

The Scottish Historical Review

VOL. XVIII., No. 70

JANUARY, 1921

The Passages of St. Malachy through Scotland

THE movement for the establishment of the continental system of ecclesiastical organization was rapidly progressing in Ireland as well as in Scotland in the early years of the twelfth century. The island was mapped out into separate dioceses, each with a bishop having ecclesiastical jurisdiction within his own area. A like movement was going on in Scotland during the same period when the native church was remodelled after the Roman or continental type. If St. Margaret had much to do with the reformation in Scotland, it may be said that the work was propagated to completion by her son, David I. The movement brought prominent sympathizers over the greater part of Europe into contact. It was taken up so vigorously in Ireland by St. Malachy of Armagh that he may be regarded as one of the principal forces behind it in that country. In the furtherance of his scheme he resolved to visit Rome and seek papal assistance. In the course of his pilgrimages to the Eternal City, he called at Clairvaux where he formed an intimate friendship with its famous abbot, St. Bernard, at that time perhaps the most influential ecclesiastic in Europe. On St. Malachy's second journey to Rome, he was suddenly seized with mortal sickness at Clairvaux and died on 2nd November, 1148, in the arms of St. Bernard.

Almost immediately after his death, an account of his life was written by that prelate. It is mainly from this narrative there may be gleaned almost all that is known of the passages of the

Irish saint through the south-west of Scotland as he journeyed from his home in the north of Ireland, on his ecclesiastical missions to Rome.

As the trustworthiness of St. Bernard's narrative is of the greatest importance, it may be well to glance at the date when it was written and the sources from which this foreign ecclesiastic obtained his information. The internal evidence supplies all that is needed to give satisfaction. As St. Bernard died on 20th August, 1153, the margin between the death of St. Malachy and that of his biographer is only small: indeed as Henry, prince of Scotland, not to speak of King David his father, is spoken of as then alive, the work must have been completed before 12th June, 1152. There is no need to strain circumstantial allusions in the text that the date of the narrative may be brought into a narrower compass.

The sources of St. Bernard's information are also satisfactory. The intimacy between the two saints, while St. Malachy was a guest at Clairvaux on three occasions, adumbrates that the narrator's facts and impressions were gained at first hand. In addition, four companions of St. Malachy were left behind in Clairvaux on the occasion of his second visit that they might be instructed in the Cistercian mode of life. There is indication also that St. Bernard had formal memoranda before him of the saint's movements and aims, supplied either by the Irish brethren at Clairvaux or communicated by correspondents in Ireland. The task of writing the Life of St. Malachy was undertaken by desire of one of these correspondents and it was afterwards dedicated to him. The completed work, as stated by its author,¹ was not panegyric, but narrative: its truth was assured since the facts had been communicated by persons in Ireland, for beyond doubt they asserted nothing but things of which they had the most certain information. The Scottish reminiscences, however, must be referred to the oral relations of St. Malachy himself, or more probably to those of his companions. Though St. Bernard states that he omitted to mention the places where St. Malachy's miracles were wrought, owing to the barbarous sound of their names, he did not adhere strictly to his rule when incidentally describing the saint's passages through Scotland. The number of places named in that country, when compared with similar mentions in other countries through which the saint travelled, seems to suggest a special interest in the author's

¹ *Vita*, preface.

mind. Though it cannot be claimed that St. Bernard was personally acquainted with King David, there is no doubt that he was interested in the ecclesiastical movement in which that king was so deeply immersed. From his narrative we get the earliest mention of some place-names in Galloway and some tantalizing allusions, the elucidation of which may well be the subject of debate.

It will not be necessary to discuss at large the dates of St. Malachy's journeys, as there can scarcely be a second opinion about them. Professor Lawlor¹ has recently studied the period with such circumspection that others may not glean where he has reaped. But so far as we are here concerned, chronology as to day and month has no need to be exact. The approximate time of his several journeys is quite sufficient for our purpose. It may be taken that he passed through Scotland to and from Rome in the same year, 1140, and that his second journey outward was made in 1148, the year of his death at Clairvaux. The Irish saint thus made three separate journeys through the south-west of Scotland, twice in 1140 and once in 1148, though it is venturesome to assume that on all occasions he pursued exactly the same route.

Though the ecclesiastical status of the regions in Scotland through which he passed is not so well defined as one would wish, there is no uncertainty at all of their political unity at that time. Within the period, 1140-1148, the territorial boundary of Scotland on the south-west, the scene of St. Malachy's pilgrimages, was fixed at the Rerecross on Stainmore on the very border of Yorkshire. The north-eastern or greater part of Cumberland and the eastern half of Westmorland were integral portions of the Scottish kingdom as well as the whole of modern Scotland. This lesson in political geography must have been known to St. Malachy and his companions, and if not, it must have been taught them by their intercourse with King David, or learned from their own experience on their journeyings. Without a doubt a knowledge of it is assumed by St. Bernard in his narrative. When, therefore, the name of Scotland is mentioned in the *Life of St. Malachy*, it must be understood as

¹See his 'Notes on St. Bernard's *Life of St. Malachy*' in the *Proceedings of the Royal Irish Academy*, vol. xxxv. Section C, No. 6, pp. 230-264, which may be taken as an introduction to his translation of St. Bernard of Clairvaux's *Life of St. Malachy of Armagh* (S.P.C.K., 1920). These studies when viewed together form an exhaustive analysis of what is known of St. Malachy's place in history.

implying the larger Scotland as it existed when St. Bernard wrote, the Scotland under the rule of King David, during the usurpation of King Stephen in England.

A study of St. Bernard's vague narrative of the first pilgrimage only shows that St. Malachy set out to Scotland from some unmentioned place in Ireland early in 1140. After certain administrative preparations had been made, 'St. Malachy set out on his journey, and when he had left Scotland, he reached York.'¹ Though the narrator says nothing more, it is suggested that the place of his departure from Ireland was at Bangor, the saint's headquarters at that period, and that he sailed to the opposite coast. The suggestion is at least plausible. From an early date the northern shore of the Rhins of Galloway has been regarded as a landing place from the north of Ireland. It was on that coast *in portu qui Rintsnoc dicitur* that the stone curroc, which carried St. Cuthbert and his mother, found a haven. Though the statement comes from a fabulous composition,² it has some reference to an early tradition about the connexion of Ireland and Galloway, and its value is enhanced by the admission of the author that much of what was contained in his pages had been related by St. Malachy to King David. He had been evidently reading St. Bernard's Life of the saint and the belief was then current that the Rhins afforded a convenient port for a sea passage from Ireland.

In any case there is no possibility for dispute that St. Malachy must have passed through Carlisle on his way through Scotland to York, and there is nothing unreasonable in the conjecture that he had made the acquaintance of King David on his journey, though St. Bernard is silent about it. From what had transpired in the metropolitan city, we learn something of his mode of travel. He had with him five priests besides ministers and other clerks, perhaps twelve companions in all, the traditional number after the sacred model. Such was the composition of the cavalcade on the first journey through Scotland. But as there were only

¹ *Vita*, § 35.

² The phrase is noteworthy: 'et miro modo in lapidea devectus navicula, apud Galweiam in regione illa, quae Rennii vocatur, in portu qui Rintsnoc dicitur, applicuit. In cuius portus littore curroc lapidea adhuc perdurasse videtur' (*Miscellanea Biographica*, Surtees Soc., p. 77). At the conclusion of this fabulous 'Libellus de ortu S. Cuthberti' (p. 87) the author states that 'Sanctus equidem Malachias regi David Scottorum quam plurima de hiis retulit,' as he had previously insisted in his preface, that his story of the Irish origin of St. Cuthbert was supported by good evidence.

three horses for the company, it is clear that progress was made at a walking pace.

It may be noted also that the stay at York was long enough for the news to spread, and there was time enough for a visit from Waldeve, stepson of King David, who was at that time prior of the Augustinian monastery of Kirkham, some sixteen miles from the city. A previous acquaintance, as Raine suggested,¹ is scarcely possible. It is far more likely that the fame of St. Malachy and the errand on which he was engaged were attracting notice in England. The death of Archbishop Thurstin took place on 5th February, 1140, about the time that St. Malachy reached York, and as Prior Waldeve is said² to have been a candidate for the vacant primacy, interest in a famous ecclesiastic on a journey to Rome would be a powerful incentive. At all events the Prior did not lose the opportunity of conferring a favour on the distinguished pilgrim to whom he gave the hack (*runcinus*)³ on which he rode.

The return of St. Malachy from Rome and Clairvaux was not long delayed. It is supposed that he reached Scotland in the autumn of the same year, 1140. The account of his exploits on the homeward journey far exceeds in detail what St. Bernard tells of him in other countries. The names of places through which he travelled are sparingly given, and they are only mentioned for the purpose of illustrating some marvel which the saint performed. The identification of some of these places, so obscure are allusions to them, is often precarious, and the places mentioned in Scotland are no exception to the rule. But, first of all, the narrative of St. Bernard should be approached from the right view-point. The narrator is writing in Clairvaux and describing the outward journey of St. Malachy from that place to his home in Ireland. 'Malachy set out from us,' he⁴ says, 'and had a prosperous journey to Scotland (*prosperè pervenit in Scotiam*), and he found King David, who is still alive to-day,

¹ *Priory of Hexham* (Surtees Soc.), i. 139, 157.

² Raine, *Fasti Ebor.*, i. 222. On the authority of the Bollandists (*Acta SS.*, Aug. 3) Raine states that Waldeve would have been elected if King Stephen had not interfered. The King was afraid that Waldeve, owing to his relationship to King David, would play, if elected, into the hands of the King of Scots. The view taken by the hagiologists may be seen in Fordun, *Scotichronicon* (ed. Goodall), i. 343-4.

³ *Vita*, § 36.

⁴ *Vita*, § 40; Migne, *Patrologia*, vol. clxxxij. 1095.

in one of his castles (*in quodam castello suo*), whose son was sick unto death.' Need there be any ambiguity about this statement? ¹ There is no mention of Carlisle, which was at that time well within the Scottish Kingdom. The castle there, which was King David's headquarters, is the only place that will fit into the historical setting and harmonize with the details of the story. For political reasons, in view of the recent annexation of the province, the king had made Carlisle the southern capital of his kingdom: there he built, if we can believe the chronicle of Huntingdon,² a very strong citadel (*fortissimam arcem*) and heightened the walls of the city. Many incidents took place in Carlisle touching the life and movements of the royal family, not only of King David, but of Prince Henry and his wife the Countess Ada, to whom he was married in 1139. The meeting of St. Malachy with the family at Carlisle in the autumn of 1140 is not inconsistent, so far as I know, with any recorded event in their lives: in fact, the circumstances of the narrative presuppose it. By necessity the saint must have passed through Carlisle on each of his journeys, and from what transpired on this occasion it would seem that he had met King David before. At all events

¹The identification of this place is largely dependent on a right interpretation of this passage. O'Hanlan says that 'on his arrival in Scotland, he paid a visit to the Court of King David,' and makes no attempt to identify the castle (*Life of St. Malachy O'Morgair*, p. 80), but Dr. Lawlor suspects an error in the narrative here, and translates that 'Malachy had a prosperous journey through Scotland,' assuming 'that the castle referred to was in the immediate neighbourhood of Cruggleton,' near Whithorn, where probably King David had been on a visit to Fergus, lord of Galloway (*St. Bernard's Life of St. Malachy of Armagh*, p. 76). Will the passage bear this interpretation? St. Malachy had not yet passed through Scotland; he had only come into it. Compare the usage of *perveniens* in the parallel passage of Aelred at this period when describing the flight of King David to Carlisle after the Battle of the Standard—'Sicque ad Carleolum usque perveniens' (Twysden, *Decem Scriptores*, col. 346). The tenor of St. Bernard's story, too, presupposes that it was one of the monarch's own castles in which St. Malachy found him with his sick son, not in a castle of one of his magnates, where he had been the guest.

²*Chronicles of the Picts and Scots* (ed. Skene), p. 212. It was natural that the Scottish king should seek to protect his new capital on the south of the city against the English, as William Rufus had built the keep of the castle on the north against the Scots. The *fortissima arx* of King David, now represented by the Courts of Carlisle, was known as the Citadel of Carlisle so long as the city remained a fortified town. Mr. George Neilson propounded an ingenious argument in 1895 that the *arx* King David built was the keep ascribed to Rufus (*Notes and Queries*, 26th Oct., 1895, No. 200, pp. 321-3). If this be so, how could an *arx* built in 1148 be described as 'la grant tur antive' in 1174 (*Chron. de Jordan Fantosme*, l. 615, Surtees Soc.)?

the news of the Prince's illness¹ directed his steps to the castle. The cure was not instantaneous: the saint's ministrations did not take effect till the following day, when the young man (*iuuenis*) was restored to health. There was joy in the castle at his recovery. Declining an invitation to remain some days with the royal party, St. Malachy pursued his journey in the morning.

