given rise to some discordant opinions, and which, now that the bitterness of national rivalry is at an end, may, we trust, be calmly considered, we would remark that, taking the testimony of English historians as our guide, all as yet seems clear, as to the much debated subject of homage. Simeon of Durham expressly declares that Malcolm agreed to obey William Rufus on the same conditions as those on which he had obeyed William the Conqueror. Under the Con­queror it is certain that Malcolm held twelve manors in Eng­land. These Rufus had seized; but he now restored them, and Malcolm renewed his obligation of homage. On a former occasion when, as we have seen, the Scottish king, in 1072, paid his homage to the Conqueror in person, the ground upon which he paid it is equally clear. Previously to the battle of Hastings, the Scottish monarchs had obtained from the Saxon kings some possessions in England. This was before the introduction of the strict feudal tenures, which came in with the Normans ; but there is no doubt that these possessions were held under the condition of aid­ing the Saxon princes in repelling the incursions of the Danes.@@1 When William the Conqueror established him­self in England, Malcolm, as we have seen, considered him as a usurper of the rights of his brother-in-law, Edgar Æthe­ling ; and, on this ground, as well as perhaps from an indis­position to embrace a system which must have been new to him, he had at first refused to pay his homage for the lands he held in England. Circumstances, however, made him change this resolution. The prevailing power of William, the acquiescence of the English under his government, and the inactivity and imbecility of Edgar Ætheling, his brother-in- law, induced him to desist from a conflict in which he ceased to have an interest. A more intimate acquaintance with the feudal tenures introduced into England taught him that, in the acknowledgment of superiority for the lands which he held in that country, there was no sacrifice of dignity as an independent monarch, and as all idea of restoring Edgar was abandoned, he paid his homage to the conqueror.@@2

The point of homage seemed thus prudently settled ; but the proud and fiery temper, which appears to have been an infirmity of both princes, soon led to a new contest between Malcolm and Rufus. A jealousy of the incursions of the Scots had formerly led the Conqueror to build two strong castles, the one at Durham, the other at Newcastle. To these bis successor now added a third at Carlisle ; a barrier which, however necessary, might possibly be considered as encroaching on the freedom of the lands which Malcolm held in Cumberland. A dispute arose, and a personal in­terview between the two kings having been considered the best mode of settling their differences, Malcolm repaired to Gloucester, where Rufus met him and proposed that he should do homage in presence of his English barons. This the Scottish monarch refused ; although he was ready, he said, to perform his homage on the frontiers of both king­doms, as had been the ancient usage. The reply was angrily received, and the two kings having parted with expressions of defiance, Malcolm assembled an army, and advancing with a speed whetted by the indignity with which he had been treated, burst into Northumberland, which he wasted with fire and sword. Sweeping onwards to Alnwick, he was about to possess himself of the castle, when the Scot­tish army was attacked by Robert de Mowbray. In the battle which ensued Malcolm was slain, and Edward, his eldest son, shared the fate of his father.

We have already observed that the mild and gentle dispo­

sition of his queen, St. Margaret, had an admirable influ­ence over the fierce and impetuous character of this prince. Of her life we have an interesting account from the pen of Turgot her confessor ; and we cannot resist borrowing a few touches from this early specimen of biography. When the king set out on his last expedition against England, Margaret was suffering from a fatal and lingering complaint. She only lived to hear of the death of her husband and her son. Her last moments are thus described by that faith­ful minister, who related what he saw: “During a short interval of ease, the queen devoutly received the communion. Soon after, her anguish of body returned with redoubled violence ; she stretched herself upon her couch and calmly waited for the moment of her dissolution ; cold, and in the agonies of death, she ceased not to put up her supplications to heaven. These were some of her words : ‘ Have mercy upon me, O God; according to the multitude of thy tender mercies blot out mine iniquities ; make me to hear joy and gladness, that so the bones which thou hast broken may re­joice.’ At that moment,” continues Turgot, “ her son, Ed­gar, returning from the army, approached her couch. ‘ How fares it,’ said she, ‘with the king and my Edward?" The youth stood silent. ‘ I know all; I know all. By this holy cross, by your filial affection, I adjure you to tell me the truth.’ He answered, ‘ your husband and your son are both slain.’ Lifting up her eyes and her hands to heaven she then said, 'Praise and blessing be to thee, Almighty God, that thou hast been pleased to make me endure so bitter anguish in the hour of my departure, thereby, as I trust, to purify me in some measure, from the corruption of my sins; and thou, Lord Jesus Christ, who, through the will of the Father, hast enlivened the world by thy death, oh deliver me.’ While pronouncing the words ‘ deliver me,’ she expired.”@@3

“ In reviewing the reign of Malcolm the Third,” says Lord Hailes, ■“ we may discern a character of steady persevering courage. From his early youth to his last invasion of Eng­land, his conduct was uniform. He maintained his throne with the same spirit by which he won it. Though he was the ruler of a nation uncivilised, and destitute of foreign resources, and had such antagonists as the Conqueror and William Rufus to encounter, yet, for twenty-seven years, he supported this unequal contest, sometimes with success, never without honour. That he should have so well assert­ed the independency of Scotland is astonishing, when the weakness of his own kingdom, and the strength and abili­ties of his enemies are fairly estimated.”@@4

Malcolm’s eldest son had fallen, as we have seen, with his father. His remaining sons, Ethelred, Edmund, Edgar, Alexander, and David, were all under age ; and his brother Donald, who, on the usurpation of the throne by Macbeth, had taken refuge in the Hebrides, appears to have remain­ed in that distant retreat during the whole reign of the late king. These islands were then independent of the Scot­tish crown. They were inhabited by a warlike race, whose chiefs yielded to the Norwegian king a fluctuating subjec­tion ; and many of these leaders having joined him, Donald, with a powerful flcet, invaded Scotland and seized the crown ; but it was for a very brief season. Duncan, a son of Malcolm, but illegitimate as is generally believed, had, in 1072, been delivered to William Rufus as a hostage for his father’s fidelity. He had received bis education at the Norman court, and having been knighted by the Eng­lish monarch, was retained in his service. With permission of William, he now invaded Scotland, and assisted by a band

**@@@, Caledonia, vol. i. p. 394.**

@@@\* In this account of the expedition of William Rufus into Scotland, and in the remarks on the disputed point of the homage, we have been induced to treat the subject a little more in detaII., availing ourselves of some manuscript notes of the late David Macpherson, a writer of great research and judgment. This seemed the more necessary, as the subject of Rufus's invasion of Scotland, and Malcolm’s stipulated homage, bas been considered by high authority as one involved in extreme obscurity.

@@@’ Hailes’s Annals, vol. i. pp. 40, 41, 4to edit. We have availed ourselves of Lord Hailes’s translation of the passage from Turgot de­scribing the queen’s death.

@@@\* Ibid. vol. i. pp. 25, 26, 4to edit.