SCOTLAND – DUNFERMLINE'S - KINGS

EXTRACTED FROM

THE PICTORIAL HISTORY OF SCOTLAND

BY

JAMES TAYLOR, D.D. LONDON 1859.

EDITED BY
SHEILA PITCAIRN F.S.A.SCOT., L.H.G.

SCOTLAND – DUNFERMLINE'S - KINGS

CONTENTS

SCOTLAND – DUNFERMLINE'S - KINGS

EXTRACTED FROM

THE PICTORIAL HISTORY OF SCOTLAND

BY

JAMES TAYLOR, D.D. LONDON 1859. VOL. 1. P.33 -

PART I

A GENEALOGICAL AND CHRONOLOGICAL TABLE OF THE SCOTO-IRISH KINGS FROM THE YEAR 503 TO 843.

From various sources the learned and industrious Chalmers has compiled the following genealogical and chronological table of the Scoto kings during this dark era, extending from the settlement of Fergus, in 503, to the accession of Kenneth to the Pictish throne, - a period of 340 years.

Loarn	[503 - 506]	the son of Erc, reigned contemporary with Fergus 503, for 3 years died 506.
1. Fergus	[506 - 506]	son of Erc.
2. Domangart	[506 - 511]	the son of Fergus reigned for 5 years.
3. Comgal	[511 - 535]	the son of Domangart, reigned for 24 years.
4. Gauran	[535 - 557]	the son of Domangart, reigned for 22 years.
5. Conal	[557 - 571]	the son of Comgal, reigned for 14 years.
6. Aidan	[557 - 571]	the son of Gauran, reigned for 34 years.
7. Eocha'-Bui	[605 - 621]	the son of Aidan, reigned for 16 years.
8. Kenneth-Cear	[621 - 621]	son of Eocha'-Bui, reigned for 1/4 of a year.
9. Ferchar	[621 - 637]	the son of Eogan, the first of the race of Lorn. reigned for 16 years.
10. Donald-Breac	[637 - 642]	the son of Eocha-Bui, reigned for 5 years.
11. Conal II	[642 - 652]	the grandson of Conal I, reigned for 10 years.
12. Dungal	[652 - 652]	reigned some years with Conal.
13. Donal-Duin	[652 - 665]	the son of Conal, reigned for 13 years.
14. Maol-Duin	[665 - 681]	the son of Conal, reigned for 16 years.
15. Ferchar-Fada	[681 - 702]	the grandson of Ferchar I, reigned for 21 years.
16. Eocha'-Rinevel	[702 - 705]	the son of Domangan, and the grandson of Donal-Breac, reigned for 3 years.
17. Ainbhealach	[705-706]	the son of Ferchar-Fada, reigned for 1 year.
18. Selvach	[706 - 729]	the son of Ferchar-Fada, reigned over Lorn from 706 to 729.

19. Duncha-Beg	[706 - 720]	reigned over Cantyre and Argail till 720.
20. Eocha III	[706 - 733]	the son of Eocha'-Rinevel, reigned over Cantyre and Argail from 720 to 729, and also over Lorn from 729 to 733, for 27 years.
21. Muredach	[733 - 736]	the son of Ainbhcealach, reigned for 3 years.
22. Eogan	[739 - 739]	the son of Muredach, reigned for 3 years.
23. Aodh-Fin	[739 - 769]	the son of Eocha III, reigned for 30 years.
24. Fergus	[769 - 772]	the son of Aodh-Fin, reigned for 3 years.
25. Selvach II	[772 - 796]	the son of Eogan, reigned for 24 years.
26. Eocha-Annuine IV	[796 - 826]	the son of Aodh-Fin, reigned for 30 years.
27. Dungal	[826 - 833]	the son of Selvach II, reigned for 7 years.
28. Alpin	[833 - 836]	son of Eocha-Annuine IV, reigned for 3 years.
29. Kenneth	[836 - 843]	son of Alpin, reigned for 7 years.

The Irish chroniclers affirm, that the three chiefs who headed the emigration were far advanced in the vale of years before leaving Ireland, and that they received the benediction of St Patrick before his death, in the year 493. This statement confirmed by their early decease after they had laid the foundation of their new settlement.

Angus was the first who died, leaving a son, Muredach, who succeeded him in the government of Ila. The death of Lorn, the eldest brother, soon followed, so that Fergus was left sole monarch of the Dalriadic Scots, a dignity which he enjoyed for the short space of three years, having died in A.D. 506.

Fergus was succeeded by his son Domangart, whose troubled reign lasted only five years. His two sons Comgal and Gauran, successively enjoyed his authority. The former had a peaceful reign of four and twenty years which afforded him leisure to extend his territory and to consolidate his power; the latter, who ascended the throne in 535, without opposition, to the exclusion of his brother's son, after a reign of twenty-two years, was slain in a battle with the Picts. The succession was thus opened to his nephew, Conal, the son of Comgal, whose unfortunate administration terminated by a civil war, in 571.

A contest for the vacant throne then took place between Duncan, his son, and Aidan, the son of Gauran, in which the latter lost his life on the bloody field of Loro, in Cantyre. The successful competitor was formally inaugurated by Columba in June (A.D.574). His long and active reign as chequered with alternate success and defeat. having gone to the assistance of the Cumbrian Britons, he overthrew the Saxons at Fethenlea on Stanmore, in 584, and again at the battle of Leithredh, in 590, when two of his sons Arthur and Eocha-fin, were slain. On the other hand, he was worsted by the Saxons, in 598, in the battle of Kirkim, where his son, Domangrat, was slain; and five years later he was totally defeated by the Northumbrians, under Æthelfrid, at the battle of Dawstane, in Roxburghshire.

Three years before this disastrous conflict, which greatly weakened the power of the Dalriads, Aidan, attended by Columba, appeared at the celebrated council of Dum-keat in Ulster (A.D.590), where he claimed the principality of Dalriada, the land of his fathers, and obtained an exemption from the homage which his ancestors had been accustomed to pay to the chiefs of Ireland. Aidan, the most powerful of all the Scoto-Irish rulers, died in the year 605, at the advanced age of eighty and was buried in the church of Kilcheran in Campbelton.

Aidan was succeeded by his son Eocha-*bui*, or Eocha the yellow-haired, who reigned sixteen years. Towards the close of his reign he became involved in a war with one of the tribes of Ulster, whom his troops twice vanquished in battle. He did not long survive his victories, when his son, Kenneth-*cear*, or the awkward. ascended the throne (A.D.621); but, after a reign of only three months he was killed fighting against the Irish, in the unfortunate battle of Fedhaevin.

Kenneth-cear as succeeded by Ferchar the son of Eogan, the first of the race of Lorn who reigned over the Scoto-Irish in North Britain. He died A.D. 637, after a reign of sixteen years. He was followed by Donal, surnamed *breac*, or freckled, the son of Eocha'-bui, of the race of Gauran, the grandson of Fergus.

At the instance of Congal, a fugitive chief from Ulster, Donal was induced to invade Ireland at the head of a motley army of Scoto-Irish, Picts, Britons, and Saxons, but he was completely defeated in a bloody battle fought on the plain of Moyrath, A.D. 637, and was obliged to consult his safety by a rapid retreat to his own dominions. He was equally unsuccessful in an enterprise against the Picts, by whom he was slain at Straith-Cairmaic by Hoan, one of the reguli of Strathclyd. His son, Cathasuidh, fell by the same hand in 649.

Conal II, the grandson of Conal I, who was also of the Fergusian race of Comgal, was the next ruler over the tribes of Cantyre and Argyle. His claims were disputed by Dungal. who had obtained the government of the tribe of Lorn, and was a descendant of its first ruler. The contest, however, does not appear to have been of long duration, for Conal died in undisturbed possession of his dominions, in 652, after a reign of ten years. Donal-*duin*, or the brown, son of Conal, reigned thirteen years and was succeeded by his brother, Maol-duin, in 665. The family feuds which had long existed between the Fergusian races of Comgal and Gauran, broke out with great fury during the reign of this prince, and led to the assassination, in 672, of Domangart, the son of Donal-breac, who was of the race of Gauran, and in retaliation, to the murder of Conal, the son of Maol-duin, in 675. These dissensions contributed greatly to weaken the race of Fergus, and to increase the ascendency of the rival house of Lorn.

On the death of Mao-duin, the sceptre was seized by Ferchar-*fada*, or the tall (apparently of the race of Lorn, and probably the grandson of Ferchar, who died in 673), who kept possession of the throne, amidst family feuds and domestic dissensions, for one and twenty years. On the death of Ferchar, in 702, the sceptre passed again to the house of Fergus, in the person of Eocha'-rineval, the son of Domangart, who was assassinated in 672. The reign of this prince was short and unfortunate. His ambition prompted him to invade the territories of the Britons of Strathclyd, but he was defeated in a bloody conflict on the banks of the Leven. In the following year, the sceptre was wrested from his feeble grasp by a prince of the rival house of Lorn.

This prince was Ainbhcealach, the son of Ferchar-fada. His excellent disposition obtained for him the epithet of Ainbhcealach-*mhaith*, or the good; but, after reigning one year, he was dethroned by his brother Selvach, and obliged, in 706, to take refuge in Ireland. At the end of twelve years he returned to Cantyre, and made a gallant effort to regain his authority, but he perished (A.D. 719) in an engagement fought in Finglein, a small valley among the mountains of Lorn. In the mean time, a more formidable antagonist to the usurped power of Selvach arose in the person of Duncha-beg, who was descended from the rival race of Fergus, by the line of Congal. He assumed the government of Cantyre and Argyle, and confined the authority of Selvach to the family district of Lorn. The rivalry between these two princes led to a

fierce and protracted warfare, which inflicted much misery on their unhappy-followers. In an attempt which they made, in 719, to invade each other's territories by means of their currachs, a naval battle ensued, which was maintained for a considerable time with great bravery and perseverance, and terminated in the defeat of Selvach.

The death of Duncha, which took place in 721, put an end to this strife, but it was speedily renewed, and carried on for several years with great fury, by his successor, Eocha III, the son of Eocha-rineval. The death of the able but unscrupulous Selvach, in 729, at length put an end to the bloodshed and misery which flowed from the contests of these rival houses. This event transferred the government of Lorn to Eocha, and the whole Scoto-Irish kingdom became again united under one monarch.

On the death of Eocha III, in 733, Muredach, the son of Ainbhcealach, of the race of Lorn, ascended the throne. This peaceful succession is believed to have been the result of a compromise brought about by the interposition of the tribes who were worn out by intestine feuds. Muredach, who now reigned sole monarch of the Dalriadic tribes, is called by the Gaelic bard, Muredhaigh-mhaith, or Muredach the good; but his reign was short and disastrous. In revenge for a base outrage committed by Dungal the son of Selvach, who had carried off Forai, the daughter of Brude, the niece of the great Pictish king Ungus, the latter, in the year 736, led his army from Strathern, through he passes of the mountains into Lorn, which he wasted with fire and sword. He seized Duna, and burned Creic, two of the fortresses of Lorn; and having taken prisoners Dungal and Feradach, the two sons of Selvach he carried them in fetters to Forteviot, his capital. Muredach collected his forces, and pursued after the retiring invaders, and having overtaken them at Cnuic-Coirbre, a battle ensued, in which the Dalriads were defeated with great slaughter by Talagan, the brother of Ungus, Muredach is supposed to have perished in the pursuit (A.D. 736), after a reign of three years.

Muredach was succeeded by his son Eogan or Ewen, who continued the war with the Picts, but died in 739, in which year the Dalriadic secptre was assumed by Aodh fin, the son of Eocha III, the grandson of Eocha-rinevel. This sovereign, who was descended from Fergus by the race of Gauran, is called by the Gaelic bard, Aodhna Ard-fhlaith, or Hugh, the high or great king. In 740, he encountered Ungus, the celebrated king of the Picts, with such success, that this powerful monarch did not again come into collision with the Scots.

After the death of Ungus, in 701, the tide of success turned against the Picts, and Aodh-fin penetrated, through the passes of Glenorchy and Breadalbane, into the heart of the Pictish territories, and reached Forteviot, the capital, where he fought a doubtful battle with Ciniod, the Pictish king. As the Picts had seized the defiles of the mountains in his rear, his situation became extremely critical; but he succeeded, by great skill and bravery, in leading his army within the passes of upper Lorn, where the Picts did not venture to follow him. Aodh-fin died in 769, after a glorious reign of thirty years.

Aodh-fin was succeeded by his son Fergus II, who reigned three years. After him Selvach II, the son of Eogan, assumed the government (A.D.772), which he held for twenty-four years; but of their reigns history has recorded nothing worthy of notice. Eocha IV, designated Eocha-annuine, the son of Aodh-fin, of the Gauran race of Fergus, succeeded Selvach II, in 796. The monarch is the Achaius of the Latin annalists. On his accession he found a civil war raging in his dominions between the rival tribes of Argyle and Lorn, which ws productive of great bloodshed and misery. The story of an alliance between Achaius and his great contemporary, Charlemagne,

was long firmly believed, but has now been proved to be a fable, though Chalmers is of opinion that something of the kind may have taken place with one of the reguli of Ireland.[1] To Achaius has also been ascribed, but without the slightest evidence, the institution of the ancient order of the Thistle. It is certain however, that he entered into an alliance with the Picts, which exercised a most important influence on the future history fo the country. His marriage with Urgusia, the daughter of Urgusia, and the sister of the Pictish kings, Constantine and Ungus, who reigned in succession, from A.D. 791 to 830, enabled his grandson Kenneth, to claim and acquire the Pictish sceptre, as the heir of his grandmother. Achaius died in 826, after a prosperous reign of thirty years. His successor, Dungal, the son of Selvach II, was the last of the powerful family of Lorn. After a feeble reign of seven years, he relinquished the sceptre, in 833 to Alpin, the son of Achaius, or Eocha IV, and Urgusia.

The ancient chronicles agree that Alpin died in 836, after a reign of three years; but conflicting accounts have been given of the time, pace, and circumstances of his death. According to the fabulous narrative of Boece, Alpin, asserting his title to the Pictish throne, was taken prisoner in a battle with the Picts, near Dundee, and beheaded. Another and more credible account represents him as having lost his life in an encounter with the Gallowegians, on a spot in the parish of Dalmellington, in Ayrshire, which , in memory of this event, for several centuries bore the name of Lacht-Alpin,-the stone or grave of Alpin. He was succeeded, in 836, by his son Kenneth, surnamed the Hardy.

On the death of Uven, the king of the Pictish throne, in right of his grandmother, Urgusia. His claims were opposed by Wrad, the son of Bargoit, who appears to have been the true heir; but, after an arduous struggle of three years, during which Wrad died, and Bred, his successor, both in his claims and in his misfortunes, was slain at Forteviot, in 842, fighting in defence of his capital and kingdom, the Scottish monarch succeeded in uniting the two crowns in his own person.

There is every reason to believe tht the story of the total extermination of the Picts by the sword of the victorious Kenneth, is the invention of a later period. It is certainly supported by nothing approaching to contemporary evidence.

Kenneth and his immediate successors styled themselves not kings of Scotland and Pictavia, but kings of the Scots and the Picts. The Picts are spoken of as distinct people down to the tenth century, and they appear to have been gradually absorbed by the predominating nation of the Scots - a result which may be accounted for by the fact, that they were in all probability a people of the same race, speaking a similar language, and differing little in their manners, customs, and institutions.

"In the person of Kenneth," says the learned Chalmers, "a new dynasty began. The king was changed, but the government remained the same. The Picts and Scots, who were a congenial people, from a common origin, and spoke cognate tongues, the British and Gaelic, readily coalesced. Yet has it been asserted by ignorance, and believed by credulity, that Kenneth made so bad a use of the power which he had adroitly acquired, as to destroy the whole Pictish people in the wantonness of his cruelty. But to enforce the belief of an action which is in itself inhuman, and had been so inconsistent with the interest of a provident sovereign, requires stronger proofs than the assertions of uninformed history, or the report of vague tradition.

[1] See "Remarks on the History of Scotland," by Lord Hailes.

The Picts continued throughout the succeeding period (from 843 to 1097) to be mentioned by contemporary authors, because they still acted a conspicuous part,

though they were governed by a new race, and were united with a predominant people."[1]

On examining the line of Pictish kings as contained in an ancient chronicle, we find that hereditary succession was wholly unknown to them, even so late as the ninth century. From a remarkable statement of Bede,[2] it may be inferred that the monarchy was elective; that the election as confined o some specific class of individuals; and that whenever there existed a doubt as to the proper object of the election, the person most nearly related to the last king by the female line was chosen. Mr Skene, is of opinion the election was not unlimited in its range, but was confined exclusively to the hereditary chiefs of the different tribes into which the nation was divided.[3]

"Such a mode of succession as this, however," he justly remarks, "was not calculated to last: each chief who in the manner obtained the Pictish throne, would endeavour to perpetuate the succession in his own family, and the power and talent of some chief would at length enable him to effect this object, and to change the rule of election into that of hereditary succession. This object appears in reality to have been finally accomplished by Constantin, the son of Fergus, who ascended the Pictish throne towards the end of the eighth century, and in whose family the monarchy remained for some time." But though the regal authority among the Picts became hereditary in the male line at this period yet in several points the succession differed from our ordinary rules of male succession. In all cases, brothers succeeded before sons; after all the brothers had succeeded, the sons of the elder brother were called to the succession; then the sons of the remaining brothers in regular order.

[1] "Caledonia," vol .i p.333. Innes, in his "Critical Essay" (vol. i. pp. 145-166) has given a most learned refutation Chalmers has, with his wonted acuteness and industry searched out all the information that can now be obtained respecting the historic events of this obscure period, and has thrown light on many points which were previously enveloped in darkness. See "Caledonia," vol. I books ii. and vi.

On the other hand, the whole story of the conquest of the Picts by Kenneth, and also Kenneth's extraction from the old royal line of the Irish Scots, have been called in question by Pinkerton, in his "Enquiry into the History of Scotland preceding the Reign of Malcolm III," a work of great learning and ingenuity, but disfigured by rash assertions and a pervading spirit of prejudice and paradox. A somewhat different view of this important revolution is taken by a recent writer, Mr. Skene, in his able work on the "Highlanders of Scotland." He contends that the conquest by the Dalriadic Scots was confined exclusively to the Piccardach or southern Picts; that the Scots were assisted in that conquest by the Cruithne, or northern Picts; and that, after the conquest, the northern Picts, although they owed a nominal submission to the kings of the Scottish line, yet, remained, in fact, independent, and still retained their ancient territories and peculiar designations. See Skene's "Highlanders of Scotland," vol. i, pp. 57-63.

[2] Bede says that the Picts on their first landing agreed, 'ut ubi res veniret in dubium magis de fœminea regum prosapia quam de masculina regem sibi eligerent, quod usque hodie apud Pictos constat esse servatum." The Picts, therefore, continued to elect their monarchs in 731 the period in which Bede closes his history.

[3] He refers to Adomnan , b. ii.ch.24 v.33 in proof of the fact that there existed among the Picts a division of the people into nobles and plebeians, and to Tacit. (Vita Agric), and to Tigernach to show that it was the former alone that were eligible to fill the trone.

Among the Dalriads the succession both to the chieftainship of the different tribes, and to the supreme government of the nation, was neither strictly hereditary nor

strictly elective, but was regulated by what has been termed the law of Tanistry. According to the law, which appears to have been termed the law of Tanistry. According to this law, which appears to have been generally followed in Ireland, as well as among the Scoto-Irish, the person in the family of the reigning prince, whether son, brother or even more remote relative, who was judged best qualified, either from abilities or experience, was chosen under the name of Tanist, to lead the army during the life of the king, and to succeed to him after his death. Taxes were, of course, wholly unknown among these rude clans: the dignity of the chief was supported by voluntary contributions of clothes cattle, furniture and other necessaries.[1]

Chalmers has asserted that at this era the tenure of land throughout the country, terminate with the life of the possessor; an opinion, it has been justly said requiring some modification, as it indicates a state of barbarism even greater than is discovered by the few glimpses of light which sometimes shoot athwart the twilight of our history.[2]

By a custom which the Scots brought with them from Ireland, denominated, in Irish, *gabhail-cine*, meaning literally, "family settlement," it appears that the fathers of families divided their lands among their sons, sometimes in equal, sometimes in unequal, portions: females were strictly excluded from any share in this appropriation, but were assigned a certain number of their father's cattle as their marriage portion;[3] females were strictly from any share in this appropriation, but were assigned a certain number of their father's cattle as their marriage portion.[3] A striking example of the operation of this law was exhibited so late as the reign of Alexander II, when the Gallowaymen took up arms in support of the pretensions of a bastard son against the claims of the three legitimate daughters of their late lord. Galloway was at that time governed by "its own proper laws," there can be no doubt that the Gallowegians had both law and custom on their side.

As to the legislative code of the Scoto-Irish: traditionary maxims and local usage seem to have supplied the place of written laws; and there can be little dout that their customs bore a close resemblance to the Brehon laws of Ireland. "This Brehon law," says Cox, "was no written law, - it was only the will of the Brehon, or lord; and it is observable that their Brehons, or judges, like their physicians, bards, harpers, poets, and historians had their offices by descent and inheritance. The Brehon, when he administered justice, used to sit on a turf or heap of stones, or on the top of a hillock, without a covering, without clerks, or, indeed any formality of a court of judicature.[4]

This state of law, as Chalmers observes, may be graced among the Scoto-Irish in Scotland till recent times. Every baron had his mote-hill, where justice was distributed to his vassals by his baron-bailie. Under the Brehon law, all crimes, even of the deepest dye, might be commuted by a mulet, or payment, which was called *eric* - a term signifying a fine, a ransom, a forfeit, and also a reparation. This rude system of jurisprudence was long recognized by the law of Scotland; and even so late as the

[1] Ware's Antiq. p. 70; Davis's Reports in the case of Tanistry, p 101; Caledonia, vol. i.p.306.
[2] Ibid. Leland's Prelim. Disc. xxvi.
[3] Among the Irish a marriage portion was called *Spre*', which literally means cattle, *Crodh* also signifies both cattle and dowry.
[4] Cox's Apparatus to his History; Harris's Ware, p.70.

reign of William the Lion, a statute was passed enacting that, "Gif ane slays anie man, he shall give twenty-nine kye and ane young cow, and make peace with the friend of

the defunct conforme to the law of the countrie." Among the Albanian Scots, the fine, or mulet, was termed *cro*; and the "Regiam Magistatem" has a whole chapter showing "the *cro* of ilk man, how mickil it is." According to this authority, the cro or a villain was sixteen cows; of an earl's son, or thane, one hundred; of an earl, one hundred and forty; and that of the King of Scots, one thousand cows, or three thousand *oras*; that is to say three oras for every cow.[1]

Very little is known of the state of society, or of the condition of the people, in this remote period. But a few incidental notices may be gleaned from the lives of the early saints. A.D. 843 Very little is known of the state of society, or of the condition of the people, in this remote period. But a few incidental notices may be gleaned from the lives of the early saints. We learn from Adomnan's Life of Columba, which was written only eighty years after the saint's death, that the houses of the Scoto-Irish were constructed entirely of wattles. Even the Abbey of Iona was built of the same rude materials. The clothing, even of the monks, seems to have been often composed of the skis of beasts, though latterly they had woollen stuffs and linen; the first probably manufactured by themselves, the linen imported from the Continent. The variegated plaid was introduced at a later period. Venison, fish, milk, flesh, and wild-fowl were the common food of the people. Their favourite beverage was a kind of mead made from honey. Their wealth consisted principally of their cattle, and the royal revenue was paid in cows, even down to the accession of Robert Bruce. "The monks of Iona," says Chalmers, "who lived by their labour cultivated their fields, and laid up corn in their garners. But it is to be recollected that the monks were everywhere, for ages, the improvers themselves , and the instructors of others, in the most useful arts. They had the merit of making many a blade of grass grow where none grew before. Even Iona had its orchards in the rugged times of the ninth century, till the *Vikings* ravaged and ruined all. Whatever the Scoto-Irish enjoyed themselves, they were very willing to impart to others. The most unbounded hospitality was enjoined by law and by manners, as a capital virtue. Manufactures the Scoto-Irish had none, and every family had its own carpenter, weaver, tailor, and shoemaker, however unskilful and inadequate to the uses of civilization. The division of labour and of arts takes place only during periods of refinement." With regard to their shipping, we have seen that the earliest inhabitants of North Britain used canoes, but the vessels of the Scoto-Irish were constructed by covering a keel of wood and a frame of wicker-work with the skins of cattle and of deer. These were denominated *currachs.* Afterwards they were enlarged, and made capable of containing a pretty numerous crew. In these currachs the first colonists must have emigrated from Ireland to the western coast of Scotland; and it was in a vessel of this description - a wicker boat, covered with hides - that Columba, accompanied by his twelve disciples, sailed from Ireland to Iona.

[1] Ibid. p.71; Leland's Prof. Disc. p.29; Skene's Stat. of King William, ch. vi.; Regiam Mag. lib. iv. ch. xxiv.; Caledonia, vol. i. p.308.

Such, then, was the condition of the different nations inhabiting North Britain in the ninth century. The Picts were by far the most powerful of these nations. Their

territories were bounded by the Frith of Forth on the south, and German Ocean on the east, the Pentland Frith on the north, and on the south partly by a range of hills termed Drumalban, which form the present western boundary of Perthshire and Inverness-shire, and partly by the sea from Loch Linne to Cape Wrath. The Pictish kingdom, therefore, consisted of the present counties of Kinross, Fife, Perth, Forfar, Kincardine, Aberdeen, Moray, Inverness, Ross, Sutherland, Caithness and the northern part of Argyle. The original capital of the kingdom appears to have been at Inverness, but was afterwards removed to Abernethy in Strathearn. The Dalriads were much less powerful. Their original territory seems to have been limited to that part of the county of Argyle which lies to the south of Loch Linne, and they appear to have maintained their possession of a territory so inconsiderable in comparison with that of the Picts, partly the strong nature boundaries and impervious nature of the country itself, partly by the close connection which they at all times preserved with their native country, and perhaps also, partly the policy with which they took advantage of the jealousies and rivalry between the northern and southern Picts.[1] The former of these tribes, indeed, on three several occasions, actually entered into a league with the Dalriadie Scots against their own country-men. And it is by no means improbable, as Mr Skene has conjectured, that the Scots obtained political pre-eminence in the first instance, only over the southern Picts,[1] and that the northern tribes if they did not actually assist the Dalriads in the struggle, at least did not actively oppose them. But the union of the various independent tribes under the rule of one monarch, led to most important changes, both in the internal condition of the country, and in its external relations; hereditary succession was established, the one formidable designation of Picts disappeared, and the name of Scotland gradually extended itself over the whole of North Britain.

~~~~~~

[1] Skene's Highlanders of Scotland, pp. 33, 445, and 59.
~~~~~~

PART II

THE SCOTTISH PERIOD - 843 TO 1097

Kenneth I MacAlpin

[839-859] Cinaed I (Kenneth MacAlpin) succeeded his father Alpin as King of Scots in 841 and later became King of Picts in circumstances which remain obscure but seems to have gained acceptance in Pictland from 843 onward. The union of the two nations of the Picts and Scots under one sovereign exercised an important influence, both on the security and extension of the united kingdom. Kenneth Macalpin appears to have been an able and a warlike prince, and he vigorously repelled the aggressions of the Saxons and Danes on his newly-acquired territories, and even made frequent incursions into Lothian.[1] It required, indeed, all his energy and valour to defend his kingdom against the assaults of the invaders, by whom its independence was menaced. On the one hand, the Britons wasted the country adjoining Strathclyd, and burnt Dumblane; and on the other the Danish pirates, under Ragner Lodbrog, plundered the east coast and carried their ravages as far as Dunkeld, on the Tay.[2] Kenneth however, succeeded in making good his position against all his assailants, and, after a successful reign he died at his capital of Forteviot, or Abernethy, A.D. 859, having governed the Scots seven years, and the Scots and Picts jointly, sixteen years. Kenneth is said to have been a religious prince, "as religion was then understood and practised." He erected a church in Dunkeld, to which he removed the relics of Columba from Iona. He had been celebrated also as a legislator, which may probably be correct; but the laws which have been ascribed to him ar undoubtedly spurious.

Kenneth left both a son and daughter; but he was succeeded by his brother Donald, according to a mode of inheritance common both in the Scottish and Pictish royal families, by which the brother of a deceased monarch was called to the throne in preference to the son, probably in order to escape the inconvenience of frequent minorities.

Donald I

[859-863] Brother of Kenneth I. Of Donald there is scarcely anything to be said. The Gaelic bard calls him "Dhomknaill dhreachruaid," or Donal of the ruddy countenance, and the Chronicon Elegiacum states that he was strenuous in war. After a reign of four years, he died at his palace of Balachon, A.D. 863, and was buried at Icolm-Kill, "the grand storehouse of his progenitors." It is said, that during the reign of Donald the old laws of Aodfin, the son of Eochan III, were re-enacted by the Scoto-Irish chiefs, at Forteviot.[3] Donald was succeeded by his nephew Constantine, the son of Kenneth.

