

**BROXHOLME, NOEL, M.D.** (1689?-1748), physician, was, according to Dr. Stukeley, a native of Stamford, Lincolnshire, of humble origin. Born in or about 1689, he was admitted on the foundation at Westminster in 1700, and in 1704 was elected to Trinity College, Cambridge. He proceeded, however, to Christ Church, Oxford, where he was nominated student 23 July 1705, and graduated B.A. 20 May 1709, M.A. 18 April 1711. In the former year, 1709, he had commenced his medical studies, under Dr. Mead, at St. Thomas's Hospital, and in 1715 was elected to one of the first of the Radcliffe travelling fellowships. Upon his return he removed to University College, as a member of which he took his degrees in physic by accumulation, proceeding M.D. 8 July 1723. Broxholme then began practice in London, was admitted a candidate of the College of Physicians 23 Dec. 1723, a fellow 22 March 1724-5, was censor in 1726, and delivered the Harveian oration in 1731. This, which was printed the same year in quarto, is remarkable for its elegant yet unaffected Latinity. He was one of the six physicians appointed to St. George's Hospital at the first general board held 19 Oct. 1733, and in the following year was made first physician to the Prince of Wales, 'with salary annexed,' an office which he resigned in 1739. At Lord Hervey's suggestion he was the first physician summoned to assist Dr. Tessier in Queen Caroline's last illness. Broxholme had married 7 May 1730, at Knightsbridge Chapel, Amy, widow of William Dowdeswell of Pull Court, Worcestershire, and daughter of Anthony Hammond, F.R.S., the wit and poet. He died at his country residence, Hampton, Middlesex, by his own hand, 8 July 1748, and was buried on the 13th at Hampton. By his will he bequeathed the sum of 500*l.* for the benefit of the king's scholars at Westminster 'in such manner as the two upper masters of the said school shall think fit,' and a like sum to Christ Church 'to be applied towards finishing the library.' Mrs. Broxholme survived her husband six years, dying in 1754. Reverting to our former authority, Dr. Stukeley, his countryman and fellow-student at St. Thomas's Hospital, we learn that Broxholme 'was a man of wit and gayety, lov'd poetry, was a good classic, . . . got much money in the Missisipi project in France. At length he came over and practised, but never had a great liking to it, tho' he had good encouragement!' 'He was always nervous and vapoured,' writes Horace Walpole, 'and so good-natured that he left off his practice from not being able to bear seeing so many

melancholy objects. I remember him with as much wit as ever I knew.' In 1754 there appeared 'A Collection of Receipts in Physic, being the Practice of the late eminent Dr. Bloxam [*sic*]: containing a Complete Body of Prescriptions answering to every Disease, with some in Surgery. The Second Edition,' 8vo, London.

[Family Memoirs of Rev. W. Stukeley (Surtees Society, lxxiii.), i. 46, 81, 96; Munk's Roll of College of Physicians, 2nd edition, ii. 89-90; Welch's Alumni Westmonasteriensis, new edition, pp. 237, 244, 245 *n.*, 260, 537; Lord Hervey's Memoirs, ii. 493; Letters of Horace Walpole, ed. Cunningham, ii. 20, 120; Gent. Mag. iv. 628, vii. 699, ix. 328, xviii. 333; Oratio Harveiana anno mdcclv. habita, auct. R. Taylor, pp. 31-3; Wills reg. in P. C. C. 205 Strahan, 188 Pinfold; Hampton Register; Collectanea Topographica et Genealogica, iv. 163; Notes and Queries, 1st ser. xii. 303, 353, 390, 2nd ser. ii. 249-50; Nichols's Literary Anecdotes, i. 484; Life of Bp. Newton prefixed to his works, i. 27; Letters and Works of Lady M. W. Montagu, ed. Wharnclyffe and Thomas, ii. 159-60; Lists of Royal Coll. of Physicians in Brit. Mus.] G. G.

**BRUCE, ALEXANDER**, second EARL OF KINCARDINE (*d.* 1681), was the second son of Sir George Bruce of Culross, and succeeded his brother Edward in the earldom in 1663. His grandfather, Sir George Bruce, settled at Culross early in the century, and there established extensive salt and coal works, the latter partly under sea, which became the sources of great wealth to the family (Douglas, *Scottish Peerage*). What part he took in the transactions of the years preceding 1657 is uncertain, but his attachment to presbyterianism is well known (though in 1665 he thinks 'a well ordered episcopacy the best of governments'), and his political principles at that time may be in part gathered from a sentence in one of Robert Moray's letters to him: 'By monarchy you understand tyranny, but I royal government.' He was obliged before 1657 to leave Scotland, and he settled at the White Swan inn at Bremen in that year. A remarkable correspondence, extant in manuscript, which was begun in that year between him and Moray, who, under similar circumstances, had settled at Maestricht, and which was carried on until the death of Moray in 1672, was left in the hands of Mr. David Douglas of Edinburgh in 1864 by Professor Cosmo Innes, and in 1879 handed by Mr. Douglas to the Earl of Elgin. It proves Bruce to have been a man of deep personal religion, of highly refined tastes, and of very wide attainments: medicine, chemistry, classics, mathematics, mechanical appliances of every kind, especially as adapted to

his mining enterprises, divinity, heraldry, horticulture, forestry, pisciculture, mining, and the management of estates—these and other subjects of acquired knowledge are discussed with evident knowledge. He was engaged in the Greenland whale fishery, and he possessed quarries of superior stone and of marble, part of which was used at Greenwich, and part in the rebuilding of St. Paul's. After the Restoration he became, upon the introduction of Moray, its first president, one of the leading members of the Royal Society. During 1657 and 1658 Bruce was extremely ill with ague. In the latter year he left Bremen for Hamburg, where he stayed at the house of his countryman, William Grison. At this time, and for some years afterwards, he was engaged, in conjunction with the Dutch mathematician, Hugens de Zulichem, in perfecting and in pushing a new invention for making pendulum clocks more serviceable at sea (*Correspondence with Moray*). A little later he took up his residence at the Hague, where on 16 June 1659 he married the daughter of M. Somerdyck, who brought him a large fortune (*ibid.* and DOUGLAS, *Scottish Peerage*). In January 1660 he was in London, 'at the stone-cutter's house next to Wallingford House, Charing Cross,' but immediately returned to the Hague, where he remained with his father-in-law until the Restoration. In June he was again in London at Devonshire House (*Correspondence with Moray*). All being now safe in Scotland he returned to Culross, and busied himself with his coal, salt, stone, and marble works. At the same time Burnet's statement that he neglected his private affairs for public work seems to be borne out by one of Robert Moray's letters, dated 22 Aug. 1668. According to Burnet, Bruce had been of great service to Charles while abroad by advancing money. It was only natural, therefore, that he should profit by the Restoration. He was at once admitted to the privy council, where he appears to have stood alone in his opposition to Glencairn and the dominant faction by urging delay, when in 1661 the king sent a letter to the Scotch privy council intimating his intention of reintroducing episcopacy (DOUGLAS, *Peerage*). The correspondence with Moray continues, but is chiefly confined to purely private matters until August 1665, when James Sharp, who at that time was in opposition to Lauderdale (with whom, through Moray, Kincardine was closely connected), and who was doing his best to slander all connected with his party, informed the king that Kincardine had been present at an unauthorised communion at Tollialoun. Kincardine's pointed

letters of remonstrance and Sharp's evasive replies are contained in the Lauderdale MSS. The report at first appears to have lost Kincardine favour at court, but so strongly did Lauderdale and Moray bestir themselves in his interest, that Sharp himself gained great disadvantage from the attempt, and in July 1666, by way of making peace, begged the king to grant Kincardine a large share of the fines (*Correspondence with Moray*). During the Pentland rebellion, November 1666, he had command of a troop of horse. In 1667, when the treasurership was taken from Rothes and put in commission, Kincardine was one of the commissioners, and was also appointed extraordinary lord of session. His business knowledge and acquaintance with home and foreign trade were of great advantage to his colleagues. Always anxious for good government, he actively assisted in the conciliatory measures upon which Lauderdale was at that time engaged with regard to the covenanters, though he often strongly urged that toleration should be 'given, not taken' (*Lauderdale MSS.*) In 1672, when Lauderdale began his career of persecution, Kincardine was almost the only one of his former adherents who stayed by him, relying upon his engagement to return to milder measures. One of the chief grievances brought against Lauderdale was that the right of pre-emption of various articles had been bestowed upon his friends to the public loss, and Kincardine helped his cause by abandoning that of salt, which he had held for a considerable time (*Lauderdale MSS.*) In January 1674 he was for a short while Lauderdale's deputy at Whitehall, during the absence of Lord Halton. During this year, however, he found it impossible to continue to support the duke; his last letter to him is dated 4 July. In compliance with Lauderdale's urgent request, Charles now ordered Kincardine to retire to Scotland. In 1675, according to Mackenzie, who, however, is the only evidence for this, he was expected to succeed Lauderdale as secretary, and came up to London; but through the intrigues of the duchess, who induced Lauderdale to believe that he was coming only to support the threatened impeachment by the House of Commons, and on account of his intimacy with Gilbert Burnet, then in disfavour, he was once more obliged to return to Scotland, where he exerted himself on behalf of the covenanters. For example, he did his best to obtain a just trial for Kirkton, one of the hill preachers, and, in consequence of a letter of complaint from Lauderdale's party, was, by an autograph letter of the king, dated 12 July 1676, dismissed from the Scotch

privy council. He appears after this to have taken no further part in politics. In 1678, however, he exerted himself to save the life of Mitchell, who some years previously had made an attempt upon James Sharp, and who was now murdered through the perjury of Rothes, Sharp, and others, and he endeavoured in vain to save Lauderdale from sharing in the guilt of this crime, which was afterwards the chief cause of the duke's fall (BURNET). In May of that year, when in London, he was 'script out of the English council' (*Lauderdale MSS.*) In February 1680 he is spoken of as being 'desperately sick,' and according to Burnet (i. 514) appears to have died in 1681.

[Burnet; Lauderdale MSS. in British Museum; Mackenzie's Memoirs; Wodrow's Church Hist.]  
O. A.

BRUCE, ARCHIBALD (1746-1816), theological writer, was born at Broomhall, Stirlingshire, and, after studying at the university of Glasgow, was ordained, in 1768, minister of the Associate (Anti-burgher) congregation of Whitburn. In 1786 he was appointed professor of divinity by the General Associate Synod, and continued to hold that office till 1806. Being dissatisfied with the action of his synod, he left it and formed, along with three others, the 'Constitutional Associate Presbytery;' this led to a sentence of deposition being passed on him by the former body. He died 28 Feb. 1816. He was a man of great theological learning, of earnest piety, and at the same time of a lively imagination, as his writings showed. The chief of these were—1. 'The Kirkiad, or the Golden Age of the Church of Scotland,' a satirical poem, 1774. 2. 'Free Thoughts on the Toleration of Popery,' 1780. 3. 'Annus Secularis,' the centenary of the revolution 1788, a long dissertation on religious festivals. 4. 'Queries,' on the commemoration of the revolution, 1797. 5. 'The Catechism modernized,' 1791, a cutting satire on lay patronage, and its effects, in the form of a parody on the Westminster Assembly's Shorter Catechism. 6. 'Reflexions on the Freedom of Writing,' 1794, a propos of a proclamation against seditious publications, bearing the motto 'What Britons dare to think, he dares to tell.' 7. A poem ridiculing the pretensions of the pope, 1797. 8. 'Lectures to Students,' 1797. 9. 'Life of James Hog of Carnock,' 1798. 10. 'Dissertation on the Supremacy of the Civil Power in Matters of Religion,' 1798. 11. 'Poems, serious and amusing, by a reverend divine,' 1812. 12. 'Life of Alex. Morus, a celebrated divine in Geneva and Holland,' 1813.

13. 'A Treatise on Earthquakes' (posthumous).

[McKerrow's History of the Secession Church; notice of Mr. Bruce by Rev. Thos. McCrie, D.D., in Scots Magazine, April 1816; collected edition of Bruce's works in Library of New College, Edinburgh.]  
W. G. B.

BRUCE, DAVID (1324-1371), DAVID II, king of Scotland, the only son of Robert the Bruce, by his second wife, Elizabeth de Burgh, born at Dunfermline on 5 March 1324, amidst the rejoicing natural to the long-wished-for birth of a male heir, came too late to receive his mother's or his father's care, and disappointed the expectations of the nation. Elizabeth died in November 1327, having borne a second son, John, who died in infancy. One of the last acts of his father was the treaty of Northampton in 1328 with Edward III, by which it was agreed that a marriage should as soon as possible be celebrated between the infant David and Joanna, the sister of the king of England, a child scarcely older than himself. Her dowry was to be 2,000*l.* a year from lands in Scotland, and she was to be delivered to the King of Scots or his commissioners at Berwick on 15 Jan. 1328. The marriage was solemnised on 12 July of that year in presence of the Earl of Moray and Sir James Douglas, as Bruce himself was too ill to attend. Within less than a year he died, on 9 June 1329, and David peacefully succeeded to his father's throne. His coronation was delayed till 24 Nov. 1331, when he was crowned, and first of the Scottish kings anointed by the bishop of St. Andrews, in accordance with the provisions of a bull Bruce had procured from Pope John XXII, too late for his own use (13 June 1329). According to the customs of chivalry he was knighted by Randolph, the regent, and then knighted the regent's son, the Earl of Angus, and others. Details of his marriage and coronation preserved in the Exchequer records show that no expense was spared to give the ceremonies the importance desirable at the commencement of a new race of independent kings. His reign nearly coincides with that of Edward III, who succeeded to the English throne two years before, and outlived David by seven years. The personal character of the two sovereigns reversed that of their fathers. David was a weak successor of the Bruce; Edward inherited the martial and administrative talents of his grandfather, instead of the feeble nature of Edward II.

The life of David naturally divides itself into five parts of unequal length, and as to two of which our information is very limited:—

I. From his coronation in 1331 to the victory of Edward Baliol at Halidon Hill in 1333.

II. His residence in France from 1334 to his return to Scotland in 1341.

III. His personal reign in Scotland from 1341 to his capture at Neville's Cross in 1346.

IV. His captivity in England from 1346 till his release by the treaty of Berwick in 1357.

V. The second period of his personal reign from 1357 to his death in 1371.

After the death of Robert the Bruce, Thomas Randolph, earl of Moray, governed the kingdom with vigour for three years; but his death, not free from suspicion of poison, in July 1332, exposed Scotland to the peril of a disputed regency. The estates met at Perth, and after long discussion chose, on 2 Aug., Donald, earl of Mar, the nephew of Bruce.

The choice was unfortunate, and there is reason to suppose the prudence of Bruce had foreseen the incapacity of Mar when he preferred Douglas in the succession to the regency, which the youth of David made inevitably long. But Douglas had by this time fallen in the Moorish war in Spain. Encouraged by the divisions amongst the Scottish nobles, and secretly aided by Edward III, Edward the son of John Baliol, with many barons who had lost their Scotch estates by espousing the English side, made a descent on the coast of Fife. The non-fulfilment of one of the conditions of the treaty of Northampton, by which these estates were to be restored, gave a pretext for renewing the war. News of Baliol's landing at Kinghorn was brought to the parliament at Perth the day of the regent's election, and Baliol, losing no time, met the regent and barons at the Muir of Dupplin, near Perth, on 11 Aug., nine days after he landed. Though greatly superior in numbers, the regent was totally routed. He himself, along with Thomas, earl of Moray, the son of Randolph, the earl of Monteith, and many other nobles, were slain. In September Baliol was crowned at Scone. His captive, the Earl of Fife, placed the crown on his head; but he had not yet conquered the country. Perth was almost immediately retaken by David's adherents, and Baliol was defeated at Annan in Dumfries by John Randolph, now Earl of Moray, and forced to leave Scotland. In 1333 Edward III came with a great force to assist Baliol, and routed at Halidon Hill, on 20 July, the Scotch army led by Archibald Douglas, lord of Galloway, who succeeded to the regency after the death of Mar. Berwick capitulated, and Edward became master of Scotland south of the Forth. On 10 Feb. 1334 Baliol, at an as-

sembly held at Edinburgh, surrendered Berwick absolutely to the English king, and, as security for an annual payment of 2,000*l.*, promised to put into his hands all the castles of south-eastern Scotland—Jedburgh, Selkirk, Peebles, Dumfries, Haddington, Edinburgh, and Linlithgow. Edward, like his grandfather, made a new ordinance for the Scottish government, but his officers never obtained complete possession of their posts. Meantime David and the queen had taken refuge at Dumbarton, one of the fortresses which held out under its brave governor Malcolm Fleming; but, Scotland being deemed an unsafe residence, he took advantage of a ship which Philip VI, the French king, sent for him, and along with Joanna and his sisters landed at Boulogne on 14 May 1334.

The royal exiles were splendidly received at Paris. Château Gaillard, the castle built by Cœur de Lion on the Seine close to the town of Andelys, was assigned for their residence, where they were maintained by Philip, though Froissart's statement that little came from Scotland to support them is disproved by the exchequer records, which show that besides provisions 4,333*l.* 18*s.* 7*d.* was remitted between May 1334 and January 1340.

The course of events in Scotland during the next seven years is outside the life of David. A new race of patriotic leaders—Murray of Bothwell, Robert the Steward, Douglas the Knight of Liddesdale—worthily sustained the fame of Robert Bruce, Douglas, and Randolph. At first they carried on the war with varying success, but ultimately they freed the country and retook all the castles. The greater attraction of a French campaign prevented Edward from ever using his whole strength against the northern kingdom. Not much is known of David's residence in France. He was of an age too young to take an active part in affairs, but not too young to learn the lessons of the extravagant and vain though splendid pomp of chivalry which distinguished the court of Philip VI. One characteristic scene at which he was present is described by Froissart—the meeting of the armies of the French and English kings about the end of October 1339. Three years previously a fleet, fitted out by David Bruce with the aid of the French king, made a diversion in favour of the Scotch, plundered the Channel islands, and seized many ships near the Isle of Wight. Edward retaliated by claiming the crown of France in October 1337, and, after two years of preparation, in September 1339 he crossed the Flemish border. At Vironfosse the two hosts came face to face. The English under

Edward were arrayed in three divisions, in all about 44,000. The French had the same number of divisions, but in each 15,000 men-at-arms and 20,000 foot. Though Edward was supported by the nobles of Germany, Brabant, and Flanders, besides his English vassals, Philip surpassed him in the rank as well as numbers of his followers; for besides the full array of France, dukes, earls, and viscounts, too long a list for even Froissart to rehearse, he was supported by three kings—John of Bohemia, the king of Navarre, and David king of Scotland. 'It was a great beauty to behold the banners and standards waving in the wynde, and horses barded, and knightes and squyres richly armed.' But no blood was shed in this first act of the war of a hundred years, which was to make the French and English, as it appeared, eternal enemies, and the French and Scots perpetual allies. Philip's counsellors were divided, but the view prevailed that it was better to allow the English king to waste his means in the maintenance of so great an army in a foreign country. The advice of Robert of Sicily, derived from astrology, that the French would be beaten in any engagement if Edward was present, also operated on the superstitious monarch. A feint of an attack caused by the starting of a hare between the camps, which led the Earl of Haynault to make fourteen knights, called in ridicule the Knights of the Hare, was an incident whose memory was perpetuated by those who thought it cowardly on the part of Philip with superior forces to decline battle on his own soil. The recollection of this scene and the victories of Crecy and Poitiers were inducements to David in later years to cast in his lot with the English king instead of with his national and natural allies.

In 1341 the brilliant successes in Scotland of Sir Andrew Murray of Bothwell, Robert the Steward of Scotland, and Sir William Douglas the Knight of Liddesdale, who in the preceding year had recovered one by one the castles north of and including Edinburgh, made it safe for David to return, and on 4 May he landed with his wife at Inverberrie near Montrose. Charters were issued under his name and seal at a council held at Aberdeen in February 1342, and though only thirteen, he assumed the personal government, which he retained until his capture at Neville's Cross in 1346. During the first two years after his return David was much at Aberdeen and Kildrummy, where his aunt, sister of Robert Bruce, who had married successively Gratney, earl of Mar, Sir Christopher Seton, and Sir Andrew Murray, lived.

In the course of 1342 he passed through Fife, attending the justice-eyres at Cupar and Edinburgh, to the Marches, and joined the Earl of Moray in a descent on the English border, during which Penrith was burnt, but nothing of consequence was accomplished. On his return north he visited Haddington, Ayr, and Kilwinning, Kirkintilloch, Inverkeithing, and Scone, and stopped at Banff before his return to Kildrummy in August. It was important that he should show himself in different parts of the kingdom. Hawking and hunting and the jousts or tournaments, the favourite amusements of the age, were fully shared in by the young king, but he did not prove himself an adept in the art of war, for which these were the appropriate training.

Two deaths, for one of which he was indirectly, and for the other directly, responsible, showed that he could not attract to his throne, as his father had done, the leading men of the country.

Sir James Ramsay of Dalwolsie, having taken the castle of Roxburgh, was imprudently rewarded by the gift of the sheriffdom of Teviotdale, then held by Douglas the Knight of Liddesdale, and Douglas having treacherously got Ramsay into his power starved him to death in the castle of the Hermitage. The other victim was William Bullock, an ecclesiastic who had distinguished himself in the service of Baliol, but changing sides received the office of chamberlain from David. Suspected of treason he was by the king's order sent prisoner to the castle of Lochindorb in Moray, where he also was starved to death. Other acts of lawlessness, as the rape of a lady of the Seton family by Alan of Seton, the execution without trial of an impostor calling himself Alexander Bruce, the son of Edward Bruce, and the state of the ordinary royal revenue, which fell from 3,774*l.* in 1331 to 1,198*l.* in 1342, and had to be increased by special parliamentary grants distributed with too lavish a hand, were signs of his incapacity as an administrator. 'Tristia felicibus succedunt' is the brief comment of Fordun. The restoration of the king had not benefited the kingdom. A murrain which specially attacked the fowls, a forerunner of the black death, added to the general distress and feeling of impending calamity. A truce with England, which followed one between Edward and Philip of France in 1343, saved Scotland for a short time from war, but the treasonable correspondence of the Knight of Liddesdale with the English king was a bad omen for its continuance. It was terminated early in 1346, when Philip, his own truce having closed, exhorted David to

invade England. Seizing the opportunity of Edward's absence at Calais, David mustered his forces at Perth, where the defection of the Earl of Ross, who slew Ronald of the Isles at the monastery of Elcho, showed how little he was able to command his vassals. Advancing to the borders, he took the castle of Liddel, put to death Selby, its governor, and, in spite of the counsels of the Knight of Liddesdale not to proceed further with a force consisting of only 2,000 men-at-arms and some 13,000 light-armed troops, crossed the Tyne above Newcastle, and ravaged the bishopric of Durham. He was met near that town on 17 Oct. at Neville's Cross by the Archbishop of York and the northern barons, and totally routed. David himself was taken prisoner by a squire, John Copland, after a brave resistance, in which it is recorded he struck out two of his captor's teeth. The earls of Fife, Menteith, and Wigtown, the Knight of Liddesdale, and many barons shared his fate. The earls of Moray and Strathearn, the chancellor, chamberlain, and marshal of Scotland were slain; the Earl of March and Robert the Steward alone of the principal nobles effected their escape. So great was the disaster, that 'the time of the battle of Durham' is used in the accounts and chronicles as a point of time.

David, with the other captives, was led in triumph through the streets of London to the Tower, placed on a tall black charger to make him conspicuous, as John of France was after Poitiers on a white charger. The next eleven years of his life were spent in England, chiefly in or near London, and at Oldham in Hampshire, varied with visits to the border or to Scotland. He was forced to bear his own charges, but the rigour of his imprisonment was soon relaxed in the hope that he would negotiate his ransom and even ally himself to England. Of David's captivity the records are almost as scanty as of his exile in France. In 1347, after taking Calais, Edward concluded a truce with France, which continued by various prorogations till 1 April 1354. Scotland was to be admitted to the truce, and in the next year the negotiations for David's ransom commenced. In October Joanna joined her husband in England. It was, however, Edward's policy to have two strings to his bow, and Baliol, whom he addressed as 'our dear cousin Edward,' while his brother-in-law was only styled Lord David de Bruce, remained nominal ruler of Scotland. In spite of his protest in March 1357 a treaty was concluded with the Scots commissioners for the ransom of David, and he was permitted on 4 Sept. to return to Scotland to procure

the sanction of the estates. Secret compacts were entered into in 1352 between Edward, David, and Lord Douglas, and between Edward and the Knight of Liddesdale. The terms of the former were purposely obscure, but indicate that in the event of David failing to persuade the estates to make peace, he engaged to act on his own account so that 'the work might be accomplished in another way.' The English commissioners were empowered to allow him to remain at Newcastle or Berwick, or even to set him at large if it would 'promote the business.' Knyghton, the English chronicler, reports that David had consented to acknowledge Edward as his feudal superior. There was no ambiguity in the agreement with the Knight of Liddesdale, who entered into a close alliance as a condition of his own release. In 1353 David had returned to England, having failed to obtain the consent of the Scotch estates to Edward's conditions, and at Newcastle conferences were renewed between the commissioners of the two countries, which resulted in a treaty on 13 July 1354, by which the ransom was fixed at 90,000 merks, payable in nine yearly instalments. Twenty hostages of noble birth were to be given for the fulfilment of the treaty, and the king himself, the nobles and bishops, as well as the principal towns, were to undertake personal obligations for its payment.

In 1355 the French king, alarmed at the project of a nine years' truce between England and Scotland, sent Eugène de Garancières with men and money to revive the war, and several border engagements followed; but early in 1356 Edward took Berwick, and obtained an absolute renunciation of the Scotch crown and kingdom from his puppet, Edward Baliol, on 21 Jan. Though he devastated the Lothians in the raid which received the name of the Burnt Candlemas, and issued a proclamation with regard to the government of Scotland, he failed to reduce even the southern district to subjection. In the north Robert the Steward maintained an independent power as regent, even during the period of the nominal reign of Baliol. At last the tedious negotiations for David's release drew near their close. At a parliament at Perth on 17 Jan. 1356-7 commissioners were appointed, and having settled the preliminaries at Berwick in August, a parliament at Edinburgh on 26 Sept. agreed to Edward's terms. The ransom was raised to 100,000 merks in ten instalments, for which the nobles, clergy, and burghs bound themselves, and commissioners from the three estates concluded the treaty at Berwick on 3 Oct. 1357.

