The
Scottish Historical Review

Vol. III., No. 12 July 1906

The Connexion between Scotland and Man

OF the four countries adjacent to the Isle of Man Scotland is nearest, and has had perhaps the most intimate connexion with it. So close, indeed, is *Nolbin* (Alban), as the Manxmen call it, that its Galloway coast is visible from Man on every clear day throughout the year.

Before dwelling upon such instances of this connexion as are known to history, we will briefly indicate how nearly the *Albanach*[1] and the *Manninagh* are allied in race and language. By the beginning of our era the pre-Aryan peoples in Man had probably been partly displaced by a Belgic race, called Mevanian, which has given its name to the island.[2] This race, which was Goidelic, also settled in the Isles and on both sides of the Forth estuary,[3] as well as in parts of Wales and Ireland. Nor is it unlikely that the Picts (also, we believe, of Goidelic origin)[4] settled in Man.[5] Both Man and Scotland had, before the fifth century, received colonists from the kindred race of the Irish *Scoti*,[6] and, finally, between the ninth and eleventh

[1] *i.e.* the native of the Western isles and west and north coasts of Scotland. The native of the Lothians is as alien to the Manxman as the native of Kent or Sussex.

[2] 'A people whose name stem is Mĕnăp-, Mŏnap-, or Manap-' (*Keltic Researches*, E. W. B. Nicholson, p. 13). The Isle of Man was called *Mona* by Cæsar, *Mevania* by Orosius, and *Monapia* by Pliny.

[3] The country called *Manaw Guotodin* in old Welsh literature.

[4] We agree in this view, so ably set forth by Mr. Nicholson in his *Keltic Researches*.

[5] For traces of the Picts in Man, see *History of the Isle of Man* (A. W. Moore), pp. 35-6.

[6] '*A Scottorum gentibus habitur*' (Orosius, I. ii. § 82, Trubner's Ed.).

centuries Man and the Scottish islands, with parts of the north and west coasts of Scotland, were conquered and occupied by the Scandinavians.

As regards language we have evidence which tends to show that, in the seventh century, the language spoken in Man was substantially identical with the Gaelic of Ireland, though at the present day it more nearly resembles the Gaelic of Scotland. There are more individual words in Manx like Scottish than Irish Gaelic, and Manx and Scottish Gaelic have practically the same method of forming plurals.[1] Though Manx local names are more distinctively Irish than Scottish Gaelic, and Manxmen have more surnames of Irish than of Scottish Gaelic origin, there are numerous Manx surnames of distinctively Scottish Gaelic origin.[2]

The earliest point of contact between Man and Scotland of which we have evidence—not the evidence of written records, but that of existing names and traditions—was in connexion with the Celtic Church. At the end of the fourth century a British saint, Ninian, built a church, called *Candida Casa*, at Whithorne, on the western shore of Wigton Bay, which is within 25 miles of Man. May we not assume that this saint, whose name probably survives in the primitive *keeills of Keeil-Lingan* and *Cabbal Lingan* in Man, or some of his disciples, landed on our shores?[3]

Then we come to St. Columba, who has left not only his own name, but that of his followers—St. Ronan, St. Adamnan, and St. Moluoc—to some of our ancient churches. But even more significant of his influence are the facts that his name has been given to a feast of the Manx Church, and that it occurs in a well-known 'charm.' His feast day (originally on the 9th of June, but, after the change of the calendar, on the 21st) was called *Yn Eaill Columb Killey*, 'The feast of Columb of the

[1] Rhŷs, *Manx Phonology*, pp. 164-5. (In *Manx Society's* volume xxxiii.)

[2] (*a*) As names of purely Gaelic origin: Callister (M'Alister), Shimmin (M'Symon), Knickell (M'Neacail, MacNicol), Fargher (Farquhar), Kaighan (MacEachan), Quarry (MacQuairie), Cannell (MacWhannell), Quinney (M'Whinnie), Quay and Kay (MacKay), Cowan (M'Owan), Bridson (M'Bride), Mylrea (M'Gilrea). (*b*) Names of Scandio-Gaelic origin: Castell (Gaskell), Corkhill (MacTorquil, MacCorquodale), Corlett (M'Leod), Cowley (MacAulay), Crennell (MacRanald). (See *Manx Names*, by A. W. Moore.)

[3] We have a thirteenth century church dedicated to St. Trinian (a corruption of Ninian) which formerly belonged to the Priory of St. Ninian at Whithorne, whose priors were barons of Man. (See *Manx Names*, A. W. Moore, p. 142.)

Church,' and to this day the Manx fishermen speak of the stormy weather which was expected about the 9th of June as *Ny gaalyn yn Eaill Columb Killey*, 'the gales of the feast of Columb of the Church.' The 'charm,' which is directed against the fairies, is as follows:

Shee Yee as shee ghooinney
Shee Yee er Columb-Killey,
Er dagh uinniag, er dagh ghorrys,
Er dagh howl goaill stiagh yn re-hollys,
Er kiare corneillyn y thie,
Er y vodyl ta mee lhie,
As shee Yee orrym-pene.

'Peace of God and peace of man,
Peace of God on Columb-Killey,
On each window and each door,
On every hole admitting moonlight,
On the four corners of the house,
On the place of my rest,
And peace of God on myself.'

It was in 795 that the Irish and Welsh annalists record the first appearance[1] of the Scandinavian vikings in the Irish Sea; and the Scottish Isles, as well as part of the mainland of Scotland, no doubt received their unwelcome attentions at the same period.

Before further discussing the proceedings of the Scandinavians[2] in the western seas, let us make clear[3] what kingdoms and peoples they came in contact with in Scotland. They were (1) The Pictish kingdom of Alban, which included all the country north of the Forth, with, presumably, the Orkneys, Shetlands, Hebrides, and the other islands north of Ardnamurchan Point; (2) The Scottish kingdom of Dalriada, including Argyllshire, Kintyre, and some of the adjacent islands; (3) The British kingdom of Strathclyde, extending from the Clyde to Morecambe Bay. About the middle of the ninth century the Scandinavians settled in the Shetlands and Orkneys, which they called the

[1] Though Mr. W. C. Mackenzie (*Hist. of Outer Hebrides*, pp. xxxiv-xxxv) conjectures that the Hebrides were overrun by Scandinavian pirates at a period long anterior to the eighth century.

[2] We include under this term both Danes and Norwegians. It is difficult to discriminate between these two kindred races, but, judging by surnames and place-names, the latter were predominant in the western seas.

[3] We use the name Scotland as a matter of convenience, but it should be borne in mind that this name was not applied to the whole kingdom till after the battle of Largs in 1263.

Norðr-eyjar, Nordreys or North Isles, and in the Western Scottish islands and Man, which they called the *Suðr-eyjar*, Sudreys or South Isles.[1] They also had settlements in Sutherlandshire (to them the southern land), in Caithness, and on the west coast as far south as Ardnamurchan Point, also in Galloway, on the east coast of Ireland and the west coast of Cumberland.

The first settler of importance was Olaf the White, who in 852 conquered Dublin and the Sudreys, and harried the mainland of Scotland.[2] The next was Ketill Finn, whom the Irish annalists speak of as a ruler of the Sudreys. But emigration to the Sudreys did not take place to any great extent till after the battle of Hafursfjord, fought about 883, in which Harald Haarfager conquered the petty kings of Norway, and made himself sole sovereign of the country. His rule was oppressive to the Vikings, whom he deprived of their *odal*, or freehold right to the land and reduced to the position of military tenants. Many of them, rather than submit, emigrated, as we have already shown. In the islands and Galloway they formed a ruling class, which gradually amalgamated with the native inhabitants to such an extent that the mixed race was called, *Gallgaidhel*, *Galgael*; or Stranger Gaels, by their Irish and Scottish neighbours. Harald soon followed his revolted subjects and conquered the Nordreys and Sudreys.[3] For a brief period both these groups of islands remained under his rule, or that of his viceroys, and then, till the middle of the tenth century,[4] Man, if not the other Sudreys, fell into the hands of the

[1] The terms *Norðr-eyjar* and *Suðr-eyjar* had not, however, always the same significance. Let us quote Worsaae: 'By degrees they [the Vikings] settled themselves on all the islands along the west coast, from Lewis to Man, which they called under one name, "*Suðreyjar*," or the southern islands, from their situation with regard to the Orkney and Shetland Isles. Sometimes, however, they did not reckon Man among them, and then divided the rest of the islands into two groups, in such a manner that not only the islands to the south of Mull were called "*Suðreyjar*," whilst Mull itself and the islands to the north obtain the name of "*Norðreyjar*."'—(*The Danes and Northmen*, pp. 266-7.) *Suðreyjar* has taken in modern times the form of *Sodor*.

[2] *Landnámabóc* (Vigfusson's translation), p. 76. *Annals of Ulster*.

[3] *Landnámabóc*, p. 26.

[4] We may note that by the cession of Cumbria by Eadmund to Malcolm in 980, Man had Scottish territory to the east as well as to the north for a century.

Scandinavian rulers of Dublin and Limerick,[1] while the Nordreys remained under the suzerainty of Norway. In these latter islands and Caithness a dynasty was formed by Turf Einar, and, at the end of the ninth century, his great-grandson, Earl Sigurd, added Sutherland, Ross, Moray, Argyll, and the Sudreys. He governed the Sudreys through a tributary earl, called Gilli in the Sagas, who resided in Colonsay. Of these dominions he only retained those on the mainland of Scotland for about seven years, being driven out of them by the Celtic chieftains of the North and West of Scotland. The leader of these, Malcolm, Maormar of Moray, slew Kenneth, King of Scotland, in 1004, and succeeded to his throne. Sigurd, no doubt with a view of strengthening his position in his remaining dominions, entered into alliance with Malcolm and married his daughter. But, nevertheless, it is possible that his authority was weakened in the Sudreys. The Irish chroniclers call Ranald MacGodfrey, who died in 1004, King of the Isles, but both he and his successor Suibne may have been subordinate to Sigurd.

After 1014, when Sigurd was killed at the battle of Clontarf, to which he had come with his islesmen and 'the foreigners of Manann,' Suibne was probably either independent or under the suzerainty of Dublin till his death in 1034. Sigurd was succeeded by his son Thorfinn, who was presented with Caithness by his maternal grandfather, Malcolm, and, for fifteen years, he seems to have ruled it and the Orkneys only. But in 1029 Malcolm died, and his successor on the Scottish throne was Malcolm MacKenneth, whose father the first Malcolm (of Moray) had slain. Malcolm MacKenneth was a southern Scot, so that it is probable the northern chieftains preferred Thorfinn, as being the grandson of their king, to him. This theory accounts for the apparent ease with which Thorfinn annexed the greater part of Malcolm's kingdom. According to the *Orkneyinga Saga* he was lord not only over the Nordreys and Sudreys but over Dublin and no less than nine earldoms in Scotland, including Galloway. Some years before his death in 1064, he probably had to yield at least his possessions in

[1] Mr. R. L. Breuner, in his interesting *Notes on the Norsemen in Argyllshire*, states that 'the first' kings of the Gall-Gael or 'Kings of Man and the Isles,' were . . . direct descendants of Ivan Beinlaus, the son of Ragnar Lodbrok, but he gives no authority (*Saga-Book of the Viking Club*, vol. iii. part iii. p. 352).

the south of Scotland to Malcolm Canmore,[1] while Man fell under the rule of the Dublin Scandinavians. It may, however, be safely affirmed that, for a period of about thirty years, the Norse king was not only the most powerful ruler in the western seas but on the Scottish mainland. Fifteen years later he was followed by an almost equally powerful Norse ruler, Godred Crovan, the conqueror of Man in 1079. Godred, who is described by the Chronicler of Rushen Abbey, as holding the Scots in such subjection that no one who built a vessel dared to insert three bolts,[2] 'also subdued Dublin and a great part of Leinster. Godred died in 1095 in Islay, and it was not till after some years of confusion, during which Magnus,[3] king of Norway, re-established the Norwegian suzerainty over both Nordreys and Sudreys for a brief period, that we find Godred's youngest son, Olaf (1113-1153) as ruler 'over all the isles.'[4]

It is during Olaf's reign that, according to the contemporary evidence of the chronicler, William of Newburgh, who knew him personally, a Manx bishop, named Wimund, had an extraordinary career in connexion with Scotland. When Wimund was sent in 1134, with other monks, to occupy the newly founded Abbey of Rushen in Man, he so captivated the people by his intellect and eloquence and also by his suave and jovial manners that he was, with the approval of the abbot of the mother abbey, Furness, recommended by King Olaf to Thurstan, Archbishop of York, for consecration as Bishop of Sodor and Man. About 1142 he announced that he was the heir of Angus, Earl of Moray, who had been killed in 1130, and, assuming the name of Malcolm MacHeth, he laid claim to that earldom. He was joined by Somerled of Argyll, who gave him his sister in marriage, by the Earl of Orkney and other chiefs. He ravaged south-western Scotland with fire and sword, and compelled King David I. to

[1] Skene (*Celtic Scotland*, vol. ii. p. 352), says that after Thorfinn's death, the Sudreys, except Man, were conquered by Malcolm, but he gives no authority for this statement.

[2] *Chronicon Manniæ* (*Manx Society's Publications*, vol. xxii.), p. 53.

[3] The stratagem by which Magnus got possession of Kintyre is well known. It is interesting to note, as showing how Man was valued, that the *Orkneyinga Saga*, in relating this incident, remarks that Kintyre 'is better than the best island of the Sudreys, except Man.'

[4] *Ibid.* p. 61.

surrender the southern portion of his kingdom to him. He then proceeded to treat his subjects with such severity that they betrayed him into the hands of the royal troops, by whom he was blinded and mutilated. Confined at first in Roxburgh Castle, and finally in Byland Abbey, he died about 1180.[1]

Mr. Andrew Lang, who follows Robertson, treats this account with contempt, merely remarking: 'Some historians regard this clerk of Copmanhurst, this noisy clerical man-at-arms and reiver, as identical with Malcolm, son of Heth, Earl of Moray. But *that* Malcolm MacHeth was not released from prison till 1157, six years after Wimund was blinded and lay in retreat at Biland.'[2] We, however, see no reason to doubt the contemporary chronicler.

Olaf's son, Godred II. (1153-1187), who for a brief period ruled over Dublin as well as over the Isles, acted tyrannically towards some of his chiefs (*principes*) in the Isles, and so they determined to depose him.[3] One of these chiefs, Somerled, said to be a descendant of Suibne, 'King of the Isles,' who was Godred's brother-in-law, having married Olaf's daughter, Ragnhild, was the leader in this revolt. He was ruler (*regulus*) of Argyll and seems to have held the islands of Bute, Arran, and Islay under Godred.[4] In 1156 a bloody but indecisive battle took place between Somerled and Godred, who agreed to divide the kingdom of the Isles between them, Somerled's share being probably Kintyre and the islands south of Ardnamurchan Point. By this curious arrangement an independent sovereignty was interposed between the two parts of Godred's kingdom. It is, therefore, not without reason that the writer of the *Chronicle of Man* exclaims: 'Thus was the kingdom of the Isles ruined from the time that the sons of Somerled got possession of it.'[5] Two years later Somerled again attacked Godred and took possession of Man, which he seems to have ruled through a sheriff (*vicecomes*)[6] till 1164, when, on his

[1] *Hist. Rerum Anglicæ*, lib. i. cap. xxiv.

[2] *History of Scotland*, vol. i. p. 127.

[3] *Chronicon Manniæ*, p. 69.

[4] Skene (*The Highlanders of Scotland.* Ed. by MacBain, p. 200), states that King David 'conquered the islands of Man, Arran, and Bute from the Norwegians' in 1035 (?1135), but gives no proof of this. David threatened Man in 1152 but certainly did not conquer it, and there seems to be no doubt that all the isles were subject to Olaf and, after him, to Godred. The *Chronicle of Man* (p. 61), states distinctly that 'no man ventured to disturb the Kingdom of the Isles during Olaf's time.

[5] *Chronicon Manniæ*, p. 67.

[6] *Ibid.* p. 75.

defeat and death at Renfrew, it again came into Godred's hands. Twenty years later Somerled's descendants, apart from their possessions on the mainland, ruled over Coll, Skye, Tyree, Long Island, and Bute only, so that it appears that Godred had re-conquered some of the islands of which he had been deprived in 1156.

The mention of a *vice-comes* in Man, in 1183,[1] seems to point to Godred having his head-quarters in one of the other islands. He died, however, in Man, and was buried in Iona. He was succeeded by his son Reginald I. (1187-1226), who was a warlike, and, during the first part of his reign, a powerful ruler. In 1198 we find King William of Scotland asking for his help against Harald, the Nordreian earl, and promising him the earldom of Caithness provided that he would drive Harald out of it. He succeeded in doing so, but was soon ousted by Harald. Nevertheless, Reginald and William continued to be allies. Reginald had placed his brother Olaf in charge of the island of Lewis, but Olaf was discontented with it, and, about the year 1208, he demanded additional islands for his support. Reginald's reply was to order him to be seized and carried in chains to William, who kept him in prison till just before his death in 1214, when Olaf was restored to Lewis. Olaf then married Christina, daughter of Ferquhard Mac-in-Tagart, Earl of Ross, and in 1223 he was in alliance with Páll, the Viscount of Skye, whose 'power and energy,' says the *Chronicle of Man*, 'were felt throughout the whole kingdom of the Isles.'[2] It is possible that Páll ruled Skye as a subordinate of Olaf's father-in-law. According to Robertson, Ferquhard and his descendants, at this time, or a little later, held both Skye and the Nordreys by grant from the Scottish kings, and were inveterate opponents of the Manx and Somerledian 'Kings of the Isles,' who held the Sudreys as fiefs from Norway.[3] It is at least clear that Olaf was in league with the opponents of his brother Reginald in that region. In 1224 he compelled Reginald to divide the kingdom of the Isles with him, and in 1226 he became sole ruler of that kingdom. For two years only did he enjoy his dominions in peace.

At the end of that period troubles again arose with Reginald, and, during his absence from Man, probably for the purpose of fighting against his brother, Reginald, accompanied by Alan of Galloway, and Thomas, Earl of Atholl, took possession of Man.

[1] *Chronicon Manniæ*, p. 79. [2] P. 87. [3] Vol. i. p. 239; vol. ii. 3, 23, 100.

It was Alan alone, however, who seems to have benefited by this conquest, as we are told that he left 'bailiffs in Man to pay over to him the proceeds of the taxes upon the country.'[1] But Olaf speedily returned and drove out the bailiffs. Thenceforward, except for a brief interval in 1230, when Godred Don, Reginald's son, occupied all the islands save Man, he reigned undisturbed till his death in 1237. Harald (1237-1248), his son, succeeded him, and, according to the *Chronicle of Man*, 'established the most solid peace with the Kings of England and Scotland, and was united to them by friendly alliance.'[2] He was evidently a potentate of some consequence. But, nevertheless, it was in his days that the shadow of a rule that was to be very much more effective than that of the distant suzerain in Norway, which had long been almost nominal, began to fall over the kingdom of the Isles. Scotland had gradually been becoming stronger, and its ambitious king, Alexander II., determined to tolerate no longer the independence of the islands adjacent to its western coast.