[1] Innes, Append. Chron. No. 3.

[2] Ibid. Turner's Hist. Anglo-Sax. vol. ii.pp.115-117/ Vol.1.

[3] Chron. Pict. Pinkerton's Enquiry, vol. ii. p. 178; Caledonia, vol. i. p. 377.

Constantine I, [863-877] During a reign of eighteen years, he was engaged in almost uninterrupted warfare with the Danish pirates. After half a century of fierce contest, they succeeded in establishing themselves in Ireland, and took possession of the commodious harbours on the east and north of that island, from which they were enabled to extend their destructive ravages along the whole of the western coast of Scotland. Fresh bands of these roving depredators issued from their native shores and penetrated into the heart of the kingdom, by all its maritime inlets; by the Clyde on the west, and by the Firths of Moray, Tay, and Forth on the east. According to the old chroniclers, these marauders were first called in by the subjugated Picts, to assist them in obtaining revenge on the son of their conqueror; but, as might have been expected, friend and foe appear to have equally suffered from their plundering incursions. In 866, under Aulaf, or Olave, a descendant of the famous Vi-kingr Ragner Lodbrog, they ravaged the coasts of Scotland for the space of three months. Four years later a more formidable armament sailed from Dublin, under the same ferocious leader, took Alcluyd, or Dumbarton, the capital of Strathclyd, ravaged the whole extent of North Britain, and returned to Dublin laden with plunder and glutted with slaughter. Thrice during the reign of Constantine, did their vessels re-appear on the coast of the devoted country; and at last in A.D. 881, the Scottish monarch was slain on the shores of the Forth, in an ineffectual attempt to defend his territories against these ruthless invaders. According to another but less trustworthy account he was taken prisoner in the battle and sacrificed in a cave on the sea-coast, near Crail in Fife, to the manes of the leader of the pirates who had fallen in the engagement.[1] Constantine's immediate successor was his brother Aodh, or Hugh.

Aodh or Hugh [877-878] Whose reign was short and unfortunate. Grig, (Usurpation of Grig, 882) the Maormor, or chief of the county between the Dee and the Spey, now forming the shires of Aberdeen and Banff, raised the standard of rebellion against him. Hugh was wounded in a battle which took place at Strathallan, and died two months after at Inverury, having held the reins of government only one year.[2] The sceptre was immediately seized by the successful rebel, who associated with himself on the throne, Eocha or Eth, son of the King of Strathclyd by a daughter of Kenneth Macalpin.

[1] Ware's Antiq. pp. 102-108; Ulster Annals, sub. an. 852; Innes, Append. Chron. No. 3; O'Flaherty's Ogygia, p. 484.

[2] Chronicles in Innes, App. No. 3 and 6; Reg. of St Andrews; Fordun, lib. iv. chap. xvii.

Eocha or Eth [878-889] son of the King of Strathclyd by a daughter of Kenneth Macalpin. Grig is said to have reigned for about eleven years, with a more extensive authority than had been enjoyed by any of his predecessors. The monkish chroniclers, who have conferred on him the high-sounding title of Gregory the Great, represent him as a mighty conqueror, who not only overthrew the Picts and the Britons, but even subdued England and Ireland. According to Chalmers, the virtues, the valour, the successes of Gregory, which shine so resplendent in the pages of these fablers, may all be traced up to the pious gratitude of the monks of St Andrews. Grig, like other usurpers, appears to have conferred some privileges on the ecclesiastics of his age, and they were studious, by grateful falsehoods, to enlogize his character and asperse the reputation of his predecessor.[1] In spite of the favour of the church, however, he and his colleague were expelled from the throne by a popular insurrection A.D. 893 and were succeeded by Donald II.

Donald II [889-904] son of Constantine I.[2] During his reign the Danish pirates re-appeared in Scotland, and were defeated at Colin, on the banks of the Tay, in the vicinity of Scone. Notwithstanding this defeat they returned from Ireland, in 904, under Ivar O Ivar, and having penetrated to the neighbourhood of Forteviot, were bravely encountered by Donald, who lost his life in the engagement, after having slain the Danish leader.[3] Donald was succeeded by Constantine II.

Constantine II [904-943] Donald was succeeded A.D. 904 by Constantine II the son of his uncle Hugh, who, like his predecessors, had to sustain repeated attaches of the Danes. In 907, they invaded Scotland, and plundered Dunkeld; but, in an attempt to assault Forteviot, they were defeated and driven from the country. This did not prevent their return in 918, when Constantine, with the assistance of the Northern Saxons, encountered and repulsed them at Tinmore - a deafeat which appears to have given a considerable period of repose to the kingdom.[4]

A new adversary, however, appeared in the person of the Saxon, Athelstan, son of Edward the Elder. The causes which led to an open rupture between this prince and Constantine have been variously stated. Some writers assert that the Scottish king had given offence by breaking the league which he had made with the Saxon prince; others, that he had provoked the wrath of Athelstan by affording an asylum to Godred, a fugitive Northumbrian prince.[5] Be this as it may the English chroniclers affirm tht the Saxon monarch, in 934, invaded Scotland by land and sea, and wasted the country, while Constantine remained secure in his inaccessible fastness beyond the firths. In revenge for this invasion, Constantine, along with his son-in-law Aulaf (or Olave),

[1] Caledonia, vol. i. p. 382; Chron. in the Reg. of St Andrews.

[2] Chron. No. 3, in Innes, Append.

[3] Ibid. Annals of Ulster, sub anno 904.

[4] Colbert, Chron.; Chron. No. 3, in Innes, Append. Annals of Ulster.

[5] Saxon Chron. p.111; Ogygia, p. 485. It is worthy of notice that North Britain is for the first time called Scotland by the Saxon Chronicle, under the year 934.

the Danish chief of Northumberland, who had lately made considerable conquests in Ireland, and his allies the people of Strathclyd and Cumbria, and the northern Welsh, invaded England, and entered the Humber with six hundred and fifteen ships. but in the memorable battle of Brunanburgh, (A.D.937) - a place, the situation of which is now uncertain[1] - the united army was completely routed, with great slaughter. Aulaf escaped with the remnant of his forces to Ireland; and Constantine, whose son was left among the slain, with difficulty made good his retreat into his own dominions beyond the Forth. A few years after his defeat, in 944, he retired into a monastery and passed the remainder of his life as Abbot of the Culdees of St Andrews.

According to Fordun, Constantine was the first of the Scottish kings who made the heir-apparent to his crown Prince of Cumberland.[2] But there is reason to believe that Cumbria was not connected with Scotland till the reign of his successor, Malcolm I, son of Donald II.

Malcolm I, [943-954] son of Donald II, to whom it was ceded by the Saxon king, Edmund, 945. The territory thus ceded to the Scots consisted of the modern Cumberland and Westmoreland. It had constituted an independent British kingdom under the name of Reged, and had strenuously resisted the attempts of the Saxon kings to destroy its independence. At length Edmund the Elder, of England, succeeded in conquering this little kingdom, and put out the eyes of the five sons of Dunmail, its last British king. He then bestowed his new acquisition on Malcolm, on condition that he would become his associate in war, or, as the terms are explained by Mathew of Westminster, "that he would defend the northern parts of England from the invasion of his enemies, whether they came by sea or land." Some ingenious writers have attempted to discover in this transaction an acknowledgment of feudal dependence on the part of the Scottish monarch; but they have overlooked the important fact, that the agreement was entered into between two independent princes, - the one of Saxon, the other of Celtic race, - more than a century before the feudal usages or tenures were introduced into England by the Normans.

Malcolm I, appears to have been a prince of great ability and prudence; but having overthrown and slain Cellach the insurgent Maormor or chief of Mora he was assassinated at Fetteressoe (A.D. 953) by one of the Moraymen, in revenge for the death of his chief.[3]

[1] Supposed by some to be Brun, in the south of Lincolnshire, by others Burgh, on the Humber, in the north of the same county. See Simeon of Durham; Saxon Annals; Innes, App. Chron. No. 3; Irish Annals; Enquiry, Vol. ii p. 183.

[2] Fordun, lib. iv chap. xxiv.; Saxon Annals.

[3] The ancient chronicles differ as to the circumstances of Malcolm's death; but the above seems the most trustworthy account. See Chron. No. 3 and 5 in Innes; Fordun, lib. iv. chap. xxvil; Wyntown, vol.1. p. 179; and Dalrymple's Collections, p. 99.

Indulph

[953-961] the son of Constantine II, succeeded Malcolm. "In his reign," says the ancient Pictish Chronicle,[1] "the town of Eden was vacated and left to the Scots to this day." It is supposed that allusion is here made to Edinburg, which had een seized by Athelstan in his invasion of Scotland, A.D. 934. The reign of Indulph was grievously troubled by the invasion of the northern pirates; and he at last lost his life in a successful engagement with these fierce plunderers, fought near the bay of Cullen, in Banffshire, where a considerable number of barrows on a moor still preserve the memory of the defeat of the Danes.[2] This encounter, which took place in 961, is called, by the old writers the Battle of the Bauds.

Duff or Odo

[961-966] son of Malcolm now mounted the throne, according to what appears to have been the legal order of succession at this time, when each king was succeed, not by his own son, but by the son of his predecessor; but his right was disputed by Cullen, the son of Indulph, who laid claim to the sceptre which his father had wielded. In an engagement which took place at Duncrub, in Perthshire, Culen was defeated, and Doncha, Abbot of Dunkeld, and Dubdou, the Maormor of Athol, his most influential supporters, lost their lives. But in the following year Duff was driven from Forteviot into the north, and was assassinated at Forres, A.D. 965, after a troubled reign of four years and a half.[3]

Culen

[966-971] the son of Indulph, succeeded to the vacant throne. "During this reign," says Fordun, "which was equally unfit and remiss, noting either kingly or worthy of recollection is to be recorded." But Culen did not long remain the power which he had so traitorously obtained and so unworthily held. Having committed an act of atrocious violence on his relation, the daughter of the King of Strathclyd, the Britons took up arms to avenge the injury and Culen, with his brother Eocha, was slain, A.D. 970, in a battle fought at a place situated to the south of the Forth.[4]

Kenneth II,

[971-995] the crown now fell to Kenneth II, another son of Malcolm I, and the brother of Duff. Kenneth was evidently a prince of great ability, but of a daring and unscrupulous character. His first act was to follow out the war with the Britons of Strathclyd, rather, it is to be presumed, with ambitious views of conquest, than to avenge the merited fate of his predecessor, who was of a rival family. The Britons had enjoyed a precarious independence for upwards of five centuries, under various reverses and the multiplied attacks of powerful adversaries; but, pressed on every side, their territories were gradually narrowed, and their power diminished. They made a gallant struggle for independence, but, weakened by the frequent devastating invasions of the Danes, they were unable to resist the attacks of their powerful

[1] Innes, App. No. 3. [2] Ibid. Chron. No. 5.
[3] Chron, No. 5, Innes, App.; Ulster Annals.
[4] Ulster Annals, and Chron, No. 3; Fordun, vol. I. p.330.

neighbours. Dunwallon, the last king of Strathclyd, after exhibiting the utmost courage in defence of his kingdom was defeated by Kenneth at the battle of Vacornar, in A.D. 973, retired to Rome, where he assumed the religious habit and died a monk, and his territories were incorporate with the rest of the Scottish dominions.[1] During the reign of Kenneth the northern pirates, undismayed by their repeated defeat, renewed their invasion of Scotland, and sailed up the Tay with a numerous fleet. They were met by the Scottish forces at Luncarty, in the vicinity of Perth. The battle was long and fiercely contested. At length the two wings of the Scottish army were compelled to give way; but they rallied behind the centre, which was commanded by the king in person, and taking up a new position on more advantageous ground, they renewed the conflict, and finally defeated the invaders with great slaughter, and drove them to their ships. Monumental barrows filled with the relics and arms of the slain, attest the truth of this battle, although some historians have affected incredulity on the subject. Connected with this memorable engagement, which is still famous in Scottish story, is the well-known tradition of origin of the family of the Hays, Earls of Errol. It is said, that when the Scots were flying from the field, with the Danes in pursuit, a husbandman named Hay, with his two sons, who happened to be at work in a neighbouring field armed only with their ploughbeams, placed themselves in a narrow pass through which the vanquished were hurrying, and impeded their flight. "What!" said the gallant rustic, "had you rather be slaughtered by our merciless foes than die honourably fight for your country? Come, rally, rally!" With these words, brandishing his ploughbeam, he rallied the fugitives and led them back to victory. "Sone efter," to use the simple language of Boece "ane counsal was set at Scone in the quhilk Hay and his sons war maid nobil and dotad for thair singular virtew provin in this field, with sundray lands to sustene thair estait. It is said that he askit fra the king certane lands li and betwixt Tay and Arole and gat als mekil thairof as ane falcon few of ane mans hand or scho lichtit. The falcon flew to ane town four milis fra Dunde called Rosse and lichtit on ane stane quhilk is yet callit The Falcon Stane and sa he gat al the lands betwix Tay and Arole six milis of lenth and four of breid quhilk lands are yit inhabit by his posterite."[2] In proof of this story an appeal is made to the arms of the Hays - three escutcheons supported by two peasants, each carrying the beam of a plough in his shoulder with a falcon for the crest. But is quite as likely that the story may have been invented to explain the arms; and there can be no doubt that the tradition is entirely fabulous. It has been proved that armorial bearings were unknown at the date of the battle of Luncarty - that the Hays are a branch of the Norman De Hayas, and did not come to Scotland till more than a hundred years after the period referred to - that they only obtained the lands of Errol from William the Lion about the middle of the twelfth century - and that it was not till the middle of the fourteenth century that the were ennobled.

[1] Caledonia vol. i. p. 356.

[2] Bellenden's Boece, book xi. chap. viii.

This decisive victory over his foreign enemies afforded Kenneth leisure and opportunity to mature and execute his domestic projects. With characterisic energy he proceeded to take measures for the abrogation of the most remarkable peculiarity of the Scottish regal constitution the mode of succession to the throne - and procure the consent of the states to a law, settling the succession on the nearest surviving descendant or blood relation of the deceased monarch, of whatever age; and providing that, in case the heir should not be of age at the time of the king's decease, a regent should be appointed to govern the kingdom until the minor attained his fourteenth year. In the prosecution of the line of policy he had adopted, Kenneth is believed to have put to death Malcolm, the son of his brother Duff, who had been already recognised as Tanist, or next heir to the throne, and invested with the lordship of Cumberland. Some of the English chroniclers* state that Lothian was ceded to Kenneth by the Saxon king Edgar; but as no mention is made of this important event in the Saxon Chronicle, or in the more ancient English annals, or in Fordun, the accuracy of the statement has been called in question. Mr Allen, however, whose authority is entitled to the greatest weight, is of opinion that the account given by Wallingford may be relied on, as, although he wrote in the twelfth or thirteenth century, he appears to have possessed original materials, which are now lost. From the defeat of the Northumbrian king Egfrid by the Picts, in 685, the district of Lothian seems to have been a kind of debateable land, alternately subject to the Scotch or Pictish, and to the Northumbrian kingdoms, though it was probably at this time in the actual possession of the Scottish King. Wallingford's account of the manner in which the quarrel respecting this disputed territory was at last determined, is, tht when Kenneth came to London on a visit to Edgar, he represented to the English monarch tht Lothian belonged by hereditary right, to the English kings; tht Edgar, after consulting with his nobles agreed to resign the territory to resign the territory to Kenneth, as it was difficult to maintain, and of little advantage to England, but only on condition that he should do homage for it to the English crown; that Kenneth assented to these terms, and promised, that he would allow the people to retain their ancient customs, and to continue English in name and in language: all which, adds the historian, remains firmly established to this day. Mr Allen is of opinion that the whole, or part of the district, was re-annexed to Northumbria on the defeat of Malcolm II, in 1005; but, after the victory over the Northumbrians, gained by the same monarch, at Carham, in 1020, a final cession of the district to the Scottish king was formally made by the Northumbrian earl Eadulf.

One of Kenneth's acts of cruelty recoiled upon him to his own destruction. After the suppression of an insurrection in the Mearns, he had put to death the only son of the chief of the district.[1] By some means or other Kenneth was induced to pay a visit to Fenella, the mother of the victim, in her castle near Fettercairn, and here he was

[1] Chron. No. 5, in Innes.

assassinated by her orders.[1] Immediately after the commission of the murder, she fled down a valley, still called Strath-Fenella, to a place in the parish of Fordun, where she was overtaken and put to death. This event took place, A.D. 994, after Kenneth had reigned twenty-four years. In spite of the energetic and unscrupulous policy of Kenneth, his son did not, after all, succeed him on the throne. The right of succession was contested by three competitors. Of these, Constantine III, the son of the ruthless Culen, is believed to have been first crowned; but in a few months he was defeated, and slain in a conflict near the river Almond, in Perthshire,[2] with a son of Duff, and younger brother of the murdered prince, Malcolm, who immediately mounted the throne as Kenneth II, surnamed the Grim by the Scottish chroniclers, from the strength of his body. His claims however, were opposed by Malcolm the son of Kenneth II, and who, after the murder of his cousin Malcolm, the son of Duff, had been recognized as the heir to the throne and as such appointed Regulus, or Prince of Cumberland. At length the rival claimants met in conflict at Monivaird, when the contest was decided by the death of Kenneth, A.D. 1003, after a reign of eight years. The scene of the battle is marked by a large barrow, called Carnchainichin - the Cairn of Kenneth.[3]

Malcolm II, [1003-1034] Son of Kenneth II for ten years after his father's death he had to contend with rivals but established himself by 1005. He was an able prince and renowned leader. He is styled "Rex Victoriosissimus," by the ancient chroniclers; but his reign appears to have been of a chequered character, according to the saying of the Gaelic bard:-

"Thirty years of variegated reign
Was king by fate, Malcolm."

In the earlier part of his reign he was harassed by successive invasions of the Norsemen, who had now, for some time, obtained possession of the Orkney islands. They made their appearance in great strength on the coast of Moray, and seized and fortified the promontory called the Burghead, where they found a commodious harbour and a secure retreat. Sigurd, the Earl of Orkney, one of these Danish Vikings, carried on his depredations along the shores of the Moray Frith, even after he had formed a matrimonial alliance with Malcolm, by marrying his daughter; but friends and foes were equally laid under contribution by these marauders. In the year 1010, they made a fresh descent upon Moray; but they were encountered near Mortlach, and defeated with great slaughter, after a protracted struggle, by Malcolm, who, in pursuance of a vow which he is said to have made on the field of battle, endowed a religious house near the scene of his victory. This

[1] Ulster Annals, anno 994; Chron. Elegiacum; Wyntown's Chron.

[2] Chron No. 5, in Innes; Fordun, lib iv. chap. xxxvii., but he is mistaken as to the place of Constantine's death; Ogygia, p. 487.

[3] Chron. No. 5, in Innes; Chron. Eleg.; Fordun, lib. iv. chap. xli.

endowment was, shortly after confirmed by Pope Benedict, and Mortlach became the seat of the earliest Scottish bishopric. Several Danish skulls, the relics of distinguished warriors who fell in the battle were built into the walls of the church of Mortlach, and were still to be seen there not many years ago. The scene of this bloody conflict is marked by a number of sepulchral mounds, which contained human bones, broken armour, and other relics of the slain.[1] In spite of this severe defeat, Sweno, the Danish king, renewed the attempt at invasion, by detaching a fleet and army, under Camus, one of his most renowned leaders. They appear to have effected a landing on the coast of Angus, near to Panbride; but they had advanced only a few miles, when they were encountered at Aberlemno, by Malcolm. After an obstinate contest, the Danes were overthrown with great slaluaghter, and their leader, in his retreat from the field of battle, was overtaken and slain. A tall and highly sculptured monumental stone which bears the name of Camus-cross is supposed to mark the spot where he was killed.[2]

Still the Danes were not discouraged and they renewed their attempts to subjugate Scotland by landing on the coast of Buchan, about a mile west from Slaines Castle, in the parish of Cruden; but they were attacked and defeated by the Maormor of the district. Sweno, at length, disheartened by so many defeats, appears to have entered into a convention with Malcolm, A.D. 1014, by which he engaged to evacuate the kingdom and to abstain from future invasion. Thus, after a severe struggle, which appears to have continued, at intervals, for nearly a century and a half (866 to 1014), the valour and energy of the Scots triumphed over the efforts of the Norsemen. It was certainly highly to the honour, both of Malcolm and his people, that these fierce Norsemen, who had been the scourge and terror of every other country in Europe, and had even placed their leaders on the English throne, should thus have been baffled in their attempts to establish themselves in the Scottish territory, and have been at last compelled to desist from the contest.

Soon after the termination of his warfare with the Danes, Malcolm was involved in a contest with the Northumbrians; and in the year 1018 he led his army to Carham, near Wark, on the southern bank of the Tweed, where he was encountered by Uchtred, Earl of Northumberland. The battle was fiercely contested, and the issue was doubtful, though the victory was claimed by the Northumbrian earl. Uchtred, however, was soon after assassinated by the Danes, and his brother and successor Eadulf-Cudel, from the dread of a second

[1] Caledonia, vol. i. p. 899; Fordun, lib. iv. chap. xl.; Old Stat. Acc. vol. xvii. p. 444.

[2] There are several other stones in different parts of the county, which bear the same name. Dr Wilson is of opinion that these Cumbus-stones, and that the name is derived from the Celtic, cam, crooked, which enters into many Gaelic compounds and proper names. About the year 1610, however, a huge skeleton was dug up near Camus-cross, which appeared to have received a mortal stroke upon the head, as part of the skull was cut away. It was found lying in a sepulchre, which was inclosed with four stones.

invasion was induced to purchase the friendship of Malcolm by ceding to him, or confirming the former cession, of the rich district of Lothian, including not only the whole of the three countries which now bear this designation, but Berwickshire, and the lower part of Teviotdale.

The last important event which occurred in the reign of Malcolm was his dispute with the celebrated Canute, the Danish king of England. The cause of the war is involved in much obscurity; but it appears to have been connected with some dispute respecting the homage due by the Scottish king for the principality of Cumberland. Canute led an army against Malcolm, who, on his part, prepared to repel the invasion; but, by the interposition of mutual friends, the dispute was amicably adjusted, and it was agreed that Malcolm should regain possession of Cumberland on performing the conditions upon which it had been transferred to him by Saxon kings.[1] Malcolm died peaceably in 1033, after an eventful reign of thirty years, and was buried at Iona. The story of his assassination at Glammis is a fiction, invented by the monkish chroniclers, and the laws which are ascribed to him by Boece and Buchanan, have been clearly proved to be the forgery of a much later age.

Duncan I,

[1033-1039] The grandson of Malcolm II by Bethoc, or Bethoc, one of his daughters, now ascended the throne, which he occupied for six years - "the gracious Duncan," who fell by the dagger of Macbeth. "On reading these names," says Sir Walter Scott, "every reader must feel as if brought from darkness into the blaze of noonday so familiar are we with the personage whom we last named, and so clearly and distinctly we call the events in which they are interested, in comparison with any doubtful and misty views which we can form of the twilight times before and after that fortunate period. But we must not be blinded by our poetical enthusiasm, nor add more than due importance to legends, because they have been woven into the most striking tale of ambition and remorse that ever truck awe into a human bosom. The genius of Shakespeare having found the tale of Macbeth in the Scottish Chronicles of Holinshed, adorned it with a lustre similar to that with which a level beam of the sun often invests some fragment of glass, which, which, though shining at a distance with the lustre of a diamond, is, by a near investigation, discovered to be of no worth or estimation."

[1] Fordun, lib, iv. chap. xli.; Matthew of Westminster, p. 209.

Macbeth [1040-1057] son of Findlach or Finlay, Maormor of the remote district of Moray. Macbeth was the Maormor of the remote district of Ross, where, it is probable, he was all but nominally independent of the royal authority. His lady, whose real name was Gruoch had regal blood in her veins. She was the granddaughter (or daughter) of Kenneth III, surnamed the Grim, who was slain fighting against King Malcolm; she had, therefore, deadly injuries to avenge on the reigning monarch. Her grandfather had been dethroned and killed by Malcolm, her brother assassinated, and her first husband, Gilcomgain, the Maormor of Moray, burned in his castle along with fifty of his friends, whilst she herself had to fly for her life along with her infant son Lulach. She sought shelter in the district of Ross, of which Macbeth was hereditary lord, and to him she gave her hand.

Macbeth, on the other hand, had wrongs of his own to avenge, for his father also had been slain by Malcolm; and thus, instigated both by ambition and revenge, he attacked and slew Duncan at a place called Bothgowan, or the Smith's House, near Elgin, in 1039, and not, as the chronicler or the dramatist allege, in his own castle of Inverness.[1]

Macbeth immediately mounted the throne to which, it has been alleged, his title according to the old rule of Scottish succession, was better than that of Duncan. He appears to have been in reality a just and equitable prince, and there is reason to believe that his administration was conducted with great ability and to general satisfaction of the people. The adherents of the family of the murdered monarch, however, resisted his authority form the first. After several unsuccessful attempts to dispossess him, they were at length joined by Siward, the Danish Earl of Northumberland, whose relation Duncan had married, and by Macduff, the Maormor of Fife, whose patriotism is said to have been inflamed by some personal injuries. These two powerful chiefs having espoused the cause of Malcolm, Duncan's elder son, who had fled to England on his father's death, they advanced against Macbeth at the head of a formidable army, during the year 1054. Their first encounter is believed to have taken pace at Dunsinane Hill, on the summit of which Macbeth, according to tradition had a stronghold. He was defeated, but escaped form the battle to his fastness in the north, where he appears to have protracted the war for nearly two years. He was at length defeated, and slain at Lumphanan, Aberdeenshire, on the 5th of December, 1056, in the seventeenth year of his reign.[2] His adherents did not immediately abandon the contest, but set up as king. Lulach, the son of Lady Macbeth by her first husband.

Lulach [1057-1058] the son of Lady Macbeth by her first husband Gruoch known as "The Simple". Lulach was raised to the throne on Macbeth's death in 1507. After a brief struggle however, he too was defeated and lost his life in a battle which was fought at Essie, in in Strathbogie, on the 3rd of April, 1057.

[1] Fordun, lib. iv. chap. xlix.; Register of St Andrews. [2] Wyntown, vol. i. pp. 238-9; Simon of Durham p. 187; Caledonia, vol. i. pp.404-416; Hailes's Annals, vol. 1. p.2

PART III

MALCOLM III

surnamed Canmore (Cean-mohr), or Great-head, all opposition to his claims being thus completely crushed, Malcolm ascended the throne in 1057, and was crowned at Scone on the 20th April, the Festival of St Mark.[1] The powerful chief of whom he was mainly indebted for his restoration to the throne of his ancestors, was rewarded with the important privileges, - that he and his successors, Lords of Fife, should have the right of placing the kings of Scotland on the throne at their coronation, - that they should lead the van of the Scottish armies whenever the royal banner was displayed, - and that if he, or any of his kindred, "committed slaughter of suddenly," they should have a peculiar sanctuary, and obtain remission on payment of an atonement in money.[2] He was a prince of great energy and valour, and his reign forms an important era in the early history of Scotland. His dominions included not ony the ancient possessions of the Scots and Picts, but the kingdom of Strathclyd, the province of Cumbria, consisting of Cumberland and Westmoreland, and the district of Lothian, forming the south-eastern portion of modern Scotland. The Cumbrians and the people of Strathclyd were of British race, while the inhabitants of Lothian appear to have been chiefly of Saxon and Danish extraction. The south-western angle of Scotland, on the other hand, known by the name of Galloway, was inhabited by a mixed race, partly of Scottish and partly of Pictish descent, and their numbers had been infested in the course of the ninth, tenth, and eleventh centuries, by various bodies of colonists from Ireland. "They appear," says Mr Allen, "at all times to have owed subjection to the Scottish kings, but they long retained the barbarous habits and the ferocious manners, which the ravages of the Northmen had impressed on the country they had quitted. In the twelfth century they are called Picts or Galwegians, and as late as the fourteenth century they are distinguished by the appellation of the Wild Scots of Galloway."

The accession of Malcolm Canmore was followed by events which ultimately led to most important changes in the manners and customs of his subjects. He had passed about fifteen years at the court of Edward the Confessor before he became king, and the habits and connexions which he had formed there induced him to maintain a more friendly intercourse with England than had been customary with his predecessors; so that, with the exception of the short and hasty incursion which he made into Northumberland in 1061,[3] nothing occurred during the reign of the Confessor, to interrupt the harmony

[1] Pinkerton strenuously maintains that Malcolm must have been not the son, but the grandson of Duncan, and the great length of the interval - fifty-four years - between the dates assigned to the death of Duncan and that of Malcolm, is adduced by him in support of this conjecture. Enquiry, vol. ii. p. 203.