The condition as to hostages was also made more severe. Three great lords were to be added to the twenty youths of noble birth formerly stipulated for. The truce between the two countries was to continue until the ransom was paid. It was ratified by the king and commissioners on 5 and 6 Oct., and again on 6 Nov. by a parliament at Scone, where David was present. On 25 Dec. Queen Joanna, along with the Bishop of St. Andrews and the Earl of March, received a safe-conduct to England, from which the queen never returned, dying near London on 14 Aug. 1362. David himself almost every year revisited England during the remainder of his reign, and his personal sympathies were so thoroughly English, that it required all the strength of the estates, and the desire of Edward for the stipulated ransom, to prevent a surrender of his own kingdom more ignominious than that of Baliol. Though his personal reign lasted for fourteen years after his return, it was entirely destitute of important events. Great difficulty was felt in raising from so poor a country the enormous ransom. It was not found enough that the whole wool of the kingdom should be granted at a low price to the king that he might resell it at a profit, and other severe taxes were imposed on the commons. The clergy had to contribute, and with some difficulty the pope was induced to allow a tenth of the ecclesiastical revenues for three years, on condition that they were thereafter to be exempted. But not all these resources together sufficed to meet the debt which the creditor was determined to exact to the uttermost, and from time to time David, like a needy debtor, made terms for the postponement of payment. There were negotiations for this purpose in 1363-5 and 1369, when an obligation was undertaken to pay off the balance due at the rate of 4,000 merks annually, under a large additional penalty in case of failure. Edward and David had latterly devised several schemes for the extinction of the debt by another process than payment. This was the transfer at David's death of the Scottish crown to an English prince. At the parliament of Scone in 1363, David ventured to propose openly that it should recognise Lionel, duke of Clarence, Edward's second son, as his heir. An indignant refusal was accompanied with a renewed declaration of the settlement of the succession on Robert the Steward by Robert the Bruce. Throughout this part of David's reign the barons of Scotland were animated by the same spirit as that which the English had shown at Runnymede. Hatred of foreign aggression, and the weakness of the king, who

was willing to yield to it, enabled them to use the opportunity to obtain guarantees for the law and constitution which, though not in precisely the same form, had a similar intention and a similar, though less complete, result to Magna Charta. Such was the real meaning of the origin of those permanent committees of parliament for judicial business called the lords auditors, and for legislation called the lords of the articles, which first appear in 1367; the provision for the more regular administration of justice and coinage of money; the revocation of the grants of the royal revenues; the rule laid down that no attention was to be paid to the king's mandates contrary to the statutes and the common law. Foiled in their attempt to divert the order of succession, Edward and David had resort to secret intrigue. David, in November 1363, went to London and undertook a personal obligation to Edward to settle the kingdom of Scotland upon him and his issue male, failing issue male of his own body. On this condition the whole of the ransom still unpaid was released. Nominal provisions were made in the event of an English heir succeeding to the Scottish throne for the preservation of the independence of Scotland similar to those of Edward I. This agreement was carefully concealed from the Scottish people, and the public negotiations for the payment of the ransom were still continued. It was in this year, and before he went to England, that David married his second wife, Margaret, widow of Sir John Logie. It is usually said that this was an unequal marriage, into which passion rather than reason led the king; but Margaret is described by Fordun as a lady of noble birth, and she was honourably received at the court of Edward. She was a daughter of Drummond, one of the lesser barons. No such rigid bar then restricted the marriage of the royal race as in later times. A sister of David, Matilda, daughter of Robert, had married a simple esquire. Still, it was a match which could bring no political strength to David, and alienated many of the Scottish nobility. A revolt of some of these was one of its consequences. David succeeded in quelling it, and threw the Steward and his three sons into prison at the instance of Margaret Logie, to whom and her relations he made large grants of land and money. Her influence did not last long, and after her divorce in 1369 by the Scottish bishops, the exact ground of which has not been discovered, the Stewards were released. She was succeeded in the king's favour by Agnes of Dunbar. The year after this divorce, on 22 Feb. 1370, David died in Edinburgh Castle childless,

and was succeeded by Robert the Steward. David was only in his forty-seventh year, but he had reigned forty-one years, reckoning from his accession.

Fordun and Wyntoun, the writers nearest the time of David, who did not know the extent of his treason to Scotland, treat his character more favourably than modern historians. They commend his administration of justice, his bravery, even his resolute assertion of the royal authority. Wyntoun, in a curious passage which evidently relates an authentic anecdote, tells how on his return to Scotland, when he was going to his privy council,

The folk, as they were wont to do,  
Pressyt rycht rudly in thare to,  
Bot he rycht suddenly gan arrace  
Out of a macer's hand a mace,  
And said rudly how do we now?  
Stand still, or the proudest of you  
Sall on his hevdy have smyte this mace.

This apparently trivial incident gives occasion to a general reflection by the historian, expressing his view of David:

Radure in prynce is a gud thying,  
For but radure all governyng  
Sall all tyme bot despysed be.

In the same passage he mentions that David only brought with him from England a single page, not what we should expect if he then had the idea of bringing Scotland under English influence. Both Wyntoun and Fordun, who, it must be remembered, were Scottish churchmen (the English 'Chronicles of Lanercost,' whose monastery he plundered, take a very different view of David), incline to the side of the king as against the nobles, whose oppression he is represented as putting down. Later writers, on the other hand, note his undoubted weakness, his love of pleasure, his passion for an English mistress—Katherine Mortimer, who died during the life of Joanna, and was buried with pomp at Newbattle—his impolitic marriage with Margaret Logie, his extravagance, his jealousy, and ill-treatment of Robert the Steward, above all his sacrifice of the independence his father had established. These inconsistent views, both of which have some foundation in fact, point to a character itself inconsistent, passionate, and headstrong, capable at times of showing strength, at bottom weak, liable to be led by various influences, in the end yielding to the persistent policy and will of the English king.

[Wyntoun, Fordun, and the *Liber Plyscardensis* are the Scotch original authorities, but Knighton and Froissart supply several details. The *Exchequer Rolls of Scotland*, vols. i. and ii.,

and W. Burnett's learned prefaces are specially valuable for the life of David.] Æ. M.

**BRUCE, DAVID** (*d.* 1660), physician, was the son of Andrew Bruce, D.D., principal (from 1630 to 1647) of St. Leonard's College in St. Andrews University. He was first educated at St. Andrews, and proceeded M.A. there. Later he went to France, and studied physic at Paris and Montpellier. He intended taking a medical degree at Padua; but the plague kept him from Italy, and he finally graduated M.D. at Valence in Dauphiny on 7 May 1657. On 27 March 1660 Bruce was incorporated doctor of physic at Oxford. He was associated with his great-uncle, Sir John Wedderburne, in the office of physician to the Duke and Duchess of York. But after fulfilling, in consequence of Wedderburne's infirmities, all the duties of the post for many years, he resigned the office and travelled abroad. Subsequently he settled at Edinburgh, and was there 'in good repute for his practice.' Wood speaks of him as still living in Edinburgh in 1690. Bruce was admitted candidate of the College of Physicians on 24 Dec. 1660, and was an original member of the Royal Society.

[Wood's *Fasti Oxon.* ii. 225; Munk's *Coll. of Phys.* i. 297.] S. L. L.

**BRUCE, EDWARD** (*d.* 1318), king of Ireland, was younger brother of Robert Bruce [q. v.], king of Scotland. In 1308 Edward Bruce took part in the incursion upon the district of Galloway by King Robert, and, during the indisposition of the latter, acted as a commander of his forces in their retreat from those of the Earl of Richmond, governor in Scotland for Edward II. Edward Bruce was subsequently despatched by his brother against Galloway, which resisted his authority. He routed the English commander and his Scottish allies there, and compelled the inhabitants to swear allegiance and to furnish contributions. In this contest he succeeded by a stratagem in putting to flight the English troops. The details of this enterprise were chronicled by the poet Barbour, from the narration of one of Bruce's associates. On the banks of the Dee, Edward Bruce defeated the forces brought against him by the chiefs of Galloway, and made a prisoner of Donall, prince of the Isles. He reduced a large number of castles and strongholds in Galloway, and brought that district under the dominion of King Robert. Edward Bruce's success in Galloway was celebrated in a contemporary poem. While King Robert was engaged on an expedition against the Isle of Man, Edward Bruce gained possession of the town of Dundee. Before the end of



1313, he besieged Stirling Castle, then almost the last fortress held in Scotland for the king of England. Philip de Mowbray, governor of the castle, after a vigorous defence, entered into a treaty to surrender it to Edward Bruce in the following midsummer, if not relieved. The terms of this treaty were disapproved of by King Robert, who, however, adhered to them. The attempt of the English army to relieve Stirling Castle led, in 1314, to the battle of Bannockburn, at which Edward Bruce was one of the chief commanders, and led the right column of the Scottish army. In the following year Edward Bruce, in conjunction with Douglas, devastated Northumberland and Yorkshire, levied large contributions, and returned to Scotland with great spoil. In 1315, in a convention of the prelates, nobles, and commons of Scotland, held at Ayr, an ordinance was enacted that Edward Bruce should be recognised as king, in the event of the death of his brother Robert without male heirs. Edward Bruce is described as a valiant and experienced soldier, but rashly impetuous. He is said to have aspired to share the kingship of Scotland with his brother. This circumstance is supposed to have induced King Robert to favour an expedition against the English in Ireland, which Edward Bruce was invited to undertake by some of the native chiefs there who regarded him as descended from the same ancestors as themselves. Edward Bruce landed in Ulster in May 1315, with about six thousand men, accompanied by the Earl of Moray and other Scottish commanders. The Scots, with their Irish allies, took possession of the town of Carrickfergus, laid siege to its strong citadel, and Bruce was crowned as king of Ireland. Edward Bruce encountered and defeated on several occasions the forces of the English government in Ireland. Robert Bruce having arrived with reinforcements from Scotland, he and his brother, early in 1317, marched from Ulster to the south of Ireland. After the return of King Robert to Scotland, Edward Bruce continued at Carrickfergus as king of Ireland. Bulls were issued by Pope John XXII for the purpose of detaching the Irish clergy from the cause of Edward Bruce. The archbishops of Dublin and Cashel and other dignitaries were enjoined by the pope to warn ecclesiastics to desist from inciting the Irish people against the king of England, and public excommunications were denounced against those who persisted in that course. A reproduction of one of those papal instruments appears in the third part of 'Facsimiles of National Manuscripts of Ireland.' Barbour

alleged that Edward Bruce defeated the troops of the English in Ireland in nineteen engagements, in which he had not more than one man against five, and that he was in a 'good way' to conquer the entire land, as he had the Irish on his side, and held possession of Ulster. The poet adds, however, that Bruce's fortunes were marred by his 'outrageous' pride. In the autumn of 1318, Edward Bruce projected another descent upon Leinster. To prevent this movement, a large army was mustered by the colonists. Bruce's chief advisers counselled him against coming to an engagement with forces numerically superior to those under his command. He, however, declined to take their advice, and would not wait for reinforcements. In October a conflict took place near Dundalk, in which Bruce was slain and his forces put to flight. Bruce's corpse was found on the field, with that of John de Maupas stretched upon it. The quarters of Edward Bruce's body were set up as trophies in the chief towns of the English colony in Ireland, and his head was presented to Edward II in England. Barbour averred that the head was not Bruce's, but that of his devoted follower, Gilbert Harper, who wore his armour on the day of battle. Owing to the death of Edward Bruce new legislative arrangements were made relative to the royal succession in Scotland. An instrument is extant by which Robert Bruce confirmed a grant of land which had been made by his brother Edward as king of Ireland. The most detailed account of Edward Bruce's proceedings in Ireland is contained in Latin annals of that country appended by Camden to his 'Britannia' in 1607. A new edition of these annals, in which the oversights of Camden have been corrected by collation with the manuscript, was printed in the London Rolls Series in 1883. John Barbour, archdeacon of Aberdeen, in his poem, composed about 1375, tells little of Edward Bruce except in connection with his transactions in Ireland and death there. Many records illustrative of affairs in Ireland during the presence of the Bruces there are included among 'Historical and Municipal Documents of Ireland,' published in the London Rolls Series in 1870.

[Johannis de Fordun Chronica gentis Scotorum, ed. T. Hearne 1722, W. Goodall 1775, and W. F. Skene 1871; Acts of Parliament of Scotland, 1814; Annals of Scotland, by Lord Hailes, 1819; Annals of Kingdom of Ireland, 1848; Hist. of Viceroy's of Ireland, 1865; Hist. of Scotland, by P. F. Tytler 1864, and J. H. Burton 1867; Facsimiles of National Manuscripts of Scotland, part ii. 1870; The Bruce,

ed. W. Skeat, 1870; Chronicles of Edward I and Edward II, ed. Stubbs, 1882-3; Chartularies of St. Mary's Abbey, Dublin, 1884-5.]

J. T. G.

**BRUCE, EDWARD, LORD KINLOSS** (1549?-1611), judge, was the second son of Sir Edward Bruce of Blairhall in the county of Clackmannan, by Alison, daughter of William Reid of Aikenhead in the same county, sister of Robert Reid, bishop of Orkney, and descended from Robert de Brus, chief justice of the king's bench in 1268. He appears to have been born about the year 1549. His early history is from the loss of the records obscure, and the date at which he became an advocate is not known, nor when he was appointed to the office of judge of the commissary court of Edinburgh, though it is clear from the Pitmedden manuscript preserved in the Advocates' Library that he succeeded Robert Maitland, dean of Aberdeen, who had been superseded in the office of lord of session in 1576. It does not, however, appear whether the dean lost his position as commissary at that or at a subsequent date, but it is certain that Bruce was one of the commissaries in 1583. In this year he received a grant of the abbey of Kinloss in Ayrshire, to hold *in commendam* for his life, subject to an annuity payable to the abbot, and a rent of 500 merks payable to the crown. About the same date he was appointed one of the deputies of the lord-justice-general of Scotland. Four years later we find him energetically defending the right of the lords spiritual to sit in parliament, on the occasion of a petition presented by the general assembly of the Scottish church praying that they might be expelled, and in the result the petition was dismissed. The popish conspiracy of 1594 brought Bruce into considerable prominence. In 1594 Bruce was despatched, with James Colvill, laird of Ester or Easter Wemyss, to the English court to remonstrate with the queen upon the countenance which she afforded to the popish conspiracy by harbouring Bothwell, to complain of the conduct of her ambassador, Lord Zouche, in carrying on secret negotiations with him, and to ask for a subsidy to help in crushing the conspiracy. His mission was partially successful. In 1597 Bruce was appointed one of the commissioners for the levying of an aid granted by parliament to provide funds for the diplomatic service and other purposes. The same year (2 Dec.) he was made a lord of session. On 15 March 1598 Bruce was again sent to the English court to make the king's apologies for certain offences of which Elizabeth complained, 'and to prepare some other particulars con-

cerning the estate of the two borders and two realms.' Probably he was secretly instructed to sound the queen and council as to the real position of his master's chances of obtaining the succession, but if so the mission appears in that respect to have been a wholly fruitless one. Early in 1601, on the eve of the discovery of the Essex plot, James, who had for some time been in secret correspondence with the conspirators, determined to send the Earl of Mar and Edward Bruce to London, ostensibly upon a mission of no special importance, but really for the purpose of ascertaining the precise posture of affairs in the country and the prospects of the plot, with a view to possible co-operation. The envoys, however, did not start until February, and consequently did not arrive until after the execution of Essex. Accordingly the king now instructed them to obtain, if possible, a formal declaration from the queen and council that he was free of all complicity in any intrigues that had ever been set on foot against her, and particularly in the late conspiracy, and an assurance of his succession to the throne on her decease. They obtained an early audience of Sir Robert Cecil, who exacted from them a pledge (1) that the king should abandon all attempts to obtain parliamentary or other recognition of his title to the succession as the condition of holding communication with them, and (2) that all such communications should be kept perfectly secret. The result was the celebrated correspondence between James and Cecil, part of which was published by Lord Hailes in 1766, and of which another portion has since been edited for the Camden Society. Bruce accompanied James to England on his accession, was naturalised by act of parliament, and made a member of the privy council in both kingdoms. He was also (22 Feb. 1603) raised to the peerage by the title of Baron Bruce of Kinloss, and on 18 May following was appointed to the mastership of the rolls in succession to Sir Thomas Egerton. In 1605 the university of Oxford conferred upon him the degree of M.A. In 1608-9 his daughter Christiana married William Cavendish, afterwards the second earl of Devonshire, the king himself giving the bride away and making her fortune up to 10,000*l.* He died very suddenly on 14 Jan. 1610-11, in his sixty-second year, and was buried in the Rolls Chapel in Chancery Lane. His eldest son, Lord Edward Bruce, was killed in a duel with Sir Edward Sackville, afterwards earl of Dorset, near Bergen-op-Zoom in 1613. His heart was discovered embalmed in a silver case, bearing his name and arms, in the abbey

church of Culross in Perthshire in 1808. His younger brother Thomas was created Earl of Elgin on 21 June 1633, and Baron Bruce of Whorlton in Yorkshire on 1 Aug. 1641. The third son, Robert, was created Baron Bruce of Skelton in Yorkshire, Viscount Bruce of Amptill in Bedfordshire, and Earl of Aylesbury in Buckinghamshire on 18 March 1663-4 [see BRUCE, ROBERT, Earl of Aylesbury].

[Acts Parl. of Scotland, iii. 484, iv. 143; Letters of John Colville (Bannatyne Club), 293; Pitcairn's Trials, i. 133; Spottiswoode's Hist. of the Church of Scotland (Bannatyne Club), ii. 322, 329; Moysie's Memoirs (Bannatyne Club), 117, 137, 139; Wood's Fasti Oxon. (Bliss), i. 311-12, 491; Cal. State Papers (Scotland 1509-1603), ii. 649, 650, 652, 708, 746, 748; Birch's Memoirs, i. 175, ii. 509, ad fin.; Haydn's Book of Dignities, 413, 414; Letters of Sir Robert Cecil (Camden Society), 75; Dugdale's Chron. Ser. 100, 101; Dugdale's Orig. 335; Correspondence of James VI with Sir Robert Cecil, xxv. 38, 45-9, 51, 78; Hailes's Secret Correspondence of Sir Robert Cecil with James VI, pp. 5, 6, et passim; Ferrerii Hist. Abb. de Kinloss (Bannatyne Club), xi.; Gardiner's Hist. of England (1603-42), i. 52; Collins's Peerage (Brydges), v. 323-4; Burnet's Own Time (Oxford edition), i. 14; Court and Times of James I, i. 7, 104; Statutes of the Realm, iv. 1016; Archæologia, xx. 515; Foss's Lives of the Judges; Brunton and Haig's Senators of the College of Justice.] J. M. R.

**BRUCE, SIR FREDERICK WILLIAM ADOLPHUS** (1814-1867), diplomatist, was the youngest of the three sons of Thomas Bruce, seventh earl of Elgin [q. v.], and his second wife Elizabeth, youngest daughter of James Townshend Oswald of Dunnikier, Fifeshire. He was born at Broomhall, Fifeshire, on 14 April 1814, and on 9 Feb. 1842 was attached to Lord Ashburton's mission to Washington, returning to England with his lordship in September of that year. On 9 Feb. 1844 he was appointed colonial secretary at Hongkong, which place he held until 1846, when on 27 June he became lieutenant-governor of Newfoundland. His next change was to Sucre, with the appointment of consul-general in the republic of Bolivia on 23 July 1847, and on 14 April 1848 he was accredited as chargé d'affaires. He was named chargé d'affaires to the Oriental republic of the Uruguay on 29 Aug. 1851, and on 3 Aug. 1853 became agent and consul-general in Egypt in the place of the Hon. C. A. Murray. On his brother, James Bruce, the eighth earl of Elgin, being appointed ambassador extraordinary to China, he accompanied him as principal secretary in April 1857. He brought home (18 Sept. 1857) the treaty with China

signed at Tientsin on 26 June 1858, and was made a C.B. on 28 Sept. His diplomatic tact was thoroughly appreciated by the home government, for he was appointed on 2 Dec. 1858 envoy extraordinary and minister plenipotentiary to the emperor of China, and on 1 March following chief superintendent of British trade in that country. His mission was prevented from proceeding to Peking by the opposition made by the Chinese. The mission therefore returned to Shanghai, where it remained until the ratification of the treaty of 26 June 1858 at Peking on 24 Oct. 1860. He proceeded to Peking on 7 Nov. 1860, but withdrew to Tientsin for the winter, while arrangements were made for putting a residence in order for his reception. The mission was established at Peking on 26 March 1861, but it was not until 2 April that Sir Frederick Bruce paid a visit to Prince Kung. On the removal of Lord Lyons from Washington to Constantinople, he was selected to fill the important office of British representative at Washington on 1 March 1865. He was made a K.C.B. of the civil division on 12 Dec. 1862, and received the grand cross of the order on 17 March 1865. He was appointed umpire by the commission named under the convention of 1864, concluded between the United States of America and the United States of Colombia, for the adjustment of claims of American citizens against the Colombian government. He died at Boston in the United States on 19 Sept. 1867, when his remains were embalmed, and, being conveyed to Scotland, were interred at Dunfermline Abbey on 8 Oct. The American press spoke in eulogistic terms of his amiable personal qualities and of the able manner in which he exercised his ministerial functions. He died unmarried.

[Gent. Mag. for 1867, pt. ii. 677-8; Hertslet's Foreign Office Lists, March 1868, p. 187; Boulger's History of China, vol. iii. (1884).]

G. C. B.

**BRUCE, JAMES** (1660?-1730), Irish presbyterian minister, was the eldest son of Michael Bruce (1635-1693) [q. v.] He was called to Carrmonee, county Antrim, but preferred a settlement at Killeleagh, county Down (near Killinchy, his father's place), where he was ordained after 6 Nov. 1684. In April 1689 occurred 'the break of Killeleagh,' when the protestants were routed and Killeleagh castle deserted by its garrison. Bruce fled to Scotland, but returned in 1691 or 1692, when Ulster was at peace. In 1696 he secured, from the presbyterian proprietors of the Killeleagh estate endowments for the presbyterian minister at Killeleagh (and three others) in the shape of a lease of lands at a

nominal rent. More important was his success in establishing at Killeleagh in 1697 a 'philosophical school' for the training of the presbyterian ministry and gentry, which proved obnoxious to the episcopalians, and was closed in 1714. In 1699 Bruce was appointed one of the synod's trustees for the management of the *regium donum*, and continued in this office till his death. His congregation was large; at his communion on 2 July 1704 there were seven successive tables, and the services began at 7 A.M. and lasted till evening. A new meeting-house was built for him, probably in 1692. In the nonsubscription controversy (1720-6) Bruce sided with the subscribers (himself signing the Westminster Confession in 1721), but was unwilling to cut off the nonsubscribers from fellowship. His presbytery (Down) was in 1725 divided into Down and Killeleagh, those (including Bruce) who were against disowning the nonsubscribers being placed in the latter. Bruce died on 17 Feb. 1730. His will (dated in February 1725) directs his burial at Killeleagh, where he was interred on 24 Feb. Tradition places the spot eastward of the episcopal church. He married, 25 Sept. 1685, Margaret (died May 1706), daughter of Lieutenant-colonel James Trail of Tullychin, near Killeleagh, by Mary, daughter of John Hamilton, brother of the first Lord Clandeboye. He had ten children, of whom three sons and three daughters survived him. His sons Michael [q. v.] and Patrick were presbyterian ministers; William [q. v.] was a publisher. From his son Patrick (1692-1732), minister successively of Drumbo, co. Down, Killallan, Renfrewshire, and Killeleagh, are lineally descended the Hervey Bruces of Downhill, baronets since 1804. Bruce published nothing. In Daniel Mussenden's manuscript volume of sermon notes is an abstract of Bruce's sermon (Prov. viii. 17) at a communion in Belfast, 20 Aug. 1704, which is strongly Calvinistic.

[McCreery's Presb. Ministers of Killeleagh, 1875, pp. 90 sq.; Porter's Seven Bruces, in N. Whig, 16 April 1885; Reid's Hist. Presb. Ch. in Ireland (Killen), 1867, ii. 477, 519; [Kirkpatrick's] Historical Essay upon the Loyalty of Presbyterians, 1713, p. 506; Bruce's appendix to Towgood's Diss. Gent. Letters, 1816, p. 359; Disciple (Belfast), April 1883, p. 100; Belfast Funeral Register (presbyterian); manuscript extracts from Minutes of General Synod; Mussenden's manuscript sermon notes, 1704-20, in the possession of a descendant of Bruce.] A. G.

**BRUCE, JAMES (1730-1794)**, African traveller, son of David Bruce of Kinnaird and Marion Graham of Airth, was born at

Kinnaird, Stirlingshire, on 14 Dec. 1730. He was educated at Harrow, and 'inclined to the profession of a clergyman,' 'for which,' his master assured his father, 'he has sufficient gravity.' He nevertheless complied with his father's wish that he should study law, until it became evident that a pursuit involving an intimate knowledge of Roman as well as Scotch jurisprudence was too distasteful to him to be prosecuted to any good purpose. He had in the meantime invigorated his originally delicate constitution by exercise and sport; and now, athletic, daring, and six feet four, seemed made for a life of travel and adventure. While soliciting permission to settle as a trader in India, his ideas received a new direction from his marriage with Adriana Allan, the orphan daughter of a wine merchant in Portugal. To gratify her mother he took a share in the business; but his wife's death in 1754, after a union of only nine months, destroyed his interest in this calling, and to detach himself gradually from it he visited Spain and Portugal under pretext of inspecting the vintage. Two incidents arising out of this excursion aided to determine his subsequent career. Having formed the project of examining the manuscripts in the Escorial, he was led to study Arabic, which incidentally directed his attention to the ancient classical language of Abyssinia; and, having observed the unprotected condition of Ferrol, he submitted, upon the outbreak of hostilities with Spain, a proposition to the English government for an attack upon the place. The scheme, though not carried into effect, gained him the notice of Lord Halifax, and the offer of the consulate at Algiers, with a commission to examine the remains of ancient architecture described but not delineated by Dr. Shaw. According to his own statement, this proposal was accompanied by the promise of a baronetcy when his mission should be completed, and the pledge that he should be assisted by a deputy to attend to consular business while he was engaged in archaeological research. Some hints as to the possibility of his extending his explorations to the Nile took the strongest hold upon his imagination, and to reach its source now became the main purpose of his life. To qualify himself yet further for his undertaking, he spent six months in Italy studying antiquities, and obtained the services of an accomplished draughtsman, a young Bolognese named Luigi Balugani. Before engaging him he had visited Pestum, and made the first accurate drawings ever taken of the ruins, a fortunate step for his own reputation, as it refuted the charge subsequently brought against him of entire

dependence upon Balugani and appropriation of the latter's work. He arrived at Algiers on 15 March 1763.