With this view he attempted to acquire the islands from Norway by purchase, but Hakon, the Norwegian King, refused to sell. This attempt was renewed later, but, before referring to it, we will continue our account of the Sudreyan kingdom. Harald died in 1248, and in 1250 Magnus, his brother, who became king in 1252, went to Man in company with 'John, son of Dugald' (presumably the ruler of the Somerledian Isles) to claim his inheritance there. The account in the *Chronicle of Man* gives an amusing glimpse of the jealousy that evidently existed between the two 'kingdoms of the Isles': 'John, son of Dugald, sent messengers to the people of Man to say, "Thus and thus does John, King of the Isles, command you." When the Manxmen heard John styled King of the Isles, they became indignant, and refused to hear anything further from the messengers.'[3] A battle ensued, in which Magnus and his ally were defeated and driven from Man. Nevertheless, when Magnus appeared in Man two years later, 'all received him with great joy and appointed him king.' In 1254 Hakon appointed him 'king over all the Islands held by his predecessors.'[4]

In 1261 Alexander III. of Scotland sent two envoys to Norway to negotiate for the cession of the isles, but their efforts led to no result. He therefore initiated hostilities which terminated in the complete defeat of the Norwegian fleet at Largs

[1] *Chronicon Manniæ*, p 91. [2] *Ibid.* p. 99. [3] P. 107. [4] P. 109.

in 1263. Magnus, who had fought on the Norwegian side, was compelled to surrender all the islands over which he had ruled, except Man, for which he did homage, and undertook feudal service with ten 'pirate[1] galleys, five of them with four-and-twenty oars, and five of them with twelve.'[2] It has been suggested that this 'tenure of Man by galley service may well have been the basis of a marine policy, the continued maintenance of which is attested by more than one of Robert Bruce's West Coast Charters, having *reddenda* of ship service, sometimes with 26 or even 40 oars.'[3]

Two years later Magnus died, and in 1266 the King of Norway, in consideration of the sum of 4000 marks, ceded the Sudreys, including Man, to Scotland. We have seen then that, during this second period of nearly 200 years, Man continued to be closely connected with most of the Scottish Isles. It was connected with them not only through its civil rulers, but through its ecclesiastical rulers, and the ecclesiastical connexion of Man and Scotland was to continue long after the civil connexion had ceased to exist. It is with this ecclesiastical connexion that we now propose to deal.

It was probably not before the beginning of the eleventh century that the Scandio-Celtic population of the Isles received Christianity. The name of a bishop, Roolwer, is not recorded till towards the end of the same century. It must be inferred from his title not that he ruled over a see in the modern sense, but that he was an ambulatory bishop, attached to the king's court, while his assistants were probably monks without any fixed abode. The visitations of the bishop would probably be limited by the often varying extent of dominions of the king. There is no record of the existence of a regular diocese before 1154. In that year was founded the diocese of Sodor,[4] with Nidaros, or Drontheim, as its metropolitan see, which, as already stated, included the Hebrides, all the smaller western islands of Scotland, and Man. This diocese was formed before the division of the kingdom of the Isles, and there is no reason to suppose

[1] The word 'pirate' did not then bear its modern meaning.

[2] *Fordun Annals*, ch. 56.

[3] *Annals of the Solway*, George Neilson, pp. 41-2. See p. 405.

[4] The modern name of the bishopric of 'Sodor and Man' seems to have arisen from the mistake of a legal draughtsman early in the seventeenth century who was unaware of the meaning of Sodor. Till that time the bishops of Man had invariably signed Sodor.

that the division of the kingdom was followed by the division of the diocese, which, indeed, continued to exist till the beginning of the fifteenth century. As proofs of this, it may be mentioned (1) that in 1349 copies of a letter of Pope Clement VI. to William, the Sodor bishop-elect, were sent to the archbishop of Nidaros, to the 'noble Robert Steward, styled Seneschal of Scotland, Lord of the Isle of Bute, in the Sodor diocese,' and to 'our beloved son, the noble John Macdonald,[1] Lord of Isla, in the Sodor diocese';[2] (2) that Pope Urban V., writing to this same William in 1367, spoke of a *Nobilis mulieris Mariæ de Insulis . . . tuæ diocesis*, who was a daughter of the above-mentioned John, here styled 'Lord of the Isles';[3] (3) that in 1374 copies of a letter of Pope Gregory XI. to John, bishop-elect of Sodor, were sent to 'the illustrious King Robert of Scotland,' and to the archbishop of Nidaros, as well as to 'William, King of Man';[4] (4) that in 1392 the same bishop is styled *Johannes episcopus Sodorensis in prouincia Nidrosiensi*;[5] and (5) that a MS. *codex* in the Vatican, written about 1400, contains the words *Sodorensis in Norwegia et prouincia Nidrosiensis*, thus showing that the connexion of Sodor with Norway still continued.[6]

A quaint reminiscence of the connexion of Man with Scotland, and more especially with the Priory of Whithorne,[7] is the special mention of the Isle of Man in a document dated 1427, in which James I. of Scotland grants 'leave and permission to all and singular, from the realm of England and the Isle of Man, of both sexes, who wish to visit the church of the Blessed Ninian,' to come to Candida Casa in Galloway 'in all safety and security, and so to return to their own parts without let or hindrance.' It contains what appears to be an unnecessary proviso that the pilgrims from the Isle of Man should come by sea. It provides also that the pilgrims, whether English or Manx, are to 'come and return by the same ways, and behave as pilgrims in each place, and that they stay not within the Scottish border more than fifteen days coming, stopping, and returning, and that they take away and carry any memento of

[1] A descendant of Somerled's.

[2] *Vatican Archives, Manx Society's Publications*, vol. xxii. pp. 336-43.

[3] *Ibid.* p. 378.

[4] *Ibid.* pp. 394-400.

[5] *Afgifter Fra-Norse Kirkeprovins, &c.* of Dr. Gustaf Storm (Christiania, 1897), p. 29.

[6] *Chronicon Manniæ*, p. 258.

[7] See p. 394.

the aforesaid church openly in their cloaks,' and, further, that 'they do not come for purposes of trade or other cause, and do nothing and cause nothing to be attempted prejudicial to the king, or his laws, or the realm of Scotland.'[1] It was indeed amiable for the Scots to tolerate the Manx within their borders for even fifteen days, for, five years earlier, the Manx had passed a law ordaining that 'all Scots avoid the land with the next vessels that goeth into Scotland, upon paine of forfeiture of their goods and their bodys to prison.'[2] The probable explanation, however, is that King James had never heard of the law in question!

Returning to secular history, we find that the direct rule of Scotland over Man, which began in 1266, was not firmly established till 1275, when the Manx were defeated in a decisive battle at Ronaldsway, near Castletown. With the death of Alexander in 1286, and the accession of the child Margaret, who was then in Norway, there began a time which was probably troublous for Man as well as for Scotland. Though there is no mention of Edward I. of England having directly interfered in the affairs of Scotland till after the death of Margaret in the autumn of 1290, there are indications that he had already either taken possession of Man or was fighting for its possession as early as 1288, when we learn that a certain Adam, son of Neso, was slain in that island in his service.[3] In the following year he paid the expenses of the bishop of Man to Norway and back, having sent him there on an embassy.[4] Early in 1290 he was certainly in possession of it,[5] and in 1293 he handed it over to Baliol, reserving his rights as lord paramount.[6] Baliol entered into an alliance with Norway and France in 1294, and revolted against his over-lord, who, on his subsequent surrender, doubtless treated Man as a forfeited fief. It remained in English hands till 1313.[7]

[1] *Reg. Mag. Sig. Reg. Scot.* Charter No. 107.

[2] *The Statutes of the Isle of Man*, vol. i. p. 20. It is stated that the late Lord Loch, a Scotsman, and one of the most distinguished Governors of Man, was on one occasion rash enough to declare that all the laws in the Statute Book were equally valid, and that he was referred to the law we have quoted above!

[3] *Rotuli Scaccarii Regnum Scotorum*, vol. i. p. 35.

[4] *Ibid.* pp. 49-50.

[5] *Calendar of Patent Rolls*, 18th Ed. I.

[6] *Rotuli Scotiæ.*

[7] For detailed account of the period, see *A History of the Isle of Man* (A. W. Moore), pp. 184-190.

In 1310[1] Edward II. issued a writ in which he enjoined his sheriffs, bailiffs, and faithful subjects in the counties of Chester, Lancaster, Cumberland, and Westmoreland, to afford assistance to the Seneschal of Man against Robert Bruce, who, as the king had heard, intended to despatch all his navy to the Isle of Man 'for the purpose of destroying it and establishing a retreat there.'[2] But Bruce did not attack Man till two years later, when, according to the *Chronicle of Man*, 'on the 18th of May, Lord Robert, King of Scotland, put in at Ramsey with a large number of ships, and on the following Sunday went to the nunnery at Douglas, where he spent the night, and on Monday laid siege to the Castle of Rushen.'[3] The castle was defended against him by one of King Edward's Scottish adherents, called in the *Chronicle* Dungali MacDowyle, and in the *Rotuli Scotiæ* Duncan Magdowall, who in 1306 was referred to as Captain of the Army of Galloway,[4] and it held out 'until the Tuesday after the Feast of St. Barnabas the Apostle,' *i.e.* for a period of about five weeks.[5]

On the 20th of December in the same year, Bruce granted the island to Thomas Randolf, Earl of Moray, in free regality (*regalitatem*), retaining only the patronage of the bishopric.[6] Randolf had in return to find annually 'six ships each of twenty-six oars,' and to pay a hundred marks of sterling at Inverness.[7]

[1] For references to Dicon of Man in 1303, who takes messages for King Edward I. to the Earl of Carrick, and to Lammal of Man in 1306, a *socius* of John of Argyll (admiral of the western seas of England, Wales, Ireland, and the isles of Scotland), who was ardently acting in the English interest, see Bain's *Calendars*, vol. iv. pp. 489, 481.

[2] *Rotuli Scotiæ*, i. 96.

[3] *Chronicon Manniæ*, p. 111.

[4] Bain's *Calendars*, vol. iv. p. 489.

[5] He had served both Edward I. and II. and had received manors in England and a knighthood for his services. He had made a peel or fort on an island in the Solway Firth, and was in 1311 constable of Dumfries Castle, which surrendered to Bruce in February, 1313. For information about him see numerous entries in vols. iii. and iv. of the *Calendars of Documents relating to Scotland*, edited by Joseph Bain; *Chronicle of Lanercost*, 207; *Rotuli Scotiæ*, i. 625, 626, 629; *Dumfries and Galloway*, by Sir H. Maxwell, pp 112, 114, and article in *Scottish Antiquary*, January, '97 (vol. xi. p. 104).

[6] When Henry IV. granted the island to Sir John Stanley, he gave him the patronage of the bishopric also.

[7] Carta Thomæ Randolphi Comitis Moraviæ De Insula Manniæ (Add. MSS.). This mention of Inverness as the place of payment is very interesting, because it seems to indicate that the government of the isles centred in that town.

Notwithstanding this conquest, and the victory at Bannockburn, it is the English who seem to have been in possession of Man in the autumn of 1314, as Edward II., on the 28th of September, gave a safe conduct to William of Galloway and Adam le Mareschal, who were going to that island on the business of Henry de Beaumont.[1]

This re-conquest of Man from the Scots was probably the work of John de Ergadia, or de Ergeyl, *i.e.* of Argyll, who was Edward's admiral of the western seas of England, Wales, Ireland, and the Isles of Scotland,[2] as in February, 1315, King Edward, in addition to a grant to him to make good his losses from the Scots, ordered a further amount to be given to him for the support of his men keeping the Isle of Man, from which he heard he had recently expelled the Scots rebels.[3]

In a further document, dated a few days later, the king commanded the Justiciar and Treasurer of Scotland to cause certain Scottish rebels recently captured by John of Argyll's men and mariners on the sea coast of Scotland, 'at present secured in the Isle of Man,' to be taken to Ireland.[4]

In the following year (1316) a certain Donekan Makoury, a subordinate of John of Argyll's, complained that he had served against the Scots during the whole year in Man, and that he had had his lands destroyed by them.[5] Evidently, therefore, English and Scots were fighting in Man,[6] but who was left in possession is uncertain. Probably, however, it was the English. For we find that in July, 1317, Edward committed the island to the keeping of Sir John de Athy, whom he ordered to provide three ships and a sufficient number of warlike men to protect it against the Scots. Sir John, in the same month, captured a Scottish pirate called Thomas Dun, killing all his men except himself and his cousin, and ascertained from him that the Earl of Moray was about to attack the island.[7] Three months later, the earl was about to set out for Man, but there is no account of whether he arrived there or not. In 1318 there was a truce

[1] Bain's *Calendars*, vol. iii. 391.
[2] *Ibid.* vol. iii. 479.
[3] *Ibid.* vol. iii. 420.
[4] *Ibid.* vol. iii. 421.
[5] *Ibid.* vol. iii. 521.
[6] It is in this year, according to the *Chronicle of Man* (p. 113), that the Manx were defeated, and the island sacked by a body of malefactors from Ireland (*de Hibernia*), under Richard de Mandeville. The *Chronicle* calls them *Hibernici*, but possibly Irish should be Scottish (see p. 407).
[7] Bain's *Calendars*, vol. iii. 562.

between Scotland and England, and in 1328,[1] when the independence of Scotland was formally acknowledged, the King of England gave an undertaking not to assist any enemies of the Scots to dispossess them of Man. It is therefore probable that that island had been restored to Scotland in 1318, and that it had remained in its possession since then. Some confirmation of this is given by the fact that Thomas Randolf, who is styled 'Earl of Moray, Lord of Annandale and Man,' granted a safe conduct to go there in 1322.[2]

In 1326 the Prior and the Canons of *Candida Casa*[3] (Whithorne) in Galloway, who had already been given lands in Man by Randolf, also received from him, besides churches in Galloway and Kintyre, the church of 'S. Brigide in Lair,'[4] *i.e.* of S. Bride in the Ayre.[5] In 1329 one tenth of a penny on Manx farm rents, which amounted to £150, was paid into the Scottish exchequer,[6] and, in September of the same year, when Richard de Mandeville, with a multitude of Scottish felons,[7] probably disaffected subjects of the youthful king of Scotland, attacked Man, Edward III sent an expedition to drive him out. He may, taking advantage of Bruce's death in this year, and the accession of David, a child of seven years old, have done this with a view of seizing Man, but, on the other hand, it is possible that he was simply carrying out his promise, Mandeville's usurpation being dangerous to both kingdoms.[8]

[1] In this year Bernard, the elect bishop of Sodor (a Scotsman), received £100 from the Scottish king for the expenses of his election (*Rot. Scacc. Reg. Scot.* vol. i. p. 114).

[2] Bain's *Calendars*, iii. 746.

[3] See p. 394.

[4] We learn this from a confirmation of the above grant given in 1451 by James II. of Scotland, which is recorded in the *Registrum Magni Sigilli Scotorum* (Charter No. 461). The grant as regards lands in Man was then, of course, futile, as the Prior of Whithorne was probably deprived of the monastery's lands in Man in 1422. Our Statute Book in that year (p. 21), states that when the barons of Man were summoned to do fealty to Sir John Stanley, the Prior of Whithorne, who was one of them, 'came not,' and was therefore among those who were 'deemed by the Deemsters, that they should come in their proper persons within forty days, or if they came not, then to lose all their temporalities, to be ceised into the Lord's Hands in the same Court.'

[5] The corruption *Lair* of *ny Heyrey*, *i.e.* 'of the Ayre,' is interesting. We find also *ly-ayre* or *le-ayre*, and the modern name of an adjacent parish is Lezayre.

[6] *Rot. Scacc. Reg. Scot.* vol. i. p. 151.

[7] It is curious that he should lead Irishmen in 1316 and Scotsmen in 1329.

[8] 2 Ed. III. *Rotuli Patentium et Clausarum Cancellariæ Hiberniæ.*

In 1331 the clergy of the Sodor diocese sent a contribution of £60 to the King.[1]

Two years later war broke out between Scotland and England, and Edward took possession of Man, granting it to Sir William de Montacute.[2] But Sir William, who was created Earl of Salisbury in 1337, seems to have been unwilling or unable to protect the island against the Scots, who, profiting by England having become involved in war against France in 1336, again threatened it. We do not know whether they conquered it or not. Edward speaks of the bishop, a Scotsman, as being his liegeman in 1340,[3] but it does not necessarily follow that he held Man in that year. In 1342 'the men of the community of the Isle of Man' paid a fine of three hundred marks in order to 'enjoy a certain sufferance of peace' with the Scots for a period of one year, and, in the same year, Edward permitted 'honest men' of the Isle to treat with them provided that they did not afford them assistance with arms or provisions.[4] This state of affairs must necessarily have been put an end to by the battle of Neville's Cross in 1346, and thenceforth, though the Scots had by no means given up the idea of recovering Man, they never again made any formidable attempt to enforce their claim to its possession.

In 1359 the *Rotuli Scaccarii Regnum Scotorum* contain what appears to be the unnecessary information that no rent was received from the Isle of Man in that year.[5] We may mention that in the *Registrum Magni Sigilli Regnum Scotorum*[6] there is a curious incomplete document in which it is stated that King Robert of Scotland had inspected a deed in which George de Dunbar, Earl of March and Lord of Annandale and Man agrees with James de Douglas that he should marry his (George de Dunbar's) sister Agnes and in which he promises them one hundred librates (5000 acres) of land in the Isle of Man, when he or they can get possession of it. As far as we know, however, they made no attempt to do so. But though Man was never again to fall under the rule of Scotland, the ancient kingdom of which it had once formed a part was being gradually absorbed by that country.

[1] *Rot. Scacc. Reg. Scot.* vol. i. p. 396. In this year Friar John of Man received an annuity from King David. *Ibid.* p. 358.

[2] *Fœdera*, 7 Ed. III.

[3] *Close Rolls*, 14 Ed. III. p. 2, m. 9.

[4] *Rotuli Scotiæ.*

[5] Vol. i. p. 570.

[6] Vol. i. 1814, p. 125.

Caithness was added to the dominions of the Scottish King some time in the fourteenth century, the Orkneys and Shetlands were part of the dowry of Margaret, daughter of Christian, King of Denmark, when she married James III in 1468, and the Western Isles were finally annexed in 1493, when John, the last Lord of the Isles, was deprived of his title and estates.[1]

ARTHUR W. MOORE.

[1] I have to thank George Neilson, Esq., LL.D., for advice and assistance in the preparation of this article.

The Cardinal and the King's Will.

'*Fy! fled Oliver! Is Oliver ta'en! All is lost!*'

This refrain came less often, and in fainter tones, from the lips of the dying King. The light of the wind-shaken flambeaux flared on the walls, hung with gold-hued leather stamped with the Thistle of Scotland, and the Lilies of France. The flames danced red on pale faces of many men scattered through the chamber of death. By the bedside was the grave doctor of medicine, Michael Durham, an austere Puritan, with his *aromatarius*, or apothecary, behind him; watching the wasted features, and wiping with an essenced kerchief the pale dank brow, of the unhappy prince. Further back, with aspect of mourning, stood but four or five of the great nobles; in a corner were huddled in whispered converse, three priests; their work was done, the King had been fortified with the last rites of the Church.

In a large chair by the fire sat a man in scarlet, his face, fair and foxy, now bent over the dance of lights and sparks on the hearth; now suddenly turned on the dying King, in the shadow of the violet velvet curtains of the Royal bed. Once the man mechanically put forth his hand to caress a great deerhound, stretched in seeming sleep in the glow of the fire; but the hound, with a low growl, flashed his white teeth, and the delicate priestly hand with the sapphire ring was hastily withdrawn.

'*Fled Oliver! Is my standard tint! All is lost!*'

The refrain came fainter, now, and broken with a sob.

The man in scarlet arose, and walked stately through the line of nobles, thrusting aside the *aromatarius*, while the surly physician made reluctant way for him, to the bedside. With a sudden sweep of his hand he drew the violet velvet curtains close behind him. He was alone, in the dusk, with the dying King! What wrought this strange masterful priest? *There was one who watched!* The despised *aromatarius*, stooping at the bed-foot, applied his eye to a rat-gnawed chink in the curtain; a gap left undarned by the heedless chamberlain of Falkland.

What the *aromatarius* saw was this:

The man clad in scarlet took from his breast an inkhorn, a pen, a quire of paper. Seizing the King's dying hand in his own, he dipped the quill in the inkhorn, and applied it to the paper. The strong white fingers of the Cardinal, above the yellow claw of the Royal moribund, moved for a moment's space. Then, drawing from his breast a little silver phial, the Cardinal scattered sand over the wet paper, while the death-rattle sobbed through the melancholy chamber. The man in scarlet replaced paper, inkhorn, pen, and phial, in his vestment; with a wave of his hand he threw back the curtains; the nobles reverently knelt around the bed, and on the last sob of the King followed the Cardinal's sonorous *Pax cum anima sua*, echoed by the priests' *In manus tuas, Domine!*

King James the Fifth had gone to his account; and a blank, signed by the dead man's hand, was in the Cardinal's keeping! 'Twas twelve of the clock at night, of Friday, December 15, 1542.