[2] Fordun, lib v. chap. ix; Buchanan, lib. ii. p. 115; Annals of Scotland, vol. i. p. 8.

[3] Simeon of Durham, p. 190.

to each other that they were popularly termed "the sworn brothers." On the accession of Harold to the English throne, Tostig took up arms against him; but having been repulsed, he took refuge with Malcolm between the sister kingdoms. He had contracted a most intimate friendship with Tostig, brother of Harold, and earl or governor of Northumberland. Simeon of Durham says they were so much attached and remained in Scotland during the whole summer.[1] But the Scottish king took no part in the invasion of England made by Tostig and his ally, Hardrada, King of Norway, in the close of the same year and in which they both lost their lives at the battle of Stamford Bridge, near York, 25th September 1066.

The death of Harold, at Hastings, a few weeks later, and the conquest of England by the Normans, caused a considerable number of the friends of the Saxon dynasty to seek refuge in Scotland from the oppressions of the victorious Normans. The most distinguished of these was the unfortunate Edgar Atheling, the heir of the Saxon line, who along with his mother, Agatha, and his two sisters, Margaret and Christian, fled to Scotland in the beginning of 1068, accompanied by Maerleswegen and Gospatric, two powerful Northumbrian chiefs, who were disgusted at the Norman tyranny.

Soon after the arrival of these illustrious fugitives in Scotland - probably about 1070 - Malcolm espoused Margaret, the elder of the two princesses, at Dunfermline. She was beautiful, accomplished, and pious; and as Edgar was weak, almost to imbecility, she might be looked upon as inheriting the claims of the Saxon royal line. The marriage of the Scottish monarch was soon followed by his invasion of England, in conjunction with he Danes and the Northumbrian barons, who were hostile to William the Conqueror. The Danes, however, after storming York, and putting the Norman garrison to the sword, were repulsed, and returned to their ships; and the discontented Northumbrians were gained over by William before Malcolm took the field. Entering England with a numerous army, the Scottish king routed the English, who opposed him at Hunderskelde, and mercilessly ravaged Durham, and the northern and western parts of Yorkshire. Gospatric, who had made his peace with William, in the meantime laid waste the district of Cumberland, and Malcolm exasperated by this retaliation on his own frontiers, continued his ravages with increased severity. Even the churches were destroyed and burnt, while the miserable inhabitants, who had fled to them for refuge, were consumed in the flames. Malcolm returned home, leading captive, says an English historian, such a multitude of young men and maidens, "that for may years they were to be found in every Scottish village, nay, even in every Scottish hovel."[2]

William was incensed to the highest degree by the repeated instructions of the Northumbrians, and both to punish their recent revolt, and to oppose an obstacle, in the desolation of the country, to the future invasions of the Danes, he laid utterly waste the fertile

[1] Ibid. p. 193. [2] Simeon of Durham. p. 201.

district between the Humber and the Tees.[1] "At this time," says William of Malmesbury, "there was destroyed such splendid towns, such lofty castles, such beautiful pastures, that, had a stranger viewed the scene, he might have been moved to compassion, and had one inhabitant been left alive, he would not have recollected the country."[2]

The inhabitants of this once populous and fertile district seem to have been almost wholly exterminated. Many who escaped the sword, died of famine; many sold themselves into slavery, to escape starvation; and many thousands of the lower order, together with a considerable number both of Anglo-Saxons and Normans of condition, who had incurred the displeasure of the Conqueror, fled for refuge into Scotland, and found a cordial reception at the court of Malcolm, who, sensible of the value of such auxiliaries, conferred honours and estates upon them with no sparing hand.

William, having secured peace at home, prepared to chastise Malcolm for his inroads into England and, in 1072, he invaded h Scottish territories both by sea and land. He overran and wasted the country as far as the Tay; but as the inhabitants according to the policy which they seem to have followed from the earliest times, destroyed or removed everything of value as the enemy advanced, William, as the Saxon Chronicle expresses it, "nothing found of that which to him the better was." In the end, Malcolm met him at Abernethy,[3] when a peace was concluded between the two kings on the conditions that Malcolm should give hostages and pay homage to William.[4] The question has been raised, and keenly disputed, - For what was this homage performed? The advocates of the English supremacy content that it was for the Scottish crown. No satisfactory evidence, however, can be produced in support of this assertion. It is true that certain of Anglo-Saxon kings assumed the title of Monarch, or Emperor, of all Britain.

But this vain-glorious assumption of a vaunting title proves nothing; and it would be easy to produce a parallel case of similar pretensions having bee put forth without any foundation. The notion that the Scottish kings were the acknowledged vassals of the Anglo-Saxon princes of England, is directly opposed to the whole course of the history of the two countries. Scotland was never conquered by any of these monarchs; nor is there any evidence that they ever made an attempt to wrest it from its ancient possessors. There is as little trustworthy evidence that any acknowledgement of the dependence

[1] Ingulpus p.79

[2] William of Malmesbury, p. 103.

[3] The place where Malcolm met the Conqueror is called "Abernith" by Ingulphus, and "Abernithiei" by Florence of Worcester. Lord Hailes Pinkerton, and other writers, have contended that it ws probably some place on the river Nith. But in speech ascribed by Ealred, Abbot of Rievalle, a contemporary of David, Malcolm's son, to Walter Espec, before the battle of the Standard, it is said tht William penetrated through Lodonia, Calatria, and Scotia, as far as Abernith, (evidently Abernethy,) where the warlike Malcolm surrendered himself to William as his vassal. Ridpath's Border History, p. 63, and note.

[4] Sax. Chron., Goodall, Introd. to Fordun, p. 46.

of the kingdom of Scotland, but for the territories which they held in England, such as Cumbria and Lothian, and which were ceded to them by the English kings on this express condition. For these possessions they of course did homage to the English crown, exactly in the same manner as the Norman kings of England did homage to the French crown, for the possessions whih they held in France.

When Malcolm exposed the cause of Edgar Atheling, he necessarily at the same time denied the right of William to the English throne, and refused to acknowledge him as his liege lord. But when William took measures to assert his authority, and invade Scotland, Malcolm submitted to his claims, and acknowledged his title to the same homage as had been paid to his Saxon predecessors. To employ the words o Lord Hailes, one of the ablest inquirers into this subject, "According to the general and most probable opinion, this homage was done by Malcolm for the lands which he held in England."[1]

William on his return from this expedition, deprived Gospatric of his earldom of Northumberland, under the pretext that he had secretly instigated the murder of Comyn, the former governor. Gospatric a second time took refuge in Scotland, where notwithstanding of his former defection, he was again cordially welcome by Malcolm, who bestowed upon him extensive estates on the eastern marches, together with the castles of Dunbar and Cockburnspath.[2] The possessor of these strong fortresses was popularly said to have the keys of Scotland at his girdle. "And the circumstance is worthy of remembrance," says Mr Tyler, "not only as marking the origin of a potent family destined to act a leading part in the future history of the country, but as indicating the policy of Malcolm, who, conscious of the inferiority of his own Celtic race, manifested a wise anxiety to prevail on strangers, whether Norman, Danes, or Saxons, to settle in his dominions."

After this agreement with William Malcolm seems to have remained quiet for some years; but, in 1079, hostilities were renewed with England, on what grounds historians have omitted to state. Availing himself of the favourable opportunity afforded by the absence of the English king, who was on the continent carrying on a war with his son Robert, Malcolm again invaded Northumberland, and wasted the country as far as the river Tyne, returning home laden with plunder.[3] The following year, as Robert was now reconciled to his father, he was intrusted with the command of an army against Scotland. But the expedition proved unsuccessful, and Robert soon returned without effecting anything worthy of notice. It was at this period that the fortress of Newcastle, on the Tyne was erected as protection against the inroads of the Scots. It necessarily and professedly tended to render insecure the authority fo the Scottish king over the district of Northumbria.

[1] Annals, vol. i. p. 316; Allen's Vindication; Pict. His. of England, vol. i. pp. 534-536.

[2] Simeon of Durham, p. 205; Gospatric is a corruption of Comes Patricius, the name and title of the powerful baron, who was the ancestor of the Earls of March.

After the death of William the Conqueror (A.D.) 1087) and the accession of his son, William Rufus, various causes of dispute took place betwixt England and Scotland. The prince appears to have withheld from Malcolm part of the English possessions to which he claimed a right; and, probably with the view of vindicating his claim, the Scottish king invaded England in May 1091, and penetrated as far as Chester-le-Street, between Newcastle and Durham, where receiving, intelligence that Rufus was advancing to meet him with a superior force, he prudently retreated without risking a battle. In the autumn of the same year, William made preparations to invade Scotland, both by sea and land. His fleet was destroyed by a tempest and many of his cavalry perished by want and cold; but in spite of these disasters he advanced with his army to the shores of the Forth. Meantime the Scots in accordance with their usual policy, had driven away their cattle and laid waste the country; so that the enemies were reduced to great extremities by the want of provisions. Malcolm crossed the Forth with his forces, and advanced into Lothian to meet the invaders. The hostile armies met, and were ready to engage; but through the mediation of Robert, the brother of Rufus, and Edgar Atheling, who was at that time with Malcolm, a peace was concluded between the two monarchs. "King Malcolm," says the Saxon chronicler, "came to our king, and became his man, promising all such obedience as he formerly rendered to his father, and that he confirmed with an oath. And the king William promised him in land and in all things whatever he formerly had under his father." Malcolm consented to do homage to William, and to hold his land under the same tenure of feudal service as he had formerly paid to his father. William on his part agreed to restore twelve manors which Malcolm had held under the Conqueror, and to make an annual payment to him of twelve marks of gold.[1] At the same time Edgar Atheling was reconciled to William, and permitted to return to England.

The peace thus made was not of long continuance. In the following year (1092) William erected a castle at Carlisle, a step which Malcolm appears to have resented, as an encroachment on the freedom of the territories which he held in Cumberland. A personal interview between the kings was proposed as the best mode of settling their differences. Malcolm accordingly repaired to Gloucester (24th August 1093); but on his arrival, William demanded that he should do homage there, in the presence of the English barons. With this demand the Scottish monarch refused to comply, but offered to perform his homage according to the ancient usage, on the frontiers and in the presence of the chief men of both kingdoms.[2] This proposal was contumeliously rejected by William, and Malcolm returning home in great displeasure, assembled an army, and burst into Northumberland, which he wasted with fire and sword. But while he was besieging Alnwick Castle, he was suddenly attacked and slain by Robert de Mowbray, a Northumbrian earl. His eldest ton, Edward, shared his fate. The manner of Malcolm's death has been variously related.

[1] Simeon of Durham, p. 216; Sax. Chron. pp. 147 -198; Hailes Annals, vol. i. p. 22.

[2] Simeon of Durham, p. 218; William of Malmesbury, p. 122; Annals, vol. i. p. 24. Vol. I.

According to Fordun the castle of Alnwick was sore pressed, and the garrison despaired of relief, when one of the besieged undertook either to deliver them or to perish in the attempt. Issuing, therefore, from the castle and carrying the keys of it on the point of his spear, he advanced to he Scottish camp, where he inquired for the king, in order that he might deliver the keys into his hand. Malcolm informed of his approach, came hastily out of his tent, without his armour, when the traitor pierced him with his spear, and in the confusion succeeded in making his escape. In the old chronicle of Alnwick Abbey, the soldier who slew King Malcolm is called Hammond, and it is stated that he escaped through the river Aln, at a place which was long after called Hammond's Ford. Fordun relates that the English, availing themselves of the confusion caused by the death of the king, made a fierce attack upon the Scots, and put them to the rut, and that Prince Edward was severely wounded in the encounter, and died three days after.[1]

The death of Malcolm was followed, in a few days, by that of his excellent queen, who had exercised a great and most beneficial influence over the fierce and impetuous character of her husband. When the king set out on his fatal expedition to England Margaret, worn out it is said by her vigils and fastings was suffering from a fatal and lingering complaint. Her biographer, Turgot, acknowledges that abstinence ruined her constitution, and brought on excruciating pains in her stomach, which death alone removed. Her last moments are described by that faithful minister, who related what he saw. Her thoughts were much occupied with the welfare of her children. "Farewell," said she to Turgot, "my life draws to a close, but you may survive me long. To you I commit the charge of my children; teach them above all things, to love and fear God, and whenever you see any of them attain to the height of earthly grandeur, O, then, in an especial manner, be to them as a father and a guide! Admonish, and if need be, reprove them lest they be swelled with the pride of momentary glory, though avarice offend God, or, by reason of the prosperity of this world, become careless of eternal life. This, in the presence of Him who is now our only witness, I beseech you to promise and to perform." During a short interval of ease she devoutly received the communion. Soon after, her anguish of body returned with redoubled violence. She stretched herself upon hr 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 my iniquities; make me to hear joy and gladness, that the bones which thou has broken may rejoice; cost me not away from they presence, and take not thy Hoy Spirit from me; restore unto me thee joy of thy salvation!" "At tht 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,` cried she, `I know all. By this holy cross, by your filial affection, I adjure you to tell me truth.` He answered:

[1] Chr. Sax. p. 199. Fordun, lib. v. c. 25; Border Hist. p. 69.

`Your husband and our son are both slain.` Lifting up her eyes and her hands to heaven, she 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 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."

The character of this excellent princess is worthy to be "held in everlasting remembrance." Her piety was sincere and deep, though somewhat tinged with asceticism; and her biographer expressly admits that her health was injured by her long vigils, fasts, and mortifications.

Her beneficence was exhibited, not merely in public and somewhat ostentatious alms-giving, in feeding indigent orphans with her own hands, ministering at table to crowds of poor persons, and washing their feet; but in secret acts of charity, and in her unwearied efforts to relieve the necessities and assuage the afflictions of her Saxon countrymen, of high or low degree, who had been expelled from their homes by the oppressions of the Norman invaders. Many of these unhappy exiles had been compelled by the want of the common necessaries of life, to sell themselves into slavery, and were dispersed over the country. She employed her agents to seek out such persons, and to inquire into their condition, and whenever their bondage appeared oppressive, she secretly paid their ransom and restored them to liberty.

Margaret appears to have laboured to elevate the condition of the people as well as to improve their manners and morals. We are told by her biographer, that she encouraged merchants to come from various parts of the world with many precious commodities, which had never before been seen in that country. Among the articles thus imported, special mention is made of highly ornamented vestments of various colours, which, when the people bought, adds the chronicler, and were induced by the persuasions of the king to put on, they seemed to become new beings, so fine did they appear in their new-fashioned clothes. She was also magnificent in her own attire. She increased the number of attendants on the person of the king, augmented the parade of his public appearances, and caused him to be served at table in gold and silver plate. "At least," says the honest historian, "the dishes and vessels were gilt or silvered over." In the management of her own household, she displayed such a mixture of strictness and kindness, that she was equally revered and loved by all who approached her. She entertained many ladies, employed their leisure hours in the amusement of the needle, and paid strict attention to the decorum of their conduct. "In her presence," says Turgot, "nothing unseemly was ever done or uttered."

The gentleness and amiability of this excellent woman, together with her prudence and good sense, enabled her to acquire complete control over the fiery temper of her husband; and her influence over him appears to have been exerted with the most beneficial effect. To her he seems to have committed the management of the religious affairs and the internal polity of his kingdom. "Malcolm," says Turgot,

"respected the religion of his spouse, was fearful of offending her, and listened to her admonitions. Whatever she loved or disliked so did he. Although he could not read, he frequently turned over her prayer-books, and kissed her favourite volumes. He had them adorned with gold and precious stones and presented them to her in token of his devotion. She instructed him to pass the night in fervent prayer with groans and tears. I must acknowledge," he adds, "that I often admired the works of the Divine mercy, when I saw a king so religious, and such signs of deep compunction in a layman."

Various abuses appear at this time to have crept into the church as well as among the people, and Margaret employed her learning and eloquence, not only in the instruction of her husband, but in controversy with the clergy, and in urging them to reform their various errors of doctrine and discipline. At this period the Scottish clergy had ceased to celebrate the communion of the Lord's Supper, on the plea that they were sinners and dreaded to communicate unworthily. They made no distinction between Sabbath and week days; and they permitted the marriage of a man with his step-mother, or the widow of his brother - a practice originating probably in avarice, as it relieved the heir of a jointure. All these abuses the queen corrected, in a firm yet temperate manner. "She displayed to the clergy," says Lord Hailes, "the vanity of their superstitions or indolent excuse for their neglect to celebrate the communion and she restored the religious observance of Sunday an institution no less admirable in a political than in a religious light." She held a solemn conference with the clergy regarding the proper season for celebrating Lent; and "three days," says Turgot, "did she employ the Sword of the Spirit in combating their errors. She seemed another St Helena, out of the Scriptures convincing the Jews;"

After her death, Margaret was received into the Romish calendar. "Others." says her candid biographer, "may admire the indications of sanctity which miracles afford; I much more admire in Margaret the works of mercy. Such signs are common to the good and the evil, but the works of two piety and charity are peculiar to the good. With better reason, therefore ought we to admire the deeds of Margaret, which made her a saint, then her miracles - *had she performed any* - which could ony have pointed her out to mankind as a saint." Nearly two hundred years after her death, her body was removed to a tomb of more distinction, in the church of Dunfermline. A legend of "a well imagined miracle" narrates, that it was found impossible to lift the body of the now saint, until that of her husband had received the same honour; as if, in her beatitude, Margaret had been guided by the same feelings of conjugal deference and affection which had regulated this excellent woman's conduct wile on earth.[1]

The character of Malcolm Canmore himself, it has been justly said, stands high if his situation and opportunities be considered. Though he was not altogether free from the fierceness and barbarity of his age, he

[1] Turgot, Acta Sanctorum, 10 June 328, quoted by Lord Hailes, Annals vol. i. pp. 36-45.

was a man of undaunted courage and of a noble and generous disposition. "From his early youth," says Lord Hailes, "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 as the ruler of a nation uncivilized 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."[1]

An incident is related concerning Malcolm by Aldred, the authority of David I, Malcolm's son, which is strongly illustrative of his courage and generosity. A nobleman of his court, had formed a design against his life. His traitorous intentions became known to the king, who during the amusement of a hunting-match, drew the conspirator into a solitary glade of the forest, upbraided him with his treachery, land defiled him to mortal and equal combat. "Now," said the gallant monarch, unsheathing his sword, "we are alone, and armed alike. You seek my life; take it." The traitor, surprised at the set of generosity, threw himself at the king's feet, confessed his crime, and intreated forgiveness. The king pardoned and restored him to his confidence, and never had any reason to repent of his manly and generous conduct.[2]

An attempt has been made to claim for Malcolm the character of a great legislator. It is asserted by Boece, that immediately after his accession, he held a parliament at Forfar, and restored to their estates, dignities, and jurisdictions, all the nobles whose fathers had been murdered by Macbeth - that he introduced among his nobles the custom of taking surnames from the lands which they passed - that he invented new titles of honour, each as those of Earls and Barons;[3] and it has even been alleged by later and able writers, tht Malcolm introduced feudal system into Scotland.[4] The story is circumstantially told, how he summoned all is nobles to meet him at Scone, and how each, bringing with him, as directed, a handful of earth from his lands, surrendered them by that symbol to the king, who granted charters of them anew to each proprietor, under the form of feudal investiture. The Moathill at Scone is said to be compose of earth brought together for this purpose and thence called *omnis terra*. But this legend is not supported by any trustworthy authority, and is totally incredible. It is very probable, as Lord Hailes remarks that Malcolm assembled the chief men of his kingdom immediately after his accession, and that he restored the estates forfeited in the reign of his predecessor; but the other political acts ascribed to him are merely conjectural. The modern title of Earl may be traced nearly to his time, and it is probable that it was now assumed by some of those who had previously borne the

[1] Annals, vol. i. p. 25. [2] Ibid. p. 26, and note. [3] Boece xii. 256.
[4] Lord Kaimes's Essay concerning British Antiquities, Essay i.

designation of Maormor, or Thane. Surnames also began to be employed about this period, though they wee not in general use till long after the days of Malcolm. The collection of laws ascribed to this monarch has been proved to be a forgery of the fourteenth century; and the assertion, tht the systematic introduction of the feudal system into Scotland is to be ascribed to his policy, is destitute both of proof and of probability. That system was not introduced by any one monarch, or in the course of a single reign, but appears to have grown up gradually under he fostering influence of various natural causes assisted from time to time by a train of favourable circumstances. Lord Hailes is of opinion that this important change was accomplished so slowly in some parts of Scotland the custom of feudal investitures did not begin to prevail, till its rigour began to be mitigated in others. Great changes, doubtless, took place in the manners and customs of the Scottish people during the reign of Malcolm Canmore; but these changes were brought about not by any new institutions which he established, but by the example of his queen, and of the Saxon nobles and their followers, whom the oppressions of the Normans forced to take refuge in his kingdom. The revolution which the introduction of English manners at the court of Malcolm produced in the frugal and abstemious habits of the Scotch, is thus piteously bewailed by an old chronicler: - "It is said that such outrageous riot ensued at this time and began to grow in use among the Scottish men, together with the language and manners of the English nation (by reason that such a multitude of the same, fling out of their country were daily received into Scotland to inhabit there), that divers of the nobles perceiving what discommodity and decay to the whole realm would ensue of this intemperance, came to the king, lamenting grievously the case, for that is venomous infection spread so fast over the whole realm, to the perverting and utter removing of the ancient sobriety of diet used in the same. Wherefore they besought him to provide some remedy in time, before hope of redress were past, that the people might be again reduced into their former frugality, who hitherto used not to eat but once in the day and then desiring no superfluous meats and drinks to be sought by sea and land, nor curiously dressed or served forth with sauces, but only feeding to satisfy nature and not their greedy appetites. Hereupon King Malcolm took great pains to have redressed this infectious poison, and utterly to have expelled it forth of his realm. Howbeit, the nature of man is so prone and ready to embrace all kinds of vice, that where the Scottish people before had no knowledge nor understanding of fine fare or riotous surfeit, yet, after they had once tasted the sweet-poisoned bait thereof, there was no means to be found to restrain their liquorish desires. But to bewail that in words," he sagely adds, "which can not be amended in deeds, is but a folly."[1]

Malcolm had a family of six sons and two daughters: Edward, who died of his wounds at Alnwick a few days after his father; Etheldred, who entered the church; Edmund; Edgar; Alexander; David; Maud, the wife of Henry I, king of England; and Mary wife of Eustace, count of

[1] Holinshed, vol. v. p. 281.

Boulogne. They all, as it has been remarked, received English names, apparently after their mother's relations. All the children of Malcolm were under age at the time of their father's death. He was succeeded by his brother, Donald Bane.

Donald III Bane

[1093-1094-] brother of Malcolm, who had fled to the Hebrides on the death of his father, Duncan, and does not appear to have visited brother Malcolm at any period of his reign. As soon as he received intelligence of his brother's death, he hurried to Scotland with a powerful armament, collected in the western isles by the assistance of Magnus Barefoot, King of Norway,[1] and apparently with little opposition took possession of the throne. According to the Celtic law of succession, Donald as the eldest male of the royal family, was heir to the crown, and his pretensions were supported by a powerful party among the Scottish nobles, to whom the innovations of the last reign, and the preference shown to strangers, had been peculiarly obnoxious. The children of the late king were hastily conveyed to England, and placed in a state of security by their uncle Edgar Atheling.

The first edict of Donald Bane was a sentence of banishment against all the foreigners who had taken refute at the Scottish court - an ignorant and foolish attempt to arrest the progress of civilisation, and to bring back the country to the savages state of the western isles, in which his own life had been spent.[2] His triumph, however, was short-lived.

(Insert from Fordun Vol.2. Chap. XXI. p. 209), tells us, Donald the Red, or Donald Bane, the king's brother, having heard of Queen Margaret's death in the Castle of Maidens (Edinburgh), on the 16th of November, the fourth day after the king. Whereupon, while the holy queen's body was still in the castle where her happy soul had passed away to Christ, whom she had always loved, Donald the Red, or Donald Bane, the king's brother, having heard of her death, invaded the kingdom, at the head of a numerous band, and in hostilewise besieged the aforesaid castle, where he knew the king's rightful and lawful heirs were. But, forasmuch as that spot is in itself strongly fortified by nature, he thought that the gates only should be guarded, because it was not easy to see any other entrance or outlet. When those who were within understood this, being taught of God, through the merits, we believe, of the holy queen, they brought down her holy body by a postern on the western side. Some, indeed, tell us that, during the whole of that journey, a cloudy mist was round about all this family, and miraculously sheltered them from the gaze of any of their foes, so that nothing hindered them as they journeyed by land or by sea; but they brought her away, as she had herself before bidden them, and prosperously reached he place they wished - namely, the church of Dunfermline, where she now rests in Christ. And thus did Donald become by the kingdom, having ousted the true heirs. Meanwhile Edgar Atheling, brother to the just mentioned queen, fearing that it might be with his nephews as the common saying is, "Trust not the

[1] Fordun, lib. v. chap. xxvi. [2] Hailes's Annals, vol,. i. p. 49; Sax. Chron. pp. 199,200.

sharer of thy throne," thought it, therefore, safer to take them away for a time, than to intrust them to their uncle, tht they might reign with him; - for every one seeks a partner in sin, but no one does so in the kingship. Wherefore he gathered together the sons and daughters of the king and of the queen, his sister, and secretly bringing them over with him into England, sent them to be brought up by his kinsmen and acquaintances not openly, but in hiding, as it were. For he feared lest the Normans - who had, at that time, seized England - should try to bring evil upon him and his, seeing that the throne of England was their due by hereditary right; and though he had stayed there in secret as it were, for a short time, yet it was told the king that he was mixed up in treason ageist him. And thus what he dreaded befell him on this wise.

Duncan II

[1094 - 1094] Duncan* an illegitimate son of the late king,[1] who had been sent as a hostage to England, with the permission of William Rufus, collected a numerous force of English and Normans, expelled Donald from the country and took possession of the throne (May 1094,) whether in his own right or for the lawful family of Malcolm, does not clearly appear. After a reign of only a few months, Duncan was assassinated by Malpedir, the Maormor, or earl of the Mearns, in November 1094, at the instigation, it is alleged of Edmund, the second of the legitimate children of Malcolm Canmore who had entered into an agreement with his uncle, Donald Bane, to share the kingdom between them.[2]

After a rein of only a few months Duncan was assassinated by Malpedir, the Maormor, or Earl, of the Mearns, in November 1094, at the instigation. On the restoration of Donald II, the throne, his inhospitable edict for the exclusion of foreigners was strictly enforced and every effort was made to overthrow the measurers which his brother had taken for the civilization of the country. Matters remained in this state for more than two years.

Note: - From Fordun Vol.2. Chap. XXI. p. 213.
And thus after King Malcolm's death, so sad for the Scots, these two - Donald and Duncan, to wit - reigned five years between them. While these, then - namely Donald, Duncan, and Edgar, too - were struggling for the kingdom in this wise, the king of the Noricans (Northmen),

* (Duncan II, Eldest son of Malcolm III and his first wife Ingibiorg, of Orkney),who had been sent as a hostage to England, with the permission of William Rufus, collected a numerous force of English and Normans, expelled Donald from the country and took possession of the throne (May 1094,) whether in his own right, or for the lawful family of Malcolm does not clearly appear.)

[1] Annals, p. 49 note; Caledonia, vol. i. p. 422 . [2] Ibid. p. 423;l Fordun, lib. v. chap. xxviii.

