

## INTRODUCTION

JOHN MURRAY, the writer of the Memorials here printed for the first time, was a member of a family of respectable antiquity even in Scotland. In the reign of James iv., William, the second son of Murray of Philiphaugh, married the heiress of the ancient house of Romanno of that Ilk. Their great-grandson acquired the lands of Stanhope, and was knighted by Charles i. He was also proprietor of the lands and barony of Broughton in Peeblesshire (charter dated 21st December 1635). His son William, a staunch loyalist, was fined £2000 by Cromwell, and was rewarded with a baronetcy by Charles ii. The estate of Broughton was sold by him, possibly to meet Cromwell's exactions. His son Sir David married first the Lady Anne Bruce, daughter of the second Earl of Kincardine, who died leaving five sons and three daughters; second, Margaret, daughter of Sir John Scott of Ancrum and widow of Thomas Scott of Whitside. John Murray was the second of seven children by this marriage, and was born in 1715.<sup>1</sup> Murray's father is described by Lockhart of Carnwath as 'a person of great worth and honour.' In 1726 he had acquired from Sir Duncan Campbell of Lochnell the

---

<sup>1</sup> The *Genuine Memoirs*, followed by the writer in the *Dictionary of National Biography*, state that Murray was born in 1718, but his own statement in the register of the University of Leyden, that he was twenty in 1735, seems conclusive evidence that the *Genuine Memoirs* are wrong. It is also improbable that he was initiated into the Roman Lodge before he was twenty-one: in fact it is almost certain that he was 'of full age' before August 1737. I have therefore accepted the Leyden statement, and accordingly placed his birth in the year of the Fifteen.

A genealogy of the family given in the appendix to this volume shows the extensive connections of the Murrays with well-known Scots families.

estate of Ardnamurchan, with the lead mines of Strontian, which he was intent on developing, and for this purpose travelled frequently from Peeblesshire through the Highlands to the West Coast. Lockhart thought this peripatetic life marked him as most suitable for a Jacobite agent, and broached the subject to him. Murray of Stanhope, however, while professing continued affection and loyalty to the Stuarts, and promising to draw his sword whenever there was to be 'a general effort for restoring the king and kingdom of Scotland,' demurred to undertaking any plotting. He would think upon and undertake no other business save the improvement of his estate, and he adds, 'Besides, when I got my life after the last affair [the Fifteen] I entered into engagements that will not allow me to be active in contriving or carrying on measures against the Government, tho' when there's a push to be made I'll venture all with the first.' He was not, however, tempted to break his engagements in this way, as he died before the Forty-Five. The writer in the *Dictionary of National Biography* seems to have confounded this prudent landlord with his grandson, Sir David, who, though only a youth of twenty in 1745, did take his part with his uncle of Broughton.

John Murray was educated at the University of Edinburgh, where, in March 1732, he entered the class of Professor Adam Watt, and in the following year he again attended Professor Watt's lectures and also those of Professor John Stevenson. Watt was Professor of Humanity from 1728 to 1734, and Stevenson of Logic and Metaphysics from 1730 to 1774. On 1st October 1735, Joannes Murray, Scoto-Britannicus, matriculated at Leyden as studiosus juris: his age is given as twenty. He spent about two years at Leyden, and then, full of the principles of his father, who had been 'out in the Fifteen,' he went to Rome. On August 20th, 1737, he was initiated into the mysteries of Freemasonry in the Roman Lodge. This Lodge was instituted in 1735, and when Murray joined it the Earl of Winton was Master ('Great Master,' as

he signs himself in the minute-book, now in possession of the Grand Lodge of Scotland); while among the members present were Allan Ramsay the painter, and John Stuart, Lord Traquair's brother. Murray's initiation took place at the last meeting of the Lodge, which had its room first at 'Joseppie's in the Corso,' and latterly at 'The Three Kings, Strada Paolina.' Clement XII. was, like his successors, opposed to Freemasonry. He suppressed the Lodge, and sent the Tyler to the prison of the Inquisition for a brief period 'as a warning to others.'

A pamphlet entitled *The Genuine Memoirs of John Murray, late Secretary to the Young Pretender*, published in 1747, and accepted by many later writers, is not trustworthy.<sup>1</sup> It states, for example, that Murray was not in Rome till 1741, and then proceeds to give an account of his introduction to the royal exiles, which may or may not be true. Murray himself gives us little information as to this part of his life. In his examination (p. 480) he states that in 1738 he was frequently with Prince Charles in Rome, but was never introduced to the Chevalier. From the fact he records, that when he saw Prince Charles in Paris in 1744, the Prince did not know him by name, but remembered having previously seen him at Rome, two things may be inferred, that Prince Charles had the royal gift of remembering faces, and that Murray's relations with the little Court at Rome could not have been intimate.

On leaving Rome, Murray 'returned through Germany to Holland,' and then to Scotland *via* Rotterdam and Sunderland. In December 1738 Murray was back in Edinburgh, for then we find that he was affiliated to the Masonic Lodge, Canongate Kilwinning No. 2, the Earl of Kilmarnock being then Grand

---

<sup>1</sup> *The Genuine Memoirs* are inaccurate in several matters. They state that Prince Henry went to France with his brother in 1745. We know that Charles went alone in 1744. Mr. Hunter is called 'Huntley,' and Polmood Primoude. An apocryphal story is given of how Murray, after the Prince's landing, rode from Inverlochy to within eight miles of Edinburgh, bearing a letter from the Prince to 'a certain nobleman, whom, indeed, to gain was gaining everything.' Murray is said to have been present at Culloden, etc. etc.

