his foragers cut off, ſo that he was reduced to diſtreſs; and at laſt his fleet being totally deſtroyed by a ſtorm, he was obliged to return to England without accompliſhing any thing.

In the mean time the prince of Wales, who had been left by his father to carry on the war in France, de­feated and took priſoner John king of France at the battle of Poictiers. In this battle were 3000 Scots, who had gone over as auxiliaries to the French monarch, and who ſuffered extremely. However, the ſucceſs of Edward, inſtead of rendering him haughty, ſeemed to have a contrary effect; and, by the mediation of Pope Innocent, a truce for two years was concluded with France, in which the Scots were comprehended. Du­ring this interval, the ranſom of the king of Scots was ſettled at 100,000 merks to be paid in ten years; for which 20 hoſtages were to be given as formerly. In conſequence of this treaty, David at laſt obtained his liberty in 1358; and Edward laid aſide all hopes of ever ſubduing Scotland. As for Baliol, he was now ſunk in oblivion; and it is not known what became of him, or when he died.

David, though now reſtored to liberty, found himſelf greatly embarraſſed with the payment of ſuch a large ſum as had been ſtipulated for his ranſom; the kingdom of Scotland being then in a moſt miſerable and exhauſted ſituation. After ſending his queen, and going into England himſelf, he could obtain no greater favour than a reſpite of a few months for the payment of the ſecond moiety; ſo that he was at laſt conſtrained to aſk aſſiſtance from France. This could ſcarcely be expected in the diſtrefled ſituation of that kingdom; however, it

was at laſt agreed, that 50,000 marks ſhould be paid to Scotland, in case the Scots would conſent to renew the war the following year. Neither party, however, kept their word; and David, being ſtill greatly diſtreſsed about the remainder of his ranſom, at laſt entered into a very extraordinary negociation with Edward, by which he conſented that the king of England ſhould be his ſucceſſor to the throne of Scotland. But this negociation was defeated through the invincible hatred which the Scots bore to an Engliſh governor. David then, being entirely unable to diſcharge the remainder of his ranſom, was obliged to enter into a new treaty; by which the kingdom of Scotland became indebted to Edward the ſum of 100,000 pounds Sterling, to be paid by equal proportions within the ſpace of 25 years, during which there ſhould be a truce between the two nations.

From this time we meet with little more of any mo­ment in the reign of King David. After the death of his Queen Johanna, the ſiſter of Edward, he married a Scots woman, of mean birth, named Margaret Logie; but by neither of his wives had he any children. Queen Margaret he divorced, on what pretence is not known; however, ſhe left the kingdom, and complained perſonally to the pope, who treated her as David’s lawful wife, and enjoined her huſband to receive her as ſuch un­der the moſt ſevere penalties. What effect theſe threats had on the king is not known; but it is certain that Margaret never returned to Scotland; and, on the 22d of February 1371, David himſelf died, leaving the king­dom to his nephew Robert Stewart, the firſt of that family who ſat on the throne of Scotland @@(K).

@@@(K) Concerning the origin of the Stewart family, we have the following account by the Scots hiſtorians. Fleance, the ſon of the celebrated Banquo, after his father’s murder by Macbeth, fled into Wales, where he had a ſon named *Walter,* by a princeſs of that country. After the reſtoration of Malcolm Canmore, this Walter returned to Scotland, where he was promoted to the high ſtewardſhip, a dignity held by ſervice, and which intitled the poſſeſſor to all the privileges of a baron. Waiter was now diſtinguiſhed, from this office, by the title of *Walter the Stewart,* which deſcended to his poſterity; and *Steward,* afterwards *Stewart,* or *Stuart,* became their ſurname.

On this ſubject Lord Hailes has the following remarks. “Our hiſtorians have recorded the achievements of Walter the Stewart of Scotland in the reign of Malcolm III. He is ſaid to have been the father of Alan, and the grandfather of that Walter who was indeed Stewart of Scotland in the reign of David I. and Mal­colm IV. It may perhaps be aſcribed to ſtrange prejudices, or to a ſpirit of ſcepticiſm, when I declare, that hitherto I have ſeen no evidence that ſuch a perſon as Walter Stewart of Scotland, in the reign of Malcolm III. did ever exiſt.

“We are gravely told, ‘That Walter the ſon of Fleance, the ſon of Banquo, Thane of Lochaber, having killed a man at the court of Griffith, prince of Wales, fought refuge with Edward the Confeſſor; and having killed another man at Edward’s court, fought refuge with Alan the Red, earl of Brittany: That, on the Nor­man invaſion, he came to England with the earl of Brittany, and ſignalized himſelf at the battle of Haſtings in 1066: That the earl of Brittany, by his firſt wife Emma, daughter of Siward earl of Northumberland, had an only child Chriſtina; and that he bellowed her in marriage on the young hero.” This is the ſtory which, after various improvements ſince the days of Boece, has had the good fortune to obtain credit.

“That Walter, before he had well attained to the age of manhood, ſhould have ſlain two men in private quar­rels, is a circumſtance improbable, yet poſſible; and therefore I object not to it. But his alliance with the earl of Brittany cannot be ſo eaſily admitted.

“Alan, ſurnamed *le Roux,* a younger ſon of Eudo earl of Brittany, was one of the gallant adventurers who came over with William the Conqueror; *he had neither territories nor court.* The hiſtorians of Brittany poſitively aſſert that he had no children. Beſides, it is hard to ſay by what accident Alan *le Roux* ſhould have become acquainted with Emma the daughter of Siward earl of Northumberland! I ſuppoſe that our hiſtorians invented this alliance, in order to ſtrengthen the connection between Walter the Stewart and Malcom III.