Donald III & Edmund

[1094-1094] On the restoration of Donald to the throne, his inhospitable edict for Bane the expulsion of foreigners was strictly enforced, and every effort was made to overthrow the measures which his brother had taken for the civilization of the country. Matters remained in this state for more that two years till 1097. At strength in 1097, Edgar Atheling, along with his nephew Edgar, raised a powerful army in England, and marching against Donald, overcame him in battle, and having obtained possession of his person, imprisoned him and put out his eyes. William of Malmesbury states, that Edmund, the unworthy son of the pious Margaret, was condemned to perpetual imprisonment, for his accession to the murder of Duncan; that, during his captivity, he was touch with remorse, and in token of penitence for his guilt, ordered the fetters he had worn in his dungeon to be buried with him in his coffin.[1] Donald Bane died at Roscobie, in Forfarshire, and with him terminated the line of the Scottish kings.[2]

We are informed by the learned Chalmers,[3] that throughout the Scottish period, Scotland proper was divided into ten districts, exclusive of Lothian, Galloway, and Strathclyd. 1. FIFE, comprehending the country between the Forth and the Tay, below the Ochil Hills. Of this extensive district the celebrated Macduff was the Maormor. II. STRATHERN, including the country between the Forth and the Ochil Hills on the south and the Tay on the north. III. ATHOL and Stormont, comprehending the central highlands, lay between the Tay and Badenoch. IV. ANGUS, comprehending the country from the Tay and the Ila on the south, to the northern Esk upon the north. V. Mearns comprehended the district which lay between the North Esk and the Dee. Fenella, the inhospitable murderess of Kenneth III, was the wife of the Maormor of this district the daughter of the Maormor of Angus. VI. ABERDEEN and BANFF comprehended the extensive country between the Dee and the Spey. Greg, the Maormor of this district, occupied the Scottish throne from A.D. 882 to 893. VII. The extensive district of MORAY comprehended the country from the Spey to the Farar or Beauly, and reached, westward, to the limits of northern Argyle. The Maormor of Moray were person of great importance at that period, and the Moray men acted a conspicuous part in the bloody scenes of Scottish history. VIII. ARGYLE, which formed the ancient kingdom of the Scots, extended along the mainland of Scotland, from the Clyde to Ross, and comprehended the adjacent isles. IX the great district of Ross was composed of the counties of Ross and Cromarty. The powerful chiefs of this province were often engaged in bloody conflicts with the rapacious Norsemen. Macbeth seized his sceptre. X. SUTHERLAND and CAITHNESS formed a district which, at the end of the tenth century was governed by Sigurd, was Maormor of Ross-shire when he slew "gracious Duncan," and the Norwegian Earl of Orkney, and after him, by his son, Thornfinn, the grandson of Malcolm II. These districts, during the Scottish

1. William of Malmesbury, p. 158

2 It is worthy of notice, that John Comyn, the lord of Badenoch, during the great competition for the crown, claimed the succession as heir of Donald Bane, through the female line.

period, were connected by very slight ties. The inhabitants of each province possessed peculiar rights, followed their own customs, and were governed by their own chiefs or Maormors, who could not be appointed or displaced by the king; and there was scarcely any recognition of a supreme legislative body or authority having the power to make laws for the whole community. The authority of the king, though it was acknowledged, was often resisted, because it could not easily enforced.

To every careful student of the events and institutions of this period, it must be evident that he predominant people were the Celtic race. The laws were Celtic, the government Celtic, the titles of honour Celtic, the usage of manners Celtic, the church Celtic, the language Celtic. "If," says Chalmers,[1] "Malcolm Canmore, a Celtic prince who did not arrogate the character of a lawgiver, had been disposed to effect a considerable change in this Celtic system, he would have found his inclination limited by his impotence. The Scottish kings, during those times, seem not to have possessed legislative power. Whenever they acted as legislators, they appear to have had some coadjutors, either some Maormors, a term by which we are to understand the civil ruler of a district, or some bishop.[2] At a later period, when the children and grandchildren of Malcolm attempt to introduce new institutions and maxims of government in the provinces of Galloway and Moray so firmly attached were the people to their ancient customs and habits that the innovations gave rise to frequent insurrections.[3]

Mention had already been made of the residence of Donald Bane, in the Hebrides, and the powerful support which the inhabitants of these remote islands gave to him in is attempts upon the Scottish crown. It is evident that they had at this period little or no political connexion with the mainland of Scotland, but were under the domination of petty chiefs, where sometimes independent, and at other periods under the superiority of the kings of Norway.

During the early portion of the ninth century they suffered much from the depredations of the Norwegian pirates, whose incessant ravages were severely felt by the various religious communities scattered over the Western Islands. It appear from the Irish annals, that these fierce marauders not only laid waste the country, and plundered the monasteries of their treasures, but also carried off great numbers of captives both male and female, and sold them for slaves in the markets of Norway and Sweden. They had not as yet however effected any permanent settlement either in the isles or on the mainland of Scotland. But toward the latter end of the ninth century the number of these pirates was greatly increased by a revolution which had taken place in Norway. Harold Harfager, or the light-haired, after a protracted struggle obtained possession of the Norwegian throne,[4] and united the provinces of the Scandinavian peninsula into one monarchy.

[1] Caledonia, vol. i. p. 455 [2] Hailes's Annals, vol. i. p. 182. [3] Ibid.
[4] Torfæus, Hist. Norw. vol. ii. b. ii. chap. xii.; Skene's Highlanders, vol. i. p. 91.

*N*ote:- From Fordun Vol.2. Chap. XXI. p. 213 & 215) Now William, writing about the aforesaid Edmund says: - Of the sons of the king and Margaret, Edmund was the only one who fell away from goodness. Partaking of his uncle Donald's wickedness, he as privy to his brother Duncan's death, having forsooth, bargained with his uncle for half he kingdom. But being taken, and kept in fetters for ever, he sincerely repented; and, when at death's door, he bade them bury him in his chains, confessing that he was worthily punished or the crime of fratricide.
Donald reigned nine years and some months. Donald himself, indeed, was by taken prisoner, blinded, and doomed to perpetual imprisonment.

PART IV

SCOTO-SAXON PERIOD. A.D. 1097-1306.

Edgar

[1097-1107] the son of Malcolm Canmore, ascended the Scottish throne in 1097, while still a youth, and retained it till is death, on the 8th of January 1107. During his reign the country appears to have enjoyed tranquility both at home and abroad. The marriage of his sister Matildia, or Maud, to Henry Beauclerk, King of England, doubtless contributed to the maintenance of peace between the two countries, and the disposition of Edgar was little likely to provoke hostilities. "He was a sweet-tempered, amicable man," says Aldred, a contemporary chronicler, "in all tings resembling Edward the Confessor, mild in his administration, equitable and beneficent."[1] Edgar, dying without issue, was succeeded by his brother, Alexander I.

Alexander I
The Fierce

Alexander I, [1107-1124] son of Malcolm Canmore, who soon after his accession, the existing amity with England was strengthened by the marriage of Alexander with the Lady Sibilla, one of the numerous illegitimate daughters of Henry I. Such an alliance, Lord Haile remarks, was not held dishonourable in those days. The extent of Alexander's territorial dominions, however, was lessened by the separation of Cumberland, which Edgar, on his deathbed, had bequeathed to his youngest brother David. Alexander at first disputed the validity of the acquiesce; but, as David was supported both by the English barons and by Henry, he found himself obliged to acquiesce in the settlement.[1]

[1] Aldred, Gen. Reg. Angl. p. 367; Haile's Annals vol. i. p. 53.
2. Hailes's Annals, Vol. 1 p. 54, and note.

The leading event of Alexander's reign was the struggle which he maintained for the independence of the Scottish Church against the pretensions of the English archbishops. Turgot, a monk of Durham, and the confessor of the late Queen Margaret, had been appointed by Alexander to the bishopric of St Andrews, A.D. 1109, but his consecration was delayed for two years, in consequence of a dispute respecting the right of performing the ceremony. This privilege was claimed both by the Archbishop of Canterbury and of York, while the king and the Scottish clergy denied that it belonged to either. The dispute was on this occasion terminated by a compromise, which left the point unsettled.

On the death of Turgot, in 1115, the see remained vacant for five years. At length, in 1120, Eadmer, a monk of Canterbury, was appointed to the bishopric. The dispute concerning the right of consecration was immediately renewed, and the English prelates used every effort to obtain the recognition of their assumed authority over the clergy of Scotland. But Alexander steadily resisted their pretensions, and vindicated, with complete success, the freedom and independence of the Scottish church.

This contest lasted for fourteen years, and Alexander did not long survive its termination. He died on the 27th of April 1124, about two years after the death of his queen, who had brought him no issue. He is traditionally remembered by the epithet of the "Fierce," according to Wyntown, on account of the vigour and promptitude with which he quelled an insurrection of the Moraymen, and punished them for their rapine;[1] or rather, perhaps, as Lord Hailes supposes, from his imperious and passionate disposition.

The resolute manner in which he maintained the rights and privileges of the Scottish church shows him to have been possessed of undaunted courage, and great firmness of character. "He was humble and courteous to the clergy," says a contemporary writer, "but to the rest of his subjects terrible beyond measure; high-spirited, always endeavouring to compass things beyond is power; (he does not appear , however, to have ever been foiled in any of his undertakings); not ignorant of letters, zealous in establishing churches, collecting relics, and providing vestments and books for the clergy; liberal even to profusion, and taking delight in the offices of charity to the poor."[1]

On the death of Alexander, David his brother, the youngest son of Malcolm Canmore and Margaret, ascended the throne.

David I

David I, [1124-1153] youngest son of Malcolm Canmore and Margaret, he ascended the throne, having passed his youth at the court of his sister in England, "his manners," says Malmesbury, "were polished from the rust of Scottish barbarity;" while his possession of Cumberland, bequeathed to him by his brother Edgar, had accustomed him to the cares and labours of administration, and had made him acquainted with the moe advanced civilization and the better regulated government of the sister country. He had also, before his accession to the throne,

[1] Aldred, Gen. Angl. p. 368.

married an English wife, Matilda, the daughter of Waltheof, Earl of Northumberland, and the widow of Simon de St Liz, Earl of Northampton. On the separation of Cumberland, from the Scottish kingdom, the king ceased to be an English baron; and accordingly it papers that Alexander never attended at the English court. But David, both by his tenure of the earldom of Cumberland, and of the earldom of Huntingdon in right of his wife, was bound to pay homage to the English king; and accordingly, when Henry I, in 1127, summoned the clergy and nobles of his realm to swear that they would maintain the rights of his daughter Matilda as heir to the throne, David was present at the assembly, and was the first who took the oath.

While David was residing at the court of Henry, Angus, Earl of Moray, rose in rebellion against him, and claimed the crown as the lineal descendant of Kenneth III, the son of Duff, the eldest son of Malcolm I, while David was descended from Kenneth II, the youngest Son of Malcolm I. David was zealous supported by the martial barons of Northumberland, and at the head of a numerous army he marched against the northern insurgents, and overthrew them at Stracathrow, in Forfarshire, A.D. 1130.[1]

On the death of Henry, in 1135,his nephew Stephen, Earl of Boulogne, in spite of his oath to maintain the settlement of succession made by his uncle, deposed Matilda, and forcibly seized the English crown. David, however, was faithful to his engagements, and immediately led an army into England, and, taking possession of the[1] whole country to the north of Durham, excepting the castle of Bamborough, compelled the northern barns to swear fealty to Matilda, his niece, and to give hostages for the performance of their oath.[2] When the news of this inroad was brought to Steepen, he said, "What the king of Scots has gained by stealth, I will manfully recover." He immediately collected a powerful army and marched to Durham. On the approach of Stephen, David finding himself deserted by the English barons, who had sworn to maintain the pretensions of Matilda, retreated to Newcastle. A compromise was ultimately effected, (Feb. 1136,) by which David consented to withdraw his troops, and to restore the country of which he had taken possession; while Stephen engaged to confer upon Henry, Prince of Scotland, David's eldest son the earldom of Huntingdon, with the towns of Carlisle and Doncaster, and promised not to make any grant of the earldom of Northumerland, until the claim of Prince Henry to that earldom, in right of his mother was heard and determined. For these possessions Prince Henry did homage to Stephen; but David himself refused to do so, although still retaining the earldom of Cumberland in his own hands.

The war was however renewed before the end of the same year, by David, on the ground that Stephen had refused or delayed to put Prince Henry in possession of Northumberland; but in reality, in consequence of a confederacy with the partisans of Matilda, to eject her rival from the throne. Stephen was at that time in Normandy; but though the efforts of Thurstan, the age Archbishop of York, David

[1] Chron. Melrose, p. 105. [2] Hailes's Annals, vol. i. p. 77.

consented to a cessation of hostilities till the English monarch should return to England. But Stephen, on his return, having rejected the demands of David, the truce was at once broken off, and the Scottish king again entered Northumberland (A.D.1137), and ravaged the country with merciless barbarity. The English historians impute these shocking excesses, not to the leaders of the Scots of those moderation they give some examples, but to the soldiers, who were composed , they tell us, of Normans, Germans, and Angles, of Northumbrians and Cumbrians, the men of Teviotdale and Lothian, the Picts, or Galwegians, and Scots.[1]

As for the king of Scots himself, says an old chronicler, "he as a prince of a mild and merciful disposition; but the Scots were a barbarous and impure nation; and their king, leading hordes of them from the remotest parts of that land, was unable to restrain their wickedness." "They exercised their barbarity in the manner of wild beasts," says another contemporary writer, "sparing neither sex nor age, nor so much as the child in the womb." On the approach of Stephen, in the beginning of the following year David deemed it advisable to fall back upon Roxburgh, where he took up a strong position and waited the approach of the English king. Stephen, however, having, it is said, discovered that some of the leader of his army had a secret understanding with the enemy, avoided the snare laid for him, and, after laying waste the Scottish borders, hastily returned to the south.

David re-entered Northumberland in March 1138, with the main body of his army, sending at the same time his nephew William, at the head of a body of Galloway men. into the west of England, where he defeated a considerable body of English, near Clitherow (4th June), and carried off a great quantity of plunder. Meanwhile, David laid siege to the strong castle of Norham, which Ralph Flambard, Bishop of Durham, had erected in 1121, to repress the inroads of the Scottish borders. Norham surrendered, after a feeble resistance, and David, having dismantled the fortress, marched forward, through Northumberland and Durham, to Northallerton, in Yorkshire, without opposition. Stephen was so hard pressed by the partisans of Matilda in the south, that he could offer no effective opposition to the invaders, whose numbers exceeded twenty-six thousand, and were composed of all the various races now united under the sway of the Scottish king. The inhabitants, of the northern counties were therefore left to their own resources, and they succeeded, chiefly by the efforts of the aged Archbishop of York, in collecting an army, though less numerous than that of the Scots. It consisted however, of all the nobility and gentry of the northern counties, and was under the command of William Peveril, Gilbert and Walter de Lacy, and especially of Walter I'Espee, an aged warrior of great experience and reputation. The venerable Thurstan bestowed his blessing upon the soldiers, and the remission of their sins;

[1] R. of Hexham, p. 216; I. of Hexham. p. 260. Gesta Stephen. It is worthy of notice, that this is the lst time the Picts of Galloway are mentioned in history. It appears that a considerable body of the Pictish nation had remained in that district, and up to this date had preserved their national peculiarities.

assured them of victory if they were penitent; and promised eternal happiness to all who should fall in battle "in defence of Christ's Church against the barbarians."

The English army was drawn up on Cutton Moor, in the neighbourhood of Northallerton. Here they erected a remarkable standard consisting of the mast of a ship fastened in a four-wheeled car. At the top of the mast a large crucifix was displayed, having in its centre a silver box containing a consecrated host, and lower down were suspended the banners of St Peter of York, St John of Beverley, and St Wilfred of Ripon. From this standard the engagement which ensued derived the name of "The Battle of the Standard." The Scots, whose ensign was a lance, with a sprig of heather wreathed around it, advanced toward the enemy in several divisions. The van guard, commanded by Prince Henry, consisted of the men of Lothian and Teviotdale, of border troopers from Liddesdale and Cumberland, and of the fierce and barbarous "Scots of Galloway," reinforced by a small body-guard of men-at-arms, under the command of Eustace Fitz-John, a Norman baron. Next came the Highlanders and the Islesman, armed only with their small round target and the claymore. After these marched the king, with a strong body of Saxon and Norman knights and men-at-arms, and the rear-guard consisted of a mixed body from Moray and other parts of the country. Many of the Scottish soldiers were very imperfectly armed and equipped, and were, therefore, unequally matched with the well-appointed men-at-arms who composed the great body of the English army.

David endeavoured to take the English by surprise, and, favoured by a dense fog, which concealed his advance, he succeeded in reaching the moor on which they were posted before they received the tidings of his approach. The alarm was suddenly given, and the English ran to arms in great disorder. To gain time at the critical conjuncture, and probably also actuated by a sincere desire to prevent farther hostilities, the English leaders sent to the Scottish army Robert de Bruce Earl of Annandale, and Bernard de Baliol, two barons of Norman descent, who held lands both in Scotland and England, to offer, as conditions of peace, to procure from Stephen a grant of the earldom of Northumberland in favour of Prince Henry. Bruce, who was far advanced in years had a high reputation for wisdom and eloquence, and during a long residence in Scotlands, had lived on terms of the closest friendship with David. He represented to his old master, the impolicy of the war which he was carrying on against his former allies and urged upon him the duty of putting a stop to the horrible outrages of the Scottish army, which were a violation of all the laws of humanity and religion. "I charge your conscience," said he, "with the innocent blood which cries aloud for vengeance. You have beheld the enormities of your army, you have mourned for them, you have openly disclaimed any approbation of them. Prove now the sincerity of your protestations and withdraw your people from a war disgraceful in all its operations, and dubious in the event. We are not mighty in numbers, but we are determined; urge not brave men to despair. To see my dearest master, my patron and my benefactor my friend and

companion in arms, with whom I spent the season of youth and festivity, in whose service I am grown old, - to see him thus exposed to the dangers of battle, or to the dishonour of flight, it wrings my heart."[1] At these words he burst into tears. David was deeply moved by the tears and expostulations of his old friend and companion in arms, but he nevertheless rejected his proposals. Bruce, in receiving this answer, and hearing himself denounced as a traitor by William Mac Donochy, the king's nephew, renounced his allegiance to the Scottish crown; Baliol also gave up the fealty which he had once sworn to David, and returned with all haste to the English army, to warn them of the approach of the Scots.

David had resolved to place the men-at-arms and the archers in the van, but that post of honour was claimed by the Galwegians who maintained that, by ancient custom, the privilege of commencing the conflict belonged to them. The men-at-arms were, for the most part, English and Normans, who had abandoned their native country, and taken refuge at the court of the Scottish king, and the disputes between them and the half-naked clans threatened the most disastrous consequences. "Whence come this mighty confidence in those Normans?" said Malise, Earl of Strathern, to the king; "I wear no armour, but there is not one among them that will advance beyond me this day." "Rude earl," said Allan de Percy, a Norman knight, "you boast of what you dare not do." The altercation was repressed by the interposition of the king, who unwillingly yielded to the demands of the Gallowaymen, and placed them in the van, under their chiefs, William Mac Donochy Ulrick, and Dovenald. The second division consisted of the men-at-arms, the archers, and he men of Cumberland and Teviotdale, under the command of Prince Henry, with whom was associated Eustace Fitz-John, a powerful and valiant Northumbrian baron, whom Stephen had offended by depriving him of the important fortress of Bamborough. The third body was composed of the men of Lothian, with the islanders and the Highland Caterans. The king himself commanded the reserve, consisting of the Scots properly so called, and the inhabitants of Moray. The English were drawn up in one compact body around the sacred standard. The men-at-arms dismounted and sent their horses to the rear; and, mingling with the archers, ranged themselves in the front of the battle.

The Bishop of Orkney as the representative of the aged Thurstan, delivered an energetic speech for the encouragement of the troops; and assured them that those who fell in this holy war should immediately pass into Paradise. The venerable Walter I'Espee also ascended the carriage in which the holy standard was fixed, and harangued the soldiers, reminding them of the glory of their ancestors and of the barbarities perpetrated by the Scottish invaders. "Your cause is just; it is for our all that you combat. I swear," said he, grasping the hand of the Earl of Albemarle, "I swear that on this day I will overcome the

[1] The speech of Bruce, which contains many curious facts, is reported at full length by Aldred; and, as he was not only a contemporary, but was honoured with the peculiar confidence of David, we may presume that it is substantially accurate. See Hailes's Annals vol. i. p. 87; Aldred, De Bello Standardi, pp. 337 - 345.

Scots, or perish!" "So swear we all!" exclaimed the barons assembled around him.[1]

The Scots advanced to the attack, shouting their war-cry, Albanich! Albanich"[2] The Gallowaymen charged the English infantry so fiercely, that their front ranks were thrown into disorder; but the English archers came to the assistance of the spearmen, and overwhelmed the Scots with incessant and well-directed showers of arrows. Prince Henry advanced to their support, and, at the head of the cavalry, charged and broke through the English ranks, says Aldred, as if they had been cobwebs, and dispersed the troops which guarded the horses in the rear. The Gallowaymen, though they had lost their leaders, Ulrick and Dovenald, rallied and prepared to renew the combat, which had now continued for two hours with the greatest fury. at this critical moment, an English soldier, elevating on the point of his spear the head of one f the slain, proclaimed it the head of the King of Scots. A sudden panic seized the Scottish forces; the Gallowaymen threw away their arms, and the troops forming the third division of the army also fled without resistance. David promptly brought up the reserve, and strove to retrieve the fortune of the day, but without effect. The terror and confusion became general; and the knights and men-at-arms who attended on the king, seeing that the battle was irretrievably lost, constrained him to retire from the field. He succeeded, however, in rallying around the royal standard a strong body of troops, which covered the retreat, and checked the pursuit of the enemy. In this memorable battle, which was fought on the 22nd of August, 1138, the Scots are said to have lost 10,000 men.

Three days after the engagement, David reached Carlisle with the remains of his army, and employed himself in collecting and re-organizing his scattered troops, which had fallen into a state of confusion bordering on mutiny. For some days he was in a state of uncertainty respecting the fate of his gallant son, who carried away by his impetuosity, had pursued too far the troops whom he had routed. On his return from the chase of the fugitives, the Prince, finding the battle lost, commanded his men to throw away their banners, and mingling with the pursuers, he passed through the horses ranks undiscovered, and after many hazards, succeeded in reaching Carlisle the third day after the king his father.

An assembly of the prelates and nobles was held at Carlisle, by Alberic, Bishop of Ostia, the papal legate, who earnestly entreated the Scottish king to listen to overtures of peace. He also persuaded the save Galwegians to restore their female captives, and induced the whole Scottish army to enter into a solemn engagement that they would not in future violate churches, nor murder old men, women, and children[1] - a circumstance which affords conclusive proof of the ferocity of the troops, and of the barbarity with which the war had been carried on.

[1] Hailes, vol. i. p.90.

[2] That is, "We are the men of Albyn!" - the most ancient name of Scotland. This war-cry, of course, asserted tht the Galwegians were the most ancient inhabitants of Scotland; in other words, the descendants of the Picts or ancient Caledonians. When they were repulsed, the English shouted in derision, "Erygh! Erygh!" - Ye are but Irish! Ye are but Irish! - alluding to that part of the Galwegians who, though ranked among the Picts, were yet wild Scots of Irish extraction.

Meantime, the victors at Northallerton were not in a condition to follow up the advantage they had gained, and the Scottish army soon re-assumed the offensive by laying siege to the castle of Wark, which they reduced by famine; and David, having razed the fortress, "returned into Scotland," says Lord Hailes, "more like a conqueror than like one whose army had been routed." Peace was soon after concluded (9th April 1139) though the mediation of the legate and of Stephen's wife, Maud, who was David's niece. The terms granted by Stephen were highly favourable to the Scottish king, and showed that, though defeated, he was not humbled. The earldom of Northumberland with the exception of the two fortresses of Newcastle and Bamborough, was ceded to Prince Henry. As an equivalent for these castles, he obtained a grant of lands in the south of England. The Northumbrian barons were to hold their estates of the Prince of Scotland, reserving their fealty to Stephen; and in return, David and all his people became bound to maintain an inviolable peace with England, and gave the sons of five earls as hostages to Stephen for their performance of this part of the treaty.[2] These conditions of peace were arranged at Durham; and Prince Henry, proceeding southward with the English queen met Stephen at Nottingham, and there ratified the negotiation. The prince, who, "by his noble and generous carriage," says an English chronicler, "had so won the heart of Stephen, that he loved him no less than if he had been his own son," accompanied the English king to the siege of Ludlow Castle, which was held out against him by the adherents of Matilda, Prince Henry was unhorsed by the besieged, but was gallantly rescued by Stephen.

In 1114, the cause of Matilda was for a short time triumphant, and David repaired to the court of his niece, and vainly endeavoured to persuade her to follow his mild and wise counsels. Her haughty demeanour, and violent measures, speedily alienated from her the affections of the people. The Londoners rose up in arms against her. She fled precipitately from the capital and, accompanied by her uncle, took refuge in the royal castle of Winchester, where she was besieged by Stephen, and from which she with great difficulty effected her escape. David accompanied her in her flight, and was indebted for his concealment, and his safe conveyance home to his own country, to the exertions to a young man, named David Oliphant, to whom he had been godfather, and who was at that time serving in the army of Stephen.

From this period David seems to have given his almost exclusive attention to the affairs of his own kingdom. The tranquility of the country was disturbed for a considerable time by the pretentious of an adventure, named Wimund, who, it is alleged, had been a monk, first in the abbey of Furness, and afterwards in the Isle of Man, but claimed to be the son of Angus Earl of Moray, slain at Stracathow, in 1130. Having succeeded in collecting some vessels, he began to make piratical excursions among the western isles. Many persons of

[1] R. of Hexham. p. 326; I. of Hexham. p. 264. Annals, vol. i. p.93.

[2] Annals, vol. i. p. 95, and note.

desperate fortunes espoused his cause, and he obtained in marriage the daughter of Somerled, Thane of Argyle, who either from policy, or from a belief in the justice of his claims favoured his enterprise. Wimund next invaded the mainland of Scotland, slew many of the inhabitants, and pillaged the country. For several years he carried on his depredations successfully, and constantly eluded the forces sent against him, either by concealing himself and his followers amid the dense forests which covered the country, or by retreating to his ships. Strange to say, the Scottish king was at length obliged, in order to put an end to the outrages of this daring and crafty adventurer, to enter into terms of accommodation with him, and to bestow on him a certain territory together with the government of the abbey of Furness, in which he had passed his earlier years. His insolent and arbitrary conduct however, excited an insurrection against his authority and he people took him prisoner, and put out his eyes. He passed the remainder of his strangely chequered life in the abbey of Biland, in Yorkshire. His audacious spirit, however, appears not to have been depressed, or even humbled, by his calamities. He took great delight in relating his adventures to the friars at Biland; and is reported to have said, "Had they but left me the smallest glimmering of light my enemies should have had no cause to boast of what they did."[1]

The remaining years of the reign of this wise and just monarch were peaceful and prosperous. Relieved, both from foreign wars and from internal disturbances, he applied himself assiduously to the improvement of the country, by the encouragement of agriculture and of manufactures, the establishment of towns, the erection of churches monasteries and other public buildings, and the enactment of judicious and equitable laws.

Aldred represents him as cultivating and encouraging every art that tended to soften and civilize his subjects. He speaks of his attention to his gardens, buildings, and orchards, that he might, by his example, induce his people to follow the like pursuits. He represents him as employing some art of his time, even in the last year of his life, either in planting herbs or grafting shoots and mentions the improvements made by him in agriculture, so that a country formerly indigent and barren, was now able, out of its abundance, to supply the necessities of its neighbours. He enumerates the towns and castles which David erected the foreign commodities he had introduced by commerce, and the improvements thence made on the dress of his subject. Lastly, he celebrates the reformation made on the morals, both of the clergy and people, and the beneficial effects which the instructions and example of the king exercised upon all classes of the community.[2]

It is assumed by some writers, that the establishment of incorporated bodies in Scotland, for the promotion of trade land commerce, is to be ascribed to the wise and far-seeing policy of David. It was during his reign tht Louis le Gros introduced these institutions into France, and in some of the ancient copies of the old Scottish laws, it is stated that David framed his burgh laws from the information furnished by certain learned men, whom he sent to other countries to observe the constitutions that had been there introduced.[3]

The death of the excellent monarch was probably hastened by that of his son Henry, which took place on the 12th of June, 1152, to the great of his countrymen, wo had formed high anticipations of the benefits to be conferred by his accession to sovereign power. Aldred, who had lived with him from childhood, and knew him intimately, says that he resembled his father in all tings, except that he had a somewhat greater suavity of manner, and that he was a son in all respects worthy of such a father. Prince Henry left by his wife Ada, a daughter of the Earl of Warenne and Surrey three sons; Malcolm who succeeded his grandfather; William surnamed the Lion; and David Earl of Huntingdon; and three daughters. The afflicted monarch roused himself form his grief to provide for the succession of his grandson, Malcolm, a child in his twelfth year. He ordered the youthful prince to be proclaimed heir to the crown, and sent him on a progress through his dominions, to receive the homage of the barons and the people. He also settled his Northumbrian territories on his grandson William, and presented the boy to the barons of that province as their future ruler, and required them to promise obedience to his authority. Having completed these prudent arrangements, the aged king, within a year followed his son to the grave. He died at Carlise on the 24th of May 1153. In striking and beautiful consistency with his life, he was found dead in an attitude of devotion. "His death had been so tranquil," says Aldred, "that you would not have believed he was dead. He was found with his hands clasped devoutly upon his breast, in the very posture in which he seems to have been raising them to heaven."

