Volume LXXXV, 1: No. 219: April 2006

CONTENTS

The Scottish Historical Review is published twice yearly, in April and October, by Edinburgh University Press Ltd for the Scottish Historical Review Trust.

SUBSCRIPTIONS

The annual subscription for 2005 (which covers postal charges) is **£34.00** for individuals (**£37.00** overseas) and **£68.00** for institutions. Remittances should be made payable to Edinburgh University Press, and sent to: Scottish Historical Review, Edinburgh University Press, 22 George Square, Edinburgh EH8 9LF. Enquiries about subscriptions and back numbers, and notifications of changes of address, should also be sent to the press at that address.

CONTRIBUTIONS

The joint editors of the *Review* are: Dr E. Cameron, Scottish History, University of Edinburgh, Edinburgh EH8 9LN (for post-1600 material); and Dr D. Broun, Department of History (Scottish), University of Glasgow, Glasgow G12 8QH (for pre-1600 material).

REVIEWS

The review editor is Dr David Allan, Department of Scottish History, University of St Andrews, St Andrews KY16 9AJ All books for review should be sent to Dr Allan at this address.

The Scottish Historical Review, Volume LXXXV, 1: No. 219: April 2006, 1–29

MATTHEW H. HAMMOND

Ethnicity and the writing of medieval Scottish history[1]

ABSTRACT

Historians have long tended to define medieval Scottish society in terms of interactions between ethnic groups. This approach was developed over the course of the long nineteenth century, a formative period for the study of medieval Scotland. At that time, many scholars based their analysis upon scientific principles, long since debunked, which held that medieval 'peoples' could only be understood in terms of 'full ethnic packages'. This approach was combined with a positivist historical narrative that defined Germanic Anglo-Saxons and Normans as the harbingers of advances in Civilisation. While the prejudices of that era have largely faded away, modern discipline still relies all too often on a dualistic ethnic framework. This is particularly evident in a structure of periodisation that draws a clear line between the 'Celtic' eleventh century and the 'Norman' twelfth. Furthermore, dualistic oppositions based on ethnicity continue, particularly in discussions of law, kingship, lordship and religion.

Geoffrey Barrow's *Robert Bruce and the Community of the Realm of Scotland*, first published in 1965 and now available in the fourth edition, is probably the most widely read book ever written by a professional historian on the Middle Ages in Scotland.[2] In seeking to introduce the thirteenth century to such a broad audience, Barrow depicted Alexander III's Scotland as fundamentally 'a Celtic country', albeit with some important 'non-Celtic elements'. This passage opens up a panorama of medieval Scotland, characterised by the interplay between 'Celtic features', most notably social structure, language and customs, and 'non-Celtic developments and anti-Celtic tendencies', like the cult of St Margaret and the Frankish feudalism of the ruling dynasty of kings.[3] 'The book will stand as one of the landmarks of historical writing set up by this generation', Archie Duncan commented in a review published in this journal in 1966,

[1] This article was delivered as a paper entitled 'Scotland in the Central Middle Ages: Ethnic Groups and Conceptual Frameworks' at the University of Glasgow on 26 April 2001 and was later presented in substantially altered form as 'Ethnicity and the History of the Middle Ages in Scotland' at the University of St Andrews on 14 November 2002. It has again undergone major revision since that point, guided largely by the kind help of Profs A.A.M. Duncan, Robert Bartlett, Colin Kidd, Dr Alaric Hall, and, above all, Dr Dauvit Broun.

[2] G.W.S. Barrow, *Robert Bruce and the Community of the Realm of Scotland*, 4th edn (Edinburgh, 2005).

[3] *Ibid.*, 5.

MATTHEW HAMMOND has recently completed a PhD at the University of Glasgow

and it is doubtful that even its author foresaw its enduring legacy.[4] It is for this very reason that its first chapter offers such a useful example of a general tendency in the discipline of Scottish history to define aspects of Scottish society and culture in terms of ethnicity. Yet few scholars have turned their attentions to the questions of *why* ethnicity is such a fundamental factor in Scottish history and how this disposition for ethnic explanations became so entrenched in the first place. What makes features like social structures and religious cults Celtic or non-Celtic at all?[5] Furthermore, why is the medieval history of Scotland so often boiled down to a dualistic tension between two ethnic groups?

All signs point to the nineteenth century as the crucible of this Scottish brand of ethnic dualism. That era saw the emergence of Scottish history as a popular and valued subject of inquiry, largely thanks to Sir Walter Scott and his brainchild the Bannatyne Club, and its many imitators, which paved the way for the professional and systematic publication of historical documents by organisations like the Scottish History Society, and resulted in the release of a few highly influential, positivist narratives by the likes of Patrick Fraser Tytler and Peter Hume Brown.[6] The nineteenth century was the setting for the formation of the modern discipline of history, in Scotland as across Europe, a process which Patrick Geary has described as 'conceived and developed as an instrument of modern nationalism'. Some readers may be dismayed at Geary's evoking the spectre of 'a toxic waste dump, filled with the poison of ethnic nationalism'. Few, however, would dispute the assertion that ethnicity (or race) and nationality were issues of importance to nineteenth-century writers, that they harboured very clear assumptions about these topics, and that their views were inculcated in the works of history they produced.[7] Certainly, as Susan Reynolds observed, 'medieval historians today do not always seem to realize how many of their assumptions derive from arguments put forward by lawyers, historians, and political writers of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries whose preoccupations were totally different from those of anyone in the middle ages'.[8]

I: Ethnic historiography in the long nineteenth century

The corpus of Scottish history produced between the last quarter of the eighteenth century to the first quarter of the twentieth is saturated with

[4] A.A.M. Duncan, 'The community of the realm of Scotland and Robert Bruce', *SHR* 45 (1966), 184.

[5] Historians in the past have tended to characterise non-Celtic elements as 'Germanic' or 'Teutonic'. Furthermore, in order to minimise reader annoyance, I have avoided the use of inverted commas for such problematic words as 'Celtic' and 'Norman'; however, their use should be seen in the light of comments expounded throughout the paper.

[6] Marinell Ash, *The Strange Death of Scottish History* (Edinburgh, 1980).

[7] Patrick J. Geary, *The Myth of Nations: The Medieval Origins of Europe* (Oxford, 2002), 15.

[8] Susan Reynolds, *Kingdoms and Communities in Western Europe, 900-1300*, 2nd edn (Oxford, 1997), xiii.

issues of race. The output of this antiquarian tradition can be described as whiggish, progressive, narrative history, with a strong ethnographical component. To nineteenth-century antiquarians, and many others besides, progress was inextricably linked to race. Over the course of the first half of the nineteenth century the 'great chain of being', polygenist anthropology, and the idea that shape of the skull explained social and cultural differences, resulted in the widely accepted belief that races were gradated hierarchically, and that their position could be ascertained from social traits.[9] The most civilized race was assumed to be the highest on the ladder. The combination of these influences with the prevalent stereotypes (promoted by Anglo-Saxonism) of Teutonic industry, libertarianism and moderation, as defined against Celtic indolence, sentimentality and laziness, would provide the long-lasting overriding scheme for the conception of Scottish medieval history.[10]

In the nineteenth century, the concept that races were 'full ethnic packages' was so natural, internalized, and taken for granted that modern methods of government, religion, habits of dress, language, and customs were routinely used as evidence for belonging to a particular racial group. Nancy Stepan has argued that '[s]o important was the reality of types and the permanence of the racial 'packages' upon which identification of the type depended …', it was assumed that '[i]f a trait in human beings were shown to be changeable, then it could not be a racial trait'.[11] These assumptions are seen time and again in Scottish historiography. For example, Duncan Keith wrote in 1886, 'Scots…display all that is Celtic in manners, customs, language and literature[: i]f they are of Teutonic descent they have never shown the distinguishing characteristics of that race'.[12] These characteristics were generally viewed as the outward signs of innate differences in these people as human beings. As James Grant put it in 1828, '[i]nventions of art, discoveries of science, legislative regulations, institutions moral, religious, and political, as they are the fruits of the investigation and experience of ages, they form the test of improvement; they ought regularly to grow out of the genius and spirit of a people, and then they may properly be said to determine the national character'.[13] Due to this belief that the racial history of a nation

[9] The 'great chain of being' was the idea that all living things were gradated along a continuous ladder. Phrenology held that individual personality traits could be 'read' based on the dimensions of the head, and was popular in the first quarter of the eighteenth century, influencing craniology—the systematic, anthropological study of skull shapes and sizes. Craniology combined factors of phrenology and comparative anatomy and was at its apex in the third quarter of the eighteenth century. See Nancy Stepan, *The Idea of Race in Science: Great Britain 1800-1960* (London, 1982), 6-7, 21-8.

[10] George W. Stocking, *Victorian Anthropology* (New York, 1987), 62-9; Colin Kidd, 'Teutonist ethnology and Scottish nationalist inhibition, 1780-1880', *SHR* 74 (1995), 45-68 at 47-8.

[11] Stepan, *The Idea of Race*, 102.

[12] Duncan Keith, *A History of Scotland, Civil and Ecclesiastical, from the Earliest Times to the Death of David I, 1153*, 2 vols (Edinburgh, 1886), i. 46.

[13] James Grant, *Thoughts on the Origin and Descent of the Gael: with an Account of the Picts, Caledonians and Scots; and Observations relative to the Authenticity of the Poems of Ossian* (London, 1828), 3.

was absolutely crucial to understanding the validity and value of its present, Scottish historians set themselves to one particular task with great vigour.

Was Scotland Teutonic or Celtic? This question structured the debate that would divide Scottish antiquarians into Teutonists and Celtists.[14] Because races were held to be universal, existing more or less the same for centuries, history could be used, like hair colour or folk tales, as evidence for the racial identification of peoples. Antiquarians saw the racial identification of Scotland as crucial, as exhibited in Keith's poetic opinion:

> The subject is important; it involves the question, whether Scotsmen are of the race which produced poets, historians, and philosophers worthy to rank with the illustrious dead of Greece and Rome, and whose language and literature are worldwide? Or are they of that race which for centuries has not been able to preserve an independent existence, whose scanty literature is unintelligible to anyone but a Celt, and even then useless, whose language is a sickly plant, which droops and dies away from its own soil?[15]

To Teutonists, it was vital for Scotland to be proved Teutonic, so that Scots would be seen in a positive and progressive light. Arch-Teutonist John Pinkerton (1758–1826) and his followers John Jamieson (1759–1838) and Malcolm Laing (1762–1818) vehemently criticized the romantic Celticness of the Ossian craze.[16] The dominance of the racialist paradigm is most strikingly demonstrated by the Celtists' acceptance of stereotypical Celtic traits. Rather than argue that Celts had the same strengths as Teutons, Celtist scholars conceded that Teutons were superior in areas of industry. Celtists had two main concerns. First, they had to establish that Scotland possessed a Celtic past. Second, they claimed that typical Celtic characteristics, which corresponded generally with Romanticist notions of Nature opposed to Industry, were positive attributes. Consequently, Celtists like the advocate James Grant (?1743–1835), William Forbes Skene (1809–92), Robert Macfarlan (1734–1804) and Patrick Graham (d. 1835) defended the authenticity of Macpherson's Ossian.[17] Furthermore, it must be stressed that both sides took for granted that races were 'ethnic packages' replete with physical and social traits.

[14] Colin Kidd has used the term Teutonist in this context, specifically in view of the nationalist implications of the debate (see below, n. 22). The author prefers 'Celtist' over 'Celticist' because the latter refers in a general sense to any scholar of Celtic languages and cultures. On racialism in nineteenth-century Scotland, see Kidd, 'Race, empire, and the limits of nineteenth-century Scottish nationhood', *Historical Journal* 46 (2003) 873-92.

[15] Keith, *A History of Scotland*, i. 35-6.

[16] As Pinkerton complained, 'even little misses lisp about the authenticity of Ossian, or the antique purity of the Celtic language': *An Enquiry into the History of Scotland preceding the Reign of Malcolm III, or the Year 1056*, 2nd edn, 2 vols (Edinburgh, 1814), i. iv. Pinkerton derides Macpherson (*ibid.*, i. lxix). See also William Ferguson, *The Identity of the Scottish Nation* (Edinburgh, 1998), esp. 250-73.

[17] Grant, *Origin and Descent*, 379-446; William Forbes Skene, *The Highlanders of Scotland*, 2 vols (London, 1837), i. 207-15; Ferguson, *Identity*, 267-8.

Medieval Scotland became the battleground upon which this issue would be decided. The Teutonist/ Celtist debate that pervaded narrative history was almost certainly the single most important theoretical problem in nineteenth-century Scottish historiography. Crucial to the struggle was the 'Pictish Question': were the Picts Teutonic or Celtic? John Pinkerton, in his *Enquiry into the History of Scotland preceding the Reign of Malcolm III* (1789, 2nd edn 1814), argued for a Gothic or Teutonic derivation. Based on Bede's assignation of Scythian origins, Pinkerton, who had argued that the Scythians and Goths were the same people in 1787, here posited that the Picts were Goths who had come from Norway.[18] He backed this view up with ethnological comparisons between Pictish society and other Gothic tribes.[19] Moreover, Pinkerton claimed that the Northern Britons, Caledonians and Picts were one and the same people, none of whom were Celtic.[20] He upheld the Dalriadic Scots as Goths who had been 'contaminated with a Celtic mixture in Ireland'.[21] Thus, Pinkerton set up a wholly Teutonic structure for Scotland with the original Gothic Picts, Britons and Gothic/ Celtic Scots being joined later by the fully Teutonic Saxons, Norse and Normans. Indeed, he managed to remove the Celtic element so far back in history that 'no account of real Celtic manners, or language, can be recovered', adding that 'the ancient Celts must have been mere savages'.[22]

Pinkerton's confident assertions about the Picts and Dalriadic Scots failed to endure. However, 'the line taken by Pinkerton [i.e., on the Picts] was widely influential within the higher ranks of British physical anthropology'.[23] Other authors devoted space to the Pictish Question, weighing the sources against each other. John Hill Burton (1809–81) and R. G. Latham (1812–88) seem to have been unable to come to conclusive answers, with Latham merely stating that 'the commonest doctrine' was a Celtic, rather than Germanic, assignation.[24] Patrick Fraser Tytler (1791–1849), perhaps wisely, avoided the whole topic by beginning his narrative history with the reign of Alexander III.[25] George Chalmers (1742–1825), like Walter Scott (1771–1832) and Joseph Ritson (1752–1803), opposed Pinkerton's view, claiming that the Picts were Celtic.[26] For James Grant, author of *Thoughts on the Origin and*

[18] John Pinkerton, *A Dissertation on the Origin and Progress of the Scythians or Goths* (London, 1787), 3-14; Pinkerton, *An Enquiry into the History of Scotland*, i. 15-16.
[19] *Ibid.*, i. 231-79.
[20] *Ibid.*, i. 105.
[21] *Ibid.*, ii. 140.
[22] *Ibid.*, i. 17.
[23] Colin Kidd, 'The ideological uses of the Picts, 1707-c.1990', in Edward J. Cowan and Richard J. Finlay (eds), *Scottish History: The Power of the Past* (Edinburgh, 2002), 177.
[24] John Hill Burton, *The History of Scotland from Agricola's Invasion to the Extinction of the Last Jacobite Insurrection*, 2nd edn, 8 vols (Edinburgh, 1897), i. 200-7; R.G. Latham, *The Ethnology of the British Islands* (London, 1852), 76-82. John Beddoe also discussed the Pictish Question in the context of comparative anatomy; see Beddoe, *Contribution to Scottish Ethnology* (London and Edinburgh, 1853), 31.
[25] Patrick Fraser Tytler, *History of Scotland*, 9 vols (Edinburgh, 1828-43).
[26] George Chalmers, *Caledonia: or, a Historical and Topographical Account of North Britain from the most Ancient to the Present Time*, 3 vols (London, 1810-24), i. 225. Cosmo Innes

Descent of the Gael (1828), the Caledonians or Picts of Roman times split into two groups: the Highland Scots and agricultural Picts of the medieval period.[27] W. F. Skene, in *The Highlanders of Scotland* (1837), argued that the Northern Picts were unaffected by the Dalriadic invasions: they became the modern Highlanders.[28] In 1867, Cosmo Innes (1798–1874) wrote that 'it is still disputed whether the Picts were a Teutonic race or Celts'.[29] By 1876, however, Skene was able to assert confidently that the Britons, Picts and Scots were all Celts and that Scotland prior to the twelfth century was 'a Celtic kingdom'.[30]

Presumably due to the difficulties posed by the Pictish argument for the Teutonic or 'Gothic' nature of Scotland, Teutonist historians developed a modified approach based instead upon successive waves of Germanic invaders.[31] As Colin Kidd pointed out in 1995, George Chalmers highlighted the contributions of Saxon, Norse, and Norman invaders in his important work *Caledonia* (1810–24). The idea behind this was that the Teutonic element gradually grew until it tipped the racial balance of the country. As Chalmers put it, 'many of the children of the Celtic people have been, no doubt, converted, from their maternal *Celticism* to the artificial *Gothicism* of the Saxon settlers'.[32] Sometimes this notion was combined with the inference that the Picts were Teutonic, as when Hill Burton noted that the Saxons 'found in Scotland people of their own race, and made a marked addition to the predominance of the Saxon or Teutonic element'.[33]

Scholars agreed universally that the point at which the tables turned decisively in favor of the Teuton was the period of 1050–1300. Chalmers calls this era 'Scoto-Saxon', based on the marriage of Malcolm III and St. Margaret: '[i]n this period we shall see an Anglo-Saxon, Anglo-Norman, and Anglo-Belgic colonization begin in the country beyond the Forth, and a Scoto-Saxon dynasty commence'.[34] Antiquaries agreed that this period was crucial because it marked a watershed in civilisation and progress. For Chalmers, 'the influence of a Celtic government [was] gradually reduced by the establishment of an Anglo-Norman

[26] (*Continued*) (*Scotch Legal Antiquities* (Edinburgh, 1872), 16-17) noted Chalmers' Celtist stance, depicting him as the 'champion of the Celts'. Some modern readers may find this strange in the context of Chalmers' non-(or anti-) nationalist views and his preference for the term 'North Britain' over 'Scotland'. See also Kidd, 'The ideological uses', 176.

[27] Grant, *Thoughts on the Origin and Descent*, 282-3.

[28] Skene, *The Highlanders*, i. 67-9. Dalriada was the name of the Irish colony on the west coast of Scotland, from the sixth century, which roughly corresponded to modern Argyll.

[29] *Facsimiles of the National Manuscripts of Scotland*, ed. Cosmo Innes, vol.i (Southampton, 1867), viii.

[30] William Forbes Skene, *Celtic Scotland: A History of Ancient Alban*, 3 vols (Edinburgh, 1876-80), i. 17.

[31] Kidd, 'Teutonist ethnology', 54-5.

[32] Chalmers, *Caledonia*, i. 612. Italics in original.

[33] Hill Burton, *The History of Scotland*, i. 373.

[34] Chalmers, *Caledonia*, i. 497. One can only presume that by 'Anglo-Belgic' he meant Flemish.

jurisprudence and by the complete reform of a Celtic church'.[35] Likewise the Celtist Skene wrote in 1876,

> The reign of David I is beyond doubt the true commencement of feudal Scotland, and the term of Celtic Scotland becomes no longer appropriate to it as a kingdom. Under his auspices feudalism rapidly acquired predominance in the country, and its social state and institutions became formally assimilated to Norman forms and ideas, while the old Celtic element in her constitutional history gradually retired into the background.[36]

This temporal division between a Celtic era and a Teutonic, feudal, or Norman epoch reflected a radical periodization shift, cutting the Scottish middle ages into two halves, which would have lasting effects. Even the staunchest Celtists embraced this racially determined construct of periodization. Skene accepted that Scotland was 'composed of several distinct races, partly of Teutonic and partly of Celtic origin, forming a people of very mixed descent, in which the Teutonic element was gradually predominating more and more over the Celtic'.[37]

The general framework of Scottish history adopted this linking of progress and race, and Celtists and Teutonists alike accepted the proposition. Even more moderate authors upheld the notion that progress and civilisation in Scottish history were to be equated with the Normans. Hill Burton cites the feudal system, stronger monarchy, use of coinage, written records, and well-developed royal administration as Norman influences.[38] Apparently only John Mackintosh, a harsh critic of Chalmers, Hill Burton and *redacteur extraordinaire* Cosmo Innes, doubted the perception of the Normans as the 'veritable originators of Scottish civilisation'. In Mackintosh's opinion, 'Several historians have boldly asserted that Scotland owes all her civilisation to these Normans and Saxon nobles, adding, by way of evidence, that the Celts never showed any disposition to follow an industrious occupation or to congregate in towns'.[39] The debate had cooled enough by 1920, however, so that James Mackinnon was able to note a tendency among historians to 'contrast [Celtic] institutions with those introduced under Norman or Anglo-Norman influence…'.[40]

Closely related to the issue of 'Normanisation' was the way in which antiquarians treated the expansion of monarchical power in the twelfth

35 *Ibid.*
36 Skene, *Celtic Scotland*, i. 459-60.
37 *Ibid.*, iii. 15.
38 Hill Burton, *The History of Scotland*, i. 350-71.
39 John Mackintosh, *The History of Civilisation in Scotland*, 2nd edn, 4 vols (London, 1892-6), i. 189. See also Kidd, 'Teutonist ethnology', 60, and Kidd, '*The Strange Death of Scottish History* revisited: constructions of the past in Scotland, c.1790–1914', *SHR* 76 (1997), 93-4.
40 James Mackinnon, *The Social and Industrial History of Scotland from the Earliest Times to the Union* (London, 1920), 55. He claimed that it was 'superficial and misleading to assert that …[the Celt] is radically inferior to [the Anglo-Norman] in the capacity for social and political organization': *ibid.*, 57.

and thirteenth centuries. Since the marriage of Malcolm III and the Anglo-Saxon heiress Margaret (ca 1070) was held to herald in the new, Teutonic dominated era, historians agreed that their reign should constitute a new dynasty, a stance which fails to reflect the royal succession at that time. Kings of this so-called Canmore dynasty were depicted as agents of Norman civilisation.[41] Historians sympathetic to the Celtic side created an image of a clash of cultures, a violent struggle of Celtic resistance to Norman intrusion and external change. Celtists held that the death of Malcolm III (1093) precipitated a struggle over the ethnic nature of the monarchy. To Robert Rait, '[t]here was a Celtic reaction, the champion of which was Malcolm's brother, Donald (III) Bane (1093-97)'.[42] In the first volume of his tripartite opus *Celtic Scotland* (1876-80), Skene depicted the epoch of 1093 to 1286 as a succession of Celtic 'insurrections', 'rebellions' and 'revolts' against the power of 'Normanizing kings'.[43] Dynastic disputes led by cadet branches of the royal family were characterized as native efforts to return Scotland to its Celtic past and described as 'the fitful struggles of her Celtic subjects to resist the power which was gradually but surely working out this process of incorporation…'.[44] Moreover, Skene described the expansion of monarchical control in terms of repression of native Celtic populations, citing the 'subjection' of Galloway (1160), Caithness (1196), and Argyll (1222) as well as the 'plantation' of Moray (1160).[45] In 1887, the Duke of Argyll (George Douglas Campbell, 1823–1900) expanded on this last event, claiming that 'one of the kings of this period—Malcolm the Fourth—drove out the Celts from the rich province of Moray, and resettled it with the mixed races of the south'.[46]

Celtists criticized the 'prejudiced view taken of the Celtic population by late historians', yet worked within the paradigm of racialist progress.[47] Whereas the Teutonists focused on the industrious achievements of the Normans, Celtists like Skene augmented their depiction of Celtic struggle against change by casting light on the failure and end of the old Celtic institutions. This tendency should be viewed in the context of popular romantic notions of Celtic twilight. For Skene, the decline of Celtic society was played out in the political, social, and religious arenas. David I (1124–53) purposely 'feudalized' the 'Celtic earldoms', which to Skene were based on kin rather than territory.[48] Skene described the 'termination of the line[s] of the Celtic earls', even though most earldoms continued into the late medieval period.[49] For Skene, what was

41 Skene, *Celtic Scotland*, iii. 1.
42 Robert S. Rait, *History of Scotland* (London, 1915), 15.
43 Skene, *Celtic Scotland*, i. 460, 462, 471, 475, 482, 483, 487.
44 *Ibid.*, i. 460.
45 *Ibid.*, i. 472, 479, 484.
46 George Douglas Campbell, 8th Duke of Argyll, *Scotland as it was and as it is*, 2 vols (Edinburgh, 1887), i. 35.
47 Skene, *Celtic Scotland*, iii. 40.
48 *Ibid.*, iii. 63.
49 *Ibid.*, iii. 288.

essentially the marriage by immigrant knights into local power structures became the break-up of traditional Celtic tribes.[50] Skene adopted the same stance in regard to the small territorial units called thanages, which he depicted as 'ancient Celtic tenures' that 'gave way before the advancing feudalism'.[51] The language Skene utilized is telling: words like extinction, suppression, termination and failure crop up repeatedly. This tone reflects the racialist, progressivist paradigm that encouraged the perception of one race superseding another.

Nineteenth- and early-twentieth-century scholars generally applied the same assumptions to their study of religion in the Scottish kingdom. Celtists upheld the early purity and excellence of the Celtic Church and highlighted its reputation for learning. To Skene, 'the early Celtic Church … must have been a powerful agent in civilising the people'.[52] By the twelfth century, however, the native church was suffering from decay and corruption, 'their ruined buildings and reduced establishment fell into the hands of laymen'.[53] To John Dowden (1840–1910), 'the Celtic Church in Scotland had fallen into degenerate ways',[54] and the 'decadent Celtic clergy were incapable of seriously stemming the inflowing tide' of Anglo-Norman influence.[55] The saintly Queen Margaret (d. 1093) was seen as the archetypal reformer, of whom Skene opined, 'there is perhaps no more beautiful character recorded in history'.[56] In the religious sphere, Margaret served the same function that her husband Malcolm III occupied in the political arena, separating two distinct historical periods. For Skene, Margaret's reforms were followed by the 'failure of the Celtic Church' in Brechin, Dunblane and Dunkeld and the 'suppression of *Keledei*' (*céli Dé* or Culdees) in St. Andrews and other locations. The establishment of new bishoprics marked the final transition from a monastic to an episcopal system. Furthermore, Skene believed that Scottish kings purposely introduced 'Roman' monastic orders to 'assimilate the native church to that of Rome'.[57] Robert S. Rait, the first Professor of Scottish History at the University of Glasgow (1913-30), went as far as to claim that 'in the reign of David I the Culdees were finally crushed'.[58]

Medievalist scholars, in addition to reflecting racialist and progressivist assumptions in their study of the Celtic church, were affected by long-standing religious debates. Presbyterian authors had long held the Celtic clergy, usually lumped together as Culdees, to be primitive and pure, and to have resembled the Presbyterian church, thus setting up an ancient historical antecedant. [59] Skene attempted an

[50] *Ibid.*, iii. 287.
[51] *Ibid.*, iii. 246.
[52] *Ibid.*, ii. 448.
[53] *Ibid.*, ii. 365.
[54] John Dowden, *The Celtic Church in Scotland* (London, 1894), 269.
[55] John Dowden, *The Bishops of Scotland* (Glasgow, 1912), 1.
[56] Skene, *Celtic Scotland*, ii. 344.
[57] *Ibid.*, ii. 392.
[58] Robert S. Rait, *The Making of Scotland*, 2nd edn (London, 1929), 24.
[59] Colin Kidd, *Subverting Scotland's Past: Scottish Whig Historians and the Creation of an Anglo-British Identity, 1689-c.1830* (Cambridge, 1993), 185-91.

objective stance, decrying the depiction of medieval Scotland as 'the battlefield on which Catholic and Protestant, Episcopalian and Presbyterian, have contended for their respective tenets'.[60] Despite being an Episcopalian himself, Skene perpetuated Presbyterian tendencies, highlighting the importance of the 'presbyter-abbot' in the Celtic Church, while pointing out the relative unimportance of the bishop.[61] John Dowden, a medievalist scholar and bishop of Edinburgh, sought to fight these Presbyterian claims by asserting that there were bishops in early Scotland and that the 'Presbyterian myth' was based on an historical error by John of Fordun.[62]

Some scholars, particularly those who worked extensively on the primary sources and dealt with detailed and specific problems, like Cosmo Innes, and those who came from a different area or class, such as E. W. Robertson (1815–74), were not wholly convinced by this orthodoxy. As Cosmo Innes wrote in 1872, 'it is too much the fashion to draw a marked line between the Celtic and Teutonic peoples'.[63] The entire community of historians and antiquaries, however, who were a small, close-knit group pertaining to a particular (upper bourgeois) social class, shared certain basic beliefs. First, it was generally accepted that 'Celt' and 'Teuton' were valid terms for historical inquiry. The Duke of Argyll discussed the 'high but very special civilisation of the early Scoto-Irish Celts',[64] and the 'true Celtic spirit'[65] in his *Scotland as it was and as it is* (1887). In Argyll's estimation, however, the early Celtic civilization spent all its energy on the Christian conversion, and subsequently accepted the 'more civilised Feudalism of the Anglo-Normans'.[66] Even sceptics of the racial emphasis, like E. W. Robertson , voiced their criticism in a manner that reflects these universal assumptions. In his *magnum opus* of 1862, Robertson treated with caution the easy differentiation between Celts and Teutons, remarking that ancient writers found the two groups 'remarkably alike'.[67] Robertson did not challenge the current ethnic stereotypes, but instead offered alternative explanations for the Celts' (supposed) modern characteristics, such as geography and intermixture with other races.

Second, all parties accepted the idea that a significant periodization shift occurred with the reign of Malcolm III and St. Margaret, and that the subsequent period was qualitatively different from the previous (Celtic) epoch. From this system of periodization stems the tendency to draw antitheses. Dowden posited a 'transition from Celtic to Anglo-Norman methods of procedure'.[68] The strict division between

60 Skene, *Celtic Scotland*, ii. v-vi.
61 *Ibid.*, ii. 42-4.
62 Dowden, *The Celtic Church in Scotland*, 43.
63 Innes, *Scotch Legal Antiquities*, 97.
64 Argyll, *Scotland as it was*, i. 23.
65 *Ibid.*, i. 52.
66 *Ibid.*, i. 21.
67 E.William Robertson, *Scotland under her Early Kings: a History of the Kingdom to the Close of the Thirteenth Century*, 2 vols (Edinburgh, 1862), ii. 197-8.
68 John Dowden, *The Medieval Church in Scotland* (Glasgow, 1910), 18.

Celtic and Teutonic or Norman institutions was encouraged by the notion of a new historical period, which gave definition and simplicity to changes occurring across the board at that time. David MacGibbon and Thomas Ross, for example, discussed a 'transition from Celtic to Norman Architecture'.[69] The periodization shift also allowed for lasts and firsts. For example, Dowden was only one of a long series to mention 'the last of the distinctively Celtic bishops of St. Andrews'.[70]

Over the course of the second half of the nineteenth century, changes took place in race science, which, if anything, intensified the racialist orientation of medieval Scottish history. A Swedish anatomist, Anders Retzius, focused scholarly attention on racial variations within Europe, introducing the 'cephalic index' in 1844. This allowed anthropologists to make racial distinctions based on head shape.[71] Edinburgh anatomist Robert Knox, author of *The Races of Man* (1850), furthered the movement's popularity in Britain.[72] By the 1880's, scholars considered craniology the most advanced method for conducting racial enquiry as opposed to the previously preferred methods of comparative philology and ethnology.[73] Around the same time, Aryan (Indo-European) philology had ascertained the relationship of Celtic, Germanic (or Teutonic) and Romance languages, which lent new confidence to the Celtist camp.[74] Both sides of the debate, however, were influenced by the 'anatomical turn' in anthropology. Skene wrote in 1876, '[The Celts] are the people of the round-headed skulls', and compared a fair-skinned brown-haired race to a large-limbed, red-haired race.[75]

In 1893, the Committee of the British Association for the Advancement of Science sent out a call for help in a field survey of Britain. The Committee's board members included John Beddoe, who had focused the comparative-anatomical approach on British peoples in 1885, and Francis Galton, the cousin of Charles Darwin who had introduced eugenics in 1883. Also on the board were members of the Society of Antiquaries for Scotland, Joseph Anderson and J. Romilly Allen, and a prominent Oxford Celticist, John Rhys. The survey sought to record '1) physical types of the inhabitants; 2) current traditions and beliefs; 3) peculiarities of dialect; 4) monuments and other remains of ancient culture; 5) historical evidence as to continuity of race'.[76] These guidelines illustrate the

[69] David MacGibbon and Thomas Ross, *The Ecclesiastical Architecture of Scotland*, 3 vols (Edinburgh, 1896), i. xii.

[70] Dowden, *The Medieval Church*, 7.

[71] Stepan, *Idea of Race*, 97.

[72] Kidd, 'Teutonist ethnology', 59.

[73] Collignon, a French scientist, measured over 7000 skulls in order to distinguish three races from head types in France. See Stepan, *Idea of Race*, 97-8. In 1885, John Beddoe studied 'Norman' skulls and attempted to define Pictish race based on hair colour. Beddoe, *The Races of Britain* (London, 1885), 196-7, 243.

[74] Kidd, 'Teutonist ethnology', 65.

[75] Skene, *Celtic Scotland*, i. 226-7. Beddoe held that lower classes, the Welsh and the Irish, tended to be round-headed and dark-haired, and that the Celtic racial type was similar to Cro-Magnon man. See Stepan, *Idea of Race*, 100-2.

[76] Members were urged to use the 'Traveller's Anthropometer' to record the subject's height standing and sitting, the length, height and breadth of cranium, face length

extent to which anthropologists still assumed races were 'complete ethnic packages' whose characteristics in the present, ranging from skull shape to superstitions, could inform scholars about historical peoples, based on the assumption that races were believed to be unchanging. Nevertheless, the more data anthropologists collected, the more they realised that 'pure races' no longer existed in Europe due to 'intermixing'.[77] Instead, they believed they could sort out the results of this 'hybridisation' through careful scientific research. The ethnographic survey was meant to detect the sort of minutiae that would allow the racial 'types' of Britain to be discovered.

The scholars who were involved on both sides of the Teutonist/Celtist debate were the founding fathers of the modern discipline of medieval Scottish history. The great histories of the Victorian Age, in particular the works of John Hill Burton, Patrick Tytler Fraser and Eben William Robertson, were born in this climate and provided the inspiration for all students of Scottish history for the following century. Their influence has been recognised by Scottish historians as recently as 2002.[78] In addition to their own narrative works, antiquaries like Pinkerton, Innes, Skene and John Stuart (1813–77), president of the Society of Antiquaries of Scotland, edited and published the charters, chronicles, saints' lives, poetry and other written remnants of Scotland's medieval past. Remarkably, Innes edited the cartularies or charter collections of thirteen religious houses in addition to producing the monumental *Origines Parochiales Scotiae* (1851–5).[79] These primary sources as well as the occasional magnum opus, like Anderson and Allen's *Early Christian Monuments of Scotland* (1903), are still in use today;[80] indeed, they form the indispensable foundation upon which the modern discipline has been founded.

No giant of the nineteenth century, however, has cast a shadow as long and as deep as William Forbes Skene's. This erstwhile

[76] (*Continued*) face length and breadth, inter-ocular breadth, bigonial (jaw) breadth, and nose length and breadth. At the time, this equipment was manufactured by Aston & Mander, 25 Old Compton Street, London, price £3 3s. complete: *Transactions of the Bristol and Gloucestershire Archaeological Society* 18 (1893-4), 1-3.

[77] Stepan, *Idea of Race*, 105. This tendency was evident from the mid century. 'The extent, then, to which the two stocks that occupy the British Isles are pure or mixed; the characteristics of each stock in its purest form; and the effects of intermixture where it has taken place, are some of our problems; and if they could each and all be satisfactorily answered, we should have a Natural History of our Civilization'. R. G. Latham, *Ethnology*, 5.

[78] R. Andrew McDonald, 'Introduction: medieval Scotland and the new millennium', in McDonald (ed.), *Medieval Scotland: History, Literature, and Music in Scotland, 700–1560* (Toronto, 2002), 4; cf. Benjamin T. Hudson, *Kings of Celtic Scotland* (Westport, Conn., 1994), xi-xiii.

[79] Innes began his career as an assistant of Thomas Thomson (who in turn had been a secretary of Lord Hailes) and ended it as professor of history and constitutional law at Edinburgh. See Ash, *Strange Death*, 50-2; Innes, *Origines Parochiales Scotiae: the Antiquities, Ecclesiastical and Territorial, of the Parishes of Scotland*, 2 vols in 3 (Edinburgh, 1851-5).

[80] J. Romilly Allen and Joseph Anderson, *The Early Christian Monuments of Scotland*, 3 vols (Edinburgh, 1903).

Historiographer Royal of Scotland was the son of James Skene (1775–1864), a friend of Sir Walter Scott.[81] Skene edited manuscripts both in Latin (John of Fordun's *Chronica Gentis Scotorum*, 1871), in Gaelic, such as origin-legends, king-lists and genealogies in *Chronicles of the Picts and Scots* (1867), and in Welsh (*The Four Ancient Books of Wales*, 1868), but it was his three-volume *Celtic Scotland* that transformed the discipline.[82] This work sought to place 'Celtic Scotland' on the same rigid academic footing as had been achieved with the country's non-Celtic past, by examining contemporary texts and analysing philological and ethnographic material, in an attempt to achieve a cogent narrative of the primarily Gaelic side of Scotland's medieval history. *Celtic Scotland*, it could be said, finally undid the damage of the Ossian scandal and the Pictish debate, and made Celtic studies reputable again. In Alexander Macbain's opinion, '[t]he Celts of Scotland … owe Dr. Skene a debt of gratitude, for he was the first to draw their early history out of the slough into which it had got, and to make it respectable…'; 'he made writers of Scottish history devote fuller attention to the Celtic side of Scottish affairs'.[83] His work was still controversial in the 1960s, provoking one particularly harsh comparison to Chalmers' *Caledonia*; however, even that critical review referred to *Celtic Scotland* as 'his still unsuperseded *magnum opus*'.[84] The field of Scottish medieval history saw the release of important primary sources in the period between 1870 and 1950, primarily by Alan Orr Anderson, David Easson, William Croft Dickinson, and A. C. Lawrie. There were no major ideological shifts in the historiography during this period, however, and it was Skene's *Celtic Scotland*, above all, that continued lighting the way for new scholars.[85] In the words of Geoffrey Barrow, '[s]ince Skene it has been impossible for serious historians to ignore the importance of the Celtic element in medieval Scottish society'.[86]

Barrow's response to Skene was ambivalent, however. Bemoaning the 'sharply drawn simplicities' of an earlier time, Barrow criticised the easily-drawn 'sharp division' between 'Saxon' and 'Celtic'. For Skene it was

81 A. J. G. Mackay, 'William Forbes Skene', rev. W. D. H. Sellar, in *The Concise Dictionary of National Biography*, 3 vols (Oxford, 1992), iii. 2759-60; W.D.H. Sellar, 'William Forbes Skene (1809-92): historian of Celtic Scotland', *PSAS* 131 (2001) 3-21.

82 *Johannis de Fordun Chronica Gentis Scotorum*, ed. William F. Skene (Edinburgh, 1871); *Chronicles of the Picts, Chronicles of the Scots, and other Early Memorials of Scottish History*, ed. William F. Skene (Edinburgh, 1867); *The Four Ancient Books of Wales*, ed. William F. Skene, 2 vols (Edinburgh, 1868).

83 William Forbes Skene, *The Highlanders of Scotland*, 2nd edn, ed. Alexander Macbain (Stirling, 1902), xiv (ellipsis mine).

84 James Anderson, 'William Forbes Skene: Celtic Scotland v. Caledonia', *SHR* 46 (1967), 146.

85 Ash, *Strange Death*, 152; Richard Oram, 'Gold into lead? The state of early medieval Scottish History', in Terry Brotherstone and David Ditchburn (eds.), *Freedom and Authority: Historical and Historiographical Essays presented to Grant G. Simpson* (East Linton, 2000), 33.

86 Barrow, *Robert Bruce*, 2. On Skene's importance, see also E. J. Cowan, 'The invention of Celtic Scotland', in E. J. Cowan and R. A. McDonald (eds.), *Alba: Celtic Scotland in the Medieval Era* (East Linton, 2000), 1-4.

'never the twain shall meet'; conversely, for Barrow, the evidence was 'more complex than he [Skene] allowed it to be'.[87] Barrow's more nuanced approach was evident from the outset of his career, particularly in his early work on 'The cathedral chapter of St Andrews and the culdees in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries' (1952), which pointed out that the *céli Dé*, far from being systematically destroyed by the reforming foreign bishops, instead underwent a very gradual transformation which culminated in their reconstitution as a collegiate church.[88] At the same time, however, Barrow sought to lift Scottish medieval history out of the parochial kailyard and deposit it firmly on the familiar ground of feudalism and Anglo-Norman studies. In 1956, Barrow released a book with the title *Feudal Britain*, a title presumably inspired by J. H. Round's *Feudal England* (1895). In it, Barrow re-affirmed Scotland's role within a broader Anglo-Norman world, making it relevant again. The spectrum of Scottish history was changed dramatically. Alongside *Celtic Scotland*, there now was *Feudal Britain* and *The Anglo-Norman Era in Scottish History* (1980).[89]

The most significant break from the past that was evident in the work of Barrow, Duncan and their followers, was a shift to a more sophisticated approach on 'full ethnic packages'—the unquestioned assumption that with race came an automatic range of traits centred on language, law and customs. This sea change should not be taken for granted or underestimated. R. L. Graeme Ritchie, professor of French at the University of Birmingham from 1919–46, penned the first-ever study solely devoted to the role of the Normans in Scotland, which was published in 1954.[90] His study marked an important advance in scholarship; nevertheless, Ritchie wrote about the Normans as though their stereotypes were natural attributes. For example, he referred to 'historic Norman qualities', 'qualities like military ardour … skill in horsecraft … zeal for religious and social reform, strict regard for legality, a genius for organization, a feeling for ceremony and symbol'.[91] In contrast, the works of Barrow and Duncan, bolstered by accompanying advances in charter scholarship, abandoned much of this old baggage. In large part, Barrow shifted the focus from supposed inherent cultural characteristics of *peoples* (e.g., Norman efficiency), preferring instead to concentrate on institutions and *structures*, like feudalism. Furthermore, Barrow's analysis was detailed and heterogeneous; in 1965 he claimed that '[n]ot only do all continental incomers get lumped together as Norman—many of them were not—the impression is also given that all

87 Barrow, 'Rural settlement in central and eastern Scotland', in Barrow, *The Kingdom of the Scots*, 1st edn (London, 1973), 257. The article first appeared in *Scottish Studies* 6 (1962).

88 *Ibid.*, 187-202.

89 G. W. S. Barrow, *The Anglo-Norman Era in Scottish History*. Ford Lectures 1977 (Oxford 1980).

90 R. L. Graeme Ritchie, *The Normans in Scotland* (Edinburgh, 1954).

91 *Ibid.*, v. Ellipsis mine. Barrow called Ritchie the Normans' 'latest and best apologist'. 'Scotland's "Norman" families', in Barrow, *The Kingdom of the Scots*, 1st edn, 279.

these 'Normans' poured into Scotland at the same time … almost overnight'.[92] Duncan, on the other hand, largely ignored the ethnic arguments in his magisterial survey entitled *Scotland: The Making of the Kingdom* (1975), deciding instead to concentrate on individuals rather than groups, and with a level of detail hitherto unseen in Scottish narrative histories. For example, despite the title of chapter 6, 'Celt, Saxon and Norman, 1058–1124', Duncan grappled with this decisive era by avoiding ethnic terminology and disagreeing with many of the accepted interpretations of milestone events in the supposed Celtic/ Saxon + Norman conflict. Duncan held that St Margaret 'supported and encouraged native devotion to native saints, and was little concerned with innovation in monastic life in Scotland'.[93] Similarly, he maintained that Margaret, Edgar and Alexander 'sought to influence, perhaps even to modify, but not to revolutionise'.[94]

II: Social science, ethnicity and the medievalists' response

Another major change in ways of thinking was going on in the sixties and seventies in other areas of academia which would affect greatly the way medievalists conceived of their period of study. In the 1960s and 70s, a debate raged over the question of race, with primordialists claiming that races were unchanging human categories, and modernists asserting that racial groups were malleable. As support in the 'hard sciences' for the biological model of race fell away, a consensus was formed, based on the modernist position.[95] Most sociologists would now agree to a definition in which races (or ethnic groups; the terms are very similar) are (a) 'socially constructed', i.e. actively defined by people, and (b) 'historically contingent', i.e., that they could change in response to social and cultural factors. In other words, people can define themselves or be defined by others as a racial or ethnic group. Such groups tend to define themselves based on a common belief in shared biological descent (though these beliefs can be changeable), as well as appearance, language, law, customs, and national identity. These concepts spread rapidly to the humanities. The most striking thesis to emerge from this interaction was that relating to the modernity of ethnic nationalism. According to this view, modern nation-states necessitated the co-identification and convergence of ethnic and national identities; this had only become

92 *Ibid.*, 280.
93 A. A. M. Duncan, *Scotland: The Making of the Kingdom* (Edinburgh, 1975), 123.
94 *Ibid.*, 132.
95 For a variety of views, see *Theories of Race and Ethnic Relations*, ed. John Rex and David Mason (Cambridge, 1986); M. Elaine Burgess, 'The resurgence of ethnicity: myth or reality?', *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 1 (1978) 265-85; A. H. Halsey, 'Ethnicity: a primordial social bond?', *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 1 (1978) 124-8; Anthony D. Smith, 'War and ethnicity: the role of warfare in the formation, self-images and cohesion of ethnic communities', *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 4 (1981) 375-97; Robin Cohen, 'The making of ethnicity: a modest defence of primordialism', in Edward Mortimer and Robert Fine (eds), *People, Nation and State: The Meaning of Ethnicity and Nationalism* (London, 1999), 3-11. On developments in race science, see Stepan, *The Idea of Race*, 83-190.

possible in the wake of such seismic cultural shifts as the advent of mass print-culture, the Industrial revolution and Enlightenment philosophy.[96] The implication that nations as such did not exist has drawn criticism from premodernist scholars.[97]

For medievalists, discussions about ethnicity are irrevocably entangled with the attempt to understand the origins of nationalism.[98] Susan Reynolds advanced her own critique of the modernist position, asserting that ethnicity and polity could converge in the Middle Ages, but in the form of medieval *regna* rather than modern nations.[99] Moreover, sociologists have drawn a distinction between ethnic and civic nations.[100] Similarly, Patrick Geary has argued that the existence of constitutional peoples in antiquity, as defined by law and allegiance, as opposed to biological peoples, based on descent, custom, and geography, underwrote a civilisation/ barbarity dualism.[101] Robert Bartlett has demonstrated that medieval attitudes were characterised by a great deal of diversity, and that thinkers were able to support either multiethnic polities or single-ethnicity states.[102] Furthermore, academics agree that individuals living in the Middle Ages saw themselves as peoples or races, with myths of common descent, and that affinities in language, social custom and physical appearance were the natural consequence.[103] The story, however, does not end there; as Bartlett has shown, 'medieval terminology may have allowed a biological or genetic construal of race, but it also allowed a picture of races as changing cultural communities'.[104]

Unsurprisingly, the critique of medieval ethnicity has led to a re-examination of many of the ethnic terms that academics use. Most relevant to Scotland has been the raging debate over 'Celticity'.[105] A deeper

[96] For two sides of the argument over whether nations existed before modernity, see Ernest Gellner, 'Adam's navel: "primordialists" versus "modernists"', and Anthony D. Smith, 'The nation: real or imagined?', both in Mortimer and Fine (eds), *People, Nation and State*, 31-42. The chief proponents of the modernist argument (although each with their own very distinctive approaches) were Ernest Gellner, *Nations and Nationalism* (Oxford, 1983), Benedict Anderson, *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origins and Spread of Nationalism* (London, 1983), and Eric Hobsbawm, *Nations and Nationalisms since 1780* (Cambridge, 1990).

[97] A critical description of the historiographical debate is offered in Anthony D. Smith, *The Nation in History: Historiographical Debates about Ethnicity and Nationalism* (Cambridge, 2000), esp. chap. 2.

[98] On differences between modern and medieval views of national and ethnic identity, see Susan Reynolds, 'What do we mean by "Anglo-Saxon" and "Anglo-Saxons"?', *Journal of British Studies* 24 (1985), 399, and Anthony D. Smith, 'National identities: modern and medieval', in Simon Forde, Lesley Johnson and Alan V. Murray (eds), *Concepts of National Identity in the Middle Ages* (Leeds, 1995), 21-46.

[99] Susan Reynolds, 'Medieval *origines gentium* and the community of the realm', *History* 68 (1984), 382-7.

[100] Smith, *The Nation in History*, 15-16.

[101] Geary, *The Myth of Nations*, 42.

[102] Robert Bartlett, 'Medieval and modern concepts of race and ethnicity', *Journal of Medieval and Early Modern Studies* 31 (Winter, 2001), 50-1.

[103] *Ibid.*, 42-3; Reynolds, 'Medieval *origines gentium*', 383-4.

[104] Bartlett, 'Medieval and modern concepts', 54.

[105] For an excellent analysis of the Celticity debate, see Patrick Sims-Williams, 'Celtomania and Celtoscepticism', *Cambrian Medieval Celtic Studies* 36 (1998) 1-35; cf.

understanding of the way that 'Celt', a word rescued from Antiquity by Renaissance luminaries like George Buchanan (1506–82), has emerged from this scholarly attention.[106] While it is possible to talk about a shared Gaelic culture reaching from Buchan to Bantry Bay, it is also now clear that Gaelic and Britonnic (i.e. Welsh) societies saw themselves as distinct, and sometimes antagonistically so.[107] Furthermore, any pan-Gaelicism itself must be balanced against the understanding that peoples like the Galwegians, men of Moray and men of Argyll seem to have seen themselves as distinct *gentes*, despite being all Gaels.[108] In any event, the idea that the Irish and Scottish Gaels, along with the Welsh and Cornish, should be thought of as 'Celtic' evolved over the course of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, based largely on linguistic grounds.[109] Patrick Sims-Williams, claiming that 'self-conscious Celtic solidarity cannot be traced back beyond the modern period', dismisses the usual counter-arguments with ease; alliances of Scots, Irish and Welsh leaders were based primarily on 'common grievance against the English'.[110]

Yet the ideas evoked by Celticism are powerful and resilient; indeed, some might say, the romantic spirit of Ossian is alive and well. 'For good or ill the Celtic label is now well established and no amount of futile flytings between archaeologists, linguists and historians will change that fact': so wrote Ted Cowan in a recent volume.[111] Indeed, the stature of 'things Celtic', real or imagined, in popular culture today is mind-boggling: a search of amazon.com for books on the topic of 'Celts' reveals over 12,000 results![112] The word still has the power to fire the popular imagination, and points to the central dilemma of the Scottish

[105] (*Continued*) Simon James, *The Atlantic Celts: Ancient People or Modern Invention?* (London, 1999) and Malcolm Chapman, *The Celts: the Construction of a Myth* (London, 1992). On Celtic identity in a Scottish context, see Cowan, 'The invention'; Stuart Piggott, 'Celts, Saxons and the early antiquaries', in Piggott, *Ruins in a Landscape* (Edinburgh, 1976), 55-76; Murray G. H. Pittock, *Celtic Identity and the British Image* (Manchester, 1999); Colin Kidd, *British Identities before Nationalism: Ethnicity and Nationhood in the Atlantic World, 1600-1800* (Cambridge, 1999); Kidd, 'Teutonist ethnology'.

[106] Cowan, 'The invention', 7-8.

[107] Sims-Williams, 'Celtomania', 14, where he claims that 'the Welsh generally disliked the Irish' and 'no umbrella term like Celtic was in use'.

[108] See Dauvit Broun, 'Defining Scotland and the Scots before the wars of independence', in Dauvit Broun, R.J. Finlay and Michael Lynch (eds), *Image and Identity: The Making and Re-making of Scotland Through the Ages* (Edinburgh, 1998), esp. 10-11. Also, William of Malmesbury saw the peoples of England in the same way; see Bartlett, 'Medieval and modern concepts', 43-4.

[109] Sims-Williams, 'Celtomania', 7-16; Cowan, 'The invention', 11-17.

[110] Sims-Williams, 'Celtomania', 11. Compare Robert I's letter to the Irish (1306/7), *Regesta Regum Scotorum v: The Acts of Robert I*, ed. A. A. M. Duncan (Edinburgh, 1988), no. 564, in which he uses the word *natio*, with Edward Bruce's letter, no. 571, to the Welsh (late 1316), which bases its plea on Christianity and origin myths. Cf. also A.A.M. Duncan, 'The Scots' invasion of Ireland, 1315', in R. R. Davies (ed.), *The British Isles 1100–1500: Comparisons, Contrasts and Connections* (Edinburgh, 1988), 100-17, esp. 110 and 114, as well as Sims-Williams' comments: 'Celtomania', 12, n.40.

[111] Cowan, 'The invention', 5.

[112] http://www.amazon.com

historian: how to reconcile the legacy of Scott and the romantic movement with the methods, practices and concerns of history in today's world. Indeed, the words 'Celt' and 'Celtic' seem to crop up more often in the titles of books and articles nowadays rather than playing a substantive role in the text.[113] One suspects that many authors of popular history and historical fiction lose much less sleep over this problem than academics; nevertheless, it is tempting to see works like Barrow's embrace of Celticity in the introduction to *Robert Bruce* as a deft attempt to meet curious young minds half-way.

The situation today with the terms 'Teutonic' or 'Germanic' could not be more different: outside of philology, this terminology became much less fashionable after the Second World War. Yet much of the baggage of Teutonism surely survives in its representative peoples, most significantly the Normans. *Normanni* as a medieval *gens* or *populus* is not, of course, anachronistic, and its ethnic identity has long been studied.[114] Medieval *Normanitas*, however, was a narrower concept than that used by many modern Scottish writers, who had a tendency in the past to cast as Norman virtually anything from south of the English Channel. Recent authors have favoured a modern term which refers to the culture specific to French-speaking knights in Britain.[115] Yet there is no evidence that 'Anglo-Norman' would have meant anything much to contemporaries, and John Gillingham has argued cogently that English identity was a more meaningful concept by the mid-twelfth century than the anachronistic 'Anglo-Norman'.[116] It is difficult, however, to know how to

[113] Several examples from the last fifteen years include Cowan and McDonald (eds), *Alba: Celtic Scotland*; Benjamin T. Hudson and Vickie Ziegler (eds), *Crossed Paths: Methodological Approaches to the Celtic Aspect of the European Middle Ages* (Lanham, 1991); Alexander Grant, 'Scotland's "Celtic Fringe" in the late Middle Ages: the MacDonald Lords of the Isles and the kingdom of Scotland', in Davies (ed.), *The British Isles: 1100–1500*; Benjamin T. Hudson, *Kings of Celtic Scotland* (London, 1994); Cynthia J. Neville, 'A Celtic enclave in Norman Scotland: Earl Gilbert and the earldom of Strathearn, 1171-1223', in Ditchburn and Brotherstone (eds), *Freedom and Authority*; Neville, 'Charter-writing and the exercise of lordship in thirteenth-century Celtic Scotland', in A. Musson (ed.), *Expectations of Law in the Middle Ages* (Woodbridge, 2001); W. D. H. Sellar, 'Celtic law and Scots law: survival and integration', *Scottish Studies* 29 (1989); Keith J. Stringer, 'Reform monasticism and Celtic Scotland: Galloway, c.1140–c.1240', in Cowan and McDonald (eds), *Alba: Celtic Scotland*.

[114] On the 'mythical' nature of *Normanitas*, see R. H. C. Davis, *The Normans and their Myth* (London, 1976); for a response to this argument, see G. A. Loud, 'The '*Gens Normannorum*'—myth or reality?', *Proceedings of the Battle Conference* 4 (1981). See also C. Warren Hollister, 'Anglo-Norman political culture and the twelfth-century renaissance', in C. W. Hollister (ed.), *Anglo-Norman Political Culture and the Twelfth Century Renaissance* (Suffolk, 1997).

[115] Some works to employ the term include Marjorie Chibnall, *Anglo-Norman England: 1066-1166* (Oxford, 1986); David Rollason, Margaret Harvey and Michael Prestwich (eds), *Anglo-Norman Durham, 1093-1193* (Woodbridge, 1994); Barrow, *The Anglo-Norman Era*. The term is least problematic when restricted to the description of the 'Anglo-Norman' dialect of French.

[116] John Gillingham, 'Henry of Huntingdon and the English nation', in Gillingham, *The English in the Twelfth Century* (Woodbridge, 2000), 124. Gillingham has also argued convincingly, based on contemporary evidence, that references to 'Normans' and 'Anglo-Normans' should be dropped in the context of the 1170 invasion of Ireland: see 'The English invasion of Ireland', in Gillingham, *The English in the Twelfth Century*.

replace the phrase. As early as 1965, Barrow commented on the variegated nature of Scottish immigration, pointing especially to the Flemish influx, and characterised Malcolm IV and William I as members of a 'Frankish aristocracy'.[117] More recently, Dauvit Broun has referred to 'Anglo-French' acculturation, which is more accurate, yet still a modern construct.[118] Whatever the solution to this dilemma, it is clear that *Franci* is the term favoured in surviving Scottish royal charters,[119] as well as in chronicles of English and Irish provenance when referring to Scotland.[120]

The last decade has seen a revival of interest in studying ethnicity for its own sake. A spotlight was thrown on the topic in 1993 when Rees Davies began a series of presidential addresses to the Royal Historical Society on the peoples of medieval Britain.[121] In Scotland, a growing awareness of what has been called the 'strategic and situational' elements in ethnic identity has led to new studies on how individuals sought to shape views for political or personal gain.[122] Bartlett has pointed out the divergence in depictions of Scotland's 'ethnicity' between Robert and Edward Bruce on the one hand and John of Fordun on the other.[123] Dauvit Broun has analysed king-lists and origin-legends from the eleventh to fourteenth centuries, noting how the royally sanctioned version of history played up the kingship's Irishness.[124] Ted Cowan has examined the ways in which political documents like Baldred Bisset's *Processus* (1301) and the *Declaration of Arbroath* (1320) emphasized Scottish

[117] Barrow, 'Scotland's "Norman" families', 285-90; Barrow, *Robert Bruce*, 7.

[118] Broun, 'Anglo-French acculturation and the Irish element in Scottish identity', in Brendan Smith (ed.), *Britain and Ireland, 900-1300: Insular Responses to Medieval European Change* (Cambridge, 1999).

[119] For an example of the use of *Franci* in royal charters, see no. 161 in G. W. S. Barrow (ed.), *The Charters of David I. The Written Acts of David I King of Scots, 1124-53, and of his son Henry, Earl of Northumberland, 1139-52* (Woodbridge, 1999), 130-1. English royal charters also used the formula '*Franci et Angli*'. See Ian Short, '*Tam Angli quam Franci*: self-definition in Anglo-Norman England', *Anglo-Norman Studies* 18 (1995), 163.

[120] For example, note the use of the term 'Frankish' or 'French' to refer to William the Conqueror's forces in AU 1072.8: Seán Mac Airt and Gearóid Mac Niocaill (ed.), *Annals of Ulster to A.D. 1131, Part I: Text and Translation* (Dublin, 1983), 508. Ian Short discusses the preference of *Franci* over *Normanni* in '*Tam Angli quam Franci*', 163-4. According to the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle,* MS E, Duncan II 'went to Scotland with what aid he could get of the English and the French'. See *The Anglo-Saxon Chronicle: A Collaborative Edition*, vol.vii, *MS E*, ed. Susan Irvine (Cambridge, 2004), 104, *s.a.* 1093; translation from Alan Orr Anderson, *Scottish Annals from English Chroniclers* (London, 1908), 118. Furthermore, in an oft-cited quotation from the Barnwell Chronicle ('the more recent kings of Scots profess themselves to be rather Frenchmen') no mention is made of 'Normans': *Memoriale Fratris Walteri de Coventria: the Historical Collection of Walter of Coventry*, ed. William Stubbs, Rolls Series, 2 vols (London, 1872-3) ii. 206; Anderson, *Scottish Annals from English Chroniclers*, 330. (Walter of Coventry copied this passage from the Barnwell Chronicle.)

[121] R.R. Davies, 'The peoples of Britain and Ireland 1100-1400: 1. Identities', *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society* 6th ser., 4 (1994) 1-20.

[122] Bartlett, 'Medieval and modern concepts', 42.

[123] *Ibid.*, 53.

[124] Dauvit Broun, *The Irish Identity of the Kingdom of the Scots in the Twelfth and Thirteenth Centuries* (Woodbridge, 1999).

identity.[125] Surviving documents of an overtly ethnographic nature tend to highlight the kings, and much of the work so far has been done in the context of the 'origins' of a Scottish national identity.[126] Despite the difficulties of source material, one hopes that future academics may be able to tease out aristocratic and religious perspectives on the process of ethnic identification from contemporary chronicles, charters and saints' lives and other texts. Alex Woolf's recent (unpublished) paper on 'The Scottish Identity of the Kingdom of Alba', which examines the ninth- and tenth-century transformation of Pictish and Scottish ethnic identity by analysing works like the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*, the *Chronicle of the Kings of Alba* and the *Life of St Cathroe*, may point to future possibilities.[127] The importance of these studies cannot be underestimated, for they bring us closer to understanding how contemporary attitudes to ethnic identity worked on the ground.

III: The surviving structures of ethnic dualism

Thanks to the Barrow/ Duncan revolution in Scottish history, coupled with the social scientists' critique on race, no historian writing today would seriously profess the belief that Celtic and Teutonic peoples developed distinct societies based upon the physical and mental characteristics inherent to their 'races'. Occasionally a writer may employ language like 'native stock' or 'intermarriage'; indeed, one even characterised the latter as 'accommodation and cooperation between races'.[128] Furthermore, while the use of anachronistic terminology is problematic, simply substituting one word with another does nothing to advance our understanding. It must be encouraging that academics have begun to investigate seriously the strategies and situations behind ethnic identification. Yet the history of medieval Scotland was founded on the misleading theories and uncritical assumptions of the nineteenth century: despite the

[125] Edward J. Cowan, 'Identity, freedom and the Declaration of Arbroath', in Broun *et al.* (eds), *Image and Identity*.

