

Reviews of Books

THE COLLECTED PAPERS OF FREDERIC WILLIAM MAITLAND, DOWNING PROFESSOR OF THE LAWS OF ENGLAND. Edited by H. A. L. Fisher. Three Volumes. Vol. I, pp. ix, 497; Vol. II, pp. 496; Vol. III, pp. vi, 566. Demy 8vo. Cambridge: University Press. 1911. 30s. nett.

ALL scholars will be under a deep debt of gratitude to the Cambridge Press for publishing in three handsome volumes the scattered papers of the late Professor Maitland, and to Mr. Fisher for his prompt and careful performance of the duty of bringing the papers together from many scattered sources, arranging them in chronological order, and providing them with a copious index.

In an almost too short introduction the editor tells us how he has gone about his work. His main principle has been the wise one of bringing together the whole mass of Maitland's scattered writings. We are heartily glad of this comprehensiveness. If the early philosophical writings, such as the fellowship dissertation of 1875 and the paper on Herbert Spencer's theory of society, seem thin in comparison with later work, they are, especially the former, of real historical interest in showing the growth of Maitland's mind, and even the early formation of his characteristic style. Even the shortest note and review in the later volumes is well worth preserving, containing, as Mr. Fisher truly says, 'a new grain of historical knowledge,' or a revelation of Maitland's original thought. Mr. Fisher notes one exception to his rule of inclusion, and has no difficulty in justifying his policy of not tearing from the texts which they illustrate Maitland's eight prefaces, written for as many volumes of the Selden Society, and his introduction to the *Memoranda de Parlamento* (1305) in the Rolls Series. He might with advantage have also noted that the most important of Maitland's many contributions to the *English Historical Review* are similarly excluded, namely the papers on 'Roman Canon Law in the Church of England,' which were made sufficiently accessible by their separate publication in 1898. We miss also Maitland's 'Introduction to the Pleas of the Crown for Gloucestershire, 1221,' which has special importance as the first of his efforts to set forth in print some of the contents of the Plea Rolls. We regret also that the Rede lecture for 1901 on 'English Law and the Renaissance' was not also included, since its publication in the form of an isolated lecture has hardly given it the publicity which it deserves. If also it were thought worth while to reprint the

luminous 'Outlines of English Legal History,' which are readily accessible in the pages of *Social England*, it is hard to see why so original and characteristic a piece of Maitland's work as his chapter on the 'Anglican Settlement and the Scottish Reformation' should not also have been extracted from the second volume of the *Cambridge Modern History*. Anyhow, if the reasons against publication in each of these cases were decisive, it is a pity that they were not told to us.

Mr. Fisher has absolutely refrained from annotation in any part of this book. We entirely agree with him that what has been written since does not 'in an appreciable degree affect the permanent value of Maitland's work,' though in the two or three sentences of unrestrained eulogy that follow, Mr. Fisher does less than justice to his hero's memory by almost suggesting an infallibility which Maitland himself would have been the first to disclaim. Yet though Maitland's bold and happy use of hypothesis and analogy more than once led him to conclusions which the majority of scholars are not likely to ratify, it would, we entirely agree, have been quite unnecessary, and indeed dangerous, to make any attempt to bring his work, so to say, up to date. It is permissible, however, to think that a little more might have been done with advantage by the editor with the view of making the papers which he has republished more easily usable. The ingenious and successful attempt to mark by asterisks such of the papers as are likely to be within the capacity of the general reader is to be commended. Yet to the very meagre table of contents, which gives us nothing but the short title of the article, we should have wished that Mr. Fisher had added the date at which the paper was written and the periodical in which it first appeared. It is true that these items of information are given in its place at the head of each article, but their repetition in the contents would have been a saving of trouble. As it is, Mr. Fisher does not even tell us where we can find the two exceptions which he notes to the general rule that the pieces here given have been previously published. The same incuriousness to the reader's comfort, or reliance on his omniscience, has also, in several cases, led Mr. Fisher to suppress the name of the book, or books, which Maitland was reviewing. Yet surely when the Court Rolls of a Lincolnshire manor and samples of local inquiries published by a Yorkshire archaeological society are reviewed by Maitland, it is not quite fair to the editors of these works to delete without a word of warning the names of the books which Maitland prefaced to his article. This omission becomes serious when, in the case of the *Quarterly Review* article on 'The Laws of the Anglo-Saxons,' the book under review is no less a work than Dr. Liebermann's great edition of the early English Law Books.

However much he may impose upon himself a self-denying ordinance, there is one species of annotation which every editor of a reprint of a work of permanent value ought to indulge in. It is, we conceive, the duty of such an editor to bring up to date the references which his author has employed. Writing in the eighties and early nineties Maitland naturally cites the editions which were the best at the time; but since he wrote, better editions have in some cases appeared, which have made these early

works comparatively obsolete, and have tended to drive them from the working library of scholars. Thus Maitland quotes in his early articles on Anglo-Saxon law the texts and references in Schmid's *Gesetze der Angelsachsen*. We think that when his works were reissued the corresponding references to Liebermann's much more definitive edition ought to have been given. Similarly, references to the customs of the Beauvaisis should nowadays be made to Salmon's edition rather than to Beugnot's. And though Lumby's edition of Knighton is as bad as an edition well can be, it is the edition which most scholars have on their shelves, and is therefore preferable to a reference to Twysden's *Decem Scriptores*. Moreover, when as in Vol. I, p. 238, Maitland refers to another article of his, reprinted in an earlier part of the same volume, a reference to the place, where the saying actually occurs within thirty pages of the reference to it, seems highly desirable. Fortunately, however, the mass of Maitland's work is so recent in date that corrections of this kind are rarely necessary.

'For the crimes of the index,' writes Mr. Fisher, 'the editor is solely responsible.' Some labour spent in examining the index has convinced us that the editor's breaches of the criminal code are neither numerous nor heinous. Substantially, the index is a good index, complete, thorough and accurate. It is good that it is, to some extent, an index of subjects as well as of names. It is inevitable that a subject index cannot be as complete as a nominal index, but as regards names referred to in the text those omitted in the index are few and of insignificant importance. It might be perhaps argued that if the five references to Adam, the first man, deserve to be carefully collected, the late Duke of Devonshire, who is referred to as Lord Hartington on I. 666, might also have been recorded, and that if three of the Wiltshire Deverills find place in the index, the other two which are also mentioned on Vol. II, p. 89 are worthy of a similar honour. There is a little hesitancy as to whether medieval men should be indexed under their surname or their Christian name. We have 'Alan de la Zouche' cheek by jowl with 'Anesty, Richard of,' and other instances might be added to these. Amusing results are sometimes got when justices and chief-justices are indexed with J. or C.J. after their names, without any suggestion whether it is their Christian name or the abbreviation of their title. The general knowledge of the reader may, however, be relied upon to convince him that 'Bryce, J.' is not Mr. Justice Bryce, but Mr. James Bryce, the eminent historian, though it requires more special knowledge not to differentiate between 'Blackburn, J.' and 'Blackburn, Lord,' who are separately indexed. On Vol. III, p. 546 'Battle, Priory of St. Peter at,' is a slip for Bath, and the 'Chacepore' of Vol. III, p. 548 is one of the rare printer's errors for Chaceporc. When these are the worst errors that scrutiny can discover, the editor may be safely declared to have left the court without a stain on his character.

Too much space has perhaps been devoted to niggling and pedantic criticism. Let it be said, as emphatically as possible, that they in no wise diminish our sense of obligation to Mr. Fisher for having lavished time and thought that took him far from his own special line of study in collecting and seeing through the press this remarkable collection of the occasional

papers of a great master. He will have his reward in the consciousness which all readers must have that Maitland's brilliancy, originality and versatility become more patent when the gleanings of more than a quarter of a century of his work are thus brought together consecutively within the covers of a single book.

T. F. Tout.

A HISTORY OF THE BRITISH ARMY. By the Hon. J. W. Fortescue. Vols. V and VI: From the Peace of Amiens to the Battle of Corunna. Vol. V, pp. xxi, 437; with 17 Plans. Vol. VI, pp. xix, 448; with 9 Maps. 8vo. London: Macmillan & Co., Ltd. 1910. 18s. nett per Volume.

WHEN the story of England's great struggle with Napoleon is read as a whole, it is easy to see what a very important turning-point in the contest the battle of Trafalgar was. It drove the Emperor to employ that double-edged weapon, the Continental System, which in the end damaged him more deeply than his adversaries by turning against him the great majority of his vassals and allies. But it is highly questionable whether in the years that immediately followed Trafalgar any one can have realised that it had been more than a merely negative success, the mere destruction of a fleet which might have been used against England. Indeed, the more one studies the period, the more one realises that Trafalgar was not by itself really decisive or final. The latest instalment of Mr. Fortescue's great enterprise will do much to help towards a realisation of the true situation. The failure of Napoleon's invasion scheme and the destruction of his main fleet at Trafalgar are narrated about the middle of Vol. V, but as one reads on the situation becomes worse instead of better. Napoleon's power, so far from being diminished, spreads over the whole of Central Europe. England's efforts against him are almost invariably unsuccessful and Vol. VI closes with Moore's death at Corunna, the apparent failure of our attempt to profit by the Spanish insurrection. The greatest and most conspicuous of naval victories seemed to have brought us no nearer an honourable peace. Supremacy at sea we had acquired, but the underlying lesson of Mr. Fortescue's volumes is that supremacy at sea is only a means to an end.

The story of the years which followed Trafalgar is a record of opportunities for effective action neglected or so feebly handled as to be wasted, of a great naval victory apparently proving barren of positive results for want of an efficient army to profit by the chances it created. 'The Channel Fleet,' Lord Salisbury once remarked, 'cannot climb the mountains of Armenia'; and if the seventy-fours of Cornwallis and Nelson could sweep the French flag off the seas, they could not prevent Austerlitz and Jena. So in these volumes one reads of opportunity after opportunity for the effective action of a British army wasted, partly because our ministers had failed to grasp the true relation between the work of the naval and military forces of the country, partly because an unsound policy in respect to the raising and organising of our military forces had left us without troops enough to use those chances. There is the failure to profit by

the chance presented us in the spring of 1807, after Eylau, when Napoleon was indeed hard pressed, there is Maida, a victory which might have been turned to splendid effect but was absolutely neglected, there are minor expeditions like the capture of Surinam which merely locked up in garrison duty troops for whom better use could have been found elsewhere, there are futile if well-meant efforts like Cathcart's expedition to the Weser in the late autumn of 1805, which resulted in a complete fiasco because our forces were not strong enough to act independently of doubtful and treacherous allies like Prussia. Worse than this one has blunders like the 1807 expedition to Egypt, and the utter waste of men and money on the Buenos Ayres venture for which no excuse or palliation can be found.