The remarkable liberality of David to the church was highly extolled by the monkish historians his contemporaries, and has been as severely censured in later times. "Had David duly considered," says Major, "the number of religious houses founded by his predecessors the parsimony wherein churchmen, especially monks, ought to live, and the little allowance made by the Scots to their kings in those times, he would not lavishly have given the crown lands to nourish the sensuality of bishops and spoil the devotion of monks."[1] To which Buchanan adds, that, "as in bodies too corpulent, the use of the members in some measure ceases, so wit, oppressed by plenty began to languish, learning became nauseous, piety superstition, and vice was taught in the schools of virtue."[2] These complaints respecting the donations which David bestowed upon the clergy, were summed up in the pithy saying of James, the first of that name king of Scotland, that David "was ane soir sanct (sore saint) for the crown."[3] But it has been justly remarked by Lord Hailes, "that we ought to judge of the conduct of men according to the notions of their age, not of ours. To endow monasteries may now be considered as a prodigal superstition, but in the days of David I, it was esteemed an act of pious beneficence."

[1] W. Newbr. vol. i. chap. xxiv.; Fordun, lib. viii. chap. ii; Hailes's Annals, vol. i. p. 100. Fordun calls this adventurer Malcolm M'Heth. It is worthy of notice, however, tht Mr Gregory, a high authority on questions of this kind, states that the claim of Wimund seems, on minute inquiry to have been well funded. See History of the Western Highlands and Isles, p. 15.

[2] Aldred ap. Fordun, lib. v. chap. xlix., lii, liii. [3] Ridpath's Border History, p. 88.

Much may be urged, too, in justification of this beneficence; and it may fairly be questioned whether any course could have been followed, better fitted to promote the civilization of a people just emerging from barbarism, as the Scots were at this period, then the erection, in all part so the country, of these monastic establishments, which were, at the outset, not only seminaries of piety but of learning, for training men of business for the service of the state, as well as men of letters for the church; and which, moreover, served as a kind of general reservoirs for diffusing a knowledge of architecture, of agriculture, and gardening, and other useful arts. No doubt, in process of time, many monasteries became the sets of sloth, ignorance, and debauchery, but candour should forbid us to ascribe accidental and unforeseen evils to the virtuous founder.[1]

David, however, had many other estimable qualities, besides his liberality to the church. He was at all times accessible to all classes of his subjects; his apartments were always open to suitors, for he had nothing secret but his counsels, says Aldred. On certain days of he week he sat at the gate of his palace, for the purpose of hearing and deciding the causes brought before him by the poor. He took great pains also to make them understand the reasons, and to convince them of the justice of his decisions; for, says Aldred, "they often argued with him, and he with them, when he refused to accept the person of the poor in judgment, contrary to justice, and they were very reluctant to acknowledge the equity of his decision when adverse to their claims." His custom as to dismiss all his attendants at sunset, and to retire for solitary meditation. At daybreak he resumed his labours. He was fond of hunting, but he never permitted this amusement to interfere with the discharge of his duties. "I have seen him," says Aldred, "quit his horse, and dismiss his hunting equipage, when any even of the meanest of his subjects, implored an audience."[2] So estimable, in a word, was the character of this excellent monarch and so faithfully did he discharge the duties of his office, that Buchanan, who was no flatterer of princes, declares, that "he equalled all former kings in military science, and excelled them in the arts of peace; in so much, that if he best heads and greatest wits should set themselves to frame the character of an accomplished prince, they could never devise nor imagine such an one as he did express himself in the whole course of his life."[3]

The tide of Saxon colonization had, as we have seen, steadily set in during the three preceding reigns, but it flowed still more copiously after the accession of David to the Scottish throne. His education at the court of Henry I, his marriage to an English countess, and his long residence in England, had made him extremely partial to the institutions, manners, and customs of that country; and great numbers of Saxon, Norman, and Flemish settlers were attracted to his court, where they received a cordial welcome and munificent grants of land.

[1] Major de Gestis, Scot. lib. iii. chap. xi. p. 105.

[2] Rer. Scot. lib. vii. p. 120.

[3] Bellenden, fol. 185.

Among the Northumbrian nobles who sought an asylum in Scotland from the vengeance of William the Conqueror, were the powerful Earl Gospatric, the founder of the great family of the Earls of March; Arkel, the progenitor of the Earls of Lennox; and Siward, the founder of a distinguished family, which terminated in an heiress, who carried the estates to the Maxwells. Among the Anglo-Normans who settled in North Britain during the reign of David, the most eminent was Hugh de Moreville, the Constable of Scotland, who acquire vast possessions in Lauderdale, the Lothians, and Ayrshire, and was the original founder of Dryburgh Abbey. The ancestor of the Riddells came from Yorkshire before 1116, and settled in Roxburghshire, of which he was one of the earliest sheriffs. The Corbets, a Shropshire family acquired lands in Teviotdale about the same period. The Lindsays came from Essex, and obtained from David, a grant of estates in upper Clydesdale and in the Lothians. The ancestor of the Somervilles was the second son of a Norman baron, who came over with the Conqueror, and obtained from him lands in Staffordshire and Gloucestershire. The Umphravilles came from Redesdale in Northumberland. The Maxwells are descended from Maccus the son of Unwyn, who attached himself to David before his accession to the throne; as did the ancestor of the family of de Sules, or de Soulis who followed him from Northamptonshire into Scotland, and was rewarded by grant of Liddesdale and other lands, both in Teviotdale and in Lothian. His descendant, Nicolas de Soulis, was one of the competitors for the crown with Baliol and Bruce, in 1290, and the whole family seem to have been involved in the ruinous effects of that memorable contest. The ancestor of the Oliphants, as we have seen, accompanied David in his flight from Winchester, in 1142, and was rewarded by a grant of the manors of Smailholm and Crailing, in Roxburghshire. The ancestor of the noble family of Seton was a Norman, named de Say, who obtained from David lands in East Lothian designated from him Say-ton, which his descendants assumed as their surname. The Keiths, Earls Marischal, are descended from Hervei, the son of Warin, who received from David, a grant of the manor of Keith in East Lothian. The progenitors of the Maules and Melvilles, the de Quincies, Berkeleys, Herrieses, Cunninghams, Lockharts, Ramsays Falconers, Rollos, Colvilles, Gordons, Grahams, Rosses, Sinclairs, Frasers, and many other families celebrated in Scottish history, sprung from Anglo-Norman lineage, and settled in Scotland during the twelfth century. The ancestor of the Hays was an Anglo-Norman, who acted as Pincerua to Malcolm IV, and to William the Lion, in the early art of his reign. The progenitor of the Ruthvens was Thor, a Danish chief, who came from the north of England, and settled in Scotland under David I. Radulph the founder of the Kinnaird family, obtained from William the Lion, before the year 1184, the lands of Kinnaird in the Carse of Gowrie. The Kers are a branch of an Anglo-Norman family, which

[1] Hailes's Annals, vol. i. p. 115.

[2] Aldred apud Fordun, lib. v. c. xlix; Hailes's Annals, vol. i. p. 10.

[3] Rer. Scot. lib. vii. p. 122. Vol. i.

settled in Roxburghshire during the thirteenth century. The powerful family of the Cumyns, which acted so conspicuous a part in the wars of Bruce and Baliol, came from Northumberland during the reign of David I. A younger son of the is family held the office of chancellor from 1133 to 1142. Bernard de Baliol, the founder of the Baliol family, came from Barnard Castle in Durham, and was a courtier of David I. Robert de Bruis or Bruce, the founder of the illustrious family of Bruce, was an opulent Yorkshire baron, who received from King David his friend and companion in arms, a grant of Annandale. The royal family of the Stuarts are descended from Walter the son of Alan, a Shropshire baron who obtained from David I, and his successors Malcolm IV, extensive possessions and a high offices. The progenitors of the immortal patriot Wallace settled under the Stuarts in Renfrewshire and Ayrshire. The Hamiltons derived their descent from the two younger son of Robert, Earl of Leicester, the grandson of one of the barons who came over with the Conqueror. Their settlement in Scotland took pace during the reign of William the Lion. During the same reign, the Dundasses, Grays Mortimers, Mowbrays, Gourlays, Anstruthers, Montfichets or Muschets, Bissets, Cheynes, and Grants, all of Anglo-Norman lineage, settled in Scotland. The ancestors of the great family of the Campbells obtained a settlement in Argyle, as early as the twelfth century by marrying the heiress of O'Dubhin, a Gaelic chief, with whom he obtained Lochow. His descendants Sir Nigel Campbell, who married Mary, the sister of Robert Bruce, joined that hero at the outset of his enterprise, and adhered to him in prosperity and in adversity, till his final triumph at Bannockburn. Not a few of the most eminent families in Scotland are of Flemish origin. The Sutherlands, Morays, Douglasses Leslies, Flemings, Inneses, and many other all owe their descent to Flemish ancestors. the Flemings, indeed, were the most enterprising race of the twelfth century, and all classes of them settled in every district of North Britain, especially in the towns and hamlets. So great was the number of Flemings who settled in Scotland at this period, that they obtained the right to be governed by their own laws. The illustrious family of the Douglases are derived from "Theobald, the Fleming," who, between 1147 and 1160, obtained from Arnold the Abbot of Kelso, the grant of some lands on the Douglas Water in Lanarkshire. Bartholomew, a Flemish chief who settled in the district of Gairoch, Aberdeenshire, was the ancestor of the Leslies. Another Flemish chief, named Freskin, obtained from David the lands of Strathbrock in West Lothian and at a later date, after the suppression of an insurrection among the turbulent inhabitants of Morayshire, was progenitor both of the Earls of Sutherland, and of the celebrated family of Moray one of whom, the gallant Sir Andrew, was the associate of Wallace and of Bruce, whose sister, Christian, he married, "Such," says Chalmers, "were the Anglo-Saxon, Anglo-Norman, and Anglo-Belgic families, who were the

[1] Caledonia, vol. i. book iv. chap. 1.

principal settlers among the Gaelic people of Scotland, during this period of her annals; such were the men who governed Scotland throughout the Scoto-Saxon period, who formed her constitution and administered her laws, who established her church transmitted her authorities, who vindicated her rights and restored her independence."[1] David was succeeded by his grandson Malcolm IV.

Malcolm IV
The Maiden

[1153-1165] grandson of David, a youth only in his twelfth year. This was the first of the minorities which were of such frequent occurrence in the government of Scotland, and was attended with not a few of he calamities which usually fall upon the nation "whose kings is a child." The old Celtic law of succession was now again in opposition to the Saxon rule. According to the former, the true heir of the throne was William, termed the Boy of Egremont, the son of William Fitz-Duncan, and grandson of Duncan, who was Malcolm Canmore's eldest son.[1] His claims were supported by no less than seven earls - of whom the principal were the earls of Strathern, Ross and Orkney - and by the great body of the Celtic inhabitants of the country. But notwithstanding the powerful support given to the Boy of Egremont, this attempt; like every other, to re-establish the old law of succession, failed of success, and the Celtic race were obliged to submit to the sway of the Saxon kings of the family of Malcolm Canmore, and to the prowess of the Saxon and Norman barons whom their prudent policy attracted to the Scottish court.

A few months after Malcolm's accession, the tranquility of the country was disturbed by the invasion of Somerled, the powerful chief of the Isles, whose daughter or sister, as we have seen, had married the adventurer Wimund, or Malcolm Mac Heth, the alleged son of Angus, Earl of Moray,[2] The events of this war, which lasted for several years are unknown; but in 1157, the contest was brought to a close by treaty, which was considered, so important, as to form an epoch, from which royal charters were dated.[3] About this time, also, occurred Malcolm's first transaction with the English king. Eight years before this, Hendry had an interview with David, at Carlisle, and received from him the honour of knighthood. On that occasion he made oath, that if ever he attained the English crown, he would restore Newcastle to the Scottish king, and cede to him and his heirs for ever the whole territory between Tyne and Tweed. Instead of performing this solemn engagement, however, Henry now demanded he restitution of those territories which Malcolm already held n England. An interview between the monarchs took place at Chester, and Malcolm young and inexperienced either overreached by the superior cunning of the English king, or betrayed by the treachery of his counsellors, whom Henry had corrupted,[4] not

1 The Boy of Egremont died in his nonage; his connexion with this insurrection has not been very clearly established.

2 Hailes's Annals, vol. i. p. 118. 3 Sir James Dalrymple's Collections, p. 425.

4 Fordun, lib. viii. c. iii. 5 R Hovenden, p. 491; Hailes's Annals, vol. i. p. 120.

only relinquished his claim to the territory to the north of the Tyne, but also abandoned to England his whole possessions in the northern counties and received in return the earldom of Huntingdon, which Hendry appears to have taken from Malcolm's younger brother, David, to whom it had been bequeathed by the late king.[5] Malcolm is stated, at this same time, to have performed homage to Henry in the same manner as his grandfather had done to Henry I, "reserving all his dignities."

This stop produced deep and universal discontent among Malcolm's subjects. The following year (1158), he repaired to the English court at Carlisle, with the view of receiving the honour of knighthood from Henry. But this interview ended in a quarrel, and Malcolm returned home in disgust, without having obtained the coveted distinction. He seems, however, to have been bent on procuring the object of his ambition, at whatever cost; and when Henry set out on his expedition for the recovery of Toulouse, in 1159, Malcolm went with him to France, and was knighted by him there.

The Scottish nobles and people, however, were indignant at the conduct of their king, in forgetting his station as an independent prince, and fighting under the banner of the English monarch; and they sent a deputation into France to remonstrate against this desertion of his duty on the part of their sovereign. "We will not," said the deputies, "have Henry to rule over us." Malcolm was constrained to comply with their wishes and to return with all haste to his own dominions. The supporters of the Boy of Egremont seem to have regarded this as a favourable opportunity for urging his claims; and while Malcolm was holding a great council at Perth.[1] Ferquhard, or Feretach, Earl of Strathern, and five other earls conspired to seize the person of their sovereign and assaulted the tower in which he had taken refuge; but a reconciliation was effected by the intervention of the clergy.

"The intentions of these noblemen," says the continuator of Fordun, "were not traitorous or selfish, but singly directed to the welfare of the state."[2] At this critical period, also a formidable insurrection broke out in Galloway; partly, it would appear, from the jealousy with which the Celtic inhabitants of the district viewed the introduction of Saxon settlers, and Saxon laws and customs. Malcolm promptly led an army against the insurgents, but was twice repulsed by them. With characteristic intrepidity he attached them a third time, and obtained a complete victory. Fergus, the Lord of Galloway submitted to the authority of Malcolm, gave his son, Uchtred, as a hostage, and assumed the habit of a canon-regular in the Abbey of Holyrood, where he died in 1161.[3]

The turbulent inhabitants of the province of Moray "whom says Fordun, "no solicitations or largesses could allure, no treaties or oaths could bind to their duty," like the men of Galloway were indignant at the intrusion of foreign settlers and the introduction of foreign

[1] Chron Mel. 1160 [2] Fordun, lib. viii. c. iv.

[3] Ibid.; Chron. 8. S. Crucis; Hailes, vol. i. p. 124.

manners. They had often rebelled against the Scottish government, and at this juncture they once more raised the standard of revolt, "in support of their native principles, and in defence of their ancient laws." After a violent struggle, Malcolm finally succeeded in suppressing the rebellion, and completely crushed the powerful family which had hitherto possessed the title of Earl of Moray, and bestowed that dignity upon the earls of Mar. It is asserted by some historians, that he had recourse to the strong measure of dispossessing the ancient inhabitants fo the province, removing them to other parts of the country and planting new colonies in their room. But such a step, if adopted at all, could have been only very partially carried into effect. There can be no doubt, however, tht Malcolm availed himself of the favourable opportunity afforded by the suppression of this revolt, to abrogate many of the ancient customs of the province, and to introduce Saxon laws in their room, and to subject the district completely to his authority.

For some unexplained cause, the ambitious Somerland a second time declared war against Malcolm, and assembling a numerous army from Argyle, Ireland, and the Isles, he sailed up the Clyde (1164) with one hundred and sixty galleys, and landed his forces near Renfrew, threatening, as some of the chroniclers inform us, to make a conquest of the whole of Scotland. Here, according to the Chronicle of Melrose;[1] Somerled was slain, with his son, Gilliecolane, and his great armament dispersed by a very inferior force of the Scots. According to tradition, however, this celebrated chief was assassinated in his tent, by a person in whom he placed confidence; and his troops, thus deprived of their leader, returned in haste to the Isles, suffering severely in their retreat from the attacks of their enemies.[2]

This was Malcolm's last exploit, for he died soon after at Jedburgh, on the 9th of December, 1165, in the twenty-fifth year of his age.

Some historians affirm, that Malcolm was deprived of the government shortly before his death. Bower relates tht Malcolm, having made a vow of perpetual chastity, and being intent on divine things, neglected the administration of his kingdom; that from these causes he became odious to the people, who constrained his brother William to accept the office of Regent.[3] The story of Malcolm's vow of chastity appears to have been a fable, in all probability founded upon his surname of Maiden, which is supposed to have been given to him on account of his youthful and effeminate countenance; for it is known from one of his own charters, that he had a natural son.[4] If such a revolution as has been mentioned did actually take place, it may have been caused by Malcolm's surrender of the northern counties to England, and his impolite attachment to the English monarch. Malcolm was succeeded by his brother William.

[1] Chron. Mel. p. 169

[2] Gregory's History of the Western Highlands, p. 16.

[3] Fordun, lib. viii. c. vi. [4] Chart. Kelso, fol. 16; Hailes's Annals, vol. i. p. 129.

William The Lion

[1165-1214] second son of Henry, Prince of Scotland, and grandson of David the First. The new monarch began his reign by courting the friendship of the English king. Contrary to the advice, of his counsellors, he passed over to the Continent to Henry, who was engaged in suppressing an insurrection in Brittany, and spent his Christmas with him in the famous old castle on Mount St Michael. If the object of William in thus paying court to the English monarch was to obtain the restitution of Northumberland, he was disappointed in his expectations. But Henry kept up his hopes with fair promises, and agreed to prolong the truce with Scotland, because it was for his own interest to preserve peace on the borders, during his absence on the Continent. William seems, ere long, to have discovered that he had been amused with fruitless expectations, for, in 1168, he sent ambassadors to France, to negotiate an alliance with that kingdom against England. This is the first negotiation between Scotland and France of which we have any authentic information.[1] Two years later, however, when Henry the eldest son of the English king, was associated with his father in the government, both William and his younger brother, David, were present at his coronation (14th June, 1170), and both did homage to the youthful monarch along with the other English barons. But, in 1170, when a quarrel broke out between Henry and his son, the Scottish king, apparently wearied of fruitless solicitations, joined in confederacy with the young king, and obtained from him a grant of the earldom of Northumberland for himself, and of that of Cambridge for his brother David. Stimulated by these concessions, William raised an army and invaded England. This inroad terminated, however, in the fruitless devastation of the country, and a truce was agreed to, which was prolonged to the close of Lent in the following year. In 1174, he again invaded Northumberland; and while the rest of his army spread themselves over the country, burning and destroying wherever they came. William, with a small body of troops lay in careless security near Alnwick. While thus engaged, he was, on the 12th of July, suddenly surprised and made prisoner by a party of Yorkshire barons, headed by Ranulf de Glanville. They had set out from Newcastle at an early hour that morning, with a party of four hundred horse, and reached the neighbourhood of Alnwick without being discovered. During their march, a thick mist fell and bewildered them, so that they became uncertain of the road. Some of the more cautious or timid proposed to turn back. "If you should all turn back," said Bernard Baliol, one of their leaders, "I will go forward alone." Animated by this declaration, they rode forward, and in a short time discovered the battlement of Alnwick Castle. In their way they suddenly encountered the Scottish king, who was riding in the fields with a slender train of sixty horsemen. William so little expected an attack of this nature, that he at first mistook the English for a returning party of his own stragglers. On perceiving his error, however, he cried out, "Now it will be seen who are true knights," and

[1] Haile's Annals, vol. i. p. 131.

instantly charged the enemy with the handful of men who attended hm. But he was speedily overpowered by superior numbers, unhorsed, and taken prisoner. His companions and several of his nobles who were not present at the conflict, voluntarily shared the fate of their sovereign. The English barons carried off their royal prize with all celerity, and returned in safety to Newcastle that night.

William was at first confined in the castle of Richmond; thence he was taken to Northampton, to meet King Henry, and was brought before him with his feet tied under his horse's belly - an act of wanton and indecent barbarity, which is calculated to give a very unfavourable idea of the personal character of the English king.[1] A few days after, Henry carried his prisoner to Falaise, in Normandy. In this strong fortress he was confined till the month of December following, when he regained his liberty by disgracefully surrendering the independence of his country. With the consent of the Scottish barons and clergy, given at Valogne on the 8th of December, 1174, William became the liegeman of Henry for Scotland, and all his other territories.[2] He agreed to deliver up to the English king the castles of Edinburgh, Stirling, Roxburgh, Berwick, and Jedburgh and gave is brother David and twenty of his principal barons as hostages for the performance of the treaty. It is worthy of remark that, while the independence of the nation was bartered away in this weak and pusillanimous manner, a prudent and memorable clause, as it has been termed, was introduced into the treaty, leaving entire the independence of the Scottish Church. This clause was successfully pleaded by the bishops and clergy before the Papal legate, in a council held at Northampton (1176), when Henry required them "to yield that obedience to the English Church which they ought to yield, and were wont to yield in the days of the predecessors." The Scottish clergy, though on English ground, and in the power of Henry, boldly made answer, "that they had never yielded subjection to the English Church, nor out they."[3]

In the beginning of the following year (1175), William returned to Scotland along with his brother David, and on the 10th of August following, he and his clergy and barons did homage to Henry at York, in terms of the treaty of Falaise. Meantime his captivity was the signal for an insurrection among the turbulent inhabitants of Galloway. Fergus, the chief of tht province, who was subdued by Malcolm IV, died in 1161. According to the ancient Celtic law of inheritance, his territories were divided between his two sons, Uchtred and Gilbert. At the head of their clansmen, these chiefs were in attendance upon King William during that disastrous expedition into Northumberland which

[1] This is the account given by Hoveden (See Hailes's Annals, vol. i. p. 135); it is proper to add, however, that Jordan Fanstosme, who has given a minute account in rhyme of William's capture, making no mention of this circumstance, and states, tht Henry had departed for Normandy before the Scottish king could be presented to him.

[2] Hailes's Annals, vol. i. p. 140; Hoveden, p. 559.

[3] Rym. Foed, vol. i. p. 39.

terminated in his captivity. On the loss of their sovereign, the Scottish army made a precipitate retreat into their own country. The Gallowaymen retired into their native fastnesses, and, with their characteristic turbulence and jealousy of foreigners, they availed themselves of this favourable opportunity to attack the Saxons and Normans who had settled in their district, and to expel the regal officers. They proceeded next to turn their arms against each other (September 22, 1176), and Gilbert caused his brother Uchtred to be assassinated with circumstances of horrible barbarity.[1] His attempts, however, to possess himself of his murdered brother's, inheritance were gallantly resisted by Roland, the son of Uchtred; and next year, William, having regained his liberty, marched into Galloway in order to chastise Gilbert; but instead of executing justice upon him for his double crime of murder and rebellion, he contented himself with exacting a pecuniary satisfaction, according to the ancient Celtic custom. In 1176, Gilbert presented himself, among the other Scottish barons, at York, did homage to the English king, and was received into favour. Henry is said to have sold his protection to the fratricide for a thousand marks. In 1184, this turbulent and ferocious chief, trusting probably to the protection of Henry, again took up arms, and began to lay waste and plunder the country with his wonted barbarity. Terms of accommodation were offered him, which he rejected; but his death in the following year freed the country from his devastations.

Rolland, the son of Uchtred, promptly availed himself of the favourable opportunity afforded by the death of Gilbert, to obtain possession of the whole province of Galloway. On the 4th of July, 1185, he defeated the adherents of Gilbert, and slew Gilpatric, their leader. With equal courage and success the overthrew the dispersed a formidable band of robbers who had overrun the country.[2] The Scottish king, it is alleged, was gratified by these enterprises of the gallant Roland; but Henry was highly incensed, and in 1186, he assembled a powerful army at Carlisle, with the intention to invade Galloway. Rolland however, was not dismayed. He fortified the passes of the country, and prepared to offer the most desperate resistance. But a compromise was afterwards made. It was agreed that Roland should retain the possessions which had been held by his father, Uchtred, and should submit to the decision of the English court as to what had belonged to Gilbert, and was now claimed by his son Duncan; Henry was satisfied with the acknowledgment thus made of the paramount authority of England, and William granted to Duncan the territory of Carrick, a district of ancient Galloway, as a full satisfaction for all his claims.

[1] Fordun, lib. vill, c. xxv.; Benedict. Abbas. p. 92. Hailes's Annals, vol. i. p. 151.

[2] Hailes's Annals, vol. i. p. 152; Chron. Mel. p. 176; Fordun, lib. viii. c. xxxix.

In the meantime, and during all the remainder of Henry's reign, entire harmony subsisted between England and Scotland. On the death of Simon de St Lis, earl of Huntingdon, without issue, Henry restored the earldom to the Scottish king, who conferred it on his brother David. On the 5th of September, 1186, William on the proposal of Henry, married, at Woodstock, Ermengarde, daughter of Richard, Viscount of Beaumont, and the descendant of an illegitimate daughter of Henry I, on which, as part of the dower of the young queen, "his cousin" the English king restored to William the castle of Edinburgh.[1] Two years towards he offered also to give up the castles of Roxburgh and Berwick, if William would pay the tenths of his kingdom for the holy war. The proposal was submitted to an assembly of the clergy and nobility, but they made answer, that "they would never pay the tenth, although both kings should have sworn to levy them."

Scarcely were the commotions in Galloway suppressed, when the Celtic inhabitants, in various parts of the country, took up arms against the new settlers, and forced them to seek shelter in the fortified places. In the more remote districts, the native chiefs exercised almost regal sway; and not withstanding the vigorous measures adopted by Malcolm IV, to reduce them to obedience, it is evident that they still acknowledged , at the utmost, only a qualified dependence upon the Scottish crown. The inhabitants of Moray revolted in 1171.

In 1179, William and his brother David were obliged to march into the district of Ross, to suppress some disturbances which had arisen there. They erected two fortresses to bridle the turbulent inhabitants of that wild and remote province, but without the desired effect. It is probable that these commotions were caused by the pretensions of Donald Bane, who claimed the crown as the son of William and grandson of Duncan, commonly called the bastard king of Scotland, and as usual obtained the support of the Northern chiefs. For seven years he held out the earldoms of Moray and Ross against all the power of the Scottish king, plundering the rest of the country far and wide. At length in 1187, while William lay with his army at Inverness, a marauding party, commanded by Roland, the lord of Galloway accidentally met Donald on the heath of Mamgarvy, accompanied only by a small body of his followers, attacked, and slew him.[2] By his death, tranquility was restored to the country.

A singular incident is related by Buchanan, on the authority of an old chronicler, as having occurred to William on his return from the expedition against Donald Bane. Gilchrist Earl of angus, for the great services performed by him to the crown and nation in this and the preceding reign, had the king's sister given to him in marriage who abusing his bed, he caused her to be slain. This murder so enraged the

[1] Chron Mel. p. 170; Hoveden, p. 632; Hailes's Annals vol. i. p. 153.

[2] Fordun, lib. viii, c. xxviii.; Chron. Mel. p. 177; Buchan. Hist. lib. vii. p. 126; Major Hist. lib. iv. c.v. p. 136.

king against him, that, forgetting former services, he devastated his castles, confiscated his estate, and banished him the kingdom, whereupon he retired to England. But in the treaty between William and Henry, it being stipulated that neither of the contracting powers shall shelter their respective enemies, Gilchrist was obliged to leave England, and returning to Scotland with his two sons, shifted from place to place, passing their time in great misery and want; but being seen by the king on the road in the neighbourhood of Perth, in the disguise of farmers, by their men they discovered themselves to be above that station, and on William's approach left the way, to prevent discovery. This shyness raising William's curiosity, he had them brought before him when, inquiring who they were Gilchrist, kneeling, in a very moving speech acquainted him with their lamentable condition, wherewith the king was so sensibly touched, that he not only pardoned him, but restored him to his former honours, favour, and estates.[1]

The death of Henry II, 6th July 1189, led to an important and memorable event, the recovery of the independence of the kingdom. Richard Cœur de Lion, his successor, then intent upon collecting money for his expedition to the Holy Land, invited the King of Scotland to his court at Canterbury, and upon William's engagement to pay to him the sum of ten thousand marks sterling - equal to about on hundred thousand pounds sterling at the present day, (1859) agreed to restore the castles of Roxburgh and Berwick, "to be possessed by him and his heirs for ever, as their own proper inheritance." "Moreover," the charter proceeds, "We have granted to him an acquittance of all obligations which our father extorted from him, by new instruments, in consequence of his captivity, under this condition always, that he shall completely and fully perform to us whatever his brother Malcolm King of Scotland, of right performed, or ought of right to have performed, to our predecessors."[2] The boundaries of the two kingdoms were at the same time re-established, as they had existed at the date of William's imprisonment. The Scottish king was put in possession of all his fees in the earldom of Huntingdon or elsewhere, and all the charters of homage done to Henry II, by the Scottish barons were delivered up. and declared to be cancelled for ever.