The Algerine consulate was a post of danger and difficulty at all times, and Baba Ali, the dey to whom Bruce was accredited, though not devoid of a certain barbaric magnanimity, was even more ferocious and impracticable than the generality. The injudicious recall of Bruce's predecessor at the dey's demand had greatly encouraged the latter's insolence. Bruce's presents were judged insufficient, and with great public spirit he advanced more than 200*l.* from his own pocket, 'rather than, in my time, his majesty should lose the affections of this people.' These affectionate corsairs, in fact, were not without grounds of complaint. Blank passports, intended, when duly filled up, to exempt English ships from capture as belonging to a friendly power, had fallen into the hands of the French, who, to damage their enemy's credit, had sold them to nations at war with Algiers. The English, finding their passes thus invalidated, had issued written papers, which the Algerines could not read, and of course disregarded. Bruce had need of all his courage and address. The two years and a quarter during which he held office passed in a series of disputes with the Algerine ruler, which frequently involved him in great danger, but in which he usually triumphed by his undeviating firmness. At length, in August 1765, finding that no assistant was likely to be given him, he resigned his appointment, and departed on an archaeological tour through Barbary, fortified by the protection of the old dey, who secretly admired his spirit. With the aid of his draughtsman and a camera obscura, he made a great number of most elaborate and beautiful drawings of the remains of Roman magnificence extant in the now uninhabited desert. These drawings, which were exhibited at the Institute of British Architects in 1837, are partly in the possession of his descendants, and partly in the royal collection at Windsor. Colonel Playfair finds them to be for the most part virtually in duplicate, but taken from slightly different points of view; one copy probably by Bruce, the other, distinguished by the introduction of conventional ornaments, probably by Balugani. Colonel Playfair's own elaborate work has superseded the imperfect account published by Bruce himself, but his researches have impressed him with the fullest conviction of the accuracy and conscientiousness of his predecessor, in whose delineations he has discovered only one error. The most important ruins visited and sketched by Bruce were those at Tebessa, Spaitla, Tamugas, Tisdrus, and Cirta. After more than

a year's travel through Barbary, at the close of which he underwent great danger from famine and pestilence at Bengazi, Bruce embarked at Ptolemeta for Candia, was shipwrecked, cast helpless on the African coast, beaten and plundered by the Arabs, and contracted an ague from his immersion, which he could never entirely shake off. His drawings had fortunately been placed in safety at Smyrna. Having, after a considerable delay at Bengazi, made his way to Crete, and partially got rid of his ague and fever, he proceeded with indomitable spirit to Syria, sketched the ruins of Palmyra and Baalbec, and, after hesitating whether he should not go to Tartary to observe the transit of Venus, arrived in Egypt in July 1768. Having conciliated Ali Bey, the chief of the Mameluke rulers of Egypt, by his real skill in medicine and supposed knowledge of astrology, and thus obtained commendatory letters to the sheriff of Mecca, the naib of Masuah, Ras Michael the Abyssinian prime minister, and other chieftains and potentates, and being also provided with a monition to the Greeks in Abyssinia from their patriarch in Egypt, Bruce sailed up the Nile to Assouan, visited the ruins of Karnak and Luxor, and embarked at Cosseir for a voyage on the Red Sea. He proceeded to the Straits of Babelmandeb, retraced his course to Jidda, and crossed from thence to Masuah, the port of Abyssinia, where he landed on 19 Sept. 1769. The place, inhabited by a mongrel breed of African savages and Turkish janissaries, was little better than a den of assassins. It had, however one honest inhabitant, Achmet, the nephew of the naib or governor, who took Bruce's part and saved his life, powerfully aided by the fame of a salute which his countrymen had fired in his honour when he quitted Jidda, and by his credentials to the Abyssinian ras, whose wrath the naib had already provoked, and whom he feared to offend further. Bruce ultimately quitted the Red Sea coast on 15 Nov., bound for Gondar, the capital of Abyssinia. He reached his destination on 14 Feb. 1770, after a toilsome march, in which he experienced great difficulties from scantiness of provisions, from the transport of his heavy instruments, and from altercations with petty chiefs on the road. In his march he witnessed the barbarous Abyssinian custom of eating raw meat cut from the living animal, which he brought such undeserved discredit upon himself by relating; and visited the ruins of Axum, his imperfect description of which is more justly open to criticism. It was nearly 150 years since any European had visited Abyssinia, except Poncet, the French surgeon, towards

the end of the seventeenth century, and three Franciscan monks who had found their way about 1750, but had published no account of their travels, and probably never returned.

The name Abyssinia is derived from an Arabic word signifying confusion; and the term—intended to denote the mixture of races in the population of the country—was, in Bruce's time as now, accurately descriptive of its political condition. Although the throne was still filled by a reputed descendant of Solomon, the prestige of royalty had well-nigh disappeared, and the country was virtually divided among a number of provincial governors, whose revolts against the nominal sovereign and contentions among themselves kept it in a state of utter anarchy. At the time of Bruce's arrival the post of ras or vizier was filled by the aged Michael, governor of Tigré, the Warwick of Abyssinia, who, having assassinated one king and poisoned another, was at the age of seventy-two ruling in the name of a third. It was Bruce's business to conciliate this cruel but straightforward and highly intelligent personage, as well as the titular king and royal family, and Fasil, the chieftain in whose jurisdiction lay the springs of the Blue Nile, which Bruce, mistaking for the actual source of the river, had made the goal of his efforts. This individual happened to be in rebellion at the time, which increased the difficulties of the situation. But Bruce, by physical strength and adroitness in manly exercises, by presence of mind, by long experience of the East, by his very foibles of excessive self-assertion and warmth of temper, was fitted beyond most men to overawe a barbarous people. When he arrived at Gondar, King Tecla Haimanout and Ras Michael were engaged in a military expedition, and the Greeks and Moors to whom he had letters of introduction were likewise absent. Fortunately for him several persons of distinction were sick of small-pox, which procured him access to the queen mother; and perhaps still more fortunately he was not at first allowed to prescribe for them, greater confidence being reposed in a cross and a picture of the Virgin Mary. The speedy death of two of the patients insured him his own way with the remainder, and their recovery won him the gratitude of the queen mother and of Michael's wife, the young and beautiful Ozoro Esther. The favour thus gained was confirmed by his feat of firing a tallow candle through a table, which Salt found talked of forty years afterwards. Bruce received an office about the king's person, and, according to his own statement, was made governor of the district of Ras-el-Feel. This circumstance was contradicted by Dofter

Esther, a priest, from whom Salt subsequently obtained information, and who cannot have been actuated by any animosity to Bruce, as the general tenor of his communications was highly favourable to him. The appointment, however, may not have been generally known in Abyssinia, or Bruce himself, who at the time could not speak Amharic, may have been under a misapprehension as to the extent of his authority. In the spring of 1770 he accompanied the king and Michael on an expedition into Maitsha, which gave him an opportunity of obtaining from the king the investiture of the district of Geesh, where the fountains of the Blue Nile are situated, and of propitiating the rebel chief, Fasil, by sending medicine to one of his generals. The expedition was unsuccessful; the king and ras sought refuge in the latter's government of Tigré, and Bruce returned to Gondar, where he spent several months, living in the queen mother's palace under her protection, but exposed to considerable danger from the hostility of a usurper who had been elevated to the nominal throne. On 28 Oct. 1770 Bruce left Gondar to take possession of his fief, and after two days' march fell in with the army of Fasil, who had returned to his allegiance, and was favouring the king's return to Gondar. Fasil gave Bruce at first a very ambiguous reception; but, overcome by his intrepid bearing, and captivated by his feats in subduing savage horses and shooting kites upon the wing, altered his demeanour entirely, accepted Bruce as his feudatory, naturalised him among his Galla followers, and dismissed him with a favourite horse of his own, and instructions to drive the animal before him ready saddled and bridled wherever he went. The steed certainly brought the party security, for every one fled at the sight of him, and Bruce was finally obliged to mount. Thus sped, he arrived at the village of Geesh, and struck upon the mighty Nile, 'not four yards over, and not above four inches deep,' and here his guide pointed out to him 'the hillock of green sod' which he has made so famous. Trampling down the flowers which mantled the hillside, and receiving two severe falls in his eager haste, Bruce 'stood in rapture over the principal fountain.' 'It is easier to guess than to describe the situation of my mind at that moment—standing on that spot which had baffled the genius, industry, and inquiry of both ancients and moderns for the course of near three thousand years.'

Bruce, however, was mistaken. He had not reached the source of the true Nile, but only that of its most considerable tributary. With a frankness which does him honour, he virtually admits the fact by pointing out

that, if the branch by whose spring he stood at Geesh did not encounter the larger stream of the White Nile, it would be lost in the sands. He maintains, indeed, that the Blue Nile is the Nile of the ancients, who bequeathed the problem of its source to us; but this is inconsistent with the fact that the expedition sent by Nero evidently ascended not the Blue Nile but the White. He was also in error—less excusable because in a certain measure wilful—in regarding himself as the first European who had reached these fountains. Pedro Paez the Jesuit had undoubtedly done so in 1615, and Bruce's unhandsome attempt to throw doubt on the fact only proves that love of fame is not literally the last infirmity of noble minds, but may bring much more unlovely symptoms in its train. There is a sense, however, in which Bruce may be more justly esteemed the discoverer of the fount of the Blue Nile than Paez, who stumbled upon it by accident, and, absorbed by missionary zeal, thought little of the exploit to which Bruce had dedicated his life.

During Bruce's absence from Gondar, King Tecla Haimanout had recovered his capital. Twenty thousand of Ras Michael's Tigré warriors occupied the city, and Bruce was in time to witness the vengeance of the victors. For weeks Gondar reeked with massacre, and swarmed with hyænas lured by the scent of carrion. Bruce's remonstrances were regarded as childish weakness. His draughtsman, Balugani, died, an event which he himself misdates by a year, and he ardently longed to quit the country. With much difficulty he obtained permission, but the general anarchy prevented his departure. The queen mother had always been unfriendly to Ras Michael. Two leading provincial governors, Gusho and Powussen, espoused her cause, and interposed their troops between Michael in the capital and his province of Tigré. After much indecisive fighting in the spring of 1771, the royal army was cut off from its supplies, and became completely disorganised in its retreat upon Gondar. The old ras, victor in forty-three battles, arrayed himself in cloth of gold, and sat calmly in his house awaiting his fate. He was carried away prisoner to a remote province, but was yet to rise again and rule Tigré seven years until his death. The king, though not dethroned, remained in virtual captivity, but was destined to experience many more changes of fortune ere he died a monk. Bruce spent a miserable autumn, prostrated with fever, harassed with debt, and in constant danger of his life from the wild Galla. On 26 Dec. 1771 he finally quitted Gondar, amid the benedictions and

tears of his many friends, bearing with other treasures the chronicles of the Abyssinian kings and the apocryphal book of Enoch in the Ethiopic version, in which alone it is preserved. The next stage of his journey was to be Sennaar, the capital of Nubia, which he reached after four months' march through a densely wooded country infested with wild beasts, narrowly escaping assassination at the hands of the treacherous sheikh of Atbara. After five months' disagreeable detention at Sennaar among 'a horrid people, whose only occupations seem war and treason,' he struck into the desert, and after incurring dreadful perils, most graphically described, from hunger, thirst, robbers, the simoom, and moving pillars of sand, on 29 Nov. 1772 reached Assouan, the frontier town of Egypt. He had been compelled to leave his journals, drawings, and instruments behind him in the desert, but they were recovered, and in March 1773 he brought the hard-won treasures safely to Marseilles.

Bruce spent a year and a half on the continent, enjoying the compliments of the French savants, recruiting his constitution at the baths of Poretta, and calling to account an Italian marquis who had presumed during his absence to marry a lady to whom he had been engaged. On his arrival in England he at first received great attention, but a reaction against him soon set in. People were scandalised by his stories, especially such as were really in no way improbable. As Sir Francis Head puts it, the devourers of putrid venison could not digest the devourers of raw beef. Bruce's dictatorial manner and disdain of self-vindication also told against him. 'Mr. Bruce's grand air, gigantic height, and forbidding brow awed everybody into silence,' says Fanny Burney in her lively sketch of him at this time in a letter to Samuel Crisp, adding, 'He is the tallest man you ever saw gratis.' No honour was conferred upon him, except the personal notice of the king. Deeply wounded, he retired to his patrimonial estate in Scotland, which had greatly increased in value from the discovery of coal; he postponed the publication of his travels, and might have finally abandoned it but for the depression of spirits caused by the death of his second wife in 1785. The need of occupation and the instances of his friend, Daines Barrington, incited him to composition, and five massive, ill-arranged, ill-digested, but most fascinating volumes made their appearance in 1790. They included a full narrative of his travels from the beginning; a valuable history of Abyssinia, 'neglecting,' however, according to Murray, 'very interesting traits of character and manners that appear in the

original chronicles; and disquisitions on the history and religion of Egypt, Indian trade, the invention of the alphabet, and other subjects, evincing that the great traveller was not a great scholar or a judicious critic. With all their faults, few books of equal compass are equally entertaining; and few such monuments exist of the energy and enterprise of a single traveller. Yet all their merits and all the popularity they speedily obtained among general readers did not effect the reversal of the verdict already passed upon Bruce by literary coteries. With sorrow and scorn he left the vindication of his name to posterity. He shot, entertained visitors, played with his children, and, 'having grown exceedingly heavy and lusty, rode slowly over his estate to his collieries, mounted on a charger of great power and size.' Occasionally he would assume Abyssinian costume, and sit meditating upon the past and the departed, especially, it is surmised, his beautiful protectress, Ozoro Esther. At last, on 27 April 1794, hastening to the head of his staircase to hand a lady to her carriage, he missed his footing, pitched on his head, and never spoke again.

Bruce's character is depicted with incomparable liveliness by himself. It is that of a brave, magnanimous, and merciful man, endowed with excellent abilities, though not with first-rate intellectual powers, but swayed to an undue degree by self-esteem and the thirst for fame. The exaggeration of these qualities, without which even his enterprise would have shrunk from his perils, made him uncandid to those whom he regarded as rivals, and brought imputations, not wholly undeserved, upon his veracity. As regards the bulk and general tenor of his narrative, his truthfulness has been sufficiently established; but vanity and the passion for the picturesque led him to embellish minor particulars, and perhaps in some few instances to invent them. The circumstances under which his work was produced were highly unfavourable to strict accuracy. Instead of addressing himself to his task immediately upon his return, with the incidents of his travels fresh in his mind and his journals open before him, Bruce delayed for twelve years, and then dictated to an amanuensis, indolently omitting to refer to the original journals, and hence frequently making a lamentable confusion of facts and dates, which only came to light upon the examination of his original manuscripts. 'In the latter part of his days,' says his biographer, Murray, 'he seems to have viewed the numerous adventures of his active life as in a dream, not in their natural state as to time

and place, but under the pleasing and arbitrary change of memory melting into imagination.' These inaccuracies of detail, however, relating exclusively to things personal to Bruce himself, in no way impair the truth and value of his splendid picture of Abyssinia; nor do they mar the effect of his own great figure as the representative of British frankness and manliness amid the weltering chaos of African cruelty, treachery, and superstition. His method of composition, moreover, if unfavourable to the strictly historical, was advantageous to the other literary qualities of his work. Fresh from the author's lips, the tale comes with more vividness than if it had been compiled from journals; and scenes, characters, and situations are represented with more warmth and distinctness. Bruce's character portraits are masterly; and although the long conversations he records are evidently highly idealised, the essential truth is probably conveyed with as much precision as could have been attained by a verbatim report. Not the least of his gifts is an eminently robust and racy humour. He will always remain the poet, and his work the epic, of African travel.

[The principal authority for Bruce's life is his own Travels, which have appeared in three editions, in 1790, 1805, and 1813. He left an unfinished autobiography, part of which is printed in the later editions of the Travels. They are also accompanied by a biography by the editor, Alexander Murray; an exceedingly well-written and in the main a very satisfactory book. Some slight coldness towards Bruce's memory may be explained by the uneasy relations between Murray and Bruce's son, who quarrelled with him during the progress of the work. Sir Francis Head's delightful volume in the Family Library goes into the other extreme. It is a mere compilation from the Travels, but executed *con amore* by a kindred spirit, and highly original in manner if not in matter. Crichton's memoir in Jardine's Naturalists' Library is an audacious plagiarism from Head. Bruce's Travels in Barbary have been most fully illustrated by Colonel Playfair (Travels in the Footsteps of Bruce, 1877). See also the Travels of Lord Valentia and Salt, Bruce's principal detractors; Asiatic Researches, vol. i.; Madame d'Arbly's Memoir of Dr. Burney, i. 298-329; Beloe's Sexagenarian, ii. 45-9; and the chapter on Alexander Murray in Archibald Constable and his Literary Correspondents, vol. i. The excellent article in the Penny Cyclopædia is by André Vieusseux.] R. G.

BRUCE, JAMES (1765?-1806), essayist, was born in the county of Forfar, in or about 1765. After an honourable career at the university of St. Andrews, he went thence to Emmanuel College, Cambridge. He graduated B.A. in 1789, and took orders



in the English church. About 1800 he was again in Scotland, where for a short time he officiated as a clergyman in the Scottish episcopal church. Towards the end of this period, in 1803, was published his only separate literary work, 'The Regard which is due to the Memory of Good Men,' a sermon preached at Dundee on the death of George Teaman.

In 1803 he came to London to devote himself to literature, and was soon a prolific contributor to the 'British Critic' and the 'Anti-Jacobin Magazine and Review,' the latter a weekly journal started almost contemporaneously with, and conducted on the same principles as, its more famous namesake the 'Anti-Jacobin' of Canning celebrity. A large proportion of the articles published in this review from 1803 to 1806 are from Bruce's pen. These articles, written with considerable ability, are chiefly on theological and literary subjects. The former are characterised by a keen spirit of partisanship, and are aimed especially against the Calvinistic and evangelical parties in the church. His contempt for the whole tendency of the thought of revolutionary France was most hearty, and helped to keep up the 'Anti-Jacobin' tradition. For a list of the titles of the most important, see Anderson's 'Scottish Nation.'

Bruce's life in London was obscure, and probably unfortunate. He was found dead in the passage of the house in which he lodged in Fetter Lane, 24 March 1806.

[Anderson's *Scottish Nation*; Irving's *Book of Scotsmen*; *Annual Register*, 1806, p. 524.]  
A. M.-L.

**BRUCE, JAMES** (1808-1861), journalist and author, was born at Aberdeen in 1808. He began his journalistic career in his native town, and there he published, in 1840, 'The Black Kalendar of Aberdeen,' an account of the most remarkable trials before the criminal courts of that city, and of the cases sent up from that district to the high court of justice, from 1745 to 1830, with personal details concerning the prisoners. In the following year appeared his 'Lives of Eminent Men of Aberdeen,' which contains, among other biographies, those of John Barbour, Bishop Elphinstone, chancellor of Scotland under James III, Jamieson the painter, and the poet Beattie.

While resident in Cupar, and editor of the 'Fifeshire Journal,' he published in 1845, under the name of 'Table Talk,' a series of short papers on miscellaneous subjects, which show a minute acquaintance with the byways and obscure corners of history and literature,

and, two years later, a descriptive 'Guide to the Edinburgh and Northern Railway.'

In 1847 Bruce was appointed commissioner to the 'Scotsman' newspaper to make inquiries into the destitution in the highlands. The results of his observations during a three months' tour appeared in the 'Scotsman' from January to March 1847, and were afterwards published in the form of a pamphlet, bearing the title of 'Letters on the Present Condition of the Highlands and Islands of Scotland.' The emigration of great numbers seems to him an immediate necessity, in order to narrow the field of operation before attempting relief. He advocates also the establishment of a compulsory poor law, and the joining of potato patches into small farms; and he pleads earnestly for the spread of education to rouse the people from their lethargy to a sense of new wants. On the whole, though he blames the neglect and selfishness of the proprietors, and quotes the verdict of one of the witnesses he examined, that 'the ruin of the poor people in Skye is that there are whole miles of the country with nothing but sheep and gentlemen upon them,' yet he finds the real cause of the distress in the indolence and lack of energy of the highlanders themselves. He was afterwards employed by the 'Scotsman' on another commission, to report on the moral and sanitary condition of Edinburgh.

Bruce subsequently undertook in succession the editorship of the 'Madras Athenæum,' the 'Newcastle Chronicle,' and, during the latter years of his life, the Belfast 'Northern Whig.' He was an occasional contributor to the 'Athenæum,' and at the time of his death he was engaged on a series of papers for the 'Cornhill Magazine.' His restless mind was ever finding interests too much out of the beaten track to allow him to be sufficiently absorbed in the events of the day; and his success as a journalist was, therefore, hardly proportionate to his abilities.

The two best known of Bruce's books are 'Classic and Historic Portraits' (1853), and 'Scenes and Sights in the East' (1856). The former is a series of sketches descriptive of 'the personal appearance, the dress, the private habits and tastes of some of the most distinguished persons whose names figure in history, interspersed but sparingly with criticism on their moral and intellectual character.' 'Scenes and Sights in the East' is not a continuous book of travels, but a collection of picturesque views of life and scenery in Southern India and Egypt, with quaint observations on manners and men. Bruce died at Belfast, 19 Aug. 1861.

[Scotsman, 22 Aug. 1861; Belfast Northern Whig, 21 Aug. 1861; Athenæum, 24 Aug. 1861.]  
A. M.—L.

**BRUCE, JAMES**, eighth EARL OF ELGIN and twelfth EARL OF KINCARDINE (1811–1863), governor-general of India, second son of the seventh earl of Elgin [q. v.], was educated at Eton and at Christ Church, Oxford, where in 1832 he took a first class in classics, and was shortly afterwards elected a fellow of Merton. It is a curious coincidence that one of the examiners on the latter occasion was Sir Edmund Head, who many years afterwards succeeded Elgin as governor-general of Canada. Among Elgin's contemporaries at Christ Church were Lord Dalhousie and Lord Canning, his two immediate predecessors in the office of governor-general of India, the fifth Duke of Newcastle, the first Lord Herbert of Lea, and Mr. Gladstone. In a contest for the Eldon law scholarship he was defeated by Roundell Palmer, now Earl of Selborne. In April 1841 he married a daughter of Mr. C. L. Cumming Bruce, and at the general election in July of the same year he was elected member for Southampton, his political views being those which were afterwards called liberal-conservative. When parliament met, he seconded the amendment to the address, which, being carried by a large majority, was followed by the resignation of Lord Melbourne's government. Shortly afterwards, on the death of his father, his elder brother having died in the previous year, he succeeded to the Scotch earldom, and ceased to be a member of the House of Commons. In March 1842 he was appointed governor of Jamaica.

Jamaica, at the time of Elgin's appointment, was in some respects in a depressed condition. The landed proprietary, which was mainly represented in the island by paid agents, had suffered considerably from the abolition of the slave trade. The finances required careful management, and the moral and intellectual condition of the negro population was very low. In all these matters progress had been made under the administration of Elgin's distinguished predecessor, Sir Charles Metcalfe; but much still remained to be accomplished, especially in the matter of educating the negroes. In this, and in the important object of encouraging the application of mechanical contrivances to agriculture, Elgin's efforts were very successful, and his administration generally was so satisfactory that very shortly after leaving Jamaica he was offered by the whig government, which had acceded to office in 1846, the important post of governor-general of Canada. His first wife had died shortly after his arrival in Jamaica, and in 1847 he married

Lady Louisa Mary Lambton, daughter of the first Earl of Durham.

In Canada, as in Jamaica, Elgin again succeeded to an office which very recently had been filled by Metcalfe, but the difficulties of the position were far greater than those which had met him in the West Indian colony. The rebellion which had taken place in Lower Canada in 1837 and 1838 had left behind it feelings of bitter animosity between the British party, which was most numerous in the upper province, and the French Canadians, who preponderated in Lower Canada. Pursuant to the recommendations made in Lord Durham's celebrated report, Upper and Lower Canada had been united under a single government, and under Sir Charles Bagot, Metcalfe's predecessor as governor-general, constitutional government had been established. During the earlier part of Metcalfe's government the French Canadians and the party that sympathised with them had been in office; but a difference of opinion between Metcalfe and his council as to his power to make appointments, even to his personal staff, without the assent of the council, had led to the resignation of the majority of the council, and had been followed by the dissolution of the assembly and an election which gave a small majority to the British party. Elgin found this party in power, but before he had been a year in office another general election gave a majority to the other side, and during the remainder of his stay in Canada his ministry was composed of persons belonging to what may be called the liberal party, the chief element in that ministry being French Canadian. From the first Elgin had very serious difficulties to contend with. The famine in Ireland, which commenced in the first year of his government, flooded Canada with diseased and starving emigrants, whose support had in the first instance to be borne by the Canadians; the Free Trade Act of 1846 inflicted heavy losses upon Canadian millowners and merchants; and last, but not least, the British party regarded with the keenest resentment the admission into the government of the country of persons some of whom they looked upon as rebels. This resentment, on the occasion of a bill being passed granting compensation for losses incurred in Lower Canada during the rebellion, culminated in riots and outrages of a grave character. The measure in question was the outcome of the report of a commission appointed by Metcalfe's conservative government in 1845. It was denounced both in Canada and in England, and in the latter country, among other persons, by Mr. Gladstone, as a measure for

rewarding rebels for rebellion, and on the occasion of the governor-general giving his assent to it, his carriage, as he left the House of Parliament, was pelted with stones, and the House of Parliament was burnt to the ground. A few days later, on his going into Montreal to receive an address which had been passed by the House of Assembly condemning the recent outrages and expressing confidence in his administration, he was again attacked by the mob, some of his staff were struck by stones, and it was only by rapid driving that he escaped unhurt. The result of these disturbances was that Montreal was abandoned as the seat of government, and for some years the sittings of the legislature were held alternately at Toronto and Quebec. Later on the situation was embarrassed by a cry for annexation to the United States, caused mainly by the commercial depression consequent upon free trade and the absence of a reciprocity treaty with the States. The latter was at last concluded in 1854, after negotiations conducted by Elgin in person. Another source of considerable anxiety at this period was the practice in vogue among certain English statesmen of denouncing the colonies as a needless burden upon the mother country. But all these difficulties were gradually overcome, and when Elgin relinquished the government at the end of 1854, it was generally recognised that his administration had been a complete success.

For two years after leaving Canada Elgin abstained from taking any active part in public affairs. On the breaking up of Lord Aberdeen's government in the spring of 1855, he was offered by Lord Palmerston the chancellorship of the Duchy of Lancaster with a seat in the cabinet; but wishing to maintain an independent position in parliament, while according a general support to the government of the day, he declined the offer.

In 1857, on differences arising with China in connection with the seizure of the *lorcha* Arrow, Elgin was sent as envoy to China. On reaching Singapore he was met by letters from Lord Canning informing him of the spread of the Indian mutiny, and urging him to send troops to Calcutta from the force which was to accompany him to China. With this requisition he at once complied, sending in fact the whole of the force, but he proceeded himself to Hongkong in the expectation that the troops would speedily follow. Finding that this expectation was not likely to be fulfilled, and that the French ambassador, who was to be associated with him in his mission, had been delayed, he repaired to Calcutta in H.M.S. Shannon, which he left with Lord Canning for the protection of that

city. Later in the year he returned to China, fresh troops having been sent out to replace those which had been diverted to India. Canton was speedily taken, and some months later a treaty was made at Tientsin, providing among other matters for the appointment of a British minister, for additional facilities for British trade, for protection to protestants and to Roman catholics, and for a war indemnity. He subsequently proceeded to Japan, where he made a treaty with the government of that country, under which certain ports were opened to British trade, and foreigners were admitted into the country.

On his return to England in the spring of 1859 Elgin was again offered office by Lord Palmerston, and accepted that of postmaster-general. He was elected lord rector of Glasgow University, and received the freedom of the city of London. In the following year he was again sent to China, the emperor having failed to ratify the treaty of Tientsin, and committed other unfriendly acts. On the voyage out the steamer in which Elgin was a passenger was wrecked in Galle harbour. The mission was not accomplished without fighting. The military opposition was slight, but the Chinese resorted to treachery, and after having, as was supposed, accepted the terms offered by the two envoys (Baron Gros, on the part of the French, was again associated with Elgin), carried off some officers and soldiers whom Elgin had sent with a letter to the Chinese plenipotentiary, and also the 'Times' correspondent, Mr. Bowlby [q.v.], who had accompanied them. The latter and one or two other members of the party were murdered. In retribution for this treacherous act, the summer palace, the favourite residence of the emperor at Peking, was destroyed. A few days later the treaty of Tientsin was formally ratified, and a convention was concluded, containing certain additional stipulations favourable to the British government. Visiting Java on his voyage home, Elgin returned to England on 11 April 1861, after an absence of about a year.