Yet there is not wanting a brighter side to the picture : Assaye with which Vol. V really opens is a prophetic beginning, a foretaste of the quality of the man who was to take up Moore's work and carry it through. And if at the moment Corunna seemed only another failure, our intervention in the Peninsula marks the adoption of that sounder military policy the gradual evolution of which can be traced through these volumes, a policy which had become possible because at last a man had come to the front who had a real idea not only of the purposes for which troops were wanted, but of the right principles by which their provision and organisation should be guided.

Indeed, it is one of the great services of these volumes that they do to some extent bring out the great work done by Castlereagh. Pitt, Addington and Windham had all tried their hands before him and had all failed. Castlereagh, taking from one scheme and another the more serviceable portions, did produce a plan based on sound principles and did achieve a far greater measure of success in providing an effective military force than any of his predecessors. As Mr. Fortescue says, 1808 marked 'a turning point no less in the reorganisation of our military forces than in their sphere of action,' and for both of these Castlereagh was largely responsible. He realised the importance of vigorously utilising the opportunity offered by the Spanish rising, of striking hard and in force at a really vulnerable point of the enemy's position ; he dropped Pitt's system, which had been copied only too faithfully by the Ministry of All the Talents, of frittering away the available troops in isolated minor enterprises, which even if wholly successful could achieve little ; what was equally important, he had made it possible to send to the Peninsula a really considerable force.

The story of the various expedients for raising troops is not a little bewildering, but it helps one to realise the importance of Castlereagh's work in setting up really sound principles. Windham had pointed out that our first need was to augment the force available for service overseas ; if we could trust the navy to secure and maintain supremacy at sea, we had no need to devote our efforts and resources to the production of forces which, like the Volunteers, could not be used abroad : what we wanted was a really effective force, capable not merely of capturing unimportant colonies and outposts, but of intervention on the Continent on behalf of our European allies on a respectable scale. To the production of such a

force all other efforts should have been subordinated, provided always that the United Kingdom was adequately equipped with forces capable of beating off raids and minor attacks, so that the fleet could feel secure of its base and so enjoy real strategic freedom.

Castlereagh's substitution of a Local Militia for the Volunteers (Vol. VI, p. 183) was a really important reform : infinitely more efficient than the incoherent, indisciplined, tumultuary levies whom they replaced, the Local Militia supplied a 'second line' force which allowed a much larger number of regulars to be sent abroad and would, had the system been properly maintained, have provided an adequate method of training the nation to arms. The whole story of the Volunteer movement, which Mr. Fortescue summarises here, having told it at greater length in his *County Lieutenancies and the Army*, is most instructive. Energy and enthusiasm, time and money were misapplied, when devoted to the production of a force which could never be of any real value was positively detrimental in as much as it competed in the never too well-supplied recruit market with forces of far greater utility. And another all important lesson is that no system of a compulsory character which allows of the vicious practice of substitution has any chance of success. It was this defect which had ruined Addington's Army of Reserve and Pitt's Additional Forces Act, by diverting into forces raised for limited service recruits who should have been drawn into the regular army. This mistake Castlereagh was careful to avoid, exemptions were allowed but not substitution, and while the ballot kept the Militia fully up to strength his method of encouraging militiamen to enlist in the line provided the regulars with a very fair supply of trained recruits.

Castlereagh then stands out clearly as the statesman who at this most critical period did most for England : he it was who was largely responsible for the expedition to Copenhagen in 1807, a stroke which, if it fell heavily on Denmark, the pawn in Napoleon's game, nipped in the bud the coalition of Baltic navies which Napoleon was planning as the first-fruits of Tilsit. Castlereagh, too, deserves the credit for the selection of Arthur Wellesley for high command in the Peninsula, and Mr. Fortescue is able to show that it is Canning who must be held responsible for the very discreditable way in which Moore was treated in connection with that expedition and with the previous one to Sweden, a venture foredoomed to failure since it had no definite purpose and depended on the co-operation of a lunatic, Gustavus IV. of Sweden. Canning suffers severely at Mr. Fortescue's hands, but the strictures are deserved : 'no military enterprise prospered while Canning remained at the Foreign Office' (VI, p. 323) is no more than the truth. One need do no more than cite his treatment of Sir Hew Dalrymple, most unjustly made the scapegoat for the convention of Cintra, when the blame, so far as it was due, belonged to the Cabinet (*ibid.* p. 252), as typical of what British officers had to expect from him.

In the course of these volumes there are many things of which mention should be made. Mr. Fortescue's powers of graphic and lucid description show to advantage in things like his account of Maida or the really excellent narrative of the great war of 1803-1805 against the Mahrattas.

Assaye is familiar to all, but how many people know the not less desperate struggle of Laswaree, or Lake's headlong chase of Holkar, or Ochterlony's defence of Delhi, or the hundred other deeds of daring and endurance which signalled the campaigns in Hindustan. Lake's generalship is well summed up—a fighting man like Ney or Blucher rather than a general of the class of Massena or Soult, 'of surpassing prowess in action,' a great disciplinarian and leader of men, a splendid fighter of battles even if his operations lacked the insight and forethought, the careful and provident organisation, the system and method of his great colleague. The little-known story of the expedition to Buenos Ayres is admirably told, and one is all the more glad to have a proper account of it because the episode is one about which, not unnaturally, very little has been written. Mr. Fortescue is deservedly severe on the headlong folly of the erratic Home Popham, and he mercifully exposes the root of the disaster, the blunders of the Ministry, beside which Whitelocke's errors, serious and culpable as they were, became insignificant. The military lessons of the expedition may be summed up in the one word 'transport': had Whitelocke and his subordinates given to that all-important subject a little of the care and trouble habitual with Moore and Wellesley, the venture might well have had a very different result.

Of the Peninsula operations, to which the greater part of Vol. VI is devoted, Mr. Fortescue gives a most excellent account. One can give it no higher praise than to say that it adds appreciably to what Napier, Professor Oman and Sir Frederick Maurice's *Diary of Sir John Moore* have given us. He shows that there were good grounds for the detaching of Craufurd to Vigo, for Moore's decision not to fight at Astorga (VI, p. 358), for sending the guns round by Elvas (VI, p. 307). He brings out clearly and without exaggeration the results of Moore's stroke at Napoleon's communications (p. 395), showing how the move on Portugal and the siege of Saragossa were checked, that the main striking force of the French was drawn off to the extreme north-west of Spain, and consequently rendered unavailable for use to the southward and south-westward, so that Andalusia was given several precious months of respite—in brief, that a bold offensive movement by a small force completely upset Napoleon's schemes for the subjugation of Spain. The volumes close with a sketch of Moore's character and achievements which is admirable, a noble and well-deserved tribute to a great man.

One or two words of criticism cannot be avoided. On p. 309 of Vol. VI there is an undeserved sneer which might have been omitted, even if Baird did give his countrymen the first chance of distinction, and a somewhat similar remark on p. 313 is uncalled for. But what one does expect in a *History of the British Army* is more about its methods and organisation, its costume, equipment, tactics, discipline, education, in a word more of the institution and less general European history. Of course, an outline of Continental affairs is essential to enable the reader to realise what England did with her army, and what she might have done, but one gets far more detail of Napoleon's intervention in Spain and of his operations against the Spaniards than one really needs. The very full account of

Portuguese affairs (Vol. VI, pp. 86-104) is hardly in proportion, and the whole of Chapter XVIII is devoted to operations in which no British troops took part. Similarly one gets a good deal more detail as to the diplomacy of the period than is essential to the understanding of it. Mr. Fortescue has of course been working through original authorities and has plenty of new stuff to give us, but one would have done without most of it gladly, if only he would have given us more of Moore and the camp at Shorncliffe where the Light Division was trained, more of the strength and distribution of the army from year to year, fuller accounts of such things as the raising of the King's German Legion, the foreign regiments in our service, the beginnings of scientific military education, and the organisation of the various arms. He gave more of this side of the story in his earlier volumes, and one's gratitude to him for the splendid work he is doing would be increased if only he would let us have more of it again. Finally, the maps are extremely good.

C. T. ATKINSON.

SOME SUPPOSED SHAKESPEARE FORGERIES. An Examination into the Authenticity of certain Documents affecting the Dates of Composition of Several of the Plays. By Ernest Law, B.A., F.S.A. With Facsimiles of Documents. London : G. Bell & Sons, Ltd. 1911.

MR. ERNEST LAW, the historian of Hampton Court, has joined the vigorous band of Elizabethan scholars who, in the space of a few years, have added more to our knowledge of Shakespeare's career than was added during the whole of the last half century. Some twenty years ago he pointed out to Halliwell-Phillipps at least one fact which was used in the sixth edition of the *Outlines of the Life of Shakespeare*, but only in the last year or two has he made in his own name contributions of first-rate importance to Shakespeare scholarship. His *Shakespeare as a Groom of the Chamber* (1910) reproduced a document which proves that when in 1604 the Constable of Castile was sent on a special mission to this country to draw up and ratify terms of peace, Shakespeare and the other members of the king's company of players attended on the Spanish visitors at Somerset House during their stay of eighteen days. The document appears to have been known to Halliwell-Phillipps, but this indefatigable scholar, who had the foible of keeping to himself more than a scholar should, preferred that its contents and whereabouts should remain his own secret. Now Mr. Law has given us an even more interesting volume, in which he does not present any new document, but proves that a document which has long been rejected as a forgery is authentic.

Peter Cunningham edited for the Shakespeare Society in 1842 *Extracts from the Accounts of the Revels at Court in the Reigns of Queen Elizabeth and King James I.*, and his extracts concluded with the 'Revels Book' for the winter of 1604-5, and for the winter of 1611-12. These two books were the only part of the volume which had direct bearing on Shakespeare. In the former there was record of 'The Moor of Venis,' 'The Merry Wives of Winsor,' 'Mesur for Mesur,' 'The Plaie of Errors,' 'Loves Labours Lost,' 'Henry the fift,' and 'The Martchant of Venis'; and in

the latter of 'The Tempest' and 'The Winters Nights Tayle.' But these records were unwelcome to a considerable body of critics who had other views on the dates of some of Shakespeare's plays. Suspicion was thrown on them the more readily as the originals had passed illegally into the hands of Cunningham, who, in the sad circumstances of his closing years, had endeavoured to dispose of them by private bargain. And Cunningham was the friend of Collier. Suspicion became conviction, and Cunningham, now dead, was branded as a forger. Under this stigma his memory has remained. Even those who believed in the accuracy of the information were content to distrust the genuineness of the documents. Mr. E. K. Chambers in his *Notes on the History of the Revels Office under the Tudors*, 1904, p. 21, a work of much first-hand research, says of them, without any qualification: 'These are forgeries, but may be based upon genuine originals among the Records.' And Sir Sidney Lee—who has lost no time in welcoming the correction—had included them in the catalogue of forgeries in his *Life of Shakespeare*.