There can be no doubt that Richard, by this instrument, made a full remuneration, at least of whatever new rights of sovereignty over Scotland had been extorted from William by the treaty of Falaise. Mr Allan remarks, "The charter replaces the two kingdoms on their ancient footing, and leaves it open for discussion, what were the lands and possessions for which homage and fealty were due to the English crown. But from one of the most full and accurate of our contemporary chroniclers, it is apparent that the independence of Scotland was understood at the time to be the effect and purport of the treaty. Benedictus Abbas, in his account of the transaction, informs us

[1] Lib. vii. p. 126.

[2] Rym. Foed. vol. i. p. 64; Hoveden, p. 662; Bened. Abb. p. 576; Hailes's Annals, vol. i. p. 155.

that William did homage to Richard for his English dignities , and that Richard, on the part of himself and his successors, granted to the Scotch king, and to his heirs for ever, an acquittance from all allegiance and subjection for the kingdom of Scotland." It is owing to this wise and just treaty, which the later English historians have censured as impolitic, and to the fidelity with which it was observed on both sides, that for more than a century after its date there occurred no national quarrel or hostilities between the two countries. The sum which William paid for this valuable boon could not have been raised without considerable difficulty among a people so poor as the Scots were at this period; and there is reason to believe that an Act was granted to him, for the payment of the ransom, by a convention of the clergy and barons held at Musselburgh. Lord Hailes concludes, from the terms of a charter granted by William to the Abbey of Scone, that the clergy (who contributed a share of the aid) re-imbursed themselves, to a certain extent at least by imposing something of the nature of a capitation tax on the inhabitants of their territories, and that this tax was so burdensome, as to induce some of the inhabitants to leave their places of residence in order to elude payment.[1] it is worthy of notice as indicating the kindly feelings which William entertained towards his benefactor, that when Richard was treacherously made prisoner by the Duke of Austria, on his way home from the Holy Land, the Scottish king sent two thousand marks to assist in paying the price of his redemption.[2]

David Earl of Huntingdon, heir presumptive to the Scottish crown, accompanied Richard in his crusade, and shared both in his success and in his misfortunes.[3] He was shipwrecked on the coast of Egypt, and taken prisoner by the Saracens, who sold him as a slaves. Having concealed his rank, he was purchased for a small sum by a Venetian, who brought him to Constantinople. There he was accidentally recognized by some English merchants, who ransomed and sent him home. On his homeward voyage he was overtaken by a violent storm, and narrowly escaped a second shipwreck on the coast of Scotland. He ascribed his deliverance to the Virgin Mary; and, as a token of his gratitude for her intercession, he founded a monestry for Tyrone monks, at Lindores, in Fife.

Scarcely any events worthy of notice occurred during remaining years of William's reign. In 1196, the peace of the northern counties was disturbed ay an insurrection, headed by Harold, Earl of Orkney ad Caithness. William with his usual promptitude, marched against the insurgents, and speedily dispersed them. In the following year, however, they again appeared in arms near Inverness, under Torfin, the son of Harold, and a second time they were defeated by the royal army.

[1] Annals, vol. i. p. 156 (note). [2] Chron. Mel. p. 179.

[3] Boece, Hist. book xiii.; Buchan. Hist. lib. vii. p. 126. Few of our readers will need to be reminded of the conspicuous part which David is made to perform in Sir Walter Scott's "Talisman."

The king now marched through Ross and Caithness to the northern extremity of the country, where he seized Harold, and detained him in captivity until his son Torfin, surrendered himself as a hostage. Harold was allowed to retain the northern part of his earldom, but the southern division was bestowed upon Hugh Freskin, the progenitor of the earls of Sutherland. Fordun says, that William, returning from this expedition into Caithness, "passed over again into Scotland," which shows that at this period the northern province was not included in Scotland proper. The chiefs of that remote district had hitherto been accustomed to consider themselves subject to the Danish, rather than to the Scottish crown. Harold having again rebelled, his son, as a punishment for his father's reiterated insurrections, and his own turbulence, had his eyes put out, and perished miserably in prison, in the castle of Roxburgh.[1]

On the accession of John to the English throne, A.D. 1199, William did homage to him at Lincoln, "saving his own rights." After the performance of the ceremony, the Scottish monarch endeavoured, but without effect, to obtain the restitution of the three northern counties of England, which he claimed as his ancient inheritance. Two years after, a misunderstanding arose between the two kings, respecting a fort which John erected at Tweedmouth to overawe the garrison at Berwick, and which William repeatedly demolished as soon as it was built. The quarrel increased to such an extent, that a war threatened to arise out of it; and, in 1209, John led an army to Norham, while William assembled his forces at Berwick. But by the intervention of the barons of both countries, hostilities were averted, and a treaty of peace was concluded between the kingdoms. John became bound not to rebuild the castle of Tweedmouth, and William, on his part, agreed to pay fifteen thousand marks "for procuring his friendship, and for fulfilling certain conventions between them."[2] William also delivered his two daughters to John, that they might be provided with suitable matches. The Scottish writers affirm, that by the terms of the agreement, Henry and Richard, the sons of John were to marry the two princesses. If so, this stipulation was not fulfilled. At a great council or parliament held at Stirling, in 1211, William asked assistance to enable him to fulfil the stipulations of this treaty, and received from the barons a grant of ten thousand marks, and six thousand from the boroughs.[3]

In the meantime, a new insurrection broke out among the turbulent inhabitants of Ross, who were not even yet reconciled to the government of the Saxon descendants, of Malcolm Canmore. Guthred, a descendant of William Fitz-Duncan, and the son of Donald Bane, who fell A.D. 1187, asserted his claim to the throne, and, landing from Ireland, spread devastation through the northern provinces. William,

[1] Fordun, lib. viii. c. lvi.

[2] Ryn. Foed. vol. i. p. 155; Hailes, vol. i. p. 164. [3] Fordun, lib. viii. c. lxxiii.

in spite of his age and infirmities, led an army against him in person; but Guthred kept possession of the mountain fastness of the north for some time, and baffled every attempt on the part of the king to take, him, until he was treacherously betrayed into the hands of Comyn, Earl of Buchan, Justiciary of Scotland, and executed, A.D. 1212.[1]

This was the last exploit of William, who, after a long illness, died at Stirling on the 4th of December 1214, in the seventy-second year of his reign - the longest reign in the range of Scottish history. Besides six natural children, he left by his queen, Ermengarde de Beaumont, one son and two daughters, Marjory and Isabel; the former of whom was married to the celebrated Hubert de Burgh, Justiciary of England, and the latter to Gilbert, Earl-marshal of that kingdom. Before the reign of William, none of the Scottish kings seem to have assumed armorial bearings.[2] The Lion Rampant, the Royal Arms of Scotland, first appears on his seal: and it is probable, that from this circumstance he received the surname of The Lion. From a similar cause, the president of the Herald's Court in Scotland is termed Lord Lion King-at-Arms.

It is worthy of notice, that most of the rulers of the northern countries of Europe, the kings of England, Scotland Norway, and Denmark, the native princes of Wales, the dukes of Normandy, the counts of Flanders, Holland, Hainault, &c. all about the same period - during the twelfth century - appear, as with one accord, to have adopted a lion as their cognizance; and that the assumption of the eagle by the monarchs of the eastern and southern portions of Europe took place almost contemporaneously.[3]

Alexander II [1214-1249] a youth in his seventeenth year, ascended the throne on the death of his father William, and was crowned at Scone on the 10th of December, 1214. One of the first acts of his reign was to enter into an alliance with the patriotic English barons against King John, in expectation of regaining the northern counties; and having crossed the borders, he invested the castle of Norham, but without success. John was so incensed, tht he marched to the north with a mixed and savage host of mercenaries - the outcasts and freebooters of Europe - headed by "Buch the Murderer," "Godeschal the Iron-hearted," "Falco without Bowels," "Manleon the Bloody," and other ruffians of a similar character, for the purpose of wreaking his vengeance on the disaffected barons and their adherents. His progress through Yorkshire and Northumberland was marked with flames and blood. The towns and castles of Morpeth, Mitford, Alnwick, Wark, and Roxburgh, together with all the villages and hamlets on the road, were given to the flames, John himself setting fire with his own hands in the morning to the house in which he had spend the preceding night, and the most shocking tortures were inflicted upon the inhabitants by the ferocious soldiery, to make them confess where they had concealed their money.[4]

[1] Ibid. c. lxxvi.; Hailes, vol. i. p. 165. [2] Anderson's Diplomata, p. 54.

[3] Chron. Mel. p. 199; Fordun, lib, ix. c. xxxvii.; Beoce, lib. xiii. p. 293. Vol. I

[3] Planche's Pursuivant of Arms. [4] Chron. Mel. p. 190; M. Paris, p. 275; Fordun, lib. ix. c. xxviii.

The Scottish king retired before a superior force; and John, vowing that he would "smoke the little red fox out of his covert,"[1] followed him as far as Edinburgh, burning the towns of Dunbar and Haddington on his way. Alexander having drawn together a powerful force, encamped on the river Esk, near Pentland, a few miles to the south of Edinburgh. John feeling disinclined to risk a battle, and unable to remain longer in a country which his savage fury had laid waste, hurried back to England, in his retreat setting fire to the Priory of Coldingham and the town of Berwick.

In retaliation for these outrages, Alexander marched into England, and laid waste the western border counties with fire and sword. The Chronicles of Melrose states that the Scots in his army - meaning, probably, the Galwegians - burnt the Monastery of Holmcultram, in Cumberland, and that, in returning home with their plunder, nearly two thousand of them, as a judgement for their sacrilege were drowned in the river Eden - rather, perhaps, in the shifting sands of the Solway Firth.[2] The Scottish king dismissed these ferocious plunderers from his army, and then advanced to the south to join Prince Louis, of France, whom the barons had invited over to assist them in protecting their rights, against their own detested and contemptible sovereign. On his way, he took possession of Carlisle and assaulted Barnard Castle, the seat of the Baliol family, where Eustace de Vesci, one of the leaders of the barons, was slain. Alexander, on reaching Dover, is aid to have done homage to Louis for the possessions which he held from the King of England;[3] and Louis and the barons, on their part, expressly recognized the right of the Scottish king to the counties of Northumberland, Cumberland, and Westmoreland, and made oath that they would not conclude a separate peace.

After the death of the infamous John (17th October, 1216), Alexander continued to co-operate with Prince Louis and the confederated barons; and as John, before his death, had made his peace with Rome, the king of the Scots, and his army and kingdom, were in consequence included in the excommunication which Gualo, the Pope's legate, fulminated against Louis and his adherents. The sentence seems to have been very little regarded either by the clergy or the people of Scotland - it was not even published by the former till after the lapse of nearly a twelvemonth.[4]

The disgraced overthrow of Louis next year (25th May, 1217), induced him to make peace with Henry III, the young king of England, without paying any regard to the interest of his Scottish ally. On hearing of the treaty, Alexander, who was on his march into England, returned home. He soon after effected his reconciliation both with Henry and the Papal See. On the 1st of December, 1217, he received absolution at Tweedmouth from the Archbishop of York and the Bishop of Durham, the delegates of Gualo; and at the same time he yielded up to Henry the town of Carlisle, and did homage for the

[1] M. Paris, p. 191-"because Alexander was of a red complexion," he adds; Hailes Vol. i. p. 171.
[2] Chron. Mel. p. 190. [3] Ibid. p. 191.
[4] Hailes, vol. i. p. 173; Chron. Mel. p. 192. Fordun, lib. ix. c. xxxi.

earldom of Huntingdon and the other possessions which he had held in England. In the following hear, the papal Legat and his delegates' extracted large sums form the Scottish clergy as the price of absolution.[1] hose who satisfied their exorbitant demands were at once relieved from the excommunication and interdict under which they had been laid; others were commanded to repair to Rome, to be absolved there; while a third class, who were either reluctant to submit to the authority of the legate, or to pay the price of reconciliation, were suspended or disposed. At length the clergy, wearied of these exactions, sent a deputation of three bishops to the Papal court, where, on a profession of penitence, they easily obtained absolution. "He must have a tender conscience," said a cardinal, in their hearing, "who confesses a crime when he has not been guilty of an offence."[2] Gualo was recalled, and the Pope confirmed the liberties of the Scottish Church, alleging as one of the grounds of this boon, "the respect and obedience which Alexander had manifested to the Papal see." It was agreed tht the disputes between Hennery and Alexander should be referred to Randolph, the new Papal legate, but they remained undecided till 1237.

On the 25th of June, 1221, Alexander married the princess Joan, Henry's eldest sister. This fortunate union had a most favourable effect in strengthening the bonds of amity between the two kingdoms; and it was followed by a long period of uninterrupted peace, which enabled the Scottish king to turn his undivided attention to the regulation of the internal affairs of his own kingdom, by the enactment of wise and just laws, many of which are still in force. Almost the only events that mark the history of the country during the next twelve or thirteen years, are some insurrections which broke out among the turbulent inhabitants of Argyle, Galloway, Moray, and Caithness, and were suppressed by the vigorous measures of the king. The disturbances in Caithness were caused by the rigorous exaction of tithes and other ecclesiastical dues, by the officers of Adam, the bishop of that province; and the bishop himself is alleged to have excommunicated the people for their refusal to comply with his demands. A great multitude having assembled to consider what courts they should follow in these circumstances, one of them exclaimed, "Short rede, good rede - slay we the bishop." The crowd ran instantly to the episcopal residence at Halkirk, assaulted it with fury, set it on fire, and burnt the prelate alive in his own palace (A.D. 1222). Alexander, who was at Jedburgh on his way to England when he heard of this atrocious deed, immediately hastened to the north, and inflicted condign punishment on the murderers, putting, it is said, no fewer than four hundred of them to death. The Earl of Orkney and Caithness was accused of having abetted or connived at the murder, for when some of the bishop's servants, who had escaped through the flames, came in haste to him to crave assistance for their master, he coolly answered, "Let the bishop come to me, and I will protect him." The earl was in

[1] Fordun, lib. ix. c. xxxii. [2] Fordun, lib. ix. c. xxiii.

consequence deprived of his estate, but the king agterwards permitted him to redeem it. In the year 1231, however, he was himself murdered in his own castle by his servants, and then burned, in revenge for this atrocious crime.[1]

The insurrection in Moray was connected with the claims of Gilliescop McScolane, a descendant of William Fitz-Duncan, to the earldom of that province. He at first obtained a temporary success - burnt the town of Inverness, spoiled the crown lands in that neighbourhood, and baffled the king himself, who went against him in person (A.D. 1228). Next year, however, he was betrayed into the hands of the Earl of Buchan, justiciary of Scotland, who put him and his two sons to death.[2] "He appears to have been the last of his race," says Mr Skene, "and thus terminated those singular attempts to place a rival family on the throne of Scotland, which lasted during a period of upwards of one hundred years, and which exhibit so extraordinary a proof of the tenacity and perseverance with which the Highlanders maintained their peculiar laws of succession, and the claims of a hereditary title to the throne."

The most formidable of these internal commotions was the last, which broke out in Galloway in 1233, on the death of Alan, the son of Ronald, the chief of that district, and high constable of Scotland, leaving three daughters, but no male heir. This Alan of Galloway who was the representative, in the female line, of the great family of the Morevilles, was the most powerful subject in the kingdom. His eldest daughter, Helen, by his first wife, married Roger de Quincy, Earl of Winchester, who became Constable of Scotland, in her right. By his second wife. Margaret, eldest daughter of David, Earl of Huntingdon, the brother of William the Lion, he left two daughters, - Christian, who married William de Fortibus, son of the Earl of Albermarle, but died without issue; and Devorguil, the wife of John Baliol, of Barnard Castle, whose son, John Baliol, was the successful competitor for the crown on the death of Margaret of Norway. The rude and turbulent Galwegians, who clung pertinaciously to their ancient customs, resolutely opposed the partition of their country among the heiresses of their late lord, and headed by Thomas, a bastard son of Alan, and Gilrodh or Gilderoy, an Irish chief, who had come to his assistance, they marched against the Scottish king, who was approaching to attack them and ravaged the adjacent country with merciless fury. Alexander got entangled among morasses, and was placed in a situation of imminent peril, from which he was extricated by the Earl of Ross, who assailed the rebels in the rear, and discomfited them with great slaughter. Their leaders, Thomas and Gilrodh, made their escape to Ireland, but next year they returned with a fresh arm, and renewed the war. This second attempt, however, was as unsuccessful as the first. The two leaders submitted to the king's mercy, and were pardoned, but their Irish followers, straggling towards the Clyde in the hope of being able to find a passage to their own country, fell into the hands of the

[1] Chron. Mel. p. 199; Fordun, lib. ix. c. xxxvii.; Boece, lib. xiii. p. 293. Vol. I.

[2] Fordun, lib. ix. c. xlvii.

citizens of Glasgow, who are said to have beheaded them all with the exception only of two, whom they sent to Edinburgh to be hanged and quartered there.[1]

About this period dissensions began to arise between the English and Scottish kings. Their claims upon each other had never been finally settled; and Henry, either from ambition or weakness, was induce to support the pretensions of the Archbishop of York to the right of officiating at the coronation of the Scottish kings, and to solicit Pope Gregory IX, to employ his authority with Alexander, to perform the conditions of the old treaty between Henry II, and William the Lion, in strange forgetfulness of the fact, that all claims under tht treaty had been expressly renounced by Richard I.[2] The Pope accordingly issued a bull (A.D. 1234), admonishing the Scottish king to comply with the demands of Henry, "as his doing so would greatly conduce to the peace and tranquility of both kingdoms." Instead of submitting to these claims, Alexander sent an ambassador to the English court, to demand the restitution of Northumberland, Cumberland, and Westmoreland, which he claimed in right of inheritance. He also alleged that his father, William, had paid to John the father of Henry, the sum of fifteen thousand marks, on condition that Henry and Richard, the sons of John, should marry Margaret and Isabella, the daughters of William, which condition had not been performed, and that Henry himself had failed to perform his engagement to marry Marjory another daughter of William's.

These claims were not finally adjusted till September, 1237, when, at a conference held at York, in the presence of Otho, the Papal legate, it was agreed tht Alexander should receive lands in Northumberland and Cumberland, of the yearly value of two hundred pounds, in full satisfaction of all his demands.[3] The following year[3] 4th March, 1238), Joan, Alexander's queen, sister of Henry, who had been long in a declining state, died at Canterbury, without leaving any issue. In the course of next year (15th May, 1239) Alexander married again. His new queen was Mary daughter of Ingelram de Couci, a great lord of Picardy, who, on account of his brave actions, extensive possessions, and three marriages with ladies of royal and illustrious families, was surnamed Le Grand.[4] The death of Joan, and the alliance with a family which had always been hostile to the interest of England, weakened the bonds of amity between Alexander and Henry; but, for several years, their old friendship continued to exist, and in 1242, Henry, when about to set out on his expedition to France, confided to Alexander the care of the northern borders. But in this same year, an event occurred which drew after it important consequences.

[1] Hailes, vol. i. p. 182; Fordun, lib. ix. c. xlviii. [2] Rymer's Foed, vol. i. pp. 328, 334. 335.

[3] Ibid. vol. i. pp. 374-400; Ridpath's border History, pp. 130-134.

[4] The de Couci family affected great pomp, and professed to consider all titles as beneath their dignity. The *Cri de* Guerre of this Ingelram, was - "Je ne suis Roy, ni Prince aussi, Je suis le Seigneur de Couci.

At a tournament held at Haddington, Walter Bisset, a member of a powerful family in the north was overthrown by Patrick, Earl of Athole, a youth distinguished for his knightly accomplishments. It is alleged that the defeat was embittered by an old feud, which existed between the Bissets and he family of Athole. A day or two after, the earl was murdered in the house where he lodged, which probably for the purpose of concealing the atrocious crime, was set on fire by the assassins. Suspicion immediately fell upon the Bissets, and the nobility, headed by Patrick, Earl of March, and David de Hastings, who had married the aunt of Athole, flew to arms, and demanded vengeance, both upon Walter Bisset and his uncle William, the chief of the family, to whom popular clamour pointed as the author of the conspiracy. Bisset strenuously denied the charge. He urged that he was fifty miles distant from Haddington when the murder was committed. He instantly procure the sentence of excommunication against the assassins to be published, both in his own chapel and in all the churches of the kingdom. He offered to maintain his innocence by single combat, but he declined a trial by jury, "on account of the malevolence of the people and the implacable resentment of his enemies." The king strove to protect him from the fury of his enemies, and the queen, according to Fordun, offered to make oath, "that Bisset had neer devised a crime so enormous;" that is to say, she was so convinced of his innocence, that she was willing to appear as one of his compurgators, if the case should be submitted to that mode of trial. At lenth it was decided tht the estate of the Bissets should be forfeited, and that they should swear upon the Holy Gospel that they would make a pilgrimage to Jerusalem, and there, for th remainder of their lives, pray for the soul of the murdered earl.[1]

Walter Bisset, however, escaped to England, and sought to avenge himself on his enemies a the expense of his country and of the king, to whose protection he owed his life. He artfully represented to the English monarch that he was lord superior of Scotland, and ought to have been first consulted before judgment was given; "that Alexander, being his vassal, had no right to inflict such punishments on his nobles without the permission of his liege lord:" and in order still farther to excite Henry against the Scottish king, he described Scotland as the ally of France, and as the asylum of the fugitive enemies of England. Henry, who was a weak monarch, was inflamed to such a pitch by these misrepresentations, that he determined on an immediate invasion of Scotland. He secretly applied to the Earl of Flanders for assistance, organized a confederacy of Irish chiefs to aid him in his enterprise, by making a descent upon the Scottish coast, and assembled a large body of troops, with which he marched to Newcastle. Alexander was nothing daunted at these preparations. He declared that he never did and never would consent to hold from the king of England any portion of the kingdom of Scotland; and, with the strenuous support of his nobles, he succeeded in raising an army of a hundred thousand foot,

[1] Hailes's Annals, vol. i. p. 157; Fordun, lib. ix. c. lix; M. Paris, p. 568.

and a thousand horse, to repel the unprovoked invasion. Matthew Paris, a contemporary English historian, has given us an interesting description of the accountrements and discipline of this powerful host, and of the spirit by which it was animated. "The Scottish cavalry," according to his account, "were brace and well mounted, although their horses were neither of the Spanish nor Italian breed, and the horsemen were clothed in armour of iron net-work. The infantry," he adds, "approached to one hundred thousand, all unanimous, all animated by the exhortations of their clergy and by confession, courageously to fight and resolutely to die in the just defence of their native land."[1] The hostile armies came in sight of each other at a place in Northumberland called Ponteland; but, fortunately for both countries, peace was concluded without bloodshed. Alexander, as M. Paris tells us, was "a devout, upright, and courteous person, justly beloved by all the English nation no less than by his own subjects." The English nobles were by no means favourable to the rash enterprise of their imbecile king; and, through the exertions of Richard, Earl of Cornwall, brother to Henry, and the Archbishop of York, a treaty was concluded (A.D. 1244) on equitable term. Henry prudently waived all demand of homage from Alexander for the kingdom of Scotland; and the Scottish monarch, on the other hand, agreed always to bear good faith and love to Henry as his dear and liege lord, and never to enter into alliance with the enemies of Henry, or of his heirs, unless they should unjustly aggrieve him. It ws also stipulated, that the treaty concluded at York 1237 should be maintained, and that the proposal there made of a marriage between the son of the King of Scots and the daughter of Henry should be carried into effect. Allan Durward, Henry de Baliol, David de Lindsay, with other knights and prelates, then swore on the soul of their lord the king that the treaty should be kept inviolate by him and his heirs.[2]

The only event of the reign of Alexander which remains to be noticed, is the maritime expedition which he undertook, in 1249, against Angus, Lord of Argyle, with he view of compelling that chief to pay to the Scottish crown the homage which he had been accustomed to render to the King of Norway. Alexander had conducted his fleet as far as the South of Mull, when he was seized with a fever, and died in a small island named Kerrara (8th July), in the fifty-first of his reign. He was buried in the Abbey of Melrose in accordance with his own desire. Alexander was undoubtedly one of characterized by Fordun as "a king pious, just, and brave; as the shield of the church, the safeguard of the people, and the friend of the miserable." He was a zealous supporter of the independence of the Scottish Church, and a liberal patron of the clergy, particularly of the Dominican or Black Friars, for whom he founded no fewer than eight monasteries at Edinburgh, Berwick, Ayr, Perth, Aberdeen, Elgin, Stirling, and Inverness. Boece supposes that his partiality to these

[1] M. Paris, p. 645; Chron. Mel. p. 156. [2] Rymer's Foed. vol. i. pp. 374; M. Paris, p. 646.

mendicants may have arisen from his having seen their founder, St Dominic, in France, about the year 1217. "The sight of a living saint," says Lord Hailes, "may have made an impression on his young mind; but, perhaps, he considered the mendicant friars as the cheapest ecclesiastics. His revenues could not supply the costly institution of Cistercians and canons regular, in which his great-grandfather, David I, took delight."[1] Alexander died on 8th of July 1249 and was succeeded by his only son Alexander.

Alexander III [1249-1286] who had not completed his eighth year when the death of his father, opened to him the accession to the Scottish throne. He was immediately conducted by an assembly of the nobility to the Abbey of Scone, for the purpose of being crowned. It was objected by some of the nobles, that the king ought to be knighted before his coronation took place, and that the day fixed for the ceremony was unlucky. But Comyn, Earl of Menteith, urged the danger of delay, as Henry was intriguing at Rome to procure from the Pope an interdict against the coronation of the young prince, alleging that Alexander, being his liegeman, should not be anointed or crown, without his permission; and he proposed tht the Bishop of St Andrews should both knight and crown the youthful monarch, as William Rufus had been knighted by Lanfrane, Archbishop of Canterbury.[2] The patriotic arguments of Comyn prevailed. on the 13th of July, David de Berneham, the Bishop of St Andrews, girded the king with the belt of knighthood, and then explained to him his duties, first in Latin, and afterwards in Norman-French. The various ceremonies' employed upon the occasion presented a curious combination of old Celtic usages and of recently imported Anglo-Norman customs. The youthful monarch was seated upon the sacred stone of destiny, which formed the coronation chair; the crown was placed on his head, the sceptre in his hand; he was invested with the royal mantle, and the barons and knights, kneeling in homage, threw their robes beneath his feet. A grey haired Highland sennachy, or bard, clothed in a scarlet mantle, stepping forth from the crowd, repeated, in th Gaelic tongue, a long genealogical recitation, in which, beginning with "Hail, Alexander, King Albion, son of Alexander, son of William, son of David," he carried up the royal pedigree through all its generations to the fabulous Gathelus, who married Scota, the daughter of Pharaoh, and was contemporary of Moses."[3] It is doubtful whether Alexander understood a word of the rhapsody addressed to him, but he is recorded to have liberally rewarded the venerable genealogist.

The English king had at this time, in the spirit of his age, resolved upon an expedition to the Holy Land; and, in order to secure the northern border of his kingdom form the incursions of the Scots during his absence, the marriage formerly agreed on between his daughter Margaret and the young king of Scotland, was solemnized at York, on the 20th of December, 1251.

[1] Hailes, vol. i. p. 174. [2] Ibid.; Fordun, lib. x. c.
[3] Fordun, lib. x. c. i.; Chron. Mel. p. 219; Rymer's Foed. vol. i. p. 465.

The ceremony was graced by the presence of Henry and his queen, of Mary de Couci, Queen-dowager of Scotland, who had come from France on the occasion with a numerous train, and of the principal nobility and prelates of both countries. The festivities, which lasted several days, appear to have been of the most magnificent character. "Were I," says a contemporary chronicler, "to explain at length the abundance of the feasts, the variety and the frequent changes of the vestments, the delight and the plaudits occasioned by the jugglers, and the multitude of those who at down to meat, my narrative would become hyperbolical. I shall only mention that the Archbishop, who, as the great Prince of the North, showed himself a most serene host to all comers, made a donation of six hundred oxen, which were all spent upon the first course; and from this circumstance I leave you to form a parallel judgment of the rest."[1]

In the midst of these festivities, Alexander performed homage for the lands which he held in England; and Henry with that mean and dishonourable policy, which was afterwards fully developed by his son, endeavoured to take advantage of the youth and inexperience of his relative and guest, by cunningly proposing that he should also render fealty for his kingdom of Scotland. But the young monarch, with a prudence and spirit beyond his years, replied, "that he had been invited to York to marry the princess of England, not to treat of affairs of state, and that he could not take a step so important without the knowledge and approbation of his parliament."[2] Henry was constrained to rest satisfied with his reply, and for the present, at least, to desist from his demand. It was agreed however, that he should send into Scotland a trusty counsellor who might act in concert with the Scottish nobles as guardian of the young king; and Geoffrey de Langley, keeper of the royal forests, was appointed to this important office; but he was speedily expelled by the barons on account of his rapacity and insolence.