The next stage of the journey home, mentioned by St. Bernard, was in Galloway, where he healed a dumb girl at Crugeldum: then he entered a village which the people called Kirkmichael (*ecclesia sancti Michaelis*) where another cure was effected. But when the saint came to the *Portus Lapasperi* he embarked for Ireland, after waiting some days for a passage. The topographical allusions here are for the most part very puzzling. The traditional interpretation is that St. Malachy cured the mute girl at Cruggleton² in the parish of Sorby, nor far from Whithorn, from which he passed to Kirk Mochrum, whose ancient church is said to have been entitled in the name of St. Michael.³ Later on, he went to Cairngarrock, which is alleged to be Gaelic for *Portus Lapasperi*, a few miles south of Downpatrick, and from that place he crossed over to Bangor on the opposite coast.

The suggestion that St. Malachy travelled in the peninsula between Luce Bay and Wigtown Bay raises no misgiving. It was natural for him to choose a route well trodden by a constant stream of pilgrims before the Reformation. Whithorn was the cradle of Scottish Christianity and St. Ninian's grave was one of the holy places of Scotland. The mention of the village of Cruggleton in that neighbourhood lends credibility to the theory, and on the supposition that the church of Mochrum was a St. Michael's church and that there were no other ancient churches of that dedication in the vicinity, the exact locality may be said to be well authenticated. But to send St. Malachy from the

¹ Prince Henry a short time before the visit of St. Malachy had been severely mauled at the siege of Ludlow in 1139, 'ubi idem Henricus unco ferreo equo abstractus poene captus est, sed ipse rex eum ab hostibus splendide retraxit' (Henry of Huntingdon, *Hist. Anglorum*, p. 265, R.S.) King Stephen, after making a treaty with King David, brought back Prince Henry with him to Ludlow. According to Sir Archibald Lawrie, who calculates that the Prince was born about 1114 (*Early Scottish Charters*, pp. 277, 321), St. Bernard's *iuuenis* would be then about 26 years of age.

² O'Hanlon, *op. cit.*, pp. 80-81.

³ Lawlor, *op. cit.*, p. 78.

south of the peninsula on a tour round by Glenluce that he may get to Cairngarroch strains reasonable belief. There is no real evidence alleged that either of the three Cairngarrochs on opposite sides of the Rhins of Galloway was ever a port of passage to Ireland or elsewhere. The etymology, moreover, which explains the Gaelic name as the equivalent of *Portus Laperasperi*¹ in Latin is exceedingly insecure. If etymology is admitted to this discussion, Portyerrock, the outlet by sea of that peninsula, is far more likely. Its usage as a port² seems to be well established both before and after St. Malachy's peregrinations.

The narrative of St. Bernard gives no clue to enable us to account for the saint's presence on the peninsula. When he crossed the river Cree, he would have made for Glenluce if he was aiming to sail from the Cairngarroch a little to the south of Downpatrick. Such would have been the direct route. But he made a detour to Whithorn. Why was this? We have already suggested that it was to visit one of the holy places, but the purpose of St. Malachy's presence there becomes more easily accounted for on the understanding that he had made no detour at all, but was pursuing a direct journey to reach his port. If the traditional identification of the *Portus Laperasperi* as one of the Cairngarrochs be abandoned, St. Malachy's itinerary in the peninsula provokes no suspicion. On the assumption that Portyerrock was his destination, the incidents of the narrative fall into their natural places. There is no

¹ Dr. Lawlor departs from the Benedictine text of *Laperasperi* (Migne, *Patrologia*, vol. clxxxij, 1096) and substitutes *Lapasperi* throughout his translation; the change is a happy emendation and makes the word more intelligible. But it is doubtful whether the philological claims of Cairngarroch are so strong and well grounded as those of Portyerrock to account for all the elements in *Portus Laperasperi*. The letter *g* at the beginning of a syllable not infrequently becomes *y* in modern speech.

² Dr. Skene identifies the 'Beruvik' in Nial's Saga with Portyerrock where the Norwegian chiefs laid up their ships after the Battle of Cluantarbh, from which they fared up into Whithorne and were with Earl Melkoff or Malcolm for a year (*Celtic Scotland*, i. 390). It was from this port 'in Galueia apud civitatem Witerne' that Cardinal Vivian sailed to the Isle of Man in 1176, some 35 years after St. Malachy's visit to that region (*Benedict Abbas*, R.S., i. 137; Twysden, *Chron. Joh. Bromton*, col. 1111). As Cruggleton is close by, there is nothing adventurous in suggesting that it was to Portyerrock that John Comyn, earl of Bogle, brought the lead ore which he dug 'in our mine of Calf' in the Isle of Man in 1292 for the purpose of covering eight turrets on his castle of Crigelton in Galloway (*Cal. of Patent Rolls*, 1281-02, p. 497; Stevenson, *Documents*, etc., i. 329).

good ground for attributing to early travellers a disinclination for sea voyages, or a desire to cross the sea by the shortest passage between land and land. The sea-borne trade of Scotland with France and Flanders was conducted from Scottish, not English, ports.

The delay of St. Malachy, during the time he was waiting for the sailing of his ship, was not passed in idleness. In the interval an oratory ¹ was constructed of twigs woven into a hedge, he himself working as well as supervising. When it was finished, he surrounded it with a wall and blessed the inclosed space for a cemetery. The place became a shrine afterwards, as St. Bernard relates,² where miracles occurred as it was reported to him up to the time he wrote. Returning to the port, St. Malachy embarked in a ship and after a prosperous voyage landed at the monastery of Bangor,³ but the time it took to complete the passage is not mentioned.

St. Bernard does not tell us the name of the place in Ireland from which St. Malachy embarked in 1148 on his second journey to Rome for the palls, but from whatever port he sailed he arrived in Scotland on the same day. When he went on board and had completed nearly half the voyage, suddenly a contrary wind drove the ship back and brought it to the land of Ireland again. In the morning, however, he went on board again, and the same day, after a prosperous crossing came into Scotland. On the third day he reached a place called *Viride Stagnum*: which he had prepared that he might find an abbey there, and leaving some of his sons and brothers as a convent of monks and an abbot (for he had brought them with him for that purpose), he bade them farewell and set out on his journey.⁴ Attempts at identification here are clearly futile. There is no foothold, except *Viride Stagnum*, which is descriptive of many pools in Galloway, where the saint founded a monastery presumably of Cistercian monks. It is 'surely a mistake,' as Keith ⁵ long ago suggested, to identify it with Soulseat where

¹ The action of St. Malachy in this respect was very irregular and betokened the backwardness of the ecclesiastical movement in Galloway. There is no reference to a Bishop of Candida Casa, without whose consent a new chapel or oratory could not have been erected there (Robertson, *Stat. Eccl. Scot.*, pp. 11, 258; Wilkins, *Concilia*, i. 382, 415). But the saint was acting like John Wesley as if the whole world was his parish.

² *Vita*, § 41.

³ *Vita*, § 42.

⁴ *Vita*, § 68.

⁵ *Scottish Bishops* (ed. Russel), p. 398. The whole of the story here is very inscrutable. St. Bernard seemed to think that a monastery could be founded by

Fergus, lord of Galloway, founded¹ a monastery of Premonstratensian canons before 1160, that is, a little before or a little after St. Malachy's foundation. The obscurity here will probably always remain a mystery.

In order to find another stage of the journey of St. Malachy in Scotland, we must turn from the narrative of St. Bernard to the pages of the Chronicle of Lanercost² where there has been preserved an episode of his pilgrimage long remembered on the Border. In recording the death of Robert de Brus, lord of Annandale, under 1295, the chronicler refers to an interesting incident in the annals of that noble family. Some time ago, he says, there lived in Ireland a certain bishop and monk of the Cistercian order, a holy man named Malachi, who at the command of the captain-general of the order hastened to that place (Clairvaux) where also he died and rests in peace, remaining famous by his miracles (*signis*). When he died the holy Bernard, who was present, preached an exceedingly mournful sermon, which the canon of Lanercost had often seen.³

When this bishop had crossed from the north of Ireland, and, travelling on foot through Galloway, came to Annan with two fellow-clerics, he inquired of the inhabitants who would give him hospitality. When they declared that an illustrious man, lord of that district, who was there at the time, would willingly do so, he humbly sought some dinner which was liberally provided. When the servants inquired, seeing that he had been travelling, whether they should anticipate the dinner hour or await the master's table, he begged that he might have dinner

a stroke of the pen in a strange land and that the community could live without maintenance.

¹ It is not quite certain that Fergus founded the monastery at Souleseat, but it is so assumed in the *Scotichronicon*, ii. 538, and in later writings.

² *Chron. de Lanercost* (Maitland Club), pp. 159-161; Sir Herbert Maxwell's translation, pp. 111-114.

³ It is evident that the writings of St. Bernard were extensively known at an early period. Not only at Lanercost at the end of the thirteenth century, but at Hexham in the latter half of the twelfth, were his writings familiar. Prior John of Hexham speaks of the *Life of St. Malachy* which 'Bernardus abbas Clariae-vallis fideli scribit relatu' (*Priory of Hexham*, i. 156-7, Surtees Soc.). The same life was also known to Fordun (*Scotichronicon*, i. 295, ed. Goodall), Trivett (*Annals*, p. 26, E.H.S.) and others. His theological writings acquired for him the title of 'Last of the Fathers,' so great was their authority. Dr. Lawlor adds in an appendix a translation of the 'sermonem satis lugubrem' referred to by the Lanercost scribe.

at once. When a table had been prepared for him on the north side of the hall, he sat down with his two companions to refresh himself: and as the servants were discussing the death of a certain robber that had been taken, who was then awaiting the sentence of justice, the baron entered the hall and bade his guests welcome.

Then the gentle bishop, relying entirely on the courtesy of the noble, said—‘As a pilgrim I crave a boon from your excellency, that as sentence of death has not hitherto polluted any place where I was present, let the life of this culprit, if he has committed an offence, be given to me.’ The noble host agreed, not amiably but deceitfully, and privily ordered that the malefactor should suffer death. When he had been hanged, and the bishop had finished his meal, the baron came in to his dinner. After pronouncing a blessing on the household he took his leave, and as he was passing through the town he beheld by the wayside the thief hanging on the gallows. Then, sorrowing in spirit, he pronounced a heavy sentence, first on the lord of the place, and his offspring, and next upon the town, which the course of events confirmed: for soon afterwards the rich man died in torment, three of his heirs in succession perished in the flower of their age, some before they had been five years in possession, others before they had been three.

In the early years of manhood it would appear that the story of St. Malachy’s malediction on his ancestors and descendants had been told to Robert de Brus, the competitor, who hastened to present himself before his shrine and undertook to do likewise every three years that the curse might be removed. When in his last days he was returning from the Holy Land where he had been with Prince Edward,¹ he turned aside to Clairvaux and made his peace for ever with the saint, providing a perpetual rent, out of which provision there are maintained upon the saint’s tomb three silver lamps with their lights: and thus through his deeds of piety this Robert de Brus alone had been buried at a good old age.

Though this tradition originated some twenty years before

¹ Prince Edward set out on the Crusade in 1270; after leaving Palestine he spent most of 1273 in France carrying on a little war at Chalons, near to Clairvaux, and returned to England in 1274 (Hemingburgh, i. 337-40, ii. 1, E.H.S.). Robert de Brus is numbered among the Crusaders who had protection of their possessions for four years during absence from the realm with Prince Edward (*Cal. of Patent Rolls*, 1266-72, pp. 465, 480).

the priory of Austin Canons was founded at Lanercost, where it is supposed the Chronicle was written, it will be difficult to dispute the truth of its main features. St. Malachy was well known in Carlisle, nine miles from Lanercost, and one of his two previous visits to that city, in which there was a priory of the same order, was sufficiently remarkable to make his exploits memorable. It is not necessary to assume exactness in the Lanercost report of the Annan incident or to pry too curiously into every detail of the tradition. All that requires to be said is that the framework of the story is worthy of credit.