. . . . . .

The local colour, whether correct or not, is laid on pretty thick in this impressive passage. You will find the essence of it, however, in all our histories. Is it a likely story? Could Cardinal Beaton expect to do the trick described, in the manner described, or in any other manner, without instant detection?

The story is given more briefly in the only known evidence, (beyond mere gossip,) for the tale; in the words of the Earl of Arran, Governor of Scotland, to Master Sadleyr, representing Henry VIII. at the Court of Holyrood. 'The Cardinal did counterfeit the late King's testament; and when the King was even almost dead he took his hand in his and so caused him to subscribe a blank paper.' [1]

Arran had not been present at the Royal deathbed; he named no man who was present and saw the doing of the deed; he did not show the will; and no witness pretends to have seen it to this day; he had been on ill terms with the Cardinal, and had been vilifying him, for four months before he told his myth to Sadleyr (April 12, 1543), but he is never known to have told it before, in answer to the questions of Henry VIII. Yet our historians, almost to a man, accept this unproved and improbable legend of what Mr. Froude calls 'an impudent forgery.' 'It has been proved,' writes a recent and careful author, 'that Beaton forged

[1] Sadleyr to Henry VIII., Edinburgh, April 12, 1543. *Sadleyr Papers*, I. 138 1809.

an instrument according to which he would have been the first man in the country.' But the 'proof' is not a will signed by the dead or dying hand of King James, and, whatever it may prove, it does not prove either forgery, or the Cardinal's use of the hand of the dying monarch. Now whether the Cardinal was, or was not a forger, makes no odds to any mortal. But it is important that history should not take things for granted on no evidence.

We must first show in what state of things the will was forged, if forged it ever was. In 1542, a series of quarrels and misunderstandings between Henry VIII. and James V. had led to war, and many of the Scottish nobles, both Catholic and Protestant, had been taken prisoners by the English, at the shameful defeat of Solway Moss (November 24). The country, too, was divided within itself. The great House of Douglas had for years been in well deserved exile, pensioners of Henry VIII.; the Earl of Angus dwelling in England, while his brother, Sir George, made his headquarters at Berwick, having his spies about the person of King James, and betraying military and political information to Lord Lisle, the English warden of the Border, residing at Alnwick. In Scotland, the Protestant nobles, in England the many captive nobles of both faiths, were inclining to be allies of Henry VIII., and some were bitter enemies of Cardinal Beaton, and of the Catholic and French party, while Henry was asserting the old English claim to absolute sovereignty over Scotland. In these circumstances the defeat of Solway Moss broke the heart of James V., then a man of thirty. The King died, (as Sir George Douglas heard on December 17, from a confidential Royal servant, a spy of his own,) *at midnight*, whether on December 14 or December 15 is disputed. The later date is the more probable.

If the King left no will, nor any authentic account of his wishes concerning the Government during his child's minority, all would be anarchy. The exiled Douglases under Lord Angus, for long pensioners and subjects of Henry VIII., would certainly make an effort to come back; and Henry VIII. would send back his prisoners on parole, sworn to return to captivity if they did not carry out his schemes for seizing the Scottish Crown, the baby Queen, the fortresses, and the Cardinal. In these circumstances it was most desirable to have a Regent, or Regents, to carry on the government. The natural choice would be the Earl of Arran, who, failing the infant Mary, was heir to the Crown of Scotland. But Arran was young, about twenty-four years of age, was inexperi-

enced in affairs; was called 'a simple man,' 'a gentle creature,' by his best friends, and was of disputed legitimacy, while members of both parties described him as false, a dissembler, and beyond belief inconstant. His clan, the great House of Hamilton, always had their hopes fixed on the Crown, and were regarded as pre-eminently brutal, predacious, and unscrupulous, even in these days of anarchy, 'shrews and evil men.'[2] Again, Arran was very strongly suspected of Protestant opinions. He was thus, in the eyes of Beaton and the party of France and of the Church, an evil Regent, if in sole authority. On the other hand, if Beaton could be adjoined to Arran in the Regency, Arran would be wax in his hands, and would be diverted from the Protestant and English interest. In less than a year after James's death, Beaton had brought matters to this posture;—Arran as puppet Regent, Beaton pulling the strings,—and thus the Cardinal actually defeated the ambitions of Henry VIII., and preserved the national independence of Scotland.

Now the strange thing is that if, on the death of James, Beaton either forged a Royal will, or procured fraudulently a notarial document setting forth James's last wishes, the will or document placed Arran in the position most fatal of all to the Cardinal's policy, that is, Arran would be left out in the cold, with every temptation to lend the weight of his clan, and of his claim as heir apparent, to the faction of England and of Protestantism.

It is obvious that nothing could suit Beaton worse. Yet the only extant document in the case, purporting to contain the last wishes of the King, does exclude Arran absolutely from power. Beaton did not take action on this document: on the other hand, Arran was at once, three days after the King's death, associated with him and with three nobles who *were* named in the deed. Does this look as if the deed were a fraudulent paper procured by Beaton?

Meanwhile, had James left *any* will, or *any* directions, as to the Regency? There was found, some twenty years ago, among the papers of the Duke of Hamilton, the document to which we have referred, a formal 'notarial instrument' in Latin, signed by Henry Balfour, 'priest in the Diocese of Dunkeld, and notary by Apostolical authority.'[3] Balfour writes that he was present, and made record of (*in notam sumpsi*) the facts which he chronicles.

[2] *State Papers*, Henry VIII., Vol. V. Pt. IV. p. 239. Lisle to Henry VIII. Jan. 9, 1542-43.

[3] Published in *Historical MSS. Commission's Report*, XI. Pt. VI. 219-220.

Of Balfour we only know, from the manuscript of the Treasurer's Accounts,[4] that from 1536 to 1539 inclusive, he received a salary or pension from the King, and sums of money to distribute among the poor, in return for their prayers for the Royal welfare. Balfour writes that, about the seventh hour before noon, on December 14, 1542, King James, weak in body but sound in mind, solemnly nominated four tutors for his infant daughter, and 'as far as he legally may' Governors of the realm during her minority; namely Cardinal Beaton, the King's own natural brother, the Earl of Murray, (he was Lieutenant General of the kingdom,) and the Earls of Huntly and Argyll. As witnesses are named Balfour himself; Learmont of Dairsie, Master of the Household; Kemp of Thomastown, a gentleman of the bed-chamber; William Kirkaldy, younger of Grange; the Court physician, Dr. Michael Durham; three or four priests, the apothecary, and others, in all twelve, reckoning Balfour. Of these Durham, Learmont, and Kirkaldy were or became noted Protestants: Kirkaldy later, during the murder of the Cardinal, watched the postern gate of St. Andrews Castle to prevent his escape.

Such is the document, without seal, or signatures of witnesses, which do not seem, (though it is not certain) to have been indispensable. I am informed on good authority that the instrument is 'a genuine document.' It is endorsed, in another and contemporary hand, 'Schir Henry Balfour instrument that never was notar,' apparently meaning that Balfour was not a notary. If so the document was void, but, as Mr. Morland Simpson has remarked,[5] 'had the witnesses not been present, as alleged in the document, what greater folly than to say they were?' Certainly the Cardinal must have supposed that Balfour was a notary, and that the witnesses would bear favourable testimony, otherwise he would not have 'taken the instrument,' as the phrase went. We may dismiss the hypothesis that the deed was forged by Beaton's enemies to bring him into discredit. The deed is not a will, is not signed by the King, and is not a forgery. Of this notarial instrument not one word is said in the State Papers and the correspondence of the period. We first catch a glimpse of it in Book I. of Knox's History, written, but not published, about 1564-66, more than twenty years after the events.

What occurred next? Long before dawn of December 18, Sir

[4] General Register House, Edinburgh, MS.

[5] *English Historical Review*, January, 1906, p. 113.

George, at Berwick, wrote to Lisle that, as he heard, from the King's servant, and his own spy, Simon Penango, who had ridden from Falkland on December 17, the chief men of Scotland were convened in Edinburgh to choose four Governors, Arran, (*not named in the deed*,) Murray, Argyll, Huntly, 'and the Cardinal to be Governor of the Princess and chief ruler of the Council.' All five, Douglas said, were cousins or brothers-in-law. On December 21, Lisle wrote to the English Privy Council, that as he heard, the King *willed before his death* that the Douglases might come home; and that the Governors should be *Arran*, Murray, Argyll, Huntly, 'and the Cardinal to be of council with them.' On December 24, Lisle writes that on Tuesday, December 19, the Cardinal, *Arran*, Argyll, Huntly, and Murray were proclaimed as Governors, in Edinburgh. They have spread abroad, he says, the story that the King, on his deathbed, commanded that the Douglases should be restored, if they would 'do their duty to their natural country,' a measure highly unwelcome, obviously, to the Cardinal.[6]

It is plain, and most noteworthy, that, though not named in Balfour's notarial instrument, the Earl of Arran, on December 19, was proclaimed Regent, in addition to the Four whom alone the document does name; and, according to Lisle, James 'willed this before his death,' that is, James included Arran in the list. Thus, if the Regents proclaimed the instrument of Balfour as their title to power, they had falsified it, and Arran was a party to the proceeding. If they did not proclaim the instrument, or any other document of the same effect, as their authorisation, then they had no authorisation at all.

It had so happened that, on December 16, Lisle sent a priest with a letter from Henry VIII. to be given into the hands of James only. Finding that James was dead, the priest gave the letter to the Scottish Council, about December 19 or 20. He was told to wait, and, on December 21, received a written reply from the Council. Arran bade the priest tarry till he could see him privately: probably on December 21-23.[7] Arran then gave the priest the following 'credence' or verbal message, for Lisle: 'Tell him that the Cardinal, who was with the King at his departing, and in whose arms he died, hath told to the Council many things in the King's name which he' (Arran)

[6] *Hamilton Papers*, I. 336, 340, 345, 346.

[7] *Hamilton Papers*, I. 345. The Council of Scotland to Henry VIII. The Council wrote to Lisle on December 23. *Hamilton Papers*, I. 350.

'thinketh is all lies and so will prove.' 'We have also,' writes Lisle to Henry VIII., in the same letter (December 30), '*otherwise* been informed that the Earl of Arran called the Cardinal "false churl," and would have drawn his sword at him, saving that other of the Council went between them, but for what cause they so fell out, assuredly yet we know not.'

We do not know the date of this event, or the cause of Arran's anger, or what tidings of the King's last wishes, given by the Cardinal, Arran thought 'all lies,' and 'will so prove.' The tidings may have been the names of the four Regents, and the King's desire for the return of the Douglases. But, if so, Arran said nothing to the priest about the notarial instrument, and nothing about a will forged by the Cardinal. He could not speak of the instrument, if he took his own appointment under it—for he could only take that by a falsification of the instrument. He spoke merely of verbal messages, orally delivered by the Cardinal to the Council.

On January 5, 1542-43, Henry VIII., having read Lisle's letter of December 30, bade him write a private letter to Arran, modelled on a minute which he enclosed, 'whereby you shall provoke him to speak, and of his answer smell the better now he is inclined.' Lisle did write to Arran, but Arran did not answer his questions. Before receiving Henry's letter, Lisle, on January 5, 1542-43, mentioned the Archbishop of Glasgow as being then Chancellor of Scotland: a thing to be noted. On January 9, Lisle, reporting what seems to have been a second visit of the priest to Edinburgh, just before Arran was made Governor (Jan. 3, 1542-43), says that the Earl 'bade the priest resort not to the Cardinal, but to the Chancellor, the Bishop of Glasgow.'[8] Clearly the Archbishop of Glasgow, Gawain Dunbar, was much more in favour with Arran than the Cardinal, late in December. In ten or eleven days, their situations were reversed.

On January 5, Lisle had written about one Archibald Douglas who told him that, when King James 'had no perfect reason,' the Cardinal asked him whether he would choose *Arran*, Huntly, Argyll, and Murray as Regents, 'whereunto the King made no answer, albeit the Cardinal reported otherwise.'[9] Here Beaton's name is not among those of the Regents: the notarial document, as usual, is not mentioned. Meanwhile, on January 3, Arran,

[8] *State Papers*, Henry VIII., Vol. V. Part IV. p. 238. *Hamilton Papers*, I. 347-349.

[9] *Hamilton Papers*, I. 357.

at a meeting in Edinburgh, begun on January 1, had been appointed Governor of Scotland, 'by a private faction,' says George Buchanan, writing in 1571. The Hamiltons and the Protestants imposed him on the country.

Huntly, it would seem, did not attend this meeting, though interested as being one of the five Regents of December 19. We learn this from the useful priest: he was told, in Edinburgh, by Bruce, a retainer of Huntly, that he thought Huntly 'would not come at all, saying "Whosoever were made King of the South, he would be King of the North,"'—'the Cock of the North!'[10]

Now it is an extraordinary thing that Arran, so bitter against the Cardinal, and so favourable to the Archbishop of Glasgow, just before the meeting of January 1-3 by which he himself was made Governor, immediately after his own appointment to the Governorship, took the great Seal from the Archbishop of Glasgow, who had held it as lately as January 5, and gave the Chancellorship to the detested Cardinal! This great promotion, at the expense of the rival Archbishop, an opponent of the Cardinal's policy, and a friend of peace with England, was recorded in the Manuscript Register of the Privy Seal,[1] on January 10. The fact has entirely escaped the notice of our historians.

Why did Arran, fresh in supreme power, deprive a preferred and blameless prelate of the highest office, and confer it on a man whom he had been accusing of lying? Lisle put this natural question to Sir George Douglas, on February 1, who replied that 'the Cardinal *caused* the Governor to take the seal from the Archbishop of Glasgow, and to deliver it to him.' How could the Cardinal, but yesterday deep in Arran's bad graces, *cause* Arran to take this step? From the dates it is manifest that, while Arran was very hostile to Beaton just before the meeting of January 1-3, which made him Governor, just after that meeting he was at Beaton's beck and call. Thus it seems probable that Arran's appointment as Governor was the result of a compromise, of a game in which Beaton held very strong cards, even when unsupported by 'the King of the North,' Huntly; while Arran held no card, such as a knowledge of Beaton's guilt, which could enable him to resist the Cardinal's demand for the Chancellorship.

[10] *State Papers*, Henry VIII., Vol. VI. Part IV. p. 238.

[1] General Register House, Edinburgh.

But Beaton's happy condition did not last. By January 12, Sir George Douglas had crossed the Border, going in advance of his brother, the powerful Earl of Angus, and of all the noble prisoners on parole, who were sworn to put the Crown of Scotland on the head of Henry VIII., as he himself declares,[2] and to place the Cardinal in his hands. Henry had promised to back them with an army of 4000 horse: but these wicked Scots did not keep faith. On January 14, Douglas met Arran, and on January 15, the pair plotted 'to lay hands upon the said Cardinal, and pluck him from his pomp,' and deliver him over to Henry. So Douglas told Lisle, on January 20, and Lisle writing on January 21,[3] remarked, 'they will have the Cardinal by the back within this ten or twelve days.'

They were even better than their word. On January 27, as the Cardinal sat with the Council in the Hamilton rooms in Holyrood, they 'had him by the back,' seized him by force, the Earl of Angus leading, and shut him up in a Douglas house, Dalkeith, then the Earl of Morton's place.

They had caught a Tartar, for not a priest would bury, baptise, or marry throughout broad Scotland, then still Catholic. Angus told Mary of Guise, who was in Holyrood, and was alarmed by the noise of the affray at the Cardinal's arrest, that he 'was but a false trumping card, that should answer to certain points he had played.' But no points were ever 'laid' to him, though Henry VIII. (March 13) heard that Sir Thomas Erskine, who had been deprived of a post at Court, was trying to buy it back by hinting that he could tell tales of the Cardinal, an he would.[4] No charges were ever made, though Parliament met on March 12; in the Cardinal's absence, and in 'his enemies' day'; and, on March 30, Henry VIII. wrote to Sadleyr, who represented him at Holyrood, 'we could never yet hear from them what special things they had to lay against the Cardinal when they took him.'[5]

They had no 'special things to lay' against Beaton, or, officially, they never would commit themselves to anything special. There was gossip enough, I do not enter on the tattle.

Beaton had been in no danger: he had friends, he had money, and by March 23 was in his own strong castle of St. Andrews. Arran protested to Sadleyr that he had no part in the Cardinal's release. He swore ''sides and wounds'; he abounded in

[2] Henry C. Dudley, November 12, 1543.
[3] *Hamilton Papers*, I. 387-392.
[4] *Hamilton Papers*, I. 466.
[5] *Hamilton Papers*, I. 494.

blasphemous oaths to prove his veracity,—and he went on to lie![6] Sadleyr asked Arran, on April 12, what *was* the charge against the Cardinal? He had been told by Lord Somerville, on the previous day, that Arran had pardoned the Cardinal for forging the King's will. Arran denied the pardon, and said, that 'the *principal* matter whereon the Cardinal was taken' was a report to the Scottish Council, in a letter from Lisle, that the Duc de Guise was about to land with four ships of war in Scotland.[7]

Arran's story was false. Douglas and Arran had decided on January 15, to 'have the Cardinal by the back,' before Lisle himself knew that there was so much as a rumour of Guise's invasion. Lisle was informed about Guise by a letter from the English Council, written on January 19, which had not reached him when Sir George Douglas told him, on January 20, of the plot devised between Arran and himself to seize Beaton.[8]

Arran, having fabled on this point to Sadleyr, went on to say that another reason for arresting Beaton was this (which we have already quoted), 'He did counterfeit the late King's testament; and, when the King was even almost dead, he took his hand in his and so caused him to subscribe a blank paper,' which, we presume, he later filled up to his liking.[9] What did the Cardinal put down under James's signature? We only know that, thirteen days after Sadleyr's letter to Henry, (April 12) that prince bade him say to Arran, 'Can you think that you shall continue Governor when the adverse party that would have made themselves by a forged will regents with you, or rather excluded you, shall have authority . . . ?'[10]

It would appear then, if we may combine our information, that Beaton is accused by Arran of having made the dying hand of James sign a blank, and of filling up the blank with King James's wish that 'the adverse party,' Beaton, Murray, Argyll, and Huntly, shall be Regents, Arran being omitted. Of course, if this was true, Beaton must have produced the will when it would, if ever, be serviceable, that is, on the King's death. If

[6] *Sadleyr Papers*, I. 136-142.

[7] I have no evidence that there was any ground for this rumour of Guise's expedition. It may conceivably have been planned when the news of the death of James V. reached the French Court.

[8] *Hamilton Papers*, I. 384-391.

[9] Sadleyr's *State Papers*, 1809, I. 138.

[10] Henry to Sadleyr, April 25. *Hamilton Papers*, I. 527.

he did, Arran reported nothing about it at the time, and if forgery was proved against Beaton, how could Arran possibly make him Chancellor at the very earliest opportunity?

What is the value of Arran's word, and of Arran's oaths 'by God's Sides,' and 'by God's wounds'? As for Arran's veracity, two lords of his own party, Protestants, Glencairn and Maxwell, told Sadleyr that they believed Arran had been lying to *him* on another matter.[1] Lord Fleming told Sadleyr that Arran was 'the greatest dissembler in the world.'[2] Such was their estimate of Arran's veracity. If the estimate be correct, his charge against Beaton is most assuredly not proved.

What was the effect of Arran's tale upon Henry VIII.? Within three months (May 1?), through his Privy Council, he bade Sadleyr offer to the Cardinal an English bishoprick, if he would turn his coat![3] Henry, of course, may have meant to deceive Beaton, that is another question. As for Arran, after an almost incredible series of shiftings from the Protestant to the Catholic camp, and back again, he suddenly, for no known reason, rushed into Beaton's arms, and remained as true to him as it was in his nature to be to anything or anybody: save that he *was* honest as regards the infant Queen.

I have given the facts, and Arran's stories.