Master. He does not seem to have attended the Lodge with regularity : he was present in December 1742, and on St. Andrew's Day, 1743, took office in Grand Lodge as Junior Grand Warden. It is interesting to note that wherever his name or signature appears in the transactions of Lodge Canongate Kilwinning they have been erased.<sup>1</sup>

After Murray's return to Scotland in 1738, his relations with the adherents of the house of Stuart became closer, though he says little of the period between 1738 and 1740. He seems to have been selected by that loyal servant of the Stuarts, James Edgar, as a suitable correspondent in Scotland, and when age and illness rendered Colonel Urquhart unable to conduct the official correspondence between Scotland and Rome, Murray was chosen by him as his successor. Colonel Urquhart's post cannot well be defined: suffice to say that he was the recognised channel by which the Scottish Jacobites communicated with their king at Rome. Murray's appointment as official correspondent was ratified by James, provided the Duke of Hamilton, who was considered head of the party, approved. This duke seems to have played a cautious part. He was sought by Jacobites and Whigs. James sent him the Thistle and the Garter: George II. decorated him with the Thistle. He managed his cards well, however, and at his death in 1743 none could have said what part he would have played had a rising taken place in his lifetime: in 1715 and 1718 he was but a boy. He, however, gave the required consent to Murray's appointment, and was regarded as the hope of the party, till his conduct with regard to Murray's request that he should join in the raising of a war fund in 1741 caused doubts as to his sincerity, in Murray's mind at any rate. His son, who was only twenty-one in 1745, gave £1500 to the cause, but, so far as I know, that fact has been concealed till now. Suspicious of him the government

---

<sup>1</sup> A facsimile of the first minute in which his name appears and has been subsequently erased is here given, by the courtesy of Lodge Canongate Kilwinning No. 2.



St John's Lodge the 1<sup>st</sup> Decemr  
The Lodge having met accord  
The R: W. appointed Mr ~~James~~  
~~James~~ ~~for~~ ~~to~~ ~~be~~ ~~the~~ ~~first~~ ~~and~~ ~~after~~  
formed And visited by the right  
Worshipfull Eaf of Helmarock &  
Sutton who with his Grand Warden  
officers of the Grand Lodge have  
administration, and being also vis  
Rome & other Lodges, Prosperi  
with the other usual of health  
R: honble & most W: Grandmaster  
Scott his Seny Grand Warden to  
& dismiss the Brethren And the  
adjourned 'till the 27<sup>th</sup> Decemr  
St John the Evangelists Day, W:  
of the Lodge are ordered to attend

John Brown R: W.  
~~James~~ ~~for~~ ~~to~~ ~~be~~ ~~the~~ ~~first~~ ~~and~~ ~~after~~  
J. W. P.  
J. W. P.

nr 5742 — 5742

ding to Adjournment  
~~was of the~~ ~~Brother~~ ~~John~~  
ter the Lodge was duly  
ht honorable & most  
& Grand Master of  
Wardens & other proper  
being assumed the  
visited by Brethren from  
rity to which Lodges  
s being Drunk The  
ter ordered Sr John  
to Close the Lodge  
the Lodge is of hereby  
r Current being the  
When the Members

~~John Murray~~ G. M.

John Scott S. G. M.

Worrieson S. G. M. T. G.

J. Douglas Master

may have been, but Dukes of Hamilton had often been suspected of more personal treasons to reigning sovereigns. His high position, and the fact that his overt acts during Prince Charles's expedition, were all that the government could desire, prevented any investigation of his views. There is no doubt that like many others he would gladly have seen the Stuarts at St. James's on his own terms, but the Forty-Five was not an adventure to his liking.

Murray's appointment, which, as he is careful to point out, brought him no salary, led naturally to his acquaintance with all the leading Jacobites in Scotland, Highland and Lowland, while Traquair seems to have acted as emissary between the Scots and English leaders of the party.

Soon after 1738 Murray married Margaret, daughter of Colonel Robert Ferguson, brother of William Ferguson of Cailloch, in Nithsdale. He also, about the same time, bought back the ancestral estate of Broughton. There are Murrays of Broughton in Galloway, and some confusion has resulted. Hill Burton, in *The Scot Abroad*, indeed goes out of his way to throw a stone at the author of these Memorials when he accuses him of calling his 'cottage and paddock' by the name of the seat of a respectable family, in order that he might be mistaken for a Wigtonshire Murray, a charge which has no foundation save in that estimable author's imagination. Broughton, in Peeblesshire, was a barony long before John Murray was born, and so far from his estate being a cottage and a paddock, it cost him £6000, and he sold it for £16,000, while in 1769 it was valued at £22,000.<sup>1</sup>

The first portion of the Memorials deals in detail with the arrangements for a descent under Prince Charles. The eldest son of the Chevalier was then twenty-four years of age. He had seen some service in Italy under his relative, the Duke of

---

<sup>1</sup> Mr. George Murray has in his possession the missives of sale of Broughton, of date 24th May 1764. It was purchased by Mr. Dickson of Havannah, whose agent was Mr. Walter Scott, W.S. (father of Sir Walter), Murray's agent being Mr. Thomas Tod, W.S. Murray's historic visit to George Square, when the teacup was broken, had to do with this transaction.



Berwick, and burned to retrieve the fortunes of his house. In the Appendix to this volume (p. 508) is printed a letter from the Chevalier to the King of France, which must dispose for ever of one of the most foolish charges made against the hero of the Forty-Five. It has been stated by many, who ought to have known better, that Prince Charles came to Scotland against his father's will, and that his intention was to grasp the Crown and throw his father over. It is of little consequence to speculate what arrangement might have been come to had George II. retired to Hanover. The fact remains that James was anxious that Charles should make an attempt to regain his inheritance, but that he himself was determined to end his days in Rome. Charles, in a letter of 12th June 1745, published by Lord Mahon, protests energetically against any declaration of this intention. 'Sovereigns upon the throne can do such things; and even then it is not advisable; but a private man ruins himself and his family in doing on't.' No character in history has been so little understood as the Prince who was proclaimed at Perth as eighth of his name. In 1744 he was fifty-six years of age, a widower, in bad health, his spirit broken by the persistent bad luck of his whole life, like his father and his son Henry, a devout and consistent Catholic. For him the day of adventure was over, and with that calm wisdom, which shows itself constantly in his charming letters to his sons, he recognised that he would be miserable in London, while he might be more than contented at Rome. Here he would have been surrounded by heretics, and his religion would have been a perpetual stumbling-block; there he would be the Pope's best friend, and could exercise a delightful influence in the way of making cardinals and bishops. He chose his part, and as he said to Louis xv., it only remained to select the time when his determination should be made known. This, then, was the true position of affairs when Prince Charles set forth from Rome.