The trustworthiness of the tradition has had singular corroboration by the discovery of a charter in the archives of the Aube, a copy of which M. Guignard communicated to Count Montalembert in 1855. Since its publication the story in the Lanercost Chronicle cannot be treated as a mere monkish legend. By this deed Robert de Brus, lord of Annandale, gave to the monks of Clairvaux the land of Osticroft in his lordship *ad sustinandum luminare coram beato Malachia* in their church.¹ As it was issued in Annandale about 1273, all the witnesses being well known men of that district, and carries the seal of the competitor, no doubts may be entertained of its genuineness. M. Guignard was unable to read the legend on the seal in its entirety, but enough was deciphered to prove its identity. There is no need, so far as we are here concerned, to uphold the embellishments of the Lanercost tradition: the curse of Malachy on the deceitful Brus may be true or untrue. It is enough to know that the saint was hospitably entertained in the hall of Annan and made the acquaintance of its lordly owner. This circumstance, perhaps, prepares us for the direction of his subsequent journey in England.

There is no mistaking the next stage of St. Malachy's journey after his departure from Annan to which, according to Camden, access by land² was very difficult. He would naturally seek one of the waths³ or fords of the estuary of the Eden opposite Annan

¹ There is no occasion to repeat the text of the charter here or to offer proofs of its genuineness. A full discussion has been given by M. Guignard (*Migne, Patrologia*, clxxxv. 1759-60), and his conclusions have been accepted by Father O'Hanlon (*Life of St. Malachy*, pp. 193-5) and by Mr. George Neilson (*Scots Lore* pp. 124-30). The French editor identified the charter with such perspicacity that little was left unsaid.

² *Britannia*, ed. Gibson, p. 1195.

³ The fords over Solway sands were the recognised highway between England and Scotland on the western border from an early period. It was by this route

and make straight for Carlisle. Passing on, as St. Bernard¹ relates, King David met him, by whom he was received with joy and was detained as his guest for some days: and having done many things pleasing to God, he resumed the journey he had begun. This was the saint's third and last visit to Carlisle. It would be pleasant to think that he had met Archbishop Henry Murdac of York when he visited King David in Carlisle that year² and received the canonical obedience of Bishop Adelulf of Carlisle. In any case the controversy about the York primacy would afford an ample subject for discussion, if regard be had to what transpired at the deposition of St. William and to the part taken therein by St. Bernard.³

Travelling down the Eden valley as he had done on his first journey, he left the kingdom of Scotland by crossing the gap of Stainmore into Yorkshire, but instead of proceeding direct to York, as he did before, he made a detour perhaps at Barnard Castle or Catterick that he might call at the monastery of Gisburn in Cleveland on the east coast near the mouth of the Tees, a monastery which had been founded by the father of his noble host at Annan. Departing from Gisburn he came to the sea, but was refused passage owing, as his biographer suspected, to some difference between the chief pontiff and King Stephen. We are not told from what port St. Malachy ultimately set sail. But inasmuch as the King of England, according to Domesday,⁴

that King Alexander II. entered Cumberland in 1216 (*Chron. de Mailros*, pp. 122-3). Archbishop Winchelsey gives some exciting experiences of the passage when he crossed in 1297 (*Wilkins, Concilia*, ii. 261-3). Edward I. had his army encamped on Burgh Marsh on his way north when death overtook him, 1307. For the importance of this route, see Neilson, *Annals of the Solway* (Glasgow: James MacLehose & Sons, 1899). The bogs and mosses which lay between Annan and the Esk were more impassable than the treacherous sands of Solway.

¹ *Vita*, § 69.

² *Priory of Hexham* (Surtees Soc.), p. 158. In this same year Henry Fitz Empress was knighted by King David in Carlisle (Hoveden, R.S., i. 211).

³ Newburgh, *Chronicon*, pp. 47-8, E.H.S.

⁴ Domesday Book, i. 298 b: 'Rex habet tres vias per terram et quartam per aquam.' It should be pointed out that Dr. Lawlor (*Proceedings of R.I.A.* op. cit. pp. 239-241: *Life of St. Malachy*, p. 121) has made an unfortunate slip in his identification of the Gisburn to which St. Malachy 'turned aside' (*divertit*) after crossing the gap of Stainmore into Yorkshire, a slip which upsets his alleged geographical direction of the third journey. It is not the Gisburn in Craven near the Lancashire border, now called New Gisburn, where there was no monastery of regular canons, but the Gisburn in Cleveland, better known as Guisborough,

had in York three ways by land and a fourth by water, it is not improbable that St. Malachy was making for the fourth way in the region of York, to escape by the shortest route from the interference of the English king.

JAMES WILSON.

a priory of regular canons founded by Robert de Brus in 1129. My view is that St. Malachy sailed from York, or its immediate neighbourhood, on both of his outward journeys, and that his itineraries in England, as given by Dr. Lawlor, must be confined within narrower limits.

Queen Mary's Jewels

A RECENT article in *The Scottish Historical Review*¹ contains an interesting reference to Queen Mary's jewels—more particularly to her pearls—which recalls a secret transaction little noticed by historians. This has not escaped the eye of Dr. Hay Fleming, who gives it a brief mention in his *Mary Queen of Scots*,² and almost sixty years ago it was fully discussed by Joseph Robertson in his *Inventories of Mary Queen of Scots*,³ but the story will bear elaboration as throwing a useful light upon the framework of Scottish society in the sixteenth century, and upon the characters of some of the great personages who graced that period.

The subject is of more than antiquarian interest. When it is recalled that in the sixteenth century the total revenue of the Scottish kings was but a few thousand pounds sterling (say about £12,000), much of which was earmarked for local requirements, the importance of the royal jewels is easily appreciated. Coin was scarce, and, bullion being rare, it was also bad; and the monarchs, who were often hard put to it to find the actual cash for their daily necessities, found an even greater difficulty in providing for those sudden emergencies which so often occurred. Hence came the extreme importance of the royal treasure—wealth in a portable form—which could be easily transferred into a stronghold when the English came; which could be concealed in the bowels of the earth, and yet not decay; which could be pledged to pay the mercenaries (main prop of the crown sometimes); and which could be themselves used, in extremity, to hearten friends or to bribe enemies. The royal jewels, in fact, were a great asset of government.

During the cruel wars of Mary's minority, great inroads had been made upon this asset. Many of the gems went to pay for the maintenance of the state, others seem to have been appropriated by the Hamiltons, and some, in 1556, were sent

¹ Vol. xvii. p. 291.

² P. 485.

³ Bannatyne, 111.

to the girl of fourteen, who, though she had lived so long in France, was none the less Queen of Scotland. But when, a widow of nineteen, Mary returned to Scotland in 1561, she brought with her jewels which dazzled even France, and far surpassed the treasures of her Scottish progenitors. 'Shee brought with her als faire jewells, pretious stones and pearles as were to be found in Europe,' writes Knox,¹ who for once is in accord with Bishop Lesley, and the 'inventory of 1561'² is a glittering list of 159 items, necklaces, rings, girdles, earrings, vases and chains, set with gems of every kind. The jewels of the French Crown, valued at nearly half a million crowns, had, of course, been returned on the death of her husband; but the treasures sent to her from Scotland had been supplemented by rich gifts from her Guise relatives and from her royal father-in-law, Henry II., whose great diamond, with its gold chain and ruby pendant, became, as the 'Great Harry,' one of the principal treasures of Scotland. The 'grosses perles,' which figure so abundantly on the list, may have come from the house of Lorraine; at all events in Mary's 'testamentary disposition' of 1566 they are assigned to the families of Guise and Aumale.

Some of the personal ornaments, obviously, must have travelled about with the queen, and much of the plate would be housed in Holyrood; but the real home of the royal jewels was in Edinburgh Castle, where they were kept in the Jewel House, or in the Register House.³ In tracing, therefore, the dispersion of the gems, which began with Mary's imprisonment in Lochleven Castle (17th June, 1567), it is necessary to study the varied history of the great citadel.

If we may judge from the rather pitiful inventory of the goods sent on to the Queen a few days after her escape,⁴ the captive must have been deprived of all her treasures save a bare minimum of plate. Calderwood⁵ tells us that on 17th June 'the Lords went down to the Palace of Holyrudhous, and tooke up an inventar of the plait, jewells, and other movables,' but

¹ *Works of John Knox* (Woodrow Society), 1846, ii. p. 267.

² Robertson's *Inventories of Mary Queen of Scots*, p. 7.

³ Robertson's *Inventories*, cxxxviii, xiii.

⁴ Hay Fleming's *Mary Queen of Scots*, p. 511.

⁵ Calderwood's *History of the Kirk of Scotland* (Woodrow Society), 1842, ii. p. 366.

Adam Blackwood¹ represents the confederates as proceeding in a less formal manner. According to him, these abominable traitors busied themselves all night long in pillaging the Queen's '*meubles, bagues et joyaux.*' Nothing of value was left by them, and of what they took little ever returned to the royal house.

So much for Holyrood; but the Castle was harder to plunder—for outsiders anyhow—and far more worth the plundering. The bulk of the royal treasures was still there, and there it was that Bothwell had bestowed the gems—worth, according to himself, more than 20,000 crowns—which Mary had given him.² The Castle had been held, since 8th May,³ by Sir James Balfour, a time-serving ruffian, who, having been a great confidant of Bothwell's at the time of the Darnley murder, was now prepared to make the highest profit he could out of the new situation. His opportunities were many. If Randolph's account is correct,⁴ this trusty custodian, who had the keys of the Register House, did not hesitate to make free with the valuables entrusted to his care. At a later date, 1573, Sir Robert Melville seems to have stated in his examination⁵ that he does not know that Sir James got any 'jowellis' during the 'lait troubles'; but the manuscript is so much damaged that its sense is conjectural, and in any case, Melville, with a halter round his neck, may not have cared to incriminate Morton's ally. Randolph certainly describes the castellan as opening a 'little coffer,' which may be identical with the famous 'casket,' and that casket itself was undoubtedly given by him to Bothwell's servants, one of whom fell into Morton's hands immediately afterwards. From this luckless wretch, George Dalgleish, information was extracted by torture; at 8 p.m. on 20th June, the casket was placed in Morton's hand,⁶ and next day it was broken open in the presence of eleven Scots lords.

This, of course, is Morton's own story, as presented to the English commissioners in December 1568, and we need not accept it as complete or accurate. It is almost certain that Balfour himself betrayed Dalgleish to Morton, and it is at least

¹ Jebb's *De vita et rebus gestis Mariae Scotorum Reginae*, 1705, ii. p. 219.

² 'Examination of Sir Robert Melville,' Robertson's *Inventories*, clviii.

³ Hay Fleming's *Mary Queen of Scots*, p. 465.

⁴ *Calendars of State Papers, Foreign, Elizabeth*, ix. No. 1334.

⁵ Robertson's *Inventories*, clviii.

⁶ Andrew Lang's *Mystery of Mary Stuart*, p. 275.

possible that the formal opening of the casket was a solemn farce. For Balfour had keys, as appears from Randolph's story, and with his connivance the box could be opened and shut at will. Certainly the 'murder-band' does appear to have vanished conveniently, and if it went, other things might go too.

At all events, it is quite certain that the casket was for some time in Morton's hands, for on 16th September, 1568, at a meeting of the Privy Council, Moray gave him a receipt for this 'silver box ower gilt with gold' and the papers it contained.¹

Valuables entrusted to the care of Balfour, therefore, were likely to meet with adventures, especially if Morton were concerned. Of this Mary was well aware, for in her interview with Moray at Lochleven on 16th August, 1567, she made her half-brother custodian of the jewels in a particular manner, alleging that unless he became responsible, neither she nor her son would ever see them again.² Moray—'good self-denied man,' as Keith sarcastically remarks—was unwilling to accept the charge, but Mary was urgent, and as soon as he was gone wrote with her own hand a letter pressing him to undertake the matter.

This he did. On the 5th September he made himself master of Edinburgh Castle,³ driving a hard bargain with Sir James Balfour, who obtained 'a remissioun as airt and part of the King's murther,' a pension for his son, and for himself the Priory of Pittenweem and £5000 down.⁴ On the 11th of the month Moray is described as making inventories of the Queen's jewels and apparel, 'which is said to be of much greater value than she was esteemed to have.'⁵ His activities, however, were not confined to the mere making of lists, but were of a nature to excite the anger and alarm of his opponents. 'The delivery of the castle and the jewels to the regent has colded many of their stomachs,' wrote Mr. James Melville,⁶ and it is extremely

¹ *Privy Council Register*, i. p. 641.

² *Catalogue of the Cottonian MSS. in the British Museum, Caligula*, Throckmorton to Elizabeth, May 20, 1567 (Keith, p. 444).

³ Calderwood's *History*, ii. p. 387.

⁴ *A Diurnal of Remarkable Occurrents* (Bannatyne Club, No. 43); *The Historie and Life of King James the Sext* (Bannatyne Club, No. 13, p. 18); Spottiswoode's *History of the Church of Scotland*, folio edition, 1677, p. 213.