Elgin had hardly been a month in England when he was offered the appointment of viceroy and governor-general of India, which Lord Canning was about to vacate. It was the last public situation which he was destined to fill, and he appears to have accepted it with some forebodings. In a speech which he made to his neighbours at Dunfermline shortly before his departure, he observed that 'the vast amount of labour devolving upon the governor-general of India, the insalubrity of the climate, and the advance of years, all tended to render the prospect of their again meeting remote and uncertain.'

He left England at the end of January 1862, arriving at Calcutta on 12 March. During the twenty months which followed, he devoted himself with unremitting industry to the business of his high office, bringing to bear upon it experience acquired in other and widely different spheres of duty, but fully conscious of the necessity of careful study of the new set of facts with which he was brought into contact. 'The first virtue,' he said to one of his colleagues, 'which you and I have to practise here at present is self-denial. We must, for a time at least, walk in paths traced out for us by others.' The first eleven months were spent in Calcutta, where, without encountering any serious illness, he suffered a good deal of discomfort from the heat. In February 1863 he moved to Simla, halting at Benares, Agra, Delhi, and other places, and holding durbars, at which he made the acquaintance of numerous native chiefs and nobles. Spending the summer at Simla, on 26 Sept. he started for Sealkote, en route to Peshawur, with the intention of then proceeding to Lahore, where, in pursuance of the Indian Councils Act, passed two years before, the legislative council was to assemble. The earlier part of the route lay over the Himalayas and the upper valleys of the Beas, the Rávi, and the Chenáb rivers. In the course of it he crossed the twig bridge over the river Chandra, an affluent of the Chenáb. The crossing of this bridge, constructed as it was of a rude texture of birch branches, much rent and battered by the wear and tear of the rainy season, involved very great physical exertion, and brought on a fatal attack of heart complaint, to which he succumbed at Dharmsála on 20 Nov. 1863. Lady Elgin and his youngest daughter were with him. A very interesting account of his last days, written by his brother-in-law, A. P. Stanley, dean of Westminster, is given in Mr. Walrond's memoir.

Of Elgin's character as a public man, the most prominent features were the thoroughly practical manner in which he habitually dealt with public questions; his readiness to assume responsibility, and the strong sense of duty which enabled him to suppress personal considerations whenever they appeared to conflict with the public interests. Of the two last-mentioned qualities striking evidence was furnished by his prompt resolve to send the troops destined for China to the aid of the Indian government. Of the first an example was afforded at an early period in his official life. Shortly after his arrival in Jamaica he came into collision with the home government on a question of taxation, regarding which the legislation of the local assembly

was disapproved in England. Fully recognising the advantages of free trade, and the principles upon which the free-trade policy was based, he was not prepared to admit that those principles, however sound in the abstract, ought to be suddenly enforced in a colony just emerging from grave financial difficulties, and by a temperate representation he induced the government to recall an order which would otherwise have caused serious embarrassment. A few years later, in Canada, influenced by similar considerations, he brought about, not without delay and difficulty, and mainly by his own persistent advocacy, the reciprocity treaty with the United States. He was charged in some quarters with having shown timidity in dealing with the disturbances at Montreal, but the charge was discredited by successive governments at home, whose confidence in his judgment and firmness was to the last unimpaired. The vigour and diplomatic ability displayed by him in China in getting his own way, both with the Chinese authorities and with his French colleague, were very remarkable. In China and in India, where he was brought into contact with Englishmen and other Europeans settled among Asiatic populations, he seems to have formed a strong, and some persons thought an exaggerated, impression of the tendency of Europeans to ill-use the inferior races, his letters, both public and private, containing frequent and indignant allusions to this subject.

In India his tenure of office was too short to admit of any trustworthy estimate being formed of his capacity to administer with success a system so different from those to which he had been accustomed in his previous career; but, had his life been spared, he would probably have taken a high place on the roll of Indian administrators. In private life he was much beloved. His letters show that he was a man of warm affections, eminently domestic, with very decided convictions on the subject of religion. He was a full and facile writer, and a fluent and effective speaker, with a style remarkably clear, abounding in illustrations from the varied stores of a well-furnished and retentive memory.

[Letters and Journals of James, eighth earl of Elgin, ed. Theodore Walrond, 1872; Kaye's *Life of Lord Metcalfe*, 1858; personal information.]  
A. J. A.

**BRUCE, SIR JAMES LEWIS KNIGHT-** (1791-1866), judge, was the youngest son of John Knight of Fairlinch, Devonshire, by Margaret, daughter and afterwards heiress of William Bruce of Llanblethian, Glamorgan-

shire. He was born at Barnstaple on 15 Feb. 1791, and was educated at King Edward's grammar school, Bath, and the King's school, Sherborne. He left Sherborne in 1805, and, after spending two years with a mathematical tutor, was articled to a solicitor in Lincoln's Inn Fields. His articles having expired, he was, on 21 July 1812, admitted a student of Lincoln's Inn. On 21 Nov. 1817 he was called to the bar, and for a short time went the Welsh circuit. The increase of his chancery practice soon caused him to abandon the common law bar, and he confined himself to practising in the equity courts. In Michaelmas term 1829 he was appointed a king's counsel, and on 6 Nov. in the same year was elected a bencher of Lincoln's Inn. Upon taking silk he selected the vice-chancellor's court, where Sir Edward Sugden, afterwards Lord St. Leonards, was the leader. With him Knight had daily contests until Sugden's appointment as lord chancellor of Ireland in 1834. In politics Knight was a conservative, and in April 1831 he was returned for Bishop's Castle, a pocket borough belonging to the Earl of Powis. His parliamentary career, however, was short, for the borough was disfranchised by the Reform Bill. In 1834 he received the honorary degree of D.C.L. from the university of Oxford. In 1835 he was one of the counsel heard at the bar of the House of Lords on behalf of the municipal corporations against the Municipal Reform Bill, and in 1851 on behalf of the deans and chapters against the Ecclesiastical Duties and Revenues Bill. In August 1837 he unsuccessfully contested the borough of Cambridge, and in September following assumed the additional surname of Bruce by royal license. Upon the abolition of the court of exchequer in equity and the transfer of its jurisdiction to the court of chancery, he was on 28 Oct. 1841 appointed by Sir Robert Peel one of the two additional vice-chancellors under 5 Vict. c. 5. He was subsequently knighted, and on 15 Jan. 1842 was sworn a member of the privy council. In Michaelmas term 1842 he undertook the further duties of chief judge in bankruptcy, and seven years later the exercise of the jurisdiction of the old court of review was entrusted to him. In 1842-3 he held the yearly office of treasurer of Lincoln's Inn, and in virtue of that office laid the foundation-stone of the new hall and library of the inn on 20 April 1843. Upon the creation of the court of appeal in chancery Lord John Russell appointed Knight-Bruce and Lord Cranworth the first lords justices on 8 Oct. 1851. In this court Knight-Bruce sat for nearly sixteen years. He died at Roehampton Priory, Surrey, on

7 Nov. 1866, within a fortnight after his retirement from the bench, which had been occasioned by the gradual failure of his sight and the shock which he had sustained by the sudden death of his wife in the previous year. He was buried in Cheriton churchyard, near Folkestone, on the 14th of the same month. At the bar he was remarkable for the rapidity with which he was always able to make himself master of the facts of any case, and for his extraordinary memory (see report of '*Hilton v. Lord Granville*,' Cr. and Ph. 284, and *Law Mag. and Review*, xxii. 281). As a judge he showed a wonderful aptitude for business and a profound knowledge of law, and so anxious was he to shorten procedure and save time in the discussion of technicalities, that in some of his decisions, which were overruled by Lord Cottenham, he anticipated reforms which were subsequently made. His language was always terse and lucid, and his judgments, especially the earlier ones, were models of composition (see the case of '*Reynell v. Sprye*,' 1 *De Gex, Macnaghten, & Gordon*, 660-711; of '*Thomas v. Roberts*,' better known as the '*Agapemone Case*,' 3 *De Gex & Smale*, 758-81; and of '*Burgess v. Burgess*,' 3 *De Gex, Macnaghten, & Gordon*, 896-905). He frequently sat on the judicial committee of the privy council, where his familiarity with the civil law and the foreign systems of jurisprudence was especially valuable. In the celebrated '*Gorham case*' he differed from the judgment of the majority of the court, which was pronounced by Lord Langdale, M.R., on 8 March 1850. On 20 Aug. 1812 he married Eliza, the daughter of Thomas Newte of Duvale, Devonshire, by whom he had several children. Two portraits were taken of him, by George Richmond, R.A., and Woolnoth respectively, both of which have been engraved.

[Foss (1864), ix. 151-4; *Law Mag. and Rev.* xxii. 278-93; *Law Journal*, i. 564-5, 607-8; *Solicitors' Journal*, xi. 25, 53-4, 79; *Law Times*, xlii. 21, 48, 57, 303; *Gent. Mag.* 1866, new ser. ii. 681, 818, 833-5; *Annual Register* (1866), Chron. 218-19.] G. F. R. B.

BRUCE, JOHN (1745-1826), historian, was heir male of the ancient family of Bruce of Earlsball, one of the oldest cadets of the illustrious house of Bruce; but he did not succeed to the estate of his ancestors, which was transferred by marriage into another family. He inherited from his father only the small property of Grangehill, near Kinghorn, Fifeshire, the remains of a larger estate which his family acquired by marriage with a granddaughter of the renowned Kirkcaldy of Grange. He received his education at the

university of Edinburgh, where he was appointed professor of logic. Having acquitted himself to the satisfaction of Viscount Melville in the education of his son, that nobleman obtained for him a grant of the reversion, conjointly with Sir James Hunter Blair, of the patent of king's printer and stationer for Scotland, an office which did not open to them until fifteen or sixteen years later. Through the influence of Lord Melville, Bruce was likewise appointed keeper of the state paper office, and secretary for the Latin language and historiographer to the East India Company. He was M.P. for the borough of Michael or Midshall, Cornwall, from February 1809 till July 1814, and for a short time secretary to the board of control. He was a fellow of the Royal Societies of London, Edinburgh, and Göttingen. His death occurred at his seat of Nuthill, Fifeshire, on 16 April 1826.

Bruce was an accurate historian and an elegant scholar, and produced several valuable works, some of which were privately printed for confidential use by members of the government. Their titles are: 1. 'First Principles of Philosophy,' Edinburgh, 1780, 1781, 1785, 8vo. 2. 'Elements of the Science of Ethics, or the Principles of Natural Philosophy,' London, 1786, 8vo. 3. 'Historical View of Plans for the Government of British India,' 1793, 4to. 4. 'Review of the Events and Treaties which established the Balance of Power in Europe, and the Balance of Trade in favour of Great Britain,' London, 1796, 8vo. 5. 'Report on the Arrangements which were made for the internal Defence of these Kingdoms when Spain by its Armada projected the Invasion and Conquest of England,' London, 1798, 8vo, privately printed for the use of ministers at the time of Bonaparte's threatened invasion. On this report Pitt grounded his measures of the provisional cavalry and army of reserve. 6. 'Report on the Events and Circumstances which produced the Union of the Kingdoms of England and Scotland; on the effects of this great National Event on the reciprocal interests of both Kingdoms; and on the political and commercial influence of Great Britain in the Balance of Power in Europe,' 2 vols., London [1799], 8vo. These papers were collected by the desire of the fourth Duke of Portland, then secretary of state, when the question of union between Great Britain and Ireland came under the consideration of the government. 7. 'Report on the Arrangements which have been adopted in former periods, when France threatened Invasions of Britain or Ireland, to frustrate the designs of the enemy by attacks on his

foreign possessions or European ports, by annoying his coasts, and by destroying his equipments,' London [1801], 8vo, privately printed for the government. 8. 'Annals of the East India Company from their establishment by the Charter of Queen Elizabeth, 1600, to the union of the London and English East India Company, 1707-8,' 3 vols., London, 1810, 4to. 9. 'Report on the Renewal of the Company's Exclusive Privileges of Trade for twenty years from March 1794,' London, 1811, 4to. 10. 'Speech in the Committee of the House of Commons on India Affairs,' London, 1813, 8vo.

[Gent. Mag. xvi. (ii.) 87. (new series) iv. 327; Martin's Privately Printed Books, 133, 138, 142, 149, 156; Biog. Dict. of Living Authors (1816), 42; Beloe's Anecdotes, ii. 432; Smith's Bibl. Cantiana, 85; Watt's Bibl. Brit.; Lowndes's Bibl. Man. (Bohn), 293; McCulloch's Lit. Pol. Econ. 106; Lists of Members of Parliament (official return), ii. 243, 258; Cat. of Printed Books in Brit. Mus.] T. C.

**BRUCE, JOHN** (1802-1869), antiquary, a native of London, though of a Scotch family, was educated partly at private schools in England, and partly at the grammar school of Aberdeen. Although brought up to the law, he did not practise after 1840, and from that time gave himself wholly to historical and antiquarian pursuits, to which he had already devoted much attention. He took a prominent part in the foundation of the Camden Society, held office in it as treasurer and director, and contributed to its publications: 'The Historie of the Arrivall of Edward IV,' 1838, the first volume of the society's works; 'Annals of the First Four Years of Queen Elizabeth,' 1840; 'Correspondence of Robert Dudley, Earl of Leicester,' 1844; 'Verney Papers,' 1845; 'Letters of Queen Elizabeth and James VI,' 1849; a preface to 'Chronicon Petroburgense,' 1849; 'Letters and Papers of the Verney Family,' 1853; 'Charles I in 1646,' 1856; 'Liber Famelicus' of Sir James Whitelocke, 1858; 'Correspondence of James VI with Cecil,' 1861; a preface to 'Proceedings principally in the County of Kent . . . from the collections of Sir E. Dering,' 1861; conjointly with J. G. Nichols's 'Wills from Doctors' Commons,' 1863; an 'Inquiry into the Genuineness of a Letter dated 3 Feb. 1613,' 1864, in the 'Miscellany,' v. 7; 'Accounts and Papers relating to Mary Queen of Scots,' conjointly with A. J. Crosby, 1867; 'Journal of a Voyage . . . by Sir Kenelm Digby,' 1868; 'Notes of the Treaty of Ripon,' 1869. He was for some time treasurer and vice-president of the Society of Antiquaries, and contributed many papers to the 'Archæo-

logia,' among which his 'Inquiry into the Authenticity of the Paston Letters,' xli. 15, may be especially mentioned. He also printed two letters relating to the affairs of the society in 1852. He wrote occasionally in the 'Edinburgh Review' and other periodicals, and was for some years editor of the 'Gentleman's Magazine.' For the Berkshire Ashmolean Society he edited a volume of 'Original Letters relating to Archbishop Laud's Benefactions,' 1841, and for the Parker Society the 'Works of R. Hutchinson,' 1842, and conjointly with the Rev. T. Perowne the 'Correspondence of Archbishop Parker,' 1853. In 1857, he contributed an edition of Cowper's poems to the Aldine edition of poets. He edited the Calendars of State Papers, Domestic Series, Charles I, 1625-1639, 12 vols. published under the direction of the master of the rolls, 1858-1871, the last volume being completed by Mr. W. D. Hamilton, and in 1867 printed privately papers relating to William, first earl of Gowrie. In 1861 he was appointed by the Society of Antiquaries a trustee of Sir John Soane's Museum. He was a man of a noble simplicity of character, and was much beloved by all who worked with him. He had been a widower for some years before his death, which occurred very suddenly at London, 28 Oct. 1869. His manuscripts deposited in the British Museum are: Catalogue of State Papers in the State Paper Office and the British Museum, and class catalogues of manuscripts in the British Museum, Add. MSS. 28197-28202, and a classified list of the letters of William Cowper, Add. MS. 29716.

[The Times, 3 and 4 Nov. 1869; J. G. Nichols's Catalogue of the Works of the Camden Society, 2nd edit. 1872; Thompson Cooper's Biog. Dict., supplement; Men of the Time, ed. 1868; Notes and Queries, 4th series, iv. 443; Catalogue of Additional MSS. in the British Museum.]

W. H.

**BRUCE, SIR JOHN HOPE** (1684?-1766), of Kinross, soldier and statesman, and reputed author of the ballad 'Hardyknute,' was the third son of Sir Thomas Hope, bart., of Craighall, Fife. His mother was the sole heir of Sir William Bruce, bart., of Kinross, and hence comes the name of the son, which in the family records stands as Sir John Bruce Hope. On the death of his elder brothers without heirs he succeeded to the estates, and came to be popularly known as Sir John Bruce of Kinross. Besides serving in the Swedish army, Bruce gained distinction as a soldier at home, rising to the rank of lieutenant-general. His public career likewise includes the governor-

ship of the Bermudas and the representation of Kinross-shire in Parliament. He died at the age of eighty-two, and was buried at Kinross. His first wife was Catherine Halket of Pitferrian, near Dunfermline, and it is her sister, Lady Wardlaw, who divides with Bruce the honour of having written 'Hardyknute.' It is extremely difficult with the existing evidence to decide which of the two wrote the poem—if indeed it was not their joint composition—but the best critics incline to give the credit to Bruce. Pinkerton, who wrote a sequel to the vigorous fragment, is quite decided in that view, resting his conclusion on a letter to Lord Binning, in which Bruce says he found the manuscript in a vault at Dunfermline. Percy accepts Pinkerton's argument and inference, and Irving, the most competent judge since their day, while acknowledging the difficulties of the case, is clearly inclined to agree with them. Unfortunately neither Lady Wardlaw nor Bruce left any authentic poetical composition, though Pinkerton would have little hesitation in attributing to Bruce not only 'Hardyknute' but other members of Ramsay's 'Evergreen' as well. There exists, however, testimony of various friends as to the exceptional accomplishments of Lady Wardlaw, and as to the probability, amounting almost to a certainty, that she was the sole and unaided author of the ballad [see WARDLAW, LADY ELIZABETH].

[Burke's Peerage; Pinkerton's Ancient Scottish Poems; Percy's Reliques; Chalmers's Life of Allan Ramsay; Chalmers's History of Dunfermline; Irving's Scottish Poets.] T. B.

**BRUCE, MICHAEL** (1635-1693), presbyterian minister, was the first of a line of seven Bruces, presbyterian ministers in Ireland in six successive generations. He was the third and youngest son of Patrick Bruce of Newtown, Stirlingshire, by Janet, second daughter of John Jackson, merchant of Edinburgh. Robert Bruce [q. v.], who anointed Anne of Denmark at Holyrood, 17 May 1590, was his grand-uncle. Bruce graduated at Edinburgh in 1654. He is said to have begun to preach in 1656. In that year John Livingstone of Ancrum, formerly minister of Killinchy, co. Down, paid a visit to his old charge, with a view to settle there again. This he did not do, but on returning to Scotland he looked out for a likely man for Killinchy, and at length sent Bruce with a letter (dated 3 July 1657) to Captain James Moore of Ballybregah 'to be communicated to the congregation.' Bruce was ordained at Killinchy by the Down presbytery in October 1657. At the Restoration Bruce's position was very precarious, but he refused a call

to Bothkennar, Stirlingshire, in 1660, and though deprived for nonconformity by Bishop Jeremy Taylor, he continued to preach and administer the sacraments 'at different places in the parish, in kilns, barns, or woods, and often in the night.' Patrick Adair [q. v.], though he pays a high tribute to Bruce's 'integrity and good intentions,' yet intimates that he and other young ministers did more harm than good, affixing the stigma of lawlessness on the whole presbyterian party in Ulster. On 23 June 1664 he was outlawed, along with John Crookshanks of Raphoe, and ordered to give himself up to the authorities on 27 July. At length, in 1665 or 1666, Bruce returned to Scotland, not to keep quiet there, for in June 1666 his field preachings procured him a citation before the lords of the privy council in Edinburgh as 'a pretended minister and a fugitive from Ireland.' He did not answer the summons, but persisted in his 'seditious and factious doctrine and practice.' Early in June 1668 he was arrested, in his own hired house near Stirling, by Captain George Erskine, governor of Stirling Castle. He made every effort to escape, wounding one of his captors, and being himself badly wounded. He was lodged in the castle, and the privy council on 4 June directed that no one should have access to him, 'except it be physicians or churgeons.' On 18 June order was given to transfer him to the Edinburgh Tolbooth, and on 2 July he was charged before the council by the king's advocate. Admitting and defending his practice of preaching and baptising in houses and the fields, he was banished out of his majesty's dominions of Scotland, England, and Ireland, under the penalty of death. He signed a bond of compliance. From the print of his sermon, preached in the Tolbooth on the following Sunday, it appears that Virginia was to be the place of his exile. But an order from Whitehall (dated 9 July) directed the privy council to send him up to London 'by the first conveniency by sea.' On 13 Sept. he was conveyed to Prestonpans, and thence in the ship John to London. A royal warrant committed him to the Gatehouse at Westminster. It is said that he was to have been transported to Tangier. His wife in vain presented his petition for 'sustenance or release.' He was allowed to preach at the Gatehouse, and among his audience was Lady Castlemaine, one of Charles II's favourites. Through her influence a second petition (still extant) was more successful. The king declined to remit the sentence of banishment, but allowed Bruce to select his place of transportation. With much quickness he at once asked to be sent

to 'Killinchy in the woods.' The end was that his kinsman, the Earl of Elgin, procured for him a writ quashing all past sentences, and he got back to Killinchy with his family in April 1670. In the summer of that year his people set about building him a meeting-house (rebuilt 1714). Though Roger Boyle, who had succeeded Jeremy Taylor as bishop of Down and Connor, instituted proceedings against him and others for preaching without license, Berkeley, the lord-lieutenant, and James Margetson, the primate, intervened, and the presbyterians were left unmolested. In 1679 Bruce signed an address presented by the Down presbytery to the Irish government, disclaiming any complicity with the rising of the Scottish covenanters put down at Bothwell Bridge. He was frequently over in Scotland during this period; we find him in 1672 at Carluke, and in 1685 in Galloway. His final retreat to Scotland was in 1689, when the war broke out, and he was 'forced over from Ireland to Galloway by the Irishes.' He had several offers of a charge, but went of his own accord to Anwoth, Wigtonshire, a parish made famous by the ministry of Samuel Rutherford. The late incumbent, James Shaw, had been ousted by the people. Bruce was a member of the general assembly of 1690. He was called to Jedburgh, but decided to remain at Anwoth. Some curious stories are told of his predications; the most remarkable is, that on 27 July 1689, the day of the battle of Killiecrankie, he was preaching at Anwoth, and declared that Claverhouse 'shall be cut short this day. I see him killed and lying a corpse.' At Anwoth he died in 1693, and was buried in the church. He was in his fifty-ninth year, and the thirty-seventh of his ministry. He married (contract dated 30 May 1659) his cousin Jean, daughter of Robert Bruce of Kinnaird, and granddaughter of the Robert Bruce mentioned above. In his second petition from the Gatehouse he speaks of his 'family of young and helpless children left behind him' in Scotland. Three of his children died young, and were buried at Killinchy. His eldest son was James [q. v.] Bruce published nothing himself, and the rough quaint sermons issued as his were taken from the notes of his hearers. 1. 'A Sermon preached by Master Michael Bruce, in the Tolbooth of Edinburgh, the immediate Sabbath after he received the sentence of exile for Virginia,' 4to, n.d. (text, Ps. cxl. 12, 13). 2. 'The Rattling of the Dry Bones; or, a sermon preached in the night-time at Chapel-yard in the parish of Carluke, Clydsdale, May 1672,' 4to, n.d. (text, Ezek. xxxvii. 7, 8). 3. 'Six Dreadful Alarms in order to



the right improving of the Gospel; or the substance of a sermon, &c., 4to, n.d. (text, Matt. vii. 24; printed about 1700). 4. 'Soul Confirmation; or a sermon preached in the parish of Cambusnethen in Clyds-dail,' &c. 1709, 4to (text, Acts xiv. 22). 5. 'A Collection of Lectures and Sermons, preached mostly in the time of the late persecution,' &c., Glasgow, 1779, 8vo (edited by J. H., i.e. John Howie; reprinted as 'Sermons delivered in times of persecution in Scotland,' Edin. 1880, 8vo, with biographical notices by the Rev. James Kerr, Greenock; contains three sermons by Bruce on Gen. xlii. 25, Ps. cxix. 133, and Mark ix. 13). 6. A manuscript collection by Daniel Mussenden, merchant of Belfast, 1704, contains a sermon on Matt. xxviii. 1-4, 'preached in Scotland' by 'Mr. Mihail Bruce.'

[Hew Scott's *Fasti Eccl. Scot.*; Wodrow's *Hist.* vol. ii. and *Analecta*; Reid's *Formal Christians*, Belf. 1729, pref.; Original Letters to R. Bruce, Dublin, 1828; J. S. Reid, in *Orthod. Presbyterian*, February 1831; Grub's *Eccl. Hist.* of Scotland, 1861, ii. 247; Adair's *True Narrative* (Killen), 1866, pp. 258 sq.; Reid's *Hist. Presb. Ch. in Ireland* (Killen), 1867, ii. 219 sq.; Witherow's *Hist. and Lit. Mem. of Presbyterianism in Ireland*, 1st ser. 1879, pp. 46 sq.; Cuming-Bruce's *Fam. Records of the Bruces and the Cumyons*, 1870, pp. 362, 384; Kerr's biog. notice, 1880 ut sup.; Porter's *Seven Bruces*, in *N. Whig*, 6 April 1885; information from a descendant.] A. G.

**BRUCE, MICHAEL** (1686-1735), Irish presbyterian minister, eldest son of James Bruce, minister of Killeleagh [q. v.], born 27 July 1686, was licensed by the Down presbytery at Downpatrick on 27 Oct. 1708, after subscribing the Westminster Confession, and promising not to 'follow any divisive courses all the days of my life.' He was ordained minister of Holywood, co. Down, on 10 Oct. 1711, and acquired the reputation of a quiet, solid preacher. He was a member of the ministerial club, founded in 1705, and subsequently known as the Belfast Society. This body, of which the mainspring was John Abernethy of Antrim [q. v.], exercised a powerful influence in liberalising the presbyterian theology of Ulster. When, in 1720, the nonsubscription controversy broke out, his father, James Bruce, became a subscriber. Bruce, who broke with Calvinistic orthodoxy, became a decided nonsubscriber, and in 1723 was one of the four ministers accused by Colonel Upton at the Belfast sub-synod as 'holding principles which opened a door to let all heresy and error into the church.' In 1724 he protested against the exclusion of Thomas Nevin of Downpatrick for alleged heresy. He preached what was intended as

a healing sermon, on 5 Jan. 1725, before the sub-synod. That same year he was placed with the other nonsubscribers by the general synod of Ulster in a separate presbytery (Antrim), and in 1726 the Antrim presbytery, of which Bruce was clerk, was excluded from the general synod, and became a distinct ecclesiastical body. A subscribing congregation was soon formed at Holywood, under William Smith, and most of Bruce's hearers deserted him. Wodrow says he had only ten or twelve families left, yielding a stipend of scarcely 4*l.* To improve his position, a fortnightly evening lecture was established in First Belfast, and Bruce was appointed lecturer, at 20*l.* a year. His reputation as a minister was high, but he wrote so little that it is difficult to form a judgment of his merits. He is believed to have had a principal hand in the nonsubscribers' historical statement, 'A Narrative of the Proceedings of Seven General Synods of the Northern Presbyterians in Ireland,' &c., Belfast, 1727, 8vo (the preface is signed by Samuel Haldiday, moderator, and Michael Bruce, clerk). He died 1 Dec. 1735, and was buried at Holywood, where Haldiday preached his funeral sermon (Ps. xxxvii. 37) on 7 Dec. In 1716 he married Mary Ker, and had four children. Samuel Bruce [q. v.] was his son. He published only, 'The Duty of Christians to live together in religious communion, recommended in a sermon,' &c., Belfast, 1725, 8vo.