Mr. Law has rehabilitated the name of Cunningham, and he has proved to those who, like Sir Sidney Lee, accepted the theory of forgery, but did not assert Cunningham's share in it, that the documents which were impounded and handed over to the Record Office in 1868 are none other than the genuine originals. He has given full details of his inquiry, in which he had the collaboration of officials of the Record Office, the British Museum, and the Government Laboratories. Not content with the evidence of handwriting, Mr. Law persuaded Sir Henry Maxwell-Lyte to permit a chemical examination of the ink. The Government analyst found nothing to support the suggestion that the writing on the suspected pages of the book of 1604-5—the pages which contained the list of the plays, of which seven are Shakespeare's—is of a different date from the writing on the remainder of the document. It was not thought necessary to subject the corresponding pages of the book of 1610-11 to a chemical test.

Mr. Law's work has many points of interest. Its value to the student of Shakespeare lies in the new and unassailable certainty that *Othello* was performed in 'the Banketinge house att Whithall' on 'Hallamas Day being the first of Nouembar,' 1604. And the genuineness of the 1611 reference to the *Tempest* disposes at once of the theory that the play was written for the marriage of the Princess Elizabeth to the Elector Palatine in February, 1613. But Mr. Law inadvertently claims too much for this reference when he says that it fixes the date of the play. It fixes only the later limit.

The stages in the Cunningham calumny are described by Mr. Law with much spirit. There is, however, one criticism which should be passed on his excellent account. It does not give sufficient prominence to the beginnings of the reaction in favour of Cunningham. The question of authenticity was not quite dormant when Mr. Law started his conclusive investigation. The following passage, for instance, will be found in Mr. D. H. Lambert's *Shakespeare Documents*, 1904, p. 52: 'I have carefully, with gentlemen at the Record Office thoroughly competent

to pronounce an opinion on such a subject, examined these documents, and it is only fair to state that at least, with all deference to the weighty opinion of the late Mr. Bond, views on the point are divided. The pages could not have been interpolated, and the character of the writing which contains the references to Shakespeare's plays, though open to question, tallies in many respects with that of the preceding entries.' Mr. Law will always have the credit, not of reopening the question, but of having caused it to be settled once and for all.

And justice was already being done to the excellence of Cunningham as an editor in his earlier and happier days. On this no one is so well qualified to offer an opinion as M. Albert Feuillerat. In his *Documents relating to the Office of the Revels in the time of Queen Elizabeth, 1908*—a great piece of editing, of which Mr. Law's praises are none too high—M. Feuillerat has given this note: 'I am glad to say that in the part of Cunningham's *Revels* included in this volume (I leave the 1605 and 1612 Books out of the question at present) I have found no forgery; on the contrary, it is but just to say that his publication is most accurate, and that I have counted no more than five or six serious misreadings. Unfortunately, I cannot say the same of Collier.'

M. Feuillerat and Mr. Law have given us new faith in the 'Revels Extracts' printed for the Shakespeare Society in 1842. It cannot vie with the massive tomes which M. Feuillerat is publishing at Louvain. But so far as it goes it is good; it is adequate to most purposes; it is, unlike the Louvain books, convenient to use. It is, above all, to be trusted.

D. NICHOL SMITH.

HISTOIRE DE L'EXPANSION COLONIAL DES PEUPLES EUROPEËNS—NEERLANDE ET DENEMARK (XVII^e et XVIII^e Siècles). By Charles de Lannoy et Herman Vander Linden. Brussels, 1911.

Two Continental scholars, Prof. de Lannoy and Prof. Vander Linden, have planned an imposing work on the development of colonisation from Europe. The method of treatment which has been adopted is to take related countries together—thus a previous volume dealt with the colonial expansion of Spain and Portugal, while the present one is concerned with that of Holland and Denmark, Prof. de Lannoy having written the Dutch portion and his colleague the part relating to Denmark. The authors have conceived the subject of their investigation in no narrow spirit. They begin by presenting an able outline of the social, political, and commercial position of the countries dealt with at the time when they began to make settlements over-sea; and, in describing the nature of those settlements, factories for foreign trade (but not for colonisation in the English sense of the word, such as trading factories in India during the seventeenth century) are included. The reader obtains a general picture of the causes which caused Holland and Denmark to expand beyond their respective borders, and then the main aspects of the particular kind of settlements established are described in each case. Further, certain of the chief characteristics of the colonies are selected for a special and detailed treatment; as, for instance, the methods of administration both in the

home country and in the colony, the economic relations between the dependency and the mother country—what, in fact, Adam Smith called 'the colonial system'—the persistence of the feeling of original nationality in the settlers and the reaction of the colonies of the mother country. Finally there is a series of maps and a good bibliography.

This work is a valuable one from several distinct points of view. It brings together the results of a great number of monographs, and it is an advantage that the work of co-ordination should be expressed in French—a language which lends itself readily to the statement of the tendencies which the authors aim at establishing. Thus the Dutch East India Company is summed up as influenced by the characteristics of its founders—it had a democratic foundation, a decentralised organisation, and an aristocratic directorate (p. 162). Moreover, it is to be hoped that finally the authors will provide a comparative treatment of the different methods of the various countries at varying periods. In this way, though the study is in the main historical, it should yield valuable light on some modern problems in colonial administration.

The whole field covered by the present volume is surveyed with great lucidity and insight. Thus the importance of sea-power is fully recognised in connection with the prosperity of colonies. At the present time one is perhaps inclined to forget how important the Dutch colonial empire was at one period, and the pages which trace its rise as the navy of Holland grew and its decline as the navy waned in efficiency are instructive, especially as coming from Continental critics. It is an instance of critical acumen that the matters in dispute between the English and Dutch East India Companies, which led to the tragedy of Amboyna, are fairly stated. With regard to the former body M. de Lannoy has followed English authorities in describing it as conforming at first to the regulated rather than to the joint-stock type of organisation; but this is now known to be an error—in England the spokesmen of regulated companies were very vociferous, and this has occasioned the undue prominence given to these companies. Also, it might be noticed, in connection with the colonial *métayage* of the Dutch West India Company, that a similar system existed earlier in the land-system of the Virginia and other English companies.

The combined treatment of foreign trading with colonising venture, suggests the reflection that colonisation, like Hedonism, has its paradox. Most of the enterprises which aimed directly at the acquisition of over-sea possessions sooner or later came to grief; while on the contrary, in several cases, undertakings, which aimed severely and consistently at commercial operations only, ended by having acquired large or even immense territories. The Dutch West India Company was an instance of the former tendency, the Dutch East India Company of the latter. The joint-authors of this work are to be congratulated on having advanced so far in an investigation which involves great research and unusual powers of exposition. The book will be essential to all students of the development of colonisation.

W. R. SCOTT.

THE RULERS OF STRATHSPEY. A HISTORY OF THE LAIRDS OF GRANT AND EARLS OF SEAFIELD. By the Earl of Cassillis. Pp. xii, 211. With Illustrations. Demy 8vo. Inverness: Northern Counties Newspaper and Printing and Publishing Co. 1911. 6s.

THE knowledge of the family pride of the Grants [we all know the story, 'and there were Grants in those days'], which has already produced one of Sir William Fraser's monumental family histories, has been, we are glad to say, the reason for the compilation of this work, which, from the care taken in its preparation and its wealth of references, cannot fail to become an important book of genealogical reference.

Sir William Fraser's *Chiefs of Grant*, on which it is rightly very largely based, extends to three enormous volumes, valuable to historians, but both difficult to obtain and awkward to transport. With the sympathy of the widow of a late chief, Caroline Countess of Seafield, Lord Cassillis has undertaken the task of making the history of the Chiefs of Grant who ruled in Strathspey accessible to the clan, and this book is the result.

It is worth noting that the chiefs of so northern a clan sprung, it is believed, from a family of Norman origin, Le Grant or Le Grand, and it is likely that they came to the north only on the return of Walter Bysset from exile about 1249. Sir Laurence le Grant was Sheriff of Inverness in 1263. The first known Grant who possessed land in Moray was Robert le Graunt, and John le Graunt of Inverallan was an adherent of John Comyn elder of Badenoch, *circa* 1297. Early Grants were connected with families bearing Norman names like 'Pylche' and 'Seres,' so it is interesting when one finds a daughter of the house marrying a Mackintosh before 1400, and John Grant in 1434 being already known as 'Ian Ruadh.' Sir Duncan Grant, knighted about 1460, was the first to be styled 'of Freuchie,' and his daughters and grand-daughters intermarried with chiefs of other Highland clans, such as Macdonalds, Camerons, Frasers, Mackintoshes and Mackenzies. It is not our design now to follow the history of the family and how they became Earls of Seafield. We shall only say that it can be traced and fully traced here, that the deeds of the heroes of the past are well narrated, and that the cadet families are not neglected by the compiler.

A. FRANCIS STEUART.

HOME LIFE OF THE HIGHLANDERS, 1400-1746. Pp. viii. 140. Demy 8vo. Glasgow: Scottish National Exhibition. 1911. 1s. nett.

THE executive of the Highland Village at the Glasgow Exhibition have done a real service in publishing this account of life in the Highlands before 1746. The work is really more comprehensive than the title suggests, and amounts to a summary of the social and economic condition of the people in the most fascinating period of their history. Some of the writers have found it impossible to draw any arbitrary line in sketching the development of the subjects with which they deal and have traced their growth from very early times.