I have not space to cite, and we may entirely disregard, the rumours given in the letters of Chapuys, the Imperial Ambassador, because *he* thought he knew the nature of the charge against Beaton, while Henry VIII., till after April 12, did not know. The letters of Chapuys merely refract rumours, derived from the letters of the Wardens of the English Border. The historians, Knox, (writing about twenty years after date) and Buchanan, whose works are of 1571, and 1582, do not even know what Regents were proclaimed on December 19, 1542; they vary from each other and they are both wrong. They confuse the mythical forged *will*, signed by 'a dead man's hand,' with the extant notarial document.[4]

Knox tells us, and nobody else does, that the Regents of December 19 'took remissions for their usurpation,' on Monday, December 25, 1542. As they alone were in power, who could

[1] Sadleyr to Henry VIII., July 28. *Hamilton Papers*, I. 605, 606.

[2] Sadleyr to Henry VIII., *State Papers*, I. 134.

[3] *State Papers*, Henry VIII., Vol. V. Pt. IV. p. 284. Cf. *Hamilton Papers*, I. 653.

[4] Knox, *History*, I. 91-93. Buchanan, *History* (1581). *Admonition to the Trew Lordis* (1571).

give them 'remissions'? If, blundering as usual, Knox means Monday, January 1, the 'private faction' which then chose Arran as Governor, might have given indemnities to the Regents. But, if so, they would be valueless till ratified, as Arran's appointment *was* ratified, in the Parliament opened on March 12, 1542-43. The records of that Parliament mention no such remissions: they are not mentioned in the Registers of the Great or the Privy Seal. Thus we have no proof of any forged will, and absolutely no official mention, even in diplomatic letters, of Balfour's instrument.

To end with my own impression; I think it probable that the notarial instrument was the basis of a compromise between Arran and Beaton, before Arran became Governor (January 1-3, 1542-43). Arran got the document, it is now in the muniment room of his representative, the Duke of Hamilton;—and the Cardinal *caused* Arran to take the Seal from his rival, the Archbishop of Glasgow, and to make him Chancellor of Scotland: though Arran, as we saw, had been trusting the Archbishop (to whom he restored the Great Seal in March, after the arrest of Beaton,) and snubbing and vilifying the Cardinal. In these circumstances, all parties were careful to make no allusion to the notarial document.

If there were a compromise, by January 1-3, 1542-43, what did the other Regents of December 19 obtain? On January 9, 1542-43, Argyll got a nineteen years' lease of the lands and lordship of Breadalbane, with other *douceurs*. On January 21, Huntly got a five years' lease of the lands and lordship of the Braes of Mar, &c.; and leases and escheats continued to fall into the laps of these potentates. (March 18. March 29. April 27. May 25).[5]

It may be urged, against my hypothesis, that the hold over Arran which Beaton possessed was a threat to go into the question of his legitimacy. Had Arran's father's divorce from his first wife, who was childless, been valid? If not, Arran was not heir apparent to the Scottish throne. I am inclined to think that this was not Beaton's hold over Arran, in December-January 1542-43. One reason is that Arran could not, by any promotion or gifts, wrench that instrument of torture from the Cardinal's hands, whereas, the notarial instrument once in his possession, he was safe as far as *that* went. The other screw, the possibly invalid divorce, Beaton could use at any time; while, by a

[5] Register Privy Seal, MS. General Register House, Edinburgh.

curious coincidence, the Protestants could equally bastardise Arran, by applying what Glencairn called 'the law of God' to his case, if he sided with their opponents, and if their party were successful. In short, it was useless to pay blackmail to the Cardinal, without depriving the Cardinal of his means of extorting blackmail. Of the screw based on his doubtful legitimacy, Arran could deprive neither the Cardinal nor the Protestants. He consequently threw the weight of his clan, and his pretensions, alternately into the scale of the cause that appeared likely to triumph on each occasion. The obscure and complicated facts as to the elder Arran's divorce of his first wife are likely to be elucidated soon, as far as possible.

ANDREW LANG.

The 'Diary' of Sir Thomas Hope (1633-45) Lord Advocate (1616-46)

OF all contemporary materials for historical study none are more valuable than those 'human documents,' Diaries and Letters. The Scottish national character for marked individuality has so seldom indulged in personal revelation of opinion and feeling that it is unwise to overlook the few specimens we have. Such neglect seems to have overtaken the 'Diary' of Sir Thomas Hope. Published more than sixty years ago by the Bannatyne Club, historical writers have done little to popularise its merits. The editing of the volume gave no help in reading between the lines, though it was a great service even to put into print the very small and obscure writing of the MS., still preserved at Pinkie House by Sir Alexander Hope, the representative of the elder branch of the family founded by Sir Thomas. At first sight but a series of short, disconnected entries, the 'Diary' is found to throw a flood of light on the public events of what was one of the most momentous periods of British history. Besides, it reveals the *vie intime* of an interesting character, his social and professional life in Edinburgh and in his rural retreat, his intellectual calibre, and his attitude to contemporary movements in Church and State.

The 'Diary' is not only a private confessional, but a record of daily occurrences as affecting not only a public man but a citizen of the capital and a country gentleman. In regard to public events there is the reticence to be expected. But the expression of personal feeling and of the ties of family relationship is of the frankest. In this last respect it is, for its time and country, unique. We have no such picture of family life as this revelation of the grandson of an exiled Frenchman, a Des Houblons of Picardy, assimilating all the Calvinistic sincerity and dourness of a time and country in which these qualities were so conspicuous. It is possible, in a limited space, to exhibit but a few of the features of the work.

As King's advocate Sir Thomas was in a position to see everything, and especially events that seem to us of great moment. Keen as all his compeers were in business and the watchful study of character and conduct, shrewd in a bargain or a law plea, sticklers for orthodoxy in so far as prudently and privately interpreted, we can only regret that neither he nor any other of his day ever dreamt of being a Pepys or a Walpole. Thus in the 'Diary' Montrose is, 'about 8 of nycht, putt in the Castell be the Committie, June, 1641,' without a word of comment. Next month there is the off-hand entry:—'Mr. John Stewart beheidit at the Mercat Croce for his leyis aganis the Erll of Ergyll.' We have more about the King's last visit and Parliament in Scotland, when he was so hastily called away by the rebellion in Ireland (1641), but this we owe to a hot point of privilege between the Advocate and another officer of State. The Privy Council sat long over the Royal Proclamation of the visit 'till efter tuelff. Bot the knok wes holden bak, and the croce clothit with tapestrie, quhilk the Prouest and Baillies being sent for could not find. But I causit bring als monie furth off my hous,' (in the Cowgate and not far off) 'vthorwais it wald haif bene done without couering.' There was not much enthusiasm in the Covenanting Town Council of Edinburgh over the visit.

As the time drew nearer there were other difficulties, the Earl of Winton telling the Privy Council that he was 'inhabill to ludge the King at Seytoun,' near Prestonpans and one of the finest mansions in Scotland. The King arrived at Halyruid at last, 'about six at evin.' Three days later he 'cam to the Parliament in coche, about 10.' It was held in the new Parliament House, in the hall as we see it now. The huddled up close of this Parliament, marking, as it proved, the crisis of the King's fate, is significantly noted in brief:—'17 Nov. The Parliament raid. 18 Nov. The Kingis Majestie tuik journey to Ingland.'

The stirring events of 1638 are but briefly referred to, but there was natural confusion in the capital, when with the following spring came the news that the King was preparing to suppress the Covenant by force of arms. There is a brave 'wappenschawing' in Edinburgh at which the College of Justice musters 500, including 'ane number of the auld advocates and wryters.' A few days before, the Castle is 'braschit be pittardis and takin be the nobilitie.' Young Sir Thomas commands General Leslie's bodyguard, while his brother and brother-in-law, Sir Charles Erskine, both rode out under the Banner of the Covenant. Sir

Thomas himself could hardly be a combatant, so he hands over his arms to his sons:—'My putrinell or carabin, indentit of rowat' (? Rouen) 'work; sword and pistolles; long carabin of rowet work all indentit' (inlaid), 'with the brace iron key and gold string; litill rowat carabin of mother-a-perll stok, to be usit quhen I haif not to do therwith, but to be readie quhen I call for it.' While at his house of Craighall he buys in Cupar, near by, two pistols, which he entrusts to his man there, along with the 'calmes key' or mould for bullets, 'to keip and dress for my use.' There is also the anxious stowing away of valuables. Sir Charles Erskine is instructed 'to put within my little irne kist his coffer with jewellis. All thir, with the meikill irne kist and writts being therin, ar putt in the laich volt cellar for eschewing of fyre; and committis the rest to the Lord.' Later on Lady Hope, with a packet of letters, crosses over from Fife 'to close vp the voultis, and sand the vpmost houssis for feir of grenades.' Meantime the King's fleet appears in the Inchkeith roads and his army is nearing the Border. At Foulden, near Berwick, the Advocate meets his Majesty in conference. The Estates are thereafter summoned, a peace is patched up, and the King makes a hasty return southwards to meet still more serious troubles.

The crisis of the Parliamentary struggle came in 1643, when the Solemn League and Covenant finally commits the whole Covenanting strength to the overthrow of the King. Sir Thomas notes the momentous 'subscryving in the Eistmost Kirk of St. Jells' (13 Oct.). Among others 'Mr. Merschell, the Inglische minister' (the Stephen Marshall of Milton's 'Smectymnuus'), 'spak, being sitting with the Inglische Commissioners under the reideris dask; and the nobilmen satt foiranent the minister, at the syd of ane tabill covert with greyn; and all the persones of the Committie satt at the tuo endis of the tabill, in a traverse tabill both south and north.' Sir Thomas tells us that 'being thair I renewit my vow to adhere' to the Covenant, but he wisely stopped short at that part which required him 'to mayntene the privilegis of the Parliament of Ingland,' with which as a subject of Scotland he had nothing to do. This precisely involved the point on which the covenanting parties were to split. But as yet all are on the full tide of the new enthusiasm. With the new year the 'old crookbacked soldier,' General Leslie, marches south with that Scotch contingent that was to prove the undoing of the King:—(8 Jan., 1644) 'General Leslie cam to my chamber about 6 at nycht and tuik leave of me, being to

begin his journey to Ingland on the morow.' With him went the recruits from Sir Thomas's own lands:—'This day, gevin to the soiours of Craighall, quho gois vnder Capt. Moffet, ilk of them thair collorrs' (colours) 'of blue and yellow silk ribbins, quhilk cost 4 merks. To them to drink amang them, j angell.' Of the terrible doings of Montrose in harrying the land for King Charles during the following summer the 'Diary' says nothing, but in a letter to Sir Charles Erskine (7 Aug., 1645) he is told how the fiery Royalist swept over the plain of Alloa and Dollar like a blight, and, as a matter of personal interest to Sir Charles, he adds, 'this last nycht thay wer at Alloway, quhair as I heir Montroiss wes resett be zour brother' (Earl of Mar), 'quhilk I will not believe.'

It is the Church and not the Law that connects Sir Thomas with two notable contemporaries, Johnston of Warristoun and Alexander Henderson, joint authors of the National Covenant. The former is entered as a name and nothing more. Henderson's historic appearances are noted, as well as some of the occasions when he was heard preaching, but without a single indication of the impression made by this very remarkable man. In 1642 he baptizes a grandchild of Sir Thomas's, one of the witnesses being Sir William Dick, the great banker who financed the Covenanting resistance. The same year found Sir Thomas at his [1] place of Cramond, where he had built the laird's aisle in the church. Here 'Mr. Alex. Henrysoun, ministrat the Communioun for x tables, and also preichit efternone.' On both occasions the memorandum, *palliatus*, is added, as if he regarded the fact of the preacher being gowned as a Prelatic innovation. He elsewhere records his objection to Laud's innovation, kneeling at the Sacrament, as well as the fact that that prying prelate had written him a letter reprimanding him for communicating at Pencaitland, doubtless in offensive Low Church fashion. Henderson's sermons are almost the only ones of the century that make tolerable reading to a modern, so that it is unfortunate we do not have, from so shrewd and honest a layman, some estimate of the effect on this occasion. It is quite characteristic, however, to note only that Henderson was gowned, perhaps as an

[1] This 'Place' is better known as Hopetoun. Sir Thomas's son, Sir James, fell heir to it and to the Leadhills mines through a marriage that his shrewd father negotiated for him. His grandson, Charles, was first Earl of Hopetoun and ancestor of the Marquis of Linlithgow. Sir James sat on the bench (1649-61) as Lord Hopetoun.

expression of the preacher's dislike to the growing influence of the Brownists or Independents who were soon to rob the old Scots Church service of much of its beauty.

The nearest church to the Cowgate house was the Magdalen Chapel, close to the base of the Free Library, but it is mentioned once, and then only in the matter of the baptism of a grandchild, 'verie waik, and I desyrit him to be baptisit; quhilk my wyff excusit, that they durst not tak the bairne furth in the cold air.' The compromise was the Chapel, but 'my wyff wes angrie at my greife.' As a State official Sir Thomas would be expected always to worship in the East Kirk of St. Giles, where he must have been a steady attender, to judge by this:—'At 2 efternone I had a heavy brasche of the colick, quhilk vexit me till I vomit all, and gatt rest in my bed till Sounday in the morning, at quhilk I wes delyverit, and rose to the preiching; for quhilk I gif God prais.' Sometimes a fire perturbed the congregation. On a Sunday in 1639 Mr. Alex. Henrysoun has just begun the exhortation prayer when there was a fray in the kirk, due to the report of a fire in a house 'on the north syd of the gait; quhairupon a gritt part of the pepill, with the Provest and Magistrates, ischit furth; and the minister stayit till thair return, be the space of 3 quartern of ane hour.' Altogether the clergy, even the leaders, get no prominence in the 'Diary,' strengthening the general impression one must form that the momentous rising of 1638 was essentially a movement of the barons, deeply roused by the King's threatened resumption of the Crown teinds in the hands of the lay patrons.

Sir Thomas was a devout man both in public and private according to the fashion of the time. We have no note of long wrestlings in private prayer such as Johnston of Warristoun is said to have indulged in, though he tells us once of being so engaged before rising in the morning, when he is answered by spiritual whisperings, unheard, he adds, by his wife. To that gross form of superstition—witchcraft, and demoniacal possession—there is no reference. But it is characteristic of that 'closer walk with God,' ever present to the Covenanter, that he reads a divine message in all his spiritual communings. His record of them we ought to be grateful for, since it brings us into the closest personal touch with him.

The old-world pride of family is revealed in the estates purchased as well as in the numerous references to the doings of the children and all the tender ties formed through them. In

this there is some compensation for the absence of that shrewd observation of men and things which was scarce possible in those days of caution, reticence, and often forced religiosity. Such references are all the more valuable, too, because we have scarce any pictures of family life at that time. The sons—John, Thomas, James, and Alexander, the scheming for their worldly advancement, the girls, and their husbands, and children—these all figure with more or less fulness in the 'Diary' and 'Letters.' Of their mother there are few direct personal notes, a revelation quite in keeping with the conventional expression of deep feeling in vogue. She is always simply 'my wyff.' When he writes of another's wife she is 'your bedfellow.'

The third son, Alexander, quite in keeping with old custom, separated himself from the family interests, and took the side of King Charles, 'quhom,' as his father says, 'he idolit as his god.' His extravagance seems to have been a shock to his old-fashioned parents. The story of it is worth telling as an exceptional revelation of deep feeling on the part of the old man. In 1635 Alexander is sent to follow his fortunes at Court, there to push for place, as so many young Scots nobles had been doing since the Union. The *persona grata* who introduced him was entrusted with fifty gold pieces for his service. What, for those days, were large money payments had too often to follow those pieces, generally through friends who were bound for Court, such as the Earl of Mar, Lord Lorn (the great Argyll). Success in suing came at last, and in significant fashion:—'(25 Oct., 1636) Letters to my sone with thanks to sundry gentlemen for concerting with him to agrie with Taverner to putt off the Chancellar from Mungo Murray, in the suit of the place of carver, for quhilk Mr. Alexander is to pay to Taverner £150 sterling.' To sustain the dignity of the young Scot, 'at this tyme one Peter Loch, a footmen, wes sent up to serve my sone, to quhom was gevin fyve dollors,' a sum ridiculously out of keeping with his master's spending, which seems to have been on an alarming scale, to judge by these notes:—'(14 Juni, 1637) A letter from my wyff to Mr. Alexander, forbidding him to send the watche, and chyding him for his spending'; (28 July) 'ressavit letters to pay to Patrik Wod £70 sterling, quhilk he had borrowit from his factor' (agent), 'to the quhilk I wrot a very angrie letter and his mother another'; Sir Thomas is so angry that the letter is 'directit to him in his mother's name,' and shortly after the elder brother, Thomas, is instructed to write, 'because I wald not wrytt myself.'

It seems that Alexander had secured a pension of £150 sterling as His Majesty's Special Carver.

A gift, from his mother, is in striking contrast to her son's costly watch:—'Item, one from his mother with the nott of the aittis, peiss, cheiss, salmond, and hering sent to him.' In 1641 we have a deeply pathetic appeal to the son from the father himself:—'As for the last part of your letter concerning yourself it hes gevin so deep a wound to my hart that I must take tyme to gather my spirit. The Lord pittie me, and direct yow in a more prudent way, and keep yow from tempting him by distrust and diffidence in not waiting patientlie for a releiff of your distresses from him, and in crocing the wearie hart of your aged father, and bringing his gray haires to the grave with sorrow. Butt of this at greter lenth quhen I haif digestit in some mesur the excess of my present greif.' Imprudence of this kind was abhorrent to the nature of the Advocate, who ever laboured to fulfil the apostolic injunction—'not slothful in business, serving the Lord.'

It is pleasant to note in the 'Diary' evidence of the beginnings of a great social change. Sir Thomas was among the 'gentlemen of the long robe' who invested the proceeds of the 'dreepin' roasts' that came to them professionally, in broad lands, thus leading the way to the mansions and pleasaunces that in time transformed the old, forbidding feudal aspect of the country. The lands of Craighall must have been among the earliest of the Advocate's purchases, for in 1631 we learn he had mortified 100 merks yearly for the support of a school in Ceres. On the east end of the church may still be seen the burial-place of the old Crawford Lindsays, long lords of the soil. There reposes the stern Crawford who compelled Queen Mary to sign her abdication. For a century and more the old house has been in ruins, but the Hopes lived there till about the Union of 1707. It stood about half a mile from Ceres, 'upon the north bank of a den, planted with trees, a situation beautifully romantic.' Thus writes the minister in the *Old Statistical Account*, adding that a little rocky hill shelters on the north from which the place got its name. This clears up an obscure note in the 'Diary.' Now and again Sir Thomas enters one of his dreams in Latin. Thus in 1641 he dreams of being caught in a thick mist *in hortis petrocellanis*, as if it were 'in the gardens of parsley.' But he is not thinking of *petro-selinum*, the Latin from which we have 'parsley.' He is really translating Craig Hall as the Cell on

the Rock or little rocky hill of the *Statistical Account*. On a later occasion he enters a solemn vow, when on the point of setting out *ad Petrocellam*, his own pet name for his favourite retreat. In his youth he had published Latin verses, his *Carmen Seculare*, but his active life allowed only of a playful word-coinage or a dream record in the classic tongue. His tastes seem not to have lain in gardening or improving, but he takes an interest in the working of the neighbouring coal-pits.

Two of his frequent journeys from Edinburgh were eventful. When ordered to withdraw to Craighall early in 1640, he left Leith within ten days of receipt of the King's letter, and 'in Bruntiland a' (one) 'nicht, cam next day to Craighall about 12.' Considering the road and the season of the year the progress was good. The Lowther party (1629) had an unpleasant experience on this road, to this effect:—'The river of Ore, narrow but deep and fierce; we rid it the height of the horse's mane and the fierceness of it turned the horse off its feet.'