⁵ *Calendar of State Papers, Foreign, Elizabeth*, viii. No. 1676.

⁶ To Sir Nicholas Throckmorton, 10th Sept., *Calendar of State Papers relating to Scotland*, 2 vols. 1858, ii. p. 845.

probable that even the 'Good Regent' played the part of the spoiler on this occasion, although Mary herself believed otherwise. Certain it is that, on 24th August, Moray's Parliament made an Act concerning the Queen's 'jowellis,'¹ and the 'advices' which the English government received from Scotland on 31st August explained that the Regent had been authorised to 'intromit' with the jewels.²

Mary had long been apprehensive. On 30th May she had instructed Lord Fleming, who was going to the French court, to protest against the sale in France of any of her gems,³ which, as she had heard, were being sent out of Scotland; and she seems to have heard of the doings of the Scots Parliament almost as soon as did her warders, for on the 1st of September she wrote to Elizabeth⁴ begging her '*Commander que le reste de mes bagues ne soyent vandues, comme ils ont ordonné en leur parlemant; car vous m'avez promis qu'il n'i auroit rien à mon presjudice.*' She added that she wished that Elizabeth had them, for they are not '*viande propre pour traystres et entre vous et moy je ne fays nulle deférance.*' If Elizabeth would take any she fancied as a gift from her (*de ma mayn ou de mon bon gré*) she would be very pleased.

A month later Elizabeth, who, according to her prisoner, had already made a promise on this very matter, wrote to Moray advising him not to sell or otherwise dispose of the jewels of the Queen of Scots, and on 6th October the Regent replied that he would obey her behest.⁵ In the course of the investigations of December 1568, however, Mary's commissioners asserted that Moray and his allies had 'reft and spuilzeit' the Queen's 'jowellis,' and after the Regent's murder, Mary herself wrote to his widow demanding the return of certain jewels, including the 'Great Harry' itself, which had come into her possession.⁶ It does not appear what reply was made, but towards the end of the year we find the Countess begging, and apparently receiving, English protection 'in respect of her persecution by Lord Huntly for the Queen of Scots' jewels.'⁷ Huntly, however, must have had but little success, for throughout the year

¹ *A.P.S.* ii. p. 56.

² *Calendar of State Papers, Scotland*, ii. p. 857.

³ Labanoff's *Lettres de Marie Stuart*, 7 vols. 1844, ii. p. 89.

⁴ *Ibid.* ii. p. 172.

⁵ *Calendar of State Papers, Scotland*, i. p. 267.

⁶ Robertson's *Inventories*, cxxxii. note 2, March 28th, 1570.

⁷ *Calendar of State Papers, Scotland*, i. p. 308.

1574 Morton was engaged in the same old dispute with the lady, now Countess of Argyle,¹ and only in 1575 did the 'Great Harry' return to the royal treasury, where it remained until, soon after 1603, it was broken up, yielding its great diamond to complete a still more magnificent jewel, the 'Mirror of Great Britain.'²

In this controversy one point of peculiar interest presents itself. The Countess of Moray plainly used the argument that the Act of 1568 (which does not survive) gave to the Regent³ 'the dispositioun of our said Soverane Lordis jowellis pertening sumtyme to his Hienes Moder.' The title of this Act of 1568, however, speaks of the 'Queen's' jewels, and Mary herself, at a later date, explicitly stated that Moray had always admitted that the jewels were hers alone. '*Ainsi qu'il a tousjours plainement déclaré devant sa mort, encore que Morthon luy a souvent voulu persuader, comme j'ay este advertie, de les dissiper, affin d'en avoir sa part.*'⁴

It is therefore possible that the Countess did not, as Robertson supposed, receive the jewel as a gift from her lord, but found it amongst his effects after he was dead, and, being pressed to return it, made use of the plea—already employed by Morton himself—that the treasures had become the property of the young king. The 'Great Harry,' of course, was a French jewel, but Mary's provisional testament of 1566 had assigned it to the Scottish crown.⁵ Be this as it may, it seems certain that the Good Regent had extracted from the treasures, and kept in his own possession, certain of the most valuable jewels—a suspicious circumstance to which we shall return.

His successor, the Earl of Lennox, was also guilty of equivocal conduct in this affair of the jewels. On 24th November, 1570,⁶ Mary wrote to the Bishop of Ross bidding him protest to the Queen, that the Earl of Lennox 'persumes to spoilze ws of certane jowellis' which were in the hands of her followers, and that he has 'inpresoned' John Semple for refusing to deliver up those entrusted to his care. Bannatyne's *Memorials*⁷ amplify our information by telling us that the valuables in question were really in the keeping of Semple's wife (Mary Livingstone), and that Blackness Castle was the place of his captivity.

¹ P.C. Reg. ii. p. 330.

² Robertson's *Inventories*, cxxxviii.

³ P.C. Reg. ii. p. 331 ; Robertson's *Inventories*, cxxx, Feb. 3, 1574.

⁴ Labanoff's *Lettres*, iv. p. 91.

⁵ Robertson's *Inventories*, p. 93.

⁶ Labanoff's *Lettres*, iii. pp. 124-5.

⁷ Bannatyne Club, No. 51, p. 348.

Most of the royal treasures, meanwhile, were still in Edinburgh Castle, and in the custody of Kirkcaldy of Grange, who, in accordance with a promise to Sir James Balfour,¹ had received the keys from Moray on 24th September, 1567.² In the hands of this champion the Queen's jewels might be considered safe, but it is evident that even Grange, in the stress of the long siege, 'intromitted' somewhat freely with the gems. In May and August 1570 he was busy strengthening his defences,³ and in August the English government ordered the detention of jewels and valuables sent to be sold in England without Mary's consent.⁴ The English, of course, were not always so scrupulous about the rights of their royal captive; but it was desirable to prevent Grange from realising his assets. The captive herself, it is true, grew somewhat apprehensive, for in December she wrote to Lethington and Grange, stating that she had heard rumours which she did not believe, 'that ye have appointed with my meubelles at the Quene of England's procurement,'⁵ and hoping that if anything of the kind had been done, 'it is rather for my advantage nor otherwise.' Her apprehensions were not altogether unfounded, for some of her jewels were sold in France by Grange's brother, James Kirkcaldy.⁶ But the money gained (or part of it) was devoted to the purchase of munitions, and as the castellan held out so long and so gallantly, in the name of Queen Mary, his action may have been justified.

All that man could do to maintain the defence he did, and only on 29th May, 1573, when his garrison was mutinous, when the water was poisoned, and the walls of the castle had, according to Knox's prophecy, 'runne like a sand-glasse,' did he surrender.⁷ But, though he gave up his person to the English commander, Sir William Drury, Marshal of Berwick, he took care that the castle should be occupied by the Scots, and Morton hastened to instal as captain his own half-brother, George Douglas of Parkhead.⁸ The 'Diurnal' specifically tells us⁹ that the English force marched off without touching the

¹ *Memoirs of his own Life*. By Sir James Melville of Halhill. Bannatyne Club, No. 18, p. 198.

² *Diurnal of Remarkable Occurents*, p. 124.

³ *Ibid.* pp. 174-184.

⁴ *Calendar of State Papers, Scotland*, ii. p. 890.

⁵ Labanoff's *Lettres*, p. 134.

⁶ Calderwood's *History*, iii. p. 74.

⁷ *Ibid.* pp. 211 and 283.

⁸ *Historie of James the Sext*, p. 145; Melville's *Memoirs*, p. 255.

⁹ P. 334.

royal jewels or the artillery; but if this was so the conduct of the commander was less exemplary than that of his men, for it is quite evident that he secured some of the gems.

In August 1573 we find Morton engaged in a correspondence with the Countess of Lennox, urging her to procure the restitution of the gems in the Marshal's possession. Killigrew, in a letter written about a year later,¹ states that these (or perhaps some of them) had been pledged to Drury for £600, but the official inventory² tells a different story. Some of the jewels had been handed over by Archibald Douglas, who would surely have a finger in every pie of doubtful flavour; others, being out at pledge, had been returned to Grange when he was a prisoner in the Marshal's hands, and others again, having been pledged to Mosman the goldsmith (afterwards hanged along with Grange) and returned by him when the Castle fell, were cast by Grange into a coffer in his own room, which coffer afterwards turned up at Drury's lodging. Grange, who was examined on 13th June,³ denied stoutly that he concealed on his person the gems returned by Mosman. 'I brought out nothings with me, but the clothes was one me, and fower crownes in my purse, as I will answer to my God.'

This story of the coffer is a little suspicious, however, and it becomes doubly so when we read in the examination of Sir Robert Melville⁴ that, before the siege, the Marshal 'gat jowellis fra the Lard (Grange) at sindrie tymes. But quhat they wer the deponar knawis not.' It would almost seem as if 'that worthy champion Grange, who perished for being too little ambitious and greedy,' conscious of Morton's hate, had at the last minute attempted to come to terms with the English. 'If Morton gets the jewels,' he may have argued, 'they are lost to the Queen. May they not, then, buy the life of the Queen's champion?'⁵ Vain hope! Elizabeth would not, in mercy, baulk her own partisans of their revenge, and though Drury took the matter heavily, Grange was abandoned to his fate.

Morton was now free to possess himself of the jewels on which he had long had his eye. The Parliament of January 1573 had authorised him to recover from 'the havaris, resettaris

¹ *Calendar of State Papers, Scotland*, i. p. 386.

² Robertson's *Inventories*, cl.

³ *Ibid.* clii.

⁴ *Ibid.* clvii.

⁵ In reading the examinations of the prisoners, however, one gets the impression that Grange, whose fate at Morton's hands was fairly certain, was made the scape-goat—even by Sir Robert Melville.

sellaris and intromettouris' the jewels 'sumtyme pertening to the Quene our Soverane Lordis moder, and pertening to his hienes sen his coronatioun,'¹ and when, on 25th April, the Castle was formally summoned before the English attack, Grange had been expressly required to surrender the jewels along with it.² Spottiswoode³ tells us how the Regent 'relieved by payment of the monys for which they were engaged the jewels impignorated by the Queen,' but he then goes on to denounce Morton's rapacity—amply corroborated by the 'Diurnal'⁴ and the 'Historie'⁵—and it is clear that what the Regent claimed in the name of the King he often put to his own use. Any 'payment of monys' by him is extremely improbable, if other means were available; and the Act of 1573 gave him large discretionary powers which he did not fail to use.

The treasures concealed in the castle, including the famous 'Honours of Scotland,' were rapidly unearthed; but though the jewels found 'hydden in a wooden chest in a cave' were 'many and riche,' the 'moste parte' were 'in gage,' and Morton set to work with vigour. The prisoners were closely examined, as has been shown, and the appearance of Lady Hume before the council, noted by the contributor of *Scots Pearls*,⁶ was part of the same process. Her husband had been one of Grange's garrison and, at the moment of her interrogation, was an invalid prisoner in the Castle.⁷ Grange had pawned some jewels to her, but according to his own account had redeemed them and could produce the 'discharge.' Whether all had been redeemed is not clear; if not there is little chance that the lady ever recovered the £600 which had been advanced on the diamonds and pearls she now surrendered. Lady Lethington (Mary Fleming) was another victim. She had been taken when the Castle fell,⁸ and though we are told by Spottiswoode⁹ that the 'ladies and gentlewomen were licensed to depart,' we find her on 29th June charged on 'pane of rebellious' to produce certain jewels—notably a chain of diamonds and rubies—which were in her hands.¹⁰ It was but three weeks since her husband was dead, and to his body Morton refused any burial till the English Queen made sharp remonstrance; but none the less

¹ *A.P.S.* iii. p. 74.

³ *History*, folio edition, 1677, p. 273.

⁵ P. 147.

⁷ July 4, 1573; *Reg. P.C.* ii. 247.

⁹ P. 272.

² Calderwood's *History*, iii. p. 282.

⁴ P. 336.

⁶ *S.H.R.* xvii. p. 287.

⁸ Calderwood's *History*, iii. p. 283.

¹⁰ *Reg. P.C.* ii. p. 246.

Mary Fleming found courage to resist the inquisitor, and refused either to produce the jewels entrusted to her, or to state any cause why she should not. She was given six days' grace, and the upshot of the affair does not appear.

But if he met with opposition here, Morton was successful elsewhere. He recovered the gems pawned with the Provost of Edinburgh,¹ and he it was who at length managed to extract the 'Great Harry' from the Countess of Argyle. Even from the English he managed to recover something, so that when, in 1578, he was deprived of his office, the inventory of the valuables he gave up 'shows perhaps less wreck than might have been looked for after ten years of tumult and civil war.'² It might even appear that Morton, whom Mary regarded as the arch-traitor, was in a sense the preserver of the royal treasures, although his efforts, ostensibly made on behalf of James VI., may have been directed to his own enrichment.