[126] On what could reasonably be called Medieval Scottish ethnography, see Edward J. Cowan, 'Myth and identity in early medieval Scotland', *SHR* 63 (1984) 111-135; Dauvit Broun, 'The birth of Scottish History', *SHR* 76 (1997) 4-22; John Bannerman, 'The king's poet and the inauguration of Alexander III', *SHR* 68 (1989) 120-49. Medieval writers drew attention to both the Irish and English lines of descent of the kings of Scots. Ethnic language was used for purposes of political expediency; Scottish kings could be Irish, they could be part-Pictish, they could be English, they could seem French, or they could be descended from Egyptian pharaohs or ancient Scythians. Cf. Broun, *Irish Identity*, 196-9; Ailred of Rievaulx, *Genealogia Regum Anglorum*, in J.-P. Migne (ed.), *Patrologia Latina*, cxcv. cols 735-6; Adam of Dryburgh, *De tripartito tabernaculo*, Migne (ed.), *Patrologia Latina*, cxcviii. cols 722-3; Anderson, *Scottish Annals from English Chroniclers*, 330; *Jordan Fantosme's Chronicle*, ed. R. C. Johnston (Oxford, 1981), 49.

[127] Alex Woolf, 'The Scottish Identity of the Kingdom of Alba in the Twelfth and Thirteenth Centuries' at *Rannsachadh na Gàidhlig 3*, University of Edinburgh, 21-23 July 2004.

[128] R. A. McDonald, 'Matrimonial politics and core-periphery interactions in twelfth-century and early thirteenth-century Scotland', *Journal of Medieval History* 21 (1995), 229.

significant advances of Barrow and his contemporaries, the conceptual framework underpinning the structure of Scottish medieval history remains unsound. The nineteenth-century debate between Teutonists and Celtists has allowed a kind of ethnic dualism to emerge and crystalise, along with its many attendant prejudices.

Perhaps the most immediately obvious carry-over from the nineteenth century has been a scheme of periodisation, in which the marriage of Malcolm III and St Margaret (ca. 1070) augured the main trend of the next two centuries: the wedding of Gaelic Scotland with English and Norman civilisation. The concept of a new royal house beginning with Malcolm III has become a deep-rooted convention in Scottish history. For example, Michael Lynch's *Scotland: A New History* includes a chapter entitled 'The MacMalcolm Dynasty'.[129] The concept, however, has no bearing on the contemporary experience of the late eleventh century. The supposed accession of the 'Canmores', whose very name is now under question, was arguably the result of political spin based on the infusion of Wessex royal blood brought by Margaret combined with the later changes to kingship initiated by David I and his grandsons.[130] Nevertheless, the notion of a Canmore dynasty continues to structure new books on the Scottish monarchy.[131] The division of the royal line that ruled Scotland from ca 840 to 1286 at this point in the late eleventh century is a result of nineteenth-century desires to separate the backward, conservative 'Celtic' kingship of the 'House of Alpin' from the more civilised, enlightened, european monarchy of the 'House of Canmore', and it is a concept which deserves proper examination.

The tendency to draw a line somewhere around 1100 has encouraged writers to make simple distinctions between the earlier, Celtic, period and the later, Norman, era.[132] Ideas about what is old and what is new are enmeshed in a binary opposition, creating a watershed that forces historical trends to flow into either a Celtic or a Norman reservoir. 'Celticness' in this context is associated with the (often ancient) past, with tradition, and is generally described in terms of survival, tenacity, stubbornness, and related concepts. For example, to return to *Robert Bruce* (1965), Barrow writes that 'many … pieces of Celtic conservatism survived north of Forth and in the south-west'.[133] Much of Barrow's work

[129] Michael Lynch, *Scotland: A New History* (London, 1991).

[130] Archie Duncan has argued that the soubriquet *ceann mór* was originally meant for Malcolm IV (d. 1165), not Malcolm III (d. 1093): A. A. M. Duncan, *The Kingship of the Scots, 842-1292: Succession and Independence* (Edinburgh, 2002), 51-2, 75.

[131] Richard Oram (ed.), *The Kings and Queens of Scotland* (Stroud, 2001); Richard Oram, *The Canmores* (Stroud, 2002). See also A. D. M. Barrell, *Medieval Scotland* (Cambridge, 2000), 13, where he writes, 'it is tempting to see the accession of Malcolm III as heralding a new era'.

[132] For example, Gordon Donaldson referred to the era before Queen Margaret as the 'Celtic Period', and noted that 'from Duncan's reign (1094) onwards, Scotland was no longer a purely Celtic country': Donaldson, *Scotland: Church and Nation through Sixteen Centuries* (Edinburgh, 1960), 7-16.

[133] Barrow, *Robert Bruce*, 3.

exhibits a laudable inclination to aim for a sense of balance between Celtic and Anglo-Norman themes.[134] Barrow continued these themes in his work of two decades later, in which he explored the evidence for a 'Lost Gàidhealtachd' in lowland Scotia, which he evocatively termed 'the fossil record'.[135] One wonders whether the Anglo-Norman Scotland of knights, tournaments and castles is any less 'lost' today. In many ways, Duncan's views augmented and supported those presented by Barrow, occasionally turning phrases such as 'zones of true Celtic survival'.[136] The real danger of these assumptions is that anything Gaelic or native is liable to be interpreted as ancient, backward and unresponsive to social change. For example, the inauguration of Alexander III has long been viewed as 'custom already very ancient in 1249'.[137] Recent research, however, has argued the existence of innovations in the ceremony which had evolved in response to specific political concerns.[138] The periodisation that is maintained through this opposition of old and new still underlies a tendency to separate 'early medieval Scotland' from 'feudal Scotland' in current textbooks.[139]

The supposedly Celtic and Norman influences in medieval Scottish society are generally seen as mutually exclusive. The most evocative image of their interaction is the coin. Geoffrey Barrow, exhibiting a characteristic striving for balance, depicted Gaelic society as 'the other side of the coin' to the new Anglo-Norman world.[140] A coin is a two-dimensional symbol, one which sums up satisfactorily the ethnic dualism which still holds sway today. As in any binary opposition, what is Celtic (or Gaelic or native) is defined against what is Norman (or Anglo-French or European) and vice versa. Just as the periodisation scheme inherited from the nineteenth century encourages assumptions about Celtic conservatism and backwardness, so this ethnic dualism propogates progressivist-racialist views on the Normans as the harbingers of civilisation and modernity. At times, the definition of 'Normanness' could be based more on an outward-looking, reform-minded attitude rather than geography or ethnic identity. For example, Marinell Ash's study of the diocese of St Andrews, although a major landmark in the discipline, nevertheless exemplified this common tendency. Ash defined 'Norman' bishops as those who 'were foreign-born or trained and who brought to their diocese a concern to

[134] Barrow, *David I: the Balance of New and Old*, Stenton Lecture 1984 (Reading, 1985), reprinted in Barrow, *Scotland and its Neighbours in the Middle Ages* (London, 1992), and 'The Other Side of the Coin', the final chapter in Barrow, *The Anglo-Norman Era*.
[135] Barrow, 'The lost Gàidhealtachd', in *Scotland and its Neighbours*, 105-26, originally published in *Gaelic and Scotland: Alba agus a' Ghàidhlig*, ed. William Gillies (Edinburgh, 1989), 67-88.
[136] Duncan, *Scotland: the Making of the Kingdom*, 450.
[137] Barrow, *Robert Bruce*, 5.
[138] Broun, 'The origin of the Stone of Scone as a national icon', in Richard Welander, David J. Breeze and Thomas Owen Clancy (eds), *The Stone of Destiny: Artefact and Icon* (Edinburgh, 2003), 189-93.
[139] Barrell, *Medieval Scotland*.
[140] Barrow, *The Anglo-Norman Era*, 145.

bring it into conformity with the practices of the western church'.[141] It is a half century since Ritchie claimed that '[t]he lines on which Scotland has developed as a civilized country were laid down once and for all before the death of King David in 1153, and these lines were Norman'.[142] While few would put it so bluntly today, it remains for Scottish historians to confront the implications of this legacy.

On the reverse side of the coin there exists the Skenian notion of a fierce Celtic resistance to Norman modernisation, albeit one inevitably doomed to failure.[143] Current scholars follow Skene in their portrayal of a centralising Scots monarchy as anti-Celtic, and their depiction of dynastic opposition as cultural warfare; and, as in Skene's work, 1094 and 1160 are banner years. Donald III Bán, that 'incorrigible old Celt', has been held up as the leader of a '"Celtic" or native reaction' after the deaths of Malcolm III and St Margaret.[144] Likewise, the 1160 'rebellion of the earls' at Perth has been touted as another instance of anti-monarchical Celtic resistance, which R. A. McDonald depicted as 'reticence toward newfangled ways'.[145] Not all scholars have viewed antimonarchical struggles as Celtic conservatism: Duncan wrote, 'they may not be accounted simply as a "Celtic reaction" for the armies which the king sent against them were equally Celtic'.[146] Indeed, McDonald has elevated the topic to a *leitmotif*, and in several works has constructed a framework, heavily influenced by Skene's views, which sets up individuals like Fergus of Galloway, Somerled of Argyll and the MacWilliams as part of a sustained native opposition to the Normanising Canmore monarchs.[147]

Historians have tended to fall into the trap of ethnic dualism in particular in four specific areas: law, kingship, lordship and religion. On these topics, the tendency to define Celtic and Anglo-Norman trends against each other has allowed frameworks set up on pairs of opposites to propogate. For example, Scottish legal historians have drawn a clear distinction between 'Celtic law', with elements such as *cáin* and *coinnmed*/ conveth, 'Scottish' or common army service, and the *breitheamh* (Latin *judex*), and 'Anglo-Norman law', with traits such as brieves, sheriffs and

[141] Marinell Ash, 'The diocese of St. Andrews under its "Norman" bishops', *SHR* 55 (1976), 105.

[142] Ritchie, *The Normans*, vi.

[143] One is tempted to view this tendency in the context of the nineteenth-century romanticist idealisation of the past in the face of industrialist modernisation, with its destruction of nature and its frantic pace of life.

[144] Donaldson, *Scotland: Church and Nation*, 18. Ritchie quoted in Donaldson, *Scottish Kings* (London, 1967), 13.

[145] McDonald, 'Matrimonial politics', 236.

[146] Duncan, *Scotland: the Making of the Kingdom*, 198.

[147] R. Andrew McDonald, *Outlaws of Medieval Scotland: Challenges to the Canmore Kings, 1058-1266* (East Linton, 2003); McDonald, *The Kingdom of the Isles: Scotland's Western Seaboard, c.1100–c.1336* (East Linton, 1997); McDonald, 'Rebels without a cause? The relations of Fergus of Galloway and Somerled of Argyll with the Scottish kings, 1153–1164', in Cowan and McDonald (eds), *Alba: Celtic Scotland*. A similar 'Celtic reactionist' view is seen in the popular writer John L. Roberts, *Lost Kingdoms: Celtic Scotland and the Middle Ages* (Edinburgh, 1997).

military tenure. *The Scottish Legal Tradition* (1991) states that 'the feudal law and institutions which found their way into Scotland were unmistakeably Anglo-Norman'.[148] Richard Oram has claimed that the 'Barrovian thesis' forms the current orthodoxy and maintains that a 'highly evolved system' of military feudalism was a 'wholesale import' into Scotland.[149] Susan Reynolds, in her recent examination of feudalism in Scotland, warned against 'presupposing that any general and coherent pattern of feudo-vassalic relations and property rights existed outside of Scotland ready to be imported'.[150] Hector MacQueen, moreover, has argued that 'the evidence does not suggest that the old native system was being destroyed or displaced as a matter of deliberate policy; rather it was being assimilated', maintaining that 'there was no conflict between the old "Celtic" law on the one hand and new "feudal" law on the other'.[151] Likewise, Reynolds proposes 'abandoning a simple contrast between feudal culture … and native or Celtic culture'.[152]

Similarly, our understanding of kingship in medieval Scotland is imbued with a sense of ethnic dualism. The question of succession, for example, is one area where a dichotomy has been established, comparing the arcane Celtic system of tanistry to the more standardised European system of primogeniture. As Ritchie put it, 'the old Celtic principle of collateral succession had been challenged and now superseded by the Norman principle of primogeniture'.[153] In a recent article, however, Alex Woolf has cast serious doubt on the use of a traditional 'system' of tanistry in Alba in the eleventh century, and it is clear in any event that an abrupt switch from a neat Celtic system to a neat Norman one only serves to obfuscate more complicated processes at work.[154]

Scottish kings are subject to an awkward and paradoxical treatment. On the one hand, they are seen as the principle proponents of 'Normanisation'; on the other, the nature of their kingship has been seen as Celtic.[155] Scottish kingship has been described as more rustic than the established European form, mainly because it did not include

[148] Michael C. Meston, W. David H. Sellar and Lord Cooper (eds), *The Scottish Legal Tradition* (Edinburgh, 1991), 34-6. *Cin* and conveth were perennial renders owed to a king or other lord based on land tenure. See also Barrow, 'The *judex*', in Barrow, *The Kingdom of the Scots*, 1st edn, 57, where he writes: '[i]t has long been recognised that *judex* represented a survival from pre-twelfth-century Scotland, that formed part of the older, Celtic order of society'.

[149] Oram, 'Gold into lead?', 39.

[150] Susan Reynolds, 'Fiefs and vassals in Scotland: a view from outside', *SHR* 82 (2003), 180.

[151] Hector L. MacQueen, 'Scots Law under Alexander III', in Norman H. Reid (ed.), *Scotland in the Age of Alexander III, 1249-86* (Edinburgh, 1990), 82, 95.

[152] Reynolds, 'Fiefs and vassals in Scotland', 192. Ellipsis mine.

[153] Ritchie, *The Normans*, 63.

[154] Alex Woolf, 'The "Moray Question" and the kingship of Alba in the tenth and eleventh centuries', *SHR* 79 (2000), 152. 'Tanistry' is the Gaelic system of royal succession characterized by an heir apparent known as the *tánaise* or tanist who was often the brother or nephew, rather than son, of the reigning king.

[155] Barrow mentions the 'Celtic character of the Scottish monarchy': Barrow, *Robert Bruce*, 5.

archiepiscopal anointment. Historians have focused on Alexander III (1249–86) as Celtic, based upon the participation of a Gaelic-speaking bard or *ollamh rígh* in a 1249 inauguration ceremony that has been portrayed as traditional, archaic, anachronistic and ritualized.[156] Barrow, however, wrote about the 'consciously "European" monarchy of Alexander III'.[157] Thus, Alexander III has been portrayed as the embodiment of both 'Celtic tradition of immemorial antiquity' as well as European culture.[158] Ethnic terminology is arguably confusing rather than illuminating the conversation on kingship.

Even more than kingship, territorial lordship is frequently described in ethnic language. In Scotia, the kingdom's heartland, the mormaers or earls are often seen as Celtic, native and conservative. Barrow, for example, characterised the earls as 'a remarkable example of Celtic survival' and referred to their 'tenacious conservatism'.[159] Furthermore, this trend belies a strong Skenian influence, allowing for phrases like 'the Celtic earl of Buchan' and the 'Celtic enclave' of Strathearn.[160] Unfortunately, studies of the earldoms are centred on the interplay between native and feudal influences, which draws attention away from where it is needed: addressing the question of what role mormaers or earls played in the contemporary society of that time, and interpreting any changes that occurred in terms of the exercise of power. At the same time, regions on the 'periphery', like Galloway and the Western Isles, are sometimes described as Celtic.[161] What these studies lack is an explanation why these western regions, which were irrevocably transformed by centuries of Norse influence, should be considered more Celtic than the east. Perhaps more than in any other area, eschewing the ethnic baggage holds the potential for fruitful new interpretations of lordship in medieval Scotland.[162]

[156] MacQueen, 'Scots law', 82. See also M. D. Legge, 'The inauguration of Alexander III', *Proceedings of the Society of Antiquaries of Scotland* 80 (1945-7) 73-82; A.A.M. Duncan, *The Nation of Scots and the Declaration of Arbroath* (London, 1970), 8; Bannerman, 'The king's poet'; G.W.S. Barrow, 'Kingship in medieval England and Scotland', in *Scotland and its Neighbours in the Middle Ages* (London, 1992), 37; cf. Broun, 'The origin of the Stone'.

[157] This was mentioned in contradistinction to the 'Celtic monarchy of Malcolm III "Canmore"'. Barrow, 'Kingship in Medieval England and Scotland', 39. Barrow also claimed that 'Alexander III's kingdom was indeed a Celtic country': Barrow, *Robert Bruce*, 2.

[158] Legge, 'The inauguration', 79.

[159] Barrow, *Robert Bruce*, 8. Barrow, *The Anglo-Norman Era*, 160.

[160] On Buchan, see W. Croft Dickinson, *Scotland from the Earliest Times to 1603*, 3rd edn, rev. and ed. A. A. M. Duncan (Oxford, 1977), 84. On Strathearn, see Cynthia Neville, 'A Celtic enclave in Norman Scotland'.

[161] On Galloway, see Keith Stringer, 'Periphery and core in thirteenth-century Scotland: Alan, son of Roland, Lord of Galloway and Constable of Scotland', in Alexander Grant and Keith J. Stringer (eds) *Medieval Scotland: Crown, Lordship and Community: Essays presented to G. W. S. Barrow* (Edinburgh, 1993), 82. R. Andrew McDonald described Somerled of Argyll as a 'representative of Celtic conservatism': McDonald, 'Rebels without a cause?', in Cowan and McDonald (eds), *Alba: Celtic Scotland*, 184.

[162] See chapters by Boardman, MacQueen and Ross in Steve Boardman and Alasdair Ross (eds), *The Exercise of Power in Medieval Scotland* (Dublin, 2003).

Religion is another topic which has suffered from an overly dualistic viewpoint. The aforementioned problems with periodisation have allowed a structure to continue in which the church before the twelfth century is described as Celtic in opposition to the hierarchical Catholic church based in Rome. This contradistinction draws on the 'Presbyterian myth', popular in the nineteenth century, that the ancient and native church of Scotland did not have bishops and was thus not truly catholic.[163] Furthermore, twelfth-century diocesan reorganisation and the introduction of reform monasticism tends to be viewed as an element of the process of Normanisation.[164] That era has even been regarded in perhaps a wistful, nostalgic manner as the endgame of a fully elaborated (and anachronistic) 'Celtic Church', again showing the influence of Skene. What one writer has described as its 'death knell' may be viewed as the result of Anglo-Norman expansion; it may also be attributed to the growth of new religious orders and the extension and bureaucratization of papal power, trends which were occurring across Europe.[165] Furthermore, mainstream Scottish historians have continued to posit native, traditional, Celtic churchmen like the *céli Dé* in opposition to the introduction of new monastic orders and the reorganization of dioceses and parishes, which have been associated with the "Normans."[166] Recently, Thomas Owen Clancy has argued against the exceptionalism of the Celtic church, and for the catholic orthodoxy of its beliefs and practices.[167] In any case, it is clear that what was happening on a Europe-wide scale was a shift from localised churches to a centralising force with the pope at the centre. Moreover, the periodisation of Christianity in Scotland is in need of a serious overhaul. Arguably the most important date for Christianity in central-medieval Scotland was not the coming of St Margaret or even the Cistercians, but rather the Fourth Lateran Council in 1215, which precipitated in Scotland, as across western Europe, a draft of reforms that affected the way ordinary people experienced their religion.

It has become almost commonplace to mention Scotland's medieval ethnic diversity. Scottish novelist William McIlvanny famously declared, 'Never forget that we are the bastard people of a mongrel nation', thus

[163] 'Historiographically, as has long been recognised, the Celtic Church is a product of the Protestant Reformation': Thomas Owen Clancy, '"Celtic" or "Catholic"? Writing the history of Scottish Christianity, AD 664-1093', *Records of the Scottish Church History Society* 32 (2002), 6.

[164] In Gordon Donaldson's words, 'the church, as well as the state, was transformed by the sons of Margaret as one aspect of the "Norman Conquest"': Donaldson, *Scotland: Church and Nation*, 20.

[165] Roberts, *Lost Kingdoms*, 28.

[166] The best study on the *céli Dé* in Scotland is still William Reeves, *The Culdees of the British Islands* (Dublin, 1864). Regarding parishes, John M. Rogers has criticized '[t]he traditional view of the establishment of parishes in Scotland', which 'has stressed the role of Anglo-Norman influence'; to Rogers, 'their role in parochial establishment has been assumed rather than proven by historians': John M. Rogers, 'The formation of parishes in twelfth-century Perthshire', *Records of the Scottish Church History Society* 27 (1997), 69-70.

[167] Clancy, ' "Celtic" or "Catholic"?', 25.

heralding one of the great themes of the 1990s—one which served to underpin the optimism of devolution.[168] Likewise, academic historians began to acknowledge more than ever before (although in a more pedestrian tone) the multiethnicity of the Scottish kingdom. At one point in the twelfth century, it would seem, the kingdom encompassed speakers of Gaelic, English, Welsh, Norse, French, Flemish and Latin. In the light of this new vantage-point, it seems strange that a peculiar dualistic model still seems to hold sway in so many ways. The kingdom of the Scots in the central medieval period existed as a mixture of diverse influences, but it was also a distinct and functioning entity in its own right. The contemporary evidence shows that Scottish society was no two-sided coin. Perhaps we can now decide to let the penny drop.

[168] Quoted in Andrew Marr, 'Perils of Ethnic Purity', *The Observer*, 4 July 1999, and in Charles Jenks, 'Was it worth it?', *Sunday Herald*, 9 August 2004.

The Scottish Historical Review, Volume LXXXV, 1: No. 219: April 2006, 30–53

DOUGLAS WATT

'The laberinth of thir difficulties': the Influence of Debt on the Highland Elite c.1550 – 1700

Abstract

In the inflationary economic conditions of the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries Highland chiefs borrowed extensively. Indebtedness was caused by increasing expenditure in response to the rising authority of the state, which included an active engagement with the central courts and the employment of the legal profession; conspicuous consumption, absenteeism following the regal union of 1603 and a relatively plentiful supply of credit occasioned by the growth of the debt market. Indebtedness was primarily the result of high levels of expenditure rather than deficiency of income. The Highland economy was devastated during the Civil War period and there is extensive evidence of severe financial distress among the Highland elite in the later seventeenth century. This was caused by the significant build up of debts from the later sixteenth century, the collapse of incomes during the mid-century political crisis and the deflationary economic environment of the period from 1650 to 1670. During the Restoration there was a fundamental shift in the nature and structure of clanship from traditionalism to commercialism. The intensity of transition was focused on the thirty or forty years following the mid-century as chiefs were faced with a debt deflation which led to a decline in their position politically, financially, socially and culturally. Many lost control of their estates to commissions. Some responded by raising rents or more intensive engagement with droving, colonisation, extractive industries and merchant networks. Others became backward looking, insecure, impoverished and melancholic. The financial crisis precipitated by the combination of indebtedness and deflation was therefore a pivotal aspect in the process by which Highland chiefs adopted the values of landlords.

The accumulation of debt by highland chiefs in the seventeenth century has been commented on by a number of historians.[1] This article traces

[1] F. J. Shaw, *The Northern and Western Islands of Scotland: Their Economy and Society in the Seventeenth Century* (Edinburgh, 1980), 43-5, D. Stevenson, *Alasdair MacColla and the Highland Problem in the Seventeenth Century* (Edinburgh, 1980), 281, A. I. Macinnes, *Clanship, Commerce and the House of Stuart, 1603-1788*, (East Linton, 1996), 114, 126-8, A. I. Macinnes, 'Repression and Conciliation: The Highland Dimension 1660-1688', *SHR* 55 (1986) 176, 186-7, and A. I. Macinnes, 'The Impact of the Civil Wars and Interregnum: Political Disruption and Social Change within Scottish Gaeldom', in R. Mitchison and P. Roebuck (eds), *Economy and Society in Scotland and Ireland 1500-1939*

DOUGLAS WATT is postdoctoral research fellow in Scottish History at the University of Edinburgh

rising indebtedness over the longer period from c.1550 to 1700, examines its causes and effects, and argues that the response to high levels of debt was central to the process by which chiefs were transformed into landlords. There has been disagreement over the nature of this change: Macinnes has argued that the shift from clanship to commercial landlordism was marked by a series of 'convulsions' [2] while Dodgshon believes it was 'a gradual affair rather than something that happened dramatically or suddenly'.[3]

The lending and borrowing of money became easier after the Reformation in Scotland and this was reflected in laws relaxing the prohibition on usury and improving the rights of creditors.[4] A 'culture of credit' developed from the mid sixteenth century, as was the case in England,[5] and research on the Grandtully estates in Perthshire and the Panmure estates in Forfarshire has highlighted the importance of credit networks among the tenants in the seventeenth century.[6] Testaments reveal that some highland chiefs were accumulating debts in the period from c1550 to 1600: John earl of Atholl died in 1579 with debts of £2,300 13s 4d (7.2% of assets), Colin Campbell of Glenorchy in 1583 with debts of £941 13s 4d (19.9% of assets), John Grant of Freuchy in 1585 with debts of £621 6s 8d (1.3% of assets) and Sir James Campbell of Ardkinglass in 1590 with debts of £2,136 13s 4d (36% of assets).[7] Assets are calculated by adding the inventory of the deceased's possessions to the debts owed to the deceased and so the percentage of assets can be viewed as a relative measure of indebtedness. Debt was being accumulated by some chiefs in the later sixteenth century but the levels noted here are unlikely to have caused any significant financial problems. Stone suggests that an annual burden of interest above a third of net disposable income could cause

1 (*Continued*) (Edinburgh, 1988). For the debts of the Scottish nobility as a whole see K. M. Brown, *Noble Society in Scotland: Wealth, Family and Culture, from Reformation to Revolution* (Edinburgh, 2000), 92-109. K. M. Brown, 'Noble Indebtedness in Scotland between the Reformation and the Revolution', *Bulletin of the Institute of Historical Research*, 62 (1989) 260-75, and K. M. Brown, 'Aristocratic Finances and the Origins of the Scottish Revolution', *English Historical Review* 104 (1989) 46-87.

2 These were caused by military action by the government on the western seaboard in the early seventeenth century, the civil wars, reconstruction during the Restoration, the Jacobite rebellions and repression in the aftermath of Culloden. A. I. Macinnes, 'Scottish Gaeldom from clanship to commercial landlordism, c.1600-c.1850 in S. Foster, A. Macinnes and R. MacInnes (eds), *Scottish Power Centres from the Early Middle Ages to the Twentieth Century* (Glasgow, 1998), 184. A. I. Macinnes, *Clanship, Commerce and the House of Stuart, 1603-1788* (East Linton, 1996), ix-x, 210.

3 R. A. Dodgshon, *From Chiefs to Landlords: Social and Economic Change in the Western Highlands and Islands, c.1493-1820* (Edinburgh, 1998), 102.

4 Brown, 'Noble Indebtedness', 263.

5 C. Muldrew, *The Economy of Obligation: The Culture of Credit and Social Relations in Early Modern England* (Basingstoke, 1998), 3.

6 L. A. Ewan, 'Debt and Credit in Early Modern Scotland: The Grandtully Estates 1650-1765', unpublished Ph.D. Thesis (University of Edinburgh, 1988); I. D. Whyte and K. A. Whyte, 'Debt and Credit, Poverty and Prosperity in a Seventeenth-Century Scottish Rural Community' in R. Mitchison and P. Roebuck (eds), *Economy and Society in Scotland and Ireland 1500-1939* (Edinburgh, 1988), 70-80.

7 Edinburgh, National Archives of Scotland [NAS], Commissary Court Records, CC 8/8/8, fo. 247-52, CC 8/8/13, fo. 133-8, CC 8/8/17, fo. 77-82, CC 8/8/22, fo. 359-63.

financial difficulties.[8] It is not possible to establish net disposable income for chiefs at this time because of a lack of source material and so we must rely on other evidence to establish if they were experiencing problems from the level of their debts.

A contract of 30 October 1554 between John Grant of Freuchy and Christian Barclay, relict of James Grant of Freuchy, stated that 'the dettis of the said umquhyll James exceid his guddis in greit sowmes'.[9] In the 1560s the earldom of Caithness was experiencing financial difficulties: 'their hous is overburdened and overwhelmed with debts; wherby yow sie at this day the house and the earldom of Catteynes weill neir ane utter ruyne'.[10] When Colin Campbell of Craignish borrowed 8,000 merks from Duncan Campbell of Glenorchy in 1584, the bond referred to his poor financial state and that the money had been borrowed to relieve him from his creditors.[11] John Campbell of Lundie experienced acute financial problems failing to pay feu-fermes and other duties, and as a result, in 1576, some of his lands were granted to Thomas Lyon, Master of Glamis.[12] Rose of Kilravock also faced problems caused by indebtedness; Katherine Falconer, his wife, was 'verie assisting to her husband, particularly in paying the debt and burden upon his fortune, which….extended, the tyme of their mariage, to the value of the halfe of their estate'.[13]

Some highland chiefs were therefore accumulating substantial levels of debt in the later sixteenth century and some were experiencing financial distress caused by these debts. All the evidence relates to mainland chiefs; no evidence has been found to indicate whether island chiefs or those on the western seaboard were borrowing in the late sixteenth century. Nevertheless, chiefs on the mainland and eastern highlands were more engaged with the market economy, had closer links with lowland society and easier access to credit.

Further evidence from testaments indicates that by the early seventeenth century some chiefs had accumulated high levels of debt. Hector Munro of Foulis died in 1603 with debts of £6,789 13s 4d; an amount which exceeded the assets listed in his testament.[14] Lachlan Macintosh of Dunnachton died in 1606 with debts of £14,447 13s 4d, including £4,221 owed to Edinburgh merchants and writers. This sum was greatly in excess of his assets of £8,022.[15] Sir Roderick MacKenzie of Coigach, the Tutor of Kintail, had debts of £38,000 listed in his

8 L. Stone, *The Crisis of the Aristocracy, 1558-1641* (Oxford, 1965), 540.
9 W. Fraser (ed.), *The Chiefs of Grant*, 3 vols (Edinburgh, 1883), iii, 113-14.
10 Sir Robert Gordon, *A Genealogical History of the Earldom of Sutherland* (Edinburgh, 1813), 149.
11 Henry Paton (ed.), *The Clan Campbell: abstracts from the Campbell collections formed by Duncan Campbell*, 8 vols (Edinburgh, 1913-1922), vi, 46.
12 E. J. Cowan, 'The Angus Campbells and the Origin of the Campbell-Ogilvie Feud', *Scottish Studies* 25 (1981) 32.
13 *A Genealogical Deduction of the Family of Rose of Kilravock*, Spalding Club, (Aberdeen, 1848), 74.
14 NAS, CC 8/8/41, fo. 1-5.
15 NAS, CC 8/8/43, fo. 179-81.

latterwill of 1626[16] and Sir Duncan Campbell of Glenorchy died in 1631 with debts of £33,061 (90% of assets).[17]

Highland earls were experiencing financial difficulties caused by excessive indebtedness in the early seventeenth century. According to Sir John Scot of Scotstarvet the very large debts accumulated by the seventh earl of Argyll were a major factor in his departure from Scotland: 'for there was so great burden of debt upon the same, that it behoved his son, the late earl, to leave the country, not being able to give satisfaction to his creditors'.[18] His Campbell kinsmen, many of whom had acted as cautioners, were left to come to an accommodation with creditors.[19] Colin Campbell of Lundy, the seventh earl's brother, lamented on the state of Campbell finances at the time:

> I beleve thair be nocht ane mair miserable surname in Scotland and of thair rank nor they ar, I mein be thame that speiks the Erisch language for ye know yourself thair is nocht tua of his surname bot it is anewgh to the half of thair rent to pay thair annual. Sua his poore friendis estait is mair miserable to the regaird ane hundretfold nor his awin[20]

The earldom of Atholl also faced financial problems. James Fraser described the situation in 1617: 'the debts vast…this great estate is low and declining every day'.[21] When John earl of Sutherland died in 1615 he 'left his house overburdened with debt'[22] and according to James Gordon, the second marquis of Huntly had accumulated debts of £1,200,000 by 1638.[23] By the early seventeenth century all the most powerful chiefs in the highlands were experiencing financial difficulties caused by indebtedness.

Island chiefs were beginning to have financial problems related to debt at this time. On 26 October 1605 MacLean of Duart was ordered by the Privy Council to pay the King's rents by selling the produce of his lands, and it was declared that they were 'not to be arreistable by any of his creditors'.[24] By 1622 MacLean's debts were still causing him trouble: 'Hector McClane of Dowart…being put at as weill for his Majesteis dewteis as for debts to his creditors quhairby his house wes lyke to be ruined'.[25] In a letter from Glasgow of 31 August 1622, Sir Rory MacLeod

16 NAS, Cromarty Muniments, GD 305/1/167/8.
17 NAS, Breadalbane Muniments, GD 112/1/488.
18 Sir John Scot of Scotstarvet, *The Staggering State of Scottish Statesmen*, ed. C. Rogers, Grampian Club (Aberdeen, 1872), 40.
19 J. R. N. Macphail (ed.), *Highland Papers*, Scottish History Society, 4 vols (Edinburgh, 1914-34), iii, 227-8, 229-31, 252, 305-6, and E. J. Cowan, 'Fishers in Drumlie Waters, Clanship and Campbell Expansion at the Time of Gilleasbuig Gruamach', *Transactions of the Gaelic Society of Inverness* 54 (1984-6) 278-9.
20 NAS, GD 112/39/40/29.
21 W. Mackay (ed.), *The Wardlaw Manuscript: Chronicles of the Frasers*, 916-1674, Scottish History Society (Edinburgh, 1905) [*Chron. Frasers*], 243-44.
22 Gordon, *Earldom of Sutherland*, 313.
23 James Gordon, *History of Scots Affairs from 1637-1641*, 3 vols, Spalding Club (Aberdeen, 1841), i, 49.
24 *Register of Privy Council* [*RPC*], first, vii, 141.
25 *Collectanea de Rebus Albanicis,* ed. W. F. Skene, Iona Club (1847), 151.

of Dunvegan complained to James VI about the cost of his annual trips to the Privy Council in Edinburgh and begged the King for a warrant to remain at home in Skye for seven years, 'within the quilk tyme I sall be godis grace decoir my housses and plant yairdis and archardis and diffray my debtis and pay my creditouris'.[26] In the same letter he pleaded that the repayment of the extensive debts of his son-in-law, the Captain of Clanranald, might be postponed for five or seven years and declared that 'be godis grace he will satisfie all men befoir that tyme expyre'.[27]

Other highland chiefs who had accumulated significant debts by the early seventeenth century included Sir John Campbell of Cawdor who, on 9 December 1617, commissioned his legal agent, the advocate Mr John Rollock, to sell some of his valuables in order to reduce his debts. It was stated that 'the burding of the Laird of Calderis obligatione debt is ane hundreth thousand merkis or therby'. Cawdor was so indebted that he was forced to call a meeting of kinsmen and friends at Dunblane in order to agree on a plan for debt reduction. The minutes of this meeting state that 'the foirsaidis debtis is metest onlie to be releivit be selling and wedsett, and in continuatione upon annual rent'. A major restructuring of Cawdor's assets was instituted including sales of land and mortgaging property. Chamberlains were appointed for the administration of the estates and auditors to oversee the financial aspects of the process. Mr John Rollock, Cawdor's legal agent, was appointed as one of the auditors and Rollock seems to have been the driving force behind much of the debt restructuring. [28]

Kenneth, Lord MacKenzie of Kintail died in 1611 with his estates heavily burdened with debt[29] and Simon Fraser, Lord Lovat died in 1633 leaving his son Lord Hugh 'under insuperable debt'.[30] Ross of Balnagown faced severe problems caused by indebtedness in the early seventeenth century: 'the hous of Balnagoun, the esteat qrof hes bene this long tyme bygone so pitifull and deplorable to all qa loves or affects the standing yrof'.[31] In 1634 Sir Colin Campbell of Glenorchy gave 8,000 merks to Lord Lorne who was 'in great debt and desyring the said Sir Colin his help to releive his lordschip of the same'.[32] Sir Lachlan Macintosh of Dunnachton had accumulated debts of more than £30,000 by the time of his death in 1622 while in 1633 John MacDonald of Moidart, the Captain of Clanranald, owed in excess of £21,000 and by 1637 Donald Mackay, first Lord Reay, had accumulated very large debts of £102,912.[33]

[26] Edinburgh, National Library of Scotland [NLS], MS 2133, fo. 114.
[27] *Ibid.*, fo. 114-5.
[28] C. Innes (ed.), *The Book of the Thanes of Cawdor, 1236-1742,* Spalding Club (Aberdeen, 1859), 241-2, 254-5.
[29] A. MacKenzie, *History of the MacKenzies* (Inverness, 1894), 235.
[30] *Chron. Frasers*, 267.
[31] W. MacGill (ed.), *Old Ross-shire and Scotland*, ed., (Inverness, 1909), supplementary volume, 7-8.
[32] C. Innes (ed.), *The Black Book of Taymouth,* Bannatyne Club (Edinburgh, 1855), 77.
[33] Macinnes, *Clanship*, 74, 82, 127.

A closer analysis of the evidence from testaments supports the thesis that the level of indebtedness was increasing amongst the highland elite in the period from the late sixteenth to the early seventeenth century. A selection of testaments has been examined in detail for the period from 1570 to 1610.[34] This selection is biased in favour of chiefs from the eastern highlands and Campbell kindreds reflecting the fact that these individuals were more likely to register testaments in Edinburgh because of their greater level of engagement with central government and lowland society. The testaments show that the average amount of debt between the years 1570 and 1589 was £819, while the average between 1590 and 1609 was £2,765. Debt as a percentage of assets increased from 18.3% between 1570 and 1589 to 39.4% between 1590 and 1609.[35] Absolute and relative levels of indebtedness were therefore increasing in the period from 1570 to 1610. These figures correspond closely to ones produced by Brown in his study of the debts of the Scottish nobility as a whole.[36] The testaments of highland chiefs indicate that their borrowing habits were not out of line with the rest of the Scottish nobility during these years and the evidence surveyed above indicates that a large number of chiefs were already in financial distress by the early seventeenth century.

Why were highland chiefs accumulating debt during this period? Was debt being used to cover deficiencies in income, or was it funding higher expenditure? Establishing income trends for individual chiefs from the later sixteenth century is difficult because of lack of evidence. Rentals survive for a few chiefs but these are intermittent and not sufficiently comprehensive to provide total income levels for chiefs in the period from 1550 to 1650.[37] The picture is complicated by inflation and the purchase of more land by certain chiefs, such as the Campbells of Glenorchy. However, it is possible to point to general trends. The inflationary price revolution produced a six-fold increase in grain prices between 1550 and 1600 and a five-fold increase for cattle.[38] This inflation continued into the seventeenth century but at a reduced rate. The majority of chiefs' rents at this time were paid in kind and not in cash, so that chiefs who were able to access markets and sell rents in kind reaped a steadily rising income over the long term. Some chiefs, such as MacKenzie of Kintail and Campbell of Glenorchy, were clearly doing this by the late sixteenth and early seventeenth century.[39] For those who chose not to

[34] For a full list of the thirty-one testaments examined see D. A. Watt, 'Chiefs, Lawyers and Debt: A Study of the Relationship between Highland Elite and Legal Profession in Scotland c1550 to 1700', unpublished Ph.D. Thesis (University of Edinburgh, 1998), Appendix IX, 300-1.

[35] *Ibid.*, 223.

[36] Brown, *Noble Society*, 106.

[37] Brown has commented that 'a true understanding of the wealth and incomes of the early modern Scottish nobility is unlikely ever to be within our grasp', Brown, 'Aristocratic Finances', 49.

[38] A. J. S. Gibson and T. C. Smout, *Prices, Food and Wages in Scotland 1550-1780* (Cambridge, 1995), 5.

[39] Dodgshon, *From Chiefs to Landlords*, 113.

sell their rents or could not gain access to markets, incomes were not monetised and were determined by the agricultural cycle. However, inflation was a key driver in encouraging greater engagement with the market. Even a relatively isolated chief such as MacDonald of Glengarry was marketing his timber in the burgh of Inverness by the 1570s.[40] There were no doubt problems at times in gathering rents[41] but this was a feature determined principally by the agricultural cycle and most significant during severe dearth.[42]

Chiefs did have other sources of income. Clan involvement in the Irish mercenary trade in the late sixteenth century involved contractual employment of clansmen (*buannachan*) from the western seaboard who were paid in money and food.[43] Other economic developments included forestry, which was being exploited from the late sixteenth century, quarrying stone and the construction of saltpans in the 1620s and 1630s.[44] It is not possible to quantify the effect of these sources of income and it remains unclear whether chiefs borrowed to invest in them. Since the evidence of commercialisation is greater after the Restoration it is suggestive that commercialisation was primarily part of a response to reducing debt rather than a process which was funded by debt.

Incomes were therefore rising over the long term in the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries. Debt was not primarily accumulated to compensate for declining incomes although in a short term perspective chiefs may have borrowed to balance their books following poor harvests or death of livestock. The inflationary environment of this period was beneficial for debtors as inflation reduced the real value of debts repayable in cash. The general financial backdrop was positive for chiefs in the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries as inflation pushed up incomes and reduced the real value of the debts they were accumulating.[45] However, financial distress could still result despite higher incomes if the chief borrowed excessively.

The management of debt encouraged chiefs to employ commercial agents in Edinburgh and Glasgow[46] and a close relationship developed with the Edinburgh legal profession who represented chiefs in the central courts and acted as their financial agents, intimately involved in

40 *RPC*, ii, 500-1.

41 Dodgshon, *From Chiefs to Landlords*, 238

42 Cregeen has highlighted the difficulties of gathering rents in Mull and Tiree in the late 1730s caused by the loss of cattle from bad weather and low prices. E. R. Cregeen, 'The Tacksmen and their Successors, A Study of Tenurial Reorganisation in Mull, Morvern and Tiree in the Early Eighteenth Century', *Scottish Studies*, 13 (1969) 124-5.

43 Macinnes, *Clanship*, 56-7.

44 *RPC*, ii, 500-1, NAS, GD 112/23/14/19, 112/18/1/1; Macinnes, *Clanship*, 75.

45 There were, however, specific periods of economic contraction caused by climatic factors and political instability, see S. G. E. Lythe, *The Economy of Scotland in its European setting 1550-1625* (Edinburgh, 1960), 16-22. The later 1630s was a period of particular economic difficulty, see A. I. Macinnes, *Charles I and the Making of the Covenanting Movement 1625-1641* (Edinburgh, 1991), 118-123.

46 Macinnes, *Clanship*, 71.

the management of debt and providing a source of credit.[47] These strategies were part of the management of indebtedness but the number of references in the sources to financial difficulties suggests that debt was a significant problem for many chiefs.

The expenditure of chiefs rose substantially in the later sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries for a number of reasons. The rising authority of central government from the later sixteenth century forced and encouraged chiefs increasingly to make use of the central courts to resolve disputes. This involved the employment of lawyers and often much time spent in Edinburgh. There was a significant inflation in legal fees between the late sixteenth and early seventeenth century. At the time of his death in 1582 George, earl of Caithness owed £5 to the advocate Mr John Moscrop, £5 to Mr John Skene and 5 merks to Mr Richard Strang for their annual pensions and fees.[48] Sir Duncan Campbell of Glenorchy paid an annual pension of £10 to Mr Oliver Colt between 1584 and 1615.[49] In 1613 an account by the advocate Mr David Primrose for Sir Duncan came to £416 8s 4d,[50] while the legal expenses of John MacLeod of Dunvegan were £3,632 9s 4d in 1636 and 1637.[51] Archibald Campbell, brother of Campbell of Lawers, who acted as a legal agent for the Campbells of Glenorchy in the 1630s and 1640s was paid a pension of 500 merks each year.[52] The legal expenses of Sir John Grant of Mulben, younger of Freuchie, in two journeys to Edinburgh in 1620, totalled £1,358 6s 5d.[53] These figures reveal the extraordinary inflation in the earning power of advocates in the early seventeenth century. A consultation with Thomas Hope, Thomas Nicholson and James Oliphant cost Grant £94 6s 8d with individual fees of £26 13s 4d, £21 6s 8d and £21 6s 8d and other payments to writers and servants.[54] The rise from an annual pension of £5 to a daily consultation fee of £26 was an explosive escalation in earning power and a significant financial burden for the chiefs who were experiencing the combination of higher fees and more frequent resort to legal services.[55]

Time spent in Edinburgh highlights the costs of absenteeism and with the removal to London of the Scottish court in 1603 expenses became even higher as many chiefs made the journey to the English court.[56] Some chiefs borrowed in London to cover the costs: for example, on a

47 Watt, 'Chiefs, Lawyers and Debt', 65-107.
48 NAS, CC 8/8/12, f. 43.
49 NAS, GD 112/29/2/1-19, *Clan Campbell*, viii, 186.
50 NAS, GD 112/36/3/3.
51 R. C. Macleod (ed.), *Book of Dunvegan,* 2 vols, Third Spalding Club (Aberdeen, 1938-9), i, 200-202.
52 *Black Book of Taymouth*, 81.
53 Fraser, *Grant*, iii, 322-334.
54 *Ibid.*, iii, 324-5.
55 The daily wage of an Edinburgh mason was between 10s and 12s between 1611 and 1629. It would therefore take a mason around fifty two working days to earn the same as an advocate might earn for one consultation. Gibson and Smout, *Prices, Food and Wages*, 305-6.
56 Watt, 'Chiefs, Lawyers and Debt', 45-9.

visit to London in 1619 Sir Lachlan Macintosh borrowed 1,000 merks from John Jowsie, a London merchant.[57] The amount of time chiefs spent at court was criticised by Gaelic poets in the later seventeenth century.[58]

There were also higher costs associated with greater engagement with local, national and international politics. The crushing of the MacDonald rebellion in Islay in 1614-15 left the earl of Argyll with substantial debts.[59] The polarisation of the highland clans and their engagement in national politics during the civil war period proved very costly and Donald Mackay, first Lord Reay of Strathnaver, spent very large sums raising recruits to fight in the Thirty Years' War.[60] There was also a significant rise in the fiscal demands of the state in the later sixteenth and seventeenth century.[61]

Conspicuous expenditure was another key reason for borrowing and the building of new or improved residences was its most immediately visible manifestation. Brown has stated that 'building works were the single biggest capital investment a noble house-hold was likely to make'.[62] The late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries was a period of extensive building activity by the highland elite with twenty-four new castles assigned by MacGibbon and Ross to this period.[63] Other aspects of conspicuous expenditure included the fine furnishings of these abodes, and the fashionable clothes and gambling bemoaned by Gaelic poets.[64]

The supply of credit also influenced the rise of indebtedness. The Scottish 'debt market' developed in the later sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries as the economy grew and capital was accumulated by merchants, lawyers, lairds and larger tenants.[65] The period from 1550 to 1640 witnessed a gradual shift in the nature of credit networks open to chiefs. Initially they borrowed from servitors, kinsmen, local burgh

57 H. Paton (ed.), *The MacKintosh Muniments*, 1442-1820 (Edinburgh, 1903), no. 288.

58 A. M. MacKenzie (ed.), *Orain Iain Luim: Songs of John MacDonald, Bard of Keppoch*, Scottish Gaelic Texts Society (Edinburgh, 1973), 90-1, 124-5, J. Carmichael Watson (ed.), *Gaelic Songs of Mary MacLeod*, Scottish Gaelic Texts Society (Edinburgh, 1965), 52-3, C. O'Baoill (ed.), *Eachann Bacach and other MacLean Poets,* Scottish Gaelic Texts Society (Edinburgh, 1979), 51.

59 Brown, 'Aristocratic Finances', 66.

60 Macinnes, *Clanship*, 127, 129.

61 J. Goodare, *State and Society in Early Modern Scotland* (Oxford, 1999), 102-32, Brown, 'Aristocratic Finances', 73-4.

62 Brown, *Noble Society,* 84-5.

63 Muckrach, Erchless, Dalcross, Kilcoy, Grandtully, Cawdor, Ruthven, Rossdhu, Meggernie, Aberuchill, Comrie, Finlarig, Achallader, Dundarave, Barcaldine, Invergarry, Redcastle, Castle Leod, Ardvreck, Kilmartin, Edinample, Balloch, Castle Menzies and Carnassery. D. MacGibbon and T. Ross, *The Castellated and Domestic Architecture of Scotland,* 5 vols, (Edinburgh, 1887-92), ii-iv.

64 MacKenzie, *Orain Iain Luim,* 124-5. W. Matheson (ed.), *The Blind Harper (An Clarsair Dall)*, Scottish Gaelic Texts Society (Edinburgh, 1970), 68-9.

65 The term 'debt market' is used to refer to the loose network of lawyers, merchants and lairds who acted as the prime source of credit for the nobility and the Scottish state in the 17th century.

merchants and tenants but increasingly from merchants and lawyers in Edinburgh. These debts involved chiefs in an expanded network of obligations outside their traditional political and social sphere. In the late sixteenth century the creditors of Grant of Freuchy and Colin Campbell of Glenorchy were all servants and locals.[66] However, by the beginning of the civil war period Edinburgh merchants and lawyers had become an increasingly important source of credit.[67] The expansion of the Edinburgh debt market made it increasingly easy for chiefs to borrow and underwrite their rising expenditure. Many chiefs must have borrowed simply because they could.

The expansion of the 'culture of credit' and a 'debt market' is reflected in the state's taxation of the interest income of creditors from 1621. The taxes levied on annual rents[68] provide a snapshot of the Scottish debt market at this time. For example the inventory of the burgh of Inverness in 1622 indicates that Inverness burgesses were a significant source of credit for chiefs such as Simon Lord Fraser of Lovat, Rose of Kilravock, John Grant of Freuchy, Sir Rory MacLeod of Dunvegan and MacKay of Strathnaver, with sums borrowed ranging from 1,000 merks to £5,000.[69] Other burghs on the fringe of the highlands such as Perth, Elgin and Nairn also provided credit.[70] Unfortunately there are a number of key gaps in the surviving records of this tax, including—crucially for an examination of the creditors of the chiefs—the burghs of Glasgow and Edinburgh where it is known from other sources that chiefs were actively borrowing.

Illegal or usurious lending was a significant part of credit provision in Scotland in the late sixteenth and early seventeenth century. There is ample evidence in the number of acts passed by parliament and privy council against usury and in prosecutions of an unofficial lending market.[71] Indeed, the 'Act anent annualrentis' of 1597 complained of interest rates between 30% and 50%.[72] Usurious lending was, of course, seldom a matter of public record.[73] The prevalence of such high interest rates indicates excessive demand for credit in a growing economy but also reflects the way in which some lenders priced in the risk of lending to those of low credit quality. There was obviously a difference in perception of the likelihood of repayment between a local Edinburgh laird and a distant highland chief. The problems faced by borrowers such as the

66 NAS, CC 8/8/17, fo. 81, CC 8/8/13, fo. 136.
67 *Black Book of Taymouth*, 96, Watt, 'Chiefs, Lawyers and Debt', 206-9,
68 NAS, Taxation of Annualrents E61/1-62
69 NAS, E61/7.
70 NAS, E61/3, E61/12, E61/32.
71 *Acts of the Parliament of Scotland* [*APS*], iii, 451, iv, 70, 119-20,133-4, 138, 187, 228, 627; *RPC*, v (?), 20-2, ix, 283-4, Ewan, 'Debt and Credit', 84-5.
72 APS, iv, 119-20. These rates were not excessive. For example interest rates in Devon in 1571 were often higher than 100%. N. Jones, *God and the Moneylenders: Usury and Law in Early Modern England* (Oxford, 1989), 73, 77. The official interest rate in Scotland was 10% in the later 16th century, being reduced to 8% in 1633 and to 6% in 1649 where it remained for the rest of the century.
73 Jones, *God and the Moneylenders,* 66.

Captain of Clanrannald may reflect usurious rates and the higher cost of their debts.

The later sixteenth century and first half of the seventeenth century therefore witnessed a rising burden of debt on the highland chiefs but the rise of indebtedness during this period should not be viewed as catastrophic. The price revolution reduced the real value of debts and provided chiefs with a rising income from their land. There is also evidence of other sources of income, although it remains unclear how successful these were in providing a return, and strategies to manage the rising amount of debt. However, the evidence of difficulties among many chiefs indicates that excessive debt was being accumulated. Indebtedness was caused by increasing expenditure in response to the rising authority of the state, conspicuous consumption, absenteeism and a relatively plentiful supply of credit occasioned by the growth of the debt market itself. Indebtedness was primarily the result of high levels of expenditure rather than deficiency of income.

The paucity of surviving evidence makes it difficult to construct a detailed debt profile of a particular chief and kindred through time. The sources available for the study of the Campbells of Glenorchy, however, allow us to examine the debts of this highland kindred in more detail than it is possible for others. Colin Campbell of Glenorchy died in 1583 with debts of £941 13s 4d: these largely consisted of sums owing to the church such as stipends and teinds and outstanding servants' fees.[74] When his son, Sir Duncan Campbell of Glenorchy, died in 1631, he had debts of 41,250 merks. There were eleven creditors who were owed sums ranging from 1,000 to 13,000 merks; nine of the eleven were kinsmen of Sir Duncan and one was his servitor.[75] There was, therefore, a distinct increase in the level of debt between 1583 and 1631 but the rising burden should be set against the extensive accumulations of land made by Sir Duncan and the high level of spending by him on new buildings, agricultural improvements and tochers in the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries.[76] Sir Duncan invested excess capital in land, and despite accumulating significantly more debt than his father, the level of indebtedness did not cause him any financial difficulties. The evidence of financial distress described above indicates that Sir Duncan was probably atypical in the management of his finances during the early seventeenth century. He was well known for being a ruthless and successful chief.

However, by 1643 the debt profile of the kindred had altered significantly:

> Sir Robert being totallie exhausit by the ladies of Glenorchy ther zeirly rents, and paying other creditouris he wes forced to borrow from Sir Chairles Erskine of Cambuskennall the soume of £20,000, and from Mr

74 NAS, CC 8/8/13, f136-7.
75 NAS, GD 112/1/488.
76 Watt, 'Chiefs, Lawyers and Debt', 137-8.

> Rodger Mowatt advocatt in Edinburgh…20,000 merks, and from Captane John Short provest of Stirline...8,000 merks, and from Patrick Hebrune of Willyes ane appoticarie in Edinburgh…5,000 merks.[77]

Such heavy borrowing outside the Campbell kindred left the family in a precarious financial position in the wake of the destructive raids on Campbell lands during the Montrose campaigns of 1644-5: 'In the zeiris of God 1644 and 1645 the laird of Glenorchy his whole landis and esteatt betuixt the foord of Lyon and point of Lesmoir weir brunt and destroyit be James Grahame soumtymes earle of Montrois, and Alexander McDonald'. According to the author of the Black Book of Taymouth the raids were estimated to have caused destruction of 1,200,000 merks. [78]

In 1648 the level of Campbell of Glenorchy debt exceeded 400,000 merks representing a 970% increase since 1631. But this was reduced to 200,000 merks between 1648 and 1654 by the careful management of Sir John Campbell of Glenorchy who increased yearly rents from the Glenorchy estates from less than 2,800 merks, following the devastation of the Civil Wars, to 16,000 merks and must have cut back on other costs, such as conspicuous expenditure.[79]

However, this period of debt reduction was short-lived; a list drawn up in 1680 for John Campbell of Glenorchy, first earl of Breadalbane, names forty three creditors who were at law against Breadalbane for recovery of debt.[80] In 1696 the private debts of Breadalbane totalled £208,007 owed to sixty-five creditors, including £25,074 that was borrowed in London.[81] The management of legal cases arising from these debts was a central concern of Breadalbane throughout the later seventeenth century. The correspondence between him and his Edinburgh legal agent and kinsman, Colin Campbell of Carwhin, writer to the Signet, is full of references to Breadalbane's debts and ideas about how to extricate him from the consequences of default. On 30 January 1694 Lady Mary Campbell, Countess of Caithness, and Breadalbane's second wife, wrote to Viscount Tarbat from London: 'My Lord [Breadalbane] is so frank in this afair to give my son an honorable provition, that I hav good ground to think itt will be the first debt he will releev his estat of'.[82]

Much of the military campaigning in the Civil War period occurred in the highlands. The marquis of Argyll's raids into Atholl in 1640, the Montrose Campaigns of 1644-5 and the Glencairn Rebellion of 1653-4 all caused massive destruction and major dislocation of the highland economy and plunged many chiefs who were already substantially in debt into severe financial difficulties.[83] The rent from Campbell of Cawdor's lands in Islay and Muckairn was between £20,000 and £22,000

77 *Black Book of Taymouth*, 96.
78 *Ibid.*, 100-1, 102.
79 NAS, GD 112/39/113/23.
80 NAS, GD 112/38/5/15.
81 NAS, GD 112/38/14/5-6
82 W. Fraser (ed.), *The Earls of Cromartie,* 2 vols, (Edinburgh, 1876), i, 103-5.
83 Macinnes, *Clanship*, 104-10.

annually before the Civil War period, but by 1651 it had collapsed by 90% to £2,216 10s 2d.[84] The Campbells of Glenorchy also experienced a drastic reduction in rents: 'all the rent of the estait did not reach 2800 merks be reason of the devastations'.[85] The marquis of Argyll's Argyllshire estates provided no rents between 1644 and 1647.[86] Income levels of highland chiefs were greatly reduced and as a result interest payments on debts could not be met. Creditors of chiefs, who by this period were often not kinsmen but Edinburgh merchants, lawyers or lowland lairds, were forced to take action in the central courts in an attempt to recover some of their investment. This involved raising apprisings on debtors' lands so that income could be directed to the creditor until the debt was paid off. For example there were extensive apprisings, for very large amounts of debt, raised on the lands of George, earl of Seaforth in 1649 and 1650 by the following creditors: Mr James Durham of Pittkero for a debt of 9,410 merks; Alexander Lord Balcarres for £23,291 13s 4d; William Downie, writer in Edinburgh for £12,178 5s; Hugh Hamilton, merchant of Edinburgh, for £10,699 18s; Robert Murray, merchant of Edinburgh, for 23,610 merks; and Mr Robert Logane for £59,405.[87] It remains unclear how effective such apprisings were, from the point of view of the creditor, in achieving any sort of recovery especially when the assets of the debtor were in isolated areas where the authority of central government remained limited. Often the debts were ultimately purchased by kinsmen or neighbouring chiefs at presumably large discounts.[88] However, the raising of an apprising was itself an important signal to other creditors, especially those who were part of the Edinburgh debt market and had no social links with the debtor, that the debtor was in financial distress. Once apprisings were raised it was very difficult for the debtor to borrow further sums in Edinburgh.

In the second half of the seventeenth century economic conditions became much harsher for debtors. There was a period of severe deflation particularly in the 1650s and 1660s. Gibson and Smout refer to a 'halving in the prices before the later 1670s for oats, oatmeal and perhaps wheat'.[89] Aberdeen beef prices fell from £9 in 1656 to bottom at £6 between 1667 and 1671 before increasing to £8 by 1689. There was also deflation of mutton prices from the late 1650s with a pick up only in the late 1670s.[90] In Forfarshire, a fertile area, valued rents for the shire fell by £2,713 between 1667 and 1682.[91] Falling prices were caused by the

84 *Book of the Thanes of Cawdor*, 303.
85 NAS, GD 112/39/113/23.
86 Macinnes, *Clanship*, 105.
87 *Registrum Magni Sigilli Regum Scottorum* [*RMS*], ix, no. 2138, 2139, 2140, 2150, 2180, x, 646.
88 NAS, GD 305/1/148/207
89 Gibson and Smout, *Prices, Food and Wages*, 165-6.
90 *Ibid.*, 65, 85, 95, 109, 118, 209.
91 J. McFaulds, 'Forfarshire Landowners and their estates 1660-1690', unpublished Ph.D. Thesis (University of Glasgow, 1980), 17.

demand shock of the civil wars on the Scottish economy and the burden of indebtedness on the Scottish landowning class.[92] A large proportion of the accumulated capital of merchants, lawyers, lairds and larger tenants had been squandered, as much of it had been invested in debts provided to the nobility, including chiefs, and the covenanting regime. Deflation spells serious trouble for borrowers, raising the real value of debts and reducing the cash exchange value of agricultural commodities. Debts rise in value each year while income in kind diminishes and a debt deflation emerges: a combination of indebteness, falling prices and high real interest rates.[93] The chiefs found themselves in severe financial difficulties; burdened with debt which was not being inflated away and faced with a downward trend in their incomes from rentals. Those who received a higher proportion of rent in cash were in a stronger position. Obtaining further debt to bail them out in the short term was also much more difficult in the tighter credit environment of the years following the Civil Wars.[94]

Against this financial backdrop it is no wonder that during the Restoration period the prime concern of many highland chiefs was the management of their debts with estate policy focused on this issue above all others. There is extensive evidence of financial distress among the chiefs in the later seventeenth century. In 1664 the lands and the barony of Foulis were apprised from John Munro of Foulis by Sir Robert Hepburn of Keith.[95] In a letter of 22 September 1665 the ninth earl of Argyll stated that he was faced with debts in the region of 1,000,000 merks.[96] In 1673 John Campbell of Duntroon was forced to relinquish control over his estates to his major creditor.[97] On 2 February 1678 twelve kinsmen of Sir James MacDonald of Sleat wrote to Lord Tarbat that 'ther has been little or no progress at all made in the payment of ther wast debts'.[98] In 1688 John, first marquis of Atholl wrote to John earl of Breadalbane about the difficulties Robert Campbell of Glenlyon was experiencing because of his extensive debts.[99] Sir John MacLean of Duart owed £232,000 to the ninth earl of Argyll; the background of a major struggle between the two kindreds in the later seventeenth century.[100] In 1688 MacDougall of

[92] This deflationary period following the price revolution of the previous 150 years probably had significant effects on the financial, economic and social history of Scotland. It has, as yet, received little attention from historians.

[93] I. Fisher, 'The Debt-Deflation Theory of Great Depressions', *Econometrica* 1 (1933) 337-357.

[94] This is indicated by comparing the large absolute amounts that were borrowed from the Edinburgh debt market in the early 1640s with the relatively smaller sums in the 1660s. see Watt, 'Chiefs, Lawyers and Debt', 298-9.

[95] C. T. McInnes (ed.), *Calendar of Writs of Munro of Foulis, 1299-1823,* Scottish Record Society (Edinburgh, 1940), 240.

[96] Sir George Sinclair and Charles K. Sharpe (eds), *Letters from Archibald Earl of Argyll to John, Duke of Lauderdale*, Bannatyne Club (Edinburgh, 1829), 24-7.

[97] NAS, Campbell of Duntroon Muniments, GD 116/1/76.

[98] Fraser, *Cromartie*, i, 27-9.

[99] NAS, GD 112/39/143/2.

[100] Macinnes, *Clanship*, 38-9, 106, 136.