A few years later his son, Sir John,[2] gets 'seisin' of Craighall as his own, but Sir Thomas continues his visits almost to the end. The summer of 1644 was mainly spent there. The leisure now earned seems to have offered the chance of reading, as this hints:—'Sent my bookis to Craighall, being of purpose to go thither myself?' (Ap. 1644). Within a month he is suddenly summoned by Sir Charles Erskine, just come home from France to find that his mother, the Dowager Countess of Mar, 'had takin a deidlie brasche' in the house in the Cowgate. On this summons Sir Thomas made the journey from Craighall through Fife with a speed that was worthy of the railway pace of pre-Forth Bridge days. 'Immediatlie I went furth of Craighall, about 8 in the morning, and came to Bruntiland about xij hours, and was at Leyth ane quarter efter one.' The lady died in Sir Thomas's house in the Cowgate, and was buried at Alloa. The funeral was, of course, a great event. Says Sir Thomas, 'I went to Alloway to the funeralls off the Countes of Mar, being 20 hors in trayne, quhair my charges wer £96; and returnit to Craighall on Setterday.' In those ceremonious days the 'suits of woe' were not soon parted with. 'This day,' says the 'Diary,' 'my sone Craighall went to sermoun, and we changit our mourning weidis for my deir dauchter, Margaret, and no sooner, and so we wore them for a zeir and 13 dayis.'

Sir Thomas Hope is a favourable specimen of a public man in

[2] Sir John was raised to the Bench as Lord Craighall.

his day and generation. In regard to the questions that moved men in religion and politics, he must have formed his own opinions, but in his pages one need not look for any critical estimate of the bearings of policy or of practice. The notable men he meets—King Charles, Buckingham, Prince Rupert, Laud, Montrose, Warristoun, Henderson—these are all names and little more. Nor does self-inquiry go further than an almost pagan study of portents and providences, and a prayer for better control of faults of temper, presumably regarded as a hindrance to advancement. The most favourable aspects he presents are on the side of the domestic affections, notably a frank simplicity of character, and integrity in the discharge of duty. In common with the most intelligent of his countrymen, Drummond excepted, he is untouched by the glories of Elizabethan literature. Of his own education or of that of his sons we are told nothing. He was a student of the newly-founded College of Edinburgh, for he notes the death (1643) of 'Good Mr. Adam Colt, my regent' or College tutor. That he himself went abroad for study to fit him for public life is unlikely, though Lowther's observation (1629) on the advocates is to this effect:—'Most of them have been travellers, and studied in France.' He appreciates this training by sending his sons to study abroad, and even advises Sir Charles Erskine, when on a visit to France, to stay till he 'get a grup of the language.' That he was not entirely immersed in affairs is witnessed by references to his books, by the free use of Latin on occasion, and by the presence now and again of a Greek or a Hebrew phrase; but he never goes out of his way to speak, otherwise than as mere matter-of-fact, of schoolmaster or of clergyman.

The intellectual status of Sir Thomas is to be estimated entirely on indirect evidence, such as has been already presented. There remains the consideration of his reading and of his writings as a specimen of the spoken Scots of his age. The fact that these are quite artless and undesigned makes them specially interesting.

Bible-reading was regularly carried on as a religious exercise, but the numerous vows and soul-questionings are not, as was usual with the serious-minded, accompanied by Biblical quotation. Hebrew he read:—'This day beguid at the 4 of Nombers in the Hebrew lectioun: Lent to my sone Craighall 4 tomes of Hebrew Bibill of Rotus Stephanus characteris.' A few words in Hebrew character are also inserted. Sometimes an entry is made in Latin. Thomas à Kempis was one of his favourites. The only other

allusion to books is this:—'Sent a letter to Erl Ancrum, to caus prent Franciscanis Vllisemus (Volusenus), or to send him heir to me to be prentit, because Mr. Robert Balcanquell wes importuning me to haif him restorit, as ane auld monument of Scottis antiquity.' The Earl was himself of some repute at the English Court as a poetaster. This Volusenus, an honest Scottish Wilson Latinised, was born at the beginning of the 16th century on the banks of the Lossie, and from the school at Elgin proceeded to Aberdeen University, later on to be known as tutor in Wolsey's household, and thereafter as professor and humanist Scot Abroad. It is hard to guess the point of interest Sir Thomas found in his writings, but he was well known to George Buchanan, and has three of his poems in the *Delitiae Poetarum*, that anthology of Scottish scholarship in Latin verse, in which Sir Thomas himself was represented. One would have preferred to see him show a little interest in what Andro Hart was issuing, say, in 1629, under his very eye, from his shop on the High Street, almost opposite the Cross. He may have rubbed shoulders with Drummond of Hawthornden when he chanced to come into town to see Hart about what he was doing for him that year, or with Montgomery, busy sending forth through Hart his *Cherry and Slae*. But the time had not yet come, least of all to even an intelligent Scot, for that wider outlook and keener observation of men and things, of Nature and art. The open book which he had ever to watch was the crooked path of his own fortunes. Outside of that the one literary influence most powerfully present would be his Bible, and there he found the highest authority for his study of dreams, portents, and mystic communings.

In these writings of Sir Thomas we have, to the life, the language and style of an educated gentleman of the seventeenth century. There is no forced pathos, and still less is there an approach to humour, but occasionally we have, in a proverbial form, specimens of that peculiarly antique combination of worldly wisdom and graphic phrasing. To put a bone in the foot of an adversary is his equivalent to our putting a spoke in his wheel. His professional experience of the part played by property in estranging parties comes out in this:—'Meum and tuum, quhilk spillis the sport in all playis.' In the case of a laird with whom the Earl of Annandale, his client, has the usual 'pley' over 'widsettis' (mortgages), he advises 'to *latt him byt on the brydell*, and I sall terrifie him with putting the minut in

registers and charging him to extend and fulfill the samyn vnder the payne thairin conteynit, quhilk is £10,000 stirling.' Though he lived in an age at once of plain-speaking and coarseness alongside of lip-piety there is no trace with him of any of these. When face to face with his enemies—and he had them—he is clear, firm, and dignified. With two agents of the King's unpopular policy, Traquair and Hamilton, he has warm moments. His replies compare favourably with Traquair's rough rejoinder: 'The Commissioner, without any occasioun offerit be me, brak out violentlie in thir speiches, eftir I had ressonit the point exactlie for his Majestie: "Be God, this man cares not quhat he speaks."'

Devotional writing, which formed the bulk of the literature of the century, is so much under the influence of English as to very imperfectly preserve the speech of the day; for the Scot, in virtue of nearness to England and his own pronounced individuality, was always bi-lingual. But the diction and pronunciation of Sir Thomas are genuinely national. This is illustrated by the following phrases, culled at random:—'Maryit on (for to): the debtis auchtand (owing, the Northern pres. part.): quhilk ar thir (which are these): 6 scheit of paper: your tutor his letter: deirer to hir nor (than) hirself: I think or (ere) now you haif them: is better acquaint (old part. in -ed dropped after a dental): I wreit (past tense) my ansuer to the haill douttis contenit (past part. Northern): the saids landis (plural adj. and plur. in -is): vpon the other morne (morning): but this man be provin (unless this must be proved): betuix and the tent of this moneth (between now and the tenth): we haif mett att divers tymes with the Erll and findis him verie willing' (good example of the Northern verb plural in -s throughout). His diction shows something of the foreign influences that affected Scottish speech. To his academic and professional training we owe these: keip peax (Lat. pax, peace), quaeres (queries), he may distresse his mother (distrain), a peice of festinatioun (Lat. festinare, àpropos of asking a judgeship for his son at twenty-one), I intend to superceid (Lat. supersedere, put off) the ending (issue), thocht he be accomptit ane young man.' Though his grandfather was a born Frenchman, his diction does not show any exceptional familiarity with the language. The following recall their foreign origin:—'Abillzeamentsis (habiliments), the valour (Fr. valeur) of the tithes, it sall haif ane essay (essai), I sall travell to draw them to thair tryall, oblissis and oblischement, it is bruttit that

Capitane Cokburne is deid' (bruit). Very few words occur that require glossing through lapse of time. Examples are:—'Trubill or fascherie; warit (expended); bruikit (enjoyed); hold zow be your maik (match or equal); thir fyve or sax oulkis (weeks—now only in Aberdeenshire); if my Lord sall scar (feel afraid) at this; letter to Mr. Alexander to chaip (buy) ane jowell and to send me word of the number and bignes of the diamondis.' Through the close connection of Scotland with Holland come two words of much interest. Sir Thomas refers to a document 'quhilk I patt in my blak cabinet in the midmost of the two blak schotells' (Ger. Schüssel, drawer, flat dish) 'quhilk ar in the middes thairof.' In the 'Wedderburn Book' (Scott. His. Soc.), of the same age, we find:—'Ane aiken freiz pres with schottles of aik thairin.' The Boer War made us familiar with the word, schil-pat, the name in South Africa for the land tortoise. The 'Diary' shows that Sir Thomas knew it. (1638) 'Ressavit from my sone my rod with the King's portrait on the hed of it, of porcupine penne' (quill) 'or of the schell poddokis' (puddock). Sir Thomas's observation is not clear here. His remark must apply, not to the walking-stick so much as to the nature of the setting of the portrait. Among the ominous accidents he loves to record there is a clear reference to such a 'rod':—'The rod I walk with wes brokin in peices and nothing left of it but the siluer head.' His speech shows the same confusion between 'rod' and 'road' as in modern dialect:—'21 Maij, 1639, This day General Leslie, Erl Rothess, and Lord Lyndsay tuik journey to the bound rod.' The expression 'the bound rod,' here is one of the many obscurities of the 'Diary.' I found a solution in the *Muses' Welcome* to James I. on his visit to Scotland in 1617.[3] One of the pieces there extols the King as uniting, under one crown, the two sides of the 'bound rod,' evidently an expression for the boundary between Scotland and the 'auld enemy.'

In the absence of an established norm for spelling, whether regulated by printing or by teaching in grammar school and

[3] In the great hall of the Place or Abbey of Paisley, Sir James Sempill of Beltrees greeted the King in the Oration recited by his son, 'a prettie boy of nine,' thus:—as the result of the Union 'one beame shall launce alike on both sides of our bound rod and our Phoebus (James I.) no more need to streach out his armes on both sides of it, devyding as it were his Royall body for embracing at once two devided Ladyes'—*i.e.* Clytia (Scotland) and Leucothoe (England). The expression is slightly different in Spalding's *Troubles*:—'Felt Marischall Leslie is makeing great preparation to the Boullrode' (March, 1640).

college, at that time entirely conducted through Latin, it is fair to regard the form the words assume as indicative of pronunciation. Spelling under such conditions can only be phonetic. In this regard the spelling of Sir Thomas much more truly reproduces the tones of his voice than any modern writing could. His spelling is perfectly consistent, and supplies most instructive information in regard to the development of the mother tongue. In his speech the 'quhilk and quho,' 'the ane,' and the 'ze' (ye) still hold their own, but the last only in a very homely letter. The first did not survive his own age. Its initial *qu* was originally a useful mark to emphasize the strong Gothic guttural, *hw*, still surviving in Scotch pronunciation, the elimination of which is a loss to modern English, so that 'which' and 'witch' sound alike. The omission of 'l,' so persistent now, and in effect analogous to the English vocalising of 'r,' did not prevail at this time, witness 'sould, wuld, coll (dock, cut short, now cowe), call' (drive, now cawe) as in the judicial torture known as 'calling the boots.' Abbreviated words are frequent:—Secretar, necessar, ordinar, lenth, strenthening, chamerlane (chawmer, chalmer, chamber). Some of them seem due to slovenly pronunciation, as solice (solicit), proportis (purports), escapes (escapades), entres (interest). The German nasal, still common in dialect, is shown in sing-ell (single), angell (angel, a coin). A strong guttural is heard in aneugh (enough), 'the laichest' (lowest) 'pryce.' A hardened sound appears, again, in sik (such), besek (beseech); off for 'of,' behove (behoof); and *s* hard in becaus, hous and houssis, pleass, coussing. The vowel sounds are more uncertain. The following may be grouped under the vowels in their usual order:—spak, brak, latt (let)—*a*; hes, wes, eftir, glaid (gled), haif (have), sait (set, noun), bay (be or by), the last post—shut *e*; breist, freind, freir (friar), signifeit (signified)—open *e*; thift, widsettis, liklie, wreit (writ and wrote), greit (great)—shut *i*; nott (note)—shut o; sone (Ger. Sohn, son), one (one)—open o; bund (bound)—shut *u*; soume (sum), jowell (jewel)—open *u*; saull (soul), yow (you, still in Border dialect), awin, awne (own)—diphthongs. Proper names must have been written purely phonetically, and are interesting in preserving local colour. Sir Thomas uses these:—Airthour (Arthur), Areskin, Erskine (place-name, Aitrik-stane), Fotherance (Fotheringham), Vauss (de Vaux, now Vans in Wigton), Bruntiland, Ripont (Ripon), Carraill (Crail as in old spelling), Mononday, Setterday, Mertimes, quhill (untill) the 28 Merche.

These observations, of a more or less philological character, ought to commend themselves as a side-light on historical study. Much learning has been expended on the verse remains of the Scottish vernacular, but little attention has been given to its prose, as preserved to us in diaries and familiar letters. The abundant religious literature, if it can be called so, of the seventeenth century is substantially English in diction, and therefore of little use on its language side. But we may be sure that men like Sir Thomas Hope put down in their diaries exactly the language used by them in daily intercourse with those of their own class. The record, being still unaffected by conventional printing, preserves the very tones of voice and the characteristic diction of the time. It so happens that, whereas the old vernacular verse diction has not lived in colloquial intercourse, such speech as we have in the 'Diary' was till quite recently that of old-fashioned, homely Lowland folk.

JAMES COLVILLE.

The Early History of the Scots Darien Company

INVESTIGATION BY THE ENGLISH PARLIAMENT*

THE investigation, made first by the Lords and then by the Commons, is important not only because of its effect on the character of the Company, but also for the stimulus it gave to Parliamentary interest in the great London trading companies.

The origin of the investigation is obscure. Various rumours were current at the time, which were set forth in a small flyer entitled, *Caveto Cavetote*, dated at 'the Admiralty Coffee-House at Charing Cross, the 14th of December, 1695.'[1] Some said the investigation was instigated by parties whose idea was the benefit of English rather than the confusion of Scots trade, and who hoped to profit by arousing national jealousy over an act which they claimed gave Edinburgh the opportunity to surpass London as an *entrepot*. Others said the investigation was started by Jacobites in order to embarrass the government and discountenance the King. Still others that the main instigator was a Scotsman, a disappointed politician who hoped to curry favour with the English by traitorously attempting to wreck his country's new enterprise. All of these causes may have had a share in the matter. Yet if one may judge by the character which the investigation took, it seems most probable that the merchants of London thought they saw here a chance to gain larger privileges by making Parliament believe that the welfare of the country was seriously imperilled.

Parliament met during the last week of November. On December 2nd, the first day of real business, the House of Lords resolved to consider the Act.[2] Accordingly, on the 3rd, the Act

*See *Scottish Historical Review*, vol. iii. pp. 210 and 316, for the earlier stages of the History of the Scots Darien Company.

[1] The only known copy is in the Library of Congress.

[2] *Jour. Ho. Lds.*, xv. 602.

was read amid considerable excitement. After a long debate, it was decided to ask the East India Company, and the private traders to show wherein the Act was prejudicial to the trade of England, and to give an account of the inconveniences that might arise from it. The Commissioners of Customs were also instructed to show how the Act would injure English trade.[3] The East India Company showed remarkable haste in complying with the request for information, for on the very day that the order passed the Lords they appointed a committee to prepare a reply.[4] They probably had excellent reasons for supposing that such a requisition was to be made.

On the 4th, nothing daunted by the attitude of the Lords—it is barely possible that they had not heard that their charter was being attacked—the directors of the Scots Company held a meeting, and considered sending ships to the East Indies.[5]

On the 5th the Lords heard the opinions of the Commissioners of Customs, and of the private traders. Memorials were presented by the East India Company and the African Company.[6] The latter laid stress on the great expense of carrying on their trade, and the necessity for larger privileges. By the Scots Act the African trade would be lost to England, for the Scots could trade cheaper, their goods being free from customs duties, and they had the right to make reprisals, both of which advantages were denied to the English.

The memorial of the East India Company declared that owing to the duties and restrictions that had been imposed upon them in England they could not compete with such an unhampered Company as this of the Scots. They also referred to the power to make reprisals, to the advantage accruing to the Scots Company from a joint stock, and to the privilege of being able to exclude interlopers, all of which had been refused them. Attention was called to the great advantage of having its ships and goods free from all manner of legal restrictions, taxes, and customs. This alone would make Scotland the *entrepot* for all East India commodities. They pointed out the danger of goods being smuggled across the border into England, besides the great encouragement offered Englishmen to join the Company and thus be free from the heavy duties and other inconveniences

[3] *Ho. of Lds. MSS.*, ii. 3; Narcissus Luttrell, *Brief Historical Relation*, iii. 557.

[4] MS. Minutes of the East India Co., Court Book No. 37, folio 41B.

[5] *Vid. supra*, p. 323.

[6] *Jour. Ho. Lds.*, xv. 605; *Ho. of Lds. MSS.*, ii. 3 and 13 to 15.

imposed by a too careful government. Their statements were substantiated by the large sums which had already been subscribed in London towards the new Company. Even some of their own members had been tempted to invest because of the great advantages offered. In conclusion they declared that a careful comparison of European acts establishing commercial companies showed the Scots to have privileges equal to, or greater than, those of any other Company.[7]

The private merchants in like manner maintained that the Act would be prejudicial to England unless more liberal terms were granted to the English traders. Apparently the merchants were successful in using the Act as a lever to secure favourable Parliamentary action, for on the next day the Lords ordered that all the trading companies in London lay before the House an account of their losses during the past year.[8]

On December 6th the directors had their last meeting in London, for seven of the directors were summoned to the bar of the House, and the Lords went into an elaborate investigation of the affairs of the Company. The directors were asked why they had incorporated themselves in a company likely to be prejudicial to England. They answered, innocently enough, that they had not thought it would be prejudicial to England, nor supposed it a crime to be incorporated in Scotland. Upon being asked for a list of the subscribers to the Company, they declared that after the subscription book was closed, it had been given to the directors from Scotland, whose names they furnished with those of the new directors. These were now ordered to appear, the Scots to bring with them the subscription book. Later in the day Paterson, being called in and examined, stated that he had been solicited in May to give an opinion for an act, that from this opinion the Act was drawn, but he did not know what measures were used to secure its passage. The Lords suspected the use of English money, but could find no trace of it.[9]

Meantime the canny Scots had sent off the subscription book post haste to Scotland. When called before the Lords and asked for it, they stated that they did not know until Wednesday that it was wanted, and had sent it away on Tuesday. Then Roderick Mackenzie, the secretary, was called in, but he also declared that he knew nothing of the whereabouts of the book. It was all

[7] *Ho. of Lds. MSS.*, ii. 14.

[8] *Jour. Ho. Lds.*, xv. 606.

[9] *Jour. Ho. Lds.*, xv. 608; *Ho. of Lds. MSS.*, ii. 4, 5.

most annoying. One of the delegates from Scotland was again asked when he had had the book last. He answered that he had parted with it on Friday, when he had given it to his man who was now on his way to Scotland.[10]

On the 12th the Lords heard the Commissioners of Customs, who observed that the Act must necessarily have a fatal influence upon the trade, navigation, and revenue of England.[11] If it could not be repealed, legal encouragement ought to be given to the English traders. They advised also that Englishmen be discouraged, under severe penalties, from having anything to do with the Company. They said the English navigation acts ought to protect the merchants from encroachments, but it might be necessary for the governors of the American plantations to be 'awakened on this occasion to put the aforesaid laws into vigorous execution.' Moreover, a certain number of vessels of competent force ought to be appointed to cruise on the coasts of America and elsewhere, with instructions to seize, and bring in as prizes, all such ships as might be found trading in contempt of the aforesaid laws.[12] As recently as October 16th, Edward Randolph had submitted to them an account of the plantation trade, in which he spoke of there being already considerable illicit trade with Scotland.[13] This would, doubtless, increase under the Act, unless special measures were taken to check it.