Mary certainly regarded him as her chief enemy, and her correspondence reveals not only her deep sense of the value of her jewels, but also the genuine alarm she felt when she heard that the Castle had fallen at last. On 3rd August, 1573, she wrote to the French Ambassador, La Mothe Fénelon, begging him to urge Elizabeth '*affin qu'elle me fasse rendre mes pierreries et aultres hardes que j'avois dans le chasteau de Lislebourgh*';³ and as appears from a letter of 27th September,⁴ Elizabeth had promised to attend to the matter. In November⁵ Mary was once more urging her request. Morton had defended himself by stating that the gems had been dissipated by previous castellans (which was true), but the injured Queen expressed the opinion that he had slain the responsible custodians and taken possession himself. Her words make it clear that Elizabeth, who had promised to have the jewels restored to her, had contented herself with writing to the Regent urging that they should be well guarded until James came of age.

Nothing, therefore, came of this negotiation, and in August 1577 Mary was in touch with the arch-enemy himself. She distrusted him profoundly; she even suspected that his overtures might be a snare of Walsingham's planning, but none the less she proposed to follow cautiously the path which had opened so unexpectedly. Morton's offer might be genuine enough, for self-interest would compel him to provide against the day

¹ Robertson's *Inventories*, cxxxvi.

² *Ibid.* cxxxviii.

³ Labanoff's *Lettres*, ii. p. 77.

⁴ *Ibid.* iv. p. 83.

⁵ *Ibid.* iv. pp. 90-91.

when James, reaching maturity, should cast him off; even if it were all deceit, the villain might be caught in his own toils and induced to write something which would ruin him with Elizabeth, and whether his offer were sincere or false, it might be a means to the recovery of the lost treasures.¹

'Quant à mes bagues, qu'il vous envoie ce qu'il en pourra promptement recouvrir, ou s'en charge par inventaire signé de sa main, et du surplus qui est égaré en envoie une déclaration, selon la cognoissance qu'il en a, et la promesse qu'il en a faicte.'

Morton fell in due course, but the Queen did not recover her jewels. The inventories taken at Chartley and Fotheringhay² show that, at the end of her life, Mary still had some of the jewels which figured in the lists of 1561-1566, but these were probably recovered during her brief spell of liberty in 1568. For the grim Regent was not a man to part with anything of value if he could help it, and in this case the last person in the world to press him was Elizabeth. Elizabeth herself was wearing Mary's pearls. Of that there can be no doubt. In August 1573, when Anglo-Scottish relations were dominated by Morton's great effort to collect the scattered gems, Alexander Hay wrote to Killigrew³ that 'some of the jewels have been recovered by the Regent, but not that piece which was in the hands of the Queen of England,' and the correspondence of De La Forest, the French Ambassador in London in 1567-8, reveals a sordid story,⁴ which can be amply confirmed from the calendars of the English State papers.

Early in February 1568, La Forest reported to his master the arrival in London of one 'Elphinstone' 'ung gentilhomme du Conte de Moray,' whose ostensible mission was to explain the proceedings of the Scottish Parliament which had met on 15th December (to condemn Bothwell *inter alia*). The Ambassador, however, believed that he had other business to negotiate, and suspected that his real object was to propose a strict alliance, on terms that Scotland should accept English suzerainty and Elizabeth should acknowledge James as her heir. A few months later Elphinstone reappeared upon another errand. On 2nd May La Forest explained to the King that he had come up, under the protection of Throckmorton, and that he had brought

¹ *Ibid.* iv. p. 384; v. p. 28.

² *Ibid.* vii. pp. 231-274.

³ *Calendar of State Papers, Scotland*, i. p. 380.

⁴ Teulet's *Relations Politiques de la France et de l'Espagne avec l'Ecosse*, 5 vols. 1862, ii. pp. 339-368; Labanoff's *Lettres*, vii. pp. 129-134.

with him some magnificent and valuable jewelry belonging to Queen Mary. This had been inspected by Elizabeth on 1st May, in the presence of Pembroke and Leicester, who had been astonished at the beauty of the gems. Writing on the same day to Catherine de Médicis, the Ambassador added that he knew neither the 'quality nor the quantity' of the jewels, though he knew they were highly valued. He thought that, if Catherine wished to buy all or some, it could be managed, for though Elizabeth would have the first option, he thought she was too cautious to buy. There was no need for haste, he concluded, for the affair was being kept very secret. The fact is that the Queen Mother had told De La Forest to keep a look-out for these jewels, but that he himself was not anxious to meddle in the matter, for in a third letter which he wrote on 2nd May (to M. de Fizes, Secrétaire d'Etat), he explained that he had written to the Queen Mother only in consequence of her instructions to him; if anything was to be done, he should be told as soon as possible, but he added, '*Nous avons assez affaire de nostre argent ailleurs.*'

A few days later (8th May), De La Forest was able to give more detailed information. Amongst the jewels sent were the '*grosses perles*' about which Catherine had formerly enquired, and as he had heard '*il y en a six cordons où elles sont enfilées comme patenostres, et oultre cela, environ vingt-cinq à part et séparées les unes des autres.*' These separate pearls, he added, were bigger and finer than those on the threads, 'most of them as big as nutmegs.' They had been variously valued at 10,000, 12,000 and even 16,000 crowns, but his own opinion was that they would go at the middle figure. He was correct, for a week later he wrote announcing that the transaction was complete. Elizabeth had bought her dear cousin's pearls for 12,000 crowns, or £3600 sterling.

The Queen Mother made the best of her disappointment. On receipt of the Ambassador's earlier letters she had written to bid him buy if he could, but apparently before her letter was despatched the news came that Elizabeth had forestalled her (21st May). Accordingly she submitted gracefully. It was very reasonable that Elizabeth should have the pearls, she would like her to buy all the jewels '*et, si je les avoiz, je les luy envoieirois.*' Sour grapes, your Majesty! If you cannot have the pearls you do not want anything else.

The Ambassador's story is correct in almost every detail,

and indeed it might well be. For he had corrupted a secretary of Sir Nicholas Throckmorton, who always played a great part in Scottish affairs, and under whose patronage Elphinstone had been introduced.¹ Thus possessed of inside information, he was able to prime the 'Sieur de Bethon,' who visited Elizabeth en route from Scotland to France, so effectually that, in the course of an interview, Beaton managed to get the Queen to make an admission about the jewels. All this, of course, rests on his own statement, but his story is strongly corroborated by circumstantial evidence.

He represents the sending of Elphinstone as very secret, and in point of fact there is no reference to his mission in the contemporary histories. Calderwood, Sir James Melville, the 'Diurnal,' the 'History' and Spottiswoode (hardly contemporary of course) are all silent in the matter. And this silence becomes all the more remarkable when we find frequent references to the French Ambassador Beaumont, who came north just as Elphinstone came south, and who (says De La Forest) actually met him ten leagues north of Berwick.² But if the histories are silent, the State Papers have much to tell us. Nicoll Elphinstone—not 'Lord' Elphinstone, as Teulet has it—was the trusted servant of Moray who was sent on to herald his return to Scotland in July 1567.³ Early in January 1568 he received from Moray letters of credit to the Queen and Cecil,⁴ and on 31st January he had arrived in London and been heard by certain of the Council.⁵ All this tallies exactly with the French Ambassador's account of his first mission; and his version of the second is confirmed with equal precision.

On 20th April Elphinstone received from the Regent, then at Glasgow, a fresh letter of credit to Cecil,⁶ and on 22nd April he arrived at Berwick.⁷ Now Beaumont had arrived in Berwick on the 21st and had gone on at once,⁸ so that the envoys would meet just about ten leagues north of Berwick, just as De La Forest said. Other documents in the same series⁹ make it

¹ Teulet's *Relations Politiques*, ii. p. 362.

² Labanoff's *Lettres*, vii. p. 130.

³ *Calendar of State Papers, Foreign, Elizabeth*, viii. No. 1459 and No. 1470.

⁴ *Ibid.* Nos. 1907, 1908.

⁵ *Ibid.* No. 1975.

⁶ *Ibid.* No. 2136.

⁷ *Ibid.* No. 2138.

⁸ Teulet's *Relations Politiques*, ii. p. 351.

⁹ *Calendars of State Papers, Foreign, Elizabeth*, viii. Nos. 2160, 2233, 2246, 2260.

clear that Elphinstone's official business was the settlement of the borders. An affair of this kind, however, did not necessarily involve a visit to London—the emissary, in point of fact, did visit Carlisle as well as Berwick—and certainly it did not require the secrecy which veiled the whole business. This was very complete. La Forest, as has been shown, was well-informed; yet even he wrote as if the jewels were still for sale on 8th May, whereas Elphinstone had concluded his business some days earlier. The news of Mary's escape had reached London, and Elizabeth, who was preparing congratulatory letters to her dear cousin, eased her conscience by dispatching Moray's envoy with a meanness which disgusted Throckmorton.¹

Was Moray, then, the vendor of the pearls? Elphinstone was undoubtedly his servant; indeed, as early as 1565, a confidential servant.² He is always described as Moray's man, and it was from Moray that he got his letters of credit. Now Moray was notoriously poor. His reliance on English gold in 1565 has been made a perpetual reproach to him,³ and at this period⁴ he was apparently in his usual penury. At this time, however, he received authority to handle the Queen's jewels, and the affair of the 'Great Harry' shows that he interpreted his powers somewhat widely. Without opportunity, of course, authority might avail little, but, as has been shown, he had opportunity enough between 5th September, when Balfour surrendered the Castle, and 24th September, when Grange was installed. The natural conclusion is that he secured, amongst other valuables, Queen Mary's pearls, which he wished to sell in order to provide himself with cash. Elphinstone may have broached the subject on his first journey south (else why the secrecy?), or it may have been broached to him; and on his second journey he took the jewels with him.

Moray's action may be justified on the ground of necessity. His business was to govern Scotland, and to govern without money was impossible. If, however, it be felt that defence is required, one line alone presents itself. Elphinstone was also the confidant of Morton,⁵ and indeed he was, some years later,

¹ Teulet's *Relations Politiques*, ii. p. 357.

² *Calendars of State Papers, Scotland*, i. p. 215.

³ *Ibid.* i. 225, 227.

⁴ *Calendars of State Papers, Foreign, Elizabeth*, viii. No. 1732.

⁵ Calderwood's *History*, iii. p. 387; Melville's *Memoirs*, p. 263.

actually employed on the 'great matter' of having Mary sent secretly to Scotland for execution.¹

Is it possible, then, that the 'Good Regent' sent Elphinstone south on purely diplomatic business, and that the wicked Morton seized the opportunity to dispose of the jewels, the fruits of his guilty collusion with Balfour? Surely this is special pleading. Elphinstone's connection with Morton seems to have become intimate only after Moray's death, and the whole circumstances of the mission, its swiftness, its secrecy and the connivance of Throckmorton, all seem to prove that the Regent himself was the principal in the business.

Mary, then, was deceived when she regarded her half-brother as a safe custodian of her jewels; no less was she deceived when she appealed to Elizabeth for aid; but most of all was she deceived as to herself. There she was, poor prisoner, imagining that she was still the great pivot of politics, and that her jewels were too sacred to be touched, whereas even her friends were constrained to despoil her, and her importance in the diplomatic world grew steadily less. It was only after she was out of the way that the 'Armada' came. In her prison then we must leave her, and for the prison's sake we may forgive her some dishonesty, some selfishness, and a certain megalomania; but what are we to think of the Queen who promised to help to recover her treasures, and who actually wrote to Moray and to Morton about the stolen goods when she herself was something very like a 'resettar'?

What exactly were the jewels which Elizabeth got? Reference has already been made to the '*grosse perles*,' which certainly accompanied Mary from France, and which were assigned, in the arrangement of 1566, to the houses of Guise and Aumale. It was probably some of these which Elizabeth bought, for Catherine de Médicis was plainly acquainted with the pearls in question. De La Forest's description undoubtedly suggests the '*grosse perles enfilées*' of the 1566 inventory. Further than this it is hard to go, for by the time the Ambassador's informant saw the jewels, the original pieces may have been broken up. Three of Mary's resplendent ornaments were in themselves sufficient to supply over 150 great pearls, a girdle, a 'cottouere' or 'edging' or 'beading,' and a 'dizain,' or rope with the pearls divided into tens. De La Forest's reference to a paternoster might perhaps suggest the 'dizain'—the big beads which divided

¹ Tytler's *History of Scotland*, 9 vols. 1841, vii. pp. 314, 321, 336.

the groups of ten were called 'pater'—but very possibly all he meant was that the pearls were strung.