In the previous year preparations had been begun for a



rising. Murray tells us what was doing in Scotland and in England, and he gives an account of a visit he paid to France in the beginning of 1743. He arrived in that country just after the death of Cardinal Fleury, in whom the Stuarts lost a powerful friend. Europe was still in the throes of the war. Dettingen was a blow to France, Broglie had been driven out of Germany; and, in short, the time had come for France to retrieve her position, as the prospects of a satisfactory peace were illusory. It is impossible and unnecessary to enter into detail as to the grounds of the hope of the Jacobites, that France would at once attempt an invasion of England. That hope was nearly realised the following year, and indeed, but for the friendly elements which again saved England, it seems almost certain that Saxe would have landed in 1744. When Murray arrived in France in January 1743, he, after some weeks of waiting, was presented to Amelot du Chaillu, Minister for Foreign Affairs, by the Jacobite agent Sempill, whose acquaintance also he now made for the first time. Nothing came of these negotiations save friendly compliments, and Murray's appointment as captain à la suite in Rothe's Irish Regiment.<sup>1</sup> In March Murray returned to London, visiting the Duke of Perth at York on his way home to Broughton. Little or nothing seems to have been done for some months. In January 1744, Macgregor (often called Drummond) of Bohaldy went to Rome, and it seems probable that he accompanied Prince Charles during part, at least, of his journey to Paris, where he arrived in February of that year. Bohaldy sent home from Rome accounts of a projected invasion in which Prince Charles or the Earl Marischal were to take part; and after his return to Paris

---

<sup>1</sup> This French Commission is extant and in possession of Mr. George Murray. By it 'Le Sieur Jean Murray' is appointed 'Capitaine Reformé à la suite du Regiment Irlandois de Rothe.' It is given at Versailles on 20th February 1743, and is signed 'Louis' and Marc Pierre Devoyer D'Argenson. Marc Pierre, Minister of War, was brother of Renée Louis, Marquis d'Argenson, Minister of Foreign Affairs, 1744-47, and author of the *Mémoires*.

he again roused the excitement of the Scots Jacobites by writing that Prince Charles and Marshal Saxe might land in England at any moment. These messages, though apparently definite, seem somehow to have proved quite unconvincing, and the leaders of the party in Scotland determined to send some one to Paris to represent their views to the Prince, and at the same time give him trustworthy information. Murray was chosen for this mission. He ostensibly went over to visit friends in the army in Flanders. There he met Bohaldy and went with him privately to Paris. The French Foreign Office was aware of Murray's visit to the Low Countries and of his meeting Bohaldy there, but this captain of the Macgregors seems, for no very ostensible reason, to have kept Murray's further progress concealed. All that the French Government was told was, that Murray had come to report on the state of Scotland, and that in consequence of his report Bohaldy found that fewer arms were necessary than had been anticipated, as the chiefs had armed their clans. Bohaldy's whole behaviour about the proposed purchase of arms at this time is mysterious. Murray's statements on this matter are probably true, and are corroborated to some extent by the minute of the French Foreign Office (*v.* p. 504).

Murray saw Prince Charles for the first time since 1738 in Paris in July or August 1744. He exposed Bohaldy's deception in the matter of his purchase of arms to the Prince and presented a Memorial (p. 376) setting forth his grievances against Drummond-Macgregor. In his evidence at Lovat's trial (p. 80 of the Official Report) Murray insists almost vehemently that he endeavoured both by argument with the Prince and by stronger remonstrances addressed to Sir Thomas Sheridan to dissuade Prince Charles from coming to Scotland without French aid. There is every reason to believe that Murray was telling the truth. The charges that he incited the Prince to come under any circumstances are not supported by any evidence that I have seen. They remain the bare

assertions of disappointed and ruined men whose loyalty led them to shift the blame of the disastrous enterprise on to the shoulders of the dog who had the worst name. Prince Charles himself always accepted full responsibility for the step, and never sought to screen himself at the expense of any of his followers—ready as he was to charge Lord George Murray with treason for his conduct during the campaign.

Prince Charles's letter to his father, written on 12th June 1745,<sup>1</sup> proves that he was misinformed as to the state of feeling in Britain. He says: 'In fine our friends without saying it directly have spoke in such a manner that I plainly saw, iff the Winter and Spring passed over without some attempt, they wou'd rise of themselves in spite of all I could say or do to prevent it, not doubting but they wou'd succeed iff in the least seconded, and that the worst that could happen them was to dye in ye field, which was preferable to living any longer in misery and oppression.'

If these were the Prince's views as to the position of affairs in Scotland, and were not merely stated as an excuse for the enterprise on which he had then determined, a grave responsibility attaches to some. 'Our friends' may include Murray, but these words prove that he alone had not misled the Prince. The evidence of the Prince's letters, apart from Murray's own statements in his Memorials, seems rather to show that Murray, while practical and energetic (Sempill and Macgregor showed neither quality), was full of enthusiasm or, probably, inspired by the presence of the Prince, had expressed his hopes in language which led them to appear better founded than in his cooler moments he knew them to be. That he urged the Prince to come without French aid is improbable. That he accepted the Prince's statement that he would do so, and that his arguments against such a course were feeble and easily overborne, is almost certain. In recalling the circumstances of the interviews between the Prince and Murray, it must be remembered that both were young men—

---

<sup>1</sup> Printed by Lord Mahon, *History of England*, vol. iii., Appendix.



the one twenty-four, the other not quite thirty years of age—and also that the Prince, ambitious, enthusiastic, and persuaded of the justice of his cause, was ready to listen rather to what he wanted to believe than to plain unvarnished fact. He had had enough of cautious inactivity from Sempill and Bohaldy. His letter of the 12th June, however, shows pretty conclusively that he alone was responsible for his expedition, and that though Murray might have done nothing to cool his ardour, the position of affairs in Europe and the British defeat at Fontenoy were the determining causes. George II. was in Hanover, a large number of troops were shut up in Flanders, the people were sick of a war in which England apart from Hanover had no clear interest. Jealous of Hanover and disgusted at the favour shown to the Electorate and its troops, taxed to provide subsidies to half Europe, shocked at the corruption of public life, the intelligent classes in England were patently discontented. France was at war with England—what more natural than that Prince Charles should persuade himself that if he carried the war across the Channel France would follow, that the people would rise and welcome him, not merely because he was their rightful Prince of Wales, but also because he came as a deliverer. In Scotland added causes of discontent arose from the still smouldering grievances of the Union. The sons of those who had been exiled after the Fifteen were burning to return and regain their position and estates—some, of course, had been leniently dealt with and were already in possession, and the more unwilling to risk anything again. Still the Court at Rome had many correspondents who were clamant in their calls to action and prodigal of the proffers of support and prophecies of success. It needed, therefore, no Murray to urge the Prince to go to Scotland, or persuade him that the time was propitious for a restoration.