It soon appeared that the English king had by no means laid aside his designs upon the independence of Scotland. In the year 1254, he procured Pope Innocent the Fourth to grant him a twentieth of the ecclesiastical revenues of that kingdom during three years, ostensibly for the aid of the Holy Land, but really for his own uses; and he despatched Simon de Montfort, the celebrated Earl of Leicester, on a secret mission, for the purpose of strengthening the English interest at the court of Alexander. At this period, the powerful family of the Comyns were at the head of Scottish affairs, and two of the barons of their party, Robert de Ros and John de Baliol, held the office of regents. They were fiercely opposed by a rival faction, headed by the Earls of March, Strathern, and Carrick, Alexander the Steward of Scotland, and Alan Durward the High Justiciary, who had been accused at York of design upon the crown. The interest of this party were espoused by Henry and his daughter, Queen Margaret, who complained that she was confined in the castle of Edinburgh, a sad and

[1] M. Paris, p. 830.

[2] Ibid. p. 829; Rymer's Foed, vol. i. p. 467.

solitary place, without verdure, and by reason of is vicinity to the sea, unwholesome; that she was not permitted to make excursions through the kingdom, nor to choose her female attendants; and that she was not allowed to enjoy the society of her husband, the king.[1] Henry despatched the Earl of Gloucester, and Maunsell, his chief secretary to the Scottish court, under the pretence of inquiring into the grievances complained by his queen, but in reality for the purpose of assisting the discontented nobles in their machinations against the party which steadily opposed his interested schemes. While the Comyns and their supporters were engaged in preparations for holding a parliament at Stirling, the earls of Dunbar, Strathern, and Carrick, in concert with the Earl of Gloucester and his associates, surprised the castle of Edinburgh, and obtained possession of the persons of the king and queen.[2] As soon as Henry heard of the success of his forerunners, Gloucester and Maunsell, he immediately issued his writs to his military tenants, and assembling a numerous army, marched to the Scottish border, declaring, he should attempt noting prejudicial to the rights of the king, or the liberties of Scotland. Alexander and his queen were suddenly removed to Roxburgh, where they had an interview with Henry, who came from the castle of Wark for that purpose. The government of Scotland was there remodelled under his influence, and a deed was drawn up by which Alexander bound himself not to admit his late counsellors, or their friend, to any share in the management of the affairs of his kingdom, until they should make satisfaction to himself and the King of England for offices they were or might to be charged with. In the room of the Comyns and their associates, the earls of Fife, Dunbar, Strathern, Carrick and the Bishops of Dunkeld and Aberdeen, and others of the nobility and clergy who were favourable to the English interest, were appointed regents of the kingdom, and guardians of the king and queen for seen years, till Alexander should have reached the age of twenty-one.[3] This deed, which was deposited in the hands of the English king, was loudly condemned, as derogatory to the honour of the kingdom, and the Bishop of Glasgow, and the and the Bishop-elect of St Andrews, the Chancellor, and the Earl of Menteith, indignantly refused to affix their seals to an instrument so prejudicial to the independence of the country.[4] Henry having thus, with characteristic cunning, concealed his designs against the liberties of Scotland under the mask of friendship, proceeded to recruit his exhausted coffers by selling a pardon to John de Baliol, and confiscating the estates fo Robert de Ros, the late regents.

The arrangement made at Roxburgh by Henry and his partisans appears to have been maintained for a bout two years, during whih the country was the scene of continual broils. Gamelin, the Bishop elect of St Andrews, who had been removed from his secular office on account of his opposition to the English faction, procured himself to be

[1] M. Paris, p. 640. [2] Chron. Mel. p. 220. [3] Hailes, vol. i. p. 202; Rymer's Foed. vol. i. p. 566.
[4] Chron. Mel. p. 221; Fordun, book x chap. ix.

consecrated by the Bishop of Glasgow, in spite of an interdict issued by the regents; and although placed without the protection of the laws, he hastened to Rome, laid his complaint before the Pope, and induced him to excommunicate his enemies, ad to declare him worthy of the bishopric.[1] The regents, enraged at the opposition of Gamelin, seized the revenues of his see, while Henry prohibited his return, and issued orders to arrest him if he attempted to land in England. But the opponents of the English faction continued to gain ground. Mary de Couci, the widow of Alexander, the Second, and John de Brienne, her second husband, visited Scotland in 1257, and animated with all her old hereditary hatred of England, immediately espoused the cause of the Comyns. At this juncture, the Bishop of Dunblane, and the Abbots of Jedburgh and Melrose - the delegates of the Pope - published the sentence of excommunication against the counsellors of the king. The Comyns promptly availed themselves of this favourable occurrence, declaired that the government was in the hands of excommunicated and accursed persons, who had shamefully mismanaged the affairs of the state, and that the kingdom would soon be laid under a papal interdict. Finding that their cause increased in popularity, the suddenly rose in arms, seized the king and queen at Kinross, carried them to Stirling and totally dispersed the English faction."[2] Henry was at that time engaged in a contest with the Welsh, and the now dominant Comyns entered into a league with, Lewellyn, Prince of Wales, and the chiefs of the Principality, which stipulated that neither of the parties should make peace with the king of England without mutual consent.[3]

Alan Durward meanwhile fled to England, and the Comyns assembled their force, and, taking the king with them, marched against the English party, however, took place - and the King of England was compelled to dissemble his animosity against the Comyns, and his bitter mortification at the failure of his designs, and to accommodate himself to the altered state of parties in Scotland. A new regency was appointed (1258), which left the government of the country mainly in the hands of the queen dowager and the Comyns; but, with the view of conciliating the opposite party, Alan Durward, and other three of the late counsellors were included in the number of the regents.[4]

Shortly after the new government was established, the Comyns lost their great leader, Walter Earl of Menteith. It was reported in England, that his death was occasioned by a fall from his horse; but, in Scotland, it was believed that he had been poisoned by his countess. The unhappy woman appears to have been instigated to the commission of this crime by a criminal passion which she had cherished for an Englishman, named John Russell, whom she soon afterwards married with indecent haste. She was openly charge with the murder of her husband, and she and her paramour were cast into prison, deprived of their estates, and ultimately compelled to leave the kingdom.[5]

[1] Chron. Mel. p. 221. [2] Hailes, vol. i. p. 205; M. Paris. p. 644. [3] Rymer's Foed, vol. i. p. 653.
[4] Ibid. p. 670. [5] Hailes, vol. i. p. 207.

the express condition that neither the king nor any of his attendants should be required to treat of state affairs during their stay at the English court, and that Henry should make oath that he would not detain either the queen or her child, if her delivery should take place in England.

In accordance with this arrangement, the king and queen, accompanied by a considerable body of the Scottish nobility and clergy, repaired to the court of Henry, where they were entertained with unusual magnificence. The queen now drew near her time; and, at the urgent solicitation of her father, it was agreed that she should lie in at the English court. But such was the well-founded jealousy which was entertained of English ambition and intrigue, that Henry was required a second time, to make oath that, in the event of the death of the queen or of Alexander, the royal infant should be delivered to an appointed body of the Scottish nobility and clergy, consisting of the leaders of both the great national parties. This stipulation having been made, Alexander returned to Scotland, and in the month of February, 1261, his queen was delivered at Windsor, of a daughter who was named Margaret, and afterwards married to Eric, King of Norway.[1]

In the beginning of the following year, Henry interposed his good offices to prevent a rupture between Alexander and Haco, King of Norway, but without effect. The Norwegian chiefs of the western islands, from their predatory habits, had long been formidable neighbours to the western coast of Scotland; and they had not only overspread the whole of the western archipelago, but had frequently invaded and plundered the mainland. The Scottish king had made repeated attempts to obtain possession of these islands, and a number of the chiefs were induced, either by force or by motives of interest, to renounce their allegiance to the Norwegian crown, and to become the feudatories of Scotland. Alexander II, as we have seen, died on the coast of Argyleshire, while leading an expedition against the isles, to compel their chiefs to acknowledge him as their feudal superior.

On the death of the king, the object of the expedition was abandoned, but it was resumed when Alexander III, took the reins of government into his own hands. After an unsuccessful attempt to gain his end by negotiation, he is alleged to have instigated the Earl of Ross, and other island chiefs, to invade the Hebrides, with the view of compelling the petty kings of these isles to acknowledge the sovereignty of Scotland. If we may credit the narratives of the Norwegian chroniclers, the invaders not only burned and plundered the villages, and even churches, but inflicted the most horrible cruelties upon the helpless inhabitants.[2] Haco, the Norwegian king, made immediate preparations for vengeance. Having collected a large fleet, he set sail from Herlover on the 7th of July 1262. With this splendid armament - the most powerful tht had ever sailed form Norway - Haco reached

[1] Hailes, vol. i. p. 212; M. Westminster, p. 377. [2] Johnstone's Notes to the Norse Account of Haco's Expedition.

Shetlands in two days, and thence sailed to Orkney, and anchored in the Bay of Ronaldsvoe. There he remained for several weeks, levying contributions from the inhabitants both of the islands and of the opposite mainland. It is mentioned by the Norse Chronicle of the expedition, that while the fleet lay at Ronaldsvoe, "a great darkness drew over the sun, so that only a little ring was bright round the orb." This incidental notice has afforded the means of ascertaining exactly the date of this expedition; and it is found that the remarkable phenomenon of an annular eclipse must have been seen at Ronaldsvoe on the 5th of August, 1263; "a fine example," it has been justly said, "of the clear and certain light reflected by the exact sciences upon history."

Haco now sailed for the south, and being joined, as he proceeded, by Magnus, the Lord of Man, and by Dugal, and other Hebridean chiefs, he found himself at the head of a fleet of above a hundred sail, most of them vessels of considerable size, and all well provided with men and arms. Dividing his forces he sent a squadron of fifty ships to plunder the Mull of Cantyre; another of five ships, to make a descent on the Isle of Bute; while Haco himself, with the rest of the fleet, remained at Gigha, a small island between Cantyre and Isla. The division which sailed against Bute, compelled the Scottish garrison of the Castle of Rothesay to surrender, and it appears that, at the instigation of Roderic, a pirate chief, who claimed Bute as his inheritance, the island was laid waste, and part of the garrison of Rothesay basely murdered. In the meantime, Haco himself, having recalled the forces which had been detached to plunder the peninsula of Cantyre, entered the Firth of Clyde, and anchored n the Sound of Kilbrannan, between the mainland and the Isle of Arran.

The Scottish government, seing the imminent danger of a descent of the Norwegian host upon the mainland, endeavoured to effect a treaty of peace with Haco, and a temporary truce was agreed on, to afford an opportunity for the discussion of the terms of pacification. The demands made by Alexander were of the most moderate kind; he claimed Bute, Arran, and the two small islands of the Cumbrays, but offered to give up to Norway the whole of the Hebrides. Fortunately for Scotland, Haco would not listen to these terms, and as soon as the truce terminated, he despatched a fleet of sixty ships up the Clyde into Loch Long, to plunder and lay waste the country on is shores. This attachment penetrated to the head of this loch, committing great devastation as they passed. A narrow neck of land divides Loch Long from Loch Lomond, the islands of which lake were crowded with inhabitants, who had fled for safety to these secluded retreats, doubtless with the confident expectation that they were thus placed completely beyond the reach of their ruthless foes. But the Norwegians dragged their light boats across the Isthmus of Tarbet, and launched them on Loch Lomond, and waste with fire and sword the isles and shores of this beautiful lake. In the words of a Norwegian bard who commemorates this exploit, "The preserving shielded warriors of the thrower of the whizzing spear drew their boats across

the broad isthmus. Our fearless troops, the exactors of contribution, with flaming brands wasted the populous islands in the lake, and the mansions around its circling bays." Another expedition of similar character was undertaken into Stirlingshire, b one of the Hebridean chiefs, who slew great numbers of the inhabitants, and returned laden with plunder.

But the delay which had taken place had given the Scots time to collect their forces, and the elements now began to fight against the invaders. A storm destroyed ten of the ships which lay in Loch Long, and soon after, on Monday, the 1st of October, the rest of the fleet, which still lay in the Firth of Clyde, encountered a tempest of such tremendous violence from the south-west accompanied with torrents of hailstones and rain, that several of the vessels were cast a-shore, and the remainder, mostly dismasted or otherwise disables, and were driven up the channel towards Largs. A multitude of armed peasants occupied the heights above the sea-shore, ready to take advantage of the disaster of the invading fleet, and they immediately fell upon the crews of the stranded vessels. But the Norwegians defended themselves with great intrepidity, and the wind having somewhat abated, assistance was sent them by Haco and they succeeded in driving off their assailants. When daylight appeared, the Norwegian king landed at the head of a strong re-enforcement, for the protection of two transports tht had been cast ashore the preceding day, and which the Scots had attempted to plunder during the night. Soon after, the Scottish army, led my the king in person, along with Alexander, the Steward of Scotland, came down from the high grounds above the village of Largs. It consisted of a numerous body of foot soldiers, well accounted, and for the most part armed with spears and bows, and of fifteen hundred cavalry, armed form head to heel, and mounted on Spanish horses, which were also clothed in complete armour. The Norwegians, who were greatly outnumbered by his force, were drawn up in three divisions, one of which occupied an eminence that rises behind the village of Largs, while the other two were stationed on the beach. As the engagement was about to commence, Haco was with great difficulty prevailed upon by his chiefs to return in his barge to his fleet at the Cumbrays, to send them further reinforcements. But he had scarcely reached his ship when another storm arose, and rendered it impossible, for the present, to land additional forces. In the meantime, the van of the Scottish army had encountered and put to flight the advanced body of the Norwegians.

The fugitives, in their headlong retreat, disordered the ranks of the squadrons drawn up on the shore. The rout soon became general. Many of the Norwegians threw themselves into their boats and attempted to regain their ships, but some of the boats became overloaded and were swamped. The rest of the troops retreated along the shore, closely pursued by the victorious Scots. They repeatedly rallied, however, and made an obstinate stand wherever the nature of the ground afforded a favourable opportunity of resistance. The Scottish king was wounded in the face by an arrow and Alexander, the Steward of Scotland, was slain.

But the pursuers pressed on in increasing numbers and with redoubled fury. The slaughter among the retreating Norwegians now became very great, and Haco the nephew of the king, and one of the most renowned champions in the host, fell, along with many others of the principal leaders; and but for the timely arrival of a reinforcement form the fleet, which by extraordinary efforts effected a landing through a tremendous surf, the Norwegian army would have been entirely destroyed. The fresh troops immediately attacked the victorious Scots, and, if we may give implicit credit to the Norse account of the battle, succeeded in driving them back from the high grounds overhanging the shore. "At the conflict of corselets on the blood-red hill," says the Norwegians chronicler, "the damasked blade hewed the mail of hostile tribes, ere the Scot, nimble as the hounded, would leave the field to the followers of an all-conquering king." The relics of the invading force then re-embarked in their boats and regained their ships.

Meanwhile, the storm continued to rage with unabated fury, and the remaining ships of Haco's magnificent fleet were dreadfully shattered and distressed. Many of them were driven from their anchorage, and dashed against each other or flung upon the shores and rocks. The beach was covered with the fragments of the vessels and with the dead bodies of their crews. A truce was granted to Haco, for the purpose of burying his dead.[1] After the performance of this melancholy duty, the unfortunate monarch collected all tht remained of his once noble fleet, and sailed away to the Island of Arran. He then, after a short delay, steered for the northern islands, which at that time were the undisputed property of the Norwegian crown; and after much loss and suffering from the stormy weather, which continued throughout the whole of his homeward voyage, he at last reached Orkney, on the 29th of October. Here an illness seized him, brought on by mental anxiety and grief, as much as by incessant fatigue. He lingered for some weeks, struggling bravely against his disease, and endeavouring to soothe his mind under his misfortunes, with the thought that he was overthrown by divine, rather than by human power. "The arm of God," he said, "and not the strength of man, hath repulsed me, wrecked my ships, and sent deth among my soldiers." As he felt his end approaching, he received the last rites which the church administers to the dying, and the spirit of the old Norse warrior reviving within him, he commanded the Chronicles of his ancestors, the pirate kings, to be read to him; and he expired at midnight, on the 15th of December, with these wild tales of bloodshed and rapine still sounding in his ears.[2]

[1] The cairns and tumuli erected over the slain Norsemen are still visible on the field of battle, a little to the south of Largs. In the centre there once stood a large granite pillar, ten feet high; it fell down many hers ago. On some of the cairns being opened great quantities of human bones have been found, and also warlike weapons, particularly axes and swords.

[2] See the Norwegian Account of Haco's Expedition against Scotland, translated, with Notes, by the Rev. James Johnstone; and Observations on the Norwegian Expedition, &c., by James Dillon, Esq., in Transactions of the Society of the Antiquarians of Scotland, vol. ii. pp. 350-407.

The victory of Largs was, in its consequences, one of the most important ever won by the Scots. It extended and consolidated the Scottish dominions, and freed the kingdom for ever, from the incursions of those savage warriors, who had been so long the terror and scourge of western Europe. Alexander lost no time in following up the advantage already gained; and so vigorous were the measure which he adopted, that the King of Man, and all the chiefs of the western isles who had adhered to Haco, were compelled to acknowledge themselves the liegemen of th King of Scotland, and to consent that, in future, they would hold their dominions of the Scottish crown. Mangus, the King of Man, did homage to Alexander at Dumfries, in 1264, and became bound to furnish to his lord paramount, when required by him, ten galleys or ships of war; five with twenty-four oars, and five with twelve.[1] Two years later, was concluded with Norway, by which all claim of sovereignty over the Isle of Man and the Hebrides, and all other islands in the southern and western seas, was ceded to the Scottish crown. But the islands of Orkney and Shetland were expressly excepted from this stipulation. It was agreed that the Hebrides, and other isles made over to Scotland were in future to be governed by the laws of that kingdom; but the Scandinavian inhabitants received permission to retire with all their property. On the other hand, it was stipulated tat the King and estate of Scotland should pay to Norway four thousand marks, of the Roman standard, and a yearly quit-rent of a hundred marks sterling for ever. And all parties became bound to fulfil their obligations, under a penalty of ten thousand marks, to be extracted by the Popes.[2] This treaty ended for ever the wars betwixt Scotland and Norway; and the bonds of amity between the two kingdoms were subsequently drawn still closer by the marriage of the Princess Margaret, the daughter of Alexander, with the youthful Eric, Haco's successor.

In 1272, Henry III, of England died, after a reign of nearly sixty years. At the coronation of his son, the able, but unscrupulous Edward I, in 1274, Alexander and his queen, the new king's sister, attended with a splendid retinue, and did homage, according to custom, for his English possessions. He seems not without reason, to have placed no great reliance on the honour or upright intentions of this brother-in-law; for he took good care to obtain a letter, under Edward's hand, declaring in explicit terms, that this friendly visit should not be construed into anything prejudicial to the independences of Scotland. In 1278, the King of Scotland appeared before the English Parliament at Westminster, and in general terms acknowledged himself the liegeman of Edward, and the oath of fealty was taken for him by Robert de Bruce, Earl of Carrick, concluding with these words: - "I shall faithfully perform the services used and wont for the lands and tenements which I hold of the said king."[3] Edward, who had evidently formed the design of entrapping the Scottish king into the performance

[1] Hailes, vol. i. p. 213; Fordun, book x chap. xviii.

[2] Hailes, vol. i. p. 215; Fordun, book x, chap. xix. [3] Rymer's Foed, vol. ii. p. 126.

of an unconditional homage, on which he might afterwards have founded the plea that Scotland was the fief of England was forced to accept the guarded acknowledgement as it was given. And he showed his understanding of that oath of fealty, as sworn on this occasion, and at the same time manifested his chagrin at the failure of his crafty scheme, by declaring that he reserved his claim of homage for the kingdom of Scotland whenever he or his heirs should think proper to make it.

The preceding years of Alexander's reign, from the time that he assumed he reins of government into his own hand, had been remarkably prosperous. The firm, yet prudent and conciliatory manner in which he conducted the affairs of his kingdom, had secured him the confidence and affection of his people; and the country freed from both foreign invasion and internal disturbances, was steadily developing its energies and advancing in civilization.

In 1281, the Princess Margaret was married to Eric King of Norway, then a youth in his fourteenth year,[1] and this most polite alliance was, soon after 1282), followed by the marriage of Alexander, the Prince of Scotland, then in his nineteenth year, to Margaret, a daughter of Guy, Earl of Flanders. But the fair prospect of continued prosperity and happiness to the king and nation which these alliances held out, was speedily overcast, and the tidings of disasters which followed each other in rapid succession, spread dismay throughout the kingdom. Alexander had, some years before this, met with a severe domestic affliction, in the death of his queen. His second son, David died when a boy. His daughter, Margaret, the Queen of Norway died in child-bed, in the latter part of the year 1283, leaving an only child, named after her mother, and called in Scottish history the Maiden of Norway. The death of Queen Margaret was followed by that of her brother Alexander, the Prince of Scotland on the 28th of January, 1284. The Scottish king was thus in a few months bereft, by death, of all his children, and the hopes which were entertained, that the peace and prosperity of the country would be maintained under the sway of his descendants, were suddenly blasted.

These sad calamities rendered it necessary that immediate measures should be taken for the settlement of the succession to the crown. For this purpose the parliament was assembled at Scone, on the 5th of February 1284, when the estates of the realm solemnly bound themselves to acknowledge Margaret, Princess of Norway, as their sovereign, failing any children whom Alexander might have, and failing any issue of the Prince of Scotland deceased. Mention is made of the issue of the prince, because the parliament, having assembled immediately after his death, it was uncertain whether the princess might not yet present the kingdom with an heir to the crown.[2] Alexander was still a man in the flower of life, and to avert, if possible, the evils of a disputed succession, he took for his second wife, Joleta, the young and beautiful daughter of the Count of Dreux.

[1] It appears from her marriage settlement, that at this period of our history, the price of land was ten years' purchase.

[2] Hailes, vol. i. p. 222.

The nuptials were celebrated at Jedburgh with great magnificence and much popular rejoicing. But evil omens accompanied this union. In the midst of the festivities which graced the joyful occasion a spectral figure, habited like the Kings of Terrors, glided with fearful gestures among the personage of a strange masque which was exhibited, and at length suddenly vanished. This skeleton-like figure was, no doubt, a part of the pageant; but it was in bad taste, and excited such terror and apprehension of evil among the guests, tht Fordun considers it as a supernatural prognostication of the fearful calamities tht were about to fall upon the country.[1] These forebodings of evil were unhappily soon realised. Within a year after his marriage, on the 16th of March, 1286, as Alexander was riding in a dark night between Kinghorn, and Burntisland, on the northern shore of the Firth of Forth, his horse suddenly stumbled over a rocky cliff above the sea, and a place now known by the name of King's Wood End, and the rider was killed on the spot.

The death of Alexander at this critical juncture was, perhaps, the greatest national calamity tht has ever befallen the kingdom of Scotland. The lamentation was universal, and all classes looked forward with dismay to the consequences which seemed likely to ensure, -

" -------- Old men and beldames
Did prophecy about it dangerously."

"When it is considered," says Sir Walter Scott,[2] "that his only near heir was a mere infant, and residing in the distant country of Norway, and that the failure of a life so precarious must necessarily open the way to all the evils of a disputed succession, it is no wonder that the credulous recalled the phantom of death, which had appeared in the hour of nuptial revelry; that even the nobles of the land listened to pale-eyed soothsayers intimating disasters which they dare not openly name;[3] or that a people, attached to music and poetry, should have commemorate their king's gentle government and their own loss, in the following rude but affectionate lines, supposed to be the earliest specimen that is preserved of the Scoto-Saxon, or Lowland Scottish dialect. (The spelling is modern.)

[1] Fordun, book x. chap. xl. [2] Quarterly Review, vol. xii. p. 340. Vol. i.

[3] Referring to the well-known prediction of Thomas the Rhymer to the Earl of March, the day before Alexander's death, "That before the next day, at noon, such a tempest should blow as Scotland had not felt for many years before." The next morning, the day being clear, says Boece, and no change appearing in the air, the nobleman did challenge Thomas of his saying, calling him an impostor. He replied that noon was not yet passed. About which time a post came to advertise the earl of the king his sudden death. "Then," said Thomas, "this is the tempest I foretold, and so it shall prove to Scotland." - See Spottiswoode, p. 47.

'When Alexander our king was dead,
  Who Scotland led in love and le,[1]
Away was sonse[2] of ale and bread,
  Of wine and war, and game and glee,
Our gold is turned into lead;
  Christ, born into virginity,
Succour poor Scotland and remeid,[3]
  That stad[4] is in perplexity.'"

Alexander died in the forty-fifth year of his age, and the thirty-seventh of his reign. "Let no one question the salvation of this king because of his violent death," says Fordun; "he who has lived well cannot die ill."[5] He was universally regretted, for his virtues both public and private. He was temperate in his habits, pure in his morals, and exemplary in all his domestic relations. He was kind and gentle in his manners, and at the same time firm and constant in his purposes. His policy towards England was conciliatory and forbearing, but he was the resolute defender of the independence both of the kingdom and church of Scotland. His love of justice was most conspicuous, and greatly endeared him to the whole body of his subjects. Attended by his justiciary and his principal nobles he made an annual progress through his kingdom, for the redress of injuries and the punishment of evil-doers; so that the common people were protected from the oppressions of the barons, and their bands of insolent retainers. "In his time," says Fordun, "the church flourished; its ministers were honoured with due reverence; vice was openly discouraged; craft and violence were alike overawed; injury ceased, and the reign of virtue, truth, and justice, was maintained throughout the land. He reigned over himself as well as others, and was regarded far and near, not only among his friends but his enemies, and especially the English, with love as well as fear" We need not wonder tht a monarch adorned with so many virtues was deeply lamented, and that his memory was long and affectionately cherished by the people of Scotland.

Margaret Maid of Norway

[1286-1290] of Norway, the granddaughter of Alexander, who had been recognized as heir to the crown in 1284, was residing in Norway at the time of her grandfather's death. It was therefore necessary, both on account of her infancy and her absence from the kingdom to appoint a regency; and at a parliament held at Scone, on the 11th of April, 1286, six guardians fo the realm were by common consent chosen to carry on the government of the country. Fraser, Bishop of St Andrews, Duncan, Earl of Fife, and Alexander, Earl of Buchan, were intrusted with the administration of the northern division of Scotland, beyond the Firth of Forth. The country to the south of the Forth was committed to the charge of Wishart, Bishop of Glasgow, John Comyn, Lord of Badenoch, and James, the High Stewart of Scotland.[6]

[1] Tranquility. [2] Abundance. [3] Remedy. [4] Placed. [5] Book x. chap. xl.
[6] Fordun, book xi. chap. i.; Hailes, vol. i. p. 225.

It soon became apparent that a long minority was he least of the evils which the kingdom had now to dread. The rule of a female sovereign was new to Scotland, and was repugnant to the whole course of the habits and feelings of the powerful and turbulent barons, who exercised almost regal sway in that country. According to the feudal system, the king was little else than the first of a band of warriors - their leader in battle as well as their ruler in peace; and in that rude and warlike age, it was reckoned disgraceful for noble knights to obey the orders of a woman. The right of the Maiden of Norway to the Scottish throne was therefore immediately called in question. Even in the parliament at Scone, the claims of Bruce and Baliol were zealously advocated by their respective partisans; and a few months later (Sept, 20, 1286), the adherents of the former, including Patrick Earl of Dunbar; Walter Stewart, Earl of Menteith; James, the High Steward of Scotland; Angus son of Donald, the Lord of the Isles; and others of the most powerful of the Scottish nobility, along with two influential English barons, - Thomas de Clare, brother of Gilbert, Earl of Gloucester, and Richard de Burgh, Earl of Ulster, - assembled at Turnberry Castle, for the purpose of supporting Bruce's title to the crown as the descendant of David, Earl of Huntingdon, brother of King William the Lion. For this purposes they entered into an agreement, by which they bound themselves to adhere to one another on all occasions and against all persons, saving their allegiance to the King of England, and also to him who should gain the kingdom of Scotland, as the rightful heir of the late king.[1]

In the meantime, the able but unprincipled King of England had formed the project of annexing the kingdom of Scotland to his own dominions. On being informed of the death of Alexander, his brother-in-law and faithful ally, he exclaimed to his confidential counsellors, "Now the time is at last arrived, when Scotland and its petty kings shall be reduced under my power." He was careful, however, to conceal his insidious designs till the proper time for their disclosure should arrive. Meanwhile, he contended himself with watching the progress of affairs in Scotland, and observing, with malignant satisfaction, the intestine strife to which the heart burnings and jealousies of the Scottish nobles gave rise. In 1288, the number of the regents was reduced to four, by the assassination of Duncan, Earl of Fife, and the death of the Earl of Buchan.[2] The High Steward, another of the regents, had espoused this cause of Bruce, and was therefore hostile to the rights of the youthful queen; and at length the quarrel between the rival factions of Bruce and Baliol broke out into an open war, and the whole kingdom was lunged into a state of confusion.[3]

While the country was thus torn by internal dissensions and rapidly tending to anarchy, it is alleged that the States of Scotland foolishly sent ambassadors to the King of England, requesting his advice and mediation towards composing the troubles of the kingdom; but the truth of his statement has been denied, as not resting upon any good authority.

