these females in a troop, out of sheer wantonness, he led the dance, carrying in front on a pole a representation of the human organs of reproduction, and singing and dancing himself like a mime, he viewed them all and stirred them to lust by filthy language. Those who held respectable matrimony in honour were scandalised by such a shameless performance, although they respected the parson because of the dignity of his rank. If anybody remonstrated kindly with him, he [the priest] became worse [than before], violently reviling him.

And [whereas] the iniquity of some men manifestly brings them to justice, [so] in the same year, when his parishioners assembled according to custom in the church at dawn in Penance Week, at the hour of discipline he would insist that certain persons should prick with goads [others] stripped for penance. The burgesses, resenting the indignity inflicted upon them, turned upon its author; who, while he as author was defending his nefarious work, fell the same night pierced by a knife, God thus awarding him what he deserved for his wickedness.

In the same year Sir Hugh of Ireland obtained a license to enter stricter religion in his country; but in the same year he suffered rejection because of discord between the Prior and the Convent. Wherefore H. remarked:

‘What profits it to leap and thus to fall?
No son of man prevails to conquer all.

Better, sometimes, to halt than forward press ;
 Virtue may profit e'en from ill success.
 A change of scene proves often no bad leech ;
 One hankers less for what seems out of reach.¹

In the same year Henry de Burgh was arrested at Durham and confined for three days in the castle because of an execution which he had performed for the Archbishop of York, wherefore he wrote to Master R. Avenel as follows :

' Robert ! if legates pass their way
 With privilege, as all men say,
 Then let me out this very day
 From prison walls wherein I stay.
 Cloisters, not towers like these, befit me,
 Thus prison rules the harder hit me ;
 Wherefore to pray your grace permit me,
 Command my jailors to demit me.
 God's House to all should aye be free
 To come and go. I cannot see
 Why I, who canon am professed,
 Should thus in person be oppressed ;
 The benefit we clergy boast of
 Is what at present I lack most of.
 Guiltless I languish in this cell.
 God help me ! Who dost all things well.'

Hugh de Burgh² wrote thus to the Archbishop:

' O Primate of York ! 'twas for you that I paid
 With my freedom in Durham. They did me upbraid,
 And maltreat my person. My servants departed
 And left me the victim of men evil-hearted.
 Three days I remained in that horrible tower,
 Forbidden to leave it, alone hour by hour.
 Holy Sire ! if you do not avenge such an outrage,
 Nor clergy nor brethren can brook it without rage.
 Thus study to rule us, upholding the law,
 Keeping good men in safety and rebels in awe.'

In the same year Llewellyn, Prince of Wales, was captured in a skirmish and beheaded incontinently.³

¹ *Quid prodest facere saltum et sic resilire ?
 In nullo genere genus est quod circuit omne.
 Sed quando tantum est casus causa salutis ;
 Robur virtutis passum dat saepe gravamen.
 Est medicinalis mutatio saepe localis ;
 Res minus optatur prope si non esse sciatur.*

² Henry and Hugh must have been the same monk.

³ He was slain in the field.

On the day following the feast of S. Agnes,¹ the King of Scotland's son, Alexander, was taken from this world, being only twenty years of age, dying on his birthday, A.D. 1283. changing the rejoicing for his birth into lamentation for his death; forasmuch as, had he lived, he would have been the light of his country and the joy of his kindred. He was carried off in Cupar-in-Fife by a lingering illness, with which he suffered a degree of mental aberration; [but], coming to his senses late on Thursday evening, he foretold regarding his death, on the morrow at sunrise should set the sun of Scotland; and for King Edward of England he said: 'My uncle shall fight three battles; twice he will conquer; in the third he will be overthrown.' These things I learnt from information of those who were with him when he died, whereof one was a knight and his tutor, the other was rector of the church and his priest.

In like manner his sister, the Queen of Norway, took the way of death in the following month of February, only thirty days later, in order that God's long-suffering should by many afflictions² soften to a proper [degree of] penitence³ the heart of the father through whose wrong doing these things came to pass.⁴

In the unlucky course of that year, the Welsh nation, unable to pass their lives in peace, broke over their borders on Palm Sunday, carrying fire and sword among the people engaged in procession, and even laid siege [to some places]; whose Prince Llewellyn, deceived (more's the pity!) by the advice of his brother David, fiercely attacked his lord the King; as we read written about Christ, 'him whom I loved most hath set himself against me.' For the King had given his own niece, only daughter of the Earl of Montfort, a lady of noble birth [endowed] with the ample possessions of her father, in marriage to Llewellyn, by whom he had two sons. But David was so much in the king's confidence that he got himself appointed

¹ He died on 28th January. St. Agnes' day is the 21st, which was his birthday.

² *Jaculis.*

³ *Patientia*, which Mr. Neilson rightly suggests must be a misreading for *penitentia*.