The first contribution is an admirable essay upon the fundamental question of the clan system, and clearly describes the different causes which

led to the growth of separate tribes. Each clan was not by any means always of one kin, although the fiction of a common ancestry, often firmly believed, contributed most powerfully to their cohesion. The relation of the chiefs to the Crown, the character and condition of the people, and the military organisation of the clans are touched upon; the nature of the patriarchal power exercised by the chiefs is also explained, with its connection with control of land and the power to protect the clansmen. Another essay deals with the allied subject of tribal organisation and land tenure. It is unfortunate that so little clear evidence has come down to us upon the important point as to how far the original Celtic system, as depicted in early Irish laws, had survived in practice in Scotland. Records belong to estates like that of Campbell of Glenorchy which were not managed upon the principles of the *Senchus Mor*, whereas the ancient Celtic apportionment of land was essentially a matter of custom. Sheriff Campbell implies that throughout the Highlands clansmen were regarded as joint owners of certain tribal lands, until the influence of an Act of 1695, allowing the division of common lands in Scotland, led to a change of status by which they became either tacksmen holding leases from the chief as feudal owner or sub-tenants under the tacksmen. Mr. William Mackay, on the contrary, in his essay on 'Industrial Life' points out that the tacksmen and sub-tenants existed as early as the thirteenth century. The Act itself, as Sheriff Campbell says, applied to ownership not to occupancy, and whether a chief was already legally the owner of the lands occupied by his clansmen or not, it gave him no new powers; on the other hand, it did not interfere with the practice of common tenancy. The Act of 1695 and the later disuse of common working of the land were alike incidents in the economic change which was taking place throughout Great Britain.

The succession to the chiefship is another point where feudal law differed from the old Celtic customs, but the genealogies and records of the clans seem to show that hereditary succession in the male line was generally followed in the period specially covered by this book. Instances to the contrary can be explained as the outcome of special circumstances, and hardly bear the general interpretation which the writer puts upon them.

An article on 'Social Life' describes the Highlanders' amusements and hospitality as well as the customs of fosterage and the character of wedding and funeral ceremonies. It deals also with the question of the poverty of the Highlands in the eighteenth century, which must have seemed extreme to English writers. But it is to be remembered that all Scotland was deplorably poor and that actual famine was a constant possibility even in the Lowlands. The cognate fact of constant unemployment in the Highlands is clearly brought out in Mr. W. M. Mackenzie's essay on 'The Clans' in discussing the cleavage between the chiefs and gentry with their immediate dependents and the cultivating class. The other side of the picture is supplied in Mr. Mackay's contribution upon 'Industrial Life,' which describes considerable opportunities of trade and a wide range of occupations which were habitually followed by the Highland natives.

Special articles also deal with the state of religion and the development of education among the Highlanders, with their superstitious practices, their buildings and dress, literature and music. Especially interesting is Dr. Hugh Cameron Gillies's account of the medical knowledge of the Highlanders, which was remarkable in its extent and practical value, and is shown by the author to furnish proof of the high character and true civilisation of the people. In this matter it is an interesting commentary on the essays upon religion and education, literature and music. A contribution in Gaelic forms an appropriate end to the book, and must add greatly to its value in the eyes of many Highlanders.

It is a great merit of the work as a whole that in spite of inevitable overlapping the writers have avoided undue repetition. No less true is it that the different contributors have succeeded in presenting a wonderfully consistent picture of the vanished world of the Highlands. Only on the question of land tenure does there appear to be a direct difference of opinion, a fact which bears high testimony to the great care and impartiality with which the authors have dealt with doubtful points and controversial subjects. The whole sketch of Highland life is wonderfully complete, and sufficient detail has been given to make the picture vivid in spite of the small compass of the book. It should serve to correct some misconceptions, such as that respecting the heritable jurisdictions which, as Sheriff Campbell points out, were not the foundation of the chiefs' power in 1745. The present succinct and impartial account of the facts as far as they are known is the more welcome since many causes have long contributed to distort popular beliefs about the Highlanders.

A. CUNNINGHAM.

THE ENGLISH FACTORIES IN INDIA, 1634-1636 ; A Calendar of Documents in the India Office, British Museum, and Public Record Office, edited by William Foster. Oxford : Clarendon Press. 1911. Pp. xl, 355-12s. 6d. nett.

THE India Office is to be congratulated on the good progress which is being made with the production of this series of Calendars and also on the high standard of editing that is fully maintained. The appearance of the present volume is particularly to be welcomed, since a point has now been reached where new ground is being opened up. Mr. Sainsbury's *Calendars* (*Calendars of State Papers, Colonial, East Indies and Colonial, East Indies and Persia*) combined summaries of the Court Books and of other documents. The last entries in Mr. Sainsbury's series closed in 1634, and it is with that year that the instalment of the *English Factories* now before us begins, so that by far the larger part of the documents summarised will be new to everyone except to the few who have had occasion to consult the originals.

The three years dealt with were full of interest and excitement. In previous reviews of Mr. Foster's *Calendars* it has been shown that, since the massacre of Amboyna, the East India trade had been very depressed indeed. By 1630 there came the beginning of better times. But as yet for a long time the company only enjoyed intermittent gleams of prosperity; and often, as the future began to look more favourable, some unexpected

misfortune was experienced. Thus Mr. Foster rightly characterises this period as an 'eventful one.' It witnessed an agreement which terminated the long disputes with the Portuguese, the obtaining of the 'golden farman' and the first voyage to China. On the other hand, the company had to face the penalties, exacted from it in India, for the piracies of the *Roebuck*, and Charles I. was supporting the rival body formed by Sir W. Courten. Very graphic accounts are given of the indignities to which Methwold was subjected by the natives on account of the plunderings of the *Roebuck*, and, although the company was not only guiltless of complicity, but was completely ignorant of the whole affair, it was eventually compelled to compensate the native merchants for their losses.

W. R. SCOTT.

AN HISTORICAL RELATION OF CEYLON together with Somewhat concerning Severall Remarkable passages of my life that hath hapned since my deliverance out of my captivity. By Robert Knox, a captive there near Twenty Years. Pp. lxxviii, 460. With numerous Illustrations. Demy 8vo. Glasgow: James MacLehose & Sons. 1911. 12s. 6d. nett.

THIS new edition of the account of Ceylon, by the prisoner who experienced a captivity of eighteen years and a half there, will be welcomed by all who know the wealth of detail in the original book, and not the less so because this edition gives many new features of his career in his own words. Robert Knox, the pious writer ('God often Spoke to my Conscience in my minority,' he writes), and his father were, when on an Eastward cruise in the ship 'Ann,' taken prisoners when seeking wood at Cottiar in 1661, and, with sixteen other unfortunate Englishmen, carried into the interior of Ceylon by the tyrant Raja Singa. Knox's father soon died, but he and his comrades remained in bondage of differing grades, terrified of their despot (who had already put to death two of his children and 'cut off' many of his subjects), and resigning themselves to a miserable captivity.

Most of them took native wives, but Knox resisted this distraction, and, with the sole consolation of a miraculously obtained Bible, applied himself to the unconscious study of the Island of Ceylon, which was the beginning of this book, while living as a pedlar. In 1679 he, with Stephen Rutland, managed to effect an escape from their bloody master, and to take refuge with the Dutch, who occupied the coasts of the island. Sent home, he wrote this book during the voyage, and then had a gratifying meeting with his surviving relatives, and was received by the pitiful East India Company and protected (for a time) by Sir John Child. He again essayed an Eastern voyage, and it is not a little strange to find the pious and resentful ex-captive not only sometimes a pirate but also a zealous slave-dealer in Madagascar! His slave-trading there almost led to another captivity, and we learn about this in his biography, which is printed here for the first time.

His later life included the publication of his excellent account of Ceylon, with the approval of the Royal Society, an hour's conversation with King Charles II., a West Indian voyage, and some peaceful days in England before he died, leaving considerable wealth, in 1720. One of the most

interesting points brought out in this book—in the newly printed portion—is the information that Knox, the Bible-quoting prisoner, was not, as has generally been asserted previously, a Scot. He himself states that his father and grandfather were both born at Nacton in Suffolk, and this is a new fact for most of his biographers.

A. FRANCIS STEUART.

THE PAST AT OUR DOORS OR THE OLD IN THE NEW AROUND US. By Walter W. Skeat, M.A. With numerous Illustrations. 8vo. Pp. xi, 198. London : Macmillan & Co. 1911. 1s. 6d.

DEDICATED to the author's father and mother on their golden wedding day, Mr. Skeat's slim little volume pleasantly continues in the second generation Professor Skeat's mingling of studies in history with philological researches. The son is more an archaeologist than the father and less a philologist, but he practises both kinds of research in his series of comprehensive essays on our food, dress and homes, considered chiefly in the light of the names of things. He has the philologist's tendency to draw very remote inferences sometimes (for example, regarding 'haggis'), but his gatherings of little domestic fact on the evolution of dishes, garments and types of houses are generally excellent. Notable instances are his treatment of plough, sickle, coat-tail buttons, the dresser, hall and belfry. The book recalls the late Sir Arthur Mitchell's way of seeing the past in the present, and is an informing popular sketch.

A BIOGRAPHY OF THOMAS DEACON, the Manchester Nonjuror. By Henry Broxap, M.A. Pp. xix, 215. With two Illustrations. 8vo. London : Sherratt & Hughes. 1911. 7s. 6d. nett.

THIS short study contributes not a little information about the little known sect which arose out of the body of original Nonjurors. The bishops who 'went out' in 1688 on account of their loyalty, decided (with the permission of their exiled king, who obtained Papal consent for his action) to perpetuate their Episcopal succession, and this continued with the assistance of certain Scottish Nonjuring Bishops, one of whom was Bishop Archibald Campbell. Later (1716) the great and learned dispute about 'The Usages' began which rent the Nonjuring Church in twain. One of the supports of 'The Usagers' was Thomas Deacon, a young nonjuring clergyman, who had been interested in 'The '15.' He removed about 1720 to Manchester, which was then 'the largest, most rich and busy village in England,' and there supported himself by the practice of medicine, while he continued writing his long-forgotten tracts.

About 1733 Bishop Campbell took the extraordinary step of alone consecrating him bishop, and after this he ruled over a small congregation in Manchester, separated, except politically, from the other more canonical Nonjurors. We get an interesting glimpse of Manchester in the '45 in this book, and of the Jacobite rising, which cost the worthy bishop the lives or freedom of three sons. Dr. Deacon did not long survive this catastrophe, as he died in 1752, after a harmless and useful life.

The author has handled his subject with so much skill that he reawakes in the reader interest in the long dead religious controversies of the Non-

juring Churches, and one sees the example their zeal gave as a protest against the dull Erastianism of the English Church till broken by the Nonconformist movement and the Anglican Revival to both of which this example may have contributed.

COLONEL THOMAS BLOOD, CROWN-STEALER, 1618-1680. By William C. Abbott. Pp. 98. With Frontispiece. Crown 8vo. Newhaven: Yale University Press. 1911. 4s. nett.