Dunnollie and his clan gentry thanked Viscount Tarbat for help in business before the Exchequer and stated that he was the 'onlie instument, under God, of keiping that familie from being extinct'.[101] Rose of Kilravock was 'so straitened that he purposed to sequestrate his estate, and to go into the military service; yet his friends diverted him from this course'.[102] MacLeod of Dunvegan, MacDonald of Clanranald, Lord Reay, MacDonald of Glengarry and Grant of Freuchy also suffered from severe indebtedness in the Restoration period.[103] The management of debts was a central part of the workload of the Edinburgh advocate of highland origins, John MacKenzie of Delvine, for his large number of highland clients.[104]

A study of testaments reinforces the picture of chronic indebtedness during this period. Out of a sample of twenty-one testaments from the years between 1650 and 1700, ten (48%) were registered by creditors of the deceased as part of the process of recovery of debt. This compares with one out of thirty-one (3%) for the period from 1570 to 1650.[105] Surprisingly there are fewer testaments available for study in the later seventeenth century, when we might have expected more to have survived, probably because of the rising indebtedness of the chiefs. By the later seventeenth century the financial position of many chiefs made it less likely that they registered their testaments in a public register where their precarious financial position might be more visible to others.

Applications to the Privy Council for protection from arrest by creditors are further evidence of chronic indebtedness. Such protections allowed debtors to enter Edinburgh without the risk of arrest and imprisonment for defaulting. In June 1662 Ewen Cameron of Lochiel applied to the Privy Council for protection from Lachlan Macintosh of Torcastle and other creditors who had letters of horning and caption against him.[106] In November of the same year Colin Campbell of Lochnell, and other cautioners of the earl of Argyll, applied for protection so they might attend a committee appointed to consider the debts of the late marquis of Argyll.[107] In 1665 protections were given to John Munro, younger of Foulis, Kennneth MacKenzie of Coul, Roderick MacKenzie of Fairburn, Colin MacKenzie of Logie, Kenneth, earl of Seaforth, Sir Allan MacLean of Duart and Colin Campbell of Lochnell.[108] In 1669 applications were made by Lord MacDonald, Cameron of Lochiel, John MacLeod of Dunvegan, Sir John Urquhart of Cromarty and Sir James MacDonald of Sleat.[109] Indeed, the government's agent for settling the highlands in the 1660s and 1670s, Sir James

[101] Fraser, *Cromartie*, i, 57-8.
[102] *Rose of Kilravock*, 379.
[103] Macinnes, *Clanship*, 126-8, 149.
[104] Watt, 'Chiefs, Lawyers and Debt', 174-94.
[105] *Ibid.*, 227.
[106] *RPC*, third, i, 224.
[107] *Ibid.*, i, 294.
[108] *Ibid.*, ii, 1, 15, 33, 52, 58, 64.
[109] *Ibid.*, iii, 34, 86, 87, 103, 104.

Campbell of Lawers, had to apply continuously to the Privy Council for protection from his creditors so that he could safely come to Edinburgh and provide the council with reports about progress of his work.[110] In the early seventeenth century James VI had tried to persuade the island chiefs to come to Edinburgh and use the central courts to resolve their differences. This policy, to a certain extent, had been successful. It is therefore ironic that in the later seventeenth century many island and highland chiefs were unable to come to Edinburgh because of the threat of arrest for unpaid debts. As a result they relied increasingly on the Edinburgh legal profession to act for them in the capital and made applications for letters of protection when it was utterly necessary that they make the journey in person.

The rising importance of debt as a major concern of highland chiefs is neatly reflected in administrative changes of the Campbells of Glenorchy. The Glenorchy chiefs issued many bonds of manrent in the later sixteenth century. These bonds were written reflections of dominance over neighbouring kindreds and they were carefully registered in special 'Books' by the Glenorchy servitors.[111] By the seventeenth century bonds of manrent were more or less a thing of the past: Wormald informs us that very few were made in Scotland after 1600.[112] A few bonds of friendship were still signed in the highlands in the later seventeenth century but in general the seventeenth century witnessed the disappearance of the bond of manrent in the highlands and lowlands.[113] As a result, by the later seventeenth century John Campbell of Glenorchy, first earl of Breadalbane, had no requirement for a 'Book of Bonds of Manrent', instead a 'Register of Wadsets' was being kept for him.[114] Wadsets were a form of mortgage which involved a conveyance of land by the borrower (reverser) to the lender (wadsetter) in return for a sum of money. A clause of reversion made it possible for the land to be returned to the borrower if the initial sum was repaid.[115] Wadsets were an increasingly common method of borrowing in the seventeenth century and Campbell of Glenorchy lands were being wadsetted from the late 1650s.[116] This transition from a 'Book of Bonds of Manrent' to a 'Register of Wadsets' is symptomatic of the rising importance of borrowing for the seventeenth century chiefs, their integration into a culture of credit and the decline of traditional lordship. It also indicates the effect of indebtedness on the land market in the highlands as those of lower rank gained a position in the landholding structure. Individuals below the chief and leading clan gentry had not gained ownership

[110] *Ibid.*, iii, 73-6, 115, 139, 263, 611, iv, 112, 146, 171, 309.
[111] J. Wormald, *Lords and Men in Scotland: Bonds of Manrent, 1442-1603* (Edinburgh, 1985), 101.
[112] *Ibid.*, 161.
[113] Macinnes, 'Repression and Conciliation', 170.
[114] NAS, GD 112/5/6.
[115] George C. H. Paton (ed.), *An Introduction to Scottish Legal History*, The Stair Society (Edinburgh, 1958), 184-5.
[116] NAS, GD 112/5/6.

of land in the sixteenth century by secularisation of kirklands as happened in the lowlands. Macinnes has commented that the expansion of proprietorship in the highlands in the later seventeenth century was 'of a similar social magnitude to the expansion of landownership in the lowlands brought about by the secularisation of the kirklands in the sixteenth century'. For example the number of recorded heritors in Argyllshire rose by 27% between 1629 and 1688.[117]

Highland chiefs were therefore struggling to come to terms with severe financial difficulties during the Restoration period. This was occasioned by the significant build up of debts from the later sixteenth century and caused by the collapse of incomes during the mid-century political crisis and the deflationary economic environment of the period from 1650 to 1670. It is not possible to determine conclusively whether the financial crisis experienced by the highland chiefs was different in degree from that of the lowland nobility;[118] however, common sense suggests that it was. The highlands were the focus of much of the military campaigns of the 1640s and the 1650s and this was very destructive to the economy. Agricultural land in the highlands was generally less productive than land in the lowlands making financial recovery more protracted. This was particularly the case in the western highlands and islands.[119] The relative costs of absenteeism were higher for highland chiefs for purely geographical reasons.

*

Having described the extension of indebtedness and its causes in the period from c.1550 to 1700 and argued that by the later seventeenth century most highland and island chiefs were in a chronic state of financial distress it is necessary to examine the effects of financial crisis on the chiefs. The problems caused by excessive indebtedness could result in the temporary eclipse of the chief from the top of the landholding hierarchy. By the later seventeenth century some chiefs were forced to relinquish control over their lands to commissions that took over the administration of estates until debts had been substantially reduced. For example, on 2 February 1678 twelve MacDonald clan gentry wrote the following to Lord Tarbat:

> When wee, though bot a few of the branches of the familie of McDonald (yet the nearest), does consider and weigh with ourselves, that through the discrepancies arysing dayly betwixt Sir James and Sir Donald his son, ther has been little or no progress at all made in the payment of ther wast debts, wee find it no less then our dewtie and concerne, both for ther owne and our preservation, to put on a resolution, as now we are resolved

[117] Macinnes, *Clanship*, 1, 142, 144.
[118] Very little analytical research has been undertaken into the finances of individual members of the Scottish nobility during the Restoration. An exception is McFaulds, 'Forfarshire Landowners'.
[119] Dodgshon, *Chiefs to Landlords*, 21.

> to doe, to separat, with your Lordships adwice and concurrance, the estate from them both.[120]

In 1672 MacKinnon of Strath transferred his estate to a commission which included John MacLeod of Dunvegan, in order that his debts could be paid off.[121] On 30 May 1674 articles were agreed between the earl of Atholl and his friends 'anent the better management of His Lordships estate and uplifting of his Lordships rents, and anent the more effectual and better payment of his Lordships Debts and annual rents yearly'. The articles stated that 'it is thought fitt that ther be a perfytt and exact list of his Lordships wholl principall debts drawn up'. The rents and duties of Atholl, Balquidder and Glenalmond were to be set aside to cover the interest payments on Atholl's debts.[122] On 5 March 1674 Robert Campbell of Glenlyon transferred the administration of his estates to a commission

> considering that there are severall debts soumes of money and uther burdings and incumbrances affecting and burdening my lands and uthers pertaineing and belonging to me. And that it is simple and altogether impossible ffor me to take course with the saids debts…without the Counsell advyse and concurrance of some of my good ffreinds.[123]

These included John Campbell, younger of Glenorchy, Sir Alexander Menzies of that Ilk, Duncan Stewart of Appin and Colin Campbell of Monzie. The commission gave them power to set and grant tacks and to receive all the duties from his lands, to appoint a factor and a chamberlain, to grant contracts of wadset and to continue until all the debts were paid off.

John Campbell of Duntroon lost control of his estate to another commission:

> taking to his consideration that his house and estait of Downtroone is under great debt and almost totally ruined thairby. And he being most desyrous above all things earthly to keip and preserve the said family from perishing…And knowing no better and moir probable way ffor preserveing the same then to comitt the manageing of the said estait…to the trust and care of the firsaidis foure persones his friends.[124]

It is noticeable that in most cases such commissions were composed of kinsmen of the chiefs or neighbouring chiefs and clan gentry. Effective control of the chief's lands was taken out of his hands but was kept within the kindred. The freedom of action of the chief was diminished and the surplus of their estates could no longer be spent in the way they wanted.

[120] Fraser, *Cromartie*, i, 27-8.
[121] *Book of Dunvegan*, i, 123.
[122] John Duke of Atholl (ed.), *Chronicles of the Atholl and Tullibardine Families* (Edinburgh, 1908), i, 164-6.
[123] NAS, GD 112/2/8/16.
[124] NAS, GD 116/1/28.

As a result their political position was curtailed, as was the exalted symbolic power of their lordship, although the land itself remained in control of the kindred or neighbours and the chief still remained at the apex of the social hierarchy in terms of the kin-based society. The evidence of such commissions indicates a decline in the power of the highland chiefs in the later seventeenth century. The chiefs do not conform to Brown's view of the Scottish aristocracy in the early modern period as among the most powerful in Europe and not affected by even relative decline.[125]

The following extract from John Nicoll's diary reveals that indebtedness could bring great indignities:

> In the moneth of November 1654, the Marques of Ergyll repaired to Dalkeith…At quhich tyme he resaved…much effrontes and disgraces of his creditouris, quha being frustrat and defraudit be the Marques of thair just and lauchfull dettis, spaired not, at all tymes as he walked, ather in streit or in the feildis, (to call him) "A fals traitour". Besyde this, his hors and hors graith, and all uther houshold stuff, wer poyndit in Dalkeith and at Newbottil, and brocht to Edinburgh, and thair comprysit at the Mercat Croce for dett.[126]

Thus was the world turned upside down in a new era as debt obligations began to replace the older ties of kinship and lordship. In November 1655 the marquis was arrested in London at the instance of a creditor, Elizabeth Maxwell, the widow of the earl of Dirleton, for a debt of £1,000 Sterling.[127] Indebtedness could even humiliate the most powerful in the realm and was a vital factor eating away the charisma and munificence of lordship.[128] That the chiefs were now less esteemed is evident from the Gaelic poetry of the later seventeenth century. The following extract from Roderick Morrison's 'Oran do Mhac Leoid Dhun Bheagain' (A Song to MacLeod of Dunvegan) criticises Roderick Macleod, who was chief between 1693 and 1699, for borrowing money to finance his purchase of foreign luxuries on the security of the MacLeod lands:

> *Thig e mach as a'bhuth*
> *leis an fhasan as ur bho'n Fhraing,*
> *'s an t-aodach gasda bha 'n de*
> *m'a phearsa le speis nach gann*
> *theid a shadadh an cuil-*
> *"Is dona 'm fasan, chan fhiu e plang.*

[125] K. M. Brown, *Kingdom or Province? Scotland and the Regal Union 1603-1715* (London, 1992), x, 3.

[126] John Nicoll, *A Diary of Public Transactions*, ed. David Laing, Bannatyne Club (Edinburgh, 1836), 140.

[127] J. Willcock, *The Great Marquess, Life and Times of Archibald, 8th Earl, and first (and only) Marquess of Argyll (1607-1661)* (Edinburgh, 1903), 296.

[128] Archibald Campbell, first marquis of Argyll had himself exploited the obligations of debt to extend his territorial influence over the estates of Sir Lachlan MacLean of Duart, John MacDonald of Moidart, Captain of Clanranald and George Gordon, second marquis of Huntly. Macinnes, *Clanship*, 96-7.

Air mal baile no dha
glac am peana 's cuir lamh ri bann".[129]

Despite the vast accumulation of debt by highland chiefs in the seventeenth century complete ruin was very rare. Survival was underwritten by the extensive land assets that could be used as a reservoir to secure further borrowing and by the conservative nature of highland society with kinship still a potent force for cohesion and kinsmen acting to preserve the existing social structure.[130] Macinnes has argued that the expansion of the land market occasioned by wadsetting and sale gave the clan Campbell unrivalled cohesion in the later seventeenth century and that the extension of landownership through debt reinvigorated solidarity between chief and clan gentry.[131] However the interpretation presented here is of a social system struggling to come to terms with the powerful forces of a debt deflation which produced a sharp fall in the economic, social and cultural power of the chiefs.

Another effect of financial distress was a more commercial attitude to the running of estates and this had a significant effect on the traditional claims of loyalty and lordship between chief and clan. To meet existing interest payments or to reduce the overall debt burden productivity of estates had to rise and chiefly expenditure had to fall. The latter was unpalatable for a lord who prided himself on conspicuous expenditure but there is evidence that chiefs did seek to cut costs. The series of commissions that were established to administer estates in the later seventeenth century involved control of expenditure. Those who had traditionally held land without paying rent, hereditary professional families or kinsmen who held land in return for military service, found themselves under pressure. In a memorandum concerning the earl of Seaforth's finances it was stated that 'all men…hes tracts of land for no dewtie at all may quiet thess landis to my lord without any acknowledgment'.[132] The decline of the hereditary professional families of Gaelic culture was surely a direct consequence of the indebtedness of the chiefs. The phasing out of tacksmen was a feature of commercial orientation in Argyllshire, the southern highlands and on estates in the central and eastern highlands under the control of lowland landlords.[133] There was also increased pressure to convert rentals into cash payment as the purchasing power of cash rose relative to the purchasing power of agricultural commodities in the deflationary environment of the later seventeenth century.

[129] 'He comes out of the shop with the latest fashion from France, and the fine clothes worn on his person yesterday with no little satisfaction are tossed into a corner- "The style is unmodish, not worth a plack. On the security of a townland or two, take the pen and sign a bond."' Matheson (ed.), *Blind Harper*, 68-9.

[130] An interesting exception was John Campbell of Duntroon whose estate was taken over by a commission and who ultimately lost all his land and house to his major creditor, Neil Campbell, sheriff-depute of Argyll. See Watt, 'Chiefs, Lawyers and Debt', 235-6.

[131] Macinnes, *Clanship*, 144, 149.

[132] NAS, Mar and Kellie Muniments, GD 124/15/147.

[133] Macinnes, *Clanship*, 145.

More appealing was the drive to increase the productivity of land. The droving trade in highland cattle was growing from the early seventeenth century but major expansion was associated with the rapid growth of London after the Restoration[134] and is likely to have been stimulated by the financial problems of the chiefs. The ninth earl of Argyll introduced short leases from five to nineteen years to ensure accountability and developed businesses in coal, salt, fishing, shipping and lime and slate quarrying.[135] His very substantial debts were surely the principal reason for this focus on commerce. The marquis of Atholl introduced more commercial estate management and John Campbell of Glenorchy, first earl of Breadalbane, invested in steelbow and the exploitation of timber.[136] But rather than expressing aristocratic self confidence, as Brown believes, both men were responding to the realities of financial crisis.[137]

Other responses by the chiefs included the development of merchant networks in London which acted as avenues of credit provision. For example, by 1696 the earl of Breadalbane had borrowed £2,400 from John Campbell, goldsmith in London; £1,410 from James Campbell, merchant in London; £2,112 from David Campbell in London; and £2,400 from Captain Dougall Campbell in London.[138] Younger sons became merchants in lowland burghs and London. Breadalbane's younger brother was apprenticed to a London merchant involved in trade to the Levant and another to an Edinburgh merchant who had connections with Dutch commerce. There was also investment in colonial ventures. Lord Neil Campbell was involved in the attempt to establish a colony at Stuartstown in South Carolina in 1682 and he and Sir Ewen Cameron of Lochiel in the colonial venture to East New Jersey in 1685.[139] These provided no financial return but are indicative of the increasingly commercial attitudes of the highland chiefs. Members of the highland elite moved into the legal profession in significant numbers in the later seventeenth century.[140] Part of the reason for this was financial and related to the high costs of the vast amount of legal work required by the management of debt. This is stated explicitly in a document by which a younger brother of the earl of Breadalbane agreed to provide free legal services for his brother.[141]

More controversial for the chiefs was raising rents and placing the financial burden for their indebtedness on their tenants. The ninth earl of Argyll quadrupled his rents from £15,000 to £61, 327 in the two decades after 1665.[142] In a letter of 3 May 1688 the earl of Atholl

[134] Macinnes, *Clanship*, 142-3. Dodgshon, *Chiefs to Landlords*, 113-14.
[135] *Ibid.*, 146-7
[136] Brown, *Kingdom or Province?* 38, Macinnes, *Clanship*, 148.
[137] K. M. Brown, *Noble Society*, 69.
[138] NAS, GD 112/38/14/5.
[139] Macinnes, *Clanship*, 147.
[140] Watt, 'Chiefs, Lawyers and Debt', 92-9.
[141] NAS, GD 112/3/73/6.
[142] Macinnes, *Clanship*, 146.

informed the first earl of Breadalbane that Robert Campbell of Glenlyon 'oppresses the poor tenants that ther is and will be much land cast waste in the Glen'.[143] There are references to rent increases in the Gaelic poetry of the period. For example Iain Lom in his 'Do Mhac Fhionghuin an T-Sratha' (A Song to MacKinnon of Strath) praises the MacKinnon chief for not extending the exactions on his tenants:

Cha b'e 'm fasan bh'aig cach
So ghlac thu mar ghnath-
Bhith smachdail mu'n mhal air tuaith.[144]

This suggests that a number of highland and island chiefs in Skye and its vicinity were raising rents. In his 'Oran do Mhac Leoid Dhun Bheagain' (A Song to MacLeod of Dunvegan) the poet Roderick Morrison makes the direct connection between conspicuous expenditure and rent increases:

crios dealbhach o'n bhuth,
bogh' chinn airgid is biugail oir-
's fheudar faighinn sin da:
's thig air m'fhearann-sa mal nas mo.[145]

The other principal effect of chronic indebtedness was psychological. Many chiefs became entrapped in long weary disputes with creditors, they could no longer travel freely without fear of arrest, they might be restrained by commissions and forced to undertake unpopular expenditure cuts and rent rises. It is no wonder that they often expressed feelings of despondency in their letters. Indeed it might be suggested that an atmosphere of gloom hung over many highland chiefs in the later seventeenth century. In their correspondence there is much talk of troubles and ruin. In 1666 Sir James MacDonald of Sleat wrote to Sir George MacKenzie of Tarbat: 'thank God I can hold my head above the water'.[146] In 1684 Alexander MacKenzie of Coul commented to his brother Mr John MacKenzie, advocate, that 'all the tyes of nature reason and religion oblige me to look to the interest and seafty of my own poore family.'[147] In 1688 the MacDougall chief and clan gentry thanked Lord Tarbat for being 'the onlie instrument, under God, of keiping that familie from being extinct'.[148] In September 1697 Kenneth MacKenzie, a son of Sir William MacKenzie first baronet of Coul, wrote that 'as dismall unfortunat and lamentable my own lot is in the world I

[143] NAS, GD 112/39/143/2.
[144] You did not adopt as your custom the habit of others here, namely, to be severe with the tenantry over rent. Mackenzie, *Orain Iain Luim*, 72-3.
[145] A finely fashioned belt from the shop, a silver-tipped bow and a golden bugle- that must be got for him: and a higher rent will be charged for my land. Matheson (ed.), *Blind Harper*, 70-1.
[146] Fraser, *Cromartie*, i, 16.
[147] NLS, Delvine Papers, MS 1329, f. 17-18.
[148] Fraser, *Cromartie*, i, 57-8.

regreat litle less my poor brother Collins condition who now since I am not in condition to help in a maner begges from door to door.'[149] Isobell the wife of the third earl of Seaforth reflected in a letter of May 1701: 'I think it will be best to me to reteir to the abay.'[150] She is referring to the debtors' sanctuary of Holyrood Abbey. Her son, Kenneth, earl of Seaforth, who faced problems caused by indebtedness and political difficulties relating to his Jacobitism, complained that 'all my mole hills is made mountains'.[151] Finally, in 1698 Sir Donald MacDonald of Sleat wrote to Tarbat: 'I have the honour and happiness of soe good a director to extricatt me out of the laberinth of thir difficulties'.[152] Such evidence indicates that highland chiefs often expressed feelings of gloom and insecurity in letters. The accumulation of large debts and the ensuing financial problems appear to have been a prime cause of these proclamations of despair.

It is no wonder that some chiefs looked to the security of the past. In 1661 Sir John Campbell of Glenorchy wrote to his father-in-law William, earl of Airth:

> This was my grandfather, Sir Duncan's admonitione to me, and I could never heir nor know of any gentlemen in the Highlands quho's prudence in the metter of governement of his estait was more extolled then his.[153]

Lord Glenorchy, son of the first earl of Breadalbane, was also an admirer of estate policy in the days of Sir Duncan Campbell of Glenorchy (d.1631): 'I long to secure our frontiers as Sir Duncan left them'.[154] The perception of decline; social, financial and political gave rise to a yearning for security which expressed itself in reflection on a golden age under Sir Duncan Campbell of Glenorchy.

Another response to the insecurity of the later seventeenth century can be discerned. When in May 1666 Hugh, eighth Lord Fraser of Lovat, travelled to Glenelg it was stated that he 'resolves to go in highland cloaths as agreeing best with the place and genious of the people' and he 'encurraged them as it becam a chiften every way'.[155] This indicates that it was unusual for a Fraser chief to wear highland clothing at this time. He was attempting to make himself more like his people because social, cultural and political changes in the previous century had made him quite unlike them. Other chiefs tried to recreate themselves in a more 'highland' guise. According to Hopkins, Simon, eleventh Lord Fraser of Lovat's distinctive characteristic was an intense self-consciousness and he worked to bolster clanship 'with all the exaggerated attention to dress and other externals and the ultimate insecurity of an antiquarian

[149] NLS, MS 1332, f. 2.
[150] NLS, MS 1356, f. 14.
[151] NLS, MS 1356, f. 120.
[152] Fraser, *Cromartie*, i, 129.
[153] W. Fraser (ed.), *The Red Book of Menteith*, 2 vols (Edinburgh, 1880), ii, 162-4.
[154] NAS, GD 112/39/182/18.
[155] *Chron. Frasers*, 465.

revivalist trying to recreate a dead system'.[156] Grimble has pointed out that John, second Lord Reay, chief of the MacKays of Strathnaver, 'appears to have recreated the antique pattern of life of the former Lords of the Isles and the lesser Celtic patriarchs'.[157]

*

The wearing of highland dress, looking back to a golden age and proclamations of despondency and decline all indicate a reflective and self-conscious group of individuals who were reacting to the insecurity of change. Their power and status was diminished by commissions and legal disputes and the new commercial orientation alienated them from their kindred. Indebtedness was at the root of much of this change and debt might be viewed as an acid dissolving the obligations of the past. The financial crisis precipitated by the combination of indebtedness and deflation was therefore a pivotal aspect in the process by which highland chiefs adopted the values of landlords. This interpretation is different from Dodgshon's view that the response of chiefs to the rising power of the Scottish Crown and integration with the market economy were the crucial determinants of the gradual transformation from chief to landlord.[158] The above argument does sustain the view of Macinnes that the Restoration era was to witness a fundamental shift in the nature and structure of clanship from traditionalism to commercialism.[159] However rather than a series of convulsions the intensity of transition was focused on the thirty or forty years following the mid century as chiefs responded to a debt deflation which led to a decline in their position politically, financially, socially and culturally and produced a backward looking, insecure, impoverished and melancholic group of men.

[156] P. Hopkins, *Glencoe and the End of the Highland War* (Edinburgh, 1986), 443.
[157] I. Grimble, *Chief of Mackay* (London, 1965), 176.
[158] Indebtedness is only briefly discussed. Dodgshon, *Chiefs to Landlords,* 36-7, 102-118.
[159] Macinnes, *Clanship*, 114.

The Scottish Historical Review, Volume LXXXV, 1: No. 219: April 2006, 54–76

LIZANNE HENDERSON

The Survival of Witchcraft Prosecutions and Witch Belief in South-West Scotland

Abstract

During the era of the Scottish witch-hunts, Dumfries and Galloway was one of the last regions to initiate witch prosecutions, but it was also one of the most reluctant to completely surrender all belief in witches until a comparatively late date. In the late seventeeth and early eighteenth centuries south- west Scotland, better known for the persecution of covenanters, took the practice of witchcraft and charming very seriously indeed, and for perhaps longer than other parts of Scotland, though the area has received surprisingly little scholarly investigation. The trial evidence is not incompatible with that found elsewhere though there is less demonic content. Accusations of witchcraft in this region were mostly concerned with the troubles of everyday life, agricultural problems, family tensions and disagreements between neighbours. From 1670 to about 1740, the very decades that were giving birth to the Scottish Enlightenment, learned interest in the supernatural was actually on the increase and the topic received an unprecedented level of questioning, investigation, and scrutiny. Ironically, the 'superstitions' that both church and state had been attempting to eradicate for some two hundred years were now being used to defend religion against the growing threat of atheism. The zeal of the ministers does seem to have contributed to the endurance of witch beliefs in the South West, as elsewhere. Against this backdrop, the survival of witch belief and the continued prosecution of witches in south-west Scotland is examined, thus contributing to our understanding of the individualistic nature of witch persecution and the various dynamics at play within the Scottish witch-hunting experience.

It is generally accepted that after the last great outbreak of persecution in 1661-2, Scotland's witch-hunting activities went into sharp decline.[1] While this is demonstrably what happened in some areas it was not so in all parts of the country. Nor was it the case that though the number of witch trials and executions lessened, belief in witches and witchcraft was

[1] Christina Larner, *Enemies of God: The Witch-Hunt in Scotland* (London, 1981), 78-9; Brian P. Levack, 'The Decline and End of Scottish Witch-Hunting', in J. Goodare (ed.), *The Scottish Witch-Hunt in Context*, (Manchester and New York, 2002), 166-81.

LIZANNE HENDERSON is lecturer in Scottish history at the Crichton Campus of the University of Glasgow. She would like to thank staff at Dumfries and Galloway Archives for their help and support, particularly Marion Stewart and Lucy Gibbon. This paper was originally presented at the *Covens and Covenanters: Witchcraft and Religion in South West Scotland* conference, May 2002, and again at the Scottish History Seminar Series, University of Edinburgh, in January 2005. The author is grateful for helpful comments on these occasions.

any less vibrant than it had ever been. In the decades following the hunt of 1661-2, there was arguably more interest, on the part of the elite and learned, in witchcraft and the supernatural in general, than ever before. From roughly 1670 to about 1740, the very decades that were giving birth to the Scottish enlightenment, the subject of the supernatural received an unprecedented level of questioning, investigation, and scrutiny. Ironically, the 'superstitions' that both church and state had been attempting to destroy for at least two hundred years were now being used, in some quarters, to defend religion against what were perceived to be the ravages of atheism.[2] The south-west region of Scotland sheds considerable light on the vexed problems of witch belief and witch-hunting, and the tenacity, or otherwise thereof, though the area has received surprisingly little scholarly investigation. The South West comprises Dumfries and Galloway, the former a county in its own right, the latter embracing the shires of Wigtown and Kirkcudbright. In comparison with other parts of Scotland the area was a relative latecomer to witch-hunting. Furthermore, the trial evidence reveals few signs of the demonic—the Devil himself seldom appears. Rather, most cases are concerned with the grind, stresses, sheer drudgery and anxieties of daily existence: disagreements between neighbours, arguments about livestock, family tensions, and the unpopularity of incomers to the community, among others.

As is well known this area acquired a more 'radical' reputation than the rest of the country due to the activities of the covenanters, whose stance in defence of religion in opposition to anglicising tendencies in the Kirk, and what was perceived to be the excesses of Stewart despotism, earned them sustained persecution by the government and increasing marginalization on the part of the Scottish establishment by the 1680s. Indeed, it is probably due to the fascination displayed by presbyterian hagiology for such legendary persecution that the subject of witch-hunting in the south-western counties has been largely ignored, though it is quite well documented, and acquired its first historian as early as 1911.[3]

The post-Restoration period was one of religious strife and tension throughout Scotland, though arguably at particularly high levels in the South West. From the turbulent years of the 1630s and 1640s to the notorious 'Killing Times' of the mid-1680s, the ideology of the covenant remained crucial to Scottish theology and political theory. The main period of covenanting activity is generally assumed to have ended with the exile of James VII and II in 1688-9, though the influence of the covenanters persisted well into the eighteenth century, and later.[4]

[2] Lizanne Henderson, 'Supernatural Traditions and Folk Beliefs in an Age of Transition: Witchcraft and Charming in Scotland, c. 1670-1740', unpublished PhD thesis (University of Strathclyde, 2003).

[3] J. Maxwell Wood, *Witchcraft in South-West Scotland* (1911; Wakefield, 1975).

[4] See Edward J. Cowan, 'The Making of the National Covenant', in J. Morill (ed.), *The Scottish National Covenant in its British Context, 1638-51* (Edinburgh, 1990), 68-89;

After the Revolution, when presbyterian orthodoxy had been re-established in Scotland, fears of English perfidy remained a source of constant anxiety and unease. The covenanters were to claim, with some reason, that they had anticipated many of the arguments that were reiterated during the so-called 'Glorious Revolution' of 1688-9, but while the presbyterian establishment appeared to be guaranteed in legislation of 1690, there was cause for concern with the opening of negotiations for union in 1701. The covenants were frequently invoked in response to the perceived threat that such union appeared to pose to the very existence of the Kirk. A number of the more committed brethren and elders, many of covenanting sympathy among them, trapped as they were in an increasingly entrenched position, displayed a tendency to regard the persecution of witches as both a religious and a patriotic duty;[5] in their view to relax the laws against witchcraft was to oppose the will of God. With this in mind, it is probably no coincidence that there was a fairly serious outbreak of witch cases in the South West at this period. The region had recently seen much persecution and bloodshed and from the earliest years of the eighteenth century was intent upon the mythologisation, to a greater or lesser extent, of its recent past.[6] It is possible, however, to detect signs of profound change in the attitudes of clergy, the elite, and eventually the folk at large, towards witch-hunting, although not towards witch belief, for there is strong evidence for the existence of known witches in Galloway well into the nineteenth century.

Stories about witchcraft abound in the South West: in the sixteenth century the poet Alexander Montgomerie wrote of the 'venerable virgines whom the world call witches';[7] In the eighteenth century, Allan Cunningham collected the story 'The Witches Tryst'; while a Mr. McWilliam communicated a version of 'The Witch of Kirkcowan' in the late nineteenth century.[8] Locharbriggs Hill, outside Dumfries, was only one of many sites throughout the south west of Scotland which was associated with the legendary of witches. Some places had several, and even competing, associations: John Gordon Barbour debates the origins of

4 (*Continued*) Edward J. Cowan 'The Solemn League and Covenant', in Roger A. Mason (ed.), *Scotland and England, 1286-1815* (Edinburgh, 1987), 182-202; Edward J. Cowan, 'The Covenanting Tradition in Scottish History', in E.J. Cowan and R.J. Finlay (eds), *Scottish History: The Power of the Past* (Edinburgh, 2002), 121-45.

5 Ian Bostridge, *Witchcraft and Its Transformations, c.1650-c.1750* (Oxford, 1997), 21-37.

6 Cowan, 'Covenanting Tradition', 125-9, 142-3.

7 Lizanne Henderson and Edward J. Cowan, *Scottish Fairy Belief: A History* (East Linton, 2001), 161, quoting Alexander Montgomerie, 'The Flyting of Montgomerie and Polwart', in George Stevenson (ed.), *Poems of Alexander Montgomerie, supplementary volume* (Edinburgh, 1910), 129-89. Although Mongomerie was almost certainly from Ayrshire, there is a Galloway tradition from the late 17th century that he was born at Cumstoun (or Compston) near Kirkcudbright. Julia Muir Watt, *Dumfries and Galloway: A Literary Guide* (Dumfries, 2000), 258-9.

8 See Hannah Aitken, *A Forgotten Heritage: Original Folk Tales of Lowland Scotland* (Edinburgh and London, 1973), 45-6, 49-50.

the Carlin's Cairn, perched on top of the Rhinns of Kells: 'Some say it was thrown together to commemorate the burning of a witch—others, that it was erected on the spot where an old female Covenanter was murdered by Grierson of Lag'. Barbour himself preferred a third theory, that it was in fact collected by the wife of a miller in Polmaddie to commemorate the memory of King Robert Bruce, 'yet' he implores us,

> let it be recollected that neither cairn nor column rises to the memory of the saviour of his country, save one little rustic cairn on the summit of the Kells Rhynns, and that little cairn, not the work of a nation, but the laborious stone-gathering of a peasant and a woman.[9]

Much of the historical material has been found in kirk session and presbytery records; ministers and elders were particularly obsessed with fornication, adultery, swearing, drunkenness and with punishing those who had been caught working or enjoying themselves on the Lord's Day. The point is that witchcraft was not always at the top of their list of priorities, but, it was far from absent. It will be argued that the south west of Scotland did take the practice of witchcraft, of charming, and of wrongfully accusing someone of being a witch, very seriously indeed and perhaps for longer than other parts of Scotland. However, it would be unwise to think that this was an obsessional interest, that witches were being hunted down and scourged on a daily basis. Witch belief operated on a more subtle and complex level—there were peaks and troughs and the outcome of an accusation was often very dependent upon the belief of the minister involved. It was he who decided whether or not to recommend the instigation of judicial proceedings, to punish the accused himself—which in the period under study was the most common outcome—or to throw the case out altogether, either through lack of evidence or simple disbelief.

*

The number of relatively late cases of witch belief in the South West is quite significant. In comparison with some parts of Scotland—for example in the North East or the Lothians where witch-hunting was well under way by the latter part of the sixteenth century—persecution in Dumfries and Galloway did not begin in earnest until the mid-seventeenth century. There was a noise of witchcraft in Galloway in 1614-5 according to the *Records of the Privy Council* ,which issued commissions for the investigation of 'sundry persons',[10] followed by an apparent lull until a reported case in Drongan, Wigtownshire in 1622[11] and a more

[9] John Gordon Barbour, *Unique Traditions chiefly of the West and South of Scotland* (Glasgow, 1886), 31, 39.

[10] *Records of the Privy Council* [RPC], x, 231, Commission to William, Bishop of Galloway, 6 April 1614, and x, 327, Commission to the Steward of Kirkcudbright, 3 May 1615.

[11] *RPC,* xii, 720, Commission to John, Earl of Wigtown, 15 May 1622.

serious outbreak in Dumfries in the years 1628-31.[12] Thereafter, cases remained fairly spotty throughout the area.[13]

Christina Larner estimated that Scotland experienced, in total, just over 3000 cases of witchcraft and around 1500 executions. The Survey of Scottish Witchcraft has recently updated the total to 3837 formal accusations though the information is still sketchy on actual executions.[14] At least 128, and possibly more, of these cases took place in the Dumfries and Galloway region; seventy-eight in the county of Dumfries, thirty-five in Kirkudbright, and fifteen in Wigtown.[15] It is hard to gauge, with any precision, what proportion of the population was affected by accusations of witchcraft as census data was not gathered until 1755. Based on Alexander Webster's unofficial census of that date, it is possible to estimate, per head of population, roughly how many individuals faced a formal accusation.[16]

Region	Population	Witchcraft Cases	Per Head of pop.
Dumfries	39,788	78	1 in 510
Kirkcudbright	21,205	35	1 in 605
Wigtown	16,466	15	1 in 1097
Total	77,459	128	1 in 605

Since the national average for persons accused of witchcraft was approximately 1 in 330,[17] the South West, and Wigtown in particular, was not an especially dangerous place to live with regard to the witch-hunts.

One frustrating problem is that the records are at times incomplete, missing or lost, or just too vague as to what really happened and to whom, for names are not always provided. Fortunately, not all cases have such scanty evidence. Two women, Jonet McMuldritche and Elspeth Thomson, who were not so far as is known related, were brought to trial,

[12] *RPC,* 2nd ser., ii, 328-9, Commission to sheriff of Dumfries, 5 June 1628; *RPC,* 2nd ser., iii, 340, 345, Commission to sheriff of Dumfries, 6 and 12 Nov. 1629; *RPC,* 2nd ser., iii, 446, 450-1, 550-1, Various commissions, 4 and 9 Feb., 1 June 1630; *RPC,* 2nd ser., iii, 550-1, Commission to Sir Robert Greir of Lag, 1 June 1631.

[13] For further references, see G. F. Black, *A Calendar of Cases of Witchcraft in Scotland, 1510-1727* (New York, 1938); Christina Larner, C. H. Lee and H. V. McLachlan, *A Source-Book of Scottish Witchcraft* (Glasgow, 1977).

[14] Of that total number 2769 occurred before, and including, 1662. After that significant turning point, 429 (or 13% of the national total) cases have been recorded. Figures are from *The Survey of Scottish Witchcraft Database* [*SSWD*] at www.arts.ed.ac.uk/witches/

[15] Dumfries and Galloway figures are from *SSWD.*

[16] James Gray (ed.), *Scottish Population Statistics including Webster's Analysis of Population 1755* (Edinburgh, 1952), 82.

[17] Based on Webster's calculation that there were 1,265,380 persons in Scotland in 1755.

found guilty, and executed in Dumfries in 1671.[18] Jonet McMuldritche was charged with using witchcraft to kill cattle and horses, but more seriously, to murder two men with whom she had a falling out. Her first victim, Robert Brown, had driven McMuldritche's cattle off his pasture-land. She confronted him about it but, in the ensuing argument, lost her temper and cursed him. Robert Cairns, her second target, had accused McMuldritche of stealing corn and hay from his barn and of cursing him with an illness. When Cairns implored her to visit him and remove the curse she refused. Both men died, allegedly as a direct result of her imprecations.

Elspeth Thomson of Rerrick was charged with cursing John Corsbie and his wife Rosina McGhie (her sister-in-law) because the couple had not invited her to the baptism of their child. Donald McGhie, Thomson's brother-in-law, spread rumours that she had used witchcraft to make the Corsbies sick. In response to his allegations Thomson's husband, William McGhie, confronted his brother Donald with a warning that things would not go well for him for calling his wife, who was also Donald's sister-in-law, a witch. Donald McGhie died shortly afterwards. To make matters worse, eyewitnesses swore that when Thomson came to pay her last respects she touched the body; immediately blood 'rushed forth from his nose, navell and ears and his corpse bleed all the way to the Buriall place'. A bleeding corpse had long been regarded as proof of guilt in murder enquiries. James VI commented,

> in a secret murther, if the deade carcase be at any time thereafter handled by the murtherer, it wil gush out of bloud, as if the blud wer crying to the heaven for revenge of the murtherer, God having appoynted that secret super-naturall signe. . .[19]

The case of Jonet Rendall, accused of witchcraft and 'devilrie' in Orkney in 1629, affords another example of the bleeding corpse. According to her dittay when she was brought into the presence of her victim, 'the cors having lyin ane guid space and not having bled any, immediatelie bled mutch bluid as ane suir token' that she was the author of his death.[20] A man was executed in Kirkcaldy in 1662 for the murder of his father, the proof of his guilt determined by the blood which fell from the victim's nose when he touched it.[21] In 1698 Mr. William Fraser, a minister

[18] Trial of Elspeth Thomson and Jonet McMuldroche or McMuldritche, 16 May 1671, is discussed in chapter 10 of Larner's *Enemies of God*. See also A. Truckell, *Material on Witchcraft and Magical Practices in Dumfries and Galloway No. 43*, 7-8, and William McDowall, *History of Dumfries* (Edinburgh, 1867), 432. Both women were executed on 18 May 'betwixt tuo and foure houres in the afernoone to the ordinare place of execution for the toune of drumfreis And their to be wirried at ane stake till they be dead And theirafter their bodies to be brunt to ashes And all their moveable goods and geir to be excheat. . .'.

[19] James VI, *Daemonologie in forme of a Dialogue. 1597* (London, 1924), 80.

[20] Trial of Jonet Rendall, Orkney, 1629, qtd. in G. F. Black, *County Folklore vol. III: Orkney and Shetland Islands* (1903; Felinfach and London, 1994), 104.

[21] George R. Kinloch (ed.), *The Diary of Mr. John Lamont of Newton, 1649-1671* (Edinburgh, 1830), 150-1, Simpkins, *County Folk-Lore Fife*, 117-18.

and step-son of the deceased Jean Gordon of Slaines, Aberdeenshire, was made, with others, to touch her corpse as a result of which 'there appeared nothing upon the body to make the least indication of her having been murdered'. The traditional ordeal of blood, although found wanting, was obviously still considered worthwhile.[22]

The case of Jonet McMuldritche was largely concerned with agricultural disputes, straying farm animals and theft. That of Elspeth Thomson was somewhat different. Though she shared with McMuldritche the reputation of possessing an ability to curse, with deadly results, her notoriety as a witch seems to have been formed, at least in part, by her husband's relations who, for some reason, disliked or disapproved of her. More than half of the depositions given against her came from the McGhie brothers and their spouses. Her husband, William, did not actually testify against her, though incriminating stories that he had told to his family were mentioned by them.[23] Thomson was blamed for the death of one family member (Donald McGhie), while another (James McGhie) also claimed he had been a victim of her spells after he had refused to give her work. An intriguing feature of both cases is that men are the primary accusers. It has been argued elsewhere that typically such quarrels were between women.[24]

Also in 1671, the Steward Depute of Kirkcudbright ordered the magistrates of Dumfries to hand over suspected witches Bessie Paine, Janet Hewat, Grissall McNae (or Rae), Margaret McGuffok and Margaret Fleming at sunrise, at the west end of the bridge of Dumfries for transportation to Kirkcudbright. They were to be tied with 'small cords'.[25] Very little information has survived about these unfortunate women, with the exception of Bessie Paine, who was charged with a series of offences which included charming oxen and cattle, and attempting to cure sick children and adults. While some of her patients recovered, others were not so lucky and may well have been the reason she found herself in trouble, both with her neighbours and the law. From the available evidence it seems that her assistance was frequently sought. She cured an ox belonging to John Turner, Elder in Ardwall by feeding it with hay, bere and green kail stocks. She then waited until the ox licked its upper lip; failure to lick would have been a sign that the animal would die. Paine was also called upon to cure Robert Hutton's cow, which she

[22] *RPC*, October 1698, quoted in Chambers, *Domestic Annals*, iii, 208-9. See also Dalyell, *Darker Superstitions of Scotland*, 36-43, and McPherson, *Primitive Beliefs in the North-East of Scotland*, 274-5.

[23] Larner, *Enemies of God*, 125.

[24] For example, see James Sharpe, *Instruments of Darkness: Witchcraft in England 1550-1750,* (London, 1997) 169-89 and James Sharpe, 'Witchcraft and Women in Seventeenth-Century England: Some Northern Evidence', *Continuity and Change* 6 (1991) 179-99.

[25] Held at Dumfries Tolbooth, Janet Hewat, Bessie Paine, Margaret Fleming, Grissall McNae and Margaret McGuffok, 6 June 1671, Letter from Glendonyng, Truckell, No. 43, 8, and Dumfries and Galloway Archive Centre website extract. A total of eight women had appeared at an Assize in Dumfries of which five were sent to Kirkcudbright for trial. Wood, *Witchcraft in South-West Scotland*, 72.

did by leading the beast through a hank of green yarn and uttering some words, none of which were comprehensible to the onlookers. At least one of her remedies involved transference, as in the case of Richard Crockett's cow which she cured, but with a warning that the first thing the cow should see, on recovering, would die. As foretold, the cow confronted one of William Wright's oxen which expired immediately.

The treatment of livestock was not her only speciality, however. When the wife of Cuthbert Browne of Craigend became ill he sent for Paine who determined 'that Agnes Rowan[26] had witched her'. Paine successfully cured the wife, hinting that the best way to combat the magic of a 'black' witch was to deploy the skills of a 'white' witch. Walter Paterson in Tarranauchtie sought Paine's help to cure his sick child after he had 'used all ordinarie means' which had proved ineffectual; the child recovered. Another father, John Crockett in Lands, asked for help with his sick child, but after Paine described the ritual that would effect a cure the mother of the infant was too frightened to go through with it, and so the child lay sick for two more years. Sometimes Paine's powers were to no avail. Agnes Davidson deponed that when her father became sick, Paine requested some hair from his head and beard, and a sample of his nail clippings. She also commandeered his garters which she wound round her arm three times from her finger to her elbow, but to no avail for, within a week, the father had died.

According to some who knew her, Paine also had a less benign side. Herbert Crockett complained that she had been responsible for the deaths of all seven of his cattle. During a lykewake, Crockett (obscurely) had cut a piece out of the cloak of Paine's husband, John Murray. Next day an enraged Paine threatened that 'befoir it were long he should have ane other thing to think upon'. A month later the cows were dead and Paine was the obvious suspect. A further quarrel between Bessie Paine and John Crockett's wife involved the loss of cattle, though it may be suspected that Crockett was not the most efficient manager of livestock since, allegedly as a result of this altercation, for eleven years thereafter 'he had no kyne [cows] at all that lives'. The malevolent side of her powers was also experienced by Robert Sturgeon who had taken a croft at Aird, formerly inhabited by Paine. Not long after he moved in, she paid him a visit and, while sitting on the hearth stone, stated, 'all the witchcraft which I have I leave it here'. It was common knowledge that within a year Sturgeon lost over thirty cattle and 'nothing he tooke in hand did prosper dureing his possession of that rowme [rental]'.[27]

Paine's clients were both male and female. This was not particularly unusual, with the exception, perhaps, of the two fathers, Paterson and

[26] There is no further information on Agnes Rowan as it would appear she was never formally accused of, or tried for, witchcraft. She is not named in Black's *Calendar* nor does the Larner *et. al. Source-Book* assign her a case number, though she is mentioned in the transcripts section.

[27] Edinburgh, National Archives of Scotland [NAS], JC26/38, Trial of Bessie Paine, Kirkcudbright, 1671. Transcript also in Larner *et. al., Source-Book*, 269-70.

John Crockett, who took the initiative in the cure of sick children, a role that might be assumed to be traditionally female. It is possible that Paine regarded herself as a professional 'white witch' or charmer. That she could un-witch a client hints at the possibility that she did not regard her special powers as evil, though some of her neighbours clearly thought otherwise. Regrettably, as none of the depositions indicate whether Paine was paid or rewarded in any way for her services, the suggestion must remain speculative.

Evidence that witches were often treated inhumanely during their internment is evidenced in this episode. All five suspects were imprisoned within a 'dark dungeon' of Kirkcudbright Tolbooth, in which they were kept in 'a most miserable conditione being alwayes at the point of starving having nothing of ther own nor nothing allowed them for ther sustenance'. In the winter of 1671 Bessie Paine died 'through cold hunger [and] other inconveniences of the prison'. Hewat, Rae, and McGuffok were released in the summer of 1672, on the grounds that they were 'maliciously misrepresented as guiltie of the most horrid crymes', pending further notice. No mention is made of Margaret Fleming who presumably was released.[28]

Elspeth McEwen, of Balmaclellan in Galloway, imprisoned for witchcraft from 1696 to 1698, was said to be a person of 'superior education'. Allegedly, she could bewitch hens into laying an enormous number of eggs, or conversely, could stop them laying altogether. She also used a wooden pin to steal milk from her neighbours' cows; the pin had only to touch the cow's udder for the process to take place. Tradition relates that the minister was sent to bring McEwen before the session, and that in the process his mare became very frightened, sweating blood on the hill near the manse, since remembered as the 'Bluidy Brae'.[29] Whatever the truth of the tale, the 'old wife of Bogha' was sent to Kirkcudbright Tolbooth where she remained for about two years. Conditions were exceedingly harsh within prison, so it is of some credit to McEwen's strength of spirit, though eventually the pain and hardships she endured led her to a confession. She was executed on 24 August 1698. The executioner, William Kirk, was treated somewhat better for he received money, food, a new outfit, and, 'when she was burning', a pint of ale.

At least one person stood up for McEwen: Janet Corbie was denounced for 'endeavouring to dissuade her to confess', vigorously asserting that people 'sinned ther sowl' who said she was a witch. Unfortunately, Corbie proved a most unsuitable ally as she was a very unpopular character who abused the Lord's Day and assailed her neighbours

[28] NAS, JC2/13, Trial of Bessie Paine, Margaret McGuffock, Grissell Rae and Janet Howat, Kirkcudbright, 1671-2; *Records of Proceedings of Justiciary Court, Edinburgh, 1661-78*, ii, 104; Larner, *et. al.*, *Source-Book*, 269-74.

[29] Maxwell states, 'one of the most convincing parts of the evidence against the accused was, that the minister's horse, which was sent to bring her up for trial, trembled with fear when she mounted, and sweated drops of blood'. Maxwell, *History of Dumfries and Galloway*, 259. That Elspeth's contact with the horse caused it to bleed is reminiscent of the ordeal by touch, used mainly to expose murderers.

from whom she stole goods, such as onions and cabbages, which she then sold for profit. Her presence could be tolerated no more and the magistrates and town council of Kirkcudbright ordered that she be banished from the burgh.[30]

In 1701, witnesses came forward to complain about Janet M'Robert. Among her long list of crimes, she had caused a woman's breast to swell, so endangering her nursing baby. This M'Robert allegedly did because she was discontented with the quantity of chaff (hay or straw) she had received to feed her cow. On other occasions, she was blamed for contaminating a cow's milk, crippling a dog, driving another dog mad, and cheating a girl out of her money. People told of hearing strange, unearthly screams coming from her house, and of having seen phantom lights flickering within. Elizabeth Lauchlon claimed that she saw M'Robert's spinning wheel moving of its own accord, and when she tried to stop it, she was thrown back against the wall. Later on, in M'Robert's house,

> the Devil appeared to her [Lauchlon] in the likeness of a man, and did bid her deliver herself over to him, from the crown of her head to the sole of her foot, which she refused to do, saying she would rather give herself to God Almighty.

After Satan disappeared, M'Robert swore Lauchlon to secrecy; when he appeared again she resisted his entreaties to accompany him. Though the evidence against M'Robert was weighty, and included allegations of Devil worship, a commission to try her was denied by the Privy Council. Not content with the verdict, the Kirkcudbright session banished M'Robert to Ireland instead.[31]

Jean M'Murray of Twynholm requested banishment in 1703, having survived multiple accusations over a period of ten years. As was the case with most suspected witches, she mostly took revenge on people who were unkind to her: she inflicted a woman with a stitch-like pain which lasted until death; she spoilt milk, and killed at least three horses. Only a few years earlier, any one of these accusations might have led to M'Murray's execution.[32]

It is clear, in a letter dated 1704 from the Commissioners of the General Assembly to the presbytery of Wigtown, that the ministers, at

[30] Trial of Elspeth MacEwen, 24 August 1698, in Wood, *Witchcraft in South-West Scotland*, 72-82, C. H. Dick, *Highways and Byways in Galloway and Carrick* (London, 1938), 480-1; MacKenzie, *History of Galloway*, ii, 37, Anon., *History of Galloway*, 2 vols (Kirkcudbright, 1841), ii, 342-3, appendix 37-40; Trial of Janet Corbie, 31 July 1697, Kirkcudbright Burgh Records.

[31] Trial of Janet M'Robert of Milnburn, 6 and 12 Feb., 10 April 1701, Kirk Session of Kirkcudbright, quoted in Wood, *Witchcraft in South-West Scotland*, 82-7, and Anon., *History of Galloway*, ii, appendix 40-2. See also Edward J. Cowan and Lizanne Henderson, 'The last of the witches? The survival of Scottish witch belief', in Goodare (ed.), *The Scottish Witch-Hunt in Context*, 198-217.

[32] Trial of Jean M'Murray of Irelandton, Twynholm, 18 and 25 April, 2 and 9 May 1703, Kirk Session of Twynholm, quoted in Wood, *Witchcraft in South-West Scotland*, 87-91, and Anon., *History of Galloway*, ii, appendix 42-4.

least in the South West and presumably throughout Scotland, felt themselves to be under threat. The letter articulated fears of the 'distressed state of diverse of the reformed churches' and the urgent need for the ministers to address in their sermons

> the pernicious heresies, idolatries and superstitions of the Romish Church, and warn them [the congregations] with wisdom and prudence of the great and imminent dangers we are in of being overrun therewith. . .[33]

In this climate of presbyterian moral panic, it is perhaps little wonder that a slight surge in the persecution of witches and charmers can be seen.[34] They had been, after all, for quite some time, the natural targets or scapegoats in times of social and spiritual crisis.

In this context it is no surprise to find the Wigtown presbytery genuinely frightened by a woman from Kirkinner, Jean Brown, who came before them in 1706 claiming that she conversed with spirits which cured her when she was ill. The spirits, which she could not see but could feel, would 'ly carnally with her as men and women do when they beget children'. They had killed a man on her behalf because she had had a quarrel with his wife. They told her 'that they who took the test[35] would go to hell', but even worse, she claimed that these spirits were her maker, and that she prayed to them, particularly the spirit with whom she had sex for he was 'the Father Son and Holy Ghost'; 'they are God and she knows they are God because none but God can lift persons from sicknesse to health'. Further blasphemy was implicit in her revelation that according to the spirits, 'this world is to be destroyed'. Brown would not, under any circumstances, ask for repentance nor would she accept that the spirits were evil and of Satan. After much praying Jean Brown was detained in prison, a woman, who was described as 'under powerfull and satanicall delusions'.[36] The excessive praying which took place

[33] NAS, CH2/373/1, 6 Sept. 1704, Letter from the Commission dated 8 Aug. 1704, *Register of the Presbytery of Wigtown*,.

[34] Occasionally, with regard to witchcraft, the brethren banded together in times of perceived crisis, offering spiritual support to their congregations and one another. The ministers at Irvine, for instance, appointed 5 May 1697 'to be kept for humiliation and fasting through the bounds of this presbytrie' in a show of support for those at Paisley investigating the Christian Shaw case (NAS, CH2/197, Irvine Presbytery Records, 27 April 1697). The following year, Irvine presbytery were involved in nominating one of their number to attend a meeting of parliament in Edinburgh 'for joyning with other Ministers sent from other presbytries in prosecution of the recommendation of the Generall Assembly and Commission, against poperie, prophanity, schism, and to crave a new and plainer law against adultery, witchcraft, . . .'. Rev. Patrick Warner was appointed to attend (NAS, CH2/197, Irvine Presbytery Records, 19 July 1698).

[35] The Test Act was implemented on 31 August, 1681. Though it was criticised on the grounds of inconsistency, most seriously its association with the Duke of York's right to the succession, a great many ministers were deprived for refusal to 'take the Test'. *Act of the Parliaments of Scotland*, viii, 243, c.6. See also W. C. Dickinson and G. Donaldson (eds), *A Source Book of Scottish History*, 3 vols (1954; London, 1961), iii, 185-9.

[36] Jean Brown, formerly from Kirkinner parish, presently a servant in Skaith, parish of Penninghame, first appeared before the Penninghame Session on 20 Jan. 1706. Given the seriousness of the case, the Session agreed to take it to the sheriff depute of

before and during Brown's presence is not usually mentioned in cases involving witches. Fear of Brown's close Satanic involvement evoked extra measures of protection; she may have been considered, at least in these ministers' experience, to be even worse than a witch. The prayers may have possibly functioned as a form of exorcism. There was some evidence of exorcism at Rerrick.[37] However, the most likely explanation was that the prayers were used against Brown, by the ministers, in self-defence.

In Dumfriesshire, Sarah Smith, from Lochrutton was questioned in 1692 but the case was eventually dropped a year later because the depositions, and all the relevant paperwork, were lost.[38] In 1699, Elspeth Goldie or Gaudie was released from prison and made to stand at the church door and was 'rebuked on the pillar', for using offensive, scandalous and revengeful language against her brother-in-law, as well as for consulting with a known witch, Janet Kennedy. Apparently, she asked Kennedy to 'witch' her brother-in-law's new wife to death.[39] One of the key aspects of the Witchcraft Act of 1563 was that it regarded consultation with witches as just as culpable as actually practising witchcraft, but this seems never to have been enforced though it was nevertheless an ecclesiastical offence.

The role played by the ministers in witchcraft cases was considerable and often determined whether or not allegations would be followed up, or formal charges pressed. Only a few examples, from a potentially rich stock of available material, can be discussed here. The area around Caerlaverock, at the turn of the century, seems to have been a hotbed of witches. In 1692 three women, from Blackshaw, Locharwoods and Mousewald, were sent to Edinburgh to be tried for their 'many grievous malefices committed upon their neighbours and others'.[40] The outcome is unknown, though it is known that a local minister, Robert Paton, was one of the investigators and that he was further involved in enquiries

[36] (*Continued*) Wigtown, who in turn referred the case to the presbytery. Henry Paton (ed.), *Penninghame Parish Records. The Session Book of Penninghame 1696-1724*, 2 vols (Edinburgh, 1933) i. 164-6. She appeared before presbytery on 29, 30 Jan., 1706, NAS, CH2/373/1, Register of the Presbytery of Wigtown. There is a comparable case at Dumfries in 1691 concerning Janet Fraser who had Satanic visions. See Wood, *Witchcraft in the South-West*, 124-31.

[37] On events at Rerrick see Alexander Telfair, *A True Relation of an Apparition, Expressions and Actings of a Spirit which infested the House of Andrew Mackie in Ring-Croft of Stocking, in the Parish of Rerrick, in the Stewartry of Kirkcudbright, in Scotland*, (Edinburgh, 1696).

[38] Dumfries, Dumfries and Galloway Archive Centre [DGA], CH2/1284/2, Records of the Presbytery of Dumfries 1687-1695, Sarah Smith in Lochrutton, 31 May, 20 July 1692, 27 June, 11 July 1693.

[39] DGA, CH2/537/15/1, St. Michael's Kirk Session Dumfries, Elspeth Goldie and Janet Kennedy, 23 Feb. to 7 Sept. 1699. I would like to thank Mr. Ian Anderson for bringing this case to my attention and for kindly providing a transcript.

[40] DGA, CH2/1284/2, *Records of the Presbytery of Dumfries 1687-1695*, Marion Dickson in Blackshaw, Isobel Dickson in Locharwoods, her daughter Marion Herbertson in Mousewaldbank, 6 Jan., 23 Feb., 15 March, 1692. See also Chambers, *Domestic Annals*, iii, 66, McDowall, *History of Dumfriesshire*, 378, and Truckell, No. 43, 8. There was possibly a fourth witch.

against other suspected witches including another Caerlaverock woman, Janet Wharrie.[41] The proceedings against Wharrie were actually instigated by herself when she approached the kirk session claiming she had been slandered as a witch. Witnesses were gathered and Wharrie appeared before the presbytery in 1697 on various allegations, such as causing a neighbour's cow to vomit grass. She had been seen down on her knees praying for the cow to vomit and 'rowt' [bellow] till it died. The cow was then observed scraping a hole with its foot and spewing into it, a most unusual occurence given that cows are unable to vomit![42] One man alleged that Wharrie had approached him one day while he was ploughing and asked him to go with her to see her sick mare, which was distempered. When he refused, she became very angry at which point his plough ceased to work and the horses started to leap around, breaking their reins. Another man claimed something similar after he refused to plough some ground for her. She was also blamed for causing illness and had been heard uttering, against the wife of one of her enemies, an imprecation that she should have 'many a bloody day & night', which seemed to happen approximately five weeks later when the poor woman spat blood and vomited the same 'in platefulls'. Witnesses to Wharrie's mischief were not hard to find and some claimed to have heard her begging that a man, whom she thought had come to wrong her, might be afflicted with the 'Glengare' [Glengore or syphilis], which immediately came to pass. While it is highly unusual for witches to be credited with the onset of venereal disease, the witnesses presumably could think of no other way this man could have contracted it. Wharrie denied all the charges.

The outcome of this episode is rather interesting for what did not happen, rather than for what did. The moderator was appointed to consult with a lawyer in Edinburgh. However, he was unable to get advice from 'any able lawyer' because of, as he states, 'their multiplicity of business at this juncture'.[43] It would appear there was a great reluctance, within Edinburgh legal circles, to become involved any longer in regional witch disputes. Since there was such uncertainty about how to proceed, the case was delayed until more advice could be sought. The latter commodity was obviously hard to come by, for Janet Wharrie's case was not discussed again until two years later, alongside those of some

[41] Robert Paton, minister of Dumfries 1696-1715, was involved in cases of 1692, 1699, 1700, 1705, and 1709. *SSWD*

[42] A cow has four digestive compartments of which one, the rumen, stores grass and allows the cud to be regurgitated and rechewed to aid digestion. Cows with toothache have been observed dropping some cud from their mouth which might look like vomiting. The leaves of the rhododendron are poisonous to cattle and would cause an overproduction of saliva which might look like the cow was vomiting. However, rhododendron was not yet introduced to Scotland and so it remains unclear what actually happened to this particular cow. Thank you to Mrs. Alison Burgess (Maryfield Farm, New Abbey) for pointing this out to me and to Mr. Hugh Dickson (Bard Veterinary Group, Dumfries) for his thoughts on the matter.

[43] DGA, CH2/1284/3, Records of the Presbytery of Dumfries 1695-1701, Case of Janet Wharrie, Caerlaverock, 21 Sept., 5, 11 and 15 Oct., and 7 Dec. 1697.

other witches who posed similar problems: 'Nothing yet being done with these women in prison suspected of witchcraft, nor with Janet Wharry in Caerlaverock'. The Lord Advocate was informed of the situation and four months later, in 1700, he reported to the brethren that nothing could be done 'effectually' because he judged the things alleged against these women were 'not so momentous as to require a commission to put them to tryall'. The jailer was paid and, presumably, though it is not actually stated, the women were released.[44] The evidence in this instance clearly suggests that while the local ministers—Robert Paton, Robert Blair, Alexander Veitch and John Somerville—were keen to act, the central authorities felt no such compunction.[45] The fact that Wharrie, (possibly together with the other women mentioned) was held for at least two years is indicative of the tenacity of local prejudice and assumption.