Murray returned to Scotland in the autumn of 1744, and saw most of the leading members of the Jacobite party soon

after. With the exception of the chivalrous and devoted Duke of Perth, every one of them was strongly opposed to the Prince's coming. In January 1745 Murray wrote a journal of his transactions with the leading members of the party, transcribed letters which had passed between him and Lord Traquair, Lochiel, and Sir James Stewart of Auchinbreck, and set forth in a letter to the Prince the 'situation and inclination of the party.' These documents were given to Lord Traquair for transmission to Paris. In the end of April this packet was returned to Murray, Lord Traquair having been unable to find 'any proper person to send it by to the Prince.' Murray and his friends had before this become anxious about the fate of their documents, and had sent another letter to the Prince to be forwarded by Mr. Charles Smith, merchant in Boulogne. This second attempted communication is not explicitly mentioned by Murray in his evidence at Lovat's trial. Another attempt, however, was made by Murray to forward the packet intrusted to Lord Traquair. In May, the younger Glen-garry received it from Murray and set out at once for France. The Prince, however, never received the documents, and Murray thus has some justification for accusing Traquair's inaction of being the cause of the Forty-Five. In June Murray received a letter from the Prince informing him that he was determined at once to start for Scotland. Murray communicated the news to the Duke of Perth and went himself to Lochiel. Dr. Archibald Cameron was sent to Lovat, who sent him back immediately with a message protesting against the folly of the undertaking. The other Highland chiefs, with whom Lochiel communicated, were of the same opinion; and Murray wrote, on their behalf, a letter to the Prince, which he received on his landing as Eriska, in which an immediate return to France was urged as the only prudent conduct. Murray presumably knew his Prince better than to expect that his letter would have the effect ostensibly desired. He says, indeed, that he wrote to prevent any one saying that he had 'neglected to acquaint him with the sentiments of his friends.' For himself he was

‘far from thinking that it would be consistent with the Prince’s dignity to return.’ Murray then returned south, but broke his journey to have an interview with Cluny on the way. With this his account of the negotiations breaks off. How far Cluny committed himself at this interview is not revealed, and we must still conjecture what that chief’s real sentiments were when later he was brought before Prince Charles as a prisoner of war.

In the beginning of August, Murray, then in Peeblesshire, learned by an anonymous letter that the Prince had landed in Moidart, and at once set out to join him, with two boxes full of proclamations and manifestoes which he had had printed in Edinburgh, and a parcel of arms. Murray had asked young Glengarry to obtain his nomination as aide-de-camp, but he seems already to have assumed his duties of secretary. He travelled north, visiting Lord John Drummond the elder and Buchanan of Arnprior. From Leny<sup>1</sup> he sent James More Macgregor or Drummond, son of Rob Roy, but more pleasantly known as the father of R. L. Stevenson’s *Catriona*, to Edinburgh to play a congenial part and deceive the Government with false intelligence. Murray joined the Prince at Kinloch-Moidart on August 18th, and from that day till shortly before Culloden he never left him. On August 25th Murray was named secretary, while his military ambition was to some extent satisfied later when he was made a colonel of hussars. There is no record that he ever led his regiment into action. The real commander was Baggot,<sup>2</sup> a French-Irish officer, and their highest force seems to have been about eighty rank and file. The regiment was formed after Prestonpans, marched to Derby, but is not heard of after the return to Scotland. Murray had coveted the post of aide-de-camp to the Prince, and his appointment to the more onerous post

---

<sup>1</sup> Mr. Blaikie informs me that he has fallen into an error in stating in the *Itinerary* that Murray visited Arnprior House. Buchanan of Arnprior was then residing at his house of Leny near Callander, and it was at Leny that Murray met him and James More Macgregor.—*Itinerary of Prince Charles Edward*, by W. B. Blaikie, Scot. Hist. Soc., 1897, p. 7, n. 2.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.* p. 93.



of secretary was evidently a disappointment. As secretary, however, he seems to have been the right man in the right place. His appointment, to begin with, raised no jealousies. He was not a soldier by profession, and his training had been purely literary. Amongst a company of country gentlemen, most of whom considered arms the only career for persons of their birth, few in any way fitted would have been willing to accept the post. Murray was a man of education—not that the Highland chiefs were illiterate—and he had been the recognised correspondent of the party for some years. In any case the appointment was justified. No complaints of his conduct as secretary were made during the whole campaign, and there is ample proof that throughout he was the embodiment of order, energy, and devotion.<sup>1</sup> The only charge made against him by any of the Prince's followers was inevitable: he is said to have had too much influence with his master, but it is nowhere proved that this influence was ever used to evil purpose, though Maxwell of Kirkconnel for one asserts the contrary. On the other hand, we have Lord George Murray's statement that he had been always extremely active in whatever concerned the providing for the army. In his Memorials Murray deals with the whole course of the expedition up to the arrival at Derby. He enters into no great detail, and adds but little of importance to our knowledge of the campaign. His Memorials were not written at the time, but some years after, and thus have not the interest and value of a diary. That he had kept something of a diary, however, appears probable, but he states that after Culloden all his papers were destroyed. He tells of the gathering of the Prince's army and of the march to Edinburgh, of the surrender of the capital and of the battle of Prestonpans, and, with regard to all these matters, supplements our knowledge. His official position gives weight to his information as to the accessions to the army, while on the few occasions where he tells of the troubles the Prince had with the many leaders under him, his statements have an irresistible

---

<sup>1</sup> See *Itinerary*, p. 41, n. 4.

authority. One of these refers to the quarrel between Lord George Murray and the Duke of Perth at Carlisle. Maxwell of Kirkconnel gives a garbled account of the matter, which has too frequently been received as authoritative. He, for no very logical reason, puts the whole blame of this and also of subsequent misunderstandings on the secretary. John Murray's own account is that Lord George conducted the preparations for the siege to the admiration of all, but that when the town surrendered, the Prince ordered him 'to go to the Duke of Perth's quarters, and together with him to treat with the deputies from the town.' This was resented by Lord George, who, on the ground that the Duke was a Roman Catholic, argued that it was bad policy to put his Grace forward as head of the army at the first English town of which the Prince got possession, while the secretary's employment in the matter seemed simply a slight to himself. Lord George resigned his post as lieutenant-general, and informed the Prince that in future he would serve as a volunteer—a show of temper which Charles never forgave, and which was but one of many misunderstandings. John Murray does not tell us of this resignation, but there is ample authority for the fact. His account is that Lord George's complaints were chiefly directed against him, and that in consequence he magnanimously resigned his place on the Prince's council. The Prince demurred, but on the secretary pointing out that it was only with a view to the Prince's interest, and that it would be 'still in his power to advise in a private manner,' he agreed. The Duke of Perth, not to be behind, resigned the chief command to Lord George, who thereafter was commander-in-chief of the army. Lord George's position, however, was never satisfactory in his own eyes, for the Prince continued to direct the movements of the army himself; and the private advice of the Duke of Perth, Sir Thomas Sheridan, and Mr. Secretary was more frequently sought than that of the responsible officers.