WE are here given an excellent narrative of the life of one of the plotters whom the see-saw of politics made so plentiful after the Reformation. Colonel Thomas Blood, a north of Ireland adventurer, was one of the chief parties in the attempt to kidnap (and perhaps hang) the great Duke of Ormonde in 1770. He had been in many plots, but his daring attempt to steal the Regalia from the Tower in 1771 brought him into most fame. Andrew Maxwell wrote of his disguise:

‘He chose the cassock, surcingle and gown,
The fittest mask for one who robs the crown.’

Brought before Charles II., the strange thing is that he was pardoned, and was soon in a high and feared, if doubtful, place as an informer. In 1680, he having found out that in spite of all his schemes

‘... Success was still to him denied,
Fell sick with grief, broke his great heart and died.’

PRINCIPLES OF BIOGRAPHY. By Sir Sidney Lee. Pp. 54. Cambridge University Press. 1911. 1s. 6d.

A BIOGRAPHER on the principles of his art can hardly fail to interest, even if he is sparing of enunciations. In this Leslie Stephen lecture Plutarch is praised without criticism of his method of ‘parallels,’ which would hardly satisfy modern conditions, though doubtless it might still be applied to balanced estimates of, say, Nelson and Napoleon. Masson’s *Milton* is referred to as a ‘swollen cairn’ (do cairns swell?). Boccaccio’s *Dante* is condemned for its impassioned but irrelevant rhetoric. Boswell—the phrase a ‘rarely inquisitive young man’ is ambiguous—gets credit for his masterpiece, but more for his art than for himself. Lockhart’s *Scott* is ranked next. Collective or dictionary biography is described as dominated by the need of brevity and by strict discipline. These are no startling doctrines. Biographical principles differ so greatly for different types of lives that we scarcely wonder that but few have been found of universal application to insist upon. The lecture opens with a restrained but hearty tribute to Leslie Stephen, honourable alike to master and pupil.

SPECIMEN PAGES OF TWO MANUSCRIPTS OF THE ABBEY OF COUPAR-ANGUS IN SCOTLAND, WITH A SHORT DESCRIPTION. By O. H. M. Bannister. 4to. Pp. 13. Five Phototype Plates. Rome: Editor Danesi. 1910.

THESE facsimile reproductions from two Vatican codices were made on the suggestion of Prof. W. M. Lindsay of St. Andrews, but the introductory

98 Specimen Pages of Two Manuscripts

notice is too brief to be satisfactory. The one MS. is a psalter, '*psalterium glossatum*,' and the other a copy of Beda's *Historia Anglorum*. The provenance is indicated by an identical title on each—*Liber Sancte Marie de Cupre*. The psalter is in 'Irish' script of 'at earliest the second half of the twelfth century,' and the copy of Beda is of the thirteenth century. Features of the psalter suggest a scriptorium in Great Britain rather than in Ireland, and a resemblance to Durham MSS. is detected in the Beda. The latter has a continuation to A.D. 796, recording events relative to the bishops of Whithorn, a fact which stimulates the wish that the pages containing this continuation might be issued in a sequel to the present specimens. Their interest can hardly be exaggerated as attesting what Mr. Bannister styles 'insular script,' and as affording concrete evidences of Celtic survival in the library of the Cistercian abbey of Cupar (Coupar-Angus), which Mr. Bannister states—without citing any authority—to have been founded in 1136. Presumably this is a slip, as the early writers with one accord from the chronicler of Melrose to Fordun, Wyntoun and Bower agree in assigning the foundation to King Malcolm the Maiden in the year 1164. The five plates are capital reproductions, and the editor's claim for the importance of the two MSS., not only for the handwritings and the liturgical and historical contents, but also for their connection with Cupar, is well made out. We trust the venture of the publisher in Rome has met the response it deserves in this country.

CONTROVERSIAL ISSUES IN SCOTTISH HISTORY: A CONTRAST OF THE EARLY CHRONICLES WITH THE WORKS OF MODERN HISTORIANS. By William H. Gregg. Pp. x, 581. With numerous Illustrations. S.R. 8vo. London: G. P. Putnam's Sons. 1910. 25s. nett.

THIS is a bewildering monumental mass of quotations and unnecessary reproductions. The laborious author expects criticism of his system, but it is so cryptic that it makes any real criticism impossible. He tilts against the historical works of Chalmers, Pinkerton, and more especially Skene, who, he alleges, founded a movement 'utterly to abolish the *old* history of Scotland, and to replace it with one which has contributed no new facts, nor established any documentary evidence.' He selects as an illustration of this the obscure period of the eighteen years of King Gregory. His contentions anent the identifications by others of Ciric, Girig, Gryg, Gyrg, Grig and Gregory; the king's career (about which he counters Skene) and his relation to the Clan Gregor, may be found in this well got up but labyrinthine work, the construction alone of which will be bound to baffle all but the most tolerant and patient of Celtic students.

A SYNOPSIS OF THE LEADING MOVEMENTS IN MODERN HISTORY. By F. R. A. Jarvis. Sm. 8vo. Pp. vi, 122. London: George Philip & Son. 2s.

EXCELLENT as a skeleton history of representative government, this synopsis constantly subordinates the biographical elements to the institutional, and achieves an unusual degree of success in the interesting treatment of principles, political, social, and economic, illustrative of the

passage of history centring upon Great Britain from the masterful epoch of the Tudors to the present age of colonial constitution-making.

The little book adds to the virtues of succinct statement and well-marshalled lines of cause and effect, a fine perception of the main trend of democratic aspiration, of the necessity to beware of socialistic tendencies to throw all responsibility on the State, and of the need of some form of co-ordinating federal sovereignty over the Empire. His conclusion is interesting—that Adam Smith's project of Empire ('the union of Great Britain with her colonies') may be converted into a living reality through economic and military pressure.

THE ROYAL HIGH SCHOOL, EDINBURGH. By James E. Trotter, M.A. Pp. xii, 195. With 32 Illustrations. Crown 8vo. London: Sir Isaac Pitman & Sons, Ltd. 1911. 3s. 6d. nett.

It is a pity that so much 'fine writing' has been attempted in this history. The 'Old Boys' who read the account of the life of the old Grammar School and its 'bickers' will find that the narrative would have gained in merit if the writer had been less diffuse. Still, he traces in his own way the history of the Schola Regia and its migrations (the archbishop's palace in which it was once housed was built, not by Thomas, but by Archbishop James Bethune), and gives full lists of those (and they are many) *alumni* who have made the name of the school great in the past, and of their rectors. He has something to interest them, too, in the school-days of Sir Walter Scott and the author of *Lavengro*, and among the portraits of past pupils which add to the interest of the book we find one of King Edward VII. when he was under the care of the then rector, Dr. Schmitz.

THE FIRST DECADE OF THE AUSTRALIAN COMMONWEALTH. A CHRONICLE OF CONTEMPORARY POLITICS, 1901-1910. By Henry Gyles Turner. Pp. xv, 320. Demy 8vo. Melbourne: Mason, Firth & M'Cutcheon. 1911. 9s.

THE author admits the difficulty of gauging the value of contemporary history, so we shall only say that this is his account—and a well-written one—of Australian political history from the appointment of the first governor-general and the opening of the first Federal Parliament in 1901 to the 'Third Labour Ministry.' We must also quote his own words 'whether my deductions are right or wrong, I can say that they have been conscientiously arrived at, and, that in forming them, I have asked no man's advice or opinion.'

A GUIDE TO THE BEST HISTORICAL NOVELS AND TALES. By Jonathan Nield. Pp. xviii, 522. Foolscap 4to. London: Elkin Mathews. 1911. 8s. nett.

THE fourth edition has brought this attempt to enumerate the best—however one may construe the word—historical novels up to date. It is a difficult and rather thankless task, yet we see that the compiler has bestowed much care upon it, and we hope that it will be of use to those who prefer their historical studies to be pursued in the guise of fiction.

The article in the *Edinburgh Review* for April on Roman Scotland will be read with peculiar interest as the eloquent, picturesque, and courageous exposition of a ripe archaeological scholar's conclusions on the general significance of the Roman occupation, especially in the light of Mr. Curle's unearthing of Trimontium and Dr. Macdonald's re-discussion of the Vallum of Antonine. The writer's pen—if conjecture as to this possibility be permissible—has heretofore been well under restraint; indeed, some of us have for years been calling for a plain and full deliverance of his theory of the interrelation of the composite barrier across North England and the simpler structure between Forth and Clyde. The article at last, and in a lively, dignified, and engaging manner, sets forth to a considerable degree the faith that is in the author, whose identity in Prof. Haverfield is archaeologically a secret of the housetops. Agricola's chain of transisthmian forts had been given up after his recall. Newstead (Trimontium) marked perhaps for thirty years later the Roman limit—a river frontier line of Tweed, or a mountain line along the northern foot of Cheviot. When Hadrian came he chose a frontier forty miles south, across which the professor enters the archaeological battle-ground of centuries. The earthen Vallum of the Cumbro-Northumbrian barrier he still leaves unaccounted for, but Hadrian built the first wall—'a solid rampart of neatly laid sods'—with 'large and small forts and turrets' all connected by a road. This work of A.D. 120-124 is characterised as a real service to the Empire, by enabling the garrison to patrol the frontier as they could never have done without it. About A.D. 142 the frontier was moved northward and the Antonine Wall built. The description of it deserves quotation for its sympathetic touches and crisp delineation.