In 1705 it was once again brought to the attention of the Dumfries presbytery that 'several persons' in the parish of Caerlaverock were suspected of witchcraft. Robert Paton, Robert Blair and John Somerville, among others, were involved. The ministers appointed to meet at Caerlaverock on 27 March, at which time 'they prayed with the familie molested' and 'discouraged', that is, expressed disapproval of 'all the persons suspected to be the instruments of the disturbance'. As the nine ministers appointed as investigators could not establish any proof that witchcraft had been involved the matter was referred to the King's advocate for his advice and opinion. His response was fairly quick, abruptly telling them that 'no criminal process can be raised against the persons suspected of witchcraft upon anything yet represented'. The presbytery then thought it fitting to let the issue rest and 'leave the matter to providence'.[46] No longer was an unsupported accusation sufficient for condemnation. The handling of this case suggests that the ministers were sympathetic to the opinions of their parishioners, in particular those who were demanding that action be taken against the alleged witches.[47] However, stricter demands regarding 'proof of guilt' were by now well established. Although central government had taken a back seat in the prosecution of witches in general, the local ministers still had to deal

[44] DGA, CH2/1284/3, Records of the Presbytery of Dumfries 1695-1701, 7 Nov. 1699, 5 March 1700.

[45] Aside from Robert Paton, Janet Wharrie and the 3 unnamed witches were investigated by Robert Blair, minister in Holywood 1698-1724, John Somerville, minister at Caerlaverock 1697-1734, and Alexander Veitch, minister at St. Michael's Dumfries 1694-1715. Veitch was involved in the Pentland Rising and was imprisoned on the Bass Rock 1679-1680. *SSWD*

[46] DGA, CH2/1284/4, Records of the Presbytery of Dumfries 1701-1710, 27 Feb., 27 March, 24 April, 26 June 1705. The entry for 27 March reads 'all the persons suspected . . . except Bessie Heslope, whom they could not find'. She is the only named accused.

[47] The nine ministers were Robert Blair, Holywood 1698-1724; James Guthrie, Kirkpatrick-Irongray 1694-1759; John Hutchison (no details); John MacMurdo, Torthorwald 1702-1720; John Nisbet, New Abbey 1697-1722; Robert Paton, Dumfries 1696-1715; John Reid, Lochrutton 1690-92; John Somerville, Caerlaverock 1697-1734; and David Wightman, Terregles 1702-1706. *SSWD*

with community frictions and therefore found it necessary to 'discourage' the suspects in order to pacify all involved.

In 1709 the minister at Kirkbean, (situated in Kirkcudbrightshire, but in the presbytery and synod of Dumfries), Mr Andrew Reid, gave his deposition against a witch by the name of Janet Harestanes. Among her crimes were causing the minister's newly-built house to come tumbling down 'in the twinkling of an eye', and only a day later, though he had escaped unscathed from the house, he nearly drowned on his way to Edinburgh. To add to his suspicions, she was unable to repeat the Lord's Prayer without making mistakes in every line. Other people claimed that she had made them sick after quarrelling with her. It was recommended by the investigators, which included Robert Paton and Robert Blair, that she be banished from the bounds. That Janet was a menace to society was clearly felt by many who knew her, for this was not the first time she had been in trouble, nor, indeed, was it the first time she suffered banishment. She first appeared before the presbytery of Dumfries in 1699 on charges of witchcraft and charming. On 2 April, 1700 the ministers decided to banish her; on 23 April, of the same year, however, she was back![48] In 1704 she was causing trouble for the session at Glencairn (just north of Dumfries) which ordered a public announcement that 'no heritor, tenant, or householder whatsoever within this parish resett or harbour Jaunet Harestanes' for she is 'reputed to be under the *mala-fama* of witchcraft'.[49] She was obviously quite a character and certainly very tenacious, but what is significant is that the clergy exhibited some tolerance in dealing with her cases, whereas a few decades earlier she would almost certainly have suffered capital punishment.

Ministers, or their families, were occasionally the target of Auld Nick's attentions. The daughter of the Rev. William Boyd, minister of Dalry from 1690, was visited by the Devil in the form of a bumble bee, and on another occasion in the form of an attractive young man who seduced her into playing cards on a Sunday and then carried her off on his black horse. Luckily for her, or perhaps she thought unluckily, her father saw them and shouted on her to come back for Christ's sake, and the young man (the Devil) put her down from his horse.[50]

In the parish of Kirkmaiden, Rev. Archibald Marshall, ordained in 1697, was famous for having 'laid the ghost of Galdenoch', a castle north west of Stranraer.[51] He also had a reputation for being a zealous

[48] DGA, CH2/1284/3, Records of the Presbytery of Dumfries 1695-1701, trial of Janet Harestanes, 1699, 1700. Deposition of Andrew Reid, minister at Kirkbean, 1709, transcript by Mr. Truckell. Robert Paton and the minister at Holywood, Robert Blair, who were involved in the investigations at Caerlaverock, were further involved in the Harestanes case, 3 May 1709. *SSWD*

[49] Janet Hairstanes, 10, 24 Sept. 1704, Glencairn Kirk Session Records, quoted in Wood, *Witchcraft in South-West Scotland*, 132-3.

[50] *East Galloway Sketches (Dalry)* 349, quoted in Wood, *Witchcraft in South-West Scotland*, 34-5; R. deB. Trotter, *Galloway Gossip or the Southern Albanich 80 years ago* (Dumfries, 1901).

[51] Andrew Agnew, *A History of the Hereditary Sherrifs of Galloway* (Edinburgh, 1864), ii, 164-66.

persecutor of witches, in which endeavour he not only employed a witchfinder, even at this very late date, but one who was, furthermore, a female. There is a story that the Kirkmaiden witches got their revenge, however, for one day when he was out walking, a hare crossed his path and from that moment on, he was unable to open his mouth in the Kirkmaiden pulpit and had to be transferred to Kirkcolm in 1700.[52] He obviously experienced a complete cure for it was reported 'his voice was so powerful, that on a calm day he could be heard distinctly across Lochryan at the Cairn'.[53]

Of particular interest in this case was Marshall's reliance upon a woman from Wigtown in his detection of witches. There is a report that she determined guilt simply by sight, as communicants filed through the church she allegedly pressed on Marshall's toes so that he could record the suspects' names. Detecting witches by sight had been a skill of Margaret Atkin, 'the great witch of Balwearie', who had herself been accused of witchcraft in 1597. She claimed that 'they had a secret mark, all of that sort, in their eyes, whereby she could surely tell, how soon she looked upon any, whether they were witches or not'. For three or four months, Atkin was taken from place to place to assist in the discovery of witches until, at last, she was found to be a fraud.[54]

The Rev. Peter Rae of Kirkbride, a man of many talents and a former law student at the University of Glasgow, was better known as the author of *The History of the Rebellion Rais'd against His Majesty King George I* (1718),[55] and for his mechanical skills—he was one of the earliest printers in Dumfriesshire; he made his own press in the manse at Kirkbride and developed his own type. An astronomical chime clock which he constructed can still be seen at Drumlanrig Castle. He was also a firm believer in the existence of witches. He was rebuked in 1706 for calling a woman a witch, for having demanded that she restore his health to him and for having attempted to break her spell by bleeding her on the forehead, thus scoring, or 'striking above the breath, or the brow'.[56] This particular form of spell-breaking was fairly common and other instances can be documented. For instance, at Glencairn in 1694 Margaret McKinch was approached by Robert Muir in Dunregon, who allegedly drew his knife and offered to 'blood her above ye b[reath]'. Margaret

[52] Wood, *Witchcraft in South-West Scotland*, 97, citing Andrew Donaldson, *Guide to Kirkmaiden*, 40.

[53] Stranraer Session Register; Agnew, *Hereditary Sherrifs*, ii, 166; *Fasti Ecclesiae*.

[54] J. Spottiswoode, *The History of the Church of Scotland*, 3 vols (1655; Edinburgh, 1851), iii, 66-7.

[55] Rev. Peter Rae (1671-1748) also published *Gospel-Ministers Christ's Ambassadors*, (Edinburgh, 1733), *A Letter to the Honourable the Society of Improvers in the Knowledge of Agriculture in Scotland*, (1740), *A Treatise of Lawful Oaths and Perjury*, (Edinburgh, 1749), and compiled 'A Natural and Genealogical History of the Shire of Drumfries' (unpublished MS). Rae's *The History of the Rebellion Rais'd against His Majesty King George I*, (Dumfries, 1718; 2nd. ed. London, 1746) was attacked in doggerel verse by Robert Ker in *A Glass wherein Nobles, Priests, and People may see the Lord's Controversies against Britain*, (1719). See *Fasti Ecclesiae*.

[56] Truckell, No. 43, 10.

submitted a written list to the session of those who had, as she said, slandered her as a witch.[57]

The Rev. John Taylor was deposed by the General Assembly from his charge at Wamphray in 1718 for, among other things, his refusal to take the Abjuration Oath[58] and for his disgraceful conduct towards the presbytery of Lochmaben, accusing them of favouring a 'Jacobite design' for Scotland. For some time after arriving in Wamphray in 1697, he had preached vehemently against dissenters, denouncing them as 'emissaries of Satan'. It seems Taylor was also a believer in witches for, when a woman in his congregation, Bessie French, was summoned before the session on charges of witchcraft, around 1709, he immediately presumed her guilt rather than her innocence. The situation was made trickier, so far as the minister was concerned, because French's own brother, and a brother-in-law, were elders of the Kirk. However, French took matters into her own hands; she forthrightly denounced Taylor and her other accusers, refused to appear before the session, and instead took her case to the Lochmaben presbytery hoping to clear her name. The presbytery found in her favour, a decision which sent Taylor into a rage, and he railed against his brethren for their laxity 'with regard to the great sin of witchcraft'.[59]

John Taylor was a curious and complex character. Throughout the twenty-one years of his ministry there persisted an ongoing dispute about the precise bounds of his glebe. One of his first actions as minister was to petition the presbytery for a perambulation of the boundaries, but at his deposition in 1718 rumours still circulated that he had illegally moved some of the boundary markers. In a bizarre episode following a disagreement with his own church, he formed a 'Presbytery of Protesters' consisting of himself and two elders. They held a conventicle on Wamphray Moor at which they denounced the Union, patronage and the Abjuration Oath. The substantial gathering apparently attracted a considerable amount of popular support and proceedings ended with a solemn renewing of the covenants. Taylor ignored a summons to appear before the Lochmaben presbytery. He subsequently had disagreements with the commissioners of supply in Moffat, who had demanded an accounting of the number of the poor in the parish. Taylor, suspecting a ploy to press men into the army, forbade his elders to attend. When five of them did so he attempted to discipline them for conduct 'worse than Judas' but they ignored him; one of the five was William French.

[57] Margaret McKinch, 9 April 1694, *Glencairn Kirk Session Record*, quoted in Wood, *Witchcraft in South-West Scotland*, 132. In the 1690s Edward Maxwell of Hills granted damages to Janet Henderson, accused of causing illness, who had been cut above the brow. Truckell, No. 43, 9.

[58] The Abjuration Oath (1710), meaning an abjuration from jacobitism and a declaration of loyalty to the protestant succession. The presbyterians had misgivings because of doubts about what type of protestantism was intended. The Oath is printed in Wodrow, *Correspondence*, i, 153-4.

[59] John Paterson, *Wamphray: Pages from the History and Traditions of a Famous Parish in Upper Annandale* (Lockerbie, 1906), 91-105.

Bessie French was initially implicated when two men, John Bell and David Johnstone from Hillhouse farm, informed the session on oath that she was a witch. Describing some of her 'malefices' and 'gross Satanic practices' they alleged that her mother before her, 'lay under the same scandal', asserting that it was due to her family connections and friends that the matter had not hitherto been drawn to the minister's attention. Although details are sketchy it would seem there was bad blood between the tenants of Hillhouse and those of nearby Wamphraygate (less than half a mile away) which latter included the family of French, Bessie and her brothers Matthew and David. Taylor should have been surprised at the accusation, for Bessie was a regular attender at church, but instead he blamed his elders for 'neglective duty in hiding from him this flagrant scandal and gross iniquity going on in the parish for so long'. He insisted that the accused appear before the session. Her brother urged her to obey the summons in order to clear her name. Matthew French was reported as frequently stating that if his sister 'were found guilty, he would be content to see her burnt'.[60] Taylor later published a *Vindication* which repeated 'these idle stories without probation' against Bessie French thus revealing 'a swatch of his unchristian and reproachful spirit'.

Contemporaries simply could not understand how the accused could be guilty since, for at least twelve years of Taylor's ministry, he 'did not scruple to admit her to partake of the Lord's Supper'. One opponent asked,

> where was his zeal against sin, especially such a horrid guilt as witchcraft for such a long time, that he never endeavoured to convince her thereof, or bring her to trial till of late?

Taylor later protested that on one occasion, when he handed Bessie French the token which would admit her to communion, he said, 'if thou be a witch, thou may take it, but the curse of God will go along with it, or something to this purpose'. Was he, in so doing, asked his critic, 'separating the precious from the vile or keeping the children's bread from dogs?' How, he asked, could a minister place a communion cup in the hand of a suspected devil? When the case was investigated by the Lochmaben presbytery they not only dismissed it outright but advised the accused to seek redress from a civil judge. Taylor's response was to accuse the presbytery of favouring witches and witchcraft, which in his deluded fashion he somehow associated with support for Jacobitism. The minister accused another individual in Wamphraygate, James Fergusson, of being 'a scandalous profane man, and one under the scandal of witchcraft and charming, a notour picker and thief, yeah an Atheist'. Yet Taylor supplied Fergusson with poor relief.[61] The anonymous respondent to Taylor's *Vindication*

[60] *Mr Taylor's Case Stated, or a Just Reply to a book, intituled, A Vindication of Mr John Taylor Minister of Wamphray* (Dumfries, 1718), 63.

[61] Taylor's *Vindication* also makes reference to James Fergusson, a charmer. Neither Bessie French or James Fergusson are in Black's *Calendar* or Larner *et. al.*, *Source-Book*.

opined that the minister 'should wear a paper hat as a token of perpetual infamy, never to be believed afterward'. Other witnesses testified that Taylor accused those elders who opposed him in the matter of witchcraft of 'having the marks of Hypocracie in their foreheads and taking the Devil's part'; and he also asserted that Bessie French's kin were 'knit together against the gospel'.

Taylor's outrageous behaviour, his unsupported and ludicrous accusations against members of the Lochmaben presbytery and his failure to subscribe the Abjuration Oath led to his suspension in 1715 by the General Assembly. In a final bizarre episode he was supposed to read notice of his own suspension after Sunday service. Members of the presbytery turned up to witness his failure to do so. Coincidentally the litigious Taylor had sued the laird of Wamphray for non-payment of his stipend and had retained the services of 'a band of armed men in Nithsdale' to serve the necessary summonses. Incredibly the laird paid up: a packed congregation looked on as armed men guarded the door of the kirk and the members of the presbytery adjourned to a nearby hostelry to fortify themselves against that cold December sabbath. Taylor was finally deposed in 1718, retiring to Eskdalemuir. He promptly set to work on his *Vindication,* though curiously he failed to comment on two further articles of libel against him; firstly, that he had pocketed some of the poor's money for himself, and secondly, that he 'did habitually and constantly lye in bed in the same room where his sister Katharin Taylor her bed was'. A formal complaint was made to the presbytery regarding the charges but no libel was proven. He was, however, admonished by 'several brethren' to cease sleeping in the same room as his sister.[62] He died in 1745 and tradition in Upper Annandale recounts that as his funeral procession advanced towards Kirkpatrick Juxta churchyard it met with part of the Jacobite army heading south. As a mark of respect the Highlanders formed a line and saluted the funeral bier, so greatly impressing the mourners. However, they emerged from the graveyard to discover that their horses had been looted by the pious Highlanders, a fitting conclusion to a remarkable career.[63]

It could be said of John Taylor as of Mr. William Morrison of Cromarty that 'a good deal of his religion consisted in finding fault, and a good deal more in the vagaries of a wild imagination'. Morrison believed that the Bible itself was opposed to the Treaty of Union and the Abjuration Oath as well as the Act of Toleration (1712). He attributed 'the deadness and carnality of the Church at this present time' to the role played by many of its members in the recent Act of Union,

> of sorrowful memory, whereby our country's power to act for herself, both as to religion and liberty, is hung under the belt of idolatrous England. Woe unto thee, Scotland, for thou has sold thy birth-right!

62 *Mr Taylor's Case Stated, or a Just Reply,* 79-80.

63 R. E. Searcher (sic), 'Notes on Rev. John Taylor Minister in Wamphray 1697-1718', *The Moffat News* 4 Mar. 1948; R. E. Searcher (sic), 'Notes on Rev. John Taylor Minister in Wamphray, 1697-1718' *Dumfries and Galloway Review,* June 1948.

He went on to lambast Erastianism, the Oath of Abjuration and, reaching a pitch of apoplectic indignation, the Union of 1707. He likened members of Parliament to

> the worms of the earth, that creep, peep, and cry, appearing out of their dark holes and dens in this time of Scotland's dark night . . . It is in the night time that evil spirits and wild beasts seize on folk, and cry in the streets to fleg and flichter them; and such as they find most feared and apprehensive they haunt most. And so, oh Scotland! is thy Church affeared and flichtered with the scriekings and worryings of an evil Parliament.[64]

Some cases are quite difficult to classify. William Drew from Newton Stewart, for instance, was called before the session of Penninghame in 1707 for beating his wife. When questioned, he confessed that he did beat her but he was provoked because she hit him with her elbow and threatened to 'expose the report of his being blamed for a warlock, by her saying she should take the mask off his face'. At least one minister, Rev. Robert Rowan, investigated the story and discovered that Drew did indeed go under the name of a notorious warlock. As proof, Rowan invoked several ministers of the presbytery of Kirkcudbright who declared that Drew had often been seen in the house of a woman, Jonet McKeoner, recently burned for witchcraft in Kirkcudbright. The witch's grand-daughter confirmed this report, adding that she had seen Drew, the Devil and her grandmother in the latter's house. Drew admitted that he had often been in the witch's house but only because he bought hair from her daughter, 'as his occupation served him'—he was a wig-maker.

It transpired that Drew was an Irishman who had arrived in Galloway via Glasgow. Testimonials from Irish and Glaswegian clergymen were deemed insufficient support for his subsequent request to have his child baptised unless he first consulted the session, who displayed some christian charity by opining,

> the assertion of one witch seemed not sufficient to debar a person from church privileges *especially in a matter so difficult to be cleared* [my italics]; upon which the minister baptised his child.[65]

*

There are various examples of particularly late cases of witch belief in the south-eastern regions. A Galloway minister commented, at the end

[64] Miller, *Scenes and Legends*, 149-50. Miller is quoting from a manuscript written between 1710-13 by William Morrison.

[65] William Drew in Newton Stewart, 7, 21 Sept., 19 Oct., 9 Nov., 1707, 5 Dec. 1708, *Penninghame Parish Records. The Session Book of Penninghame 1696-1724*, 2 vols. vol. 1. The Rev. Robert Rowan, minister at Penninghame, was ordained in 1696 and died in 1714, *Fastii Ecclesiae*. The church was, in theory, responsible for dealing with wife abuse though comparatively few cases appear in the session records. A case of a man selling his wife appeared in the kirk session records of Elgin in 1698. Both the husband and the man who bought the wife were punished with a public rebuking and referred to the town magistrate. Cramond, *The Records of Elgin*, vol. 2, 320-1.

of the eighteenth century, that although witch belief was not entirely laid aside 'the kirk session no longer indulges a spirit of inquisitorial investigation on a train of idle and vexatious processes'.[66] Hindsight would prove him partly right, for although the church had more or less lost interest in persecuting witches and charmers, many of their parishioners had not. In the first half of the nineteenth century, there were still people living in Wamphray who had seen the Devil, or the fairies 'dancing round them, a' the colours of the rainbow'. There were housewives who had watched the cream, when the butter was coming too slow, poured out of the kirn and into a pot with pins thrown into it to

> prick the conscience of the witch. Woe to the poor woman who happened to come to the door while the pot was on the fire, she was looked on as an uncanny person ever after and avoided.[67]

One of the best documented of cases were the incidents surrounding Jean Maxwell, tried in Kirkcudbright in 1805 for 'pretending to exercise witchcraft, sorcery, inchantment, conjuration, &c.'. She was found guilty and sentenced to one year's imprisonment in Kirkcudbright Tolbooth. Maxwell, who was considered to be a witch by her community, and a public menace in the eyes of the law, could no longer be formally charged with witchcraft but she was charged, in accordance with the 1735 Witchcraft Act, of pretended witchcraft.[68] The so-called 'last of the Ayrshire witches', Isabel or Bell M'Ghie, was actually born at Kelton, in Kirkcudbrightshire, in 1760, later residing at Beith in Ayrshire. Though not judicially charged with any crime, her notoriety was increased following an interview (which was later published) by a local archaeologist, Mr James Dobie, in 1835, the year before she died. Bell's reputation mainly derived from healing both humans and animals, or from counter-magical charms. She specialized in dairy problems, but that she was more than a simple charmer is suggested by her own testimony that she had known many witches in her youth, notably a warlock named Douglas whom she feared. He allegedly revived a dead horse and, on another occasion, cast a spell on a minister which rendered him unable to preach in his own pulpit, though he could do so in others, a story reminiscent of that concerning the Rev. Marshall at Kirkmaiden.[69]

An article appeared in the *Dumfries Weekly Journal* in 1826 giving details of a woman in Annan, believed to be suffering from the effects of witchcraft. 'We did not believe that people within sixteen miles of

66 *Old Statistical Account*, v, Kirkpatrick-Durham, 248.
67 Paterson, *Wamphray*, 186-7.
68 *Remarkable Trial of Jean Maxwell, the Galloway Sorceress; which took place at Kirkcudbright on the Twenty-eighth day of June last, 1805; For Pretending to Exercise Witchcraft, Sorcery, Inchantment, Conjuration, &c.* (Kirkcudbright, 1805), 1-24. See also Cowan and Henderson, 'Last of the witches', 212-3.
69 A. MacGeorge, *An Ayrshire Witch*, [reprinted from *Good Words* for private circulation] (London, 1886). See also Cowan and Henderson, 'Last of the witches', 212-3.

Dumfries laboured under a state of such superstitious ignorance in the nineteenth century'. The sister of the bewitched woman attacked the suspect, an old woman, with a knife. She tossed her to the ground and 'cut her across the brow!!!—a mode of dissolving the spell considered by the witch-believers of former ages, and, it now appears, even at the present day, to be altogether infallible'.[70]

A writer for *The Gallovidian* (1902), probably more concerned with folktale than reality, discussed a witch who allegedly lived at Hannayston in the Kells in the mid-eighteenth century; 'Some say her name was Nicholas Grier, others that it was Girzie McClegg, but it matters little which now'. She was blamed with stealing butter, causing cows to sicken and sucking milk from them in the shape of a hare. She also appeared as a cat walking on its hind legs. Anyone she disliked, she drowned by 'sinking a caup in the yill-boat [a wooden ale cup in the ale barrel] in her kitchen'. In the midst of so much incredible reportage it is striking that she was said to have muttered her incantations in Gaelic, a language which had probably died out in the area by the sixteenth century. He added that 'although the roasting of them [witches] alive has gone out of fashion now, the witches still exist in most Galloway villages, objects of fear and aversion to the natives'. Feeling the need to excuse the survival of Scottish witch belief, he continued,

> The English may hold us up to ridicule for believing such things, but they must not forget that they are devoutly believed in all over England yet; even in London they are far from extinct.[71]

*

The fatal conclusion to Janet McMuldritche's diabolical activities arose out of comparatively minor incidents involving cattle grazing and the alleged theft of provender. Elspeth Thomson appears to have been the victim of her relatives. In each case the accusers died in inexplicable circumstances, resulting in the execution of McMuldritchie and Thomson. The intriguing case of Bessie Paine concerning charming and the knowledge of folk remedies for animals and humans alike, as well as a measure of malefice, might also have resulted in judicial execution had she not died in prison. Elspeth McEwen paid the supreme penalty as late as 1698. Thereafter, punishments for witchcraft were less severe, though the reality of the crime was not, apparently, in doubt, as in the cases of Janet M'Murray, Jean Brown, Janet Wharry, Janet Harestanes and Elspeth Rule. Though the incident is poorly documented, what is claimed to be 'the last trial for witchcraft by the Court of Justiciary in Scotland' occurred at Dumfries in 1709 when Elizabeth Rule was condemned to be branded on the cheek with a red-hot iron; 'People living in 1790 have been told by their parents, that the smoke

[70] *Dumfries Weekly Journal*, 7 Nov. 1826.
[71] R. deBruce Trotter, 'No. III. The Witch of Hannayston', *The Gallovidian* 4 (1902) 40-4

caused by the torturing process was seen issuing out of the mouth of the unhappy woman'.[72]

It may be that the concentration of witch cases in Caerlaverock owed something to the zeal of the local ministers, such as Rev. Robert Paton who had been involved in no less than five investigations from 1692 until 1709, and Rev. John Somerville, who participated in at least three cases in 1699 and 1705. There is certainly evidence that opinion in the localities was often in favour of prosecution, while the central authorities were opposed. Individual ministers no doubt had a significant influence upon their congregations. Thus, individuals such as Marshall, Rae, and the impossible Taylor of Wamphray remained intent upon witch-hunting, though not always for the most spiritual of reasons. More women were appearing who were the kindred spirits of Bessie French, one of the great unsung heroines of Annandale, who rejected outright Taylor's preposterous claims and who took her own case to the presbytery with satisfactory results.

Most of the suspected witches appear to have been guilty of no more than folk healing and possibly suspect veterinary practices. Others have the appearance of social misfits or well-known trouble-makers. It seems clear that the zeal for prosecution displayed by certain parish ministers was not shared by the central authorities, as in the case of supposedly witch-ridden Caerlaverock where local enthusiasm for retribution received a tepid reception in Edinburgh. Almost unbelievably, the minister at Kirkmaiden still employed a witch-finder in the late 1690s. But the Rev. Rae was rebuked for labelling a woman a witch and the Rev. Taylor of Wamphray was vehemently (and successfully) denounced by Bessie French for falsely accusing her of witchcraft. Janet Harestanes was a repeat offender, a circumstance that would have been difficult to contemplate a few decades earlier.

Although attitudes were gradually changing, the area was still in the grip of covenanting fervour around 1700, and as such was a potentially dangerous place for women. While most of the examples discussed were perfectly compatible with earlier cases what was novel was the authorities' willingness to spare the accused, Elspeth McEwen excepted. Thus the South West, one of the last Scottish regions to initiate witch prosecution, was also one of the most tenacious in its reluctance to surrender all belief in witches and the evil supposedly caused by them.

[72] Trial of Elizabeth [Elspeth] Rule, 1709. William McDowall, *History of the Burgh of Dumfries with notices of Nithsdale, Annandale, and the Western Border* (Edinburgh, 1867), 434-5. Black's *Calendar* cites the *Southern Circuit Book 1708-1710* in MS which I have so far been unable to locate.

The Scottish Historical Review, Volume LXXXV, 1: No. 219: April 2006, 77–101

STANA NENADIC

The Impact of the Military Profession on Highland Gentry Families, *c.* 1730 – 1830

Abstract

The expansion of the British military establishment from *c.*1730 to 1830 is well known, as is the large numbers Scots and particularly highlanders who formed the British officer class. There is a common assumption—in some respects well founded—that the army had a beneficial impact on the political and economic experience of Scotland. This article offers an alternative interpretation through a focus on the social and cultural implications for highland gentry families of having so many male kin engaged in one particular career. The first two sections examine the scale and increasing attractions of military employment relative to other career destinations, notably farming, the legal profession and trade via urban business apprenticeship. Two generations with different motivations are compared, and the importance of the loss of practical farming and commercial expertise is noted. The next section explores the impact of military employment on relationships within families, particularly between officers and their father or elder brother, but also on relationships with female kin and on the broader processes of family formation through marriage. Of particular significance was the tendency towards teenage recruitment among the highland officer class, which removed boys from the influence of family and gave rise to reckless behaviour, extreme individualism and conspicuous consumption, posing major problems for gentry families and estates. The article concludes that although the military profession was a valuable short-term route for disposing of sons in a gentlemanly manner, the impact on their families and on the highlands could be highly disruptive. Yes, there was success and material benefits for a lucky few, but also tragedy, failure and family discord for many.

The expansion of the British military establishment over the course of the eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries is well known.[1] Colony building and defence of empire, frequent European warfare and major peacekeeping activities at home, transformed Britain into a significant 'fiscal-military state' with a large army and navy supported by a sophisticated tax system.[2] In the early decades of the eighteenth century the number of military officers and men in Britain fluctuated, according to

[1] For a recent survey see, S. D. M. Carpenter, 'The British Army' in H. Dicknson (ed.), *A Companion to Eighteenth-Century Britain* (Oxford, 2002) 473-80.

[2] J. Brewer, *The Sinews of Power: War, Money and the English State, 1688-1783* (London, 1989).

STANA NENADIC is senior lecturer in Economic and Social History at the University of Edinburgh

war-status, between 12,000 'and 25,000. The peacetime establishment was in the order of 18,000 in the 1750s— about 2,000 of these were officers—and the wartime establishment peaked at 68,000 in 1761 during the Seven Years War. Another peak of over 90,000 was achieved in 1777 at the height of the American War. The Napoleonic Wars pushed the numbers to over a quarter of a million in the early nineteenth century—a mobilisation of men that was not matched again until the First World War.[3]

For most of the eighteenth century the British officer class was disproportionately drawn from the Scottish gentry.[4] Many Scotsmen were the military heroes of the day and Scottish variants on military manliness and Scottish military style were uniquely influential.[5] It is estimated that between a quarter and a third of all officers in the British army of the second half of the eighteenth century were Scots, and a high percentage of these were the sons of the highland gentry.[6] A similar proportion was Irish.[7] The large numbers of Scots and Irish officers reflected the large numbers of Scots and Irish regiments,[8] though men from these countries were also numerous in English regiments.[9] From the end of the century men of prominent birth, including peers and their sons, were to enter the army in growing numbers,[10] as did the sons of the urban middle class;[11] and many men of all backgrounds served part-time as militia and volunteers in their own locality.[12] On the whole, however, military officers in the regular army were drawn from the gentry and disproportionately from the highland gentry.

The numbers of military officers relative to other elements of the gentry or the pseudo-gentry professions (law and church) is hard to determine with certainty. The 1759, taxation-based estimates of Joseph Massie suggest that at the time of the Seven Years War there were 8,000 army and navy officers in Britain (only a quarter of these in the army) and military officers comprised 16% of a broadly defined British elite.[13] A more sophisticated assessment by Patrick Colquhoun in 1815, based

3 C. Cook and J. Stevenson (eds) *The Longman Handbook of Modern British History, 1714-1980* (London, 1983), 220.

4 J.E.Cookson, *The British Armed Nation, 1793-1815* (Oxford, 1997) ch. 5, 6.

5 See, P. Womack, *Improvement and Romance: Constructing the Myth of the Highlands* (London, 1989) ch. 3.

6 See J. E. Cookson, *The British Armed Nation, 1793-1815* (Oxford, 1997) ch. 5.

7 *Ibid.* ch. 6.

8 A. K. Murray, *History of the Scottish Regiments in the British Army* (Glasgow, 1862).

9 P.E. Razzell, 'Social Origins of Officers in the Indian and British Home Army, 1758-1962', *British Journal of Sociology* 14 (1963) 248-60.

10 This was particularly true of certain high status regiments, where the number of peers as regular army officers doubled in the half century after 1800 compared with the half century before. L. Colley, *Britons: Forging the Nation, 1707-1837* (New Haven, London, 1992) 184.

11 Razzell, 'Social Origins of Officers', 248-60.

12 For a Scottish study see: M.M. Lodge, 'The Militia Issue: the Case of the Buccleuch Fencibles, 1778-1783', unpublished M.Litt. Thesis (University of Edinburgh, 1985).

13 P. Mathias, 'The Social Structure in the Eighteenth Century: a Calculation by Joseph Massie', *Economic History Review* 2nd ser. 10 (1957) 30-45.

on numbers taken from the Census and Income Tax along with the published Army and Navy Lists,[14] gauged that at the end of the Napoleonic Wars, there were 21,000 regular military officers on full pay in Britain and 8380 full-pay naval officers, plus a further 6,500 half-pay and pensioned officers. By these calculations, the military profession comprised about 35% of Britain's elite.[15] If a third of officers were Scottish, and the Scottish gentry and pseudo-gentry professionals were about one fifth of those of Britain as a whole, one can estimate that Scottish officers comprised at least 40% of all Scottish gentlemen in 1815 and in the region of 50% of highland gentlemen. The 'half-pay' system and the tendency for military men to adopt their military titles and behaviour as life-long indicators of status, further suggests that despite the post-1815 decline in numbers in active service, army officers remained significant.[16]

Much has been written on the impact of the British military establishment on the politics and identity of Scotland. The development of 'Britishness', the rise of empire and the 'myths of the highlands' have all been tied to the growth in military participation among Scots.[17] The impact of the army on the economics and politics of highland estates in Scotland has also been explored.[18] Less has been said, however, on the impact of military life on the life and experience of those who were the ordinary officers[19]—and almost nothing has been written to date on the social and cultural effect on Scottish and particularly highland gentry families of having so many male kin engaged in one particular career. This article seeks to do the latter through an exploration of the ways in which involvement in the military profession evolved and shaped family relationships, family formation and family finances. The first two sections examine the scale and increasing attractions of military employment relative to the other career destinations adopted by the sons of the highland gentry, notably farming and trade. Two generations are compared—those that came to adulthood in the 1730s and 1740s and the sons and nephews of these men who come to adulthood in the 1760s and 1770's.[20] At a time when the highland counties were being drawn into the painful process of social and economic modernisation, these two generations of soldiers were strikingly different in their characters and

[14] P. Colquhoun, *Treaties on the Wealth, Power and Resources of the British Empire* (London, 1815).

[15] This is a broad estimate that excludes the female element of the 'gentlemen and ladies living on incomes'.

[16] Scottish fiction provides good illustrations. See. S. Ferrier, *Marriage* (Edinburgh, 1818) and S. Ferrier, *The Inheritance* (Edinburgh, 1824).

[17] Colley, *Britons*; M. Pittock, *Inventing and Resisting Britain* (London, 2001).

[18] A. Mackillop, *More Fruitful than the Soil: Army, Empire and the Scottish Highlands, 1715-1815* (East Linton, 2000); A. Macinnes, *Clanship, Commerce and the House of Stuart, 1603-1788* (East Linton, 1996).

[19] Though the hagiography of nineteenth-century military heroes is remarkable.

[20] Most of the individual and family illustrations that are used here are drawn from the extensive kin connections of one particular Highland family over several generations. See, S. Nenadic, 'Experience and Expectations in the Transformation of the Highland Gentlewoman c. 1680-1830', *SHR* 80 (2001) 201-20, for details on the Campbells of Barcaldine.

careers. They indicate significant alternative explanations for the motivation for, and impact of, enlistment to those offered by Colley or Cookson in their accounts of the making of 'Britishness' and the rise of 'defence patriotism'.[21]

The section that follows considers the impact of military employment on relationships within families, particularly between officers and their father or elder brother, but also on relationships with female kin and the broader processes of family formation. Of importance here was the reckless and nomadic lifestyles that officers adopted, especially the growing numbers who entered the army in their early teens, and the tendency towards conspicuous consumption and the adoption of an anglicised status agenda, which placed major burdens on families and estates. The article concludes that although the military profession was a valuable short-term route for disposing of sons in a gentlemanly manner —an opportunity that boys and young men were eager to seize—and was clearly connected in certain specific ways to 'Britishness'—there was also a distinctly highland cultural agenda in play. The impact on highland gentry families was less positive than is commonly suggested, particularly when it is considered where the sons of such families had previously made their careers. Indeed, the evidence suggested here is of an ambiguous process, socially and culturally disruptive, that brought success and material benefits for a lucky few, but also tragedy, failure and family discord for many.

*

For their younger sons in particular, the gentry of Scotland's highland counties, as elsewhere, had always been obliged to seek employment and sources of income beyond that generated through the ownership or tenancy of land. Even elder sons and heirs commonly added to a landed income through paid employment.[22] Diversification was the key to success for families and this meant that men of gentry background became merchants or professionals—particularly lawyers, medics, government office holders, occasionally clergymen and increasingly soldiers.[23] The great advantage of a military career over most of the other areas of employment was that it required no education or training. There were no compulsory officer training schools in Britain, though there were a number of private military academies in London by the later eighteenth century.[24] The only skill that was required of a potential

[21] Colley, *Britons*. Cookson, *British Armed Nation*, p. 128, comments on the 'generalized social explanation for the success of military recruitment in Scotland' but also notes the lack of local studies.

[22] A recent study of country-house building in England suggests that those who built new houses or made extensive additions to an existing house generally did so with sums of money acquired from non-estate sources. R. Wilson and A. Mackey, *Creating Paradise; the Building of the English Country House, 1660-1880* (London, 2000).

[23] The modest incomes of the Scottish clergy ensured that, in contrast to England, this was not a popular career for the sons of the gentry.

[24] The only officers to have a systematic training in the second half of the eighteenth century were those attached to the artillery, a relatively small group who attended the

officer was horsemanship—an accomplishment taught in childhood to the sons of the gentry as a matter of routine and increasingly available in towns through urban riding academies. All other qualifications were of a social and cultural character: according to one contemporary, the qualities 'valued in an officer were the qualities valued by the country gentry; courage, physical toughness, a determination to stand up for one's rights, a touchy sense of honour.'[25] It is not surprising that professional commentators lamented the absence in Britain of formal military training on the European model—'how much better would our Army be supplied with officers than it is at present. Men would be officers by their ability, not from distaste to other professions, or a want of proper qualifications for them.'[26] Of course, entry to a military career did require personal connections and cash to purchase a commission.[27] Unlike a business investment, the capital did not need careful monitoring once the investment was made: unless the holder was killed, the value of a commission remained intact.

In the early decades of the eighteenth century the opportunities offered by the military profession were relatively few, though the relationship between the Scottish and particularly the highland gentry and military service was of long standing. In the sixteenth century and through much of the seventeenth men who were raised in a martial culture at home often found lucrative careers as mercenary soldiers in the service of European kings and princes. A typical case was General Thomas Dalyell of the Binns estate near Edinburgh, a royalist career officer and 'soldier of fortune', who was in the paid service of the King of Poland and the Tsar of Russia for about ten years during the Cromwellian occupation of Scotland. At the time of his death in 1685, all four of his adult sons were in military service, two in Scotland and two abroad.[28] In European terms, this was not unusual. The city-states of Italy supported many extended gentry and noble families whose men routinely found employment as professional soldiers.[29] Though the men involved

24 (*Continued*) Royal Military Academy at Woolwich, which provided a formal education from 1741. Cavalry officers mostly attended private riding schools and infantry officer learned their skills through drilling and on the battlefield. The Royal Military College, the first state-sponsored training school for infantry and cavalry officers was founded in 1799. Carpenter, 'British Army' p. 478.

25 P. C. Bruce, *The Purchase System in the British Army, 1660-1871* (London, 1980).

26 Samuel Bever, *The Cadet: a Military Treaties, by an Officer* (London, 1762), 114.

27 Bruce, *Purchase System*. In the second half of the eighteenth century the cost of a first level commission as cornet or ensign ranged from £250-400, according to the prestige of the regiment. Jamie Campbell, one of the feckless younger sons of Duncan Campbell of Glenure, entered the Highland Regiment of Colonel Stirling in May 1774 at a cost of £400 cash. The position was organised by his maternal uncle, Major James MacPherson. Edinburgh, National Archives of Scotland [NAS], GD170/1354/27,29, Letters of Major James MacPherson to his brother-in-law Duncan Campbell of Barcaldine.

28 J. Dalyell and J. Beveridge, 'Inventory of the Plenishing of the House of the Binns at the Date of the Death of General Thomas Dalyell, 21st August 1685', *Proceedings of the Society of Antiquaries of Scotland* 5th Ser. 10 (1923-24) 344-370.

29 G. Hanlon, 'The Decline of a Provincial Military Aristocracy: Sienna, 1560-1740' *Past and Present* 155 (1997) 64-108.

were a restless group of perpetual bachelors, devoted to feats of physical prowess, much given to feuding and fighting among themselves, and difficult to control within families, symbolic importance was attached to this military life. Such men were trained from boyhood in fighting skills and horsemanship along with complex social skills such as dancing and conversation, in order to take advantage of the military patronage that took place at court. Success as a mercenary abroad was important for family prestige and also a source of wealth for a lucky few

The collapse of the early-modern mercenary labour market in the late seventeenth century left behind a significant employment vacuum. Among the Italian gentry there was a shift in career choice towards that other potentially lucrative 'bachelor profession', the Catholic Church, particularly when demand for clergymen rose with the Counter-Reformation. In Scotland, where there was no wealthy clerical hierarchy in either the Catholic or the Protestant church, few were attracted to this profession. A privileged minority—with money and brains—could find careers in the expanding legal profession, but for most of the highland gentry the main alternatives were farming or commerce.[30] However, as in Italy, a culture of militarism survived long after real employment had declined and it is not surprising that when military careers again became a reality with the expansion of the British army after 1750, highland gentlemen—including men with sophisticated commercial training—flocked to the profession.

This eagerness to shift towards army employments is well illustrated by the family of Campbell of Barcaldine, middling lairds from the Appin area of northern Argyll.[31] Patrick Campbell (b. 1677) had eight sons who came to adulthood in the period from the 1720s to the 1740s. His plans for their future careers, which were extensively discussed within the kin network, were entirely consistent with gentry strategies for maximising the interest of the family as a whole. As was usual in such families, the opportunities made available to older boys were always better than those of the younger, with greater sums spent on education or training for those higher in the sibling hierarchy. The elder two, John and Colin, were destined to be practical landowners and were educated as 'gentlemen', partly with private tutors in Perth and Edinburgh and partly in the office of an Edinburgh lawyer, where they gained a smattering of the type of legal knowledge that was useful to modernising lairds. The third son, Duncan, with little likelihood of inheriting land (though in the event he did succeed to an estate) was trained to be a professional lawyer. His early education was similar to that of the elder brothers; for, as stressed in a contemporary career manual, a lawyer's 'education ought

[30] It is estimated that *c.* 90% of the Scottish legal profession had a landed background. J. Clive, 'The Social Background of the Scottish Renaissance' in N.T. Phillipson and R. Mitchison (eds), *Scotland in the Age of Improvement* (Edinburgh, 1970) 225-244.

[31] The detailed history of this family is pieced together from the extensive personal documents and correspondence contained in NAS, GD170, Campbell of Barcaldine papers.

to be Liberal. This is not only necessary to qualify them for their profession; but to enlarge the mind and give it a bias above little pettifogging practice.'[32] He served a formal apprenticeship over many years, partly in Glasgow and partly in Edinburgh, and practised his profession throughout his long life. In common with many Scottish lawyers, through a combination of a good income from his practice and business acumen, he was able to accumulate a significant landholding of his own and was by far the most successful of Patrick Campbell's sons.[33] The fourth son Allan was educated in a similar way to the elder two, but not with the intention of land ownership, but rather to be a substantial tenant on his family estate, a tacksman, and also a 'man of business' for the head of the family. The acquisition of practical farming knowledge was part of his training. Alexander, the fifth son, was intended by his father to be a clergyman, but he objected so loudly to this as a boy that his father relented. In the absence of other avenues and mindful of cost, Alexander, along with the next two sons, Archibald and Robert, were each provided with merchant apprenticeships—two in Glasgow and one in Stirling. Finally, the youngest son, Donald, was apprenticed to a tradesman, an Edinburgh 'cherurgeon', for three-years of training in the practical skills of the surgeon.

None of Patrick Campbell's sons was destined for a military career, but with military opportunities about to rise, it is not surprising that in adulthood five of these men turned their ambitions to such employment. The first to do so was the youngest, Donald, who qualified as a surgeon in 1734 and set his sights on the navy—the largest element of the military establishment at that time—which was, according to one contemporary commentator, the best way of making a good income and possibly even a fortune through the trade. The manner of this is worth quoting in full—for the basic principles also applied to office holding in the army.

> The salary of a surgeon of the Navy is but inconsiderable, that is the pay he immediately receives from the Crown is but small; but his perquisites depend upon the largeness of the ship. He has forty shillings for every clap or pox of which he cures.... he has a chest of medicines at the government expense.... and is allowed for slops... all of which put together make a surgeon's place in a sixty-gun ship to be worth near two hundred pounds per annum in time of peace, besides his share of prizes in time of war, in the division of which he is ranked as Lieutenant.[34]

Sadly, in common with many military men, Donald's career was short: he died at sea in 1738, a victim of fever, aged twenty-five, unmarried and poor.

[32] R. Campbell, *The London Tradesman, being a Compendious View of all the Trades, Professions, Arts, both Liberal and Mechanic, now Practiced in the Cities of London and Westminster* (London, 1747) 71.

[33] The high earning potential of the legal profession is explored in G. Holmes, *Augustan England: Professions, State and Society, 1680-1730* (London, 1982).

[34] Campbell, *London Tradesman*, 56-7.

By the early 1740s, with war in progress in Europe, four of the sons of Campbell of Barcaldine, now in their twenties or early thirties, were either in, or about to join, the army, mostly to serve with the Earl of Loudon's regiment. Colin, the second son, enjoyed the privileges of land inheritance and was a practical farmer, but he also craved the excitement and prizes that the army offered. He served on-and-off for nearly ten years and rose to the rank of captain, but suffered injury and resigned his commission in order to marry and develop his estate. Allan, the fourth son, also abandoned farming for the military option. He remained in the army for decades, serving as lieutenant in North America, the Caribbean and Ireland and was stationed for many years at Chatham Barracks.[35] Alexander—whom his father had wanted to be a clergyman—had soon given up on his business career and, like Allan, spent several years as a tenant farmer on his brother's estate before joining the army and also rising to lieutenant. He was seriously injured in 1748 and after two years on half pay he returned to farming in Argyll, but died in 1751, having never fully recovered. Archibald stuck with commercial pursuits in Glasgow for a period, but was bored and longed for something more exciting. As he wrote to brother Duncan,

> I can only give my mind to forming encampments, sieges and battles, my mind is so entirely hurried in castle building that now I'm a Captain then a Colonel sometimes a General but in a few minutes coming to myself after I have moved in those high stations I find the General reduced to a fifth brother that has neither credit nor money to purchase an Ensign's staff.[36]

The money was found, however, and he entered the army soon after, only to die abroad of fever in 1754.

It is striking to note that three of the four younger sons of Patrick Campbell died prematurely, unmarried, undistinguished and poor as a result of their military service— and the brothers who remained outside the army lived longer, were married and produced thriving families. In the wake of the Jacobite rebellion, loyal government service, in both the army and as Crown Factors (offices held by the two elder brothers) will have helped the political fortunes of this family, who, though mostly Whig, had close marriage connections with several local Jacobite families.[37] However, none of the brothers generated wealth or achieved high office from their time in the army, which was the primary personal and family motive for adopting such a career. Yet some men of similar background who entered the army as adults in the mid-eighteenth century were successful in exploiting the opportunities that it represented, not

[35] Allan's career can be pieced together from letters to brother Duncan. NAS, GD170/1067.

[36] NAS, GD170/1074, Archibald Campbell to Duncan Campbell (his brother) n.d./ c. 1751.

[37] See V. Wills (ed.) *Reports on the Annexed Estates, 1755-1769*, 2 vols, (Edinburgh, 1973) for details of the lengthy administrative career of John Campbell of Barcaldine. John's 'natural' son Mungo was also a Crown Factor, as was Colin Campbell of Glenure (victim of the Appin murder), the second brother.

through war-prizes or spectacular promotions, but through business. They were, in effect, soldier-entrepreneurs. A typical case was Major James Macpherson (b.1725), the eldest son of a Glenorchy laird and cattle drover and brother-in-law to Duncan Campbell the lawyer, third son of Patrick Campbell of Barcaldine.[38] Coming from a sophisticated commercial background, it is not surprising that James was apprenticed to a Glasgow merchant in his teens with the intention of following a trading career. He was in business for several years with modest success, but in 1761, at a high point of military recruitment for the Seven Years War, James Macpherson, a bachelor aged thirty-six, travelled to London to seek an army commission at his own expense. By exploiting family patronage as well as his Glasgow-business connections, he gained a place in the 42nd Regiment of the Royal Highlanders and spent the next two years in full-time service in England and Ireland, rising to captain.

James Macpherson returned to Glasgow, the regimental headquarters, at the end of the war and the rest of his unheroic, but financially lucrative career, was spent in Scotland. He was a captain of Edinburgh castle in 1775 and major in charge of Dumbarton castle by 1778. Throughout these years he was heavily involved in recruiting for his regiment and in hunting out commissions for his younger relatives. He was also engaged in the business of military supply, which generated a personal profit sufficient to allow him to marry and purchase a small estate while still a serving officer. When he left the army in October 1778 he had a comfortable income from his property and £500 from the regiment on leaving—'a little more than the price of my commission'[39]—that he invested in a high-yielding life-insurance policy. But he continued to maintain a series of business interests linked to the army—building on both his family connections and his early commercial career in Glasgow. The most important was a venture to supply uniforms to highland regiments, which he ran in partnership with a textile manufacturer. When he died ten years later he left his wife and children with a comfortable fortune.[40]

*

James Macpherson was of a generation where an urban commercial career was socially acceptable for a gentleman of his background—and commonly sought by highland gentry families, to their considerable advantage[41]—and a military career was usually entered later in life with little cost to his family. Men of this type, combining entrepreneurial flair

[38] NAS, GD170/1354/1-72, Letters from Major James Macpherson to his brother-in-law Duncan Campbell of Glenure.

[39] NAS, GD170/1354/51, Major James Macpherson to Duncan Campbell of Glenure (his brother-in-law), November 1778.

[40] The final letter in the series was sent from 'Lochfinehead' in September 1789. 'I came here about a fortnight ago for the benefit of my health...'. NAS, GD170/1354/72.

[41] Explored in Macinnes, *Clanship, Commerce*. See also, W. Mackay (ed.) *Letter Book of Bailie John Steuart of Inverness* (Edinburgh, 1915) for the trade and family connections of such a businessman.

with military opportunism, benefited most from the army, for they could expect to generate a handsome profit even when they were not at war. James Macpherson was also of a generation where relatively few men entered the military profession. As the century progressed, however, two developments arising out of the closer integration of Scotland into the social and cultural values of England, trapped the gentry in Scotland, and particularly the highland gentry, into sending their sons at an increasingly young age and in growing numbers into military employments. The first was the changing perception of business as a respectable avenue in life, consistent with gentry status.[42] Second, and connected to the first, there was the growing trend for Scottish gentry families, including those from fairly modest backgrounds, to educate their sons at English boarding schools to give them valuable network connections and anglicised gentlemanly credentials.[43] Education of this type was expensive, as were the other still-gentlemanly careers, such as the law. For families faced with a narrowing set of expensive options for their sons, the army was an attractive alternative, providing a quasi-education and employment from an early age at relatively small initial cost and also providing opportunities for social networking within an anglicised context. Youths, often as young as twelve, were sent into regular regimental life with little or no preliminary training. Commissions purchased for teenage entry (as a coronet or ensign) were cheap and certainly much cheaper than several years at school followed by university or a legal training. An officer earned an income and could rise through the ranks if lucky in war, or if his family paid for promotion. The son in question was out-of-the-way and fully occupied under male supervision—a boon to widowed mothers in particular.[44] Illegitimate sons for whom a father maintained a responsibility, which was common in Scotland, were easily sent off to seek their fortunes elsewhere.[45] Useless and delinquent sons were similarly dispatched.[46]

[42] It is hard to pinpoint when and why this happened, but it may be linked to the shift in commercial activity from the trade in landed and colonial produce to the trade in urban manufactures.

[43] L. Colley, *Britons* cites the importance of certain English elite boarding schools in generating a sense of Britishness; and Boswell remarks on the 'over education' of 'wandering' younger sons of the Highland gentry.

[44] See the recollections and letters of Anne McVicar Grant, a literary Highland widow, for a poignant account of the early death of her son in the army. A. Grant, *Memoire and Correspondence of Mrs Anne Grant of Laggan* (London, 1845).

[45] Illegitimate children had variable fortunes, and were often bitter at their experience - though this was also common among younger sons in large families. See footnote 37.

[46] As in all things military, Jane Austen provides an example in her novel *Persuasion*, first published in 1818, in the form of 'thick-headed, unfeeling, unprofitable Dick Musgrove.' As she explains, 'the Musgroves had had the ill fortune of a very troublesome, hopeless son; and the good fortune to lose him before he reached his twentieth year; that he had been sent to sea, because he was stupid and unmanageable on shore....He had been several years at sea, and had ...been six months on board Captain Frederick Wentworth's frigate....he had, under the influence of his captain, written the only two letters which his father and mother had ever received from him during the whole of his absence; that is to say, the only two disinterested letters; all the rest had been mere applications for money.' J. Austen, *Persuasion* (London, 1965) 76-7.

For a younger son of the mid-eighteenth century, and for the family into which he was born, the army quickly became a highly attractive form of employment—and those who still found themselves involved in farming or commerce, yearned for the military option. This is well illustrated by the experience of Patrick Campbell, the third son of the lawyer-laird Duncan Campbell of Glenure.[47] In 1763, at the end of the Seven Years War and having spent some months in training at a private military academy near London, Patrick was a compulsory 'reduced' half-pay lieutenant in his mid-teens, with an annual government income of about £45.[48] His uncle, the businessman Robert, who was based in London at the time of Patrick's 'reduction', suggested that the boy might be found a commission in a regular regiment, which was probably what he wanted for himself—but his father though otherwise; a regular commission was expensive. Patrick was called back to the highlands and after much pulling of patronage strings, Duncan got him the tenancy of a forfeited farm in 1767, from where he subsequently operated a cattle-droving partnership. Patrick's ambition, however, was always to return to the army, which he managed to achieve in 1775, when, for the cost of a quota of recruits, made possible by a highland levee, he entered Colonel Simon Fraser's 71st Highland Regiment at the rank of captain, aged about thirty. In his opinion, being a field officer was a route in life that was 'far more respectable and I am sure profitable...than being a Morvern drover or tenant.'[49]

As a motive for being in the army, 'respectability'—with all the contemporary connotations of public regard and status—was new to this second military generation of the highland gentry. The generation before was motivated by profit for self and family, coupled with adventure. As Captain Patrick Campbell fully appreciated from his youthful experience at a military academy, to be an officer in the British army was to be a gentleman, in receipt of a gentleman's income. Even during peacetime, many officers were granted half-pay status to keep them in readiness for future war and half-pay at the level of Captain was just enough to maintain the decencies of gentlemanly life for a single man. Of course, the average income of a military officer from military duties alone—estimated by Massie in 1759 as £100 per annum and by Colquhoun in 1815 as £200[50]—was not enough to place him on a level with those who derived their incomes from land (assuming rents were paid), law or even modestly successful commerce. It was, nevertheless, a socially acceptable income, associated with a cosmopolitan, leisured and

47 NAS, GD170/1176/1-15, Letters of Major Patrick (Peter) Campbell to his father Duncan Campbell of Glenure. NAS, GD170/391, Accounts and Papers of Major Patrick Campbell with his father Duncan Campbell of Glenure.

48 Patrick's early experience in London is mentioned in letters sent from there by his Uncle Robert, the businessman. NAS, GD170/1186/1-102.

49 NAS, GD170/1176/12/2, Major Patrick Campbell to Duncan Campbell of Glenure (his father), 2 Mar. 1778. This details the sale of his farming interests in Scotland to purchase a majority at the cost of £3,000.

50 Colquhoun, *Treaties*, Mathias, 'Social Structure'.

high-status lifestyle.[51] Moreover, although membership of the military establishment did not necessarily provide an income for life, it did give a status for life; for even in retirement, officers were known by their military titles.[52] In an age when status hierarchies were challenged and transformed by new occupations and new types of wealth, an officer in His Majesty's Army or Navy had an easily recognised and valued position in the newly emerging Britain-wide status system. To quote a sophisticated commentator on gentry affairs in the early nineteenth century—'the profession, either navy or army, is its own justificant. It has every thing in its favour; heroism, danger, bustle, fashion. Soldiers and sailors are always acceptable in society. No body can wonder that men are soldiers and sailors.'[53] Soldiers and sailors could, if lucky, advance their status through military service. This was probably the greatest attraction of the military career, though some elements of elite society viewed with disdain a profession that was 'a means of bringing persons of obscure birth into undue distinction, and raising men to honours which their fathers and grandfathers never dreamt of.'[54]

From the middle decades of the eighteenth century, highland gentry boys grew up with military aspirations. In some families almost every son became a soldier and those who were deliberately kept out of the military line—normally the eldest—yearned for the army life. James Boswell, diarist and biographer, was such a boy.[55] As the eldest son of an Ayrshire lawyer-laird with a family tradition in the legal profession, James (b.1740) was destined like his father to be a lawyer, an expensive profession to enter, and mundane to pursue, but one which normally generated an income suitable for marriage and generally safe as far as health was concerned. His brother David was apprenticed to an Edinburgh banker, though he ended his days as a poor clerk in London. The youngest, John, was sent into the army in his teens. James, who had no taste for study and hated the rough provincialism of Scotland, longed to enter the prestigious 'guards' in London and to lead the life of glamour and adventure that an English commission seemed to offer. This was denied by a careful father, anxious to protect his finances and ensure the continuity of the family. And with good cause, for neither David or John could afford to marry and John degenerated into mental illness.

Patrick Campbell—the young man who in 1775 felt it was more 'respectable' to be an officer than a tenant and drover—was a close contemporary of James Boswell; all of Patrick's brothers, except the eldest

[51] Colquhoun's estimate of income in 1815 puts the military officer at the bottom of the gentry/pseudo-gentry hierarchy.

[52] See the numerous examples give by E. Grant, *Memoirs of a Highland Lady*, 2 vols, ed. A. Tod (Edinburgh,1997), particularly in recounting the titles of the mostly elderly ex-military relatives who were the tenants on her father's estate.

[53] J. Austen, *Mansfield Park* (London, 1966), 136, first published in 1814.

[54] The words are from Sir Walter Elliot, the status-conscious and foolish baronet in J. Austen, *Persuasion.* (London, 1965), 49, first published in 1818. See also, J. D. Grey, 'Military (Army and Navy)' in J.D. Grey, (ed.) *The Jane Austen Handbook* (London, 1986) 307-13.

[55] See, P. Martin, *A Life of James Boswell* (Yale, 1999).

who, like Boswell, followed his father into the legal profession, became soldiers in their teens. When Patrick eventually re-entered the army as a captain, he was sent to America, where he rose to the rank of major, having sold his farming interest to purchase a majority. In America he met and married a Quaker heiress with a family background in trade. His health was compromised by service, however, and he left the army to in New York, where he died in 1782, a wealthy man in his late thirties with a wife and son who remained abroad.[56] Over the course of his military career, he not only made himself a fortune—using his profession to achieve prosperity through marriage—he travelled widely, he was sophisticated in the ways of the world and familiar with metropolitan life. This was in striking contrast to his father and elder brother, both provincial lawyers, who never travelled beyond Britain and only rarely went further than Edinburgh. The army more than any other employment with which the highland gentry was associated was characterised by a propensity for travel and high levels of social mixing among the national elite. Even men who had been in the army but then returned to Scotland continued to travel at home and overseas—a habit once formed was hard to break.[57] Many who left the army and retired to private life never returned to their homes, but, like Patrick Campbell, remained abroad or chose to settle in London or in one of the English leisure towns. The military profession was also the first professional group in Britain to have a social club in London exclusive to their membership, and it is not surprising that a Scotsman of gentry background was largely instrumental in its founding.[58]

The elite sociability with which officers were characterised and which made the profession so attractive to many, was partly a consequence of living in circumstances where there was little active soldiering to be done and much time available for hospitality and conviviality. Indeed, hospitality in the English gentlemanly manner was an increasingly important part of the social expectations of an officer, and commonly resulted in an expenditure that many could ill afford. Social mixing was also necessary for securing patronage and promotion—the more so during peace than in war, because peace brought reduction in employment opportunities. Officers had to play the patronage game to get on in life, which partly depended on family connections, but increasingly relied on face-to-face sociability within the right circles and the personal credentials of the individual seeking advance. This is revealed by the life and experience of Colin Campbell, another military son of Duncan

[56] NAS, GD170/1176/1-15, Letters of Major Patrick (Peter) Campbell to his father Duncan Campbell of Glenure. NAS, GD170/391, Accounts and Papers of Major Patrick Campbell with his father Duncan Campbell of Glenure.

[57] A classic case, whose life is well documented, is that of General Thomas Graham of Balgowan (Lord Lyndoch), a Perthshire laird and hero of the Peninsular wars, who travelled the length of Europe in retirement in his sixties and seventies, often visiting the sites of great battles, such as Borodino in 1819, which had quickly become a tourist attraction. See A. Brett-James, *General Graham, Lord Lynedoch* (London, 1959) ch. 26.

[58] Brett-James, *General Graham* 308-11.