[Haldiday's *Funeral Sermon, 1735*; Appendix to *Duchal's Sermon for Abernethy, 1741*, pp. 36 sq.; *Bible Christian*, 1841, p. 111; Witherow's *Hist. and Lit. Memorials of Presbyterianism in Ireland*, 1st series, 1879, pp. 295 sq.; Porter's *Seven Bruces*, in *N. Whig*, 16 April 1885.] A. G.

**BRUCE, MICHAEL** (1746-1767), poet, the fifth of eight children of Alexander Bruce, weaver, was born at Kinnesswood, a hamlet in the parish of Portmoak, on the eastern shore of Lochleven, Kinross-shire, on 27 March 1746. His father was an elder of the seceding church which adhered to Thomas Mair of Orwell, Kinross-shire, ejected from the anti-burgher synod for holding that 'there is a sense in which Christ died for all men.' Bruce, who was a quick and delicate boy, was early taught to read and write, and was made useful as a 'wee herd loon' in tending sheep. At the village school his great companion was William Arnot, to whose memory he wrote 'Daphnis' in May 1765. At the age of eleven he had resolved to be a minister. When he was about sixteen his father received a bequest of 200 merks Scots (1*l.* 2*s.* 2*d.*), which he devoted to his son's education. Bruce was enrolled

in the Greek class at Edinburgh University, under Robert Hunter, on 17 Dec. 1762. He attended three sessions at Edinburgh, not confining himself to the arts course (for in 1763 he took Hebrew along with natural philosophy), and taking pleasure in belles lettres and poetry. He acquired, as his letters show, an admirable prose style, and contributed some poems to the Literary Society. Leaving the university in 1765, he became schoolmaster at Gairney Bridge, in the parish of Cleish, Kinross-shire, on the western side of Lochleven. He had twenty-eight pupils, at the rate of 2s. a quarter, and free board with their parents in rotation. He wrote a poetical appeal to the managers for a new table, and contemplated the publication of a volume of poems. While boarding in the house of one Grieve of Classlochie he fell in love with his pupil, his host's daughter Magdalene. He celebrates her in his 'Alexis' (under the name of Eumelia) and in two songs. She married David Low. Still eager for the ministry, Bruce found that the anti-burgher synod would not receive him as a student, owing to his connection with Mair. Accordingly he applied to the burgher synod, and was enrolled in the classes of John Swanston, minister at Kinross. In 1766 he looked out for a new school, and found one at Forrest Mill, near Tillicoultry, Clackmannanshire. To this period belongs his correspondence with his father's apprentice, David Pearson, who had settled at Easter Balgedie, near Kinnesswood. He fell ill, being in fact seized with consumption, but was for the time restored through the skill of John Millar, M.D., to whom he addressed some grateful lines, enclosed to Pearson on 20 Nov. 1766. On 7 Dec. he mentions his 'Lochleven' as being 'now finished.' David Arnot (with whom Bruce had kept up a literary correspondence, often in Latin) is portrayed in it as Agricola; Lælius is thought to be George Henderson, a college friend, who died in 1793. At length ill-health forced him to resign his school in the course of the winter, and he made his way home on foot. In the spring he penned his touching 'Elegy' on his own approaching death. On 5 July (6 July, ANDERSON) 1767 he was found dead in his bed. His father (of whom there is a memoir by Pearson in the Edinburgh 'Missionary Chronicle,' 1797) followed him on 19 July 1772.

During Bruce's life his ballad of 'Sir James the Ross' was printed in a newspaper. His 'Lochleven,' his 'Pastoral Song,' and his song 'Lochleven no more' (in both of which Peggy is Magdalene Grieve) appeared in the 'Edinburgh Magazine.' At the time

of his death, John Logan, his class-fellow, then tutor in the family of Sir John Sinclair, undertook to bring out a volume of his friend's poems, and for this purpose got possession of most of Bruce's manuscripts, consisting of poems and letters, and especially a quarto volume into which, in his last illness, he had transcribed his poems. Not till 1770 did Logan issue the small volume of 'Poems on several Occasions, by Michael Bruce,' Edinburgh, 12mo, prefixing a very well-written biographical preface. It contains but seventeen pieces, including some by different authors; 'the only other author ever specified by Logan was Sir John Foulis, bart., to whom the Vernal Ode is ascribed by Dr. Anderson' (GROSEART). Pearson maintains that the whole contents of the volume were known to him as Bruce's except this ode, the 'Ode to the Fountain,' 'Ode to Paoli,' 'Chorus of Elysian Bards,' and 'Danish Odes.' Moreover, to Bruce's companions the volume appeared strangely defective. His father at once said, 'Where are my son's Gospel sonnets?' He went to Edinburgh for the manuscripts, and got some of the papers, but never recovered the aforesaid quarto. The chagrin hastened the old man's death. In the 'Weekly Magazine, or Edinburgh Amusement' of 5 May 1774 the 'Ode to the Cuckoo,' from the 1770 book, appears as a contribution signed 'R. D.,' in the next number the piracy is exposed, and the real initials of the thief are said to be 'B. M.' A charming paper in the 'Mirror' (No. 36, Saturday, 29 May 1779, signed 'P.,' and ascribed to William Craig, one of the lords of session) drew public attention to Bruce's genius, as exhibited in the 1770 volume. Two years later Logan published 'Poems, by the Rev. Mr. Logan, one of the ministers of Leith,' 1781, 8vo. The first piece in this volume is the 'Ode to the Cuckoo,' with a few verbal changes from the 1770 issue; at the end are nine hymns, the first and fifth being revisions of hymns already in print. All these hymns and adaptations are claimed for Bruce by his brother James, who says he had heard them repeated. The Scottish kirk adopted them into its 'Paraphrases' in 1781, and from this source they have been introduced into innumerable hymn-books. With regard to the 'Ode to the Cuckoo,' on which the controversy mainly turns, there is an accumulation of evidence. Bruce writes that he had composed a 'poem about a gowk.' A copy of the ode in Bruce's handwriting is said to have been seen by Dr. Davidson of Kinross, and by Principal Baird of Edinburgh. Pearson affirms that Alexander Bruce read the poem aloud from

his son's quarto book, a few days after Michael's death. It was never seen in Logan's handwriting before 1767, the year in which he obtained Bruce's manuscripts. After publishing his own volume, Logan in 1781-2 tried to prevent by law a reprint of the 1770 book; but it was reprinted at Edinburgh for a Stirling bookseller in 1782. It was reprinted in 1784, 1796, and 1807. Against Logan it is urged that his posthumously published sermons (1790-1) show plagiarisms; and that he claimed as his own (using them as candidate for a chair at Edinburgh) a course of lectures afterwards published in his lifetime by Dr. W. Rutherford. The vindication of Bruce's authorship of the contested poems and hymns was ably undertaken by William Mackelvie, D.D., of Balgedie, in his 'Lochleven and other Poems, by Michael Bruce; with Life of the Author from original sources,' Edinburgh, 1837, 8vo, and has been further pursued by the Rev. Dr. Grosart, in his edition of Bruce's 'Works,' 1865, 8vo, with memoir and notes. On the other hand, the claim of Logan is advocated in David Laing's 'Ode to the Cuckoo, with remarks on its authorship, &c.,' 1873 (privately printed). A strong point is that the Rev. Dr. Thomas Robertson, minister of Dalmeny, writes to Baird on 22 Feb. 1791, saying that he and Logan had looked over the manuscripts of Bruce together; and the cuckoo ode is not among those he identifies as Bruce's. In the article 'Michael Bruce' in the 'Encyclopædia Britannica' (ninth edition, 1876, iv. 393) stress is laid on the admission of Logan's authorship of the 'Ode to the Cuckoo' by Isaac D'Israeli, Thomas Campbell, Robert Chambers, and David Laing. The writer erroneously supposes that Bruce's title to this ode was first (after Logan's claim) brought forward by Mackelvie. The letters of Pearson (29 Aug. 1795) and Joseph Birrel (31 Aug. 1795), claiming the ode for Bruce, are given by Anderson in his life of Logan (1795). Later defences of Logan's claim will be found in the 'Brit. and For. Evangelical Review,' 1877 and 1878, articles by John Small, M.A. (reprinted separately) and Rev. R. Small. It is not easy to relieve Logan of the charge of having appropriated Bruce's poem; at the same time his alterations, so far as they can be traced, appear to be improvements on the original work.

[Life, by Robert Anderson, M.D., in his *British Poets*, vol. ix. 1795, pp. 273 sq., 1029 sq., 1221 sq.; Miller's *Our Hymns, their Authors and Origin*, 1866, pp. 242 sq., 247 sq.; Shairp, in *Good Words*, November 1873; authorities cited above.]

A. G.

VOL. VII.

BRUCE, PETER HENRY (1692-1757), military adventurer, was born at Detring Castle in Westphalia, his mother's home, in 1692. He was descended from the Bruces of Airth, Stirlingshire. His grandfather, John Bruce, took refuge from the Cromwellian troubles in the service of the Elector of Brandenburg, and his father was born in Prussia, and obtained a commission in a Scotch regiment in the same service. The father accompanied his regiment on its return to Scotland in 1698, and took his wife and child with him. The boy was now sent to school at Cupar in Fife for three years, after which he remained three years more with his father at Fort William. In 1704 his father took him to Germany, and left him with his mother's family, by whom he was sent to a military academy to learn fortification. Soon after his uncle Rebeur, who was colonel of a regiment serving in Flanders, took charge of him, and entered him in the Prussian service (1706). He got his commission in his sixteenth year (1708), in consequence of distinguished conduct at the siege of Lille, and he appears to have been present at a considerable number of the battles and sieges in which Prince Eugene's troops took part. In 1711 he quitted the Prussian service, and entered that of Peter the Great of Russia, on the invitation of a distant cousin of his own name, who held high rank in the Russian army at that time. He was sent with despatches to Constantinople in 1711, and his 'Memoirs' give an interesting account of that city as he saw it. His 'Memoirs' also contain many interesting anecdotes of Peter the Great and his court during the years 1711-24, for the greater part of which period Bruce appears to have lived at St. Petersburg when not following the czar on his expeditions. In 1722 he accompanied the Persian expedition led by the czar. They sailed down the Volga from Nischnei-Novgorod to Astrachan, and then coasted along the western shore of the Caspian as far as Derbent, passing through the countries of several Tartar tribes, of whose manners and habits he gives a very good account.

After this expedition he at last succeeded in obtaining leave of absence for a year, and quitted Russia in 1724, determined never to see it again. He now returned to Cupar after an absence of twenty years, and settling down on a small estate left him by his grand-uncle, he married, and turned farmer for sixteen years, during which time he had several children. In 1740, desiring to increase his income, he again took military service, and was sent by the British government to the Bahamas to carry out some fortifications there. Five years later he again returned

to England, and was immediately employed in the north, fortifying Berwick and other towns against the Pretender. Here his 'Memoirs' abruptly break off; but we learn from the 'advertisement' prefixed to the edition of 1782, that he retired the same year (1745) to his house in the country, where he died in 1757. His 'Memoirs,' his only literary work, were originally written, as he tells us, in German, his native language, and were translated by him into English in 1755. They were printed at London in 1782 for his widow, and are favourably noticed in the 'Monthly Review' for that year. They are pleasantly written, and show very close and intelligent observation.

[Bruce's Memoirs; Monthly Review, 1782.]  
G. V. B.

**BRUCE, ROBERT DE I** (*d.* 1094<sup>p</sup>), was an ancestor of the king of Scotland who made the name of Bruce or Brus famous. The family is a singular example of direct male descent in the Norman baronage, and it is necessary to distinguish with care the different individuals who bore the same surname, and during eight generations the christian name of Robert. The surname has been traced by some genealogists beyond Normandy to a Norse follower of its conqueror Rollo, a descendant of whose brother, Einar, earl of Orkney, called Brusi (which means in old Norse a goat), is said to have accompanied Rollo and built a castle in the diocese of Coutances. A later Brusi, son of Sigurd the Stout, was Earl of Orkney, and died 1031. But the genealogy cannot be accepted. The name is certainly territorial, and is most probably derived from the lands and castle of Brin or Bruis, of which a few remains in the shape of vaults and foundations can still be traced between Cherbourg and Vallonges. More than one de Bruce came with the Conqueror to England, and the contingent of 'li sires de Bréaux' is stated at two hundred men (*LELAND, Collectanea*, i. 202). Their services were rewarded by forty-three manors in the East and West, and fifty-one in the North Riding of Yorkshire—upwards of 40,000 acres of land, which fell to the lot of Robert de Bruce I, the head of the family. Of the Yorkshire manors the chief was Skelton in Cleveland, not far from Whitby, the seat of the elder English branch of the Bruces after the younger migrated to Scotland and became lords of Annandale.

[Orkneyinga Saga; Ord's History of Cleveland, p. 198; Domesday, Yorkshire, 332 b, 333, and Kelham's Illustrations, p. 121; Dugdale's Baronage, i. 447. Registrum Honoris de Richmond, p. 98, gives the seal of Robert.] Æ. M.

**BRUCE, ROBERT DE II** (1078<sup>p</sup>–1141), was son of Robert I, and companion of David I of Scotland at the court of Henry I. He received from David I a grant of Annandale, then called Strath Annet, by a charter c. 1124 (*A. P. Scot.* i. 92, from the original in *Brit. Mus. Cartæ Antiquæ*, xviii. 45). It was bounded by the lands of Dunegal, of Strathnith (Nithsdale), and those of Ranulf de Meschines, earl of Chester, in Cumberland, and embraced the largest part of the county of Dumfries. Like David, a benefactor of his church, Robert de Bruce founded a monastery of canons regular at Guisburn in Cleveland, with the consent of his wife Agnes and Adam his eldest son. The church of Middleburgh, with certain lands attached to it, was given by him to the monks of Whitby as a cell of Guisburn, and his manors of Appleton and Hornby to the monks of St. Mary at York. Along with Bernard de Baliol of Barnard Castle he tried to make terms between David and the English barons before the battle of the Standard in 1138; but failing in this attempt he renounced his Scotch fief of Annandale, and, notwithstanding his affection for David, fought with zeal on the side of Stephen. He died in 1141, and left by Agnes, daughter of Fulk Pagnel of Carlton, two sons. The elder, Adam, succeeded to Skelton and his other English lands, which continued in the family till 1271, when, on the death of Peter Bruce, constable of Scarborough, without issue, they were parted between his four sisters. His second son, Robert de Bruce III, saved the Scotch fief of Annandale either by joining David I, if a tradition that he was taken prisoner by his father at the battle of the Standard can be relied on, or by obtaining its subsequent restoration from David or Malcolm IV.

[Ælred de Rievaulx's Descriptio de bello apud Standardum juxta Albertonam; Dugdale's Monasticon, i. 388–412, and ii. 147.] Æ. M.

**BRUCE, ROBERT DE III** (*d.* 1138–1189<sup>p</sup>), second son of Robert II, and so called Le Meschin or the Cadet, was the founder of the Scottish branch. He held the Annandale fief, with Lochmaben as its chief messuage, for the service of a hundred knights during the reigns of David I, Malcolm IV, and William the Lion, who confirmed it by a charter in 1166. He paid escuage for the manor of Hert in the bishopric of Durham in 1170, which he is said to have received from his father to supply him with wheat, which did not grow in Annandale. The date of his death is uncertain, but he must have survived the year 1189, when he settled a long-pending dispute with the see of Glasgow by an agree-

ment with Bishop Jocelyn, under which he mortified the churches of Moffat and Kirkpatrick, and granted the patronage of Drivesdale, Hoddam, and Castlemilk, in return apparently for a cession by the bishop of his claim to certain lands in Annandale.

[Charter of William the Lion in Ayloff's *Charters*; Madox's *History of Exchequer*; *Registrum Glasguense*, pp. 64-5; *Calendar of Documents relating to Scotland*, i. No. 197.]

Æ. M.

**BRUCE, ROBERT DE IV** (*d.* before 1191), son of Robert III, was married in 1183 to Isabel, daughter of William the Lion, by a daughter of Robert Avenel, when he was given the manor of Haltwhistle in Tyndale as her dowry. He must have survived his father, if at all, only a short time, as his widow married Robert de Ros in 1191, and the date of his father's death being uncertain it may be doubted whether he succeeded to Annandale. He was succeeded by William de Bruce, his brother, in that fief, who was the only exception to the line of Roberts. William held Annandale along with the English manors of Hert and Haltwhistle till his death in 1215.

[*Dugdale's Baronage*, i. 449; *Graham's Lochmaben*, pp. 16 and 17.]

Æ. M.

**BRUCE, ROBERT DE V** (*d.* 1245), son of William de Bruce, married Isabel, second daughter of David, earl of Huntingdon, younger brother of William the Lion, and thus founded the claim of his descendants to the crown. In 1215-16 he obtained from King John a confirmation of a grant of a market and fair at Hartlepool. He was a witness at York in 1221 of Alexander II's charter of jointure to his wife Joanna, sister of Henry III. During this reign his own great estate and royal connection by marriage made the lord of Annandale one of the chief barons of southern Scotland. Like his ancestors he was liberal to the church, confirming and increasing their grants. He died in 1245, and was buried at the abbey of Saltrey in Huntingdonshire.

[*Rymer's Fœdera*, i. 252; *Dugdale's Baronage*, i. 449; *Monasticon*, ii. 151. Several charters by or to him are amongst the *Duchy of Lancaster Charters*, and notes of them are printed, *Calendar of Documents relating to Scotland*, i. Nos. 1680-5.]

Æ. M.

**BRUCE, ROBERT DE VI** (1210-1295), sometimes called the **COMPETITOR**, from his claim to the crown against John Baliol [q.v.], succeeded to the lordship of Annandale on his father's death in 1245, and on that of his mother in 1251 to ten knights' fees in Eng-

land, her share of the earldom of Huntingdon. He married, ~~the year before his father died,~~ Isabel, daughter of Gilbert de Clare, earl of Gloucester. His active career was distributed between the two kingdoms, in each of which he was a powerful subject.

In 1238 Alexander II, on the eve of an expedition to the Western Isles, despairing of issue, recognised the claim of Bruce to the succession; but the birth of Alexander III in 1241 frustrated his hopes. In 1250 he acted as one of the justices of Henry III, but during the next seven years he appears to have transferred his field of action to Scotland. On the death of Alexander II in 1255 he was one of the fifteen regents named in the convocation of Roxburgh to act during the minority of the young king, and he formed the head of the party favourable to the English alliance cemented by the king's marriage to Margaret, daughter of Henry III. That king appointed him sheriff of Cumberland and governor of Carlisle. Between 1257 and 1271 he again frequently served on the English king's bench, and in 1268 he was appointed capitalis justiciarius, being the first chief justice of England, with a salary of 100 marks. In 1260 he accompanied the king and queen of Scotland to London. In the Barons' war he fought for Henry, and was taken prisoner at Lewes in 1264, but was released after the victory of Evesham (1265) turned the tide in favour of the king, when he resumed his office as sheriff of Cumberland. On the accession of Edward I he was not reappointed to the bench, and appears again to have returned to Scotland. He was present at the convention of Scone, 5 Feb. 1283-4, by which the right of succession of Margaret, the Maid of Norway, was recognised; but on the death of Alexander III in 1286 a powerful party of nobles met at Turnberry Castle, belonging to his son Robert, earl of Carrick, in right of his wife, and pledged themselves to support each other and vindicate the claims of whoever should gain the kingdom by right of blood, according to the ancient customs of Scotland. They assumed as allies Richard de Burgh, earl of Ulster, and Thomas de Clare, to whom authority was given to proceed with arms against any one who broke the conditions of the bond, 20 Sept. 1286 (*Documents illustrative of the History of Scotland*, edited by Rev. J. Stevenson, i. 22). The nobles who joined in this league were Patrick, earl of Dunbar, his three sons, and his son-in-law James the Steward of Scotland, and his brother John, Walter Stewart earl of Menteith, Angus, son of Donald lord of the Isles, his son Alexander, and the two Bruces, the lord of Annandale,

and his son, the Earl of Carrick. They united the chief influence of the south and west of Scotland against the party of John de Baliol, lord of Galloway, and the Comyns. A period of civil war ensued, during which Robert de Bruce, lord of Annandale, asserted his title to the crown. Unable to secure his aim, Bruce took part in the negotiations at Salisbury, which resulted in the treaty of Brigham in 1290, with the view of uniting Scotland to England, subject to guarantees for its independence by the marriage of Margaret to Prince Edward. The death of Margaret reopened the question of the succession, and one of the regents, William Fraser, bishop of St. Andrews, made the appeal to Edward I as arbiter, which led to the famous competition at Norham in 1291-2, decided in favour of John de Baliol on 17 Nov. 1292. According to Sir F. Palgrave, Bruce had also some years before appealed to Edward, but the documents adduced to prove this are without date, and the ascription of at least one of them to Bruce is conjectural. The course of litigation at Norham, where Bruce, as well as Baliol, recognised Edward's title as lord paramount to decide the cause, and the grounds upon which the claim of Bruce was rejected, have been stated in the life of Baliol [q. v.] A protest by Bruce amongst the documents carried off by Edward from Scotland, afterwards delivered to Baliol (*Acts Parl. Scot.* i. 116), and an agreement for mutual defence between Bruce and Florence, count of Holland, another of the competitors, entered into on 14 June 1292 (*Documents illustrative of the History of Scotland*, edited by Rev. J. Stevenson, i. 318), show that Bruce was not disposed to acquiesce in the adverse decision. His great age prevented him from any active measures to overturn it, and he resigned his rights and claims in favour of his son, the Earl of Carrick. He retired to his castle of Lochmaben, where he died on Good Friday, 1294-1295, at the age of eighty-five, and was interred at Guisburn in Cleveland, the family burial-place, where his stately tomb may still be seen. His character is well drawn in Walter of Hemingford: 'Toto tempore vitæ suæ gloriosus extitit; facetus, dives, et largus, et habundavit in omnibus in vita et in morte.' He had three sons: Robert, earl of Carrick, Bernard, and John.

[Dugdale's Baronage, i. 450; Rymer's Fœdera, i. 698; Documents illustrating the History of Scotland, ed. Sir F. Palgrave; Ord's History of Cleveland; Foss's Judges of England, ii. 269.]  
Æ. M.

BRUCE, ROBERT DE VII, EARL OF CARRICK (1253-1304), son of the Competitor,

Robert de Bruce VI, is said to have accompanied Edward, afterwards Edward I, in the crusade of 1269. On his return he married Marjory, countess of Carrick, and became by the courtesy of Scotland Earl of Carrick.

A romantic story handed down by the Scottish historians, that Bruce was carried off by the heiress when hunting near her castle of Turnberry, is probably an invention to excuse his marriage with a royal ward without the king's consent. In 1278 he did homage to Edward on behalf of Alexander III for his English fiefs. In 1281 he borrowed 40*l.* from his old comrade Edward I, a debt which played a part in the fortunes of his son. He was present at Scone in 1284, when the right of succession of the Maid of Norway was recognised, but took part with his father and the other nobles in the league of Turnberry, on 20 Sept. 1286, intended to defeat it. Like his father, however, he joined in the treaty of Brigham (14 March 1290), rendered abortive by Margaret's death. The agreement between Florence, count of Holland, and his father on 14 June 1292, to which the earl was a party, shows that Bruce anticipated an adverse decision. About this time he went to Norway with his eldest daughter Isabel, possibly on account of her marriage to King Eirik, the widower of Margaret, the daughter of Alexander III, which took place on 15 Nov. 1293, but also perhaps to avoid attendance at Baliol's parliament, to which he was summoned. It may have been with the same motive that after the death of his wife in 1292 he resigned the earldom of Carrick to his son, afterwards king (*A. P. Scot.* i. 449 a b). On the death of his father he did homage to Edward for his English fiefs on 4 June 1295. On 6 Oct. following he was given the custody of the castle of Carlisle during the king's pleasure, and three days after he took before the bishop of Durham and barons of the exchequer an oath to hold it faithfully and render it to no one but the king. When Baliol attempted to assert his independence, as was natural, his rivals the Bruces sided with Edward, and in 1296, after that monarch had taken Dunbar, Bruce the elder, according to the Scotch chroniclers, claimed the fulfilment of a promise, by which he was to be made king of Scotland. The answer, in Norman-French, of Edward, as given by Wyntoun (*B.* viii. 1927) and Fordun, though it has been doubted, suits his character:—

Ne avons ren autres chos a fere  
Que a vous reamgs (i.e. reaulmes) ganere

Hawe I nought ellys to do nôwe  
But wyn a kynryk to gyve yhowe?

Baliol, in revenge for Bruce's aid to Edward, seized Annandale, and gave it, with the castle of Lochmaben, to John Comyn; but his possession was brief, for Clifford, the English warden, retook it in the same year. The elder Bruce retired from Scotland and lived on his English estates till his death in 1304, when he was buried at Holmeulstram in Cumberland. Besides his eldest son Robert the king, he left Edward, lord of Galloway [see BRUCE, EDWARD], killed at Dundalk in 1318; Thomas and Alexander, taken in Galloway, and executed at Carlisle by Edward's order in 1307; and Nigel, who suffered the same fate at Berwick in 1306. His daughters, Isabel, Mary, Christian, Matilda, and Margaret, all married Scotch nobles or landed men in the life of their brother, whose hands were strengthened by these alliances in his contest for the crown. A sixth daughter Elizabeth, and a seventh whose name is unknown, are of doubtful authenticity.

[Rymer's *Fœdera*, ii. 266, 471, 558, 605, 612; Stevenson's *Documents illustrative of History of Scotland*. See Index under Robert Bruce, Earl of Carrick, but the references after 1295 are to his son Robert, afterwards king; *Acts Parl. Scot.* i. 424 a, 441 a, 447 b, 448 a. There are many errors in the early Scottish writers as to the Bruce genealogy, and the repetition of the same name led to frequent confusion of different persons; but these are now corrected by the more accurate examination of the records due to Chalmers's *Caledonia*, Lord Hailes, and Kerr in his *History of the Reign of Robert the Bruce*.] Æ. M.