After the arrival of the army at Derby, Murray's narrative stops, and there is a blank until after Culloden. In his examination, taken in the Tower in August 1746, he lifts the curtain but once or twice on this intervening period. For instance, he tells us that when he learned that Lord George Murray, Lord Elcho, and, indeed, every member of the Prince's council, except the Duke of Perth, had at Derby declared their opinion for marching back to Scotland, he advised the Prince to yield. Of the serious quarrel between the Prince and Lord George Murray in January 1746 Murray says not a word. Though the letters and remonstrances<sup>1</sup> began by Lord George on January 6th and continued till the end of the month, which resulted, in spite of the Prince's strenuous opposition, in the withdrawal of the force beyond the Forth, require little elucidation, it would have been of interest to know Murray's part in the dispute. Charles yielded, but he ends his letter consenting to the retreat thus: 'After this, I know that I have an army that I cannot command any further than the chief officers please, and therefore, if you are all resolved upon it, I must yield; but I take God to witness that it is with the greatest reluctance, and that I wash my hands of the fatal consequences which I foresee, but cannot help.' Lord George Murray's part in this interference with the royal authority destroyed all friendship between him and the Prince. Charles regarded him henceforth as little better than a traitor. In April 1747, hearing that he had gone to Rome, he writes to the Chevalier: 'It wou'd be of the most Dangerous Consequences iff such a Divill was not secured immediately in sum Castle where he might be at his ease but without being able to escape, or have ye Liberty of Pen or Paper.'<sup>2</sup> Again (p. 398), he says that he has 'good reason to suspect by circumstances together that Murray was in a click with Lord George, tho' he pretended and appeared to be otherwise.' To these com-

---

<sup>1</sup> See *Itinerary*, pp. 73-78.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.* p. 81.



munications James replied with his usual sense, urging the Prince to forgive Lord George, as there was no question of his loyalty and affection. This appeal was in vain; Charles refused to see Lord George, and they never met again. Charles's ingenious theory that the two Murrays were 'in a click together' may have arisen from the secretary counselling consent first to the retreat from Derby and then, possibly, to the retreat from Falkirk. These at least were both regarded by Charles as the result of 'disobedience, insolency, and creating dissension' by Lord George, and were the chief grievances against him.

When the Prince was at Elgin in March 1746, John Murray became seriously ill. The Prince's troops left Inverness before Culloden, and Murray was carried in a litter to Foyers. The day of the battle he was carried across Loch Ness to Mrs. Grant's of Glenmoriston, where Dr. Cameron 'acquainted him with the disaster of the preceding day.' He was able next day to go to meet the Duke of Perth at Invergarry. Getting little comfort from his Grace, who, 'quite wore out with fatigue,' had evidently at last lost faith in the ultimate success of the expedition, Murray went on to Loch Eil, where he met the Cameron chief and Stewart of Ardsheal. These determined to attempt to rally a force who should 'keep the hills' till it was discovered whether help was coming from France or not. From Loch Eil, Murray went with his host to Callich, and thence to a wood, where some huts had been hurriedly erected for their shelter and concealment. Here they heard some news of the Prince, and despatched Dr. Cameron to urge him not to leave the country. Hay of Restalrig, who had undertaken Murray's duties (and by all accounts performed them badly<sup>1</sup>) met Cameron and told him the Prince had sailed. This statement was doubted, and another messenger was sent next day. Then it was made certain that the Prince had left for the Hebrides. The arrival of two ships from France was announced with arms, money, and ammunition. Murray went

---

<sup>1</sup> *Itinerary*, p. 41, n. 4.

to the ships to receive this contribution. He found them off the coast in action with three British men-of-war,<sup>1</sup> and was told that they had landed thirty-five thousand Louis-d'ors in six casks, but that in the hurry one of the casks had gone amissing. This cask was found by a boy: seven or eight hundred pounds had been abstracted. Murray took possession of the money. Here begins the story of the hidden treasure, which was essential to round off the romance of the Forty-Five.

Next day the British ships having retired, after 'meeting with a severe drubbing,' the French commodore set sail with the Duke of Perth, who survived but a few days, Lord John Drummond, Lord Elcho, Sir Thomas Sheridan, Lockhart of Carnwath, Hay of Restalrig, and some others. Murray and Lochiel remained: Murray because, he says, he would not desert his Prince; Lochiel because he would not then desert his clan. Murray had also the responsibility of disposing of the French treasure; there is no evidence that he failed in that trust. His refusal to escape with his dying friend Perth must be set to the credit side of Murray's strangely involved account with honour.

Murray explains his transactions with the money more fully than is done in the statement of charge and discharge printed by Chambers in the Appendix to his *History of the Rebellion*. He tells us that Barrisdale, Clanranald, and some others on the spot, thought the money should be at once divided amongst them by way of an equivalent for their losses. He opposed this rough-and-ready manner of settlement, promised to pay all arrears, to allow half a Louis-d'or for each wounded man and a small allowance for widows, and sent the money in charge of Dr. Cameron to Lochiel.

Murray followed by way of Loch Morar, and in a few days a conference was held in Lochiel's country,<sup>2</sup> when plans for rally-

---

<sup>1</sup> Murray says opposite 'Keppoch' (p. 273), apparently a mistake for 'Borradaile.'