⁴ Certain clerics never wearied of imputing to Alexander III., the best king that the Scots ever had, responsibility for all the calamities which befel both his country and his family.

guardian of his [the King's] head in place of the Great David ap Udachis.¹ And forasmuch as nothing is so deadly as an enemy within the household, he persuaded his brother to rebel, trusting after the act to conciliate the king by his [David's] proved devotion. Having therefore raised an army, the King went in person to Wales, accompanied by gallant men; where, albeit at great expense and loss of men, he first occupied the land of Anglesey [which was] fertile, abounding in all good things. Which [island] he divided among English farmers, removing the Abbey of Aberconway and founding it elsewhere; but in that place² because of its suitability he built a town, a castle and a spacious harbour, the ditch surrounding the castle with the tide.

At this time the head of Llewellyn, who had been slain by the treachery of his own people, was sent to the King, although he would not have approved of this being done.³ However, it was taken to the Tower of London, and fixed upon a stake. Arising out of these events, the King took proceedings against the traitor David; for, having returned to Hereford, he intended to revisit the seat of his government, when fresh rumours reached him that the author of perfidy could not desist from adding to his iniquity. The King therefore resumed the campaign, and, determined to exterminate the whole people of that nation, he caused them to be beset by land and sea in the district of Snowdon with a great fleet, so that by famine he might crush those stoney hearts which relied upon [safety in] stones and rocks.

At length [David], having been conquered through privation, surrendered, and the King sent him forward to the Tower of London with wife and children; and, having built Flint Castle, received the common people to mercy, having appointed his own bailiffs and [made] many new laws. He also possessed himself of the ancient and secret treasures of that people, [dating], as is believed, from the time of Arthur; among which he found a most beautiful piece of the Holy Cross, carved into a portable cross, which was the glory of their dominion and [carried] the presage of their doom. Which

¹ Obscure. Stevenson's edition reads *vice magni David apud achis*, which is unintelligible.

² At the mouth of the Conway.

³ The fate of Llewellyn ap Gruffudd has been briefly noted already *ad ann.* 1282.

[cross], it is said, Helena kept after the Invention as a special portion, and brought with her when she returned to Britain with her husband. The Welsh had been accustomed to call it, after the fashion of their own language, 'Crosnaith.'

Thus the King returned from the said campaign about the Nativity of the Glorious Virgin,¹ bringing with him as proof of his triumph the ensign of salvation of the human race; and, with a great procession of nobles, bishops and clergy, brought that monument of our redemption to London to be adored by the citizens.

David's children were condemned to perpetual imprisonment, but David himself was first drawn as a traitor, then hanged as a thief; thirdly, he was beheaded alive, and his entrails burnt as an incendiary and homicide; fourthly, his limbs were cut into four parts as the penalty of a rebel,² and exposed in four of the ceremonial places in England as a spectacle; to wit—the right arm with a ring on the finger in York; the left arm in Bristol; the right leg and hip at Northampton; the left [leg] at Hereford. But the villain's head was bound with iron, lest it should fall to pieces from putrefaction, and set conspicuously upon a long spear-shaft for the mockery of London. Just as the holy Jeremiah composed metrical dirges for the desolation of Judaea, so the Welsh nation composed a heroic elegy upon the death of their Prince and the desolation of their nation, at the end whereof they always commemorate David with curses, forasmuch as he was the author of this misfortune, whereon H. spoke these lines:

' David of Wales, a thief and traitor,
Slayer of men, of Church a hater,
A fourfold criminal in life
Now dies by horse, fire, rope and knife.
The ruffian thus deprived of breath
Most meetly dies by fourfold death.'³

In the same year, John, Prior of Lanercost, resigned, for whom adequate provision was granted and confirmed under the seal of Bishop Ralph.⁴ In the same year, on the morrow of the

¹ 8th September.

² *Depellatoris*, probably an error for *debellatoris*.

³ *David Walensis, equus, ignis, funis et ensis,
Infelix, fatum tibi dant recis et cruciatum.
Es nece quadrifida—fur, proditor ac homicida,
Hostis et ecclesiae debes de jure perire.*

⁴ Ralph de Ireton, Bishop of Carlisle.

Assumption of the Blessed Mary,¹ Simon of Driffield was elected Prior.

Item, in the same year, on the fifth of the Ides of January,² William, Archbishop of York, was translated, whose translation was procured and the expenses thereof borne by Sir Antony Bek, who, in the same [year], was consecrated Bishop of Durham, in the presence of the King and chief men of the country.