**BRUCE, ROBERT DE VIII (1274–1329)**, king of Scotland, son of Robert de Bruce VII, earl of Carrick, and Marjory, daughter and heiress of Nigel, second earl of Carrick, by Marjory, daughter of Walter the Steward of Scotland, born on 11 July 1274, was descended on the father's side from a Norman baron who came with William the Conqueror to England; and on his mother's from the Celtic chiefs of Galloway, as the names of her grandfather Duncan, created earl of Carrick by William the Lion, and her father, Niel or Nigel, show. Soon after the death of her first husband, Adam de Kilconquhar, in 1271, his mother married Robert de Bruce (VII), son of the Competitor Robert de Bruce (VI), who assumed, according to Scottish custom, the title of Earl of Carrick. On the decision of the disputed succession in 1292 in favour of Baliol, and the death of his wife in the same year, the earl resigned that title to his son, and three years later acquiring, through the death of his father, the lordship of Annandale, he was afterwards known as Domi-

nus de Annandale, while his son, the future king, was styled Earl of Carrick until his coronation in 1306. On 4 June 1295 Edward I records by a writ under his privy seal that Robert, son and heir of Robert de Bruce, senior, now deceased, had done homage for lands held of the king, and this Robert, earl of Carrick, is by another writ nominating him keeper of the castle of Carlisle called Lord of Annandale on 6 Oct. 1295, having resigned the earldom three years before. The deed of resignation, dated at Berwick on Sunday after the feast of St. Leonard (6 Nov.) 1292, was presented to Baliol at the parliament of Stirling on 3 Aug. 1293. As it was necessary that sasine of the lands should be taken by the king before he could receive the homage of the new vassal, the sheriff of Ayr was directed to take it and ascertain their extent, after which Bruce was to return and do homage. It is uncertain whether homage was ever rendered, for the disputes between Baliol and Edward had commenced, and from the first both the young Bruce and his father took Edward's side. On 24 Aug. 1296, along with the Earls of March and Angus, Robert de Brus 'le veil' (the elder) and Robert de Brus 'le jovene' (the younger), earl of Carrick, took the oaths of homage and fealty to Edward at Berwick (*Ragman Rolls*, 176 a). A series of writs in favour of the earl shows one means by which their support was gained. A debt due by him to Edward, perhaps the old debt contracted by his father in 1281, was respited on 23 July 1293, and again on 11 Feb. and 15 Oct. 1296. By the second letter of respite it appears that the earl was about to proceed to Scotland, and by the third that he had rendered such good service that the king granted him the delay needed to admit of easy payment. His father had meantime been made keeper of the castle of Carlisle, and Baliol had retaliated by seizing Annandale, which he conferred on John Comyn, earl of Buchan. In the same year Baliol's renunciation of allegiance to the English king led to the brief campaign in which Berwick, Dunbar, Roxburgh, Edinburgh, and Stirling were taken, and on 2 Jan. 1296 the abject Baliol surrendered at Kincardine or Brechin his crown and realm to Edward. In the following year the Earl of Carrick, with other Scottish nobles, received a summons to accompany Edward to Flanders as his direct vassals. The Scotch, like many English barons, declined to obey a summons in excess of feudal obligation, and Wallace, during Edward's absence abroad, having raised the standard of revolt, Bruce, although, according to Hemingford, he had sworn alle-

giance to Edward at Carlisle on the host and the sword of Thomas à Becket, joined for a brief space the army of the popular leader. Urgent letters had been sent to him to aid the Earl of Warenne, Edward's commander, then advancing towards Scotland, with as many men as he could muster, and at least a thousand foot from Kyle, Cunningham, Cumnock, and Carrick. Instead of complying, in June 1297, along with Wishart, bishop of Glasgow, James the Steward of Scotland, and Sir William Douglas, he laid waste the country of the adherents of Edward. Warenne, an inactive general, sent in advance Henry de Percy and Robert de Clifford, who succeeded on 9 July 1297 in making terms with Bruce and his friends by the treaty called the capitulation of Irvine. The Scottish barons were not to be called to serve beyond the sea against their will, and were to be pardoned for their recent violence, while they in turn came into the peace, or, in other words, acknowledged their allegiance to Edward. The Bishop of Glasgow, the Steward, and Alexander de Lindsay became sureties for Bruce until he should deliver his daughter Marjory as hostage for his fidelity, which might well be doubted. The treaty appears to have been confirmed by Bruce at Berwick early in August. Wallace was at this time in the forest of Selkirk, along with Sir Andrew Murray of Bothwell, gathering together the Scottish commons, who, with less division of interest than the nobles, were determined to deliver their country from the English. On 11 Sept. he defeated Earl Warenne and Cressingham the treasurer at Stirling Bridge. Dundee and other castles surrendered in consequence of this victory, and the English evacuated Berwick. Wallace and Sir Andrew Murray, son of the elder Sir Andrew, assuming the title of leaders of the Scottish army in the name of John (i.e. Baliol), by God's grace illustrious king of Scotland, with consent of the community carried the war into Northumberland and Cumberland. At this time Baliol, and not Bruce, was the name under which the standard of Scottish independence was borne, but its bearer was Wallace, and its defenders the Scottish commons. In 1298, Edward returning from Flanders conducted in person the Scottish war with larger forces and better generalship, and his defeat of Wallace at Falkirk on 22 July wrested from the Scotch the fruits of the victory of Stirling Bridge. At this time Bruce again sided with his countrymen. Annandale was wasted and Lochmaben Castle taken by Clifford, and Bruce himself, to use the words of the contemporary Hemingford, 'when he heard of the

king's coming fled from his face and burnt the castle of Ayr, which he held.' Edward's campaign was a single victory, not a conquest. Pressing affairs, especially the contest with his own subjects, whose desire for the confirmation of the charters he was reluctant to concede, recalled him to England, and he was obliged to trust the settlement of Scotland to the nobles, to whom he assigned earldoms and baronies, or, as the chronicler expresses it, the hope of them. Annandale and Galloway and certain earldoms, a term which includes Carrick, he assigned to no one, that he might not irritate those earls who had only recently seceded and had not finally cast in their lot with their countrymen. As regards Bruce this conciliatory policy, so characteristic of Edward until the time for conciliation was past, had its effect, and from 1298 to 1304 he was at least not actively engaged against the English king. A truce was effected by the mediation of Philip IV of France in 1298. Baliol being now the pensioned prisoner of Edward, and Wallace an exile, a regency was appointed, which consisted of William of Lamberton, bishop of St. Andrews, John Comyn the younger, and Robert Bruce earl of Carrick, with whom for a time John de Soulis was conjoined. The only document which names Bruce is a letter of 13 Nov. 1299, by which the regents propose to Edward a suspension of hostilities on both sides. Comyn was the active regent representing the interest of Baliol and his own, as heir through his mother Ada, Baliol's sister. In 1300 the truce was renewed till Whitsunday 1301, and though Edward made an abortive attempt to resume the war on 26 Jan. 1302, the truce was again, at the instance of the French king, prolonged till November. It was during this period of intermittent war and truce, for in 1300 Edward took Caerlaverock, and in 1301 wintered at Linlithgow, that Pope Boniface VIII intervened in the dispute as to the succession to the Scottish crown, and claimed a right to decide it as lord paramount. On 27 June 1300 he despatched a bull to Edward demanding the withdrawal of his troops and the release of the Scotch ecclesiastics in his custody, which was presented by Archbishop Winchelsey to Edward at New Abbey in Galloway in October. Edward immediately summoned a parliament at Lincoln on 20 Jan. 1301, when the memorable answer denying the pope's claim to interfere in the temporal affairs of England, and asserting the feudal dependence of Scotland, was drawn up and confirmed by the seals of seven earls and ninety-seven barons for themselves and the whole community. Langtoft,



a contemporary, states that Bruce was present at this parliament.

At the Broadgate lay the Bruce, erle was he that day.

But his name is not in the list of those summoned, or of those who agreed to the reply to the pope. It is improbable that he was there or actively engaged in the controversy which was carried on by a memorial presented to the pope on behalf of Edward in favour of the English supremacy, and replies by the Scotch in the 'Processus Baldredi contra figmenta Regis Angliæ,' drawn by Baldred de Bisset, rector of Kinghorn, one of the Scottish commissioners at Rome. It was the policy of Bruce at this time to remain in the background, but events were hastening which brought him forward as the first actor on the stage. Scottish history at this juncture was involved with the relations of the English king to the court of France and the see of Rome. Edward made up his quarrel with Philip the Fair, whose sister Margaret he married in 1299, and with whom an alliance was completed on 20 May 1303. Gascony was restored to France, and Scotland, up to this time supported by the French king, was abandoned. The pope also, anxious to stir up Edward against Philip, with whom he had a nearer and more dangerous controversy as to the rights of church and state, though unsuccessful in his object, temporised to gain it, and withdrew his protection from the Scotch. Edward, who had reconciled his own subjects by tardy concessions, to procure the necessary supplies of men and money for the invasion of Scotland, commenced the war in earnest in 1303. In September of the previous year he ordered Sir John de Segrave to make a foray by Stirling and Kirkintilloch, but it was delayed till the following spring, and on 24 Feb. Segrave was defeated by Comyn, the regent, at Roslin. Edward himself then took the command, and in a brilliant campaign traversed the whole country from the border to Elgin, perhaps to Caithness, reducing every place of strength and wintering at Dunfermline. On 24 Jan. of the following year (1304) the capitulation of Stirling, the only castle which held out, completed his conquest. The evidence is slight, but sufficient to show that in this campaign Bruce still supported Edward. On 3 March Edward writes to Bruce: 'If you complete that which you have begun, we shall hold the war ended by your deed and all the land of Scotland gained,' and on the 5th of the same month to his son, referring to the Earl of Carrick and the other good people who

were advancing to the parts near Stirling to pursue his enemies; on the 30th to the earl himself, a letter sent by John de Bottetourt [q. v.], who was to receive supplies for his service; and on 15 April there is an urgent letter requesting him to spare no pains to cause the siege engines he was preparing with stones and timber to be forwarded, and on no account to delay because of the want of lead.

But while Bruce was thus openly supporting Edward, a secret alliance into which he entered with Lamberton, bishop of St. Andrews, the friend of Wallace, proves he had other designs, and though its terms are general, it was the first overt act which committed Bruce to the cause called patriotic in Scotland and treason in England. On 11 June, more than a month before the fall of Stirling, the earl and the bishop met at Cambuskenneth and subscribed a bond which bound them to support each other against all adversaries at all times and in all affairs, and to undertake nothing of difficulty without communication. When Lamberton was taken prisoner in 1306 he admitted the genuineness of the document, and his connection with Bruce was one charge preferred against him by Edward before the pope. Lamberton is an important link in the history of the war of independence, bringing into contact its first period under Wallace with its second under Bruce, and proving the continuity of the resistance to Edward though the leaders were different. In 1305 Wallace was betrayed and carried prisoner to London, where he was executed as a traitor, though he denied with truth that he had ever taken any oath to Edward. He was the only victim at this time. Towards the nobles and the country generally a contrary course was pursued. The one thing unpardonable was stubborn resistance, and the king evidently thought that clemency and organised government would reconcile Scotland to his rule. With this view, in a parliament held at London in Lent 1305, Edward ordered that the community of Scotland should meet at Perth on the day after the Ascension to elect representatives to come to London to a parliament to be held three weeks after the feast of St. John the Baptist (24 June) to treat of the secure custody of Scotland. His advisers in this were the Bishop of Glasgow, the Earl of Carrick (Bruce), Sir John Segrave, his lieutenant in Lothian, and Sir John de Landale, the chamberlain of Scotland. Representatives were accordingly chosen, and the English parliament to which they were summoned finally met on 16 Sept. Bruce was not one of

the representatives, but other Scotch nobles were specially summoned, and he is assumed to have been of their number. An ordinance, on the model of similar ordinances for Wales and Ireland, was drawn up for the government of Scotland, by which John de Bretagne, the king's nephew, was named his lieutenant in Scotland; Sir William de Beacote, chancellor; and Sir John de Landale, chamberlain. Two justices were appointed for Lothian, Galloway, the district between the Forth and the mountains, and the district beyond the mountains respectively. Sheriffs—either Scotchmen or Englishmen—removable at the discretion of the lieutenant and chamberlain, were named for the counties. Coroners were to be also appointed, unless those who held the office were deemed sufficient. The custody of the castles was committed to certain persons, and as regards the castle of Kildrummy in Aberdeenshire, he was to place it in charge of a person for whom he should answer. This shows, it has been said, how much Bruce was favoured; but it is perhaps rather a proof of the attitude of half confidence, half distrust in Edward's dealings with him during the earlier period of his career, and for which the warrant was soon to appear. The provision of the ordinance as regards the laws was to prohibit the use of the customs of the Scots and of the Britons (Brets), the Celts of the highlands and Galloway. It is not known how long Bruce remained in London. On 10 Feb. 1306 he suddenly appeared in Dumfries, and in the church of the Friars Minor slew John Comyn, the late regent, and his uncle Robert. The English contemporary writers and the Scotch, the earliest of whom (Barbour) wrote at least half a century later, assign a different train of incidents as leading to this act of violence. They agree that its proximate cause was the refusal of Comyn to join Bruce in opposing Edward, but the former ascribe the treachery to Bruce, who, concealing his designs, had lured Comyn to a place where he could fear no danger, while the latter relate that Comyn had revealed to Edward the scheme of Bruce to which he had been privy—having formed a similar bond with him to that of Lambertton—and so palliate the act of Bruce by the plea of self-defence. Records fail us, and both classes of historians wrote with a bias which has descended to most modern writers, according to the side of the border to which they belong. The hereditary enmity of the families of Bruce and Comyn, and the place of the deed, support the English view, which, in the absence of further evidence, must be accepted as more probable. Hailes suggests that the death of Comyn was due

to hot words and a chance medley, but Bruce's subsequent conduct proves a design which can scarcely have been devised on the spot, though its execution may have been hastened by the death of Comyn, his possible rival for the crown. Bruce had now abandoned his former indecision, and acted with a promptness which proved he knew his opponent and the hazards on which he staked his life. He had seen the head of Wallace on London Bridge, and at Westminster the stone of destiny, on which the Scottish kings had been crowned at Scone. Which was to be his fate? It was in his favour that he numbered only about half the years of the greatest of the Plantagenets, but against him that the Scottish nobles were still divided into factions, though the popular feeling created by Wallace was gaining ground, while the church, in the persons of its two chiefs—the Bishops of St. Andrews and Glasgow—was on his side. What determined the issue was that in Scotland a great noble now placed himself at the head of the people, while in England the sceptre and the sword, to which Edward clung with the tenacity of a dying man, were about to pass into the hands of a son incapable of wielding them. After the death of Comyn, Bruce, collecting his adherents chiefly in the south-west of Scotland, passed from Lochmaben to Glasgow and thence to Scone, where, on 27 March 1306, he was crowned by the Bishop of St. Andrews, the Bishops of Glasgow and Moray being also present, and the Earls of Lennox, Athole, and Errol. Two days later Isabella, countess of Buchan, sister of Duncan, earl of Fife, claimed the right of her family, the Macduffs, Celtic chiefs of Fife, to place the king upon the throne, and the ceremony was repeated with a circumstance likely to conciliate the Celtic highlanders. Though crowned Bruce had still to win his kingdom, and his first efforts were failures. On 19 June he was defeated at Methven near Perth by the Earl of Pembroke, and forced to seek safety in the mountains, first of Athole and then of Breadalbane, where on 11 Aug., at Dalry in Strathfillan, Lord Lorne, the husband of an aunt of Comyn, surprised and dispersed his followers, notwithstanding his personal prowess. His wife and other ladies of his family were sent to Kildrummy for safety, and her saying, whether historical or not, proved true, that he had been a summer but would not be a winter king. It is a curious circumstance that this lady, the sister of De Burgh, earl of Ulster, whom he married after the death of his first wife, Isabella, daughter of Donald, earl of Mar,

appears to have been a lukewarm supporter of her husband. After wandering as a fugitive in the west highlands, Bruce took refuge in Rachrine, an island on the Antrim coast. Meanwhile Edward, despite his years, having heard at Winchester of the death of Comyn and rising of Bruce, came north with all the speed his health allowed, and displayed an energy which showed he knew he had to cope not with a single foe but a nation. In April, at Westminster, he knighted his son Edward and three hundred others to serve in the wars, and swore by God and the Swan that he would take vengeance on Bruce, and devote the remainder of his life to the crusades. The prince added that he would not sleep two nights in one place till he reached Scotland. Before he started, and in the course of his journey, Edward made grants of the Scotch estates of Bruce and his adherents. Annandale was given to the Earl of Hereford. A parliament was summoned to meet at Carlisle on 12 March, when a bull was published excommunicating Bruce, along with another releasing Edward from his obligations to observe the charters. The attempt to crush the liberty of Scotland went hand in hand with an endeavour to violate the nascent constitution of England. Edward's constant aim was to reduce the whole island to a centralised empire under a single head, untrammelled by the bonds of a constitutional monarchy. His oaths and vows were unavailing, and he died at Burgh-on-the-Sands on 7 July 1307, without touching the soil of Scotland. Before his death he showed what his vengeance would have been. Elizabeth the wife, Marjory the daughter, and Christina the sister of Bruce were surprised in the sanctuary of St. Duthac at Tain and sent prisoners to England, where they remained till after Bannockburn. The Countess of Buchan and Mary, another of his sisters, were confined in cages, the one at Berwick, the other at Roxburgh. The Bishops of St. Andrews and Glasgow and the Abbot of Scone were sent to England and suspended from their benefices; but the pope declined to bestow them on Edward's nominees. Nigel, Bruce's youngest brother, was beheaded at Berwick; Christopher Seton, his brother-in-law, at Dumfries; Alexander Seton at Newcastle. The Earl of Athole was sent to London and, being a cousin of the king, hanged on a gallows thirty feet higher than the pole on which the head of Wallace still stood and that of Sir Simon Fraser, executed at this time. The other brothers of Bruce, Thomas and Alexander dean of Glasgow, having been taken in Galloway, were sent to Edward at Carlisle and there executed,

their heads being exposed on the gates and the tower. A little before this, John, a brother of William Wallace, was captured and sent to London, where he met his brother's fate. There were many victims of minor note. But, says the chronicler of Lanercost, the number of those who wished Bruce to be confirmed in the kingdom increased daily, notwithstanding this severity. He might have said because of it, for now every class, nobles and gentry, clergy and commons, with only one or two exceptions, as the Earl of Strathearn and Randolph, Bruce's nephew, saw what Edward meant. Life and limb, land and liberty, were all in peril, and common danger taught the necessity, not felt in the time of Wallace, of making common cause.

Edward's hatred of Scotland passed beyond the grave. On his tomb, by his order, was inscribed 'Edwardus Primus, Scotorum Malleus: Pactum serva.' One of his last requests was that his bones should be carried with the army whenever the Scotch rebelled, and only reentered after they were subdued. This dying wish was disregarded by his weak heir, who wasted in the pomp of his funeral, followed by the dissipations of a youthful court, the critical moment of the war, fancying that, with Bruce an exile and his chief supporters in prison or on the gallows, it was over before it had really begun. Bruce meanwhile, like Alfred, was learning in adversity. The spider, according to the well-known story, taught him perseverance. After spending the winter in Rachrine he ventured in early spring to Arran in Scotland, and thence to Carrick, his own country, where he had many brave adventures and hair-breadth escapes, which should be read in the verses of Barbour or the tales of Scott. Scarcely certain history, they represent the popular conception of his character in the next and succeeding generations. On 10 May he defeated the Earl of Pembroke at Loudon Hill, but failed to take Ayr. Edward, in the end of August, roused himself; but a march to and back from Cumnock without an action was the whole inglorious campaign. His favour for Piers Gaveston and consequent quarrels with the chief barons of England, as well as his approaching marriage to Isabella, daughter of Philip the Fair, led him to quit Scotland. In his absence Bruce and his brother Edward reduced Galloway, and Bruce, leaving his brother in the south, transferred his own operations to Aberdeenshire. It was rumoured that Edward would have made peace on condition of getting aid against his own barons. The feeble conduct of the war on the English side, and frequent

changes of generals, indicate distracted counsels, which in part account for the uninterrupted success that now attended Bruce's arms.

In the end of 1307, and again in May 1308, unless the chroniclers have made two expeditions of one, he overran Buchan, and on 22 May defeated its earl, one of his chief Scotch opponents, at Inverury—a soldier's medicine for the illness his hardships had brought on. Fifty years after, when Barbour wrote, men still talked of the 'harrying of Buchan.' In the same year Edward Bruce again conquered the Galwegians, and Sir James Douglas took Randolph, the king's nephew, prisoner, who afterwards atoned for this apostasy to the national cause by good service. Bruce next turned to Argyll, where the lord of Lorne, his principal opponent in the west, met the same fate as the Earl of Buchan, his troops being defeated at the pass of Brander, and Dunstaffnage taken.

In March 1309 a truce with England was made through the mediation of Philip of France and the pope, and Lamberton, bishop of St. Andrews, was released by Edward and allowed to return home, after receiving homage and pledges, which gave hope that he would act in Edward's interest. Further negotiations were carried on for the whole of the following year; but mutual surprises and breaches of the truce rendered it certain that the war was only interrupted.

On 24 Feb. 1310, at a general council in Dundee, the clergy solemnly recognised Bruce as rightful king of Scotland. It was a sign of the progress he had made that all the bishops joined in this declaration.

In the autumn of this year Edward, with a large force, made an expedition into Scotland as far as Linlithgow; but Bruce evaded him, and he returned without any material success, though a famine followed the ravages of his troops. A second projected expedition in 1311 did not take place. The next three years were signalised by the reduction of the castles still held by the English in Scotland. Linlithgow had been surprised by the stratagem of a peasant called Binney, in the end of 1310; Dumbarton was surrendered by Sir John Menteith in October 1311; Perth was taken by Bruce himself on 8 Jan. 1312. It marked his position that he concluded on 29 Oct. at Inverness with Hakon V a confirmation of the treaty of 1266 between Alexander III and Magnus IV, by which the Norwegian king ceded to Scotland the Isle of Man, the Suheys, and all the other islands 'on the west and south of the great Haf,' except the isles of Orkney and Shetland (*Acts Parl. Scot.* i. 481). Encouraged

by his success, he made a raid into the north of England. On his return he reduced Butel in Galloway, Dumfries, and Dalswinton, and threatened Berwick, where Edward himself was. In March 1313 Douglas surprised Roxburgh, and Randolph Edinburgh; in May Bruce made another English raid, failed to take Carlisle, but subdued the Isle of Man. Edward Bruce had about the same time taken Rutherglen and Dundee, and laid siege to Stirling, whose governor, Mowbray, agreed to surrender if not relieved before 24 June 1314. All the castles were dismantled or destroyed; for experience had shown they were the points which the English invaders were able longest to hold. By the close of 1313 Berwick, the key to the borders, and Stirling, the key to the highlands, alone remained in English hands. The disputes between Edward and his barons were now in some degree allayed by the institution of the lords ordainers and the execution of his favourite Gaveston, and it was felt if Scotland was not to be lost a great effort must be made. Accordingly, on 11 June, the whole available forces of England, with a contingent from Ireland, numbering in all about 100,000 men, of whom 50,000 were archers and 40,000 cavalry, were mustered at Berwick, the Earls of Lancaster, Warenne, Arundel, and Warwick alone of the great feudatories declining to attend in person, but sending the bare contingent to which their feudal obligations bound them. They at once marched to the relief of Stirling, and punctual to the day reached Falkirk on 22 June. A preliminary skirmish on Sunday with the advanced guard, which attempted to throw itself into the town, was distinguished by the personal combat of Bruce, who, raising himself in his stirrups from the pony he rode, felled Henry de Bohun with a single blow of his battleaxe. When blamed for exposing himself to danger, he turned the subject by lamenting that the axe was broken.

It was the first stroke of the battle, with a direct effect on its issue as well as in history and drama. Bruce's troops were one-third of the English, but his generalship reduced the inequality. He had chosen and knew his ground—the New Park, between the village of St. Ninian and the Bannock Burn, a petty stream, yet sufficient to produce marshes dangerous for horses, while the rising ground on his right gave points of observation of the advance of the English. He divided his troops into four divisions, of which his brother Edward commanded the right, Randolph the centre, Douglas the left; Bruce himself with the reserve planted his standard at the Bore

Stone (still remaining on this spot), and a good point to survey the field. The camp followers were stationed on the Gillies' Hill, ready at the critical moment to appear as a reinforcement. The plain on the right, over which the cavalry, to avoid the marshy ground, had to pass, was prepared with concealed pits and spikes. But what made the battle famous in the annals of the military art as in those of Scotland was that the Scottish troops, taught by Wallace's tactics, fought on foot—not in single line, but in battalions, apparently of round form, with their weapons pointed outwards to receive on any side the charge of the enemy. A momentary success of the English archers commenced the battle. It was reversed by a well-directed charge on their flank of a small body of light horse under the marshal Sir Robert Keith. The Scottish bowmen followed up this advantage, and the engagement then became general between the English heavy-armed horsemen, crowded into too narrow a space, and the whole Scottish force, Bruce with the reserve uniting with the three divisions and receiving the attack with their spears, which the chronicler describes as a single dense wood. The rear of the English either was unable to come up or was entangled in the broken ranks of the van or first line, and at a critical moment the camp followers, who had been hidden behind the Gillies' Hill, crossed its crest as if a new army. A panic ensued. Edward and his immediate followers sought safety in flight, and the rout became general—one knight, Sir Giles d'Argentine, alone had courage to continue the onset, and fell bravely. The number of the English suffocated or drowned in the Bannock or the Forth was calculated at 30,000. Edward, pursued by Douglas, with difficulty reached Dunbar, and thence by sea Bamborough.

No battle of the middle ages has been more minutely recorded, but space forbids further detail. A Carmelite friar, Barton, brought to celebrate the victory, was made by his captors to recount the defeat of the English. The Chronicle of Lanercost gives the narrative of an eye-witness. Barbour, who fifty years after enlarged the description, had known some who fought, and subsequent inquiries confirm the accuracy of his plain but vivid verse. It was a day never forgotten by those who took part in it, and to be remembered by distant posterity. It decided the independence of Scotland, and, like Morgarten and Courtray, it was the beginning of the end of feudal warfare. The knights in armour, whose personal prowess often gained the field, gave place to the common

soldiers, disciplined, marshalled, and led by skilful generals, as the arbiters of the destiny of nations. In the career of Bruce it was the turning point. The effects of the victory were permanent, and it was never reversed. Many English kings invaded Scotland, but none after Edward I conquered it.