<sup>2</sup> Murray says at 'Mortleg' (p. 274), evidently a confusion of names: the conference took place at Muirlaggan on Loch Arkaig.

ing the army were discussed. A rendezvous was appointed, Lovat promising to send four hundred men under his son, and the other chiefs guaranteeing various reinforcements. Before the date fixed for the assembling of this little army of resistance Murray buried in 'three several parcels in the wood,' beside Loch Arkaig, fifteen thousand Louis-d'or. The army—alas for promises—amounted when at last assembled to some four hundred, of whom two hundred were Camerons: thirteen hundred had been promised. The Master of Lovat was 'never so much as heard of' with his four hundred men. Murray gives a detailed account of the subsequent proceedings of this little body till its voluntary dispersion a few days later in face of an overwhelming force of Government troops. During these days six casks were carried about by the clans, three filled with French gold, three filled with stones, to replace the three already buried in Cameron ground. Murray tells us he adopted this deception 'to give no jealousy to the other clans of his having more confidence in the Camerons than' in them. He buried twelve thousand Louis-d'or near to the foot of Loch Arkaig, 'about a mile from Lochiel's house,' retaining five thousand Louis 'for necessary expenses.' Thus the total buried treasure is shown to have been twenty-seven thousand Louis-d'or.

When the clans finally dispersed, Murray, having received intelligence that the Prince was in Uist, set out for the coast with the intention of joining his master. He fell ill again, however, and was dissuaded from going, on the further ground that his ignorance of Gaelic would mark him, and make him rather a danger than a help to his fugitive Prince. He attempted, however, to communicate with him, and waited for instructions in Lochiel's country for some days. He met his wife and his nephew, Sir David Murray, near Strontian, and again forgathered with Lochiel. It was agreed, says Murray, that he should go to Leith and charter a ship to convey himself and Lochiel from Scotland to Holland. A port in Fife



was agreed upon as the rendezvous. Murray's account of his journey to Glen Lyon, to Breadalbane, and thence to Balquidder, south to Carnwath, and on to Kilbueho<sup>1</sup> and Polmood, is full of interest, and recalls Waverley's journey through part of the same country. At Polmood, his sister's house in Peeblesshire, he went to bed at two in the morning, 'overcome with fatigue, and before five<sup>2</sup> was waked, the dragoons at the gate.' So ended Murray's part in the Forty-Five, and had his life ended here he would have been handed down to posterity as one of the paladins of that last romance of Scottish history. Unfortunately for Murray's reputation, the scenes that were still to be played have made more impression on the chroniclers than those of the earlier acts of the drama before the dragoons came to Polmood. Even after his capture, however, he informs us that he was careful of his friends, and sent an Edinburgh physician, Dr. Cochran, who visited him in the castle, to Leith to engage the ship for Lochiel.

Murray's wife got back to Edinburgh with some difficulty, and soon after her arrival gave birth to a son, who did not long survive. His nephew Sir David was taken, and imprisoned for some time at York. His release was brought about by the influence of his relatives, amongst whom Lord Hopetoun may be mentioned. He afterwards went to France. He was in Paris in 1747, and at the time of Prince Charles's arrest and imprisonment at Vincennes, Sir David Murray, it is recorded, was one of his friends who was arrested and imprisoned in the Bastille. In a list in the French Foreign Office of the Prince's friends in Paris in 1746-47, Sir David Murray is described as an impetuous and brave youth of twenty-two, who had been condemned to death, but had had his sentence changed to exile, with the confiscation of his

---

<sup>1</sup> Dickson of Kilbueho married Margaret, the eldest daughter of Sir William Murray of Stanhope. Their son, the laird at this time, was John Murray's cousin.

<sup>2</sup> The Lord Justice-Clerk says 'at three in the morning.'

estates. He died in 1770, and was succeeded as titular baronet by his uncle Charles, who was collector of customs at Borrowstoneness; he died, however, within a few months, was succeeded by his son, another Sir David, who also died soon after his succession, and John Murray of Broughton then assumed the title, in spite of the attainder.

Prince Charles as soon as he heard of Murray's capture attempted to get him, Glengarry, and Sir Hector Maclean brought under the protection of the French King so that they might, as French officers, be exchanged as prisoners of war: English officers captured during the recent campaign in Flanders,<sup>1</sup> as well as prisoners sent by Charles from Scotland, were to be offered in exchange. The French ministers were ready to help, though they appear to have had no great hopes of success.

Then comes the report that Murray has turned king's evidence, and we hear nothing more of the matter, so far at any rate as he is concerned. Prince Charles's letters, his insistence, his assertion that Murray was worth a thousand men to the standard prove that his secretary had retained his confidence to the end. Then comes his letter to his father bewailing Lovat's fate and Murray's 'rascality.'<sup>2</sup>

Murray's capture was considered of great importance by the government, and correspondence with regard to him at once began between the Lord Justice-Clerk and the Secretary of State. The assertion that he was drunk when the Lord Justice-Clerk first interviewed him is unworthy of belief. The poor man was wretchedly ill; he had ridden over half Scotland with scarcely a rest, and the dragoons probably found him in a somewhat dazed condition at three o'clock in the morning. The Justice-Clerk himself gives fatigue as a more charitable reason for his condition. In fact his lordship admits his bad state of health when it was certified by the king's apothecary.

---

<sup>1</sup> Appendix, pp. 518, 520.

<sup>2</sup> Appendix, p. 404.

The Duke of Newcastle seems from the first to have expected Murray to give information, and authorised the Justice-Clerk to sound him, without, however, promising a pardon. Murray was sent off to London on July 7th in a coach with a guard of dragoons. Fletcher, not having received the duke's instructions in time, followed, and we have a full account (pp. 417, 418) of his interview with the prisoner at Dunbar. Murray stated that 'if he had any hopes given him he would discover all he knew.' What mental reservation the prisoner made, he would have us discover from his Memorials. The date of his capture became a matter of importance, as an Act of Parliament attainted him by name, if by July 12 he did not surrender to justice. His capture on June 27th was somewhat disingenuously interpreted as sufficient. He was examined on August 13th, 22d, 27th, and in October he writes offering more information. On November 11th, a further examination was taken before the Lord Chancellor, the Duke of Newcastle, the Earl of Chesterfield, and Mr. Pelham. Then on the 17th of the same month, he sends a lengthy statement (p. 455) in supplement of the information given at the examinations. In December we find the Duke of Newcastle sending an extract from Murray's examination to the Lord Justice-Clerk with the view of preparing a case against Sir John Douglas. So far, Murray's revelations seem to have been mainly about the English Jacobites who had failed to rise. He mentions all the leading men in the Prince's army, but Drummond-Macgregor and Traquair are almost the only Scots names mentioned of those who merely plotted. In February 1747 the evidence was being prepared for the trial of Lord Lovat, and the committee charged with the management of the trial decided that 'it would be proper to make use of Mr. Murray as a witness.' Accordingly in February new examinations take place, and on March 9th the trial of the aged chief of the clan Fraser began. It caused prodigious sensation, and occupied seven days. Lovat whined and blustered alternately. Murray came up to his



precognitions, but even without him it seems probable that the evidence of sundry Frasers would have sufficed to bring Lovat to the block. The trial is well known, though it would appear that many who have ransacked the English language to find epithets vile enough for Murray had never read his evidence. His position was not heroic, and all that can be said for him seems to be that he might have told a great deal more about other people.