In the same year, Edward the Fifth, son of Edward the Fourth, was born at Carnarvon.³

At the feast of Holy Trinity,⁴ Robert de Coquina, Bishop of Durham, died, and when he was about to be interred in the chapter house of that place, those who were making
A.D. 1284. the grave impinged upon the tomb of a bishop unknown to them, Turgot, who had been Prior of Durham, and afterwards Bishop of St. Andrews in Scotland, but returning to Durham, ended his life in that place. By this time he had lain in the depth of the earth eight score and nine years, yet he was not only found entire in his body, but also in his vestments, the diggers having accidentally broken the case containing his pastoral staff. Having therefore shown the unchanged remains of this venerable man to several persons, they filled in the place with the earth that had been thrown out, and prepared elsewhere a grave befitting such remains.

We have seen this man, about whose funeral we are now speaking, in life bountiful enough and merry, also quite facetious enough at table. It occurred to me once to extract a meaning from his sport, by way of example. For instance, he kept in his court, after the custom of modern prelates, as some relief from their cares, a couple of monkeys—an old and a young one. One day at the end of dinner, desiring to be refreshed by amusement rather than by food, [the bishop] caused a silver spoon with whitened almonds to be placed in the enclosure of the younger monkey, the bigger one being kept away [from it]. She [the little monkey], seeing the coveted food, and wishing to avoid being despoiled by the bigger one, made every endeavour to stuff all the contents of the spoon into her left cheek, which she managed to do. Then, just as she thought to escape with the spoil, the

¹ 16th August.

² 9th January.

³ The chronicler reckons the Saxon kings named Edward in the list of English kings.

⁴ 4th June.

older monkey was released, and ran to her, seized the right cheek of the loudly screaming little one, drew out all that was stuffed into the left cheek, as if out of a little bag, and refreshed itself, until not a single [almond] was left. Everybody who saw this burst out laughing, but I perceived therein an image of the covetous of this world, calling to mind that proverb of Solomon in the twenty-second [chapter]: 'He that oppreseth the poor to increase his riches, shall himself give to a richer man and come to want.'¹

At the feast of All Saints in this year, Alexander, King of Scotland, took a second wife, Yoleta by name, daughter of the Comte de Dreux, to his own sorrow, and to the almost perpetual injury of his kingdom, as will be repeatedly made clear.

In the same year [a son] was born to King Edward at Carnarvon in Snowdon, upon whom was bestowed his father's name on S. Mark the Evangelist's day.²

During that war in Wales a bridge of boats was made in the place called Menai, that is, between Snowdon and Anglesey, where Sir William de Audley, Lucas Tanay, Roger de Clifford and many others, old and young, were drowned.

In the same year there was granted to my lord the King of England a twentieth of all the churches of England.

Pope Martin departed from this world, to whom succeeded Honorius the Fourth, who sat for two years. Feeble and gouty, he was made Pope from [being] Cardinal, A.D. 1285. and being able neither to walk nor stand, made for himself a revolving chair. On the day of his consecration, one of the cardinals made these verses upon him at the instance of certain brethren :

'They place a wretched hulk in Peter's seat,
Maimed of both hands and lamed in both his feet.'³

Howbeit, he did one good thing in publicly reproving [all] false apostles, *orbanibulos* and ribald persons who had started in the city itself without authority from the Roman see, and in issuing written orders that if any such persons were apprehended, they should first be warned to relinquish their sect and enter the

¹ The vulgate here differs in sense from the authorised version, where the passage runs, 'and he that giveth to the rich.'

² 25th April.

³ *Ponitur in Petri monstrum miserabile sede,
Mancus utroque manu, truncus utroque pede.*

cloister of holy religion, and if they did not comply with this, they should be handed over to the public authority. In connection with this a certain trustworthy burgess of Hartlepool declared on his return from Rome that he knew of a dozen of these fellows being beheaded in one day. Two of them also were arrested in Berwick, with their wives and children, and were found to be carrying long daggers at their hips and purses full of silver.

In the course of this year King Alexander of Scotland was removed by sudden death from the world after he had reigned thirty-six years and nine months. He departed from the world on the fourteenth of the kalends of April,¹ late on Monday night, being the vigil of S. Cuthbert, Bishop and Confessor, the liberties and bounds of whose Bishopric he [Alexander] had violated for three years past. And whereas it was held by the superior [clergy]² that the Lord would remove from the world both his children and his wife during his own lifetime for his chastisement, and [whereas] that did not cause him to reform, any one may perceive how there was fulfilled in him holy Job's prophecy, which saith: 'God will visit upon his children the sorrow of the father, and when he has accomplished [this] he shall know it.'

Of a truth it was foretold to him by just men that the Lord had shaken His sword against him, that He had bent and made ready His bow against him, and had prepared many arrows against him, etc. Besides all this there was repeated in the province throughout the whole of that year a fatal saying by the Scots, that at that time should come the Judgment Day, at which many trembled and a few scoffed.