'The chief item in the new order is the new feature, the Wall. A continuous rampart was built for thirty-six miles from Old Kilpatrick on the Clyde to Bo'ness on the Forth, along the very line where Agricola had once placed his forts. Its shorter length, its meaner ruins, its less delightful and majestic scenery have won for this Wall far scantier notice than has fallen to the southern Wall. Few, we think, have cared to walk it from end to end: few have gained from it that impression of Roman power which marks the greatest remains of the ancient world. Yet it is a serious piece of frontier work. Like Hadrian's Wall, it was built of sods and ran along a continuous valley from sea to sea. But it followed to the southern not the northern side of the valley and it made no attempt at straightness; instead it wound from hill to hill in unceasing anxious quest of strong military positions, and its whole scheme is that of the one central section of Hadrian's Wall which crowns the line of basalt crags. Many forts guarded it, some actually built on it, others a few yards to the rear. Most of these forts, as far as is known at present, were of one general type. They were girt by ramparts of turf like the Wall itself; within these ramparts they covered a space equal to a square of a hundred yards and housed a garrison of five hundred men; they stood on selected sites approximately two miles apart. On the other hand, they were reinforced by no such smaller forts or towers as mark the lines of Hadrian. The garrisons of the northern wall were perhaps stronger: they were certainly massed closer

than those of the south.' This new frontier 'did not supersede the earlier southern line. The two were held together.' And at this point the professor, or at any rate the Edinburgh Reviewer, advances new doctrine for the new frontier, when he says that Pius did not aim at annexing part of southern Scotland, and that he took not a new province but a remote strategic point, closing the door against the unconquered Caledonians of the hills so as to shut them out from raids into the south. All the land west of the road from Carlisle past Carstairs to the centre of the Wall 'lay wholly outside the Roman strategy.' This interpretation (does it apply to Berwickshire also where there are no Roman remains?) is difficult, and some of us may hesitate before accepting it. However this may be, the frontier did not succeed; there were repeated revolts; about A.D. 162 the Wall was lost for a time; about 180 it was lost altogether, when Newstead (rebuilt after 162) was lost also—'the end of Roman Scotland.'

There was still to come at the beginning of the third century the campaign of Severus, about which the professor is dubious whether that Emperor ever passed the Cheviots, ascribing to him, however, the mighty work of rebuilding in stone Hadrian's Wall of turf, and walling the forts with stone also. 'With his death in 211 Scotland drops out of the tale of the British frontier.'

It is impossible to read without a responsive thrill the panegyric of the Britannic *limes* which concludes the article. The garrisons might fail at last, but they were saving Europe by the two centuries of defence. We may ask for further proof before adopting the inference about the Tweed frontier, the limited scope of policy behind the Antonine Vallum, the magnitude of the building programme assigned to Severus and certain consequences deducible therefrom; but we are not the less grateful forsovid, learned, and stirring a presentment of facts which are beyond gainsay, and of frank and persuasive theories which require ruminating, and admit of no hasty refutation however obstinately inspired. And certainly we appreciate Professor Haverfield's closing sentences: 'The Roman walls in Scotland and northern England have passed utterly out of our modern lives. They did not in the end save Roman civilisation in our corner of the empire. But before they perished they helped to do a work for which to-day all Europe may be grateful.'

The Milecastle on the Wall of Hadrian at the Poltross Burn. By J. P. Gibson and F. Gerald Simpson, with contributions by Prof. R. C. Bosanquet and H. H. E. Craster (Kendal: Titus Wilson. 1911) is a private reprint from *Cumberland and Westmorland Antiquarian and Archaeological Society's Transactions*. Poltross Burn is the boundary between Northumberland and Cumberland, and the milecastle there, near Gilsland, was excavated last year. The results are, with much clearness, exhibited in the report by Mr. Gibson and Mr. Simpson, which is made additionally effective by a fine series of photographic plates showing general views, the north gate, the connection with the Great Wall, the ovens (of three periods), coins, fibulae and bronze objects. Besides, there are unusually well-defined and large plans done by Mr. Simpson, as well as sections and drawings of pottery, etc.

Chief interest probably lies in the facts or inferences (1) that three successive floors were found, proving three occupancies; (2) that the coins, pottery and fibulae of the lowest floor are of second century dates and types; and (3) that the milecastle was abandoned before 330 A.D. The sum of fact suggests to the authors the conclusion that 'the building of the milecastle and Great Wall took place about 120 A.D.,' and that the invasion of 180 A.D. was the occasion of the first destruction, while there are no data to fix the period of the second destruction following the first rebuilding. The lines of inference, singly slender, are strong by convergence, and offer the sharpest contrasts of interpretation to those of the Edinburgh reviewer. The argument that milecastles of stone are incompatible with a wall of turf carries a great appearance of force. In any view the positions maintained by Mr. Gibson and Mr. Simpson, with their extensive local knowledge and experience in similar excavations, much accentuate the difficulty of adopting as at all countenanced by archaeological fact the conclusion that Severus, not Hadrian, built the Murus.

The English Historical Review (April), besides formal papers on the Papal claim of fealty from William the Conqueror, the year-book of Edward II., and the letters, etc., of Henry VIII., has a variety of important notes. One is a collection of biographical data for Mary, abbess of Shaftsbury, believed to have been the poetess Marie de France. Another is a short comment with text of two chapters of Robert the Bruce in 1315 conveying the sherriffdom and burgh of Cromarty to Sir Hugh of Ross. The fact that the text of this grant was already known does not lessen the interest of its presence in our contemporary's hospitable page. Sir James Ramage proposes to account for Pipe Roll as—not a cylinder parchment but as—coming from O.F. *pipe espere de baton*. A reference to Laborde's *Glossaire Français du Moyen Age* voce *pippe*, giving many instances of the word in connection with medieval book-binding, would perhaps lend Sir James's explanation some corroboration, but meantime the explanation he offers is far from clear. A facsimile from the Vatican archives shows the words *Pater sancte* in the handwriting—'probably the only surviving specimen' of Edward III.

In the July issue Professor Hoskins, tracing the points of contact between chancery practices of England and Sicily in the twelfth century, registers a remarkable body of fact concerning Thomas Brown (or le Brun), an Englishman employed as assistant to the chancellor of King Roger of Sicily and thereafter from 1160 until 1180 filling an important place at the exchequer of Henry II., as the well-known *Dialogus* sets forth. The opinions of Reginald Pecock, especially as revealed by his *Book of Faith* recently edited by Professor J. L. Morison, are sympathetically expounded by the Rev. E. M. Blackie, who appears in considerable degree to share Prof. Morison's estimate of the originality and boldness of Pecock's interpretation of the relations of faith and reason, and his plea for the dominance of the latter virtually making the creed itself subject to 'sufficient evydencis.' What a glory it would have been to his memory had he faced the stake with that doctrine. But as later to Erasmus, the Church was still more to him than the individual creed. Professor W. H.

Stevenson once more earns gratitude for his learned exposition of a strange fragment of medieval congratulation to King Athelstan after the defeat of Sictric of Northumbria in 926, and before the battle of Brunanburh—because the Scottish king—'Constantinus Rex Scottorum et velum Brytannium'—is apparently regarded as King Athelstan's colleague and friend. The little poem is best known from the imperfect version given in *Reliquiae Antiquae*, 1843, ii. 179, but a fresh version from an eighth century Durham MS. printed in 1909 has now enabled Prof. Stevenson to furnish an emended text. In editing it he furnishes a very satisfactory parallel in matter and form in a poem addressed to Charlemagne.

In the *Juridical Review* for April, Mr. John Bartholomew makes a faithful assembly and an interesting analysis of Bonds of Manrent, quoting many examples and endeavouring to distinguish their intricate strands of relationship with feudal dependence on the one hand, and the clan system and cognate covenants of mutual defence on the other. An abuse of feudalism, manrent at times too readily approximated to blackmail; it was the corollary of an insufficiently protective central power; and, like most of such institutions, it long defied the statutes of 1457 and 1555, by which, according to Stair, it was 'utterly abolished.'

Special features of the *Rutland Magazine* for April are a note on the bell-lore of Oakham and a set of reprints of election squibs of 1841.

While the *American Historical Review* for July has its due quota of interesting matter on the Russo-Japanese War, the records of early settlement in Carolina, and the story of American politics, including the opening of the slave question campaign in 1860, the most attractive contribution for European reading is Dr. G. L. Burr's annotated transcript with facsimiles of a fragment of script on a blank page of a copy of Luther's German Bible printed in 1546, the year of the great reformer-translator's death. It is the engrossment of a letter evidently contemporary recording how Luther 'our chariot and true charioteer in Israel' died after a heart seizure sudden and short enough, yet giving time for the application of unavailing remedies before he passed away with *Pater in manus tuas*—words that have soothed so many parting souls before and since—on his lips. Dr. Burr suggests that the letter must have been written within a day or two after 18th February, 1546, and that it probably illustrates the actual putting in force of Melancthon's counsel that to avoid false stories (of suicide or the like) the friends of Luther should at once make known the circumstances of his death.

The *Maryland Historical Magazine* for June, among varied notes on the hostilities in the Revolution and during the war of secession, prints a letter by William Wilmot in 1777 describing his escape from capture in an attack on the British force on Staten Island when some 200 of his companions had to surrender.

Wilmot's independent spirit communicated itself to his spelling! He tells briskly of the 'houraw or hussaw from the ouné end of our little line

to the other' when they saw the 'hesions' (Hessians) fall back at one stage of the encounter before their fire. Less heroic is his story of his hiding in a hay shed 'devotely praying for the dark shades of knight to appear.'

The *Iowa Journal* (July) describes the exploratory expedition made in 1805 by Lieutenant Zebulon M. Pike from St. Louis up the Mississippi to one of its sources at Leech Lake, Minnesota. The lieutenant's journal has all the charm of geographical discovery with adventures among Sac, Fox, Iowa, Sioux and Chippewa Indians to boot. His transaction with the last named at Fort Snelling—a purchase of 100,000 acres for the United States in return for presents of about \$200—was at least shrewd bargaining. Another article quite as interesting and even more curious, gives the minutes of proceedings of a conference of Governor Henry Dodge with the chiefs of the Chippewas at Fort Snelling in 1837, resulting in a purchase of a vast territory between Lake Superior and the Mississippi for over \$200,000. The Indians doubtless were still poor enough bargainers, but the record of the speeches of Flat Mouth, Rat's Liver and the Loon's Foot are proofs that the Great Father beyond the mountains (the United States president) was somewhat more warily regarded by them than his predecessor had been in the days of Lieutenant Pike.

A striking feature of the *Revue Historique* (Mai-Juin) is Henri Marczali's story of a celebrated case of the fourteenth century *Le Procès de Félicien Záh*—a Hungarian killed in 1330 in the palace of Charles-Robert I., King of Hungary, after an attack on the king, in which the queen, Elizabeth, had several fingers cut off. Záh, who was one of the nobility, underwent a post-mortem sentence of denunciation subjecting his family to the third generation to the death penalty, and his more distant kinsfolk to slavery. It is an extraordinary sentence setting forth the treason and ambition of Záh and his 'mad-dog-like' murderous ferocity. But it proves to be elaborately false; it was an official hushing up of the real fact that Záh was avenging an insult to his daughter by the queen's brother, to which the queen was privy. The middle ages rich as they are in such things, have rarely matched this tale of fury and vengeance and wrong, and of the slow but final vindication of Záh from the fierce injustice which the lying sentence did to his name.