None of the ornaments mentioned in the inventory seem to have been in 'six cordons,' and in any case, Elizabeth, whose common-sense was more highly developed than her sense of honour, would probably break the pieces up at once if they were intact when she got them. Hay's letter, it is true, does seem to speak of one particular 'piece,' but I have tried in vain to draw conclusions from a comparison of the authentic pictures of the two Queens. Gloriana is, as a rule, so thickly encrusted with gems, that accurate observation seems to be impossible.

J. DUNCAN MACKIE.

Early Orkney Rentals in Scots Money or in Sterling

IN examining the earliest of Peterkin's *Rentals of the County of Orkney* recently, a somewhat surprising circumstance came to light. The rental in question is that of Henry Lord Sinclair ('that deit at Flowdin') for the years 1502-03, compiled immediately after he had obtained a fresh lease from the Crown of the lordships of Orkney and Shetland. In the *summa* at the end of each parish the money values of the total rents and duties are given, and one would naturally suppose that these would be expressed in Scots money. This was the assumption explicitly made by Captain Thomas in his otherwise very acute and exhaustive account of this rental, published in the *Proceedings* of the Society of Antiquaries of Scotland for 1883-84; and, so far as I am aware, he has been followed by any other writers who have touched upon the subject.

Actually, however, when the rental is closely examined there can be no doubt at all that the conversions are expressed in sterling money, and this completely alters estimates of Orkney rents and taxation at that period. Some of the clearest pieces of evidence may be briefly summarized.

1. A comparison of the rent, in Scots money, which Lord Sinclair paid for his lease (see *Exchequer Rolls*), with its returns as disclosed in his rentals, show that if those returns were expressed in Scots money also, he would have been a heavy loser by the transaction; but as some of the factors are a little uncertain (such as his returns from Shetland), we may confine ourselves here to the consideration of a single item—the rent of Burray. For this island £20 Scots was paid by the Bishop of Orkney to the Crown and allowed to Lord Sinclair in the account, while the entire total of rents and duties given in the rental was £10 12/11½.¹ If this £10 12/11½ were Scots money

¹ Misprinted as £41 12/11½ in Peterkin. £10 12/11½ is the actual value of the rents given in kind, and is the figure in the 1492 Rental.

the tacksman was actually paying nearly twice as much as he got from the island. So it clearly must have been sterling.

2. The *lowest* conversion price of Orkney beir given in the *Exchequer Rolls* between the years 1476 and 1509 was 4/2 Scots per boll. Sixteen bolls made a chalder, and 36 Orkney meils of beir also made a chalder. The lowest recorded price of a meil of Orkney beir in these *Rolls* was therefore 1/10 Scots, or a trifle over 6d. sterling. The standard Orkney price both in the 1492 and 1502-03 rentals was 4d., which therefore must obviously have been sterling money. It may be added that this difference between 4d. and 6d. (in some years 1/-) shows that money was dear and prices low in Orkney compared with Scotland.

3. The purchase price of an Orkney merkland at that time was one merk (13/4) 'Inglis'—*i.e.* sterling. But the standard rent was 10 settens of malt, equal to 10d. in rental money. If this money were Scots, then Orkney land must have been selling at over 53 years' purchase! This, of course, is a preposterous rate; 10d. sterling gives 16 years' purchase, and the '5th part fall' very commonly found in the 1502-03 rental (where most rents were down) gives the normal rate of 20 years.

4. In this old rental we find Sir William Sinclair of Warsetter, Lord Sinclair's brother, getting a tack of 13d. land in Tuquoy in Westray for 'thre pundis Scottis payment allanerlie' (only), in place of the duties and old rent. The 'allanerlie' of course implies a reduction, and in point of fact all Sir William's tacks were given him at much reduced rents. But the duties came to 14/1, and the old rent to £1 16/- according to this rental, and £1 19/- according to the 1492 rental. The previous total payment was thus either £2 10/1 or £2 13/1, so that if this had been Scots money, Sir William would have been paying a considerably enhanced rent. It must therefore have been sterling.

Several other cases of payments may be noted, in which the currency must have been Scots, in contradistinction to the usual currency of the rental, especially where 'fees' are mentioned. Thus William 'Swoundyis' got the 'grassum' of Brek in Deerness 'ilk 3 year 20/- in his fee': 20/- at the rental conversion rate meant 40 meils of grassum every three years, and as he only paid 20 meils in annual rent, such an exorbitant extra is obviously impossible. The 20/- was plainly Scots money.

One final instance is particularly instructive and conclusive. The whole rent and duties of Tofts in St. Ola were 'assignit

for 20/- in Angus Portaris fee yeirlie.' The value of these duties and rent was $5/5\frac{1}{3}$ in rental money, and thus this sum was equivalent to 20/- in the currency of Angus Porter's fee. The ratio of the two currencies works out at 3.6 to 1, and that is the exact ratio of sterling to Scots money in 1503.

Curious though it seems at first sight that a Scottish nobleman's rental should be expressed in sterling money, especially when his accounts with the Crown for the same lands were all in Scots currency, the explanation is really not far to seek. Orkney had only comparatively recently (in 1468) come under the Scottish Crown, and before that date sterling money was the currency generally used, as is shown by the one earlier document where many details of Orkney affairs are given: the 'Complaint' of 1424 or 1425. Many fines and the value of a number of articles are specified, and each time they are expressed in sterling money.

Among these items is one that amply confirms the rental values as being sterling: David Menzies, governor of the islands and factor for the young earl, is stated to have 'collected (for his own benefit) out of the earl's rents . . . 800 pounds English since his father died and a year before he died.' The maximum time covered was six years, which gives an average of £133 6/8d. sterling a year; and Menzies cannot have had the audacity to pocket the *whole* rents. Actually the total rent in 1502-03, allowing for parishes omitted and items not entered in the parish tackmen's accounts, works out about £200 a year—probably rather less. So that this £200 could not possibly have been Scots money. In fact, it is clear that the lost ancient rentals of Orkney must have been in sterling money, and hence the same currency was retained throughout Lord Sinclair's leases.

J. STORER CLOUSTON.

James Boswell as Essayist¹

IN speaking of James Boswell in the rôle of Essayist, I take as my text a collection of seventy essays contributed by him to the *London Magazine* from October 1777 to July 1783, a period of five years and nine months. They are now almost forgotten and not easy to obtain; early numbers of the magazine in which they lie buried are scarce; so scarce indeed, that as far as I can discover, complete sets are possessed by few public libraries. It is not, however, on account of their rarity that I venture to bring them again into the light; a work may be rare and yet the lawful prey of Oblivion: it is rather, because I see in them new material for the study of Boswell the *man* and of his *magnum opus*—material which has been neglected by critics, hostile and friendly alike.

Although published anonymously, with the whimsical title *The Hypochondriack*, there is no question about the authorship. Boswell himself, in a letter still extant, sent a copy of his ninth paper to his friend Sir Alexander Dick of Prestonfield, inviting criticism; to his bosom friend Temple on 4th January, 1780, he wrote: 'I really think my *Hypochondriack* goes on wonderfully well'; and in the *Life of Johnson* there is explicit acknowledgment: 'I told him I should send him some essays which I had written which I hoped he would be so good as to read and pick out the good ones. *Johnson*: Nay Sir, send me only the good ones; dont make me pick them.'

The essays are written, I need hardly say, on the approved eighteenth century essay model: each has its motto from Greek or Latin author: all deal with hackneyed subjects, *Fear*, *Excess*, *Luxury*, *Melancholy*, *Praise and Censure*, *Government*, *Dedications*, and the like, round which hundreds of essays had been written long before Boswell took up his pen to swell the number. Sometimes a theme runs into three papers; that is so

¹Read before the English Association (Glasgow Centre), February 15th, 1919.

in the case of *Love, Marriage, Death, Country and Town Life*, while *Drinking* has four to itself. Four, written earlier than 1777, have been introduced into the series evidently at times when the printer was clamant for copy. They are only interesting as showing that while a mere youth the author had an ambition to enter the lists as an essayist and that occasionally he had contributed to the *London Advertiser*. One of these (*number X of the series*) opens thus: 'My scheme of writing a periodical paper, entitled *The Hypochondriack*, was formed a good many years ago, while I was travelling upon the continent; and in the eagerness of realising it and seeing how it would do, I sat down one evening at Milan and wrote *The Hypochondriack* No. X, pleasing myself with the fancy that I was so far advanced, and with the enthusiasm which critics ascribe to epic bards, 'plunging at once into the middle of things.' That essay was hastily composed in a gay flow of spirits thirteen years ago and I shall present it to my readers as my tenth number without making any variation whatever upon it':—a characteristic Boswellian confidence.

My difficulty has been to decide how best to present these forgotten essays to a new audience. When one starts off to read them for the first time they appear to be little more than an ambitious attempt to produce a work on the lines of the *Rambler*. That book of Johnson's, as one should expect, was the exemplar, and some things gravely uttered by Boswell are reminiscent of it. But the echoes are only occasional, and long before the seventieth essay has been reached, the peculiar personal note of the Biographer, which never fails as passport to indulgent attention, will have discovered itself even to the most cursory of readers. The literary quality of the essays is fine, as might easily be exemplified by selected passages: in them we become acquainted with his thoughts, moods, and ambitions; with his eager interest and restless curiosity in *life* and notably also with some of his *methods* in striving to attain to literary craftsmanship. He puts something of himself into all his counsels, and freshens up his subject by racy anecdotes, illustrations and quotations. But unless I am mistaken the *documentary* value exceeds the literary, and for my present purpose at any rate will call for most attention.

In October 1777, when the first essay made its appearance, Boswell was verging on thirty-eight years of age. In verse and prose he had practised his pen assiduously from boyhood, and

published freely, though nearly always anonymously, but his one serious contribution to literature, as yet, had been the *Journal of a Tour to Corsica*. In turning now to essay-writing it was not, I feel sure, with any expectation that thereby he would increase his literary reputation. In 1763, or soon after, he had deliberately chosen as his task, biography, with Johnson as subject, and ever since had pursued it steadily. His Corsican Journal, particularly the second part, the parleyings with Paoli, was an experiment in *method*, a preparation for the achievement of the masterpiece at which he secretly aimed. What then was the purpose of the Essays? His contemporaries, except perhaps his friend Temple, could not have answered that question, for the answer was involved in what Carlyle calls Boswell's 'great secret.' Ostensibly they were written for the author's pleasure and to entertain readers, the pretended aim of every author since books began to be written. Let me quote a short passage from the prefatory essay :

'To undertake the writing of a large book is like entering on a long and difficult journey, in the course of which much fatigue and uneasiness must be undergone, while at the same time one is uncertain of reaching the end of it; whereas writing a short essay is like taking a pleasant airing that enlivens and invigorates by the exercise which it yields while the design is gratified in its completion. Men of the greatest parts and application are at times averse to labour for any continuance, and could they not employ their pens on lighter pieces, would at those times remain in total inactivity. Writing such essays therefore, may fill up the interstices of their lives and occupy moments which would otherwise be lost. To other men who have not yet attained to any considerable degree of constancy in application, the writing of periodical essays may serve to strengthen their faculties and prepare them for the execution of more important works.'

To Boswell himself these words had a fuller meaning than to any of his readers. The fact is that in 1777 his life-task for the time was at a stop through no fault of his own; and being unwilling to remain inactive he was now wishful to fill up an interstice in his own life, strengthen his faculties, and prepare for the execution of a more important work. Although the world did not know it, his own *Journal of a Tour to the Hebrides* was already prepared for the press and was only held back for the reason that he did not wish to offend Johnson. The famous trip had been discussed between him and Johnson in the first year of their acquaintance; it was accomplished in 1773, and two years later worthily narrated in Johnson's *Account of a Journey to the Western Islands of Scotland*. But to that work

Boswell had always desired to write what he called a Supplement. During the trip he had kept a diary, as his custom was, of which Johnson in one of his letters to Mrs. Thrale says: 'Boswell writes a regular journal of our travels which I think contains as much of what I say and do as of all other occurrences together.' From the Journal itself, as published, we know now that Johnson frequently perused it: 'He came to my room this morning before breakfast to read my Journal, which he had done all along. He often before said, 'I take great delight in reading it.' To-day he said, 'You improve: it grows better and better.' I observed, there was a danger of my getting a habit of writing in a slovenly manner. 'Sir, said he, it is not written in a slovenly manner. It might be printed, were the subject fit for printing.' And in two letters to Temple we discover the reason for the book being withheld. On May 10th, 1775, Boswell writes: 'I have not written out another line of my remarks on the Hebrides. I found it impossible to do it in London. Besides, Dr. Johnson does not seem very desirous I should publish any Supplement. Between ourselves he is not apt to encourage one to share reputation with himself. But dont you think I may write out my remarks in Scotland and send them to be revised by you, and then they may be published freely? Give me your opinion of this.' And on November 6th, 1775, he writes: 'Dr. Johnson has said nothing to me of my remarks during my journey with him, which I wish to write. Shall I task myself to write so much of them a week and send to you for revisal? If I dont publish them now they will be good materials for my *Life of Johnson*.'