The most important result as regards Bruce was the settlement of the succession at the parliament of Ayr on 26 April 1315. By a unanimous resolution the crown was settled on Robert and the heirs male of his body, whom failing, his brother Edward and the heirs male of his body, whom failing, on Robert's daughter Marjory and her heirs, upon condition that she married with his consent, or, after his death, with the consent of the estates. Provision was made for a regency in case of a minority by the king's nephew, Randolph, earl of Moray. In the event of a failure in the whole line of the Bruces, Randolph was to act as a guardian of the kingdom until the estates determined the right of succession. The bishops and prelates were declared to have jurisdiction to enforce the Act of Settlement. Soon after it passed Marjory married Walter the hereditary Steward of Scotland. Their son, Robert II, was the first king of the race of Stewart, succeeding after the long reign of his uncle, David II, son of Bruce by his second marriage, who was not yet born. This settlement showed the prudence of Bruce, and the anxiety of the Scottish nation to avoid at all hazards another disputed succession, or the appeal to external authority in case it should occur. Edward Bruce, described in the act as '*vir strenuus et in actis bellicis pro defensione juris et libertatis regni Scotiae quamplurimum expertus*,' had stood by his brother in the struggle for independence, and deserved the preference which ancient, though not unbroken custom, gave to the nearest male over a nearer female heir. But his active and ambitious spirit was not satisfied with the hope of succeeding to the Scottish crown. The defeat of Edward at Bannockburn, and his incapacity as a leader, encouraged the Irish Celts to attempt to throw off the English yoke. 'All the kings of lesser Scotland (Scotia Minor) have drawn their blood from greater Scotland (Scotia Major, i.e. Ireland), and retain in some degree our language and customs,' wrote Donald O'Neil, a Celtic chief of Ulster, to the pope, and it was natural that they should summon to their aid the victor of Bannockburn. Robert declined the offer of the Irish crown for himself, but in May 1315 Edward Bruce landed at Carrickfergus with 6,000 men. The brilliant campaign of this year, which for a

moment made it seem possible that the line of Bruce might supplant that of Plantagenet, ending disastrously in the death of Edward Bruce at Dundalk, belongs chiefly to his life, and not to that of Robert. But in the spring of 1317 Robert Bruce, who had in the previous year subdued the Hebrides, and taken his old enemy John of Lorne, went to his brother's assistance. His engagement when surprised by the English at Slane in Louth is said by Barbour to have been the greatest of the nineteen victories of the Irish war. The odds were eight to one, and Edward, who marched in the van, had hurried on out of sight of his brother's troops, so that the honour was undivided, and Robert reproached Edward for neglect of good generalship. The Scotch army after this met with little resistance in its progress to the south of Ireland. Limerick was taken, but Dublin saved by its inhabitants committing it to the flames. An incident too slight to have been invented marks the humanity of Bruce in the midst of the horrors of war. Hearing a woman cry in the pangs of childbirth, he halted his troops and made provision for her delivery.

For certis, I trow there is na man  
That he ne will rew a woman than,

is Barbour's expression of the speech or thought of the gentle heart of the brave warrior. The arrival of Roger Mortimer as deputy infused new vigour into the English, and the Bruces, their success too rapid to be permanent, were forced to retreat to Ulster. Before the disaster of Dundalk Robert returned to Scotland, where the English had taken advantage of his absence to resume the war. The eastern and midland marches had been gallantly defended by Sir James Douglas against the Earl of Arundel and Lord Neville, and Sir John Soulis had protected Galloway from an inroad of Hartcla, warden of the English march. Berwick still remained in the hands of Edward II, a source of danger, as well as a standing memorial of the former subjection of Scotland. To its reduction Bruce on his return at once addressed himself.

In the autumn of 1317, while he was engaged in preparations for the siege, two cardinals, Jocelin and Luke, arrived in England with bulls from Pope John XXII 'to his beloved son the nobleman Robert de Bruce, at present governing the kingdom of Scotland,' commanding him to consent to a truce of two years with England. They had secret instructions to excommunicate him if he disobeyed. The cardinals did not venture across the border, and their messengers were

received by Bruce with a pleasant countenance, showing due reverence to the pope and the church, but declining to receive the bulls because not addressed to him as king. They urged in vain the desire of the pope not to prejudice the dispute between England and Scotland, for Bruce had the answer ready: 'Since my father the pope and my mother the church are unwilling to prejudice either party by giving me the title of king, they ought not to prejudice me during the controversy by refusing that title, as I both hold the kingdom, receive the title from all its people, and am addressed under it by other princes.' Another attempt to proclaim the bull by Adam Newton, guardian of the Friars Minor in Berwick, had no better result. Newton saw Bruce at Ald-Camus (Old Cambus), where he was at work day and night in the construction of siege engines, and, having got a safe-conduct for himself and his papers, returned, in hopes of being allowed to deliver them. But Bruce was firm, and would not receive the bulls unless addressed to him as king, and, as he now added, until he had possession of Berwick. Newton had the daring to proclaim the truce, but on his way home he was robbed of his papers and clothes. 'It is rumoured,' he adds to his report, 'that the Lord Robert and his accomplices, who instigated the outrage, now have the papers.' Care had been taken that another mission of John XXII sent to proclaim his accession to the papal see should not enter Scotland, so that the prelates and clergy of the Scottish province remained now, as in the former period of the war, free from a divided allegiance, and the church of Scotland was virtually independent.

In March 1318 the town of Berwick, which had stood the siege during the winter, was taken by a surprise contrived by Spalding, one of the citizens, and a few days after the castle capitulated. Entrusting it to the custody of Walter the Steward, Bruce invaded and wasted the north of England. The death of his only remaining brother and his daughter rendered a new settlement of the crown expedient, and a parliament met at Scone in December. By one of its statutes Robert, son of the Steward, and Marjory, the king's daughter, were recognised as next of kin; failing next issue of the king should he succeed while a minor, Randolph, and failing him James, lord Douglas, was to be regent. Substantially this was a re-enactment of the statute of Ayr. An important declaration was added that doubts without sufficient cause had been raised in the past as to the rule of succession, and it was now defined that the crown ought not

to follow the rules of inferior fiefs, but that the male nearest in descent in the direct line, whom failing the female in the same line, whom failing the nearest male collateral, should succeed, an order sufficiently conformable to the imperial, that is the Roman law.

In this parliament Bruce established his title to be deemed as wise and practical a legislator as he had proved himself a general. The most important acts related to the national defence and the administration of justice. Every layman worth ten pounds was to be bound to provide himself with armour, and every one who had the value of a cow with a spear or bow and twenty-four arrows. A yearly weapon schaw was to be held by the sheriffs every Easter. While provision was thus made for the equipment and training of an armed nation, the excesses attendant on such a condition were restrained by a law that if any crime was committed by those coming to the army, they were to be tried before the justiciar. Stringent acts forbade the export of goods during war, or of arms at any time. As regards justice the usual proclamation was made with emphasis: 'The king wills and commands that common law and right be done to pair and riche after the auld lawes and freedomes.' The privilege of repledging, by which a person was removed from the jurisdiction of the king's officers, was restricted by the provision that it was to apply only when the accused was the liegeman of the lord or held land of him, or was in his service or of his kin, and if this was doubtful, a verdict of average was to decide. A new law was made against leasing making, a quaint Scotch term for treasonable language. 'The kynghes' statute and defendyt that none be conspirators nor fynders of taylis or of tidingis thruch the quhilkis mater of discord may spryng betwixt the kyng and his pepull,' under penalty of imprisonment at the king's will. A hortatory statute recommended the people to nourish love and friendship with each other, forbade the nobles to do injury to any of the people, and promised redress to any one injured. This was aimed at the oppressions of the feudal lords, and exhibits the side of Bruce's character which gained him the name of the good king Robert from the commons. With regard to the civil law, the feudal actions commenced by the brieves of novel disseisin and mort d'ancestor, as well as the procedure in actions of debt and damage, were carefully regulated. The unreasonable delays (essoigns) which impeded justice were no longer to be allowed. No defender was to be called on to plead until the complainer had fully stated his case. Bruce, like Cromwell, Frederick the

Great, and Napoleon, was a law-reformer. The man of action cannot tolerate the abuses by which law ceases to be justice.

A statute identical with the 'Quia Emptores' of 17 Edward I is ascribed to Bruce in the Harleian and other later manuscripts, and is included in the 'Statuta Secunda Roberti Primi,' by Sir J. Skene. But while transcripts of English law were not unknown in Scotland, they are little likely to have been made by Bruce, and this statute, which by preventing subinfeudation would have completely altered the whole system of Scottish land rights, is certainly spurious. In 1319 Edward tried to cut off the trade of Scotland with Flanders, but the count and the towns of Bruges and Ypres rejected his overtures. A vigorous effort to recover Berwick was repelled by Walter Stewart, its governor, aided by the skill of Crab, a Flemish engineer, and Douglas and Randolph invaded England, when the Archbishop of York was defeated in the engagement called the Chapter of Mytton, from the number of clergy slain. This diversion and the lukewarmness, if not absolute abstention, of the Earl of Lancaster and the northern barons, led to the raising of the siege. When Bruce visited Berwick he complimented his son-in-law on the success of his defence, and raised the walls ten feet all round. The pope somewhat tardily excommunicated Bruce and his adherents for his contumacy, but the English king felt unable to continue the war, and on 21 Dec. a truce was concluded for two years.

On 6 April 1320 a Scottish parliament at Arbroath addressed a letter to the pope asserting the independence of their country and promising aid in a crusade if the pope recognised that independence. Part of this manifesto which relates to Bruce deserves to be quoted. After referring to the tyranny of Edward I, it proceeds: 'Through His favour who woundeth and maketh whole we have been preserved from so great and numberless calamities by the valour of our lord and sovereign Robert. He, like another Joshua or Judas Maccabeus, gladly endured trials, distresses, the extremities of want, and every peril to rescue his people and inheritance out of the hands of the enemy. The divine providence, that legal succession which we will constantly maintain, and our due and unanimous consent have made him our chief and king. To him in defence of our liberty we are bound to adhere, as well of right as by reason of his deserts . . . for through him salvation has been wrought to our people. . . . While there exist a hundred of us we will never submit to England. We fight not for glory, wealth, or honour, but for that

liberty which no virtuous man will survive. Wherefore we most earnestly request your holiness, as His vicegerent who gives equal measure to all and with whom there is no distinction of persons or nations, that you would behold with a fatherly eye the tribulations and distresses brought upon us by the English, and that you would admonish Edward to content himself with his own dominions, esteemed in former times sufficient for seven kings, and allow us Scotsmen who dwell in a poor and remote corner, and who seek for nought but our own, to remain in peace.' A duplicate of the letter in the Register House is printed in the 'National MSS. of Scotland,' vol. i. Moved by this appeal, fearing to lose a province of the church, and knowing probably the weakness of Edward, the pope issued a bull recommending him to make peace with Scotland.

A conspiracy against Bruce, headed by Sir William Soulis, grandson of one of the competitors for the crown, at which he probably aimed, and taken part in by some of the landed gentry but none of the nobility, was betrayed by the Countess of Strathearn and easily put down, though the parliament of Scone, at which some of the offenders were condemned and executed for treason, got the name of the Black Parliament to mark its difference from the other parliaments of the reign. This, the only rising against Bruce, proves his firm hold of all classes. It was different with Edward. The party amongst his nobles who opposed him formed not a casual conspiracy but a chronic rebellion. Headed at first by Lancaster, and after his death by the queen mother and Mortimer, it made his whole reign a period of dissension which would have weakened a more powerful monarch, and told largely in favour of Scotland and Bruce. In December 1321 Lancaster entered into a correspondence with the Scotch leader Douglas, who invaded Northumberland and Durham simultaneously with the rising of Lancaster; but his defeat by Sir Andrew Hartcla at Boroughbridge on 16 March 1322, followed by his execution, put down for a time the English rebellion. Edward in premature confidence wrote to the pope that he would no longer make terms with the Scots except by force, and invaded Scotland in August, penetrating as far as Edinburgh and wasting the country with fire and sword. The prudence of Bruce, by which everything of value on the line of the invasion was removed, his own camp being fixed at Culross, north of the Forth, baffled as completely as a victory the last attempt of Edward II to subdue

Scotland. The opposite evils of want of food and intemperance forced him to withdraw, and the sarcasm of Earl Warenne on a bull taken at Tranent, 'Caro cara fuit,' indicates at once the disaffection of his barons and his own contemptible generalship. In the autumn Bruce, at the head of a very large force, estimated at 80,000, retaliated by invading Yorkshire, defeating Edward near Biland Abbey, where John de Bretagne, earl of Richmond, and Henry de Sully, Butler of France, and many other prisoners were taken. The English king narrowly escaped being himself captured at York. The commencement of 1323 afforded still stronger evidence of Edward's incapacity to rule his own subjects. Sir Andrew Hartcla, although created Earl of Carlisle and rewarded with a large pension and the wardenship of the marches, met Bruce and entered into a secret treaty to maintain him and his heirs in possession of Scotland. On the discovery of this, Hartcla was tried and executed on 2 March 1323, and the Earl of Kent appointed warden in his place. But though able so far to assert his authority, the defeat at Biland had taught Edward that he could not cope with Bruce, and in March 1323 a truce gave time for negotiations at Newcastle and Thorpe, where, on 30 May, a peace for thirteen years was concluded, which was ratified by Bruce as king of Scotland at Berwick on 7 June. The continued favour shown by Edward to the Despensers, which had been the cause of Lancaster's rebellion, led to a new conspiracy in the family of the ill-fated king. His queen Isabella, and Roger Mortimer her paramour, carried it on in the name of his son, and in 1325 his brother, the Earl of Kent, joined it. Edward, deserted by almost all his barons, was taken prisoner in 1326, deposed early in the following year, and murdered on 21 Sept.

Bruce naturally took advantage of the distracted state of England to strengthen his title to the Scottish crown. In 1323 the skilful diplomacy of Randolph obtained from the pope the recognition of the title of king of Scotland by a promise to aid in a crusade, and three years later, by the treaty of Corbeil, the French king made a similar acknowledgment. At a parliament held at Cambuskenneth in 1326 the young prince David, born two years before, was solemnly recognised as heir to the crown, which in case of his death was to go to Robert the son of Marjory and the Steward. This is the first Scottish parliament in which there is clear evidence of representatives of the burghs, and the grant made by it to Bruce for his life of a tenth of the rents of the lands, as



well wood and domain lands as other lands, and both within and without burgh, supplies one reason for their presence. The clergy probably made a grant in a separate assembly of their own. Although the peace between England and Scotland was ratified by Edward III on 8 March 1327, both sides made preparations for the renewal of the war, so that it is difficult to support the accusations of breach of faith against either. On 18 May Edward contracted with John of Hainault for a large force of mercenary cavalry, a sign that he was unable to rely on his own feudal levy.

On 15 June Randolph and Douglas crossed the border with 20,000 men, and Edward with more than double that number advanced to Durham. The Hainault mercenaries could not be relied on to co-operate with the English troops, and their dissensions, of which Froissart has left a lively picture, had probably much to do with the English discomfiture. A series of manœuvres and counter-manœuvres on the Tyne and Wear showed that neither side was willing to try the issue of a battle. Randolph declined a challenge to leave a favourable position on the north of the Wear and fight on the open ground at Stanhope Park. Douglas with a small band made a daring night attack on Edward's camp on 4 Aug., when his chaplain was slain and the young king with difficulty escaped. The Scotch under cover of night abandoned their camp and retreated homewards, and on 15 Aug. Edward disbanded his army at York, dismissing the Hainaulters, who had been found too costly or too dangerous allies.

Bruce himself now assumed the command, but his sudden attack on the eastern marches failed. Alnwick repulsed an assault of Douglas, and Randolph and Bruce were not more successful in the siege of Norham. While still engaged in it he was approached by English commissioners with overtures of peace. The preliminaries were debated at Newcastle, and at a parliament in York on 8 Feb. 1328 the most essential article was accepted. It was agreed that Scotland, 'according to its ancient bounds in the days of Alexander III, should remain to Robert king of Scots and his heirs and successors free and divided from the kingdom of England, without any subjection, right of service, claim, or demand, and that all writs executed at any time to the contrary should be held void.'

The parliament of Northampton in April 1328 concluded the final treaty by which (1) peace was made between the two kingdoms; (2) the coronation-stone of Scone was

to be restored; (3) the English king promised to ask the pope to recall all spiritual processes against the Scots; (4) the Scots agreed to pay thirty thousand marks; (5, 6, and 7) ecclesiastical property which had changed hands in the course of the war was to be restored, but not lay fiefs, with an exception in favour of three barons, Lord Wake, the Earl of Buchan, and Henry de Percy; (8) Johanna, Edward's sister, was to be given in marriage to David, the son and heir of Bruce, and to receive a jointure of 2,000*l.* a year; (9) the party failing to observe the articles of the treaty was to pay 2,000*l.* of silver to the papal treasury.

On 12 July 1328 the marriage of the infant prince and bride was celebrated at Berwick. The English and Edward, when he attained his independence from the guardianship of the queen mother and Mortimer, denounced this treaty as shameful, and ascribed it to the departure of the Hainaulters, the treachery of Mortimer, and the bribery used by the Scots. But it was the necessary result of the situation at the commencement of his reign, and the bloody war of two centuries failed to reverse its main provisions. Scotland remained an independent monarchy. The chief author of its independence barely survived the accomplishment of his work. On 7 June 1329 Bruce died at Cardross of leprosy, a disease contracted during the hard life of his earlier struggles. There are frequent, and towards the close increasing, references to his physical sufferings, which made his moral courage more conspicuous. He was buried by his wife, who had died in 1327, at Dunfermline, but his heart was, by a dying wish, entrusted to Douglas, to fulfil the vow he had been unable to execute in person of visiting the holy sepulchre. His great adversary Edward I had made a similar request, not so faithfully executed, and his grandson granted a passport to Douglas on 1 Sept. to proceed to the Holy Land, to aid the Christians against the Saracens, with the heart of Lord Robert, king of Scotland. The death of Douglas fighting against the Moors in Spain, and the recovery of the heart of Bruce by Sir William Keith, who brought it to Scotland and buried it along with the bones of Douglas in Melrose Abbey, may be accepted as authentic; but the words with which Douglas is said to have parted with it,

Now passe thou forth before  
As thou was wont in field to bee,  
And I shall follow or else die,

are an addition to the original verses of Barbour. When the remains of Bruce were disinterred at Dunfermline in 1819, the breast-

bone was found sawn through to permit of the removal of the heart.

Some interesting particulars as to the last years of Bruce are furnished by the Exchequer Rolls of Scotland. Enfeebled by disease he had to trust the chief conduct of the war to the young leaders he had trained, Randolph and Douglas, and he spent most of his time at Cardross, which he had acquired in 1326. He employed it in enlarging the castle, repairing the park walls, and ornamenting the garden, in the amusement of hawking, and the exercise of the royal virtues of hospitality and charity. Like other kings he kept a fool. A lion was his favourite pet, shipbuilding his favourite diversion. His foresight had discerned the importance of this art to the future strength and wealth of Scotland. Before his death he made preparations for his tomb, and commissioned in Paris the marble monument, afterwards erected at Dunfermline, which was surrounded with an iron-gilt railing, covered by a painted chapel of Baltic timber. The offerings to the abbot of Dunfermline and the rector of Cardross, as well as the annual payment to the chaplains at Ayr for masses for his soul, appear also to have been by his orders.

By his first marriage with Isabella of Mar he had an only daughter, Marjory, the wife of the Steward and ancestor of the last line of Scottish kings. By his second marriage with Elizabeth de Burgh, which he contracted about 1304, he had two daughters—Matilda, who married Thomas Ysaak, a simple esquire, and Margaret, the wife of William, earl of Sutherland—as well as his late-born son and successor, David II, and another, John, who died in infancy. Of several children not born in wedlock, Sir Robert, who fell at Dupplin, Walter, who died before him, Nigel Stewart of Carrick, Margaret, wife of Robert Glen, Elizabeth, wife of Walter Oliphant, and Christian are traced in the records.

[If the character of Bruce is not understood from his acts, of which a singularly complete narrative, here condensed, has descended from so distant a time, no words could avail. Any such attempt, which might become easily mere panegyric, is better omitted, and the space left devoted to a notice of the authorities upon which this life has been based. Barbour's Bruce, the Scottish epic, is a poetical, but in the main a true, account of his whole career. Wyntoun's and Fordun's chronicles are not so full as might have been anticipated; and the former confines himself, in many important facts of the reign, to giving a reference to the Archdeacon Barbour. The English chroniclers and the Chronicle of Lanercost may be referred to with advantage. The success of Bruce and the weakness of Edward II were too conspicuous to be hidden by

any national bias. The slender historical materials for the life of Wallace leant themselves on the one side to the legendary narrative of Blind Harry, and on the other to the fictions of the English writers, such as Hemingford and Rishanger, as to the real character of Wallace and the policy of Edward; but the acts of Bruce are too fully contained in authentic records and permanent results to leave room for misinterpretation. He was not originally a Scottish patriot, and may be described, as Wallace cannot, as an English rebel; but after he once assumed the leadership of the Scottish cause he never faltered under any danger or made a false step in policy until he secured its success. The records chiefly to be consulted are in Rymer's *Fœdera*, Riley's *Placita*, the Documents illustrative of Scottish History, published by Mr. Joseph Stevenson and Mr. Bain for the Record Series; the Scottish Exchequer Rolls; and the Acts of the Scottish Parliament. *Kerr's Life and Reign of Robert the Bruce* and *Lord Hailes's Annals* are both very accurate and full collections of the facts. The History of England down to the death of Edward I, by Mr. Pearson, and Longman's *Reign of Edward II* are the most trustworthy modern authorities as to the war with England written by Englishmen. Tytler's and Hill Burton's Histories of Scotland require both to be read. As an independent historian Pauli's *Geschichte Englands* is of great value, and probably the best single account of the war of independence.] Æ. M.

**BRUCE, ROBERT (1554–1631)**, theological writer, second son of Sir Alexander Bruce of Airth, who claimed descent from the royal family of Bruce, studied jurisprudence at Paris, and on his return practised law, and was on the way to becoming a judge. But a very remarkable inward experience constrained him to give himself to the church. He went to St. Andrews to study, and on becoming a preacher (1587) was forthwith called to be a minister in Edinburgh. On 6 Feb. 1587–8 he was chosen moderator of the general assembly—a rare and singular testimony to the wisdom, the stability, and the business capacity of one so young. In 1589, when the king went to Norway to fetch his bride, and parties in Edinburgh were somewhat excited, the king appointed Bruce an extraordinary privy-councillor, and such was his influence that he kept all quiet, and on the king's return received from his majesty a cordial letter of thanks (19 Feb. 1589–90). The queen was crowned at Holyrood and anointed by Bruce on 17 March following. He again became moderator of the general assembly 22 May 1592. His power and success as a preacher were very remarkable, and he continued to enjoy the king's favour till 1596, when, giving offence to his majesty by his opposition to certain arbitrary proceedings, he, with

others, was banished from Edinburgh. The king desired to introduce episcopal government into the church, and the disinterested character of Bruce's opposition is apparent, for had he consented, no man would have been more sure to benefit by the change. This quarrel with the king was for the time made up; but soon after a new bone of contention arose. After the Gowrie conspiracy the king ordered the ministers to give thanks for his release (6 Aug. 1600), and to specify certain grounds of thanksgiving about which some of them had doubts. Bruce and others gave thanks, but in terms more general than the king desired. After much negotiation, and many efforts of friends to get the matter settled, the king carried his point, and ordered Bruce to leave Edinburgh. The prospect of his leaving was felt profoundly by the christian community, who hung on his lips, and enjoyed in a rare degree his eloquent and powerful preaching. But the king was inexorable, and Bruce's ministry in Edinburgh came to an end.

The last thirty years of his life were spent here and there. From 1605 to 1609 he was confined to Inverness, where he met with much harsh treatment from Lord Enzie and others, but where his preaching was a singular refreshment to his friends. In 1609 he was at Aberdeen, the atmosphere of which was very uncongenial, for it was a stronghold of the episcopalians. Sometimes he was at his patrimonial estate of Kinnaird, near Stirling, where he repaired at his own expense the parish church of Larbert, and discharged all the duties of the ministry; and occasionally at his other estate, at Monkland, near Glasgow. Wherever he had an opportunity of preaching, great crowds attended; he preached with remarkable power, and his own life being in full accord with his preaching, the influence he attained was almost without a parallel in the history of the Scottish church. In 1620 he was again banished to Inverness, and begged very hard that, owing to his infirmities and weakness, he might be allowed to remain at home. The king was obdurate, and the request was refused. In 1624 he was allowed to return to Kinnaird, where he died 13 July 1631. His remains were accompanied to the grave by four or five thousand persons of all ranks and classes, from the nobility downwards. From his very youth he had been regarded with remarkable esteem and affection, and the bitter trials that chequered the last half of his life commended him all the more to the esteem of those who were like-minded. It was this chequered mode of life, this moving about from place to place without any settled

charge, that prevented him, as the like causes prevented Richard Baxter in England, from leaving on his country so deep a mark as his character and abilities were fitted to make. Andrew Melville described him as a 'hero adorned with every virtue, a constant confessor and almost martyr to the Lord Jesus.' Livingstone, another contemporary, said, 'Mr. Robert Bruce I several times heard, and in my opinion never man spoke with greater power since the apostles' days.'

As an author Bruce is best known by his 'Way to True Peace and Rest: delivered at Edinburgh in sixteen sermons on the Lord's Supper, Hezekiah's sickness, and other select scriptures.' This book appeared in 1617, and bore the motto, significant of its author's experience, 'Dulcia non meruit, qui non gustavit amara.' The sermons are in the Scottish dialect, and are remarkable as a singularly clear and able exposition of the scriptural doctrine of the Lord's Supper, enforced with great liveliness and power.

Bruce's conduct in his conflicts with the king and in some other matters has been placed in a somewhat less favourable light in Spottiswood's 'History of the Church of Scotland' and in Maitland's 'History of Edinburgh.' These views are controverted in Wodrow's 'Life of Bruce' and in M'Crie's 'Life of Melville.'

[Row's, Spottiswood's, and Calderwood's Histories of the Church of Scotland; Autobiography and Life of Robert Blair; Livingstone's Memorable Characteristics; Melville's Autobiography; Wodrow's Collections as to the Life of Mr. Robert Bruce; Wodrow Society's Life and Sermons of Rev. Robert Bruce, edited by Principal Cunningham, D.D.; Scott's Fasti, i. 4, 17.] W. G. B.

**BRUCE, ROBERT**, second EARL OF ELGIN and first EARL OF AILESBUARY (*d.* 1685), was the only son of Thomas, third lord Bruce of Kinloss, and first earl of Elgin, and Anne, daughter of Sir Robert Chichester of Raleigh, Devonshire. While his father was still alive he was, at the Restoration, constituted, along with the Earl of Cleveland, lord-lieutenant of Bedfordshire, 26 July 1660. He was returned member for the county to the convention parliament in the same year, and also to the parliament which met in 1661. Succeeding to his father's estates and titles in December 1663, he was, on 18 March 1663-4, created Baron Bruce of Skelton in the county of York, Viscount Bruce of Ampt-hill in Bedfordshire, and Earl of Ailesbury in Buckinghamshire. On 29 March 1667 he was constituted sole lord-lieutenant of Bedfordshire, on the death of the Earl of Cleveland. The same year he was appointed

one of the commissioners for such moneys as had been raised and assigned to Charles II during his war with the Dutch. On 18 March 1678 he was sworn a privy councillor. He was also one of the gentlemen of the king's bed-chamber, and a commissioner for executing the office of earl marischal of England, as deputy to Henry, duke of Norfolk. At the coronation of King James II he bore the sword, and on 30 July 1685 he was appointed lord chamberlain of the household. He died 20 Oct. of the same year at Amptill, and was buried there. By his wife, Diana, daughter of Henry Grey, first earl of Stamford, he had eight sons and nine daughters. Wood says: 'He was a learned person, and otherwise well qualified, was well versed in English history and antiquities, a lover of all such that were professors of those studies, and a curious collector of manuscripts, especially of those which related to England and English antiquities.'

[Collins's Peerage, ed. 1812, v. 122-3; Douglas's Peerage of Scotland, i. 515-16; Cal. State Papers, Dom. Series; Wood's Fasti (Bliss), i. 491.] T. F. H.