In December preceding, next before these [events], under the sign of Capricorn, many terrible thunderings were heard, and lightning was seen, which, in the opinion of wise men, presaged the overthrow of princes, who were [thus] warned to take heed to themselves. But whereas all these and other warnings were of no avail to enlighten his [Alexander's] mind, God punished him by the means He appointed. For he [Alexander] used never to forbear on account of season or storm, nor for perils of flood or rocky cliffs, but would visit, not too creditably [both] matrons and nuns, virgins and widows, by day or by night as the fancy seized him, sometimes in disguise, often accompanied by a single follower. On

¹ 19th March.

² *Superioribus*, perhaps meaning 'old people.'

that very day, then, when judgment was imminent (though he suspected it not) there arose such a mighty tempest that to me and most men it seemed disagreeable to expose one's face to the north wind, rain and snow. On which day, he [Alexander] was holding a council in the lofty Castrum Puellarum¹ with a great assembly of the nobles of the land, for the purpose of replying to the emissaries of the King of England, who were due at Norham on the third day [after] with the bodily presence of Thomas of Galloway, whose release from prison was besought at that time by Sir John de Baliol, the son of the older Baliol.

When they had sat down to dinner, he [Alexander] sent a present of fresh lampreys² to a certain baron, bidding him by an esquire to make the party merry, for he should know that this was the Judgment Day. He [the baron], after returning thanks, facetiously replied to his lord: 'If this be the Judgment Day, we shall soon rise with full bellies.'

The protracted feast having come to an end, he [Alexander] would neither be deterred by stress of weather nor yield to the persuasion of his nobles, but straightway hurried along the road to Queensferry, in order to visit his bride, that is to say Yoleta, daughter of the Comte de Dru, whom shortly before he had brought from over the sea, to his own sorrow and the perpetual injury of the whole province. For she was then staying at Kinghorn. Many people declare that, before her engagement beyond the sea, she had changed her dress in a convent of nuns, but that she had altered her mind with the levity of a woman's heart and through ambition for a kingdom.

When he arrived at the village near the crossing, the ferry-master warned him of the danger, and advised him to go back; but when [the King] asked him in return whether he was afraid to die with him: 'By no means,' quoth he, 'it would be a great honour to share the fate of your father's son.' Thus he arrived at the burgh of Inverkeithing, in profound darkness, accompanied only by three esquires. The manager of his salt pans, a married man of that town, recognising him by his voice, called out: 'My lord, what are you doing here in such a storm and such darkness? Often have I tried to persuade you that your nocturnal rambles will bring you no good. Stay with us, and we will provide you with decent fare and all that you want till morning light.' 'No need for

¹ Edinburgh.

² *De murena recenti.*

that,' said the other with a laugh, 'but provide me with a couple of bondmen, to go afoot as guides to the way.'

And it came to pass that when they had proceeded two miles, one and all lost all knowledge of the way, owing to the darkness; only the horses, by natural instinct, picked out the hard road. While they were thus separated from each other, the esquires took the right road; [but] he, at length (that I may make a long story short), fell from his horse, and bade farewell to his kingdom in the sleep of Sisara. To him Solomon's proverb applies: 'Wo unto him who, when he falls, has no man to raise him up.' He lies at Dunfermline alone in the south aisle, buried near the presbytery. Whence [comes it] that, while we may see the populace bewailing his sudden death as deeply as the desolation of the realm, those only who adhered to him most closely in life for his friendship and favours, wet not their cheeks with tears?

But, whereas a chronicle which strews its course with extinguished cinders will be deemed too dry, I shall here relate, to the praise of the incorrupt Virgin, what befel on the Annunciation¹ immediately after this event. In that kingdom there is a village called Stanehouse² on this side of the burgh of Stirling, wherein a farmer, not sufficiently respecting the feast of the Conception of the Son of God,³ went to the plough, yoked his team, and, having set his own son to drive the animals, began to plough the turf. But as the oxen did not go fast enough, and by avoiding [the yoke] drew a crooked furrow, the obstinate fellow cried to his son to goad them, and shouted curses on the beasts. At length, wrought into a fury, he seized a plough staff, and, meaning to deal a heavy blow on the restive one of the oxen, he aimed amiss, and struck the head of his own son, who fell dead. Thus he became the murderer of his own offspring, an outlaw from his own people, obnoxious to the Author of Salvation, and the betrayer of his own [cause].⁴

¹ 25th March.

² Probably Stonehouse in Lanarkshire.

³ *I.e.* the Annunciation. Father Stevenson, confusing it with the Conception of the Virgin, noted it as 8th December.

⁴ It was by tales like these, diligently circulated, that the clergy terrified their flocks into due observance of holy days; but in this instance the moral had been more apparent if the punishment had fallen upon the impious father instead of the innocent son.

(To be continued.)