Campbell the lawyer-laird, who based his attempts to secure military advance through his private social life and sophisticated networking in London.[59]

Colin Campbell, like all of his brothers except the eldest, was a career officer from his teens.[60] His entry into regimental life in the early 1760s was organised by his maternal uncle Major James Macpherson (the soldier-entrepreneur whose history is sketched above) and he served for most of his career with the 42nd Royal Highland Regiment, rising from ensign to lieutenant and finally to captain and stationed, variously, in Scotland, India, England and Ireland. During his years in India from 1781 to 1783, at the time of the Second Mysore War, he suffered serious injury followed by chronic fever. Having arrived back home he spent two years on sick leave, attempting to recover in Bath and London, with occasional visits to his family in the north. Yet, despite poor health, he enjoyed a vigorous social life, networked furiously, engaged in various status-enhancing strategies and was one of the early members of the highly prestigious, London-based Highland Society.[61] It is not surprising that at about this time, Colin Campbell, who was a second son, began to lobby his elder brother to grant him the title and tenancy of Glenure, a secondary estate connected with the Campbells of Barcaldine. And having achieved the tenancy, he was able to call himself Captain Colin Campbell of Glenure, and in effect have two status titles—one linked to his military profession and one linked to his gentry family background. On returning to military service, which meant a return to garrison duties in Scotland and then Ireland, this ambitious man turned his attention to another device for getting on the world—marriage. Like his younger brother in America, Colin Campbell married an heiress and when he died of fever in 1797—the legacy of his India days—he was the proprietor of an Irish estate near Cork.[62]

Patrick and Colin Campbell both died young as a consequence of their military service. This was typical of military men. Atypically, both were successful in their personal lives, for they used the status and gentlemanly credentials that the army bestowed to achieve wealth through socially ambitious marriages. Most young men who entered the army hoped for fortune. Most, however, did not achieve it, as another brother in the same generation of the family clearly reveals. Alexander Campbell—Sandie—was the first of five siblings to enter the army. In 1763, at

[59] The importance of family and patronage connections, even among the great military heroes of the day, is nicely articulated in a recent and not altogether complementary biography of Nelson. T. Coleman, *Nelson: the Man and the Legend* (London, 2001)

[60] NAS, GD170/1628/1-50, Letters from Captain Colin Campbell of Glenure to his brother Alexander Campbell of Barcaldine. NAS, GD170/1090/1-43, Letters from Captain Colin Campbell of Glenure to his father Duncan Campbell of Glenure.

[61] J. Sinclair *An Account of the Highland Society of London from its Establishment in May 1778 to 1813, Drawn up at the Deisre of the Society with an Appendix Containing a List of Members, Rules etc* (London, 1813).

[62] NAS, GD170/1628/50, Captain Colin Campbell of Glenure to Alexander Campbell of Barcaldine (his brother), 1797.

the end of the Seven Years War and in his early twenties, he was living in London, a half-pay lieutenant, recently married and, like his brothers, looking for 'gentlemanly' employment.[63] He had hopes that his father would get him the tenancy of a forfeited farm in the highlands, but since he since he knew nothing of farming—which was typical of teenage recruits—his father declined to act. He tried his hand at business, but soon went bankrupt. He finally turned to America and in 1774 he left Greenock with letters of introduction to officers and merchants in New York. There he established a grocery business, dealing mainly with the army, he also joined one of the British regiments and by 1777 he was engaged in numerous activities to generate a remarkable income and support an expensive life style. As reported by a relative—'in the first place... Sandie is a Captain in Mcleans, in the 2nd place he is Brigade Major to De-Lancys Corps of York Independent Companies, in the 3rd place he is wood cutter general to the army and in the 4th place he has got a Lieutenancy for his son (a boy about 3 or 4 years old) in Mcleans regiment. In short...his income, one way or another, cannot be less than £1000 or £1200 per annum.... He has a country house on Long Island and a town house in New York.'[64] He was a wealthy man, but the situation was unstable. His relatives urged him to prudence, to leave the army and bring his profits home, but he did not heed their warnings. He was killed in action in 1779, his property was confiscated and his wife and children were penniless and back in Scotland by the early 1780s. With the small capital that she still owned in Scotland, along with a government pension of five pounds for each of her daughters, Mrs Campbell went into business as a Glasgow tea retailer. Her only son entered the army as a teenage ensign in the 1790s and was dead within a couple of years.[65]

*

As Sandie Campbell's career demonstrates, making money and holding onto it were very different indeed. This characteristic of officers was a commonplace from the 1760s and was in striking contrast to the generation before, who could exploit their business backgrounds to good effect in the army. Another characteristic of the post-1760 gentleman soldier experience—and one that was to have implications for individuals and their families—was conspicuous consumption. As noted in the various biographies sketched so far, soldiers were remarkable for their experience of travel and for cosmopolitan sociability furth of Scotland. At a time when increasing numbers of the British gentry, male and female, were travelling for leisure and consumer opportunities,[66] the Scottish

63 He worked for Uncle Robert for a while, who paid him £140 p.a., and he also had his half-pay. He estimated his family expenses in London at £200. NAS, GD170/1063-9.

64 NAS, GD170/1065/3/1, Alexander Campbell of Greenock to his cousin Duncan Campbell.

65 NAS, GD170/1705, Letters from Mary Campbell, relict of Major Alexander Campbell, 1768-1793.

66 See J. Brewer, *The Pleasures of the Imagination: English Culture in the Eighteenth Century* (London, 1997) ch. 16.

military officer was doing the same as part of his profession. This was important for a developing sense of Britishness, but it also introduced this growing element of the Scottish and highland gentry to levels of expenditure and expectations that they could not afford, and which damaged their families.

In a regimental system where men of modest background mixed with men of wealth, the expenditure norms of the latter set the tone. Officers were expected to provide their own uniforms and horses, which could be very expensive. Mess costs could be high—making some regiments prohibitive to all but the very rich—and the costs of the fashionable social life into which many officers were drawn could be great. It was easy to raise a loan on the security of an officer's salary and many young men and even teenage boys found themselves in considerable debt soon after entering military life. The cost to their fathers was often very much more than the cost of commissions, and family relationships were consequently strained.[67] Family correspondences were full of exhortations to greater financial prudence from fathers to sons and contemporary fiction gives many cautionary tales of improvident and unprincipled young officers.[68] The two youngest sons of Duncan Campbell of Glenure—James and Hugh—contracted such high debts that their father eventually abandoned them to their creditors. From the start of his military career, Hugh was vastly interested in fine clothing. As he wrote from New York in 1778:

> Dear Father, I am sorry that I am under the necessity of drawing upon you for forty pounds Stirling: but I can assure you that it was consistent with nature to keep up the character of an officer and gentleman.... I am not a gambler nor am I a man of gallantry, but after all my money goes and I don't know how rightly...[69]

Keeping up the character of an officer and gentleman not only involved costly clothing, but the maintenance of horses and packs of hunting dogs in some cases;[70] there were servants and attendants, and also the furniture and paraphernalia of domestic life and hospitality, which frequently travelled with a officer even when on active duty.[71] Military men

67 Lieutenant Allan Campbell, writing from Dover Castle in 1775, sought to warn his brother Duncan that army life was expensive. 'I can assure you that all the pay that he [Duncan's son] is to receive since he came to the regiment will be little enough to defray the expense of two suits of regimentals...sword, sash....[etc]'. NAS, GD170/1067/6/1

68 The most famous example of the early nineteenth century is the devious seducer Captain Wickham in Jane Austen's, *Pride and Prejudice*. The Scottish novelist Susan Ferrier provides several more, though it is worth noting that the virtuous hero of *Marriage*, is an English-raised military man of Highland background.

69 NAS, GD170/1118/8/1, Letter from Hugh Campbell to his father Duncan Campbell of Glenure, New York, July 22 1778.

70 See the case of Lord Lyndoch, who kept a hunting pack, horses and necessary servants in Spain during the Penninsular Wars. A feckless man where money was concerned. Lyndoch eventually ruined his estate. Brett-James, *Lord Lyndoch*.

71 See *Autobiographical Journal of John Macdonald Schoolmaster and Soldier, 1770-1830* (Edinburgh, 1906). John Macdonald, having entered the army as a pipe-major in 1778,

of the later eighteenth century were famous for the tendency to high consumption and their search after comfort in situations of hardship. This was a far cry from the austerity and restraint that was commonly recommended in the military manuals of the day.[72] James Boswell, always attracted by the glamour of military men, noted such a case in his travels through the highlands in 1773, when he and Johnson visited Sir Allan Maclean on Mull.

> Sir Allan, like all other officers, who, though by their profession obliged to endure fatigues and inconveniences, are peculiarly luxurious...I take it the suffering, or at least the contemplating of hardships to which officers are accustomed (for from Sir Allan's account even of the American expeditions, it appeared that though the poor common soldiers are often wretchedly off, the officers suffer little, having their commodious camp equipage, and their chocolate, and other comforts carried along in little room, and prepared by their men, who are most subservient beings), makes them fonder of all indulgences.[73]

Such conspicuous consumption when allied to gambling and 'gallantry', that is the pursuit of fashionable women and heiress hunting, ensured that many military men spent more than they ever earned and were locked into the pitiful business of keeping up appearances to get by in life.[74] Excitement, extravagance, an excessive preoccupation with clothing and outward image and an immoderate engagement in expensive sociability, gave the military profession its 'fashionable' image.[75] But on the other side of the coin, members of the profession could also be easily characterised as reckless, foolish and morally suspect.[76] Many men of this background led highly irregular personal lives that brought despair to their loved ones and many ruined their family fortunes or were a constant drain on family resources.

The impact on family finances inevitably extended to family estates and tenancy arrangements. In its organisation and culture, the army operated to maintain a hierarchical status quo that placed a high value

71 (*Continued*) spent most of his military career as a servant—mainly as butler—to various military officers, travelling with their personal property and providing for their hospitality in the field and abroad.

72 As in S. Bever, *The Cadet: a Military Treaties, by an Officer* (London, 1762). In ch. 13 'Concerning the education, study, application and behaviour of officers in private life' he laments the luxury, idleness and libertine tendencies of the British officer.

73 F. A. Pottle and C. H. Bennett (eds), *Boswell's Journal of A Tour to the Hebrides with Samuel Johnson* (London, 1936) 327.

74 See examples quoted in Hayes, 'Scottish Officers'.

75 The term is commonly used in early nineteenth-century literature.

76 Duncan Campbell of Glenure's military sons were a case in point. Captain Colin Campbell was brought before the Glasgow Sheriff in March 1778, where he was accused of ravishing a servant girl. The case, which was a great local scandal, was dismissed as not proven. NAS, GD170/1354/46, Letter from Major James MacPherson to his brother-in-law Duncan Campbell of Glenure. One of the military sons of Robert Campbell, Duncan's brother, was thought to have caused the early death of his father by his criminal behaviour. As reported by Allan from London in 1774—'I fear he has ruined his father's family if he is catched he'll surely be hanged.' NAS, GD170/1067/5

on links with land. Land was the basis of status and it was also, in a practical sense, an important source of military recruits in some areas at certain points in time.[77] Thus men of gentry background who were unlikely to inherit land in their own right, nevertheless sought to connect landownership to their military office as a device for raising their own status within the officer corps. Such behaviour was not unique to soldiers, but it was very pronounced in this profession and did have a negative impact on the use of land in many parts of Scotland and particularly in the highlands, where increasingly debt-ridden landlords were eager to give tenancies to military relatives in return for secure rental payments from guaranteed military pay.[78] The problem with such tenants was that they were not necessarily good farmers. Career soldiers who entered the army in their teens were not familiar with farming practice and given their tendency to travel, were not resident on their farms for sufficient spans of time to allow them to develop any agricultural knowledge or skills. As Alexander Campbell of Barcaldine—the lawyer-laird—wrote to his brother, Captain Colin Campbell, when the latter pleaded for the tenancy of Glenure in the 1780s—'you are not accustomed to the country business'.[79] Because the properties that were tenanted by soldiers were small and most officers could not afford to employ an agent or factor, these farms often languished. Their purpose was prestige. So when Alexander Campbell finally and reluctantly granted his brother the property and title—Captain Colin Campbell of Glenure—his fears were well founded. Colin rarely visited the estate and most of his interest in the property was invested in building a new high—status dining room onto the house and commissioning a new suite of dining room furniture.[80] Relationships were strained, the brothers argued over an inheritance from their mother and all communication ceased for over ten years.[81] During his mature adult life in the last two decades of the eighteenth century, Alexander Campbell of Barcaldine deliberately cut all contact with three of his four younger soldier-brothers, mainly over financial matters. His older, 'natural' soldier-brother Sandie, and his other younger soldier-brother Patrick were already dead by the early 1780s. Alexander was never to meet Patrick's wife or son, who remained in America; he never met the Irish wife and children of Colin; and he abandoned the impoverished widow and children of Sandie to their own devices.

For the Campbells of Barcaldine, as with other families, though the resort to military careers for younger sons became increasingly

77 See, Mackillop, *More Fruitful*.
78 *Ibid*.
79 NAS, GD170/1628/30, Captain Colin Campbell of Glenure to Alexander Campbell of Barcaldine (his brother), May 1786.
80 NAS, GD170/1628/41-43. Letters from Captain Colin Campbell of Glenure to his brother Alexander Campbell of Barcaldine his brother, 1788.
81 NAS, GD170/1628/50, Letter from Colin Campbell, Cork 1797, which re-established communication with his brother Alexander and provides an account of what he'd been doing during ten years of silences.

necessary for short-term financial and status gains, it was also increasingly damaging to long-term family relationships and family finances. Fathers and elder brothers now found it near impossible to control the behaviour of their military kin in the interests of the family, once they were launched on their military careers and motivated by self and not family concerns. Another group who suffered were women. The purchase system made enormous demands and raising the necessary lump sum to get a young man into office could pose financial difficulties.[82] One way that gentry families sought to get access to capital sums for the purchase of commissions was to target those members of the family with assets but limited intrinsic economic or production value for the family as a whole; thus widows and older spinsters with annuities were frequently under pressure to help out.[83] In the early nineteenth century, Lady Louisa Stuart, a middle-aged spinster living on a modest annuity, was petitioned on several occasions by her widowed and impecunious sister, Lady Caroline Portarlington, for significant sums to purchase teenage commissions for her younger sons. Neither their wealthy brother—the Earl of Bute—nor the elder son of Lady Caroline—heir to an indebted Irish estate—was willing to help.[84]

Widows and older spinsters were invariably marginalised in highland gentry society and the rise in military careers worsened their position.[85] The fact that the military provided the gentry with a socially acceptable avenue for disposing of surplus males—one, moreover, that put responsibility on the son to make his own fortune—was attractive to gentry families. Unfortunately, there were no equivalent routes in life for surplus gentlewomen: and surplus gentlewomen there were , particularly as more and more men entered the army; for rates of marriage among officers were low, many died young and those that married often did so outwith Scotland. The 'spinster problem,' which was endemic in highland gentry families, was partly a consequence of mass employment in the military profession.[86] The cost to families of maintaining their unmarried female kin was considerable and growing, for as with sons, by the second half of the eighteenth century, the earlier route of commercial apprenticeships for unmarried daughters was no longer consistent with gentry status. These women had to be maintained as dependants, and as highland gentlewomen entered the ranks of conspicuous consumers, their costs were rising. Some enterprising souls, facing the prospect of life-long spinsterhood for themselves or their female kin, did follow the military abroad. Katharine Read (1723-78), daughter of

82 Bruce, *Purchase System*.

83 Duncan Campbell's widow was frequently petitioned for financial help by her many grandchildren, particularly the children of her daughters.

84 See Mrs Godfrey Clark (ed.), *Gleanings from an Old Portfolio, Containing Some Correspondence between Lady Louisa Stuart and her Sister Caroline, Countess of Portarlington, and Other Friends and Relations*, 2 vols (Edinburgh, 1896).

85 Nenadic, 'Highland Gentlewoman'.

86 See Nenadic, 'Highland Gentlewoman' for examples from the family of Cambell of Barcaldine.

Alexander Read of Turfbeg and Logie, a Forfarshire gentleman, who did much to support her soldier-brothers and their families through her success as a fashionable portrait painter, even went to the extreme of travelling to India in the 1770s to find an officer husband for her niece and to get some portrait commissions for herself among military men.[87] This was unusual, most spinsters of highland gentry background simply stayed at home, destined for a fate of genteel, celibate, marginalised poverty—in much the same way that most of the men that they might have married were destined, as soldiers, for a fate of genteel, unmarried, though not necessarily celibate poverty, beyond the shores of Scotland.

*

The impact of military careers for such large numbers of the highland gentry was profound. Military office gave men who did not have automatic access to land a valued status and title, which they generally adopted for life, so that even when they had retired they were still known by their military rank. They dressed distinctly, both in and out of uniform, and had distinct forms of address, behaviour and leisure.[88] More than any other profession with which the highland gentry were connected, the military profession preserved and celebrated traditional values, while simultaneously adapting very effectively to the new polite and urban world. Certain British towns, particularly the leisure and county towns, were full of officers on leave or half pay, many of them highland Scots—seeking to entertain themselves, sometimes recovering from illness or injury and always looking for further opportunities among their peers and patrons.

The military profession was highly visible by the late eighteenth century and—in the language of the day—it was 'fashionable'. The impact of military employment, however, could be very damaging for the many gentry families and particularly the highland gentry families who provided the officer corps. Of course, such a statement runs directly counter to the generally positive assessment of the army as an avenue to material opportunity that has dominated most commentaries on the subject.[89] In particular the relationship between Scots, the military and empire has led one notable analyst to remark, 'There could have been few gentry families in Scotland after *c.* 1760 which did not reap some benefit from the profits of empire, even if the precise scale of the gains made awaits much more detailed research.'[90] It may never be possible to know the 'precise scale of the gains', but this detailed research suggests some cause for caution when the issue of 'benefit' is explored in a broader, cross-generational context that embraces the social and cultural impacts.

87 A. F. Struan, 'Miss Katharine Read, Court Paintress', *SHR* 2 (1905) 38-46.

88 Colley *Britons*, 193: J. Babington, *Records of the Fife Fox Hounds, Compiled by Lieut. Col. Babington* (Edinburgh, 1883).

89 See, B. Lenman, *The Jacobite Clans of the Great Glen, 1650-1784* (London, 1984); Macinnes, *Clanship, Commerce*; MacKillop *More Fruitful*; T. M. Devine, *Scotland's Empire, 1600-1815* (London, 2003).

90 Devine, *Scotland's Empire*, 334

The family of Campbell of Barcaldine, along with their extensive networks of kin, demonstrate quite clearly the astonishing popularity of military employment for the sons of the highland gentry. When military opportunities started to rise from the 1750s, adult men who were trained and active in other careers—notably commerce and tenant farming—rushed to become soldiers; and fathers pulled all manner of patronage strings to get their teenage boys into junior offices in the army. Quickly, a well-established and highly advantageous gentry practice of placing younger sons into business apprenticeships all but vanished. Even the sons of successful businessmen of highland family background—such as Robert Campbell of Stirling—turned their backs on commercial careers to take the military route in life.[91] Of course, highland gentlemen still engaged in tenant farming on family estates—but increasingly the desirable tenant was an officer on full or half pay, with ready cash for the rent, but not necessarily accustomed to the 'country business'. For gentlemen such as these, land equalled status more than income and they were often elderly, ineffective or absentee.[92]

Though it is impossible to quantify the precise impact, which did include some short-term benefits,[93] these trends were clearly of long-term disadvantage to highland gentry families and their estates—particularly the loss of businessmen, whose importance can be seen when scrutinising the intimate financial relationship between a lawyer-laird like Duncan Campbell and his younger brother Robert, the latter raised from boyhood to serve the interests of his elder brother and the family.[94] Of course, there were some impressive highland soldier-entrepreneurs in the first few decades of military expansion, mostly officers with a solid background in commerce who operated business interests from within the army. The business connection collapsed quite rapidly, however; largely through the practise of using the army, rather than apprenticeships or other forms of land-focused training, as a quasi-education for teenage boys. The army became a 'respectable' career and an opportunity for personal status enhancement on terms that, when compared with trade or farming, were more leisured, though risky to health and far less mundane. This does not mean that in certain circumstances the army could not be exploited for financial gain. At some points in time, highland recruiting did bring much needed cash to many estates; cleaver men in high office could exploit the government's cash bounties; and there were prizes for a very lucky few. The vast majority of men who joined the army, however—if the cases cited here are at

[91] Robert Campbell was greatly opposed to his sons entering the army, NAS, GD170/1186

[92] Grant, *Memoirs*, ii suggests that the usual residents on the farms at Rothiemurchus were mostly elderly ex-army relatives.

[93] With reference to recruiting and rents see, MacKillop, *More Fruitful*, ch. 5.

[94] This relationship is explored in S. Nenadic 'Military men and businessmen: Scots in London in the mid-eighteenth century', unpublished paper presented to the 'Scots in London in the 18th Century' Conference. University of Edinburgh, November 28, 2004.

all typical—did not come into such categories and some were the cause of much distress to their families. The Campbells of Barcaldine was repeatedly driven to states of serious crisis, financial and reputational, by the affairs of their military kin—no other type of employment exercised such an impact on the family. John Campbell of Barcaldine (1704-78), an able man, supplemented the income from his own estate through employment as a Crown Factor on Forfeited estates in Perthshire. By the mid-1770s, however, he was ruined and was obliged to sell Barcaldine to his half-brother Duncan. The principal reason for his downfall was the cost associated with the military careers of his sons; particularly the recklessness of his eldest who eventually killed himself in 1779 while serving as Governor of Fort George. In the opinion of his nephew, Patrick—'...a poor situation the honest man has brought himself to. Cheated by the one son and bullied by the other son out of his estate.'[95] The only reason the property remained in the family and in reasonably good financial health was because Duncan, through his legal practice and business dealings, had accumulated sufficient capital to purchase and stabilise the estate.

From the evidence explored here, it was the practice of placing young teenagers in commissions—popular from the Seven Years War through to the early nineteenth century, when banned by government[96]—that was most damaging to highland families. Putting boys in the army not only robbed the highland gentry of their kin connections in urban business or commercial farming, it removed boys at an impressionable age from the controlling influences of the family, it introduced them to luxury-driven lifestyles and it led to an early exposure to 'English' gentlemanly status systems. Boys who entered the army as youngsters were not trained or educated for anything that was 'useful' to the family, other than being in the army. The motives for teenage army entry were complex and shifting, and deserving of much more scrutiny than is possible here. Regardless of motive, however, the impact was damaging. Indeed, the man who finally ruined the Barcaldine estate was one who began his career as a teenage officer and through his military office and associated elite fashionable connections was drawn early into a pattern of expenditure that far exceeded his income.

Duncan Campbell (1786-1842), son and grandson of lairds who had supported the estate through successful legal practice, was the first in the family (he succeeded to his inheritance as a youth in 1800) to combine major landownership with a military career. He entered the army as a teenager at the start of the Napoleonic Wars, swept along on the tide of 'defence patriotism' that drew unprecedented numbers of Scotsmen into the military.[97] He was encouraged to do so by his widowed

[95] NAS, GD170/1176/8, Major Patrick Campbell to Duncan Campbell of Glenure (his father), 24 Dec. 1774

[96] Carpenter, 'British Army'.

[97] Cookson, *British Armed Nation*; J.E. Cookson, 'The Napoleonic Wars, Military Scotland and Tory Highlandism in the early nineteenth century', *SHR* 78 (1999)

mother; had his lawyer-father been alive, the story may have been different. He served in Copenhagen in 1801 and fought with Wellesley in the Peninsular Wars. In 1810, when painted by Henry Raeburn in military uniform—the first of the family to commission a fashionable portrait—he held 'double-rank' as lieutenant in a regiment of Foot Guards—an expensive, elite London regiment—and captain in a Scottish regiment. Even at this early stage he was getting into debt, for in 1812, Raeburn wrote to Campbell requesting that he settle forthwith his long outstanding bill of fifty guineas.[98] His military exploits and later office as Deputy Lord Lieutenant for Argyll were rewarded with a baronetcy in 1831—so he was successful in status terms. However, he had embarked on a perilous course of reckless spending—a cause of dismay among his own family and disgust among his business-owning in-laws in Glasgow - that finally ended in ruin, a pattern of behaviour that was seen elsewhere among commonly cited 'successful' career soldiers.[99] The Glenure estate was sold in 1818 and the Barcaldine property, which the family had owned since the late seventeenth century, supported through trade or diligent legal practice, was lost in 1842 when he died in virtual bankruptcy.[100] Sir Duncan Campbell of Barcaldine ruined his family. He was, of course, a very fine military gentleman and he was also, as the Raeburn portrait reveals, a loyal and patriotic Briton. So what does this sketch of a highland gentry family and their military employments reveal about that other frequently cited theme of eighteenth century Scottish experience—the formation of Britishness and its impact on the highlands?

Of the period that is commonly identified as one of 'defence patriotism', during the French and Napoleonic wars, it would seem that the highland gentry embraced an ethos that was common to the whole of Britain—a kind of loyal, British military patriotism in which highlanders played a critical role, and which in turn defined both the image and practice of highland regiments through the nineteenth century and beyond.[101] Sir Duncan Campbell was part of this culture. The two generations of highland military elites that came to maturity before the late eighteenth century, and are the focus of this article, were motivated by more complex, individualistic, localised and shifting agendas.[102] These

[97] (*Continued*) 60-75, suggests there was a transformation in the character and public perception of Scottish regiments quite suddenly at the end of the Revolutionary War in 1799 that gave rise to massive patriotic popularity.

[98] See D. Thomson, *Raeburn* (Edinburgh, 1997) 140-1.

[99] Lord Lyndoch was a case in point, see Brett-James, *Lord Lyndoch*. Another frequently cited 'success story' (see Devine, *Scotland's Empire*, 317) is MacKenzie of Seaforth, a career soldier who eventually achieved high office as Governor of Barbados in 1800. But Lord Seaforth, like Sir Duncan, spent more than he ever earned and eventually lost his estate.

[100] NAS, GD170, Introduction.

[101] Cookson, *British Armed Nation*; H. Streets, *Martial Races: The Military, Race and Masculinity in British Imperial Culture, 1857-1914* (Manchester, 2004).

[102] Mackillop, *More Fruitful* ch.7. also questions the robustness of the 'British identity thesis' with reference to the broader process of Highland recruitment.

included short-term financial opportunism through recruiting and renting, the hope of quick and spectacular riches through war, adventure and escape from mundane provincialism, and also access to a type of 'respectable' career—with the associated social life and consumption—that was more acceptable in a changing gentry status regime than urban business or practical farming. An appreciation of the importance of contemporary Scottish preoccupations with English gentlemanly status systems is critical for any understanding of the military generation that came to maturity in the period from the 1760s to the 1780s.[103] This was 'Britishness' of a sort, but not the patriotic Britishness that is commonly represented as having a foundation in Scotland from the middle decades of the eighteenth century.

In describing, often in painful detail, the ambitions and activities of their numerous military kin, no one connected with the family of Campbell of Barcaldine, soldier or civilian, ever wrote of loyalty or patriotism prior to the early nineteenth century—other than when they were trying to claim military pensions from the Crown, as happened in the case of Sandy Campbell's widow, following his death in battle in 1779. This supports the conclusion of one notable recent commentator that 'too much has been claimed for the Scottish regiments before the Napoleonic wars.'[104] Indeed, the only overt statement of attachment to any identity beyond that of the family and estate—or, occasionally, regiment, though most officers shifted regiment as opportunities arose— was that made by Captain Colin Campbell, recovering in London from his India exploits, when he became an early member of the Highland Society in 1784. Colin Campbell, a socially ambitious man, was probably involved with the Highland Society for status and patronage reasons, for it was a prestigious and fashionable body that gave him access to such powerful magnates as the Duke of Argyll within a cultural context of metropolitan politeness. He may also have been making a heart-felt statement of gentlemanly-highland-Britishness through membership of an organisation which, while not at this time particularly 'military' in tone,[105] was devoted to the preservation and promotion of highland culture and economy within the context of union and Hanoverian loyalty. Indeed, this was a strong and established ethos within the Barcaldine family, which in the generation before had provided three Crown Factors for the Forfeited highland estates, all practical farming men with a good legal knowledge, again with the mixed motives of family interest, personal opportunism and a complex local-national political agenda.[106]

[103] See J. Dwyer and R. B. Sher (eds), *Sociability and Society in Eighteenth Century Scotland* (Aberdeen, 1992), esp. J. G. Basker, 'Scottiscisms and the problem of cultural identity in eighteenth century Britain'. Also, on 'culture-shifting' among the Highland elite, see S. Nenadic, 'Consuming at a distance: the Highlands of Scotland in the first half of the eighteenth century.' *British Journal for Eighteenth Century Studies,* forthcoming.

[104] Cookson, 'Napolenoic Wars' p. 63

[105] Cookson 'Napoleonic Wars', suggests a major shift c. 1800 in the preoccupations of Highland society towards militarism.

[106] This more complex, nuanced and localised culture and identity among the Highland elite than is commonly assumed in the 'fiscal-military state' and centralised

Captain Colin Campbell's multiple ambitions and identities, and simultaneous attachments to both a local and national agenda, may well have been typical of his and his father's generation of military and non-military kin, but were probably different to what came after with highland gentlemen, such as Sir Duncan Campbell, who were mostly absentees but also highly involved with military highlandism.[107] We should not lose sight of the fact that, though a more successful man than many of his peers because he married to advantage, Colin Campbell was responsible for neglecting a family property, which he had sought for status reasons and was incapable of managing in any practical sense; he fell out with his elder brother over family financial matters, in common with most of his military siblings; and he suffered years of ill health, from which he eventually died at a relatively young age, as a result of service in India. For this man and for his family, though there were some gains on the positive side—and gentlemanly 'Britishness' may have been one of them—there were also many negative consequences that arose from mass involvement in the military profession.

[106] (*Continued*) centralised 'Britishness' thesis is also suggested in A. Mackillop, 'The political culture of the Scottish Highlands from Culloden to Waterloo', *Historical Journal* 46 (2003) 511-32.

[107] Seen, for instance, in Sir Duncan's plans for remodelling Barcaldine House in the military baronial style. NAS, GD170.

The Scottish Historical Review, Volume LXXXV, 1: No. 219: April 2006, 102–132

GORDON PENTLAND

The Debate on Scottish Parliamentary Reform, 1830-1832

Abstract

The voluminous historiography of the 'Great Reform Act' of 1832 and the more modest historiography of the Reform Act (Scotland) have tended to focus on how far the legislation effected a break with an aristocratic constitution. What this approach does little to illuminate, however, is the extent to which the reform legislation was framed and debated as a renegotiation of the relationship between England and Wales, Scotland, Ireland and the Empire. In Scotland, this meant that the extensive debate on reform tended to revolve around different interpretations of the Union of 1707 and Scotland's subsequent history and development. This article explores the reform debate among Scotland's political elite and, in particular, how the issue was tackled in Parliament. It demonstrates that in the fluid context provided by the developing constitutional crisis after 1829 simple divisions of 'Whig' and 'Tory' and even 'Reformer' and 'Anti-reformer' do not adequately describe the range of positions taken on the question of reform. The need to respond to the arguments of parliamentary opponents and to fast-moving events outside of Parliament ensured that responses to reform tended to be idiosyncratic. This article argues that the combination of the nature of reform as a renegotiation of the Union and the need to appeal to those outside of Parliament saw the reform debate prosecuted as a contest over the language of patriotism. Both sponsors and opponents of reform claimed to represent the voice of 'the nation', but this contest was far more complex than a straightforward confrontation between Anglophile 'assimilationists' and defenders of Scottish 'semi-independence'.

Those historians who have attempted complete accounts of Britain's crisis of reform have instinctively referred to the debate and controversy that surrounded the passing of the 'Great Reform Act' between 1830 and 1832, and have made only fleeting reference to the other two Reform Acts which were passed in 1832 to restructure the parliamentary representation of Ireland and Scotland.[1] In one sense such omission is perfectly reasonable, given that the main parliamentary battleground was, indeed, the measure for England and Wales. This was especially true after the government's intention to pilot all three bills through Parliament simultaneously was rendered impractical by the amendment

[1] The standard account is still Michael Brock, *The Great Reform Act* (London, 1973); see also Edward Pearce, *Reform! The Fight for the 1832 Reform Act* (London, 2003).

GORDON PENTLAND is lecturer in History at the University of York

moved by General Gascoyne in April 1831. This attacked the government's proposed redistribution of parliamentary seats and called for no reduction to be made to the English representation in Parliament, a move that was explicitly designed 'to prevent the aggrandizement of the Irish and Scotch, at the expense of the English representation'.[2]

Historiographical debate on the reform measures has tended to revolve around the issue of whether they represented, or were intended as, a decisive break with an aristocratic constitution or a carefully engineered adjustment, which left much of the old system, and in Scotland its most obnoxious features, intact.[3] Gascoyne's amendment might thus be seen as an obstructionist tactic of inveterate anti-reformers, self-interestedly seeking to preserve the unreformed system. The amendment and the lengthy exchanges that followed it do, however, highlight another major area of the reform debate. The measures were debated throughout as a renegotiation of the British constitution and a rebalancing, or indeed unbalancing, of the political relationships between England and Wales, Scotland, Ireland and the Empire.[4] This was an area of contention which government had to consider very seriously as it attempted to legislate effectively for the multiple union. While ministers remained committed to increasing the representation of Scotland and Ireland, this could not be done to too great a degree, especially in Ireland, without losing votes in the Commons. Scottish and Irish votes, however, were important, and so the architects of reform had to steer between the Scylla of what the Lord Advocate saw as a selfish 'English nationality' and the Charybdis identified by Lord Holland in a potential 'combination of Irish and Scotch reformers and the antireformers'.[5] It is partly with a view to illuminating some of these 'national' aspects of the reform question, that this article will investigate the debate on the Reform Bills for Scotland between 1830 and 1832.

It was a measure of the low priority given to the Scottish reform bill that Lord Althorp, the Chancellor of the Exchequer and leader of the House of Commons, could consider Scotland in just one line in the plan he submitted to the committee of reform in December 1830: 'Give Scotland a Representative Government.'[6] The reform bill for England and

[2] *Parliamentary Debates* [*Parl. Debs.*], 3rd ser., iii, 1528.

[3] The English historiography is ably surveyed in Philip Salmon, *Electoral Reform at Work: Local Politics and National Parties, 1832-1841* (Woodbridge, 2002), 3-11; for Scotland see William Ferguson, 'The Reform Act (Scotland) of 1832: Intention and Effect', *SHR* 45 (1966) 105-114; Michael Dyer, *Men of Property and Intelligence: The Scottish Electoral System Prior to 1884* (Aberdeen, 1996), 23-68.

[4] For the neglected imperial dimension to the reform debates see Miles Taylor, 'Empire and Parliamentary Reform: The 1832 Reform Act Revisited' in Arthur Burns and Joanna Innes (eds), *Rethinking the Age of Reform: Britain 1780-1850* (Cambridge, 2003), 295-311.

[5] National Library of Scotland [NLS], Advocates' Manuscripts [Adv. MSS], 9.1.8, fo. 77, Francis Jeffrey to Henry Cockburn, 5 Sept. 1831; Abraham D. Kriegel (ed.), *The Holland House Diaries 1831-40* (London, 1977), 58.

[6] Durham University Library [DUL], Grey Papers, GRE/B46/1/29, Lord Althorp's Plan of Reform.

Wales remained the principal battleground throughout the reform debates, while the need to legislate sensitively for Ireland, still dangerously divided after the Wellington administration's passing of Catholic Emancipation in 1829, made her representative arrangements second priority. Although Sir James Graham, the First Lord of the Admiralty, took some responsibility for Scottish reform, it fell to the Scottish law officers, Francis Jeffrey, the Lord Advocate, and Henry Cockburn, the Solicitor-General, to draft the measure. Jeffrey, relying on the support of a handful of other Scottish MPs, undertook to prosecute the measure in Parliament. In doing so, he pitted himself against Scottish MPs who remained, of all the national groupings, the most consistently opposed to reform.[7]

The approaches to reform among Scottish political elites defy easy categorisation. There were broad areas of agreement, but it is difficult to identify coherent Whig and Tory positions on the reform bills. One alternative would be to follow a division that was identified by contemporaries: 'It was no longer Whig and Tory: It was Reformer and Anti-reformer.'[8] Even such non-party labels as pro- and anti-reform, however, prove inadequate in a fluid context where what was often debated was not whether there ought to be reform, but rather to what extent and along what lines it ought to be carried. Certainly, distinct theoretical approaches can be glimpsed, more especially in the printed texts produced by some members of Scotland's political elites and the rival periodicals, *Blackwood's* and the *Edinburgh Review*. In debate, however, the need to respond to the arguments of opponents and to events outside Parliament meant that the responses of most MPs were idiosyncratic.[9]

This pressing need to respond to events outside Parliament suggests that high politics cannot be seen as an isolated practice, impervious to what was happening 'out of doors'.[10] MPs were speaking not only to their immediate parliamentary audience but also to a large popular movement that demanded reform. Alexander Somerville, working as a gardener's labourer during the debates on the first and second readings of the English reform bill, attested to the extra-parliamentary interest in what MPs actually said: 'The speeches were perused with intense interest, even in such places so socially remote as our bothy'.[11] When the duke

[7] For how different national groups of MPs voted on the reform bills see Gordon Pentland, 'Radicalism and Reform in Scotland, 1820-1833' unpublished Ph.D. thesis (University of Edinburgh, 2004), 291.

[8] Rusticus, *Letter to the Right Hon. Earl of Minto* (Edinburgh, 1831), 5.

[9] Mark O'Neill and Ged Martin, 'A Backbencher on Parliamentary Reform, 1831-1832', *Historical Journal*, 23 (1980) 539-63.

[10] For arguments for a cohesive political culture in Britain and for the influence of the English Political Unions on Parliament see Peter Jupp, *British Politics on the Eve of Reform: The Duke of Wellington's Administration, 1828-30* (London, 1998); Nancy D. LoPatin, *Political Unions, Popular Politics and the Great Reform Act of 1832* (London, 1999).

[11] Alexander Somerville, *The Autobiography of a Working Man* (London, 1848: reprint, 1951), 91.

of Buccleuch made what reformers believed were false representations of their motives, he received detailed refutations of his speeches in the post.[12] There was thus a good deal of interaction between Parliament and the popular movement for reform. Just as the actions and arguments of the popular reform movement could be materially affected by what was said and done in Parliament, so could the speeches and votes of MPs be influenced by experience or perceptions of what was happening outside of Westminster.

With this large reform movement in Scotland claiming to represent the voice of 'the nation', and a reform measure that sought a fundamental change in Scotland's position within Britain, both reformers and anti-reformers attempted to capture the language of patriotism. This aspect of the reform question ought to be seen in the context of wider historiographical debate. George Davie's monumental *The Democratic Intellect*, in attributing to the anglicisation of Scottish universities in the nineteenth century a destructive impact on Scottish culture and institutions, identified a dynamic that seems applicable to the Whig reforms of 1832.[13] Nicholas Phillipson's work on the reform of the Court of Session is, however, more valuable in exploring this aspect of the reform debate. The fundamental remodelling of the Court, an immobile Scottish institution protected by powerful vested interests and the Union settlement, provides a close analogy for the issue of Scottish parliamentary reform. The reform aimed at, which had a long lineage but was only completed in 1830, was to introduce trial by jury into the ordinary forms of the Court of Session. Such a reform might be viewed as a clear case of assimilation, straightforwardly giving to Scotland the benefits of a much-vaunted English liberty. Phillipson, however, examined the contested nature of this process, whereby both Whigs and Tories might oppose the reform if it were not seen to be in the best interests of Scotland, though many found they could do so only through 'an ideology of noisy inaction', which might accept the inevitability of assimilation, but remained concerned about its impact on Scottish society and institutions.[14] The language of patriotism was similarly contested in the consideration of parliamentary reform, and no party achieved a monopoly on its use. Just as simple categories of pro- and anti-reform only inadequately reflect the complexity of debate, so too do notions of a bi-polar

[12] Edinburgh, National Archives of Scotland [NAS], Buccleuch Muniments, GD224/507/32, David Brown to the duke of Buccleuch, 20 April 1831.

[13] George Elder Davie, *The Democratic Intellect: Scotland and her Universities in the Nineteenth Century* (Edinburgh, 1961). A similar interpretation of Scottish politics, where a patriotic pre-1832 governing class offering effectual government is contrasted with the 'ruthless anglicisation' of the Whigs, is offered in Michael Fry, *The Dundas Despotism* (Edinburgh, 1992), 379-84.

[14] Nicholas Phillipson, *The Scottish Whigs and the Reform of the Court of Session, 1785-1830* (Edinburgh, 1990); Nicholas Phillipson, 'Nationalism and Ideology' in J. N. Wolfe (ed.), *Government and Nationalism in Scotland: An Enquiry by the Members of the University of Edinburgh* (Edinburgh, 1969), 167-188. Davie's Anglicisation thesis has also been convincingly questioned in subsequent work on Scottish education, especially R. D. Anderson, *Education and Opportunity in Victorian Scotland* (Oxford, 1983), 358-61.

confrontation between Anglophile 'assimilationists' and defenders of Scottish 'semi-independence' oversimplify this particular aspect of it.[15]

This article will therefore consider parliamentary reform as it was debated in Parliament and in the ranks of the Scottish political elite. The principal Scottish debates on parliamentary reform occurred on the introduction of the three successive Scottish reform bills. Lord John Russell's introduction of the government plan of reform on 1 March 1831 was followed on 9 March by his asking leave to bring in the Scottish bill.[16] Following the government's defeat on Gascoyne's amendment, and the subsequent general election, the next major debate followed the reintroduction of the bill, when Jeffrey moved a second reading on 23 September.[17] The final major debates took place on Jeffrey asking leave to bring in another bill in January 1832, after the rejection of the English bill by the House of Lords in October, and on its second reading in May.[18] Over this two-year period, however, Scottish reform was debated constantly. The political elite avidly followed the progress of the various bills in the press, and last ditch amendments or clauses could quickly stimulate debate. These less publicised issues provided fora for the discussion going on among Scotland's political elite.

*

In the first instance, it is important to realise that what MPs debated was the reform of a representative system that was peculiar to Scotland. While the Act of Union had determined that Scotland would return forty-five representatives to the House of Commons, it had left the franchise and other electoral machinery largely untouched. This system had ensured that, by 1830, Scotland's whole electorate was probably less than 4,500 in a population of 2,300,000.[19] The reform critique focused on the system that produced this narrow electorate, and highlighted two principal grievances. First, it condemned the county franchise, which was based largely on a statute of 1681 and had been increasingly open to abuse. In particular, the creation of 'fictitious' or 'faggot' votes on the qualification provided by the feudal superiority over land rather than ownership of the land itself, was condemned as a practice that led to aristocratic domination and illegitimate influence.[20] Second, it highlighted the oligarchic system of municipal government, whereby sitting town councils elected their own successors on the authority of a statute of 1469. If this was seen as a recipe for corruption and mismanagement in

15 Lindsay Paterson, *The Autonomy of Modern Scotland* (Edinburgh, 1994), 46-72.

16 For the major Scottish contributions to these debates see *Parl. Debs.*, 3rd ser., ii, 1144-60, 1182-7, iii, 59-81, 125-43, 317-25.

17 *Ibid.*, vii, 527-80.

18 *Ibid.*, ix, 632-45, xii, 1175-1209.

19 Norman Gash, *Politics in the Age of Peel: A Study in the Technique of Parliamentary Representation 1830-1850* (London, 1953), 36.

20 For the representative system in the Scottish counties see William Ferguson, 'The Electoral System in the Scottish Counties before 1832', *Stair Society Miscellany*, 2 (1984) 261-94.

local government the fact that these councils, grouped together in districts of burghs, also returned Scotland's burgh MPs meant that municipal and parliamentary reform in the Scottish context were but two sides of the same coin.[21] A final point to make about the Scottish franchises and electorate is that in their narrowness they stood in marked contrast to those in Ireland and England. There were, of course, serious reform arguments that applied to the representative system throughout the United Kingdom, but there was broad agreement that unique features in Scotland's representation made it the very worst component of this system. Indeed, by December of 1831, Lord Holland was convinced that even the most extreme English anti-reformers would concede reform in Scotland 'for the old system there is admitted to be too preposterous to be defended'.[22] The peculiarities of Scotland's system would thus become a key battleground in the arguments between reformers and anti-reformers.

Indeed, the narrowness of the Scottish system meant that the majority of Scottish MPs had little to gain from parliamentary reform, and they remained the most trenchant opponents of the government's legislation. In England, as D. C. Moore has demonstrated, the forty shilling freeholder franchise in the counties had increasingly allowed voters from urban areas without separate representation to undermine the landed interest in industrial counties.[23] English reform might, therefore, garner support from landholders who would welcome redistribution plans that would remove this urban influence from the county representation. In Scotland, a restrictive franchise ensured that neither county nor burgh MPs were exposed to such pressures and, consequently, could oppose reform as being materially against their own interests.[24] They were, of course, exposed to the pressure of public opinion, which, if it could not exert much direct electoral influence, might affect the opinions of both electors and elected indirectly. Although a majority of Scottish MPs, particularly before the general election of 1831, voted consistently against the government bills, few were willing to take to their feet and explain their opposition to Scottish reform in the initial debates. Even fewer were prepared, following the public reaction that had vilified the duke of Wellington and William Dundas, the MP for Edinburgh, to declare against the necessity of any reform.

[21] For the representative system in the Scottish Burghs see Michael Dyer, 'Burgh Districts and the Representation of Scotland, 1707-1983', *Parliamentary History* 15 (1996) 287-307; D. W. Hayton (ed.), *The History of Parliament: the House of Commons, 1690-1715*, (5 vols, Cambridge, 2002), i, 161-77; Edward Porrit, *The Unreformed House of Commons: Parliamentary Representation before 1832* (2 vols, Cambridge, 1903), ii, 115-42.

[22] NLS, Correspondence of J. A. Murray, MS 19735, fo. 65, Lord Holland to J. A. Murray, 14 Dec. 1831.

[23] D. C. Moore, 'Concession or Cure: The Sociological Premises of the First Reform Act', *Historical Journal* 9 (1966) 39-59.

[24] For the representative system in the Scottish counties see Ferguson, 'The electoral system in the Scottish counties before 1832', 261-94.

Those who opposed reform certainly could not do so with the confidence they had during the 1820s and earlier. Although we should not overemphasise the transformative effect of the period, the idea that parliamentary reform in Scotland could be opposed by invoking the inviolability of the Union settlement had taken a decisive beating. Though reformers had consistently argued that the abolition of heritable jurisdictions in 1747 had decisively proved the mutability of the settlement, the constitutional changes effected by the repeal of the Test and Corporation Acts in 1828 and particularly the concession of Catholic Emancipation the following year, demonstrated the power of the Parliament to amend the terms of the Union.[25] This certainly had an impact on some Scottish members, who had to abandon or reconfigure arguments that they had levelled against political reform before 1828. Sir George Clerk, the MP for the county of Edinburgh, had argued against Lord Archibald Hamilton's motion to amend the Scottish county representation in 1823 that the terms of the Union utterly forbade such a measure, but had to concede by 1831 that 'the change proposed was within the power of Parliament'.[26]

In any case, constitutional immutability had never been the principal argument deployed against reform, and those who opposed it more often rested their claims on a more nuanced and flexible interpretation of the constitution. In 1831 those who opposed reform, as they had done in the 1820s, tended to appeal to Burkean notions of an essentially prescriptive constitution. This argument had important common and natural law antecedents and posited a constitution which had proved itself ideally suited to the practical needs of the people and had evolved over time, amended by the experience of generations.[27] The argument was decisively stated in the context of the French Revolution, and could provide a definitive case against the pursuit of the kind of 'speculative' reform that had characterised the proceedings of the revolutionaries and had found a popular audience in Britain through the writings of Thomas Paine. Burke had sought to establish that the experience of generations, which had amended practical abuses as they became apparent

[25] This absolute parliamentary sovereignty in some ways remained, of course, ambiguous and contested, as the Ten Years' Conflict and the Disruption of the Church of Scotland would demonstrate after 1833; see Michael Fry, 'The Disruption and the Union' in Stewart J. Brown and Michael Fry (eds), *Scotland in the Age of Disruption* (Edinburgh, 1993), 31-43; H. T. Dickinson, 'The Ideological Debate on the British Constitution in the Late Eighteenth and Early Nineteenth Centuries' in Andrea Romano (ed.), *Il Modello Costituzionale Inglese e la sua Recezione nell'area Mediterranea tra la fine del 700 e la prima metà dell '800* (Milan, 1998), 166-77.

[26] *Parl. Debs.*, 2nd ser., ix, 623 and 3rd ser., iii, 126. Sir George Clerk (1787-1867) was MP for the county of Edinburgh 1811-32 and then again 1835-7 and was connected to the Dundas interest. He was a lord of the admiralty 1819-27 and 1828-30 and under-secretary for the Home department in the last few months of Wellington's administration.

[27] J. G. A. Pocock, 'Burke and the Ancient Constitution: A Problem in the History of Ideas', *Historical Journal* 3 (1960) 125-43; Paul Lucas, 'On Edmund Burke's Doctrine of Prescription: Or, an Appeal from the New to the Old Lawyers', *Historical Journal* 11 (1968) 35-63.

and produced the constitution in its present form, had to be preferred to the theoretical approach of individuals or single generations.[28]

Such arguments were still the meat and drink of much political debate, and those who opposed the bill consistently represented it as a 'speculative' or 'theoretical' measure, and sought to highlight the manifold dangers of adopting such an approach to Britain's political institutions.[29] The argument had more force in the Scottish context, where reformers had long pointed to the total insufficiency of Scottish representation and the consequent need for its complete reform. This suspicion of theory was perhaps bolstered by the involvement of the Scottish bill's architects, Francis Jeffrey, the Lord Advocate, and Henry Cockburn, the Solicitor-General, in political economy through the *Edinburgh Review*. Furthermore, in Parliament, prominent Scots like Jeffrey and Sir James Mackintosh, pressed the point that while the notion of 'restoration' was applicable to the English context, it certainly could not be used in reference to Scotland, where a total absence of popular representation meant that political arrangements essentially had to be devised from scratch. Anti-reformers seized on such arguments and lost no opportunity to point out the dangers of such an approach. Sir George Murray, MP for Perthshire, explained his continued opposition to the bill in September 1831 by suggesting that while the English bill certainly made great changes to her ancient institutions 'the Scotch Bill went far beyond that, as it completely overturned and destroyed the system of Representation which had existed in that portion of the empire both before and subsequent to the Union'.[30] The ministers were examples of men who 'looked not to practical good through experience, but to theoretical good through speculation', and the House need only look so far as France for an example of the turmoil that came with 'destroying the ancient institutions, and of overturning the social edifices that had existed for generations'.[31]

Members who opposed the bills frequently invoked the spectre of the French Revolution to oppose the speculative reform of Britain's institutions. Lord Francis Leveson Gower, MP for Sutherland, claimed to remember the anarchy caused by the French Revolution and was alarmed by the open display in Britain of the tricolour flag 'the emblem and forerunner of revolution in other countries'.[32] All MPs operated

[28] Edmund Burke, *Reflections on the Revolution in France* (London, 1790); H. T. Dickinson, *Liberty and Property: Political Ideology in Eighteenth-Century Britain* (London, 1977), 270-318.

[29] It was a common trope in criticism of the Whigs that 'they followed abstract principle, without regarding other considerations'; 'Parties', *Blackwood's Edinburgh Magazine* [*Blackwood's*] 28 (1830) 90.

[30] *Parl. Debs.*, 3rd ser., vii, 566. Sir George Murray (1772-1846) had been an officer during the French Revolutionary and Napoleonic Wars and served as Wellington's quartermaster-general in the Peninsula 1809-14. He sat for Perthshire in the Dundas interest 1824-32 and held various offices during his career, most notably as colonial secretary under Wellington 1828-30.

[31] *Ibid.*, 571-2.

[32] *Ibid.*, ii, 1150.

within the ideological context bequeathed by the French Revolution, and the lesson emphasised by those who opposed reform was that taught by Burke—speculative reform led to revolution. Indeed, for Lord Gower, the two were inseparable, and he eulogised the memory of men like Pitt, Windham and Canning who 'boldly placed themselves between the Constitution and that dreaded plague, Reform, which was but another word for revolution'.[33] Such assertions were doubtless given extra force by the continuing instability of Europe after another, albeit more moderate, revolution in France had overthrown Charles X in the 'glorious three days' of July 1830. This tendency of the opponents of reform to interpret domestic politics in a European context, and particularly through the prism of the 1790s, was given sustained expression in the series of thirteen articles 'On Parliamentary Reform and the French Revolution' penned by Archibald Alison for *Blackwood's*.[34] It was not only the opponents of reform, of course, who believed that Continental events were relevant to domestic reform, and the government too was anxiously following events in France. In January 1832, perhaps with the revolt of the Lyon silk-workers in November 1831 in mind, Jeffrey informed Cockburn: 'I am sure we are very uneasy at the ticklish state of things in France. If monarchy is again cast down there, there will be war and revolution all over the continent.'[35]

If opponents of reform had largely retreated from an argument based on the inviolability of the provisions of the Union, they were not deprived of the ability to portray themselves as patriotic defenders of Scotland's peculiar position since 1707. The predisposition to value experience over theory provided opponents of the bill with their most frequently employed arguments. It allowed for the defence of irregularity and the apparently haphazard nature of Britain's representative system, which, nevertheless, perfectly represented all interests. In looking back to the reform crisis, and reflecting on the results of the legislation, Archibald Alison recalled the predictions he had made at the time and which he now believed had been confirmed:

> […] the Reform Bill would destroy the virtual representation of the colonies, which had grown up with the purchase of the close boroughs by colonial wealth; close the avenue by which the highest and most disinterested talent had hitherto obtained an entrance into the Legislature; vest supreme political power in a single class […] to the exclusion of the varied

[33] *Ibid.*, 1147.

[34] [Archibald Alison], 'On Parliamentary Reform and the French Revolution [nos. I-XIII]', *Blackwood's* 29-31 (1831-32). Archibald Alison (1792-1867) had been made an Advocate-Depute in 1822 and lost this post when the reform government came to power in 1830. He turned to journalism to make a living and in his thirteen articles in *Blackwood's* he expounded some of the arguments that would form the basis of his most famous work, the *History of Europe during the French Revolution* (1833-42). For an analysis of Alison's political journalism see Maurice Milne, 'Archibald Alison: Conservative Controversialist', *Albion* 27 (1995) 419-43; Michael Michie, *An Enlightenment Tory in Victorian Scotland* (East Linton, 1997), 159-71.

[35] NLS, Adv. MSS, 9.1.8, fo. 119, Francis Jeffrey to Henry Cockburn, 18 Jan. 1832; Sharif Gemie, *French Revolutions, 1815-1914* (Edinburgh, 1999), 44-62.

> interest which had hitherto divided the powers and attracted the attention of Government from all the different quarters of the empire.[36]

It was by a similar argument that the singularity of Scotland's arrangements could be justified in Parliament. It was a defence of Scotland's semi-independence since the Union, but one premised on the practical results of this arrangement, rather than on simple invocations of its immutability. One manner in which this had been done before 1830 was to maintain that the British system could only be appreciated when viewed in its entirety. Lord Binning had used this argument to justify his opposition to James Abercromby's motion to amend the representation of Edinburgh in 1824.[37] This position had, however, been undermined by the Wellington administration's disfranchisement of some 200,000 Irish forty-shilling freeholders as a security for the passing of Catholic Emancipation in 1829. The argument was still voiced throughout the reform crisis, and Alison defended the existing system by pointing to the constitutional balance maintained by the 'popular' and 'aristocratic' interests being predominant in different parts of the country: 'Cornwall and Scotland are the great fortresses of the aristocratic; London and the manufacturing districts, of the democratic factions.'[38] By October 1831, however, Lord Binning, now the earl of Haddington and sitting in the Lords, was compelled to follow the logic of his own earlier position. Though he still opposed the government's bill, he was convinced of the necessity of political reform in Scotland, which he had only resisted before on the basis that 'it would be impossible to introduce it without its being followed by a Reform of the Representation in England'.[39] Now that it was proposed to alter the representation in all three kingdoms, an argument that sought the maintenance of Scottish singularity as a check on political arrangements elsewhere was unsustainable.

In fact, the principal argument against reform of Scotland's representation, though still deriving from the notion of a prescriptive constitution, rested on less well-defined notions of the singularity of Scotland, her people and her institutions. It was delivered by Lord Gower during the debate on the English reform bill and formed the first defence of Scotland's representation. Certainly, he argued, were one to suggest a change in Scotland's parliamentary representation to the shade of Fletcher of Saltoun, 'the last of Scotchmen', he might recount the political and religious partisanship, the oppression of the lower orders and the corruption of his own day. Fletcher, or any noble-minded contemporary of his, claimed Gower, would doubtless assent to such political reform.[40] Gower then considered the present state of Scotland and,

[36] Archibald Alison, *Some Account of My Life and Writings: An Autobiography,* 2 vols, (Edinburgh, 1883), i, 305.
[37] *Parl. Debs.*, 2nd ser., x, 472.
[38] [Alison], 'Parliamentary Reform and the French Revolution, No. III', *Blackwood's*, 29 (1831) 440.
[39] *Parl. Debs.*, 3rd ser., viii, 60-1.
[40] *Ibid.*, ii, 1144-5.

seeking to subvert Whig reform arguments, he cannily took his evidence from an influential pro-reform article by Henry Cockburn, which had appeared in the *Edinburgh Review* in October 1830. The article, while lamenting the lack of political representation, painted a rosy picture of the state of Scottish society, and Gower cited word for word Cockburn's praise of the general education and peacefulness of Scotland's rapidly increasing population and her 'generally diffused wealth'.[41]

By this argument, what was important was not the theory behind Scotland's political arrangements, but the results they produced. These were, in post-Union Scotland's case, an enviable level of material prosperity and civilisation. This defence was one premised on the singularity of Scotland's position after 1707, retaining peculiar institutions and an increasingly educated people who, however, sensibly avoided claiming abstract political rights and, according to Lord Stormont, 'preferred peace to revolution; they wanted to have their ancient institutions preserved to them, and they wanted to be left alone. In short, they preferred their own institutions, founded on practice to any the noble lord could offer them founded on theory.'[42] It was a patriotic argument that celebrated Scotland's progress since 1707, but which sought to defend its chartered rights and institutions as then secured. This argument could attribute Scotland's present advanced position not to the effects of the Union and the reflected freedom and 'intrinsic excellence of the English constitution', but rather to Scotland's own peculiar institutions and historical development.[43] Thus, for Alison, Scotland's progress did derive from a 'long and unparalleled series of beneficent legislation' but the origins of this were in the period before 1707: 'All the great foundations of public prosperity […] were laid by the Scottish legislature prior to the English Union.'[44] The Union had indeed brought good government, but it was good government only because it left Scotland alone to flourish under its own excellent institutions.[45] When reformers were believed to be indifferent to the peculiar arrangements that had produced such results, arguments could be made that were nationalistic and anti-English.

This was bolstered by the impression among opponents of the bill, that insufficient time was devoted to consideration of Scottish reform, the introduction of which was disposed of within one hour late at night.[46] In light of this perceived neglect of Scottish legislation, opponents might represent the largely English cabinet as a crude, centralising force, indifferent to the Scottish aspects of the reform question. When he was defeated by a reform candidate in the election for the

41 *Ibid.*, 1145-6; [Henry Cockburn], 'Parliamentary Representation of Scotland', *Edinburgh Review* 52 (1830) 208-9.
42 *Parl. Debs.*, 3rd ser., ii, 1187.
43 [Alison], 'Parliamentary Reform and the French Revolution, No. XI', *Blackwood's* 30 (1831) 775.
44 *Ibid.*, 777.
45 *Ibid.*, 773-4.
46 *Parl. Debs.*, 3rd ser., iii, 317-25.

Selkirk burghs in May 1831, James Johnston of Alva levelled a particularly virulent and nationalistic blow at the Whig administration:

> […] even the Lord Advocate did not know; by his own confession, Ministers had not confided to him what their intentions were; so that in effect Scotland was to have laws made for her by Englishmen, who knew nothing about the country. Was it to be endured, that we, countrymen of Bruce and Wallace, should submit to receive laws from the descendants of those men whom our heroic ancestors had beaten in the field; and that we were to have their plan of government forced down our throats.[47]

The defence of the singularity of Scotland's position necessitated interpretations of the Scottish people for whom opponents of the reform bill purported to be acting, and of the movement that was vociferously demanding reform outside Parliament. One approach was to maintain that the Scots remained peaceable and uninterested in political reform. This, however, became increasingly difficult to sustain and the more typical approach was to represent the reform agitation as temporary, the result of peculiar circumstances rather than well-informed and deeply-held convictions on the part of the Scottish people. Lord Gower attributed the movement not to 'the force of argument' but rather to 'a concurrence of circumstances and from events which had taken place on the Continent' and expressed confidence in March 1831 that a reaction would not be long in coming.[48] Perhaps the most common explanation for the agitation was to attribute it, as Sir George Warrender did, to the 'firebrand' of the ministerial bill.[49] Correspondents of the duke of Buccleuch assured him that 'if the mobility were let alone' there would be no reform meetings, and lamented and vilified the narrow and dangerous tactics of government: 'Excitement alone is the ministerial weapon of offence or defence, and this in the end will work their own ruin'.[50]

Opponents of the bill, like Lord Loughborough, also expressed the conviction that support for the reform bill in Scotland came from the 'distress which pervaded all classes' and the belief that reform would provide remedies for material grievances.[51] One pamphlet written by 'a Freeholder and Landholder of Scotland' suggested that the lower orders would ever remain discontented with their lot and desire change. This clamour should not be regarded as an expression of political beliefs, but a call for material improvement: 'what they desire is not a change in government, but a change in their circumstances'.[52] It was this

47 *Scotsman*, 25 May 1831.
48 *Parl. Debs.*, 3rd ser., ii, 1147.
49 *Ibid.*, vii, 547.
50 NAS, Buccleuch Muniments, GD224/507/65, Capt. T. W. O. Brown to the duke of Buccleuch, 14 May 1832; GD224/507/56, William Burn to the duke of Buccleuch, 17 May 1832.
51 *Parl. Debs.*, 3rd ser., xii, 1187.
52 A Freeholder and Landholder of Scotland [J. C. Colquhoun], *The Constitutional Principles of Parliamentary Reform* (Edinburgh, 1831), 64. J. C. Colquhoun of Killermont,

interpretation of the motives of the lower orders that could move Sir Charles Forbes in the Commons, and the duke of Buccleuch in the Lords, to claim that reform petitions had been put in gin shops to be signed.[53] When potential subscribers asked what the benefits of reform would be, Forbes claimed they were persuaded to sign by the answer 'they would have whisky for nothing; that there would be no gaugers, and that all would be quite free'.[54] These sorts of petitions were worthless when set next to the petitions against the bill from what he and others considered as the true representatives of Scottish opinion and the watchdogs of the constitution, the freeholders in the counties.[55] It was a similar profound distrust of the people which saw Sir William Rae qualify the image of them as peaceable in the opening debates: 'He regretted the extension of the franchise, because it was well-known that Scotchmen seldom came together in a multitude without causing bloodshed, or at least riot'.[56] This view of the incapacity of the people, or at least the lower orders, to engage in respectable politics, coloured the responses of opponents of the bill to the various stages of the reform crisis. Rae restated his position following a rash of election disturbances in May 1831 and cited these as 'proof of its correctness', a sentiment supported by Clerk.[57] *Blackwood's* was triumphant that the much vilified Rae had been vindicated and that, at the first opportunity, the people 'broke out into the very excesses which had been foretold by those who knew them best'.[58]

The elections themselves also rendered the immediate political context more problematic for those Scottish MPs who had opposed the bill, and particularly for those who had voted for Gascoyne's

52 (*Continued*) who became MP for Dumbartonshire at the first reformed general election in 1832, wrote several pamphlets during the reform crisis, which were denounced by the radical press; see for example *Reformers' Gazette*, 8 Dec. 1832.