M. G. Bloch concluding his study of Roman class origins reverts in great measure to the position of Niebuhr against Mommsen's more recent view of the origin of the plebs. Diplomatic papers deal with Fancan and Richelieu, and with the French negotiations during the Prussian war with Denmark in 1864.

In the next number of the *Revue* (Juillet-Août) a poignant contribution, by M. Paul Gaffarel, re-examines the evidences for the massacres of the Vaudois in 1545, which so cruelly stained the closing years of Francis I. with Lutheran blood. The scrutiny unfortunately does not materially lessen the degree and extent of persecution, although the number of thousands of victims at Cabrières and Mérindol eluding exact computation may well have been somewhat overstated by protestant controversialists. The villains in the tragedy, President Oppède, Advocate-general Guérin

and Captain Polin, were subsequently prosecuted, but emerged with acquittal from the ordeal of embittered accusations. Guérin, currently believed to have been the 'expiatory victim for the massacres,' really suffered on a still more disgraceful charge. He was hanged and decapitated, and his head set on a stake in front of his own door, but this was not for the massacres, but for forgery. M. Gaffarel naturally reckons the story of these persecutions as among the most sinister pages in French annals. M. Marcel Marion, commencing a narrative of certain examples of the application of the laws against the royalist emigrations in 1792-93, points out that the threat of no quarter to the revolutionaries necessarily exposed the *émigrés* to reprisal, and that the cruel wrong which resulted in many cases was due to abuse of laws in themselves justifiably severe. M. Henri Prentout challenges the received interpretation of the Gaulish *Litus Saxonicum* in the *Notitia*, and controverts the view that it specifically connoted the Bessin in Normandy, suggesting that the term more probably was indefinite and embraced the whole coast line from the Loire to the Rhine.

The *Revue des Etudes Historiques* (July-December, 1910) contains an interesting seventeenth century study (not yet completed) in the articles on the life of Isabelle de Montmorency, Duchess of Châtillon and of Meklembourg. Her brilliant and varied career was the subject of many verses and *jeux d'esprit* by contemporary writers, and M. Fromageot's vivid narrative is not merely a personal sketch, but a living picture of many of the members of the great families of Montmorency and Coligny. 'Le grand Condé' was her cousin, and the Duc de Châtillon, with whom she made a romantic marriage, was a great-grandson of Admiral Coligny. Isabelle was not merely a beauty, but a woman of strong character, deep in the confidence of her distinguished cousin; she played no mean part in the Fronde, and counted for much in the fortunes of the great Catholic house generally.

M. de Vaissière's papers on Poltrot de Méré, the murderer of Guise, are also full of interest, in their discussion of the details of the crime, and the perennial question regarding the possible or probable complicity of Coligny, Soubise, and other Huguenots, not to mention Catherine de Médicis herself. On this last point much remains to be said, and M. de Vaissière hopes to bring forward more proof to establish her responsibility in the affair. Coligny he acquits of instigation, if not of foreknowledge and indifference.

General Collier de la Marlière, a descendant of an English Collier who went to France with Henry V. and remained there, is also the subject of an essay. He joined the Republican Army at the Revolution, chiefly from motives of necessity, and after a brief but notable career, ended by himself falling a victim to the guillotine.

Communications and Replies

NOTE ON THE PORTRAIT OF JAMES I. (*S.H.R.* vii. 113). Mr. James L. Caw has done good service by publishing such excellent copies of the Edinburgh series of portraits of the five Jameses in the *Scottish Historical Review*, vol. vii. No. 26, and it is to be hoped that his paper may be the means of throwing light upon the origin of the well-known picture that has long done duty as a portrait of King James I. That picture represents the king with flowing hair and a bifid beard, wearing a curious cap with a peculiar ornamentation, and a jacket open at the neck, laced loosely with a cord across the chest.

So far as I have been able to trace it, the portrait first appeared as one of a series of Scottish kings in J. Jonston's *Inscriptiones historicae Regum Scotorum*, which was published at Amsterdam in 1602. From Jonston it was reproduced in William Drummond's *History of Scotland* in 1655, where various liberties have been taken with the dress, and T. Murray's *Laws and Acts of Parliament of Scotland* in 1681. In 1797 it was copied by Pinkerton (*Iconographia Scotica*), who pronounced the series of portraits of which it forms a part to be 'entitled to the greatest confidence of authenticity.' But those were uncritical days, and Pinkerton apparently took no further pains to trace the origin of the picture, though he notes that it had twice appeared since Jonston's time, adding mysteriously that these copies (*i.e.* from Jonston) 'are of no authority.' The portrait appeared again in the *Pictorial History of England* (ii. 133) in 1856, and it has recently taken a fresh lease of life in R. Garnett, *English Literature*, i. 287 (1903); S. Cowan, *Royal House of Stuart*, i. 166 (1908); and as a frontispiece in A. Lawson, *The King's Quair* (1910).

It seems, therefore, as if it had come to stay, and it would accordingly be well to look a little more narrowly into its claim to authenticity.

It will be seen that Jonston, who first published it 165 years after the king's death, says nothing as to where he had taken it from, and no one seems to have raised the question since. But if we compare his series with that now acquired for the National Portrait Gallery in Edinburgh, it is impossible to miss the resemblance between the two, not so much in the features of the portraits as in the details of the dress and ornaments, *e.g.*

(a) the cap and the laced front of James I., together with a general similarity, though Jonston added the right hand grasping a sword;

(b) the ornament on the cap of James II.;

(c) the pendent of the chain and the ornament on the cap of James III.;

(d) the cap and the chain across the chest of James IV. ;

(e) the whole costume of James V. ;

all pointing to the Edinburgh panels as being probably the originals on which Jonston worked.

I quite agree with Mr. Caw (p. 114) in ascribing these panels to the middle of the sixteenth century, the only really contemporary portrait among them being that of James V. ; the others I conceive to be mere guess-work, such as was common enough among portrait-painters who undertook orders at that period. Mr. Caw, however (p. 115), thinks that 'the likenesses were almost certainly founded upon earlier portraits then existing but now lost,' and that 'the costumes are archaeologically correct.' But both of these propositions appear to me to be exceedingly doubtful, and until something more indisputable is advanced it seems necessary to utter a caution against the prevalent fashion of taking the Jonston picture as an authentic representation of the features of James I., though the trustees of the Portrait Gallery are certainly to be congratulated upon having apparently acquired the sixteenth century original which Jonston (in the French sense) vulgarised.

Incidentally let me add that there appears to be no reason for supposing with Mr. Caw (p. 116) that the picture of James II. at Kilchberg (not Kielberg) near Tübingen has 'now disappeared.' According to present information all the (so-called) portraits of Ehingen's nine sovereigns are at Kilchberg yet.

J. HAMILTON WYLIE.

4 Lawn Road, Hampstead, London, N.W.

'SCOTTISH ISLANDS IN THE DIOCESE OF SODOR' (*S.H.R.* viii. 261). With reference to Mr. Reginald L. Poole's extremely interesting paper I offer the following notes :

Chorhye = Chorbrye = Kiarbarey = the Saga name for Kerrera, which comes in quite appropriately next after Mull.

Carrey. On the old maps (*e.g.* Ortelius, 1570 ; D'Arfeville and Lyndsay, 1583 ; Speed, 1610 ; and Straloch, 1653) the island of Kara appears quite as prominently as Gigha (Saga name, Gud-ey), which is immediately to the north of it. Your contributor is probably correct, however, in his ingenious suggestion that the transcriber has miswritten Canney (Canna), which fits in better as to position.

Howas = Hivist, one of the many forms of Uist (Saga name, Ivist). The suggestion of Howse is founded on a misreading of Dean Munro, who gives the name of the parish as Howfe (not Howse). See *Origines Parochiales* for various other spellings.

De insulis Alne must, I think, refer to a *group* of islands, and here I suggest that the word Alne may be a corruption of Flanni, *i.e.* the Isles of St. Flann. The Flannan Isles also called The Holy Isles and The Seven Hunters, are a small group twenty miles west of the Lewis.

Swostersey. Principal Lindsay would seem to have solved this puzzle ; the Wattersay referred to is probably the one near Barra, which best suits the geographical progression.

Episcoporum h(...) must, one would think, refer to the isles referred to by Principal Lindsay and known as the Bishop's Isles. *h*(...) may stand for *haebudensium*?

I suggest that the lacuna in the middle of page 259 should read: *pertin* (*entibusque*), and not (*entiisque*).

The use of Sodor as a place-name is, of course, a barbarism—the contraction 'Sodor' in some Latin manuscript (representing *Sodorensis*, *i.e.* Sudreyan) having been taken for a noun.

As we are dealing here with the Saga period, the names of the various Sudreyar are, as we should expect, chiefly given in their Norse form.

ROBERT L. BREMNER.

With reference to the same paper Mr. David MacRitchie writes:

Mr. Reginald Poole's identification of *Chorhye* with the island of Tiree in the papal bull of 1231 is borne out by the pronunciation of the word 'Tiree' when expressed according to English phonetics. The Gaelic word *tir*, 'land,' is pronounced like English 'cheer,' and I have heard a Gaelic-speaking woman pronounce 'Tiree' as if it had been written in English 'Cheree,' the accent being strongly on the second syllable. There is a modern tendency, even among Gaelic speakers—at any rate when they are speaking English—to pronounce the word as 'Tie-ree.' But as the woman referred to belonged to the caste of tinkers, a caste noted for its conservation of old forms, her 'Cheree' may safely be taken as the oldest pronunciation. From 'Cheree' to the 'Chorhye' of the papal bull is but a step.

BATTLE OF DUNDALK. What is the true date of the battle of Dundalk which brought Edward the Bruce's Kingship of Ireland to an end?

Mr. MacCarthy, Editor of the *Ulster Annals*, accepts the criteria in Clyn Towit, "1318, on the feast of blessed Calixtus, Pope and martyr, Oct. 14 on the morning of Saturday"; elsewhere it is given as 5th October, 1317, which was a Wednesday.