After Lovat's execution Murray was released from the Tower. He did not receive a pardon till June 7th, 1748, when one was granted jointly to him and to Hugh Fraser, also a witness at the trial, and he had thus the nominal threat of a trial hanging over him for more than a year.<sup>1</sup> After that Murray seems to have attempted to prefer a claim for an indemnity for losses sustained during his detention in London, with what success I have been unable to discover.

Of Murray's subsequent life little is known. It cannot have been happy. Every Jacobite shunned 'Mr. Evidence Murray.' For years, the Prince who had treated him with affection, who had 'looked on him as one of the honestest, firmest men in the whole world,' regarded him as a rascal and a villain. At last, after nearly twenty years, a strange incident occurs. Charles made one of those mysterious visits to England, described once for all in *Redgauntlet*. In 1763 he was in London and he visited John Murray. No record,

---

<sup>1</sup> In the Record Office is the following communication from the Attorney-General:—

‘*To the King's Most Excellent Majesty.*

May it please your Majesty,—

‘In obedience to your Majesty's commands, signified to me by his Grace the Duke of Bedford, referring to me the enclosed memorial of John Murray of Broughton, Esq., and directing me to report my opinion what may be properly done therein.

‘I have considered the same, and supposing what is therein stated to be true, I am humbly of opinion it may be proper that a *Noli prosequi* should be granted to the information mentioned in the memorial.

‘All which is most humbly submitted to your Majesty's Royal Wisdom.

19 Jun. 1749.’

‘D. RYDER.

alas, remains of that interview, full of strange memories to both. All we know of it is from the recollection of a little boy of nine years old who was present, and upon whose mind the visit of the stately red-faced gentleman was impressed by his father. 'Charles, you have seen your king,' said the old secretary to the boy who was afterwards to make some name behind the footlights, and whose son again was to be the ally of Sir Walter, the dramatist of *Rob Roy* and *Guy Mannering*. As Mr. Lang has pointed out, about this very time<sup>1</sup> Sir Walter's father threw out of the window the teacup that had touched the lips of Murray of Broughton. Was the Prince more forgiving than the Edinburgh lawyer? Or was some information wanted that Murray alone could give? Or had Murray rehabilitated himself in the eyes of his master?

Of Murray's later days no record remains. After the sale of Broughton in 1764 he would appear to have resided mainly in London. It is stated in *Notes and Queries* (4th series, xi. 414, 419), that he died at Cheshunt, Hertfordshire, on 6th Dec. 1777. In Collet's *Relics of Literature* there is an account from a newspaper (name and date not given) of Sir John Murray's arrest and confinement in a mad-house, with a letter from his son Robert, explaining the circumstances. From these it would appear that Murray's reason had given way, that 'the meanest mechanics of different denominations' (so says Mr. Robert Murray) 'gratified their curiosity and boasted of interviews with mad Secretary Murray,' and that in consequence 'his two sons, two servants, and a peace officer removed him from his lodgings in 'Denmark Street, near St. Giles, with every mark of tenderness and respect, and placed him under the care of Dr. Battie.' When this happened, whether it happened at all, or whether it is as apocryphal as the letter from Frederick the Great to Prince Charles, given in the same volume, must remain among the unanswered questions

---

<sup>1</sup> The incident probably occurred in the following year. Mr. Lang has confounded Charles Murray the actor with his son Mr. W. H. Murray, of the Edinburgh Theatre.—*Bibliographica*, vol. iii. p. 417.

which might be asked at many points in Murray's career. It may not be true, but it seems at least a not improbable conclusion to a career begun with high ideals and carried on for a time with unswerving devotion.

It is difficult to overcome the prejudice of a century and a half: it is hard to dissociate the secretary from the king's evidence, the loyal servant from the betrayer of Lovat. The history of the preparations for the Forty-Five as told by Murray, and as corroborated by every authority, shows his capacity, energy, and tact. Those qualities were displayed by him during the whole progress of the expedition, and his own story leaves the impression that he was one of the most capable of Prince Charles's supporters.

Murray's wife, the beautiful Miss Ferguson, left him and went to the Continent while he was in the Tower. She never returned, and it is alleged was unfaithful to him.<sup>1</sup> By her he had three sons, David, a naval officer, Robert, of whom little is known, and Thomas who entered the army and became a lieutenant-general. His second wife was 'a young quaker lady named Webb.' She is elsewhere stated to have been a Moravian, and is reported to have been a lady of great personal charms. She was recognised and lived in Scotland for some years as Lady Murray, though the date of the death of Murray's first wife has never been ascertained. Murray eloped with Miss Webb from a boarding-school. By her he had six children, the eldest of whom was Charles Murray the comedian, whose eldest son was Mr. W. H. Murray of the Edinburgh theatre, the friend of Sir Walter Scott. His eldest surviving son, the great-grandson of Murray of Broughton, is Mr. George Siddons Murray, the possessor of the manuscripts which are here printed, and the present representative of the house of Stanhope.<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> There is a tradition in the Murray family that she became the Prince's mistress. There is not only not a particle of evidence for this, but the story is inherently improbable.

<sup>2</sup> Charles Campbell (see Colonel Allardyce's *Historical Papers relating to the Jacobite Period*, p. 352) describes Murray thus: 'The last time I saw him he was in a scarlet dress and a white cockade. He is a well-looking little man of a fair complexion.'



These Memorials seem to have been written about 1757 and later, and to have been intended as a vindication as well as a history. They were possibly not completed when the author died in 1777; at any rate the missing portions have not come down to us. The existing portions have been carefully preserved by his descendants. Sir Walter may have seen them; Chambers certainly read them, made one or two notes on the margin, which remain, and was in correspondence with Mr. W. H. Murray with regard to them. If the story of Murray's ultimate insanity is true, then the fact that neither Part I. nor Part II. is finished is easily explained. It were not wonderful that in the end the public obloquy from which he could not free himself should have preyed upon his mind and destroyed his intellect. The manuscripts are not in Murray's own hand, but have all been revised by him, as is shown by notes, corrections, and additions in his writing.