[1] Tytler's Hist. of Scot. vol. i. p. 55. [2] Fordun, book xi. chap. xi. [3] Hailes, vol. i. p. 226.

It is certain, however, that in the end of the year 1280, Eric, King of Norway opened a negotiation with Edward regarding the affairs of his infant daughter, and her kingdom of Scotland. This was precisely what the English monarch wished and expected, and he at once eagerly caught at the offer made to him by the father of the youthful queen. At his request the Scottish regents appointed the Bishops of St Andrews and Glasgow, with Robert Bruce and John Comyn, to treat, in the presence of the English monarch, regarding the matters proposed by the Norwegian ambassadors, "saving always the liberty and honour of Scotland."[1] To this conference, which was appointed to be held at Salisbury, Edward sent the Bishops of Winchester and Durham, and the Earls of Pembroke and Warenne.

Edward had, at the outset, formed a project of a marriage between the young Queen of Scotland and his only son, Edward, Prince of Wales, and he had secretly procured a dispensation for the marriage from the Pope, as the youthful pair were within the prohibited degrees. This scheme, however, was not yet suffered to transpire, and no direct allusion was made to it in the treaty which was drawn up at Salisbury. It was there stipulated, that the queen should be immediately conveyed either to her own dominions or to England, untrammelled by any matrimonial engagement; and that if Edward received her thus free, he would, on demand, deliver her as free to the Scottish nation; provided always, that good order should be previously established in Scotland, so that she might reside there with safety to her person, - a clause which evidently gave an unscrupulous monarch, like Edward, the power of detaining the queen in England, as long as it might serve his purpose to do so. The Scottish commissioners undertook, before receiving the queen, to give security to Edward, that she should not marry without his counsel and consent, and that of her father, the King of Norway. It was also stipulated that peace and good order should be established in Scotland before the arrival of the queen, so that she might go there with safety, and remain in all freedom; and with regard to the guardians or public officers in Scotland, it was provided that should any of these be suspected persons, or in the opinion of the King of Norway unfit for their offices, they should be removed and persons of the highest rank and character appointed in their room by the advice of the "good men" of Scotland and Norway; and if they differed in their opinions, the dispute should be settled by the commissioners whom Edward might appoint to act as umpires.

Of this convention three copies were made, one in Latin, which was transmitted to the King of Norway, and two, in French, were retained for the use of the Scots and English, - proof, as Lord Hailes remarks, that among both nations at this period, Norman-French was the language in which state affairs were generally conducted.[2]

[1] Ibid., Rym, Foed, vol. ii. p. 431. [2] Annals, vol. i. p. 228; Rymer Foed, vol. ii. pp. 446, 447.

The conditions of this treaty, so favourable to the designs of the English monarch, render it evident that some at least of the Scottish commissioners had been gained over to his interest; and it is probable that they had been privately sounded respecting the proposed marriage between Prince Edward and their queen, and had been instructed to prepare the minds of the nobility and people of Scotland for its favourable reception. As soon as the project alliance became generally known, the Estates of Scotland assembled at Brigham, a village on the north bank of the Tweed, between Coldstream and Kelso, and from thence addressed a letter to the English king, expressing, in warm terms, their joy at the good news which had reached them, "that the Apostle had granted a dispensation for the marriage of Margaret, their dear lady and their queen, with Prince Edward, and beseeching him to inform them if the report was true. If it is,` they conclude, "`we, on our part, heartily consent to the alliance not doubting that you will agree to such reasonable conditions as we shall propose to our council.`"[1] They wrote at the same time to Eric, King of Norway, informing him of their consent to the union, and urging him to send his daughter immediately to England. It is evident that, at this period, the idea of an alliance with England was by no means unpopular among the Scottish nobility, many of whom as we have seen, were of Anglo-Norman extraction, and held estates in both kingdoms. They were careful, however, to take the most jealous precautions that all the rights and immunities of Scotland, as a separate kingdom, should be upheld and preserved. The final arrangements respecting the proposed marriage were concluded at Brigham, on the 18th of July, 1290, between the guardians, clergy, earls, barons, and whole community of Scotland, and the Bishop of Durham and five other plenipotentiaries on the part of England. It was agreed tht the rights, laws, liberties, and customs of Scotland were to be inviolably observed in all times coming, through -out the whole kingdom and its marches, saving always the rights which the King of England, or any other person, has possessed before the date of this treaty, in the marches or elsewhere, or which may accrue to him in all time coming. It was stipulated also, that failing Margaret and Edward, or either of them, without issue, the kingdom should belong to the nearest heirs to whom it ought of right to belong, wholly freely, absolutely, and without any subjection; that the queen, if she should survive her husband, was to be given up to the Scottish nation free from all matrimonial engagements; that the kingdom of Scotland was for ever to remain separate from England; that the ecclesiastical privileges of the country should be preserved in all their integrity; that no native of Scotland was in any case whatever to be compelled to answer, out of the kingdom, for offences committed in Scotland; that the national records were to remain within the realm, and that no aids of money or levies of troops should be demanded, unless in such cases as were warranted by former usage.[2]

[1] Hails, vol. i. p. 228; Rymer Foed. vol. ii. p. 472. [2] Hailes, vol. i. pp. 231-235.

The articles of this treaty were ratified by the guardians and community of Scotland, and eagerly confirmed by Edward, who took a solemn oath to maintain them inviolate. Edward presuming on the power which he had thus acquired over the Scottish people, appointed the Bishop of Durham to the office of Governor of Scotland, a step altogether unwarrantable; and growing more insolent in his demands as he found them patiently submitted to, he intimated to the Estates, "that certain rumours of danger and peril to the kingdom of Scotland having reached his ear, he judged it right that all castles and places of strength in that kingdom should be delivered up to him."[1] This demand, however, met with a peremptory refusal, with which Edward was obliged to rest satisfied. But the events of a few weeks rendered these treaties and stipulations of no effect. The young queen having at length set sail from Norway, fell sick on her passage, and died at Orkney about the end of September, 1290, in the eighth year of her age. When the tidings of this fatal event reached Scotland, "the kingdom was troubled," says the Bishop of St Andrews, "and its in habitants sank into despair." In 1284, the crown had been settled on the descendants of Alexander III, but no further provision had been made for its descent. By the untimely death of the Maiden of Norway, the descendants of Alexander III, were altogether extinguished,[2] and the country was now exposed to all the evils of a disputed succession, to intestine broils, and, as it proved, to foreign conquest.

INTERREGNUM.

[1] Rymer Foed, vol. ii. p. 488.

[2] It is a remarkable fact, that within the period of a century, William the Lion, and his posterity, had made no fewer than ten marriages, and yet there was not now a descendant of that king in existence. Of these ten marriages, so may as six produced no issue; the remaining four produced only four males and five females, and all these nine persons were now dead. See Pict. His. of England, vol. i. p. 707.

SCOTLAND – DUNFERMLINE'S - KINGS 2

CONTINUED

INTERREGNUM. - The situation in which Scotland was now placed seemed every way favourable to the designs of the English king. There is no authority for believing, as has sometimes been asserted, that the parliament or people of Scotland ever requested the advice and mediation of the English monarch in settling the succession to the throne. But it now appears, from some important documents recently discovered,[1] that a direct invitation to interfere in the affairs of Scotland was given to him by Robert Bruce, Lord of Annandale, and his adherents; and that they appealed to the authority and protection of Edward and of the royal crown of England, against an alleged design of William, Bishop of St Andrews, and John Comyn, the guardians of Scotland, to raise John Baliol to the throne; and placed themselves, their adherents, kindred, and effects, movable and immovable, under the special guard and protection of the English king. These documents afford too much reason to suspect, that Bruce and his accomplices

[1] Palgrave's Documents and Records, illustrating the History of Scotland. Fordun Barbour, and Wyntown represent Bruce as having had the first offer of the Scottish crown, and that it was only on his refusal to hold it as the vassal of the English king that Baliol was preferred. The documents referred to, show, that these statements are completely devoid of truth.

were prepared to sacrifice the independence of their country, to conciliate the favour of Edward and to gain their own selfish ends. It would appear, also, that two of the guardians of Scotland, and a majority of the nation, were at this period inclined to prefer Baliol as the lawful heir of the Scottish crown; and hence this base and treasonable attempt, on the part of Bruce and his partisans, to obtain the support of the English king. Edward readily listened to their appeal so far as suited his own interest. There can be no doubt that he had already resolved to claim the right to determine this question, in his pretended character of Lord superior of the kingdom of Scotland; and the motives which led to his interference are candidly stated by an old English historian: - "The King of England having assembled his privy council and chief nobility, told them that he had it in his mind to bring under his dominion the king and the realm of Scotland, in the same manner tht he had subdued the kingdom of Wales."[1]

For this purpose he summoned the barons military tenants of Yorkshire, Lancashire, Westmoreland, Cumberland, and Northumberland, to assemble at Norham, on the 3rd of June, 1291; and he requested the clergy and nobility of Scotland to hold a conference with him at the same place, but on an earlier day - the 10th of May. On

the day appointed the conference took place. The proceedings were opened by the English Justiciary, Roger Brabazon, who, in the name of his sovereign, distinctly announced that he meant to regulate the succession to the throne of Scotland, as Lord Paramount of that kingdom, "Wherefore," he added "our lord the king, for the due accomplishment of this design, doth require your hearty recognition of his title of Lord Paramount of the kingdom of Scotland."[2]

There could be nothing more unjust than this claim of the English monarch. It has been observed by Sir Walter Scott, that "to create a fief as a feudal dependence, the superior must be proprietor of the lands which he bestows upon the vassal, and the vassal must receive them under condition of homages and services. Now, the monarchs of England were never in possession of Scotland, properly so called. That kingdom, the original seat of the Scots in the remote province of Argyle, was extended by the conquest of the Picts to the northern borders of the Firth of Forth, called, from being their boundary, the Scottish sea. The provinces thus conquered and melted down into the kingdom called Albania, and afterwards Scotland, were territories which the English had never possessed, or claimed right to, and lay beyond the moe northern wall, where the southern Britons never set foot, but as flying from the sword of the Romans. This change of territory in North Britain took place early as 538. At his period, there is not only no proof of the King of England having interfered with the conquest of the Scots over Pictland, or to dispose of the lands of the vanquished; but it seems probable there was not a king of England to make the grant, or to receive the homage. The idea, therefore, that Scotland was held as a fief of England, seems totally groundless.

[1] Tytler, vol. i. p. 69. [2] Ibid. p. 70; Hemingford. vol. i. p. 38.

At no moment, till the temporary usurpation of Edward I, had any king of England such possession of Scotland as to dispose of it as a fief, either to the Scottish king, or any other; nor was it in any respect by English cession, permission, or convenience, that Kenneth Macalpine and his successors swayed their sceptre."[1]

The modern supporters of the English supremacy over Scotland, unable to resist the force of these arguments, have endeavoured to show that the supremacy in question was "one of a peculiar nature - a special tenure arising out of the ancient dependence of the Scottish Regulus, upon the Anglo-Saxon Bretwalda, Basileus, or Emperor, and not to be cramped by arguments to be drawn from a later jurisprudence." According to this theory, Scotland was not a feudal dependency of England, but "a member of the Anglo-Saxon empire," governed by "under-kings," and subjected to its "over-lord, the Basileus, or emperor of Britain." To this assertion it may be answered, First, That there is no evidence that the dignity of Bretwalda ever had a legal or permanent existence among the Anglo-Saxons. "An imaginary being," it has been justly said, "is created to substantiate an imaginary right." Until the time of Egbert, (A.D. 825) there was nothing like unity among the Anglo-Saxon kingdoms; and the superiority he had

acquired over the other petty Anglo-Saxon princess was soon lost by his successors. The whole of England was not united in one monarchy till the complete subjection of the Danish invaders, and the coalition of the southern and northern states, after the death of Edwy (A.D. 958). In these circumstances, it is preposterous to talk of the dependence of the Scottish "under-king," on the Anglo-Saxon Bretwalda, or "over-lord," when there was no Bretwalda, in existence to enforce or to receive the acknowledgment of supremacy. Secondly, Edward claimed the right to settle the succession to the Scottish throne, not as Bretwalda, or Basileus, but as the feudal Superior and Lord Paramount of Scotland. As such, he was acknowledged by the competitors for the crown, and by the Scottish guardians and nobles. After the convention at Norham, he styles himself, in addition to his former titles, the Superior or Sovereign Lord of Scotland. It was, therefore, the feudal superiority of tht kingdom which he claimed and attempted to exercise, and not any vague, undefined supremacy, as the emperor of Britain. Thirdly, Circular writs were addressed by Edward "to the cathedrals and principal monasteries throughout England, commanding them to search their chronicles and archives for all matters relating to Scotland, and to transmit them to the king under their common seals;" but no instance, nor even pretended instance, was adduced (excepting the temporary submission of William the Lion), in which homage had been rendered for the kingdom of Scotland, or feudal services performed which could be regarded as an acknowledgment of superiority. If any such instance could have been adduced, we may rest assured that it would have been brought forward.

[1] Quarterly Review, vol. xli. p. 342.

The only homage which the Scottish kings paid to the English crown before the Norman Conquest was not for the kingdom of Scotland, but for the possession which, having formerly been part and portion of England, were ceded to the Scots by the monarchs of that country. These territories were: the lordship of Cumberland, ceded to the Scottish crown in 945; and Lothian, including Berwickshire, ceded in 971. These later districts, though they have long been integral parts of Scotland were never subjects of a Scottish king till they were ceded by Edgar to Kenneth, under the condition of homage and allegiance, and were held by the Scottish princes under this burthen, exactly in the same manner as the English monarchs held their own French possessions, under the burthen of homage and fealty to the King of France. It is, no doubt, true, as we have seen, that on various occasions the English sovereigns endeavoured to circumvent their Scottish neighbours, and to present the homage which they admitted to be due for their possession in England into an unconditional homage for the kingdom of Scotland.[1] All such attempts, however, were steadily resisted and baffled, with the single exception of the case of William the Lion, from whom a general acknowledgment of fealty was wrung, as the price of his liberation from captivity. But his engagement to become the liegeman of the English king was cancelled

by Richard I, on payment of a large sum of money; so that the relation between the countries returned to the original footing. The very treaty which Edward had entered into the with the Scottish Estates, at Brigham, in 1290, was sufficient to prove how unfounded were his pretensions to supremacy over Scotland; or if that country had been a fief of the English crown, then the Maiden of Norway would, of necessity have been a ward of the King of England, who would have had a right to dispose of her in marriage, without submitting to negotiate on the subject with those who, in that case, would have been his own vassals. Nevertheless Edward, availing himself of the favourable conjuncture of affairs, and of his own position as the umpire among the competitors for the Scottish throne, demanded , as a preliminary condition of his decision, "the hearty recognition of his title as Superior and Lord Paramount of the kingdom of Scotland."

Bruce and his adherents, who had instigated this demand, must of course have been prepared for this claim of superiority, but the rest of the assembly listened to it with astonishment and dismay. At length, a solitary voice ws heard to utter these words: "No answer can be made while the throne is vacant."[2] "By Holy Edward," cried the King of England, "whose crown I wear, I will vindicate my just rights or perish in the attempt." "And to make this speech good," says an old English chronicler, "he had issued writs for the convocation of his army, so that, in case of his demand being resisted, he might conquer all

[1] It is worthy of notice, tht in the attempt given in the English official records of the homage rendered by Alexander III, the original words of homage have been fraudulently erased, and others substituted in their place, - a clear proof that the terms in which it was expressed had not been satisfactory to the English monarch. The record is still extant, and the fraud visible.

[2] Walsingham, p. 56.

opposition, were it to the death."[1] "He was enraged because they suspected him, and at the same time showed that their suspicions were just." The Scottish Estates found themselves placed in very trying circumstances, and they requested time to consult with their absent members. Edward rejoined that they were all sufficiently informed by the tenor of his summons, and at first would give them only till next day. A further delay was then requested, and they were allowed a term of three weeks to return a definite answer. This delay the king knew might promote his views, and, at any rate, could not injure them, as by that time the barons he had summoned would be assembled in arms.

The power of Edward was no doubt formidable, but enemies still more dangerous were at work in their own councils. A umber of the principal nobility had already been gained over to the English interest, and by their intrigues, and the liberal distribution of money, no less than ten competitors were induced to claim the Scottish crown for the purpose of perplexing the question, as well as of removing the opposition which they might otherwise have offered to the designs of the English king.

All hoped that their time-serving submission to Edward's claim of submission to Edward's claim of superiority would meet with reward, while they clearly foresaw that the candidate who declined to

acknowledge the title of Lord Paramount, claimed by the arbitrator, would forfeit any chances of success. Thus weakened by mutual jealousies, and disunited by conflicting interests, the Scottish barons yielded to the imperious demands of the English monarch, and basely sacrificed the independence of their country to promote their own selfish ends.

On the 2nd of June, 1291, the adjourned meeting of he clergy and nobility of Scotland took place on a green plain, called Hollywell Haugh, near Uprettlington, opposite to Norham Castle. There were present no fewer than eight persons who, under various titles, laid claim to the crown. The Bishop of Bath and Wells, then Chancellor of England opened the proceedings. He stated, that "by various evidences it sufficiently appeared that the English kings were Lords Paramount of Scotland, and, from the most distant ages, had either possessed or claimed that right; that Edward had required the Scots to produce their evidences or arguments to the contrary, and had declared himself ready to admit them if more cogent than his own, and upon the whole matter to pronounce righteous judgment; and that, as they had brought forward no answer to invalidate his right, it was the intention of the King of England, as Lord Paramount, to determine the question of the succession."[1] The chancellor then turned to Robert Bruce, Lord of Annandale, and demanded, "Whether he was content to acknowledge Edward as Lord Paramount of Scotland, and willing to receive judgment form him in that character?" Bruce says the official record of the proceedings, definitely, expressly, publicly, and openly declared his assent. The same question was then put to the other seven

[1] Hailes, vol. i. p. 246; Rym. Foed, vol. ii. p. 545.

competitors, all of whom returned the same answer. Next day, John Baliol and his brother-in-law, John Comyn, Lord of Badenoch, the two remaining competitors, appeared and solemnly acknowledged the superiority of the English king. The selfish pusillanimity which the Scottish nobility thus exhibited, produced its usual result of increased arrogance. No sooner had this disgraceful scene terminated, than the chancellor protested, in the name of his master, that, although he consented to act now as Lord Paramount, he did not resign his right of property in the kingdom of Scotlands, acclaim able hereafter in fit manner and time convenient.[1] After this insulting declaration, the whole of the claimants affixed their signatures to two important instruments. The first declared that, "Forasmuch as the King of England has evidently shown to us that the sovereign seignory of Scotland, and the right of determining our respective pretensions, belong to him, we therefore agree to receive judgment from him as Lord Paramount, and we become bound to submit to his award."* By the second deed, possession of the whole land and castle of Scotland we delivered into the hands of Edward, under the pretence that a judgment cannot be without execution, nor expression without possession of the subject of award,"[2] but on condition that Edward should find security for the faithful restitution of his charge, within two

months after the date of his award. It was finally agreed, that a body of one hundred and four commissioners should be appointed, in order to prepare the point in dispute of an ultimate decision, and to report to the king, - forty being named bu Balliol, for himself and the competitors who approved of his fist, - forty by Bruce, and the competitors who agreed with his nomination, and the remainder by Edward himself, who, moreover, was empowered to add to the number if he thought fit.

On the 11th of June 1291, the four regents of Scotland made a solemn surrender of the kingdom into the hands of Edward, and the governors of its castles also gave up its fortresses to his disposal. The conduct of one of the Scottish nobles in this hour of trial is worthy of notice, presenting, as it did, a noble contrast to the base and selfish spirit which his brother barons displayed. Gilbert de Umfraville, the Earl of Angus, who commanded the important fortress of Dundee and Forfar, declared, that having received these in charge from the Scottish nation, he would not surrender them to the King of England, without an obligation to indemnify him, from Edward and all the competitors. To remove his objections, a letter of indemnity was drawn up, and signed by the claimants of the crown and the guardians of the realm; and in their name he was enjoined to deliver up the fortresses of which he held the keys. The scruples of Umfraville being thus removed, he yielded obedience to the injunction, and placed Dundee and Forfar in the hands of the English king.[3] The custody of the kingdom was immediately redelivered to the regents by Edward, who was probably satisfied, in the meantime, by his acknowledgment of his claims and compliance with his demands; but he enjoyed the regents to appoint

[1] Rym. Foed. vol. ii. p. 551. [2] Ibid. p. 553; Hailes, vol. i. p. 249. [3] Hailes, vol. i. p. 250, 251.

Allan Bishop of Caithness, an Englishman, to the important office of Chancellor; and he nominated Walter of Agmondesham, another agent of England, as his associate in office. A few days after, he appointed Bryan Fitzallan, an English baron, to be jointed in commission with the Scottish regents, and by these steps secured an effectual influence over the government of the country. The great seal of Scotland was then delivered to the joint chancellors, the Bishop of Caithness and Walter Agmondesham. At the same time, Robert Bruce, and his son John Baliol, and regents, and man of the principal Scottish barons, swore fealty to the King of England. One ecclesiastic only, the Bishop of Sodor, presented himself to perform the disgraceful ceremony. The peace of the king, as Lord Paramount of Scotland, was then proclaimed, and the assembly finally adjourned to the 3rd of August.[1] The interval was employed by Edward in making a progress through Scotland; in the course of which he visited Edinburgh , Kinghorn, St Andrews, Dunfermline, Linlithgow, Stirling and Perth. All classes of persons, - bishops, earls, barons, and burgesses, - were required by him to sign the rolls of homage as his vassals. Whoever refused to take the oath of allegiance, was ordered to be punished buy imprisonment.[2]

When the commissioners assembled at Berwick, on the 3rd of August, to reeive the claims to the crown, twelve competitors presented themselves. These were -

1. John de Baliol, who claimed the crown as the grandson of Margaret, the eldest daughter of David, Earl of Huntingdon, brother to King William the Lion.
11. Robert de Bruce, who was the son of Isabel, second daughter of David Earl of Huntingdon.
III. John de Hastings, who was the son of Ada, the third daughter of David, Earl of Huntingdon.
IV. John Comyn, Lord of Badenoch, who claimed as the great-grandson of Donald Bane, formerly King of Scotland.
V. Florence, Earl of Holland, descended from Ada, the sister of King William the Lion.
VI. Patrick Dunbar, Earl of March, descended from Ilda, or Ada, daughter of William the Lion.
VII. William de Vesci, who claimed as grandson of Marjory, daughter of William the Lion.
VIII. William de Ross, descended from Isabella, daughter of William the Lion.
IX. Robert de Pynkeney, descended from Marjory, daughter of Henry Prince of Scotland and sister of William the Lion.
X. Nicolas de Soulis, descended from Marjory, a daughter of Alexander II, and wife of Allan Durward.
XI. Patrick Galythly claimed as the son of Henry Galythly, who he contends, was the lawful son of William the Lion.
XII. Roger de Mandeville, descended from Aufrica, whom he affirmed, to be a daughter of William the Lion.

[1] Rym. Foed. vol. ii. p. 573. [2] Ibid. p. 252.

To these twelve competitors a thirteenth was soon afterwards added, in the person of Eric King of Norway, who claimed the crown as the heir of his daughter Margaret.[1]

The pretensions of nine of these claimants ere obviously inadmissible, and they indeed voluntarily withdrew their claims before the final decision was pronounced. There is every reason to believe, that most of them had been induced to enter the lists by the secret intrigues of the English king, for he purpose of neutralizing their opposition to his schemes, and of rendering the election more complicated. And having served this end, their claims were at once put aside.

The final decision of the cause was postponed till the following year (1292) apparently to give the commissioners full time to make the necessary investigations, but really with the view of accustoming the people of Scotland to regard the English monarch as their Lord Paramount. On the 2nd of June, the commissioners made a report to Edward, who commanded them to consider, in the first place, the claims of Bruce and Baliol, - thus virtually deterring tht the crown must be awarded to the descendants of David, Ear of Huntingdon.

After some preliminary deliberations, which were nothing more than a premeditated piece of acting planned by the English king, the commissioners reported that there appeared to be a difference of opinion among the Scottish members of their nobody, by whose advice if unanimous it would have been the duty of the king to have regulated his conduct; and they therefore declined to give any advice, without having to better judgement of the prelates, nobility and other wise men of England. On this the further consideration of the question was appointed by Edward to take place in a parliament, to be held at Berwick, on the 15th of October. He declared that, in the meantime, he would consult the learned in foreign parts;[2] and recommend all persons present, of both kingdoms, to study the case and consider what ought to be done.

When the parliament met at Berwick on the day appointed, Edward requested the commissioners to give an answer to the following question:- "1st. By what laws and usages ought judgement to be given? 2nd. If there are either no laws by which the case may be determined, or if the laws by which land and Scotland should be at variance, how ought judgement to be given? And 3rd. Ought the succession to the crown of Scotland to be regulated by the same principles which were applicable to earldoms and barons?" The commissioners replied, that the decision must be given according to the laws and usages of the two kingdoms; but if none existed applicable to the present case, the king might and should make a new law; and that the succession to the crown of Scotland must be decided in the same manner as the succession to earldoms, baronies, and other indivisible inheritances.[3]

[1] Hailes, vol. i. pp. 255-258; Rymer, vol. ii. p. 576-578.

[2] Fordun avers, tht long before this time Edward had consulted foreign lawyers. The case is imperfectly put, says Lord Hailes, and the opinions are irreconcilably different. - Annals, vol. I p. 260. 3. Hailes, vol. I p. 260

After these preliminaries, Bruce and Balliol were heard at great length in support of their respective claims. Bruce pleaded, tht his right to the crown had been recognised by the States of the realm in the reign of Alexander the Second; [1] that Alexander, toward the close of his life, and without the prospect of having heirs of his own body, had summoned the bishops, earls ad barns of the land, and demanded of them which of the issue of the daughters of his uncle David, Earl of Huntingdon, had the preferable claim to the succession; that they, being there assembled, decerned and adjudged according to their own laws, the imperial laws, and others, tht the son of the second daughter should inherit prior to th daughter of the firstborn and al the clergy, as well as laity, unanimously and cordially showed the same as a true judgement to the king; that Alexander, then taking the Lord of Annandale by the hand, presented him as his true and lawful heir, to all the nobles and magnates, clergy as well laity, as his lawful heir to the kingdom of Scotland; and that the whole of them, by the king's command and in his presence took the oath of fealty to Bruce, upon the holy gospels; tht Alexander the Third gave his friends to understand that, failing issue of his own body, Bruce was his right heir; and that an

oath had been taken to maintain the succession f the nearest in blood to that monarch, - failing the Maid of Norway and her issue. Bruce farther insisted, that the succession to a throne ought to be decided by the law of nature, rather than by the laws and usages in force between subject and subject, by which law he, as the nearest collateral in blood had the strongest claim; that his title was supported by the custom of succession to the Scottish crown, by which the brother, as nearest in degree, was preferred to the son of the deceased king; that a woman, being incapable of governing, ought not to reign; and therefore, as Devorguil, the mother of Baliol, was alive at the death of Alexander the Third, and could not reign, the kingdom devolved upon him as the nearest male of the blood royal.

The reply of Baliol t the first and most powerful part of Bruce's pleading, was weak and evasive. He cotended himself with, merely affirmng, tht no conclusion cold be drawn from the acknowledgemnt of Alexander and Second, as he left heirs of his own bodly; and he passed over, without notice, the sttement respecting the declaration of Alexandesr the Third, and the oath teke byteh scottish people to maintain the succession of the next in blood to that monarch. To the other arguments adduced by Bruce in support of his claim, Baliol answered, tht the claimants were in the court of their Lore Paramount, who must give judgmentg in this case, as in the case of other tenements held of the crdown,

[1]. The documents connected with this important fact were first published y the Record Commission in 1837. The parliamentary settlement of the succession, it has been justly said, places the right of the family of Bruce to the crown on a firmer basis than that of conquest, and is an important, and it may be added, a novel feature in that important litigation. North British Review vol. iii. p. 364; Palgrave's Documents and Records, illustrating the History of Scotland p. 23.

[3] Hemingford, p. 33.