53 Sir Charles Forbes (1779-1852) was MP for Malmesbury 1818-32 and is a prime example of a Scot who had spent his earlier career in India before sitting for an English borough. He was a strong opponent of the reform bills, although he was one of the first to argue that, because the franchise was based on property, women ought not to be excluded from its enjoyment.

54 *Parl. Debs.*, 3rd ser., iii, 1244; For Buccleuch's comments *Ibid.*, 1320-1. The duke of Buccleuch had such opinions confirmed for him by reports from the country, a teacher from near Falkirk describing the agitation there as stemming from promises made that reform would provide 'cheap meal—low priced provisions—little work—cheap whisky'; NAS, Buccleuch Muniments, GD224/507/36, John Mitchell to the duke of Buccleuch, 6 Nov. 1831.

55 See speeches of the earl of Haddington and the duke of Wellington on presenting petitions from counties of Edinburgh and Dumbarton; *Parl. Debs.*, 3rd ser., iii, 1313-17, 1321-2.

56 *Ibid.*, 324. Sir William Rae (1769-1842) was Lord Advocate for successive Tory governments between 1819 and 1830 and then again under Peel in 1834-5 and after 1841. He was fiercely attacked by the reform movement for his outspoken comments in debate and his record of sitting for small constituencies (Anstruther Burghs, 1819-26; Harwich, 1826-30; Bute, 1830-1; Portarlington, 1831-2).

57 *Parl. Debs.*, 3rd ser., iv, 363-4.

58 [Alison], 'Parliamentary Reform and the French Revolution, No. VI', *Blackwood's* 29 (1831) 921.

amendment. With a ministry now sure of carrying the principle of the bill in the House of Commons, few Scottish MPs ventured to oppose the reform bill in its entirety, instead seeking to minimise its impact by amending the proposed redistribution of seats. Essentially, they now styled themselves as 'moderate reformers' no longer opposing the principle of reform itself, but only the theoretical provisions that would upset the balance of a prescriptive constitution. Crucially, the approach from prescription precluded only the kind of theoretical reform from which the dangers of revolution might be feared. Those who opposed the reform bills were thus able to argue that it was only this type of sweeping reform that was anathema to them, while many, such as Sir George Clerk, MP for the county of Edinburgh, could emphasise that they were prepared to 'alter and amend'.[59] This altered mode of opposition was more prevalent after the general election and had one principal political aim—the protection of the landed interest from what Charles Douglas, the MP for Lanarkshire, described as 'a direct attack on the agriculturalists'.[60]

If it was in their interests to attack the proposed plan of redistribution, when the Scottish bill was placed next to the English measure anti-reformers were presented with an issue that allowed them to make stronger claims for the patriotic high ground. A prominent theme in nearly all speeches by erstwhile anti-reformers after the general election was that, in terms of the number of additional seats she was offered, justice was not being done to Scotland. The liberal press was apt to denounce the sham patriotism of these 'grovelling and false-hearted Scotsmen' especially because many of those who clamoured for extra seats had also voted for Gascoyne's motion in April, which had ensured that none of these might come from the English representation.[61] The arguments with which opponents of the bill supported this position were, however, consistent with earlier approaches. Accepting the principle of the bill as a *fait accompli*, the progress of Scotland within the Union was now mobilised as an argument for extra members, as it was by Colonel Lindsay:

> […] this Bill did not give a fair proportion of Members to Scotland, considering the wealth and population of that country. The proportion had long been settled, and being altered, as it was now proposed to be, the Articles of Union were violated; while, at the same time, justice was not done to Scotland.[62]

While the unreformed representation had been beyond the wit of man, full of anomalies and not reducible to any theory, it had been perfect in its practical results. It was this kind of argument which had been

[59] *Parl. Debs.*, 3rd ser., iii, 126.
[60] *Ibid.*, vii, 539.
[61] *Scotsman*, 23 April 1831.
[62] *Parl. Debs.*, 3rd ser., vii, 551-2.

deployed to defend the existence of the nominal or rotten boroughs in England. These, as well as providing the opportunities for the representation of imperial interests and for talented men of small fortune to enter Parliament without a ruinous contest, also served to supplement Scotland's inadequate representation. Sir George Murray had premised his support for Gascoyne's amendment on his belief that 'the number of Scotchmen was greater now than it would be under the new system, for it was well known that great numbers of Scotchmen sat for English boroughs'.[63] Indeed, the Lord Advocate himself was in the position of sitting for Lord Fitzwilliam's pocket borough of Malton until the general election of 1831. The wholesale changes being made to a system that achieved such advantageous results for Scotland could thus allow Warrender, in January 1832, to claim that Scotland had an additional right to extra members because of 'the facility with which Scotch Gentlemen had hitherto obtained seats in that House, through the medium of close English boroughs'.[64]

Members who lamented the demolition of this practically perfect system thus charged government with introducing a reform that was theoretical, yet did not apply this theory equally across the three kingdoms. Sir George Murray made the case at length in calling for more seats to represent the Scottish counties and demanding that in new-modelling the representation 'all parts of the empire ought to have been treated fairly … According to the principles of the Bill, however, Scotland was not fairly treated'.[65] This patriotic argument was even used to attempt to stimulate a popular reaction against the reform measure, and an Edinburgh bill poster from June 1832, *Scotland's Appeal to her Sons*, addressed itself 'to all Scotsmen, *whether Whigs or Tories, Reformers or Anti-Reformers*'. It claimed that the object of British government, prosecuted by any party, had always been 'to insult and degrade SCOTLAND to the situation of a CONQUERED PROVINCE' and indicted the reform bill for suggesting 'that TWENTY-EIGHT ENGLISHMEN are equal in all respects to FORTY-FOUR SCOTSMEN'. To redress this injustice it exhorted all Scots to call meetings to petition for more seats and for the same rules to be applied equitably to Scotland and England, and asked 'because Scotland was cheated at the Union, does that afford any good reason for her being ALWAYS cheated?' The poster ended this patriotic harangue by citing twelve lines from 'Scots wha hae'.[66]

*

If there was thus no single or coherent ideological defence of the unreformed representation or assault on the proposed reform, the supporters of reform also deployed idiosyncratic arguments and appealed to the

[63] *Ibid.*, iii, 1653.
[64] *Ibid.*, ix, 634.
[65] *Ibid.*, 638.
[66] NAS, Buccleuch Muniments, GD224/507/31, Scotland's Appeal to her Sons [printed].

language of patriotism. Of all the political groupings of the early nineteenth century the Whigs had the best claim to be an organised party, although this was true only in a partial sense. Even the appointment of Wellington's government in 1828 had not served to unite them and, while they became more organised and coherent towards the end of 1830, they remained a broad church, comprehending different positions on parliamentary reform.[67] The cabinet formed by earl Grey to prosecute reform reflected this breadth, incorporating liberal Tories and one ultra Tory in the duke of Richmond, as well as Whigs of differing ideological hues.[68] D. C. Moore advanced sophisticated sociological arguments for interpreting this mixed political elite's espousal of reform as an essentially conservative measure, a constitutional 'cure' designed to maintain the steadily eroding power of the landed interest by creating 'deference communities' as parliamentary constituencies.[69] As John Milton-Smith argued, however, such an approach tends to generalisation and thus undervalues the complexity and flexibility of individual approaches to the reform question, and the specific political context in which the legislation was formed.[70] The coalition lacked one coherent justification for the measures it pursued, and was sustained and united by the common belief that reform was a matter of expediency, if for some it was also a matter of principle.[71] For the Scottish Whigs, there were two basic approaches to reform, which might be usefully defined as 'old' and 'new' Whig. These cannot be seen as distinct creeds, but rather as broad critiques, which mingled with one another, as they did with other ideologies, to produce idiosyncratic approaches to reform.

An old Whig approach to reform was certainly apparent, as we might expect from a ministry headed by Grey, whose recent biographers have portrayed him as 'above all, a Whig aristocrat of the eighteenth century, who lived through but never entirely accepted an age of rapid social and political change'.[72] Relying on much the same ideological inheritance, old Whig ideas about parliamentary reform could appear similar to more conservative critiques. In seeking to balance 'interests' and maintain the equilibrium of a tripartite constitution of king, Lords and Commons, this critique was similarly averse to speculation and favoured terms such as 'amending' or 'restoring'.[73] James Loch, MP for the Tain

67 Ian Newbould, *Whiggery and Reform, 1830-41* (London, 1990), 40-50; Jupp, *British Politics on the Eve of Reform*, 290-307; Peter Mandler, *Aristocratic Government in the Age of Reform: Whigs and Liberals, 1830-1852* (Oxford, 1990), 13-72.

68 For Grey's cabinet see G. M. Trevelyan, *Lord Grey of the Reform Bill* (London, 1920), 247-9; Newbould, *Whiggery and Reform*, 54-5.

69 D. C. Moore, *The Politics of Deference: A Study of the Mid-Nineteenth Century English Political System* (Hassocks, 1976), 137-190.

70 John Milton-Smith, 'Earl Grey's Cabinet and the Objects of Parliamentary Reform', *Historical Journal* 15 (1972) 55-74.

71 *Ibid.*, 62-3; Jonathan Parry, *The Rise and Fall of Liberal Government in Victorian Britain* (London, 1993), 72-86.

72 E. A. Smith, *Earl Grey, 1764-1845* (Oxford, 1990), 326; see also John W. Derry, *Charles, Earl Grey: Aristocratic Reformer* (Oxford, 1992).

73 Milton-Smith, 'Earl Grey's Cabinet', 65-6.

burghs after 1830, and more notorious as one of the architects of the Sutherland clearances, is indicative of this old Whig approach to political reform in Scotland. Loch was invited to submit a plan of reform to the Whig government in December 1830, and the scheme he offered was a clear reflection of old Whig ideas about political reform. His plan began by suggesting that the guiding principle of any parliamentary reform should be 'the corrections of those anomalies and abuses which the change of circumstances and the progress of some portions of the Country, more than others, has produced in the state of the representation'. Interestingly, he sought a county franchise for Scotland based on 'some Principle […] already existing in the Constitution of that Country', pre-empting those who would oppose reform on the basis that it destroyed Scotland's semi-independent constitutional arrangements.[74] As far as Loch was concerned, reform was about amending abuses, balancing different interests in a manner which maintained the influence of those possessing landed wealth, and doing so in line with the constitution or at least the traditions and institutions of Scotland.

The plans of reform advocated by men such as Loch before the introduction of the government's bills had more than a passing similarity to the kind of reform which opponents of those measures would come to advocate during the course of 1831.[75] Indeed, it is instructive as to the common political assumptions of much of the Scottish elite that Loch could, as early as December 1830, level criticisms against those chosen to draft the Scottish legislation, which pre-empted most of the arguments which would be levelled at Jeffrey in Parliament throughout 1831:

> […] now with all submission I must contend that no class of Men are less capable of advising on a practicable Question affecting the interests of all classes of the Country —they are theoretical in their views, exclusive in their Society contemning all who differ from them in opinion holding by far too cheap the general body of the Landed Proprs. of the Country […] Their object is to have a measure that will create a more perfect state of political condition than now exists. That I take it is not the object of Parliamentary Reform, which ought to aim at no more than doing away with the anomalies produced by time, and suiting your Institutions to such changes.[76]

This critique of the Edinburgh Reviewers, and implicitly of new Whig ideology, highlighted three main concerns about the approach to reform pursued by the architects of the Scottish legislation, all of which were superficially apparent in Cockburn's *Review* article of October 1830. First, Loch argued that the Reviewers' approach was not based on

[74] DUL, Grey Papers, GRE/B46/1/32, Mr. Loch's Plan of Reform for Scotland.

[75] Loch himself supported the Scottish bill in Parliament, voting for it but not speaking in its defence. For similar 'old Whig' approaches to Scottish reform see Alexander Dunlop, *Letter to the Freeholders of Dumbarton, on Parliamentary Reform* (Edinburgh, 1830); Sir John Sinclair, *Thoughts on Parliamentary Reform* (Edinburgh, 1831).

[76] NAS, Loch Muniments, GD268/29/2-3, James Loch to William Adam, 5 Dec. 1830.

principles of amending and preserving the existing, prescriptive constitution but was speculative. Cockburn had portrayed Scotland as lacking any representation whatever: 'there never has been, and while the existing system endures, there never can be, any thing resembling a real representation in Scotland'.[77] The existing system would, therefore, have to be dismantled and a new one raised in its place. Second, by adopting the theory of a uniform franchise, which was part of Cockburn's plan, it threatened to upset the delicate balance of interests, and particularly to destroy landed influence in Scotland.[78] Third, that it threatened to ignore the peculiarities of Scottish society in a project aimed at blind assimilation and ignored native opinion. Certainly, Cockburn had been scathing of the calibre of Scottish MPs and his article had begun by suggesting that it was impossible to see the elections in England 'without turning with sorrow and humiliation to Scotland'.[79] Loch's criticisms were voiced by a large number of the Scottish political elite, both Whig and Tory, throughout the reform crisis, and they provide a framework in which to investigate new Whig ideology and its influence on reform in Scotland.

New Whig ideas about reform owed a great deal to the Scottish tradition of conjectural history which argued that, while the past still provided a guide to actions, to it must be added sagacious conjectures with respect to the future. It had also moved away from discussion about what form of government was most meritorious, instead identifying commerce as the motor of society, and its maintenance as the ultimate aim of political institutions.[80] In practical political terms, this meant that, while abstract innovation remained dangerous, wise legislation must pursue the 'gradual and prudent accommodation of established institutions to the varying opinions, manners, and circumstances of mankind'.[81] This intellectual legacy was reinforced by personal relationships, which were especially apparent in the group influenced by the teaching of Dugald Stewart, professor of moral philosophy at Edinburgh University between 1785 and 1810. From this seat of learning Stewart taught an entire generation of Scottish and British politicians, including not only Cockburn and Jeffrey, but other figures prominent during the reform crisis such as Henry Brougham, Lord Palmerston and James Mill.[82] Responsibility for the Scottish reform measure devolved on two of Stewart's erstwhile students, Francis Jeffrey and Henry Cockburn, who acted in collaboration with key members of the Scottish political elite, most notably the MP for the Ayr burghs, Thomas Kennedy. What was marked in the opening

77 [Cockburn], 'Parliamentary Representation of Scotland', 209.
78 *Ibid.*, 224-5.
79 *Ibid.*, 208.
80 Biancamaria Fontana, *Rethinking the Politics of Commercial Society: The 'Edinburgh Review' 1802-1832* (Cambridge, 1985), 147-60.
81 Stefan Collini, Donald Winch and John Burrow, *That Noble Science of Politics: A Study in Nineteenth-Century Intellectual History* (Cambridge, 1983), 34.
82 *Ibid.*, 44.

debates was the relatively small number of speakers who spoke in support of the Scottish measure. Jeffrey's ideological defence of the bill was supplemented, not by speeches from MPs in Scottish seats, but those from Daniel O'Connell, MP for county Clare, and Joseph Hume, the Scottish radical who sat for Middlesex.[83] The situation improved after the general election, which afforded government two members who were passionate advocates of the bill and were prepared to defend it at length—William Gillon, MP for the Linlithgow burghs, and Robert Ferguson of Raith, MP for the Kirkcaldy burghs.[84] Older hands were also pitching in more consistently by this point, with Charles Grant, the President of the Board of Control and county MP for Inverness, and Sir James Mackintosh, sitting for Knaresborough, adding their weight to the government's case.[85]

In the opening debates, however, the Lord Advocate was largely left to his own devices. In presenting and defending the measure, the influence of conjectural history was most apparent in the powerful counter-argument made against the idea that Scotland's prosperity and improvement since 1707 rendered any innovation in her representation a dangerous pursuit. Jeffrey delivered a coherent attack on this notion in his speech during the debate on the introduction of reform in March 1831. He began by highlighting the high level of 'wealth, splendor, and cultivation' that England had achieved under the Tudors and Stuarts. This was evidence of the fact that 'for nations to attain a great measure of prosperity and an infinite measure of wealth, very little political freedom was necessary'.[86] Anti-reformers, according to Jeffrey, were peddling a fallacious argument which, in simply viewing the practical existence of prosperity and civilisation as proof positive of the adequacy of political arrangements, left no room for progress and utterly misrepresented the relationship between liberty and commercial prosperity. By invoking the examples of the Italian republics and the German trading towns of the middle ages, he sought to demonstrate the general principle, that it was commercial prosperity itself that created the desire for and necessity of political reform. Commercial growth was the motor of society, creating leisure time for education and cultivation, a process that imparted to increasing numbers in society 'a sense of dignity and independence, which led at once to the assertion of political power and importance'. By this argument 'liberty was the daughter, not the mother of riches'.[87] It was this approach, which relied heavily on the tenets of conjectural history, which allowed Jeffrey to derive a general theory of political reform: 'The fact was deducible from principles which admitted of no question, that as long as nations continue crescent and progressive in

[83] *Parl. Debs.*, 3rd ser., ii, 1156-60, iii, 190-6.
[84] *Ibid.*, vii, 540-7, 549-50.
[85] *Ibid.*, 553-5, 559-64.
[86] David Hume and Adam Smith had both argued that commerce and personal liberty could flourish under various forms of government; Collini *et al.*, *That Noble Science*, 30.
[87] *Parl. Debs.*, 3rd ser., iii, 61.

wealth they constantly and successively outgrow the dimensions of their political institutions.'[88]

The proof that reform was needed was simply the existence of reasonable and lasting discontent among those beneficiaries of commercial growth who had gained not only wealth but respectability and intelligence, and a concomitant right to claim to be represented. This reasonable discontent was certainly apparent to Jeffrey in the extra-parliamentary movement demanding reform, and the remedy lay in the enfranchisement of the middle classes through the medium of the ten-pound franchise.[89] The Scottish Whigs consistently identified a respectable middle class, whose enfranchisement was justified on grounds of expediency as well as principle. In contradistinction to this class, whose virtues and intelligence rendered them worthy of representation but whose exclusion from the constitution made them discontented, he described another:

> […] of far more desperate, and dangerous individuals—persons […] who utterly distrust and despise all the institutions of the country; who hate all law and authority, and aim directly, and with little disguise or equivocation, at the destruction of all property, and the abolition of all dignities.[90]

The great danger to be apprehended from resistance to reform was that the middle classes, if their claims were denied, would come to side with this dangerous faction with fatal consequences. Reformers also looked to the French Revolution and drew political lessons from it; their conclusions were, however, different from those of anti-reformers. James Abercromby was clear that avoidance of a similar fate to that of France's *ancien regime* depended upon the government passing a significant measure of reform that might 'unite such a large portion of the people, as to give us a fair chance of avoiding violence'.[91] If the bill miscarried, and particularly if it did so by the agency of the House of Lords, he was certain that the people would apply lessons learned from the French as well:

> If the Lords are rebellious, the people will not bear it, & they will denounce the Lds as the greatest of all national grievances. In this they will be encouraged by the example of France, where a hereditary Peerage is at a great discount. With such an example before their eyes it will be very difficult to save the Lords, & they may settle their own fate by being violent.[92]

88 *Ibid.*, 62.

89 For ideas about the 'middle class' during the reform debates see Dror Wahrman, *Imagining the Middle Class: The Political Representation of Class in Britain, c. 1780-1840* (Cambridge, 1995), 298-327; Fontana, *Rethinking the Politics of Commercial Society*, 154-8.

90 *Parl. Debs.*, 3rd ser., iii, 69.

91 James Abercromby (1776-1858) trained as a lawyer before becoming the auditor of the duke of Devonshire's estates and then MP for Midhurst 1807-12 and Calne 1812-30. He took a prominent role in Scottish questions in Parliament and had led the campaigns to reform Edinburgh's representation in 1824 and 1826. He was elected MP for Edinburgh alongside Jeffrey in the first reformed Parliament and became the first Scottish speaker of the House of Commons in 1835.

92 Royal Archives, Windsor Castle, Melbourne Papers, box 104/3, James Abercromby to Viscount Melbourne, undated.

In applying these principles to the Scottish representation, Jeffrey and other reformers certainly made no secret of the fact that innovative reform was what was required and, in September 1831, he and Sir James Mackintosh both took in the broad sweep of British history to defend a total change in Scotland's political arrangements. It was apparent to all that Scotland had advanced rapidly in wealth, population and education since 1707. Her political arrangements had also been fixed at the Union, and both Jeffrey and Mackintosh painted a bleak picture of seventeenth-century Scotland to demonstrate that this progress had been achieved, according to the earl of Rosebery 'not in consequence of its Representative system but in spite of it'.[93] Mackintosh asserted during the debate in September 1831:

> From whatever period the history of Scotland was looked at, from the time of the Union of the Crowns to the Union of the kingdoms, it was found that it had the same system of Representation it had up to the present day. Yet under that Parliamentary Constitution, and that system of Representation, Scotland became the scene of bloodshed—the theatre of atrocious crime—of cruel religious and civil wars, and of every horror that could barbarize a nation.[94]

Jeffrey similarly sought to defuse the argument that the same might be said of England by pointing to Scotland's backward state. In the seventeenth century her people were only motivated by religion and 'a gloomy fanaticism […] and while they suffered political oppressions unresisted, drew their swords at once for a scattered remnant and a broken covenant'. Scotland could therefore take no constructive part in 'the great outbreak and overflow of English liberty'.[95]

Scotland's subsequent rapid advance was thus attributable to the positive results of the Union rather than to 'its Parliamentary Constitution, or to its Representative system'. While this was most apparent in the commercial benefits of the Union, both Jeffrey and Mackintosh were prepared to give some credit for the improvement of the population and the political elite to the example set by free English institutions and political culture. This was, however, no substitute for direct access to the benefits of a free constitution, and Jeffrey stressed that he was in no way defending notions of 'virtual representation' when he asserted that 'Scotland had derived from England, not merely the benefit of greater liberality of ideas, but greater knowledge of political rights, and more respect for political duties'.[96] Jeffrey continued his analysis by pointing out that for the first fifty years of the Union, Scotland claimed no political rights and expressed no national feeling save over religion. This he

93 *Parl. Debs.*, 3rd ser., viii, 63.
94 *Ibid.*, vii, 561.
95 Similar arguments about 'the feudal Parliament of Scotland' and 'the barbarous state of society in that part of the kingdom' were made by Lord Brougham on moving the second reading of the Scottish reform bill on 4 July 1832; *Parl. Debs.*, 3rd ser., xiv, 55-62.
96 *Ibid.*, vii, 532-3.

attributed to 'a state of ignorance which the advantages of a rapidly increasing trade, and a more extended intercourse with other countries, have now so thoroughly dispelled'.[97]

Where there was division apparent in the arguments of Scottish reformers, it appeared over this attribution of Scotland's prosperity to the advantages of the Union. Some who supported the bill, approached the arguments of their opponents by rejecting Jeffrey and Mackintosh's approach and grounding their interpretation of Scottish progress in the specific institutions secured by the Union, rather than in that union itself and the benefits of English example. Andrew Johnstone, MP for the East Fife burghs, noted the prevalence of the argument 'that Scotland derived the chief of her present advantages, both in wealth and other respects, from the benefits which were conferred on her since her union with England' but argued that such benefits were 'chiefly the result of her own industry'. Such advantages had important origins in 'the chief of her popular institutions—namely, her Church', which had most certainly not arisen from the connection with England.[98] A pamphlet in support of the bill widened this praise of Scottish institutions, and highlighted not only a liberal and enlightened clergy, but also Scotland's legal and educational systems, and her poor law, 'things indigenous to our soil', as that 'to which Scotland, in reality, owes her prosperity'.[99] While the author acknowledged the manifest benefits of the Union 'to both kingdoms', he took issue with Jeffrey's gloomy portrait of pre-1707 Scotland, which had in fact struggled since the Romans 'for the sacred cause of her religion, her liberties and her independence'.[100]

All reformers argued, however, that in 1831 Scotland could boast an ever-increasing class of propertied, respectable and intelligent citizens who still laboured under the manifold disadvantages of a feudal system of representation that had been petrified in 1707. The reform argument was one for the completion of the Union, by granting Scotland access to the free institutions and representation that had been denied to her in 1707. Disagreement among reformers, as is suggested by Loch's comments, was over how far this process should proceed. For Jeffrey and Mackintosh there were no indigenous political and libertarian traditions to which they might appeal, and Mackintosh claimed that while it was fair to describe the English measure as 'a restoration of ancient principles' the same simply could not be true of Scotland. It was a mockery to suggest that the Scottish bill 'restored rights they had never possessed, and renewed a Constitution which they never enjoyed.'[101] Reform in Scotland would necessarily involve the wholesale replacement of the

[97] *Ibid.*, 534.
[98] *Ibid.*, xi, 1183.
[99] A Reforming Scottish Freeholder, *Letter to the Right Hon. Earl Grey, K. G. First Lord of the Treasury, &c. &c. &c. on the Inadequacy of the Proposed Number of Representatives Allotted to Scotland* (Edinburgh, 1832), 15-16.
[100] *Ibid.*, 16-20.
[101] *Parl. Debs.*, 3rd ser., vii, 560.

existing feudal arrangements. Jeffrey made no secret of this aim when he introduced the second bill to the Commons, and gave a radical statement of intent that was anathema to many more conservative members:

> He would then at once declare that the object of the Bill was not to take away any part of the system, but to take down the whole of it, to take it down altogether, for the whole principle of it was bad. He gloried in making the avowal that no shred or rag, no jot or tittle of it was to be left.[102]

In the light of this rather radical statement, perhaps the aspect of Loch's critique which needs most detailed consideration is that which has been repeated by historians, that in remodelling the representation the Scottish Whigs were aiming at assimilation.[103] It is clear that they did see the reform act as the emancipation of Scotland from a native feudal political system, or as Cockburn more colourfully put it: 'The last links of the Scotch feudal chain dropping off under the hammers that one may distinctly hear erecting the first Hustings our country ever saw!'[104] Jeffrey's private statements echoed the prejudices of many eighteenth-century English politicians against the tenor of Scottish politics. He described native politics as 'Scotch dirt' and became increasingly annoyed with the constant jobbing of 'our hungry Scotch Whigs'.[105] To Jeffrey, the Augean stables of Scottish corruption could be cleansed only by direct access to rejuvenated English liberties. The measures were, however, patriotically presented as amending an 'ungenerous' union, which had been characterised by 'the stronger party imposing conditions that seemed not equitable on the weaker'.[106] This was the approach adopted by other Scottish reformers and Robert Ferguson demonstrated his unionist-nationalism when he addressed the electors of the county of Haddington in May 1831:

> He thought this was a cause in which Scotsmen would feel proud to come forward—it was to put them on level with England—it was to place them on a political footing they never before had. He hailed the measure as the real union of Scotland with England—he considered the former union as a union of humility.[107]

[102] *Ibid.*, 536.

[103] The best investigation of an essentially English-oriented eighteenth-century 'North British patriotism' is Colin Kidd, 'North Britishness and the Nature of Eighteenth-Century British Patriotisms', *Historical Journal* 39 (1996) 361-82; see also his *Subverting Scotland's Past: Scottish Whig Historians and the Creation of an Anglo-British Identity, 1689-c.1830* (Cambridge, 1993).

[104] NLS, Correspondence of Lord Cockburn, Dep. 235, Box 1, Henry Cockburn to Thomas Dick Lauder, 30 Dec. 1830.

[105] NLS, Adv. MSS, 9.1.8, fos 26, 95, Francis Jeffrey to Henry Cockburn, 10 March 1831 and 7 Nov. 1831.

[106] *Parl. Debs.*, 3rd ser., vii, 533.

[107] *Scotsman*, 11 May 1831. For the idea of 'unionist-nationalism' in nineteenth-century Scotland, see Graeme Morton, *Unionist-Nationalism: Governing Urban Scotland, 1830-1860* (East Linton, 1999).

Subsequent historians, partly on the basis of Cockburn's published works, have tended to represent the Scottish Whigs as out-and-out assimilationists.[108] Michael Fry says of Cockburn 'at every point where he could exert a direct personal influence, he actually wanted to make Scotland as much like England as possible'.[109] William Ferguson also highlighted sloppy drafting and prejudices against Scottish civil law as the causes of deficiencies in the bill.[110] Doubtless mistakes were made, the atmosphere of crisis, the lack of time devoted to the Scottish bill, and Jeffrey and Cockburn's nature as brilliant criminal, rather than civil, lawyers all contributing. What is not apparent in Cockburn's published work is that many of the mistakes were due to pressure from a cabinet intent on making the three bills as similar as possible, and beset by the problems of legislating for the multiple union.[111] Cockburn's largely retrospective analysis has tended to belie the fact that even the bill's most enthusiastic sponsors were actuated by a desire to legislate sympathetically for Scottish peculiarities.

The limits of the Scottish Whigs' faith in assimilation are most apparent in their private correspondence. Jeffrey wrote from London and was time and time again compelled to conform to cabinet expectations, no matter how incompatible they may have been with Scottish law or institutions. To an extent, Jeffrey's correspondence with Cockburn supports the conclusions about the overbearing influence of an English cabinet voiced by some Scottish opponents of the bill. The tone was set during the consideration of the first draft of the bill and Jeffrey wrote in February 1831: 'The Cabinet […] smashed all the *mechanism* of our Scotch bill yesterday, in an inhuman manner; from a peremptory and inflexible resolution to make it conformable to what they have settled for England'.[112] Jeffrey's complaint was about the cabinet abolishing the review jurisdiction of the Court of Session, which had been reviewing Freeholder qualifications since 1743. Cockburn was still livid at Lord Althorp's apparent acceptance of bad advice on this aspect of reform in April 1832, which he felt constituted 'the wanton introduction of glaring blots, the bad working of which will hereafter be ascribed to the reform itself and not to any defect in it'.[113] In this prediction he was correct, and the eventual

[108] Cockburn's key published works dealing with the reform bills are Henry Cockburn, *The Journal of Henry Cockburn, being a Continuation of the 'Memorials of his Time', 1831-1854*, 2 vols, (Edinburgh, 1874); Henry Cockburn, *Letters Chiefly Connected with the Affairs of Scotland* (London, 1874); Henry Cockburn, *Life of Lord Jeffrey, with a Selection from his Correspondence*, 2 vols (Edinburgh, 1852).

[109] Michael Fry, 'The Whig Interpretation of Scottish History' in Ian Donnachie and Christopher Whatley (eds), *The Manufacture of Scottish History* (Edinburgh, 1992), 80-1.

[110] Ferguson, 'Reform Act (Scotland)', 105-114. The claim that the Scottish legislation was badly drafted was raised by contemporaries; see for example *Letter to Robert Adam Dundas, Esq. M.P. on the Enfranchising Clauses of the Scottish Reform Bill* (Edinburgh, 1832).

[111] Karl Miller, *Cockburn's Millennium* (London, 1975), 118-19.

[112] NLS, Adv. MSS, 9.1.8, fo. 14, Francis Jeffrey to Henry Cockburn, 28 Feb. 1831.

[113] Cockburn, *Letters*, 400-1, Henry Cockburn to T. F. Kennedy, 13 April 1832.

machinery of courts of sheriffs and substitutes was widely criticised after 1832.[114]

If they were careful to try to urge the impropriety of some English measures as regarded Scots law, the same was true of their attitude to Scottish institutions. In terms of assimilation, some issues could prove divisive, as did the issue of whether to allow Scottish clergymen to claim the vote on their benefices. The press abounded with angry letters about it and the desire to avoid the Erastianism of the English church and maintain the idea of 'two kingdoms' was expressed from many quarters.[115] The issue was raised in the House of Commons by the presentation of a petition from the Presbytery of Dunblane in April 1831, which asked that ministers of the Church of Scotland be given the vote in any reform measure.[116] Parliamentary debate was long delayed, however, and not until the committee stage did the pro-reform Andrew Johnstone, a long-serving elder in the Church, move that no member of the clergy, of any church in Scotland, be allowed to vote on the qualification of their benefice. He made the motion 'to preserve her institutions […] and to preserve that peculiar character which belonged to the Church and people of Scotland'.[117] Johnstone cited the Dunblane petition as proof that 'churchmen, both in ancient and modern times, had been and were desirous of political power in Scotland' and portrayed the enfranchisement of ministers as the equivalent of the imposition of lay patronage in 1712.[118] As far as he was concerned, the church ought to be separate from the state, and giving political power to the clergy would destroy their character and respectability—they must therefore be saved from 'the importunities of patrons, from the solicitations of electors, or from any unhallowed conflicts (which God forbid should ever take place) in regard to sectarian differences'.[119] The debate that followed cut across party lines, and Johnstone was opposed by Althorp, Murray and Warrender and supported by a handful of English members.[120] From a distance, Cockburn also supported Johnstone, and subsequently noted: 'All right thinking men were for disqualifying Scotch clergymen from voting merely because it was better for them not to be seduced into politicks.

114 Ferguson, 'Reform Act (Scotland)', 109.

115 The demand not to enfranchise ministers was also provoked by the clerical movement and petitioning campaign against the government's plan for Irish education, which stimulated a good deal of criticism of the clergy meddling in politics; see for example *Loyal Reformers' Gazette*, 23 July 1831.

116 *Parl. Debs.*, 3rd ser., iii, 1348-9.

117 *Ibid.*, xiii, 477.

118 *Ibid.*, 479.

119 *Ibid.*, 480.

120 Murray had presented the Dunblane petition in April but had not been favourable to its claim, hoping instead that the Scottish church might be represented 'in the House of Peers by means of her dignitaries, and in the Commons, by the Members for her Universities'—by the committee stage of the bill, apparently after consultation with members of the clergy, he reversed his position and opposed Johnstone's motion; *Parl. Debs.*, 3rd ser., iii, 1349, xiii, 491-4.

But it was not English; & this, as on too many other occasions, was held conclusive.'[121]

On this particular issue, there were also differences between the law officers. Jeffrey himself was for enfranchising the clergy, largely on the grounds that it was inconsistent to allow English and Irish clerics to vote and not Scots. This idea also received the support of Roderick Macleod, MP for Sutherland, who considered the issue in a letter to James Loch, and came out explicitly in favour of a measure 'which assimilates as much as possible the representation of Scotland to that of England'.[122] These national questions cut across positions taken among the political elite on the more general question of reform.

Exasperation and frustration with the fiats and interference of an assimilationist cabinet lasted for the entire duration of the crisis, flaring up again in June 1832 with the attempt to establish a heritable property qualification for Scottish burgh MPs. Jeffrey, on whose behalf an Edinburgh election canvas had begun, absolutely refused to introduce the clause, and was joined in this resolution by all of the pro-reform Scottish members, leaving it to Althorp to introduce it himself. Jeffrey made it clear that he opposed the clause because it would disqualify men with wealth gained through commerce from standing, but the language used was also that of resisting pressures for conformity with the English measure: 'I scarcely expect to succeed in this not being English'.[123] Fearing too that even the immense unpopularity of the amendment in Scotland would not change the government's mind, he urged Cockburn: 'If you could show any solid distinction between Scotland and the rest of the Empire to justify the exemption it might still be listened to. But to say the truth, there is on this particular no solid distinction.'[124]

Resistance to assimilation was a genuine response to perceived threats to Scottish institutions, but it could also be exploited in the attempt to frame legislation that accorded more with Scottish 'new' Whig principles. In this instance, Jeffrey sought to stop the Scottish representation from being restricted to the landed aristocracy, and eagerly sought a precedent or justification within Scotland. He was supported by public opinion and, in Edinburgh, reformers held a meeting to oppose the clause, and J. A. Murray more pointedly denounced the assimilationist tendencies of the government:

> What was the real difficulty they had to contend against? Was it not the feelings and prejudices of English members in favour of every thing that was English. They did not know much about Scotland, and it was not to be expected that they would regard opinions in Scotland so much as their

[121] NLS, Adv. MSS, 9.1.8, fo. 54, Note by Cockburn on letter from Francis Jeffrey, 23 Jun. 1831.
[122] NAS, Loch Muniments, GD268/87/31-2, Roderick Macleod to James Loch, 25 May 1832.
[123] NLS, Adv. MSS, 9.1.9, fo. 52, Francis Jeffrey to Henry Cockburn, 18 June 1832.
[124] *Ibid.*, fos 53-4, 19 June 1832.

> own. They conceived that every thing established in England was right; and that it would be a boon to give Scotland the same as they had themselves.[125]

This controversy surrounding the property qualification neatly illustrates the complicated relationship between events in Parliament and the popular movement for reform in Scotland. While there is some justification for Cockburn's subsequent claim that the Whigs 'everywhere put themselves at the head of the people' the interactions between reformers in Parliament and the movement outside were far more complicated.[126] In particular, the Whig government took a rather ambiguous position on the Political Unions.[127] This ambiguity was expressed by Jeffrey, who wrote to Holland in January 1832 and explained that the Unions had 'contributed greatly to preserve peace and good order', though he remained wary that: 'If the measure were to misgive, they would be engines of the most frightful efficacy'.[128] Within this relationship the Political Unions could exercise a degree of influence on policy and, indeed, individual MPs and radicals might use a general fear of these bodies as leverage with which to further their own objectives.[129] The Political Unions in Scotland greeted the announcement of the qualification clause with a petitioning campaign and condemnations of this 'most extravagant insult to the people of Scotland'.[130] It was this context that allowed Jeffrey to convince Althorp to drop the clause, which was done immediately after the presentation of petitions against it from the Glasgow, Edinburgh and Renfrewshire Political Unions.[131]

Perhaps the most critical question that raised the issue of Scotland's position within Britain was how many extra seats Scotland should receive. With anti-reformers mounting a very vocal challenge for extra seats after the elections of 1831, it became a focal point of patriotic debate. On this point the Edinburgh lawyers were of a mind with the likes of Rae, Clerk, and Warrender, although they would certainly have apportioned any extra seats differently. Jeffrey made numerous representations to the cabinet that Scotland required extra seats, both to placate opposition and to do justice to her increased wealth and population. The cabinet, and Althorp in particular, resisted such appeals on the basis of the measure's unpopularity with English MPs and because it would afford O'Connell and Irish opinion an argument for more seats. Facing a strong challenge to redistribution proposals from

125 *The Scotsman*, 23 June 1832.
126 Cockburn, *Journal*, i, 30.
127 LoPatin, *Political Unions*, 87-130.
128 British Library, Holland House Papers, Add. MSS 52644, fos 149-50, Francis Jeffrey to Lord Holland, 29 Jan. 1832.
129 For an interpretation of the role of 'threats' of revolution and disorder throughout the reform crisis see Joseph Hamburger, *James Mill and the Art of Revolution* (New Haven, 1963).
130 *Dundee Advertiser*, 12 July 1832.
131 *Parl. Debs.*, 3rd ser., xiii, 1057-8.

anti-reformers, the need to get seats from government for the representation of towns and cities increasingly became a priority of the Scottish Whigs. In May 1831, Jeffrey requested extra seats for both towns and populous Scottish counties, and he based his request on exactly the same argument by which opponents of the bill would demand extra seats. In comparison to the redistribution in England and the granting of extra seats even to her tiniest counties, justice was not being done to Scotland by the principles of population and wealth that Lord John Russell had claimed as the guide for the reform legislation.[132] Jeffrey's approach could at times become nationalistic, even to the point of using crude national stereotypes in his agitated correspondence with Cockburn. For example, when Wales was given extra representation he railed: 'The concession to the cheese-eating, goaty, Principality of Wales, in the Committee, strengthens our claim considerably; and I think the English nationality, leading them to keep all their spare members to themselves, is visibly abated.'[133]

The frustration was directed again at the essentially English nature of the reform. The obstacle identified is not, in this case, an authoritarian and assimilationist cabinet, but a more generally defined English nationalism, which was reluctant to augment the representation of Scotland and particularly Ireland at the expense of the English centre. This argument was even more patriotically stated in the published letter to earl Grey mentioned above, which supported the reform bill, but which encouraged the government to treat Britain as a single entity, and seize upon reform as an opportunity to make amends for the imperfect Union of 1707. According to its author, the objectives of reform were:

> […] to restore privileges which have been unduly destroyed; to legislate for the united kingdom as a *whole*, and not as frittered into parts; to *restore* to Scotland that representation which her actual wealth, population, enterprise and intelligence demand, and which is especially due, from the sacrifice of *rights* wrested from her at the Union.[134]

Such issues highlight the inadequacy of the term 'assimilation' when applied to Scottish political elites during the reform crisis. Certainly, there were out-and-out assimilationists who argued for a single bill for the three kingdoms and complete uniformity of provision, but these were few. In reality, the consideration of Scotland's position within Britain was rarely that simple, and there were significant differences between the views of reformers. They all argued for a level of political assimilation 'to bring Scotland within the action of the constitution', but

[132] DUL, Grey Papers, GRE/B37/3/13, Francis Jeffrey to earl Grey, 12 May 1831. Of course, as Norman Gash pointed out, government could always counter that a similar argument might be made for the augmentation of the representation of Middlesex and Surrey which had a combined population similar to that of Scotland; Gash, *Politics in the Age of Peel*, 48. Hume, in fact, did make this argument, although he agreed that Scotland deserved a greater number of MPs; *Parl. Debs.*, 3rd ser., x, 1085-6.

[133] NLS, Adv. MSS, 9.1.8, fo 77, Francis Jeffrey to Henry Cockburn, 5 Sept. 1831.

[134] Reforming Scottish Freeholder, *To the Right Hon. Earl Grey*, 23-4.

there were clearly limits to this. Rendering Scottish political institutions compatible with the progress of commercial society, rather than making them conform to an English model, was the purpose of the bill's architects. This could certainly in part be achieved with reference to English liberties, but ought not to be pursued without due regard for Scottish institutions and laws. Over this point the Whig lawyers came into repeated conflict with the cabinet, and could level against it arguments which were similar to those employed by opponents of the bill. Something that was common to all reformers was that when Scots believed that they were being denied equal access to English liberties, as with their frequent calls for extra seats, what Kidd calls 'a traditional Scottish chauvinism' could emerge.[135]

*

There was therefore no single or coherent ideological defence of the unreformed representation or assault on the proposed reform. Nearly two years of unprecedented political excitement both in and outside Parliament certainly had a considerable impact on how members spoke of the Scottish representation. J. C. D. Clark's high political interpretation, which suggested that notions of an immutable Protestant constitution collapsed quickly under the force of events between 1829 and 1832, is certainly applicable to the Scottish context.[136] The provisions of the Union of 1707, which had been taken to define her position within this constitution, were rarely defended as inviolable, although anti-reform arguments could still emphasise the singularity of Scotland's constitutional position. This separateness was portrayed as positive, both in explaining Scotland's phenomenal commercial progress since 1707 and in delivering defences of the British representative system as an integrated whole. Certainly, there was a large degree of constitutionality to this approach, but with the emphasis on the results of this anomaly-ridden constitution, which had proved itself ideally suited to all the practical needs of the people and the nation's progress. Indeed, the notion of Scottish singularity could be carried to the extent of suggesting that Scotland had a separate constitution, and Colonel Lindsay, referring to the successful passage of the English measure through the commons, lamented that the 'Constitution of England' had been ejected, and that: 'He must expect that the same fate would attend the Constitution of Scotland.'[137] In defence of this constitution, which represented the wisdom of generations, the government's reform measures, particularly as they applied to Scotland, were represented as dangerously speculative. Such reform would destroy the delicate balance of interests preserved by the old system and ensure the utter domination of the landed interest by the new ten-pound voters.

[135] Kidd, 'North Britishness', 361, 377-82.
[136] J. C. D. Clark, *English Society 1660-1832: Religion, Ideology and Politics During the Ancien Regime,* 2nd edn (Cambridge, 2000), ch. 6.
[137] *Parl. Debs.*, 3rd ser., vii, 553.

Interpretations of reform that rest on the notion of a crisis in elite politics tend to obscure the extent to which arguments used by elites had to be modified in the light of extra-parliamentary realities. The large, vocal and sustained agitation outside of Parliament could not be effectively dismissed as an effusion of popular feeling that would quickly disappear if resisted. In light of the seeming inevitability of reform, opponents of the bills, after the general election of 1831, sought to re-brand themselves as moderate but patriotic reformers who sought justice for Scotland within the new system. They had lost the argument over the necessity of Scottish reform. The reform debates and the dynamic context in which they were held thus present us with a complex picture of discourses in transition. Certainly, self-interest and political expediency help to explain the positions taken and arguments employed by Scottish MPs who opposed the reform legislation. We must also recognise, however, that, to MPs who had consistently defended the prescriptive constitution against the dangers of theory and speculation, the reform bills and the movement that supported them necessitated a reformulation of ideas.

Similarly, Cockburn's narrative, delivered in his several published works, does not reflect the opinions of all Scottish Whigs. The architects of Scottish reform approached the issue with an idiosyncratic critique. In the pages of the *Edinburgh Review* and through the various movements that had developed during the 1820s to question Scottish institutions and society, they had come to regard the entirety of Scottish representation as corrupt and essentially feudal. While these political arrangements had not impeded Scotland's progress since the Union, the links between liberty and commercial society convinced Cockburn and Jeffrey that it was imperative for Scotland to enlarge her political institutions if this progress was to be maintained. This was no blind assimilation, however, and Jeffrey and Cockburn were both concerned that Scottish reform should be prosecuted with due sensitivity to Scottish law and institutions. Their ultimate goal of modernisation through the maintenance of commercial society certainly encouraged some emulation of English practices, but this ought to be seen as accommodation rather than assimilation.[138] Far from everything after the ten-pound franchise being, as Cockburn claimed, 'mere detail and machinery' the Scottish Whigs constantly came into conflict with a cabinet for whom Scottish reform did not constitute a priority, and the Scottish landed interest which mounted a strong rearguard action to defend its position.[139] This approach necessitated what many could denounce as a 'radical' approach to Scottish reform, which was at odds with the common political culture of Scottish elites. If Whigs were united in recognising the expediency of reform, Loch's bitter denunciation of Jeffrey and Cockburn and the proximity of his arguments to those of the opponents

[138] Paterson, *Autonomy of Modern Scotland*, 69-72.
[139] Cockburn, *Journal*, i, 1.

of the bill, suggest that a nuanced approach to the discourses of reform is required. In many important aspects, particularly his insistence that reform ought to maintain the landed interest and be pursued in line with Scotland's constitution and existing institutions, he approached the arguments of those who opposed the bill. Indeed, by the end of 1831, opponents of the bill were advocating in Parliament just the kind of reform that Loch had in mind in December 1830.

The reform debate in Scotland necessitated a questioning of many fundamental aspects of Scottish society and, among political elites, of the central tenets of their political convictions. Dividing MPs into 'reformers' and 'anti-reformers' insufficiently describes a fluid context in which the subject of discussion shifted: from debating whether there ought to be a reform at all, MPs came to discuss what manner and degree of reform was acceptable. So too did all MPs try to present themselves as lovers of their country, and no group achieved a monopoly on the language of patriotism. This contest was sharpened by the nature of the legislation as renegotiating Scotland's position within the Union. As the government struggled to legislate effectively for England and Wales, Ireland and Scotland, national questions emerged which could cut across positions taken by MPs on other aspects of the reform question. While the broad outlines of different positions are identifiable, the striking feature of the debate was its ability to elicit idiosyncratic responses to reform.

The Scottish Historical Review, Volume LXXXV, 1: No. 219: April 2006, 133–139

Notes and Comments

AU 729.2 and the last years of Nechtan mac Der-Ilei

In a recent article in this journal Professor Thomas Clancy alluded in passing to an alternative translation of an entry in the Annals of Ulster concerning the latter part of the career of Nechtan mac Der-Ilei which I had suggested to him.[1] Having been 'flushed out' in this fashion I feel obliged to make the alternative translation public and to discuss briefly some of its implications. The passage in question is as follows:

> *Bellum Monith Carno iuxta Stagnum Loogde inter hostem Nectain 7 excercitum Oengusa 7 exactatores Nectain ceciderunt; hoc est: Biceot m. Moneit 7 filius eius, Finguine m. Drostain, Feroth m. Finnguine 7 quidam multi, 7 familia Oengussa triumphauit.*[2]

This is translated by Mac Airt and Mac Niocaill, following earlier editors, as:

> The battle of Monid Carno near Loch Laegde between the hosts of Nectan and the army of Aengus, and Nectan's exactors fell i.e. Biceot son of Monet, and his son, Finnguine son of Drostan, Feroth son of Finnguine, and many others; and the adherents of Aengus were triumphant.[3]

A. O. Anderson, in his gargantuan *Early Sources of Scottish History*, represented the same passage thus:

> The battle of Monith-Carno, near lake Loogdae, [took place] between the army of Nechtan and the army of Angus; and Nechtan's tax gatherers fell, namely Biceot, son of Moneit, and his son; Finguine, son of Drostan; Feroth, son of Finguine, and many others: and the family of Angus triumphed.[4]

The passage has been interpreted as marking the end of a second brief reign by King Nechtan following his re-emergence from the monastery

1 T. O. Clancy, 'Philosopher-king: Nechtan mac Der-Ilei', *SHR* 83 (2004) 125-49 at 136 n.48, 144 n.74 and 146 n.80. I had communicated my suggestion to him via e-mail some months previously.

2 AU 729.2.

3 Seán Mac Airt and Gearóid Mac Niocaill (ed.), *Annals of Ulster to A.D. 1131, Part I: Text and Translation* (Dublin, 1983), 183.

4 A. O. Anderson, *Early Sources of Scottish History*, 2 vols (Edinburgh, 1922 and Stamford, 1990), i. 225-6. Anderson used, and closely followed, W. M. Hennessy (ed.), *Annala Uladh- Annals of Ulster: otherwise Annala Senait, Annals of Senat: a chronicle of Irish affairs from A.D. 431 to A.D. 1540*, 4 vols (Dublin, 1887-1901), i. 180-2.

to which he had apparently been consigned in 724, or the prison where he had been sent by his successor, Drust, two years later.[5] It has also been taken as clear evidence that the apparent alliance between Nechtan and 'Oengus' (the future Pictish king Onuist son of Urguist) that had led to Nechtan's restoration to the kingship had broken down.[6]

Our understanding of this entry depends very heavily on our understanding of two words, *hostem* and *exact[at]ores*.[7] In all the published translations the first word has been rendered as 'army' and the second, though left untranslated by Mac Airt and Mac Niocaill, has been interpreted by most commentators as meaning something like tax- or tribute-gatherers. One cautious note was sounded by Marjorie Anderson who, after following the traditional interpretation in the main text of her *Kings and Kingship*, added a footnote which reads:

> It is fair to point out the ambiguities in AU. *Hostis* could be "enemy" (though *inimicus* is the word we should expected) and *exactores* could be "expellers". These interpretations would produce a totally different story.[8]

Indeed; and it is the purpose of the present note to argue that these alternative interpretations are the more credible. The word *hostis* is practically unknown elsewhere in the Irish chronicles.[9] The only other usage I have been able to identify occurs in the Annals of Tigernach, under the year corresponding to AU 685, which contain the following passage, a citation from Bede's *Chronica Maiora*:

> *Gisulphus dux gentis Long[o]bardorum Bene<u>en(n)ti Campaníam ighne, gladio et ca<pt>iuitate uastau[it], cumque non esset qui eius impetuí resisteret, apostolic<u>s papa Iohan[n]és, qui Sergio success<s>erat, mís[s]is ad e[u]m sacerdotibus ac dona<ri>is perpluri<mis>, uniuers<o>s redemi<t> captí<u>os atque ho[s]tes domum redire feci<t>. Cui success[s]it al(i)ius Iohannes, qui inter multa operum illustrium fecit oratorium sancte Dei genitricis, opere pulcher<rim>ó intra e(x)cl<e>siam beatí <a>pos<to>lí Petri.*[10]

[5] Anderson, *Early Sources*, i. 226 n.1, for the interpretation, and AT 724 and AU 726.1 for the retreat into religion and imprisonment.

[6] Alex Woolf, 'Onuist son of Uurguist: *tyrannus carnifex* or a David for the Picts?', in D. Hill and M. Worthington (ed.), *Æthelbald and Offa: Two Eighth-Century Kings of Mercia*, British Archaeological Reports, British Series 383 (Oxford, 2005), 35-42 at 36.

[7] The second word appears as *exactatores* in MS.A of AU but *exactores* in MS B.

[8] M. O. Anderson, *Kings and Kingship in Early Scotland* (Edinburgh, 1973; 2nd edn Edinburgh, 1980), 178 n.226. This note has had surprisingly little impact on the scholarship and, indeed, I only stumbled across it well into the process of preparing this note.

[9] Searching the vocabulary used in these texts has been made immeasurably easier by the resources made available by University College Cork's *Celt* project accessible at http://www.ucc.ie/celt/ .

[10] Whitley Stokes, 'The Annals of Tigernach: third fragment', *Revue celtique* 17 (1896) 79-223, at 208-9. Square brackets are as in Stokes' edition; angled brackets signify Stokes' emendations; round brackets signify letters omitted by Stokes (all according to the apparatus in Stokes' edition). The passage reads, in translation: 'Gisulf, *dux* of the Langobard *gens* in Benevento laid waste Campania with fire and sword. Because there was nobody who could resist his onslaught the apostolic pope, John, who had succeeded Sergius, sent priests to him and very many gifts; he redeemed all the

Bede produced *Chronica Maiora ca* 725 so that this usage is almost exactly contemporary with the events described in AU 729.2. Here the meaning of *hostes* is clearly 'enemy' and this meaning occurs with regularity throughout Bede's *Historia Ecclesiastica*.[11] *The Dictionary of Medieval Latin from British Sources* cites multiple, though not exhaustive, examples of *hostis* as 'enemy', but only one example, from a letter of Alcuin, of its use for 'army'.[12] The word occurs once in the Adomnán's life of Saint Columba, interestingly in the account of Oswald's victory over Caedualla.[13]

It is of course curious that *hostis* appears nowhere else in the early medieval Irish chronicle-record, and this in itself may suggest that the entry for AU 729.2 may not have originated within the Iona Chronicle, although this must remain conjecture.[14] Marjorie Anderson's suggestion that *inimicus* was the more normal word for 'enemy' in this context does not appear to be born out by the evidence. This word also appear to be used only once in the chronicle-record at AU 1063.3 in the notice of the death of three Irish dynasts.[15] It seems fair to conclude that in AU 729.2 it is likely was that *hostem* was intended as the accusative singular of *hostis*—'enemy'. The first part of the entry, reading *Bellum Monith Carno iuxta Stagnum Loogde inter hostem Nectain 7 excercitum Oengusa*, should thus be translated: '[t]he Battle of Monith Carno, by Loch Loogde, between the enemy of Nechtan and the army of Oengus'.

The problematic word in the second part of the sentence is less easy to interpret. *Exactatores* appear to be a *hapax legomenon*. It is usually taken to be an error for *exactores*, a noun deriving from the verb *exigere* which can mean (as we have seen) either 'expeller', or an 'exacter' (either of a penalty or of revenue or dues). Neither *exactator* nor *exactor* appears elsewhere in the Irish chronicle-record nor in the *Historia Ecclesiastica*. The word *exactor*, however, does appear thirteen times in the Vulgate. In Exodus it is the word used for 'slave drivers' during the Egyptian captivity,[16] and once, at XX.xxv:

> *Si pecuniam mutuam dederis populo meo pauperi qui habitat tecum, non urgebis eum quasi exactor, nec usuris opprimes.*

[10] (*Continued*) captives and made the enemy return home. He was succeeded by another John, who, among other great works, built an oratory to the Holy Mother of God, the most beautiful of works, within the church of the blessed apostle Peter.'

[11] Puttnam Fennel Jones, *A Concordance to the* Historia Ecclesiastica *of Bede* (Cambridge, MA., 1929), 244-5.

[12] R. E. Latham and D. R. Howlett (ed.), *The Dictionary of Medieval Latin from British Sources* (Oxford, 1975-), i. 1180.

[13] Adomnán, *Vita Columbae*, I.i., A. O. Anderson and M. O. Anderson (ed. & trans.), *Adomnan's Life of Columba* (Edinburgh, 1961, 2nd edn, Oxford, 1991), 14.

[14] For the Iona Chronicle lying behind the *Annals of Ulster*, and other Irish chronicles, at this point see John Bannerman, 'Notes on the Scottish entries in the early Irish annals', *Scottish Gaelic Studies* 11 (1968) 149-170, reprinted in J. Bannerman, *Studies in the History of Dalriada* (Edinburgh, 1974), 9-26. It is tempting to see Bedan influence in this usage. Is this passage a sole surviving fragment of an **Historia Ecclesiastica Gentis Pictorum*? Probably not.

[15] Thanks are due once more to UCC's online resource site http://www.ucc.ie/celt/ .

[16] Exodus V.vi., V.x. and V.xiv.

Here the traditional translation is 'money-lender', but a more general sense of 'oppressor' could be read into the phrase.[17] This reading is born out by subsequent uses of the word, particularly in Job, Isaiah and Zachariah.[18] In Luke the word is used for a gaoler.[19] Without other early Insular comparanda the Vulgate reading is probably the best indicator of what this word would have meant to the author of our text. Rather than exercise ourselves over whether we should read *exact*[*at*]*ores* as 'expellers' or 'tax gatherers', we are able to cut the Gordian knot with reference to the Vulgate and translate the second portion of the sentence, *7 exactatores Nectain ceciderunt; hoc est: Biceot m. Moneit 7 filius eius, Finguine m. Drostain, Feroth m. Finnguine 7 quidam multi, 7 familia Oengussa triumphauit*, as follows; 'and the oppressors of Nechtan were slain; that is: Biceot son of Monet, Finguine son of Drostan, Feroth son of Finguine and many others, and the *familia* of Oengus triumphed'.

The implications of this reading of the text are that Nechtan mac Der-Ilei's second reign did not end with a rebellion by Oengus/Onuist in 729 but continued until his own death in 732,[20] still placing him on the throne while Bede put the finishing touches to his *Historia Ecclesiastica*.

ALEX WOOLF

[17] 'If you lend money to one of my people among you who is needy, do not be like an *oppressor*, charge him no interest.'
[18] Job III. xviii and XXXIX.vii, Isaiah III.xii, IX.iv, XIV.ii and XIV.iv, and Zachariah IX.viii and X.iv.
[19] Luke XII.lviii.
[20] AT 732.

An Unpublished Letter from Adam Smith

Fewer than two hundred letters from Adam Smith are extent, surprisingly few for a figure of his time and eminence.[1] This paucity gives even a single additional letter greater interest than it might have from a more prolific correspondent. That printed here, like many of Smith's, is concerned with patronage and the context is known from other surviving letters. On 7 December 1786, Edmund Burke (1730-97) wrote to Smith on behalf of his close friend and 'cousin', William Burke (*c.* 1728-98), then serving in India as Deputy-Paymaster of the Forces, a position he owed to Edmund.[2] Burke feared that, under the new, reforming administration of Lord Cornwallis (1738-1805), who was on the point of leaving to take up his appointment as Governor-General, William's position was under threat. Burke therefore asked Smith to write to Colonel Alexander Ross (1742-1827; Cornwallis's secretary), and 'any other friends', on William's behalf. Smith duly wrote to Ross on 13 December, forwarding the letter to Burke himself. In a covering letter (which does not survive, but the purport of which can be inferred from Burke's reply of 20 December), Smith offered also to write to Sir John Macpherson (*c.* 1745-1821) and Sir Archibald Campbell (1739-91). In his reply, Burke made some suggestions about what Smith might say in these letters.[3] Macpherson, a member of the Supreme Council of Bengal, had succeeded as acting Governor-General in February 1785, when Warren Hastings resigned to return to England. Campbell was Governor of Madras.[4]

These letters to Macpherson and Campbell were presumed lost. That to Macpherson, however, is preserved among the collection of his papers now in the British Library (Oriental and India Office Collections, MS Eur. F. 291/161). It is addressed 'Sir John Macpherson | Baronet | Calcutta' and endorsed 'Adam Smith | 2d Jan[uar]y *1787* | received 15th *August*' and '252' (probably its number in the guard book into which it was formerly pasted).

Smith knew Edmund Burke reasonably well, though their friendship has left little trace in the epistolary record.[5] Most recently, they had

1 E. C. Mossner and I. S. Ross (eds), *The Correspondence of Adam Smith* [*Correspondence*] (2nd ed., Oxford, 1987).

2 Edmund called William his 'cousin', but the relationship remains undocumented. Edmund made the appointment during his brief period as Paymaster-General in 1782.

3 *Correspondence*, 297-300.

4 Smith had known Macpherson since at least 1778, and Campbell since at least 1759 (*Correspondence*, 57, 236). Campbell was appointed in 1785, and arrived in Madras in April 1786.

5 The surviving letters are either complimentary (Burke to Smith on the publication of the *Theory of Moral Sentiments*; Smith to Burke on his entering and leaving office), or

spent time together during Burke's visits to Scotland in 1784 and 1785, to be installed as Lord Rector of the University of Glasgow. Smith is likely to have made William's acquaintance in London during the late 1770s. Nothing in this letter suggests that he knew William well; indeed, as a recommendation it seems decidedly tepid, mentioning William's social qualities rather than his abilities. Nevertheless, Edmund thought it sufficiently strong to forward to Macpherson.

The second paragraph of the letter alludes to the predicament in which Cornwallis's appointment (in effect, his own supersession) placed Macpherson. Should he serve under Cornwallis, or return home? In the event, Macpherson left Calcutta on 29 January 1787, on the Berrington, before he could have received Smith's letter.[6] Cornwallis had a low opinion of William Burke, and regarded his Indian appointment as 'a most unnecessary job'.[7] Even so, Cornwallis did not displace him, probably to avoid any appearance of political vindictiveness. William remained as Deputy-Paymaster until he left India of his own accord in 1792.

My Dear Sir

The principal purpose of this letter is to recommend to your particular countenance and protection a Gentleman who, I believe, does not stand in need of any such recommendation, as he has written to many of his friends in very strong terms of the friendship and kindness w[hi]ch you have already shewn to him.[8] As some of Mr William Burkes friends, however, seem to imagine that my recommendation may be of some service to him, I cannot refuse telling you what, you probably know as well as I, that he is as honest, as kindhearted and as friendly a man as ever I knew in the whole course of my life. I am certain there is no trust which you can repose in him that he will not execute with the utmost zeal and fidelity.