Apart from the historical interest of the Memorials, some literary value may be claimed for them. Murray's university education resulted in such scholarship as befitted a gentleman of his position and no more. He gives us a few Latin tags of the most familiar sort, while references to Scipio, Hannibal, Dion of Syracuse, and Gustavus of Sweden show an acquaintance with ancient and modern history which, if not deep, appears at least to have been fairly wide. He was evidently a man of some culture and literary instinct. His style is that rather of the public speaker than of the man of letters. It seldom lacks vigour, but it is occasionally cumbrous. The Memorials abound in trenchant phrases, and an apt illustration from time to time lightens the page. Through all, however, is seen the gloomy figure of an unhappy man, sometimes indignant, sometimes querulous, now with a sneer and again with something approaching a whine. He strives to say nothing against the dynasty to whom he owed his life, but even he cannot be silent about Cumberland's brutality. He compares the two princes, and his hero suffers no derogation.

Murray's loyalty to the House of Stuart was traditional and more. Whatever his views may have been before he went to Rome, he returned captivated by that charm which won Prince Charles so many devoted servants. The interview at the back of the Tuileries stables in 1744 completed the Prince's influence, and from that day till the end, in spite of all, there can be no doubt that Murray was instinct with a personal loyalty and devotion to his Prince.

It is no part of my duty in editing these Memorials to attempt any special pleading on behalf of their author. He speaks here in his own defence. It is right, however, not only that the facts of his life should be briefly set down, but that the actual results of his 'rascality,' as the Prince himself calls it, should be noted. Murray's evidence was used by the Government only against Lord Lovat. Without it that aged intriguer might have escaped the glory of Tower Hill. Take it that Murray brought him to the scaffold, nobody ever was more worthy of such a fate. His private crimes, even in these more humane days, would have sent him to penal servitude: his political offences may be summarised as treachery both to the King in London and to the King at Rome. In Murray's eyes Lovat's double-dealing was ample justification for any revenge he could compass. Lovat had failed at the beginning to join the Prince's standard, when his example would have been worth thousands of men; when he did send his son, it was too late to influence the wavering chiefs. His vacillation had done much to ruin the expedition, and he therefore deserved no mercy. Lovat's death was the price of Murray's life. The cynic may ask whether King George or the laird of Broughton made the better bargain.

Murray's evidence at Lord Lovat's trial and his private examinations before members of the Privy Council show that he did nothing to bring into jeopardy any single individual who had borne arms with Prince Charles. He tells practically nothing that the Government did not already know.

The Duke of Perth, Lochiel, and in fact nearly all the leaders, had already escaped to France: nothing he might say about them could do harm. Cluny he barely mentions; Lockhart of Carnwath he screens; Lord Traquair had skulked in London; the English Jacobites had caused, in Murray's eyes, the ruin of the whole campaign. Their failure to rise and join the Prince had, day after day, from Carlisle to Derby, caused the bitterest disappointment, and at last resulted in the disaster of the retreat: and this after all the plottings and promises of years. Again, Murray argued, his country, through them, was the scene of cruelties unexampled in civilised warfare, his Prince was a fugitive, his friends dead or exiled, and nothing was left but revenge on the false friends, for the open enemies were unassailable. He was young, just over thirty; life had surely something more in store, though his dearest hopes were ruined. His evidence did little harm to anybody save Lovat, for of the others only Lord Traquair suffered imprisonment: he made his own arrangements with the Government, and was released without the annoyance of any judicial proceedings. At the least, therefore, Murray must be distinguished from the common informer, and the view that his 'infamy' is his only claim on the memory of posterity must be modified by a knowledge of the man and his surroundings.

The documents which form the text of this volume have been continuously in the possession of John Murray's descendants, and are now printed by the courtesy of his great-grandson, Mr. George Siddons Murray. They are well-preserved, having been bound in four volumes. There is a fifth volume, which is not printed here: it contains a detailed examination of the Report of the inquiry into General Cope's conduct, which took place in 1749. The writer has given no title to his manuscripts: they do not form a diary, and were not written till many years after the events they record. I have therefore ventured to call them 'Memorials.'



In the Appendix will be found, now printed also for the first time—(1.) A series of letters from the Stuart Papers in possession of Her Majesty, which illustrate Murray's text ; (2.) Murray's private examinations before the Privy Council, and other papers and letters from the Record Office and the British Museum ; (3.) Forty letters and minutes from the French Foreign Office. These last cover the period from the arrival of Prince Charles in France in 1744 to the date on which Murray's resolution to give evidence against Lord Lovat was made known. They do not exhaust the materials for students of this period at the Quai D'Orsay, as only those bearing directly on Murray's text have been selected for publication here.

To Her Majesty the Queen I beg leave to record my humble gratitude for permission to consult and print portions of the Stuart correspondence in the Royal Library at Windsor, and also for permission to reproduce the miniature of Prince Charles, which formerly belonged to the writer of these Memorials.

My thanks are due to M. Hanotaux, to the officials of the French Foreign Office, and to Her Majesty's Ambassador and Mr. Thornhill of the British Embassy in Paris, for obtaining and granting permission to consult the French Archives.

I have to thank the Hon. J. D. Edgar, Speaker of the Canadian House of Commons, for permission to reproduce the miniature of Prince Charles, which he has inherited from his great-granduncle, James Edgar, Secretary to the Chevalier. This miniature was painted in Paris in 1744 or 1745, and has never before been engraved. To Mr. Andrew Lang my thanks are also due for permission to reproduce the miniature of the Prince formerly in the possession of John Murray. This portrait was one of seven painted in Rome some years before Charles left for France.

My thanks are also due to the officials of the Record Office

and the British Museum ; to Mr. R. R. Holmes of the Royal Library, Windsor, for courteous assistance in my examination of the papers in their charge ; to Mr. Law, the Secretary of the Scottish History Society, for his unfailing help, informed criticism and advice ; and to my friend Mr. W. B. Blaikie, author of the *Itinerary of Prince Charles*, whose stores of knowledge of the period have been constantly at my disposal.

R. F. B.

*April 30, 1898.*