Following the Commissioners of Customs, came the representatives of the East India Company with another paper urging that the best way to prevent inconveniences to English trade was to establish their company by an Act of Parliament, which should grant such privileges and immunities as were necessary. In opposition to this request for a monopoly, came Mr. Gardner, a private merchant, who suggested that trade be made more open instead of less so. He also urged that the duty on East India goods be refunded on exportation, that no persons residing in England or Ireland be allowed to be concerned in the Scots Company, that all Scots ships putting into any English port be heavily mulcted before being allowed to sail, and that the Scots receive no relief or assistance from any of the English colonies. This last suggestion was destined to be secretly adopted by the Government, and to have dire consequences for the unfortunate

[10] *Ho. of Lds. MSS.*, ii. 6, 15, 17; *Jour. Ho. Lds.*, xv. 610.

[11] *Ho. of Lds. MSS.*, ii. 17.

[12] *Ho. of Lds. MSS.*, ii. 17.

[13] *State Papers Colonial, America and West Indies*, xv. 71.

colony at Darien. The Royal African Company also presented another paper in which they urged the granting of larger privileges by the English Parliament. They too conceived that the only way to prevent great mischiefs was to establish a company with exclusive rights, *i.e.* a monopoly.[14] The Lords did not at present take the hint about granting the English traders larger privileges. Instead they voted to present an address to the King, representing to him 'the great prejudice, inconveniences, and mischiefs' the Act might bring to the trade of England.[15]

By a curious coincidence—or was it something more—on this very day the Commons resolved that for the more effectual preservation of English trade, a 'council of trade' ought to be established by Act of Parliament.[16] This was known later as the Board of Trade. It is impossible to prove any connection between the investigation into the inconveniences arising from the Scots Act, and the establishment of the famous Board of Trade. But one cannot help feeling that the great interest which the Scots Company aroused in matters relating to trade was a considerable factor in the Board's establishment just at this time.[17]

On the next day, the 13th December, the Address was considered and agreed to, and a message sent to the Commons desiring their concurrence.[18a] In the manuscript minutes of the House of Lords for this date there is this entry: 'Moved that a day may be appointed to receive what may be proposed in order to have union between England and Scotland.'[18] Already clear-headed men saw that the only real remedy for the inconveniences arising from the Act was a union of the two realms, but in the present excited condition of the Lords such a suggestion was not likely to meet with any consideration. The entry was cancelled.

On December 14th the Address was considered in the Commons, and agreed to without discussion. It is rather curious that hitherto they had taken no formal notice of the Scots Company. It might have been supposed that they would have been the first to take cognizance of this danger to English trade.[19]

[14] *Ho. of Lds. MSS.*, ii. 17 to 19.

[15] *Jour. Ho. Lds.*, xv. 610.

[16] *Jour. Ho. Com.*, xi. 359; Narcissus Luttrell, *Brief Historical Relation*, iii. 560, 563.

[17] Leopold von Ranke, *Hist. of England*, v. 104.

[18a] *Ho. of Lds. MSS.*, ii. 6; *Jour. Ho. Lds.*, xv. 611.

[18] *Ho. of Lds. MSS.*, ii. 6.

[19] *Jour. Ho. Com.*, xi. 361 to 363; *Jour. Ho. Lds.*, xv. 613.

However on the 16th the Lords were notified that the Commons agreed to the Address. On the 17th, between three and four o'clock in the afternoon, the Lords and Commons went in a body to present it to the King at Kensington.[20]

Their Address represented that by the Act Scotland would be made a free port for East Indian commodities, and would take England's place in supplying Europe. London trade and English revenue would both be undermined by the smuggling in of cheap goods across the border. Trade in American commodities also would be lost. It was pointed out that the naval power of England had been promised to support the Company and make reprisals. They feared this might lead even to the destruction of English commerce.

The King's reply was dignified and satisfactory: 'I have been ill-served in Scotland, but I hope some remedies may be found to prevent the inconveniences which may arise from this Act.'[21] It was undoubtedly true that the King had known nothing of the Act until some time after it had been touched with the sceptre by his Commissioner and had become law. As only two weeks had elapsed between the time when the Act was first presented to the Scots Parliament and the date when it became law, there was small chance that the King, then on the Continent conducting the war against the French, could have heard of it. He had particularly instructed his Commissioner, when directing him to promote trade, to forward any act that might be passed for this purpose, before giving it the royal assent.[22]

This had not been done in the case of the Company's Act. No wonder the King felt that he had been 'ill-served.' The reply, however, was sufficiently oracular to be taken in more than one way. The Lords believed that traitorous English gold had been used to secure the passage of the Act. So the Scots were willing enough to believe that William thought so too, and referred to bribery when he said 'ill-served.'[23]

Soon after his attention had been called to the Act, the King turned out both of his Secretaries of State for Scotland.[24] They

[20] *Jour. Ho. Lds.*, xv. 615; *Jour. Ho. Com.*, xi. 364, 365; Narcissus Luttrell, *Brief Historical Relation*, iii. 562.

[21] *Jour. Ho. Lds.*, xv. 615. [22] *Acts Parl. Scot.*, IX. App. p. 126, Note.

[23] *An Enquiry into the Causes of the Miscarriage of the Scots Colony at Darien.* Glasgow, 1700, pp. 14-15.

[24] Narcissus Luttrell, *Brief Historical Relation*, iii. 567; iv. 1, 5, 12, 17; Burnett, *History of His Own Times*, ii. 162.

were sacrificed to English jealousy. The King's Lord High Commissioner, the Marquis of Tweeddale, who had touched the Act with the sceptre, thus giving it the King's approval and the force of law, was also turned out.[25] The effect of this policy was to stir up the Jacobites to renewed activity. They were given an opportunity to embarrass King William, which they were not slow to make use of. It was to be their aim from now on to secure the success of this Company, which was sure to be a thorn in the side of their unloved monarch.

But to return to the Parliamentary investigation; for the Lords did not stop with the address, but continued their hearings. The West India merchants presented a paper in which they stated that they did not believe the Scots Act would affect them at present. As remedies they suggested freedom of trade, or that if the Scots did make any settlement in the West Indies, the English duties be entirely repaid upon export. The Leeward Island merchants offered as their opinion, in addition to suggestions already proposed, that by encouraging the trade to India greater quantities of goods would be imported, which would so reduce prices as to discourage the Scots from seeking that trade.[26] Apparently they had no idea that the Scots would one day be sending an expedition to their part of the world. In fact their influence was entirely lent to the cause of the London East India merchants, who were doubtless responsible for having their memorial printed with a few slight alterations, under the title: 'Some Remedies to Prevent the Mischiefs from the late Act of Parliament made in Scotland, in relation to the East-India trade.' (London? 1695.)[27]

The Levant Company's memorial contained no new suggestions, but reinforced the others in proposing the prohibition of English subjects joining with the Scots and the encouragement of English trade in those parts of the world to which the Act had particular relation, *i.e.* Africa and the Indies, East and West.[28]

On the 20th of December the House of Lords took up the while matter *in extenso*. After reading all the various memorials, definite proposals were considered looking toward the following objects: the prohibition of Englishmen joining the Scots; the establishment of the East India Company by act of Parliament;

[25] *MS. State Papers Scotland*, W. B., xvi. 280, 281.

[26] *Ho. of Lds. MSS.*, ii. 20.

[27] The only known copy is in the British Museum.

[28] *Ho. of Lds. MSS.*, ii. 21.

the special taxation of Scots ships entering English ports; and the enforcement of the navigation acts in the American plantations.[29] It was decided to proceed with a first draft of bills for carrying out these propositions, but interest in them flagged and none of them were passed.[30] So far as the Lords were concerned, the nine days' wonder was over, and their attention was now centred on quite another subject, the state of the coin. The hope of the East India Company that the interest aroused by the Scots Act might redound to their peculiar advantage was not destined to be fulfilled; although it was ordered together with other merchants to offer the Lords suggestions for an act for a chartered company. They replied by pointing out that the late act passed in Scotland left nothing to be desired as a model; they could not suggest a better precedent.[31] Both Lords and Commons seemed to favour establishing the East India Company by Act of Parliament as a means of defeating the efforts of the Scots. But towards the end of the session the matter was deferred for a year, because the Government feared that the increased opportunity for investment which would arise from the establishment of such a large stock company as was proposed would interfere with the Treasury's plans for raising money to carry on the war with France.[32]

The investigation, however, was not without certain definite results. One was to instigate the Commissioners of Customs to send the governors of all the plantations in America a circular letter regarding the enforcement of the navigation acts with especial reference to the Scots Company. This letter, after calling attention to the passing of the Act, its tendency to discourage the trade and navigation of England, its consideration by the Lords, and the address to the King, declared that if the Scots settled in America English commerce there would be utterly lost. With the letter were sent copies of the Act, the Address and the Answer to it as the best means of inciting them to execute vigorously the laws of England for the security of the plantation trade. Further, the Governors were requested to see that the customs officers performed their duties and gave strict account of every ship trading within their districts, guarding particularly against allowing any to pass to or from Scotland. Finally they

[29] *Ho. of Lds. MSS.*, ii. 6.

[30] *Jour. Ho. Lds.*, xv. 618 to 619.

[31] *Jour. Ho. Lds.*, xv. 639; *Ho. of Lds. MSS.*, ii. 30.

[32] Bruce, *Annals of the East India Company*, iii. 201, 202.

were reminded of the penalties which followed breaking the navigation acts.[33]

Another result was that the Commissioners of Customs were ordered by the Lords to render an account of the exports and imports for the past three years, a larger undertaking than the Commissioners cared to assume, for they estimated that such a report could not be performed in less than a year and a half, even with a dozen extra clerks working constantly on it.

An indirect result of the investigation was a general overhauling of the Admiralty, who were asked to show why so many difficulties had been put in the way of English commerce.[34] In fact, the excitement and interest aroused in high quarters by the Act was used by the English merchants in every possible way for their advantage.

The attention of the Commons had been called to the subject when the Address was sent for their concurrence on the 17th of December. They had then appointed a committee to examine into the methods taken for obtaining the Act, and to discover particularly whether corruption had been practised in promoting it.[35] Their interest waned and the matter dropped for a time, although the committee carried on its investigations. The chief interest of the Commons was in the state of the coin and the clipped money. Minor annoyances also engrossed their attention.[36] They even took the trouble to order that the constables of Westminster see to it that the passages in or about Westminster Hall be kept free of chairmen and coachmen, who were accustomed to stop and annoy members of the House, and that the postmaster attending the House should not deliver letters to members while the House was sitting. In the meantime the East India Company, fearing that the Commons might forget that the Scots Company still existed, petitioned on the 20th of January, 1696, stating that several ships were being fitted out in the Thames for the East Indies by persons whom they believed to be subscribers to the Scots Company.[37] At all events application had been made to the directors of the Company, who were then in London, for permission to trade in the East Indies under

[33] Jan. 9, 1696; *Ho. of Lds. MSS.*, ii. 23 and 481-3.

[34] *Jour. Ho. Lds.*, xv. 613.

[35] *Jour. Ho. Com.*, x. 365.

[36] *Ibid.*, xi. 367.

[37] *Jour. Ho. Com.*, xi. 398; Richard Edge to Roger Kenyon, *Hist. MSS. Com.*, XIV. iv. 396.

the privileges of the Act.[38] Accordingly the Commons ordered the aforementioned committee to make its report, which it did on the following day, presenting with it copies of the oath *de fideli* and the journal of the proceedings of the London directors.[39]

During their sittings the committee had examined Roderick Mackenzie, who, as might be expected, gave them little satisfactory information. He had heard, to be sure, that the fees for passing the Act amounted to £150, but he knew nothing positive about it as he was only the secretary, and had little to do with the finances of the Company. The report also includes an examination of Paterson, who gave much the same testimony as at the bar of the House of Lords. Other directors had been examined, who made the best excuses they could. None, of course, knew anything about the passage of the Act, nor how it had been secured. One confessed that he was a member of the English East India Company, and accordingly had been opposed to sending out an interloper. Another admitted that his subscription had been obtained by a practice familiar to promoters. He had been told, in short, that if he did not subscribe at once there were others who would get the advantage which he was offered first.[40] Upon hearing the committee's report, the oath, and the transactions of the Company, the Commons became quite excited and resolved that the directors had committed a high crime and misdemeanour in taking the oath *de fideli* and in raising money in England. It was resolved to impeach them, and a committee was appointed to prepare articles of impeachment.

This committee, however, had difficulty in getting evidence. Roderick Mackenzie refused to testify, and, on the request of the committee, was ordered by the House to be taken into the custody of the Sergeant-at-Arms. But he successfully eluded the search officers. Accordingly, on the 8th of February, the House moved to ask the King for a proclamation for apprehending the unfortunate secretary.[41] This was issued on the 13th, but he could not be found.[42] He was in hiding in London hoping to be called to Edinburgh. His absence put the committee at

[38] MS. East India Co. Court Book No. 37, Folio 46A, and MS. East India Co. Letters Out, p. 78.

[39] *Jour. Ho. Com.*, xi. 400. [40] *Ibid.*, xi. 400-407. [41] *Jour. Ho. Com.*, xi. 436.

[42] The only known copy of this proclamation was sold at auction in London last year for one guinea.

a great disadvantage, for he was almost the only person who might be made to give the evidence they desired.

By this time, however, it was felt that the Scots Company had been effectually demolished and that further Parliamentary action would only add unnecessarily to the growing irritation in Scotland over the insults that had been offered her Parliament and her citizens. It will be remembered that the House of Lords had believed and tried to prove that the passage of the Act had been obtained by bribery, and, furthermore, had summoned to its bar the delegates from Edinburgh, who included the popular Lord Belhaven. This action and the King's dismissal of his secretaries, who were well liked in Scotland, greatly irritated the country.[43] The attention of England was diverted to another subject: the discovery of the plot against the King's life.[44] Altogether it was deemed best to let the matter drop. So the committee never reported, and no articles of impeachment were ever presented.

Further action was in fact unnecessary.[45] Parliament had succeeded in frightening the Company out of England; the English subscribers were only too glad to withdraw their subscriptions; it was doubted whether the Scots could do much by themselves, although nothing could be done to prevent their trying.

The history of the Company would have been far different had Parliament allowed it to have the benefit of English capital and experience. It was the intention of Paterson and the promoters to create an essentially British concern. Both the stock and the directorate were to be equally divided between England and Scotland. But the action of the English Parliament resulted in making the enterprise thoroughly Scottish. The Scots, insulted and thrown on their own resources, were incited to hurl themselves headlong into an undertaking far greater than was warranted by the extent of their capital or the experience of their merchants. Although it is doubtful whether the Scots would have been willing to allow the headquarters of the Company to remain long in London, the English subscribers would undoubtedly have made strenuous and probably successful efforts to prevent the Company from embarking on such a foolish enterprise as the Darien

[43] *An Enquiry into the Causes of the Miscarriage of the Scots Colony at Darien*, p. 3; Narcissus Luttrell, *Brief Historical Relation*, iii. 535.

[44] Narcissus Luttrell, *Brief Historical Relation*, iv. 21.

[45] Richard Edge to Roger Kenyon, *Hist. MSS. Com.*, XIV. iv. 366.

Scheme. The Company would have carried on trade with Africa and the Indies, and had a comparatively uneventful career. But the English Parliament had now endowed it with the enthusiastic backing of the whole Scottish nation.[46] Its support became a matter of national honour, and its history was destined to be tragic rather than commonplace.[47]

HIRAM BINGHAM.

[46] '"Twas the notice the parliament of Ingland first took of it made the wholl nation throng in to have some share, and I'm of opinion the resentments people are acted by, are the greatest supplys that furnishes life to that affaire.'—Adam Cockburn, Lord Justice Clerk, to Lord Tullibardine, 18 Dec., 1697, *Hist. MSS. Commission*, XII. vii. 58.

[47] J. Hill Burton, *History of Scotland*, 1897, viii. 19-28.

The Pentland Rising and the Battle of Rullion Green

THE following letter—extracted from the collection of the Carte MSS. in the Bodleian library—must of course be read in connection with Mr. Sandford Terry's detailed study of the Pentland Rising and the battle of Rullion Green, and is published as a supplement, not a criticism, of that work. The first result of a close comparison of the two is an acknowledgment of the historical insight that has produced out of complex (and sometimes conflicting) evidence a narrative which a document so important as the official despatch of the King's Major-General does, substantially, nothing but confirm.

The main facts of General Drummond's career are already known: that he was a cadet of the Madertie branch of the family—that he supported the Royalist cause both in England, where he was imprisoned after Worcester, and in Scotland, where he was an emissary from Charles II. to the uneasy forces under Glencairn. Mews, the Royalist agent and reporter, says that without him the adventure would have come to an even speedier end than it found at Lochgarry in 1654—he being 'not only a good soldier, but a sober rationall man,' in which case, as Mews said, he would have been an 'extraordinary losse' to that company. He had some personal intercourse with Cromwell, and Charles, at all events in exile, was his 'affectionate friend.' After the failure of the rising he found employment with Dalziel in the foreign levies of the Czar Michaelovitch, and returned with that officer to Scotland in 1665, bringing with him several of the distinctions—and, Bishop Burnet thought, too many of the methods—of Russian military service. He was appointed Major-General of the new Scotch forces, and one of his earliest duties was to take the field with Dalziel's van for the reduction of the rebellious Covenanters in the south-west.

Mr. Terry's survey of the march is based on abundant evidence—from Wallace, who commanded the insurgents, from

Veitch, who served in their ranks, from James Turner, who was throughout a prisoner in their hands. Drummond himself was aware that the enemy had the better of him in the matter of scouting intelligence—and his own was notably accurate. His report only confirms Turner's praise of the marching quality of Wallace's foot, since it appears that he was all through even further behind than was believed. He was at Strathaven not, as Wallace asserts, on the night of the 24th of November, but of the 25th, to which date a despatch from the Scotch Privy Council to the Commissioner Rothes (*Lauderdale Papers*, i. 246) bears independent witness. His foot crossed Lanark ford on the night, not the morning, of the 26th, and on the following morning, when Blackwood reported him to Wallace as 'not nearer than Calder, if there,' he was in fact marching out of his Lanark quarters. 'Calder Torphicens hous,' where Charles Maitland told his brother Lauderdale they rested the night of the 27th, becomes in Drummond's letter 'tarfichens hather,' and Bathgate has a somewhat similar (but obscure) suffix.

As to the battle Mr. Terry appears to have steered a middle course among the various accounts of witnesses with differing sympathies, capabilities, and points of vision, and between his version and Drummond's,—which yielded perhaps to official restraints—there is no serious discrepancy. The general outline seems to be that after the repulse of Drummond's fore party there were three separate attacks by Dalziel's right wing—the two first unfavourable to him—the third so successful that he seized the occasion to engage his left—and by a simultaneous advance of his whole line beat in the enemy's horse upon their foot and routed them, the darkness alone staying his pursuit. The accounts of the two leaders, Wallace and Drummond, agree well together, down to details such as the hand-to-hand fight with swords in the first main attack, and the incautious advance of Wallace's right wing of horse after the third. Maitland of Halton, though apt to be impulsive in his figures, agrees in outlines. Where he differs we may take it that the general was right. Halton was an officer and a gentleman, and wrote (and spelt) as such. Drummond was an old campaigner and a man of letters—(his funeral sermon compares him favourably with Agricola, Cato, Epaminondas, and Julius Caesar Scaliger)—and his despatch is both business-like and picturesque. In one point he corrects the accepted version. Dalziel's loss was evidently less trivial than was supposed—a fact which might have consoled the

Covenanters in the hardships of their flight. It is noticeable that the very phrase about 'cashiered preachers' to which Wodrow takes exception in the accounts of various English historians occurs at the end of this letter, which may have been the official source of the error—pleasantly termed a 'plain falsehood' by Wodrow. M. SIDGWICK.

Carte MSS. lxxii. f. iii.

Letter from Major-General William Drummond to Lord Rothes.