**BRUCE, THOMAS**, third EARL OF ELGIN and second EARL OF AILESBURO (1655?-1741), was the sixth and eldest surviving son of Robert, second earl [q. v.], and Diana, daughter of Henry Grey, first earl of Stamford. When the Prince of Orange landed in England, he was one of the noblemen who adhered to the cause of James, but on the king's withdrawal from Whitehall he signed the application to the Prince of Orange. He was one of those appointed to meet with the king when he was stopped by fishermen near the isle of Sheppey, to invite him to return to Whitehall. He accompanied the king in his barge to Rochester, previous to his final flight. Afterwards he returned to London, but he never took the oaths to William and Mary. When the French threatened a descent on England, in 1690, during William's absence in Ireland, an order was given, on 5 July, by Queen Mary for apprehension of the earl and of other Jacobite noblemen, but the danger having passed it was not deemed necessary to put the order into execution. In 1691 King William issued an order to enable him and his countess to make provision for paying their debts and to make leases of their estates. In May 1695 he was present at a meeting held at the Old King's Head tavern, Aldersgate Street, London, to concert measures for the restoration of King James, and was sent over to France to persuade Louis to grant a body of troops to aid in the enterprise. On account of his con-

nection with the plot he was committed to the Tower in February 1695-6. His wife, Elizabeth Seymour, sister and heiress of William, duke of Somerset, died in childbed from anxiety connected with his imprisonment. He was admitted to bail on 12 Feb. following, and obtained the king's permission to reside in Brussels, where he married Charlotte, countess of Sannu, of the house of Argenteau, in the duchy of Brabant. He died at Brussels in November 1741, in his eighty-sixth year. By his first wife he had four sons and two daughters, and by the second he had an only daughter, Charlotte Maria, who was married in 1722 to the Prince of Horne, one of the princes of the empire. One of her daughters, Elizabeth Philippina, married Prince Gustavus Adolphus of Stolberg Guedern, and was the mother of Louisa Maximiliana, the wife of Prince Charles Edward Stuart, the pretender. The Earl of Elgin was succeeded by Charles, his second and only surviving son.

[Collins's Peerage, ed. 1812, v. 124-6; Douglas's Peerage of Scotland, i. 516.] T. F. H.

**BRUCE, THOMAS**, seventh EARL OF ELGIN and eleventh EARL OF KINCARDINE (1766-1841), was born on 20 July 1766, and succeeded to his earldoms in 1771 on the death, without issue, of his elder brother, William Robert. He was educated at Harrow and Westminster, and he also studied at St. Andrews University and in Paris. In 1785 he entered the army, in which he rose to the rank of major-general. His diplomatic career began in 1790, when he was sent on a special mission to the Emperor Leopold. In 1792 he was appointed envoy at Brussels, and in 1795 envoy extraordinary at Berlin. In 1799 he was appointed to the embassy to the Ottoman Porte, and he was desirous that his mission to Constantinople should lead to a closer study and examination of the remains of Grecian art within the Turkish dominions. Acting on the advice of Sir William Hamilton, he procured at his own expense the services of the Neapolitan painter, Lusieri, and of several skilful draughtsmen and modellers. These artists were despatched to Athens in the summer of 1800, and were principally employed in making drawings of the ancient monuments, though very limited facilities were given them by the authorities. About the middle of the summer of 1801, however, all obstacles were overcome, and Elgin received a firman from the Porte which allowed his lordship's agents not only to 'fix scaffolding round the antient Temple of the Idols [the Parthenon], and to mould the ornamental sculpture and visible figures thereon

in plaster and gypsum,' but also 'to take away any pieces of stone with old inscriptions or figures thereon.' The actual removal of ancient marbles from Athens formed no part of Elgin's original plan, but the constant injuries suffered by the sculptures of the Parthenon and other monuments at the hands of the Turks induced him to undertake it. The collection thus formed by operations at Athens, and by explorations in other parts of Greece, and now known by the name of the 'Elgin Marbles,' consists of portions of the frieze, metopes, and pedimental sculptures of the Parthenon, as well as of sculptured slabs from the Athenian temple of Nike Apteros, and of various antiquities from Attica and other districts of Hellas. These sculptures and antiquities, now in our national collection, may be found enumerated and illustrated in the 'Description of the Collection of Ancient Marbles in the British Museum' (parts vi-ix.), in Michaelis's work 'Der Parthenon,' and in other archaeological books. Part of the Elgin collection was prepared for embarkation for England in 1803, considerable difficulties having to be encountered at every stage of its transit. Elgin's vessel, the *Mentor*, was unfortunately wrecked near Cerigo with its cargo of marbles, and it was not till after the labours of three years, and the expenditure of a large sum of money, that the marbles were successfully recovered by the divers. On Elgin's departure from Turkey in 1803, he withdrew all his artists from Athens with the exception of Lusieri, who remained to direct the excavations which were still carried on, though on a much reduced scale. Additions continued to be made to the Elgin collections, and as late as 1812 eighty fresh cases of antiquities arrived in England. Elgin, who had been 'detained' in France after the rupture of the peace of Amiens, returned to England in 1806. No inconsiderable outcry was raised against his conduct in connection with the removal of the antiquities. The propriety of his official actions was called in question; he was accused of vandalism, of rapacity and dishonesty, and in addition to these accusations, which found their most exaggerated expression in Byron's 'Curse of Minerva,' an attempt was even made to minimise the artistic importance of the marbles which had been removed. Elgin accordingly thought it advisable to throw open his collections to public view, and arranged them in his own house in Park Lane, and afterwards at Burlington House, Piccadilly. Upon the supreme merits of the Parthenon sculptures all competent art critics were henceforth agreed. Canova,

when he saw them, pronounced them 'the works of the ablest artists the world has seen.' After some preliminary negotiations, a select committee of the House of Commons was appointed in 1816 to inquire into the desirability of acquiring the Elgin collection for the nation. This committee recommended its purchase for the sum of 35,000*l.*, and in July 1816 an act was passed giving effect to their proposal. The committee, after a careful examination of Elgin and other witnesses, further decided in favour of the ambassador's conduct, and of his claim to the ownership of the antiquities. The money spent by Elgin in the formation, removal, and arrangement of his collection, and the sums disbursed for the salaries and board of his artists at Athens, were estimated at no less than 74,000*l.*

Elgin was from 1790 to 1840 one of the representative peers of Scotland, but after his return to England he took little part in public affairs. He died on 14 Nov. 1841.

[Peerages of Burke and Foster; Douglas's Peerage of Scotland (ed. Wood), i. 522 f.; Memorandum on the Earl of Elgin's Pursuits in Greece, 1810 and 1815; Report from the Select Committee on the Earl of Elgin's Collection, 1816; Ellis's Elgin Marbles, pp. 1-10; Edwards's Lives of the Founders of the Brit. Mus., 1870, pt. i. pp. 380-96; Michaelis's *Der Parthenon*, pp. 73-87, 348-57; Michaelis's *Ancient Marbles in Great Britain*, pp. 132-51.] W. W.

**BRUCE, SIR WILLIAM** (*d.* 1710), of Kinross, architect in Scotland to Charles II, was the second son of Robert Bruce of Blairhall, by his wife, Catherine, daughter of Sir John Preston of Valleyfield, and was born in the early part of the seventeenth century. Though too young to have played a part in the troublous reign of Charles I, no one in Scotland probably contributed more in a private capacity to bring about the restoration of the royal family, to whom he proved a firm and constant friend. He is said to have been the channel of communication between General Monk and the young king, and to have had the honour of first conveying to the latter the inclination of the former to serve him. Being a man of ability and address, he retained the friendship of the monarch, who rewarded him in the very year of the restoration with the office of clerk to the bills, a very beneficial one in those days. Eight years after, having acquired the lands of Balcashie in Fife, he was created a baronet by royal letters patent dated 21 April 1668. He soon after acquired possession of the lands of Drumeldrie, in the same county, his title to which is dated 18 April 1670, and having afterwards

acquired from the Earl of Morton the lands and barony of Kinross in that county, he was, says Douglas, 'ever after designed by that title.' His skill and taste in building led to his appointment, in 1671, as 'the king's surveyor and master of works,' and to his employment in the restoration of Holyrood House, the ancient palace of the Stuarts in Edinburgh. He designed the quadrangular edifice as it now stands. The work was not completed till 1679, and latterly not altogether under Bruce's supervision. In 1681 he was summoned as representative in parliament of the county of Kinross, by royal letters dated at Windsor on 13 Aug. in that year. In 1685 he built his own house at Kinross, a mansion which appears to have been originally intended for the residence of the Duke of York (afterwards James II), should he have eventually been excluded from succeeding to the throne. He also built Harden House in Teviotdale, and in 1698 the mansion house of Hopetoun in Linlithgowshire was commenced from his designs. It was finished four years later, and the design, 'given by Sir William Bruce, who was justly esteemed the best architect of his time in that kingdom (Scotland),' as says Colin Campbell, will be found delineated in his 'Vitruvius Britannicus.' The house, however, was at a later date considerably altered and modified, even in some particulars of the plan, by the better-known architect, William Adam [see ADAM, ROBERT].

Bruce is also said to have designed a bridge over the North Loch, a sheet of water which formerly occupied the site of the gardens now extending from the foot of the Castle Rock to Princes Street in Edinburgh; but it was never executed, and the works already enumerated (with the addition of Moncrieffe House in Perthshire, also designed by him) are the chief if not the only known proofs of their author's architectural skill. It is impossible to say that they exhibit any amount of originality or artistic genius; but these were probably little regarded in his time, when the architect's merit consisted mainly in suiting the requirements of modern life to the supposed rules of ancient construction. At the end of two centuries, however, Holyrood House is still a quaint and interesting enough structure. Bruce died at a very great age in 1710, and was succeeded by his son, who, according to Douglas, was 'also a man of parts, and, as he had got a liberal education, was looked upon as one of the finest gentlemen in the kingdom when he returned from his travels.' Neither his parts nor his education, however, prompted him to distinguish himself, and they are both useful now only

as indices of the qualities of the 'king's master of works,' his father. On his death the title went to his cousin, with whom it became extinct.

[Adam's *Vitr. Scot.*, fol., 1720-40; Campbell's *Vitr. Brit.*, fol., 1767 (vol. ii. 1717); Kincaid's *Hist. of Edinburgh*, 12mo, 1787; Anderson's *Scottish Nation*, 1860; Douglas's *Baronage of Scotland*, 1798.] G. W. B.

**BRUCE, WILLIAM (1702-1755)**, publisher and author, the youngest son of James Bruce, minister of Killeleagh [q. v.], was born in 1702. He received a collegiate education, but entered business life. In 1730 he was at Dublin in partnership with John Smith, a publisher who had been educated for the ministry. In 1737 or 1738 he became tutor to Joseph, son of Hugh Henry, a Dublin banker (M.P. for Antrim 1715). With his pupil he visited Cambridge, Oxford, and probably Glasgow, for purposes of study. About 1745 he settled permanently in Dublin, and was an elder of Wood Street, his brother Samuel's congregation. He was certainly a nonsubscriber, most probably an Arian. In 1750 the general synod at Dungannon accepted a scheme of his origination for a widows' fund, which came into operation next year. In 1759 it became necessary to reduce the annuities, but it now yields three times more than was originally calculated by Bruce. In Dublin Bruce was distinguished as a public-spirited citizen. He published a pamphlet, 'Some Facts and Observations relative to the Fate of the late Linen Bill,' &c., Dublin, 1753 (anonymous, third edition), to show that the linen manufacture of the north of Ireland was exposed to a double danger by the projected closing of the American market, and the proposed abolition of the protective duties on foreign linens and calicoes. Bruce, who was unmarried, died of fever on 11 July 1755, and was buried in the same tomb with his intimate friend and cousin, Francis Hutcheson (died July 1746), the ethical writer. Gabriel Cornwall (died 1786) wrote a joint epitaph for the two friends in Latin. Bruce kept no accounts, and died richer than he thought. All his property he bequeathed to his friend, Alexander Stewart of Ballylawn, co. Donegal, afterwards of Mount Stewart, near Newtownards, co. Down (born 1699, died 22 April 1781; father of the first marquis of Londonderry). Stewart divided the property among Bruce's relatives, in accordance with a paper of private instructions. Bruce was the author, in conjunction with John Abernethy (1680-1740) [q. v.], of 'Reasons for the Repeal of the Sacramental Test,' which appeared in five weekly num-

bers at Dublin in 1733, and was reprinted in 1751 as the first of a collection of 'Scarce and Valuable Tracts and Sermons' by Abernethy.

[Essay on the Character of the late Mr. W. Bruce in a Letter to a Friend, Dublin, 1755 (by Gabriel Cornwall, dated 11 Aug.; prefatory letter to Stewart by James Duchal, D.D.), reprinted, Monthly Rev. vols. xiii. xiv.; Armstrong's Appendix to James Martineau's Ordination Service, 1829, pp. 64, 96; Hincks's Notices of W. Bruce and Contemporaries in Chr. Teacher, January 1843 (also issued separately); Reid's Hist. Presb. Ch. in Ireland (Killen), 1867, ii. 405, iii. 234, 289 sq.] A. G.

**BRUCE, WILLIAM (1757-1841)**, presbyterian minister, the second son of Samuel Bruce, presbyterian minister, of Wood Street, Dublin, and Rose Rainey of Magherafelt, co. Derry, was born in Dublin on 30 July 1757. He entered Trinity College, Dublin, in 1771. In 1775 he obtained a scholarship, and afterwards graduated A.B., supporting himself by private tuition. In 1776 he went to Glasgow for a session, and in 1777 to the Warrington Academy for two years. Bruce, in presbyterian matters, favoured the looser administration prevalent among his English brethren. His first settlement was at Lisburn. He was ordained on 4 Nov. 1779 by the Bangor presbytery. Bruce was long enough at Lisburn to acquire considerable reputation as a public man. His father's old congregation at Strand Street, Dublin, called him on 24 March 1782 as colleague to John Moody, D.D., on the death of Thomas Plunket, great-grandfather of the present (1886) archbishop of Dublin. Bruce took part in the volunteer movement of 1782, serving in the ranks, but declining a command. At the national convention which met in November 1783, in the Rotundo at Dublin, he sat as delegate for the county of the town of Carrickfergus, and was the last surviving member of this convention. In 1786 he received the degree of D.D. from Glasgow. His Dublin congregation was increased by the accession to it, on 25 or 29 March 1787, of the Cooke Street congregation, with its ex-minister, William Dunne, D.D. In October 1789 he was called to First Belfast, as colleague to James Crombie, D.D. (1730-1790). This call he did not accept, but on Crombie's death he was again called (11 March 1790) to First Belfast, and at the same time elected principal of the Belfast Academy. His Dublin congregation released him on 18 March. In the extra-synodical Antrim presbytery, to which his congregation belonged, he was a commanding spirit; his broad view of the liberty which may consist with presbyterian discipline is

seen in the supplement 'by a member of the presbytery of Antrim' to the Newry edition, 1816, 12mo, of Towgood's 'Dissenting Gentleman's Letters.' In practice he did not favour the presence of lay-elders in church courts. His congregation, which comprised many of the best families of Belfast, increased rapidly, and it was necessary to provide additional accommodation in his meeting-house. He had a noble presence and a rich voice. He drew up for his congregation a hymn-book in 1801 (enlarged 1818 and still in use), but while he paid great attention to congregational singing he resisted, in 1807, the introduction of an organ, not, however, on religious grounds. He broke the established silence of presbyterian interments by originating the custom of addresses at the grave. The Belfast Academy chiefly owed its reputation to him. But though Bruce, from 1802, delivered courses of lectures on history, belles lettres, and moral philosophy, his main work as principal, from 1 May 1790, when he entered on his duties, till he resigned his post in November 1822, was that of a schoolmaster. He taught well, and ruled firmly, not forgetting the rod; early in his career the famous barring out of 12 April 1792, which roused the whole town, tried his mettle and proved his mastery. In the troubles of 1797 and 1798 Bruce enrolled himself as a private in the Belfast Merchants' Infantry; he despatched his family to Whitehaven; and regularly occupied his pulpit throughout the disturbances. Many of the liberal presbyterians had been active in urging the insurrection; hence Bruce's attitude was of signal importance. His influence with the government in 1800 was exerted to secure adequate consideration for the presbyterians at the Union. At this period Bruce's advice was much sought by the leaders of the general synod. In November 1805 there were negotiations for the readmission of his presbytery to the synod without subscription, but in May following the idea was abandoned as inopportune. Bruce penned the address presented to George IV at Dublin (1821) in the name of the whole presbyterian body. He sought no personal favours; at the death of Robert Black [q. v.] in 1817 the agency for the *regium donum* was open to him, but he forwarded the claims of another. The Widows' Fund, founded in 1751, through the exertions of his granduncle, William Bruce (1702-1755) [q. v.], was greatly improved by his efforts and judgment. Protestants of all sections welcomed his presence on the committee of the Hibernian Bible Society, an institution which he recommended in letters (signed 'Zuinglius') to the 'Newry Telegraph'

(reprinted in the 'Belfast Newsletter,' 16 Nov. 1821). He had a good deal to do with the establishment of the Lancastrian school, with which was connected a protestant but otherwise undenominational Sunday school. To provide common ground for intellectual pursuits among men of all parties, he had founded (23 Oct. 1801) the Literary Society, a centre of culture in the days when Belfast took to itself the title of the Ulster Athens.

Bruce eschewed personal controversy. He had always owned himself a unitarian, in the broad sense attached to the term at its first introduction into English literature by Firmin and Emlyn; when used in the restricted sense of the modern Socinians, such as Lindsey and Belsham, he sensitively repudiated all connection with that school (see his letter in *Mon. Rep.* 1813, pp. 515-17). Finding his position 'misrepresented by the violence of party zeal,' Bruce, in 1824, issued his volume on the Bible and christian doctrine. The book marks an era. Unitarianism in Ireland had long been a floating opinion; it now became the badge of a party. In the preface (dated 17 March) Bruce claimed that his views were 'making extensive though silent progress through the general synod of Ulster.' This was accepted by trinitarians as a gage of battle; the general synod at Moneymore, on 2 July, agreed to an overture giving 'a public contradiction to said assertion.' Bruce joined the seceders of 1829 in the formation of the Unitarian Society for the Diffusion of Christian Knowledge (9 April 1831), though he would have preferred as its designation the colourless name, 'A Tract Society.' By 1834 he had retired from public duty, and was suffering from a decay of sight, which ended in blindness. In November 1836 he removed to Dublin with his daughter Maria. Here he died on 27 Feb. 1841. He married, on 25 Jan. 1788, Susanna Hutton (died 22 Feb. 1819, aged 56), and had twelve children, of whom six survived him. Several portraits of Bruce exist; the earliest is in a large picture (1804) by Robinson, containing portraits of Dr. and Mrs. Bruce and others, now in the council-room of the Belfast chamber of commerce; a three-quarter length, by Thompson, is in the Linenhall Library, Belfast, and has been engraved in mezzotint (1819) by Hodgetts; a fine painting of head and bust is in the possession of a grandson, James Bruce, D.L., of Thorndale; an engraving by Adcock from a miniature by Hawksett was executed for the 'Christian Moderator,' 1827. He published: 1. 'The Christian Soldier,' 1803, 12mo, a sermon. 2. 'Literary Essays on the

gress of Religion and Learning; and on the Advantages of Classical Education,' Belfast, 1811, 4to, 2nd edition 1818, 4to (originally published in the 'Transactions of the Belfast Literary Society,' 1809 and 1811). 3. 'A Treatise on the Being and Attributes of God; with an Appendix on the Immateriality of the Soul,' Belfast, 1818, 8vo (begun in 1808, and finished November 1813). 4. 'Sermons on the Study of the Bible, and on the Doctrines of Christianity,' Belfast, 1824, 2nd edition 1826, 8vo (not till the second edition did he rank his doctrines as 'anti-trinitarian'; his Arianism is evidently of a transitional type; in later life he was anxious to have it known that he had not altered his views, and on 27 Sept. 1839 he signed a paper stating that 'the sentiments, principles, and opinions' contained in this volume of sermons 'coincide exactly with those which I entertain'). 5. 'The State of Society in the Age of Homer,' Belfast, 1827, 8vo. 6. 'Brief Notes on the Gospels and Acts,' Belfast, 1835, 12mo. 7. 'A Paraphrase, with Brief Notes on St. Paul's Epistle to the Romans,' Belfast, 1836, 12mo. 8. 'A Paraphrase and Notes on the Epistles and Apocalypse,' Liverpool, 1836, 12mo. 9. 'A Brief Commentary on the New Testament,' Belfast, 1836, 12mo. Besides these he contributed papers, scientific and historical, &c., to the 'Transactions of the Royal Irish Academy,' 'Belfast Literary Society,' 'Dublin University Magazine,' and other periodicals. Among these articles may be noticed a series of twenty-three historical papers on the 'Progress of Nonsubscription to Creeds,' contributed to the 'Christian Moderator,' 1826-8; these are of value as giving extracts from original documents. His 'Memoir of James VI,' in 'Transactions of the Royal Irish Academy,' 1828, gives copies of original letters, and information respecting his ancestor, Rev. Robert Bruce of Kinnaird.

[Armstrong's Appendix to Ordination Service, James Martineau, 1829, pp. 75-7, 89; Porter's Funeral Sermon, The Christian's Hope in Death, 1841; Bible Christian, 1831, pp. 47, 239, 289, 1834, p. 389, 1841, pp. 111 sq.; Chr. Reformer, 1821, pp. 218 sq., 1859, p. 318; Reid's Hist. Presb. Ch. in Ireland (Killen), 1867, iii. 389, 444 sq.; Witherow's Hist. and Lit. Memorials of Presbyterianism in Ireland, 2nd ser. 1880, pp. 187 sq.; Benn's Hist. of Belfast, 1877, p. 453, vol. ii. 1880, pp. 48, 172; Belf. Newsletter, 26 Feb. 1819; Minutes of Gen. Synod, 1824, p. 31; Irish Unit. Mag. 1847, p. 357; Disciple (Belf.), 1883, pp. 84, 93 seq.; C. Porter's Seven Bruces, in Northern Whig, 20 May 1885; manuscript extracts from Minutes of Gen. Synod, 1780; manuscript Minutes of Antrim Presbytery, First Presb. Ch., Belfast, and Unit. Soc. Belfast; tombstones at Holywood.] A. G.



**BRUCE, WILLIAM** (1790–1868), Irish presbyterian minister and professor, was born at Belfast 16 Nov. 1790, the second son of William Bruce (1757–1841) [q. v.] He was educated first at the Belfast Academy under his father; entered Trinity College, Dublin, on 2 July 1804, where he obtained a scholarship and graduated A.B. on 20 July 1809. Meantime he attended a session (1808–1809) at Edinburgh, where he studied moral philosophy, church history, &c., under Dugald Stewart, Hugh Meiklejohn, and others. His theological studies were directed by the Antrim presbytery, by which body he was licensed on 25 June 1811. On 19 Jan. 1812 he was called to First Belfast as colleague to his father, and ordained 3 March. He had few of his father's gifts, but his quiet firmness and amiability gave him a hold on the affections of his people. Theologically he followed closely in his father's steps. It is believed that he edited the Belfast edition, 1819, 8vo, of 'Sermons on the Christian Doctrine,' by Richard Price, D.D. (originally published 1787), which contain a mild assertion of a modified Arianism, as a middle way between Calvinism and Socinianism. In 1821 Bruce came forward as a candidate for the vacant classical and Hebrew chair in the Belfast Academical Institution. Two-thirds of the Arian vote went against Bruce, in consequence of the hostility hitherto shown to the institution by his family; but Sir Robert Bateson, the episcopalian leader, and Edward Reid of Ramelton, moderator of the general synod, made efforts for Bruce, and he was elected on 27 Oct. by a large majority. The appointment conciliated a section which had stood aloof from the institution on the ground that it had sympathised with unconstitutional principles in 1798, and ultimately the government grant, which had been withdrawn on that account, was renewed (27 Feb. 1829). Bruce, still keeping his congregation, held the chair with solid repute till the establishment of the Queen's College (opened November 1849) reduced the Academical Institution to the rank of a high school. The Hebrew chair was separated from that of classics in 1825, when Thomas Dix Hincks, LL.D., another Arian, was appointed to fill it. Bruce took no active share in the polemics of his time. An early and anonymous publication on the Trinity sufficiently defines his position. In later life he headed the conservative minority in the Antrim presbytery, maintaining that nonsubscribing principles not only allowed but required a presbytery to satisfy itself as to the christian faith of candidates for the ministry. The discussion was conducted with much acrimony (not on Bruce's

part), and ended in the withdrawal of five congregations, since recognised by the government as a distinct ecclesiastical body, the northern presbytery of Antrim, of which, at its first meeting, 4 April 1862, Bruce was elected moderator. In the same year the jubilee of his ordination was marked by the placing of stained glass windows in his meeting-house. He retired from active duty on 21 April 1867. From 1832 he had as colleague John Scott Porter, who remained sole pastor [see BRUCE, WILLIAM, 1757–1841]. He continued his services to many of the charities and public bodies of the town. He studied agriculture, and carefully planted his own grounds at The Farm. His last sermon was at a communion in Larne on 28 April 1867. He died 25 Oct. 1868, and was buried at Holywood 28 Oct. On 20 May 1823 he married Jane Elizabeth (died 27 Nov. 1878, aged 79), only child of William Smith of Barbadoes and Catherine Wentworth. By her he had four sons and six daughters; his first-born died in infancy; William died 7 Nov. 1868, aged 43; Samuel died 6 March 1871, aged 44.

He published: 1. 'Observations on the Doctrine of the Trinity, occasioned by the Rev. James Carlile's book, entitled "Jesus Christ, the Great God our Saviour,"' Belfast, 1828, 8vo, anonymous; Carlile was minister of the Scots Church, Mary's Abbey, Dublin (died March 1854). 2. 'On the Right and Exercise of Private Judgment,' Belfast, 1860, 8vo (sermon, Acts iv. 19, 20, on 8 July). 3. 'Address delivered to the First Presbyterian Congregation, Belfast, on Sunday, 12 Jan. 1862, in reference to the recent proceedings in the Presbytery of Antrim,' Belfast, 1862, 12mo. 4. 'On Christian Liberty; its Extent and Limitation,' Belfast, 1862, 12mo (sermon, 1 Cor. viii. 9, on 5 Oct., the day of the re-opening of his church after the erection of memorial window).

[J. S. Porter's Funeral Sermon, *The New Heaven and New Earth*, 1868; Reid's *Hist. Presb. Ch. in Ireland* (Killen), 1867, iii. 445; J. L. Porter's *Life and Times of H. Cooke*, 1871, p. 62 sq.; Belfast Newsletter, 1821; Benn's *Hist. of Belfast*, 1880, ii. 108; Chr. Unitarian, 1862; Nonsubscriber, 1862; Chr. Life, 4 Dec. 1878; C. Porter's *Seven Bruces*, in *Northern Whig*, 25 May 1885; manuscript Minutes Antrim Presbytery, Northern Presbytery; Minutes and Baptismal Register, First Presb. Ch. Belfast; tombstones at Holywood; private information.] A. G.

**BRUCKNER, JOHN** (1726–1804), Lutheran divine, was born on 31 Dec. 1726 at Kadzand, a small island of Zealand, near the Belgian frontier. He was educated for the ministry, chiefly at the university of Franeker, where he studied Greek under