The public is at present much divided in their opinion whether it is most likely that, in consequence of Lord Cornwallis's appointment, you will remain in India, or return to Europe. The general wish of the Public; I can venture to assure

[5] (*Continued*) requests for help (in 1775, for the renewal of Richard Champion's china patent; and in 1786 on behalf of William). Some indication that their friendship meant more than the paucity and formality of these letters might suggest is that two of Smith's three letters to Burke (1 Jul. 1782, 15 Apr. 1783) begin 'My dear friend', a salutation that Smith had previously reserved for David Hume, his closest friend (I owe this point to one of the *SHR*'s anonymous referees). The only other person whom Smith so addressed was Edward Gibbon (10 Dec. 1788). Burke's letters to Smith progress from the formal 'Sir' (10 Sept. 1759 through 'Dear Sir' (1 May 1775) and 'My dear Sir' (20 June 1783) to 'My dear friend' (7 Dec. 1786) and 'My dearest friend (20 Dec. 1786). Burke, however, used 'My dear friend' more liberally than did Smith.

[6] *Calcutta Gazette*, 25 Jan., 1 Feb. 1787.

[7] Cornwallis to Lord Rawdon, 2 Dec. 1789, in C. Ross (ed.), *Correspondence of Charles, First Marquis Cornwallis*, 3 vols (London, 1859), i. 452.

[8] Burke asked Smith to tell Macpherson that William had made 'the strongest acknowledgements of his Kindness to him' (20 Dec. 1786, *Correspondence*, 300).

you, is that you should remain and continue to give all the assistance and information to the new Governour General which it is universally believed you are capable of giving. This is likewise the most earnest wish, so far at least as I can gather it, of your most zealous and particular friends.[9] I will not, however, presume to offer any advice upon the subject; as I have not the least doubt that you will do the precise thing which, in your situation, is most proper to be done. I have the honour to be, with the most affectionate remembrance,

My Dear Sir | Your most faithful | humble Servant | Adam Smith

Edinburgh | 2d Jan[ua]ry. 1787

Queen's University, Kingston, Ontario F.P. LOCK

[9] This was the advice of his friend James Macpherson (1736-96): 'The Chapter of Accidents is an excellent one' (Cornwallis might die); 'nothing earthly can be gained by disgust'; and 'any precipitate Step' might interfere with his hopes for some 'reward, for services' (to Macpherson, 24 Dec. 1786; London, British Library (Oriental and India Office Collections), MS Eur. F. 291/126).

The Scottish Historical Review, Volume LXXXV, 1: No. 219: April 2006, 140–181

Reviews

A History of Scottish Medicine. Themes and Influences
By Helen M. Dingwall. Pp.282.
ISBN 0 7486 0865 6
Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press. 2003. £19.99

The author in her introduction highlights the dilemma that faces historians of medicine: whether to deal with medicine in Scotland or Scottish medicine. The title tells us about her decision, although she does acknowledge that 'the complexities of the past' and her particular approach do not provide a complete answer to the question and she is less certain that in the age of technology medicine in Scotland has remained distinctively Scottish.

This new work is significant in that it is the first wide-ranging account of Scottish medicine to appear for nearly a quarter of a century and, more importantly, the first to be written by someone who is not a Scottish physician or surgeon; in other words it is not a doctor's history. However, as the author points out, this work is not intended to be a comprehensive review of all aspects of Scottish medicine; rather, her intent is 'to offer a general perspective as a basis for further detailed research.' In the space of less than 300 pages Dr Dingwall has dealt not only with the influences shaping Scottish medicine in Scotland but also with the impact of Scottish doctors on the development of medicine in other countries and in particular areas of medical practice—in England, the Empire, Russia and in the early years of the United States of America; at sea, as military surgeons and in the field of public health.

Her research illustrates the degree to which the study of medical history has progressed since Comrie's history of Scottish medicine was published in 1932; Dr Dingwall has moved away from the "peoples and places" approach of Comrie and while not ignoring a chronological narrative she has placed the development of Scottish medicine firmly in the context of cultural, social and economic change, at the same time exploring the influence of European teaching on Scottish medical education. As John Pickstone put it in a recent review: '[medical history] cannot be understood without reference to the major intellectual and political movements…' (*Social History of Medicine* 18 (2005) 308) and in this volume the author has fulfilled that task.

The book is in three parts, divided chronologically: from earliest times to *c.*1500; from *c.*1500 to *c.*1800; and from *c.* 1800 to 2000. Each section is prefaced by a chapter offering 'brief general historical surveys' and setting the context in which medicine changed and developed. To take one example, the development of the medical and surgical colleges in Scotland is handled skilfully, setting their emergence in the context of economic transformation and the population shift which occurred with urbanisation. It is this contextual approach that is valuable, a methodology that is markedly different from that used by the majority of doctor historians. This technique of scene-setting works well on the whole, but this reader was left feeling that too much information was presented in the space available; a larger format may have proved more successful. The further reading list and bibliography are comprehensive, covering historical theory, Scottish history and all aspects of Scottish medicine from the general to the specific; such topics as alternative medicine, dentistry, hospital histories, women in medicine and the military are included.

There were sections that I found less satisfactory, in particular that dealing with the nineteenth century, but this may be the consequence of a perspective

born of a career in surgery and a more recent involvement in the study of nineteenth century epidemics. However, this does not detract from a first-rate achievement: this is a text which will undoubtedly prove to be an important introduction to Scottish medicine and an essential source in this expanding field.

University of Edinburgh, Royal College of Surgeons of Edinburgh NEIL MACGILLIVRAY

The Celts: A History from Earliest Times to the Present.
By Bernhard Maier. Pp. ix, 310.
ISBN 0 7486 1605 5.
Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press. 2003. £49.50.

This is an English version of the author's recently published German study *Die Kelten* (München 2000: Beck), a work which surveys the diverse evidence for the presence and activities of Celtic-speaking peoples past and present, drawing on up-to-date scholarship in the several disciplines involved to offer the general reader an integrated picture and specialists in one field access to current thinking in others. The English edition is aimed at the same dual readership and is essentially the same work.

Through the author's strong sense of purpose and the translator's intelligence and art *The Celts* is clear and readable, well ordered and well sign-posted. It is divided into three major sections: the ancient, the mediaeval and the modern world. Each section is sub-divided by place and, where applicable, by period, which makes it easy to find one's way around. It is also very nicely produced, although it may be remarked that this is the only such book encountered by the present writer to contain no illustrations at all. By contrast, the German edition contains thirteen images—admittedly austere black and white ones—of metal-work, illuminated manuscripts and so on. Apart from this puzzling gap, *The Celts* is a highly presentable piece of publishing.

It has to be said that there are considerable numbers of books around with similar or identical content and title. T.G.E. Powell's 1958 volume for Thames and Hudson's 'Ancient Peoples and Places' series may be seen as the first of the modern genre, capitalising on the rapid post-war expansion of archaeology and seizing the opportunity to fuse this with current thinking in the fields of literature (Celtic and classical), language and history. The authors who have followed Powell in writing about the Celts display different emphases, depending on whether their primary expertise is literary, historical, philological, archaeological, or none. But the main ingredients remain essentially the same: a comparative, mostly Indo-European frame of reference (e.g. for language, religion and institutions); archaeologically derived evidence (e.g. for material culture and 'everyday life'); and the continuing literary traditions (mediaeval and modern) of the British Isles and Brittany.

The 'market niche' for the German version of Dr Maier's book was clearly enough defined: by contrast with Britain, there were few scholarly-popular works of synthesis available in German. Specifically 'Celtic' books like Helmut Birkhan's *Kelten* and Karl-Horst Schmidt's *Geschichte und Kultur der Kelten* are heavily weighted towards linguistic matters and the proto-historical period; while the magnificent archaeological publications based on the excavations at Hallstatt, Heuneburg, Hochdorf and elsewhere have tended to be uncompromisingly specialist in their coverage and tone. Yet the last few decades have seen a considerable widening of interest in Germany's Celtic past and in the mediaeval and modern 'Celtic Fringe', and Maier's *Die Kelten* clearly spoke to

that interest. For an Anglophone audience, with many more such publications in the field, the justification for publishing this work has to be somewhat different. It has, in fact, several distinctive qualities, amongst which the most important is a 'Celtic Studies' perspective, in which the different contributing disciplines are all made subservient to the aim of describing the world and evaluating the achievements of the subjects of study.

The book has notable virtues too. Dr Maier is a disciplined scholar who does not burden the reader with speculations masquerading as scholarly ideas, as happens all too often at the scholarly-popular interface. On the contrary, he gives the impression of doing his best to understand and reproduce the arguments of the experts. He has his own specialist areas of expertise, of course, e.g. in ancient Celtic religion; but while his writing in these areas carries an additional punch, he resists the temptation to make too much of them, and strains to integrate them with the other categories of evidence. In the same way he has discreetly laboured to pitch his narrative at a consistent level— 'current orthodoxy', as one might term it—and shields the reader from controversial views. Sometimes one hankers to know more about Dr Maier's own view, or to hear the two sides of an argument. But the advantages of the chosen method to the beginning student are obvious, and the self-restraint is doubtless in part attributable to publishers' restrictions. The same emphasis on consistency is evident in the bibliography cited. Where many authors show themselves strong in certain areas and weak or cosmetic in others, Maier's is up-to-date, discriminating and misses few tricks in its mission to provide the reader with a trustworthy *vade mecum* to the next level of scholarly engagement.

The aim of providing comprehensive coverage within a limited space results in abridgement and selection. While this is mostly achieved in a skilful manner, the narrative is occasionally so summary that there is an actual hiatus if one does not already know the material, which defeats the purpose of the exercise. I sensed such gaps *inter alia* in regard to the Anglian settlement of north-east England and south-east Scotland (pp. 163ff), in the transition from ancient to mediaeval Brittany (pp. 185ff), in the leap from the Book of the Dean of Lismore to Iain Lom in Scottish Gaelic literature (pp. 213ff), in the juxtaposition of nineteenth-century nationalistic sentiment in Wales and the Welsh language movement of the 1960s (pp. 233ff), and in the association of Scottish devolution with the Gaelic language (p. 248). In each case an extra sentence or paragraph could have clarified things significantly.

Again, the central chapters are constructed to a fairly rigid formula: each has a brief (usually chronologically based) introduction, and then focuses on two or three key thematic aspects of the chapter's subject-matter. One can respect the reasoning behind this approach, given the limited space available. And it is surely important for us to heed Dr Maier's estimation of what is most significant, where our thinking may have become hide-bound. Yet at certain points one feels sure that something crucial to the larger picture has escaped his net. Examples with Scottish relevance include the wider political aims of King James VI and I in regard to his 'Celtic fringe' (pp. 210ff); and the importance of religious revival and evangelicalism in the emergence of the modern Highlands (pp. 217ff). Perhaps the publishers should have given Dr Maier about half as much space again!

One of the pleasing things about *The Celts* is the fact that it is pretty much free from the hang-ups about Celts and Celtic identity that afflict too many British writers, including some professional archaeologists and anthropologists. On the other hand, it would appear that Dr Maier's desire to reflect current orthodoxy all round has induced him to include some statements about the non-existence or non-entity or meaninglessness of Celts in the ancient world (see pp. 4-6 and

39) which are at odds with his sane and expert handling of the classical literary sources and the Celtic linguistic evidence in the body of his text. Here the underlying assumption is that in classical times there were thought to be—and were—a people or peoples called—and in certain circumstances calling themselves—Celts (or a related name-form). This position (for which see the concluding remarks on pp. 249-50) seems a fair enough position for the twenty-first century.

In conclusion one may reiterate that this is a very useful addition to the literature for precisely the purposes its author intended it. He has built a level and pretty robust bridge over some quite troubled waters.

University of Edinburgh WILLIAM GILLIES

The Stone of Destiny: Artefact and Icon.
Edited by Richard Welander, David J Breeze and Thomas Owen Clancy. Pp. xx, 283.
ISBN 0 903903 22 9.
Edinburgh: Society of Antiquaries of Scotland. £25.00.

This book originates in a conference held in Edinburgh in 1997 to mark the return of the Stone of Destiny to Scotland the previous year. But this is more than just the conference proceedings; its scope has been expanded to cover inauguration stones and seats in Scotland, Ireland and on the Continent. This presumably explains the delay in publication, although an explanation, if not an apology, from the editors would have been appropriate for such a long-promised volume on a high-profile subject. The volume appears in the monograph series of the Society of Antiquaries of Scotland and has been produced to a standard that is mostly consistent with this. The exceptions are the unsightly cover design, while some references cited in the text are missing from the bibliography.

The book begins with an introduction by David Breeze but nowhere do the editors define its objectives, making it impossible to assess whether the volume achieves their aims. The seventeen chapters are grouped into six parts covering 'The Stone as an Object', 'Inaugurations and Symbols of Dominion', 'Scone', 'The Taking of the Stone', 'The Return' and 'Envoi'. Some of the contents, notably on the geology of the Stone and its returns to Scotland in 1950-51 and 1996, are already familiar. This leaves the volume's largest section, on comparative studies, as its most distinctive and original contribution. Its chapters discuss royal inauguration practices and places among the Scots of Dal Riata (Ewan Campbell), in mediaeval Gaelic literature (Thomas Owen Clancy), in mediaeval Ireland (Elizabeth FitzPatrick), on the Continent (Stuart Airlie) and the sites of Finlaggan on Islay (David Caldwell) and Govan (Stephen Driscoll). This section is the real strength of this book, placing the study of the Stone in a wider international context. The range of parallels discussed here adds substantially to our understanding of the symbolism and use of inauguration stones and chairs. The inauguration of Scottish kings on a block of sandstone emerges as a specific form of a once-widespread range of related royal rites. These contributions reveal that such inauguration ceremonies were not immutable but changed over time according to political and religious circumstances.

The book's greatest weakness is its structure, which is disjointed and eccentric in places. For example, physical aspects of the Stone are discussed by Peter Hill in the second chapter. But the results of technical examinations, including X-ray

analysis, are not covered until the penultimate chapter, by Richard Welander, on the Stone's return to Scotland in 1996. Similarly, two important papers reassessing the evidence for thirteenth-century inaugurations at Scone, by Archie Duncan and Dauvit Broun, complement each other and should be read together, yet they appear in different sections, separated by an unrelated chapter.

In contrast to the detailed discussion of comparative material, the Stone's specific setting is given more cursory treatment. The section on Scone contains only two chapters and ignores the issue of its early mediaeval origins and royal associations. Richard Fawcett refers to the considerable number of carved and moulded architectural fragments in the grounds of Scone Palace as the only visible evidence of the abbey fabric but, inexplicably for a chapter entitled 'The Buildings of Scone Abbey', devotes only two sentences to them. This missed opportunity contrasts with Paul Binski's detailed art-historical analysis of the Coronation Chair. Scone is pivotal to our understanding of the Stone. Yet, as Driscoll notes, we know more about the physical layout at Govan, despite its location in an urban and post-industrial landscape, than picturesque Scone. Our poor understanding of Scone exposes the inadequacy of the official and academic response to the return of the Stone to Scotland in 1996. A welcoming ceremony, a conference and this (overdue) book are meagre rations. More appropriate, surely, would have been a multi-disciplinary programme of co-ordinated research not only into the Stone itself but also into its earliest recorded setting.

A surprising omission is the mythology concerning the Stone, its origins, powers and authenticity. This is an integral element of the Stone as an icon and deserves study in its own right. Another gap results from the positions of some of the editors and contributors within Historic Scotland. Although giving them unparalleled access to modern source material and recent events, their professional neutrality has resulted in self-censorship. Without a critical appraisal of the events they describe, the chapters on the Stone in the modern period (Graeme Munro) and its return in 1996 (Welander) are simply narratives accounts. Welander's chapter, epitomised by the photograph of the beaming faces of the (named) officers of the Lothian and Borders Police Stone of Destiny Security Team, is more appropriate to a popular guidebook or Historic Scotland promotional literature.

In contrast to these gaps, several contributors (Breeze, Hill, Campbell) discuss the origins of the Stone and its 'original' function(s), but their brief comments are repetitive and their conclusions contradictory and speculative. Campbell's tentative suggestion that the Stone owed its significance to its original role in sealing a chamber in which relics were kept was argued in more detail by this reviewer in a book published in 2000 but which is absent from the bibliography. Given the prominence of the debate concerning the Stone's origins, a chapter should have been devoted to this issue, enabling a more detailed analysis.

In conclusion, this is a useful addition to the literature on the Stone of Destiny but it fails to live up to expectations. While the discussion of comparative material is excellent, the book fails to address adequately such fundamental issues as the origins, authenticity and mythology of the Stone and its setting at Scone. Moreover, poor ordering of its contents limits the accessibility, impact and effectiveness of the volume overall.

Gloucester NICK AITCHISON

Robert the Bruce: A Life Chronicled.
By Chris Brown. Pp. 416.
ISBN 0 7524 2575 7
Stroud: Tempus Publishing Ltd. 2004. £30.00.

It was with a great deal of interest that I agreed to review this book. The publisher's 'blurb' which accompanied the text further piqued my curiosity. This described it as 'a masterpiece of research [...] essential reading for any student of the period [...]', and as 'the only source book for documents on the life of Robert the Bruce'. These are very bold claims since historians interested in this period have been well-served of late.

During the last two decades three excellent books have been published that approach the first phase of the wars of independence from different angles. These are *Edward I* by Michael Prestwich (1988), *The Wars of the Bruces* by Colm McNamee (1997) and *Under the Hammer* by Fiona Watson (1998). All of these books are required reading for any student of the period. A number of important articles by authors like Dauvit Broun, Sonja Cameron, Sean Duffy, A.A.M. Duncan, Michael Penman and Grant G. Simpson (to name but a few) have also appeared in various journals during this time and have added greatly to the debate surrounding various aspects of the wars. Last, but by no means least, we also have two older books that are still considered to be essential reading: G.W.S. Barrow's evergreen monograph *Robert Bruce and the Community of the Realm of Scotland* (4th edn, 1988) and *The Scottish War of Independence* by E.M. Barron (1934).

All of these publications have been largely based on primary source material edited during the nineteenth century. This material includes works like the *Calendars of Documents Relating to Scotland* edited by J. Bain (4 vols, 1881-88), the *Documents and Records Illustrating the History of Scotland* edited by Francis Palgrave (1837), and the *Rotuli Scotiae* (2 vols, 1841). Some important additions to this collection of primary source material have also been made during the last fifty years. These comprise *Edward I and the Throne of Scotland* by E.L.G. Stones and Grant G. Simpson (2 vols, 1978), Barbour's *Bruce* edited by M.P. McDiarmid and J.A.C. Stevenson (3 vols, 1980-85), and *Regesta Regum Scottorum*, v, edited by A.A.M. Duncan (1988).

Mr Brown gives a single rationale for producing this new book: he wanted to make some of the surviving documentary material on the life of Robert I '[...] more readily available'. This intention is to be commended, even though the author soon admits (thereby contradicting his publisher) that the book is useless to students because he has not provided the reader with the proper academic apparatus for analysing the text. Taking this comment into account, it can only be presumed that this book is aimed at a general readership. This in itself is no bad thing, provided the information in the book is reliable.

The author has divided his book into twelve sections. Seven of these twelve chapters are devoted to primary source material in translation: Sir Thomas Grey of Heton's *Scalacronica*, John of Fordun's chronicle, the Lanercost Chronicle, the acts of King Robert I, the Chamberlain's rolls, English state records and Barbour's *Bruce*. These were presumably chosen to provide a fairly representative mix of the surviving records from both sides of the border.

To any reader with an interest in the history of mediaeval Scotland this list should look odd. It has been recognised since 1999 that John of Fordun was not the author of the Gesta Annalia appended to *Chronica Gentis Scottorum*, and therefore not the author of these extracts on King Robert. Instead, in his seminal chapter in *Church, Chronicle and Learning in Mediaeval and Renaissance*

Scotland (Edinburgh, 1999), Dauvit Broun demonstrated that these passages were part of a manuscript that he called Gesta Annalia II, and which was derived in some way from a St Andrews chronicle. In choosing to ignore (if that is indeed what happened) the historiographic consequences of Broun's chapter, and in continuing to assign the authorship of the Gesta Annalia material appended to *Chronica Gentis Scottorum* to John of Fordun, Mr Brown is helping to perpetuate yet another chain of error in Scottish history.

Dauvit Broun, however, should not feel too offended. As far as this book is concerned he is in good company since the author also fails to include any mention of McDiarmid and Stevenson's edition of Barbour's *Bruce*. Accordingly, anyone reading Mr Brown's commentary on A.A.M. Duncan's edition of *The Bruce* (1997) might be led to believe that Professor Duncan was wholly responsible for interpreting the Edinburgh manuscript, 'E'. In fact, in his edition of the text Duncan makes it quite clear that he adopted McDiarmid and Stevenson's edition entirely and only made some literal changes to the text.

The remaining five chapters of *Robert the Bruce: A Life Chronicled*, amounting to about 10 per cent of the book, are short commentaries written by the author that either cover aspects of King Robert's reign or are concerned with a particular extract. Among these sections the author has contributed material on why there was a battle at Bannockburn in 1314, tactics used during the battle, the people of King Robert, a commentary on Barbour's *Bruce*, and King Robert in romance. While pleasant to read, these sections offer no great insights or new revelations about Scotland between 1306 and 1329.

Unfortunately, however, these five chapters also contain a number of glaring errors. The worst of these must be Mr Brown's description of the Treaty of Berwick in 1328 in which the Scots and the English made peace. Any member of the public looking to follow this reference up and read more about this treaty will search in vain. Perhaps the author meant to refer to the Treaty of Edinburgh-Northampton? Mr Brown also occasionally has a problem in identifying the correct geography. The island he discusses on page 43 was not Galloway but most likely Threave island (Richard Oram, *The Lordship of Galloway* (Edinburgh, 2000), 222).

In fact, this book gives every impression of never having been proof-read. If it had been, such simple errors would surely have been picked up. This also probably explains why at least four books are referred to in the text but never appear in the bibliography: Herbert Maxwell's translation of the Lanercost Chronicle (actually Chapter 3 of the book); *Calendar of Documents Relating to Scotland*, v, (1986) by G.G. Simpson and J.D. Galbraith; *Image and Identity* (eds, Dauvit Broun, R.J. Finlay and Michael Lynch, 1998), and Roger Mason (ed.), *People and Power in Scotland* (1992). In similar vein, not too many general readers might be aware that Mayhew and Gemmill's *Changing Value of Money* (p. 13) is actually the same text as Gemmill, E. and N. Mayhew *Changing Values in Mediaeval Scotland* (bibliography).

My last bone of contention is this: Mr Brown's sole rationale for cobbling this book together was to make some of the surviving evidence for the life and times of King Robert I more readily available. In fact, Barbour's *Bruce*, which accounts for 210 pages (over 50 per cent) of the text, can quite easily be bought as a Canongate paperback either for £5 second-hand or for £10 new. Similarly, another sixty-eight pages can also be easily accessed in Llanerch reprints. This means that over two-thirds of this book can quite easily be found in any high-street bookshop, probably most second-hand bookstores, and any public library. The remaining third is not worth the £30 price-tag.

This book was a good idea but poorly executed. It is not the only source book on the life of King Robert I for historians. It cannot be recommended as

essential reading for students. It most definitely is not a masterpiece of research. Had I paid for this book I would have demanded my money back.

University of Stirling ALASDAIR ROSS

The Declaration of Arbroath: History, Significance, Setting.
Edited by Geoffrey Barrow. Pp xiii, 148.
ISBN 0 903903 27 X.
Edinburgh: Society of Antiquaries of Scotland. 2003. £19.99.

The appearance of a second book in two years dealing with the Declaration of Arbroath is testimony to the special significance accorded to this letter by modern audiences. No other mediaeval Scottish diplomatic missive has produced even a fraction of the material written on this 1320 letter in the name of the Scottish barons to Pope John XXII. It has even become the focal point for global celebrations of Scottishness as well as being the subject of a conference in 2001 whose proceedings form this volume. At the outset, however, it is important to understand the importance of the sub-title, 'History, Significance, Setting'. For this is a book about the place of the Declaration, geographical and historical, more than about its content or immediate context.

The arrangement of the seven articles included could have made this clearer. Rather than being organised alphabetically they might have been more helpfully grouped according to theme. For example two chapters clearly deal with setting. Richard Fawcett provides a detailed architectural description and history of Arbroath Abbey which includes a fascinating account of the move from hostility through neglect to conservation in the treatment of the building after the Reformation. This account would sit well alongside the excellent discussion of the abbey's foundation and growth up to 1320 by Keith Stringer which gives a convincing analysis of this exceptionally well-endowed community. Stringer's argument that fresh impetus was provided by new endowments from King William in the 1190s exactly fits with Fawcett's dating of the main building period, not to the initial foundation of the 1170s but to the end of the twelfth and early thirteenth centuries. These two articles provide a second study of a major reformed abbey alongside the recent study of Melrose Abbey by Fawcett and Richard Oram.

Three papers deal with the transmission and commemoration of the Declaration. Grant Simpson discusses the recent debate about the document, in which his role has been central, and then looks at the early transmission of the text. What is clear from this examination is that, for someone like Walter Bower, the 1320 letter had no special importance and its purpose was imperfectly known. Bower included many similar documents and accords greater significance to the writings of Baldred Bisset twenty years before. J.N.G. Ritchie's discussion of celebrations in Arbroath to mark the Declaration is a fascinating account of twentieth-century perceptions of the Scottish past and their importance (even sensitivity) in discussions of the Scottish present and future. By comparison Edward Cowan's piece relating the development of 'Tartan Days' in North America and Australasia seems rather too close to the events it describes, both in terms of the author's personal attitudes and in terms of chronology.

What is most striking about this collection is that only two of the essays actually focus on the events of the early fourteenth century. Moreover, one of these, Archie Duncan's analysis of the context and content of the letters of 1309-10, known as the Declaration of the Clergy, is something of a prequel. Though long known about and much-quoted, this is the first detailed examination of the

dating and purpose of the four versions of this text. Duncan's argument that the letter was issued twice for the purpose of presenting Robert's case to the council of the church at Vienne is based on good reasons. However, reasons could also be advanced in its language and aims to suggest that it had an internal purpose. None of the manuscript copies of the letter was found beyond Britain. Moreover, the absolution of Scots from oaths to King John or Edward of England by the leading Scottish clergy, which the letter claims to give, would have been an important message within Scotland. If the arguments about Robert Bruce's qualities and rights and the denunciation of his enemies in the name of the Scottish church were not central planks of Bruce propaganda to his subjects, what were his partisans saying to win and consolidate support in the kingdom at this crucial point?

It is left to Dauvit Broun's article to shed new light on the Declaration itself. Broun concentrates on the pedigree of the Scots as a people and, he argues, more importantly, as the possessors of the line of kings referred to in the letter. He demonstrates that the precise claims to 113 kings were the product of a process of drawing up and extending the royal line which had been sponsored by the crown in the preceding century and which had seen some unscrupulous grafting onto the family tree. Broun concludes with a passage in which he analyses the value of such a claim of descent for an elite and a king who knew themselves to be 'foreign' in ethnic Scottish terms. He also argues convincingly that ideas of nationhood in the letter should be equated not with ethnicity or even shared descent but with membership of a common structure of allegiance to a king and to a line of kings. The development of this as an exclusive loyalty between the late thirteenth and late fourteenth centuries is also suggested. Indeed, it was surely the main result of the wars, with the 1320 letter as a key landmark in the process.

This is a valuable collection with much to recommend it but, Broun apart, there is something of a Declaration-shaped hole in the volume. As Simpson suggests, the key statements about the document were made thirty or so years ago, especially by himself and Professor Duncan. Current analysis remains on a plateau and, while it is well-suited by its language and content to act as a totemic symbol of the Scottish historical past, the letter should not be allowed to overshadow other efforts to judge the political values of this crucial era.

University of St Andrews MICHAEL BROWN

Scotichronicon: Volume 9.
Edited by D.E.R. Watt with Alan Borthwick, Dauvit Broun, L.J. Engels, Nicholas Hadgraft, Catherine Hall, John Higgitt, Sally Mapstone, A.B. Scott, W.W. Scott and J.B. Voorbij. Pp. xxiii, 558.
ISBN 1 873644 647.
Edinburgh: Aberdeen University Press. 1998. £45.00.

It is not easy to review a work which its own editor describes as 'one of Scotland's great national treasures' (p. xv). What is certain is that current and future generations of Scottish historians will treasure the new edition of the *Scotichronicon* which has been published under the general editorship of the late Professor D.E.R. Watt. The publication of Volume 9 of this new edition in 1998 marked the completion of a project which has proved remarkable in its scale and achievement. As the editor relates here, the idea of a new edition of the *Scotichronicon* was first mooted in 1958 and the project was set in progress seriously in 1976. It has involved the collaboration of nearly a score of scholars

and, since the appearance of the first volume (actually Volume 8) in 1987, this team has produced a volume on a nearly annual basis. For sheer organisation, persistence and unity of purpose Professor Watt and his team have managed something remarkable. Their achievement is not likely to be repeated in an age when competition rather than collaboration is encouraged between universities and when deadlines for scholarly production are measured in months and years—not the decades required for a work of this magnitude.

In Volume 9 Watt makes it clear that the production of a full edition of the text of *Scotichronicon* in the preceding eight volumes has not been without problems. Publishing the volumes as they were ready, rather than in order or all at once, has created difficulties in cross-referencing between volumes and some inconsistencies and limits in the identification of Bower's source material which has drawn criticism from some reviewers. The inclusion here of an index for the whole work does go some way towards solving the former difficulty. Similarly an extensive list of addenda and corrigenda is testament to the problems of running such a large collaborative effort. In his introduction to this final volume, Watt modestly states that 'what is presented here should be regarded as 'work-in-progress' (p. xv). But while this may be true, the work already done and the progress made has been prodigious. These new volumes replace the eighteenth-century edition of the *Scotichronicon* by Walter Goodall whose own achievement was considerable, not least because he was 'perpetually intoxicated' (p. 220). Goodall's text was based on only one of the manuscripts and lacked critical apparatus, notes and translation. With the completion of the Watt edition, using all six surviving manuscripts of the full text and four abbreviated versions of the chronicle, it is perhaps no exaggeration to talk in terms of the restoration of a national treasure. As Watt says in the introduction to Volume 9, 'without study of the *Scotichronicon*, one's study of Scotland and its history cannot get very far' (p. xv). During the years since 1987, as successive volumes have appeared, Scottish historians and mediaevalists in general have been able to recognise what has been previously obscured, and appreciate the achievement of Abbot Bower as the author of the greatest work of mediaeval Scottish historical writing, as well as of Professor Watt and his team for making it accessible as never before.

Volume 9 actually contains a wide variety of material collected together to conclude and complete the edition. The opening section consists of a selection of additional items which are not considered to be part of Bower's main text but are associated with the *Scotichronicon* in a number of its manuscripts. These items include the prologue, preface and preliminary writings in Bower's working copy of the chronicle (Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, MS 171), the Liber Extravagans, a short collection attached to the chronicle, a short continuation of the work to 1460 and two more epitaphs for James I. The interest of these short pieces is testament to the central position of the *Scotichronicon* in Scottish historical writing. The prologues contain virtually the only information we have on Bower's model and forerunner, John of Fordun, while amidst the additional items there is a reference to (and partial rebuttal of) John Barbour's lost work on the Stewart family. These references to the great historians of the previous generation are paralleled by the additions of a later literary figure, Gilbert Hay, to Bower's copy of his chronicle, giving the impression of a continuing tradition of study and writing in late fourteenth- and fifteenth-century Scotland.

The content of these pieces also provides tantalising information. The Liber Extravagans comprises three genealogical poems, one Scottish, one English and one on the Norman Conquest. The Scottish verse is a unique survival. Written between 1298 and 1305, it champions the rights of King John (not King Robert) and Scotland against the 'alien head', the rule of Edward I. The English verses

reveal a less defensive element in Scottish claims. They promote the claims of St Margaret and her heirs as the rightful rulers of England and make clear that this claim resides in the Scottish royal dynasty. Similar claims are found in the *Buke of the Howlat* and elsewhere, and point to an assertive tradition that directly countered English claims to British empire. The epitaphs for James I and the short continuation of the *Scotichronicon* shed light on internal political attitudes. The opaque language of the epitaphs lifts rarely, but references to Methven and Perth standing as witnesses to James's murder and to the 'barons of Stirling' and 'the valley of Edinburgh' granting 'a dowry of strife' hint at the disturbed events of February and March 1437. That these short poems echo Bower's own horrified reaction to James's death is hardly surprising given that they originate in the manuscript owned by the Carthusians of Perth, where the dead king was buried. The strong royalist sentiments expressed in the short continuation of the *Scotichronicon* through James II's reign and which lead to a distortion of events are testament to a prevailing royalist perspective on the preceding decades by the early 1470s.

As with the *Scotichronicon* itself, there is much in these additions for today's historians to debate and examine. The full exposure of buried historical material for the scrutiny of new generations has been the chief achievement of the editorial team. The second part of Volume 9 consists of some opening shots in this process. Some of these studies give necessary, and often fascinating, information about the manuscripts and editorial process. These are supplemented by a series of short articles on a wider series of topics by the general editor and a number of other scholars. Short biographical pieces on Bower and his 'patron', David Stewart of Rosyth, and on the sources, themes and attitudes that characterise the chronicle, are included. It is perhaps inevitable that, alongside the edited text of the *Scotichronicon*, these articles seem less than authoritative. Several stress that they are starting-points for discussion and, as such, all the essays are useful. However, the efforts to put Bower and his writing in the context of his life and times are less successful. Bower's view was not detached. His criticism of ecclesiastical ambition, referred to in Chapter 23, may have stemmed from the failure of his own; his hostility towards Murdoch duke of Albany in Book 15 was, perhaps, influenced by the latter's role in blocking Bower's advancement; and the abbot's despair over the state of Scotland in the 1440s was probably linked to his and his friends' defeat in the civil war of 1444-45. Just as Watt urges his readers not to give his edition 'a false magisterial quality' (p. xv), neither should Bower be revered as a lofty and impartial spokesman of a 'patriotic, conservative' community. Mapstone's article on Bower and kingship does illustrate the tensions between Bower's portrait of James I and the reality of the latter's reign effectively, while Borthwick's study of David Stewart of Rosyth contains much new information. However, both are inclined to be respectful of attitudes and activities that may have been more partisan and self-interested than they admit.

It may, indeed, have seemed hard for contributors to be too critical of chronicle or patron within the pages of the edition itself, and this, perhaps, emphasises the gap between original material and argumentative studies. Bower felt the same tensions. In his prologue he distinguished between himself, the mere writer, and another, the author. It is testament to all those involved in the *Scotichronicon* project, but especially to Professor Watt, that this authority has so quickly become attached to this edition. The study of mediaeval Scotland has been altered permanently for the better.

University of St Andrews MICHAEL BROWN

Elizabeth and Mary: Cousins, Rivals, Queens.
By Jane Dunn. Pp. xxxv, 538.
ISBN 0-00-653192-X.
Hammersmith: Harper Perennial Press. 2003. £8.99.

One of the review lines on the jacket of Jane Dunn's *Elizabeth and Mary: Cousins, Rivals, Queens*, states 'This mythic story will never die', which forms a fair assessment of the contents of this new entry into the realms of royal biography and 'popular history'. The more-than-five-hundred narrative pages are infused with drama, romance, emotion, jealousy, and intrigue, much of it derived from historical gossip, anecdotes, and legends from the lives of both women that have, through repetition, become firmly embedded in the popular conceptions of their lives and reigns. This book contains plenty of the mythos which non-scholarly readers crave, and which research students reluctantly give up at the insistence of pedantic tutors.

Dunn has woven her story to depict an inescapable intertwining of the two queens' lives from their births to the death of Mary and the defeat of the Spanish Armada, with a particular concentration on the period between the 1560s and the 1580s. Dunn weaves their stories together chapter by chapter as the two women move through major events in their lives and reigns, with the narrative line handed back and forth between them using well-placed final sentences for sections on one monarch that lob the metaphorical tennis ball of the narrative over to the other. Dunn creates for them a tightly strung relationship redolent of Friedrich Schiller's play that puts the two women face-to-face, an event that never took place, much to the chagrin of romantics and dramatists alike.

While keeping them wound together, it is Dunn's apparent intent to clarify their differences, with an eye to assessing the personality and character traits that allowed one woman to maintain her throne until her natural death but brought the other to a premature end on the executioner's block. For Dunn, their divergent fates are a product of their individual choices at crucial moments in their careers, and she gives great weight to the factors in their life histories, and to personal incidents, that predated those moments of decision, analyzing their actions and motivations with the relish of a modern psychologist seeking justification of the prisoner's actions before the jury. In particular, the emotional insecurity of Elizabeth I and the emotional instability of Mary Queen of Scots forms a recurring motif with which Dunn views the great moments of each woman's life.

Dunn's narrative mixes together general histories, biographies of the monarchs both modern and period, calendars of state papers, memoirs, and correspondence collections, ranging from the recent edited volume *Collected Works of Elizabeth I* to a Victorian edition of the venerable *Actes and Monuments of John Foxe*. The combination of straightforward documents and romanticized or discreetly edited memoirs and time-hallowed anecdotes is prefaced by the occasional caution, as when Dunn parenthetically comments that Foxe may have used 'poetic license' in his recital of a particular incident. However, as this comes toward the end of a long narrative of events in which Foxe's oft-questioned account is freely interspersed, it would be difficult for someone unfamiliar with the sources or the scholarship to recognize the occasions when hearsay or myth blends with history in the smoothly flowing text of Dunn's book.

Dunn also speaks with a confident voice when assessing the impact of events on the subsequent emotions and motivations of her long-dead characters, and in imagining the way in which a situation must surely have affected them in the longer-term, sometimes making the speculative sound like a matter of fact. In

her way, Dunn appears to be trying to create windows into men's, or women's, souls, a tempting preoccupation for any historical biographer. She is also entirely comfortable with speculative modern physiological and psychological assessments of her subjects' states of mind and body—for example arguing that Mary Stuart's shift of attitudes toward Elizabeth after her marriage to Darnley could have been the result of 'the potency of newly discovered sexual love' or 'the reckless energy of a manic-depressive mania'. Dunn also shows a tendency to overemphasize a point of analysis, as if fearful that her readers will fail to grasp the implications of her subjects' actions, or remember them in relation to later actions, as when she several times reiterates her observation that the Spanish either disliked or were confused by Elizabeth I in the early days of her rule.

The text itself is rich with comments culled from ambassadorial letters and memoirs, including the oft-told story of Melville's visit to Elizabeth I, at which time the English queen supposedly sought to dazzle him with her superior merits. The recounted speeches and conversations will surely give this book great appeal to readers, but could use a bit more cautionary flagging for scholarly purposes. For example, there is still a lively debate about how much of, or in what form, Elizabeth's 'Tilbury speech' was ever delivered by her, but Dunn simply repeats it, and in fact uses it as an example of Elizabeth's skill in oratory. Throughout the book, all of the more dramatic aspects are heightened—sexual awareness and tension, danger, stress, emotion, all ride at high levels, and people and situations are described in romanticized language. Mary I is a pitiful fanatic; the Earl of Leicester is described as 'lusty Lord Robert Dudley'; Mary Stuart falls into her half-brother's arms for comfort on his return to her court after the murder of David Rizzio, and her emotional outbursts are sometimes characterized as borderline madness. There is a constant undercurrent in the text of menace, sexuality, and anxiety highly reminiscent of the dark and dramatic tone taken by the writer and director for the Cate Blanchett film, *Elizabeth*.

As remarked at the beginning of this review, the mythic story will never die. Much of the 'history' of Elizabeth and Mary is replete with the small legends and stories that are beloved of non-specialists, and give greater human warmth to their subjects, whether or not we possess sufficient evidence to support their inclusion in historical scholarship. For the further interest of the general audience, this particular paperback edition features a special section at the back, with an author interview and biography, a summary of various reviews, and a brief examination of movies and plays dealing with Elizabeth and Mary's lives. Dunn's book is well-suited to a modern general reader who embraces the efforts of an author to give them supposed 'insight' into the mind of a character, and make an historically distant figure more human and approachable. At this Dunn is quite skilled, and this volume is likely to be greatly appreciated by people who seek human interest stories rather than those pursuing academic quests.

Yale University LISA L. FORD

Mary Queen of Scots and the Casket Letters.
By A.E. MacRobert. Pp. x, 235.
ISBN 1 86064 829 0.
London: I.B. Tauris Publishers. 2002. £29.50.

A.E. MacRobert's book represents the most recent instalment in the notoriously long-running debate about the Casket Letters and Sonnets, allegedly written by a murderous Mary Queen of Scots to her adulterous lover James

Hepburn, the Earl of Bothwell. Past historians like Walter Goodall (1754), William Tytler (1790), T.F. Henderson (1888, 1905), Andrew Lang (1901), H.F. Diggle (1960), and M.H. Armstrong Davison (1965) have subjected this set of dubious documents to close scrutiny in an effort to settle the question of Mary's guilt. In recent years, the debate has been treated briefly by Jenny Wormald (1988) and in more depth by Antonia Fraser (1969) and John Guy (2004), as part of their larger studies of Mary Queen of Scots. In one way or another, these three acknowledge the political uses to which the Casket Letters were put and the difficulty—even impossibility—of resolving the debate in the absence of the original documents. MacRobert nevertheless attempts a 'drastic re-evaluation' of the textual mystery by returning to the 'limited' though 'essential' contemporary sources. While MacRobert's assiduous attention to textual and practical details may be admirable, his book fails to offer any substantially new information and reaches the disappointing and unsurprising conclusion that the 'Casket Letters can no longer be considered as sound evidence' against the Queen.

He gives three reasons for writing a book on the Casket Letters. Spurred on by the question of their authenticity, he wants to reprint the full set of Letters. Second, he wishes that the Letters, as 'the core of the evidence against Mary', might not 'just be pushed to one side and ignored'—a concern hardly warranted given the endless speculation about their authenticity. Finally, in the absence of an 'agreed version or interpretation', MacRobert aims to present 'a balanced account' of the historical episode to which the Letters pertain. The first part of the book, 'The Crisis of 1567-68', attempts this by describing and speculating about the events surrounding Darnley's murder. Regrettably, MacRobert's historical account lacks clarity: his reluctance to endorse particular theories with any consistency makes the presentation of evidence difficult to follow. Although organised under specific headings such as 'The Use of Gunpowder' and 'Mary's Return to the Palace', the historical discussion seems unfocused, with multiple conclusions—sometimes within one paragraph—adding to the confusion. For example, MacRobert concludes his review of the circumstances of Darnley's death with the following statements:

> Unless Darnley was strangled just as he left the house and his corpse was then taken into the garden, it should be realised that he might have escaped in the darkness. If the house was in fact surrounded by 30 to 50 men...his chance of escape to safety was slight. It is, however, possible that the number of conspirators was much smaller and that Darnley was unlucky to encounter any of them. On the other hand, perhaps his assassins knew exactly where he would go (p. 40).

Although here, as elsewhere, MacRobert successfully accounts for all possible scenarios, the result is a series of disjointed explanations, which neither concentrates on the essential questions nor fully pursues any one thread of argument.

The second part of the book, 'The Casket Letters', reviews the circumstances of their discovery and then analyses each document. The interpretation of the Letters seems sound, if derivative. Many of MacRobert's observations can be traced to the work of other historians and enthusiasts, not only those writing in earlier centuries but also those who revisited this debate in the 1960s. For example, MacRobert identifies 'the man' of Letter I as a possible reference to the infant James, a suggestion made by Armstrong Davison, who cites R.H. Mahon (1924). Similarly, in his analysis of Letter IV, he suggests that a 'turtle-dove' missing its mate recalls a poem written from Darnley to Mary, a possibility previously noted by Diggle. These specific instances may be observations

worth repeating, of course, but his reading of the Letters does not generally advance our understanding of these documents. This section of the book also includes brief discussions of the two marriage contracts and the Casket Sonnets. In the latter, he rightly notes a similarity in tone with Letters III, IV, V, and VI, but otherwise his abbreviated treatment of the poems consists wholly in pointing out lines that Mary could not possibly have written—because they do not fit her circumstances—and those that would be incriminating if authentic.

MacRobert provides a set of illustrations, some of which readers might have encountered before: portraits of the major figures, the sketch of the murder scene at Kirk o'Field, and, somewhat more curiously, photographs of Provand's Lordship in Glasgow, where Mary may have lodged in January 1567. Appendices helpfully reproduce the variant texts of the Casket Letters, Sonnets, and marriage contracts between Mary and Bothwell. The author includes a handwritten translation in English of Letter V, which recently came to light in the Public Record Office, though he does not comment on its discovery (SP 53/2/64). He does not seem to know, however, about a transcript in Scots of Letter III at the British Library (Add. MS 48027, fol. 276^{r-v}), nor of a copy of the Casket Sonnets preserved among the Lennox papers at Cambridge University Library (Oo.7.47, fols. 46^{r}-49^{r}), both of which might have led to fuller commentary on these items. One technical matter is worrying: MacRobert does not follow conventions of quotation. Although he usually signals his source, inverted commas are used inconsistently if at all, making it difficult for the reader to judge where quoted material begins and ends, or even what material is paraphrased and what quoted directly.

MacRobert finally determines that 'It is too simplistic to hold that the Casket Letters were either completely authentic or entirely forged. There is, however, sufficient evidence to endorse the view that there was extensive manipulation and forgery'. With this in mind, he suggests 'new lines of enquiry' by calling for more investigation into Darnley's possible plots against Mary and further consideration of Bothwell's motives in keeping such a collection of documents in the first place. Here, the author raises legitimate concerns, and especially in the latter case he identifies a logical crux in the entire Casket Letter fiasco. MacRobert brings to his project a genuine spirit of curiosity, a desire for historical accuracy and an ability to imagine numerous conflicting scenarios. The greatest obstacle to his success is that he has entered a debate whose urgency has passed. Perhaps it is time to replace the traditional form and purpose of the Casket debate—can exegesis of these documents settle the question of Mary's character?—with larger explorations into the politics of rhetorical and textual strategy in the sixteenth century.

University College, Oxford TRICIA A. M^{c}ELROY

Scots in Habsburg Service, 1618-1648.
By David Worthington. Pp. 330.
ISBN 90 04 13575 8.
Leiden: Brill. 2004. EUR 96.00.

It may be unfair to commence a review of David Worthington's book, a work scrupulously detailed and graphically revealing as only a few of the more recent titles in the scholarship of The Thirty Years' War have been, by referring to an equally meticulous study, edited by Steve Murdoch in 2001. For the latter's *Scotland and the Thirty Years' War, 1618-1648* received meagre applause, provoking the resistance of certain German historians by reassessing this peculiarly

'German' matter of scholarly debate from a distinctively Scottish, or Scoto-British, perspective. It is to be feared, however, that Worthington's own work, a pioneering study that almost uniquely provides a detailed chronology and exhaustive glossaries on this subject, will provoke similar knee-jerk responses; for it specifically foregrounds the complex networks of diplomatic initiatives that Scots were involved in as part of their services to the Austrian and Spanish branch of the House of Habsburg. It also draws attention to the melding of religious and political motivations into an inspiring Scottish identity abroad that expressed itself in loyalty to the Scottish-born 'Winter Queen', Elizabeth Stuart, amid a conflict that arguably affected the lives of people in places as remote as Salem and Nova Julia. In this it follows naturally on from Murdoch's *Britain, Denmark-Norway and the House of Stuart, 1603-1660* (2003) and Alexia Grosjean's *An Unofficial Alliance: Scotland and Sweden, 1569-1654* (2004), for both of these studies are largely devoted to the commitment of tens of thousands of Scots in the service of Scandinavian monarchs ostensibly fighting for the cause of Elizabeth Stuart.

It would be hard to deny that Worthington's study demonstrates a quality and scope of research which introduces an additional, and no less interesting, perspective to this subject—that of those fewer, but remarkably influential, Scots fighting on the Habsburg side in the conflict. Consulting archives in Spain, Belgium, Austria, and the Czech Republic and, needless to say, in Britain as well, 'in order to account for the activities of Scots in this vast region of the European mainland' (p. 11), Worthington carefully reconstructs the political cosmos of the Imperial courts in Vienna and Madrid wherein Scotsmen fulfilled their diplomatic, military or advisory roles with varying degrees of success. While concisely describing from start to finish the interconnected historic processes which sparked off the war between the newly-elected King of Bohemia (Frederick V, the Count Palatine) and the Austrian Habsburg Emperor (Ferdinand II) in 1619, Worthington assesses the activities of Scottish clients of the Habsburgs in the context of their endeavours and achievements abroad. By way of example, great transparency is given to the lives of a group of Scottish expatriates, exiles, and sojourners, who gained advancement in Habsburg service. Independently but simultaneously, staunch men such as William Semple in Madrid, James Maxwell in Brussels, and Walter Leslie in Vienna, played important roles in Imperial policy and intrigue prior to and during the war.

On the premises of an ever-persistent multi-layered perspective that correlates to questions concerning controversial issues such as the "Wars of the Three Kingdoms", the "pro-Palatinate initiatives" or the "Scottish Catholic cause abroad", the study is able to elucidate those hitherto-obscure relations and activities between Imperial Europe and Scotland, while, at the same time, providing insights into the conflicting views of British political and regal controversies that they engendered. To facilitate the progress of the book towards a convincing set of conclusions, it is divided into two parts. This bifurcation notwithstanding, Worthington succeeds in drawing a colourful picture of the Spanish and Austrian Habsburg political landscape that became 'home' to several Scotsmen, 'wandering throughout the continent in search of employment'—indeed, *Scotus ubique latet.*

As a preliminary (Chapter 1), Worthington ventures a substantial synopsis of the pre-history of Scottish activities in Central, Western and Southern Europe up to 1618 without covering the largely accredited Scottish contacts with Scandinavia, France and northern parts of the Netherlands. He reveals that the historical relationship between Scotland and the Habsburg had long been in existence, and that it had attracted Scotsmen for various reasons (exile, travel,

education, missionary work, diplomacy, etc.) to embark on a journey to the continent.

In the first part, comprising Chapters 2 to 4, prominence is given to Colonel William Semple, Father Hugh Semple and their circle of Scottish Hispanophiles in Madrid. As *gentilhombre de la boca* to Philips II, III and IV in Madrid, William Semple eagerly encouraged the Spanish crown in the 1620s to revive the Armada ethos in order to launch a naval campaign against the three Stuart kingdoms. Semple hoped that this foray would result in the re-Catholicisation of his native shores. Father Hugh Semple, S.J., a permanent resident in Spain since 1614, who made efforts to open a Scots seminary in Madrid in the prospect of a Spanish match between Charles I and the Infanta in 1623, entered diplomatic service at a later stage of the war when he was employed to promote a settlement of the Palatine issue that haunted the relationship between Spanish Habsburg and the Stuart kingdoms. Albeit a non-partisan commitment to Elizabeth of Bohemia, the former Princess Palatine, Scottish efforts in this direction were hampered by the shifting interests of the Imperial court in Madrid. On the other hand, a further reason for this is traceable in an inner Scottish conflict 1625-33, raging between militancy against the Stuart political cause in terms of the Palatinate and a feeling of loyalty to king and country that clearly forbad such thinking. It goes without saying that the death of William Semple in 1625 delivered a major blow to the Hispanophile fanatics and Scottish nationalists in Spain, since the loss of the living quintessence of protest necessarily weakened their cause.

Such brief references to highly interconnected aspects in this book cannot, of course, give a sufficient impression of the great richness of material and argument characterising Worthington's approach. However, as regards the Spanish Habsburg court in Madrid, it becomes evident from his account that the gradual nullification of Scottish influence with the Spaniards by the end of the conflict in 1648 was due to an inability to promote a bilateral programme with the Spanish that was favourable and acceptable to the parties involved. Unsurprisingly, Worthington has traced a similar development in terms of the Stuart-Austrian Habsburg relationship. In the second part, which consists of Chapters 5 to 9, his cynosure is Walter Leslie and his circle. Leslie's career in Austrian-Habsburg service is spectacular. Among his meritorious actions for the Imperial court in Vienna, the involvement in the assassination of Wallenstein in 1634 retrospectively appeared to be the most conspicuous. Above all, there is little reason to think that Leslie and his fellows were more successful than their cousins in Spanish service in the same period of time. Following Walter Leslie and John Gordon in their pursuit of support for the Palatine issue and in their search for court patronage and future employment, Worthington not only outlines the personal dimension of each individual in this conflict through specific examples but he also provides a clear insight into the capabilities of each individual Scot concerned to "play" his part in the cosmopolitan, international world of the Imperial courts of the Austrian and Spanish branches of the House of Habsburg. It is, moreover, this conception of the overlapping of the microcosmic fears, hopes, and plans of the individuals in service, with the macrocosmic reactions of the Imperial courts, that strengthens the credibility and readability of this study. That Worthington's footnotes and glossaries concerning the 'previously ignored' will also stimulate further enquiries in adjacent fields of research should scarcely need saying.

University of Bonn CHRISTOPH GINZEL

The British Atlantic World, 1500-1800.
Edited by David Armitage and Michael J. Braddick. Pp. xx, 324.
ISBN 0333963415.
Houndmills: Palgrave Macmillan. 2002. £49.50.

According to J.H. Elliot, the rise of the new Atlantic history is 'one of the most important new historiographical developments of recent years'. Along with the new British history, it is forcing scholars of early modern England, Scotland, Ireland and North America out of the comfort zone of their national histories. It 'pushes historians towards methodological pluralism and expanded horizons' (p. 27), and challenges us to 'trace connections' and 'draw comparisons' (p. 236).

David Armitage and Michael Braddick have edited an outstanding primer that will be warmly welcomed by first-time sailors and experienced navigators of this oceanic field. The collection is topped and tailed by two of the doyens of the new Atlantic history, Bernard Bailyn (who writes the Preface) and John Elliot (who provides the Afterword). Armitage himself contributes the introductory essay, a sophisticated theoretical analysis of the new subject. But the heart of the book lies in ten thematic essays arranged into three categories. The first category, 'Connections', contains pieces on migration (Alison Games), the economy (Nuala Zahedieh) and religion (Carla Pestana); the second, 'Identities', covers civility and authority (Braddick), gender (Sarah Pearsall), class (Keith Wrightson) and race (Joyce Chaplin); and the third, 'Politics', tackles empire and state (Elizabeth Mancke), revolution and counter-revolution (Eliga Gould) and slavery (Christopher Brown).

The topics covered indicate the diversity and ambition of the new Atlantic history. If the emergence of the new British history was largely driven by the questions of political historians (especially concerning the origins of the English Civil War), Atlantic history is more wide-ranging in its origins and scope—both thematically and geographically. The essays assembled in this unusually coherent collection provide wonderfully compressed overviews of their topics. Inevitably, some subjects lend themselves to the Atlantic approach more than others—as Elliot observes, migration and slavery are particularly well suited to this kind of treatment, and it is no surprise that the essays by Games and Brown are among the most satisfying. But the quality of the collection as a whole is very high, and each piece is packed with striking detail and provocative generalisation. Elliot even offers a speculative piece of 'counter-factual Atlantic history' in which Christopher Columbus enters the service of Henry VII of England and an expedition of five hundred West Countrymen conquers the Aztecs, with world-historical consequences (pp. 241-43).

There are also, however, some questionable statements. Gould suggests that 'Few historians would dispute the interconnectedness of what they now describe as the "three British revolutions" of 1641, 1688, and 1776' (p. 196). In fact, few scholars apart from John Pocock (to whom Gould refers) show the slightest interest in the connections between 1641 and 1776, and many historians of the English Civil War would insist that if a 'revolution' took place at all it did not do so until 1648-49. On another matter, historians of the Covenanter Parliaments will be surprised at the claim that the Glorious Revolution 'opened the way for the first truly independent parliaments in Scottish history' (p. 203). In other essays, the vastness of the subject inspires grandiose phrases—'inter-hemispheric civilisation' (p. xiv) will presumably appeal to science-fiction fans. The new subject is even generating new jargon. We read of 'circum-Atlantic history', 'Trans-Atlantic history', 'Cis-Atlantic history', the 'white' Atlantic, the 'black' Atlantic, the 'red' Atlantic, the 'multicoloured'

Atlantic and even the 'green' Atlantic (a reference to the Irish, not to ecology). One can only be grateful that there is as yet no sign of a 'tartan Atlantic'.

Scotland, in fact, does not loom particularly large. It receives reasonable coverage in the essays on migration and revolution, but in several others the Scots make only a token appearance. The index contains more references to Ireland, not least because it was such an important trial-ground for English colonialism. Scotland's relatively low profile reflects the fact that for much of the period from 1500 to 1800 the majority of Scots were facing East rather than West. As Games suggests, 'In their Atlantic orientation the English were distinct from the Scots, who were precociously European in orientation' (p. 37). Of course, the Scots made up for lost time in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, though the authors of this volume were unable to benefit from the latest studies of Scottish overseas migration, such as Tom Devine's *Scotland's Empire, 1600-1815* (2003) and Marjory Harper's *Adventurers and Exiles: The Great Scottish Exodus* (2003).

Despite this, historians of Scotland will find this to be a very stimulating collection. It provides a broader framework for national histories, and succeeds admirably in its task of pushing historians towards expanded horizons.

University of Leicester JOHN COFFEY

The 'Conquest' of Acadia, 1710: Imperial, Colonial, and Aboriginal Constructions.
By John G. Reid, Maurice Basque, Elizabeth Mancke, Barry Moody, Geoffrey Plank and William Wicken. Pp. xxiii, 297.
ISBN 0802037550 cloth; 0802085385 paper.
Toronto: University of Toronto Press. 2004. £40.00 cloth; £20.00 paper.

This collection of nine essays, by six United States and Canadian scholars, examines the British conquest of the French colony of Acadia and the subsequent problems which beset the administrators of the renamed Nova Scotia. The authors take a rather post-modernist approach to the conquest, arguing that there is no 'single valid narrative' of the conquest and that 'the events that are central to this book were experienced differently by native inhabitants, Acadians, and British and French officials, and by British colonists in New England and then in Nova Scotia' (p. xi). Consequently, each chapter takes a different approach and studies a different aspect of the conquest and its legacy.

Although the work is a collection of separate essays, it does have a clear central focus, and the essays develop several central themes. In particular, the authors also place the Acadian experience in the broader context of the eighteenth-century Atlantic world and arrive at two central conclusions. As they explain, 'The first is the bankruptcy of the notion that this period in history was the "colonial" era. Colonies existed, but they existed in relationship to imperial and native worlds that interacted with each other as well as with colonial population' (p. 208). The second is that the interaction between British, Acadian and Mik'maqs 'by conforming neither with the accepted pattern of a colony of settlement nor with that of a "middle ground" provides the historian with an intermediate model. Here European settlement existed and so did imperial institutions of governance. The Acadian communities, however, represented a form of settlement that had become divorced from state formation and from formal imperial expansion' (pp. 208-09).

The authors also stress the pivotal role of negotiation in shaping their model of imperialism. Central to all negotiations in the region was the weakness of the British administration in Nova Scotia. Deprived of both money and men, British administrators were unable to impose their rule on the Acadians or Native

American population. Their weakness then forced administrators to recognise the 'neutrality' of the Acadians. The Acadians in turn could not be regarded as British subjects, and Nova Scotia was therefore a colony without subjects. Lacking subjects, however, British officials struggled to establish the economic, civil and judicial framework necessary for a functioning colonial society.

To develop these themes the work is divided into four sections. The first section of the work, 'The Event,' provides the historical context for the conquest. The second section, 'Precursors,' consists of two chapters examining the antecedents of the conquest, stressing that the conquest was not a new experience for the Acadians but in many ways merely a continuation of previous events. The third section, 'Agencies', examines the processes by which Acadia was 'conquered' and transformed into Nova Scotia. In this section Geoffrey Plank considers the limited role of New Englanders while William Wicken studies the important role of the native Mi'kmaqs. Both authors emphasise the role of diplomacy and imperialism in forming early Acadia, a theme that is taken much further in the final chapter of the section by John Reid which examines the diplomatic responses to the 1710 conquest. The fourth section, 'Transitions,' explores the longer-term processes and consequences of the conquest, examining the problems faced by the British regime in Annapolis, the development of Acadian attitudes to neutrality and the imperial dimension of the conquest with its opportunities for the British to forge a multi-ethnic empire.

While scholars with an interest in Scottish history and the history of Scottish overseas ventures might be disappointed at the lack of a Scottish dimension and the absence of any discussion of Scottish involvement in early Nova Scotia, this work does appeal to a far larger audience than those interested solely in the history of Acadia and Nova Scotia. Indeed, much of the focus of the work is on demonstrating how many of the patterns in Acadia relate to the Atlantic empires of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. By stressing the themes of the conquest rather than providing a narrative of the conquest, the work reveals much about the nature of the French and British/English Atlantic empires in this period. In particular, it provides a picture of communities on the edge of empire: French Acadians, Native Americans, New England fishermen and fur traders, British soldiers and administrators.

While the book is published both in hardback and paperback, the lack of a central narrative, combined with the sometimes rather theoretical approach, might diminish the appeal of the work to non-academic and undergraduate audiences. In addition, the work would also benefit greatly from a more detailed map. While it contains one map (and one contemporary plan of Port Royal), this covers a large region from Boston to Newfoundland and provides little detail of places discussed in the text.

Ultimately, the work uses Acadia as a case study to make some important conclusions about the nature of empire-building in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. In particular, the work highlights several contradictions inherent in the growth of European Atlantic empires. For while the seventeenth century was a time of state formation in Europe, when the state was being more clearly defined in terms of its geographical boundaries and political consciousness, the expansion of European states into North America ran contrary to these developments, blurring state boundaries and creating nebulous political and social identities. The work also demonstrates that there were varied responses to the British invasion and that even within the Acadian community there were different interpretations, different narratives, of the conquest. Yet the idea that different Acadians in different geographic locations, or with different trading or political sympathies, should have seen events in different contexts, is hardly surprising. Nor is the discussion of Mi'kmaq responses to the conquest as complete

as might be desired, although this probably reflects the paucity of source material. However, for scholars with an interest in early American and Canadian history, or in the development of European Atlantic empires, this is an important work that provides a rich context and comparison for developments elsewhere.

University of Dundee MATTHEW C. WARD

Patrick Ferguson: 'A Man of Some Genius'.
By M.M. Gilchrist. Pp. xii, 84.
ISBN 1 901663 74 4.
Edinburgh: NMS Enterprises. 2003. £7.99.

This is a small book, just ninety-six pages in all, with twelve black-and-white illustrations. The general editor of the series is the same person who has edited two very useful National Museums of Scotland series, 'Scots Lives' and 'Scotland's Past in Action', Iseabail MacLeod. Both series incorporate quite important little surveys, including, for example, the only general overview of the history of Scottish education that the late Don Withrington ever wrote. It is not the big book his peers expected for a professional lifetime, and which he was so well qualified to write, but it is better than nothing. This slim volume, however, is rather different in format from the other titles in the two series, because the nature of its subject enabled there to be co-operation in its publication, and one hopes in its sale, with the Royal Armouries. Their Head of Collections, Graeme Rimmer, contributes a foreword, pointing out that the Royal Armouries acquired in 2000 a particularly fine and well-documented example of the rifle with a screw-plug breech-loading mechanism that Ferguson patented in 1776, and which, though produced in such small quantities as to be an extreme rarity for collectors today, made the rifle a practical and serviceable military weapon at the time. The main trouble with small books that are inherently important is the same trouble as with small books in general: they are difficult to market. It would, however, be a great pity if the significance of this particularly important little book were to escape wider notice.