That last sentence explains much. The *Journal of a Tour to the Hebrides*, the most finished kit-kat portrait in our literature, was intended to be the first instalment of the *magnum opus*, but could not be published during Johnson's lifetime and in consequence might even need to be recast when the second instalment, the *Life of Johnson*, the full length portrait, came to be executed.

Fortunately the Hebridean Journal has reached us in its original form; and no editor, with Mr. Croker before his eyes, is ever likely to have the temerity to attempt to foist it into the text of the *Life of Johnson*.

Seeing now that the Essays were written after the completion of the first instalment of the Biography, and during what looks like a period of enforced suspension of the life task, it has still to be shown that in writing them Boswell was sharpening his pencil and preparing for the execution of something more important—

the great *Life of Johnson*. All the papers, with the exception of the four early ones already mentioned, were, in my opinion, written mainly with the object of clarifying his mind on points discussed between him and Johnson during the fourteen years of their acquaintance, and were in great part derived from and suggested by the Journals and note books containing the memoranda of these discussions. When read collectively and with the *Life of Johnson* steadily kept in view, that, I believe, will be admitted by all readers. As every one knows, a very considerable part of the Biography is made up of Johnson's observations on what are called commonplace subjects: many of them subjects treated by him in the *Rambler*, *Idler*, or other occasional papers. One has only to glance at the full index compiled by Dr. Birkbeck Hill to realise that. But in the Biography, as Mr. Augustine Birrell remarks, Johnson's 'recorded utterances cannot be reconciled with any one view of anything. When crossed in conversation or goaded by folly he was capable of anything'; and no one knew it better than his Biographer, whose gentle demurrers from many of the magisterial *dicta* have been so cunningly introduced into the text. To attempt to show in detail the relation of the essays to the Biography is impossible, within the limits at my disposal, and for that reason a few examples culled from the essays, must suffice, which, if they do not demonstrate, will at least suggest what I mean by *relation*. In some of the passages I shall also try to indicate the biographical value of the essays and to communicate something of the Boswellian flavour. A more enjoyable hour perhaps might be spent in discussing the purely literary merits of the essays; but at present I am directing attention almost exclusively to their value as fresh material for the study of Boswell and the *Life of Johnson*, his great achievement in the field of biography.

I begin with the essay on Diaries (*number LXVI of the series*).

'The ancient precept *γνωθι σεαυτον*—'know thyself,' which by some is ascribed to Pythagoras, and by others is so venerated as to be supposed one of the sacred responses of the Oracle at Delphos, cannot be so perfectly obeyed without the assistance of a register of one's life. For memory is so frail and variable, and so apt to be disturbed and confused by the perpetual succession of external objects and mental operations, that if our situation be not limited indeed, it is very necessary to have our thoughts and actions preserved in a mode not subject to change, if we would have a *fair* and distinct view of our character.

'This consideration joined with 'the importance of a man to himself' has had some effect in all times. . . . 'The importance of a man to himself'

simply considered is not a subject of ridicule, for in reality a man is of more importance to himself than all other things or persons can be. The ridicule is, when self importance is obtruded upon others to whom the private concerns of an individual are quite insignificant. A diary therefore . . . may be of valuable use to the person who writes it, and yet if brought forth to the public eye may expose him to contempt, unless in the estimation of the few who think much and minutely, and therefore know well of what little parts the principal extent of human existence is composed.'

Quoting Lord Bacon, 'It is a strange thing that in sea voyages, where there is nothing to be seen but sky and sea, men should make diaries; but in land travel, where so much is to be observed, for the most part they omit it, as if chance were fitter to be registered than observation,' he proceeds to tell of a visit made by him to India House for the sole purpose of examining the journals, the log-books as we should say, kept by captains of the company's ships. Then coming back to his main theme he says:

'But it is a work of very great labour and difficulty to keep a journal of life, occupied in various pursuits, mingled with concomitant speculations and reflections, in so much, that I do not think it possible to do it unless one has a talent for abridging. I have tried it in that way, when it has been my good fortune to live in a multiplicity of instructive and entertaining scenes, and I have thought my notes like portable soup, of which a little bit by being dissolved in water will make a good large dish; for their substance by being expanded in words would fill a volume.¹ Sometimes it has occurred to me that a man should not live more than he can record, as a farmer should not have a larger crop than he can gather in. And I have regretted that there is no invention for getting an immediate and exact transcript of the mind, like that instrument by which a copy of a letter is at once taken off.' . . .

'The chief objection against keeping a diary fairly registered with the state of mind and the little occurrences by which we are intimately affected is, the danger of its falling into the hands of other people, who may make use of it to our prejudice. . . . I have kept a Diary for considerable portions of my life. And in order to guard against detection of what I wish to be concealed, I once wrote parts of it in a character of my own invention, by way of a cypher, but having given over the practice for several years, I forgot my alphabet, so that all that is written in it must for ever remain as unintelligible to myself as others. This was merely a loss. But a much worse circumstance happened. I left a large parcel of diary in Holland to

¹ In *Dr. Johnson His Friends and His Critics*, p. 190, Dr. Birkbeck Hill discusses two questions (1) 'How much of Johnson's reported conversation is his own and how much Boswell's?' and (2) 'Whenever Boswell pretends to give Johnson's exact words, does he, even though he omits a great deal, show in what he gives, the literal accuracy of a shorthand reporter?' Boswell's explicit statement in the *Essays* has escaped the notice of all commentators.

be sent after me to Britain with other papers. It was fairly written out and contained many things which I should be very sorry to have communicated except to my most intimate friends; the packages having been loosened, some of the other papers were chafed and spoiled with water, but the Diary was missing. I was sadly vexed, and felt as if a part of my vitals had been separated from me, and all the consolation I received from a very good friend, to whom I wrote in the most earnest anxiety to make enquiry if it could be found anywhere, was that he could discover no trace of it, though he had made diligent search in all the little houses, so trifling did it appear to him. I comfort myself with supposing that it has been totally destroyed in the carrying. For, indeed, it is a strange disagreeable thought, that what may be properly enough called so much of one's mind, should be in the possession of a stranger, or perhaps of an enemy.'

Then after remarking that a diary will afford the most authentic materials for writing a biography which, 'if the subject be at all eminent, will always be an acceptable addition to literature,' he goes on :

'I was lately reading the Diary of that illustrious and much injured prelate Archbishop Laud, which the violent and oppressive rage of rebellion dragged forth as part of the evidence against him. It is estimable not only for the fragments which it contains of important history, but for the tender, humane, and pious sentiments which it undeniably proves were the constant current of his mind.'

Then he gives a few specimen entries. Laud's Diary he contrasts with another, and this for my present purpose, is the most important thing in the essay.

'There is,' he says, 'a Diary of a very different character called a Spiritual Diary and Soliloquies, by John Rutty, M.D., published in two volumes quarto. In the Critical Review for March 1777 there is an account of this singular curious work, introduced with some observations so good, that in justice both to the writer of them and my readers I cannot but transcribe them. [Then follows the quotation.] Dr. Rutty was an Irish physician of merit and one of the people called Quakers. His diary is written with an honest simplicity and conscientious self examination which are rarely to be found, so that while we cannot but laugh, we must feel a charitable regard for him.' [Then nine specimens of the entries are given.]

That diary of Dr. Rutty is now among the books that are no books, but his name and the fact that he was a diarist will be remembered as long as English is spoken, for that whole passage is transferred to the *Life of Johnson* (anno 1777; vol. iii. p. 197 Napier's edition).

'He was much diverted with an article which I shewed him in the Critical Review of this year, giving an account of a curious publication,

entitled 'A Spiritual Diary and Soliloquies' by John Rutty, M.D. Dr. Rutty was one of the people called Quakers, a physician of some eminence in Dublin and author of several works. This Diary which was kept from 1753 to 1775, the year in which he died, and was now published in two volumes octavo, exhibited, in the simplicity of his heart, a minute and honest register of the state of his mind; which, though frequently laughable enough, was not more so than the history of many men would be, if recorded with equal fairness. The following specimens were extracted by the reviewers.' [Then they follow.] 'Johnson laughed heartily at this good Quietist's self condemning minutes; particularly at his mentioning, with such a serious regret, occasional instances of *swinishness* in eating, and *doggedness of temper*. He thought the observations of the Critical Reviewers upon the importance of a man to himself so ingenious and so well expressed that I shall here introduce them.' [Then follows the citation, the same as in the essay.]

In the Biography, Boswell has corrected *quarto* to *octavo*, added a few dates, and slightly polished his periods here and there. But he has also lifted from another part of the essay the phrase 'the importance of a man to himself,' showing that his 'lucubrations,' as he styled the essays, were used in the preparation of the final text of the *Life of Johnson*.

Another excellent essay, 'Conversation among Intimates,' (*number XXV of the series*) is brought to a conclusion in characteristic fashion:

'There is, no doubt, as the wise man tells us, 'a time for all things,' and while I am inculcating gay relaxation with the same earnestness which is generally employed in inculcating grave assiduity I do most certainly not mean to recommend relaxation at random. The Roman poet says, *dulce est desipere in loco, it is agreeable to play the fool in a proper place*, or to express it fully in the English idiom, *time and place convenient*. I would add to time and place, *convenientia personae*, something suitable to character. For, the relaxation of one person should be very different from the relaxation of another. I would not have a judge give way to an impulse of animal spirits, and be a merry fellow while he is upon the bench, nor would I have him dance in a public assembly room; and indeed a person of that grave dignity of station should be seen in his hour of amusement but by very few, as there are very few who can distinguish the substantial general character itself from the occasional appearances which it assumes. Still more should a clergyman be upon his guard against having the most innocent levity of behaviour in him, seen by others. For as the usefulness of his office depends much upon the weight of authority which opinion gives him it is his duty to take care that that opinion be not lessened. Levity of behaviour in him, if not in excess, is clearly no evil in respect to himself only, and therefore he may indulge it in private. But it is an evil in respect to others, in whose imaginations the venerable impression of the sacred character must not be at all effaced. There is a noted story that Dr.

Clarke, the celebrated metaphysician, and one or two more eminent men of his time, were diverting themselves quite in a playful manner; but when Clarke perceived a certain beau approaching, he instantly made a transition to composed decorum, calling out with admirable good sense, 'Come, my boys, let's be grave, there comes a fool.' There cannot be a better illustration than this of my opinion as to the prudent conduct of relaxation with due discernment as to those before whom a man of respectable character should give a loose to it.'

Now, as is well known, when the Hebridean Journal was published the author was subjected to so much abuse and ridicule for the figure he himself cut in the book, that he felt it necessary in the splendid dedication to Sir Joshua Reynolds of the *Life of Johnson* to take notice of the sour critics. This short passage from that dedication is another example of *relation*.

'In one respect, this work will in some passages be different from the former. In my 'Tour' I was almost unboundedly open in my communications; and from my eagerness to display the wonderful fertility and readiness of Johnson's wit, freely shewed to the world its dexterity, even when I was myself the object of it. I trusted that I should be liberally understood, as knowing very well what I was about, and by no means as simply unconscious of the pointed effects of the satire. I own indeed, that I was arrogant enough to suppose that the tenor of the rest of the book would sufficiently guard me against such a strange imputation. But it seems I judged too well of the world; for though I could scarcely believe it, I have been undoubtedly informed, that many persons, especially in distant quarters, not penetrating enough into Johnson's character, so as to understand his mode of treating his friends, have arraigned my judgment, instead of seeing that I was sensible of all that they could observe.

'It is related of the great Dr. Clarke, that when in one of his leisure hours he was unbending himself with a few friends in the most playful and frolicsome manner, he observed Beau Nash approaching; upon which he suddenly stopped. 'My boys,' said he, 'let us be grave, here comes a fool.' The world, my friend, I have found to be a great fool as to that particular on which it has become necessary to speak very plainly. I have therefore in this work been more reserved; and though I tell nothing but the truth, I have still kept in my mind that the whole truth is not always to be exposed.'

For the anecdote so aptly used in his own defence Boswell turned to one of his essays, improving it by slightly condensing it.