Pentland Novemb^{r} 29th 1666

May it please yo^{r} Gr^{ce}

I beg you be not offended for my soe long silence, for I had noe resolucon to write that w^{ch} would only have vexed you, nor could I untill this time free you from the anxiety that I am sure troubled yo^{r} heart, & that yo^{r} Gr^{ce} might know pfectly all Our proceedings, I shall begin at Our March & give you a short acc^{t} of all passages untill this day; Upon Sunday the 18th Inst. Our march began from all Our severall Quarters & upon tuesday the 20th wee met att Glasco, wee spent Wednesday in preparacons for what wee wanted, whereof Bandeliers was a cheif defect; and in consultacons with My Lord Glasco & y^{e} other Noblemen who Comanded, thursday the 22th the horse watched killmarnock & the foot upon friday at Much adoe, there wee understood that the rebells were convened at Machlin with all their force & a resolucon to fight us, they had been in Air & taken about 200 Armes of all sorts out of the tolbooth, w^{ch} had been formerly gathered out of y^{e} Countrey when it was disarmed, all the Gentlemens houses they searched for horses & armes And (I beleive) found diverse ready to their hands, w^{ch} must bee judged as taken by force. Saturday the 24th wee came to Machlin, the rebells were gone to Comnock & from thence to the Moor kirk of kyll & to Douglas, wee judged & not amisse that they designed for Oltsdale (Clydesdale ?) Hanylton & Glasco & there upon Sunday took a neerer way to stop that course & marched through Evendal to Streven (Strathaven), where wee had notice that they were at Lathmahago (Lesmahagow) but 4 miles from us, that Sunday they knowing of us as they used to have quick Intelligence of Our motions in a Countrey of their owne freinds disaffected to us, they passed the river Glyde to Lenricke (Lanark), their foot in 2 boates w^{ch} Imediately they sunk, & forded with their horses not wthout danger, the river being great. Upon Monday the 26th Our fore partie had a view of y^{m} on the rivers syde over agst us, as if they meant to forbid Our passage, but when Our body of horse began to appeare, they marched of & kept a lusty rearguard with more order then could have been hoped from them, wee past the ford instantly deep & strong, w^{ch} made us very doubtfull whither it was wadable by the foot & followed them 4 miles on their reare, but in regard of the distance from Our foot & approach of y^{e} night, could not with any reason engage with them, wee gott over the foot that night with much danger but not one lost, tuesday wee followed the rebells track for 8 miles through a black mosse & marking their way to make for huhghgour (?), wee were affrayed of Edenburgh & bent Our course to tarfichens hather (?), the rebells had marched on Monday from Lenrick to Bathkt Huhthgour (Bathgate —— ?) & were at Collintone

2 Myles from Edenburgh, on Tuesday the 27th by midday to Our admiration whatever their designe or invitacon was for soe desperate a March they found their plot p'vented, wee judged rightly they would gett of to Bigger, & betook us to fall in their way, going over the Pentland Hills at Currie, Our fore party of about 100 horse discovered them on their march towards Linton the bigger way near a place called Glencors kirk & with great boldnes sett upon them, & endured the danger to face all their strength, horse & foot, untill Our Cavalry farre behind came up & that spent near 2 houres, Soe had God blinded these fooles to neglect their advantage, Our party being in a ground whence they could not come of, Some sharpe charges past in this time, wch the rebells gave & received with desperate resolucon to Our prejudice, at last Our horse comes on & gave breathing to that weary party, but Our foot was yet 4 miles from us, wee found it convenient to draw from that ground very advantageous for their foot, wch they after much consideracon began to imploy agst us, but wee prevented them & gott of a little to a better ground where they made a fashion to annoy us without any gaine, soe soon as Our foot came up wee put Ourselves in order & embattled in a faire plaine upon their Noses, they upon the hill above did the like but gave us noe disturbance thô well they might, by this time the sun was sett, wee must make haste and advanced a partie of horse & foot from Our right hand to assault their left wing of horse wch instantly came downe & met them, & there the work began, wee fought obstinately a long time wth swords untill they mixed like chessmen in a bag, wee advanced Our right wing & they their left to give reliefe, there againe it was disputed toughly, then came a strong partie of foot from their body & forced our right wing back to the foot in some disorder, but this was instantly rectified, their right wing of horse came from their ground foolishly & crosses their foot, apprehending their left wing to bee in distresse, wherein they were mistaken & soe gave our left wing their Slack, wch opportunity wee had hold on & there went their Cavalrie in disorder, Our whole body then advanced & beat in their horse upon their foot, then confusion & flight followed, wee pursued in the dark, killed all the foot & but for the night & steep hills had wholy destroyed them, Some prisoners there are fitt for examples, I know not how many but I conjecture not above 140, for there was sound payment, Our losse I cannot tell, but it is greater then many of their Skins were worth, their number was about 15 or 1600, & would without doubt have encreased, if God had not confounded their Imaginacons & rebellious dispositions, upon Monday the rebells swore the Covenant at Lenrick & all to die in defence of it, most of these who led their troupes were cashiered preachers, now I trust yor Grce is at ease. I am

Yor Grces
Most obedient & most humble Servt
W. DRUMOND.

Endorsed. Leter from Major Genrll Drumond to the E. of Rothess of the defeat of the Rebells in Scotland. 29 Nov. 66. Rec. 4th Dec. 1666 in a letter from the Ld Arlington.

The 'Scalacronica' of Sir Thomas Gray

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

AFTER the death of Edward the First after the Conquest, his son, Edward the Second, reigned in great tribulation and adversity. He was not industrious, neither was he beloved by the great men of his realm; albeit he was liberal in giving, and amiable far beyond measure towards those whom he loved and exceedingly sociable with his intimates. Also, in person he was one of the most powerful men in his realm. He took to wife Isabel, daughter of Philip le Beau, King of France, whom MS. he married at Amiens and brought to England, where they were fo. 206 crowned in London with great solemnity. Then the king and his said wife Isabel passed again into France, to Paris, to treat of his affairs in Gascony, when the said King Edward entertained the said King of France at Saint-Germain-en-Prés, which feast was greatly spoken of at the time.

At which time it was reported to the said King Philip of France that the wives of his sons had misbehaved. He had three sons—Philip, Louis, and Charles—by his wife the daughter of the King of Navarre (by whose inheritance he was King of Navarre), the mother of which wife was married to Edmund, brother of Edward the First of England, after the Conquest, by whom he begot Thomas and Henry, afterwards Earls of Lancaster. He [King Philip] also had one daughter, this same Isabel, Queen of England. He was informed, then, that the said ladies [his daughters-in-law] had committed adultery *par amours* with knights of his Court, which thing weighed heavily upon his heart. Wherefore, after the departure of the said King of England, the said King of France enquired of Philip Dawnay, an old knight of his Council, what should be done to those who

had intrigued with the wives of the king's sons and princes of the blood royal of France.

'Sire,' replied the worthy gentleman,[1] 'they deserve to be flayed alive.'

'Thou hast pronounced judgment,' said the king to him; 'they are your own two sons, who shall suffer the punishment according to your judgment.'[2]

One of them was condemned immediately; the other escaped to England, but was taken at York and sent back to the said King of France, for which the King of England received much blame from murmurs of the Commons, seeing that the said knight had come for succour to his realm. The said knight was flayed alive; two of the ladies were put to a shameful death; the third was enclosed in a high wall without meat or drink, where she died.

It was generally reported among the common people that this scandal was communicated to the King of France by his daughter Isabel, Queen of England, although this was supposed by many people to be an untruth. It was judged and declared by the Commons that, because of this cruelty, neither the father [King Philip] nor the sons should live long. The father died shortly after.[3] His three sons aforesaid became Kings of France, one after the other, for a short time. The eldest of them,[4] who was King of Navarre during his father's life, had no offspring[5] but one daughter,[6] who afterwards married the Count of Evreux, and became King of Navarre in right of his said wife. The second brother[7] had by his wife, daughter of the Count of Artois, three daughters, who afterwards shared the succession to Artois. The Duke of Burgundy married one, the Count of Flanders another, and the Lord of Faucony took the third as his mistress. Charles, the third brother,[8] and last to become King, died without offspring, whereupon the succession to France should by right have devolved upon Edward [III.] of England,

[1] *Le prudhom.* [2] *Com iuge auez.* Omitted in *Maitland Club Ed.*

[3] 29th Nov., 1314. [4] Louis X., *le Hutin*, d. 5th June, 1316.

[5] He had a posthumous son who died an infant.

[6] Succeeded as Joanna II., Queen of Navarre, on the death of her brother-in-law, Charles IV.

[7] Philip V. d. 3rd Jan., 1322.

[8] Charles IV., *le Beau*, d. 13th Jan., 1328, last of the Capets. At his death the crowns of France and Navarre were again separated.

son of Isabel, sister of the said three brothers and kings, as the nearest heir male,[1] for at [the time of] the decease of the said Charles, their uncle, the last king of the three brothers, the daughters of the two aforesaid brothers and kings had no male issue, wherefore the said Edward, son of Isabel of England, was the nearest heir male. Nevertheless, as will be recorded hereafter, for want of good advice, and because he was young and entangled with other matters, he lodged no challenge whatever upon the death of his uncle Charles, so that another collateral,[2] the son of the uncle of the aforesaid Charles,[3] was crowned King by means of his supporters, especially of Robert of Artois (to whom he was afterwards the greatest enemy), because no other challenged the right at the proper time, nor until a considerable time after, as will be recorded hereafter; which [thing] is correct, and ought to be a notable thing and remembered everywhere.

At this time Thomas de Gray[4] was warden of the castle of Cupar and Fife,[5] and as he was travelling out of England from the King's coronation to the said castle, Walter de Bickerton, a knight of Scotland, who was an adherent of Robert de Brus, having espied the return of the said Thomas, placed himself in ambush with more than four hundred men by the way the said Thomas intended to pass, whereof the said Thomas was warned when scarcely half a league from the ambush. He had not more than six-and-twenty men-at-arms with him, and perceived that he could not avoid an encounter. So, with the approval of his people, he took the road straight towards the ambush, having given his grooms a standard and ordered them to follow behind at not too short interval.

The enemy mounted their horses and formed for action, thinking that they [the English] could not escape from them. The said Thomas, with his people, who were very well mounted, struck spurs to his horse, and charged the enemy right in the centre of their column, bearing many to the ground in his course by the shock of his horse and lance. Then, turning rein, came

MS. fo. 207

[1] *Al plus prochain heire masle.* He means the nearest male in blood, for Edward III., as Isabel's son, was not technically heir male.

[2] The insertion here of a full stop instead of a comma in the *Maitland Club Ed.* makes nonsense of this long sentence.

[3] Philip V. de Valois, eldest son of Charles, Count of Valois, brother of Philip IV.

[4] Father of the chronicler.

[5] *Gardein du chastel de Coupir et de Fif.*

back in the same manner and charged again, and once again returned through the thick of the troop, which so encouraged his people that they all followed him in like manner, whereby they overthrew so many of the enemy, their horses stampeding along the road. When they [the enemy] rose from the ground, they perceived the grooms of the said Thomas coming up in good order, and began to fly to a dry peat moss which was near, wherefore almost all [the others] began to fly to the moss, leaving their horses for their few assailants. The said Thomas and his men could not get near them on horseback, wherefore he caused their horses to be driven before them along the road to the said castle, where at night they had a booty of nine score saddled horses.

Another time, on a market day, the town being full of people from the neighbourhood, Alexander Frisel, who was an adherent[1] of Robert de Brus, was ambushed with a hundred men-at-arms about half a league from the said castle, having sent others of his people to rifle a hamlet on the other side of the castle. The said Thomas, hearing the uproar, mounted a fine charger before his people could get ready, and went to see what was ado. The enemy spurred out from their ambush before the gates of the said castle, so doing because they well knew that he (Sir Thomas) had gone forth. The said Thomas, perceiving this, returned at a foot's pace through the town of Cupar, at the end whereof stood the castle, where he had to enter on horseback, [and] where they had occupied the whole street. When he came near them he struck spurs into his horse; of those who advanced against him, he struck down some with his spear, others with the shock of his horse, and, passing through them all, dismounted at the gate, drove his horse in, and slipped inside the barrier, where he found his people assembled.

This King Edward the Second after the Conquest bestowed great affection during his father's life upon Piers de Gaveston, a young man of good Gascon family; whereat his father became so much concerned[2] lest he [Piers] should lead his son astray, that he caused him [Piers] to be exiled from the realm, and even made his son and his nephew,[3] Thomas of Lancaster, and other magnates swear that the exile of the said Piers should be for ever irrevocable. But soon after

[1] *Qenherdaunt estoit*, misprinted *qenderdaunt* in *Maitland Club Ed.*

[2] *Prist malencoly.*

[3] He was not the King's nephew, but a distant cousin, son of Edmund 'Crouchback,' Earl of Lancaster.

the death of the father, the son caused the said Piers to be recalled suddenly, and made him take to wife his sister's daughter, one of Gloucester's daughters, and made him Earl of Cornwall. Piers became very magnificent, liberal, and well-bred in manner, but somewhat[1] haughty and supercilious, whereat some of the great men of the realm took deep offence. They planned his destruction while he was serving the King in the Scottish war. He had caused the town of Dundee to be fortified, and had behaved himself more rudely there than was agreeable to the gentlemen of the country, so that he had to return to the King because of the opposition of the barons.[2] On his way back they surprised and took him at Scarborough, but he was delivered to Aymer de Valence upon condition that he was to be taken before the King, from whose [Aymer's] people he was retaken near Oxford, and brought before the Earl of Lancaster, who had him beheaded close to Warwick,[3] whereat arose the King's mortal hate, which endured for ever between them. MS. fo. 207b

Adam Banaster, a knight bachelor of the county of Lancaster, led a revolt against the said earl by instigation of the King; but he could not sustain it, and was taken and beheaded by order of the said earl, who had made long marches in following his [Banaster's] people.

During the dispute between the King and the said earl, Robert de Bruce, who had already risen during the life of the King's father, renewed his strength in Scotland, claiming authority over the realm of Scotland, and subdued many of the lands in Scotland which were before subdued by and in submission to the King of England; and [this was] chiefly the result of bad government by the King's officials, who administered them [the lands] too harshly in their private interests.

The castles of Roxburgh[4] and Edinburgh[5] were captured and dismantled, which castles were in the custody of foreigners, Roxburgh [being] in charge of Guillemyng Fenygges,[6] a knight of Burgundy, from whom James de Douglas captured the said castle upon the night of Shrove Tuesday,[7] the said

[1] *En party.*

[2] *Pur debate des barouns*, or 'because of the displeasure of the barons.'

[3] A.D. 1312. [4] 6th March, 1314. [5] Lent, 1314.

[6] Sir William de Fiennes. [7] *La nuyt de quarrem pernaunt.*

William being slain by an arrow as he was defending the great tower. Peres Lebaud, a Gascon knight, was Sheriff of Edinburgh, from whom the people of Thomas Randolph, Earl of Moray, who had besieged the said castle, took it at the highest part of the rock, where he suspected no danger. The said Peter became Scots in the service of Robert de Brus, who afterwards accused him of treason, and caused him to be hanged and drawn. It was said that he suspected him [Peres] because he was too outspoken, believing him nevertheless to be English at heart, doing his best not to give him [Bruce] offence.

The said King Edward planned an expedition to these parts, where, in [attempting] the relief of the castle of Stirling, he was defeated, and a great number of his people were slain, [including] the Earl of Gloucester and other right noble persons; and the Earl of Hereford was taken at Bothwell, whither he had beaten retreat, where he was betrayed by the governor. He was released [in exchange] for the wife of Robert de Brus and the Bishop of St. Andrews.[1]

As to the manner in which this discomfiture befel, the chronicles explain that after the Earl of Atholl had captured the town of St. John[2] for the use of Robert de Brus from William Oliphant, captain [thereof] for the King of England, being at that time an adherent of his [Edward's], although shortly after he deserted him, the said Robert marched in force before the castle of Stirling, where Philip de Moubray, knight, having command of the said castle for the King of England, made terms with the said Robert de Brus to surrender the said castle, which he had besieged, unless he [de Moubray] should be relieved: that is, unless the English army came within three leagues of the said castle within eight days of Saint John's day in the summer next to come, he would surrender the said castle.[3] The said King of England came thither for that reason, where the said constable Philip met him at three leagues from the castle, on Sunday the vigil of Saint John, and told him that there was no occasion for him

MS. fo. 208

[1] William de Lamberton, from whom Bruce received more advice and encouragement than from almost any other at the outset of his enterprise.

[2] Perth.

[3] It was not with King Robert, but with his brother Edward, that this agreement was made; much to Robert's displeasure, whose main strategy it was to avoid a pitched battle.

to approach any nearer, for he considered himself as relieved. Then he told him how the enemy had blocked the narrow roads in the forest.[1]

[But] the young troops would by no means stop, but held their way. The advanced guard, whereof the Earl of Gloucester had command, entered the road[2] within the Park, where they were immediately received roughly by the Scots who had occupied the passage. Here Peris de Mountforth, knight, was slain with an axe by the hand of Robert de Brus, as was reported.[3]

While the said advanced guard were following this road, Robert Lord de Clifford and Henry de Beaumont, with three hundred men-at-arms, made a circuit upon the other side[4] of the wood towards the castle, keeping the open ground. Thomas Randolph, Earl of Moray, Robert de Brus's nephew, who was leader of the Scottish advanced guard,[5] hearing that his uncle had repulsed the advanced guard of the English on the other side of the wood, thought that he must have his share, and issuing from the wood with his division marched across the open ground towards the two afore-named lords.

Sir Henry de Beaumont called to his men: 'Let us retire a little; let them come on; give them room!'[6]

'Sir,' said Sir Thomas Gray,[7] 'I doubt that whatever you give them now, they will have all too soon.'

'Very well!' exclaimed the said Henry, 'if you are afraid, be off!'

'Sir,' answered the said Thomas, 'it is not from fear that I shall fly this day.' So saying he spurred in between him [Beaumont] and Sir William Deyncourt, and charged into the thick of the enemy. William was killed, Thomas was taken

[1] The Torwood.

[2] The Roman Road, running through the Park which Alexander III. had enclosed for the chase.

[3] It was Sir Henry de Bohun, nephew of the Earl of Hereford, who fell in single combat with the King of Scots.

[4] The east side next the Carse.

[5] He commanded the central of the three divisions which formed Bruce's front.

[6] Randolph's division being entirely on foot, of course the English squadron could have pushed on to establish communication with Stirling Castle, for which purpose they had been detached. It was characteristic of the chivalrous ceremony of the day that Beaumont should have insisted on awaiting attack from the Scots.

[7] Father of the chronicler.

prisoner, his horse being killed on the pikes, and he himself carried off with them [the Scots] on foot when they marched off, having utterly routed the squadron of the said two lords. Some of whom [the English] fled to the castle, others to the king's army, which having already left the road through the wood had debouched upon a plain near the water of Forth beyond Bannockburn, an evil, deep, wet marsh, where the said English army unharnessed and remained all night, having sadly lost confidence and being too much disaffected by the events of the day.

The Scots in the wood thought they had done well enough for the day, and were on the point of decamping in order to march during the night into the Lennox, a stronger country, when Sir Alexander de Seton, who was in the service of England and had come thither with the King, secretly left the English army, went to Robert de Brus in the wood, and said to him: 'Sir, this is the time if ever you intend to undertake to reconquer Scotland. The English have lost heart and are discouraged, and expect nothing but a sudden, open attack.'[1]

MS. fo. 208b

Then he described their condition, and pledged his head, on pain of being hanged and drawn, that if he [Bruce] would attack them on the morrow he would defeat them easily without [much] loss. At whose [Seton's] instigation they [the Scots] resolved to fight, and at sunrise on the morrow marched out of the wood in three divisions of infantry. They directed their course boldly upon the English army, which had been under arms all night, with their horses bitted. They [the English] mounted in great alarm, for they were not accustomed to dismount to fight on foot; whereas the Scots had taken a lesson from the Flemings, who before that had at Courtrai defeated on foot the power of France. The aforesaid Scots came in line of 'schiltroms,'[2] and attacked the English columns, which were jammed together and could not operate against

[1] This incident is important, and does not appear in other chronicles of Bannockburn. Sir Thomas Gray, father of the writer, was at the time a prisoner in the Scottish camp, and probably communicated the information direct to his son. It is true that Sir Alexander de Seton transferred his allegiance from Edward II. to King Robert about this time. In March, 1322-3, he proceeded with Sir William de Mountfichet on a mission to the English Court from King Robert.