First and most obviously, it is a detailed biography, as far as the here scrupulously-surveyed surviving manuscript and printed sources permit, of a man who is most important in the history of firearms. Born in the Edinburgh of the Enlightenment in 1744, Patrick Ferguson came from a North-East family, the Fergusons of Pitfour, with strong Jacobite associations, though his father was a jurant Episcopalian who had no difficulties in accepting the Protestant Succession and swearing the oaths to the Illustrious House of Hanover. The family fortunes had been damaged in the South Sea Bubble, but Patrick's father James was a most successful advocate and, despite defending Jacobite prisoners at Carlisle in 1746, became Dean of Faculty in 1760 and a Lord of Session in 1764. There is interesting material in this biography on Patrick's close relations with his mother and three sisters, and it is clear that the sisters were far from stereotypically 'feminine' in their interests, despite being brought up in an age when the rise of sentimentality threatened to impose a singularly limited range of physical and emotional expectations upon middle- and upper-class women. Sister Jean, for example, at the age of sixteen had, according to her mother, devoted most of her energies to hunting, shooting, riding and Latin, and very little to needlework, though she enjoyed playing chess and bowls with her mother. Unless you happen to have read the foretaste of this affectionate and lively family in the brief pamphlet (justified by the family mausoleum) that

Dr Marianne Gilchrist produced for the Society of Friends of the Kirk of the Greyfriars in 1999, much of this is as new as it is refreshing.

Educated at the Royal Military Academy at Woolwich, Patrick Ferguson was commissioned first into the Scots Greys, though he subsequently transferred to the 70th Foot and died a major, acting colonel, commanding American loyalist militia at the Battle of King's Mountain. Always an enquiring soldier proud of his Scots identity, he had the passion for improvement that marked so many of his nation. He funded many of his experiments with improved weapons himself, and they were not confined to shoulder weapons, for he also experimented with a light breech-loading field-piece. That never proved itself in action as his excellent rifle did. His spirit was as remarkable as his mind, for he was plagued by illness and wounds from the start to the finish of his brief career. Latterly his right arm and hand were effectively useless due to the shattering of his arm by a musket ball, but he taught himself to write, fence and ride with his left hand. He lived and died a very brave man. That is the central message of Marianne Gilchrist, inspired by an understandable passion for her extraordinary subject.

There is a deeper point to be made, however. As the author says in this book, Ferguson, though demonised by American republicans in his lifetime and since, was one of the heroes of the War of the American Revolution. Like most ideologically-driven republican movements (the French and Irish cases are very similar), the American one has from the start been honkingly self-righteous and devoted to committing cultural genocide on those American political traditions that disagreed with it, usually starting the job with systematic physical terrorism against any unfortunate Loyalist groups caught in the maelstrom of the Revolution. Exhibitions on the 'Black Heroes of the Revolution' are intermittently held in the Capitol in Washington, without any mention of the fact that a majority of the blacks who fought heroically in the War of the Revolution fought for good reason for a good cause — that of King George III. Ferguson appears to have been the only non-American present at King's Mountain. He was a man of liberal mind and would have preferred the American crisis settled by negotiation. The war was a protracted, bloody, murky civil war marked by incompetence and bad faith on both sides. After the extremely radical concessions offered by the Carlisle Commission, Ferguson fought with a clear conscience against the irreconcilables who were going to create a new and hostile state. His only charge against the king and his ministers was the just one that they were fighting an inevitable war in a manner likely to make an unavoidably bad outcome worse. Historians are not, or should not be, cheerleaders. They need to deconstruct the aggressive over-simplification of the past. This wee book is a step in that direction.

University of St Andrews BRUCE LENMAN

Irish Immigrants in the Land of Canaan: Letters and Memoirs from Colonial and Revolutionary America, 1675-1815.
By Kerby A. Miller, Arnold Schrier, Bruce D. Boling and David N. Doyle. Pp. xxvii, 788.
ISBN 0 19 5044513 0.
Oxford: Oxford University Press. 2003. £45.00.

This handsomely produced and highly readable volume on Irish immigration to America can best be understood and read as two complementary books, one an exposition of the experiences of Irish immigrants to the (future) United States and the Caribbean and the other a more argument-based work about the

identity politics of 'the confusing but creative possibilities of eighteenth-century Irish-American ethnicity' (p. 627). The value of this volume is more readily appreciated when its two personalities are disentangled.

The sixty-eight chapters that form the bulk of the book—over six hundred pages of it—are case studies sorted into seven sections: the causes of Irish emigration; the processes of Irish emigration; farmers and planters; craftsmen, labourers and servants; merchants, shopkeepers and peddlers; clergymen and schoolmasters (only three chapters, but more are to be found in other sections); and Irish immigrants in politics and war. The first section makes good use of documents from residents of Ireland who considered emigration, but did not follow through, in order to shed further light on the situations that so many others left behind. Historians of Atlantic travel will find the most material in Section II, which includes letters and memoirs regarding voyages, while historians of trade will correspondingly look to Section V. Social historians of the period will find it almost universally interesting.

Each chapter studies an individual or group and begins with the context of their circumstances before presenting one or more edited texts—most often letters—and then ending with information on the subsequent history of the person(s) involved. The prologue and epilogue to each primary text are often the fruit of research in archives on both sides of the Atlantic and include thoughtful analysis of persons, texts and contexts. The edited texts themselves, which make up perhaps one quarter of the book, are thoroughly footnoted so as to aid understanding on two levels: the literal meaning of obsolete or dialectal words and constructions, and what can be inferred from linguistic clues about the writer's cultural background, including in some cases what sort of background the writer wishes the recipient to infer. Occasionally, linguistic discussion in the footnotes digresses into, for instance, quotes from Shakespeare reflecting similar usage; many readers may find this superfluous, but it can readily be ignored. Useful information on language for those with an interest is given in an appendix by Boling.

Because this volume is a textually-based social history of a period without universal literacy, the authors were necessarily faced with the problem that some groups, particularly women and the poor, are underrepresented in the documentary record. By casting their net wider than letters and diaries, they have redressed this imbalance as far as possible. For instance, they have found petitions from Irish-born Americans in court records from Chester County, Pennsylvania and used published confessions by three Irish-born thieves being hanged in New Jersey, some of which were clearly written by amanuenses. The interpretive difficulties of dictated (and therefore possibly altered) texts are addressed appropriately, in keeping with the careful and illuminating analysis typical of this book.

The discussions of changing identity politics among 'Irish' (broadly defined) on both sides of the Atlantic are far too complex to relate in detail here, but can be summarised as follows. The late eighteenth century saw the rise of the ecumenical nationalist United Irishmen and *emigré* sympathisers who gave the term 'Irish' a broad and positive connotation, though many of those so defined, such as Anglicans, Methodists, Quakers, and indeed some Catholics and Presbyterians, distanced themselves from these anti-royalist republicans. Likewise, self-consciously 'respectable' Protestant Irish in America were often tarred with the same brush as their Catholic compatriots, despite the former being an overwhelming majority in the Americas; Irish-American Protestants, therefore, including some of no Scottish ancestry, began to distinguish themselves in early nineteenth-century America with the positively-construed term 'Scotch-Irish'. In the revolutionary and post-revolutionary United States, bitter divisions

between loyalists and revolutionaries, radical egalitarians and aristocratic parties, and city and backcountry further subdivided most groups, including at the parochial level, often parallel to similar divisions in Ireland. On both sides of the Atlantic, the temporary ecumenicity of Irishness dissolved under these and other social pressures. The results are still with us today, a point the authors make but do not labour.

The authors' arguments regarding the evolution of these identities appear in the introduction but then lie mostly dormant, if latent, in much of the subsequent material. They come to the fore only in Section VII, on politics and war, where they are finally explicated at greater length and given documentary substantiation. Many readers, not knowing that this awaits them, may be frustrated to find in the intervening four hundred pages that they are expected to accept on faith these arguments that form important context for much of what they read. Reading Section VII after Section I or II will almost certainly give greater satisfaction.

The breadth and importance of this volume will appeal to scholars working in a variety of fields on both sides of the Atlantic. It is also quite well resourced for reading by the interested layman, and even considering it as a collection of edited texts alone it would be worthy of its space on the shelves of many libraries, both academic and public.

University of St Andrews WILLIAM H. CAMPBELL

Adventurers and Exiles: The Great Scottish Exodus.
By Marjory Harper. Pp. 438.
ISBN 1861974523.
London: Profile Books. 2004. £9.99.

For many historians, Scotland remains an unknown, somewhat exotic, place. The country's small size and population has caused its people and their experiences to remain peripheral within the fields of both world history and British imperial studies. As a result, with several notable exceptions covering the eighteenth century, Scottish history has remained somewhat separate from other Atlantic histories. Despite the fact that Scots played a significantly large role running Britain's nineteenth-century empire and were instrumental in industrialization—arguably the most important world-historical process—Scottish studies have for the most part remained a piecemeal affair. Concerned more with people than with process, the existing scholarship has not yet connected itself to the growing historical fields of internationalization and globalization. Instead, because the Scots went everywhere in the world during this period, most establishing new lives and leaving scores of descendents, genealogists looking to trace a reverse path to Scotland regularly seek out and share information on family experiences. Blessed with excellent archival material, Scotland is often at the centre of genealogical trips to the British Isles. It is therefore puzzling to ponder the country's centrality to genealogy and its peripheral character where scholarship is concerned.

Every so often, a book comes along that holds enormous promise for bridging this gap between genealogical research and historical scholarship. Typically such works seek to make Scotland more central to world-historical processes. These books, while full of systematic and careful scholarship, are also extremely easy reading. In this way, a wider audience becomes possible, and the limitations of Scotland's small size can be more easily overcome. Marjory Harper's *Adventurers and Exiles: The Great Scottish Exodus* clearly attempts to be such a work. Concerned with telling the stories of Scottish migrants who lived mostly, but not

entirely, in the nineteenth century, the book envisions itself as filling a gap in the scholarly literature. It puts 'the remarkable nineteenth-century diaspora at the hub'; in so doing, it attempts to assert Scotland's centrality in European, if not world, affairs (p. 1).

Having said that, however, *Adventurers and Exiles* is much better genealogy than it is history and, as a result, unfortunately does not fulfil its own scholarly ambitions. While much of the data the author presents is intriguing—and sometimes makes for a good read—the parts never add up to an overarching argument of significance. If the Scots were significant in their migration patterns, as the author argues in Chapter 1, then the author needs to tell us why—beyond showing, simply, that Scots traversed the globe in far larger numbers relative to their population than other Europeans. If there are any patterns to this migration, or if there were any meaningful changes over time, then these have not been fully fleshed out.

Part of the problem lies in the book's organization. The author has chosen an interesting and potentially exciting approach. Rather than looking at the impact of Scots in different receiving societies or looking at changes in migratory patterns and processes over time, the book uses a process-centred structure. Looking at the factors that inform the act of migration, the book has chapters on migration's push factors, its pull factors, and those who recruited migrants. So too does it look at benevolent aid (a response to industrialization), children's migrations, the oceanic voyages, and settlement experiences. *Adventurers and Exiles* even considers sojourning (a term that my own work *Sojourners in the Sun* introduced to the field a decade ago) and identity as part of the process of migration. Within each of these sections are a series of (sometimes) entertaining anecdotes and illustrations from around the globe. But at the same time, scholarly readers will get little or no sense of change over time, or of the comparative experiences of Scots in different places, or even of the international networks that Scots maintained as they left their homeland. In short, the book's anecdotes are only loosely connected within these thematic chapters. Perhaps as importantly, if not more so, the chapters themselves are just not tied together well at all.

Scholarly readers of this book should also be aware of two significant flaws, especially relative to the book's ambitions. The first is that the data that is presented here comes disproportionately from Aberdeen and the northeast. In a certain sense this is not surprising given the author's geographic proximity to those sources. And, to be sure, there are some Highlanders and Lowlanders who appear. But the majority of documentary illustrations come from only one of Scotland's many regions. There is some justification for this, as previous scholarship has tended to focus elsewhere, but only experts would know this. By no means ought non-expert scholars to consider Aberdonians representative of Scots migrating into the nineteenth-century British empire. The second, and related, problem with the narrative sources is that they overwhelmingly look at Scots in Canada. To be sure, references are regularly made to Scots migrants in the Caribbean, Ceylon, Australia, New Zealand, and South Africa. But these illustrations pale when compared with the number of Scots who went to Canada. As significantly, these experiences are generalized to the point that there is little room either for regional differentiation or for trans-national connections to be identified. The Empire, to which all of these Scots migrated, is simply absent as an analytical concept or construct in this work. It is much worse off than it ought to be as a direct result of this absence.

What this amounts to, in my view, is a lack of context. This is not a book about Scots in the Empire, though it could have been one. Nor is this a book about Scottish migration in world history, though it could also have been that. Nor, really, is this a book about the 'Scottish diaspora' that the author attempts to

address in the conclusion (pp. 369-72) because, of course, we don't really see the idea of a diaspora work its way through the book's chapters. The book's lack of historical context and overarching argument will leave many scholarly readers puzzling over its significance. Though this is a book that tells the story of Scottish migrants, a scholarly audience requires more than a good story to keep it happy. Indeed, we require a road map that shows us how a specific person or sequence of events relates to a larger process. Without either a strong introduction with a solid historiographical overview or a strong conclusion, it is incumbent upon an author to weave a narrative thread through its chapters to guide readers' thinking. This book lacks all of these attributes.

In general, migration studies can contribute to at least three different historical literatures: that of the sending society, that of the receiving society, and that of a trans-national, or process-centred field, such as either world history or imperial studies. Judged within each of these fields, *Adventurers and Exiles* is problematic. Where it has its best success is in locating some Scots migrants within the nineteenth-century Scottish regional past. This is Scottish history that puts into the public domain more archival sources than were previously available. The book has much more trouble in trying to establish a connection between Scots migrants and the histories of their new societies. And it has even more trouble in trying to map out any sort of Scottish contribution that might have transcended national boundaries. As a result, we know little of the Scots who are mentioned beyond their specific experiences in specific locations; their larger contributions, if they existed, are absent. This then becomes something like genealogy passing for historical scholarship.

Finally, scholars would do very well to note that the book contains indications of either sloppy scholarship or hasty editing.

Several other issues will prove problematic for scholars using this book. Related to the lack of an overarching argument that connects the chapters, the book also lacks a satisfying introduction and conclusion, both useful in directing scholars to areas of particular interest. In addition, there are at least a dozen places where the quoted archival material extends to a page or more in length (pp. 57-58, 59, 146-7, 152-3, 213, 216-18, 219-20, 234, 241-2, 243, 249-50, 251-2). Careful editing or a stronger authorial voice, more likely from another scholar, would better lead the reader through this material. Even less helpful, the endnotes to the book consist largely of simple archival citations and page numbers: absent are the useful explanatory and historiographical notes that scholars of any discipline require.

Moreover, and somewhat troubling, is the author's almost complete omission of secondary sources in both the text and the notes. I found myself reading (p. 285) a fairly complete summary of the fifth chapter of my book *Sojourners in the Sun* without either a footnote to the argument that I made or a textual reference to the book itself. But there is more: the book's first illustration, 'The Caledonian Voyage to Money-Land' (p. 10), has an attribution of 'early nineteenth century'. The correct date of the illustration is 1762; it appeared in a publication entitled *The British Antidote to Caledonian Poison* which makes its significance to a larger argument, missed by the author, quite plain. While I am not an expert on Scots in Australia, New Zealand, South Africa, or Canada, it would not be surprising to learn that there were similar errors and omissions in those areas. These details are not insignificant. Rather, they greatly contribute to scholarly confidence in any work. This book, as a result, is best used as a collection of primary source material and not as the much-needed scholarly interpretation that it could have been.

University of California, Berkeley ALAN L. KARRAS

Jane Carlyle: Newly Selected Letters.
Edited by Kenneth J. Fielding and David R. Sorensen. Pp. xxxviii, 334.
ISBN 0 7546 0137 4.
Aldershot: Ashgate. 2004. £50.00.

One quibble at the outset: the version of the author's name. 'Jane Carlyle' is unexpected, given that Jane herself frequently used 'Jane Welsh Carlyle' (with due prominence to her maiden as well as her married name), and that this form has been pretty well invariably adopted in the past. Even here, 'JWC' crops up, as in the introduction from time to time. Yet any concern that the book might attempt to recast Jane merely as her husband's wife, and not as the independent and outstandingly talented individual she was, is soon dispelled by the contents. The editors—both associated with the definitive, ongoing *Collected Letters of Thomas and Jane Welsh Carlyle* [sic!]—have gone to extraordinary lengths to give a selection of some 250 letters (out of roughly 2000 surviving) which is both representative and novel. Thus there are rather fewer letters to Thomas than in previous collections; some well-known set-pieces easily available elsewhere, such as the sequence written from Troston in 1842, are omitted; there is a new selection from the haunting and intimate journal that Jane kept in 1855-6; and, most importantly, several letters and other documents are printed from sources—some of them private—which were overlooked or unknown in the past.

Yet the story that unfolds in this volume is not essentially unfamiliar. The doctor's daughter from Haddington marrying the brilliant but penniless Thomas; years of isolation and poverty at Craigenputtoch; the move to London in 1834; the rapidly changing cast of servants and visitors at Cheyne Row; the deep embitterment of Jane's middle years by her husband's infatuation with the first Lady Ashburton; and, in the end, illness, recovery and sudden death in Hyde Park in 1866. What the book provides is, rather, a deepening of some traditional perspectives. Most significantly, it supplies fresh material for a reconsideration of Jane's friendships with other women, problematic though these still remain. The brief but intense correspondence with the American actress Charlotte Cushman—of which Jane's side is given in full, Cushman's in extract—is a case in point. The extravagance and fervour of Cushman's writing in particular (Jane's is a trifle cooler), and Cushman's known history of attachments to other women, inevitably arouse the modern reader's curiosity. Could Jane all her life have suppressed 'a lesbian inclination' (p. xxvi)? The letters that the editors have carefully selected throughout the volume show how such a suspicion travesties the complex and many-layered nature of Jane's female friendships. That some women who were (like Cushman) in modern terms lesbian or bisexual were attracted to Jane seems undeniable. Jane herself was drawn to, or at least amused by, women who defied convention in their private lives, ranging from the courtesan Catherine Walters to George Eliot. But even her most affectionate letters to women are more maternal than erotic in tone ('Carina', 'Baby', 'little Woman'), and as the editors point out, she politely but definitely held back from Cushman's advances, using illness as an excuse for not replying. The letters printed here will make possible a properly nuanced analysis of the various kinds of emotional need and elaborate role-playing acted out in Jane's correspondence with other women.

To a remarkable degree, every editor of the Carlyles' letters is still in dialogue with his or her predecessors, for some early depictions of the couple had a long life. J.A. Froude, entrusted by Thomas with the tasks of writing his biography and editing Jane's letters, drew a highly coloured and often misleading portrait of the couple, alleging that life in Cheyne Row was 'a protracted tragedy' owing

to Thomas's neglect and self-absorption—and, notoriously, his physical incapacity to consummate the marriage. An important source for this interpretation was Jane's confidante Geraldine Jewsbury, who discussed the marriage at some length in a letter of 1876 to Froude only recently published in full. In the book under review, the ghosts of Froude and Jewsbury still loom large—perhaps too large, for their exaggerations and distortions have long been recognized, and it hardly seems necessary for them to be rehearsed at the length they are here. The pursuit is carried from the introduction to the edition itself, where several opportunities are taken to repeat Jane's (and others) expressions of disdain and impatience for her friend (e.g., 'a flimsy tatter of a creature like Geraldine', p. 261, and the 'everlasting Jewsbury', p. 195).

Yet Froude's and Jewsbury's dramatizations, misleading though they were, derived to some extent from Jane herself. For what emerges with astonishing clarity from this selection is the extent to which the letters are performances—sustained monologues, complete with confiding addresses to the reader, snatches of repeated dialogue, crisp and often cynical asides. It is no coincidence that one of Jane's most extended writings (an appeal to Thomas to increase her allowance) is cast in the form of a parliamentary speech, while another (describing a visit to Haddington in 1849) takes its name from a play (*Much Ado about Nothing*). Particularly remarkable is the use of 'coterie speech'—characteristic turns of phrase (sometimes only a single word), deriving from friends, family or servants. Jane's writing is densely crowded with these, often marked off by inverted commas, underlined, or phonetically spelt, and sometimes juxtaposed with allusions to more conventional written or remembered sources, including Goethe, George Sand, the Bible and indeed her husband—for surely the famous account of Jane's appearance before the Tax Commissioners in 1855 (printed in extract here) echoes the description of the trial of Marie Antoinette in *The French Revolution*. Yet these collocations are achieved without the slightest incongruity: the sense is rather one of a continuous but controlled orchestration of voices, a summoning-up of the past and the distant, the written and the oral, to be heard on equal terms in the present.

Unfortunately, some of these voices may not be audible to the uninitiated reader, for the 'coterie speech', puzzling though it sometimes is, is nowhere explained or glossed. In other ways, too, the texts are less accessible than they might be, for though there is a sensitive and helpful linking narrative (along the line of Trudy Bliss's in her excellent earlier selection) and a useful index, practically none of the letters is given complete and the book is entirely without footnotes. Two texts that I was able to collate against the originals in Oxford (pp. 146-51, 184-6) turned out to have a considerable number of errors of transcription, most of them of little significance, but one or two quite serious (about thirty words have been omitted through 'eyeskip' in the fourth paragraph on page 150, for example).

There will inevitably be points of interpretation or emphasis in this book on which views may differ, and it is regrettable that more pains were not taken to provide an absolutely reliable text. But where so much of the material is new, and the editors' knowledge so deep, one must resist the temptation to cavil. The publication of a selection of Jane Welsh Carlyle's writings as extended and wide-ranging as this one is warmly to be welcomed, and the editors are to be thanked for introducing another generation of readers to this most self-conscious, contradictory and finally enigmatic of letter-writers.

Oxford PETER JACKSON

Jinglin' Geordie's Legacy: A History of George Heriot's School and Hospital.
By Brian R.W. Lockhart. Pp. viii, 440.
ISBN 1 86232 257 0.
East Linton: Tuckwell Press. 2003. £20.00.

Brian Lockhart is to be congratulated for writing a history of George Heriot's, of which he is a former pupil and teacher, an institution that at significant points in the development of education in Scotland has played a prominent role. This book is thoroughly researched and offers something to a variety of audiences, from former pupils to the academic market. Its core contributions are, firstly, to explain to a modern audience the model nature of Heriot's bequest in the seventeenth century, and the expansion of the benefits of this through the Heriot outdoor schools across Edinburgh from the 1830s. These subjects were last discussed at length in the mid-nineteenth century by previous historians of Heriot's Hospital, William Steven and Frederick Bedford. Secondly, Lockhart breaks new ground on the controversy over the future of the Hospital from 1863, and the history of the Heriot day school from 1886.

Early chapters incorporate discussion of well-selected issues, such as the source of Heriot's wealth, drawing on Bruce Lenman's work on Jacobean goldsmith-jewellers' creation of credit facilities for their royal and aristocratic customers. The long-running controversy, still being vigorously conducted in the 1850s, over who was architect of the Edinburgh landmark 'Wark' building is analysed, as are the equally persistent problems caused by the dominance of Edinburgh town councillors on the governing body, and their putting of their own and the town's financial interests before those of the Hospital. Given the broad target audience, however, more explanatory material would have been helpful. The highly worthwhile discussion of Heriot land purchases in Edinburgh would have benefited from an explanation of land-holding practices, and feuing in particular. Again, the recurrent and interesting material on the connections between Heriot's and the Edinburgh High School and University as destinations for more scholarly Hospital inmates, especially in the eighteenth century, would have been made more accessible by notes explaining these institutions. Pruning of long sections on the completion of the Hospital chapel and on the clashes between governors and former pupils' organisations would have enabled excellent material in the notes, which generally reward careful reading, to be moved into the body of the text and, in turn, left room for such explanations.

Heriot's played a key role in mid-nineteenth century Edinburgh, both educationally and politically. Brian Lockhart makes this abundantly clear in discussions of internal reforms started by headmasters Steven and Bedford, in his detailing of Duncan McLaren's role in initiating the Heriot outdoor school scheme and in defending the Hospital as the inheritance of Edinburgh's poor, and in his chapter on the struggle over the Hospital's continued existence, which resulted in its becoming a day school. The wealth of evidence Lockhart has gathered, particularly on the various inquiries held in the 1870s, is impressive, but the battle lines remain confusing and a conclusion on the outcome is missing. Aspects such as the impact of Heriot's on Edinburgh's town council elections, the changes in McLaren's position, and the meaning of the abolition of the outdoor schools for educational provision in the city, can also only find a mention in a work this wide in scope.

The later chapters on the Heriot day school are a sure-footed guide to developments. An invaluable contribution is the evidence Lockhart has gathered which would otherwise have been lost with the passing on of those involved. This compensates for a rather top-down approach. Curricular developments and accompanying expansion of the School's accommodation are excellently

described, as are the disadvantages in personnel terms of a closed community in the early twentieth century. What is missing, however, is anything substantive from a pupil's point of view. The characteristics of authoritarian regimes are, for instance, only briefly mentioned and the uniform hardly at all. In terms of the wider impact of Heriot's, there is valuable discussion of the connection with the Heriot-Watt College, but the role of Heriot's in nineteenth- and twentieth-century Edinburgh landholding is not conclusively dealt with.

Jinglin' Geordie's Legacy is at its best for all its audiences in the discussions of the internal tensions during William Dewar's time as headmaster and in its treatment of the attempt by Lothian Regional Council to take the School into the state system in the 1970s. Here Brian Lockhart brilliantly blends written evidence, contributions from those involved, and his own experience to produce a chapter which makes clear that Heriot's was still particularly significant in the history of Scottish education at this time. He draws a fascinating parallel between these conflicts and those of a century before. As with his treatment of the 1870s and 1880s, however, Lockhart reaches no explicit judgement on the outcome of the 1970s struggle. He identifies the consequences of the School being forced into independent status by the 1980s, including the waning significance of the Foundation for single-parent and less affluent families. However, he does not close the circle with Heriot's bequest and answer the parallel question to that posed in the nineteenth century, namely whether independence in this case was in conformity with George Heriot's intention. The inclusion in an appendix of the full text of William Dewar's 1979 letter to *The Scotsman* on the issue, and its clear statement of where responsibility lay for the loss of the benefits of grant-in-aid, may, however, be a diplomatic way of dealing with a still highly political issue.

Examination of the book as a whole suggests that the publisher should have taken steps to ensure that illustrations were better placed. This particularly applies to sections dealing with Hospital architecture, in which more detailed illustration is also necessary. Criticism of this nature should not, however, detract from Brian Lockhart's solid achievement in this book, which proves that a history of a single institution can make a significant contribution to the historical debate across a range of issues, while at the same time appealing to a more general readership.

Fachhochschule of Central Switzerland GORDON MILLAR

Migranten und Internierte: Deutsche in Glasgow, 1864-1918.
By Stefan Manz. Pp. 317.
ISBN 3 515 08427 4.
Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag. EUR 63.80.

In recent decades, as the history of immigration has begun to receive serious attention from some British historians, if not the mainstream establishment, much of which has a blind spot when it comes to such issues, a series of groups has begun to receive considerable attention. Jewish and Irish migrants, with a serious historiography dating back to the nineteenth century, lead the way. Similarly, 'Black' people have also received attention for decades from a variety of scholars. More recently, a series of other, perhaps less obvious, minorities have also come to attract serious study from historians.

One of these is the Germans, which should not actually surprise because they have had a significant presence in Britain for hundreds of years. In fact, this group has reached its numerical peak in recent decades. Over the past two

centuries this minority has consisted of variety of ethnic, social and religious components. Historians have increasingly turned their minds to them. While much of this has focused upon refugees from Nazism, since the early 1990s the migrants who moved to Britain during the nineteenth century have received increasing attention. Indeed, my own general studies on the nineteenth century and the First World War have been followed by more specialist studies.

Stefan Manz's volume might be said to fall into the latter category, except for the fact that it covers the fairly lengthy time period of 1864-1918. But it certainly offers new departures in at least two ways. First of all, it is the only substantial work on the history of Germans in Scotland. In fact, it is one of relatively few books to look at any individual minority in Scotland, other than the Irish and Jews, although most general works on Britain have tackled immigrants in the country as part of the broader picture. More importantly, from the point of view of the historiography of Germans in Britain, Manz's book is a focused city case study of the type that has characterized the historiography of immigrants in the USA during the nineteenth century.

Manz has actually produced an outstanding piece of scholarship, whose strengths lie in all its facets. In fact, there are no obvious weaknesses. The book describes the development of the German community during the nineteenth century, beginning with the reasons for migration to the town and the growth of the local community, moving on to its social and economic structure and then describing the way in which it developed as an ethnic community. Manz stresses the diversity of the community throughout his narrative. The story of the Germans who moved to Britain during the nineteenth century does not have a happy ending and Manz concludes his work by describing the consequences of the xenophobic hostility that destroyed German communities throughout the country. Without wishing to stretch the point too far, it is fair to draw parallels between the history of German Jewry and the evolution of the German minority in Britain during the nineteenth century. Both emerged as successful groups and both faced destruction as a result of extreme wartime intolerance.

Before describing the course of events, Manz begins with a methodological introduction in which he tells us that he is taking a micro-historical and prosopographical approach. While he may not be the first person to have done the latter in the historiography of immigrants in Britain, he is probably the first to have constructed the history of a community by examining individual experiences, which he then brings together under the various themes which take his narrative forward. Manz is completely familiar with the small historiography of Germans in Britain and, more importantly, contextualizes his story within the extant literature on the history of immigration into the country.

The book is extremely thoroughly researched. Apart from a full acquaintance with the secondary literature, Manz travelled widely both in Scotland and beyond for the purposes of examining all of the relevant archival sources, which he cited. He also made much use of newspaper sources, especially the *Glasgow Herald*. Manz further travelled to German archives including various branches of the Bundesarchiv and the Evangelisches Zentralarchiv in Berlin containing information about German communities throughout the world.

One of the most original aspects of this work is the prosopographical approach taken. This is not one that has been used in any studies of immigrant communities in Britain before 1945. It allows detailed insights into how an ethnic community evolves though the experiences of individuals. The urban-based micro-historical approach also deserves mention. Certainly, this does not represent a new departure to the study of immigrants groups in Britain, as several studies of pre-First World War Jewry, especially in the East End

of London, exist. Nevertheless, it is the first study of the German community in an urban location in Scotland.

Unfortunately, most of those who read this review will not have the linguistic ability to read the book it describes. This is a great pity because of the thoroughness of the research, the command of ideas and the richness of the narrative. It traces the rise and fall of an immigrant minority in Britain, describing the way in which the country both accepted and then rejected one particular immigrant group: Glasgow could be any other location which had a similar-sized German community, whether Bradford, Leeds, Liverpool or Manchester. The book really does represent a case study of a national picture. For non-German speakers, let us hope that it appears as an English translation for it is a very rich work of scholarship that deserves a very wide readership.

De Montfort University PANIKOS PANAYI

McCrae's Battalion: the Story of the 16th Royal Scots.
By Jack Alexander. Pp. 320.
ISBN 1 84018 707 7.
Edinburgh: Mainstream Publishing. 2003. £15.99.

The First World War continues to fascinate. Debates rage in scholarly circles about the nature of the Schlieffen Plan, the operational 'learning curve' on the western front, and the representations of the war in popular culture. These are important historiographical questions. But from our ivory towers we are sometimes guilty of overlooking the impact of the war on local communities and their patriotic citizens who flocked to the colours in the heady days of 1914. Yet it is through such local studies that we might find the true essence of the war. In 1992 Geoffrey Moorhouse published a memorable book on Bury and the Lancashire Fusiliers that hauntingly traced the scars left on the town as a result of that regiment's grievous losses at Gallipoli. In similar vein, Jack Alexander has produced a fine study of Edinburgh and the 16th Royal Scots—McCrae's battalion—that was decimated during the Battle of the Somme. Although more of a regimental history than Moorhouse's work, it evocatively captures the tender interface between home front and battlefront. One cannot fail to be profoundly moved by the fate of Private George Peters—a thirty-five-year-old letterpress printer from Buccleuch Place with a wife and two children who was killed by shellfire in the trenches near Armentieres—when one sits in a comfortable university office in the same street in which he once lived.

The 16th Royal Scots were raised in the autumn of 1914 by Sir George McCrae, a self-made Edinburgh businessman and Liberal MP who had played a prominent role in the city's pre-war territorial force. This New Army battalion was built around the Heart of Midlothian football team and their supporters. The maroons were in dazzling form that season and leading the League. Eleven players immediately volunteered to 'march wi Geordie' and this initiated a wave of enlistments from among the Tynecastle faithful eager to serve alongside their Saturday-afternoon heroes. Soon the battalion was 1,000 strong. In December it was drawn up along George Street before proceeding to its first home: George Heriot's school. Over the winter the recruits were put through an intensive programme of basic training, but the route marches in the snowy Pentland hills took their toll on the Hearts footballers who continued to turn out for their club. Agonisingly, they were pipped to the title by Celtic in the final weeks of the season. In the spring of 1915 McCrae's left Edinburgh to undergo manoeuvres south of the border with other battalions which were to form the 101st Brigade.

The town came out to see them off and the tears welled up. As the train pulled out of Waverley station, the fatherly Hearts manager, John McCartney, watched with disbelief as his beloved team disappeared from sight: 'The finest men I ever knew had gone.'

The battalion landed in France in 1916 and was earmarked to spearhead the British attack on the Somme on 1 July. Shortly before dawn on that fateful day the troops filed into their assault positions near La Boisselle. An early morning mist shrouded the valley in front of them, but the sun was beginning to burn through. The order was given to fix bayonets. Throats went dry and stomachs tightened. Some men nervously cracked jokes; others literally trembled with fear. At 7.30am the whistles blew and McCrae's went 'over the top'. The slaughter began. The German gunners emerged from their deep dugouts, where they had been protected from the British bombardment, and scythed down the advancing Scots. One doomed soldier was seen to put his hands in front of his face as if to shield himself from the hail of lead and iron. All around khaki turned maroon. Amazingly, some brave souls penetrated the German trench system. The Germans were determined to drive them out but the Scots heroically fought off repeated German counter attacks. Sir George joined his men in the German trenches and was in the thick of the action. He positioned himself on a parapet and picked off Germans with his rifle while his servant spotted for him. On 3 July the 16th Royal Scots were relieved, having held onto their slim gains, but the battalion had been virtually destroyed. Of the 800 men who had taken part in the attack, 600 had been killed or wounded. Among the dead were three Hearts players: Sergeant Duncan Currie, Private Ernest Ellis and Private Harry Wattie. 1 July 1916 was Edinburgh's blackest day since Flodden.

Despite its horrendous casualties on the Somme, McCrae's continued to fight with distinction on the western front until the end of the war. Sir George was soon invalided home—broken with exhaustion—and the other surviving members diluted with draftees from other regiments. But the battalion performed with great dash during the offensive at Arras in 1917, stoically endured the muddy horrors of Passchendaele later that year, and then held the line unbroken in a desperate rearguard action on the Lys in the spring of 1918. When one young soldier, a Partick Thistle supporter, was told that he was to be transferred to the 16th Royal Scots he wrote home that it was a 'feather in my cap' to become a member of the famous Edinburgh footballers' battalion. The action on the Lys was to be McCrae's final battle. The battalion was disbanded shortly after through lack of replacements. The butcher's bill had been paid in full. The 16th Royal Scots had suffered 1,400 dead during the war—including, among its fallen officers, Lieutenant Cuthbert Lodge, the son of the Professor of History at Edinburgh University. Only thirty of the 'originals' were still on the strength at the end. Fittingly, the piper played 'Flowers of the Forest' as the men were drawn up for the last time. It was a lament for lost friends.

In 1919 a reunion of McCrae's former officers was held at the North British Hotel on Princes Street. As the diners beat their fists on the tables to simulate drumfire, an old battalion trench song echoed round the room: 'Did ye stand wi McCrae on the German hill?/Did ye feel the shrapnel flyin?/Did ye close wi the Hun, comin in for the kill?/Did ye see your best friends dyin?' At the end of the evening it was decided that some suitable memorial to the dead should be established. The original idea was that twin cairns would be erected: one in Edinburgh and one at Contalmaison on the Somme. These would bear the regimental badge and on 1 July each year a party of local schoolchildren would travel to France to lay a wreath. The Edinburgh Corporation, seemingly oblivious to the sacrifices made by the sons of the city, was unimpressed and declined to provide funding. In the face of civic indifference, the veterans were forced to

scale down their expectations and fall back on their own resources. £1,000 was raised from former members of the battalion and the relatives of those killed, and in 1922 a tablet was erected on the north wall of the Albany aisle in St Giles Cathedral to commemorate the fallen of the 16th Royal Scots. It wasn't a grand public monument, but at least it was a mark of respect for the dead pals. For many of the living the war never really ended. The lingering effects of wounds and exposure to gas would handicap survivors for the rest of their lives. There were also deep mental scars to overcome. The daughter of one veteran recalls that at the beginning of every July her father, normally a cheery soul, would lock himself in the front room for several hours and cry. She never understood why.

Alexander's book—the product of twelve years of assiduous research—will be of as much interest to historians of sport and the city of Edinburgh as to Great War enthusiasts. The last of the surviving McCrae's have now passed away and those who did not live to see old age are no more than sepia-tinted ghosts behind dusty glass frames. The author has produced a worthy and fitting tribute to the memory of a gallant generation.

University of Edinburgh JEREMY A. CRANG

Moon Over Malaya: A Tale of Argylls and Marines.
By Jonathan Moffatt and Audrey Holmes McCormick. Pp. 414.
ISBN 0 7524 2114X.
Stroud: Tempus Publishing. 2002. £12.99.

This book is quite entertaining, interesting, well-written, and useful. It is also uneven in quality. Jonathan Moffatt and Audrey Holmes McCormick have essentially produced an oral history of the 2nd Battalion of the Argyll and Sutherland Highlanders—an army unit from Scotland that could trace its history back some two hundred years—and its role in the ill-fated defence of Malaya and Singapore. With this book, Moffatt and Holmes McCormick argue that, despite the ultimate defeat, British soldiers fought well in tactical engagements.

The person most responsible for the performance for the Argylls according to the authors was Lieutenant-Colonel Ian Stewart, Commanding Officer of the 2nd Battalion, and 13th Laird of Achnacone. Coming from a family with a long and noble tradition of military service to the crowns of Scotland and the United Kingdom, Stewart demanded harsh and realistic training in jungle warfare. Moffatt and Holmes McCormick contend that the soldiers in the unit were 'unanimous' in the praise of their commander. One of them told the authors, 'The men would follow him to hell and back' (p. 39).

The book includes a nice beginning chapter on the men, examining their motivation for joining the army. For many, a life soldiering was a welcome alternative to living in poverty in Scotland. In this chapter and in others, the authors argue in effective fashion that pride in the 2nd Argylls was one of the reasons the men fought so well in Southeast Asia. The sources of this pride were varied. The formation drew family members to it, with enlistees serving in the same regiment and battalion in which their fathers and uncles had fought in the First World War, or which brothers and cousins had joined before them. Kilts, a tradition in the British Army that went back two centuries, also added to *esprit de corps*.

When the fighting starts, the story is riveting, but concentrates on small unit engagements. This narrow focus is a reflection of what the individual interviewees were doing in Malaya and Singapore in 1941 and 1942. Moffatt and Holmes

McCormick compensate, using unit histories and contemporary documents to put these individuals' stories into a larger context.

One of the best-known incidents of this campaign came very early on in the hostilities. Japanese naval aviation units sank HMS Prince of Wales, a new battleship, and HMS Repulse, an old battlecruiser, which had arrived, along with four destroyers, to bolster the defence of Singapore. The Royal Marines that survived the sinking formed a naval battalion on shore. Many of these Marines were from Scotland and fought alongside the 2nd Argylls, which gives this book its odd sub-title and focus. After the defeat, the authors include chapters on the experiences the men faced as prisoners of war, and then what became of them after the conflict ended.

There are a number of shortcomings to this book. The first is the inherent weakness of a series of interviews done some fifty years after the fact. No matter how well-intentioned people are in answering questions, memories falter, details fade away, and personal accounts tend to glorify the past. These problems are obvious when dealing with oral histories, and a number of the selections the authors use have these flaws. The most blatant was when one of the interviewees fondly recalled getting into bar-room brawls, which probably is a pleasant memory to a man living life trapped in an old and enfeebled body. To their credit, Moffatt and Holmes McCormick are on many occasions reluctant to accept colourful stories without some form of qualification. On the other hand, though, it seems that the authors are determined to use every fact that they collected. How important is it that readers know what was on the menu at the first post-war reunion of the Argylls, the type of socks the men wore, or that the regiment dressed in kilts of loosely twisted wool threads instead of those that were hard twisted? There are also embarrassing glitches that better copy-editing might have caught. On page 351 the readers are about to learn what Field Marshal Sir Bernard Montgomery thought of Stewart only to turn the page and have a new paragraph start that has nothing to do with the Field Marshal or the Laird. Finally, if this unit was as good as the authors suggest—and they make a convincing case in this matter—then why were the Japanese victorious? The explanation for the outcome of the campaign is rather vague and disappointing.

In the end, this book is a worthwhile account. Members of the general public will find it engaging, and enjoy its easy flow. It can also be used in classrooms with profit, but only if the instructor is aware of its limitations.

U.S. Air War College NICHOLAS EVANS SARANTAKES

The Scottish Labour Party: History, Institutions and Ideas.
Edited by Gerry Hassan. Pp.vii, 255.
ISBN 0 7486 1784 1.
Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press. 2004. £15.99.

Surveying the last 150 years or so of Scottish political history a number of significant changes are apparent: firstly, Liberalism was the hegemonic force in Scotland in the nineteenth century, but collapsed like a pack of cards after the First World War; secondly, there was a period of Tory dominance, but since 1955 the party has spiralled in an irresistible downward direction; thirdly, there is the mercurial rise of the SNP in the late 1960s and 1970s, which has threatened to win independence for Scotland, but has never quite delivered; and, finally, there is the Labour Party, as entrenched and as dominant as Liberalism was in its heyday. We seem to have experienced almost unconsciously a series of peaceful political revolutions, and yet, outside of a deluge of writing on the rise of the

nationalist vote in Scotland, we know very little about the nation's political development in the post-Second World War decades. That particularly applies to Labour. For all its hegemonic status north of the border the history of the Labour Party, particularly after 1945, remains uncharted and under-analysed. Thus, Gerry Hassan's edited collection of essays, which emphasises the party's growth and development since 1950, is very welcome, providing as it does a framework to begin the serious task of analysing the modern Labour Party in Scotland.

However, like any collection the quality of the chapters is uneven, although a number stand out in terms of the excellence of the writing and the level of analysis. Part of the problem lies in the diversity of the contributors, who range from historians to political scientists, to journalists to policy-makers. There is also a wide diversity in terms of approach, the broad brush style sitting rather uncomfortably with more narrowly-conceived pieces of work. Thus the collection is rather haphazardly put together and the reader would have been better served with a series of essays that had a consistency of purpose and methodology. One example of this might be taken from Section IV, which purports to deal with Scotland the wider world but in fact contains an essay on trade unions and the Labour Party and something on Gordon Brown's philosophy.

The content is very good in places, but rather poor in others. Indeed, such is the level of tedium in some of the chapters that one comes to understand why there exists such a large democratic deficit in Scotland and the rest of the UK. These are writers obsessed with committees, institutions and personalities, and who have no understanding of forces that shape them or change them, far less any concern for their impact on the people of Scotland. The editor's overview of Labour Party history since 1950, however, is extremely useful and thought-provoking and contains a number of nuggets that could be the subject of more analysis and investigation. Apparently, the party north and south of the border share striking similarities in term of social profile. Membership is overwhelmingly white, male, middle-aged and middle class and generally is indifferent towards activity, with around 50 per cent never attending meetings in a year (pp. 6-7). Labour is also a party at a crossroads, facing a choice between jettisoning its past and accepting New Labour and the social market or clinging to Old Labour, class and state socialism. The former, obviously, is electorally attractive, while the latter is more principled and more in keeping with the party's ethos and traditions. It is therefore a party fighting for its very soul. But, while interesting and engaging, the other contributors do not build upon Hassan's analysis. The chapters on history are slight in terms of analysis, while the others are so varied in terms of the themes and issues they address that they leave the reader wondering what is the point of the book?

What stands out in the history of Labour in Scotland is that the party cannot be abstracted from the working-class culture within which it was established, but also how that culture has itself been fundamentally transformed in the course of the twentieth century. The party was formed as an alliance of the white, Protestant skilled workers and the petty bourgeoisie. In the course of this century that culture has been decimated by far-reaching economic restructuring, the historical impact of which is still unclear. This has produced a new type of party, as Hassan notes: one that is less misogynist and less sectarian, and these developments are to be welcomed; bu, that transformation has also been at the expense of other, more desirable features—notably a commitment to greater social and economic equality. For in spite of its weaknesses and flaws, the older workplace culture was capable of mobilising workers around commonly agreed interests and values. In its absence, and as a result of the changes mentioned, we are left with a de-skilled working class unable to challenge effectively the

appropriation by capital of its working space and time to anything like the extent of its industrial forbears. The results of this have been socially disastrous. Even the Tory historian, Ferdinand Mount, writing in *The Sunday Times* (5 September 2004), has argued that both Tory and Labour governments in recent years have created a class of what he misleadingly calls 'downers', who while suffering 'the daily practical misery of not making ends meet', also have to contend with 'seeing how little the society they live in values their efforts … and entrenches [their] feelings of worthlessness and inferiority '.

We therefore need to worry less over Labour's relationship to the Scottish Parliament, or whether Brown will replace Blair, or whether the committee structure in Parliament is working effectively, or whether Labour is pro- or anti-Union, and more about these fundamental issues of providing decency and comfort as a right of citizenship. That would bring people and their aspirations and concerns into the debate, something that might prove uncomfortable for Hassan's contributors.

University of St Andrews WILLIAM KNOX

She Was Aye Workin': Memories of Tenement Women in Edinburgh and Glasgow.
By Helen Clark and Elizabeth Carnegie. Pp. 192.
ISBN 1 873487 05 3.
Oxford: White Cockade Publishing, in association with The People's Story, Edinburgh and the People's Palace, Glasgow. 2003. £8.99.

Personal space was non-existent in the tenement housing of Glasgow and Edinburgh; a tenement child's first place of rest was often in a chest of drawers, and similarly, the kitchen table provided the dead with a final resting place before burial. The majority of working-class families were crowded into one-room single-end and two-room room-and-kitchen tenement housing for most of the nineteenth century; as recent as 1951 half of all Glaswegians still lived in houses with only one or two rooms, and a shared toilet in the stair. The shortage of space dictated cleaning and cooking rotas, facilities for bathing, storage of personal belongings, and sleeping arrangements, all of which inevitably created a loss of privacy. Such close proximity to family members over the life course demanded much from the individual, in both logistical as well as psychological terms. An identity based on the role of the individual was less significant than that of collective familial roles. Furthermore, the organisation of family life was largely the culmination of a co-operative effort, arguably driven by the female members of the household. Indeed, for the entirety of her life, a tenement woman's sphere was almost entirely confined to the management of her family and home. Not surprisingly, reminiscences of tenement living resonate with a tremendous sense of claustrophobia.

A compilation of oral histories conducted for the People's Story in Edinburgh and the People's Palace in Glasgow, *She Was Aye Workin': Memories of Tenement Women in Edinburgh and Glasgow* is composed almost entirely of the reminiscences taken from over sixty contributors. Quite specific remembrances are articulated verbatim. These testimonies of life in tenement housing provide a gendered perspective, not unlike those found in other oral history projects conducted over the past twenty years, such as *Uncharted Lives: Extracts from Scottish Women's Experiences* by the Glasgow Women's Studies Group (1983), *A Woman's Place: An Oral History of Working-Class Women, 1890-1940* by Elizabeth Roberts (1984), and *Up Oor Close: Memories of Domestic Life in Glasgow Tenements 1910-1945* by Jean Faley (1990). Indeed, this text is best seen as a counterpart to

Jean Faley's *Up Oor Close*. Unlike Faley, however, Helen Clark and Elizabeth Carnegie provide an 'unvarnished' narrative of tenement women in early twentieth-century Edinburgh and Glasgow. Incorporating themes over a woman's lifetime, they frankly address personal aspects of womanhood and women's particular roles in the tenements. Their selected narratives of the largely female experiences of tenement life promote the feminist thesis that women in particular were subsumed into the domestic sphere. The central theme of a woman's place in the home is most insightfully represented in the chapters on marriage and work.

Various accounts provide illuminating, albeit contradictory, insights into the minutiae of everyday life and the prevalent contemporary attitudes towards domesticity and married life in particular. Specific details pertaining to preparation for marriage, expectations from married life, child-rearing, finances, schedules, and housekeeping duties robustly substantiate the fact that a tenement woman 'was aye workin'. ('She used tae be up at the crack o' dawn, she was never in bed before twelve at night. She made oor clothes, she knitted our jumpers, she had a huge washing. Everything had to be done the hard way…'.) What is also made evident is that these women were literally anchored to a 'life in one room' for long periods during their lives. Hence very few references are provided to their adult roles in public, other than within the neighbourhood in the interest of managing and maintaining the household. One could suggest that these women experienced the majority of their lives in a sphere of their own.The notion of a separate sphere for women is important to explore within the narrow context of working-class tenement households such as those referred to in the text. Although flawed in terms of general application, the separate sphere model is useful in two areas of inquiry concerning the memories represented here. First, were men as uninvolved in their roles as husbands and fathers as the writers would suggest? Such polarised views of men as either abusive, unreliable or absent altogether indicates a schism between men and women in these scenarios. This clearly cannot be generalised. Second, how did the perceptions of the lack of personal space vary between the genders? For instance, one man casually refers to living in his mother's home for the first seven years of his marriage, whereas a woman recalls: 'In a single end I just felt totally closed in'. The nuance of the gendered experience of proximity remains to be more overtly analysed. Concepts such as the dearth of personal space and disengagement are manifestly related to power and status differentials. Albeit unexplored, these dichotomies are further magnified by the authors' individuated approach to the material.

The source of strength in an oral history project such as this is also vulnerable to its inherent weaknesses. The structure, allowing the participants' collective voice to be represented in toto, is problematic. Although it is immeasurably important to the modern social historian to use oral histories, these are yet in the form of selective raw material. By allowing the memories of women's experiences to predominate the text, the authors neglect to incorporate their evidence into a disciplined historical context. Their analysis is used almost exclusively as a means to integrate their numerous case studies, rather than to analyse the content as such. The work as a whole does not benefit from current gender theory: a feminist interpretation can only be presumed by what was included and excluded respectively. Specifically, many questions remain unasked concerning the long-term social problem of tenement housing as well as the history of the family in Scotland. Nevertheless, the material as such is an important record of the personal experiences of life in tenement housing.

The role of oral history in historiography continues to be debated among a small sector of academia. It would be fruitless simply to reiterate their

arguments, but the spirit of their concerns is worth addressing at this juncture. By its very nature, the quality of information obtained from contributors is quite vulnerable to the passing of time, memory, various agendas, and, of course, the fact that some material cannot be substantiated. With these problems in mind, Helen Clark and Elizabeth Carnegie have been thorough in their inclusion of variable answers, which clearly reflect a more open-ended approach to the subject. Their sensitivity to their contributors' unique perspectives is also evident: they give voice to important topics that typically remain confined to the privacy of the family. It must be said that older people in more recent oral history projects have confirmed the content of *She Was Aye Workin*'. In conclusion, one must regard this text as an important endeavour to preserve Scottish urban history, and provide the historian with undeniably rich material.

University of St Andrews ELIZABETH L. BLACK

Herring. A History of the Silver Darlings.
By Mike Smyllie Pp 224.
ISBN 0 7524 2988 4.
Stroud: Tempus. 2004. £9.99.

The herring has been of such importance in fisheries that not a few books have been written about it over the past century and more; and since herring are now of much reduced importance the question might be raised whether there is scope for another book on such a well-known fish species. However Mike Smylie has found a fresh angle of approach to the subject. He himself smokes herring for sale; and every chapter of the book is introduced by a recipe with cooking instructions for preparing, or involving, herring. The objective of this book is more to create an atmosphere than to make a scholarly analysis: such eye-catching chapter titles as 'A Hundred Herring Baked in a Pie' and 'The Rudiments of the British Empire' give a useful clue to the tenor of the text. In effect the author ranges freely, following his own inclinations and interests. The book is in three parts, respectively entitled 'The Common Atlantic Pool', 'Catchin' Herring', and 'Curin' Herring'; and it consists of short chapters of which there are in all nineteen. The work is very readable and gives many interesting points of information; but it does not aim at an in-depth discussion or analysis, whether of the biology of the species, or of its historical or economic importance: in the main it is a series of methodically arranged vignettes. While there is a bibliography there are no specific references to sources of information.

The book sets out to range widely over the role of the herring and what it has meant to a great variety of people and communities around the North Atlantic and in Europe. The early history of herring fishing was never systematically recorded, but there is no doubt that a fishery that always showed big variations from day to day and from year to year does include numerous colourful episodes: and here the author is happy to present many of these. His book includes numerous examples and gives many instances of personal experience of fishermen, fish curers and others. Its nearest parallel in previous fisheries literature is the book by Mark Kurlansky on the cod—the other main species in the long and colourful story of the fisheries of the North Atlantic.

The first section is the main historical part of the work. Such early records as exist of herring and herring fishing reflect the feudal legacy of much of Europe and are largely from the archives of towns and religious houses; however the importance of herring to the Romans and the Saxons is also claimed. The

mention of herring in the Domesday Book is recorded, as are their records in mediaeval Great Yarmouth and Scarborough with their herring fairs. The uncertainties and imprecision of the various mentions of herring in fifteenth- and sixteenth-century Hanseatic records are recognised, together with acknowledgement that this was the first definite phase of their major commercial importance. There is something of a brief diversion to the author's own personal interests with the systematic account of the different methods and traditions of curing herring. The chapter entitled 'The Gold Mine in the North Sea' refers to the rise of the Dutch open sea fishery, and to the international conflicts and rivalry that it provoked. In doing so several of the most important developments of the herring fishery are recognised as well as its importance in wider history, although from the viewpoint of the latter the presentation is perhaps over-dramatic. This chapter opens with the contribution of the shadowy figure of Willem van Beukels who is popularly credited in the fourteenth century with devising the method of removing the gut from herring (before putting them in salt) that greatly enhanced their keeping quality. It also mentions the compulsory and duty-free use of solar salt from Spain and Portugal and the development of the 'buss', the vessel which took aboard barrels and salt which caught the herring and on which curing was done. In effect the methods and organisation of the Dutch which allowed them to dominate an important international resource for over two centuries are underlined.

The earlier efforts at herring fishing in Britain are treated in the chapter which has the somewhat extravagant title of 'The Rudiments of the British Empire', and the government bounties which stimulated the main take-off of Scottish fisheries from the latter half of the eighteenth century are itemised, although somewhat perversely the accompanying need for harbours is passed over. The remaining two chapters in this section deal with some of the more colourful episodes in the fisheries of Norway and New England: the fisheries were of major importance on much of the Norwegian west coast in the nineteenth century; and in the same century a variety of catching methods and markets developed in New England.

The second part of the book is very largely—and appropriately—about Scotland: the Scottish herring fishery during the nineteenth century grew to the point that it was the biggest fishery in the globe. A chapter is devoted to fish weirs, which were actually of limited importance for catching herring; but the following chapter deals with the drift net which for centuries was the main catching method, but this chapter gets equal space with that on weirs. The chapter on 'West Coast Toilers' is mainly about the Clyde fishery which was enmeshed in controversy and became dominated by the ring net; and main historical episode of the build-up of the Scottish East Coast fishery is more fully dealt with in the two chapters which are on sail boats and steam boats. A chapter is then devoted to the very testing anti-climax of the inter-war period when the main continental herring markets were badly disorganised. This part of the book is completed by a chapter devoted to the distinctive cultural characteristics of fishing communities and covers such issues as family boats, housing, wedding customs and the numerous superstitions.

The third section, 'Curin' Herring', opens with the treatment of the herring fisheries of the west coast of the Highlands and Islands; and although herring were cured there, the big herring curing industry was actually on the east coast: the author appears to have been influenced by the still-visible remains of deserted curing stations. A chapter is devoted to an essential element of the fisheries in the 'fisher lassies', the women who gutted and packed the herring into barrels, and many of whom followed the fishing at its various bases; the chapter sub-title of 'an Unheard-of Phenomenon' is well-taken, as these essential women

workers are under-represented in extant literature. It is understandable that with his own background and interests the author has a chapter on 'Smoking the Herring', which details the making of the traditional East Anglian bloater and the more recent history of the kipper. The penultimate chapter is on legislation relating to the herring, which details developments from the late eighteenth century to the recent provisions under the Common Fisheries Policy; it is to be noted that there is also an appendix in which there is an extended verbatim quotation from the observations of the Rev. Nigel Marsh on the herring in the important parliamentary report of 1800, which was effectively on the eve of the main phase of expansion. Half of the concluding chapter on the 'Legacy of the Herring' is somewhat surprisingly on the North-East USA and Canada: and herring have now become of minor importance, whatever their more important and colourful past. The final comments are on 'red herring' which is seen as an ironic term for the intention to mislead by laying false trails, and the stated corollary is that in our modern age of affluence we have perhaps forgotten how to live.

The book is well illustrated by a wide range of evocative photographs and lino cuts; and while these add an important dimension to the text, on a number of occasions they could have been better reproduced—although this would no doubt have added to the cost of production. Even so these are essential in helping the author to capture the atmosphere of the herring fisheries

The book will find a wide readership, and that is not likely to be confined to those places where the herring and the herring fishery are important parts of tradition and folk memory; but it will be more useful for checking on memorable episodes and eye-catching details than as a balanced and in-depth historical work.

University of Aberdeen JAMES R. COULL

The Sectarian Myth in Scotland: Of Bitter Memory and Bigotry
By Michael Rosie
ISBN1403921679
Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan. 2004. £45.00. Pp. x, 184

Sectarianism is a vexed issue in Scottish history and public life, discussion habitually serves to inflame rather than to inform and usually has a narrow frame of reference: football, schools, parades. In this book Michael Rosie seeks to begin a new analytical and rational discussion of the topic. The first part of his argument is that Scotland is not a sectarian society; that there is no evidence of sectarian views extending beyond the bounds of individual prejudice to characterise politics or the organisation of society. The most obvious comparison is with Northern Ireland, where confessional politics and social organisation along the lines of denomination are much more evident. Most of Rosie's clearly argued conclusions are drawn from statistics from the census and a variety of surveys of opinion; sometimes the reader wishes for a more textured discussion, but it is Rosie's intention to argue from evidence considered to be as objective as possible in order to counter the partisan views which have coloured much earlier discussion of the topic. He finds little support for the contentions that voting patterns correlate with religious denomination; the notion of a Roman Catholic bloc vote for Labour is undermined, as is the image of a Presbyterian Unionist phalanx. In matters of identity he argues for a relegation of religious persuasion as an explanation of attitudes towards, and perceptions of, Scottishness. He concludes on this aspect: 'If contemporary Scottishness is

understood as a landscape of social justice, of welfare provision, and of collective responsibility for the weak, then is it really any surprise that Catholics, Protestants and the non-religious are united in a sense of themselves as Scottish?' (p.70)

In what might appear to be an odd structural juxtaposition, the second half of the book moves from the contemporary to the historical; this is, however, explicable in the nature of Rosie's thesis and in that of the arguments he is seeking to counter. He argues that the 'sectarian myth' lives on despite the absence of real evidence for the persistence of sectarianism itself in today's Scotland because there is a perception that 'the past' was a sectarian place. He points out, however: 'to find that religion and politics mixed much more in the past is not the same thing as finding sectarianism, nor prejudice, nor bigotry. Rather it is to find that the past was more religious.' (p. 70). The remaining sections of the book deal with such historical topics as: the relationship between the labour movement, the Irish community and Roman Catholicism; the development of Roman Catholic education, leading up to and following the Education Act of 1918; the anti-Catholic campaigns of leading Presbyterian clergymen in the inter-war period; and the activities of such organisations as Alexander Ratcliffe's 'Scottish Protestant League' and the 'Protestant Action Society' led by John Cormack. Rosie's conclusion is that the evidence surrounding these episodes does not provide convincing support for a sectarian history of Scotland. For example, the apparent sectarian atmosphere of the inter-war period can be more sensibly characterised as short-lived sound and fury from small groups and isolated individuals; it did not take root in institutional, public or political life in Scotland. Rosie does not have a great deal to say about these topics that is original, but their inclusion here is an important building block in his argument and it complements the fresh research in the first part of the book. Historians are wont to criticise social scientists for lacking historical perspectives so it would be churlish to do other than compliment Dr Rosie for his well worked consideration of the historical dimension. To be slightly more critical, it might be said that there is a gap in the book: the consideration of the contemporary scene and the discussion of the pre-1939 period leaves a large hole in the middle. Profound changes took place in Scotland in the period between 1945 and 1970 which are rarely explored: Unionism, and elements of unionism, peaked and then declined; church adherence reached a high point before giving way to secularisation; and the economy changed in a way which made sectarian practices in the workplace—a topic not much discussed in this book—difficult to sustain. That Michael Rosie is not the only scholar to elide this important period does not entirely get him off the hook.

What is the overall significance of this book? Those who argue for the enduring nature of sectarianism might be culpable—certainly if we follow Rosie's argument—in the perpetuation of an imagined grievance; but are those who take the opposite extreme guilty of a comfortable self congratulation about the benign nature of Scottish society? Perhaps. This is not, however, the view adopted or recommended by Rosie. His concluding chapter is a exhortation to more critical approaches to the topic; he ends by arguing that '[m]uch of the debate about sectarianism has proved imprisoned in an imagined history, invoking exaggerated terrors at the outset of a new era for Scotland.' (p. 150) It is to be hoped that this new era includes a more mature, less sectarian debate about sectarianism. This book could well be the start of it.

University of Edinburgh EWEN A. CAMERON