To avoid a tedious minuteness I shall now group together a few more illustrations which will not require such lengthy citations and comparisons. Let me begin with the minor poet, Thomson of the *Seasons*. Johnson always regards Thomson as a true poet, but Boswell inclines to qualify his praise: 'His *Seasons* is indeed full of elegant and pious sentiments, but a rank soil,

may a dunghill will produce beautiful flowers.' In the essay (*number LXX of the series*):

'There may be fine thoughts on the surface of a coarse mind, as beautiful flowers are found growing upon rocks, upon bogs, nay upon dunghills.'

Both in the Biography and the essay (*number XVI of the series*) the same quotation from Lyttleton is applied to Thomson, namely, that 'he loathed much to write.'

In the essay *Pleasure in Excess* (*number IV of the series*; Jan. 1778), we read:

'Even an excess of pleasure is an evil. For, strange as it may seem, it is most certainly true, that in our present state of being an extreme degree of pleasure turns into pain; as the author of *Virtue*, an ethic epistle, has very happily expressed it—

Till languor suffering on the rack of bliss
Confess that man was never made for this.'

In the Biography (anno 1777; vol. iii. p. 221, Napier's edition):

'The feeling of languor which succeeds the animation of gaiety is itself a very severe pain; and when the mind is then vacant, a thousand disappointments and vexations rush in and excruciate. Will not many even of my fairest readers allow this to be true?'

And in a footnote to the passage he adds:

'But I recollect a couplet apposite to my subject in *Virtue*, an ethic epistle, a beautiful and instructive poem by an anonymous writer, in 1758, who, treating of pleasure in excess, says

Till languor, suffering on the rack of bliss
Confess that man was never made for this.'

Again, in the essay (*number XIV of the series*) discussing reviews and reviewers, Boswell says: 'And we have seen from the evidence brought by Dr. Shebbeare in a court of justice, that the gain of reviewers is very liberal.' In the Biography (anno 1783) we read: 'I mentioned the very liberal payment which had been received for reviewing; and as evidence of that, it had been proved in a trial, that Dr. Shebbeare had received six guineas a sheet.'

In the essay, *Hypochondria and Madness* (*number V of the series*) Boswell carefully defines these ailments, and combats the opinion that there is no difference between them, and says:

'Mr. Green in his poem *The Spleen*, of which I have heard Mr. Robert Dodsley boast as a capital poem of the present age, preserved in his collection, has enumerated exceedingly well the effects of hypochondria,' etc.;

and turning to the Biography we read :

‘On Saturday September 20th after breakfast . . . Dr. Johnson and I had a serious conversation by ourselves on melancholy and madness ; which he was, I always thought erroneously, inclined to confound together’ (vol. iii. 201) ;

and in another place this :

‘I related a dispute between Goldsmith and Mr. Robert Dodsley one day when they and I were dining at Tom Davies in 1762. Goldsmith asserted that there was no poetry produced in this age. Dodsley appealed to his own collection and maintained that though you could not find a palace like Dryden’s Ode on St. Cecilia’s Day, you had villages composed of very pretty houses : and he mentioned particularly *The Spleen*.’

Boswell manifestly was consulting his journal when he wrote the essay.

Another illustration, one of the best, is the essay Fear and Pity (*number II of the series*), where we read :

‘In our present state, fear is not only unavoidable by rational beings, who know that many evils may probably, and some must certainly befall them, but as far as we can judge, it seems to be one of the preventives and correctives of human suffering. Accordingly that great judge of human nature, Aristotle, when justly extolling the usefulness of tragedy, as medicine for the mind, tells us in a metaphorical definition taken from physic, *δι’ ἐλέου καὶ φόβου περαίνουσα τὴν τῶν τοιούτων παθημάτων κάθαρσιν*,—*it by the means of pity and fear purges the passions.*’

In the Biography (April 12th, 1776) :

‘I introduced Aristotle’s doctrine, in his Art of Poetry, ‘*κάθαρσις τῶν παθημάτων*, the purging of the passions’ as the purpose of tragedy. ‘But how are the passions to be purged by terror and pity?’ said I, with an assumed air of ignorance, to incite him to talk, for which it was often necessary to employ some address.’

Boswell sorrowfully adds that his record on this occasion does great injustice to Johnson’s commentary on the classic subject, which was so forcible and brilliant that one of the auditors whispered at the conclusion, ‘O that his words were written in a book.’ The essay may be Boswell’s attempt to recapture some part of the discourse ; at any rate, it clearly shows his journal in use.

In the essay, Of Speaking and Keeping Silent (*number XXIII of the series*), we read :

‘Sometimes our benevolence will be best exercised in talking and sometimes in listening just as we find the humour of those with whom we are

at the time. I write to the ordinary run of mankind. For, there does to be sure now and then appear an extraordinary man, by whom all should be willing to be instructed and entertained. Of such a man London can boast in the present age. I shall not name him; because if the description does not present him to the minds of any of my readers as much as his name could do, they are unfortunate enough either not to know him, or not to be sensible of what the most of all his contemporaries acknowledge . . . It is not however against too much speaking only that I would guard my readers . . . Such of my readers as wish to see the subject treated in a serious manner, with a view to consequences, more awful than it is my purpose at present to introduce, may consult that valuable treatise entitled *The Government of the Tongue*.

In the Biography (April 2, 1779), the same subject is discussed and is concluded, 'I by way of a check quoted some good admonition from *The Government of the Tongue*, that very pious book (vol. iii. 372).

There is a curious dialogue in the Biography, concerning the Chinese, which seems to be isolated, and to have little connection with anything else; Johnson had been calling East Indians barbarians:

'*Boswell*. You will except the Chinese, Sir. *Johnson*. No, Sir. *Boswell*. Have they not arts? *Johnson*. They have pottery. *Boswell*. What do you say to the written characters of their language? *Johnson*. They have not an alphabet. They have not been able to form what all other nations have formed. *Boswell*. There is more learning in their language than in any other, from the immense number of their characters. *Johnson*. It is only more difficult from its rudeness; as there is more labour in hewing down a tree with a stone than with an axe.'

In the essay, Things and Words (*number LIII of the series*), we read:

'I am at present engaged in looking into a book of which I heard accidentally. It is entitled Bayeri *Museum Sinicum*, being a complete account of the Chinese language, printed at Peterburg in 1730, and it appears to me to display an aggregate of knowledge, ingenuity and art, that is enough to make us contemplate such powers of mind with inexpressible veneration.'

It may of course be only coincidence.

So much for *relation*: many more examples might easily be given. The following few passages illustrate Boswell's sound literary judgment.

In the Biography you will remember how he distinguishes between Johnson when 'he talked for victory' and 'Johnson when he had no desire but to inform and illustrate': this is

what he says in the essay *Of Disputing for Instruction* (*number XXXIV of the series*):

‘The desire of overcoming is not only an obstruction to the propagation of truth but contributes to disseminate error. A Goliath in argument will take the wrong side merely to display his prowess, and though he may not warp his own understanding, which is sometimes the case, he will probably confound that of weaker men’;

and in the essay which immediately follows, *Of Imitating the Faults of Great Men* (*number XXXV of the series*)—

‘In literary compositions, the faults of celebrated writers are adopted, because they appear the most prominent objects to vulgar and undiscerning men, who would fain participate of fame like theirs by imitating their manner. . . . How many men have made themselves ridiculous by dull imitation of the sudden sallies of fancy and unconnected breaks of sentiment in Sterne? How many pigmy geniuses have, like the frog in the fable, that burst itself by vainly thinking it could swell to the size of an ox, become contemptible by aping the great style of the modern colossus of literature.’

The ‘Goliath in argument’ and ‘the modern Colossus of literature,’ are of course Johnson, who is frequently so styled in the *Biography*.

The essay concludes thus :

‘The delusive propensity to imitate the vices of eminent men, makes it a question of some difficulty in biography whether their faults should be recorded. . . . I am . . . of opinion that a biographer should tell even the imperfections and faults of those whose lives he writes, provided that he takes a conscientious care not to blend them with the general lustre of excellence, but to distinguish them and separate them, and impress upon his readers a just sense of the evil, so that they may regret its being found in such men, and be anxiously disposed to avoid what hurts even the most exalted characters, but would utterly sink men of ordinary merit.’

In another essay, *Of an Author’s Revising of his Works* (*number XXVII of the series*):

‘Correction is a capital difficulty which authors have always held out to the attention of their readers. The ancients talk a great deal of the metaphorical *file* in literary performances; and Horace recommends keeping a work for no less than nine years before one should venture to publish it. But is there not in this a great deal of quackery, or at least unnecessary anxiety? . . .

‘Many a book has been so altered and corrected in subsequent editions, though carrying the same title that one might compare it to the ship of the Argonauts which was so often repaired that not one bit of the original wood remained. Indeed, I have always considered it not quite fair to the

purchasers of the first edition of a book, to alter, correct and amend, and improve it so much in after editions, that the first is rendered by comparison of very little value. Yet it would be hard to restrain an author from making his own work as perfect as he can. The purchasers of a first edition have had what they considered to be value for their money. They may keep that value; and are not under any obligation to purchase a better edition. The case is not quite clear. I shall therefore leave it to the consideration of my readers and only relate a witty remark of a learned friend, who when I had complained that a book which I had bought when it came first out, was altogether changed in a new edition; then, said he, if you buy this edition you will get another book.'

'Some men have a vacillancy of mind which makes them quite indecisive in their composition, so that they shall alter and correct as long as they can; and at last be fixed only because the types cannot be kept longer standing. When this is only as to the language it is ridiculous enough. But when their indecision respects the very substance of their work, they are surely very unfit to be authors. An eminent printer told me that a book of some authority upon law was printed at his press, and that when the proof sheets were returned by the author, there was frequently an almost total alteration of many parts. This, said he, was an effectual preventive to me from ever going to law; for, I considered, if the authority itself was so uncertain, what must be the uncertainty of the interpretations of that authority.

In the next essay he speaks of authors distrusting their own opinion of their works and having recourse to the judgment of friends. This is his own opinion, and we know that he followed it always:

'That a fondness for our own compositions may prevent us in many instances from perceiving their faults, I allow; and therefore the opinion of impartial friends may be of use. But unless I am convinced that my friends are in the right I will not comply with their opinion.'

The essay which brings the series to a conclusion is written in Boswell's best style, almost as well finished as the prefaces in the *Biography*:

'I am absolutely certain,' he says, 'that in these papers my principles are most sincerely expressed. I can truly say in the words of Pope,—

I love to pour out all myself as plain,
As downright Shippen, or as old Montaigne.

Perhaps indeed, I have poured out myself with more freedom than prudence will approve, and I am aware of being too much of an egotist. . . .

'There is a pleasure when one is indolent, to think that a task, to the performance of which one has been again and again subjected, and had some difficulty to make it out, is no longer to be required. But this pleasure, or rather comfort, does not last. For we soon feel a degree of uneasy languor, not merely in being without a stated exercise, but in being

void of the usual consciousness of its regular returns, by which the mind has been agreeably braced.

‘A conclusion however, should be put to a periodical paper, before its numbers have increased so much as to make it heavy and disgusting were it even of excellent composition, and this consideration is more necessary when it is entirely the work of one person, which in my first number I declared the *Hypochondriack* should be. I have resolved to end with number seventieth, from perhaps a whimsical regard to a number by which several interesting particulars are marked, the most interesting of which is the solemn reflection that ‘the days of our years are three score years and ten.’ To choose one number rather than another, where all numbers are rationally indifferent, there must be a motive, however slight. Such is my motive for fixing on Number Seventieth. It may be said, I need not have told it.’

Boswell’s motive for concluding with the seventieth essay was good enough for periodical readers, but there were other and better reasons not needing then to be publicly divulged. His succession to the family estates in August 1782, on the death of his father, Lord Auchinleck, had brought new cares and new employments which were pressing heavily on him. That was one reason: another and weightier one was the sudden and serious illness of Dr. Johnson, whose paralytic seizure in June exactly synchronises with the dispatch to the printer of the seventieth essay, which appeared in the July number of the *London Magazine*.

The essays were tentative and preparatory for the greater task that now seemed at hand. They had served their purpose and been useful more than once in furnishing topics for conversation during the most fruitful period of his intimacy with Johnson, the years 1777-1783. What perhaps is most remarkable to a twentieth century reader is, that nearly every subject discussed in them is brought under review in the Biography during those six years; giving the impression that the Biographer had proposed the themes and incited Johnson to talk on them.

Be that as it may, it is scarcely doubtful, that the essays are intimately related to the Biography and were used by Boswell in the preparation of the final text. That is the only proposition I have advanced and I hope that even the few examples I have given, will have made it fairly clear.

J. T. T. BROWN.