G. LAW.

[There cannot be a doubt that the date was Saturday, St. Calixtus day, 14th October, 1318. All original authorities, Scottish and Irish, agree on the point. The latest examination of the question is in Mr. W. M. Mackenzie's *The Bruce*, note to bk. xviii., where the source of the erroneous 5th October is traced to the *Annals of Ireland* in the old Latin edition of Cantuar' *Britannia* used by Hailes. Later editions, *e.g.* ed. 1695, p. 1137, trace the text of the *Annals* expressly and correctly thus—"On Saturday which happen'd to be the feast of Pope Calixtus a Battle was fought . . . two leagues from Dundalk." It is right to suggest in slight correction both of Father Stevenson, editor of the *Lanercost Chronicle*, and of Mr. Mackenzie that the *Chronicle* may be read as putting the battle not on the 13th as they state, but on the 14th of October—*infra quindenam post festum sancti Michaelis*, that is, the fifteenth day after 29th September, which is October 14, differing from the simple 'quinzaine' of St. Michael which is the 13th.]

ORDER OF THE STAR OF BETHLEHEM. The Monastic Order of the Star of Bethlehem was one of the lesser orders of which little seems to be known. Mathew Paris, in his *Historia Major* under the year 1257, mentions that a house in Cambridge was given to the Bethlehemite Brethren, whose dress is similar to that of the Black Friars, but is marked on the breast with a red Star with five wavy rays, and in the centre a round brazen knob representing the Comet which appeared at Bethlehem at the Birth of our Saviour.

The only house of this Order in Scotland was at St. Germans in the Parish of Tranent in East Lothian. As to when it was founded we have no information; but from the dates of some of its rulers, it must have been established much earlier than the one in England.

The Order appears to have been closely connected with the Bishopric of Bethlehem, which was suffragan to the Patriarch of Jerusalem. The first mention of the Order is in a deed in the *Reg. Epis. Glasg.*, where Sir Milo Corneth is a witness as to Stobs of date 1208-14. This does not mention St. Germans; but in a cyrograph between De Quinci and Holyrood as to the tithes of Tranent, where St. Germans is situated, in 1222, Milo Cornet, Prior of St. Germans, is a witness. The identity of these two is, I think, well established. He also, as Milo Corneth, witnesses undated charters to Dunfermline by De Quinci and to Newbattle by Richard de Morville.

In the Charters of Soltre [Bannatyne Club] 'Edward de Albo Fonte' grants Soutra the lands of Quhitwel 'et terram insuper de Bothoclyd quam tenui de *Sancto Germano*, pro qua quidem terra solvent annuatim *illius loci custodi* quatuor denarios ad Festum Sancti Michaelis pro omnibus et singulis que dictis terris exigi poterunt aut debebunt.' This deed is undated, and in the printed tabula the approximate date is given c. 1238-1300; but as Sir Wm. Sancto Claro, sheriff of Edinburgh, is a witness, the period may be shortened to between 1266-1290.

In Bayamond's Roll [Theiner, *Mon.*] Fratres de Sancto Germano paid 40s.

Friar John of St. Germans, who was the bearer of a letter of condolence to King Alexander from Edward I. in 1284, may or may not have been connected with this St. Germans. In 1291 the Pope grants a relaxation of one year and forty days of penance to those who visit the church of St. Germans, Traverent, and on the Feast of St. German.

In the valor verus the Domus de Sancto Germano is valued at £3 6s. 8d. and the tenth 6s. 8d.

In Ragman Roll, Bartholomew Magister domus Sancti Germani de Travenynt appears as owning land in Aberdeen and in Kincardine 28 Aug. 1296.

The Papal Letters and Petitions supply us with various other notices.

The Pope writes to David, King of Scotland, asking him to assist William, Bishop of Bethlehem, to recover certain sums of money due to him from certain benefices and other sources in Scotland, Sept. 1332.

In 1408 Robert, Duke of Albany, petitions on behalf of Richard de Mariton, a Canon of Scone, for the Hospital of St. Germans of the value of

£50 of old valuation, which was wont to be given by the Bishop of Bethlehem to clerks, bearing the Red Cross; and which was void, as Roger de Edinburgh is a notorious schismatic, notwithstanding that Henry de Ramsay unlawfully holds it.

This Roger de Edinburgh, a priest, who describes himself as of noble birth and akin to the King of Scots, had petitioned in 1394 for a canony of Rouen Cathedral, and in 1403 the Precentor of Bayeux petitioned on his behalf for a benefice in the gift of the Bishop and Chapter of Aberdeen.

The possession of this Hospital was the subject of much litigation. About four years later Henry de Ramsay, of noble birth and Rector of the Augustinian Hospital of St. German of the Star of Bethlehem, in the Diocese of St. Andrews, claims that the said Hospital, when void by the death of John Rollock, a papal chaplain, was given to him, first by his Ordinary, and then by papal authority, on deprivation of Roger de Edinburgh, a schismatic; and whereas Richard de Mariton, by a surreptitious grant obtained by false statements, is maliciously litigating about the same before Thomas de Carnes, official of St. Andrews, he prays the Pope to remit the cause to John Garsie, papal auditor, so that the Hospital may be given to the said Henry, which petition is granted in 1412.

As far back as 1373 John Rollo (Rollock above) Master here appears as one of the clerks of the wardrope (*Excheq. Roll*).

In the Douglas Charters, Dominus Richard Langlandis, Magister Hospitalis St. Germani, appears as a witness in 1421.

In 1466 Friar Patrick Pyot, master of the Hospital, gives sasine of certain burgh tenements in Crail to Sir John Ottyr; sasine is given by William Pyot, his brother, as his bailie.

In the *Antiquities of Aberdeen* (Spalding Club), Patrick Pyot, 'Magister Domus Sancti Germani Ordinis Sancti Augustini Iherosolimitani Cruciferorum cum Stella,' grants Donebankis in feu to Michael of Donebankis 1475. There is in the Dun charter chest a writ by John of Chalmers, master of St. Germans and parson of Aberluthnocht, in reference to the teinds of that parish for the year 1473. It is dated July 1474. There are also deeds of the same Chalmers as 'pensionarius' of St. Germans. These would appear to point out that there were two masters called Patrick Pyot with Chalmers ruling in the interval. In the Crail writs Mr. Thomas Pyot, Preceptor of the Star of Bethlehem, occurs in 1490. He seems to have been succeeded by the most famous master of the Hospital, the great and good Bishop Elphinstone of Aberdeen—a preferment that appears to be unknown to the writers of the life of the Bishop. Elphinstone appears as Preceptor in 1506 and 1510 in writs in the Kinnaird charter chest.

In General Hutton's MSS. in the Advocates' Library is a statement that 'Thomas Pyot, master of St. Germans, resigned properties in Glenmuick, Glengarden, and elsewhere, and rents in Fife, Lothian, Angus and Mearns to Bishop Elphinstone.' Unfortunately, the General does not condescend on dates, nor does he, as far as I could see, mention where the deed was that he quoted. This is to be regretted as evidently this was the deed by which the Preceptorship was resigned in the Bishop's favour. In the *Acta Dom. Aud.* is a mention that an annual of 4s. from a tenement

in Leith was to be paid yearly 'to ye place of ye sterne of Bethlehem' in 1483.

About 1542 Mr. Henry Lauder, the Queen's advocate, is designated of St. Germans. He as a young man made an oration in the 'French tongue' to the Queen on her first entry to Edinburgh. In the Denmyln MSS. in Advocates' Library is a Papal Letter granting permission to him, his wife and children to have a private altar. In the Register of the Great Seal, 1577, there is a confirmation of a charter by Alexander Morison vel Moreis, chaplain vel Preceptor de Capelle S. Germani de Stella Bethleemitate infra Partes Laudonie, of the Lands of St. Germans to George Douglas and Elizabeth Fairlie, his spouse, reserving life-interest to Francis Douglas of Borg, his father, and to Agnes Lauder, his spouse, and on their resignation. This was apparently in reference to making up the titles as the lands had been dispoised years before as shown above.

Thomas Dempster, of Muiresk, whose gigantic mendacity can only be palliated by his 'perfervidum ingenium Scotorum,' states that Donatus Grant eremita here wrote a work in 1354 entitled 'De Wiclifitarum Perfidia,' which fact is probably a creation of his active brain. He also states 'Eremita quidam Scotus imaginem Deiparæ Virginis Lauretanæ humeris suis in Scotiam, divina revelatione admonitus, deportavit et Musselburgi, quarto a regia Edinburgo lapide Villa Sancti Germani deposuit, ad quam toto regno atque etiam ex Anglia creberrimus piorum hominum concursus et solennis peregrinatio. Io. Leslaeus lib. ix. Hist. Scot. pag. 442 scripsit Revelationes suas Delata est ab eo imago an. MDXXXJ existimo hunc et Monachum et Ordinis Eremitanæ D. Hieronymi, quod illo ordo Sancti Germani Coenobium haberet, viris doctis et sanctis celebre.' Dempster was not the only writer to confuse the Hospital of St. Germans with the Chapel of Loretto at Musselburgh.

The name of Pyot [Magpie] was held of little respect, as in 1707 a petition was presented to Parliament by William Pyot for himself, his kinsmen and relations, humbly showing that their predecessors were of the surname of Graham, but that owing to an unhappy difference in the clan they were obliged to cover themselves under the surname of Pyet. They therefore earnestly entreat Parliament to discharge the ignominious nickname of Pyet and to allow them to take the surname of Graham which they cannot do without a Public Act. Parliament granted the prayer, and an act was passed for the purpose.

In *Exegesis in Canonem Divi Augustini*, by Robert Richardson, Canon of Cambuskenneth, Paris, 1530, a rather rare book, is a list of the orders that follow the rules of St. Augustine. The Star of Bethlehem is not mentioned, but it may be included under that of the Cruciferorum, those bearing the Star of Bethlehem having made the Pilgrimage to Bethlehem.

J. G. WALLACE-JAMES.

Haddington.

THE BATTLE OF HARLAW. Five hundred years ago, on 24th July, 1411, the battle of Harlaw was fought, near Inverurie, some

The Battle of Harlaw

twenty miles from Aberdeen. Donald, Lord of the Isles, having ravaged Ross—the earldom of which was in dispute—marched southward declaring that he would harry and burn the town of Aberdeen. The lowland forces, under the Earl of Mar, repelled the Celtic invasion, possibly in a more effective way than was thought of at the time. Aberdeen was saved, although its Provost, Robert Davidson, who led out thirty or forty of the burghers, was killed in the battle.

In commemoration of the five hundredth anniversary of this battle a pageant was held in Aberdeen on Coronation Day. To those who took an interest in the historical details, the procession was one of great interest. The leading personages were admirably represented. Although the details of costume, arms, etc., had been carefully thought out, and were in point of fact as nearly historically accurate as was possible, a section of the onlookers regarded the procession as merely a grotesque display. On the whole, however, the local committee had reason to look back with much satisfaction on their successful enterprise.