[2] The 'schiltrom' or *shield troop* was the favourite formation of the Scottish infantry. It was a dense column, oval in form, resembling in effect a modern square.

them [the Scots], so direfully were their horses impaled on the pikes.[1] The troops in the English rear fell back upon the ditch of Bannockburn, tumbling one over the other.

The English squadrons being thrown into confusion by the thrust of pikes upon the horses, began to fly. Those who were appointed to [attend upon] the King's rein, perceiving the disaster, led the King by the rein off the field towards the castle, and off he went, though much against the grain.[2] As the Scottish knights, who were on foot, laid hold of the housing of the King's charger in order to stop him, he struck out so vigorously behind him with a mace that there was none whom he touched that he did not fell to the ground.

As those who had the King's rein were thus drawing him always forward, one of them, Giles de Argentin, a famous knight who had lately come over sea from the wars of the Emperor Henry of Luxembourg, said to the king:

'Sire, your rein was committed to me; you are now in safety; there is your castle where your person may be safe. I am not accustomed to fly, nor am I going to begin now. I commend you to God!'

Then, setting spurs to his horse, he returned into the mellay, where he was slain.

The King's charger, having been piked, could go no further; so he mounted afresh on a courser and was taken round the Torwood, and [so] through the plains of Lothian.[3] Those who went with him were saved; all the rest came to grief. The King escaped with great difficulty, travelling thence to Dunbar, where Patrick, Earl of March, received him honourably, and put his castle at his disposal, and even evacuated the place, removing all his people, so that there might be neither doubt nor suspicion that he would do nothing short of his devoir to his lord, for at that time he [Dunbar] was his liegeman. Thence the King went by sea to Berwick and afterwards to the south. MS. fo. 209

Edward de Brus, brother to Robert, King of Scotland,[4] desiring to be a king [also], passed out of Scotland into Ireland with a great army in hopes of conquering it.[5] He remained

[1] The full stop here is omitted in the *Maitland Club Ed.*, making nonsense of the passage.

[2] *Maugre qil enhust qi enuyte sen departist.* [3] *Lownesse.*

[4] This is the first occasion on which Gray acknowledges King Robert's title.

[5] More probably King Robert sent him there to create a diversion favourable to the Scottish war.

there two years and a half, performing there feats of arms, inflicting great destruction both upon provender and in other ways, and conquering much territory, which would form a splendid romance were it all recounted. He proclaimed himself King of the kings of Ireland;[1] [but] he was defeated and slain at Dundalk by the English of that country,[2] [because] through over confidence he would not wait for reinforcements, which had arrived lately, and were not more than six leagues distant.

At the same time the King of England sent the Earl of Arundel as commander on the March of Scotland, who was repulsed at Lintalee in the forest of Jedworth,[3] by James de Douglas, and Thomas de Richmond was slain. The said earl then retreated to the south without doing any more.

On another occasion the said James defeated the garrison of Berwick at Scaithmoor, where a number of Gascons were slain.[4] Another time there happened a disaster on the marches at Berwick, by treachery of the false traitors of the marches, where was slain Robert de Nevill;[5] which Robert shortly before had slain Richard fitz Marmaduke, cousin of Robert de Brus, on the old bridge of Durham, because of a quarrel between them [arising] out of jealousy which should be reckoned the greater lord. Therefore, in order to obtain the King's grace and pardon for this offence, Nevill began to serve in the King's war, wherein he died.

At the same period the said James de Douglas, with the assistance of Patrick, Earl of March, captured Berwick from the English,[6] by means of the treason of one in the town, Peter de Spalding.[7] The castle held out for eleven weeks after, and at last capitulated to the Scots in default of relief, because it was not provisioned. The constable, Roger de Horsley, lost there an eye by an arrow.

Aymer de Valence, Earl of Pembroke, travelling to the court of Rome, was captured by a Burgundian, John de la Moiller, taken into the empire and ransomed for 20,000 silver livres,

[1] 2nd May, 1316. [2] 5th Oct., 1318.

[3] In 1317. Not of the House of Brittany, as Hailes follows Barbour in stating, but a Yorkshire knight, owner of Burton-Constable.

[4] *Ou furount mors toutes playnes de Gascoins;* 'where the Gascons were slain to a man.'

[5] The 'Peacock of the North.' [6] 28th March, 1318.

[7] Barbour calls him "ane burgess Sym of Spalding."

because the said John declared that he had done the King of England service, and that the King was owing him his pay.

This James de Douglas was now very busy in Northumberland. MS. Robert de Brus caused all the castles of Scotland, except Dun- fo. 209b barton, to be dismantled. This Robert de Brus caused William de Soulis to be arrested, and caused him to be confined in the castle of Dunbarton for punishment in prison, accusing him of having conspired with other great men of Scotland for his [Robert's] undoing, to whom [de Soulis] they were attorned subjects, which the said William confessed by his acknowledgment. David de Brechin, John Logie, and Gilbert Malherbe were hanged and drawn in the town of St. John,[1] and the corpse of Roger de Mowbray was brought on a litter[2] before the judges in the Parliament of Scone, and condemned. This conspiracy was discovered by Murdach of Menteith, who himself became earl afterwards. He had lived long in England in loyalty to the King,[3] and, in order to discover this conspiracy, went to [de Soulis's] house.[4] He became Earl of Menteith by consent of his niece, daughter of his elder brother, who, after his death at another time, became countess.

The King of England undertook scarcely anything against Scotland, and thus lost as much by indolence as his father had conquered; and also a number of fortresses within his marches of England, as well as a great part of Northumberland which revolted against him.[5]

Gilbert de Middleton in the bishoprick of Durham, plundered two Cardinals who came to consecrate the Bishop, and seized Louis de Beaumont, Bishop of Durham, and his brother Henry de Beaumont, because the King had caused his [Gilbert's] cousin Adam de Swinburne to be arrested, because he had spoken too frankly to him about the condition of the Marches.

This Gilbert, with adherence of others upon the Marches, rode upon a foray into Cleveland, and committed other great

[1] Perth.

[2] *Sur une lettre*, in the original, but evidently the word ought to be *litiere*.

[3] Which King? Edward of England or Robert Bruce to whom he revealed the plot. The expression is: *qi longement auoit demore en Engleterre a la foy le roy*.

[4] This passage is obscure also, *Qi pur decouerer cet couyne sen ala a lostel.*

[5] The omission of a full stop here in the MS. makes nonsense of this paragraph.

destruction, having the assistance of nearly all Northumberland, except the castles of Bamborough, Alnwick, and Norham, of which the two first named were treating with the enemy, the one by means of hostages, the other by collusion,[1] when the said Gilbert was taken through treachery of his own people in the castle of Mitford by William de Felton, Thomas de Heton, and Robert de Horncliff, and was hanged and drawn in London.

On account of all this, the Scots had become so bold that they subdued the Marches of England and cast down the castles of Wark and Harbottle, so that hardly was there an Englishman who dared to withstand them. They had subdued all Northumberland by means of the treachery of the false people of the country. So that scarcely could they [the Scots] find anything to do upon these Marches, except at Norham,
MS. where a [certain] knight, Thomas de Gray,[2] was in garrison
fo. 210 with his kinsfolk. It would be too lengthy a matter to relate [all] the combats and deeds of arms and evils for default of provender, and sieges which happened to him during the eleven years that he remained [there] during such an evil and disastrous period for the English. It would be wearisome to tell the story of the less [important] of his combats in the said castle.[3] Indeed it was so that, after the town of Berwick was taken out of the hands of the English, the Scots had got so completely the upper hand and were so insolent that they held the English to be of almost no account, who [the English] concerned themselves no more with the war,[4] but allowed it to cease.

At which time, at a great feast of lords and ladies in the county of Lincoln, a young page[5] brought a war helmet, with a gilt crest on the same, to William Marmion, knight, with a letter from his lady-love commanding him to go to the most dangerous place in Great Britain and [there] cause this helmet to be famous. Thereupon it was decided by the knights [present] that he should go to Norham, as the most dangerous [and] adventurous place in the country. The said William betook himself to Norham, where, within four days of his arrival, Sir Alexander de Mowbray, brother of Sir Philip de Mowbray, at that time governor of Berwick, came before the castle of Norham with the most spirited chivalry of the Marches

[1] *Par affinite.* [2] Father of the chronicler.

[3] *Et ia le meinz aucuns de sez journes en le dit chastel enuoit lestoir deviser.*

[4] *La guer,* misprinted *quer* in *Maitland Club Ed.* [5] *Vn damoisel faye.*

of Scotland, and drew up before the castle at the hour of noon with more than eight score men-at-arms. The alarm was given in the castle as they were sitting down to dinner. Thomas de Gray, the constable, went with his garrison to his barriers, saw the enemy near drawn up in order of battle, looked behind[1] him, and beheld the said knight, William Marmion, approaching on foot, all glittering with gold and silver, marvellous finely attired, with the helmet on his head. The said Thomas, having been well informed of the reason for his coming [to Norham], cried aloud to him:

'Sir knight, you have come as knight errant to make that helmet famous, and it is more meet that deeds of chivalry be done on horseback than afoot, when that can be managed conveniently. Mount your horse: there are your enemies: set spurs and charge into their midst. May I deny my God if I do not rescue your person, alive or dead, or perish in the attempt!'

The knight mounted a beautiful charger, spurred forward, [and] charged into the midst of the enemy, who struck him down, wounded him in the face, [and] dragged him out of the saddle to the ground.

At this moment, up came the said Thomas with all his garrison, with levelled lances, [which] they drove into the bowels of the horses so that they threw their riders. They repulsed the mounted enemy, raised the fallen knight, re-mounting him upon his own horse, put the enemy to flight, [of whom] some were left dead in the first encounter, [and] captured fifty valuable horses. The women of the castle [then] brought out horses to their men, who mounted and gave chase, slaying those whom they could overtake. Thomas de Gray caused to be killed in the Yair Ford, a Fleming [named] Cryn, a sea captain,[2] a pirate, who was a great partisan of Robert de Brus. The others who escaped were pursued to the nunnery of Berwick. MS. fo. 210b

Another time, Adam de Gordon,[3] a baron of Scotland,

[1] *Derier ly*, misprinted *derier* in *Maitland Club Ed.*

[2] *Vn amirail de la mere, vn robbour.* This appears to be the same man as the pirate John Crab, whose engineering skill enabled Walter the Steward to repulse the attack on Berwick in 1319. (*See* Barbour's *Brus*, cxxx. and Bain's *Calendar*, iii. 126.)

[3] Formerly a supporter of the English King; but, being suspected in 1313, was imprisoned in Roxburgh Castle. (Bain's *Calendar*, ii. No. 337.)

having mustered more than eight score men-at-arms, came before the said castle of Norham, thinking to raid the cattle which were grazing outside the said castle. The young fellows of the garrison rashly hastened to the furthest end of the town, which at that time was in ruins, and began to skirmish. The Scottish enemy surrounded them. The said men of the sortie defended themselves briskly, keeping themselves within the old walls. At that moment Thomas de Gray, the said constable, came out of the castle with his garrison, [and], perceiving his people in such danger from the enemy, said to his vice-constable: 'I'll hand over to you this castle, albeit I have it in charge to hold in the King's cause, unless I actually drink of the same cup that my people over there have to drink.'

Then he set forward at great speed, having [within] of common people and others, scarcely more than sixty all told. The enemy, perceiving him coming in good order,[1] left the skirmishers among the old walls and drew out into the open fields. The men who had been surrounded in the ditches, perceiving their chieftain coming in this manner,[2] dashed across the ditches and ran to the fields against the said enemy, who were obliged to face about, and then charged back upon them [the skirmishers]. Upon which came up the said Thomas with his men, when you might see the horses floundering and the people on foot slaying them as they lay on the ground. [Then they] rallied to the said Thomas, charged the enemy, [and] drove them out of the fields across the water of Tweed. They captured and killed many; many horses lay dead, so that had they [the English] been on horseback, scarcely one would have escaped.

The said Thomas de Gray was twice besieged in the said castle—once for nearly a year, the other time for seven months. The enemy erected fortifications before him, one at Upsettlington, another at the church of Norham. He was twice provisioned by the Lords de Percy and de Nevill, [who came] in force to relieve the said castle; and these [nobles] became wise, noble and rich, and were of great service on the Marches.

Once on the vigil of St. Katherine during his [Gray's] time,

[1] *En le maner.*

[2] *A la gise.* This may be an idiomatic expression for moving briskly, *gise* meaning 'a goad' as well as 'manner, way.'

the fore-court of the said castle was betrayed by one of his men, who slew the porter [and] admitted the enemy [who were] in ambush in a house before the gate. The inner bailey and the keep held out. The enemy did not remain there more than three days, because they feared the attack of the said Thomas, who was then returning from the south, where he had been at that time. They evacuated it [the forecourt] and burnt it, after failing to mine it. MS. fo. 211

Many pretty feats of arms chanced to the said Thomas which are not recorded here.

About this time Joscelin d'Eyville[1] caused the manor of Allerton to be seized, and held it by force of arms; such disorder taking place because the barons respected not the King's authority, so that every one did as he pleased. At which time John the Irishman[2] ravished the Lady de Clifford; the malefactors were called *schaualdours*.

The barons came at this time to a parliament in London, their people being dressed in livery with[3] quartered coats; and there began the mortal hatred between them and the King.

At which time appeared the star comet; also it was a dear year for corn, and such scarcity of food that the mother devoured her son, wherefore nearly all the poor folk died.

The aforesaid King tarried in the south, where he amused himself with ships, among mariners, and in other irregular occupation unworthy of his station, and scarcely concerned himself about other honour or profit, whereby he lost the affection of his people.

At the same time there came a man who declared himself to be King by right, having been taken out of the cradle and this Edward substituted as King. This fellow was hanged at Northampton, declaring[4] that the devil in the shape of a cat had made him say this.

By intervention of the nobles of the realm the King was reconciled with Thomas, Earl of Lancaster, in regard to the death of Piers de Gaveston, which [reconciliation] endured for a while, and soon afterwards [the quarrel] was renewed.

[1] An ancient Northumbrian family whose castle of Dilston (d'Eyville's toun) still remains, a ruin, near Corbridge.

[2] *Johan le Irroys*, who abducted the lady from Barnard Castle in the autumn of 1315. The King sent three knights and thirty-six esquires to rescue her.

[3] *Ove = avec*, misprinted *ou* in *Maitland Club Ed.* [4] *Reioyaunt.*

This King Edward was on one occasion before Berwick with all his royal power, and had besieged the town, which shortly before had been lost to him through the treachery of Peter de Spalding, when he [the King] had given it into the hands of the burghers of the town, in order to save the great expense to which he had been put before. At the same time the Scots entered by way of Carlisle, and rode far into England, when the common people of the towns and the people of Holy Church assembled at Myton,[1] and were there defeated, as a folk unaccustomed to war before fierce troops. Wherefore the King raised his siege of Berwick, intending to operate against his enemies within his realm; but they moved through the wasted lands towards Scotland so soon as they knew of the raising of the siege, [to effect] which had been the reason for their expedition.

The King left his Marches in great distress [and] without succour, and retired towards the south, where the great men
MS. fo. 211b of his realm were again in rebellion against him, [namely] the said Earl of Lancaster and others, who besieged his [the King's] castle of Tickhill.[2] The Castle of Knaresborough[3] was surprised by John de Lilleburn, who afterwards surrendered upon terms to the King. The Queen besieged the Castle of Leeds, to whom it was surrendered, for the barons would not relieve it out of respect to the Queen Isabel. The said barons came in force, with banners displayed, against the King, at the bridge of Burton-on-Trent, where they were defeated, and retired towards Scotland, as it was said, to obtain aid and support. But at the bridge of Boroughbridge, Andrew de Harcla and other knights and esquires of the north, who were of the King's party, perceiving the barons approaching in good order,[4] seized one end of the bridge aforesaid, the way by which they [the barons] had to pass; where the earls and barons were defeated, killed and captured; the Earl of Hereford being slain, the Earl of Lancaster and many of the barons being taken and brought before the King. The lords de Moubray and de Clifford were hanged at York in quartered coats, such as their people had worn in London. Thomas, Earl of

[1] 'The Chapter of Myton,' 20th Sept., 1319.

[2] In the West Riding. The Norman keep was demolished in 1646 by the Parliamentarians.

[3] Dismantled in 1648 by the same authority.

[4] *A la maner.*

Lancaster, was beheaded at Pontefract[1] in revenge for Piers de Gaveston, and for other offences which he had often and habitually committed against the King, and at the very place where he had once hooted, and made others hoot, the King as he [the King] was travelling to York.

Andrew de Harcla was made Earl of Carlisle; but he did not last long; for in his pride he would commit the King to having made peace with the Scots in a manner contrary to his instructions; which was the finding of the King's council. This Andrew was tried by the chief men of his council at Carlisle, and was there drawn and hanged.[2]

Andrew de Harcla had behaved gallantly many times against the Scots, sometimes with good result and sometimes with loss, [performing] many fine feats of arms; until he was captured by them and ransomed at a high price.[3]

In the summer[4] following the death of the Earl of Lancaster the King marched with a very great army towards Scotland, having, besides his knights and esquires,[5] an armed foot-soldier from every town in England. These common people fought at Newcastle with the commons of the town, where, on the bridge of the said town, they killed the knight, John de Penrith, and some esquires who were in the service of the Constable,

[1] A.D. 1322.

[2] In February, 1323, Sir Andrew, who took his family name from the manor of Harcla in Westmorland, had done King Edward splendid service. It is true that he entered into unauthorised negotiations with King Robert, and that an indenture, pronounced to be treasonable was drawn up between them at Lochmaben, 3rd January, 1322-3; but it is pretty clear that Harcla never meant to betray his country. He despaired, and with good cause, of Edward II.'s government, and endeavoured to avert the disasters which he foresaw by acknowledging Robert as King of Scots, thereby securing the peace which Robert was anxious to restore between the two countries.

[3] Barbour refers to de Harcla's capture by Sir John Soulis of Eskdale, with fifty men against Harcla's three hundred, 'horsyt jolyly.' He alludes, also, in most tantalising manner to a ballad celebrating the exploit:

> 'I will nocht reherss the maner
> For quha sa likis, thai may her
> Young wemen, quhen thai will play,
> Syng it amang thaim ilk[a] day.'

On 23rd November, 1316, Sir Andrew petitioned King Edward II. to grant him two Scots prisoners in aid of his ransom, adding that his valet, John de Beauchamp, will explain how he, Sir Andrew, came to be taken.

[4] *Le procheyn este*, omitted in *Maitland Club Ed.*

[5] Who of course had each his armed followers.

and the Marshal, because they tried to arrest the ruffians so as to quell the disturbance; so insolent were the common folk in their conduct.

The said King marched upon Edinburgh, where at Leith there came such sickness and famine upon the common soldiers of that great army, that they were forced to beat a retreat for want of food; at which time the King's light horsemen[1] foraging at Melrose were defeated by James de Douglas. None [dared] leave the main body to seek food by foray. So greatly were the English harassed and worn with fighting that before they arrived at Newcastle there was such a murrain in the army for want of food, that they were obliged of necessity to disband.

MS. fo. 212

The King retired upon York with the great men of his realm; when Robert de Brus having caused to assemble the whole power of Scotland, the Isles and the rest of the Highlands, pressed ever after the King, who, perceiving his approach, marched into Blackhow Moor with all the force that he could muster on a sudden. They [the Scots] took a strength on a hill near Biland, where the King's people were defeated,[2] and the Earl of Richmond, the Lord of Sully, a baron of France, and many others; so that the King himself scarcely escaped from Rivaulx, where he was [quartered]. But the Scots were[3] so fierce and their chiefs so daring, and the English so badly cowed, that it was no otherwise between them than as a hare before greyhounds.

The Scots rode beyond the Wold and [appeared] before York, and committed destruction at their pleasure without resistance from any, until it seemed good to them to retire.

[1] *Lez hoblours.* [2] 14th October, 1322.

[3] *Estoient*, omitted in *Maitland Club Ed.*

(*To be continued.*)